



University
of Glasgow

Leslie, Laura (2014) *Adorno as the devil in Mann's 'Doctor Faustus': aspects of modernism in music, literature and critique*. MMus(R) thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/5233/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given



**Adorno as the Devil in Mann's *Doctor Faustus*: aspects of modernism
in music, literature and critique**

Laura Leslie

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Music (R)

Department of Music

School of Culture and Creative Arts

College of Arts

University of Glasgow

March 2013

Abstract

Thomas Mann's *Doctor Faustus* is considered to be one of the most important works of literature produced in the twentieth century. It is a study of music, of genius, of culture and of the political and aesthetic crises of modernism, centring on the nefarious pact the main character, a composer, makes with the devil. This diabolical figure is fundamental to any critical analysis of *Faustus*, and for many scholars the devil has become synonymous with the philosophical works of Mann's collaborator on this project, the German philosopher and social theorist Theodor W. Adorno. The image of Adorno as the Devil has continued to fascinate scholars in the decades since the publication of Mann's novel, resulting in a wide range of critical and interpretive responses. This dissertation will explore aspects of the works of both men, seeking to reveal the importance of *Doctor Faustus*, *Philosophy of Modern Music* and *Aesthetic Theory* as expressions of the crises of modernity, using Jean-François Lyotard's essay *Adorno as the Devil* to illustrate the continued relevance of these works to discourses concerning the future of art and philosophy.

Contents Page

<u>Introduction</u>	4
<u>Chapter One</u>	9
Adorno and Mann: The Correspondences	
<u>Chapter Two</u>	17
Modern and Romantic Genius: Adorno and Kant	
<u>Chapter Three</u>	23
Genius in <i>Faustus</i> : Mann and Leverkühn	
<u>Chapter Four</u>	30
The importance of the devil in <i>Faustus</i> : an alternative view	
<u>Chapter Five</u>	38
<i>Philosophy of Modern Music</i> : Adorno, Schoenberg and Mann	
<u>Chapter Six</u>	47
Whither critique? Jean-François Lyotard's 'Adorno as the Devil'	
<u>Bibliography</u>	56

Introduction

The Faust myth, a story in which the main character makes a pact with the devil and barter his soul in exchange for greatness, dates back at least as far as the 16th Century. There are many possible sources for the legend, but the first known publication of the tale was in the chapbook *Historia von D. Johann Fausten*, published in 1587. This version became the basis for two of the most significant literary interpretations of the myth in Christopher Marlowe's *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* (1604) and later in Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *Faust Part 1* (1808) and *Faust Part 2* (1832). As well as these key works of literature, Faust proved to be particularly popular with musicians of the nineteenth century, and was portrayed in works by Liszt, Schumann, Busoni and Berlioz.

Thomas Mann's twentieth century retelling of this myth is an extremely complex representation of the original story, first published in 1947; it was informed by Mann's own experiences and observations of the world around him in the wake of the Second World War. In simple terms, *Doctor Faustus* is an account of the life of composer Adrian Leverkühn, the protagonist of the novel, whose wretched tale is related by his friend and admirer Serenus Zeitblom. As in previous versions of the legend, such as the works by Goethe and Marlowe, *Faustus* does not confront directly the issue of the quest for greatness but also engages certain ideological and philosophical assumptions relating to art and music, assumptions against which many of the wider cultural and social concerns of the period unfold. Zeitblom's narrative is an intricately constructed critique of significant political and musical developments as well as philosophical reflections on the place left for art following the atrocities caused by the dominance of the National Socialist party.

The twentieth century saw radical transformations in the world of art as artists, writers and thinkers struggled to find new ways to express their rapidly changing social circumstances which were the result of major political and economic developments. This was reflected in aesthetic practice which attempted to move away from the values of the Romantic era and extended aesthetic consciousness via new techniques and materials. The artist was now required to think deeply about and justify the

individualised methods used in the creative process. For example, in 1914, Georg Lukács, writing in *The Theory of the Novel* stated that:

“...the central problem of the novel is the fact that art has to write off the closed and total forms which stem from a rounded totality of being – that art has nothing more to do with any world of forms that is immanently complete in itself.”¹

Lukács identified a new difficulty facing artists; that legitimate art could never be considered complete. These problems were compounded by the lack of certainties left behind by the horrors of the Nazi regime and Auschwitz – raising questions of the nature of the role of post-war artistic activity. As the above quotation from Lukács suggests, in literature, novelists of the era were often confronted by the difficulty in constructing narrative forms that could adequately describe and reflect the current social and cultural situation, and in this particular sphere there was the additional problem of trying to create legitimate works of literature which could follow the works of James Joyce and others. The question of the validity of traditional novelistic forms continued to dominate the thoughts of writers and critics – like Lukács, Maurice Blanchot was preoccupied by the idea of the possibility of the complete artwork, suggesting that a finished work is ‘self-defeating’, whilst one that is incomplete is meaningless in that it is still able to promise meaning. He wonders if man is “capable of literature when literature verges upon the absence of the book?”² Blanchot’s essay suggests that some artists (he is speaking particularly of novelists and composers) responded to the difficulties of twentieth century art by challenging the rigorous structures of traditional forms and organising their work in a way which caused it to appear far more disjointed than earlier artworks. Thomas Mann’s *Doctor Faustus* might be regarded as an example of this type of reaction to the dilemma in its employment of the technique of montage – it boasts a fragmented structure which combines a variety of traditional narrative forms and styles, musical analysis and philosophy. This approach means that *Faustus* appears to be unfinished, but this suggests that its success lies not in its completeness, but elsewhere – conceivably in its open-ended nature, its allegorical effectiveness and in its search to find ways to represent and overcome the problems facing modernist literature.

¹ Lukács, Georg, *The Theory of the Novel*, p.17

² Blanchot, Maurice, ‘Ars Nova’, p.84

In a move that perhaps underlines the importance of the need for artists to engage in critical thinking in the modernist era, particularly where their own work was concerned, Thomas Mann compiled a book about *Doctor Faustus* where he explained the circumstances of the work's creation. In it, he draws the reader's attention to his observations on the position of the novel in culture, and in doing so points directly to the pressing concerns of the time:

Levin writes, "Joyce's technique passes beyond the limits of English realistic fiction. Neither *A Portrait of the Artist* nor *Finnegans Wake* is a novel, strictly speaking, and *Ulysses* is a novel to end all novels." This probably applies to...*Doctor Faustus*. T.S Eliot's question "whether the novel had not outlived its function since Flaubert and James, and whether *Ulysses* should not be considered an epic" paralleled my own question whether in the field of the novel nowadays the only thing that counted was what was no longer a novel.³

Mann's statement illustrates the crisis present in art in the mid-twentieth century, and creates an impression that it was felt that there was a need for a complete rethinking of the concept of what was meant by a 'novel' and what its possibilities might be. There is a sense of finality in his words as he seems to imply that the novel as it had been previously understood would come to an end, with nothing concrete to follow it.

Through his portrayal of Leverkühn's diabolical pact, Mann seems to suggest that there is no certain redemption for the creative genius, and that there can be no resolution of the struggles faced by the autonomous artist. As Evelyn Cobley points out, this is not representative of the way he would usually choose to settle questions of the relationship of the artist to society. The conditions of the time have forced the author to seek an entirely different approach:

The dilemma for protagonists like Thomas Buddenbrook, Tonio Kröger, Hans Castorp, and Gustav von Aschenbach is that they are torn between two spheres...Mann's solutions for these protagonists vary from rejecting the "Bürgerethik" ["bourgeois ethic"] to superimposing it on the aesthetic.⁴

But by the time he comes to write *Doctor Faustus*, it seems that Mann is no longer able to support these ideas and for him, finding a way to completely dissolve these tensions

³ Mann, Thomas, *The Story of a Novel*, p.91

⁴ Cobley, Evelyn, 'Avant-Garde Aesthetics and Fascist Politics' p.48

would not be an acceptable representation of the problems inherent in modern day culture.

Of course, Leverkühn's experiences have far more specific consequences than simply being representative of the artists of the era. The nature of his constant battles with his conscience and his pact with the devil are the direct result of his musical endeavours. Music, as the author explained himself, was a tool for Mann to portray the connection between Germany and the rest of the world as well as the character of the German people, because he felt that more than any other art it occupied a 'demonic realm', and that the only way to depict a truly German Faust was to portray him as a musician. However, there are other significant implications of the use of music – as music itself was an art whose meaning was unfixed, rendering its precise function in society rather ambiguous, Mann was able to incorporate it into *Faustus* in order to convey the seriousness of the uncertain future of all art and artists. One of the aspects of the novel's fragmentary or montage structure is that music – both philosophical discussions and detailed analytical descriptions thereof – is an essential part of the development of the themes and plot direction. It is not used simply as a secondary feature of *Doctor Faustus*, but almost as if it were as fundamental to the creation of a novel as words themselves. Blanchot summarises the significance of music to *Doctor Faustus* and explains why it is important to a novel which is troubled by the state of modern art:

He (Mann) even suggests that this discovery (twelve-tone), achieved through the personal folly of a man and the general folly of the times, is not a chance mistake, but represents the madness natural to an art which has come to its end. He says in his journal that the music of Schoenberg furnished him all that he needed to describe the general crisis of civilisation and of music and this to point up the main idea of his book: the coming of sterility, the innate despair which makes the pact with the demon possible.⁵

This dissertation will provide an examination of scholarly activity on a constellation of topics grouped around Mann's *Doctor Faustus* and its relationship to the work and thought of critical theorist Theodor W. Adorno, who found himself exiled in California at the same time as Mann. It will examine the urgent search for new methods

⁵ Blanchot, Maurice, 'Ars Nova', p.77

of describing the changing realities of life in the first half of the twentieth century and beyond; the requirement for new approaches in music, art, philosophy and culture in a century which had seen two world wars and the horrors of the concentration camps – the “chthonic changes which have affected existence as such, and thus also the a priori form of great art over the last forty years”⁶ – and the need to reflect this in more fragmented, open-ended works which could replace the more stable forms of the past.

The dissertation will seek to reveal *Doctor Faustus* – the result of a uniquely close collaboration between one of the leading novelists and one of the most important philosophers and social critics of the day – as a particularly rich source which sheds significant light on modernist aesthetics, on the philosophy of Adorno and major issues confronting art, philosophy and culture in the twentieth and twenty first centuries. It will look at the work of both men as a contribution to modernism and the degree to which this modernism was tempered by a link to, or nostalgia for, more traditional forms of art.

In particular, it will examine the work of a number of scholars who have been struck by the image of Adorno as the devil, suggested in the novel by the appearance of a diabolic character whose views appear to have much in common with the philosopher. The Adorno-devil nexus has resulted in a range of critical responses and its controversial nature has continued to stimulate responses from scholars and critics in the decades since the publication of *Doctor Faustus*. The reason that this deserves attention is because the use of Adorno’s philosophical material in Mann’s novel – a novel which its author implied was a ‘novel to end all novels’ – together with its associated responses has pushed forward a new debate on the future of the potency of the type of critique favoured by Adorno. If there is indeed a place for it, what space does this kind of critique occupy in postmodern thought?

⁶ Adorno, Theodor and Thomas Mann, *Correspondence 1943-1955*, p.85

Chapter One

Adorno and Mann: The Correspondences

“...there is something marvellously enticing and mysterious in the world of “correspondences” [*Beziehungen*]. The word itself has for a long time enchanted me, and what it signifies plays a pre-eminent role in all my thinking and artistic activity.”⁷

Thomas Mann, Letter to Karl Kerényi, 1934

The association of Adorno’s philosophical works with the diabolical figure with whom Leverkühn makes his fateful pact is not an issue which has only recently become significant in scholarly responses to the novel. The published correspondence between Adorno and Mann show that the comparison was first made by critics and commentators immediately after the publication of *Doctor Faustus*. This caused Adorno to react with some consternation, remarking in a letter to Mann:

You will also be aware that certain Christian critics, such as Doflein and Horst, have officially identified me as your very own Devil – and hopefully you will feel as much at home in this infernal climate as I do myself.⁸

And he later commented :

That our own dear Hans Mayer, in his book about you, has identified me as the literal model for your Devil, with whom I have little in common beyond the horn-rimmed spectacles, will have astonished you as much as it has me – for I have certainly never been aware of possessing such diabolical characteristics.⁹

And finally, somewhat flippantly, he signs a letter “In true devotion, Your ancient Devil.”¹⁰

⁷ ed. Huhn, Tom, *The Cambridge Companion to Adorno*, p.153

⁸ Adorno, Theodor and Thomas Mann, *Theodor W. Adorno and Thomas Mann: Correspondence 1943-1955*, p.36

⁹ Ibid., p.54

¹⁰ Ibid., p.71

There is evidence of only one response from Mann on this matter. In July 1950, he wrote to Adorno, sharing Adorno's surprise and annoyance that Hans Mayer should have the nerve to draw such a parallel.

