

LION FEUCHTWANGER'S ERFOLG: FILM AND THE NOVEL

LION FEUCHTWANGER'S ERFOLG:  
FILM TECHNIQUE AND THE MODERN HISTORICAL NOVEL

By

IRENE CHRISTINE MARKUS, BA Honours, LLB

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

© Irene Christine Markus, June 1994

MASTER OF ARTS (1994)  
(German)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY  
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Lion Feuchtwanger's Erfolg: Film Technique and the Modern Historical  
Novel

AUTHOR: Irene Christine Markus, BA Hons. (University of Western Ontario)  
LLB (University of Western Ontario)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Gerald Chapple

NUMBER OF PAGES: viii, 101

## ABSTRACT

Feuchtwanger felt that due to such technological advances as film, the twentieth-century reader demanded something different from the novel, and he believed that this new film audience would eventually look at verbal texts from a different perspective. Through film techniques he hoped to meet this demand and provide what he felt was a much-needed "Erneuerung" of the novel. He sought to employ these cinematic methods in an attempt to liberate the narrative form from what he perceived to be its limitations. His ultimate goal was to stimulate the reader's social understanding and commitment through his/her emotions. To this end he experimented in a limited but revealing way with film techniques derived from Sergei Eisenstein's theory of dialectical montage. Surprisingly, the significance of Feuchtwanger's use of this type of montage and its implications for Erfolg and the novel in general has not yet been thoroughly investigated or illuminated in the current secondary literature available.

This thesis aims at providing an analysis of Feuchtwanger's theoretical considerations regarding the "modernisation" of the historical novel via film techniques in his 1930 novel, Erfolg: Drei Jahre Geschichte einer Provinz. I address Feuchtwanger's intentions concerning the employment of film techniques in the novel, as set out in his theoretical writings, and have



dealt with his artistic use of Eisensteinian montage. I also examine Feuchtwanger's use of a less "filmic" type of montage, along with the techniques of simultaneity and changing point of view, techniques he hoped would render his novel more "filmic."

One of Feuchtwanger's main requirements for the historical novel is the didactic element. The film techniques he employed have specific implications for his theory of the historical novel, and it is through the application of techniques derived from Eisenstein's theory of dialectical montage that he is able to create didactic art in his historical novel.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Jerry Chapple, for his help in the creation of this work, along with my committee members, Dr. Jean Wilson and Dr. Hans Schulte, for their helpful suggestions. Thanks also to Dr. Fritz and Rosemarie Widmaier, who are ultimately responsible for my undertaking of this project. And special thanks to Mike Lutz for his never-ending patience and support throughout the entire process.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Abbreviations</b>		viii
<b>I. Introduction</b>		1
i) Who Is Lion Feuchtwanger and Where Is He Now?		1
ii) Lion Feuchtwanger's Novel <u>Erfolg</u>		3
iii) Feuchtwanger and the Twentieth-Century Historical Novel		9
iv) Thesis Statement		12
<b>II. Feuchtwanger and Eisenstein: <u>Erfolg</u> and <u>Battleship Potemkin</u></b>		15
A. Revitalizing the Historical Novel		15
i) Introduction		15
ii) Recent Research		22
B. Film: Feuchtwanger Meets Eisenstein		28
i) The German Reception of <u>Battleship Potemkin</u>		28
ii) Eisenstein's Theory of Dialectical Montage		32
iii) Feuchtwanger's Interpretation of Eisensteinian Montage in <u>Erfolg</u>		37
C. Film into Novel: Montage, Simultaneity and Changing Point of View		41
i) Eisensteinian Montage in the "Orlow" Chapter		41
ii) Klenk's Role in the Didactic Purpose of "Panzerkreuzer Orlow" and Eisensteinian Montage		50
iii) "Generic" Montage in <u>Erfolg</u>		60
iv) Film Techniques: Simultaneity and Changing Point of View in <u>Erfolg</u>		68

<b>III. Conclusion</b> .....	79
i) Feuchtwanger's New Historical Novel and Film Techniques .....	79
ii) The Genre Question in <u>Erfolg</u> .....	89
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	95

## ABBREVIATIONS

The following is a list of frequently used abbreviations for primary and secondary references in the text. Full references can be found in the bibliography.

CPI	Sergei Eisenstein, "The Cinematographic Principle and the Ideogram."
DAFF	Eisenstein, "A Dialectic Approach to Film Form."
<u>Desdemona</u>	Lion Feuchtwanger, <u>Das Haus der Desdemona</u> .
LGA	Wolfgang Müller-Funk, <u>Literatur als geschichtliches Argument</u>
M&C	Eisenstein, "Montage and Conflict."
MRE	Feuchtwanger, "Mein Roman <u>Erfolg</u> (1931)."
P&E	Feuchtwanger, "Der Film <u>Potemkin</u> und mein Buch <u>Erfolg</u> ."
RHI	Feuchtwanger, "Der Roman von heute ist international."
WE	Synnöve Clason, <u>Die Welt erklären</u> .

## I. INTRODUCTION

### i) Who Is Lion Feuchtwanger and Where Is He Now?

Who is Lion Feuchtwanger? In the course of my research on Feuchtwanger's work I have been asked this question countless times by people also involved in studying German literature. Others, familiar with the author, merely ask "Why study Feuchtwanger?" Unfortunately, the works and accomplishments of this prolific writer have been long forgotten, and the majority of his novels are available only through the former East German Aufbau Verlag as part of Feuchtwanger's collected works. His novels formed an important part of the school curriculum in the former East Germany, where they were considered modern-day classics, probably due partly to Feuchtwanger's own Marxist tendencies and his one-time admiration of the Soviet Union, but also because "die moderne Literatur (Proust, Kafka, Joyce, Camus oder Grass) dort nicht rezeptionsfähig war" (Dietschreit XV); hence the label "Ersatzklassiker" (Dietschreit XV).

Feuchtwanger was born in Munich in 1884 and died in California in 1958. He enjoyed a very lucrative career in writing in Germany as well as abroad, and his novels were translated into more than twenty languages (von

Sternburg 28). His reputation in Germany, however, quickly faded after his death, and many of his works were forgotten or simply ignored. Even during his lifetime many of his contemporaries held him to be a second-rate writer. For example, Marcel Reich-Ranicki, in his mostly insulting essay "Lion Feuchtwanger oder Der Weltruhm des Emigranten,"<sup>1</sup> refers to Feuchtwanger as "ein typischer Publikumsschriftsteller" (443). He goes on to cite Kurt Tucholsky who said of Feuchtwanger: "Ich halte den Mann für sinnlos überschätzt. Das ist genug für Engländer" (444). He quotes Thomas Mann who, upon being approached to write an excerpt for the Aufbau Verlag's tribute to Feuchtwanger on his 70th birthday (1954), is said to have been at a loss for any good words concerning Feuchtwanger's work and so instead stated the following: "Besonders gern höre ich ihn über sich selber sprechen, seine persönlichen Angelegenheiten, seine Verlags-und Übersetzungsprobleme, seine weiträumigen Erfolge,--und wirklich, er spricht häufig und ausführlich davon" (Reich-Ranicki 444). Reich-Ranicki saw as a major weakness the fact that Feuchtwanger in effect made his work too accessible to a wide audience: "Denn Feuchtwanger gehört zu jenen Erzählern, die alles, was sie zu sagen haben, direkt aussprechen, und das nicht nur einmal: In seinen Büchern wird

---

<sup>1</sup> Reich-Ranicki does have some positive words to say about Feuchtwanger and specifically about Erfolg; however, the tone of the essay is definitely negative, and it is difficult to accept his praise of Feuchtwanger in view of all of the insults directed at him (see page 80 below).

alles genauestens ausgeführt, nichts ausgespart, nichts angedeutet. Er macht es dem Publikum sehr leicht, wohl allzu leicht" (446).

Such attitudes are unfortunately far-reaching. In the preface to the American edition of Georg Lukács' The Historical Novel, Irving Howe writes of Lukács' inclusion of Feuchtwanger in his work that "[t]here is the standard praise for Maxim Gorky as "the greatest writer of our time," and an apparent readiness to take seriously such third-rate "progressive" writers as Lion Feuchtwanger" (9). With all due respect to the writers of these comments, it appears that such condemnations are often biased by the fact that Feuchtwanger's works are indeed accessible to a wide audience--that he entertains through his writing. Unfortunately, many cannot see past this entertainment factor and denounce his work because it does not belong to a realm of literature consisting of esoteric art that serves an exclusive group of individuals. But his art is more than mere entertainment, and it is perhaps time for us to take another look at Feuchtwanger and to reassess his work.

ii) Lion Feuchtwanger's Novel "Erfolg"

Lion Feuchtwanger's novel Erfolg: Drei Jahre Geschichte einer Provinz is part of his Wartesaal-Trilogy: Erfolg (1930), Die Geschwister



Oppermann (1933) and Exil (1939). He explains in his epilogue to Exil the content and the purpose of the trilogy:

Inhalt des Roman-Zyklus sind die Geschehnisse in Deutschland zwischen den Kriegen von 1914 und 1939, das heißt, der Wiedereinbruch der Barbarei in Deutschland und ihr zeitweiliger Sieg über die Vernunft. Zweck der Trilogie ist, diese schlimme Zeit des Wartens und des Übergangs, die dunkelste, welche Deutschland seit dem Drießigjährigen Krieg erlebt hat, für die Späteren lebendig zu machen. Denn es wird diesen Späteren unverständlich sein, wie wir ein solches Leben so lange ertragen konnten, sie werden nicht begreifen, warum wir so lange zuwarteten, ehe wir die einzig vernünftige Schlußfolgerung zogen, die nämlich, der Herrschaft der Gewalt und des Widersinns unsererseits mittels Gewalt ein Ende zu setzen und an ihrer Statt eine vernünftige Ordnung herzustellen.

(787)

While Feuchtwanger was writing Erfolg--1927-1930--he was in a self-imposed internal exile. A native of Munich, he was forced by growing anti-Semitic sentiments in Bavaria to flee to Berlin. The novel deals with those events which occurred in Germany--more specifically in Munich--between the years 1921-1924. Erfolg, the first anti-fascist novel to emerge in Germany (Berndt 131), deals with the first phase of Hitler's rise to power and chronicles what Feuchtwanger saw at the time as the near rise and certain fall of Hitler and the threat of Nazism. The novel consists of five books with a total of 124 chapters and includes three distinct plot lines: the case of Dr. Martin Krüger, Johanna Krain's campaign for Krüger's freedom, and Rupert Kutzner's rise to political power.

Dr. Martin Krüger is an art historian and the former director of the National Gallery. He is found guilty of perjury as a result of his testimony at a previous trial. This charge of perjury results from his denial of having had sexual relations with the accused, Anna Elisabeth Haider, an artist who later committed suicide. The real motivation behind the charges against him is his progressive taste in the works of art which he has recently obtained for the gallery. He is found guilty as charged and sentenced to prison after a trial which, due to the political corruption of the legal system, results in a travesty of justice. Krüger serves twenty-two months of a three-year sentence before he dies in jail.

Johanna Krain is a young Bavarian woman. She is the former partner of Krüger and testifies on his behalf at his trial. She lies when she provides Krüger with an alibi by telling the court that he was with her on the night in question. Her testimony does not help Krüger's case. After his conviction, Krain becomes his advocate and attempts to make connections with individuals who have the power and influence to help free Krüger. Johanna spends twenty-two months making contacts with such individuals, but to no avail. During this time she falls in love with the writer Jacques Tüverlin. Together, the two are able to "rehabilitate" Krüger by making known to the world the inequities perpetrated against him by the Bavarian justice system. They accomplish this through art: Krain writes and directs a film about Krüger's

case, "Ich hab's gesehen," and Tüverlin writes a book about it, "Jahrmarkt der Gerechtigkeit."

Acting as a backdrop to the above two plot lines is Rupert Kutzner's (read Hitler's) rise to power. Kutzner and his party gain momentum and force within the context of a failing economy. To allow Feuchtwanger to sum up in his own words the conditions in Bavaria which made the state so accessible for Kutzner and his party:

Das Land Bayern ist der eigentliche Held meines Romans. Hier liegt ein Konflikt: Bayern ist die Agrarprovinz eines großen Industriestaates, Gegensätze ergeben sich zwischen Stadt und Land. Auf Grund vollkommen logischer ökonomischer Gesetze, durch die Entwicklung des modernen Transportwesens und der Weltmärkte sehen sich die Bauern dem Wettbewerb mit Lieferanten aus Südafrika oder Amerika ausgesetzt. Sie sind dem Staat nicht mehr so notwendig wie ehemals. Dadurch wird ihr Unwille erweckt, der um so größer ist, als sich die Stadt noch immer des Wohlstandes zu erfreuen scheint. Sie verbünden sich gegen die Stadt, so wie die österreichischen Bauern gegen Wien. Sachlichkeit wird den gemütlichen, unsachlichen Bayern aufgezwungen. Sie werden immer konservativer, Anhänger des Zollschatzes, Nationalisten im Augenblick, wo sie erkennen, daß die Zölle imstande sind, die Konkurrenz auszuschalten. Hinter ihrer reaktionären Politik stehen ebenso wirtschaftliche Erwägungen wie hinter der Revolution der Stadt.

(MRE 388)

Feuchtwanger concludes with the following precis of his own novel: "Auf dieser Neuordnung der Dinge baue ich meine Geschichte auf: Eine Frau liebt einen Mann. Sie kämpft um den Mann, den sie liebt. Er wird aus politischen

Gründen zu einer Kerkerstrafe verurteilt--die Geschichte spielt in München im Jahre 1922--obwohl er unschuldig ist" (MRE 388).

The reception of Erfolg between 1930 and 1931 was, in all of the countries in which it appeared, mostly positive (Wessler 115). Judith Wessler argues that the German reviewers who praised Feuchtwanger's novel felt that he had "very accurately depicted the political and economic conditions of Munich during the years of 1921 to 1923 [sic]," and that the book was seen as a witty satire of Bavaria and Munich. Still others who viewed it positively saw it as a portrayal of the corruption and disintegration of the Bavarian justice system (Wessler 115).

The following is an example of one of the many positive reviews of Erfolg, as paraphrased by Wessler in her book Lion Feuchtwanger's "Erfolg:" A "Großstadt" Novel:

Arnold Zweig, in his review entitled "Roman einer Provinz. Lion Feuchtwanger: Erfolg," for the Berliner Tageblatt of 12 September 1930, states that the novel is one of the most artfully constructed narratives of recent German literature. . . . Zweig praises the novel as a masterpiece of creative composition. However, he maintains that, from the 120 courses of life which make up the novel, perhaps a dozen could have been left out. (119)

The negative German reviews of the time tended to overlook Feuchtwanger's inherent love for Bavaria and Munich, and saw Erfolg as an attack on Bavaria. They felt that the novel was a polemic against the state and

was ultimately a vengeful attempt at political propaganda (Wessler 117).

Wessler goes on to summarize a negative review written by a Dr. Ludwig

Wassermann of Munich, for the Jüdisch-liberale Zeitung:

Wassermann states that by virtue of the fact that Feuchtwanger has combined political criticism with his novel Erfolg he must allow himself to also be reviewed politically. Feuchtwanger has apparently obtained his historical knowledge from biased newspaper reports, and he acts as if he is really informed about the political relationships he is writing about. Wassermann maintains that Feuchtwanger's portrayal of Bavaria, its population, and its state functionaries uses individual actions as actions of all Bavarians. It is a monstrous generalization. Bavarian justice cannot be generally characterized in such a way. (129)

The articles which Wessler discusses indicate that most of the negative reviews are ones which see the novel as a personal insult to Bavaria or attack upon it. Feuchtwanger is accused of having allowed subjective feelings to rule in his writing and it is said that the outcome clearly showed this. The positive reviews, on the other hand, tend to discuss issues of considerably less emotional value; they view Erfolg as a well-crafted work of art dealing with important concerns. Americans in particular reacted very positively to the novel. Wessler argues that "the reception in America is overwhelmingly positive, because Americans do not see themselves, their own politics, and their own country as the object of attack" (118). For example, in a review for Forum, Virgilia Peterson Ross describes the novel as follows: "He unearths

closet skeletons, pesky pains, and deep-seated dreams in tavern, home and institution. He digs in a hundred bosoms for the precise grain of desire which determines these hundred personalities" (Wessler 139).

It can be seen from the reviews, both positive and negative, that Erfolg received much attention at the time of its initial appearance on the market. It was first published by the Kiepenheuer Verlag as a two-volume work, and the first printing was comprised of 18,000 copies. Initially, the publisher had difficulties selling the copies from the first printing because many bookstores, especially ones in Bavaria, boycotted Erfolg because of its political content (von Sternburg 35). Despite these setbacks, sales of the novel picked up, and shortly after its debut in Germany it appeared simultaneously in Sweden, England and the United States (WE 19). Feuchtwanger may be forgotten by many today, but he had an immense readership in his day.

### iii) Feuchtwanger and the Twentieth-Century Historical Novel

A concern which preoccupied Feuchtwanger for much of his career was his belief that there was a need for a new type of novel for the twentieth century; he was specifically intrigued by the historical novel. He was trained as an historian and received his PhD in history at the University of Munich in 1907, but he gave up an academic career in favour of pursuing a career in writing.

