

**A Poetics of *Care*, or
Time and the *Dasein* of Modernism in Thomas Mann and Martin Heidegger
(1924/1947)**

Kevin Parker Eubanks

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of English and Comparative Literature.

Chapel Hill
2010

Approved by:

Eric Downing

Gregory Flaxman

Clayton Koelb

Federico Luisetti

John McGowan

©2010
Kevin Parker Eubanks
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

A Poetics of *Care*, or
Time and the *Dasein* of Modernism in Thomas Mann and Martin Heidegger (1924/1947)
Kevin Parker Eubanks
(Under the direction of Eric Downing)

A Poetics of 'Care', or Time and the 'Dasein' of Modernism in Thomas Mann and Martin Heidegger (1924/1947) seeks to establish the usefulness of Martin Heidegger's reformulation of time and subjectivity during the period from 1924-1947 for reconceptualizing interpretations of time and tragic experience across the spectrum of literary and philosophical modernism(s). Between the earliest expressions of his temporality in *The Concept of Time* [*Der Begriff der Zeit*] (1924) and *Being and Time* [*Sein und Zeit*] (1927) and its later incarnation(s) in, for example, *The Origin of the Work of Art* [*Ursprung des Kunstwerkes*] (1936) and *The Thinker as Poet* [*Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens*] (1947), Heidegger finds conventional modernist approaches to time either too subjectivist or too relativist in formulation. Heidegger not only rejects a conception of time as that *in* which subjectivity happens but also an idea of time as that *toward* which subjectivity is oriented from the outside. In neither case, according to Heidegger, do these framings capture the embeddedness of time for the subject. For Heidegger, time is much more than the object of a definable and radical, even playful, experimentalism with which we have come to associate modernism; it is neither comprised of stable modes (past, present, future), nor is it hierarchical, subjective or even a relation among other relations that, along with the question of time, are said to have preoccupied the modernists, most notably the questions of narrative, history and subjectivity.

According to Heidegger, temporality is *the* relation of being itself, what he calls *Dasein* as *being-there* or *being-in-the-world*, and it is thus *at Dasein* that the very possibility of a distinctly modernist narrative, history or subjectivity is configured.

In a much more fundamental sense, Heidegger proposes time as a phenomenon *at* which subjectivity is always already happening, and as early as 1924 even goes so far as to equate time with the subject, or with what he calls “human, *historical Dasein*.” Although it is the most conspicuous heir to the cultural obsession with time that is typically said to have dominated high modernism, the full scope of Heidegger’s remarkable study of temporality during the period from 1924-1947 has never been elaborated – neither in terms of its potential literary applications nor in terms of its engagement with the historical moment of modernism itself. Emphasizing the works of Heidegger’s contemporary and fellow German, Thomas Mann, namely *The Magic Mountain* [*Der Zauberberg*] and *Doctor Faustus* [*Doktor Faustus*], which bookend this crucial period in Mann’s own development *toward* what I would like to call a Heideggerian recognition, I trace the way in which *Dasein*, the historical moment *at* which time “temporalizes itself,” emerges as a construct capable of explaining these configurations and of fostering radically new interpretations of both the temporality of modernism as well as the modernism of temporality. In a final chapter, and taking into account Heidegger’s insistence that time or *Dasein* as *being-there* is also always a “*being-towards* the possibility of its absolute impossibility,” I explore the “rumor” (Geulen) of the *end* of art that preoccupied a later modernism and ultimately argue that the distinguishing mark of both modernism and the modernist time-novel is the tragic recognition that modernism *is* the historical *being-towards* its own impossibility.

To my wife, Stephanie, and my son, Becton

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to first acknowledge all of my esteemed committee members: Eric Downing, Gregory Flaxman, Clayton Koelb, Federico Luisetti and John McGowan. A special debt of gratitude is owed to my principal advisor, Eric Downing, without whose tender yet uncompromising guidance, support, criticism, and conversation I never would have reached the point of completion. And I want all of you to know how grateful I am and always will be not only for your support and encouragement along the way but for the exceptional examples you always *are* and *have been*. I also wish to sincerely thank the following faculty and graduate student colleagues at UNC and Duke: Edna Andrews, Inger Brodey, Diane Leonard, Valerie Bernhardt, James Rolleston, Carol Flath, Anne Marie Rasmussen, Thomas Spencer, Shelley Hay, Bess Dawson, Derek Thiess, Bobby Blankenship, John Ribo, Henry Veggian, Al Miller, Marc Cohen, Anna Panszczyk, Catherine Clark, Kara Getrost, Michael Rulon, Will Taylor, and Jasmine McKewen, among others. For *being-there* for me through it all (in one indispensable way or another) I wish to acknowledge my very best friends: Carrie and Tedd, Kevin and Karin, Joe, Big Alex, Andy, Vittles, Mo, and Black. Finally, I'd like to thank my family, and especially those to whom this project is dedicated, for their enduring love, faith and support.

PREFACE

Thomas Mann is arguably Germany's most revered novelist. This is due not only to the ingenious facility of his art but also and in part to a sort of literary heroism with which he is typically associated, a liberal-humanist, democratic activism that suffuses every one of his most notable works and that in its own way has always stood in strong resistance to the conservative forces in art and politics that achieved their ultimate expression in National Socialist Germany during World War II. Thomas Mann's active resistance against fascism in Germany, his forced exile, and his emotional struggle with that history is for the most part well-known and well-respected. The memory of Martin Heidegger, on the other hand, is always bathed in the light of disapproval because of his complicity with the National Socialists during the tumultuous years of the Second World War and because of his apparent unwillingness to come publicly to terms with this past in the years following the war. His short-lived tenure as a Nazi party member and life-long silence on the issue, along with the corresponding resentment these realities have provoked, have placed his work, permanently it would seem, on trial.

Despite these well-known differences, it is nevertheless surprising that literary scholars in Germany and the United States have thoroughly neglected the very real correspondences in the works of Mann and Heidegger, especially during the period from 1924-1947, which one could argue frames the most important span of their respective professional development, and in this very real, historical sense Mann and Heidegger are powerful contemporaries. The front end of this period marks the publication of Mann's self-

described *Zeitroman* or time-novel, *The Magic Mountain* [*Der Zauberberg*] (1924), as well as Heidegger's *The Concept of Time* [*Der Begriff der Zeit*] (1924), a critical preparatory work toward the monumental *Being and Time* [*Sein und Zeit*] (1927), in which Heidegger first introduces readers to his modernist reformulation of time and the subject that he calls *Dasein*. The latter end of this time period not only marks an important moment in the definitive maturation of shared ideas first developed in *The Magic Mountain* and *Being and Time*, but it also culminates in the publication of the so-called greatest efforts of both writers, Mann's *Doctor Faustus* (1947) and Heidegger's *The Thinker as Poet* [*Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens*] (1947) and *The Letter on Humanism* [*Der Brief über den Humanismus*] (1947), in which both Mann and Heidegger seek explicitly, and with a sympathetic emotional intensity that grows out of their mutual proximity to the events themselves, to come to terms with the contemporary events in German history that more than anything else determined the respective fates of their lives and work.

In Mann's late work *Doctor Faustus*, the protagonist Adrian Leverkühn, much like Heidegger himself, violates everything around him – himself, his nation, his art, his friends and family, and even history itself – and yet scholars still debate whether in the end he is condemned or saved for his hubris.¹ In fact, Mann claims that Adrian “bore the suffering of the epoch” [“das Leid der Epoche trägt”] and confesses that he has never loved any “creature of [his] imagination” more than Adrian Leverkühn [“daß ich nie eine Imagination [...] geliebt hätte wie ihn”] (*Story* 88/*Entstehung* 81). What strikes me most here is that contemporary scholars already predisposed against Heidegger, and who call for a continued

¹ Rüdiger Safranski in *Martin Heidegger: Between Good and Evil* [Trans. Ewald Osers. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1998] not only recognizes this correspondence between the real-life tragic fate of Martin Heidegger and the fictional tragedy of Adrian Leverkühn depicted in Thomas Mann's *Doctor Faustus*, but he also organizes Heidegger's biography around Mann's fictional model.

engagement of his philosophy in light of his infamous political ties, ultimately blame Heidegger's downfall on precisely the same cultural-historical milieu with which Mann so clearly identifies his most *beloved* character. Thus the gist of my project is to explore this unlikely affiliation and to demonstrate that if "it was through a 'definite orientation of his thought that Heidegger fell *into* the proximity of National Socialism'" (Wolin 6), then it was this same orientation through which Thomas Mann fell *away* from such proximity. In so doing I hope to bring together two very significant figures of German history, whose work is often thought, and justifiably so, to be caught up in very different, even diametrically opposed, intellectual traditions. Despite the obvious distance(s) between them, however, it is partly my goal to show that Mann and Heidegger do indeed belong to similar intellectual, historical and aesthetic orbits. One could argue, for instance, that it is precisely the relevance of Heidegger's and Mann's works for a particular understanding of German history and the proximity of these works to the historical period in question that gets the works of the former *dismissed* and those of the latter *acknowledged*, and it is this dramatic and unfortunate irony that my project hopes to both illuminate and reconcile through a juxtaposition of Mann's and Heidegger's respective literary and philosophical treatments of modernist time and tragic experience.

Though I am steadfastly opposed to the aggressive intolerance of many of Heidegger's critics, my aim is not to exonerate Heidegger. Rather, I am interested in reopening the potential of his body of work, in particular the comprehensive temporality described in *Being and Time*, for exploring the historical, even the literary or imaginative, character of the controversy that surrounds Heidegger's thought, a controversy, by the way, that Mann himself anticipates and narrates in both *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus*,

the novels that frame the historical period under study. Put another way, I wish to investigate the way the drama and fate of Heidegger's philosophy resonate with narrative forms of possibility, such as the ideas of time and the tragic in modernist literature. Although well-established figures in the fields of philosophy and literary theory, among them Jacques Derrida and Stanley Corngold, have long called on literary scholars to explore the potential of Heidegger's work to facilitate new and provocative entries into literary and cultural analysis, the call has gone largely unanswered. To answer this call, *A Poetics of 'Care', or Time and the 'Dasein' of Modernism in Thomas Mann and Martin Heidegger (1924/1947)* carries out a detailed analysis of the evolution of ideas of time in Thomas Mann and Martin Heidegger during the period 1924-1947 with a view toward answering, in the end, the ways in which the evolution of these correspondences supports a complimentary and comprehensive understanding of modernist time and tragic experience.

Toward this end, the first two chapters of my dissertation set out to accomplish two goals, respectively. First, I situate my task within the broader historical scope of transnational literary and philosophical modernism in order to demonstrate both the relevance and necessity of rereading conventional approaches to modernist time and tragedy in literature and philosophy from the standpoint of an approach that *requires* both Mann and Heidegger. The second chapter devotes itself to historically justifying and situating the comparison of these two, presumably very different figures by tracing the separate historical development(s) of ideas of time and tragic experience in the works of Mann and Heidegger during the period 1924-1947. Among other things, this task will involve an investigation into both the changing weight assigned to history and historical thinking throughout this period (and not just by Mann and Heidegger, of course) as well as their unchanging, shared preoccupation(s)

with the themes of death, history and the tradition of *Bildung*. For the purposes of following Heidegger's part in this comparison, I intend to undertake a sort of literary analysis of Heidegger's famous characterization of time and being as *Dasein* and, in what amounts to the same thing, to introduce and explain key principles of his so-called "impenetrable" (Eiland) theory of temporality from *Being and Time* that informs so much of the dissertation. All of this will go a long way toward preparing the reader for the close textual analysis that makes up the larger part of my argument, toward ameliorating some of the challenges that always accompany any encounter with Heidegger's idiosyncratic and much-criticized language and presentation, and toward justifying the analogy I set up between *Dasein* and Mann's literary *world(s)*. Most importantly, perhaps, my plans for the introduction will go a long way toward demonstrating that it is through such correspondences that I ultimately view Heidegger as an essential voice in modernist discussions of time and narrative and Mann (and the modernist *Zeitroman* more generally) as the key to reading Heidegger from any position of fairness, authority and objectivity, which is also to say, from the position of what Heidegger himself might call *authenticity* [*Eigentlichkeit*].

My third chapter explains the problem of time and tragedy in modernist narrative by considering the character and nature of the *future* or what Heidegger calls the *coming-towards* of *being-towards-death*. It argues first and foremost that Heidegger's description of being-towards-death and the tragic deferral that is said to always accompany it resonate meaningfully with what has been called the "dilemma of closure" that haunts the narrative atmospheres of *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus*.² Heidegger's famous description of death as "the possibility of [*Dasein*'s] absolute impossibility" (*BT* 294) and the central

² "Although it knows its end absolutely, [*Dasein*] will always be that in relation to which it will never know anything: the knowledge of the end always withdraws, is concealed in being deferred" (Stiegler 231).

problem of Being and Time, which Heidegger describes as the impossibility of *Dasein*'s ever grasping itself as a whole, closely parallel Mann's own time-problems as he presents them in *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus*, namely the problems associated with the end and with endings. My reading in this chapter intentionally limits its attention to the Faustian moments in both novels and thus to a direct and focused analysis of what might be called the novel's imagined response to Heidegger's reading of being-towards-death in order to demonstrate the ontological basis of the *Zeitverträge* [time-pacts] entered into by Hans Castorp and Adrian Leverkühn, that is to say, the ontological basis of the "dilemma of closure," which is without question a key narrative feature of both novels.

My fourth chapter considers the problem of time and tragedy in modernist narrative with a view toward the *past*, or what Heidegger calls both the *having-been* of *Dasein* and the ontological ground of *history*. Despite both the influence of Adorno on Mann's portrayal of history in *Doctor Faustus* as well as the implications of the famous Adorno-Heidegger debate, which revolves almost exclusively around Adorno's rejection of Heidegger's historical metaphysics, Mann cannot be said in *Doctor Faustus* to have simply and slavishly laid out in narrative form Adorno's influential brand of historicism. As I attempt to demonstrate, Mann refuses in the end to deny the past an ontological depth and *presence* that Heidegger likes to call *Dasein*'s *authentic* sense of the past as having-been. In *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus*, the difference between what Heidegger calls an inauthentic and an authentic history, or the difference between the history that one *writes* and the history that one *is*, is clearly evident in the tension that marks the impossibility of "telling time" (Cohn) in Mann's novels. The source of this impossibility lies in the awkward demand placed upon the narrators to narrate the complex temporalities of their subject(s) – awkward

because, as I suggest, “telling time” involves narrating a past that in being told must at the same time cast something aside (as both Heidegger and Adorno affirm), and it is precisely the recognition and recovery of this loss (however incomplete in the end) that constitutes the tragic insight of Mann’s protagonists and any measure of *authentic* existence in Heidegger. Thus, as I hope to confirm, Mann’s treatment of history does indeed describe the deeper matter of historical authenticity and of what Heidegger calls *being-historical*, which emerges in *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus* as the commitment to a notion of the past as having-been that in its unavailability, in its being cast aside, *remains* always alongside *Dasein* and ultimately determines not only the life and fate of Hans Castorp and Adrian Leverkühn but also the typically overlooked significance they are meant by Mann to suggest.

My final chapter also sets for itself two goals and focuses exclusively on Mann’s and Heidegger’s later writings and on the intersection that links the question of time with the question of the possibility of art under modernism, as is perhaps appropriate for a conclusion that hopes to situate Mann and Heidegger at the margins or *end* of modernism. First, it continues to follow the development of Mann’s and Heidegger’s ideas of time and temporality by taking up the idea of the *end* of time as well as the *end* of art – the latter, of course, is the powerful “rumor” (Geulen) that preoccupied both Mann and Heidegger throughout their respective careers, but especially during the historical period in question, at the end of which Mann and Heidegger directly engage the tragic, unspeakable guilt that accompanies a historical trajectory out of which the sort of world emerges in which the impossibility of art can even be imagined. Secondly, and with a view toward the question of the end of art, I demonstrate the way in which Mann’s narratives help to both mediate the alleged differences and also illuminate the correspondences between what is typically

understood as a very public and contentious debate between Adorno and Heidegger, a debate, moreover, which to a large extent still shapes our beliefs about modernism and modernity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I.	Introduction – Not the Usual Suspects: Toward a Rereading of Modernist Time in Mann and Heidegger (1927/1947).....	1
II.	Dasein and the <i>Time-Novel</i>	21
	Thomas Mann and the <i>Zeitroman</i>	21
	Heidegger, <i>Dasein</i> , <i>Sorge</i>	34
III.	Being-Towards-Death and the ‘Dilemma of Closure’.....	56
	Heidegger and <i>Sein zum Tode</i>	59
	<i>The Magic Mountain</i>	66
	<i>Doctor Faustus</i>	111
IV.	Authenticity and the Jargon of History.....	167
	Heidegger, <i>Geschichte</i> , <i>Eigentlichkeit</i>	177
	<i>The Magic Mountain</i>	190
	<i>Doctor Faustus</i>	225
V.	Conclusion – Critical <i>Care</i> , or <i>Care</i> as Critique: Thomas Mann and the Adorno-Heidegger Debate.....	264
	The End of Time.....	264
	The End of Art.....	272
VI.	Works Cited.....	284

Chapter I

Introduction

Not the Usual Suspects: Toward a Rereading of Modernist Time in Mann and Heidegger

This is a dissertation about time and modernism: about the place of time in modernism, and about the place of modernism in time (which is also to say, in history). Insofar as it plans to explore these topics and their intersection in specific literary and philosophical discourses from the modernist period, its first obligation is to sketch out the contemporary critical atmosphere that both explains and justifies its approach.

Almost all contemporary discussions of modernism recognize the importance of modernist experimentations with and break from 19th century narrative time conventions and the historical conditions which prompted both. On the one hand, modernist representations of time are said to have developed as a response to historically specific advancements in technology and the cultural and intellectual shifts prompted by these advancements. Just as the historical foundations of realism lie in 19th century industrialism, scientific positivism and imperialism, modernist representations of changing perceptions of time are often said to reflect the even more technically accelerated and epistemologically fragmented nature of modern experience in the twentieth century as the bulwarks of 19th century realism collapsed under the weight and impossibility of their own ambitions. This is the subject of many critical works that explore the question of modernist time, including Stephen Kern's seminal

work *The Culture of Space and Time* (1983) and Ronald Schleifer's *Modernism and Time* (2000) (Kavaloski 34-5).

On the other hand, modernist representations of time developed independently as purely aesthetic responses to the restrictive, prohibitive time-conventions of 19th century realism. In the realist novel, generally speaking, the predominant mode of time is linearity, which relies upon an absolute chronological sequence of beginning, middle and end in which the end justifies the beginning and middle in a relationship of predetermined harmony. In fact, the success of the realist novel may be said to depend upon the degree to which this harmony is realized through its reestablishment at the end of the novel (Kermode 5-7; Kavaloski 26-32). Ultimately, realist literature claims to depict not only the world but time itself *as it is* and assumes that it is the same for everyone (Kavaloski 28). Thus it is said that narrative moves away from representing time as it is for everyone toward a distinctly modernist literature that exposes a very different idea of time and reality as at the very least always relative to a subject and thus as diverse as individuals themselves. Walter Pater, a prominent early voice in the shift toward modernism, puts it this way: "the first step towards seeing one's object as it really is, is to know one's own impression as it really is, to discriminate it, to realize it distinctly [and] [O]ur education becomes complete in proportion as our susceptibility to these impressions increases in depth and variety" (1507-8). Likewise, as Ford Madox Ford would eventually argue, "It became very early evident to us that what was the matter with the Novel [...] was that it went straight forward, whereas [...] To get...a man in f[i]ction you could not begin at his beginning and work his life chronologically to the end. You must first get him with a strong impression, and then work backwards and forwards over his past" (qtd. in Kern 31), and Virginia Woolf, too, laments the "appalling narrative

business of the realist” and claims that “[Neither] Life [nor time] is a series of gig-lamps symmetrically arranged; life is a luminous halo, a semi-transparent envelope surrounding us from the beginning of consciousness to the end” (2089).

The primarily aesthetic shift that takes place with modernism toward the privileging of a subjective, pluralistic experience of time is also the subject of a long critical history; some notable examples include A.A. Mendilow’s *Time and the Novel* (1952), Theodore Ziolkowski’s *Dimensions of the Modernist Novel* (1969) and Ricardo Quinones’s *Mapping Literary Modernism* (1985) (Kavaloski 31-5). In order to summarize these two tendencies (the historical and aesthetic influences on modernist representations of time) in the criticism of modernist time, I’ll limit my analysis to the works of Kern and Mendilow since they constitute, respectively, the most comprehensive and the earliest treatments of the subject, and because both so clearly embody traditional and long-accepted approaches to the question of time and modernism they will best help prepare readers for the comparison that is the aim of my study and that seeks, in part, a reevaluation of the questions these approaches obviously privilege.