There are certainly many perceptive insights in [Mayer's] book for which one should be grateful, but also significant omissions and irrelevancies, and the idea that my musically schooled Devil is specifically drawn after your own image is absurd in the extreme. Do you ever wear horn-rimmed spectacles? There is certainly no other trace of similarity to be found here. But people are always anxious to 'notice' as much as possible in these matters.¹¹

There is also evidence, however, that Mann had written to the critic in question to let him know that he was greatly appreciative of Mayer's engagement with his work.¹² His comment in the quote above, from a letter to Kerényi, indicates his profound interest in considering the relationship of ideas and things to one another; something reinforced by his preference for the technique of 'montage' that played an extremely significant role in the construction of *Doctor Faustus*. Although these letters can often be insightful and valuable, it can also be difficult to ascertain the true opinions of the writers. Mann does not comment extensively on the interpretation of Adorno as the devil or directly confront Mayer on the subject, which might indicate that he is not willing to disclose the whole truth and cause his friend to become more irate. This makes it very difficult to decipher who, if anyone at all, Mann meant to portray in this diabolical figure. It is certain, however, that since its publication, Adorno's known contribution to the work has continued to encourage scholarly debate on the extent of his influence on Mann's work. These studies, with varying degrees of success, have often demonstrated that there may be some justification for these initial, and (for Adorno) apparently objectionable views. Evidently, Adorno considered this parallel to be ridiculous and did not feel that it was necessary to give it any serious thought, but this is fiercely contradicted by the interest it has sparked in many academics whose works span several decades.

So why is it that academics continue to return to the image of Adorno as the devil? There can be no doubt that the impression given by linking these two figures is a

¹¹ Ibid., p.57

¹² "I cannot, and need not, say how grateful I am to you for the spirited way in which you have immersed yourself in my life's work, for the way you have depicted it as a kind of constellation." Ibid., p.59

hugely intimidating and powerful one. The major reason for the persistent interest in this comparison is not because it is believed that the portrayal of the diabolical figure is a representation of Adorno's personality – the issue is a far more substantive one. The passages in which the devil is featured in Mann's novel are dominated, as will be discussed later, by a dialectical tone and a deep concern for the future of modern art. Further than this, it has been well documented that when the devil, in the form of an intellectual speaks to Leverkühn specifically about music, he is not speaking his own words, but those written by Adorno in an early draft of *Philosophy of Modern Music*. As a result, the fact that the devil's dialogue has a connection with Adorno's works is not in itself really much of an issue for debate at all, but instead raises far more interesting questions about the nature of the connection. This is summarised by Max Paddison, who points to the importance of this particular type of writing in German culture of the period. The quote below also exemplifies the kind of unquestioning acceptance of the connection between Adorno's work and the presentation of the devil in *Doctor Faustus* demonstrated by a vast number of scholars.

It needs to be remembered that Adorno's writing comes from a long German literary tradition of using the extremes and the rhetoric of exaggeration, irony and the grotesque, as strategies for revealing underlying truths. It goes back to E.T.A Hoffmann, finds its greatest exponent in Nietzsche, and its most accomplished twentieth-century master in Thomas Mann (Adorno's own cameo appearance as the devil in intellectual guise in Mann's *Doctor Faustus*, delivering whole passages lifted straight out of an early draft of *Philosophy of New Music*, neatly reinforces the point).¹³

But what exactly is it that Adorno finds so unacceptable about this comparison with the Adversary in Mann's novel? Paddison is right (and so are a great number of other scholars) to comment on the fact that the passages in *Doctor Faustus* have been copied directly from *Philosophy of Modern Music*, and it would be difficult for anyone to successfully challenge this; Adorno's voice, articulating some of his most important cultural and musical theories jump out at the reader from beyond the page. Although any understanding of Adorno's philosophy will complement a reading of *Doctor Faustus*, this does not mean that once these theories are incorporated they remain unchallenged

¹³ ed. Cross, Jonathan, 'Stravinsky as devil: Adorno's three critiques', *The Cambridge Companion to Stravinsky* p.193

throughout the novel. However, there is no clearer use of Adorno's ideas in their original, unquestioned form than in Leverkühn's interaction with the diabolical figure, and there is no escaping the fact that Mann's literary technique of montage has irrevocably associated Adorno with the diabolical figure that appears in Chapter 25. Therefore this surely cannot be, as Mann states, scholars trying to 'notice as much as possible', or making convenient and ridiculous associations purely for effect. It seems unlikely, or even impossible, that Adorno would not therefore have detected his presence in the prose spoken by the devil, a copy of his own writing, especially as he was well aware of Mann's intentions to borrow and combine the works of others. He does not object to Mann's obvious use of his material in this way; not during the creative process of the work or after its publication. So could it really be that he takes issue with his personality being misconstrued in such a way, or are there deeper concerns to be investigated here?

First, it may be useful to conduct an examination of the contemporary reviews of the novel to which Adorno is reacting in his letters to Mann. Among those who were first to identify the connection is the twentieth century writer Erich Doflein, who stated that:

The divinatory power which the ailing Leverkühn derives from his secularized pact with the Devil and the lucid force of Adorno's deliberately paradoxical dialectic are the two extremes which here join hands: Adorno is the authentic Lucifer of this "Faustus". Yet his dialectic is condemned to paralysis. This combination of symbol and diagnosis drives the author to take refuge in the idea of fate. A tragic hero of cultural crisis is thereby dressed up as Faust.¹⁴

There is perhaps little wonder, therefore, that Adorno responds with some indignation to Doflein's writing since it appears to be rather confused and the opinions of the author are at times very unclear. It is difficult to understand precisely what Doflein intends to say when, for example, he states that the extremes of Leverkühn's 'divinatory power' derived from his pact with the devil and Adorno's dialectics have 'joined hands' and this is the reason why Adorno can be identified as the devil in Mann's novel. However, what is not ambiguous as far as Doflein's critique is concerned is that in his opinion, Adorno's dialectical style is what lends legitimacy to the comparison of

¹⁴ Adorno, Theodor and Thomas Mann, *Correspondences 1943-55*, p.39

Adorno to the devil. Doflein appears to believe that the incorporation of Adorno's philosophy into *Doctor Faustus* changes the way the novel has been structured and consequently impacts negatively on the overall effectiveness of Mann's portrayal of the struggles of the modern day artist. For this critic, Adorno's dialectic is 'condemned to paralysis', alluding to the fact that Adorno's approach to aesthetics is not able to move this philosophical debate forward. Lyotard is an important voice in this debate and as this idea is a particularly crucial one, it will be explored in greater detail towards the end of this dissertation.

Similarly, one of the sources mentioned by Adorno in his letter to Mann, 28th December 1949, appears to view the appropriateness of the image of Adorno as the devil through the lens of style. The reference is described as follows by the editors of Mann's and Adorno's *Correspondences*: "The essayist, story writer and literary critic Karl August Horst (1913-1973) has described the collaboration between Adorno and Thomas Mann as a 'devil's pact' in which Mann himself had fallen victim to the 'devil of dialectic.'"¹⁵ Horst's critique seems to take this comparison one step further than Doflein's, apparently representing Mann as a victim of the implied evil powers that Adorno possesses. A far more provocative image than this is that there was a pact of some description made between Adorno and Mann that, like the agreement between the devil and Leverkühn, the two men signed some sort of contract that gave Mann what he desired, but also meant that in return he was indebted to Adorno. This might not be quite so far-fetched as it seems, as in many ways it could be considered that Adorno and Mann made an arrangement where knowledge was exchanged, and Mann did 'owe' the musical detail in his novel to Adorno's expertise. However, Horst's depiction of this relationship brings far more sinister factors into play, suggesting that Adorno's dialectical style is the consequence, or the price, for Mann's quest for greater musical knowledge. It is also dialectics that Max Paddison ascribes to the association of Adorno and the devil, highlighting his preference for working towards the truth through the use of extremes and opposites. As far as Horst is concerned, Mann, in choosing to turn to Adorno's musical expertise, has ended up suffering a far greater consequence than he had bargained for. According to Horst's interpretation of this collaboration, Mann has effectively sold his soul in teaming up with a master of dialectics. And just as Doflein

¹⁵ Ibid., p.39

describes the paralysis suffered by Adorno's dialectical style and its effect on *Doctor Faustus* overall, Horst thinks that the presence of Adorno's philosophical approach ultimately has no positive impact on the novel.

If Adorno is identified as the devil because of his commitment to dialectical style, then critics such as Doflein and Horst and their interpretations of this complex work might have something rather important to offer to the debate. Both of these critiques – Doflein's in more direct terms – point to concerns the writers have with the effect the appropriation of Adorno's philosophy has on Mann's *Faustus*. Neither are convinced that the absorption of the dialectical style, which they believe can be detected in Mann's writing, has allowed Mann to stay faithful to his key themes and characters. In other words, these critics believe that Adorno's presence in the novel has not been able to move any ideas forward, and he therefore takes on the role of a diabolical figure. This idea, that Adorno's dialectics are 'paralysed', is a key aspect of the essay 'Adorno as the Devil', in which Lyotard discusses not only the position of Adorno's critique but also the future of critical theory in general. If this was something that troubled Adorno, this blatant dismissal of the relevance of his work might have been reason enough for him to react to these assessments of *Doctor Faustus* with some displeasure.

However, it is essential to be wary of attaching too much importance to the views of these critics. Adorno was perhaps right to be suspicious of some of the opinions expressed in their reviews, and there are, as Mann states, some obvious 'omissions and irrelevancies.' For Doflein and Horst, Adorno is not only Leverkühn's devil, but he is also Mann's. They conclude that Adorno's contribution to *Doctor Faustus* has a negative impact on the action and structure of the novel as it leaves Mann with no choice but to force his work towards a conclusion that is pre-determined by Adorno's thinking – Doflein says that this "drives the author to take refuge in the idea of fate." This belief also leads Doflein and Horst to overlook the importance that the borrowing or the re-writing of pre-existing works had for Mann's work, and the fact that he had used this, through the corresponding themes and ideas in his writing, as a way of portraying the cultural and political situation that had erupted around him. Approaching *Faustus* in this way is dangerous because the view that Adorno has forced the novel in a different direction does not do justice to Mann's treatment of the key themes in his work or to the fact that he actively sought the help of others in an effort to accurately portray the

artistic concerns which are so crucial to his protagonist. Nor does it acknowledge the crisis widely felt by artists of the period; both Doflein and Horst seem to be blind to the difficulties modern novelists faced in moving away from traditional forms and structures.

On the other hand, the idea that Adorno is not only present in the novel as the character of the devil, and that by association his ideas might be considered as diabolical, but also that he is Mann's own devil, is a thought-provoking one. The collaboration between Adorno and Mann is a particularly interesting example of the possibilities inherent in combining philosophical ideas with a fictional world as the ideas of a Marxist critical theorist are blended with the views of an author who is arguably known for being more traditional in his sympathies towards bourgeois culture. Reflecting on how Adorno's philosophy comes to be absorbed into Mann's novel, Evelyn Cobley points to the differences between the opinions of the two men and the new cultural and social crises that might have motivated Mann's interest in Adorno's work:

It is possible that Mann heard an echo of his inability to separate the "good" and the "bad" Germany in Adorno's contention that opposites are mutually constitutive. Throughout *Doctor Faustus* we are treated to a vertiginous display of opposites turning into each other...the narrative emphasises the tendency of opposites to reverse themselves. But where Mann seems to consider this tendency to be "magical" or "demonic," Adorno draws attention to the impact of the material conditions on the dialectical interplay of subjectivity and objectivity.¹⁶

Here, Cobley seems to almost confirm the suspicions of Horst and Doflein that Adorno's dialectics, and his fascination with opposites, is what brings the diabolical to Mann's work. Although not part of Mann's established cultural ideology, Adorno's ideas seem to be the only way the author can find of conveying the state of the world around him, which, in the grip of the Nazi party, is dominated by fear, misery and evil. For Mann, *Doctor Faustus* was intended to be a novel where music would become representative of the wider social and political crises experienced by Germany in the first half of the twentieth century. Georg Lukács' presentation of "...the problems of the

¹⁶ Cobley, Evelyn, 'Avant-Garde Aesthetics and Fascist Politics', p.55

novel form” as “the mirror-image of a world gone out of joint.”¹⁷ suggests that the modern novel, riddled with its own doubts and fears, is perfectly suited to a portrayal of the cultural and social concerns of the age. *Faustus* is a novel that reflects many elements of a world fragmented by conflicts and changes. Itself a ‘mirror image’, in its characters and plot it also holds up a mirror to the political and artistic changes of the time, as well as the interpretive responses to these alterations. As James Schmidt states, “*Doctor Faustus* is, if nothing else, a phantasmagoria of correspondences, imitations, resemblances.”¹⁸

¹⁷ Lukács, Georg, *The Theory of the Novel*, p.17

¹⁸ ed. Huhn, Tom, ‘Mephistopheles in Hollywood: Adorno, Mann, and Schoenberg’, *The Cambridge Companion to Adorno*, p.153

Chapter Two

Modern and Romantic Genius: Adorno and Kant

In order to illuminate the issues raised by the parallels between the devil in *Doctor Faustus* and Adorno's philosophical writings, a study of the texts in question by Adorno seems most pertinent. As well as serving as evidence of the social and cultural concerns of the time, these works are the source for fundamental features of Mann's novel; namely genius and the diabolical, and the embodiment of these themes in Adrian Leverkühn, as he wrestles with the problems of modern music. An exploration of these key ideas in *Aesthetic Theory* and *Philosophy of Modern Music* allows for a greater understanding of the role these same ideas play in the development of the main themes of Mann's novel, as well as offering a view of the similarities and differences between the opinions of the author and the philosopher and how this affects the absorption of Adorno's theories into Mann's fiction.