As Lothar Kahn states in his biography on Feuchtwanger, he "seriously entertained the notion of a university career. But fear of the discipline it entailed--the preparation of lectures for the same hours every week--ultimately discouraged him" (Kahn 39-40), and although he gave up an academic career, he did not abandon his love for history.

Feuchtwanger had stopped writing dramas by the time he wrote Erfolg. He had written his dramas in the early part of his career, and later rejected those "romantic" tendencies which formed the underlying aesthetic of his early works.<sup>2</sup> He felt that the novel remained a potent genre, very much alive, and very useful for the expression of the modern writer's concerns. But it was through the sub-genre of the historical novel that he felt he could best achieve his later goals of portraying history as a type of mirror of the problems of his time.

The following thesis will examine Feuchtwanger's Erfolg as an example of this new type of historical novel. His ideas on this subject are illustrated in his writings about the novel in general, as well as the historical novel specifically. Portions of these theories were written in the form of essays and articles between 1931 and 1948. The essays of this period, which can be found in various journals and compiled works, are: "Historischer Roman--

---

<sup>2</sup> In his own bibliography of published works, he actually left out these early works of his "adolescence" (Kahn 40).

Roman von heute!" (1931), "Der Roman von heute ist international" (1932), "Vom Sinn und Unsinn des historischen Romans" (1935), and "Notes on the Historical Novel" (1948). His major work, Das Haus der Desdemona, oder Größe und Grenzen der historischen Dichtung, 1961, was Feuchtwanger's life's work and remains a fragment, since he died in 1958 while still in the process of writing it. Desdemona was to be an amalgamation of Feuchtwanger's earlier theories of the historical novel. He referred to it as a major project which he had thought about for much of his career and for which he had for years compiled extensive notes and outlines before he actually began writing it in the last two years of his life (Desdemona, Afterword 221).

The result of Feuchtwanger's preoccupation with the historical novel was to be found with his first historical novel, Die häßliche Herzogin Margarete Maultasch, 1923 (Faulhaber 67). As I have stated, his first writings on the historical novel appeared in 1931, one year after the first publication of Erfolg, with Desdemona being his last written work. One must ask oneself whether Feuchtwanger's theoretical writings are a reflection of his own historical novels, or whether he had these theories in mind when writing these novels. For the purposes of this thesis, the importance does not lie in the chronological priority of his theories and Erfolg, but rather in the coexistence of these works.

Feuchtwanger attempted to formulate a historical novel which would break free from the negative connotations associated with the historical novel



as "Trivialliteratur" and would overcome the constraints of "Professorenromane." He felt that the twentieth-century reader, because of such technological advances as film, demanded something different from the post-World War I novel (RHI 423-24). This new film audience would eventually look at verbal texts from a different level of perception. To accommodate this new audience/readership Feuchtwanger applied filmic techniques to the novel to liberate the narrative structure from what he perceived to be its earlier limitations. These techniques enabled him to portray simultaneity of events, various viewpoints, and to inject into the novel reports not directly related to the main "story-line." He wanted to create a multi-layered work which would encompass a broader framework of human experience (RHI 423). Through his various borrowings from film, he added "new" dimensions of time, place and consciousness to the novel, thereby broadening its scope and making it more "modern" and consequently more appealing to a modern audience (RHI 423).

#### iv) Thesis Statement

As I have said above, Feuchtwanger's main concern while writing Erfolg, and indeed during most of his career, was to create a new historical novel. His theories on the subject are loosely formulated in the above-mentioned essays and in Desdemona. As I have discussed above, the

chronology of Feuchtwanger's theoretical writings with respect to Erfolg could pose possible difficulties, as the theoretical writings which I will discuss were written after Erfolg. As I have stated, I do not see this as an obstacle to my present investigation and will not treat it as one. I will not attempt to ascertain what Feuchtwanger had in mind when writing Erfolg, but will rather examine the novel in light of these later theories, which I feel are a manifestation of Feuchtwanger's concerns throughout the course of his writing career.

In his attempt to create a new historical novel Feuchtwanger set out a method through which to achieve his goal. As I will show, he specifically set out in his writings on the novel that the use of film techniques was necessary in order to bring about the changes which he saw as crucial to its modernisation. What is problematic, however, is that Feuchtwanger's prerequisite for the use of such techniques is that they achieve the same effect in the novel form as in film, i.e., that they render the novel "filmic." I will examine primarily his use of those techniques derived from Eisenstein's theory of dialectical montage, paying lesser attention to those of a more "generic" nature. I will show that Feuchtwanger's use of "generic" techniques such as simultaneity and changing point of view does not, in the case of Erfolg, achieve the same effect as in film. Only Feuchtwanger's use of techniques based on Eisenstein's theory of dialectical montage is effective in rendering a key chapter in Erfolg filmic and, consequently, "modern."

In his theory of the historical novel Feuchtwanger does not specifically mention filmic techniques as a way of modernising this sub-genre. However, I will demonstrate in the final chapter of my thesis that this theory of the historical novel demands the use of these techniques in the form of Eisensteinian montage, as an impetus for the success of a practical application of his theoretical considerations as set out in his various writings. Interestingly, elements of an almost pure form of Eisensteinian montage are only to be found in one chapter: the "Orlow" chapter in book IV, chapter 1. I will demonstrate how Feuchtwanger's theories and intentions with respect to a new historical novel come to full bloom in this one chapter of Erfolg.

To end on a bibliographic note, I will be using the Rowohlt edition of Erfolg (1956). According to Synnöve Clason, one of the leading researchers in Feuchtwanger studies, this edition derives from and is identical in content to the original two-volume edition published in 1930 by Kiepenheuer and can be used as an authoritative edition (WE 11).

## II. FEUCHTWANGER AND EISENSTEIN: "ERFOLG" AND "BATTLESHIP POTEMKIN"

### A. Revitalizing the Historical Novel

#### i) Introduction

Approximately one year before Erfolg was published, Feuchtwanger was asked, as part of a survey for the "Vossische Zeitung" (March 31, 1929), "Warum schreiben Sie keine Filme?" Feuchtwanger's response:

Schreibe ich ein Buch, dann bin ich, um meine Vision an den Empfänger heranzutragen, nur auf mich selbst angewiesen. Schreibe ich ein Stück, dann brauche ich Regisseur, Schauspieler, dreißig bis vierzig Helfer, um an den Zuschauer heranzukommen, und von meiner Vision bleibt wenig. Schreibe ich einen Film, dann bleibt von meiner Vision ein Dreck; denn *Unternehmer* und *Regisseur* kommen mit ihrer "Erfahrung", ihrer "Kenntnis der Millionenseele" und drängen mich an die Peripherie. (230)

But his rejection of script-writing was not based on any literary snobbishness.

Indeed, he saw film as a serious and valid art form.

Feuchtwanger felt, as did many post-World War I writers, that the novel was in serious need of a modernisation to bring it into the twentieth century. This was due to the new awareness of his readers with respect to the

world around them, resulting from technological advances such as film and radio. But the novel was far from becoming extinct:

Immer wieder hat man erklärt, jetzt sei das erzählende Buch ein für allemal erledigt. Erst durch das Kino, dann durch den Rundfunk, dann durch die steigende Wirtschaftsnot, dann durch den steigenden Einfluß der barbarischen, geistfeindlichen Schichten, die heute überall, und besonders bei uns, an die Macht kamen. Aber die Pessimisten unkten zu Unrecht. Das erzählende Buch lebt immer noch, es ist gesünder als je. (RHI 422)

He concluded this from statistics of booksellers and libraries. He found that not only was the number of readers increasing, but the types of books that they were reading were also changing. The readership was moving away from reading as pure entertainment or escapism: "Der Leser sucht seit dem Krieg im Roman offenbar anderes als Unterhaltung" (RHI 422). He felt that this was evidenced in what he called the "Millionenaufgabe" (RHI 422) of authors such as Thomas Mann, Sinclair Lewis and Upton Sinclair.

Likewise, readers would also not find what they were searching for in scientific and scholarly books:

Was die wissenschaftlichen Bücher dem heutigen Menschen bieten, das klärt ihn über viele Einzelfragen auf, aber es verschafft ihm kein Weltbild. Dieses Weltbild sucht er im erzählenden Buch. Von ihm verlangt er, daß es die getrennten Erkenntnisse der Wissenschaft organisch in ein Bild zusammenfüge. Die große Masse der Bildungsempfänglichen sucht im Roman den Ersatz

für Philosophie und Religion. Hoffte, im erzählenden Buch auf dem Weg über das Gefühl einen Standpunkt zu finden, von dem aus eine Orientierung in der verworrenen Welt möglich ist. (RHI 422-23)

The modern-day novel could satisfy these demands, but it would have to change in order to do so: "Will der moderne Roman dieses Verlangen befriedigen, dann muß er andere Inhalte und andere Formen wählen als der Vorkriegsroman" (RHI 423). The content and form would have to differ from that of the pre-war novel. Feuchtwanger's rationale for this belief was based on the assumption that the world was changing, and that the novel too would be able to transform itself within this context. By no means did this changing world signal the demise of the novel: "Es ist augenscheinlich ein Bedürfnis nach dem erzählenden Buch in der Welt; zu lesen, gilt ihr als lebenswichtig" (RHI 422).

Feuchtwanger envisioned various changes which would lead to the modernisation of the novel. He felt that by implementing these changes the novel could be brought into the twentieth century. The readership was no longer interested in intricate plots involving famous or larger-than-life figures, for such displays had nothing to do with their own lives and the world in which they lived. Basically, these types of portrayals proved to be devoid of any meaning which was relevant within the context of the readers' own lives. The writer would instead have to take on the task of assuring the participation of the reader. This could be done by providing the reader with a feeling of connection

to characters from times past, and to their respective characteristics. Or the author could take a different approach: rather than portraying a single person, he/she could portray a whole stratum of people, a whole epoch, and show the connection of the individual to society and to the time (RHI 423).

This new novel would also have to purge itself of nationalistic tendencies. Feuchtwanger asserted that an age in which economic borders no longer corresponded to linguistic borders had begun. Germans, rather than simply being citizens of Germany with its political borders, were now citizens of the planet earth. Within the context of this international community, he felt that there was no place for "Heimatkunst" in its most nationalistic sense. Against the backdrop of modern literature "Heimatkunst" would seem outdated. But he did not advocate an entire abandonment of everything "local." Rather, he advocated a shift of emphasis within the context of the modern world: "Gewiß wählt auch der heutige große Romandichter am liebsten die Heimat zum Gegenstand seiner Dichtung, aber er sieht sie eben nicht nur mit dem Auge des Lokalpatrioten, sondern mit dem Auge des Weltbürgers" (RHI 424).

One way of modernizing the novel, and maintaining its readership in this new technological age, was to borrow film techniques and to transplant them into the novel (RHI 424-25). Feuchtwanger was looking to accommodate the general public, rather than the intelligentsia. He would tend to agree with Adolf Behne's statement from his article "Die Stellung des Publikums zur

modernen deutschen Literatur," which was published in Die Weltbühne on May 18, 1926: "[d]as Buch des Dichters wird nicht zum Massenartikel werden, wenn es die Bedürfnisse der Masse nicht einmal kennt . . ." (220). He would probably not agree with Behne's sentiments expressed in that same article with respect to the death of the novel:

Es wird die Zeit kommen, da wir kaum noch Bücher schreiben--sobald wir erst erkannt haben, wieviel exakter jeder Beweis im Film zu führen ist. Zunächst aber wird der Film die Literatur beeinflussen im Sinne einer Reinigung. Man kann wohl schon jetzt etwas von solcher Wirkung spüren. (220)

Feuchtwanger certainly did not fear that the novel was in danger of dying a slow death because of film. Rather, he felt that it could be modernised and made to stay alive in the twentieth century by accepting the influences of film and borrowing techniques from the very art form which it, in a sense, had served to shape. Feuchtwanger felt that film's influence could only serve to enrich the novel and that rather than write film scripts to be turned into films, "ein besseres Geschäft ist, die Mittel des Films der dichterischen Vision anzupassen" (Warum schreiben Sie keine Filme? 230).

Because the "new" film audience was being exposed to film and its various techniques which make certain assumptions with respect to narrative logic and perception, Feuchtwanger anticipated a heightened level of understanding on its part: "Der heutige Mensch ist durch den Film rascher in



der Auffassung geworden, wendiger in der Aufnahme schnellwechselnder Bilder und Situationen" (RHI 424-25). This film audience would look at verbal texts from a different level of perception, and they would be more sophisticated with respect to interpretation. They had been trained by film to think in a new way, for in film their participation was required in interpreting the interconnection of images within the context of narrative advancement. As Keith Cohen states in Film and Fiction:

On the purely denotative level of understanding, a mass of conveniences had to be accepted by the movie-goer before the shots that flashed before his eyes could make sense or assume the outline of a story. . . . The spectator's task was not simply to see what was being shown to him more vividly than ever before, but also to see what was being revealed purely by implication. (80-81)<sup>3</sup>

Within the context of the ever-increasing popularity of film, which heightened and even changed the viewers' awareness and interpretation of art, viewers were transported to a new plane of thinking within the realm of art. Feuchtwanger felt that in order to keep up with this art form and the new demands--with respect to art-- which it fostered in its audience, he would have to find a way to translate or transport film techniques into the novel form.

Thus Feuchtwanger knew that the novel would have to change in order to meet the demands imposed on it by what he felt was a modern

---

<sup>3</sup> The "implication" of which Cohen speaks is radically different from any verbal implication such as allusion, metaphor, etc.

society. He looked to film, the newest art form, for possible suggestions for this new novel. He did not shun film as an art form for the masses. Rather, he recognized in film a means of reaching out and affecting the emotions of a broad audience and in the process "educating" them. But he was not ready to give up the novel to begin making films; instead he incorporated the new technology of film into the novel by transposing film elements into the novel form. In this way he would be able to maintain the interests of his readers in an age where technological advances such as film and radio were capturing the interest of vast audiences. As well, Feuchtwanger believed that he would be able to reach more effectively the reader on an emotional level by employing these film techniques. If these techniques could have such an emotional impact on the film audience, then why should they not also be effective in the novel form?

In the last two parts of this chapter I will show how Feuchtwanger applied film techniques in Erfolg specifically, and the effect which these techniques produced in the novel. First, however, it would be beneficial to examine the current state of research in this area, so as to demonstrate the relevance of this thesis for research on Feuchtwanger.

ii) Recent Research

In their 1978 book, Lion Feuchtwangers Roman "Erfolg", Egon Brückener and Klaus Modick acknowledge the vast body of Feuchtwanger research which emerged in the former GDR from the mid-fifties and on. They also lament the lack of critical studies of Feuchtwanger's works in the former West Germany as opposed to the research taking place in other countries:

Die Tatsache, daß Feuchtwanger einer der meistgelesenen deutschen Autoren im nicht-deutschsprachigen Ausland ist, erklärt auch das Phänomen, daß die Forschung in den USA oder etwa in Skandinavien mehr über Feuchtwanger ans Licht gebracht hat, als alles, was in der BRD bisher zu diesem Thema erschienen ist. Eine tiefgreifende Auseinandersetzung mit dem Werk Feuchtwangers hat auch in der UdSSR stattgefunden.

(4)

This statement remains relatively true even more than fifteen years after its appearance. Although there has been more research done in the former West Germany since that time, the quantity of research in the former East Germany and other countries far outweighs it.

Although there is quite a body of literature connected to Erfolg, the current secondary literature relating to the novel itself and to Feuchtwanger's theories of the historical novel does not address his use of Eisensteinian montage in Erfolg, my main concern. The issue of film and film techniques in Erfolg is addressed by critics, but most provide only a very superficial analysis

without examining its manifestations in the novel itself. This does not signify any shortcomings in these works; rather it is an indicator of an unexplored issue within the context of research on Erfolg. Indeed, much of the secondary literature available, and especially the works mentioned above, are thorough and informative with respect to the issues with which they deal; however, as stated, they do not choose to tackle the "film" issue in much detail.

The most thorough handling to date of Feuchtwanger's relation to Eisenstein can be found in Matthias Schmitz' 1979 article "Feuchtwanger/ Eisenstein oder: Romanmontage und Montagefilm." Schmitz discusses Feuchtwanger's use of Potemkin in the "Orlow" chapter and its effect on Otto Klenk, the classist former Justice Minister. He views the fact that the film does not have a lasting effect or impact on Klenk as a departure from a pure Eisensteinian montage. Schmitz admits that Feuchtwanger too wants to affect the reader/viewer's emotions through special film techniques but maintains that he stops short of Eisenstein's ultimate goal, which is to bring the audience to action. Schmitz interprets the fact that the film does not have a lasting effect on Klenk as a rejection on Feuchtwanger's part of the contention that art can even have such an effect. He argues that for Feuchtwanger art can affect the emotions of its audience, but it does not have the ability to move them to "revolution."