Stephen Kern’s *The Culture of Time and Space, 1880-1918* claims that “[f]rom around 1880 to the outbreak of WWI a series of sweeping changes in technology and culture created distinctive new modes of thinking about and experiencing time and space” (1) and sets about describing and outlining these changes from a broad variety of perspectives. Kern writes that individuals and even nations “behave in distinctive ways when they feel they are cut off from the flow of time, excessively attached to the past, isolated in the present, without a future, or rushing toward one” (3), and he confirms with respect to the cultural and historical specificity of modernity what Mendilow’s observations had already confirmed with

respect to the literary treatment of time under modernism: that at least two comprehensive changes in thinking about time during this period, both of which have major implications for understanding the literature of the period, include the affirmation of a plurality of *times* and *temporal experience* and the affirmation of the reality of a private, wholly subjective experience of time, for which the philosophy of Henri Bergson is said to form the “theoretical core” (8). And finally, he organizes, as does Mendilow to a lesser extent, the ideas of this period on the nature of time around three pairs of opposing views that, according to Kern, encompass the debate as a whole: whether time was homogenous or heterogeneous, atomistic or a flux, irreversible or reversible (11).

No study of modernist time would be complete if it didn't acknowledge the intellectual contribution of Bergson's philosophy of time from *Time and Free Will*, which had a far-reaching influence on modernist literature. And the core of this influence is located in his theory of *durée* [duration]. Bergson defines time as pure quality and space as pure quantity, the former purely intensive and heterogeneous and the latter purely extensive and homogenous. Pure duration is “a qualitative multiplicity, with no likeness to number; an organic evolution which is yet not an increasing quantity; a pure heterogeneity within which there are no distinct qualities [or parts]” (*TFW* 226). Bergson was solely concerned with the way we know ourselves *in* time, a fact that both influenced and precipitated Heidegger's critique of Bergson's temporality in *Being and Time*, and his increasingly predominant focus on the *value* of the past for the present meant that for Bergson time was, as it was implicitly for Kant, a matter of freedom, and more particularly, a matter of subjective freedom. In *Creative Evolution* Bergson describes the best outcome of modern philosophy as one in which the “material world [will] melt back into a single flux, a continuity of flowing, a

becoming” (qtd. in Kern 26). It is precisely this ethical shadow that attends Bergson’s notion of duration which shows the most eloquent influence of Bergson on Marcel Proust, that the past in duration is the source of freedom and happiness. Thus only a life open to the fluid movement of duration has access to an essential source of individual freedom and happiness (Kern 62). For Bergson, absolute knowledge can only be given in intuition, such as that sort of universal intuition shared by all which *is* “our own personality in its flowing through time – our self which endures.” Referring to time in spatial terms can only end in a relative knowledge since the spatial figuratives used to describe temporal experience always fall short of articulating the human experience of time, indeed falsify it. Recognizing this, Bergson attempts the following definition: “let us free ourselves from the space which underlies movement in order to consider only the movement itself [thought without an object], the act of tension or extension, in short *pure mobility*. We shall have this time a more faithful image of the development of our self in duration [...]” (qtd. in Kern 24). According to Kern, “the effect of this trying analogy is to underline the difficulty [and in the process define it] of expressing in words the true nature of our existence in time, which [Bergson] calls ‘duration’ [...]” (Kern 24-25). Ultimately, the idea of duration as a continuous, heterogeneous flow that cannot be measured and that constitutes the comprehensive becoming in which every human dwells and which every human consciousness occupies as long as it *is* greatly influenced modernist representations of time in literature and philosophy, including Heidegger’s.

Adding to the influence of philosophies of time, such as Bergson’s, fields as diverse as modern physics, psychology, sociology, economics and industry also mounted forceful and convincing oppositions to a classical, Newtonian notion of absolute or homogenous time, in which time is defined as a “sum of infinitesimally small but discrete units” (Kern 20) that

flows at a steady, uniform rate completely external to the human experience of it. Whatever their differences, these developments all posit time as relative, plural and as fraught with contradiction. In fact, the most important repercussion of, say, Einstein's theory of relativity, was the conclusion that there is no privileged observer. No one was in such a privileged position that he/she could see the world (and time) *as it is*. Likewise, time could no longer be understood as a constant, homogenous, stable and absolute phenomenon. One is always seeing things in terms of one's relation to them. And it was not only modernist literature that celebrated and exploited these contradictory elements of nature; rather, contradiction, it was discovered, is built into nature itself.

Modern technological developments, as one would expect, seemed to only confirm and exploit the philosophical and scientific revelations about the character of time as a relative flux. Kern acknowledges that the cinema, for example, emerged out of modernist experiments in photography and cinematography and sought to capture the movement of objects in time in order to adequately represent time as flux rather than atomistic and discrete, as reversible rather than irreversible. According to Kern, "the structure of history, the uninterrupted forward movement of clocks, the procession of days, seasons, and years, and simple common sense tell us that time is irreversible and moves forward at a steady rate" (29), but the technological innovations of cinema and photography almost immediately challenged these views. With cinematic technique, time could be reversed, stopped, spliced, fused, interrupted and with the novelty of the photograph, the moment, the perspective, the slice or instant was ripped out of the temporal continuum and exposed without commentary and thus without the system of control which would have ascribed to it a greater or lesser degree of value.

For Kern, the introduction of a standard universal world-time in July 1913, precipitated by advancements in communications and transportation and the expansion of the global marketplace, dramatically qualified the experience of an absolute, objective, international time and supplanted the heterogeneous, cultural, natural time experience of an earlier age; and more broadly speaking the establishment of universal standard time enforced an experience of time drastically different from an inner experience of time. Nevertheless, although this new “public” time was viewed as more or less accurately marking duration and succession and the broader public accepted the introduction of standard time without question or concern, artists and writers reacted almost immediately to its negative implications for human knowledge and experience and to the sharp distinction between “public” and “private” time that it emphasized (11-16).

Kern offers several familiar examples from the world of modernist literature to demonstrate the reaction of modernist fiction to this emergent, fundamentally modernist understanding of the character and nature of time. Joseph Conrad’s protagonist in *The Secret Agent* is a Russian anarchist in England charged with blowing up the Greenwich observatory, the most “graphic symbol of centralized political authority” (Kern 16). Oscar Wilde in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* inverts public and private time when the portrait of Dorian ages while he himself remains young. Proust’s Marcel experiences a deeply private and erratic time that is out of sync with other characters in the novel and that cannot be accounted for by a “dial superficially marked” (qtd. in Kern 16). Kafka’s characters endure an ontological terror that is often tied to temporal experience; when Gregor Samsa awakes to find himself turned into a giant insect, his initial reaction is shock at having missed the train that will get him to work on time. And Joyce’s *Ulysses* offers the reader various *times* of extreme

heterogeneity. Not only are Odysseus's mythic travels compressed into the very brief confines of Bloom's 24-hour sojourn through Dublin and in turn the strict confines of the hours of the day extended backwards and forwards across the spectrum of characters' inner thoughts that seem unconfined by time, but each episode that makes up the novel would appear to suggest a unique experience of time. (Kern 16-18)

Of course, the modernist's view of time as flux also owes much to the other modernist developments in literature, namely the growing belief, first articulated by William James in 1884, that human consciousness is "a stream and not a conglomeration of separate faculties or ideas" (Kern 24). The notion that thought or consciousness is comprised of separate units of feeling or faculty (as in Kant, for instance) implicitly suggests a spatial representation of time, which Bergson (and Heidegger) worked continuously to suppress; in fact, Bergson called the spatial representation of time a *vice*. Along with Bergson and Husserl, James believed that "[e]ach mental event is linked with those before and after, near and remote, which act like a surrounding 'halo' or 'fringe.' [...] The whole of it surges and slows, and different parts move along at different rates, touching upon one another like the eddies of a turbulent current" (Kern 24). In short, these three belong more or less to the same camp, which believed that time is not composed of discrete parts and thus is not jointed – rather, it flows (Kern 24).

While Kern offers a privileged space for literature in his study, insofar as its specific engagement with the cultural, social and technological changes of the age help to reveal the scope and measure of the effects of these changes on modernist society as a whole, his treatment of literary texts is always brief and marginal. And though it can be argued that the literary selections of A. A. Mendilow are anything but comprehensively representative of this

engagement, Mendilow's focus in *Time and the Novel* is on the aesthetic operations that underlie and accompany this shift as opposed to the historical developments that may or may not have made them possible but that are nevertheless reflected in modernist literature; indeed, according to Mendilow, it is precisely these aesthetic operations that signal the *modernism* of the work.

For Mendilow, as for Kern, a modernist view of time presents something like Spengler intended with his description of modernity as a world of things-becoming rather than of things-become, the world-as-history as opposed to the world-as-nature, a world of time rather than a world of space (3). According to Mendilow, time under modernism is no longer subjugated to space but rather space is made to submit to time. Mendilow anticipates studies like Kern's when he acknowledges the way in which the time-obsession of the 20th century is conditioned by the increased pace of living, a wide-spread sense of the transience of all forms of modern life, and more particularly, by the rapidity of social and economic change. The loss of assuredness and the anxiety typically associated with the rapid changes that characterize modernization lies at the foundation of literary modernism's obsession with questions of time. (Mendilow 3-10)

For the modernist novel, Mendilow writes, the static symmetry and unity of Aristotelian-Newtonian time and action could no longer be imposed on the dynamic formlessness of life, which the modernists experienced not as an unchanging unity and whole but as a variable, flowing and alienating reality. Endings no longer resolve problems but rather signal the beginning of new ones. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Mann's *The Magic Mountain* where the novel ends with the outbreak of world war. Hence the character of our future perspectives shifts continuously and uninterruptedly opens up new horizons

almost infinitely. This emphasis on change and movement only underscores the character of the time-obsession of the modernists, where time is no longer a matter of faith or certainty but only of doubt, but then at the same time, of potential and possibility. Like society and culture, the novel in the age of modernism acquires for itself a protean shape, quality, character, and focus as it embraces a certain elasticity and release from the rigid, formulaic rules of its predecessors. And time, since it functions as a condition of the very possibility of narrative, lies at the heart of not only cultural but also narrative experience; this is especially true of the problem of portraying the passage of time. (Mendilow 3-21)

Despite modernists' efforts to represent time as it really was, fiction, according to Mendilow, in its thematic, formal and medial limitations, always resists the attempt:

As fiction is a time-art, the problems of its structure, conventions and techniques form a veritable arabesque of different time-values and factors. [...] The novel is not a 'pure' art; it must have a subject, related, no matter how exiguously, to the world we live in and know through our sense. The theme must deal with the behavior of human beings who act, feel, and think in time and are subject to all its vagaries, varieties and variations. [...] All fiction must as in life begin and end and be comprised of events, however tenuously they may qualify as *events*, which precede, follow and relate somehow to each other. [Moreover] The medium of fiction imposes the most serious limitation on the expression of a variety of temporal experience because the nature of language and communication, even as a time-art, is that of distinct and separate units of meaning which must be followed sequentially so that meaning unfolds *in time* [...]. (Mendilow 31)

The problem arises when the writer wishes in a medium, which is decidedly against the attempt, to create the effect of simultaneity, of constant presence or immobility, of reversibility, of immediacy, which is all to say, an experience of time which approaches a *lived*, that is, a human or real, rather than artificial, experience of time – the experience of duration – and it was, of course, a foundational objective of modernism to experiment with pushing the boundaries of the medium in order to accommodate and test the limitations of the form (Mendilow 31). It is important to point out, Mendilow adds, that as hard as the writer may try to approximate this experience, it is always the reader whose duration becomes so closely bound with the narrative so as to be indistinguishable from it – the sequential narrative itself *and* the reader's experience of the text as narrative collapse into each other in the experience of reading which itself cannot escape participating in the mutual duration it signifies. This, according to Mendilow, is why one of the hallmarks of a great novel is the extent to which it *captures* a reader; it is so deceptive, artful, illusory and binding in its existence so as to intervene between the reader and his immediate perception of reality, thus giving the reader a direct sensation of being *in the novel*; in this way the reader forgets both himself, the author and the novel – the entire artificiality of the experience (Mendilow 32-3).

Suffice it to say that, alongside its seminal insights into the relationship between time and modernism, Mendilow's study not only confirms the manner in which Bergson's theory of duration greatly affected the way the modernist novel treated character, plot, and structure, but it also inaugurates the critical tradition that cannot seem to move beyond the limits of this recognition. Bergson writes in *Time and Free Will*: "We instinctively tend to solidify our impressions in order to express them in language. Hence we confuse the feeling itself, which is in a perpetual state of becoming, with its permanent external object, and especially with

the word which expresses the object” (qtd. in Mendilow 150) – consider the word *time*, for example. Such an impasse shows the inherent difficulty of communicating a lived experience of time through a medium almost diametrically opposed to the possibility of such communication, and this is why fiction may be described as a sort of “contract of error” between writer and reader, and between the perceiver and the perceived object (qtd. in Mendilow 151). Mendilow describes the novel as “a fictitious narrative in prose which seeks to illustrate and illuminate human experience and behavior within the limitations imposed by the medium of language and by the necessities of form, by approximating as closely as possible to what we apprehend as reality. The test of its immediate success is its power to evoke the feeling of presentness *in* [...] and *at* that reality [...]” (238). Thus Mendilow successfully shows the difficulties involved in *being* a novel, especially in a modernist age hyper-aware of the complexities and the inescapable aporetic character of communicating or representing a lived time and experience. In the end, Mendilow suggests, the modernist novelist may be said to have spent a lifetime coming to terms with Bergson’s theory.

The so-called Bergsonian period of modernist literature from which the “usual suspects” are gathered, e.g. Joyce, Woolf, Faulkner, Svevo, Proust, etc., represents a finite moment in history when novel ideas of time influenced a series of innovative responses in the arts and sciences. But, as T.S. Eliot would perhaps explain it, the introduction of these new developments, through the dialectical process of their inclusion in tradition (especially, I think, where that process involves a radical break from tradition) simultaneously alters the substance and trajectory of that tradition. For my purposes, the question becomes how representations of time may be said to have evolved as modernism itself not only progressed but as it progressively radicalized the implications of its inheritance. Mann and Heidegger

certainly belong to the list of “usual suspects,” but in another sense, as I will argue, their special significance and the striking correspondences in their respective treatments of time has yet to be acknowledged, much less worked through. It is, moreover, a difference that reveals itself precisely in the *way* they are included, or in Heidegger’s case, excluded, from traditional analyses of modernist time.

Any contemporary study of modernist time contributes little to the debate by simply recapitulating the aporias of time that led to this feeling of exhaustion in the first place, that is, by demonstrating the way modernist novels “depart drastically from inherited conceptions of time” (Kavaloski 7) in terms of agency, duration, development, linearity and direction. It is, for instance, well-known that modernist texts expose the mock temporality of realist narratives and open up the human experience of time to reflect a more “real” sense of time as highly pluralistic and individual. The value and interpretive potential of these conclusions notwithstanding, this dissertation seeks to distance itself from these traditional readings and to deploy the works of Mann and Heidegger as evidence and justification for a reevaluation of a later modernism’s preoccupation with time and temporality.

First, while conventional readings freely describe the division of time into the binary oppositions of private vs. public, subjective vs. objective, etc., as the ground for modernism’s otherness, these evaluations rarely elaborate the ground of these divisions itself. The so-called obsession with the mystery of time’s linearity, continuity, measurability, homogeneity and direction that informs so many seminal works of criticism on the subject of modernist time and which in the end is said to both facilitate and accompany the turning inward of modernism is inevitably treated as the *end* of such experimentation rather than as having

prepared the ground for a philosophy and literature that moves decidedly beyond such experimentation and toward dramatizing its implications.

Secondly, the notion that modernist interpretations of time can only be accessed or are wholly dependent on the mediation of other discourses, such as those of philosophy, psychology, history or physics (this is seen in the general despair of Mann's narrator in *The Magic Mountain* when he wonders whether time itself can actually be narrated) fails to account for the way in which narrative as such constitutes its own formidable response to and dramatization of the problem of time. Contrary to the claims of many critics, however, literature cannot give us an unmediated representation of time (Kavaloski 36-7). This is confirmed, I think, by de Man's recognition in *The Rhetoric of Temporality* that time in the ordinary sense of the term is always already a catachresis, an unstable metaphor, which is thus always already mediated. In addition, such a reevaluation requires that the diversity of responses to time and temporality during the modernist period be viewed not as distinct, strictly independent discourses, but rather as symptomatic of a widespread, i.e. transnational and interdisciplinary, confrontation with both an interpretive crisis and a crisis of interpretation (of which both Mann and Heidegger are essential rather than marginal expressions).

Finally, and most importantly, my dissertation argues that the key to such a reevaluation may lie in the historical evolution of modernist approaches to time, an evolution that to my knowledge has never been acknowledged and that can be clearly articulated by tracing the maturation of literary and philosophical treatments of time during a later modernism. Part of the reason for the weariness associated with conventional discussions of modernist time is their perennial focus on the influence of Bergson's theory of duration,

which while having provided a lasting and meaningful interpretive tradition and access to the heart of many of modernism's most seminal works, Mann's included, may have nevertheless been pushed to its limits. In the conventional scenario, Mann's *The Magic Mountain* is viewed as a late modernist response to the Bergsonian and Einsteinian traditions, and Heidegger is treated as an afterthought, as a less compelling continuation of what are, after all, Bergsonian preoccupations. But this view fails to account for the fact that Mann's most famous time-novel is also only his earliest or that it is followed by two other monumental productions that continue his exploration of the subject, and it almost absolutely ignores not only Heidegger's commitment to overcoming Bergson but also the complex and comprehensive potential of Heidegger's temporality to illuminate the narrative world(s) of literary modernism.

If we allow, for instance, for the lasting historical influence on modernist literature of Bergson, Einstein and Husserl, we should also allow for the possibility that Heidegger's deliberate reevaluation of time both in terms of and in the midst of this tradition may also have ramifications for the critical study of the modernist novels, especially time-novels, that emerged in the wake of his vital reconsideration of time and temporality in *Being and Time*. It is, by the way, no counter claim to say that the distinction lies in the fact that while many modernist authors were either indirectly or directly influenced by the work(s) of Bergson and Einstein, none claim to have been similarly inspired by Heidegger's philosophy. Nevertheless, the appearance of Heidegger's *Being and Time* emerges out of the same historical and intellectual milieu that gave us the evolution of the modernist novel; like the novels of the period it is itself a response not only to its predecessors but to the *Zeitgeist* as such. In short, Heidegger's readings of Bergson, Einstein and Husserl beg for a rereading of

modernist time across the board and especially during the historical period which prompted such a comprehensive philosophical reevaluation. I believe establishing this link and describing this trajectory will release contemporary discussions of modernist time from the burden of their *untimeliness* and reinvigorate critical discussions of the subject, especially where Heidegger and Mann are concerned, since this shift is particularly evident in the trajectory described in the move from *The Magic Mountain* (1924) to *Doctor Faustus* (1947).³

So what does this mean, then – a rereading of modernist time that undertakes to compare representations of time and the tragic in Mann and Heidegger? Most importantly, it means I will argue that what distinguishes Heidegger’s temporality from that of his predecessors in the history of philosophy is precisely what distinguishes Mann’s literary treatment of time from many of those writers with whom he is typically associated. If we accept that Heidegger’s innovations include, among other things, his emphasis on the primacy of human finitude, the ontological weight of history and his reformulation of the category of the subject (*Dasein*), then I will argue that Mann’s narrative preoccupations during the period under study reveal a comparable shift of attention and critical effort that in turn will help to elaborate Heidegger’s complex temporality. Both Heidegger and Mann show us that narrative is not simply grounded in time because “it must deal with the behavior of human beings who act, feel, and think in time” or even because “All fiction must as in life begin and end and be comprised of events [...] which must be followed sequentially so that meaning unfolds *in time*” (Mendilow 31), but because the narrative impulse itself has its

³ For the broader discussion of the *untimeliness* of time in contemporary critical theory, see J.H. Miller’s “Time in Literature,” *Daedalus*, 132.2 (Spring 2003): 86-98; and Fredric Jameson’s “The End of Temporality,” *Critical Inquiry*, 29.4 (Summer 2003): 695-718.

basis first and foremost in “a mystery – a figment and all-powerful” [“Ein Geheimnis, – wesenlos und allmächtig”] (*MM* 344/*ZB* 521) articulation of a fundamental temporalization at the core of what it means to be human and historical, a temporalization, moreover, that links modernist representations of time not only with the traditional tragic category of death, but also with categories that emerge as tragic only under the pressures of modernist modes of representation, particularly in Mann and Heidegger, namely, the categories of history and subjectivity.

