Alan Corkhill

PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST(E): Klaus Maria Brandauer's Screen Adaptation of Thomas Mann's *Mario und der Zauberer*

Sixty-four years separate the appearance of Thomas Mann's *Mario und der Zauberer* (*Mario and the Magician*, 1930) and Austrian actor/ director Klaus Maria Brandauer's screen adaptation of the novella. The film, shot at several locations, was produced by Jürgen Haase during 1993 and released for cinema on 15 December 1994. The film licence had been obtained by PROVOBIS (Hamburg) as early as 1988, but the scripts lay idle until work started on the film in 1991. The lavish co-production enjoyed its world premiere in Venice in September 1994 and was shown for the first time on the German TV channel ZDF in May 1997.

Although it was Haase's idea to refashion the novella, the award-winning movie owed its execution to the personal vision of Brandauer in collaboration with screenwriter Burt Weinshanker, whom Brandauer selected for his latest cinematic venture because Weinhanker's "version" came closest to his own "intentions".[1] The high budget movie, featuring Anna Galiena and Julian Sands, with Brandauer himself in the role of the magician (*in lieu* of Anthony Hopkins), is the most recent in a line of cinematic renderings of Mann's literary oeuvre stretching back to the 1923 production of the Nobel prize-winning novel *Buddenbrooks* (1901).[2]

---

[1] KLAUS MARIA BRANDAUER, "Respektlosigkeit gehört dazu", *Berliner Zeitung*, no. 293, 15 December 1994. This and all subsequent quotations from the German are my translations.

[2] Mann was disappointed with Gerhart Lamprecht's film adaptation of *Buddenbrooks*, describing it as little more than a "mediocre merchant's tragedy",

Set in the fictitious seaside resort of Torre di Venere shortly after Mussolini's seizure of power, Mann's narrative centres on the machinations of a deformed conjurer/mind-reader/hypnotist, "Cavaliere" Cipolla, who becomes a victim of his own demagogic attempts to brainwash, enslave the human will and rob individuals of their dignity. The chain of incidents culminating in the fatal shooting of the hunchback by a local fisherman, Mario, humiliated by the magician's kiss in full public gaze, is vividly recalled by the first-person narrator, a German intellectual. Having witnessed, along with his wife and two children, the entire enthralling performance of hypnotic tricks in the town's *municipio*, the narrator feels powerless to resist the grotesque spectacle on stage, sensing his own dangerous complicity in the unfolding events. The holidaymakers had already fallen prey to unnatural excesses of patriotic fervour, racism and xenophobia, not the least being their unjustified ostracisation by the hotel management and a ludicrous fine resulting from their eight-year-old daughter's "provocative" exposure of herself on the beach. Cipolla's infectious nationalistic rhetoric, which comes to the fore in the manipulation of his audience and his increasingly sinister hold over his mesmerised subjects, interlinks the two distinct parts of the novella. The tense storyline, commonly read as a political allegory,[3] not only captured Brandauer's imagination; it also gave inspiration to a string of playwrights, librettists, composers and ballet directors.[4]

---

rather than the saga of a patrician family. See RENÉ KRAUS, "Thomas Mann, ganz privat. Ernsthaftes Feriengespräch mit dem Dichter", *Neue Freie Presse*, 15 August 1930, quoted in *Frage und Antwort. Interviews mit Thomas Mann. 1909-1955*, ed. Volkmar Hansen and Gert Heine (Hamburg: Albrecht Knaus, 1983), p. 170.

[3] In retrospect Mann actually stressed the narrowness of a purely allegorical reading. See his letters to Charles Duffy (14 December 1945) and Louis Grant (14 October 1949), *Dichter über ihre Dichtungen*, Vol. XIV: *Thomas Mann*, ed. H. Wysling and M. Fischer (München: Heimeran; Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1979), pp. 372-73.

[4] In 1949 Mann granted Yale University's Drama Department permission to stage a dramatised version of the novella. See Thomas Mann to Bill Goodhart, 17 February 1949, *Die Briefe Thomas Manns*, ed. H. Bürgin and H.-O. Mayer (Frankfurt a.M: Fischer, 1982), Vol. III: *Die Briefe von 1944 bis 1950*, p. 593. Two years later Mann consented to a ballet rendition. See Thomas Mann to Alberto Mondadori, 13 March 1951, Ibid. Vol. IV: *Die Briefe von 1951 bis 1955 und Nachträge*, p. 27. 1956 saw the appearance of Luchino Visconti's dance melodrama, *Mario e il mago*, followed by a Hungarian dance adaptation in 1964, choreographed by V. Fülöp and Z. Kun. Then in the late 80s the Batignano Festival commissioned Stephen Oliver to write the text and fourteen-voice score for a work

Brandauer's cinematic adaptation reworks the plot, characterisation, setting and political and mythical subtexts of Mann's novella. While the interrogation of the degenerate nature of fascism still serves as a common thematic denominator, Brandauer represents the phenomenon in additional ways, for example, through the acoustic and visual devices of film. By far the most radical deviation from the original storyline in terms of the denouement and its symbolic import is undoubtedly Cipolla's "undeserved" escape from a bullet fired by the casual waitress Sylvestra in the confused aftermath of hypnosis, resulting in the accidental shooting of Mario, the much-loved celebrity of Torre's annual waiters' race.

If the plethora of (socio)political, psychoanalytical and – more recently – psychosexual interpretations of the novella is given less critical weight,[5] and the work is viewed as part of Mann's ongoing preoccupation with the dilemma of the *Künstlerexistenz*, as I believe it should be, then in a generic sense *Mario und der Zauberer* could legitimately be classified as a *Künstlernovelle*. Whereas the *Künstlerroman*, an offshoot of the apprenticeship novel, traces the artistic growth of its main protagonist to maturity, the *Künstlernovelle* has a greater tendency to *problematise* particular aspects of this development, concentrating – as Martin Swales neatly puts it – on "the uniqueness of the creative individual to which the narrative voice bears witness – whether sceptical, grudging, sympathetic, or enthusiastic".[6] Nevertheless, I have difficulty accepting Swale's general proposition that "the *Künstlernovelle* is not concerned with the outsider as a psychological or pathological phenomenon".[7] While Swale's

---

entitled *Mario and the Magician.* It premiered on 5 August 1988. Oliver substitutes a young German widow for the visiting German writer. Apart from a few minor aberrations, the plot displays fidelity to the original text. The novella likewise inspired librettist Rod Anderson and composer Harry Somers to collaborate on a three-act opera for the Canadian Opera Company, which premiered in May 1992.

