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ABSTRACT: Even if the title of Wolfgang Koeppen’s last novel, *Der Tod in Rom*, alludes quite obviously to Thomas Mann’s novella, *Der Tod in Venedig*, Koeppen’s text must be understood first and foremost as a response to Mann’s most controversial novel, *Doktor Faustus*. The novels of Mann and Koeppen rank among the most well-known literary examinations of National Socialism but stand in a complementary relation to each other. *Doktor Faustus*, published in 1947, analyzes the cultural and intellectual origins of German fascism, while *Der Tod in Rom*, published only seven years later in 1954, criticizes the continuity of National Socialist ideologies in postwar Germany. Both authors focus their analyses of fascism on a fictional avant-garde composer who seems at first glance detached from any political context. *Doktor Faustus* is the fictional biography of the composer Adrian Leverkühn, written by his friend Serenus Zeitblom in the last years of the Second World War. Leverkühn agrees to a pact with the devil, symbolically confirmed by the composer’s syphilitic infection; through this pact, Leverkühn tries to overcome the crisis of modern music. The conception of the novel is based, as the author himself has emphasized, on ‘die Parallelisierung verderblicher, in den Collaps mündender Euphorie mit dem fascistischen Völkerrausch’. By contrast, Siegfried Pfaffrath, the fictive composer of Koeppen’s novel, understands his avant-garde compositions as a form of resistance against the reactionary climate [...]
Even if the title of Wolfgang Koeppen’s last novel, *Der Tod in Rom*, alludes quite obviously to Thomas Mann’s novella, *Der Tod in Venedig*, Koeppen’s text must be understood first and foremost as a response to Mann’s most controversial novel, *Doktor Faustus*. The novels of Mann and Koeppen rank among the most well-known literary examinations of National Socialism but stand in a complementary relation to each other. *Doktor Faustus*, published in 1947, analyses the cultural and intellectual origins of German fascism, while *Der Tod in Rom*, published only seven years later in 1954, criticizes the continuity of National Socialist ideologies in post-war Germany. Both authors focus their analyses of fascism on fictional avant-garde composers who seem at first glance detached from any political context. *Doktor Faustus* is the fictional biography of the composer Adrian Leverkühn, written by his friend Serenus Zeitblom in the last years of the Second World War. Leverkühn agrees to a pact with the devil, symbolically confirmed by the composer’s syphilitic infection; through this pact, Leverkühn tries to overcome the crisis of modern music. The conception of the novel is based, as the author himself has emphasized, on ‘die Parallelisierung verderblicher, in den Collaps mündender Euphorie mit dem fascistischen Völkerrausch’. By contrast, Siegfried Pfaffrath, the fictive composer of Koeppen’s novel, understands his avant-garde compositions as a form of resistance against the reactionary climate in the economically booming post-war Germany. These reactionary tendencies are embodied by Siegfried’s parents, who are trying, less than ten years after the end of the war, to repatriate their relative Gottlieb Judejahn, a former SS general and wanted war criminal. The actual starting point of my paper, however, is the fact that both novels are preceded by epigraphs taken from Dante’s *Inferno*. I will begin by commenting on the references to Dante in *Doktor Faustus* and then continue by analysing the allusions to the
Commedia in Koeppen’s novel, which constitute, as I will demonstrate, a complex constellation among the three texts.²

Very few of Thomas Mann’s narratives are preceded by epigraphs.³ Hence, it can be assumed that he had the symbolical and narrative structure of his novel in mind when he chose the evocation of the Muses at the beginning of Canto II of the Inferno (Inf. II, 1–9) as the epigraph for Doktor Faustus. Moreover, Mann was quite familiar with Dante’s epic, which he at least partially read when writing Doktor Faustus, as his diary of that time documents.⁴ In his novel Der Zauberberg, he had already alluded, through the figure of the Italian humanist Lodovico Settembrini, to several motifs from the Commedia.⁵ In the case of the later novel, a quite obvious association is provided by the motif of the descent into hell, which is common to the Commedia and to the traditional story of Faust:⁶