Now that we have elaborated the historical context in which any discussion of Mann, Heidegger, and their respective treatments of time and the tragic must be responsibly situated, we can venture a discussion of the details of this proposed evolution. With the trajectory that takes us from the publication of Mann’s *The Magic Mountain* and Heidegger’s *The Concept of Time* in 1924 to *Doctor Faustus* and Heidegger’s later works around 1947, we encounter the evolution of a critical exigency that carefully and consciously exceeds literary or philosophical experimentations with time typical of conventional readings of modernist time and that rather signals the continuation, progression and deepening of such preoccupations. Thus Mann goes further than Proust, Joyce and Woolf by making time the subject (in both senses of the term) of both *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus*; likewise, Heidegger seeks to move beyond Bergson, Einstein and Husserl by situating time at the ground of what it means to *be* subject.

Thus it may be argued that modernism’s initial experimentations with time ultimately suggest and result in the growing awareness of the ontological priority of time, which is expressed in the emergence of time *as* tragic subject, that “unique portion of eternity known as oneself [that] can always be irredeemably lost” (Eagleton 52), and which is precipitated by

an evolution in modernist analyses of death and history and, in particular, the relation of these to what we have come to call the modernist narrative and the modernist subject that both inhabits it and is transfigured in it. In short, Heidegger's and Mann's historical situation at the end of their respective traditions in philosophy and literature seem to beg for a comparison as they both signal historically specific responses to the same intellectual preoccupations, and thus when compared reveal a certain evolution of thought and attention with respect to modernist theories of time and the tragic, or better yet, with respect to the emergence (in/as modernism) of time as the idea of the tragic and the emergence of the tragic as an idea of time.

Stephen Kern's description of a particularly German sense of time from 1880-1918 goes a long way toward helping to situate and prepare a reading of time and tragedy in Mann and Heidegger during the latter half of the modernist period. Kern argues that the national sense of time in Germany that prepared the way for German modernist representations of time was characterized paradoxically perhaps by the lack of a unified German national identity. A history of political strife and fragmentation produced a cultural anxiety and urgency during an age of imperial conquest and expansion that found the Germans increasingly obsessed with the question of national unity. On the one hand, the future of Germany was plagued by doubts inherited from a legacy of political discontinuity and the fact that as a nation Germany itself was still in the uncertainty and vulnerability of its infancy. On the other hand, the future was bathed in an anxious light of expectation, the result, according to Kern, of the influential historicism of Hegel, Darwin and Marx, all of which promised either implicitly or explicitly a future reconciliation and progression out of

the discontinuities and tensions of the past. For Kern, a distinctly German temporality described a nation in fast-forward, bent on making up for lost time. (Kern 277-78)

Kern, of course, along with many conventional readings of modernist time and of Mann's place in the modernist time-novel tradition, stops short of recognizing, much less elaborating, the implications and impact of his own insight. For Kern, this idea of a national sense of time serves only as a historical framework for shedding light on the character and nature of narrative representations of time and thus only recapitulates the reciprocal relationship between historical and intellectual developments in the modernist period in Germany and the way in which writers such as Mann and Heidegger *represent* this shared temporality.

What this stopping short always seems to neglect are the ontological implications of the relationship it admits, namely, that as much as the relationship between modernity and modernist representations of time is a matter of historical influence, it is also a matter, in the case of Mann and Heidegger, of what it means to *be* German, or of what amounts to the same thing, what it means to *be* historical. Here we should recall Mendilow's evaluation of the problem of *being* a novel, for in this way the problem of *being* and the problem of *narrative* emerge as closely related questions. In fact, it is only after recognizing these implications that we are able to see the gravity that binds Mann and Heidegger within similar intellectual orbits. This *being* German is precisely what distinguishes Mann's and Heidegger's treatment of time and that for both Mann and Heidegger determines, perhaps overdetermines, so much of their work and that points well beyond the limited reach of conventional readings which identify a *merely* historical connection between Mann's and Heidegger's narrative treatment of time and a national-cultural sense of time without elaborating the ontological aspect of

such a connection and the implications of this aspect for understanding their respective views of time. In short, what Kern describes as a mere analogical correspondence between national time and narrative representations of time actually suggests an ontological correspondence that is consistently grounded in time and temporality and that my dissertation hopes to elaborate. A less important question is whether one buys Kern's argument for a national temporality as the cause of German aggression in the modernist period. What may or may not be true about the paradigm described by Kern is grounded in what certainly *is* true for both Heidegger and Mann – the question of time is always also a question of both history *and* ontology, or better, the question of what it means *to be German* is for Mann and Heidegger also the question of what it is *to be*.

Chapter II

Dasein and the Time-Novel

Thomas Mann and the *Zeitroman*

The maturation of Mann's treatment of time from 1924-1947 shows very clearly how the persistence of an idea of time both remains and evolves amidst shifting historical conditions that thus require a corresponding shift in the evolution of Mann's narrative and critical responses to history. In order to advance such a claim it is first of all necessary to take for granted what is after all a key assumption of my argument, i.e. that the best place to trace this development is *not* in the so-called philosophical speculation of Mann's characters (this is where most critical interpretations of Mann's treatment of time begin and end and thus why *Doctor Faustus* is never read against Mann's conception of the *Zeitroman* and *Bildungsroman*, i.e. why it is never read as a novel *about* time) but rather in his careful treatment of death, history, and *Bildung*, the significance of which no one will disagree carries over from one novel to another during this period and continues to preoccupy Mann's thought and narrative efforts.

The Magic Mountain tells the story of Hans Castorp, a young engineer, who ventures to the sanatorium Berghof intending a three week stay with his cousin before fulfilling his civic duties but ends up spending seven years on the magic mountain. In the words of his author, Castorp "is in the end a prototype and forerunner, a little prewar German who by 'intensification' is brought to the point of anticipating the future" ["ist am Ende ein Vortypus und Vorläufer, ein Vorwegnehmer, ein kleiner Vorkriegsdeutscher, der durch 'Steigerung'

zum Anticipieren gebracht wird”] (*Letters* 132/*Briefe* 238).⁴ The expansion of time from three weeks into seven years is reflected both in the narrative structure itself as well as in the expansion of Castorp’s private experience of time as he struggles to come to terms with the static, timeless atmosphere of the Berghof (thus the novel tends to flow at the same rate as the temporal expansion it describes). This temporal predicament clearly reflects the sort of national time-sense described by Kern above (and Mann himself) in which both the future and the anxiety surrounding it are foregrounded. On the one hand, Castorp stands poised on the brink of a future filled with hope and active anticipation. On the other hand, the future is characterized by a passive expectation in which the future is comprised of monotonous repetition and consistently at risk of a falling away into a timeless nostalgia that threatens to produce both a public (historical) and private (psychological) stasis if not an active, dangerous regression. Along the way Castorp is caught up in an ideological and personal struggle that is likewise said to mirror the contest between temporalities. The novel ends as it began in what Kern calls a more active futural mood with Castorp finally rejecting the Berghof’s temptations to passivity and timeless repetition and actively reengaging with time, i.e. history, as he enters the First World War.

Conventional interpretations of the novel locate its central message in the constellation of meanings attached to the novel’s treatment of death, history and *Bildung*. Castorp’s *Bildung*, in fact, is typically framed within the strict confines of the temporalities associated in the novel with both death and history. The curious paradox of Castorp’s time at the Berghof, according to Hofrat Behrens, the chief physician, is that the mountain climate can be “good for” his disease in the double-sense of the phrase, i.e. that it has the potential to

⁴ Munich, April 23, 1925, to Julius Bab

both nourish as well as cure the disease (Reed 231). Thus Castorp's *Bildung* is comprised of what Reed, Travers and many others, including Mann himself, describe as the "deepening of the mediocre individual by contact with death" (Reed 238-9). It is only through confronting death, i.e. falling prey to and eventually overcoming the lure of disease and timelessness at the Berghof – "life without time, life without care or hope, life as depravity, assiduous stagnation; life as dead" ["das Leben ohne Zeit, das sorg- und hoffnungslose Leben, das Leben als stagnierend betriebsame Leiderlichkeit, das tote Leben"] (*Magic 627/Zauberberg* 951; qtd. in Reed 264) – that Castorp is able in the end to rejoin history, commit to a life of action and historical responsibility and integrate the understanding that death is not so much the enemy of life and history but rather it justifies them, makes them worth living and defending.

Mann's treatment of death in the novel and the tendency it describes toward a sympathy with death is said to be simultaneously a critique of European history. The static, timeless atmosphere of the Berghof with its patients divided along national lines and its politics mired in apparent impasse and irreconcilability, though its symbolic value is complicated and extensive, clearly also represents a pre-1914 European society described by Kern as "explosive, feverish, constantly taking its temperature, [and] struggling from one crisis to the next" (106). Likewise, Reed calls the outbreak of World War I the "detonation of these moods, which have built up dangerous pressures" and which predominate on the magic mountain:

The 'great stupor' [*grosse Stumpfsinn*] which results from the monotony of sanatorium life and gives rise to the frivolous and sensational pastimes, and the 'great irritability' [*grosse Gereiztheit*] which derives directly from the

stupor stand for the pointlessness and lack of organic prospects for pre-1914 Europe and for the aggressive moods which [this] purposeless existence fostered. (Reed 263)

According to Reed, it is this correspondence between the temporality of death and decay and the temporality of life and history, which is also the tension between timelessness and time, that informs not only the novel's themes but also the development of Mann's political thinking over the period of the novel's composition. As a result, Reed argues, and rightly so, Castorp's *Bildung* comes to reflect the author's own political education while the novel was being written, and it is this ultimate correspondence between the narrative and its creator that makes the novel's status as *Bildungsroman* both possible and necessary. By the time the novel was completed the author of *The Magic Mountain* had altered his opinions with regard to what it had always been the goal of the novel to advocate and in this way Mann was fated to realize for himself what Castorp was also surprised to learn (Reed 244). Thus, according to most interpretations of the novel, does the symbolic weight of the Berghof shift from representing a tragic, Nietzschean aestheticism in which Berghof existence is favorably set apart from and elevated above practical historical, bourgeois life to representing "a doomed political society [...] because of the life it permitted: a life without time, carefree, hopeless, stagnant, vicious, dead" (Reed 264). In the end, Castorp "is more aware of the dangers of excessive 'sympathy with death' than of the need to integrate it into a mature view of life" (Reed 244) and, as Reed also points out, if the world of the Berghof is to be read at all positively then it is because Castorp's *Bildung* on the magic mountain essentially ends with his repudiation of the temptations encountered there (264).

If the timeless atmosphere of the Berghof and the sympathy with death that it provokes serve to lure Castorp, if only temporarily, away from the call to action and historical responsibility (and thus only temporarily “conditions” his experience while ultimately allowing him to escape), then an even more pervasive but similar threat literally and fatally infects Adrian Leverkühn, the protagonist of Mann’s later novel *Doctor Faustus*. The lack of a commitment to action that characterized the passive waiting of the patients at the Berghof in *The Magic Mountain* has given way not to a wave of renewed civilization and historical activity and prosperity but to the active resolution of even darker historical forces that much more so than the isolated charms of the magic mountain permeate all levels of public and private discourse and experience.

As its title suggests, *Doctor Faustus*, Mann’s self-proclaimed last great novel, takes the form of a troubling allegory of the psychological, political and historical climate that nourished fascism and the collision and constellation of forces that made the German atrocities of WW II possible, describing a Germany that has made a fatal bargain with the Devil in return for political power and historical supremacy. The protagonist Adrian Leverkühn, whose life story is narrated by his intimate life-long friend, Serenus Zeitblom, is a coldly detached, extremely cerebral composer whose efforts to produce a radically new artistic breakthrough through an innovative and *timely* compositional form, the so-called *strict style* [*strenger Satz*], both require and unleash the diabolical forces that of course insist on his condemnation and ultimate sacrifice. In keeping with Mann’s continuous fascination with the intersections of creativity with disease, decay and the diabolical, Adrian, in deliberately infecting not only himself, but also his art and his nation, exchanges his soul and the capacity to love for the creative genius that in Mann disease very often inspires. The

effect of the virus that infects Adrian and Germany, as Mann himself explains it as early as 1905, is “intoxication, stimulus, inspiration” [“Rausch, Stimulans, Inspiration”] (qtd. in Reed 361),⁵ but the productivity it enables demands perhaps unforgivable transgressions against self and society and thus, too, inevitable sacrifice and judgment. Just as the disease that plagued Germany required both a violent outbreak and the running of its course, Adrian and his art teeter on the edge of impossibility and must, too, be resolved. For Adrian the judgment for his crimes are resolved only in death, and the consequences of his art likewise appear to condemn art itself. Next to the “unfeigned and untransfigured” [“unverstellte und unverklärte”] (*DF* 256/ 323) suffering of history, suffering’s representation in art is no longer adequate; as Adorno would eventually explain it, it is barbaric. The novel ends with the oft described naïve hopes of the narrator that something of that which he loved in his friend would escape the misfortune bestowed upon him and be recovered for the future prosperity of his legacy and homeland, a hope, that is to say, for “a miracle that goes beyond faith” [“ein Wunder, das über den Glauben geht”] (*DF* 534/672).

The abrogation of time that characterized the isolated monotony of life at the Berghof is revealed in *Doctor Faustus* as a more fundamental negation symbolized in Adrian’s twelve-tone compositional style. Whereas the humanist idealism of Settembrini is often said to win out in *The Magic Mountain*, *Doctor Faustus* describes a world in which Settembrini not only loses the duel with Naphta, but a world in which the duel has *already* been lost. The moderating role played by Settembrini is generally attributed in *Doctor Faustus* to the narrator, Zeitblom, whose inefficacy and unreliability are now long accepted tropes in traditional criticism of the novel. Unlike Settembrini, who exerted a powerful influence over

⁵ This early journal entry is also mentioned by Mann in *The Story of a Novel* 17-18/*Entstehung des Doktor Faustus* 21-22.

Castorp, Zeitblom apparently has little influence over the tragic course of his friend's fate. And perhaps it goes without saying that Adrian Leverkühn is much more than a "little prewar German who anticipates the future" but rather a monumental (in the Nietzschean sense of the term) historical figure from the privileged world and tradition of German art, who actively precipitates the future, produces it, brings it into being and consummates it.

Moreover, the increase in urgency and consequence that accompanies the shift from *The Magic Mountain* to *Doctor Faustus* can be seen in Mann's continued thematic treatment of death, history and *Bildung* since they reassert themselves in the latter novel imbued with clearer, even more critical meanings and implications. While the sympathy with death in *The Magic Mountain* was, as Mann himself often endeavored to explain, not meant to end in nihilism but rather meant to be tempered with humor and what in the end was an affinity with life, in *Doctor Faustus* Adrian Leverkühn bargains away his soul in what amounts to an absolute sympathy with death. This absolute sympathy is evident in the comprehensiveness of the analogy insofar as it determines not only Adrian's life and work, but also the life and work of the narrator as well as the history recounted and in which the narration takes place. As Reed explains it, the function of death and disease in the later novel suggests "a more fundamental evil" than the relatively manageable pathology of *The Magic Mountain* (17). Suffice it to say for now that what was depicted as a philosophical *discourse* on time and death in *The Magic Mountain* is in *Doctor Faustus* consummated as literal and figurative *intercourse*.

Likewise, history is said to take on an equal and closely related urgency in the later novel as well. Many scholars have noted the contrast between the rather marginal and ambivalent role of history in *The Magic Mountain* and the more concrete allegorical

equivalence established in *Doctor Faustus* between Adrian's fate and the historical fate of Germany in the mid-twentieth century. According to these scholars, it is precisely this historical fate that gives the later novel its substance, value and distinction among Mann's works and that not only brings into relief themes formed very early on in his writings but that allows him to finally situate these themes within "a larger and more significant scheme than he ever dreamt of" in 1905 when the idea for the novel was first hatched (Reed 17). Where the First World War was blamed on the passive waiting of European diplomacy, the deferral of accountability, cultural resentments and a battle of worldviews, the Second World War is traced rather to a resolute sort of reaction and regression represented literally in the emergent political threat of fascism and figuratively in the biological march of Adrian's disease and in his development of the *strenger Satz*.

The representation of history in *Doctor Faustus* also achieves an epic specificity unparalleled in Mann's oeuvre. By the time Mann was writing *Doctor Faustus* in the 1940s Mann was wholly aware of the interconnection of German history with his own past and fate. What was merely a presentiment in *Death in Venice* and a prediction in *The Magic Mountain* emerges as a firm conviction in *Doctor Faustus*, i.e. that "political developments have their root in culture" and the psychology of its producers and that any sort of reckoning with one's history must also be a confrontation with the self and with one's private past (Reed 16). This development is emphasized when one considers the complex circumstances and temporality of the narrative. Mann wrote the novel in exile, having been chased out of his country by the authors of the disease for which his novel is an account, and the bulk of the novel was written amidst the unleashing of the very historical forces that the novel is meant to evaluate and judge. In the end, it is a powerfully concrete proximity to history that the later novel both

exploits and by which it is exploited. Despite the differences, however, between the two novels and the over twenty years that separates their composition, Mann undertakes in both novels with a strikingly similar allegorical method to warn and educate his readers about the character and nature of the same threat at different stages of its historical development.

Finally, although *Doctor Faustus* is not typically read as a *Bildungsroman* and though Mann himself, unlike with *The Magic Mountain*, never identified it as such, there are plenty of reasons to interpret the novel in terms of the genre. And not only because it has so much in common with Mann's earlier attempt in *The Magic Mountain* to engage the genre but because it is very consciously about the *Bildung*, which is also to say, the self-formation and self-development of its protagonist. Just as *The Magic Mountain* accounts for the development and consequences of Castorp's education in the matters of love and death while at the Berghof, *Doctor Faustus* follows Adrian's encounter with the same through his musical education and the fated evolution of the *strenger Satz*. Where Castorp's *Bildung* eventually leads him down the mountain away from the sick, death-filled air of the Berghof having changed, been *gebildet* and having found himself, the outcome of Leverkühn's *Bildung* is inscribed in his compositions as a conscious and seemingly inevitable commitment to historical, personal, and narrative stasis. As with *The Magic Mountain*, however, if a positive interpretation is wanted, then it can be found in the curious way in which the novel, precisely through their concealment and negation, nevertheless in the end illuminates and sets into relief those possibilities forbidden by the composition itself.

T.J. Reed describes the move from *The Magic Mountain* to *Doctor Faustus* as a move away from an idea of art as transcendent toward an idea of art as artifact, as always reflective of, engaged with and determined by historical experience. And it is important to reiterate

here that this movement also has its temporal expression insofar as this shift is typically also described as Mann's move away from an abstract exploration of *die Zeit selbst* toward a more concrete notion of time as history. Following this paradigm, Mann's early work up to *The Magic Mountain* emphasizes the opposition between the extraordinary sensitivity of the artist and the quotidian, bourgeois (historical) society and culture above which the world of art and the artist is always precariously situated. This opposition exemplifies the earliest expressions of what is otherwise the constant and evolving influence of Nietzsche on Mann's work. On the one hand, in Mann's early work art eternally justifies the dangerous predicament of life and existence. This is the accepted interpretation of *Death in Venice*, for example, where this Nietzschean sympathy helps to explain why Aschenbach's fate is not wholly to be regretted but rather embraced insofar as his death follows the intimate contact with a reality justified and made possible only through aesthetic experience (his death is justified by his susceptibility to Tadzio's beauty). On the other hand, in *The Magic Mountain* an art that is completely detached from society and history is negatively reflected in the static timelessness of the Berghof; art and culture can only be revitalized if they reengage with reality and time, in this case, history. Likewise, in *Doctor Faustus*, where this trajectory achieves its most extreme expression, history is said to thoroughly supplant the once-thought timeless capacities and privileges of art and aesthetic experience (Reed); the possibilities for artistic production in *Doctor Faustus* are reduced to parody, to the rearrangement of finite musical material and seem to echo Adorno's claim that in the end, art, like life, must age, become rigid and die. The equation of Adrian's life and work with the rise of fascism finds all of the novel's allegorical value in the concretely historical specificity of the latter rather

than in the alleged vagueness of the former, i.e. in the individual, private, subjective, even the ontological or biological implications suggested by the narrative of Adrian's "life and work."

Conventional readings of time in Mann's novels focus almost exclusively on *The Magic Mountain's* treatment of the theme of timelessness and thus, too, its association with other modernist time-novelists, such as Joyce, Faulkner, Woolf and Proust, but these readings almost always fail to acknowledge that Mann's treatment of time in *The Magic Mountain* grew not only out of Mann's awareness of his place in this tradition but also out of his most vital concerns in *Death in Venice* and that he continued to develop these themes through the composition of *Doctor Faustus*. It is well known, for instance, that Mann himself originally intended *The Magic Mountain* as a sequel and companion piece to the earlier novella (Reed), and this dissertation, among other things, would like to trace the maturation of what is really always already a *preoccupation* in Mann's *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus* in order to confirm, instead of a fracture or interruption or even a shift in his thought, the ongoingness or persistence of this preoccupation with time and temporality from 1924-1947. And this in order to demonstrate that *Doctor Faustus* is every bit as much a *Zeitroman* as *The Magic Mountain* insofar as the movement from *The Magic Mountain* to *Doctor Faustus* constitutes not a trajectory away from a preoccupation with time itself but rather toward it.