[5] See the exhaustive review of critical literature on the novella in THOMAS MANN, *Kommentar zu sämtlichen Erzählungen*, ed. Hans R.Vaget (München: Winkler, 1984), pp. 220-50, and in *Thomas Mann Handbuch*, ed. H. Koopmann (Frankfurt a.M.: Kröner, 1990), pp. 590-600.

[6] Martin Swales, "Narrative Accommodations: The Legacy of the Romantic Künstlernovelle", *Echoes and Influences of German Romanticism. Essays in Honour of Hans Eichner*, ed. M. S. Batts and others (New York: Peter Lang, 1987), pp. 183-94 (p. 185).

[7] Ibid., p. 190.

assumption may hold true for some nineteenth-century exemplars of the canon such as Mörike's novella *Mozart auf der Reise nach Prag* (Mozart on His Journey to Prague, 1855), it is the psychopathological dimensions of artistry that clearly inform Mann's earlier novella *Der Tod in Venedig* (*Death in Venice*, 1912) and, as I am about to demonstrate, *Mario und der Zauberer*, as well as Kafka's *Ein Hungerkünstler* (A Hunger Artist, 1922).

E. T. A. Hoffmann's romantic tales of demonised painters and goldsmiths are no less forceful schematisations of the mixed blessing of artistic endeavour than Mann's novellas *Tonio Kröger* (1903) *Tristan* (1903) and *Der Tod in Venedig*. With *Mario und der Zauberer*, however, we run up against a problem of definition and delineation. Who is the true artist? Assuming that the narrator is a professional writer of renown, indeed an autobiographical persona, we might wonder whether he has realised Kröger's dream of synthesising the respectability and humanistic decency of the *Bürger* and the bohemianism of the *Künstler*. Yet we may equally ask: to what extent does Cavaliere Cipolla qualify as the prototypal artist? Certainly, the physically handicapped and morally degenerate "*illusionista*"[8] epitomises the much-debated nexus Mann himself established between artistry, sickness and even criminality.[9] In his *Kunstnovelle* Mann has allowed the lofty figure of the artist, of which the writer Gustav Aschenbach *(Der Tod in Venedig)* is admittedly a more conspicuous paradigm, to be eclipsed, if not usurped by the artiste – the con-artist as it were, who, having quite literally taken centre-stage, sets up an ideological antagonism far graver than the parodistic slight to artistic pedigree intimated by Kröger's clownish dance teacher, François Knaak, or the strolling Neapolitan street musicians on the garden terrace of Aschenbach's Lido hotel. This is precisely why an interrogation of Brandauer's realignment of priorities is now so crucial, for the film reclaims the authority and status of the artist by rendering him far less of a passive bystander and "accomplice" to the hypnotist's seductions than Mann appears to have done. To this end Brandauer

[8] THOMAS MANN, *Mario und der Zauberer*, in Id., *Gesammelte Werke in zwölf Banden*, Vol. VIII, *Erzählungen Fiorenza. Dichtungen* (Frankfurt-am-Main: S. Fischer, 1960), p. 670 (cited hereafter in the text as GW).

[9] See on the subject of the suffering artist-genius the authoritative study by C. A. M. NOBLE, *Krankheit, Verbrechen und künstlerisches Schaffen bei Thomas Mann* (Bern: Herbert Lang, 1970).

takes considerable liberties with Mann's storyline. Not only does he reinvent the narrator; the character of Cipolla, too, while forfeiting little of its enigmatic ambivalence (the name Cipolla denotes a multi-layered onion), undergoes a process of rehumanisation and resexualisation.

I propose here to illustrate the nature and extent of such divergences by focusing on the artist/artiste dichotomy highlighted in the film. This inevitably raises the methodological issue of whether cinematic appropriations can or should be judged in relation to the literary texts on which they are based. Needless to say, the film possesses its own self-referentiality, intertextual threads, ideological parameters and aesthetic autonomy. And yet the contemporary pertinence of Mann's message was not lost on the director, who described the novella as a "story for the present day"[10] given its universalisation of prejudice, (racial) intolerance and violence. When asked, in one of numerous interviews coinciding with the film's release, to explain the appeal of Mann's subject matter, Brandauer retorted: "Similarities, contemporary variations on the theme have to be in the air, otherwise they are of no interest to us, and they would be unlikely to interest me either".[11] And in the same vein: "For me [Mann's] novella is a piece of contemporary history. Unfortunately it has retained its relevance".[12] Accordingly, the rise of Italian fascism is paralleled by the emergence of the extreme right in Europe since the end of the Cold War. At the same time, Brandauer was in a position to revisit Italian history of the 1920s and 30s with the benefit of hindsight, and portray the contagion of fascism on the screen in imagery less equivocal than Mann's discreet verbal symbolism. Thus producer Jürgen Haase's contention that references in the novella to

---

[10] *Frankfurter Rundschau*, no. 121, 28/29 May 1997, p. 11.

[11] "Die Fuhrmänner sind wir: Norbert Beilharz im Gespräch mit Klaus Maria Brandauer", *Mario und der Zauberer: Das Buch zum Film von Klaus Maria Brandauer*, ed. J. Haase (Berlin: Henschel, 1994), p. 95. Hereafter abbreviated in the notes to *Mario*. Compare the narrower definition of the film as a "political morality play", in *Fischer Film Almanach 1995. Filme, Festivals, Tendenzen*, ed. H. Schäfer and Walter Schobert (Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer, 1995), p. 248.

[12] "Bereit für die Massenpsychose. Gespräch mit dem Schauspieler Klaus Maria Brandauer", *Tagesspiegel* (Berlin) no. 15129, 22 December 1994.

Italian fascism had been largely expunged from the film script seems strangely incongruous. [13]

Much ink has been spilled over the timing and forcefulness of Mann's denunciation of fascism prior and subsequent to his self-exile in 1933.[14] Suffice it to say within the parameters of this study that the narrator's barometric recording of something disturbingly unpleasant in the air – both literally in terms of Torre's oppressive mid-summer heat and figuratively in the numerous allusions to the prevailing mood of xenophobia and chauvinism in the small coastal community – mirrors the author's first-hand encounters with Italy's rapidly changing political climate under the Duce and his subtle artistic distillation of the psychopathology of fascism. The explicitness of Brandauer's moving pictures transforms "atmospheric" fascism into the real thing, even if at times by association only (as exemplified by the sudden dismissal of the kindly hotel manager Signor Graziano and the suspicious circumstances surrounding his death in symbolically inclement weather).