Lo giorno se n’andava e l’aer bruno
toglieva gli animai che sono in terra
dalle fatichè loro, ed io sol uno
m’apparechiava a sostener la guerra
sì del cammino e sì della pietate,
che ritrarrà la mente che non erra.
O Muse, o alto ingegno, or m’aiutate
o mente che scrivesti ciò ch’io vidi,
qui si parrà la tua nobilitate. (Inf. II, 1–9)

But is it really Mann who has placed the epigraph or must this not be attributed to the narrator Serenus Zeitblom? This question has been raised by Gérard Genette, who coined the term ‘paratext’ to refer to all texts that are not part of a main text, such as epigraphs, dedications, and forewords. Genette arrives at the conclusion that it seems more interesting to attribute the epigraph of Doktor Faustus to the narrator, Serenus Zeitblom, than to the author, Thomas Mann.⁷ Genette’s perspective can be reinforced by arguing that the epigraph fits perfectly within the intellectual horizon of the classical philologist Zeitblom, who (to the annoyance of some readers) misses few occasions to demonstrate his humanistic background. In addition, Zeitblom follows the pattern of the epigraph by evoking the Muses at a crucial point of the novel’s plot, when Leverkühn contracts syphilis and enters into a pact with the devil: ‘Mir ist, als sollte ich Apollon und die Musen anrufen, daß sie mir bei
der Mitteilung jenes Geschehnisses die lautersten, schonendsten Worte eingeben mögen.8

To me, however, it seems more convincing to locate the epigraph in a liminal space between the narrator Zeitblom and the author Mann, since it evokes certain characteristics that can be linked to the biographical situation of the latter. Like Dante, Thomas Mann was constrained to eat the salty ‘pane altrui’ (Par. XVII, 58): *Doktor Faustus* is a work of exile like the *Commedia*. Furthermore, Thomas Mann’s novel is a reckoning with Hitler and the intellectual and political climate of Munich, while the *Commedia* can be read as a harsh criticism of Pope Boniface VIII and Dante’s native town of Florence. Finally, it can be assumed that the author of *Lotte in Weimar* also had another poet in mind when choosing the motto for his adaptation of the Faust saga: Johann Wolfgang Goethe, whose tragedy *Faust II* is filled with allusions to the *Commedia*. The epigraph’s penultimate line, ‘o mente che scrivesti ciò ch’io vidi’ (Inf. II, 8), claims an authenticity of experience, but this should not lead us to an overhasty attribution of the line to Zeitblom, who can after all assert that he has witnessed the novel’s events. Mann has assigned many of his former aesthetic and political convictions to Zeitblom, and for this reason *Doktor Faustus* may be understood as a ‘radical autobiography’,9 which allows us, at least in a metaphorical sense, to attribute even this line to the author. The author, narrator, and protagonist of *Doktor Faustus* form a unity that can be compared to the relation between the historical Dante, the narrator of the *Commedia*, and the poetic protagonist Dante wandering across the realms of the nether world.

More references to the *Commedia* can be found in the main text of *Doktor Faustus*. At the beginning of his career as a composer, the former theologian Leverkühn sets several passages from the *Purgatorio* and *Paradiso* concerning the problem of divine grace to music. In taking inspiration from Dante, Leverkühn inserts himself in a tradition initiated by real composers like Liszt and Tchaikovsky; this pattern would be pursued after 1945 by Hans Werner Henze and Salvatore Sciarrino.10 Zeitblom is deeply impressed by ‘die bewegende musikalische Dichtung, die dem Purgatorio-Gleichnis von dem Manne verliehen war, der in der Nacht ein Licht auf seinem Rücken trägt, das ihm nicht leuchtet, aber hinter ihm den Weg der Kommenden erhellt’.11 By setting this passage – which, of course, is taken from the conversation between Virgil and the clandestine Christian Statius (Purg. XXII, 65–73) – to music, Leverkühn
illustrates his elitist self-image as an avant-garde composer: he precedes other composers as Virgil precedes Statius.