Reed's description of this general tendency away from abstraction is merely the consensus of the bulk of scholarship on the issue of the evolution of Mann's narrative form and content to 1947.⁶ While the paradigm is true enough and useful for exploring the insinuation of history upon Mann's narratives, it doesn't necessarily and automatically demand the decentering, if not the outright exclusion, of the value and influence of the

⁶ See Lukacs, Bergsten, Fetzer, Vaget, Scaff, etc. for ongoing examples of this agreement.

metaphysical that Mann is said to have privileged in his earlier work. It seems more likely, as Mann himself seemed to always clarify, that the relationship between the ontological and the historical, to recall the opposition with which we began, moves from one of clear distinction, the result of a rather naïve, youthful reading of Nietzsche (Mann himself would, of course, admit this), toward the more hybrid recognition of a relationship that admits the ontological into the historical and vice versa, and toward what is also a more profoundly balanced and deeper, mature reading of a more mature Nietzsche in which history is neither contrasted nor opposed to essence but out of which history emerges *as* essence.

Of course, Mann himself acknowledges this problematic opposition in his famous effort to define *The Magic Mountain* as a time-novel in the double sense:

[*Der Zauberberg*] ist ein Zeitroman in doppeltem Sinn: einmal historisch, indem er das innere Bild einer Epoche, der europäischen Vorkriegszeit, zu entwerfen versucht, dann aber, weil die reine Zeit selbst sein Gegenstand ist, den er nicht nur als die Erfahrung seines Helden, sondern auch in und durch sich selbst behandelt. (*GW*, vol. 11, 611-612; qtd. in Cohn, 211)⁷

As long as the terms of this *doppeltem Sinn* are held to be mutually exclusive and as long as it is required that the same could not be said of *Doctor Faustus*, scholarly efforts to come to terms with Mann's attempt at explanation will remain incomplete. The meticulous reduction of Mann's treatment of time in *The Magic Mountain* (as well as the strict omission of the subject as a key narrative feature of *Doctor Faustus*) to an *einmal* abstract philosophical representation of time and, on the other hand, a *zeitgeistlich-historisch* representation fails to

⁷ “[*The Magic Mountain*] is in a double-sense a time-romance. First in a historical sense, in that it seeks to present the inner significance of an epoch, the pre-war period of European history. And secondly, because time is one of its themes: time, dealt with not only as a part of the hero's experience, but also in and through itself. The book itself is the substance of that which it relates” (*Making* 725).

account for not only the plurality of times in the novel(s) but also the ontological certainty that makes this plurality possible. Like the obstacle encountered by the narrator of *The Magic Mountain*, who, according to Dorritt Cohn, cannot but fail to adequately represent the passage of time for the reader, conventional readings of time in the novel that ignore the mutual reciprocity that binds the *einmal historisch* with *die reine Zeit selbst* are thus bound to exclude time rather than disclose it.

When Thomas Mann claims that his novel is a time-novel in the double sense of the term, a novel about the time in which it was written and about time itself, indeed *of* time, it is assumed that by the latter he is referring solely to the narrator's and Castorp's abstract philosophical speculations on the character and nature of time and to the author's experimental and vividly modernist notion to have the novel stage the duration described by its plot. But Mann's novel, like so much of his work, is also a novel about the intersection of love and disease and evokes an overall "sympathy with death" that resonates across the private *Erlebnis* and public *Erfahrung* of its hero. This sympathy is often linked by critics with the sense of the time-novel as *einmal historisch*, i.e. as depicting the spirit of its age, but in the analysis which follows I hope to demonstrate that this sympathy can equally be traced in the other sense of the time-novel as being *about* and *of die Zeit selbst*. And in this way it will be shown how Mann's work on either end of the period under study reveals the evolution of a modernist conception of time and narrative that goes beyond mere narrative experimentation and moves rather towards the identification of time with death, history, and *Bildung*, which in themselves take on a gradually strengthening ontological character throughout the process of this evolution. In making such a claim I hope to demonstrate that such themes as those which had always moved him were primarily temporal determinations

that from 1924-1947 deepened rather than dissolved away as prominent features of his narrative inquiry. In the process it will become clear, too, that for the likes of both Mann and Heidegger, the *Zeitroman* is not only “*einmal*” *historisch* and on the other hand about *die reine Zeit selbst*; rather, *die reine Zeit selbst ist einmal* “*immer schon*” *historisch* and history “*immer schon*” a determination of *die reine Zeit selbst*. For it has already been shown, according to Reed, that Mann himself was already beginning to see the difficulty of unraveling what was essentially entangled even while writing *The Magic Mountain*; and even if we take for granted, which we will not, what Mann appears to have been able to separate in *The Magic Mountain*, i.e. the historical specificity of the epoch and the private experiences of his hero, in *Doctor Faustus* the two have become fused in a deeply meaningful way in the figure of Adrian Leverkühn and in a manner that has real implications for critical readings of time in the novels written during the period under study here.

Heidegger, *Dasein*, *Sorge*

It is perhaps no coincidence that with Heidegger death and history (and even something like *Bildung*) are systematically incorporated into his philosophical conceptions of time and being and that time for the first time is defined in these very terms. In fact, it is precisely on the essential character and nature of death, history and the temporality of self-development for an authentic understanding of time that Heidegger parts ways with his predecessors, namely, Kant, Bergson and Husserl. Thus it is fair to say that one may view Heidegger’s philosophical development alongside Mann’s narrative development as a comparable response (involving and revolving around the same questions) to a distinct modernist tradition of philosophical and narrative inquiry.

And as also was the case with Mann, critics note a shift in Heidegger's thought, the so-called *Kehre*, from his preoccupation in *Being and Time* with the ontological character of time toward a preoccupation in later works, including *The Origin of the Work of Art* [*Ursprung des Kunstwerkes*] (1935), *Letter on Humanism* [*Der Brief über den Humanismus*] (1947), *The Poet as Thinker* [*Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens*] (1947), *The Question Concerning Technology* [*Die Frage nach der Technik*] (1949), and [*Unterwegs zur Sprache*] (1959), for example, with the more concrete categories of language, history, art and technology. While I acknowledge this so-called shift and its historical preconditions, as I argued above with respect to Mann's narrative development, the claims for such a shift typically and nevertheless neglect to consider what persists in it, i.e. the way in which as late as 1947's *Doctor Faustus* Mann was clearly engaged with questions of temporality left unsettled in *The Magic Mountain* and the way in which, as the title indicates, Heidegger's late lecture *Time and Being* [*Zeit und Sein*] (1962) clearly marks a return to the central preoccupations of his earliest efforts and admits the tragic impossibility of his lifelong task. In fact, Heidegger himself denies such a monumental shift in the direction of his thought and insists that his later work merely continues the attempt to elaborate his concerns in *Being and Time*, namely, the temporality of Dasein's being-in-the-world, through a deeper investigation into the character and nature of that world.⁸

So where does Heidegger stand with respect to time? In *Being and Time, Introduction to Metaphysics* as well as in earlier and later writings, time remains existentially bound to the question and meaning of Being. In *Being and Time* Heidegger defines temporality as "the

⁸ See Heidegger's comments in William Richardson's *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought* (1963).

meaning of the Being of the entity which we call ‘Dasein’” [“der Sinn des Seins desjenigen Seienden, das wir Dasein nennen”] (BT 38/SZ 24):

Dasein *ist* in der Weise, seiend so etwas wie Sein zu verstehen. Unter Festhaltung dieses Zusammenhangs soll gezeigt werden, daß das, von wo aus Dasein überhaupt so etwas wie Sein unausdrücklich versteht und auslegt, *die Zeit ist*. Diese muß als der Horizont alles Seinsverständnisses und jeder Seinsauslegung ans Licht gebracht und genuine begriffen werden. Um das einsichtig werden zu lassen, bedarf es einer *ursprünglichen Explication der Zeit als Horizont des Seinverständnisses aus der Zeitlichkeit als Sein des seinsverstehenden Daseins*. Im Ganzen dieser Ausgabe liegt zugleich die Forderung, den so gewonnenen Begriff der Zeit gegen das vulgäre Zeitverständnis abzugrenzen [...]. (SZ 24)⁹

Heidegger justifies the task of the reinterpretation of temporality in the Introduction to *Being and Time*, where he points to a traditional and reductive misinterpretation of time that extends “von Aristoteles bis über Bergson” (SZ 24) and which has always applied time as an ontological *function* for distinguishing various realms of Being, yet which has always failed to understand the priority of time’s association with the question of Being as such, that is to say, with the temporality of the function itself:

Die “Zeit” fungiert seit langem als ontologisches oder vielmehr ontisches Kriterium der naiven Unterscheidung der verschiedenen Regionen des

⁹ “Dasein *is* in such a way that, by being, it understands something like Being. Remembering this connection, we must show that *time* is that from which Dasein tacitly understands and interprets something like Being at all. Time must be brought to light and genuinely grasped as the horizon of every understanding and interpretation of Being. For this to become clear we need an *original explication of time as the horizon of the understanding of Being, in terms of temporality as the Being of Dasein*. This task as a whole requires that the concept of time thus gained be distinguished from the common understanding of it” (BT 39).

Seienden. Man grenzt ein “zeitlich” Seiendes (die Vorgänge der Natur und die Geschehnisse der Geschichte) ab gegen “unzeitlich” Seiendes (die räumlichen und zahlhaften Verhältnisse). Man pflegt “zeitlosen” Sinn von Sätzen abzuheben gegen “zeitlichen” Ablauf der Satzaussagen. Ferner findet man eine “Kluft” zwischen dem “zeitlich” Seienden und dem “überzeitlichen” Ewigen und versucht sich an deren Überbrückung. “Zeitlich” besagt hier jeweils so viel wie “in der Zeit” seiend, eine Bestimmung, die freilich auch noch dunkel genug ist. Das Factum besteht: Zeit, im Sinne von “in der Zeit sein”, fungiert als Kriterium der Scheidung von Seinsregionen. Wie der Zeit zu dieser ausgezeichneten ontologischen Funktion kommt und gar mit welchem Recht gerade so etwas wie Zeit als solches Kriterium fungiert und vollends, ob in dieser naiv ontologischen Verwendung der Zeit ihre eigentliche mögliche ontologische Relevanz zum Ausdruck kommt, ist bislang weder gefragt, noch untersucht worden. (SZ 25)¹⁰

Heidegger’s challenge – some would call it anachronistic, but Heidegger, of course, thought it very *timely* – to the history of Western philosophy involves nothing short of unveiling the temporal character of Being itself by suggesting that the term *temporal* cannot denote being *in* time but must refer instead to a more originary, primordial temporality from which such a

¹⁰ “For a long while, ‘time’ has served as the ontological [...] criterion for naively distinguishing the different regions of beings. ‘Temporal’ beings (natural processes and historical events) are separated from ‘atemporal’ beings (spatial and numerical relationships). We are accustomed to distinguishing the ‘timeless’ meaning of propositions from the ‘temporal’ course of propositional statements. Further, a ‘gap’ between ‘temporal’ being and ‘supratemporal’ eternal being is found, and the attempt made to bridge the gap. ‘Temporal’ here means as much as being ‘in time,’ an obscure enough definition to be sure. The fact remains that time in the sense of ‘being in time’ serves as a criterion for separating the regions of Being. How time comes to have this distinctive ontological function, and even with what right precisely something like time serves as such a criterion, and most of all whether in this naïve ontological application of time its genuinely possible ontological relevance is expressed, has neither been asked nor investigated up to now” (BT 39; BW 61).

historical *certainty* is derived, namely, the certainty that time is something *in* which human being is situated. According to Heidegger's formulation, the timeless, the eternal, and the supra-temporal are all *a priori* temporal with regard to their Being, and "not just privatively by contrast with something 'temporal' as an entity 'in time', but in a *positive* sense" (BT 40), which is to say, with regard to the *sense* [*der Sinn*] of Being, for which temporality is the primary determination: "Thus the way in which Being and its modes and characteristics have their meaning determined primordially in terms of time, is what we shall call its 'Temporal' determinateness" "[W]eil der Ausdruck ['zeitlich'] [...] noch für eine andere Bedeutung in Anspruch genommen wird, nennen wir die ursprüngliche Sinnbestimmtheit des Seins und seiner Charakter und Modi aus der Zeit seine *temporale* Bestimmtheit" (BT 40/SZ 26). The activity of this determinateness takes place of course at the site of the opening of Being, which is always to say, *at* Dasein, and the interpretation of the opening of Being in terms of temporality unfolds therefore as a result of the analytic of Dasein, which is precisely the philosophical aim Heidegger had in mind while composing *Being and Time*. In a different but closely related way, Heidegger recapitulates the nature of this relationship of Dasein to time in *Introduction to Metaphysics* [*Einführung in die Metaphysik*] (1935/1953):

Daß wir das Sein verstehen [...] ist nicht nur wirklich, sondern es ist notwendig. Ohne solche Eröffnung des Seins könnten wir überhaupt nicht 'die Menschen' sein. [...] [S]treng genommen können wir nicht sagen: es gab eine Zeit, da der Mensch nicht *war*. Zu jeder *Zeit* war und ist und wird der Mensch sein, weil Zeit sich nur zeitigt, sofern der Mensch ist. [...] [Und] nicht weil der Mensch von Ewigkeit her und alle Ewigkeit hin ist, sondern weil Zeit

nicht Ewigkeit ist und Zeit sich nur je zu einer Zeit als menschlich-
geschichtliches Dasein zeitigt (*EM* 90).¹¹

The above passages generate several important ideas concerning Heidegger's philosophy of time (and the manner in which it resonates with Mann's goals in/from *The Magic Mountain* and/to *Doctor Faustus*). The first is Heidegger's assertion that time is not eternity, which is to say, time is neither eternal nor in its essence situated anywhere near the familiar opposition of "being-in-time" and "being-outside-time" or "timeless." Time, in opposition to this – its complete Other-ness, the character of which will become increasingly clearer as this analysis unfolds – is for Heidegger a condition for the possibility of Dasein's being-within-time or relating itself or other entities in any way to eternity. Secondly, the claim that time "temporalizes itself" only in relation to Dasein suggests a basic auto-operation at the level of the Being of Dasein, which is associated throughout *Being and Time* with the original terms *Geschehen* (*historicize*) and *Zeitigen* (*temporalize*), the verbal qualities of which reinforce the significance for Heidegger's philosophy of time that it be construed as an *active* operation at the core of Dasein's Being as long as it *is*. Finally, "time always temporalizes itself only at one time, as human, historical Dasein" ["Zeit sich nur je zu einer Zeit als menschlich-geschichtliches Dasein zeitigt"], in which case the temporalization of time is manifested always and only *as* Dasein, not in-time but *as* time itself. Moreover, this "one time" *at* which Dasein is temporalized as human and historical actually refers to an operation that would appear in what Heidegger refers to as the ordinary conception of time to endure *over time* but

¹¹ "That we understand Being is not just actual; it is also necessary. Without such an opening up of Being, we could not be 'human.' [...] [S]trictly speaking we cannot say there was a time when there were no human beings. At every *time*, there were and are and will be human beings, because time temporalizes itself only as long as there are human beings, [...] not because there are human beings from all eternity and for all eternity, but because time is not eternity, and time always temporalizes itself only at one time, as human, historical Dasein" (*Metaphysics* 89).

which functions rather alongside Dasein *as itself* and which constitutes the essence of Dasein as the *Erstreckung* [stretching-along] of its existence. The ontological representation Heidegger employs to explain the temporality described is called *Sorge* [*Care*], the existential-temporal(-izing) structure that simultaneously unifies and enables Dasein, or that which is recognized as the Being of Dasein as such.

Paul Ricoeur admits that Heidegger's most innovative contribution to our understanding of time lies in his introduction of *die Sorge* as the primordial source of temporality and, in what amounts to the same thing, his association of time not with a theory of knowledge or consciousness (as in Kant or Hegel) but rather with Being itself. Thus the feasibility of Heidegger's philosophy of time depends on time retaining the "scars of its relation to the question of Being" and its proximity to notions of cognition, will and morality without being reducible to any of these, as well as on Heidegger's ability to provide and maintain a structural unity between his tortuous descriptions of existence and temporality (Ricoeur 63-64).

Heidegger identifies three modes of existence, which constitute Dasein's Being-in-the-world and which are defined essentially as *Sorge*: thrownness [Geworfenheit], fallenness [Verfallen] and projection [Entwurf]. To borrow a term from Ricoeur, as constitutive of *Sorge* these three "existentials" are also depicted in their onto-temporal character by Heidegger as Being-already-in-the-world [Schon-sein], Being-alongside-the-world [Sein-bei], and Being-ahead-of-itself-in-the-world [sich-vorweg-sein], respectively (BT 236-37). It is no accident that the verbal (throwing, falling, projecting), adverbial and locative (already, ahead, alongside) expressions display at the basic level of language Heidegger's deliberate

focus on the entanglement of existence and temporality in their relationship to the question of Being.¹²

The existential quality of thrownness and its onto-temporal counterpart Being-already-in-the-world refer to Dasein's primordial condition of always existing somewhere "between" birth and death, of having already "been delivered over to itself – [...]" ["ihm selbst überantwortet"], and of having already "been thrown *into a world*" ["je schon *in eine Welt* geworfen"] (BT 236/SZ 255). Fallenness or Being-alongside-the-world indicates that factual quality of Dasein's condition, in which Dasein finds itself *at all times* "absorbed in the world of its concern" ["in der besorgten Welt aufgegangen"] (BT 237/SZ 255), which is to say, absorbed in the world of particulars by which it is always immediately surrounded. In its fallenness, Dasein tends to "flee in the face of uncanniness" ["das Fliehen vor der Unheimlichkeit"] (BT 237/SZ 255), of that which is unfamiliar or that with which it is not concerned in its everyday activity – facticity refers to that self-abandonment of Dasein in which it no longer recognizes itself as a "thrown fact" ["als geworfenes Faktum"] (BT 376/SZ 434). Finally, there is the quality of projection or Being-ahead-of-itself-in-the-world, which for Heidegger occupies a preeminent place in the triadic structural unity of *Sorge*. What is referred to here is probably best described by Heidegger himself:

Das Dasein ist Seiendes, dem es in seinem Sein um dieses selbst geht. Das 'es geht um...' hat sich verdeutlicht in der Seinsverfassung des Verstehens als des sichentwerfenden Seins zum eigensten Seinkönnen. Dieses ist es, worumwillen das Dasein je ist, wie es ist. Das Dasein hat sich in seinem Sinn je schon zusammengestellt mit einer Möglichkeit seiner selbst. [...] Das

¹² Ricoeur also recognizes as much (see *Time and Narrative*, vol. 3, 71).

Dasein zum eigensten Seinkönnen besagt aber ontologisch: das Dasein ist ihm selbst in seinem Sein je schon *vorweg*. (SZ 254)¹³

Thus a thrown and fallen Dasein in its Being already-in- and alongside-the world finds itself simultaneously ahead-of-itself insofar as its factual self-understanding is determined quite completely by its potentiality-for-Being something else, something ahead of and beyond itself; “Dasein, in grasping itself as potentiality for being, realizes that it must make itself something, else face the meaninglessness of being nothing in particular” (Atkins 3).

In moving from the primary analysis of the structure of *Sorge* to his principal exegesis of the operation of temporality as such, Heidegger distinguishes the existential qualities of thrownness, fallenness, projection and the onto-temporal qualities of Being-already, Being-alongside and Being-ahead from the active temporalizing effects of what he calls the ‘ecstases’ of temporality, which have the designations *having-been* [*Gewesenheit*], *making-present* [*Gegenwärtigen*], and *coming-towards* [*Zukommen*] (SZ 428-441/BT 370-80) and which form the temporal, effectual unity of *Sorge* and thus also the meaning of the Being of Dasein as such. The meaning of authentic *Sorge* or that upon which the meaning and Self-constancy of Dasein is founded is for Heidegger the primordial meaning of temporality: “*The primordial unity of the structure of care lies in temporality*” [“*Zeitlichkeit enthüllt sich als der Sinn eigentlichen Sorge*”] (BT 374/SZ 432). This existential primordiality, which endures as the in-itself of Dasein, disperses not *in* but *as* the human experience into several discrete but nevertheless mutually dependent “fugitive” modes of temporalization, namely,

¹³ “Dasein is an entity for which, in its Being, that Being is an issue. The phrase ‘is an issue’ has been made plain in the state-of-Being of understanding – of understanding as self-projective Being towards its ownmost potentiality-for-Being. This potentiality is that for the sake of which any Dasein is as it is. In each case Dasein has already compared itself, in its Being, with a possibility of itself. [...] [O]ntologically, Being towards one’s ownmost potentiality-for-Being means that in each case Dasein is already *ahead* of itself in its being” (BT 236).

everydayness [Alltäglichkeit], historicity [Geschichtlichkeit] and within-time-ness [Innerzeitigkeit], all of which characterize and make possible that inauthentic existence out of which what Heidegger calls “ordinary time” [der vulgäre Zeit] is said to derive (BT 374+).