Schmitz contends that while Eisenstein sees montage as a "collision" of individual parts which derive a meaning only as a result of this "collision," Feuchtwanger's montage in the "Orlow" chapter is more like the montage of Vsevolod Pudovkin, who saw montage as a "linking" process rather than a "collision." He derives his argument from what he sees as Feuchtwanger's use of montage as a formal technique, "das die Darstellung verschiedener Handlungs-, Motiv- und Bewußtseins-elemente in ihrer Gleichzeitigkeit im Rahmen eines 'vorgegebenen' inhaltlichen Gesamtzusammenhangs erlaubt" (78). But he misinterprets Pudovkin here, for Pudovkin saw montage as a means of "creating" a narrative structure through building blocks, and not as a tool which would allow him to portray certain effects within an existing narrative structure. Ultimately, Eisenstein's "collision" and Pudovkin's "linkage" are only theoretical distinctions anyhow--for one person's "collision" is another person's "linkage"--whereas the application of these theoretical viewpoints often produced similar results. David Cook states:

Ultimately, . . . the argument between Eisenstein and Pudovkin was less about the formal aspects of montage than about the psychology of the viewer, with Eisenstein believing that cinematic meaning is generated through the cognitive collision of frames within the viewer's mind and Pudovkin that it is generated through the cognitive linkage of frames.

(196)

Schmitz concerns himself mainly with the belief that Feuchtwanger stopped short of a pure Eisensteinian montage--if it was ever Eisensteinian at

all. He states that, since Feuchtwanger did not make Potemkin have a lasting effect on Klenk, he thereby rejects the potential of such art to bring an audience to action. Schmitz does not address the argument that it is quite meaningful that art could even have an effect on an individual such as Klenk, who would otherwise have absolutely no sympathy for the general populace and its cause. He does not discuss the fact that this in itself is indicative of the power of art; if it can have even a temporary effect on an individual like Klenk, then it could also potentially have phenomenal effects on less resilient individuals.

As I have stated, Schmitz discusses Feuchtwanger's rendering of Potemkin and its effect on Klenk. He acknowledges Feuchtwanger's attempted use of Eisensteinian montage in the "Orlow" chapter but does not examine the actual structure of the "Orlow" chapter as a manifestation of Eisenstein's theory of dialectical montage. He therefore overlooks the technical application of these theories as a possible means of illuminating exactly to what extent Feuchtwanger applied Eisensteinian montage and the extent of its effects.

Synnöve Clason's 1975 book Die Welt erklären. Geschichte und Fiktion in Lion Feuchtwangers Roman "Erfolg" is, according to Egon Brückener and Klaus Modick, "d[er] zweite Versuch einer intensiven Analyse des Romans"(Lion Feuchtwangers Roman "Erfolg" 11).<sup>4</sup> Clason searches for a

---

<sup>4</sup> The first work to take on this same task is Joseph Pischel's Lion Feuchtwangers "Wartesaal"-Trilogie. Zur Entwicklung des deutschen bürgerlich-kritischen Romans in den Jahren 1918-1945 (Diss. Phil. Rostock 1966).

"Deutung" for Feuchtwanger's satirical novel Erfolg. She attempts to find this meaning by examining Feuchtwanger's use and portrayal of historical events and people. She examines the stylistic methods which are available to Feuchtwanger, which are normally not available to the historian, and attempts to discover what makes Feuchtwanger different from an historian.

Clason briefly argues that Feuchtwanger's use of film techniques and his use of Eisenstein's Potemkin are to be seen as possible stylistic conventions implemented by him in his quest for a new historical novel. She views the role of Potemkin in Erfolg as that of a historical document, and also an indicator of Feuchtwanger's belief in the fact that art could possibly have a revolutionary effect by rendering "reality" real for its audience. Clason addresses Feuchtwanger's intentions with respect to his belief in the effect of such art, but she does not pursue a comprehensive investigation of its manifestation in the "Orlow" chapter specifically.

In Lion Feuchtwangers Roman "Erfolg", Egon Brückener and Klaus Modick deal with film elements in Erfolg in a sub-chapter comprising four pages out of a total of 178. They see film techniques in Erfolg as a possibility of broadening the scope of the novel by affording it new "Strukturmöglichkeiten." Potemkin, a "Zeitdokument," shows us how art can convey a "höhere Wirklichkeit" by acting upon the emotions of the audience. This chapter only

scratches the surface of what Feuchtwanger did with film techniques in Erfolg and does not delve into the text itself for a further examination.

Wolfgang Müller-Funk, in Literatur als geschichtliches Argument (1981), offers an analysis of film techniques very similar to that of Brückener and Modick--in fact he often uses the same quotations to prove the same points, which only serves as an indicator of his inability to break new ground on this issue. The analysis in this work, as in Brückener and Modick's work, offers only a starting point and begs for a more in-depth analysis of this issue.

In part C. below I will explore Feuchtwanger's use of Eisensteinian montage in Erfolg and will show how crucial these particular film techniques are for this novel specifically, and for the modern novel generally. But first I will discuss the effect of Potemkin in Germany at the time of its initial screening there, in order to illuminate some of the motivating factors for Feuchtwanger's use of Eisensteinian film techniques. I will then outline the main points of Eisenstein's theory of dialectical montage, before proceeding to a discussion of Feuchtwanger's use of Eisensteinian montage in Erfolg.



## B. Film: Feuchtwanger Meets Eisenstein

### i) The German Reception of "Battleship Potemkin"

Sergei Eisenstein's 1925 film Battleship Potemkin is today an undisputed classic in film masterpieces and is a staple of cinematic studies. The film renders events from the Russian Revolution and was in 1925 considered in many countries to be radical and subversive--communist propaganda for the masses.

The first German showing of Potemkin was a closed screening at the "Großes Schauspielhaus" in Berlin on January 21, 1926.<sup>5</sup> After the initial screening in Germany, the film was hastily submitted to the censorship bureau and public screenings were prohibited.

In his reports on the censorship debates regarding Potemkin, a Secret Police official (Mühleisen) expressed the opinion that

the film was not only called upon to give a certain justification to the Bolshevist Revolution in Russia, but also to teach how to instigate uprisings and revolutions. Similarly the showing in Germany of this sailor's [sic] uprising is part of a widespread revolutionary propaganda program which specifically provides training in the technique of insurrections. . . . the film is directed for the

---

<sup>5</sup> The film was first shown in the Soviet Union on December 24, 1925 at the Bolshoi Theatre in Moscow, but did not have its general release there until January 19, 1926.

most part toward the personnel of the armed forces and police, and excites them toward a breach of discipline and revolt. Proceeding from all this, it should be borne in mind that showings of the film are capable of jeopardizing public tranquillity and order. (Marshall 118)

Mühleisen recognized the universal applicability of Eisenstein's work of art. He stated that "[t]he fact that the film depicts the circumstances of Russian life, to a considerable extent different from ours, is of no importance" (Marshall 118). There was a great concern on the part of German officials that viewing of the film could potentially contribute to a similar revolution in Germany. (Eisenstein would have interpreted this as a success on his part!)

On March 24, 1926, the Berlin Censorship Committee put forth a resolution to prohibit the film from being shown in Germany. On April 10, 1926, however, the Chief Film Censorship Committee of Berlin revoked this decision and decided to allow Potemkin to be shown for public viewing--but only a substantially edited form. The film was prohibited from being shown to young audiences. Five days later, on April 15, the War Ministry of Germany put forth an order forbidding soldiers from frequenting theatres where Potemkin was being shown.

The scenes and shots which were cut showed a physical overthrowing of soldiers and ship officials by the sailors, as well as brutality as used by the soldiers against the masses on the stairs of the famous Odessa step sequence. As a result of this resolution, a total of 30.15 metres of film

were cut before the first public viewing was permitted at the Apollo Theatre in Berlin on April 29, 1926.

For the remainder of 1926, the censors continually censored or threatened to censor the film. All of this unintentional publicity roused the interest of the German public and ensured that theatres all over Germany were filled for months (Murray 12), while in most other European countries Potemkin was officially banned (Cook 179).

Edmund Meisel was invited by Prometheus, the company that distributed Potemkin in Germany, to compose a musical score for Potemkin, prompting the composer to comment that he was pleased at the opportunity to "compose a musical work which would match, in style and rhythm, the action of a film which is a great work of art" (Marshall 125). But even this accompanying score was seen as an accomplice in the insurrectionist intentions of Potemkin. Meisel wrote in a letter in the Moscow Newspapers in 1927:

After the reactionary press labelled my music as subversive because of its impetuous rhythm, which matched the action, Minister Bolz in the Württemberg Landtag prohibited it as dangerous to the State. This generally speaking is the first time that political charges have been brought against a musical composition.  
(Marshall 125)

Feuchtwanger would most likely have seen Potemkin in Germany at some point in 1926, but it is not known whether he saw an edited version of the film--which is most likely--and if so, which edited version. He might have seen

an uncut, unauthorized version of Potemkin, but we can only speculate about this fact.

By the time Feuchtwanger wrote the "Orlow" chapter of Erfolg, a few years had passed since his initial viewing of Potemkin. Surprisingly, Feuchtwanger did not want to refresh his memory, deliberately avoiding another viewing:

Trotzdem nahm ich, um meinen Eindruck nicht zu verfälschen, keinerlei Inhaltsangaben oder wie immer geartete Beschreibungen des Films zu Hilfe, sondern verließ mich ausschließlich auf das, was in mir haften geblieben war.

(P&E 73)

What Feuchtwanger did not want to mar was his initial understanding of the film, derived in part from its emotional effect on him during the time of viewing. And it was this very "effect" of Potemkin upon its viewing audience which so concerned German, and other European officials, prompting them to label the film a propaganda piece.

For Feuchtwanger, Potemkin was the main inspiration for employing film techniques in Erfolg. What led him to do this was the effect which the film had had on him, as well as on the rest of the viewing audience of the time. Feuchtwanger asserts, "die Vorstellung, das Wesen dieses Films und seine Wirkung durch das Wort wiederzugeben war eine der Grundvisionen des Werkes [i.e., Erfolg]" (P&E 73). In order to achieve this "Wirkung" Eisenstein had employed film techniques based on a theory of dialectical montage. In

order to achieve the same effect within the novel form, Feuchtwanger attempted to employ these film techniques within the context of the novel. I will now present Eisenstein's theory of dialectical montage in detail.

## ii) Eisenstein's Theory of Dialectical Montage

Through the use of what he called "dialectical montage", Eisenstein sought to arouse in the viewer specific emotions, and ultimately to bring the viewer to action or, more appropriately, revolution. "Eisenstein created a completely new editing technique . . . based upon psychological stimulation rather than narrative logic, which managed to communicate physical and emotional sensation directly to the audience" (Cook 157).

Eisenstein stated in his essay "The Cinematographic Principle and the Ideogram" (CPI), that although Japanese cinema of the twenties was completely unaware of montage, the actual principle of montage is "the basic element of Japanese representational culture"--namely its writing (90). He proceeded then to use Chinese representational writing--the hieroglyph--as an example of the most basic and earliest form of montage. He was interested specifically in the category of hieroglyphs called the *huei-i*, also called the "copulative" category. He explains it as follows:

The point is that the copulation (perhaps we had better say, the combination) of two hieroglyphs of the simplest

series is to be regarded not as their sum, but as their product, i.e., as a value of another dimension, another degree; each, separately, corresponds to an *object*, to a fact, but their combination corresponds to a *concept*. From separate hieroglyphs has been fused--the ideogram. By the combination of two "depictables" is achieved the representation of something that is graphically undepictable.

(92)

An example of this would be the picture for "dog" and the picture for "mouth" would signify "to bark." Eisenstein defined this as montage: "[i]t is exactly what we do in the cinema, combining shots that are *depictive*, single in meaning, neutral in content--into *intellectual* contexts and series" (CPI 92).

Film montage was not only to be characterised by this type of "union," but rather by "collision." "By the conflict of two pieces in opposition to each other. By conflict" (CPI 97). For Eisenstein conflict lies not only at the root of dialectical montage, but at the root of all art--in fact, conflict is dialectical montage. He disagrees with his contemporary and colleague Vsevolod Pudovkin, who sees "linkage" as the basis of montage. According to Eisenstein, "linkage" is "merely a possible special case" (CPI 98).

Eisenstein's theory of montage operates according to the Marxist dialectic as derived from Hegel. The collision in montage envisions constant conflict between thesis and antithesis, resulting in a synthesis. In Eisensteinian film editing, the first shot is a thesis. When it collides with another shot whose "visual content" (Cook 180) comes into conflict with that of the first shot (this

second shot being the antithesis) a synthesis results. The formula for this synthesis would be  $A+B=C$ , rather than  $A+B=AB$  (Pudovkin's "linkage"). The resulting synthesis--"C"--becomes the new thesis. And just as with the Chinese hieroglyphs, the result of the "copulation" or collision of "A" and "B" is not the sum of the two--or "AB"--but is rather a value which is totally different from either "A" or "B"--a value of "a new, higher dimension" (DAFF 107). This cycle then continues "until the end of historical time" (Cook 180)--or until the end of the film.

Each shot or "montage cell" in a sequence is an independent unit which derives meaning only through its conflict with another shot. Each shot has a "lack of existence as [a] single unit"; one should not be misled by these words, however, for Eisenstein does not imply that there is an actual lack of existence, but rather a lack of "meaning" in an individual montage cell. He goes on to state that "[e]ach piece can evoke no more than a certain association" (M&C 85), and it is the collision of these independent units which give the film a narrative meaning. In fact, the collision of these shots is what drives the whole film/narrative forward. Eisenstein explains the effects of this process:

If montage is to be compared with something, then a phalanx of montage pieces, of shots, should be compared to the series of explosions of an internal combustion

engine, driving forward its automobile or tractor: for, similarly, the dynamics of montage serve as impulses driving forward the total film.

(M&C 77)

It should be noted that Eisenstein hoped to produce an emotional effect on the audience with this brand of montage, or in other words affective art. He intended to produce didactic art, and it was by manipulating the emotions of the viewer that he could achieve such an end. For instance, Eisenstein posited that if one were to film a murder in one shot, the effect would be purely "physiological," and that the result would only function as a piece of "information" (DAFF 117). However, if one were to reconstruct the murder through montage--by turning portions of the whole murder into montage cells--each montage cell would "summon up a certain association--the sum of which [would] be an all-embracing complex of emotional feeling" (DAFF 117), this emotion being drawn from the audience.

Eisenstein took for granted that every person who viewed the conflict of an "A" and a "B" would read the same "C" as the conclusion. This is, of course, a very dangerous assumption and a very grave flaw in his theory. However, it is not our purpose here to discuss issues of fallibility in his theories but rather to examine Feuchtwanger's use, in Erfolg, of the techniques based on these theories.

The ultimate meaning of these collisions is to be derived from the viewer. As Viktor Zmegac says, the meaning of montage is "Text-exzentrisch,"



that is, "[es] bezieht sich auf Kontexte, die durch das Bewußtsein des Rezipienten hergestellt werden" (262). Zmegac is speaking here of what I will call a "generic" type of montage, rather than Eisensteinian montage specifically, but his statement holds true for both forms. The following definition of montage provides a good distinction of the two forms:

Its simplest meaning is "cutting." Sergei Eisenstein, however, developed an elaborate theory of montage based on the idea that contiguous shots relate to each other in a way that generates concepts not materially present in the content of the shots themselves. (Montage can also refer to the presentation of a great deal of narrative information through editing in a short period of time.) (Cook 916-17).

Although there may exist problems of authorial/autorial intentionality in such a situation, Feuchtwanger appears to take for granted that Potemkin is so effective with its collision of shots that the meaning will be inevitable. For example, a shot of a child playing can be placed beside a "conflicting" shot of a gun--the viewer perceives death. There may exist problems of authorial/autorial intentionality with respect to extracting from the viewer or reader the desired "C" in such a situation, but Feuchtwanger seizes only upon the very obvious and most manipulative sections of the movie to demonstrate the effectiveness of such intention. For example, in Potemkin there is a famous series of shots of a stone lion. The first shot is of a sleeping lion; in the second shot the lion is waking and is about to rise; the third shot shows the lion

standing and ready to pounce. For Eisenstein this sequence of shots was to represent the metaphor "the very stones roar" (Giannetti 134).

One can see in this sample of Eisensteinian montage that the ultimate meaning of such montage is not always easily ascertainable. The shot sequence of the lions provides us with an example of a more abstract version of Eisensteinian montage. In assuming that all of his viewers will be able to ascertain the meaning of the collision of these sequence of shots Eisenstein presupposes a common social, psychological and hermeneutic reference point between himself and his audience. Feuchtwanger did not attempt to incorporate any such abstract metaphorical comparisons in Erfolg. I will demonstrate, however, his use of a more ascertainable and less manipulative form of Eisensteinian montage and the effects which it produces in the novel.

### iii) Feuchtwanger's Interpretation of Eisensteinian Montage in "Erfolg"

Feuchtwanger shows his understanding of Eisenstein's theories at work in Book IV, Chapter 1 of Erfolg, entitled "Panzerkreuzer Orlov"--a thinly disguised reference to the film Battleship Potemkin. This chapter has been discussed by critics as a parallel to Potemkin (see above), as it is an accurate "play by play" of the film. However, the presence of Eisenstein's theories of dialectical montage at work in the written word are completely ignored by them.

In this chapter, Feuchtwanger demonstrates the effects of the film on its audience without specific reference to Eisensteinian montage, but with evidence of this type of montage in the description. We can see a parallel between the structure of this chapter and the structure of Potemkin which is conveyed through the form of the description of the film.