The concept of genius has long been debated in many fields. Perhaps because its very nature causes it to resist definition, it has been the focus of many scholarly debates as philosophers wrestle with its inherent conceptual difficulties and scientists struggle to quantify and categorise it. More often than not, a study of genius, because of the difficulties involved in solving its complex nature through the application of logic and reason, is likely to raise more questions than it is able to answer. It cannot easily be proven where genius originates from or an explanation provided for why it is acceptable to apply the term genius to certain human beings and not to others, and where the line should be drawn between the presence of genius and the absence of genius. However, despite the deep fascination with this subject, which has been demonstrated by a great number of scholars, it could still be said that there are common factors between the theories of genius which indicate that there may well be certain strands in the concept of genius that have become widely accepted *without* questions being asked of them. Why is it, for example, that most writing on artistic genius assumes that exceptional achievements are a result of the creativity of an individual who is simply superior to all others? And why, when there are no set rules and no strict parameters for identifying genius, is it possible for certain people to be so widely accepted as such?

Adorno believes that these assumptions about genius have become redundant. He writes in *Aesthetic Theory* that the concept of genius as it is understood in the modern era stems from the importance attached to the individual or the creator in works of art. This kind of genius became particularly prevalent during the Romantic period, and the question of its validity occupies Adorno's thoughts. For him, this understanding of genius obscures any meaning the concept may have because of its glorification of the individual; it becomes worthless to the extent that it would be better to eradicate the concept completely. *Aesthetic Theory* shows Adorno working through the complications inherent in genius and searching for any redemptive features it may have which might explain the necessity of its existence. Crucial to this discussion is his treatment of the two contrasting but interdependent categories of subject and object.

Subjectivity and objectivity are key in the search for an explanation for the crises experienced by art in the modern world. The first hurdle that is to be overcome in the search for an understanding of the subject-object distinction is to determine what exactly is meant by 'the subject' or 'the object' in philosophical discussions of these terms. There is a tendency in interpreting these categories to think of them as two separate terms with only one meaning for each word. This is certainly not the case. In fact, subject and object are tightly connected and reliant upon each other, and can often mean different things at different times; whether the text is referring to the content of an artwork, the reception of the work or to the role of the individual in art, for example. As Adorno states, "The terms are patently equivocal."¹⁹ He goes on to say that this is because "Defining means that something objective, no matter what it may be in itself, is subjectively captured by means of a fixed concept. Hence the resistance offered to defining by subject and object."²⁰

It is necessary for Adorno that theories of the artwork regard the subject as a component of the work which requires the object, and vice-versa. Subjectivity in art is an alienated element of the work until the intervention of objectivity, just as the work of art cannot be objective until it is passed through the subject, which is acting as the mediator in this context. As these two terms must be considered as mutually dependent, dividing subject and object in order to consider them as two separate

¹⁹ ed. O'Connor, Brian, 'Subject and Object', *The Adorno Reader*, p.138

²⁰ Ibid., p.139

entities in works of art is dangerous. The balance between the two terms can be easily tipped and this has disastrous effects on the ways the work can be appreciated; therefore, Adorno believes that the only way to consider subject and object in the work of art is to acknowledge that their relationship is a dialectical one, and that an examination of any of the elements in an artwork will reveal the presence of both of these categories. A theory of aesthetics which treats subjectivity and objectivity as separate spheres would be non-dialectical, and Adorno states that this type of analysis would have the effect of ensuring that the artwork becomes part of only one of these spheres. For an example, he looks to the theories of art in Kant's *Critique of Judgement*, which in Adorno's opinion demonstrate an attempt to work towards an objective theory of aesthetics by introducing 'universally conceptual formalization.' However, it is precisely because of this formalisation, which is based on subjective reason and is "contrary to aesthetic phenomena as what is constitutively particular,"²¹ that Kant's critique pushes the artwork back towards the subjective sphere and fails to recognise the dialectical relationship between subject and object.

It is with this analysis of *Critique of Judgement* in mind that Adorno believes the dominance of the subject in the Romantic interpretations of genius can be traced back to Kant, who first attached a greater importance than there had previously been to the subject, thereby suggesting that it was here and only here that genius might be found. This concentration on subjectivity and the individual fitted well with the Romantic belief in the importance of freedom of expression, and genius was thought of as an ideal in contrast to, and separately from, logic and reason in science and philosophy. But for Adorno, there is no validity in thinking of the subject in this undialectical way – "In the artwork the subject is neither the observer nor the creator nor absolute spirit, but rather spirit bound up with, performed and mediated by the object."²²

In the *Critique of Judgement*, Kant describes the enhanced abilities and the power that possessing genius can bring to an artist and the impact which he believes this has on the works they produce. A key aspect of Kant's interpretation is nature; and one of the main arguments in *Critique of Judgement* is that genius in an artist may be recognised through their ability to harness, to overcome, and to surpass nature:

²¹ Adorno, Theodor W., *Aesthetic Theory*, p.218

²² Ibid, p.218

Genius is the talent (natural endowment) that gives the rule to art. Since talent is an innate productive ability of the artist and as such belongs to nature, we could also put it this way: Genius is the innate mental predisposition (ingenium) through which nature gives the rule to art.²³

Crucially, Kant outlines several categories which he believes must be in play in order for genius to be apparent in an individual's work. Firstly, originality: originality must be important because, according to Kant's definition of talent, there can be no rule or law to govern this, and no instruction that would allow an individual to learn to be a genius. This would therefore assume that anything which is produced by the artist possessing genius must be original as there can be no precedent. Secondly, although genius does not derive from any rules, it must create rules for successive artists. In Kant's words, "...they must be exemplary; hence, though they do not themselves arise through imitation, still they must serve others for this..."²⁴

One final and vital part of Kant's understanding of genius is that the artist must have no knowledge of why he is able to produce such creative brilliance. This is connected to the idea that to be considered an artist, one must not follow a set of rules – by not knowing the origin of their genius, the artists therefore cannot explain what they have done in order to bring about such extraordinary results. As will be shown later, this is challenged directly in Mann's *Faustus* in Leverkühn's dialogue with the devil.

Adorno, in contrast, views the composer as a necessary aspect of composition; essential to the creation of the composition, and to ensuring, through their mediation, that the balance of subject and object in the work is adequately maintained. But their role is no greater than this. In contrast to Kant, instead of regarding the human as the originator of the work, Adorno regards the artist as a mediator²⁵ through whom "historically determined stylistic changes express themselves."²⁶ He argues that there is no natural talent as Kant suggests which allows for the formation of an original artwork:

²³ Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Judgement* p.307

²⁴ Ibid, p.308

²⁵ "The act carried out by the artist is minimal, that of mediating between the problem that confronts him and is already determined, and the solution, which is itself similarly lodged in the material as a potential. If the tool has been called the extension of an arm, the artist could be called the extension of a tool, a tool for the transition from potentiality to actuality." Adorno, Theodor W., *Aesthetic Theory*, p.219

²⁶ Kraus, Justice, *Expression and Adorno's Avant-Garde*, p.174

The concept of genius is false because works are not creations and humans are not creators. This defines the untruth of any genius aesthetics that suppresses the element of finite making, the τέχνη in artworks, in favour of their absolute originality, virtually their *natura naturans*; it thus spawns the ideology of the organic and unconscious artwork, which flows into the murky current of irrationalism.²⁷

For Adorno, the desire to glorify the artist has been born out of a bourgeois society that wishes to relieve itself of the trouble of engaging fully with an artwork. If the artist can be elevated to this superior position, the result is that the viewer "...is supposed to be satisfied with the personality – essentially a kitsch biography – of the artist."²⁸ Consequently, the artwork is received by the viewer as a secondary element or simply as a product of the artist's creative powers, and the content of the work fades quietly into the background. If this is considered in the light of present day artistic behaviour, it is easy to observe this glorification of the artist. Today, with the powers of commercialisation at their height, it is perhaps more commonplace now than ever before that personality alone has become increasingly dominant in the reception of if not all, at least popular art. The content of the work seems completely irrelevant, and the idea of genius appears to be significantly less complex in these responses to art to the extent that it has been diluted to an unrecognisable degree. Describing an individual as a genius now no longer requires any greater justification other than the apparent evidence of the fleeting influence of the personality of the artist on contemporary culture.

However undesirable this idea of genius may be to Adorno, it would not be useful, he argues, to dispense with the term entirely. This would have the effect of ruining spontaneity in the artwork, which would cause "An aesthetic mentality...that wholly swept away the idea of genius [to] degenerate into a desolate, pedantic, arts-and-crafts mentality devoted to tracing out stencils."²⁹

Adorno also alludes to the fact that genius is often understood to be a divine blessing. This too, he sees as a product of the Romantic era, which created a sort of aura around the concept; making it appear untouchable to the vast majority of people. This

²⁷ Adorno, Theodor W., *Aesthetic Theory*, p.224

²⁸ Ibid., pp.224-225

²⁹ Ibid., p.225

is another area where Adorno and Kant are unable to agree, with Kant identifying spiritual forces that can be associated with genius: "...that is presumably why the word genius is derived from [Latin] genius, [which means] the guardian and guiding spirit that each person is given at his own birth, and to whose inspiration [Eingebung] those original ideas are due."³⁰ And unsurprisingly, Adorno is highly critical of this idea:

...only later, perhaps given the insufficiency of mere conviction in artworks, did genius become a divine blessing...It becomes ideology in inverse proportion to the world's becoming a less human one...Privileged genius becomes the proxy to whom reality promises what it denies humanity as a whole.³¹

In these terms, the artist is granted or gifted the power from a supernatural force which enables them to produce entirely original and extraordinary works. This creativity, once granted to them, is theirs to keep and they are therefore considered to be the sole owner of the ideas and inventions contained within the artwork. However, given Adorno's consideration of genius, it seems that it is not so simple that the gift of genius can be bestowed from a divine power and without any price. It is much more interesting – and clearly this was something which fascinated Thomas Mann – that the deep consideration of the divine might reveal that the source of an individual's ability to harness advanced creative powers is in fact a place where evil resides, in the depths of despair. As Adorno surmises, it is not the direct, well-lit and guided path to success that is capable of motivating or facilitating the artist's desire to reach the highest level of creativity, but instead their achievements must involve the acknowledgement of something much less pure and much more terrifying, that would inspire the fear necessary for genius to manifest itself: "Without the ever present possibility of failure there is nothing genial in artworks."³²

³⁰ Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Judgement*, p.308

³¹ Adorno, Theodor, *Aesthetic Theory*, p.225

³² Ibid., p.225

Chapter Three

Genius in *Faustus*: Mann and Leverkühn

The opposition of and the connections between dark and divine forces can strongly be felt in Mann's understanding of the concept of genius. The importance of this to *Doctor Faustus* is underlined by the fact that it is immediately obvious to the reader that Zeitblom is disturbed and preoccupied by the contradiction between what he has always believed and the behaviour he observed first hand in Leverkühn:

...this word "genius", although extreme in degree, certainly in kind has a noble, harmonious, and humane ring...And yet it cannot be denied (and has never been) that the dæmonic and irrational have a disquieting share in this radiant sphere. We shudder as we realize that a connection subsists between it and the nether world, and that the reassuring *epitheta* which I sought to apply: "sane, noble, harmonious, humane," do not for that reason quite fit, even when – I force myself, however painfully, to make this distinction – even when they are applied to a pure and genuine, God-given, or shall I say God-inflicted genius, and not to an acquired kind, the sinful and morbid corruption of natural gifts, the issue of a horrible bargain...³³

This troubling comment sets the tone for the representation of genius in *Faustus* – alerting the reader to the fact that the treatment of this concept will be complex. That the artist who is a genius can only have acquired their exceptional abilities through the intervention of the devil is certainly one of the most important elements in *Faustus*. But, as Zeitblom's remark suggests, it would be an exaggeration to interpret Leverkühn's genius simply as a result of the powers of the diabolical. Leverkühn is shown to actively engage with the divine through his theological studies, before he finally decides to commit himself to a life as a musician. The fact that he turns to the devil in order to reach his goal of artistic greatness indicates that even for someone who has acquired a thorough knowledge and understanding of the miraculous powers of God, there is no alternative – that while it would ensure his soul remained intact, divine intervention would not grant a type of genius that would allow for the production of a modern music which would satisfactorily reflect the 'desperate situation of art'.