Mann's narrator has been visually reincarnated in the diffident man of letters Professor Bernhard Fuhrmann,[15] sensitively portrayed by English actor Julian Sands. No doubt a pun was intended with the compound noun Fuhr-Mann (the travelled [Thomas] Mann). Throughout the film Fuhrmann's tense facial expression and keenly observant gaze betray the anxiety of premonition and foresight. Compared to Cipolla he is a man of few words. Treated from the very outset by the servile hotel director-to-be Pastore as a second-class citizen (the Fuhrmanns are not collected from the station at Porto Clemente by the hotel taxi as on previous visits, but make their humbler entry into Torre on a mule-drawn cart) the patrician *littérateur*

---

[13] JÜRGEN HAASE, "Novelle-Drehbuch – Film. Metamorphosen", *Mario*, p. 31.

[14] See specifically on this topic: WOLFGANG FREESE, "Thomas Mann und sein Leser. Zum Verhältnis von Antifaschismus und Leseerwartung in 'Mario und der Zauberer'", *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, 51 (1977), pp. 659-75.; KLAUS MÜLLER-SALGET, "Der Tod in Torre di Venere. Spiegelung und Deutung des italienischen Faschismus in Thomas Manns *Mario und der Zauberer*", *Arcadia* 18 (1983), pp. 50-65.

[15] Despite his north German reserve, Fuhrmann is not a "pedantic [...] scholar", as asserted by DENNIS F. MAHONEY, "Torre di Venere in neuem Licht. Klaus Maria Brandauers filmische Auseinandersetzung mit Thomas Manns *Mario und der Zauberer*", *Colloquia Germanica* 31: 4 (1998), pp. 357-73 (p. 360).

and apolitical exponent of humanistic values finds himself increasingly relegated to the margins. Only the youthful and playfully seductive holiday waitress, Silvestra, a warm admirer of his fiction, with whom he is able to engage in brief but meaningful dialogue at the Café Esquisito, recognises the "visionary" in Fuhrmann.[16] At a time when it was particularly incumbent upon the writer to document the downward spiral of *Kulturnationen* into barbarism, Fuhrmann affirms the special responsibility of his *métier*, likening the artist to an "extremely sensitive seismograph" (*F*).[17] Torre di Venere, mistakenly viewed by the urbane "homecomer" as a boring provincial backwater, turns out to be very much a *locus amoenus* in which the "Professore" is confronted by the truth of his own Faust-like dictum, "I have always felt that whatever happens to me is the microcosm of events in the world at large" (*F*). Indeed, a telling reminder of the trappings of fascist sentiment in miniature is the bizarre nocturnal firework extravaganza at which the town's elite party-faithful conduct themselves as though they were participants in an absurdist drama, thus providing the Fuhrmanns with every justification for packing their bags. Rachel Fuhrmann (the Jewish first name is more than a coincidental designation) is no less susceptible to socio-political tremors and reverberations, even pleading for the completion of the family holiday in (neutral) Switzerland. Ironically, by deciding to stay and see the "adventure" through to the bitter end (*F*),[18] Fuhrmann, like his Mannian counterpart, is guilty of flirting with the very obscurantism that rationality and commonsense have sought so strenuously to keep at bay. Mann himself, increasingly wary of the artist's perilous exposure to seduction by the irrational, was ready to propose a radical dispositional shift, to quote an extract from a guest lecture delivered in September 1930:

---

[16] This and all subsequent citations in the text indicate by the letter "*F*" refer to the screen version. Brandauer made comparatively few adjustments in content and language to Weinshanker's screen script, most of which is reproduced in: "Szenen und Bilder. Mario und der Zauberer. Auszüge aus dem Drehbuch", *Mario*, pp. 35-90.

[17] Haase regards Fuhrmann as a "seismograph with an intellectual presence", compared to Cipolla, the "demagogue with a physical presence", *Mario*, p. 30.

[18] See the more flippant reading of the film's message in JAN HAWEMANN, "Mario und der Zauberer", www.hawemann.com/jan/kino/95/mariozauberer.html (30 April 2000): "The actual message of the film is: if you are not enjoying your holiday, go home; you will save yourself a great deal of bother".

> [H]eute ist der Moment gekommen, wo auch der Künstler, der Dichter, der Schriftsteller ihren Anteil an den großen, rationalen Problemen zu nehmen haben, die auf der Tagesordnung der Welt stehen. So sehr sich auch der Dichter in seinem Herzen der heiligen Unvernunft, als seiner ureigensten Domäne, verbunden fühlen mag, muß er doch dem eigentlichen Menschenwürdigen der Vernunft die Vorhand lassen. [19]
>
> (Today the moment has come when artists, poets and writers have to engage with the big rational problems that are the order of the day worldwide. However much the poet may feel committed in his heart to holy irrationalism, his primordial domain, he must allow reason, the real seat of human dignity, the upper hand.)

Fuhrmann's guest lecture, the "Responsibility of the Writer in our Times", delivered at the Ministry of Culture in Rome and attended by high-ranking representatives of state and church, attests unambiguously to the waning authority of the artist as the voice of reason and universal conscience. In September 1930 Mann had bewailed in a similarly titled address, *Die geistige Situation des Schriftstellers in unserer Zeit* (The Intellectual Position of Today's Writer), the increasingly marginalised importance of art (in the broadest sense), even suggesting that to practise it might border on the criminal.[20] Yet there was still a community expectation that the writer in some way wielded moral authority. Mann reports, for instance, that, following a live reading of the novella, he was accosted by a hard-line socialist complaining bitterly of a seeming lack of commitment on his part to "making art morally accountable".[21] Mann's response was to stress the difficulty of such an undertaking in his highly politicised age.[22] But in any case, in his seminal work *Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen* (Reflections of a Non-Political Man, 1918) he had already defined the role of the artist not as a moralist given to preaching virtuousness but rather as an aesthete, albeit not in the sense of Nietzsche's morally indifferent or amoral *Renaissance-Ästhetizismus*.