Heidegger locates the opening to such a radical conception of time’s basic primordially in the futural quality of projection, of Being-ahead-of-oneself-in-the-world, or more specifically, in the essential temporal movement of *coming-towards*, what Heidegger refers to most notoriously in its ontological grounding as *Sein zum Tode* [Being-towards-death]. Heidegger writes: “*The primary phenomenon of primordial and authentic temporality is the future*” [“*Das primäre Phänomen der ursprünglichen und eigentlichen Zeitlichkeit ist die Zukunft*”] (BT 378/SZ 436), and a moment later he defines *Sorge* itself as Being-towards-death: “*Care is being-towards-death*” [“*Die Sorge ist Sein zum Tode*”] (BT 378/SZ 436).

As mentioned, the understanding for Heidegger is that through which Dasein comes to know its own potentiality-for-being. In this way Dasein is always *ahead* of itself and *comes toward* itself. But Dasein’s possibilities, always out *in front*, culminate in the nullity of death, which Heidegger describes not as merely an end to Dasein’s existence, but as the ultimate impossibility of Dasein as such. This leads for Heidegger to the most important characteristic of temporality, its finitude, which is concealed by the ordinary conception of time. Death in the sense described below does not refer merely to the biological death of the individual but to an existential and defining limit to Dasein’s existence; as Kim Atkins explains it, “[a]s such a limit, death represents the finitude of human being – a finitude that is not merely a chronological limit but a semantic limit, a defining limit in relation to which one’s life can be given determinate meaning as ‘who’ one is” (3):

Dieses Strukturmoment [das ‘Sichvorweg’] der Sorge sagt doch unzweideutig, daß im Dasein immer noch etwas *aussteht*, was als Seinkönnen seiner selbst noch nicht ‘wirklich’ geworden ist. Im Wesen der Grundfassung des Daseins liegt demnach eine *ständige Unabgeschlossenheit*. Die Unganzheit bedeutet einen Ausstand an Seinkönnen.

Sobald jedoch das Dasein so ‘existiert’, daß an ihm schlechthin nichts mehr aussteht, dann ist es auch schon in eins damit zum Nicht-mehr-da-sein geworden. Die Behebung des Seinausstandes besagt Vernichtung seines Seins. Solange das Dasein als Seiendes *ist*, hat es seine ‘Gänze’ nie erreicht. Gewinnt es sie aber, dann wird der Gewinn zum Verlust des In-der-Welt-seins schlechthin. *Als Seiendes* wird es dann nie mehr erfahrbar. (SZ 314-15)¹⁴

Thus Dasein’s potentiality-for-being depends upon and is determined by that *constantly something still to be settled*, which in an everyday sense may refer to any number of real possibilities, tasks, debts, etc., which are constantly and actually deferred, but which in their primordial-temporal meaning refer concretely to the greatest negation of all possibility and potential, the ultimate deferral at the core of Dasein’s being: “Death is the possibility of the absolute impossibility of Dasein” [“Der Tod ist die Möglichkeit der schlechthinigen Daseinsunmöglichkeit”] (BT 294/SZ 333).

¹⁴“The ‘ahead-of-itself,’ as an item in the structure of care, tell[s] us unambiguously that in Dasein there is always something *still outstanding*, which, as a potentiality-for-Being for Dasein itself, has not yet become ‘actual’. It is essential to the basic constitution of Dasein that there is *constantly something still to be settled*. Such a lack of totality signifies that there is something still outstanding in one’s own potentiality-for-Being.

But as soon as Dasein ‘exists’ in such a way that absolutely nothing more is still outstanding in it, then it has already for this very reason become ‘no-longer’Being-there’ Its Being is annihilated when what is still outstanding in its Being has been liquidated. As long as Dasein *is* as an entity, it has never reached its ‘wholeness’. But if it gains such ‘wholeness’, this gain becomes the utter loss of Being-in-the-world. In such a case, it can never again be experienced *as an entity*” (BT 280).

It is in Dasein's disposition toward its own death that its existence is described as authentic or inauthentic. Heidegger writes: "*Temporality gets experienced in a phenomenally primordial way in Dasein's authentic Being-a-whole, in the phenomenon of anticipatory resoluteness*" ["*Phänomenal ursprünglich wird die Zeitlichkeit erfahren am eigentlichen Ganzsein des Daseins, am Phänomen der vorlaufenden Entschlossenheit*"] ((BT 351/SZ 402), where anticipation [*vorlaufenden*] denotes Dasein's authentic Being-towards-death (BT 350), or as Otto Pöggeler explains it, the manner in which Dasein (for and on behalf of itself) "heightens the possibility, which Dasein is, to its extreme limit where it becomes boundless impossibility, namely, the impossibility of any existing as a definite potentiality-for-being" (44); and where resoluteness [*Entschlossenheit*] refers to Dasein's authentic potentiality-for-being-itself in the world into which it has fallen, that is, it refers to Dasein's factual possibilities as Being-in-the-world and to its "*read[iness] for anxiety*" [*angstbereite*] (BT 343): "[*T*]his reticent self-projection upon one's ownmost Being-guilty, in which one is ready for anxiety – we call 'resoluteness'. [...]. [*R*]esolution is precisely the disclosive projection and determination of what is factually possible at the time" ["*das verschwiegene, angstbereite Sichertwerfen auf das eigenste Schuldigsein – nennen wir die Entschlossenheit. [...]. Der Entschluß ist gerade erst das entschließende Entwerfen und Bestimmen der jeweiligen faktischen Möglichkeit*"] (BT 343-45/SZ 393-95). Though the details of this primordial being-guilty and its entanglement with the other ecstases of Heideggerian temporality as well as its connection to tragedy and tragic experience will be carefully disclosed throughout the course of the analysis that follows, for now suffice it to say that authentic existence is characterized by anticipatory resoluteness and inauthentic existence by

a sort of irresolute and both moral and ontological indifference toward Dasein's own potentiality-for-Being and therefore toward death itself.

However, the distinction between authentic and inauthentic existence in Heidegger is less distinct than it appears, for if the existential possibility of Dasein as such is based upon the disclosure of Dasein to itself as Being-ahead-of-itself or *coming-towards*, which is to say, as Being-towards-death (294), then this possibility is essentially and always a *thrown* possibility, which in the everyday sense conceals from Dasein its *having already been* “delivered over to its death” [“seinem Tod überantwortet ist”] (BT 295/SZ 333-4).

Thrownness, according to Heidegger, reveals itself in its most primordial sense, which is to say, in its direct relation to Being-towards-death, only in anxiety, a state-of-mind which discloses to Dasein the fact that it exists as “thrown Being *towards* its end” [“geworfenes Sein *zu* seinem Ende”] (BT 295/SZ 333).

And herein lies the thrust of Heidegger's notion of *care* or *Sorge* as the unity or totality of Dasein's temporality. Dasein's future is never something merely to come but rather it is something toward which Dasein is always already headed; likewise, Dasein is never past; it is never “no longer there” and thus cannot ever establish itself as something “arising and passing away in the course of time” (BT 375-6). Similarly, what Heidegger calls the “moment of vision” and associates with the authentic present constitutes a resolute Dasein's having “brought itself back from falling,” i.e. out of the inauthenticity of its everyday concerns, and is really not a moment at all inasmuch as the moment typically refers to the finite temporal boundaries of the “now” as being securely situated in between the ‘before’ and ‘after’; rather, what Heidegger calls the “*Augenblick*” is a seeing through such inauthenticity toward the stretching-along [Erstreckung] which Dasein, as *Sorge*, essentially

is and taking action in any given situation on the basis of this recognition and disclosure (BT 376) as the authentic Being-alongside this *Erstreckung*. That this seeing-through essentially takes Dasein *outside of itself* testifies to the *ecstatic* nature of Heideggerian temporality.

Dasein does not occur in time but as time, and it is only because it is fundamentally temporal that it can imagine its existence as occurring in or out of time (in the ordinary sense) at all:

“*Temporality is the primordial ‘out-side-of-itself’ in and for itself*. We therefore call the phenomena of the future, the character of having been, and the Present, the ‘ecstases’ of temporality” (BT 377), which constitute “the totality of the structure of care” (BT 376). Thus along with the coming towards and the having been, an authentic present requires that a resolute Dasein *be there* more authentically by recognizing itself anew as that entity which at every moment comes towards itself as having-been.

Consequently, the ecstatic movement which takes Dasein outside of itself also, and perhaps even more importantly, projects an anxious Dasein toward itself, and this function of *Sorge*, even if we admit for the moment that the structural complexity of care makes it hard to keep it comprehensively and consistently in view, has major ramifications for our analysis of literature and Mann’s treatment of *Bildung*, in particular. This is because for Heidegger care is first and foremost *the* “hermeneutical situation” (BT 358) in which Dasein always finds itself. If as Heidegger claims, “Dasein is an entity for which, in its Being, that Being is [always already] an issue,” (BT 236) then time is also *the* issue for Dasein. This “being-an-issue” for Dasein signifies its authentic hermeneutical task, that “for the sake of which” Dasein exists (BT 236), and *Sorge* is both the why and how of its being raised as an issue.

That Dasein cares about itself and others is what initially and authentically opens itself toward itself and the world. And with this, though he never explicitly says as much,

Heidegger's task completely coincides with the ideal purposes of narrative, namely, a caring that opens a world and which describes a deep and abiding care for that world which it opens. This is why it is no surprise that Heidegger's earliest intuitions of care begin not only with a discussion of Dasein as a necessary philosophical reformulation of traditional attitudes toward subjectivity but from within a strictly literary context that establishes care as a matter of selfhood and as a matter of interpretation – moreover, as a matter of self-interpretation, which is, of course, also to say, a matter of *Bildung*.

According to Heidegger, Dasein authentically engages itself only when it identifies itself constantly with that with which it is authentically concerned, namely, its very being as care, “the entity for which the *issue* is the Being of the entity that it is” (BT 369). When Heidegger writes that “The they-self keeps on saying ‘I’ most loudly and most frequently because at bottom it *is not authentically* itself, and evades its authentic potentiality-for-Being” or that “Selfhood is to be discerned existentially only in one's authentic potentiality-for-Being-one's-Self – that is to say, in the authenticity of Dasein's Being *as care*” or that “*The self-constancy of the Self* [...] is the *authentic* counter-possibility to the non-Self-constancy which is characteristic of irresolute falling” (BT 369), he explicitly corrects and redirects conventional conceptions of *Bildung* and the processes of subject-formation that constitute it insofar as he both reorients the task of *Bildung* as the authentic interpretation of one's being-in-the-world as care (i.e. temporality, ecstases, the going outside of oneself in order to come towards oneself as having been) and the character, nature and identity of the subject that undertakes such a task.

Elsewhere in *Being and Time* Heidegger ventures to explain temporality as the ontological meaning of *Sorge* from which his discussion of selfhood is derived and long

before he writes *The Origin of the Work of Art*, in which he locates the truth of art and Dasein in the dialectical strife between “world” and “earth,” he even more explicitly connects *Sorge* with the purposes of *Bildung*. In the section entitled “*Confirmation of the Existential Interpretation of Dasein as Care in terms of Dasein’s Pre-ontological Way of Interpreting Itself*,” Heidegger relates an ancient fable that reveals the historical, i.e. literary, origins of man as a function of *Sorge*, and it is to this historical origin that Heidegger’s complex ontology is indebted and from it that he inherits his notion of temporality as the meaning of *Sorge* and as the basis of Dasein’s being-in-the-world:

Als einst die Sorge über ein Fluß ging, sah sie tonhaltiges Erdreich: sinnend nahm sie davon ein Stück und begann es zu formen. Während sie bei sich darüber nachdenkt, was sie geschaffen, tritt Jupiter hinzu. Ihn bittet die Sorge, daß er dem geformten Stück Ton Geist verleihe. Das gewährt ihr Jupiter gern. Als sie aber ihrem Gebilde nun ihren Namen beilegen wollte, verbot das Jupiter und verlangte, daß ihm sein Name gegeben werden müsse. Während über den Namen die Sorge und Jupiter stritten, erhob sich auch die Erde (Tellus) und beehrte, daß dem Gebilde ihr Name beigelegt werde, da sie ja doch ihm ein Stück ihres Leibes dargeboten habe. Die Streitenden nahmen Saturn [die Zeit] zum Richter. Und ihnen erteilte Saturn folgende anscheinend gerechte Entscheidung: ‘Du, Jupiter, weil du den Geist gegeben hast, sollst bei seinem Tode den Geist, du, Erde, weil du den Körper geschenkt hast, sollst den Körper empfangen. Weil aber die Sorge dieses Wesen zuerst gebildet, so möge, *solange es lebt*, die Sorge es besitzen. Weil aber über den Namen Streit

besteht, so möge es ‘homo’ heißen, da es aus humus (Erde) *gemacht ist*. (SZ 262-3; emphasis mine)¹⁵

First of all, the passage, according to Heidegger, signifies a historical proof of his temporal ontology; in other words, this “ancient fable in which Dasein’s interpretation of itself as care has been embedded” (BT 242) demonstrates the ancient, pre-philosophical characterization of Dasein as that entity first and foremost for whom its being is an issue and signifies this being-an-issue as the originally historical basis of its drive toward self-interpretation. Secondly, it is no coincidence that these earliest, elemental attempts of Dasein to interpret itself take the form of a historical, literary document. For Heidegger, this accords to literature not only a privileged hermeneutical authority but also links all modern literary efforts with modes of mythological inquiry. Perhaps even more importantly, it helps to justify (according to the critical demands of historicism) that his “existential Interpretation is not a mere fabrication, but that as an ‘ontological construction’ it is well grounded and has been sketched out beforehand in elemental ways” (BT 242) and that he has been “brought to the existential conception of care from Dasein’s pre-ontological interpretation of itself as ‘care’” (BT 244).

Third, the nature of *Sorge* cannot be described merely as a hermeneutical model made available to Dasein in order that it might interpret its being-in-the-world, but much more

¹⁵ ““Once when Care was crossing a river, she saw some clay; she thoughtfully took up a piece and began to shape it. While she was meditating on what she had made, Jupiter came by. Care asked him to give it spirit, and this he gladly granted. But when she wanted her name to be bestowed upon it, he forbade this, and demanded that it be given his name instead. While Care and Jupiter were disputing, Earth arose and desired that her own name be conferred on the creature, since she had furnished it with part of her body. They asked Saturn [Time] to be their arbiter, and he made the following decision: ‘Since you, Jupiter, have given its spirit, you shall receive that spirit at its death; and since you, Earth, have given its body, you shall receive its body. But since Care first shaped this creature, she shall possess it *as long as it lives*. And because there is now no dispute among you as to its name, let it be called ‘homo’, for it *is made* out of ‘humus’ (earth).” (BT 242)

fundamentally, it emerges here, according to Heidegger, as the hermeneutical process to which Dasein essentially belongs ““for its lifetime”” and thus ““Being-in-the-world’ always already retains the stamp of ‘care’” (*BT* 243). Fourth, Heidegger argues, it is not insignificant that the name given to man (*homo*) stems not from the source of its being but from that out of which it is made (*humus*), for the source of its being, according to Heidegger, lies in the negotiation established between the arbiter, Saturn (Time), and *Sorge*, to which Dasein’s being belongs. This ancient transaction, in fact, is the basis for Heidegger’s entire temporal analytic of Dasein where *Sorge* essentially binds and equates the terms in the title of Heidegger’s treatise, namely, *being* and *time*: “Thus the pre-ontological characterization of man’s essence expressed in this fable, has brought to view in advance the kind of Being which dominates [Dasein’s] *temporal sojourn in the world*, and does so through and through” (*BT* 243).

Finally, tracing the historical etymology and uses of the term, Heidegger links the various meanings of *Sorge* over time not only with something like *Bildung* but also with terms which will play a fundamental role in the chapters that follow, including mortality, conscience, and anxiety, and it is through these connections that we will come to understand how Heidegger ultimately defines *Sorge* as the unity of the ecstases of temporality. Suffice it to say, for now, that while Heidegger notes throughout *Being and Time* the various meanings of *Sorge* in its ontical, everyday usage over time as “anxious exertion,” “carefulness,” “devotion,” “worry,” “concern,” etc., all of these ontical descriptions of *Sorge* have their ontological basis “in a state of Being which is already underlying in every case,” which is to say, the meaning of *Sorge* as the being of Dasein or temporality as the ontological meaning of *Sorge*.

According to Heidegger, when Seneca, for instance, recognizes the relationship between man's mortality and his perfectability as a function of *Sorge* (Cura), he historically, like the fable, reiterates the ontological truth Heidegger is hoping to establish: "Among the four existent natures (trees, beast, man, and God), the latter two [...] are distinguished in that God is immortal while man is mortal. Now when it comes to these, the good of the one, namely God, is fulfilled by Nature; but that of the other, man, is fulfilled by *care*" (BT 243). Consequently, Heidegger argues, the goal of man's *Bildung*, namely, the possibility of both his perfectability and the source of both his conscience and his thoroughgoing anxiety, are wholly determined by *Sorge*, which is also to say, by his mortality or the temporality of Dasein's being as its authentic coming-towards itself as having-been:

Die perfectio des Menschen, das Werden zu dem, was er in seinem Freisein für seine eigensten Möglichkeiten (dem Entwurf) sein kann, ist eine 'Leistung' der 'Sorge'. Gleichursprünglich bestimmt sie aber die Grundart dieses Seienden, gemäß der es an die besorgte Welt ausgeliefert ist (Geworfenheit). [Deshalb] [d]er 'Doppelsinn' von 'cura' meint *eine* Grundverfassung in ihrer wesenhaft zweifachen Struktur des geworfenen Entwurfs. (SZ 264)¹⁶

What distinguishes Heidegger's philosophy of time from its forerunners, namely, Augustine, Kant, Bergson and Husserl, is the primacy with which Heidegger invests the future, which was anticipated in the discussion above of authentic Being-towards-death and

¹⁶ Man's *perfectio* – his transformation into that which he can be in Being-free for his ownmost possibilities (projection) – is 'accomplished' by 'care'. But with equal primordially 'care' determines what is basically specific in this entity, according to which it has been surrendered to the world of its concern (thrownness). [Thus] In the 'double-meaning' of 'care', what we have in view is a *single* basic state in its existentially twofold structure of thrown projection. (BT 243)

its close, one might say dependent, relationship with projection, Being-ahead-of-itself and the *coming-towards* of authentic existence and primordial temporality. Furthermore, the character of this primacy, which has led to critical misreadings of Heidegger that will occupy us more explicitly later, is unique in that the future or *coming-towards* for Heidegger is always bound to and includes the past as *having-been*. Thus the ontical phenomena of death, history and even *Bildung* find their ontological answer and justification precisely in Heidegger's so-called "hermeneutic phenomenology," and it is fair to say that for Heidegger, as for Mann, a coming to terms with time means at the same time a coming to terms with death as a sort of coming-towards and history as having-been because the process of this coming to terms is fundamentally grounded in what Heidegger calls *Zeitlichkeit*, or temporality. For Heidegger, I will argue, this process belongs to the essential constitution of Dasein as *Sorge*; for Mann, it belongs to the essential development of *Bildung*. As I will demonstrate, for Heidegger being-towards-death and history are something that we *are* and something which we are always *becoming*, and as such they are also something which, if we are living authentically, we are always endeavoring to interpret and understand, and it is my humble opinion that Thomas Mann, especially in the period under study, dramatizes time as precisely such a markedly human, modernist and, ultimately, tragic endeavor.