³³ Mann, Thomas, *Doctor Faustus*, p.4

Mann's novel can be seen to challenge some of the categories of the concept of genius stipulated by Kant. Indeed, the fact that Leverkühn interacts with the diabolical character at all refutes Kant's idea that the artist in question must have no knowledge of where their genius comes from. In *Doctor Faustus*, the devil refers to this Romantic interpretation of genius that associates virtuosity with a divine power. Genius is recognised as a 'gift', but not one that originates from God:

Really gifted. That is what we recognised betimes and why from early on we had an eye on you – we saw that your case was quite definitely worth the trouble, that it was a case of the most favourable situation, whereof with only a little of our fire lighted under it, only a little heating, elation, intoxication, something brilliant could be brought out...Gifted but halt is the German – gifted enough to be angry with his paralysis, and to overcome it by hand-over-head illumination.³⁴

The most noteworthy aspect of this passage is perhaps the idea that this 'gift' or 'talent' demands the intervention of evil and will not be able to reach the same heights of genius with the pure and good help of God. For the modern artist, the corruption of culture and society occurring all around them has rendered the creation of guiltless, morally sound art impossible. By describing this gift as 'paralysis', the devil also implies that the modern artist, the recipient of this gift, can no longer be healthy – genius is only possible with the aid of the demonic, and consequently must be ridden with disease. Near the end of Leverkühn's life, Zeitblom reflects on the source of creativity:

Was I not right to say that the depressive and exalted states of the artist, illness and health, are by no means sharply divided from each other? That rather in illness, as it were under the lee of it, elements of health are at work, and elements of illness, working geniuslike, are carried over into health? It is not otherwise, I thank the insight given me by friendship which caused me much distress and alarm, but always filled me too with pride: genius is a form of vital power deeply experienced in illness, creating out of illness, through illness creative.³⁵

³⁴ Ibid., pp.228-229

³⁵ Ibid., pp.345-355

In her study of *Faustus*, Susan von Rohr Scaff summarises what she considers to be Mann's interpretation of genius and his understanding of the ways that art can be created.

Genius, according to Mann's best known representation of it, is a dangerous pathological phenomenon. Inspiration, akin to hallucination, is the fevered arousal of dark, irrationally destructive life forces. The risks of the creative act are severe...Mann himself, moreover, attests to the same maddened villainy that these characters discern in the artist. Describing Dostoevsky's talent, Mann makes the nefarious source of creativity explicit. Genius is linked to a deep "satanic" guilt, and art owes its being to sickness, insanity and spiritual criminality. The judgement of Dostoevsky, which Mann says applies to *Doktor Faustus*, appears to support the view that all great art...must be inspired by sinister forces.³⁶

Arguably, this is one of the most important ways that Adorno's philosophical theory manifests itself in Mann's novel. The notion of genius as a unique power bestowed on an individual by a pure and godly source is, in this chapter more than any other, tackled head on and examined for its legitimacy. The Kantian conception of genius is present in *Faustus*, but rather than just being passively absorbed, it is spoken about openly by a diabolical character who almost seems to confront the reader directly, asking them to entertain the idea of a power equally as strong as that of the divine but not at all pure. Perhaps this gift might originate from godly sources, but it can only be turned into brilliance with the help of evil. The mere fact that Leverkühn, a scholar who is intimately familiar with the teachings of the Bible and the gifts that may be bestowed through the power of God, turns to a far more sinister source for help, suggests that the production of great art cannot be associated with or be a result of intervening divine powers. All along there is the implication that Leverkühn is well aware of the relationship music has with the diabolical, demonstrated by his intense pursuit of religious studies in order to avoid the powerful and demonic act of composition, and his more serious, entirely conscious decision to deliberately contract syphilis in order that he should be suitably equipped (i.e. diseased) for his subsequent life as an artist. There is never at any point in *Doctor Faustus* a choice presented to Mann's protagonist – he cannot ignore his affinity with music, and as a result he is

³⁶ Scaff, Susan von Rohr, *The Duplicity of the Devil's Pact*, p.159

powerless to free himself from the clutches of the devil. In the modern age, there is a price to be paid for everything.

Although the genius debate is at its most heightened in Chapter 25, Mann is careful to have introduced this topic prior to Leverkühn's discussion with the devil, ensuring that the notion of genius remains central to the novel as a whole. One of the ways he is able to achieve this is to contrast the characters of Leverkühn – the talented, creative and forward-thinking composer – with the narrator Zeitblom, who self-confessedly betrays more liberal and rational views than those of his friend. Zeitblom's views tend to display a sympathy with the Romantic notions of art and creativity, and they portray what could be described as a more black and white view of religion than those articulated by Leverkühn. Leverkühn, on the other hand, possesses a conscience that is perpetually troubled by conflict; conflict between his pull towards music and his desire to stay away from it, and conflict between his belief in God and his conviction of the presence of the devil. Zeitblom is often shocked or concerned by his friend's statements concerning his observations on the relationship between God and the devil or the source of his own creative powers. An example of this is his reaction to Leverkühn's dodecaphonic technique, to which he says: "The rationalism you call for has a good deal of superstition about it – of belief in the incomprehensibly and vaguely dæmonic..."³⁷ The excerpt that follows is a particularly apt illustration of the difference in the opinions of the two men. Zeitblom points directly to the importance of such concepts as art, the artist and imagination in the Romantic era:

I am an old-fashioned man who has stuck by certain romantic notions dear to me, one of which is the highly subjectivizing contrast I feel between the nature of the artist and that of the ordinary man. Adrian – if he had found it worth the trouble – would have coldly contradicted such a view...he reacted so witheringly to the "romantic tripe" which the world in its folly had been pleased to utter on the subject that he even disliked the words "art" and "artist"...It was the same with the word "inspiration"...and "imagination"...his hatred and mockery were too tormented to be a merely objective reaction to the intellectual movements of the time. Though they were objective too; I recall that once, even as a student, he said to me that the nineteenth century must have been an uncommonly pleasant

³⁷Mann, Thomas, *Doctor Faustus*, p.193

epoch, since it had been harder for humanity to tear itself away from the opinions and habits of the previous period than it was for the generation now living.³⁸

This description of Leverkühn's reaction to the cultural situation of the time also points to Mann's interest in the role of the individual artist in society. As we have already seen, this is something which occupies Adorno's thoughts; in particular he is concerned about the bourgeois desire to credit the artist with any creative success to the extent that the artwork becomes purely an extension of the artist's personality. This, in Adorno's view, is one of the main dangers of the changing distinction between the categories of subject and object. Subjectivity and objectivity are present in many ways throughout *Doctor Faustus*, but perhaps culminate in Leverkühn's invention of the twelve-tone technique. Leverkühn outlines his understanding of the subject/object dynamic to Zeitblom as follows:

In art...the subjective and the objective intertwine to the point of being indistinguishable, one proceeds from the other and takes the character of the other, the subjective precipitates as objective and by genius is again awaked to spontaneity, 'dynamized,' as we say; it speaks all at once the language of the subjective. The musical conventions today destroyed were not always so objective, so objectively imposed. They were crystallizations of living experiences and as such long performed an office of vital importance: the task of organization. Organization is everything. Without it there is nothing, least of all art. And it was aesthetic subjectivity that took on the task, it undertook to organize the work out of itself, in freedom... Old or new, I will tell you what I understand by 'strict style.' I mean the complete integration of all musical dimensions, their neutrality towards each other due to complete organization.³⁹

His admission that he believes the subjective and the objective to be 'intertwine[d] to the point of being indistinguishable' in the artwork also indicates that this is another instance of Mann making use of Adorno's philosophical understanding of these categories. The way in which Leverkühn compares subjectivity and objectivity could therefore be described as dialectical and is closely related to the idea that heaven and hell, God and the devil, are mutually dependent, an idea which at this point in the novel he has become content to accept. While it appears that this type of relationship between

³⁸ Ibid., pp.24-25

³⁹ Ibid., pp.190-191

opposites becomes something Leverkühn is gradually increasingly more prepared to entertain, it would, on the other hand, be difficult to truly describe Leverkühn's general state of mind as content. He suffers greatly, not just from the physical afflictions that are a result of his aggressive illness, but also from his constant philosophical and musical interaction with extremes. His irresistible attraction to the forces of two opposites is highlighted by the devil as he answers Leverkühn's inquiries about hell, his eventual destination:

To knit up in two words its quintessence, or if you like its chief matter, is that it leaves its denizens only the choice between extreme cold and an extreme heat which can melt granite. Between these two states they flee roaring to and fro, for in the one the other always seems heavenly refreshment but is at once and in the most hellish meaning of the word intolerable. The extreme in this must please you.⁴⁰

Leverkühn's apparent inability to reconcile opposing forces, which are present in almost all aspects of his life throughout his existence, and their relationship to the main themes of the novel is no coincidence. Mann, like Leverkühn, had reached a point before he began writing *Doctor Faustus* that left him struggling to understand the evils that had taken place to transform his own country so dramatically, and in a position where he found that his traditional views on art, politics and culture were difficult to apply to the abhorrent situation. It was his intention to make Leverkühn a character who was torn apart by conflicts, searching for a way to create art. Mann wanted Adrian to be "...a kind of ideal figure, a "hero of our time," a person who bore the suffering of the epoch."⁴¹ It has already been well established that Adorno's philosophy as well as his musical studies were an invaluable source for Mann, and the dialectical style of his writing, which relentlessly drove opposite ideas to their extremes, suddenly started at this time to appeal to Mann's troubled conscience as the most appropriate way to articulate the true extent of the crisis in which modernity found itself. In Leverkühn's conversation with the devil in his intellectual guise, this idea is pushed to the foreground with plenty of concerns raised for the fate of art and culture, but crucially with no solutions offered. Thus, the author's (and Adorno's) preoccupation with opposites are present throughout *Doctor Faustus* in many ways, but this description of hell is a most interesting example.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p.246

⁴¹ Mann, Thomas, *The Story of a Novel*, p.88

It provides a very clear location for the interaction of opposites, situating them within one specific, identifiable place where they remain independent from one another but must also coexist. The devil's account of the underworld also represents the inner conflict of the thinker, who mediates between two poles. An idea which has already been considered – through the writings of Doflein and Horst – that Adorno, instead of simply being represented by the diabolical figure in *Faustus*, might really be Mann's own devil, comes to the fore here. Perhaps the point that Horst and Doflein were attempting to make was that for Mann, dialectics could often be representative of the diabolical. After all, in reaction to the analysis of the two critics, Adorno did comment to Mann that he hoped the author felt "...as much at home in this infernal climate as I do myself."⁴²

⁴² Adorno, Theodor and Thomas Mann, *Correspondences 1943-1955*, p.36

Chapter Four

The importance of the devil in *Faustus*: an alternative view

It might be said that Leverkühn becomes more intimately acquainted with the idea of the devil when he begins studying theology at university. His professors at Halle seem preoccupied with the notion that an examination of the powers of God must precipitate an understanding of his counterpart. Kumpf, one of Adrian's teachers, is described as being "on a very familiar footing with the Devil." He is the first character to seriously portray the belief that the devil and God are of equal weight and that one cannot exist without the other. Kumpf states that: "Wherever theology is...there too the devil belongs to the picture and asserts his complementary reality to that of God."⁴³

Although this appears at first to be a striking development of the diabolical theme in Mann's novel, Kumpf's radical comments are then superseded by his colleague, Schleppfuss, who according to Zeitblom, makes Kumpf's "good out-and-out ways with the Devil" seem like "child's play". Schleppfuss can be literally translated as 'drag foot', and the similarities between the appearance of the lecturer and that of the traditional image of the adversary do not escape Zeitblom's observations. Schleppfuss goes further than his fellow professor by referring, although rather briefly, to the connection between the devil and art:

According to Schleppfuss...the Evil One himself was a necessary emanation and inevitable accompaniment of the Holy Existence of God, so that vice did not consist in itself but got its satisfaction from the defilement of virtue, without which it would have been rootless; in other words, it consisted in the enjoyment of freedom, the possibility of sinning, which was inherent in the act of creation itself.⁴⁴

Despite the depiction of Schleppfuss as the more intellectual teacher, with better articulated ideas and his devil-like appearance, he does not seem to be the intellectual who ultimately has the most influence on Leverkühn's thinking. To return to the section of the novel where composer and Adversary finally come face to face with each other in Leverkühn's mind, Kumpf's presence can be once again detected. The first disguise

⁴³ Mann, Thomas, *Doctor Faustus*, p.96

⁴⁴ Ibid., p.100

adopted by the devil is the shabbily dressed actor character, who interestingly refuses to engage with Leverkühn unless he speaks old German. This is different to the second mask the devil adopts, when he becomes the intellectual. It is almost as if this is symbolic of Leverkühn's recognition that he has outgrown the teaching of his old professors and is heading towards a new understanding of cultural values and of the role religion has to play in a society which has been radically changed by political and economic circumstances. While the devil as the actor speaks to Leverkühn about Germany, of the composer's childhood and of the nature of Germany as well as the German people, the intellectual devil is concerned with the desperate situation of modern art and the challenges that Leverkühn must overcome as a composer of this era. Evelyn Cobley sums up the significance of this distinction rather effectively in terms of Leverkühn's musical development: "It is in the scene with the devil that Mann hints at Leverkühn's radical ideological departure from his previous allegiance to *völkisch* versions of the devil."⁴⁵ Cobley's portrayal of Leverkühn's altered attitude to his old professors and his new preference for the appeal of the philosophical stance of the intellectual devil⁴⁶ is perhaps another subtle indication of the role that Adorno's philosophy has to play in the progression of the plot and in the growth of Leverkühn's character. To describe this as a 'radical ideological departure' points to the necessity that Mann found in searching for a philosophy that could adequately provide him with the tools to depict the crisis of conscience experienced by the modern artist due to the failure he perceived in his traditional views to bring any resolution to the insufferable situation.