A further blow to Fuhrmann's self-esteem is the derisory reaction of the assembled dignitaries to the (quaint) concept of creative genius,

---

[19] .The lecture was reproduced in full in the *Schweizer Illustrierte Zeitung*, 8 October 1930, Hansen/Heine (eds), p. 172.

[20] THOMAS MANN, *GW*, Vol. X: *Reden und Aufsätze 2*, p. 301.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

to the very notion of an artist's unique "talent" (*F*). It is in this increasingly bellicose climate that Fuhrmann misreads the mood of his audience and commits a tactical blunder by prefacing a heartfelt, though somewhat old-fashioned defence of the values of human love, truth and decency over the forces of bigotry, intolerance and irrationalism with an outspoken condemnation of the unhealthy furore arising from his daughter's seemingly innocent violation of public morals at the beach. During question time, Fuhrmann's declared preference for love and mutual respect over political opportunism is countered by the claim that there could be no greater opportunist than the artist, insofar as he manipulates his work and creates his own order out of chaos.[23] This frank, though still civil(ised) exchange of views, to which Mann was accustomed in his addresses at more august forums, such as the League of Nations, is punctured by a torrent of interjections from xenophobic extremists with voices raised in anger at the writer's perceived anti-Italian jibes.

A similarly hostile audience drowned out Mann's *Deutsche Ansprache. Ein Appell an die Vernunft* (German Address. An Appeal to Reason) in Berlin 1930, hitherto his boldest diatribe against the perils of National Socialism in the wake of the Reichstag elections of that year. In the address he lobbied – arguably with calculated opportunism – for the formation of a common front of cultured bourgeoisie and socialist working class to combat the inhuman fanaticism of the political right.[24] Ironically, his fictional man of letters had just warned of the dangers of order slipping out of control, or in Mannian phraseology, of *Form* yielding to *Unform*. Fuhrmann's only line of resistance, namely to rise to his feet and leave the rostrum silently in shocked bewilderment, allegorises the impotence of liberal German intellectuals to stem the tide of totalitarianism. But equally at stake here in socio-psychological terms is the credibility of the performer per

---

[23] The narrator's manipulation of the reader to his own advantage, his subversion of the truth to suit his own self-justificatory motives, is an aspect of the story underlined by GEORGE BRIDGES, "Thomas Mann's *Mario und der Zauberer*. 'Aber zum Donnerwetter! Deshalb bringt man doch niemand um!'", *The German Quarterly* 64: 4 (1991), pp. 501-517 (p. 513).

[24] Haase's claim that the film underplayed the historical reality of European fascism is refuted by an interjector who openly lauds Mussolini as Italy's salvation – "Fortunately we have our Duce" (*F*) – and then challenges Fuhrmann to declare whom Germany has anointed to lead her.

se, inasmuch as any loss of control over a captive audience spells defeat and ignominy for the artist, whether writer or conjurer.

Fuhrmann's proactive moral stand, his high-handed insistence on the writer's "duty to stand up to the world, to communicate his insights to others in an unadorned fashion" (*F*), at least gives the writer a public visage, and contrasts markedly with the passive indignation displayed by Mann's narrator, which is largely internalised or aired within the confines of the family. Given his strong sense of accountability to the wider social sphere, Fuhrmann has clearly moved far beyond the insular concerns of the pathologically hypersensitive Tonio Krögers – middle-class artists with programmatic "bad consciences".

Turning now to Cipolla's artistic credentials and the power of his craft, we are reminded of the multiple appellations Mann's narrator accords him (and, by analogy, of the numerous identifiers Goethe ascribes to Mephistopheles in the First Part of *Faust*). While the label "Zauberer" is the most generalised of these, subsuming the roles of sorcerer, conjurer and wizard,[25] the term "Zauberkünstler" (*GW*, p. 670) is used pejoratively in the novella, thereby blurring further the artist/artiste divide. This is far removed from the Romantics' loftier equation of "Zauberkünstler" and divinely appointed poet-seer. Not surprisingly, then, the narrator/commentator immediately dissociates himself from the lower ranking "Typus des Scharlatans [und] marktschreierischen Possenreißers" (type of charlatan or comic huckster – *M*, p. 127) on the podium. By contrast, without access to Bernard Fuhrmann's thoughts during the performance, we can only extrapolate the latter's assessment of Cipolla from facial reflexes. These exhibit the same contradictory blend of revulsion and fascination articulated verbally by Mann's narrator – an allure that keeps both sceptical onlookers glued to their seats against their better judgment. It could be said that Mann explores the creative process in his novella by splitting the artistic psyche into two halves. Similarly, it might well be the case that Fuhrmann and the itinerant entertainer of dubious origins represent differing forms of problematic artistry, although it seems entirely questionable whether the latter is the writer's *alter ego* on whom he projects the darker, irrational impulses of his own creative psyche.

[25] "Zauberer" was the family nickname by which Mann was affectionately known for over half a century. This seems quite ironic in the light of Mann's high artistic calling.

Given the novella's political overtones, despite Mann's insistence on a broader interpretive base it would be entirely consistent with an allegorical reading of the storyline for Brandauer to have also turned his loner-magician into the personification of dictatorship. Indeed, sanctioning Cipolla's survival by affording him a lucky escape from a bullet intended for him accords with historical reality,[26] and makes the narrator's sensation of cathartic release and relief at the turn of events both premature and ingenuous from an historical point of view. However, this allegorical dimension is extraneous to my reading of Cipolla's behaviour in the film, for it is my contention that he is depicted here as intrinsically apolitical.[27] There is no evidence to suggest that he is party to the tide of nationalism sweeping the country – in contradistinction to Mann's artiste who is unequivocally hell-bent on whipping up chauvinist sentiment (quite literally with the aid of a claw-handled riding crop). Firstly, nothing Fuhrmann has heard about the magician prior to the evening performance connects him with the dissemination of fascist propaganda. Quite the contrary. Silvestra's post-mortem on the open-air variety show of the previous evening reveals an uneasy relationship between entertainer and police. And secondly, at the grand soirée itself, having told his select audience how his physical impediment had disqualified him for military service in 1914,[28] Brandauer's Cipolla expresses no compensatory desire to serve his country in the overtly patriotic manner displayed by the Cavaliere. His reluctance to become involved politically is borne out during the incident in which the hotel waiter Francesco bursts into the packed *tonnara*[29] with a challenge to the reputedly omniscient magician to name Signor Graziano's assassin.[30] In a moment of high drama Cipolla

---

[26] The failed attempt on the "charmed" life of Adolf Hitler is the subject of Brandauer's first film *Georg Elser – Einer aus Deutschland* (1989).