The reader experiences Potemkin through the eyes of the former Bavarian Justice Minister, Dr. Otto Klenk. Klenk, a sort of modern-day Coriolanus, is at this point in the novel taking a brief respite from Bavaria in Berlin. He belongs to a privileged class and has an absolute disregard for the general population.

Feuchtwanger presents a "play-by-play" of the film. As the film narrative moves forward through the juxtaposition of a series of "montage cells" or shots, so does the narrative in this chapter. He does this by actually constructing the chapter as a montage in itself, which is guided by the film on the screen (i.e., "film" is incorporated into the novel).

Cinematic "shots" are represented by Feuchtwanger through the use of a single sentence or a small, brief groups of sentences. The effect of this arrangement is a collision of elements or "shots" which subsequently elicit a response from Klenk. The reactions of Klenk--and of the audience--to the events taking place on the screen are interspersed among the "colliding"

"shots," but often the reader provides the reaction him/herself. These reactions represent the effect or product of these collisions.

At times Feuchtwanger represents Klenk's reaction to what is occurring on the screen--namely the collision of shots--with a sentence or short group of sentences independent from his descriptive sentences. Feuchtwanger, whether knowingly or not, addresses the limitations of the use of Eisensteinian montage when used within the context of a written text. The use of individual sentences as representations of individual variables in the dialectic equation would move away from a pure application of Eisenstein's equation for dialectical montage. The combusive process is, in these cases, drawn out by the interruption of punctuation--this would serve to detract from the desired effect of simultaneity of colliding shots. Along with the punctuation, the effect of the collision of single sentences is further interrupted by the fact that most of the individual sentences contain a subject and a predicate. Given the desired effect of Eisensteinian montage, I would argue that the whole equation "thesis + antithesis = synthesis" ( $A+B=C$ ) should warrant one single sentence. Within a written text, the "one sentence per equation" formulation brings us closest to the combusive process which Eisenstein envisions with visual shots as variables in this equation.

Nevertheless, we cannot discount Feuchtwanger's use of multiple sentences to constitute the equation. Even within the confines of these

limitations Feuchtwanger is able to derive a quick and choppy collision--due to the use of short sentences--which serves to build tension and derive emotion from the reader, which was Eisenstein's ultimate goal with respect to dialectical montage.

It is important to note that Eisenstein saw the "A" and the "B" of his montage formula as happening so quickly that it would appear as though they were superimposed upon each other. Of course this is only a theoretical distinction, but it can be seen how one could come closer to achieving this effect with montage in film as opposed to a written text. What the viewer can see in several seconds in a visual image or shot could possibly take many sentences to describe. With the written word, one always gets the sense that the "B" definitely follows the "A." Regardless of how short a sentence is, it is always seen on the page as physically following the previous sentence--superimposition is thus much harder, if not impossible, to achieve.

In Erfolg, Klenk's description is comprised entirely of "shots" which are represented by brief, concise sentences, clauses or utterances which when juxtaposed with other shots create a meaning. The film and chapter narrative then advances through the "collision" of these individual "shots."

### C. Film into Novel:

#### Montage, Simultaneity and Changing Point of View

##### i) Eisensteinian Montage in the "Orlow" Chapter

Up to this point I have given a general overview of Feuchtwanger's use of Eisensteinian montage in the "Orlow" chapter. I will now show specific manifestations of the dialectical equation in the chapter and will assess his success with respect to its application.

In Feuchtwanger's play-by-play presentation of the film Potemkin in the "Orlow" chapter, he conveys the actual process, development and effect of the collision of thesis and antithesis through Klenk's reaction toward such a collision, as we have seen. As stated, the reader is at times given the result of these collisions (i.e., the "C", or synthesis) as perceived by Klenk. Other times the "A" and the "B" are provided, but the reader must furnish his/her own "C."

In order to see how Feuchtwanger makes Eisensteinian montage work within the context of the Potemkin chapter, we will trace the development of the film parallel to the development of its effect upon Klenk. As the film narrative unfolds in this chapter, Klenk's progressively increasing emotional involvement comes to light. It is this effect on the viewer which is necessary for

the proper function of Eisenstein's theory of dialectical montage, and it is this effect which Feuchtwanger wanted to reproduce in his novel.

The chapter's first words put the film into a social context by informing the reader of the great impact that Potemkin had in contemporary Germany, more specifically in Berlin:

Während die anderen Berliner Kinos zu dieser frühen Stunde geschlossen sind oder vor sehr wenigen Zuschauern spielen, stauen sich hier die Autos. Schutzleute, Gaffer. Der Film "Panzerkreuzer Orlow" ist schon sechsdreißigmal gezeigt worden, viermal jeden Tag, sechsdreißigtausend Berliner haben ihn gesehen. Dennoch sind die Leute erregt, als führte man ihnen heute zum erstenmal etwas vor, worauf die Welt wartet.

(Erfolg 497)

Klenk refuses to be taken in by this mass hysteria over the film. He only goes to see the film because "[a]nschauen muß man sich so was, wenn man schon in Berlin ist. Er [Klenk] wird den Filmjuden nicht hereinfliegen auf ihre künstlich gemanagte Sensation" (Erfolg 497). The sceptical Klenk believes that he cannot be seduced by this type of political propaganda for the masses.

The description of the film is interspersed with Klenk's reaction to it. This structure allows us to monitor Klenk's development in conjunction with events developing on the screen. The film begins to have an effect on Klenk as he sees the cramped sleeping quarters of the sailors and an officer walking through the narrow spaces between the sleeping soldiers. "Man spürt richtig die schlechte Luft des Raums" (Erfolg 497).

Klenk is drawn into the film and his emotions are manipulated as a result of the montage techniques used. If we use the formula  $A+B=C$ , "A" and "B" are two conflicting shots, and "C" is the effect of the collision, or rather the emotion or reaction produced in Klenk (as the viewer) by this collision. These "shots" are represented by Feuchtwanger by using single sentences or very short groups of sentences. For example, we can see this pattern in the following excerpt of the narrator's account of Klenk's thoughts:

- [A] Der Schlafrum der Mannschaft. Hängematten, dicht aneinander.
- [B] Ein Vorgesetzter, herumschnüffelnd zwischen unruhig schlafenden Matrosen.
- [C] Das ganze nicht unbegabt gemacht. Man spürt richtig die schlechte Luft des Raums [emphasis mine]. (Erfolg 497)

Whereas Klenk's visual perception of what is occurring on the screen and his reaction to it occur instantaneously, the written transcription of these perceptions is, of course, more drawn out. But one can still see the basic structure of the dialectic equation as represented in these groups of sentences.

The next morning, as the sailors crowd around a piece of maggot-infested rotting meat which is to be their dinner, Klenk begins to fathom the severity of the situation, and he begins to sympathise with and understand the sailors:

- [A] Die Leute scheinen schon öfters derartiges Fleisch gekriegt zu haben.
- [B] Schimpfen.
- [C] Das ist begreiflich. (Erfolg 498)



When the sailors are served their dinner, they refuse to eat the rotten meat; Klenk begins to feel an uneasy sympathy setting in: "Merkwürdig, daß der Klenk von diesen simplen Menschen und Begebnissen angerührt wird" (Erfolg 498). In this example we are given Klenk's general reaction of growing sympathy to a whole series of equations which are not visibly set out for the reader.

But Klenk is aware that the film has been created as a manipulative tool:

Der Minister Klenk, die um ihn Sitzenden groß überragend, denkt nicht daran, sich von dieser Unruhe anstecken zu lassen. Er hat gelesen: ein Film ohne Aufbau, ohne Weiber, ohne Handlung; Spannung ersetzt durch Tendenz. Anschauen muß man sich so was, wenn man schon in Berlin ist. Er wird den Filmjuden nicht hereinfliegen auf ihre künstlich gemanagte Sensation. (Erfolg 497)

During his viewing of the film he recognizes that the accompanying music is designed to seduce him further, but he cannot escape its effect, "sie läßt einen nicht los" (Erfolg 498). As Klenk's emotions continue to be manipulated he is drawn further into the film; he experiences a withdrawal into his old persona--a power hungry official with little or no understanding for the rights and freedoms of the people he is meant to serve: "Natürlich muß man diesen Saufilm verbieten. Es ist ganz raffinierte Stimmungsmache, eine Schweinerei. Es ist wirklich keine genügende Ursache, die Disziplin aufzusagen, weil ein Stück Fleisch madig ist" (Erfolg 498).

As the film progresses and the sailors begin their mutiny, Klenk is drawn in again. He is drawn into the tenseness of the moment and then, when the mutiny is effected and the tension subsides, Klenk sees that there is no escaping:

Klenk sitzt still, es hat ihm den Atem verschlagen, er sitzt, der riesige Mann, mäuschenstill. Es hat keinen Sinn, das zu verbieten. Es ist da, man atmet es ein mit jedem Atemzug, es ist in der Welt, es ist eine andere Welt, es ist Blödsinn, sie zu leugnen. Man muß da anschauen, man muß diese Musik hören, man kann sie nicht verbieten. (Erfolg 499)

He "sees" and accepts the truth represented by the events being portrayed on the screen: "Matrosen übernehmen den Dienst der Offiziere; die Maschine funktioniert nicht schlechter dadurch" (Erfolg 499).

When the ship lands and the people of Odessa show their support for the sailors, Klenk begins to feel uneasy, for he anticipates the arrival of "die anderen," the soldiers: "Klenk wird kribbelig. Halten die anderen still? Lassen sich die anderen das einfach gefallen? Er ist gar nicht für die andern, er ist viel zu lebendig, als daß er sich von dem Elan dieser ganzen Angelegenheit nicht mitreißen ließe" (Erfolg 500). Although he does not intend to side with the soldiers, he begins to feel that the film is becoming unrealistic because of the absence of any armed forces: "Allein es stört ihn, daß der sonst so wahre Vorgang unwahr zu werden beginnt durch dieses Versäumnis. Es stört ihn, daß es nicht stimmt" (Erfolg 500). But he is not disappointed for long:

"Aber siehe! Es stimmt doch. Da sind sie, die andern. Sie sind nicht faul gewesen, und jetzt sind sie da" (Erfolg 500). He is once more rid of his scepticism and is drawn back into the film.

At this point we come to Feuchtwanger's representation of the famous Odessa steps sequence. In this, the most dramatic scene in Potemkin, and consequently Orlow, the dialectic equation is no longer supplemented with Klenk's reactions, and the reader must now supply the "C" to the equation. The whole paragraph is a sequence of collisions of "A" shots and "B" shots. Although these "shots" are made up of groups of sentences, the scene is so dramatic and skilfully represented by Feuchtwanger that the reader cannot help but feel the tension. As this scene is the most important of the film, it would be beneficial to set out each equation as it occurs in the paragraph.

- [A] Eine Treppe ist da. Eine riesige Treppe, sie hört nicht auf. Auf ihr, in unendlichem Zuge, trägt das Volk seine Sympathien zu den Meuterern.
- [B] Aber es trägt nicht lange; denn auf dieser Treppe sind sie, die andern. Eine Schwarmlinie Kosaken, die Treppe hinunter, Gewehr unterm Arm, langsam, bedrohlich, unausweichlich, sperrend die ganze Breite der Treppe.
- [A] Es kommt Bewegung ins Volk. Sie gehen schneller, sie laufen, sie rennen, sie laufen davon, sie fliehen. Einige merken nichts, verstehen nichts, die bleiben langsam, verwundert.
- [B] Man sieht die Soldatenstiefel die Treppe hinuntersteigen, sehr groß, sehr langsam, eine Stufe, noch eine Stufe, und man sieht ein wenig Rauch aus den Gewehrläufen.

- [A] Und jetzt laufen sie nicht mehr auf der Treppe, jetzt stürzen sie, was ihre Beine und ihre Lungen hergeben.
- [B] Einige aber rollen hinunter, kollern hinunter, es ist nicht mehr ihr Wille, der sie hinunterkollern läßt, nicht ihre Beine und ihre Lungen, sondern nur das Gesetz der Schwerkraft, der Trägheit; denn sie sind tot.
- [A] Und immer gleichmäßig schreitet der Stiefel der Kosaken,
- [B] und immer mehr kollern, rollen hinunter.

And then the most dramatic contrast of the entire Odessa steps sequence:

- [A] Eine Frau, die einen Kinderwagen geschoben hat, schiebt ihn nicht mehr, wer weiß, wo sie ist, sie ist nicht mehr da; aber der Wagen setzt seinen Weg von allein fort, eine Stufe, und noch eine und eine sechste und eine zehnte, bis er endlich stehenbleibt.
- [B] Und dahinter, sehr groß und sehr langsam, der Stiefel des Kosaken. (500)

In Feuchtwanger's representation of this scene, he uses the reader's own reaction, rather than Klenk's, to advance the narrative. The reader cannot help but be drawn in by these contrasting "shots." Feuchtwanger is able to create a tension through the representation of this scene which comes incredibly close to the effect derived from Eisenstein's own representation in Potemkin, but his "C" is to have a different effect than that of Eisenstein. Both artists aspire to bring about an awareness in the reader with respect to the manipulation of the general populace by authority, and both attempt to show the reader/viewer that members of the general populace are nothing more than expendable property for this exploitative state. The difference, however, is to be found in the artist's

intention with respect to how the reader/viewer is to subsequently make use of this information, a point which I will discuss in the next section.

In the final, climactic moments of the film, when the ship is confronted by other battle cruisers brought in to assist in the dismantling of the Orlow, the reader once again perceives the "C" of the dialectic equation as provided by Klenk. The Orlow signals: "Schießt nicht, Brüder." The ship slowly approaches its enemy: "Schießt nicht." And as for the audience, "[m]an hört die Menschen vor der Leinwand atmen, die Erwartung ist beinahe unerträglich. 'Schießt nicht!' hoffen, bitten, wünschen mit aller Kraft ihrer Herzen die achthundert Menschen in dem Berliner Kino" (Erfolg 501). And then Klenk, "[m]it der wilden Kraft seines Herzens wünscht: 'Schießt nicht' " (Erfolg 501). The *Potemkin* is allowed to pass unharmed. The tension subsides. The climax is over.

But why does Klenk succumb to the effects of the film, even though he knows before he even enters the theatre that the underlying purpose of the film is the manipulation of the viewers' emotions? Why can he not prevent himself from being drawn in? The shocking effect of collision of shots creates emotions in him which he cannot subdue. He loses the struggle and is seduced by the impressions of the film. He, Klenk, the former Justice Minister, a modern-day Coriolanus, becomes one of the mob. The seduction is

completed with the climactic moment when Klenk joins in with his "Schießt nicht!"

Klenk, upon leaving the theatre, after having been so affected by the film, is shaken and embarrassed. He questions himself: "Was war denn das? Würde er vielleicht nicht schießen lassen auf die Meuterer? Wie ist das möglich, daß ein Mann wie er wünschen kann: 'Schießt nicht?' " (Erfolg 501) But he realizes that he has seen the truth--that he cannot ignore it: "Das ist nun also da, man kann es verbieten, aber es bleibt in der Welt, es hat keinen Sinn, den Kopf davor zu verstecken" (Erfolg 501).

As Klenk looks in a window he sees on his face a look of helplessness, like an animal in a trap. He laughs, embarrassed. But as he hails a taxi, taps his pipe and puts it in his mouth, the old Klenk returns; Coriolanus is revived after a temporary lapse: "Und schon hat er sein Gesicht wieder eingerenkt in das alte, wilde, vergnügte, mit sich einverständene" (Erfolg 502). The old Klenk is back, the individual, he is no longer one of the mob.

It is only when Klenk physically leaves the theatre that he can emotionally free himself from the effects of the film. Once outside the theatre he can compose himself and metamorphose back into the old Klenk. But he cannot help but be troubled by the emotive force of the film and its power over him. This piece of propaganda, about which he was at first so sceptical, is able to seduce him and also make him realise that there may perhaps be

empowerment available to every person who is willing to accept it. He understands that the film does indeed have relevance for the world in which he lives, and the effect which it has upon him in the theatre is almost a warning as to what such art can actually do. And it is his fear and realisation of such potential which causes Klenk to be embarrassed. Klenk, of the so-called "ruling class," is made for a moment to see the transitoriness of a class system within the context of mankind's existence as a whole.

ii) Klenk's Role in the Didactic Purpose of "Panzerkreuzer Orlow" and Eisensteinian Montage

As I have shown, Feuchtwanger at times provides Klenk's reaction of the film as either a general reaction to a series of events taking place on the screen, or as the "C" of the dialectic equation,  $A+B=C$ . I have shown that Feuchtwanger, at times, also allows the reader to determine his/her own "C" or general reaction to events on the screen. It is possible that he could have presented the entire chapter in such a manner, allowing the reader to ascertain the "C" in all cases. However, had Feuchtwanger done this he would not have been able to show the power that such didactic art can have. In using Klenk--rather than the lowest common denominator in the population--

to show the effects of the film, Feuchtwanger is able to present the potential of this type of art.

What exactly does Feuchtwanger say about didactic art and the power that it can have over the individual? In allowing Klenk to retreat into his former self is Feuchtwanger denying that art can have a lasting didactic effect? I would argue that Feuchtwanger does not deny the power of didactic art, rather that he realizes that although it may be didactic, it cannot act as a literal call to arms.