So far, I have only considered *Doctor Faustus* from a perspective which confers a central importance to the appearance of the diabolical character in the middle of the text. Although there is a significant body of literature, including Cobley's article, which highlights the importance of Leverkühn's encounter with the devil to the development of the novel as a whole, there are also some interesting papers which provide an alternative reading of the text and often attempt to overthrow the traditional, accepted interpretations of the work. This is clearly demonstrated in 'Exorcising the Devil from Thomas Mann's *Doktor Faustus*' by Karin L. Crawford, where the author boldly states

⁴⁵ Cobley, Evelyn, 'Decentred Totalities', p.183

⁴⁶ Leverkühn's description of this guise adopted by the devil tells the reader that he is more at ease in the presence of this figure than in the company of the shabbily dressed actor.

that there is no devil in the novel. Crawford attempts to provide an analysis of Mann's work in which the demonic does not take centre stage. The more subtle implications of her study, however, reveal the problems inherent in forcing the removal of one crucial element of a large and complex work. Crawford's study, although deeply flawed, is important because its failure to make its case ends by underlining the significance of the demonic in *Doctor Faustus*, in relation to Adorno's contribution, to the work as a study of genius and also to the understanding of the very real cultural, social and musical concerns that are portrayed in Mann's fiction.

Crawford proposes that the various presentations of the devil in the novel are not accurately reported instances and encounters of Leverkühn's life but that these are actually the imaginings of Zeitblom. Crawford's reading of *Faustus* proclaims these imaginings to be a result of Zeitblom's unrequited love for his friend; the bitterness he feels because this is not reciprocated leads him to deliberately create a portrayal of Leverkühn's life which will "demonise" Adrian. She therefore suggests that Mann's novel should be considered with love as its central motif. In isolating love as an alternative theme she is not alone, as several scholars before her have attempted to provide new analyses based around this idea, including John F. Fetzer, who believes that it is imperative to realise that the dominance of the theme of death in the novel cannot be considered without devoting equal attention to its counterpart.⁴⁷ However, it is Crawford's treatment of this idea – which forms the foundation of her entire argument – that turns a potentially legitimate offering of an alternative reading into a series of underdeveloped ideas which gradually become increasingly implausible.

What makes Crawford's work unconvincing is that she lets her faithfulness to her argument blind her to some of the most notable aspects of *Faustus*. These are often vitally important, and it is sometimes not that Crawford does not know about them, but rather that she is prepared to ignore them or to play down their importance to push her case through. She is not simply viewing the novel from a different perspective, but actually proposing that the devil is an inconsequential and distracting feature of Mann's work, and that as a result it does not deserve to be credited with the level of importance that many scholars have been inclined to attach to it. Crawford's study reveals the

⁴⁷ In *Music, Love, Death and Mann's Doctor Faustus*, Fetzer refers to the music-love-death triangle which he describes as a traditional feature of literature studies but one that has been largely ignored in relation to *Faustus*.

serious consequences inherent in removing the devil from *Doctor Faustus*, and the paragraphs which follow will seek to investigate the cost of the loss of this crucially important figure by examining Crawford's interpretation in relation to the role of Adorno's philosophy, the portrayal of music and the novel as an example of modernist literature.

The previous chapter of this dissertation highlighted that *Doctor Faustus* was deeply indebted to Adorno's understanding of artistic genius and its origins, not as a gift not from God, but from hell. Crawford, however, does not view Leverkühn's musical advances as the workings of a diabolical genius or even an artist who is intent on greatness, but instead thinks that these developments point to the composer as a revolutionary. So far this is not a difficult idea to accept – it seems entirely reasonable that Leverkühn could achieve artistic genius by being radical. Indeed, this is a type of genius that Adorno refers to in *Aesthetic Theory*:

Incidentally, the concept of genius as it came in vogue in the late eighteenth century was in no way charismatic; in that epoch, any individual could become a genius to the extent that he expressed himself unconventionally as nature. Genius was an attitude to reality, "ingenious doings," indeed almost a conviction or frame of mind...⁴⁸

However, Crawford overlooks one very important aspect of *Faustus*, which is that Mann was keenly aware that in order to achieve the musical breakthrough he desired, Leverkühn would have had no choice but to enter into a pact whereby he exchanged his soul in order for this level of creative prowess to be brought about. Her commitment to rewriting the main focus of the novel causes her to lose grip on the importance of the sociological and cultural issues, and the novel as a commentary on the perilous situation of art. Crawford fails to recognise the suffering of Leverkühn as a depiction of genius – diseased and decaying – in the modern age. Instead she is intent on proving that he is not seeking "disease or demonic powers", but love, because in *Faustus* "disease is disease and suffering is suffering, and both may come to an end through love that emanates from empathy and compassion."⁴⁹ At times, it does seem that Crawford forgets that it is Mann, and not Zeitblom, who is the author of this work, which leads her

⁴⁸ Adorno, Theodor W., *Aesthetic Theory*, p.225

⁴⁹ Crawford, Karin L., 'Exorcising the Devil from Thomas Mann's *Doktor Faustus*', p.176

to ignore the intentions of the author himself. These are intentions that Mann is at pains to highlight in *The Story of a Novel*. His notes say “Finished reading Adorno’s essay...The desperate situation of art: the most vital factor. Must not lose sight of ill-gotten inspiration, whose ecstasy carries it beyond itself...”⁵⁰

Crawford is evidently aware of the role Adorno had to play in the creation of Mann’s novel, and furthermore demonstrates a familiarity with some of his main philosophical ideas. However, this understanding seems to pale into insignificance when Crawford sets about attempting to prove that at the very end of *Doctor Faustus*, the theme of love really does conquer all. She decides that it was not only Mann’s intention to end the novel on a note of hope, but that Adorno is also of the opinion that human suffering can be brought to an end through love. She states that “Adorno and Mann both look for hope in the human capacity to love by suggesting that love might put an end to the barbarism that was the Holocaust and hence also to suffering.”⁵¹

It is almost true to say that Mann wanted there to be an element of hope in the ending of *Faustus*, but this, as Mann states himself, was not something encouraged or supported by Adorno:

He...took issue with the end, the last forty lines, in which, after all the darkness, a ray of hope, the possibility of grace, appears. Those lines did not stand as they stand now, they had gone wrong. I had been too optimistic, too kindly, too pat, had kindled too much light, had been too lavish with the consolation. I had to grant that Adorno’s criticisms were justified.⁵²

Despite this, Crawford is perhaps making too much of a forward-looking glimmer of hope, which is a small feature of the final pages of the text, and not something that is a dominating factor in the work itself. Considering Adorno’s reaction to interpretations of the devil as himself, it is interesting to reflect on how he might have viewed Crawford’s interpretation of his ‘position’ on love as a solution to the crises of the modern world.

It is already quite apparent that these crises are not terribly important to Crawford, and there is further evidence that she has failed to consider the novel in the broader context of the political and aesthetic developments of the day. One of the

⁵⁰ Adorno, Theodor W. and Thomas Mann, *Correspondences 1943-1955*, pp.42-43

⁵¹ Crawford, Karin L., ‘Exorcising the Devil from Thomas Mann’s *Doktor Faustus*’, p.170

⁵² Mann, Thomas, *The Story of a Novel*, pp.222-223

problems she finds with the demonic in the novel is its role in connecting music with the nature of Germany and the German people –

To listen to Serenus's demonic narrative necessitates accepting the symbolism of disease and the necessity of suffering. If we do so, the novel passes political judgement through its political theological metaphor. But in this context, the novel would suggest that modernism, and more specifically modernist music, parallels barbaric developments in German politics. Yet Mann certainly did not view the music in this manner, nor would he have had a reason to propagate such a conservative cultural judgement.⁵³

This statement seems rather puzzling. Any reading of *The Story of a Novel* will immediately confirm that this is not true – Mann certainly did mean music to be representative of “the culture and the era.”⁵⁴ It is clear that this interpretation of the text leads her to also ignore the social and cultural themes present in Adorno's musical analyses and subsequently appropriated by Mann to support his aim to connect the particular experiences of Leverkühn to the universal conditions experienced by all Germans at the hands of the Nazi regime. We know that this was definitely his intention because he himself states that the connections between Leverkühn and Germany, between music and Germany and between the devil and Germany are all fundamental to his vision of the end product. Crawford's analysis, which proposes to eliminate the centrality of the demonic theme, inadvertently does the opposite and highlights its significance. This is due to her refusal to engage with the material fully and her apparent disregard for Mann as the creator of the work:

...Serenus uses this text to demonize the artist, obscure reality, and attribute an evil power to the development of German culture that parallels the nation's descent into the barbarism of the Third Reich. But if we reject Serenus's demonization of Adrian, we are left to reconstruct his biography from the elements of the text that can be established as accurate and true within the fictional context – dialogues, letters, and reports of events, i.e., those moments least implicated in the narrator's judgement. What we find is the story of Adrian's loves and the love that was necessary for him to compose.⁵⁵

⁵³ Crawford, Karin L., 'Exorcising the Devil from Thomas Mann's *Doktor Faustus*', p.180

⁵⁴ See Mann, Thomas, *The Story of a Novel*, pp.41-42

⁵⁵ Crawford, Karin L., 'Exorcising the Devil from Thomas Mann's *Doktor Faustus*' pp.174-175

Crawford's misreading of *Faustus* and her misunderstanding of the importance of its wider cultural context leads to a strange confusion of the traditional and the modern, which is present throughout the paper. We know Mann stated that he wanted Leverkühn and music to be a microcosm for the musical and political developments of the day, but Crawford seems unaware of this, insisting that there is no such parallel and that Mann never intended to imply that there was. She is correctly attempting to argue for the status of the work as a modern novel, but her argument backfires because it is wrongly based on her misconception that *Faustus* does not feature a musical/political parallel. She chooses to overlook the evidence which supports the fact that *Doctor Faustus* was constructed as a reaction to the various developments of modernism: political, musical, literary and cultural. In trying to prove Mann's modernity, her misreading causes her to do precisely the opposite.⁵⁶

Crawford then identifies Mann's return to "earlier moments in German cultural history, within Romanticism in particular" in a novel that is "an important statement on modernism".⁵⁷ Again, she is right to do so; however, in making reference to the "Romantic tradition of turning to the devil"⁵⁸, she once again proves that she has misunderstood the use of the image of the devil in *Doctor Faustus* as an emblem of the fragmentation and chaos brought to modernity. Although she is able to recognise Mann's novel as an important work of the modern age, Crawford seems to be unable to understand why this is so beyond the fact that Leverkühn's compositions are representative of key musical developments of the period.

In her treatment of this main theme, and because of her determination that the novel can survive intact without the dialogue between Leverkühn and his interlocutor, she dismisses and eradicates Mann's fears about the fate of art that are constantly present throughout the novel either as a feature of the foreground or the background, so that they provide an essential sense of continuity to the work. Additionally, in her failure to sufficiently acknowledge the importance of the musical context of the work, Crawford underestimates the influence of Adorno's thinking to *Doctor Faustus*. However, it is interesting that in removing the presence of the devil in Mann's novel, Crawford consequently demonstrates an incomplete understanding of the crucial role in

⁵⁶ See quote from p.180 of Crawford's article, quoted on p.35 of this dissertation.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p.180

⁵⁸ Ibid., p.176

Faustus that is played equally by Adorno's musical writings and his philosophical texts. In analysing Mann's novel, it is extremely difficult to consider the novel as an isolated work of art without making reference to, or understanding fully, the impact of the artistic concerns of the day on the text. Although it is not Crawford's intention to do so, she proves that there is an irrevocable connection between Adorno's work and the diabolical character, not only in the words that are a direct copy of *Philosophy of Modern Music*, but in the musical and cultural issues that Mann's protagonist struggles with throughout the novel. Crawford's study refutes any lingering idea that the devil could be considered to be incidental in any analysis of *Doctor Faustus* and instead confirms it as an absolute necessity. Alternative readings of such a complex work are to be encouraged, but not if this is achieved with an argument that attempts to close down the open-ended and serious nature of its main ideas.