The novel’s most important reference to the Commedia is to be found in the famous conversation between Leverkühn and the devil, which is situated in the exact centre of the novel. This conversation takes place in the Italian village of Palestrina, near Rome, a location that has multiple symbolic meanings. As is characteristic of many of Mann’s later narratives, events of cultural-historical importance interfere with autobiographical experiences. In Palestrina, Mann started to write his first novel Die Buddenbrooks, and Leverkühn follows his author when he composes his first feature-length opus, an opera based on Shakespeare’s Love’s Labour’s Lost, in the same place. Furthermore, the village’s name refers to the Renaissance composer Palestrina as well as to the eponymous opera composed by Thomas Mann’s contemporary Hans Pfitzner. The world premiere of the opera Palestrina, which took place in 1917 at the Munich Hofoper, deeply impressed Thomas Mann, but in the years following the First World War the author fell out with the composer because of Pfitzner’s reactionary political convictions. In 1933, Pfitzner was among the initiators of the pamphlet Protest der Richard-Wagner-Stadt München, which used Thomas Mann’s lecture Leiden und Größe Richard Wagners as a false pretext for a denunciation of Mann’s politics. This event led Mann to leave Germany for his exile in France, Switzerland, and the United States. The claim that Mann establishes a subtle connection between the Commedia and Pfitzner’s opera also seems to be supported by the composer’s libretto. In his long monologue situated in the opera’s first act, the main character unmistakably paraphrases the famous lines ‘Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita l mi ritrovi per una selva oscura’ (Inf. I, 1–2) from the beginning of the Inferno’s first canto:

Wie schrecklich,
Sich plötzlich einsam tief im Wald zu finden
Wo in der Finsternis kein Ausweg ist.
So in der Mitte find’ ich mich des Lebens
Verstehe nicht, wie je ich schaffen konnte
Wie je ich mich erfreute, je ich liebe.13

Of course, these contexts are not referred to by Serenus Zeitblom, who composes the biography of Adrian Leverkühn and not of Thomas Mann; in fact, the erudite classical philologist writes: ‘Der Ort war Pal-
estrina, die Geburtsstätte des Komponisten, Praeneste mit ihrem antiken Namen und als Penestrino, Trutzburg der Fürsten Colonna, von Dante im 27. Gesang des Inferno erwähnt. This canto, dedicated to the eight malebolgia where the counsellors of fraud are punished, is dominated by the Ghibelline commander Guido da Montefeltro, who represents the modern counterpart of Ulysses in the preceding canto. Guido gives Dante and Virgil an account of his last years: he retired from military life to become a Franciscan, but was absolved by Dante’s worst enemy, Boniface VIII, in order to conquer Colonna’s stronghold for the pope. However, the absolution proves to be useless after Guido’s death, when a devil comes to snatch away the commander’s soul from Saint Francis, arguing in a scholastic manner: ‘Tu non pensavi ch’io loico fossi!’ (Inf. XXVII, 123). This narration possesses some analogies with Leverkühn’s development, making Zeitblom’s reference to Canto XXVII of the Inferno quite significant. Much as Guido leaves the Franciscans to become a commander once again, so Leverkühn shoves ‘die H. Schrift unter die Bank’: Mann’s protagonist abandons his theological studies to become a composer. Furthermore, both figures, in spite of their diabolical pacts, hope to attain divine grace. And although the devil, with whom Leverkühn converses in Palestrina, is not a scholar, he is after all a veritable philosopher, since he quotes complete passages from Adorno’s Philosophie der neuen Musik.