My argument relies quite confidently on the assumption that Heidegger's analytic of Dasein and the theory of temporality upon which it is based can be usefully applied to literature insofar as the latter may be understood as the "self-expression of Dasein" (Alleman, qtd. in Corngold, 441). Such a claim is not without precedent. Ricoeur famously refers to narrative as fundamentally a way of staging being-in-the-world (qtd. in Vanhoozer 49). And Stanley Corngold makes an explicit call toward just such an understanding in his well-known

analysis of Heideggerian *Stimmung* [mood] and literary emotions when he emphasizes the “reluct[ance] to speak of an ‘essential’ absence of connection between *Sein und Zeit* and literature” (439). Though Corngold traces Heidegger’s influence in the literary theories of Staiger, Blanchot, de Man and Derrida, among others, he rightfully seeks to validate an even more explicit and “essential” connection between *Being and Time* and literature, a connection that pivots (although it is never explicitly engaged by Corngold in his essay) around the question of *die Sorge*. In this I also share Corngold’s enthusiasm. But even Corngold doesn’t produce in any way a comprehensive analysis of Heideggerian temporality in terms of literature, much less in terms of contemporary German literature and the so-called “modernist epoch in German poetics” that his argument suggests Heidegger is responsible for inaugurating. Rather, Corngold’s presentation merely prepares the way for the sort of reading I intend and is, in the end, more a call to action than a critical study of the topic.

Though Corngold certainly grasps the essential value of Heideggerian mood for literary analysis, insofar as he emphasizes Heidegger’s original perception that “the poetic character of language could be the measure with which language realizes the possibilities of the disclosure reserved to mood” (441), he never elaborates the “poetic character of language” nor the “possibilities of the disclosure” it makes possible in terms of what Heidegger clearly identifies as their reciprocal basis in *Dasein*’s temporality, nor does he specifically relate his observations to the broader tradition of modernist poetics, which would bring him into not only Thomas Mann’s orbit but also the more fundamental orbit of modernist literary evaluations of time and tragic experience. Nevertheless, Corngold’s acknowledgement of this meaningful correspondence, that in Heidegger we are confronted

by a “vital moment within an epoch of German poetics” (441) seems to me to beg for a careful and thorough response and elaboration that this project hopes to *be*.

Heidegger’s earliest description of Dasein *as* temporality appears in *The Concept of Time* [*Der Begriff der Zeit*] (1924) and states as explicitly as anywhere in his writings the fundamental connection between time and the being of Dasein: “In summing up, we can now say: Time is Dasein” [“Zusammenfassend ist zu sagen: Zeit ist Dasein”] (BZ 123-5/CT in *Becoming* 212). Consequently, if we grant the possibility forwarded by Corngold that literature occupies a privileged place in the tragic, i.e. temporal, disclosure of being and that in fact with Heidegger it may be said to stage the self-interpretation of Dasein’s being, and if we accept Heidegger’s apparent equation of Dasein as being-there with time and temporality as such, then we can justifiably proceed with an analysis that is bent on convincing readers of the value of reading the *Zeitroman* as something like a *Daseinsroman*, in which Mann’s evolving treatment of time in *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus* emerges as a sort of coming-towards a thoroughly Heideggerian recognition, and likewise of reading Heidegger’s analytic of Dasein as, at the very least, a plausible basis for interpreting the modernist *Zeitroman*.

Chapter III

Being-Towards-Death and the 'Dilemma of Closure'

In what follows I argue that Heidegger's analytic of Dasein in *Being and Time* (1927), in particular the interpretation of death that grounds and accompanies it, both illuminates readings of death in *The Magic Mountain* (1924) and *Doctor Faustus* (1947) as well as anticipates what Susan von Rohr Scaff and other scholars have called the "dilemma of closure" in Mann's late work *Doctor Faustus*. I also argue in turn that *Doctor Faustus*, as Mann's principal and final attempt at narrating a theory of time (that it is such an attempt is in fact one of my primary claims), helps to clarify both his more famous and more conspicuous treatment of time and death in the earlier novel as well as Heidegger's persistent struggle throughout his philosophical career to systematically grasp the meaning of time for being as such. Though few readers will deny that *Doctor Faustus* is a tragic novel and that its tragic implications are the very point of the novel, the question of time in *Doctor Faustus* is one that has been taken up only sporadically, always in an extremely limited sense, and that has rarely been explained in terms of these tragic implications.

These conversations rightly and inevitably compare the treatment of time in *Doctor Faustus* to the way in which the theme is rendered even more centrally in *The Magic Mountain* or the *Joseph* novels and thus see in Mann's development as a novelist a movement away from a preoccupation with an abstract conception of time as such ("die reine Zeit selbst") towards a very different and more urgent investment in a notion of time *as*

history. Generally speaking, these readings of time in *Doctor Faustus* commence from the reference point of what was originally described by Gunilla Bergsten as the novel's multiple time-levels that constitute both the narrative world and the world of the narrative and with which readers of the novel are already quite familiar. At any rate in almost every case the subject of time in the novel is mediated through and remains distinct and subordinate to other themes around which the novel is said to primarily turn.¹⁷ So to argue that *Doctor Faustus* is a *Zeitroman* (time-novel) is still a bit of a novelty and as such often meets with a certain and typically equal degree of suspicion and curiosity.¹⁸

These reactions, of course, are partly justified insofar as they stem from the fact that Mann himself attributed the title of *Zeitroman* only to his much earlier work *The Magic Mountain*, where the temporality of the novel always carries with it a double sense: "First in a historical sense, in that it seeks to present the inner significance of an epoch, the pre-war period of European history. And secondly, because time is one of its themes" ["einmal historisch, indem er das innere Bild einer Epoche, der europäischen Vorkriegszeit, zu entwerfen versucht, dann aber, weil die reine Zeit selbst sein Gegenstand ist"] (*Making* 725). On the one hand, then, Reinhard Mehring's claim that *Doctor Faustus* is a *Zeitroman* reflects my own claim in what follows. On the other hand, however, and thus in tandem with contemporary ideas about the meaning of time in the novel, Mehring restricts his understanding of the *Zeitroman* to its limited and familiar correspondence with *Geschichtsdeutung* as first outlined by Bergsten, which is to say, as a novel of its (historical) time. And while I certainly wouldn't disagree that *Doctor Faustus* is exactly that – a novel of

¹⁷ All of the scholars I contend with in this chapter (Vogel, Scaff, Cobley, Mehring) can be said to *limit* their discussions of time in this way.

¹⁸ See most recently Reinhard Mehring's "Apokalypse der deutschen 'Seele'? Thomas Manns *Doctor Faustus* als *Zeitroman*."

its time – it seems to me that in *Doctor Faustus* we witness an extreme maturation of Mann’s views on time, views which certainly do not dispense with the author’s preoccupation in *The Magic Mountain* with “die reine Zeit selbst” in favor of a purely historical time but rather which seek to reveal the ontological character of history. These views posit a notion of history as thoroughly implicated in and interwoven with a complex and evolving interpretation of what Heidegger might call the temporality of being and the *apriori* historical nature of Dasein as such.

But before we can agree that *Doctor Faustus* is as much a *Zeitroman* as *The Magic Mountain*, we must first establish what Mann meant to accomplish with the genre when he set about writing *The Magic Mountain* and the way Heidegger’s notion of being-towards-death resonates with Mann’s earlier and later undertakings to stage and describe what Paul Ricoeur has called the ‘epic of death and tragedy of culture’, which is also to say, Mann’s efforts to write into existence Hans Castorp and Adrian Leverkühn, for both of whom, above all things and much like Heidegger’s Dasein, “time is the issue.” That the dilemma of closure in *Doctor Faustus* is closely tied to Mann’s conception of the end is well known. Mann himself characterized *Doctor Faustus* as “ein Buch des Endes” – a novel of and about *endings* – and in such a way, I think, as to suggest that the evolution of his views on time since *The Magic Mountain* had finally settled, as they did with Heidegger, on the perhaps essential problem of the meaning of death for history, culture, and the individual.¹⁹ What may be novel about the approach presented here, however, is my staging of this problematic in Mann against arguably the most prominent theory of time of any of Mann’s contemporaries that to my mind both anticipates and allows for a provocative rereading of

¹⁹ qtd. in Ball, Scaff, Vaget, et al.; for original claim see December 9, 1948 letter to Karl Kerényi and *Entstehung des Doktor Faustus* (83).

this critical aspect of the novel, namely, Heidegger's analytic of Dasein and its grounding in being-towards-death. Of course before we can accomplish this we must clearly define and elaborate what is so fascinating and relevant – especially for literary analyses (what Corngold calls “Heidegger's poetics”) – about Heidegger's notion of *Sein zum Tode* or being-towards-death.

Heidegger and *Sein zum Tode*

I have already explained Heidegger's innovations with respect to contemporary philosophies of time *at the time* he was writing *Being and Time* (1927) as a sort of post- (or past-) modernism if when we bring modernist time into view we see only Joyce or Woolf, Einstein or Bergson. One of the most important ways that Heidegger undertook this reevaluation of time is to theorize *death* as a temporal concept. For example, if time was always relative to the subject (as a certain strain of modernist literature is often said to have demonstrated), that is to say, to what Heidegger calls Dasein, or being-there, then time was always relative, too, to the prospect of Dasein's not-being-there, to its being-gone – in short, to Dasein's end or death. And thus the question of being-towards-death begins with Heidegger's prioritization of the future and of the being of Dasein as primordially and *a priori* futural. Thus, too, I have already ventured to explain the priority assigned by Heidegger to being-towards-death in his so-called “analytic of Dasein” in *Being and Time* (1927). There Heidegger describes not only the human experience of time but Dasein itself, which is after all the name for this duration (and thus, too, for being itself) in terms of the interestingly eroticized entanglement of what he calls the *Ekstase* [ecstases] of temporality,

in which Being-ahead and coming-towards as the existential and temporal expressions of being-towards-death hold a preeminent position.

To recall the existential basis of being-towards-death requires first that we revisit Heidegger's concept of Dasein's understanding: "'Understanding, as existing in the potentiality for Being, however it may have been projected, is *primarily* futural.' [...] The future is meaningful because it is a way of existing for Dasein [or] what it *means to be in time*" (qtd. in Vanhoozer 44).²⁰ More precisely, it is the *only* way of existing, according to Heidegger since *Being and Time* defines Dasein itself as understanding:

'Understanding is the existential Being of Dasein's own potentiality-for-Being; and it is so in such a way that this Being discloses in itself what its Being is capable of.' Dasein 'understands' a situation when it grasps the possibilities available to it, when it 'knows' what it is capable of in a given situation. The means by which understanding grasps its possibilities, and thus its own being, is 'projection'. [And] Interpretation, according to Heidegger, is the 'working out of possibilities projected in understanding.' (Vanhoozer 43)²¹

For this reason, however, it is incorrect to assume that Ricoeur provides a "narrative corrective" to Heidegger by replacing Heidegger's "ontology of understanding" with an "epistemology of interpretation" because Heidegger's *hermeneutic* phenomenology already assumes the centrality and significance of interpretation at the very basis of Dasein's being. In fact, it is fair to say, that Heidegger's ontology *is* a matter of interpretation. An understanding that comes towards itself and towards its most extreme possibilities is always also a Dasein coming towards its own death, not *in* time but as time itself – Dasein is

²⁰ See SZ 446/BT 387.

²¹ See SZ 192/BT 184.

precisely this coming towards itself in the persistent mode of self-interpretation that necessarily ends in the impossibility which is incapable of being seized by Dasein's understanding, of interpreting or being interpreted – death, or “the possibility of the absolute impossibility of Dasein.” Unlike in Ricoeur, however, literature is not necessarily privileged by Heidegger; instead, it joins the many other *ways* available to Dasein to interpret its being-in-the-world, including psychoanalysis, philosophy, science, and the everyday mandate to *be* something, or else “risk being nothing at all”.

Furthermore, as we will soon see, Mann's narratives help to elucidate Heidegger's distinction between an everyday and an authentic understanding of Dasein's self-projection and its nature as first and foremost interpretive. In *The Magic Mountain* we find Hans Castorp in the beginning of the novel pondering his future as a civil engineer just as in *Doctor Faustus* much time is devoted to Adrian's musical education and the uncanniness of his biographical *Bildung towards* music. But the everydayness of these possibilities are interrupted and fused throughout both novels by the understanding that both possibilities (engineer, musician) serve as sort of palimpsests for a deeper understanding that each novel and the course of the protagonists' fate in each novel is meant to interpret; indeed, the task that each novel gives to its protagonist to interpret involves the most extreme possibilities available to each. As Heidegger points out repeatedly throughout the writing of *Being and Time*, “In so far as it holds before Da-sein its most extreme possibility, the forerun (Vorlauf-zumTod) is the fundamental way in which the [self-] *interpretation* of Da-sein is carried through” [“Der Vorlauf ist, sofern er die äußerste Möglichkeit des Daseins ihm vorhält, der Grundvollzug der Daseinsauslegung”] (*CT* in *Becoming* 208/*BZ* 117).

Projection expresses itself temporally in what Heidegger calls Dasein's coming-towards. Consequently, to be *in* time, according to Heidegger, means only to constantly approach one's possibilities for being. As Kevin Vanhoozer explains the situation: "Because Dasein is the kind of being that is constituted by projecting itself ahead in possibilities, Heidegger can say that 'Dasein is constantly 'more' than it factually is'" (Vanhoozer 42). Or as John Macquarrie writes: 'Man is possibility. He is always more than he is, his being is never complete at any given moment [...]' (qtd. in Vanhoozer 42).

For Heidegger, though, Dasein's most extreme possibility (the possibility of being nothing at all) is precisely its own death, and it is in this way that death authentically dictates the temporalities of life and world, or *being-there* (da-sein). The possibility of death – the prospect of being-gone, of being nothing at all, or rather, not being – comprises both Dasein's primordial as well as its everyday understanding of itself. Primordially, Dasein is its own death in so far as it is always already on its way toward its being gone. But even in the everyday sense, the sense in which Dasein persistently flees from the recognition of this inevitability, death reveals itself as "the from-which of our fleeing" and thus reasserts itself:

Dasein ist kein Vorgang, der Tod nichts, was gelegentlich hinten nachkommt. Der Tod ist etwas, was den Menschen bevorsteht, worum das Leben selbst weiß. Damit ist allerdings noch keine Definition des Todes gegeben. Es steht mir Vieles bevor. Aber hier ist ein Unterschied! Wenn mir ein Ereignis bevorsteht, so ist das ein Vorgang, der mich trifft, der mir aus der Welt begegnet. Der Tod kommt nicht irgendwo her auf mich zu, sonder er ist etwas,

was ich selbst bin; ich selbst bin die Möglichkeit meines Todes. Der Tod ist das äußerste Möglichkeit meines Daseins. (DK 167)²²

If the understanding is equated with being-there (Da-sein) and with the potentiality of being something else, then it is equally and always concerned with the utmost extreme of this possibility. Consequently, as its own potentiality for being, Dasein is always out ahead of itself and is said to be futural. As I pointed out in the introduction, this being-gone of Dasein is much more than a chronological or biological limit, but it is a semantic and hermeneutic limit, and Heidegger goes through great pains to explain this fundamental and, perhaps most importantly, this irrevocable aspect of the concept:

Dieses Vorbei, als zu welchem ich vorlaufe, macht in diesem meinem Vorlaufen zu ihm eine Entdeckung: es ist das Vorbei von *mir*. Als dieses Vorbei deckt es mein Dasein auf als einmal nicht mehr da; einmal bin ich nicht mehr da bei den Sachen, bei den und den Menschen, bei diesen Eitelkeiten, diesen Winkelzügen und dieser Geschwätzigkeit. Das Vorbei jagt alle Heimlichkeiten und Betriebsamkeiten auseinander, das Vorbei nimmt alles mit sich in das Nichts. Das Vorbei ist keine Begebenheit, kein Vorfall in meinem Dasein. Es ist ja *sein Vorbei*, nicht ein Was an ihm, das sich ereignet,

²² “Dasein is not a process, nor is death something that incidentally comes afterward, at the end. Death is something that stands imminently before human beings; it is something that life itself knows. But this still does not give us a definition of death. There are many things that are imminent for me. But here there is a difference! When an event [Ereignis] is immanent for me it is something that pertains to me and that meets me in the world. Yet death is not something that comes to me from somewhere and sometime, it is rather what I myself am. I am myself the possibility of my own death. Death is the uttermost end of what is possible in my Dasein; it is my most extreme possibility” (DK in *Becoming* 263).

das ihm zustößt und das es ändert. Dieses Vorbei ist kein Was, sondern ein Wie. Und zwar das eigentliche Wie meines Dasein. (BZ 117)²³

In fact, narrative's emphasis on the future, like the emphasis that coordinates Dasein's relation to its own being, stems not only from the threatening certainty of its own finitude, of its being-gone, but Dasein equally regrets the indeterminacy of its own death, being thrown toward a fate it will never know and never experience. Death, and consequently, too, Dasein itself, is always deferred; moreover, the process of deferral is described by Heidegger as the primordial manner of its existence, the 'how' of Dasein. This aspect of being-towards-death, the aspect of deferral, amounts to a problem of closure rarely acknowledged in Heidegger, and certainly this compelling feature of Dasein's predicament can be read alongside what scholars admit is a similar dilemma in Mann's historical novels.

That Dasein is constantly more than it factually is, that its being is never complete as long as it *is* testifies both to the permanence of Dasein's coming-towards but also to the problem of deferral, which is, after all, also a problem of closure that is rarely taken up by critics who write about being-towards-death, including those predisposed to agree with Heidegger. Bernard Stiegler, however, is a relatively recent and notable exception – Stiegler describes Heideggerian deferral as follows, and it will help me to elaborate what in both Mann and Heidegger amounts to a “dilemma of closure”:

Dasein is the being who [...] defers. [...] Dasein *is for* the end, but its end *is not* for it. The end of Dasein is the indeterminate. [...] This never-being-finished constitutes

²³ “This being-gone, as that to which I forerun, brings about a discovery in my thus forerunning to it: it is *my* being gone. As thus being gone, it uncovers my Da-sein as all at once no longer there; all of a sudden I am no longer there in the midst of such and such matters, intimate with such and such people, surrounded by these vanities, these tricks, this verbosity. This being gone dissipates all secretiveness and busyness, it takes everything with it into the nothing. Being gone is not some occurrence, not some chance incident in my Da-sein. It is *its own being gone*, not some ‘what’ about it, some event that by chance befalls Da-sein and alters it. This being gone is not a ‘what’, but a ‘how’, indeed the proper ‘how’ of my Da-sein” (CT in *Becoming* 207).

the mark of Dasein's finitude, the infinitude of the finite, that is, of the radical end as what can only be completed in being deferred [...]. (231)

In its everydayness Dasein flees from the knowledge of death's inevitability:

Leben beruhigt über den Tod und versucht durch die Art, wie es ihn auslegt, sich ihm zu entfremden, ihn aus dem Horizont des Lebens zu schaffen [...]
[Dasein] sorgt sich von dieser Möglichkeit des Todes weg. Es sorgt ständig dafür, daß es versäumt, den Tod als Möglichkeit. (DK 167)²⁴

Consequently, not only does Dasein in its everydayness avoid death as a possibility, but as Heidegger also shows, the inevitability and certainty of death as the most extreme of Dasein's possibilities is always already punctuated by an even deeper avoidance and indeterminacy, the indeterminacy that lies in its most extreme possibility being an irrevocable impossibility.

Grasping this paradoxical reality as one's own is not only the measure of Dasein's authenticity but also, I would maintain, the measure of Castorp's and Leverkühn's and thus, too, of venturing a reinterpretation of the treatment of time and death in Mann's *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus*. Moreover, such a task involves venturing not only to explain how *Doctor Faustus* may also be quintessentially a *Zeitroman* in the same tradition as the earlier novel but also to provide a very different answer to Ricoeur's very insightful question about moving beyond the facile temporal dichotomies that are typically said to constitute *The Magic Mountain's* treatment of time and death. When Ricoeur asks, for instance – “Must the decomposition of time be interpreted as a prerogative of the world of sickness, or does this

²⁴ “Life tranquilizes itself regarding death and, by interpreting it in a certain way as something foreign to life, abolishes it from the horizon of life [...] [Dasein] is continually taking care to *omit* the possibility of taking hold of [its own] death” (DK 264).

world constitute a sort of limit-situation for an unprecedented experience of time? (115) – he simultaneously throws into question conventional readings of the novel, anticipates the same problem in *Doctor Faustus* (without ever mentioning the later novel), and takes up the task of describing such an unprecedented experience. But as I have already pointed out, Ricoeur’s answer not only fails to answer the question, but he also neglects – ironically, of course, since Heidegger’s temporality forms the basis of his entire narrative theory – to define both the unprecedented experience of time and its relation to death and sickness in terms of Heidegger’s being-towards-death or in terms of the particularly modernist character of its emergence.

The Magic Mountain

In the analysis of *The Magic Mountain* that follows, I undertake to explain the correspondences that link Heidegger’s understanding of being-towards-death with Mann’s treatment of death in *The Magic Mountain*. First, and by way of introduction, I attempt to establish the overarching link between what Mann calls “the meaningful interweaving of life and death” [“das Sinngeflecht von Leben and Tod”] (*Letters* 131/*Briefe* 238) and Heidegger’s insistence on what he calls the “how” of death’s proximity to life. For both Mann and Heidegger, a life that seeks to avoid death not only evades life itself, but it also fails to acknowledge the temporality that is the basis of its authenticity – while this temporality is attested to in Heidegger by the coming-towards of Dasein as the possibility of its ownmost extreme impossibility, namely, in being-towards-death, in Mann it is grounded primarily in the Faustian temporality that governs the narrative structure of *The Magic Mountain* and haunts the progressive teleology of Castorp’s *Bildung*.