I will first examine Klenk's background and character in order to better understand the significance of this individual as a measuring stick for the power of Eisensteinian montage in Erfolg. By examining the unlikelihood of such a character succumbing to this didactic art form, we can better understand the importance of Klenk as its focus.

Klenk's only loyalty is to himself and to an almost defunct old order to which he adheres. He clings to a Bavaria of the past and is not interested in change, for that could mean a disruption of the old order and its power structure. For example, Krüger's lawyer, Dr. Geyer, is an idealist who hopes that one day soon every individual will have equal rights under a fair and impartial legal system, and he attempts to write a book on the corrupted Bavarian legal system, in the hope that he can somehow change it. Klenk's reaction to this is one of outrage:



Logik, Menschenrechte, Reichseinheit, Demokratie, zwanzigstes Jahrhundert, europäische Gesichtspunkte; einen Schmarren. Er [i.e., Klenk] schnaubt durch den gepreßten Lippen, knurrt wie ein aufgeregtes Tier gegen den Feind. Was versteht so ein Wichtigmacher wie der Geyer, so ein Gschafthuber und Streber, so ein Saujud, von dem, was in Bayern und für Bayern recht ist. Es hat ihn niemand gerufen. Hier will niemand besser gemacht werden.

(Erfolg 75)

Klenk, from an old family of high officials who have for generations prospered in office, does not want any part of Geyer's plan, for he still considers himself a part of the old order of Wilhelmenian Germany, a conservative not interested in changes, especially if they mean allowing for a broader base of equality among Germans, Bavarians specifically. Most of his actions are affected by this attitude and involve an utter disregard for the individuals who make up the general populace.

Klenk's brand of justice is also administered based on these biases. His decisions are based upon political considerations or mere whims. For example, in making his decision about whether to grant a reprieve to the vagabond, Prokop Woditschka, a Czech national blatantly framed for criminal negligence in a massive railway crash for which the State Railway was itself criminally negligent, Klenk refuses the reprieve in order to save the reputation of the State Railway and justifies his decision with the following reasoning:

"Der Mann Woditschka als solcher war gleichgültig. Einzige tatsächliche Folge

einer Begnadigung dürfte sein . . . daß in Zukunft an Stelle Bayerns die Tschechoslowakei für den dorthin abzuschiebenden Vagabunden Woditschka zu sorgen hätte" (Erfolg 117).

In a subsequent case, Klenk must decide whether to grant a reprieve to Hornauer, a brewery worker wrongfully convicted of criminal negligence resulting in the death of a fellow worker. He is tempted to save the unfortunate worker not because of his belief that the worker is innocent but because Klenk himself would like to annoy one of his enemies, the powerful magnate Baron von Reindl:

Die Direktoren und einige von den Hauptaktionären der Brauerei verkehrten in dem sehr feudalen Herrenklub, in dem auch Klenk manchmal seine Abende zu verbringen pflegte. Die ganze Sache war persönlicher als der Fall des Prokop Woditschka. War der Heizer Hornauer unschuldig, so waren die Geheimräte von Bettinger und Dingharder schuldig, angesehene, gewissenhafte Großbürger. Freilich auch der Reindl, dem es Klenk gerne gegönnt hätte. Der saß zwar nur im Aufsichtsrat der Kapuzinerbrauerei, war aber doch, wie jeder wußte, der Herr. Es war verlockend, einem an sich bedauernswerten Burschen ein paar Monate Gefängnis zu ersparen, besonders wenn man dem Reindl noch eins auswischen konnte. Aber andernteils handelte es sich um ein altverdientes Unternehmen, um die wichtigste bayrische Industrie, um allgemeine bayrische Belange. Klenk konnte sich das kleine Gaudi nicht leisten.

(Erfolg 120)

Even when Klenk is "de-throned" from his position as justice minister and it appears that he has lost his political power his attitudes do not

change. He joins Kutzner's party, the True Germans, although he does not support the party, for by this time they hold a great deal of power. He no longer has the security and prestige of holding the office of Justice Minister, but he still maintains an arrogance and self-confidence that he will eventually re-amass his own political power by joining in where the power is. As a result of his association with the True Germans, Klenk does indeed regain political power by remaining in close contact with the most important politicians and business people. He quickly realises, however, that Kutzner's success will be only short-lived: "Zu spät, Herr Nachbar. Deine Bäume sind abgeblüht" (Erfolg 719). What initially draws Klenk to Kutzner is Kutzner's great plan, which Klenk perceives as a promise of power and prestige. Once Klenk no longer believes in the secret, powerful plan, he no longer believes in Kutzner:

Schon als er [Kutzner] seinerzeit das erstemal davon sprach, hatte dem Klenk diese Schublade imponiert. Eigentlich war sie das einzige, was ihm an Kutzner imponierte. . . . Als jetzt der Führer wieder geheimnisvoll davon anfing, warf er [Klenk], war es Scherz, war es ein wirkliches Projekt? ihm beiläufig hin . . . ." (Erfolg 719)

Although for a brief time a member of the True Germans, Klenk is never interested in the ideological aspect of the struggle; for him it is simply a struggle for power. When he realizes that the True Germans will not amount to anything he immediately disassociates himself from them with no embarrassment or regret. For, after all, he still has himself; he is proud to be

Klenk and proud that he does not belong to the common rabble: "Klenk hieß Klenk und schrieb sich Klenk. Ihm war es recht, daß er nicht zu diesem glatten Allerweltsgeschwerl gehörte" (Erfolg 716).

Turning now to the "Orlow" chapter, we ask how this individual can possibly be moved by a people's film such as Potemkin. What could make this opportunist actually "feel" for the plight of the common person? This is not just an outward show of sympathy to gain an upper hand or to gain power, but an emotional experience, inwardly derived, and one over which Klenk temporarily has no power.

He is not easily seduced. He resists being drawn in and recognizes that he is being manipulated by the images on the screen and the accompanying music, but he cannot escape its effect. The power of this type of montage is evidenced by its capability to seduce someone like Klenk, a self-interested member of the old order and the upper class and not just an average citizen. Although Klenk ultimately slips back into his old individuality, it cannot be said that the effect of the film is totally nullified. Klenk has no need, at this point in his career, to take up the cause of the people, for he still has money and a substantial amount of power and fame, and the people's cause has nothing to offer him in this regard. But this does not mean that the film has not had a lasting effect on him, for the effect of this type of art, according to Feuchtwanger, is not outwardly apparent:

Der Film Potemkin erreicht das Ziel, das nur ein vollendetes Kunstwerk erreichen kann, und das beschreibender oder wissenschaftlicher Darstellung nicht zugänglich ist: er hebt Inhalte des Unterbewußtseins über die Schwelle des Bewußtseins. Er vermittelt, nicht auf dem Umweg über das Hirn, sondern eben viel direkter, vom Unterbewußtsein her, das Besondere der russischen Revolution, das Gefühl ihrer Notwendigkeit, ihren Enthusiasmus. Er bezwingt dadurch auch die Schwankenden und die Gegner.

(P&E 73-74)

Although Klenk is only temporarily affected by the film, he cannot escape the truth which it represents. He may be able to retreat back into his old persona, but he cannot escape this truth, one which "real life" could not make him acknowledge, but which art could. It may not manifest itself outwardly in his behaviour, but it is lodged in his subconscious, and he cannot escape it. I agree with Schmitz (83) that it is this effect on the subconscious which is important for Feuchtwanger's call to arms. Whereas Eisenstein wants his viewers to be moved to action in the form of revolution through group assertion, in an attempt to gain empowerment and rights, Feuchtwanger's aim is an intellectual call to arms. His revolution is one of reason, understanding and acceptance of the truth. This is an intellectual revolution against barbarianism, and he wants his readers to subsequently carry on with their own lives in a more enlightened way. This enlightenment manifests itself in different ways in different individuals, but it shares with Eisenstein's notion of didacticism as a call to revolution the same basic intention--a move away from apathy,

even if it only begins with a realization of the truth. It is through this type of art that the "Schwankenden" and the "Gegner" will be forced to see the truth--even if they are not moved to revolution. Through Klenk, who epitomizes this opposition, we are shown just how effective this type of art can be. As

Synnöve Clason states:

Was die russische Revolution selbst nicht vermocht hatte: bei einem reaktionären bayrischen Minister Verständnis für die Nöte und den Kampf des Proletariats zu wecken, das bewirkt der Mythos vom Matrosenaufstand im Hafen von Odessa im Jahre 1905, wie ihn *Sergej Eisenstein* gestaltet hatte. (WE 130)

Clason also points out another interesting point in this connection when she states that it is Klenk to whom Tüverlin turns in order to measure the effect of his book about class justice and impending fascism in Germany (WE 130). Tüverlin knows that if he can strike an emotional chord with Klenk that he has then succeeded in his goal. Klenk is once more used as a measuring stick for the effectiveness of a type of art which is to have a emotional impact on its audience. If the "message" can be brought home to Klenk, then it can have a positive effect on just about any opponent. Ultimately, both Johanna's film and Tüverlin's book succeed in this measure: "Nicht Krügers Schicksal an sich beeindruckt Klenk, sondern erst der Film Johanna Krains und das Buch Tüverlins lassen ihn hinterher seine Schuld erkennen" (WE 130). This is an indicator of the power of art in general.

Klenk's attitude is that his actions are never regrettable if done in the pursuance of maintaining his power in Bavarian politics, for the good of Bavaria as he sees it, and anything that he does in pursuing this goal is justifiable, even at the expense of individuals' rights and freedoms. This attitude is evidenced in the following quotation:

Wenn es ihn jetzt erwischte, wenn er jetzt abkratzen müßte, zu dieser Stunde, hatte er viel ausgelassen in seinen fünfzig Jahren, hatte er viel zu bereuen? Nichts hatte er zu bereuen. Wenn er sein Leben um und um drehte, es war ein gutes Leben, er brauchte, wenn er ja dazu sagte, die Stimme nicht zu dämpfen. Er war ein Bayer, ein alpenländischer Mensch. Bayern und die Zeit paßten nicht recht zusammen: um so schlimmer für die Zeit. (Erfolg 716)

It is only through art that Klenk is finally made to "see" what the consequences of his actions are on the individuals around him. Clason argues that

erst das Kunstwerk die Wirklichkeit 'wirklich' macht und Vorurteile aufzulösen vermag. Die Parallelität zwischen dieser Rehabilitierung Krügers und dem Orlow-Kapitel (IV/I) ist unmissverständlich [sic]. (WE 130)

But Clason seems to go too far in her connection. Klenk's acceptance of the truth about the injustices of the Bavarian justice system, with respect to the Krüger case--as portrayed in Johanna's and Tüverlin's respective works of art--is a manifestation of the powerful didactic effect that art can have. But it would be incorrect to say that the rehabilitation of Krüger through these art forms is a direct parallel to the "Orlow" chapter. This conclusion disregards totally the fact

that the "Orlow" chapter is not about one specific case--it operates according to a philosophy of a collective experience of history. Klenk's realization of the truth of the Krüger case reveals itself not as a universal manifestation, but really only on the level of the rehabilitation of one individual, through a realization of the corruptness of the Bavarian justice system.

One cannot deny that the similarity between Klenk's realization of the truth with respect to Krüger and with respect to the events portrayed in the "Orlow" chapter both hinge on a figurative "opening" of Klenk's eyes to see reality as portrayed in and experienced through art. The Klenk/Krüger connection remains quite individualized. Klenk acknowledges the injustices done to Krüger by the Bavarian justice system, government and Bavarian society, and the rehabilitation of Krüger remains just that. Klenk's acknowledgement of these facts stems from a bet made with Tüverlin that Tüverlin would not be able to make Krüger speak and to avenge the injustices perpetrated against him:

Klenk: Dieser Tote wird den Mund nicht aufmachen . . .  
 Tüverlin: Er wird ihn aufmachen . . . Wollen wir wetten,  
 daß er sprechen wird? (743)

Tüverlin's bet with Klenk that he can make the dead speak remains related strictly to the Krüger case.

As I have demonstrated, it is necessary for Feuchtwanger's intentions that an individual such as Klenk be affected by the Orlow film. He



may, on the outside, retreat into his old persona once he has left the theatre, but he is left with the truth of the images with which he has been confronted in the theatre. These images remain implanted in his subconscious for future reference, and they are also perhaps the impetus for his understanding and acceptance of Johanna's and Jacques' art at the end of Erfolg.

As I have stated, Feuchtwanger's aim is to strike an emotional chord with the reader, but he ultimately leaves it up to the reader to derive a message from the information put before him/her. The reader is to take this information away in his/her subconscious, and it becomes a part of his/her subconscious which affects future decisions and actions. In effect, Feuchtwanger advocates didactic art in the vein of Eisensteinian montage, but only in a toned down version.

### iii) "Generic" Montage in "Erfolg"

I have analyzed the key use of Eisensteinian montage in Erfolg and have shown Feuchtwanger's success in employing these techniques, as well as the significance of Klenk as a measuring stick for the effectiveness of such art. But the use of Eisensteinian montage is the exception with respect to the film techniques employed by Feuchtwanger. In the remainder of Feuchtwanger's 807-page novel, montage takes on a different form. It does not

serve to produce an immediate reaction or perception of an event. It does not take on the urgent tone or create the tension of a quick juxtaposition of opposing "shots." I will now illustrate Feuchtwanger's use of "generic" film techniques such as a standard montage, simultaneity and changing point of view and will discuss the effectiveness of these techniques in making Erfolg more "filmic."

Feuchtwanger appears to have understood quite well what Eisenstein wanted to achieve through montage. He demonstrates this in the "Orlow" chapter, but does not import it into his work as a whole. The montage presented outside of the Potemkin chapter differs from Eisensteinian montage. For Eisenstein, the narrative structure emerges through the process of montage, while in Erfolg there is a narrative structure which is independent of the result of the montage process, and which is interspersed with "disjointed" inclusions. As Synnöve Clason states, "diese Art von Montage [ermöglicht] dem Verfasser, den Rahmen der Fabel zu durchbrechen und Stoffe in den Roman einzubringen, die in der Fiktion nicht verarbeitet werden konnten" (WE 78). But this montage has an entirely different effect and serves a different purpose from that intended by Eisenstein.

Kurt Rumler states in his essay, "Filmisches Erzählen in Zusammenarbeit mit Brecht," that Feuchtwanger, in his novel Simone, was successful in using film techniques throughout the novel as a whole. Rumler

argues that he uses an Eisensteinian type of montage, and that this montage relies on the reader's reaction to derive meaning, and that it is through this interaction that the novel is driven forward:

Die Wirkung erreicht Feuchtwanger, indem er episch unvermittelt *aufeinander gereiht* (Eisenstein) Elemente montiert. Der Leser soll aus der *Nicht-Übereinstimmung* verschiedener *voneinander unabhängiger Stücke* (Eisenstein) sein Textverständnis aktiv selbst konstituieren.

(97)

But, as I have argued, aside from the "Orlow" chapter, Feuchtwanger does not use an Eisensteinian form of montage in Erfolg, but rather a more "generic" form of montage, a technical method that does not come "equipped" with an elaborate theory, and one that is not specifically derived from film. This type of montage is best described by Viktor Zmegac with reference to Volker Klotz's definition. Zmegac refers to it as being a "visible" montage, rather than one that integrates itself into the work:

Das Prinzip dieser [Montage] besteht, wie Klotz . . . formuliert, "nicht auf die Natur, sondern auf Technik." Im Gegensatz zu den Konventionen mimetischer Poetik, die zumeist die Konstruktion verbergen, "wird hier offen vorgezeigt: wo ein Teil aufhört und ein anderer beginnt; wie sie aneinander befestigt sind; wie sie einzeln und wie sie miteinander funktionieren."

(260)

Feuchtwanger's use of montage in Erfolg produces a disorienting effect which does not serve to promote the story line or drive the action of the novel forward but is rather digressive. Feuchtwanger inserted chapters into

Erfolg which were merely "Berichte." These are found between chapters which advance the narrative, but where these occur does not seem to be significant. The juxtaposition of these chapters with the rest of the novel produces a break; it acts as an intrusion in the narrative, and serves as a "Verfremdungseffekt" (Zmegac 261). This type of montage manipulates the reader by forcing him/her to withdraw temporarily from the main narrative in order to regain a proper distance from the work, and to be objective with respect to the events being portrayed.

When Feuchtwanger inserts, through montage, these documentary chapters he stops the progression of the narrative. Although it can be argued that these chapters are ultimately a part of the narrative as a whole, they do present a discontinuity in its advancement. Keith Cohen would imply that such is often the case with montage in the novel, but that such montage has quite a different effect from the montage envisioned by Eisenstein. He argues that montage is often spoken of as being comprised of a "disjunctive, nonsequential nature of two or more shots joined together" (81). Cohen stresses that the effect of such montage is quite different in a film from what it is in a novel. He argues that when we speak of the essence of montage being conflict through juxtaposition--which he concedes to be true--that we

neglect the inevitable continuity imposed on the film at the time of its projection and viewing. When two shots, mutually illogical, unconnected, or even contradictory, are brought together in the film, the automatic and relentless flow of images forces at least the appearance of sequence. There is no such thing as a non sequitur in the movies.