Chapter Five

Philosophy of Modern Music: Adorno, Schoenberg and Mann

“The possibility of music itself has become uncertain.”⁵⁹

The importance of Adorno’s *Philosophy of Modern Music* to Mann’s text has already briefly been highlighted through secondary literature, contemporary reviews of *Doctor Faustus* and by the words of Adorno and Mann themselves. In *The Story of a Novel*, Mann recalled his conviction that *Philosophy of Modern Music* would be ideal for the purposes of his work after just the first reading:

Here indeed was something important. The manuscript dealt with modern music both on an artistic and on a sociological plane. The spirit of it was remarkably forward-looking, subtle and deep, and the whole thing had the strangest affinity to the idea of my book, to the “composition” in which I lived and moved and had my being. The decision was made of itself: this was my man.⁶⁰

Philosophy of Modern Music offers a dialectical depiction of the music of Schoenberg and Stravinsky, and shows Adorno juxtaposing critiques of the two most extreme representatives of this vital and transformative period in music history. In the opening pages of the text, Adorno ensures that the reader is immediately aware of the reasons for this choice, and that this focus on opposites will continue to be important throughout *Philosophy of Modern Music*:

...the basis for a philosophically orientated consideration of new music...only in such extremes can the essence of this music be defined; they alone permit the perception of its content of truth. ‘The middle road,’ according to Schoenberg...‘is the only one which does not lead to Rome.’ It is for this reason and not in the illusion of grand personality that only these two composers – Schoenberg and Stravinsky – are to be discussed.⁶¹

It is a widely acknowledged fact that Adorno was an admirer of the works of the Second Viennese School (he was a composition student of Alban Berg), which would perhaps encourage the expectation that *Philosophy of Modern Music* would attempt to

⁵⁹ Adorno, Theodor W., *Philosophy of Modern Music*, p.83

⁶⁰ Mann, Thomas, *The Story of a Novel*, p.43

⁶¹ Adorno, Theodor W., *Philosophy of Modern Music*, p.1

show Schoenberg in the best possible light, presenting Stravinsky to be the antithesis of his German counterpart. Indeed, the titles of each part of the book at first make this a likely prospect – “Schoenberg and Progress” and “Stravinsky and Restoration”, and these along with the introductory pages seem to point to Adorno’s views on the position of each composer in the creation of modern music. However, the reality is not nearly so clear cut as this. In fact, in some places the text shows that Adorno can be fiercely critical of Schoenberg, and although he does point out some of the triumphs of Schoenberg’s work in the face of the crises experienced by modern art, he is also at pains to highlight its severe limitations. As well as being hailed as one of the most influential studies of its time, this text, like much of Adorno’s work, has divided critics in their responses and driven some to reactions of dismay and intense disapproval. One of the strongest negative reactions to the book was demonstrated by Schoenberg himself, who recognised Adorno’s critique as an attack on him and his work. Max Paddison states that “Schoenberg...was not fooled by Adorno’s apparently positive reading of his work, clearly recognising a criticism of his serial music when he saw it.”⁶² For the purposes of this dissertation, I will focus on Adorno’s criticisms of Schoenberg’s music only and how this may have influenced the creation of the musical material in *Doctor Faustus*.

It is worth bearing in mind at this juncture that Mann intentionally chose music and placed it at the heart of his novel because he believed that its demonic nature was the best way to portray the evil inherent in the Faustian pact between Leverkühn and the devil. He wrote to Adorno in 1945 to ask for some advice about the nature of one of Leverkühn’s most significant compositions *Apocalypsis cum figuris*, and the difficulty which Mann experienced in creating a credible impression of a complex musical structure. However, he seems to ask Adorno to provide more than just the technical musical details:

Would you consider, with me, how such a work – and I mean Leverkühn’s work – could more or less be practically realized, and how you would compose the music if you yourself were in league with the devil?⁶³

⁶² ed. Cross, Jonathan, ‘Stravinsky as devil: Adorno’s three critiques’, *The Cambridge Companion to Stravinsky*, p.193

⁶³ Adorno, Theodor and Thomas Mann, *Correspondence 1943-1955*, p.13

The incorporation of not just Adorno's philosophy but also of the twelve-tone method underlines the importance of *Philosophy of Modern Music* to Mann's ability to succeed in carrying out his interpretation of the Faust myth. More significantly, the connection between these two works raises questions about Mann's inclusion of Schoenberg's compositional techniques in order to depict the diabolical features which he perceived in music. This chapter aims to discover what it is about Adorno's philosophical analysis of the composer's music that would encourage Mann to be convinced of its suitability for the role music was intended to play in *Doctor Faustus*.

Adrian's first music teacher, Wendell Kretschmar, delivers key lectures on Beethoven in the early stages of the novel, based on Adorno's analysis of the music of the composer. The most crucial of all of these lectures concerns Kretschmar's preoccupation with the missing third movement of Beethoven's piano sonata opus 111. Mann has Kretschmar articulate the apparently controversial opinion that Beethoven had been unable to compose a final movement for this sonata because at that time, in the most 'personal' or 'subjective' phase of his career, Beethoven realised that in fact subjectivity had "entered its own death."⁶⁴ Opus 111 heralded a move away from the historically established tonality of the past, and indicated for the first time that atonality might be possible. This then caused Beethoven to retreat to an idiom where he was more comfortable, to a music where the opposing categories of subject and object can coexist, despite the fact that, as Evelyn Cobley suggests, "...he already knew that this form was no longer adequate to the socio-historical situation."⁶⁵

Cobley goes on to state that as a result of Beethoven's failure to progress this move towards atonality, the devil informs Leverkühn that it will become his responsibility to continue from where Beethoven had left off. However, there is one more demand placed on the composer: unlike Beethoven's final works which exhibit a return to traditional forms such as the fugue, Leverkühn's resolution of this problem must be appropriately reflective of the social and cultural concerns of the time.

It will become Leverkühn's task to pursue to their utmost the radical implications of sonata opus 111 that Beethoven chose to abandon. In his search for authenticity, Leverkühn will no longer have at his disposal the organically

⁶⁴ Cobley, Evelyn, *Decentred Totalities*, p.184

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p.184

harmonious principle that had entered into crisis in Beethoven's music...As the Devil puts it, "the masterpiece, the self-sufficient form, belongs to traditional art, emancipated art rejects it". If Leverkühn is to achieve an aesthetic breakthrough, he has to discover a form that speaks to his own times.⁶⁶

Cobley's analysis demonstrates that Leverkühn's challenge, which he battles with throughout the novel, is to find a way to overcome the fact that, as the devil states, "the historical movement of musical material has turned against the self-contained work."⁶⁷ In other words, what is left for the composer Beethoven and after musical expression and subjectivity have effectively been exhausted? James Schmidt believes Mann's presentation of this situation, encouraged by Adorno's analysis of Schoenberg, shows that the only way Leverkühn can think of to resolve this predicament is to invent the strict twelve-tone technique. And this rigorous organisation, according to Zeitblom, had significant transformative effects on the possibilities of subjectivity in Leverkühn's very last composition:

The creator of "*Fausti Wehe-klage*" can, in the previously organized material, unhampered, untroubled by the already given structure, yield himself to subjectivity; and so this, his technically most rigid work, a work of extreme calculation, is at the same time purely expressive.⁶⁸

Leverkühn's compositions (particularly his later works) are portrayals of the technical innovations of Arnold Schoenberg's response to the new demands of modernism, depicted as the diabolical, diseased resolution to the stagnant state of musical development since Beethoven. Leverkühn boldly announces his intention to 'take back' Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, and his success, achieved in *The Lamentation of Doctor Faustus*, through "...a formal treatment strict to the last degree, which no longer knows anything unthematic..."⁶⁹ is described by Zeitblom with a mixture of shock and pride.⁷⁰ Schmidt points out that Leverkühn wanted to "...replace Beethoven's song of joy and brotherhood with an ode to sorrow,"⁷¹ indicating that

⁶⁶ Ibid., pp.184-185

⁶⁷ Mann, Thomas, *Doctor Faustus*, p.240

⁶⁸ Ibid., p.488

⁶⁹ Ibid., pp.487-488

⁷⁰ "Purely orchestral is the end...it is, as it were, the reverse of the "Ode to Joy," the negative, equally a work of genius, of that transition of the symphony into vocal jubilation. It is the revocation." Ibid., p.490

⁷¹ ed. Huhn, Tom, *The Cambridge Companion to Adorno*, p.165

although the twelve-tone method would radically change the mood of the Ninth Symphony, it would not eradicate expression.

But it is important to be clear that although he is devoted to using the twelve-tone technique to represent Leverkühn's genius-inspired achievements, it is not the only way in which Mann chooses to depict music, and it is possible to find evidence that he does not completely approve of it. While the author is obviously able to appreciate that this musical development – the organisation of sounds in twelve-tone composition and the progression of atonality – occurred because of the need for new forms, it is possible to detect in the novel a sense of nostalgia for the nineteenth century harmonic trends. It has already been pointed out that *Doctor Faustus* represents a shift in the way Mann deals with the relationship of the artist to society that is recognisable in his previous works. These earlier novels, such as *Buddenbrooks* and *The Magic Mountain*, paint a picture of Mann the traditionalist, an author with conservative views and someone who was not entirely unsupportive of bourgeois ideals. *Faustus*, although markedly different from his other works, does not demonstrate a desire on Mann's part to completely turn his back on his more established point of view. While the tone of *Philosophy of Modern Music* demonstrates a more assured standpoint of an author who is supportive of the idea that the work of modern composers and their technical break-throughs are necessary in reflecting the societal and cultural changes of the era, *Doctor Faustus* at times betrays a lingering nostalgia for the tonality of the past. Although Mann allows his protagonist to produce compositions similar to that of Schoenberg, this did not mean that this was in line with his own personal tastes. "...I once again heard Schubert's glorious B flat major Trio, and meditated while I listened on the happy state of music that it represented, on the destiny of the musical art since then – a lost paradise."⁷²

The fact that the key speech about the necessary burden placed on modern composers is delivered by the devil, who is speaking words written by Adorno, telling of the destruction of tonality, is perhaps indicative of Mann's attitude to this shift in compositional styles. Although on one hand the presentation of Adorno's philosophical ideas in Mann's novel shows an understanding of the problems encountered by modern artists, these developments are often approached with an air of regret and distrust. It

⁷² Mann, Thomas, *The Story of a Novel*, pp.228-229. Earlier in the book, Mann refers to a record in his diary where he states that "The triad world of the 'Ring', my diary confesses, is at bottom my musical homeland." (p.95)

seems likely that blunt dismissals of the ineffectiveness of tonality of the modern age in *Philosophy of Modern Music* would have been difficult for Mann to accept:

All the tonal combinations of the past by no means stand indiscriminately at the disposal of the composer today. Even the more insensitive ear detects the shabbiness and exhaustion of the diminished seventh chord and certain chromatic modulatory tones...It is not simply that these sounds are antiquated and untimely, but that they are false. They no longer fulfil their function. The most progressive level of technical procedures designs tasks before which traditional sounds reveal themselves as impotent clichés.⁷³

Therefore, the fact that Adorno's words are embodied by the devil is possibly a representation of Mann's personal opinions on what he regards as the diabolical temptations of modern music. Adorno, as a propagator of modernism whose writings express a pressing need for the destruction of the tonal forms deeply admired by Mann, is perhaps in this sense Mann's own devil, as Doflein and Horst seemed to suggest in the wake of the publication of *Doctor Faustus*.

Justice Kraus says that it is Adorno's belief that in modern music, subjective expression became an impossibility, and that this is exemplified by Schoenberg's dodecaphonic technique.⁷⁴ Kraus contrasts this with Mann's study of the composer in *Faustus*, claiming that despite Adorno's influence, the novel portrays a more traditional view of expression in music – that which was most prevalent in the Romantic period – than Adorno's critiques would allow:

One especially important divergence concerns the role of the composer in modern music. Adorno claims that composers' subjective contributions are far less important than in the past. The historical development of music, he asserts, leaves little or no room for composers to make subjective decisions or to express subjective ideas. Mann's novel, in contrast, emphasizes the subjective aspect of expression, even where Adorno denies its possibility most vehemently: with regard to Arnold Schönberg's method of twelve-tone composition.⁷⁵

⁷³ Adorno, Theodor W., *Philosophy of Modern Music*, pp.24-25

⁷⁴ "The material transformation of those elements responsible for expression in music, which – according to Schoenberg – has taken place uninterruptedly throughout the entire history of music, has today become so radical that the possibility of expression itself comes into question." Ibid., pp.13-14

⁷⁵ Kraus, Justice, *Expression and Adorno's Avant-Garde*, pp.170-171

Kraus is right to point out that despite the involved nature of their collaboration, there can often be distinctions between the way each writer has chosen to interpret and articulate their thoughts on the position of the composer in modern culture. The distinction to which Kraus is referring – the issue of expression in twelve-tone music – has already been briefly alluded to in this chapter, in the quote from the closing pages of *Doctor Faustus* where Mann's character Zeitblom identified Leverkühn's twelve-tone composition as 'purely expressive'. It seems odd in many ways that Mann, the lover of the operas and orchestral music of Wagner, who confessed to not enjoying his experience of listening to twelve-tone music, would credit these types of composition with the ability to restore expression. But this optimism even in the face of doom can be associated with the influence of Romantic thinkers on the works of the novelist⁷⁶, and confirms that despite his concern for the wretched situation of modern art, Mann's commitment to bourgeois aesthetics and to traditional forms had not been entirely lost in the creation of *Doctor Faustus*. Adorno's comments that the ending of *Faustus* was too optimistic, even after Mann had edited his work to make it seem less hopeful, reveal he could not share in Mann's optimism that this technique would not be the destroyer of musical expression.