[27] See on this point GERT SAUTERMEISTER, *Thomas Mann: Mario und der Zauberer* (München: Fink, 1981): "Cipolla is no fascist politician but a (pseudo)artist, and his soirée of hypnotic tricks is not indicative of a fascist gathering, but is an aesthetic parable, one that aestheticises the Fuhrer-Volk relationship through experimental magic" (p. 28).

[28] There is a possible autobiographical connection in the fact that Mann found a doctor to exempt him from war service.

[29] The venue, as the film script informs us, is a disused hangar where tuna boats were once housed.

[30] It is a telling indictment of the times that Fuhrmann's impassioned plea to his audience in Rome not to allow "death" to gain the upper hand in human

remains silent and unmoved, and the show proceeds as though nothing had transpired to rupture the aesthetic illusion.[31] Ironically, then, in Brandauer's re-assessment of history it is an Italian who has come to symbolise traditional German aloofness and abstinence from political *engagement* – a state of affairs defended by Mann in *Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen*. On the other hand, Fuhrmann's commitment to the politicisation of his metier is more attuned to the shift in Mann's ideological position during the late twenties.

If the filmic Cipolla refrains from colluding with the forces of fascism, from subordinating art to national politics, then by what other means does he wreak havoc, given his parity with Mann's *Zauberer* in terms of the range of performable stage tricks and "powers"? Even though Cipolla is not all he seems, he appears far less menacing than in the novella – much more like a second-rate entertainer than a great artist. There is no mention of his whip or of his "high asthmatic voice" with its eerie "metallischer" quality (*M*, p. 128);[32] rather the contrary. Brandauer's Cipolla has a wry humour and speaks in a soft compassionate voice. Arguably, his conduct towards others proves most ruthless and ultimately destructive when he resorts to psychosexual terrorisation, possibly as a compensation for his own (hetero)sexual inadequacy. It is almost as though Cipolla has channelled his pent-up feelings of physical and libidinal inferiority into the refinement of his craft.

Cipolla provides a foretaste of his satyr-like lewdness during a (quite literal) tête-à-tête with Rachel Fuhrmann on the rocky promontory where, as legend would have it, the *torre di Venere* once stood. In the course of his fanciful account of the residence of Vulcan and his unfaithful spouse Venus, Cipolla's self-identification with the lame god of fire becomes apparent, if only by association.[33]

---

thinking (and by implication in affairs of state) is immediately followed by graphic shots of Graziano's dredged up corpse.

[31] This incident could have provided a welcome opportunity for the Fuhrmann family to make their exit. In the novella the intermission serves the same (symbolic) purpose.

[32] Benito Mussolini's speaking voice had the same 'metallic' resonance exhibited by Mann's Cipolla, but not by Brandauer's apolitical showman.

[33] His lameness also associates him with the Devil, although I cannot agree with the anonymous amazon.de reviewer that Brandauer's Cipolla is "the quintessence of evil", *Mario und der Zauberer*, www.amazon.de/exec/obidos/ts/

Brandauer's remythologising of the prestidigitator signals a major departure from the novella's alignment of Cipolla with the god Dionysus. Of course, in the novella the Cavaliere's need to replenish his energies through the use of artificial stimulants is a fundamental travesty of Nietzsche's belief in the Dionysian spirit as the quintessential embodiment of creative energy in ancient Greek culture.[34] Brandauer's magician appears mildly inebriated from the outset and drinks and smokes during the grand performance like his Mannian opposite number, yet is less of a Dionysian caricature than the latter.

Brandauer's mythical recasting gives greater poignancy to the political import of the text; for not only is Vulcan synonymous with the natural destructiveness of Etna and Vesuvius. Cipolla, who is ringed by lit candles at both performances, and Marcello, his fire-eating and fire-spewing assistant, serve as a symbolic warning of the violent political eruptions soon to shake the foundations of Europe society. For his part, Cipolla is aware of the two sides to the mythical Vulcan: his destructive nature ("Vulcan was the god of fire, especially in its destructive element" [*F*])[35] and his skill at fashioning fine *objets d'art* out of gold. Not by accident, then, does Cipolla orchestrate a beautiful illusion amidst the ugliness of everyday life in the form of a shower of golden confetti that reigns down on the enchanted audience. But perhaps there is a Dionysian dimension to Cipolla's "artistry" after all: the gift of clairvoyance which for Rachel Fuhrmann constitutes "a special gift" (*F*), but a terrible "curse" (*F*) for the magician himself. Cipolla's acute powers of observation, aptly diagnosed by Signora Angiolieri as the magician's uncanny forte ("he looks straight into people's hearts" – *F*), merely expose the sorry truth about the human condition; that "the hearts of all humans beat to exactly the same pitiful rhythm" (*F*). Ironically, the gift of intuition and foresight to which both Cipolla and

---

video-reviews/ B00004R .../302-3009846-078085 (22 February 2001). Brandauer – at least in his interviews – stops short of reading metaphysical evil into the behaviour of his magician.

[34] See on this point RONALD SPEIRS, *[Thomas] Mann: Mario und der Zauberer* (London: Grant & Cutler, 1990), p. 38.

[35] Vulcan also fashioned breastplates for warfare. It is noteworthy that in an early film sequence ("Tonnara/Pergola") the crippled Cipolla is eased into a metal corset by his faithful retainers Christiana and Marcello.

Fuhrmann can lay legitimate claim narrows significantly the gulf between artist and artiste.