(81)

But I would argue that it is possible to achieve in the novel a type of non sequitur through montage. In Feuchtwanger's documentary chapters of Erfolg, in which spatial and temporal boundaries established within the main narrative are surpassed, he is able to suspend the main narrative and then return to the point at which he left off. Such a chapter does not drive the novel forward in the way the collision of shots would drive a film forward, but rather, as I stated, it serves a digressive function. These digressions are not filmic, but they are a very effective means to Feuchtwanger's end of forcing the reader to withdraw from the material and to incorporate some objectivity into the reader's experience.

This type of montage is actually a part of the narrative structure but is not crucial to narrative development. Matthias Schmitz states:

Es sind zudem auch selbständige, den Bereich der eigentlichen Romanhandlung weit überschreitende Erzähl- und Berichtspartien eingefügt; wiederholt wird der Handlungsablauf durch einmontierte Partien, die Dokumentcharakter annehmen, wie durch essayistisch-kommentierende Einschübe unterbrochen.

(81)

Schmitz points out that these "commentaries" are in a sense picked up by characters in the form of debates about art and "Weltanschauung,"

doch erörtern oder ergänzen sie nicht mehr bloß das Romangeschehen, sondern weiten sich zu selbständigen, die Fiktion potentiell überschreitenden geschichtsphilosophischen und ästhetischen Deutungen der Wirklichkeit schlechthin aus. (81)

These "documentary" chapters also serve the function of affording the narrator a distance from the specific events being depicted and to provide the reader with a more general overview of the time period or of history.

Wolfgang Müller-Funk argues:

Die chronikalischen Kapitel und Abschnitte . . . haben . . . vor allem die Funktion, die Daten der allgemeinen Geschichte, die nicht in den Rahmen des konkreten Geschehensablaufs einzubinden sind, die aber für dessen Verständnis vonnöten sind, in das literarische Modell einzufügen. (LGA 99)

He adds that montage is older than both film and photography, and that what makes "modern" montage unique is its revolutionary disregard for an integrative form of montage, and its opting for a "visible" form of montage. He is correct in stating also that Feuchtwanger employs this form of revolutionary montage (LGA 100). He goes on to say that in Feuchtwanger's case this montage technique does not at all have to be examined in conjunction with film, for it can stand alone as a technique within the context of Feuchtwanger's own theories of the novel:

Im Grunde genommen ist Feuchtwangers Verwendung der Montagetechnik nichts anders als eine ästhetisch radikalisierte Form seines Gestaltungsprinzips, durch ein Nebeneinander von vielen Einzelhandlungen, Episoden, literarischen Motiven und chronikalischen Berichten, eine möglichst breite, extensive Welt mit einem dichten Sinnzusammenhang zu erzeugen. (LGA 101)

Müller-Funk is referring here not to Feuchtwanger's use of Eisensteinian montage in the "Orlow" chapter but to the "documentary" chapters which Feuchtwanger inserted into Erfolg. His contention on this point would appear to be correct. Feuchtwanger's use of these documentary chapters does not seem to mimic the use of montage in film. The transition is not quick enough for their insertion to lose any effect which would be derived from such technical endeavours. The effect is to be found instead in the actual content of these chapters, not in their insertion into the novel.

This type of "visible" montage can be found in only seven out of the 124 chapters of Erfolg. The chapters provide the reader with details of Bavarian or German life and history during this time period: "Das Land Altbayern" (book IV, chapter 4); "Aus der Geschichte der Stadt München" (book IV, chapter 9); "Der Fluß Ruhr" (book IV, chapter 20); "Bayrische Lebensläufe" (book III, chapter 10). They also provide reports with respect to world events and statistics of the time: "Kurzer Rückblick auf die Justiz jener Jahre" (book I, chapter 4); "Einige historische Daten" (book II, chapter 14); "Polfahrt" (book V, chapter 1).

The chapters function to give the narrator a distance from the material in order to present a more objective stance. The reader is also thereby discouraged from relating to the characters and events. Any characters appearing in these chapters do not re-appear as characters in the main story line; the reader cannot form any sort of emotional attachment to them. The time period is made to feel extremely distant and it can be inferred from the narrator's language and tone of description that the misguided actions or thoughts described no longer prevail in present day. For example:

Die Bevölkerung des Planeten zählte in jenen Jahren 1800 Millionen Menschen, darunter etwa 700 Millionen Weißhäutige. Die Kultur der Weißhäutigen wurde für besser gehalten als die der andern, Europa galt als der beste Teil der Erde; eine langsame Gewichtsverschiebung fand statt hinüber nach Amerika, wo etwa ein Fünftel der weißen Menschen lebte. (Erfolg 213)

But Feuchtwanger carefully plans the effects of these reports. They are not inserted merely as a break from or a supplement to the main narrative. For example, through the use of statistics, Feuchtwanger provides a satirical slant to his reports. These are statistics about everyday life which serve to render foolish many of the events or situations of the time. The chapter "Einige historische Daten" is filled with statistics about German and Bavarian life:



Unter den Schriftstellern deutscher Zunge, die auch außerhalb ihrer Sprachgrenzen Namen hatten, waren 27 links-, 1 rechtsgerichtet. In den Reichstagswahlen entfielen im Kreis Oberbayern-Schwaben auf die Landsparteien 19,2 Prozent der abgegebenen Stimmen, in Berlin 61,7. Abonnenten rechtsgerichteter Blätter waren von 100 Münchner Studenten 57, von 100 Münchner Offizieren 91, von 100 Hamburger Arbeitern 2, von 100 eingeschriebenen Berliner Huren 37. (Erfolg 218)

In this same chapter Feuchtwanger cannot resist taking a poke at Bavaria in particular: "Geborene Idioten und Kretins gab es in Deutschland 36 461, davon in Bayern 11 209" (Erfolg 218).

The seven documentary chapters do not constitute montage in a filmic sense. This montage serves to satirize, distance and even clarify. The effects of these chapters are not the same as can be found when dealing with film montage. Because these are whole chapters, what is lacking is the quickness in transition present in a visual montage. Not being a part of the main narrative, this type of "chapter" montage cannot provide an effect similar to that produced with the use of integrative elements.

iv) Film Techniques: Simultaneity and Changing Point of View in "Erfolg"

In his essay, "Der Film Potemkin und mein Buch Erfolg,"

Feuchtwanger states:

Die Erfahrungen, die ich in dem Film Potemkin an mir selber machte, haben dazu beigetragen, daß ich versuchte, auch die Technik des Romans zu erneuern, indem ich bewußt auf den Roman Mittel des Films anwandte (Gleichzeitigkeit, Belichtung des gleichen Menschen oder des gleichen Ereignisses von verschiedenen Seiten her), Mittel, die man bisher auf diesem Gebiet nicht verwandt hat [emphasis mine].

(74)

We have seen how Feuchtwanger used an Eisensteinian form of montage in the "Orlow" chapter. He also attempted to portray in Erfolg the immediacy and dramatic tension of simultaneity and wanted to expand the reader's realm of experience by employing changing points of view. I will show in this section how he used the film techniques of simultaneity and changing point of view, and their effect in rendering the novel more "filmic."

As I have shown, in Eisensteinian montage the "A" and the "B" occur simultaneously, with the effect that the "A" and the "B" appear superimposed upon each other. One could argue that this is filmic simultaneity for it too supersedes configurations of time and space. Eisensteinian montage demands not only the surmounting of time, but also the overcoming of spatial considerations, but not in the same way as a pure simultaneity, for his displacement of spatial configurations involves superimposition. The difference between the two lies in the resulting co-existence of elements, or lack thereof. In simultaneity, the elements of the spatial and temporal configurations do not "collide," and the result is the co-existence of elements. In Eisensteinian

montage, however, when boundaries of time and space are overcome, the result is conflict and "collision," and the consequence is a combustive process. Once the boundaries of time and space have been overcome, there is, for Eisenstein, no possibility of co-existence of elements.

I will now discuss Feuchtwanger's attempt to incorporate simultaneity into his novel. As I have argued above, this simultaneity is distinct from any aspects of simultaneity found in Eisenstein's theory of dialectical montage. In book I, chapter 13, "Eine Stimme aus dem Grab und viele Ohren," simultaneity is demonstrated through the use of a leitmotif. Various daily newspapers carry a report about love letters revealed at the Krüger trial. These newspapers act as a leitmotif indicating simultaneity, which Feuchtwanger attempts to present by portraying different characters' reactions within the same paragraph:

Es las diesen Bericht der Kultusminister Dr. Flaucher. Er hockte zwischen den alten Plüschmöbeln seiner dumpfen, niederen Wohnung. Dies war mehr, als er sich erhofft hatte. Er knurrte befriedigt etwas Musik vor sich hin, daß der Dackel Waldmann aufschaute. Es las den Bericht der Professor Balthasar von Osternacher, der repräsentative Maler, den der Mann Krüger einen Dekorateur geheißen hatte. Er lächelte, machte sich von neuem und intensiver an seine Arbeit, obwohl er für diesen Abend eigentlich hatte Schluß machen wollen, er hielt jene Wertung durch den Mann Krüger jetzt für endgültig widerlegt. Auch der Dr. Lorenz Matthäi las den Bericht, der ausgezeichnete Gestalter bayrischer Volkstypen; sein fleischiges, unbeherrschtes Hundsgesicht wurde noch knurriger, die Säbelhiebe aus seiner Studentenzeit noch röter.[...]

(Erfolg 82)

The newspapers with the specific headline for the day serve to inform the reader that the events being portrayed in the chapter are simultaneous, but the structure of the representation does not add to the effect. The paragraphs and sentences within the paragraphs dwell too long on each character's reaction, and encumber the simultaneous reactions with an overabundance of ancillary information with respect to each character. It is in such instances that one can see the obstacles present in literature which are not present in film, namely with respect to representation of simultaneity.

In film, a shot--which might only contain a single image--can comprise an elaborate visual description, which can be communicated in mere seconds. But with the written word, any description that the author wishes to convey must be "spelled out." The description through words, when read, can serve to draw out a single "moment" into a much more elaborate affair. What is lost in this transmission process is the immediate and quick impact of the visual shot. The process is drawn out, and the effect is largely lost.

The same loss of effect is experienced when Feuchtwanger attempts a representation of simultaneity with the word "mittlerweile," or the phrase "um die gleiche Zeit." These are used as a link to show simultaneity between individual chapters. An example of the former can be found in the first sentence of book II, chapter 21, "Die Funktion des Schriftstellers": "Dieser Schriftsteller Jacques Tüverlin ging mittlerweile [emphasis mine], etwa eine

kleine Stunde von der Konditorei "Alpenrose" entfernt" (257), and once again in book IV, chapter 16, "Von der Fairness." In book I, chapter 10, "Der Maler Alonso Cano (1601-1667), the first sentence reads: "Um die gleiche Zeit saß der Mann Krüger in der Zelle 134" (70).

Feuchtwanger's linking of individual chapters gives an impression of simultaneity, but not a filmic sense. The word "mittlerweile" or a phrase such as "um die gleiche Zeit" is not strong enough to produce a filmic simultaneity between chapters which are about eight pages in length. Technically, the reader knows that the events of the chapters are occurring simultaneously, but the reader does not actually get a sense of the simultaneity, for there is a chronological order to the reading of the chapters which is far too drawn out to achieve a filmic effect.

Feuchtwanger also wanted to incorporate into his novel a changing point of view, which in film terms means a changing point-of-view shot. Giannetti defines a point-of-view shot as "[a]ny shot that is taken from the vantage point of a character in the film, showing what the character sees" (472-73). This technique is also known as a subjective camera, and is defined by Thomas and Vivian Sobchack as "[a] situation in which the audience involvement with the scene is intensified through identification with the camera point of view" (492). This technique serves to expand the vantage point of the viewer and to broaden the realm of experience.

In Erfolg, simultaneity and changing point of view are so closely connected that Synnöve Clason uses the term "Gleichzeitigkeit" to describe instances of simultaneity as well as of changing point of view. For example, in chapter 1 of book II, "Ein Waggon in der Untergrundbahn," Feuchtwanger portrays a group of people riding the subway home from work. On the subway, the individuals interact because of a specific newspaper headline.

Viele lasen die kaum eine Stunde alten  
Spätabendzeitungen mit ihren Bildern und ihren heftig die  
Neugier stachelnden Schlagzeilen. "Attentat auf den  
Abgeordneten Geyer", hieß die Schlagzeile des einen  
Blattes. Die andere Zeitung hingegen, diese Mitteilung in  
unscheinbaren Lettern auf der zweiten Seite bringend,  
behielt die Schlagzeile ihrer ersten Seite "Großen  
Unterschleifen sozialistischer Beamten" vor. (133/34)

Clason states that this is one of the chapters which functions to give the reader the "Eindruck der Gleichzeitigkeit" (WE 82). But, as Cohen states, "simultaneity embraces both time and space: temporal coincidence and spatial disjunction" (141). He indicates that both of these elements are required. However, in the chapter under discussion there is no spatial disjunction. There is only really one "image" in which this temporal coincidence occurs. Thus it would appear that the techniques in this chapter, although filmic, would best be classified as "changing point of view"--Feuchtwanger's other intended film technique.

In the subway chapter, the reader experiences the interpretation of the headline news about Dr. Geyer through the eyes of various individuals.

However, the reader does not get a clearer or more complete picture of the report as a result of exposure to these various reactions, for it is the reactions and opinions of these individuals which overshadow the actual report.

Zwei junge Menschen, die, die Köpfe gegeneinander geneigt, zusammen aus einem Zeitungsblatt die Nachricht gelesen hatten, sahen sich an, finster angerührt, schwiegen, die Gesichter fast verstört. "Wenn ein Arbeiter von reaktionärem Lumpenpack verhauen wird", sagte mit hoher, etwas fiebriger Stimme ein bebrillter, dünnberockter, junger Mensch zu zwei andern, " und das kommt alle Tage vor, dann nehmen sie keine so großen Typen." . . . "Immer mit ihrer faden Politik", dachte ein Mann mit einer Maske starrer Männlichkeit, einen riesigen Ring am Finger, und blätterte weiter zu dem Bericht über die gestrige Premiere, in der ein Fachkollege gespielt hatte. (Erfolg 134/35)

Because the reader is not familiar with any of the individuals on the train, there is no one point of view which is authoritative for him/her. Feuchtwanger--through descriptions of individuals' clothing--situates the individuals present, putting them into a social context so that the reader may better interpret the opinions presented. However, Feuchtwanger also warns us of the reliability of these points of view as a whole with the following paragraph:

"Zeiten sind das!" jammerte eine aufgeregte Dame, die Nachricht, einem anderen Fahrgast über die Schulter lugend, erspäht hatte. "Wer ist hingerichtet worden?" schrie ihre halbtube, klapprige Mutter zurück. "Der Dr. Geyer." -- "Ist das der Minister, der die Inflation gemacht hat?" schrie vom andern Ende des Wagens die Mutter. Mehrere suchten sie aufzuklären, jemand bat indigniert um Ruhe. Es sei also doch der Minister, konstatierte befriedigt die Schwerhörige. (Erfolg 135)

Another example of changing point of view is found in book I, chapter 6, "Das Haus Katharinenstraße 94 sagt aus." This chapter presents us with a much more concrete example of Feuchtwanger's attempt at adopting a changing point of view. The chapter takes place in the courtroom during the Krüger trial, and the changing point of view occurs through the eyes of the jurors present at the trial. Changing points of view allow the reader to experience the events of the trial through the eyes of these jurors. This example, however, attaches to the points of view a hierarchical standing, for we are already familiar with many of these individuals and many of their descriptions are further qualified with occupational and social details:

Der Geschworene Feichtinger, Gymnasiallehrer von Beruf, schaute die Zeugin aus blassen Augen hinter seiner Stahlbrille aufmerksam und verständnislos an. Er mühte sich pflichtgemäß eifrig, den Aussagen zu folgen; doch ebenso langsam wie gründlich von Begriff, erkannte er nicht recht, worauf Fragen und Antworten hinauswollten. Insbesondere vermochte er nicht festzustellen, inwiefern die einzelnen Bekundungen mit der Grundmaterie in Zusammenhang standen. Das alles ging ihm zu schnell, die Methode war ihm zu modern hastig. Er kaute an den Nägeln, korrigierte manchmal mechanisch in Gedanken eine Satzkonstruktion, schaute aus blassen Augen auf die Münder der vielen Zeugen. (Erfolg 41)

The reader is given the opportunity to evaluate the information based on his/her understanding of the character, and how much weight will be put on the information given by each character will ultimately rest with the reader's evaluation of that character. But Feuchtwanger himself manipulates



this process in that he gives the reader the information upon which he/she will base his/her opinion. Provided that the reader interprets the information in the way in which Feuchtwanger intended, he/she will assess the information given by these characters in a way prescribed by Feuchtwanger.

Changing point of view in Erfolg also falls short of Feuchtwanger's intentions. Although this technique is not exclusive to film, it must be examined with respect to its function in film, since it is from this medium that Feuchtwanger claims to have borrowed it. Whereas in film the exposure of individuals or events from different angles takes place because of a changing camera perspective, Feuchtwanger must carry out this task in the novel by using the perspective of different characters. In film this change of perspective is a physical change, and we get the impression of seeing the same character or situation from all sides--there is the potential there of seeing the "whole"; in Erfolg, we often get the impression that we are "seeing" the same side of a character or situation, but through different "eyes." The difference here is a literal point of view versus a figurative point of view.