Secondly, I will discuss the way in which for both Mann and Heidegger death functions as a *possibility* of life. The relentless teleology of being-towards-death in Dasein's coming-towards itself as the *possibility* of an extreme impossibility resonates with the positive and distinctly modernist telos of Hans Castorp's *Bildung* in *The Magic Mountain*. This telos, I will argue, is manifested in several critical "moments" in the novel: young Castorp's arrival on the mountain and his subsequent habituation to the routine of the cure, his "sudden enlightenment" ["plötzliche Klarheit"] (DZ 332-3) upon encountering his own death in the x-ray image of his hand, and the alleged completion of his *Bildung* with the thunderous outbreak of the first world war that ends the novel.

Finally, I will discuss the way in which for both Mann and Heidegger death functions as the *impossibility* of life. By following the more negative, subtractive, yet still "productive significance" ["produktiven Bedeutung"] of many of these same moments,²⁵ I engage that *other* fundamental aspect of being-towards-death, namely, death as the possibility of an *impossibility*. Such an approach will go a long way toward laying out the correspondences between this oft-described problem of closure in Heidegger and the so-called 'dilemma of closure' (Scaff 91-5) in *The Magic Mountain* and toward comprehensively elaborating what Heidegger would certainly be apt to call the ontological status of death in *The Magic Mountain*.

*

It is revealing that in between his 1924 preparatory lectures at Marburg on "The Concept of Time" and his hasty publication of *Being and Time* (1927), itself an incomplete fragment (speaking of the problem of closure), Heidegger had read *The Magic Mountain* and

²⁵ This term is used by Mann in *Freud und die Zukunft* (1936) to denote Freud's recognition of the dynamic bond between a "will to[ward] truth" and a "will to[ward] death". (GW, Bd. 9, 480-2)

given some indication as to what he viewed to be the most salient of the novel's insights. And though his remarks are so open as to leave room for any number of possible interpretations, none of which may be called definitive, it is my opinion that his remarks could be said to resonate quite meaningfully not only with Mann's own assessment of the metaphysical questions raised by the novel but also with the author's frequently-felt obligation to clarify his intentions in the novel and, consequently, to interpret the novel for his readers.

In July 1925 Heidegger shares the first impressions made on him by the novel with his then student, Hannah Arendt:

Ich habe den *Zauberberg* angelesen. [...] Freilich die Größe der Darstellung – ist unerhört; was ich bislang von der “Zeit” zu lesen bekam, ist nicht überwältigend – aber es wäre lächerlich, wollte ich daraufhin das Werk absuchen.

Aber daß Phänomen wie das Dasein von seiner Umwelt gelebt wird und nur vermeintlich selbst lebt, das ist mit einer Meisterschaft angesetzt, daß ich vorläufig einzig darauf konzentrieren bleibe. (*Briefe* 40)²⁶

Any translation which reads the mention of “Dasein” in the above passage as denoting mere “existence” and not as simultaneously charged with the attributes of Heidegger's contemporary philosophical inquiries into the questions of being and time risks missing the point of Heidegger's observations, for it is clear that Heidegger is wont to read Castorp's

²⁶ “I have begun reading *The Magic Mountain*. [...] Of course, it is extraordinary how brilliantly that world is depicted; what I have read until now about that ‘time’ was unremarkable – but it would be absurd to comb through the work from that standpoint.

But the phenomenon, as well as existence, is lived by its surroundings and only apparently lives itself – that is developed with such mastery that for now I am concentrating on that alone” (*Letters* 28).

predicament and quest as Dasein's own – the Dasein of his 1924-5 lectures and of *Being and Time*, in which Dasein is confidently defined as time or authentic temporality as such, or even better, as the “human, historical” site at which time takes place *as being-in-the-world*.²⁷ In addition, Heidegger recognizes the problem of “time” in the novel in terms of complications also recognized by Mann when the author describes the temporality of the *Zeitroman* as *einmal historisch* and on the other hand about *die reine Zeit selbst*. As I point out in the previous chapter, the impression made by the novel is something much more than either.

At the time of the letter, of course, Heidegger could not have been privy to the retrospective insights into the novel offered by Mann in his 1939 lecture “The Making of *The Magic Mountain*” [“Einführung in den *Zauberberg*”], but Heidegger's interests in the novel certainly anticipate Mann's recognition of the novel's complexity with respect to its treatment of time. Just as Mann says *The Magic Mountain* is intended to “*be* that of which it speaks” [“immer zugleich das zu sein, wovon es handelt und spricht”] (*Making* 725/ *GW*, Bd. 12, 441), Heidegger clearly suspects a correspondence between his own understanding of Dasein as a function of time – “wie das Dasein von seiner Umwelt gelebt wird und nur vermeintlich selbst lebt” – and the “Ehrgeiz” of a novel that proposes to *be* “das, wovon es erzählt” – in other words, the ambition of a novel that seeks to *be* time (*GW*, Bd. 12, 441). Consequently, what seems like irony – that for Heidegger “time” is not the way into the novel: “[es] wäre lächerlich, wollte ich daraufhin das Werk absuchen” – is really in line with both his and Mann's understanding *at the time* of the need for a more complex and radically different treatment of the subject of time altogether.

²⁷ “Zusammenfassend ist zu sagen: Zeit ist Dasein” [In summing up, we can now say: Time is Dasein] (*BZ* 123-5/(*CT* in *Becoming* 212).

If for Heidegger the temporality of Dasein has its essence in being-towards-death, then it seems appropriate to make an entry into the claim that Heidegger's temporality might help to illuminate Mann's treatment of time and death in *The Magic Mountain* precisely where the correspondence lies – at the intersection of Heidegger's efforts to maintain his idea of death as Dasein's being-towards “the possibility of [its] absolute impossibility” [“die Möglichkeit der schlechthinnigen Daseinsunmöglichkeit”] and what the critical tradition in Mann scholarship has come to call the crisis of narrative closure in *The Magic Mountain* (BT 294/SZ 333).²⁸ Heidegger's struggle to elaborate the existential-ontological structure of death and Mann's dilemma of closure amount to the same problematic desire – an effect of temporality that seeks ultimately to describe the structural unity of death *within* life and to explore the affinity, or, perhaps, the *authenticity* of their relation rather than their presupposed, mutual, and hostile opposition.

This correspondence reveals itself most forcefully in Heidegger's insistence on the imminence of death *in* life as well as on the meaning of death as a *possibility of life* and in Mann's well-known insistence throughout much of his work that *life* enjoys and suffers a complex sympathy with death. Just as Heidegger will claim that ““Der Tod kommt nicht irgendwo her auf mich zu, sondern er ist etwas, was ich selbst bin; ich selbst bin die Möglichkeit meines Todes. [...] Ich selbst bin mein Tod gerade dann, wenn ich lebe [...] [und] den Tod zu verstehen als Möglichkeit des Lebens” (DK 166),²⁹ Mann describes the central motif of *The Magic Mountain* as Hans Castorp's coming towards a very similar recognition:

²⁸ See, for example, Veget, Vogel, Scaff, Cobley, Travers, and Wiegand.

²⁹ “[...] [D]eath is not something that comes to me from somewhere or sometime, it is rather what I myself am. I am myself the possibility of my own death. [...] I myself am my death precisely when I live [...] [and] understand death as a possibility of life” (DK in *Becoming* 263).

[*Der Zauberberg*] zeigt, wie dem jungen Mann aus dem Erlebnis von Krankheit, Tod, Verwesung die Idee des Menschen erwächst, des “Hochgebilds” organischen Leben, dessen Schicksal seinem schlichten Herzen nun zu einem wirklichen und dringlichen Anliegen wird. [Castorp] ist sinnlich und geistig verliebt in den Tod [...]; aber diese schlimme Liebe läutert sich wenigstens moment- und erleuchtungsweise zu einer Ahnung neuer Humanität, die er als Keim in seinem Herzen trägt [...]" (*Briefe* 232).³⁰

Mann himself says quite emphatically that this vital pairing was much more important to him than the *einmal historisch* social implications of the novel and, I would argue, much more important, too, than the many irresolvable inquiries into the nature of *die reine Zeit selbst* that take up a good portion the novel: “Aber freilich, das ‘andere’, das Sinngeflecht von Leben und Tod [...] war mir viel, viel wichtiger” (*Briefe* 238).³¹ And no one would disagree that both *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus* ultimately seek to engage the question of the “productive significance” of this “schlimme Liebe.” As I do argue, however, the productivity of this familiar bond in *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus* between “the ‘sublime structure’ of organic life” [“des ‘Hochgebilds’ organischen Leben”] and “sickness, death, and decay” [“Krankheit, Tod, Verwesung”], a bond traced primarily in the history of Mann’s engagements with Nietzsche and Freud, always follows the demands of a

³⁰ See letter to Josef Ponten (2/25/1925): “[*The Magic Mountain*] shows how there grows in the young man, out of the experience of sickness, death, and decay, the idea of man, the ‘sublime structure’ of organic life, whose destiny then becomes a real and urgent concern of his simple heart. He is sensuously and intellectually infatuated with death (mysticism, romanticism); but his dire love is purified, at least in moments of illumination, into an inkling of a new humanity whose germ he bears in his heart [...]" (*Letters* 125); See also Mann’s comments in “Zur Begrüßung Gerhart Hauptmanns in München” (1926): “The German [...] reaches health only by acquiring final knowledge of sickness and death” (qtd. in Travers, “Death, Knowledge” 36).

³¹ “But I grant you that the ‘other things,’ such as [music and] the *meaningful interweaving of life and death*, were much, much more important to me” (*Letters*, to Julius Bab, 4/23/1925, 131, emphasis mine).

fundamental temporality that neither Freud nor Nietzsche ever acknowledged, but which both Mann and Heidegger in 1924 certainly, and finally, do elaborate.

Mann's preoccupation with the "dire love" ["schlimme Liebe"] between life and death mirrors Heidegger's own preoccupations with what he calls the "how" of death's proximity to life, and it is, in fact, precisely over the question of "how" death is proximate to life that both Mann and Heidegger appear to be in agreement, an agreement that I believe warrants further study. Mann's "schlimme Liebe" not only resonates with Heidegger's insistence on death as at once both a "possibility of life" ["Möglichkeit des Lebens"] and as the "possibility of the impossibility of Dasein" ["Möglichkeit der Daseinsunmöglichkeit"], but the temporality of this echo also sheds light on the productivity of the correspondence. As I will demonstrate, the "how" of death's proximity to life is also a question of "how" Dasein, as life or existence, is disposed toward its future as coming-towards the possibility of its own *ending*.

In the passages above, these correspondences are highlighted in such a way that will guide the rest of this analysis. For Heidegger, death's proximity to life lies in its embeddedness in and as Dasein itself: "Death is not something that comes to me from somewhere and sometime, it is rather what I myself am" ["Der Tod kommt nicht irgendwo her auf mich zu, sondern er ist etwas, was ich selbst bin"]. Moreover, insofar as death is always a futural prospect, it emerges in Heidegger's thought as a distinct *possibility* of life, just as that life, Dasein, emerges *as* the constant unfolding of its own future: "I am myself the possibility of my own death" ["Ich selbst bin die Möglichkeit meines Todes"]. And finally, for Heidegger, as with Mann, the prospect of authentic life hinges upon Dasein's recognition of itself *as* this "meaningful interweaving of life and death" ["das Sinngeflecht von Leben

und Tod”] that is consequently governed by the future as being-towards-death. And insofar as Dasein’s temporality is governed by the future, which is to say, by the coming-towards of *possibility*, its future is at the same time characterized by the absolute *impossibility* toward which it is destined, namely, the liminal possibility of its own death and *disappearance*.

Likewise, Mann’s synopsis of the productive capacity of this “schlimme Liebe” reveals a similar temporality. For Mann, death’s proximity to life also lies in an embeddedness like that suggested by Heidegger. As is the case for Dasein, death does not come at Castorp from “somewhere or sometime,” but rather it “grows” out of his very own experience, “[a] germ he bears in his heart” [“als Keim in seinem Herzen”]. Consequently, Mann seems to suggest, along with Heidegger, that death is indeed a *possibility* of life, for it is only “out of death” [“aus dem Tod”] that Castorp is able to arrive at a sublime understanding of organic life [“des ‘Hochgebilds’ organischen Leben”]. Moreover, it is also equally clear that the idea of humanity [“Idee des Menschen”] that grows out of Castorp’s intimate contact with death is at the same time an idea of himself as well as an idea of his own fate [Schicksal], which now weighs on his heart precisely because it is his *own*. Finally, this orientation toward the future also betrays the temporal complexity of that “schlimme Liebe” as being-towards the possibility of an impossibility, for in as much as Castorp’s proximate experience of and contact with death [“Erlebnis von [...] Tod”] in the *Snow* episode calls forth the unimagined possibilities of human life and existence, i.e. Dasein, he is still, at the end of the novel, headed toward his own death, which is of course also to say, toward the very real possibility of his being nothing at all. In addition, and as Heidegger points out with respect to the novel’s “end without an end” [“Ende ohne Ende”] – “What is left unsaid throughout the novel is really the most positive” [“Was so *unausgesprochen* im

Ganzen steht, ist wirklich das Positivste”] (*Briefe* 45) – the possibilities eternally suggested by the hope invested by Mann in Castorp’s and Germany’s future are complicated by Castorp’s unspoken “dream of love” [“Ein Traum von Liebe”], which is, after all, still both a dream and a wish, “die er als Keim in seinem Herzen trägt, während der Bajonettangriff ihn mit sich reißt” (*Briefe* 232).³² Thus, too, it is a dream of love “out of death” *and* out of the future, which as such is not yet able to speak: “Augenblicke kamen, wo dir aus Tod und Körperunzucht *ahnungsvoll* und regierungsweise ein *Traum von Liebe erwuchs*” (*Zauberberg* 1085; emphases mine).³³

Suffice it to say I believe the source of the productivity of this typically maligned combination that Mann calls “the dire love between love and death” [“die Schlimme Liebe zwischen Leben und Tod”] lies in the temporality of what Heidegger calls being-towards-death and what Mann on more than one occasion calls a “passing through” [e.g. “durchlaufen,” “hindurchgehen”] it (*Making* 726); as with being-towards-death, such a “passing through” clearly connotes that stretching-along or *Erstreckung* that Heidegger calls Dasein or life as *being-there*, and as such this passing through also connotes the temporality of Dasein’s coming towards both the *possibility* and *impossibility* of itself. Consequently, and in such a way that will have major ramifications for our understanding of Mann’s innovative reconceptualization of the modernist *Bildungsroman*, I suggest not only that the

³² “whose germ he bears in his heart as the bayonet attack carries him along” (*Letters*, to Josef Ponten, 2/5/1925, 126). See also Mann’s famous description of Castorp in a letter to Julius Bab: “Hans Castorp ist am Ende ein Vortypus und Vorläufer, ein Vorwegnehmer [...] der durch ‘Steigerung’ zum Anticipieren gebracht wird. Das ist in der Entlassungsanrede direkt ausgesprochen, und während der Arbeit sagte ich immer: ‘Ich schreibe von einem [...] der vorm Kriege schon über den Krieg hinauskommt’” (*Briefe* 239). [“Hans Castorp is in the end a prototype and forerunner, a little prewar German who by ‘intensification’ is brought to the point of anticipating the future. This is as good as said in the author’s final words of dismissal, and in the course of the work I was constantly telling myself: ‘I am writing about a young German who *before* the war has *already* reached *beyond* the war’” (*Letters*, to Julius Bab, 4/23/1925, 132, emphasis mine)].

³³ “Moments there were, when out of death, and the rebellion of the flesh, there came to thee, as thou tookest stock of thyself, a dream of Love” (*Magic* 716).

unausgesprochene Zeit – which Heidegger senses as “wirklich das Positivste” in *The Magic Mountain* and that refers to the coming-towards of Dasein as the possibility of its own impossibility, and thus, too, its coming-towards itself as time – is the temporality of what Mann calls “das Sinngeflecht von Leben and Tod,” but, even more importantly, I will also argue that Castorp, like Dasein – insofar as it is the possibility of its own death – emerges as the site of this continuous exchange in the novel.

*

Though Susan von Rohr Scaff is the only scholar to my knowledge to undertake the comparison, no one will argue that the so-called atemporality of the Berghof, “Das Leben ohne Zeit, das sorg- und hoffnungslose Leben, das Leben als stagnierend betriebsame Liederlichkeit, das tote Leben” (*Zauberberg* 951),³⁴ prefigures the “consummate ‘a-temporal’ experience” (Scaff 73) of Leverkühn’s *strict style* [*strenger Satz*], or that the problem of Adrian’s salvation is anticipated in the problem of deferral that unnaturally delays Castorp’s departure from the Berghof or characterizes the so-called ending of the novel, which barely accomplishes its goal, the “end without an end” [“das Ende ohne Ende”], as Heidegger describes it. According to Scaff, the timeless world of the Berghof is mitigated only by the promise of self-transformation that the ending of the novel suggests and that the conventional *Bildungsroman* demands; in *Doctor Faustus*, however, Mann offers no respite from the crisis of timelessness. In the latter novel, Scaff claims, time itself, as the very ground of *Bildung*, is thoroughly negated, whereas in the former novel its negation and decomposition are only alleged and ultimately judged inauthentic. In so far as this is the case, Scaff reasserts the more or less common view that *Doctor Faustus* merely recapitulates with

³⁴ “Life without time, life without care or hope, life as depravity, assiduous stagnation; life as dead” (*Magic* 627; qtd. in Reed 264).

more urgency Mann's exploration of the dangerous psychological and historical consequences of a German culture obsessed with the problem of eternity and guided too heavily by a collective "sympathy with death." Nevertheless, what Mann scholars have never considered is the fundamental temporality of this major motif (of atemporality) in both novels, which is also to ask, whether the portrayal of the *atemporality* of death isn't rather the portrayal of a distinct, and, as Heidegger would dare to add, a priori and vital *temporality*.

Elaborating this vitality begins fundamentally with the Faustian model and temporality that informs the structure of the narrative itself. Mann himself admits that the novel conforms to the Faustian paradigm, in which the

Held [...] der Himmel und Hölle durchstreift, es mit Himmel and Hölle aufnimmt und einen Pakt macht mit dem Geheimnis, mit der Krankheit, dem Bösen, dem Tode, mit der anderen Welt [...]. – auf der Suche nach dem 'Gral', will sagen nach dem Höchsten, nach Wissen, Erkenntnis, Einweihung, nach der Stein der Weisen, dem aurum potabile, dem Trunk des Lebens" (GW, Bd. 12, 445).³⁵

Hans Castorp, after all, like Adrian Leverkühn, does make a Faustian bargain when he decides to remain on the magic mountain, and he is certainly taken on a Mephistophelean journey that reaches its climax on *Walpurgisnacht* and in the end of the novel quite literally deposits him a changed man whose account has been balanced through a deeply subjective recognition (about the nature of time, death and, ultimately, too, himself), which constitutes the completion of his Faustian *Bildung*.

³⁵ In which the "hero [...] ranges heaven and hell, makes terms with them, and strikes a pact with the unknown, with sickness and evil, with death and the other world [...]. He is forever searching for the Grail – that is to say, the Highest: knowledge, wisdom, consecration, the philosopher's stone, the *aurum potabile*, the elixir of life" (*Making* 727-8).

Though the correspondences run very deep throughout the novel that would help to verify the Faustian structure and content of *The Magic Mountain*, I must limit my remarks to what is, after all, my primary concern: the question of the novel's distinctly Faustian temporality. As I showed in the previous chapter, there seems to be a consensus, following Stephen Kern's description of what he calls a particularly German sense of time under modernism, that the "future" of modernity was characterized by a frenetic, anxious expectation. And it is certainly worth pointing out that the quintessentially German tragedy *Faust*, even with all its historical variations, remains a tragedy of anticipation, and, thus, too, of a time very much like that described by Kern. *Faust*, "the most famous German representative of the form" (*Making* 727), is, after all, the tale of a quest for the infinite, a quest to be set free from the boundaries of the finite that in each case is completed only upon the very condition of that finitude – it must, after all, end, and Faust must live up to *his end* of the bargain. Thus are we given Castorp at the end of the novel mired not only in the excited anticipation of battle but suffering under the burden of a "wirklichen und dringlichen" anxiety over his inevitable fate. *Faust* is driven solely by the sort of fundamental anticipation of death that Heidegger associates with the coming-towards of *Sein zum Tode* – indeed, Heidegger would certainly admit that the Faust myth is merely a narrative representation of Dasein's coming-towards.³⁶ The protagonist, along with the narrator and reader, looks forward to the moment of the pact and then again to the long narrative of its terms – indeed, its very literal coming to term(s), which, of course, the novel itself always already *is*. Thus the long process of Castorp's *Bildung* and Faustian *Abenteuer* is not only characterized by the drawn out terms of something like what Heidegger calls

³⁶ See Emil Staiger's *Grundbegriffe der Poetik* (1946) in which Staiger explains the temporality of dramatic action explicitly in terms of Heideggerian *Entwurf* or *projection*.