The dialogic exchange with the assailed Signora Fuhrmann, who is acutely conscious of the magician's subtext of sexual innuendo and withdraws in the interest of decorum,[36] functions as a dress-rehearsal for the ensuing mental and verbal seduction of Silvestra. In view of the story's fatal ending, it hardly augurs well that Silvestra, the nominated "vestal virgin of the year" (*F*) opens Torre's visually sumptuous waiters' race by firing a pistol, the secularised equivalent of the sacred flame tended by the six priestesses at the Temple of Vesta in Rome. It is equally ominous that the fate of vestal virgins who dared to break their thirty year vow of chastity becomes a topic of light-hearted banter as Silvestra, clad in the white garlanded robe of a temple server, dances flirtatiously with Fuhrmann at the hotel ball in the early part of the film. Ironically, Silvestra is herself coerced into the abandonment of her chastity pledge in a demeaning public declaration and display of love for the magician, having rejected under the same hypnotic spell the tender kiss of the decidedly more handsome suitor Mario. Silvestra's trance-like state is reminiscent of the mechanical maidens fashioned by Vulcan in his Olympic smithy to do his bidding. The "journey" (*F*) Cipolla invites Silvestra to undertake with him recalls the novella's subtitle *ein tragisches Reiseerlebnis* [*a tragic travel experience*], albeit in the restricted sense of an exploratory game of aesthetic eroticism in which Cipolla plays out his private phantasies on the pretext of a special affinity between hypnotist and subject: "These fools and cowards fear his visionary power. But you, bewitching Silvestra, you are different. You know him [Cipolla]. You understand this man. You love him unconditionally" (*F*)

The ensuing "confusion of feelings", which Hans Mayer identifies as a keynote of Kleistian tragedy,[37] assumes catastrophic proportions. This is no ordinary evening at the "theatre". Discharging a pistol for the second time, Silvestra accidentally trains its symbolic fire on the wrong person (Brandauer retains the novella's characteristic twist),

---

[36] The entire film is full of erotic suggestiveness, a characteristic of film adaptations of Mann since the sixties.

[37] HANS MAYER, *Thomas Mann* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1980), p. 165. In Kleist's play *Amphitryon* (1807) Alcmene's "confused feelings" result directly from Zeus's duplicity.

thereby sparing the Vulcanian igniter of her misdirected passion. Arguably, in Freudian terms Silvestra's own sexual frustration, which fails to be sublimated through redirection into some higher cause, finds an outlet in an act of unreflected aggression. On the mythical level, however, both assailants could be said to have risen up against their masters – the cupbearer Ganymede (to whom Mario is likened in the novella (*GW*, p. 707) defying Zeus, and the handmaiden turning against her maker. In view of the fact that the emancipated Silvestra and not the gentle Torre waiter has become both the humiliated casualty and unswerving avenger of Cipolla's lascivious prank (Brandauer's substitution at least removes the ambivalence of Cipolla's sexual proclivities),[38] the director could justifiably have retitled the film "Silvestra and the Magician".[39] In either case, the warning remains unchanged: there is inevitably a point at which the human will vigorously resists any onslaught on its integrity.[40]

The binary opposition artist/artiste also extends to Sofronia Angiolieri, the hospitable proprietor of the *Pensione Eleonora*, to which the slighted German family retreat following the whooping-cough fiasco at the Grand Hôtel. In the novella she is married to a quiet, retiring man, in the film to Torre di Venere's newly appointed police prefect, a bald-headed buffoon with a fetish for toy cars and motorcycles and a childlike bonhomie in the execution of his civic duties. In effect, the latter practises an old-fashioned style of sentimental Italian nationalism soon to be submerged in the perilous undercurrents of fascism. The Angiolieris of the film are both ardent devotees of Puccini and custodians of a record collection and other

[38] The Weinshanker script omits the figure of the young and healthy *giovanotto*, the heterosexual corrective to Cipolla's latent homosexual inclinations. For a persuasive reading of Mann's grappling with his homoerotic urges via the figure of Cipolla see BRIDGES, "Thomas Mann's *Mario*", pp. 501-17.

[39] In view of Silvestra's coquettishness (her aunt, Signora Angiolieri, says of her in the company of Rachel Fuhrmann that she is "not right as a vestal virgin", I agree with Jan Hawemann, "Mario und der Zauberer", www.hawemann.com/jan/kino/95/mariozauberer.html (30 April 2000): "The role of evil seducer cannot be unequivocally attributed to Brandauer's magician [...] In the film, more so than in the tale, it becomes evident that seduction requires two parties".

[40] In Visconti's one-act ballet Mario has a greater motivation for shooting the magician, having hired the latter to procure the girl he secretly loves. Tricked into believing that he holds his beloved in his arms, the young waiter takes revenge. For a synopsis of the ballet see HORST KOEGLER, *Friedrichs Ballettlexikon* (Velber bei Hannover: Friedrich, 1972), p. 375.

memorabilia relating to the opera composer. Under Cipolla's somnambulistic guidance the Signora is coaxed onto the stage as she sings (or warbles) Floria Tosca's famous aria *Vissi d'arte, vissi d'amore.* Even though her performance technique ranks her with dilettantes rather than alongside virtuosi, the symbolism of the *Tosca* aria, which begins: "I lived for art, I lived for love/Never did I harm a living creature whatever misfortunes I encountered", cannot go unnoticed. In terms of the thematic centrality of art, the underlying message seems to be that decent people live for art and love, never prostituting these ideals to power and violence.[41] Not so Mann's Cipolla, "the type of artist for whom art is a means of achieving power". Undoubtedly the maxim scribbled on the autographed score Sofronia allegedly received from Puccini, "whoever has lived for love will die for love" (*F*), is meant to have some bearing on the slaying of Mario. Conceivably, the unintentional murder of the waiter, whose natural goodness and kindness Cipolla deeply respects, signifies the demise of a pre-fascist way of life. Thus Mario's death could be construed as signalling the "loss of innocence [...] An era has lost its innocence and with it people who either run energetically with the 'new times' or lack the energy to confront them".[42]

Not unlike Puccini's tragic heroine, the celebrated Italian actress Eleonora Duse also dedicated herself to art and love, only to suffer the consequences as the mistress of the protofascist writer Gabriele D'Annunzio. While Mann has his Cipolla use his power of telepathy to reveal that Signora Angiolieri was once the confidante of the actress (hence the name of her guesthouse *Pensione Eleonora)*, Brandauer entwines Sofronia's past with that of her erstwhile maestro and lover Puccini. The sole reference to Eleonora Duse in the film is made by Cipolla during the variety show on the piazza. A major newspaper, he claims, had reported that Italy could boast only two great artists – Eleonora Duse and himself. An identification with Eleonore Duse may well be valid – not in terms of fame, but of background, as the actress

[41] SPEIRS, *Mann*, p. 46.