Finally, the novel leaves unanswered the question whether Leverkühn will be taken by the devil like Guido da Montefeltro or redeemed like Goethe’s Faust. The references to Dante favour the first view, while the allusions to Goethe suggest the second one. Thomas Mann wanted to discourage one-sided interpretations of his novel at any price, since he understood Doktor Faustus neither as a condemnation of nor as an apology for Germany.

After all, is the hell of Doktor Faustus only a purgatory? This question forms the starting point of Koeppen’s criticism of Mann, which the younger author articulated most clearly in a late essay published in 1980: ‘Der Tod in Venedig war eine Höllenfahrt. Thomas Mann liebte solche Reisen. Er wiederholte sie. Schließlich blieb es beim Fegefeuer. Der Dichter kam heil wieder heraus, feierte Auferstehung, geläutert, gestärkt, auf einer höheren Sprosse des Ruhms.’ By associating Mann with purgatory, where Dante had already relegated the majority of the artists appearing in the Commedia, Koeppen implicitly blames Mann for not taking a firm stand and for regarding history only from an
ironic distance. In criticizing Mann’s later works, Koeppen probably had in mind the narrative structure of *Doktor Faustus*. The interposition of a fictitious narrator allows Mann to make Serenus Zeitblom his mouthpiece while at the same time dissociating himself from the classical philologist’s conservative convictions. By taking recourse to Dantean imagery, Koeppen articulates a well-known topos which has been suggested by many of the Nobel-Prize winner’s critics: Mann’s irony emanates from an all-embracing relativism.

If we compare the passage quoted above with a statement Koeppen made about Louis-Ferdinand Céline’s novel, *D’un château l’autre*, his critical attitude towards Mann becomes even more evident. Interestingly, in Koeppen’s reluctant praise of Céline’s novel on the collapse of the Third Reich, which took place while the French author was at Sigmaringen, Dante’s decent into hell figures again as point of reference:

> Es tut mir leid, es sagen zu müssen: Ich kenne keine bessere, keine ein- 
dringlichere, keine wahrere Beschreibung des gewaltigen, von den Mitle-
benden gar nicht begriffenen und in der Not des Alltags menschlich-allzu-
menschlichen Zusammenbruchs. Wo Céline als Dichter spricht, ist er groß. 
[...] Er ist eine rührende Erscheinung, wenn er, seinen geliebten Hauskater 
auf dem Arm, wie Dante durch die Hölle schreitet [...].17

Although Koeppen does not call into question Mann’s performance as a key figure in German exile literature, and although he is obviously disgusted by Céline’s affinity for fascist ideology, he refuses to accept the political attitude of the two authors as a criterion when judging their literary works. According to Koeppen, the fascist writer Céline outmatches the committed anti-fascist Mann in the authenticity of the experiences described. However, one cannot entirely dismiss the suspicion that the rancour of a writer who remained in Germany during the Third Reich against the central representative of the German exile community leads to Koeppen’s criticism of Thomas Mann. It is striking that many characters in Koeppen’s post-war trilogy are exiles, a fact that might be ascribed to a latent desire for self-justification on the part of Koeppen, who for Thomas Mann belonged to the ‘Ofenhockern[]ber, denen] der Ofen zusammengebrochen [war]’;18 in this way Mann articulated his criticism of the so-called writers of ‘inner exile’.

In his novel *Der Tod in Rom*, published almost a quarter of a century before the essay, Koeppen formulated his criticism of Thomas Mann in a literary text. Here, too, Dante serves as the catalyst for
Koeppen’s criticism. By taking the epigraph for his novel from the *Commedia*, Koeppen establishes a complex constellation between the two modern novels and the medieval epic. The epigraph taken from Canto III of the *Inferno*, ‘il mal seme d’Adamo’ (*Inf.* III, 115), in the original a periphrasis for the doomed souls conducted by Charon over the river Acheron, indicates the line of attack: Koeppen judges Mann’s representation of evil to be inadequate, since the author of *Doktor Faustus* limits himself to analysing the cultural and intellectual origins of National Socialism and lets evil appear only in the symbolic character of the devil.