This is not to disqualify Feuchtwanger's attempt at establishing a changing point of view. Ultimately, it is a fiction that these characters see things differently, and the distinction is really only rhetorical. But Feuchtwanger attempts to delineate these different characters in such a way that we have the perception of experiencing inherently different points of view. Although he does

this very effectively, this is not the technique of changing point of view which he claims to have borrowed from film. In film, when we speak of this technique, we speak literally of "changing point of view." There is an "omniscient" camera which physically changes location to offer a literally different point of view or angle. All points of view have equal authority, and what we have, essentially, is one point of view. Cohen states that

[i]f we take point of view to be, in its widest meaning, the narrative vehicle by which the story is told, then important variations can be found in many traditional forms of fiction. . . . If, on the other hand, we take point of view to refer to the specific angle and distance established between the diegetic matter and the narrative vehicle, [then] the modern novelist has, consciously or unconsciously, staked a trail that leads to perspectival techniques strikingly similar to the continual shifting of angle and distance in the camera set-ups of cinematic narration, or montage. (157)

Feuchtwanger's use of point of view would tend to fall into the category described by the former definition and thus would have only very tenuous connections to film. It would appear that it falls short of being any sort of revolutionary new technique and tends toward the technique to be found in more traditional forms of fiction which are not directly related to film.

The effect is entirely different when Feuchtwanger substitutes actual characters for "the camera." In film this effect is achieved by use of the subjective camera in a "point-of-view shot," where the camera actually takes the place of a character's angle of vision. This would come closer to what

Feuchtwanger does with the technique which he labels changing point of view. What he says and what he does, however, still remain two different things. Cohen refers to this attempt at changing point of view as "multiperspectivism," or "the depiction of a single event from radically distinct points of view" (208) and acknowledges its presence in much post-cinema literature, but differentiates it from a stricter definition of cinematic changing point of view.

As I have shown, Feuchtwanger's intentions with respect to the application of film techniques in the novel fall short of his expectations where the above-mentioned "generic" techniques of simultaneity and changing point of view are concerned. It is when he uses techniques which tend towards an Eisensteinian theory of dialectical montage that he is most successful, the result being more "filmic."

### III. CONCLUSION

#### i) Feuchtwanger's New Historical Novel and Film Techniques

I have shown the results of Feuchtwanger's use of film techniques in rendering Erfolg filmic and, according to him, modern. I would like to end this discussion of film techniques by examining their ramifications for Feuchtwanger's new historical novel within the context of his theories of the historical novel.

Feuchtwanger felt that historical fiction was more alive than historical "truth." According to him, a scholarly rendering of history would always yield inherent biases and was therefore no more "true" than historical fiction. He was sceptical about historical research as a science and any claim to pure objectivity in the writing of history. He believed that the historical truth which was so sought after in this field was not ascertainable, and that in the end it could only provide a bare skeleton made up of the "facts" themselves. Feuchtwanger sums it up as follows:

. . .immer wieder wurde mir bewußt, daß diese "reine Wissenschaft" nichts liefern kann als Skelette. Es sind zuweilen sehr sauber präparierte Skelette, deren Betrachtung eine Art ästhetischer Befriedigung verschafft; aber mit lebendigem Fleisch umgeben kann ein solches Skelett nur dichterische Phantasie. (Desdemona 17)

Feuchtwanger did not deny the importance of historiography in its own right, but he did condemn it as a dry and essentially "empty" practice. These facts could only be brought to life within the context of historical fiction, and it was this desire to render history "lebendig" which ultimately drove him to write history in the form of the historical novel. But he did not deny that he too had used many of the tools of the historian:

Nun leugne ich ganz und gar nicht die Verdienste der methodischen quellenkritischen Forschung. Ich selber habe quellenkritische Studien getrieben, ich folgte oft und gern den geistreichen, manchmal sehr spannenden Erörterungen und Hypothesen der exakten Wissenschaft, ich danke diesem Studium manche gute Stunde. (Desdemona 17)

Feuchtwanger, however, expressed what he felt to be an insufficiency with respect to the results which historians could produce. In Desdemona, he cites Henry Ford's statement, "History is bunk" (15), as being analogous to his own sentiments. He believed that one should be suspicious of the belief of the nineteenth-century proponents of historicism who asserted that they could elevate history to an "ernsthaften Wissenschaft," and he viewed the often

quoted words of Leopold von Ranke, "Ich will zeigen, wie es eigentlich gewesen ist" (Desdemona 15), as suspect.<sup>6</sup>

One of the things which drew Feuchtwanger to represent history, albeit in a fictional mode, was its potential effect on the general public. He was amazed at its readiness to accept what he would call "spurious histories," or "Nicht-Ereignisse". He refers to legends and tales such as that of William Tell which, although proven never to have happened, are still embraced by the general populace. He tells the story of how, after Shakespeare's Othello became famous, a palazzo belonging to the Moro family in Venice came to be known as the "House of Othello." In 1844, the German painter Friedrich Nehrlich painted the "House," and as an appendage to it painted a small two-window palazzo, which he facetiously labelled the "House of Desdemona." Feuchtwanger explains the fate of the painter: "Von da an galt der kleine Palazzo als "Casa di Desdemona", und als der Maler den Tatbestand aufklären wollte, wurde er verprügelt" (Desdemona 12). It is this rejection of truth on the part of the general public which intrigued Feuchtwanger with respect to the representation of historical distortions, for he believed that it was these "Nicht-Ereignisse" which make up a large part of what we call "history":

Begebenheiten, die nie stattgefunden haben oder doch nicht so, wie sie erzählt werden, bilden einen großen Teil

---

<sup>6</sup> Feuchtwanger mistakenly attributes the von Ranke quotation to Johannes Ranke.

dessen, was man gemeinhin Geschichte nennt, sie werden hartnäckig geglaubt, sie leben zäher als die ernsthaft dokumentierten "Fakten" der wissenschaftlichen Geschichtschreibung. (Desdemona 12)

Feuchtwanger wanted to represent history in such a way that it would have a meaning within the context of the reader's own life, and felt that this end could best be achieved through historical fiction, as opposed to academic historicism.

The essence of Feuchtwanger's new historical novel was to be the author's "Erlebnis."<sup>7</sup> He required the main motive of the historical novel to be a portrayal of the writer's contemporary surroundings and problems and saw this as the necessary basis for any historical fiction. This was, for him, the actual substance of historical fiction (Desdemona 142). But Feuchtwanger strongly asserted that an objective stance had to be created. This objectivity came into play with the material itself. In order to project more clearly (read: objectively) the contemporary picture, the author distanced it from the contemporary world. By placing the author's experience of present-day issues in a historical context the author allowed him/herself and the reader to observe and evaluate from a detached perspective; his metaphor is instructive: "Der Autor weiß, daß man eine bessere Perspektive nur aus der Distanz gewinnen

---

<sup>7</sup> Feuchtwanger finds the English word "experience" to be an insufficient translation of the German "Erlebnis;" it is used to translate both the German "Erfahrung" as well as "Erlebnis", which are two entirely different things. I will maintain the German "Erlebnis" in my discussion (see p.174 of Desdemona).

kann, daß man die Linien eines Gebirges aus der Entfernung besser erkennt als mitten im Gebirge" (Desdemona 140).

Feuchtwanger did not promote an escapist form of literature. He did not intend to bring to life a past era in order to flee from the present, for "[e]chte Dichter haben auch in ihren Schöpfungen, die Historie zum Gegenstand hatten, immer nur Zeitgenössisches aussagen wollen, ihr Verhältnis zur eigenen Zeit, ihr erlebtes Erkennen, wieviel von der Vergangenheit in der eigenen Zeit atmet" (Desdemona 129). His ultimate goal was to create an historical novel which would, above all, serve a didactic purpose, but he felt that he could only achieve this didactic end if he could evoke an emotional response in the reader. Herein lies the decisive factor for Feuchtwanger's choice of historical fiction over academic historical writing: it is much easier to evoke an emotional response through fictional writing than through "factual" narrative. Faulhaber sums it up in the following way:

While history appeals only to the intellect, historical fiction appeals to man's emotions as well. With true pedagogical insight, Feuchtwanger saw that acceptance of any lesson presupposes an interrelationship of reason and emotion. In order to evoke an emotional response, he felt that the poet had to breathe life into the documentary material, which he likened to a mere skeleton of a planned work. (69)

Didacticism through emotional manipulation was a main element of Feuchtwanger's new historical novel. His theories call for this emotional



intervention through various techniques such as presentation of "real" characters to whom the reader can relate, and the avoidance of an overabundant description of historical minutiae, which would only serve to distract the reader and detract from the emotional process. But I would argue that Feuchtwanger's use of filmic techniques, specifically Eisensteinian montage, is a way of rendering his new historical novel more "affective." The use of these film techniques within the context of Feuchtwanger's own theories of historical representation brings about more compelling results in deriving emotion from the reader than an application of his theories would on its own.

The fact that Klenk is seduced by the film is a phenomenal occurrence, for how can Klenk possibly 'relate' to these sailors? He is not indifferent towards the sailors or hostile towards their cause, as one would expect given his social biases, rather he sympathizes with the sailors on a human level. This sympathy is a result of the emotional effect of Eisenstein's film, and without Eisensteinian montage Klenk might remain unmoved by a representation of these events. It is through the use of this type of montage that Feuchtwanger can reach all the Klenks in society by means of the historical novel. Through the historical novel Feuchtwanger intended to attract a broad range of readers, and by supplementing theory with Eisensteinian montage, Feuchtwanger finds a means of enticing the Klenks of society. This montage is

a necessity for completing the "Erneuerung" of the historical novel and for reaching the emotions of the broadest possible spectrum of readers.

But one might ask whether Feuchtwanger--by providing his reader, at times, with the "C" of the dialectic equation--in fact trivializes the dialectical aspect of Eisenstein's montage techniques? By furnishing his reader with the "C" in the  $A+B=C$  formula, does he render this process inconsequential? It could be argued that if he had wanted to demonstrate the power of this process in deriving a didactic effect, he would allow the reader to produce his/her own "C" in all cases. But if he allowed the reader to produce his/her own "C" in all instances, he would risk an overly subjective stance on the part of the reader, which could serve to quash entirely the objectivity which is so important in his work. The historical background would allow for a certain amount of objectivity, but this type of montage might ultimately be far too powerful to have it work directly on the reader within the context of Feuchtwanger's new historical novel, for it could potentially engulf the reader in too much subjectivity. Feuchtwanger wanted his reader to be emotionally affected by his art, but not to give up a certain amount of objectivity. In order to sustain some degree of objectivity, Feuchtwanger forces the reader, by often providing the "C" through Klenk, to remain one step removed from the dialectic process, in order to be able to analyze the situation. But by doing this, Feuchtwanger still maintains a degree of emotional hold on his reader so as to

transmit didactic intent, but by preventing his readers from becoming entirely immersed in the dialectic process, he forces them to remain at least partially detached in this emotional process.

It could also be argued that Feuchtwanger--or any writer, for that matter--could never represent the collision of his "A" and "B" as effectively with the written word as can be done in film, and that difficulties would therefore exist with respect to the reader's inference of the desired "C." For example, when Klenk thinks: "Man spürt richtig die schlechte Luft des Raums" (Erfolg 497), this physical sensation of claustrophobia could likely never be conveyed with equal success in a printed text. Eisenstein believed that since his shots were uncomplicated and brief, and since so much information could be conveyed through a visual image within a matter of seconds, that the end result of his dialectical montage was that his "A" and "B" actually had the effect of appearing to be superimposed upon each other and that the result of this "collision" was his "C"; the whole equation would take place as a single combusive burst. But there are possible limitations with the written word which might make it difficult for such an effect to be derived from a written text. It is more difficult to make a reader perceive that words are "superimposed" upon each other. With the written word, the transmission process is going to be longer with respect to the representation of images. The image that a viewer can perceive in a matter of mere seconds in film could take many sentences to

describe. This transmission process would then also be affected by the speed with which the reader reads the written text; it would be difficult to ensure a certain pace of reading. However, in film the viewer has no control over how quickly he/she is confronted with images, nor the speed of their transition. Thus images can be presented more quickly in film and the duration of their appearance can also be controlled. With respect to filmic representation, these are two very definite limitations facing an author like Feuchtwanger.

It is quite evident from what has been said that Feuchtwanger's use of Eisenstein's dialectical montage in the novel can be distinguished from the two types of "generic" montage discussed in this thesis. Its connections to these types of montage, as well as to simultaneity, remain visible nevertheless. When we look at the use of montage for Feuchtwanger's conception of historical representation within the context of his theory of the historical novel, it appears that these techniques allow the reader to relate to the events being portrayed, but at the same time they allow Feuchtwanger--through his use of the given "C"--to control the reader's objectivity so that he/she is not so immersed in the events that they cannot be objectively evaluated. The reader is to take an active role in evaluating and assessing the information before him/her, and it is therefore important that he/she remain objective.

As I have shown, Eisensteinian montage is only used in one chapter of Erfolg, but it is nevertheless very important to Feuchtwanger's

modernisation of the historical novel. Feuchtwanger spoke of the incorporation of film techniques as being significant for the creation of a modern novel, and the most effective use of these techniques is to be found in the "Orlow" chapter. In addition, the montage techniques used in the chapter also serve to enhance Feuchtwanger's theory of a new historical novel. I would argue that the "generic" film techniques discussed fall short of Feuchtwanger's intentions with respect to rendering Erfolg filmic, and hence "modern," due to the fact that these techniques, or variations of them, do not derive directly from film and can be found in pre-cinema literature.<sup>8</sup> (see Film and Fiction by Keith Cohen for a detailed discussion). The generic techniques used by Feuchtwanger do not appear to be defined by any specific set of theoretical considerations, and Feuchtwanger's interpretation of them provides results which are not filmic. On the other hand, Eisenstein's theory of dialectical montage is specifically defined, and can therefore be incorporated more readily into the novel. Although we can only speculate as to whether Feuchtwanger actually had access to these theories, it appears that he was quite familiar with their basis as derived from the Marxist dialectic. Due to the effect of Potemkin on Feuchtwanger and his understanding of the techniques employed in it, he was able to transfer successfully the techniques and their effect into the novel. Their presence in Erfolg is of paramount importance for rendering a key part of his novel filmic

---

<sup>8</sup> See Film and Fiction by Keith Cohen for a detailed discussion of this topic.

and consequently pointing the way to a new historical novel for the twentieth century.

ii) The Genre Question in "Erfolg"

Marcel Reich-Ranicki, for all of his criticisms of Feuchtwanger's work, had to admit that Erfolg was Feuchtwanger's "von heute her gesehen, originellstes und wichtigstes Werk." (443) He went on to say:

Nur ein einziges Werk von Feuchtwanger war, glaube ich, für die Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in unserem Jahrhundert von Bedeutung--und es ist eben nicht ein historischer, sondern ein zeitkritischer Roman: das zunächst überaus kühl aufgenommene Buch Erfolg. (452)

As is evident from Reich-Ranicki's statement that Erfolg is not an historical novel and my investigation of it within the context of theories of the historical novel, there is no consensus on how to categorize this novel. I will end my thesis by looking at the question of genre as it pertains to Erfolg. One can see from the secondary material available that critics--myself included--feel the need to categorize Erfolg in order to carry on an investigation of it. This is nothing new or interesting in itself, but the varying results which it produces are. For example, Frank Dietschreit includes Erfolg among Feuchtwanger's *Gegenwarts-Romane* (39), Wilhelm von Sternburg calls it a *Zeitroman* (Weinert 41), and Harald Weinrich calls it an historical novel because that is how

Feuchtwanger composed it (221). Hans-Harald Müller on the other hand asks the question whether Erfolg is "ein historisch-dokumentarischer Schlüsselroman, der die bayerische Geschichte der Jahre 1921 bis 1924 zum Gegenstand hat," or whether it is, as Thomas Mann wrote, "ein Beispiel für 'komische Kunst', der Geschichte eher Stoff denn Gegenstand der Erkenntnis ist" (167). After a thorough investigation Müller concludes with the following:

Feuchtwangers Erfolg ist, wie mir scheint, ein Roman dessen Qualitäten weder in der Erklärung der Welt noch in seiner geschichtsphilosophischen Konzeption liegen, sondern in einer ironisch auf die Geschichte anspielenden fiktionalen Gestaltung von 'Drei Jahre Geschichte einer Provinz'. (179)

What Feuchtwanger does in his own writings on the historical novel is to contemplate a modern historical novel with enough breadth to encompass most of the characteristics of the sub-genres mentioned above. For him, what is more important than the label that the work bears in the end is that it achieve specific goals, all of which are connected with creating a new novel. As I have discussed, this new novel, according to Feuchtwanger, would have to be created to incorporate advances of modern technology, but it would also have to function as a means of transmitting the author's "Erlebnis" to the reader, with an eye to functioning as a didactic tool. According to Feuchtwanger the main purpose of his theories is to achieve these goals, and I would argue that if this is accomplished, Feuchtwanger has, in Erfolg, set out to

do what he intended, regardless of the label which is subsequently stamped upon the novel.