[42] *Amazon.de: Rezensionen: Mario und der Zauberer*, www.amazon.de/exec/obidos/ts/video-reviews/Boooo4R .../302-3009846-078085, (22 February 2001). Mario's "loser" status is evident from the very outset; not only does the mayor have difficulties remembering the name Mario Anzio when referring to the previous year's winner of the waiters' race; this time round Mario is robbed of the spoils of victory when a dog is let loose by the pampered rich-boy Fuggiero.

was initially a member of a poor, itinerant theatrical troupe that toured the Italian countryside. In terms of craftsmanship though, the (unequal) comparison is made in obvious jest and self-irony. It underscores once again the gulf separating the artist from the pseudo-artist – a discrepancy Brandauer's more affable and relaxed Cipolla is at least willing to acknowledge.

* * *

In 1950 Mann, an avid cinema-goer and staunch advocate of the motion picture as a vehicle of artistic expression in its own right, declared enthusiastically regarding a planned film version of *Mario*: "In anticipation I enjoy already the pleasure of seeing my narrative transformed into a picture and its essence and spirit transferred into the sphere of the visible".[43] Nothing came of this venture, just as a 1931 proposal, for which Mann's publisher had negotiated international filming rights worth US$10,000 failed to materialise.[44] Mann was to see his novel *Königliche Hoheit* (Royal Highness, 1909) adapted to the screen by Harald Braun in 1953, but had already passed away when film-maker Kurt Hoffmann launched his version of his 1954 picaresque novel *Bekenntnisse des Hochstaplers Felix Krull* [*Confessions of Felix Krull, Confidence Man*] in 1957. One wonders just how harshly Mann would have judged Brandauer's transformation, especially in terms of cinematic technique and the adjustment of the novella's thematic foci.[45] He might have preferred Italian director Luchino Visconti's respect for fidelity to the spirit of the original in the handling of *Der Tod in Venedig*, despite the daunting challenge of exteriorising lengthy

---

[43] Thomas Mann (in English) to Abe Polonski, 3 April 1950, in *Briefe Thomas Manns*, Vol. III, p. 728.

[44] See ERNEST PRODOLLIET, *Das Abenteuer Kino. Der Film im Schaffen von Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Thomas Mann und Alfred Döblin* (Freiburg Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1991), p. 83. Film-makers Joseph Losey, Ingmar Berman, Bernhard Wicki and Luchino Visconti also had vague plans to rework the novella. See Heinz Ungereit, "Zeitlos zeitgemäß": Vorwort, *Mario*, p. 7. The only other film adaptation is a 1978 Czech TV production, *Mario und der Zauberer*, under the direction of Miloslav Luther.

[45] The film lends itself , among other things, to a feminist re-reading, especially in the light of the changed ending which raises the issue of violated female honour.

passages of interiorised action.[46] Whereas Mann relies heavily in *Der Tod in Venedig* on a highly intellectualised form of narration, "which may be visualised easily by the inner eye of the reader but not so easily by the eye of the camera",[47] in Braundauer's *Mario und der Zauberer* there is a straightforward causal nexus between reflection and observation, in the sense that externals themselves trigger the reflective process in the narrator. But in any case, the camera does not need to filter exteriority through the limited point of view of Mann's intellectual, given Brandauer's shift from limited reflective observation to visually stimulating "action". This is exemplified by the aforementioned waiters' race, a brilliant *tour de* force by Hungarian director of photography Lajos Koltai.

Whilst a good deal more could and no doubt will be said about the aesthetics of the production, notably the choice of music,[48] camera shots and staging techniques, not to mention the pervasive light and fire symbolism,[49] the thrust of my argument has been to contrast two medium-specific sets of perspectives on the figure of the artist(e) and the function and centrality of art. Thus whilst the screen version may well be judged a *Kunstfilm* on aesthetic grounds (and not all critics

---

[46] Mann must have been aware of the cinematic limitations of a work as philoso-phically dense and psychologically complex as *Der Tod in Venedig*. In 1935 he admitted that his subject matter did not readily lend itself to cinematic adaptation. See: "Thomas Mann in Prag", *Prager Presse*, 22 January 1935, Hansen/Heine (eds), p. 204. The striking thematic parallels to be drawn between *Mario und der Zauberer* and Wiene's film classic *The Cabinet of Dr Caligari* (1919) have been documented by JEFFREY MEYERS, "Caligari and Cipolla: Mann's 'Mario and the Magician'", *Modern Fiction Studies* 32: 2 (1986), 235-239.

[47] HANS RUDOLF VAGET, "Film and Literature. The Case of 'Death in Venice': Luchino Visconti and Thomas Mann", *The German Quarterly*, 53 (1980), 159-75 (p. 160).

[48] The music for the soundtrack came under the direction of Brandauer's son Christian. Haase notes: "The allusion to Puccini has the attraction of incorporating in an organic way the music as a filmically highly emotional element" (HAASE, *Mario*, p. 32). Exceedingly appropriate is the military music specially composed for the closing shots in the compartment of the north-bound express, in which Bernhard and Rachel Fuhrmann sit in stunned silence. For eight-year-old Sophie Fuhrmann, who performs a conjurer's trick at the door of the compartment, the magical deceit of pure theatre remains tragically unbroken. In the novella, too, the narrator's children are unable to distinguish between artistry and humbuggery.

[49] MAHONEY, "Torre di Venere", devotes more attention to film aesthetics and symbolic imaging than I intended to do here.

would agree),[50] generically it qualifies as a *Künstlerfilm* – not as a portrait of the artist(e) as an apprentice struggling towards an understanding of his creative vision, but rather as a master craftsman wrestling with the credibility of his calling and/or charisma. And it is not the first instance of Brandauer's preoccupation with the credentials (and credibility) of the artist(e) in the context of totalitarian power politics, as his own lead role in *Hanussen* (1988) will confirm. The film traces the chequered career of Jan Erik van Hanussen (1889-1933), a Viennese variety artist, conjurer, clairvoyant and author of books on the paranormal. Masquerading as a Danish aristocrat, Hanussen (Hermann Steinschneider) curried favour with high-ranking leaders of the NSDAP, who marvelled at the accuracy of his predictions. However, his prophetic vision of the Reichstag in flames made him a political liability, and he was shot by the SA in a wood on the outskirts of Berlin following the disclosure of his real (Jewish) identity. Hanussen's craft, which bears some resemblance to Cipolla's, may have furnished some of the raw material for the Weinshanker/Brandauer film.[51]