However, a more informed consideration of Adorno's work than Kraus's analysis offers would seem to suggest that Kraus falls short of presenting a complete picture of Adorno's views on Schoenberg's compositional style. It would be wrong to create an impression that Adorno was an enthusiast for twelve-tone music, as he had serious reservations about some of the basic principles behind the method. He was distrustful of the desire to control all aspects of music with rigorous structure and organisation, and found that the aim to create a totally unified work was redolent of the totalitarian control exercised by fascist regimes. According to Evelyn Cobley, it was not just the similarities that the dodecaphonic technique had with the political situation which unsettled Adorno:

⁷⁶ " ...*Doctor Faustus* is a novel steeped in Romanticism, brimming over with Durer-inspired images, the love-death motif, and the Romantic quest for artistic mastery. And even as Mann warns of the "melancholy" and "aristocratic nihilism" that lie at the heart of parody through his Mephistophelean music critic, he fills his novel with many parodic twists. And from whom does Mann inherit these weapons of critique? From Nietzsche, the incurable romantic and parodist." Picart, Caroline Joan S., *Thomas Mann and Friedrich Nietzsche*, p.55

Schönberg created a system which was for Adorno “questionable as an ideal” because the drive toward the total integration of all elements struck him not only as totalitarian in fascist terms but also as complicit with the destruction of meaningful social relations under the reifying impact of late capitalism. Adorno blames the “blatant emptiness of the integral composition” for merely registering, rather than resisting, the “integration” of a society in which the economic basis of alienation continues to exist unchanged while the justification of antagonisms is denied by suppression.⁷⁷

Cobley goes on to explain that while Adorno does acknowledge the possibilities opened up to the artist because of Schoenberg’s (or Leverkühn’s) technical innovations – for example, he saw the enormous amount of musical variations that became viable as a result to be extremely important – he was unable to divorce any positives to be found in the usage of the twelve-tone system from the considerable price to be paid by the music itself for a serialist approach. For serialism is precisely just that, in Adorno’s eyes: a system. He observes a structure which imposes itself on the composition to such an extent that the presence of each and every note is decided on by this method, its cold and mechanical properties ensuring that expression is dominated to the degree that it is almost entirely eradicated. Cobley and Adorno agree that this extreme level of control paradoxically leads to the elements of the dodecaphonic technique almost being offered up to chance: “Twelve-tone precision treats music according to the schema of fate, divesting itself of any implication of meaning present in the musical object itself...”⁷⁸ Just as Leverkühn is not able to avoid his pact with the devil, Adorno concludes that the predetermined structure of twelve-tone music propels it towards its own doom. To put it bluntly, “fate is disaster”⁷⁹.

Cobley claims that Adorno was concerned by the implications of the twelve-tone technique for music, but also the impact it had on the role of the composer – “The act of composition itself is no longer experienced as the creative effort of the artistic genius...”⁸⁰ It is true that Adorno states that the artist is “...no longer a creator”⁸¹; that he was troubled by the idea that expression in works that employed the dodecaphonic

⁷⁷ Cobley, Evelyn, ‘Avant-Garde Aesthetics and Fascist Politics’, p.67

⁷⁸ Adorno, Theodor W., *Philosophy of Modern Music*, p.48

⁷⁹ Ibid., p.48

⁸⁰ Cobley, Evelyn, ‘Avant-Garde Aesthetics and Fascist Politics’, p.67

⁸¹ Adorno, Theodor W., *Philosophy of Modern Music*, p.26

technique would be first dominated and eventually obliterated by the method. The artist is obviously instrumental here, because as Adorno states in *Aesthetic Theory*, this is where expression originates - "The materials are shaped by the hand from which the artwork received them; expression, objectivated in the work and objective in itself, enters as a subjective impulse..."⁸² However, Cobley's statement makes poor use of the term 'genius' and consequently (and misguidedly) infers that Adorno, like Kant, believed that genius was detectable in artists themselves and that their natural talent alone provided the potential for the production of great works of art. It has already been shown through an examination of Adorno's understanding of genius that he was firmly opposed to this approach as he thought that this understanding of the concept risked unnecessarily glorifying the artist as the only factor involved in the creative process.

On the other hand, while Adorno might have strongly disliked the parameters of genius as they were described by Kant, neither is there any evidence that he was of the opinion that an adequate alternative to the Kantian interpretation of genius would be to hand over complete control of the subjective role to the work itself. As far as he was concerned, twelve-tone music had not been able to overthrow the Romantic notion of genius but instead ensured that this attitude to creativity had become more firmly stuck in the past than ever before - "In twelve-tone technique, a childlike belief in genius runs parallel to the total rationalization of material, this belief culminates, finally, in ludicrous priority conflicts or possessive claims to originality."⁸³

⁸² Adorno, Theodor W., *Aesthetic Theory*, p.218

⁸³ Adorno, Theodor W., *Philosophy of Modern Music*, p.134

Chapter Six

Whither critique? Jean-François Lyotard's 'Adorno as the Devil'

You never say anything about the positive object of negative theology, yet you leave no doubt that such a theology exists...⁸⁴

Max Horkheimer to Adorno, transcript of conversation in Los Angeles, 1941

The essay by French postmodern philosopher Jean-François Lyotard entitled 'Adorno as the Devil' offers a different perspective on the Adorno-Mann collaboration. Lyotard's analysis extends the parameters of this discourse by using these texts to examine the effects of Adorno's dialectical style on his main philosophical ideas. He expresses many of the same concerns as Adorno about the problems facing artists of the modern era - agreeing that the reality of their situation calls for the creation of new kinds of art, philosophy and politics. However, postmodernism was a response to the issues raised by modernism, and artists again attempted to find new ways to express their reaction to the innovations of the previous era. 'Adorno as the Devil' therefore lays some serious charges at Adorno's door; accusing his philosophy of the failure to divorce itself from traditional attitudes and to respond appropriately to the crises of modern capitalist society with sufficient radicalism.⁸⁵ In essence, Adorno's critical theory does not go far enough for Lyotard.

Lyotard's approach to philosophy represents a move away from overarching, normative statements. He is opposed to philosophical theories which treat concepts under an all-encompassing system, and instead propagates the idea that each situation or 'event' requires its own individual analysis. James Williams explains why Lyotard was so distrustful of philosophical studies which somehow managed to find a way to group together a series of disparate ideas in a single structure:

He attempts to show that there is no overall narrative that can give us overarching rules between fields...The fragmentation and loss of shared values

⁸⁴ Hullot-Kentor, Robert, *Things Beyond Resemblance*, p.29

⁸⁵ James Williams describes Lyotard's "dissatisfaction" with tradition, referring specifically to the political aspect of art, philosophy and linguistics. See Williams, James *Lyotard: Towards a Postmodern Philosophy*, p.4

characteristic of postmodernity becomes the incommensurability of language games and the disbelief in metanarratives.⁸⁶

Lyotard manifests his opposition to grand narrative structures with a writing style that is reflective of the open-ended, fragmentary and unfinished form adopted by many twentieth century artists. This can make his work at times, not unlike Adorno's, abstruse and paradoxical. The structure of *Adorno as the Devil* is an example of the author's rejection of totalities - single overarching responses to philosophical and aesthetic questions - creating a fragmentary construction in line with the postmodern values identified by Williams. This chapter aims to explore the reasons Lyotard offers for these deficiencies and why they ultimately lead to his belief that "Adorno is criticism's finale, its bouquet, its revelation as fireworks."⁸⁷

"I am the spirit that negates,"⁸⁸ announces Mephistopheles in Goethe's *Faust*, and it seems that for Lyotard, Adorno could equally well lay claim to this epithet. Lyotard explains that it is not just the use of dialectics as a philosophical method which earns Adorno this title but that it can be attributed also to his continued focus on the negative moment of the discourse. Adorno (as the devil) uses this negativity to stretch dialectics to an extreme where it can no longer function appropriately, causing its collapse and failure. Lyotard states that: "The diabolical figure is not just dialectical, it is expressly the failure of dialectics in dialectics, the negative in the heart of negativity, the suspended moment or momentaneous suspension."⁸⁹ This is perhaps inevitable: as Robert Hurley points out, Lyotard thought that critical theory "suffers from the fatal weakness which Marx assigned to atheism: it is forced to take on the adversary's position."⁹⁰

Lyotard finds that the unrelenting focus on the moment of negativity in Adorno's dialectics excludes all possibility of affirmation; that Adorno is quite content to continue with this approach to his critique of society, showing that it is eternally damned without any hope of redemption. Karl Popper contrasts this with the social critiques of Marx,

⁸⁶ Ibid., p.27

⁸⁷ Ibid., p.130

⁸⁸ Berman, Marshall, *All That is Solid Melts Into Air*, p.47

⁸⁹ Lyotard, Jean-François, 'Adorno as the Devil', p.136

⁹⁰ Hurley, Robert *Introduction to Lyotard*, p.124

finding that unlike Adorno, Marx offers the “promise of a better future”. The destruction of this promise, according to Popper, renders the theory “vacuous and irresponsible” in Adorno’s work.⁹¹ Georg Lukács has a particular destination in mind for intellectuals who follow Adorno’s lead – he thinks that they “have taken up residence in the ‘Grand Hotel Abyss’...a beautiful hotel, equipped with every comfort, on the edge of an abyss, of nothingness, of absurdity.”⁹² Through this metaphor, Lukács supports Lyotard’s suspicion that it is the attachment to the negative moment which causes the “suspension” of productive discourses of this nature and consequently the failure of the dialectical method. Critical theorists, in their determination to avoid positivity and to continue to reinforce their negative stance, have attempted to “clear their consciences by virtue of their objection alone.”⁹³

Lyotard thinks lack of affirmation in Adorno’s critical theory can also be detected in the works of composers such as Schoenberg, emphasising the futility of this approach – “It is precisely this affirmative operation which is lacking in the Marxism of Frankfurt. It is vain to reinforce composition in the Schoenbergian sense, as it is vain to search out the right position from which to struggle in the leftist sense...” Lyotard offers instead the works of John Cage as an admired alternative to the failed works of the Frankfurt and Schoenberg schools – “...the artist no longer composes, he lets his deployment’s desire go its way. That is affirmation.”⁹⁴ He reinforces his approval of Cage’s works by incorporating some of the elements of his indeterminate compositional procedures in his writing style in a section of his essay.

However, perhaps Lyotard makes a mistake common to the work of other scholars such as Kraus in making too much of Adorno’s undoubted admiration for Schoenberg. He often appears to think that to criticise Schoenberg is to criticise Adorno when in fact Adorno’s misgivings about the composer’s twelve-tone technique is made clear in many passages of *Philosophy of Modern Music*, criticisms which have already been discussed in Chapter Five.

⁹¹ ed. Elliott, Anthony, ‘Central Terms and Thinkers’ *The Routledge Companion to Social Theory*, p.242

⁹² Lukács, Georg, *The Theory of the Novel*, p.22

⁹³ Wolfe, Ross, <http://rosswolfe.wordpress.com/2008/06/20/adornos-critique-of-hegels-philosophy-of-history-in-negative-dialectics/> Wolfe also describes these critical theorists as “politically impotent...left with a sort of armchair cynicism...”

⁹⁴ Lyotard, Jean-François, ‘Adorno as the Devil’, p.132

Adorno's persistent faith in the dialectical method, a cue he takes from Hegel and Marx, leads him to become an unlikely worshipper at the altar of what Lyotard describes as the 'religion of history'. This is one of the metanarratives Lyotard detects in Adorno – his commitment to the dialectical style allows the religion of history to dominate his entire oeuvre, creating a safe, overarching structure which houses all of his separate ideas together: "This dialectics is... therapeutic resolution in the framework of a religion, here the religion of history."⁹⁵ However, the impact of history on Adorno's dialectics is very different from its influence on the works of his predecessors. Adorno's negativity causes him to be unable to articulate the potential for historical progress inherent in the dialectics of both Marx and Hegel. But Lyotard senses a paradox at play here: despite his failure to offer solutions to the despair he observes and his belief in the impossibility of these solutions, Adorno still desires reconciliation. His works appear to deny the possibility of this reconciliation, because the only way to realise it is in its absence; it can only be negatively expressed. Lyotard thinks that Adorno's repeated denial of these totalities only pushes Adorno towards the belief that their existence is still entirely possible. Negative dialectics has therefore failed as its negation of totality only encourages the possibility of the realisation of this totality:

Adorno defines his method as a dialectics of work and of contradiction...the totality is missing: *the reconciliation of the subject and the object has been perverted into a satanic parody, into a liquidation of the subject in the objective order*. Totality is missing = there is no god to reconcile = all reconciliation can only be represented in its impossibility, parodied = it is a satanic work. You wasted your time replacing God with the devil, the prefix super – with the old sub-terranean mole, you remain in the same theological deployment...Adorno's work, just as Mann's and Schönberg's, is marked by nostalgia. The devil is the nostalgia of God, impossible god, therefore possible precisely as god.⁹⁶

Adorno is the devil in Lyotard's view because of his tendency to cling to totalities. These totalities are no longer relevant and this is why Adorno has no choice but to negatively realise them. Lyotard thinks that the heavy concentration on the negative and totalising concepts throughout Adorno's work is what makes *Philosophy of Modern Music* so easily adapted to the diabolical theme in *Doctor Faustus*. He explains that

⁹⁵ Ibid., p.127

⁹⁶ Ibid., pp.132-133 (Italics are Adorno's words, quoted from *Philosophy of Modern Music*.)

Adorno looks upon music as Christ-like in its ability to take on the darkness and the guilt of the modern world, but that this is again negatively realised in the sense that he does not credit art with any of the redemptive powers which Christianity might offer:

The justification given the new music, essentially that of Schönberg, is that it has taken upon itself all the darkness and guilt of the world, that it finds all its happiness, all its beauty in forbidding itself the appearance of the beautiful. Art is a kind of Christ in its denouncing function.⁹⁷

Adorno's portrayal of music as Christ, negatively realised, means that it is ideal for the purposes of the devil's speech to Leverkühn. Mann appropriates Adorno's theories of music unchanged, and uses them to give a voice to the devil, who insists that he alone can ensure the existence of artistic genius, which must be paid for with intense and eternal suffering. There is certainly no possibility of redemption for Leverkühn in *Doctor Faustus*.