In comparison with *Doktor Faustus*, the references to the *Commedia* in *Der Tod in Rom* are less explicit but more intense. Apart from the paratextual epigraph, the name of the Italian poet and the title of his epic are never mentioned in the novel; nonetheless, the perambulations of Koeppen’s characters through Rome consistently evoke the topography of Dante’s *Inferno*. Just as in James Joyce’s *Ulysses* Dublin is superimposed onto the Mediterranean of Homer’s epic poem, Koeppen transforms Rome into Dante’s Inferno. The Italian capital seems to be less a cohesive setting than an assembly of historical, architectural, and literary fragments.¹⁹

In his dissertation on Wolfgang Koeppen, the writer Hans-Ulrich Treichel suggested that *Der Tod in Rom* narrates the story of a descent.²⁰ The characters of Koeppen’s novel are not only moving horizontally through Rome, but are also descending into an imaginary realm of the dead. Unlike Dante, the former SS general Gottlieb Judejahn is not impressed by the infernal horror glimpsed in the dungeon of Castel Sant’Angelo:

> Im untersten Kerker trat er gelassen an den Schacht im Fels, an das Grab des lebendigen Leibes. Kriege und Kerker, Gefangenschaft und Tod, immer hatte sie es gegeben, Petrus war am Marterkreuz gestorben, und seine Amtswalter hatten den Martertod ihren Feinden bestellt, so würde es bleiben, und so war es gut. Es war menschlich. Wer sprach von Unmenschlichkeit?²¹

And when the paedophile composer Siegfried Pfaffrath meets some boys on the bank of the river Tiber, Koeppen not only parodies Mann’s Venetian novel, but also evokes the *Commedia*, making his protagonist say: ‘[I]ch verfluchte mich, ich stieg zu den Toten hinab’.²²
The compilation of ancient, Christian, and modern examples in the *Commedia* corresponds to the overlapping of different temporal levels in Koeppen’s novel. The characters are distinguished by their different ways of perceiving Rome: the conductor Kürenberg admires ancient Rome, the deacon Gottlieb Judejahn visits the sanctuaries of Catholic Rome, and the composer Siegfried Pfaffrath is drawn to the vivacity of the modern capital. The characters’ heterogeneous perceptions of Rome are described using allusions to the *Commedia*. The deacon Gottlieb Judejahn sees in the splendour of the Vatican ‘ein spätes Siegesmal Simons des Zauberers’ – the mythological character whom Dante had chastised at the beginning of the nineteenth canto of the *Inferno* (see *Inf.* XIX, 1–12). The temporal structure of *Der Tod in Rom* has clear analogies to the *Commedia*: the two and a half days of the novel's action correspond exactly to the duration of Virgil and Dante’s per- egrination through the Inferno. Analogously to the *Commedia*, the tem- poral framework of Koeppen’s novel is extended considerably by several flashbacks to the years of the Third Reich. Only the beautiful waitress at the bar where a great deal of the novel’s action takes place does not accord with these allusions: her name is not Beatrice but Laura.

However, the central point for Koeppen is the literary representation of evil. Unlike *Doktor Faustus*, *Der Tod in Rom* does not feature intellectual masterminds of fascism. Instead, with the mass murderer Gottlieb Judejahn, Koeppen presents a deeply anti-intellectual offender. In contrast to Thomas Mann, Koeppen saw the origins of fascism arising in criminal natures like Judejahn rather than in a cultural disaster. While the debates reported by Serenus Zeitblom are concerned largely with the aesthetics of music, Koeppen’s novel can be read as a descent into ‘das stinkende blutige Labor der Geschichte’. It is in this context that the former SS general Judejahn, who escaped his sentence at Nuremberg by finding a shelter as military supervisor in an unnamed Arab state, takes centre stage. For Judejahn, ideologies such as Aryan domination are less important than the sheer execution of power and violence, which gives him satisfaction. It is difficult to decide what he relishes more: sleeping with Laura or shooting the Jewish wife of the conductor Kürenberg. The Arabian desert is as appropriate for his murderous activities as the German forest. Dreaming of an ‘Epoche ohne Goethe’, he is full of disdain for ‘Bildungsbürgers’ like his brother-in-
law – whose meaningful name, Friedrich Wilhelm Pfaffrath, evokes the German Empire before World War I.