Brandauer's film is arguably more than a cinematic adaptation of a literary source. Indeed, the director justified his accretions to the novella (the race, the ball, the re-profiling of individuals) as a means of broadening his audience's understanding and appreciation of the exemplar: "[We] would not have made [these insertions], had we not, in the process of broadening our understanding of Thomas Mann's novella 'Mario und der Zauberer', read them into the story".[52] Thus the term "filmic extension" would seem to do greater justice to a

---

[50] See the dismissive review, "Der Magier im Dorfzikus. Brandauer verfehlt Thomas Mann: *Mario und der Zauberer*", www.filmberichte.de 1995/mario html (22 February 2001): "It is none other than the director and actor Klaus Maria Brandauer who has attracted attention to his little film. But he has not succeeded". See in the same uncomplimentary vein VERENA LUEKEN, "Er tappte seherisch umher. 'Mario und der Zauberer'", *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, no. 291, 15 December 1994: "Brandauer's work is so decidedly boring that the question arises as to why the actor-director arbitrarily [...] tinkered so long with the perfect, extremely filmic dramaturgy of the novella that all the tension and subtleties have vanished from it". Despite such negativity, the film was awarded the Andrej-Tarkowski Prize at Moscow's 19th International Film Festival in 1995.

[51] For differences between Cipolla and Hanussen, see BIRGIT GLOMBITZA, "Mario und der Zauberer", *Die Woche*, no. 51, 16 December 1994: "[Brandauer's] magician Cipolla is no thought-manipulator à la 'Hanussen', but an incapacitated pompous ass".

[52] "Die Fuhrmänner sind wir", *Mario*, p. 99.

transformational process designed to foreground the psychological, existential and political facets of artistic expression problematised by Mann, while re-examining the status, relevance and influence of the artist for the postmodern age. As heirs to totalitarian strategies of mass persuasion, today's cinema-goers would have come to expect a blurring of the boundaries between the artist of high calling and the charismatic travelling virtuoso and "Unterhaltungskünstler" (popular entertainer – *M* 123). For both Fuhrmann and Cipolla an empathetic public constitutes an indispensable prerequisite for plying their craft, which indeed the latter is at pains to impress upon his audience in the *tonnara*: "You are our inspiration, for in the end you are the ones who determine our act; you are part of the magic" (*F*). Both writer and showman are ultimately subject to market forces, particularly the glamour of the *Bioskop* (early cinematography) and the advent of talkies. Mann infers this more than Brandauer in the narrator's mention of the hall serving as a picture-theatre on some evenings. But in terms of the gifts they are able to utilise to best effect, Cipolla's less cultivated art of persuasion, through greater self-marketability, gives him an incontestable edge over the humanistic rhetoric of the "educated, esteemed professore" (*F*), as Cipolla describes the visiting German *homme de lettres* with seeming condescension.

Inevitably, one has to accept at face value or take serious issue with Brandauer's own assessment of his film's major emphases. For one thing, he would have us believe – as a spate of press interviews attest – that dehumanising the demonised Cavaliere meant divesting the magician of the subversive artistry which, in the novella, contributes so dangerously to the latter's power base: "In Mann's case he is an art figure such as one only finds in literature. I am interested in how he lives with his flaws but still fascinates us. He cannot perform magic, he cannot do anything".[53] Significantly, too, Brandauer sets greater store by Fuhrmann as a solidly dependable *pater familias*, rather than as a creative artist of note, so that one is left wondering why he has chosen to downplay the centrality of the artist/artiste dichotomy, emerging as it does from Weinshanker's script in fresh, subtle variations. Admittedly, reinventing Cipolla was tantamount to eschewing "the dark side of the

[53] "Im Gespräch mit Klaus Brandauer auf seine Thomas-Mann-Adaption 'Mario und der Zauberer'", *Neues Deutschland*, no. 292, 15 December 1994.

artist".[54] Yet how could Brandauer have failed to notice that his pseudo-artist resembles a "marktschreierischen Possenreißers" even more closely than Mann's artiste, given the visual unambiguousness of the circus burlesque enacted on the piazza? Indeed, the film exploits "Cipolla's proximity to the fairground and circus",[55] lending prominence to the interesting sociological phenomenon of the funfair or sideshow as a locale for earning a living, however precarious.[56] Cipolla's visionary craftsmanship, reinforced by the imagery of mythical association, renders the director's depiction of him as a "pitiful actor incapable of anything"[57] simplistically inappropriate. Furthermore, in the light of Brandauer's avowed admiration for Mann's novel *Doktor Faustus* (1947), the "German bible of last century",[58] it is not hard to discern in his magician some of the Mephistophelian traits that underpin the novel's allegorised artist/Satan problematic.[59] At the same time, Brandauer's *littérateur* becomes as vocal a mouthpiece as the novella's intellectualised narrator for Mann's autobiographical meditations on the changing interrelationships of art, morality and politics, whilst Sofronia Angiolieri embodies even more demonstrably than her moonstruck counterpart in the novella the excesses of an ethereal *l'art pour l'art* aesthetic that leaves its practitioner vulnerable to manipulatory and seductive forces. In short, then, notwithstanding the primacy of other (socio)psychological, philosophical and ideological discourses addressed in the film, Brandauer may be said to have continued in earnest, even if not by his own admission, the interrogation of the nature and pre-eminence of art(istry) common to all screen adaptations of Mann's literary oeuvre hitherto.

---

[54] *Tagesspiegel*, no. 15129.

[55] SAUTERMEISTER, *Thomas Mann*, p. 89.

[56] Sautmeister mentions that in Weimar Germany alone "approximately 200,000 independent traders earned a living as itinerants at fairgrounds" (ibid., p. 89). Mann may well have viewed these fairs as hotbeds of totalitarian activity, for he refers in his contentious address of 1930 to National Socialism as "that movement with its gigantic wave of eccentric barbarism and primitive mass-democratic funfair vulgarity". See THOMAS MANN, *Deutsche Ansprache. Ein Appell an die Vernunft*, *GW*, Vol. XI: *Rede und Aufsätze 3*, p. 878.

[57] *Tagesspiegel*, no. 15129.

[58] "Der Star des Tages – Heute: Klaus Maria Brandauer", *Die Welt*, no. 294, 16 December 2000.

[59] This problematic found expression in the cinematic transformation of Klaus Mann's *Mephisto*, in which Brandauer played the part of Hendrik Höfgens.