Regardless of whether Erfolg is classified as historical or purely "zeitkritisch," it cannot be denied that Feuchtwanger dared to cross numerous boundaries in literature. From a structural point of view he attempted to supersede preconceived notions of what one could and could not do within the context of the novel form. His use of filmic techniques--both Eisensteinian and "generic"--served to give to his novel another dimension of time and space. Further, his striving for fragmentation as a means of better perceiving the whole added a new texture to the novel. Although Feuchtwanger was not the first to do this (see Joyce, Döblin, Dos Passos), he was delving into this new territory at about the same time as many others who were experimenting with such techniques. Unfortunately his works inauspiciously bore the label of "accessible" literature, and his reputation in the world of "serious" literature suffered because of it.

But to dismiss Feuchtwanger's work as "popular" literature would be unconscionable. With Erfolg, Feuchtwanger achieved much in the way of modernizing the novel. He recognized a need for change and recognized the direction in which this change would have to take the novel. Within the context of this modernisation of the historical novel, Feuchtwanger set up a model for literature which ultimately extends far beyond the realm of this particular novel.



His use of filmic techniques--specifically in the "Orlow" chapter--have implications which are far-reaching. What we will not or cannot acknowledge in "real life," we must be made to acknowledge in art. This attitude is exemplified in the last chapter of Erfolg, in which Johanna Krain completes her film about Krüger and his fate, and Jacques Tüverlin completes his book on the same topic. Through these two art forms, Johanna and Jacques are able to force their audience--and specifically Klenk--to see the reality which they previously refused to perceive, and to rehabilitate Krüger in the process.

It is this power of art with which Feuchtwanger was ultimately concerned. He came to realize just how powerful didactic art could be after seeing Eisenstein's Potemkin. But what is remarkable is that in his didactic work Feuchtwanger did not fail to entertain his readers. Even if one dismisses entertainment as inappropriate for "serious" literature, it is hard to deny that Feuchtwanger successfully combined entertainment, modernity and didacticism. By combining the application of his theories with film techniques, Feuchtwanger revitalized the historical novel for the twentieth century. He produced a novel which was just as accessible to the average person as it was "valid" for any snobbish proponent of "serious" art.

Perhaps Feuchtwanger was overshadowed by other literary figures of his time. Perhaps his method of combining entertainment and didacticism was ahead of its time, or even out of its time. There is no

conclusive answer as to why many of Feuchtwanger's works have been consigned into near obscurity, but perhaps it is from Feuchtwanger's own words that we can gain the most insight into this query:

Für den Erfolg eines Literaturwerkes ist der rechte Zeitpunkt des Erscheinens von hoher Wichtigkeit. Das gilt für große Zeitspannen und für kleine. Gewisse Werke können Erfolg haben nur in Zeiten, die ein bestimmtes Weltbild bevorzugen. Sie werden von der Zeitströmung getragen; andere, von größerem Format, gehen unter, weil sie gegen die Zeitströmung schwimmen. (Desdemona 159)

Perhaps Erfolg was, in its day, "von der Zeitströmung getragen," as Feuchtwanger would put it, and perhaps too, being too bound to its time, the novel has outlived its relevance. But Feuchtwanger's attempt to legitimize popular literature produced a work which was also ahead of its time, one which swam against this very "Zeitströmung" specifically because of this very attempt to elevate popular literature. The inability to categorize Erfolg and its author presents two final related questions. Is the novel dated, or was it ahead of its time? Is it popular literature or "high art"? Or, seen from another angle, is Feuchtwanger a "Schriftsteller" or a "Dichter"? It is difficult to categorize Feuchtwanger and his novel with such absolute terms, so that we find ourselves searching for a middle position incorporating both extremes. Perhaps such a mixed genre is rare for German literature, which would partly explain why Erfolg, a combination of elements of popular literature and serious

literature, is so difficult to categorize as "high-brow" literature. But now, as the end of the twentieth century nears, the time is ripe for us to re-evaluate Erfolg and Feuchtwanger himself and to locate them in their proper place in the history of twentieth-century German literature.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### 1. Primary Sources

- Feuchtwanger, Lion. Das Haus der Desdemona, oder Größe und Grenzen der historischen Dichtung. München: Langen Müller, 1984.
- . "Der Autor über sich selbst (1935)." Text und Kritik 79/80 (1983): 1-4.
- . Erfolg: Drei Jahre Geschichte einer Provinz. Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1955.
- . "The Essentials of German Character (1928)." Ein Buch nur für meine Freunde. Frankfurt: Fischer, 1984. 405-07.
- . "Der Film Potemkin und mein Buch Erfolg." Text und Kritik 79/80 (1983): 73-74.
- . "Historischer Roman--Roman von heute!" Weimarer Republik. Manifeste und Dokumente zur deutschen Literatur 1918-1933. Ed. Anton Kaes. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1983. 343-345.
- . "Mein Roman Erfolg (1931)." Ein Buch nur für meine Freunde. Frankfurt: Fischer, 1984. 388-90.
- . Afterword. Exil. By Feuchtwanger. Frankfurt: Fischer, 1984. 787-91.
- . "Der Roman von heute ist international. (1932)." Ein Buch nur für meine Freunde." Frankfurt: Fischer, 1984. 422-27.
- . "Notes on the Historical Novel." Books Abroad 22 (1948): 345-47.
- . "Vom Sinn und Unsinn des historischen Romans (1935)." Lion Feuchtwanger "...für die Vernunft, gegen Dummheit und Gewalt". Ed. Walter Huder and Friedrich Knilli. Berlin: Publica Verlagsgesellschaft, 1985. 154-59.

- . "Warum schreiben Sie keine Filme?" Vossische Zeitung (31. März 1929), in: Weimarer Republik. Manifeste und Dokumente zur deutschen Literatur 1918-1933. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1983. 230.
- . "Wie kämpfen wir gegen ein Drittes Reich?" Weimarer Republik. Manifeste und Dokumente zur deutschen Literatur 1918-1933. Ed. Anton Kaes. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1983. 590-591.

## 2. Secondary Sources

- Batt, Kurt. "Klio und Kalliope." Neue deutsche Literatur 10 (1962): 98-105.
- Behne, Adolf. "Die Stellung des Publikums zur modernen deutschen Literatur." Die Weltbühne 22 (18. Mai 1926) Nr.20, in: Weimarer Republik. Manifeste und Dokumente zur deutschen Literatur 1918-1933. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1983. 219-222.
- Berendsohn, Walter A. Der Meister des politischen Romans: Lion Feuchtwanger. Stockholm: Schriften des deutschen Instituts der Universität Stockholm, 1976.
- Berndt, Wolfgang. "The Trilogy Der Wartesaal." Lion Feuchtwanger: The Man, His Ideas, His Work. Ed. John M. Spalek. Los Angeles: Hennessey, 1972. 131-155.
- Borchmeyer, Dieter and Viktor Zmegac. Moderne Literatur in Grundbegriffen. Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1987.
- Brauer, Wolfgang. "Tun und Nichttun. Zu Lion Feuchtwangers Geschichtsbild." Neue deutsche Literatur 7.6 (1959): 113-22.
- Brod, Max. "Von Sinn und Würde des historischen Romans." Die neue Rundschau 67.2-3 (1956): 491-502.
- Clason, Synnöve. "Die Verarbeitung des Bayern-Stoffes in Erfolg." Jahrmarkt der Gerechtigkeit. Ed. Wolfgang Müller-Funk. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1987. 87-103.

- . Die Welt Erklären. Geschichte und Fiktion in Lion Feuchtwangers Roman "Erfolg". Stockholm: Almqvist, 1975.
- . "Zeitroman und historischer Roman." Moderna Språk 46 (1972): 380-89.
- Cohen, Keith. Film and Fiction/The Dynamics of Exchange. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.
- Cook, David A. A History of Narrative Film. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1990.
- Dahlke, Hans. "Das Zeugnis des Erfolgs." Weimarer Beiträge 21.4 (1975): 167-78.
- Dreyer, Stefan. Schriftstellerrollen und Schreibmodelle im Exil: Zur Periodisierung von Lion Feuchtwangers Romanwerk 1933-1945. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1988.
- Dietschreit, Frank. Lion Feuchtwanger. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1988.
- Eisenstein, Sergei. The Battleship Potemkin. Trans. Gillon R. Aitken. London: Faber, 1988.
- . "The Cinematographic Principle and the Ideogram." Film Form. Ed. and trans. Jay Leyda. New York: Harcourt, 1949. Rpt. in Film Theory and Criticism. Ed. Gerald Mast and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford UP, 1985. 90-103.
- . "A Dialectic Approach to Film Form." Film Form. Ed. and trans. Jay Leyda. New York: Harcourt, 1949. Rpt. in Film Theory and Criticism. Ed. Gerald Mast and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford UP, 1985. 103-23.
- . "Montage and Conflict." Film Form. Ed. and trans. Jay Leyda. New York: Harcourt, 1949. Rpt. in Film Theory and Criticism. Ed. Gerald Mast and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford UP, 1985. 75-87.
- Faulhaber, Uwe Karl. "Lion Feuchtwanger's Theory of the Historical Novel." Lion Feuchtwanger: The Man, His Ideas, His Work. Ed. John M. Spalek. Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 1972. 67-81.

- Fischer, Ludwig. "Die Exilspezifische Entwicklung des historischen Romans Lion Feuchtwangers." Schreiben im Exil: Zur Ästhetik der deutschen Exilliteratur 1933-45. Ed. Alexander Stephan and Hans Wagener. Bonn: Bouvier, 1985. 224-35.
- Fischer, Ludwig Maximilian. Vernunft und Fortschritt. Geschichte und Fiktionalität im historischen Roman Lion Feuchtwangers. Königstein: Anton Hain Meisenheim, 1979.
- Fischer, Matthias Johannes. "In der Küche des Kochs? Aspekte einer fragmentarischen Theorie des historischen Romans bei Feuchtwanger." Text und Kritik 79/80 (1983): 19-27.
- Fuegi, John. "Feuchtwanger. Brecht and the "Epic" Media. The Novel and the Film." Lion Feuchtwanger: The Man, His Ideas, His Work. Ed. John M. Spalek. Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 1972. 307-322.
- Gay, Peter. Weimar Culture: The Outsider As Insider. New York: Harper, 1970.
- Giannetti, Louis. Understanding Movies. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1987.
- Grosshut, F.S. "Lion Feuchtwanger and the Historical Novel." Books Abroad 34 (1960): 9-12.
- Hans, Jan, Lutz Winckler. "Von der Selbstverständigung des Künstlers in Krisenzeiten. Lion Feuchtwangers 'Wartesaal-Trilogie'." Text und Kritik 79/80 (1983): 28-48.
- Hartmann, Horst. "Die Antithetik 'Macht-Geist' im Werk Lion Feuchtwangers." Weimarer Beiträge 7.4 (1961): 667-93.
- Hilscher, Eberhard. "Aus dem Wartesaal in den Zug nach Moskau. Über Lion Feuchtwanger." Poetische Weltbilder: Essays über Heinrich Mann, Thomas Mann, Hermann Hesse, Robert Musil, Lion Feuchtwanger. Ed. Eberhard Hilscher. Berlin: Morgen. 200-26.
- Humble, M.E. "Lion Feuchtwanger's Erfolg: The Problems of a Weimar Realist." Weimar Germany: Writers and Politics. Ed. Alan Bance. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic P, 1982. 65-76.

- Kahn, Lothar. Insight and Action: The Life and Work of Lion Feuchtwanger. London: Associated UP, 1975.
- Keune, Manfred. "Das Haus der Desdemona: Lion Feuchtwanger's Apologia For A Mimesis of History." Lion Feuchtwanger: The Man, His Ideas, His Work. Ed. John M. Spalek. Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 1972. 83-98.
- Klemperer, Victor. "Der gläubige Skeptiker." Neue deutsche Literatur 2 (1959): 5-17.
- Linn, Rolf N. "Feuchtwangers Erfolg: Attizismus in asianischer Zeit." Weimarer Beiträge 1 (1965): 75-83.
- Lukacs, Georg. The Historical Novel. Trans. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell. Boston: Beacon, 1963.
- Marshall, Herbert, ed. The Battleship Potemkin. New York: Avon, 1978.
- Modick, Klaus. "Lion Feuchtwanger als Produzent. Über die kuriosen, eigentümlichen, ja wunderlichen Methoden des Dr. Feuchtwangers." Text und Kritik 79/80 (1983), 5-18.
- . "Lion Feuchtwanger im Kontext der zwanziger Jahre." Weimarer Beiträge 11 (1982): 179-186.
- . Lion Feuchtwanger im Kontext der zwanziger Jahre: Autonomie und Sachlichkeit. Königstein: Scriptor, 1981.
- and Egon Brückener. Lion Feuchtwangers Roman "Erfolg". Leistung und Problematik schrifstellersicher Aufklärung in der Endphase der Weimarer Republik. Kronberg: Scriptor, 1978.
- Mueller, Dennis. "Characterization of Types in Feuchtwanger's Novels." Lion Feuchtwanger: The Man, His Ideas, His Work. Ed. John M. Spalek. Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 1972. 99-111.
- Müller, Hans-Harald. "Lion Feuchtwanger: Erfolg (1930)." Deutsche Romane des 20. Jahrhunderts: Neue Interpretationen. Ed. Paul Michael Lutzeler. Königstein: Athenäum, 1983. 167-82.



- Müller-Funk, Wolfgang. "Der Erfolg der Sinngabe oder: die List der Vernunft. Mythographie und Aufklärung in Lion Feuchtwangers Roman Erfolg." Text und Kritik 79/80 (1983), 49-60.
- . Literatur als geschichtliches Argument. Zur ästhetischen Konzeption und Geschichtsverarbeitung in Lion Feuchtwangers Romantrilogie "Der Wartesaal". Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1981.
- . "Selbstfindung und Protest. Macht und Ohnmacht. Psychologische und lebensphilosophische Bruchstücke zu Erfolg." Jahrmärkte der Gerechtigkeit. Ed. Wolfgang Müller-Funk. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1987. 61-74.
- Ongha, Hamid. Geschichtsphilosophie und Theorie des historischen Romans bei Lion Feuchtwanger. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1982.
- Pazi, Margarita. "Jud Süß--Geschichte und literarisches Bild." Literatur und Kritik (1977): 480-88.
- Petersen, Klaus. Literatur und Justiz in der Weimarer Republik. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1988.
- Pfanner, Helmut F. "Die 'Provinzliteratur' der zwanziger Jahre." Die deutsche Literatur in der Weimarer Republik. Ed. Wolfgang Rothe. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1974. 237-54.
- Reich-Ranicki, Marcel. "Lion Feuchtwanger oder Der Weltruhm des Emigranten." Die deutsche Exilliteratur 1933-1945. Ed. Manfred Durzak. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1973. 443-56.
- Roch, Herbert. "Lion Feuchtwanger: Erfolg." Ost und West 12 (1948): 86-88.
- Rodiek, Christoph. "Stierkampf und Politik. Motivanalysen zu Feuchtwanger, Sastre und Fries." Arcadia 19.2 (1984): 153-64.
- Rumler, Kurt A. "Filmisches Erzählen in Zusammenarbeit mit Brecht." Text und Kritik 79/80 (1983), 86-98.
- Schmitz, Matthias. "Feuchtwanger/Eisenstein oder: Romanmontage und Montagefilm. Anmerkungen zu einem produktiven Mißverständnis." Text und Kritik 79/80 (1983): 75-85.

- Sobchack, Thomas and Vivian C. Sobchack. An Introduction to Film. Little: Boston, 1987.
- Sternburg, Wilhelm von. "Der Weg zum Weltruhm." Lion Feuchtwanger: Materialien zu Leben und Werk. Ed. Wilhelm von Sternburg. Frankfurt: Fischer, 1989. 13-36.
- Szepe, Helena. "Zwischen Heimatstil und Sozialkritik: Feuchtwangers Roman Erfolg". Orbis Litterarum 32 (1977): 159-65.
- Weinert, Roland. Lion Feuchtwangers "Wartesaal-Trilogie". Köln: Pahl-Rugenstein, 1988.
- Weinrich, Harald. "Als Hitler noch der Kutzner war. Harald Weinrich über Lion Feuchtwanger: Erfolg (1930)." Romane von gestern--heute gelesen. Band 2, 1918-1933. Ed. Marcel Reich-Ranicki. Frankfurt: Fischer, 1989. 221-29.
- Weisstein, Ulrich. "Clio The Muse: An Analysis of Lion Feuchtwanger's Erfolg." Lion Feuchtwanger: The Man, His Ideas, His Work. Ed. John M. Spalek. Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 1972. 157-186.
- Wessler, Judith. Lion Feuchtwanger's "Erfolg": A "Großstadt" Novel. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Wolff, Rudolf. "Lion Feuchtwanger: Ein König des historischen Romans. Eine Vorbemerkung." Lion Feuchtwanger. Werk und Wirkung. Ed. Rudolf Wolff. Bonn: Bouvier, 1984. 6-10.
- Yuill, W.E. "Lion Feuchtwanger." German Men of Letters, Vol. 3. Ed. Alex Natan. London: O. Wolff, 1964. 179-206.
- Zerrahn, Holger. Exilerfahrung und Faschismusbild in Lion Feuchtwangers Romanwerk zwischen 1933 und 1945. Bern: Peter Lang, 1984.
- Zwerenz, Ingrid. "Feuchtwangers Frauen." Text und Kritik 79/80 (1983): 112-30.