Significantly, Gottlieb Judejahn’s first appearance already evokes motifs taken from Dante’s *Inferno*. The narrator addresses Judejahn as a ‘Minister der Hölle’\(^2\) and compares him to Ulysses;\(^2\) when reading this passage, one should recall the Ulysses of the *malebolgia* of the fraudulent counsellors rather than the hero of Homer’s epic, since Judejahn returns neither to his wife, Eva, nor to his native country, Germany. In an exact inversion of the *Commedia*, he is not a living soul descending into the netherworld, but an allegory of death walking through the Rome of the mid-1950s: ‘Er kam aus dem Totenreich, Aasgeruch umwehte ihn, er selber war ein Tod, ein brutaler, ein gemeiner, ein plumper und einfallsloser Tod.’\(^2\)

The formulation ‘er selber war ein Tod’, which refers to the novel’s title, suggests the aspect I would like to stress in my analysis of the constellation of these three texts. While Koeppen’s characters may be understood as unambiguous allegories – Judejahn actually personifies evil, violence, and death – Thomas Mann’s representation of evil achieves the complexity of a symbol. Mann’s self-commentaries show that he adhered to Goethe’s distinction between allegory and symbol, which devalues the clarity of allegory.\(^2\) After the novel’s publication, Mann complained, in a letter to his daughter Erika, that ‘alle die d-e-u-t-s-c-h-e Allegorie so fürchterlich hervorheben’.\(^3\) Several months later, he noted in his diary: ‘Morgens mit K. über die Starrheit der kritischen Annäherung an den Roman. Seine Symbolik spielt in mehreren Farben.’\(^3\)

The novel’s complexity emerges very clearly in Leverkühn’s conversation with the devil, where the devil appears in three different disguises as a ‘Zuhälter, Musikgelehrter und nackte Dämon’.\(^3\) Mann had seen the danger of ‘den Deutschen mit ihrer “Dämonie” zu schmeicheln’;\(^3\) this apprehension does not seem to be wholly inappropriate given the fact that the devil not only foreshadows the terror of the fascist regime but also quotes complete passages from Adorno’s *Philosophie der neuen Musik*.

By contrast, Koeppen employs forms of allegorical representation which have been rehabilitated in modernity by Charles Baudelaire and Walter Benjamin. Koeppen’s characters may be understood as allegories of political mentalities: Friedrich Wilhelm Pfaffrath represents the involvement of the national-conservative bourgeoisie in National Socialism, and his son Dietrich, deformed to the level of a caricature,
embraces the opportunism of the first post-war generation. In particular, the monstrous inhumanity of the mass murderer Gottlieb Judejahn explodes the constraints of symbolic representation, thus becoming an allegory of fascism.34 Introduced as a ‘Minister der Hölle’,35 the former SS general is demonized, but at the same time trivialized, since he murders only for his own satisfaction, without pursuing any political or ideological aim, apart from cherishing a primitive ‘Führerkult’. He thus resembles the primitive devils modelled after the medieval soldiers who guard the corrupt politicians suffering in the boiling tar of the fifth malebolgia (cf. Inf. XX and XXI). Being commander and subordinate, tormentor and tormented at the same time, Judejahn dies at the end of the novel, much as two devils fall into the boiling tar, to the delight of Dante and Virgil. The fact that Death finally himself dies is the only glimpse of hope provided by Koeppen’s historical pessimism, which was based on his expectation of the nuclear inferno of a third world war.
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