Lyotard's portrayal of Adorno shows someone who is unable to completely resist the pull of metanarratives, and for Lyotard these metanarratives are an inappropriate way to express the actuality of modern life and art. However, Adorno himself recognised the same limitations of the theology-based narrative and expressed his discomfort with structures that preferred the universal over the particular because of their similarity to totalitarian thought. This is actually something he criticises both Schoenberg and Stravinsky for in *Philosophy of Modern Music*:

In the works of both, all musical minutiae are predetermined by the totality, and there is no longer any interaction between the whole and the part. The commanding disposition over the totality banishes the spontaneity of the moment.⁹⁸

Hent de Vries, however, considers Lyotard's assessment of the inappropriateness of Adorno's dialectics to be unconvincing. His reading of Lyotard leads him to the opinion that Lyotard has incorrectly interpreted the 'tradition of theological-metaphysical thinking' in Adorno which the French philosopher believes is at the heart of Adorno's writings on the limitations of modernity. According to de Vries, Adorno's

⁹⁷ Ibid., p.127

⁹⁸ Adorno, Theodor W., *Philosophy of Modern Music*, pp.51-52

philosophy does manage to avoid totalities, and its structures actually ensure that it remains this way, which is something that Lyotard is unable to achieve:

In its strongest formulations, precisely because it understands itself to be an irredeemably fragmented thinking following on the loss of any totality, Adorno's dialectics remains skeptical (sic) about every flirtation with a totality of meaning which has vanished...this preserves his work from the danger of "political Stravinskyism", against which the philosophy of libidinal desire which Lyotard defends in this early text and its correlative "politica figura" can never really be protected.⁹⁹

Max Pensky's take on *Adorno as the Devil* is similar to that of de Vries. Both agree that the main weaknesses which Lyotard identifies in Adorno's work are in fact what turn out to be some of its major strengths. However, unlike de Vries, Pensky frames the fallacies he identifies in Lyotard's interpretation of Adorno's work from the point of view of its relevance. This is a question raised repeatedly and tirelessly by supporters and critics of Adorno in equal measure. Lyotard, while showing some admiration for the successes of Adorno's critiques, seems to suggest that Adorno is "...the quintessentially out-of-fashion, irrelevant modernist thinker, whose tragic mask subverts to its own self-parody."¹⁰⁰ Pensky, however, argues that this is not the case, and invokes Fredric Jameson's crucial (and apparently controversial) theory that it is largely Adorno's old-fashionedness that actually makes his thinking extremely current, and therefore relevant. Jameson concedes that Lyotard is correct to point out the deficiencies which he highlights in *Adorno as the Devil*. However, Jameson also claims that these 'deficiencies' are not in fact failures but can simply be regarded as differences between modern and postmodern philosophy. The application of Adorno's negative approach to postmodern thought, therefore, might have a positive transformative effect in the sense that it could fill some of the areas not confronted by postmodernism.

Much of Jameson's argument thus rests upon the insistence that Adorno's actuality consists in his dissimilarity from his contemporary poststructuralism; it is his very out-of-date Marxism that allows him to reinvent a relevance for the contemporary situation that currently fashionable Continental philosophy simply does not have. In this sense, Adorno's every anachronism becomes a component

⁹⁹ de Vries, Hent, *Minimal Theologies*, p.332

¹⁰⁰ ed. Pensky, Max, *The Actuality of Adorno*, p.8

of his relevance: his failure to make the linguistic turn, for example, like his clinging to concepts of totality, experience, and historical truth, preserve an aspect of thinking, and constitute a range of negative conceptual possibilities, which imply a critical perspective entirely distinct from that of poststructuralism...¹⁰¹

The critical engagement of scholars such as Penksy and de Vries with Lyotard's essay illustrates that the Adorno/devil nexus continues to produce discourses of a philosophical and literary nature. Often the aim of these deliberations is to seek meaning in the connection between Adorno's philosophy and the presentation of the devil in Mann's *Doctor Faustus*, but crucially the most productive of these remain faithful to the original texts by ensuring that these discussions are never-finished theses that attempt to provide answers or to close down these meanings.

As a postmodern philosopher, it is clear that Lyotard recognises the importance of Adorno's work. However, Adorno fails to take the valid points of his critique far enough and from Lyotard's perspective this renders his work inadequate in its portrayal of the crises of the modern world. Although Adorno was aware of the need for new, open and fragmented forms, Lyotard thinks that his critique is hampered by his affinity with outmoded views which were attached to unified and coherent narrative structures – views which according to Lyotard no longer have value. *Adorno as the Devil* presents Adorno as a modern philosopher who could see the need for major artistic changes but was more traditionalist than many would choose to acknowledge.

Lyotard was not the only person to make this link between Adorno and the Frankfurt School and Romanticism. Strangely, another writer to identify this trend was in fact Thomas Mann. In describing Adorno's promotion of 'radical modern music', he says:

But then how is it that this radicalism, which the layman tends to think of as a kind of musical sans-culottism, is accompanied by an intense feeling for tradition, a distinctly historical attitude, and an unswerving insistence upon technical

¹⁰¹ Ibid., p.8

mastery and craft discipline – such as I have found time and again among musicians of this type?¹⁰²

Adorno himself remarked in letter to Mann that despite his admiration for Schoenberg's later works he detected a conservatism and traditionalism in his approach.¹⁰³ Mann's novel itself, the focus of this study, is certainly an example of a modernist work with its roots in the past – while its construction, its montage technique, its lack of finish, is certainly modernist in its attempt to find a unique solution to the issues raised by the material – its theme of love-death, and the central figure of a suffering, tormented artist betray an adherence to Wagnerian Romantic grandeur. The novelist's appreciation of a need to break away from the past was perhaps mitigated by an emotional attachment to cherished forms of art and thought.¹⁰⁴ Adorno was perhaps more radical in his desire to break with traditional forms, more intellectually rigorous; despite this, we have seen that, from the perspective of Lyotard and others, Adorno himself is not free from a similar reproach. It is perhaps inevitable that all works of substance, no matter how radical in intention, manifest some influence of the past. However, as the number and range of commentaries discussed above testify, this has not diminished the importance of the work of these modernists to literature, music and philosophy and to the continuing relevance of their search for appropriate ways of describing new realities. And these new realities might also have their links with the realities of the past. As Robert Hullot-Kentor describes, some of the political and cultural problems which have motivated the revival of Adorno's theories in the U.S.A rather disturbingly bear a resemblance to the issues of disunity, destruction and war that were most pressing for Adorno:

...Adorno's philosophy took shape in dread recognition of the reversion of society to the primitive...Without a doubt the preeminent reason that his work must now be of vital concern in the United States is for what precisely can be learned from it in a narration that has so palpably entered primitive times. The vindication of

¹⁰² Mann, Thomas, *The Story of a Novel*, p.44

¹⁰³ "Only a few weeks ago I witnessed the first performance of the scene of the Golden Calf...which was just like something described in your Faustus novel...the very immediate effect of the piece, in spite of its musical complexity, reveals a latent conservatism – I am not sure whether he has not effectively attempted, albeit brilliantly, to produce some old effects by rather new means." Adorno to Mann, *Correspondences 1943-1955*, p.66

¹⁰⁴ "...exposure to the most recent and remarkable products of the Joycean, and post-Joycean, world, such as 'En attendant Godot', can only divert me at best – and I cannot help feeling some anxiety for the society that finds acclaimed expression in such a work." Mann to Adorno, *Ibid.*, p.107

torture, the desiderated abrogation of due process while utilizing its protections for its destruction, the paranoiac assault on thinking, the fixed denial of reality, the gangsterism of secrecy, the strategic humiliation of opponents, the cowering press, the trumpeted urge for sacrifice in the name of nation, the effort to legislate mystification in the sciences, the vengeful transformation of the judiciary, the coded speeches addressed to the faithful, the claim to divinely sanctioned autarchy by a president who speaks, reads, and writes only with difficulty and who is plainly incapable without a sworn cabal of advisers: there are contemporary trappings of phenomena as anciently recurrent in history as the steady exhalation of a desert wind.¹⁰⁵

The works studied inspire a variety of responses, ensuring that the discourses initiated by philosophers such as Adorno and Lyotard are kept open. The critiques of Pensky and de Vries show that neither Adorno nor Lyotard have created philosophies which ensure their works are impervious to criticism; that the weaknesses inherent in their work encourage scholars to continue engaging with the texts to produce productive contributions to dialogues about the situation of art and society.

¹⁰⁵ Hullot-Kentor, Robert, *Things Beyond Resemblance*, p.3

Bibliography

Books

Adorno, Theodor W., *Philosophy of Modern Music*, Continuum: London 2007

Adorno, Theodor W., *Aesthetic Theory* (trans. Robert Hullot-Kentor), Continuum International Publishing Group: London 1997

Adorno, Theodor W. and Thomas Mann, *Theodor W. Adorno and Thomas Mann: Correspondence 1943-1955*, Polity Press: 2006

Bergman, Marshall, *All That is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*, Verso, 1983

ed. Cross, Jonathan, *The Cambridge Companion to Stravinsky*, Cambridge University Press, 2003

ed. Elliott, Anthony, *The Routledge Companion to Social Theory*, Routledge, 2010

Fetzer, John Francis, *Music, Love, Death and Mann's Doctor Faustus*, Camden House, 1990

ed. Guyer, Paul, *The Cambridge Companion to Kant*, Cambridge University Press, 1992

ed. Huhn, Tom, *The Cambridge Companion to Adorno*, Cambridge University Press, 2004

Hullot-Kentor, Robert, *Things Beyond Resemblance: Collected Essays on Theodor W. Adorno*, Columbia University Press: New York, 2006

Jarvis, Simon, *Adorno – A Critical Introduction*, Polity Press: Cambridge, 1998

Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Judgement* (trans. Werner S. Pluhar), Hackett Publishing Company: Indianapolis, 1987

Lukács, Georg, *The Theory of The Novel*, MIT Press, 1971

Mann, Thomas, *The Story of a Novel: The Genesis of Doctor Faustus*, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1961

Mann, Thomas, *Doctor Faustus: The Life of the German composer Adrian Leverkühn, told by a friend*, Vintage, Random House: London, 1999

ed. O'Connor, Brian, *The Adorno Reader*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2000

ed. Pensky, Max, *The Actuality of Adorno: Critical Essays on Adorno and the Postmodern*, State University of New York Press, 1997

Picart, Caroline Joan S., *Thomas Mann and Friedrich Nietzsche: Eroticism, Death, Music, and Laughter*, Editions Rodopi: Amsterdam, 1999

ed. Robertson, Ritchie, *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Mann*, Cambridge University Press, 2002

de Vries, Hent, *Minimal Theologies: Critiques of Secular Reason in Adorno and Levinas*, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005

Williams, James, *Lyotard: Towards a Postmodern Philosophy*, Polity Press: Cambridge, 1998

Journal articles

Blanchot, Maurice, 'Ars Nova' (trans. Donald Schier) from: *Perspectives of New Music*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Spring - Summer, 1979), pp. 76-84.

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/832834> Accessed: University of Glasgow 27/01/2013

Cobley, Evelyn, 'Avant-Garde Aesthetics and Fascist Politics: Thomas Mann's *Doctor Faustus* and Theodor W. Adorno's *Philosophy of Modern Music*', *New German Critique*, No. 86 (Spring-Summer, 2002) pp.43-70.

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3115201> Accessed: University of Glasgow 28/11/2011

Cobley, Evelyn, 'Decentered Totalities in Doctor Faustus: Thomas Mann and Theodor W. Adorno', http://www.js-modcult.bham.ac.uk/articles/issue2_cobley.pdf Accessed 06/01/2012

Crawford, Karin L., 'Exorcising the Devil from Thomas Mann's *Doktor Faustus*', *The German Quarterly*, Vol.76, No.2 (Spring, 2003), pp.168-182.

Published by: Wiley Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3252173>

Hurley, Robert, 'Introduction to Lyotard', *Telos* Spring 1974, Vol.1974, no.19 pp.124-126

Kraus, Justice, 'Expression and Adorno's Avant-Garde: The Composer in *Doktor Faustus*', *The German Quarterly*, Vol.81, No.2 (Spring, 2008), pp.170-184

Published by: Wiley-Blackwell on behalf of the American Association of Teachers of German Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27676163> Accessed: University of Glasgow 12/10/2012

Lyotard, Jean-François, 'Adorno as the Devil', *Telos* Press: New York, Spring 1974

Scaff, Susan von Rohr, 'The Duplicity of the Devil's Pact: Intimations of Redemption in Mann's *Doktor Faustus*', *Monatshefte*, Vol. 87, No. 2 (Summer, 1995), pp.151-169

Published by: University of Wisconsin Press Stable URL:
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30153408> Accessed: University of Glasgow
 12/10/2012

Websites

Wolfe, Ross <http://rosswolfe.wordpress.com/2008/06/20/adornos-critique-of-hegels-philosophy-of-history-in-negative-dialectics/> Accessed: 26/03/2013