Dasein's coming-towards itself as being-towards-death, but even at the end of the novel, Castorp is *not yet finished* but rather *still* given as the very process of this fundamental anticipation – a “little prewar German” poised to anticipate the future of Germany [“ein kleiner Vorkriegsdeutscher, der durch ‘Steigerung’ zum Anticipieren gebracht wird”] (*Briefe* 239).

The Faustian bargain of *The Magic Mountain* not only involves a bargain to acquire death “as an instrument of knowledge,”³⁷ which is also to say, a bargain for the knowledge of the future, but it also requires, along the way and in living up to the truth disclosed by this knowledge, that Faust *become* that future. For instance, even as Mann claims that his hero's quest is a quest for the “Highest,” he simultaneously suggests that Castorp *is* himself a “heightening” of the “ordinary stuff of which he is made” (*Making* 725). This *Steigerung*, of course, is facilitated by and associated by Mann throughout the novel with Castorp's “passing through” death even as he is headed inexorably toward it (*Making* 726). Consequently, Castorp's quest is at the same time the anticipatory process of Castorp's coming towards himself *as* his own death. It is for this reason that we can say with some confidence that Castorp's *Bildung* is motivated by his consistent and progressive identification with death throughout the novel, though he is in the midst of “seeming life,” or that we can sense the coming-towards and the notion of death as a *possibility* of life in Heidegger's recognition that Castorp finds himself *already* in the “nassen Graben” long before he is finally dismissed by the narrator and his “contract” has come to term.

Moreover, Castorp's acquisition of this knowledge and the *becoming* or *Bildung* that it signifies is anything but static and atemporal – in fact, it is the very stuff of time, according

³⁷ Mann, *Freud und die Zukunft* (in *Essays of Three Decades*, 414)

to Heidegger, the way that time temporalizes itself *for* and *as* Dasein and what he called earlier the “how” of death’s proximity to life. With this in mind, one could argue that what *The Magic Mountain* signals is not merely a preoccupation with the timelessness of death as such but rather with the temporality of the *approach* toward death, or what is a lot like it, i.e. Mann’s confirmation that “Leben ist Pein, und nur solange wir leiden, leben wir. –” (*Entstehung* 128).³⁸ This *as long as* not only sums up the temporality and thus, too, the ontological status of both the Berghof and the *strenger Satz*, Faustian dilemmas through and through, but it also clearly reiterates the tragic temporality of being-towards-death in so far as it emphasizes the perpetuity of life as suffering *alongside* and *as* the approach of the *until*, the “moment” at which, of course, Dasein *is* no longer.

*

Castorp’s drawn-out “arrival” at the Berghof demonstrates very clearly the temporality of the coming-towards that is the ontological basis of death as Dasein’s most extreme *possibility*. Very early on in the novel, *before* Castorp actually arrives at the Berghof, the changes in landscape (this spatial metaphor the narrator relates explicitly to changes in Castorp’s temporal perspective) that accompany Castorp on the journey to the Berghof parallel and prefigure the perception of time (or supposed lack of it) that prevails at the Berghof itself. Among other things, this coincidence serves to show not only that the temporal changes are not solely the result of the strange life at the Berghof but rather of the movement of life itself when the veil of ordinary existence is lifted and an authentic time is prepared for disclosure, but also that his traveling remains a *continuous* climb, that his journey is *not yet* at an end when he *arrives* at the Berghof. Perhaps even more importantly,

³⁸ “Life is pain, *as long as* we live we suffer” (*Story* 144, emphasis mine).

it demonstrates that the sort of time described is not solely aligned with a world of corruption and disease but with the movement away from his everyday “attachments” toward something more primordial, what Heidegger, and I think, Mann, too, would call an authentic, unprecedented, and “unspoken” [“*unausgesprochene*”] experience of time:

Der Raum, der sich drehend und fliehend zwischen ihn und seine Pflanzstätte wälzt, bewährt Kräfte, die man gewöhnlich der Zeit vorbehalten glaubt; von Stunde zu Stunde stellt ihr innere Veränderungen her [...]. Gleich ihr erzeugt er Vergessen; er tut es aber, indem er die Person des Menschen aus ihre Beziehungen löst und ihn in einen freien und ursprünglichen Zustand versetzt [...]. Zeit, sagt man, ist Lethe; aber auch Fernluft ist so ein Trank. (DZ 12)³⁹

The dynamic predicament Mann describes here clearly resonates with certain fundamental principles of Heidegger’s notions of authenticity and being-towards-death, namely, that an authentic forgetting counters the inauthentic forgetting of everyday existence, the latter of which is characterized by the industrious commercial life Castorp is leaving behind in the world below. With the authentic forgetting that accompanies Castorp’s travels up the mountain, he is simultaneously *reminded* of something like being itself, given something back as he is beginning to acquire a “free and original” [“*freien und ursprünglichen*”] knowledge or memory of himself *as* precisely this coming towards.

Moreover, it is important to emphasize the incongruity between the alleged stasis of timelessness and the dynamism of the approach toward it. Remember that Stephen Kern describes the atmosphere of *The Magic Mountain* and of the national sense of time in

³⁹ “Space, rolling and revolving between him and his native heath, possessed and wielded the powers we generally ascribe to time. From hour to hour it worked changes in him [...]. Space, like time, engenders forgetfulness; but it does so by setting us bodily free from our surroundings and giving us back our primitive, unattached state [...]. Time, we say, is Lethe; but change of air is a similar draught [...].” (*Magic* 4)

Germany in 1914 as anxious, explosive, feverish. Such an idea already complicates a traditional scholarly insistence upon stasis by implying the friction of activity. Here in the very beginning one can see, for instance, the duplicity and complexity of Castorp's (and Mann's) recognition that his *An-kunft* at the Berghof is not merely the end but also the beginning of his journey, or better, that the moment of his arrival (*Ankunft*) at the Berghof already contains the possibilities of his future (*Zukunft*) within it and is thus more of an "approach" than it is an "arrival" in the sense of having-finished.

In fact, it is precisely the unique significance of the temporality of this moment into which Heidegger's concept of being-towards-death allows us some provocative insight. On the one hand, like the ending of the novel, as Heidegger reads it, Castorp's arrival or beginning is also "eine Ende ohne Ende," especially if we consider the seven years he spends there (having only intended a three week stay) or the fact that the so-called end of his journey is precisely the beginning of his *Bildung* in the dark matter(s) of sickness and death, which he has already begun to "pass through" *on the way* to the Berghof. For example, along the way *toward* the Berghof Castorp not only passes through marshes once thought to be "bottomless" ["unergründlich"], but at the same time his ascent above the tree-line, where life no longer flourishes, is accompanied by thoughts of "the impoverishment of life" ["Gedanke des Aufhörens und der Verarmung"] and sparks his earliest attacks of nausea that signal the earliest moments of his progressive physical and psychological *habituation* [Gewöhnung] to these internal changes ["innere Veränderungen"]. In another sense, however, Castorp has indeed arrived at the end, which is also to say, at a place where the end is and resides, both because it is the end of the line and because the place itself, this landed estate of the "aristocracy of death," dramatizes and rehearses the end of life. In either case we

are confronted in Castorp's awkward "arrival" at the Berghof with the dynamic temporality of his gradual attunement to what it may mean to *be-towards-death*.

Nevertheless, it is not simply death *as the end* which resonates, but rather the being toward it in a Heideggerian sense. In being-towards-death, the end resonates back over the course of Castorp's life which, after all, continuously calls him toward his utmost possibility – this alleged being "zwischen ihn und seine Pflanzstätte" is not at all unlike what Heidegger calls *Erstreckung* or the stretching-along of Dasein that is always also a being-toward. And it is this traveling, the "continuous climbing," that in the novel first draws Castorp's attention to the spatio-temporal changes that comprise the course and trajectory of his *Bildung*:

Heim und Ordnung lagen nicht nur weit zurück, sie lagen hauptsächlich klaftertief unter ihm, und noch immer stieg er darüber hinaus. Schwebend zwischen ihnen und dem Unbekannten fragte er sich, wie es ihm dort oben ergehen werde [...]. Er wünscht, am Ziel zu sein, denn einmal oben, dachte er, würde man leben wie überall und nicht so wie jetzt im Klimmen daran erinnert sein, in welchen unangemessenen Sphären man sich befand. Er sah hinaus: der Zug wand sich gebogen auf schmalen Paß [...] [und durch] [s]tockfinstere Tunnel kamen [...]. (DZ 13)⁴⁰

Here, too, Mann emphasizes both the paradox of the arrival as both beginning and ending – "He wished he were at the end of his journey [so that] he could begin to live" – as well as his insistence on what Heidegger would certainly call Dasein's duration as a being-between –

⁴⁰ "Home and regular living lay not only far behind him, they lay fathoms deep beneath him, and he continued to mount above them. Poised between them and the unknown, he asked himself how he was going to fare [...]. He *wished* he were at the *end* of his journey; for once there he could *begin to live* as he would anywhere else, and not be *reminded* by this *continual* climbing of the incongruous situation he found himself in. He looked out. The train wound in curves along the narrow pass [...] and passed through pitch-black tunnels [...]" (MM 4; emphases mine; Trans. H.T. Lowe-Porter).

“Poised between them and the unknown.” In addition, we find in this passage, as in the one before it, Mann’s emphasis on the “internal changes” taking place within Castorp and the “incongruous situation” in which he finds himself. These alchemistic movements serve to emphasize Castorp’s anxious approach toward the source of these alterations – his immanent approach toward the unknown, which lies quite explicitly in the eventualities of Castorp’s future that comprise the rest of the narrative; the most extreme of these *possibilities*, of course, is his inevitable death. And it almost goes without saying that the temporality of this approach is only underscored by the spatial and atmospheric changes he is undergoing during his “arrival” – “Zeit, sagt man, ist Lethe; aber auch Fernluft ist so ein Trank. [...] Heim und Ordnung lagen nicht nur weit zurück, sie lagen hauptsächlich klaffertief unter ihm, und noch immer stieg er darüber hinaus” – and by the very literal coming towards of the train that takes him inexorably toward his destination or arrival, which, as we have already established, is not quite an arrival after all.

The temporality of Castorp’s arrival reinforces very early on in the novel what can only be called a major leitmotif of the treatment of time and death in both *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus*, namely, time’s tendency to quicken as one approaches death. In the chapter most often cited to by scholars in defense of what has been called the “politically suspect” atemporality of the Berghof and the “life without time” that it appears to advocate and to engender in our protagonist, “Excursus on the Sense of Time” [“Exkurs über den Zeitsinn”], the narrator tells the reader quite explicitly that the process of Castorp’s habituation to the sort of time endured at the Berghof tends to dispense with time altogether, while the constant “change and incident” of ordinary life in the flatland is what “rejuvenates” both the time and self:

Gewöhnung ist ein Einschlafen oder doch ein Mattwerden des Zeitsinns, und wenn die Jungenjahre so langsam erlebt werden, das spätere Leben aber immer hurtiger abläuft und hineilt, so muß auch das auf Gewöhnung beruhen. Wir wissen wohl, daß die Einschaltung von Um- und Neugewöhnungen das einzige Mittel ist [...] unseres Zeitsinn aufzufrischen [...], eine Verjüngung [...], und damit die Erneuerung unseres Lebensgefühls überhaupt zu erzielen (DZ 160).⁴¹

It is this predicament that traditional readings of the novel take at face value. But as with everything else in Mann, there is built into this predicament a natural ambivalence not unlike the one described by Castorp earlier as his own and often unaccounted for by critics. To demonstrate such an incongruity we need only turn to one of the more powerful and complex symbols employed by Mann as early as *Death in Venice* but that reappears again and again in both *The Magic Mountain* and *Doktor Faustus* – the *Sanduhr* or hour-glass, since this symbol not only emphasizes the “hastening while” of time’s passage but also what amounts to the same thing, the relentlessness of time’s passage and the approach toward the end as Castorp’s coming towards the most extreme *possibility* of himself.

While it may in fact be true that time passes more slowly for the young precisely because they are by nature *not yet* habituated to the seemingly infinite vicissitudes of life, which are precisely what the narrator claims rejuvenate and “refresh our sense of time,” it is certainly not the case – neither for those who have in “later life” become habituated to novelty and change, nor, especially, for those heightened toward the *Gewöhnung* itself as

⁴¹ “Habituation is a falling asleep or fatiguing of the sense of time; which explains why young years pass slowly, while later life flings itself faster and faster upon its course. We are aware that the intercalation of periods and change and novelty is the only means by which we can refresh our sense of time [...] and rejuvenate it, and therewith renew our perception of life itself. (MM 104)”

Castorp is – that their conception of time involves merely a “falling asleep” or a “fatiguing” of the sense of time. As the narrator reminds us, in “das spätere Leben” the timely approach of death forces time not so much to fall asleep but rather to awaken and “fling itself faster and faster upon its course.” This paradox is certainly worth mentioning in conjunction not only with the earliest moments of Castorp’s *Gewöhnung* but also with the subject of this chapter, which is the way in which death, as the most extreme change and incident of life, does anything but stall time, but rather quickens and underscores it. And this is the case for our hero throughout the novel and the explanation, to cite just one example, for the quickening of the novel’s end, which has him rushing amidst change and incident toward his certain fate. It is put simply, the difference between being the spectator and being the spectacle itself, between watching the sand filter through to the bottom chamber of the glass and *being* the hour-glass.

For my purposes in this chapter, what is important to recognize in this early tone-setting by Mann is the hidden Faustian terms around which it is organized. We are not only confronted early on with what I have already called the Faustian temporality of the approach that, among other things, contests the common claim of “atemporality” in the novel, but we are also confronted with a temporality that links the bargain with life itself, a temporality not at all unlike the one that Heidegger attributes to Dasein, which *is* the being- or coming-towards these ordinarily hidden terms and whose authenticity, like Castorp’s, I would argue, lies in their receptiveness to the disclosure of these terms. In the first instance, the Faustian correspondence lies in the quickening of time that accompanies the immanent approach toward death and directly foreshadows the very literal terms of the Devil’s bargain with Adrian Leverkühn in *Doktor Faustus* – “our gift is the hour-glass” [“unsere Gabe [ist] das

Stundglas”].⁴² Such a temporality, of course, also reiterates the vital anticipation that is both the Faustian legacy of *The Magic Mountain* and the hidden, *unausgesprochene* temporality (insofar as “[es] nimmt für das Auge gar nicht ab im oberen Hohlraum, nur ganz zuletzt, da scheints schnell zu gehen und schnell gegangen zu sein”) that accompanies Castorp from the beginning of the novel.

In the second instance, just as Heidegger calls Dasein “the possibility of [its] own death,” Mann clearly insists upon the identification of his hero with precisely such a temporality in so far as the bargain refers much less to an isolated moment in either Castorp’s or Leverkühn’s life but rather to the temporality of that duration that is called Dasein. As the possibility of his own death, Castorp *is* the coming towards that Heidegger calls being-towards-death, and the process of his identification with such a temporality is obvious from the outset as I have already demonstrated in the example of his approach toward the Berghof. But the function of the hour-glass serves to reinforce this particular aspect of the temporality of Castorp’s *Bildung*. Near the end of the novel, the image of the Stundglas is recalled in connection with Castorp’s cigar-smoking in order to emphasize Castorp’s ultimate identification with his duration *as* being-towards-death and in such a way, I believe, to enforce this very important equation that links being-towards-death with the processes of Castorp’s *Bildung* and self-formation, indeed with the self as such:

[Hans Castorp] hatte hier oben eine Marke gefunden [...]: ein Fabrikat, das [...]
[...] mit dem versehen, man einfach wie am Meere lag und es aushalten
konnte, -- eine besonders gut gepflegte Sandblattzigarre [...] [die] zu

⁴² “Zeit ist das Beste und Eigentliche, das wir geben, und unsere Gabe das Stundglas, -- ist ja so fein, die Enge, durch die der rote Sand rinnt, so haardünn sein Gerinnsel, nimmt für das Auge gar nicht ab im oberen Hohlraum, nur ganz zuletzt, da scheints schnell zu gehen und schnell gegangen zu sein [...]” (DF 306).

schneeweißer, haltbare Asche [...] daß sie dem Genießenden statt einer fließenden Sanduhr hätte dienen können und ihm nach seinen Bedürfnissen auch so deinte, denn seine Taschenuhr trug er nicht mehr. Sie stand, sie war ihm eines Tages vom Nachtschiff gefallen, und er hatte davon abgesehen, sie wieder in messenden Rundlauf setzen zu lassen, -- aus denselben Gründen, weshalb er auch auf den Besitz von Kalendern [...] schon längst verzichtet hatte: [...] dem stehenden Immer-und-Ewig zu Ehren. (DZ 1074).⁴³

Here we are given a very changed Hans Castorp, who at the end of the novel appears to have resolutely accepted time as something very much like being-towards-death when he learns to “measure” time by the smoking of his cigar, which he likens to watching the sand of the hour-glass fall away. The temporality of the Sanduhr, which is also the temporality of the “quicksilver cigar” called the “silent sister” [“stumme Schwester”] – a thermometer without figures said to measure “what time actually is” [“was eigentlich die Zeit sei”], but whose verdict in the novel remains *unausgesprochen* – is not only reiterated, but Castorp essentially learns that he himself is like both the Sanduhr and the “Stumme Schwester,” that he *is* the unknown that he has always already been coming-towards.⁴⁴ Moreover, this temporality, we will remember, is foreshadowed in the opening pages of the novel, where the difference “zwischen ihm und seine Pflanzstätte” is quickly altered into the difference “zwischen [Heim

⁴³ “Hans Castorp could lie and bear it out indefinitely, as one does at the sea-shore. It was an especially well-cured brand [...] evenly consuming to a snow-white ash [...] so evenly and regularly that it might have served the smoker for an hour-glass, and did so, at need, for he no longer carried a time-piece. His watch had fallen from his night-table; it did not go, and he had neglected to have it regulated, perhaps on the same grounds as had made him long since give up using a calendar [...]. Thus he did honour to his abiding-everlasting” (MM 708).

⁴⁴ “[...] als ihm ganz unverhofft die ausgezeichnete Einsicht zuteil wurde, was eigentlich die Zeit sei: nämlich nichts anderes, als einfach eine Stumme Schwester, eine Quecksilbersäule ohne Bezifferung”/“[...] when he was unexpectedly vouchsafed a signal insight into the true nature of time; it proved to be nothing more or less than a ‘silent sister,’ a mercury column without degrees” (DZ 141)/MM 92].

und Ordnung] und die Unbekannten,” a move that effectively identifies Castorp himself not only with the unknown, *unheimliche* sense of time found at the Berghof but also with that unknown aspect of himself, indeed with the very self toward which his *Bildung* will eventually lead him.

Likewise, the narrator’s recollection in this passage of Castorp’s “walk by the ocean of time” serves merely to reinforce the recognition that Castorp belongs to time, that he *is* time [“denn du bist *der Zeit*”] (*MM* 546; emphasis mine) and that the alleged vanishing of time is only apparent insofar as it merely vanishes into *the self of which it is made*, a self, by the way, that is always already underway, as Heidegger would certainly describe it, toward its own end.⁴⁵ And this is the meaning, I think, of the abiding-everlasting [“das Immer-Ewig”] to which Castorp has devoted himself toward the end of the novel; it signals the hero’s “forever searching” for the eternal sleep of death, a search made manifest as a coming towards the self as the possibility of its own death, but at the same time it signals the infinite deferral of his “arrival” that is always only the *possibility* of Dasein’s absolute impossibility.

That such a temporality clearly asserts itself here demands, if not merely the reader’s recognition, then reconciliation with the sort of temporality typically attributed to the Berghof – the sense of the timeless, what Ricoeur calls “the decomposition of time,” which is said to characterize life there. The same incongruity that characterizes the distinction between the timelessness of the Berghof and the temporality of the approach toward the Berghof is not at all unlike “[die] unangemessenen Sphären” Castorp finds himself in at the

⁴⁵ “Du gehst und gehst...du wirst von solchem Gange niemals zu rechter Zeit nach Hause zurückkehren, denn du bist *der Zeit* und sie ist dir abhanden gekommen”/ “You walk and walk – never will you come home at the right time, for you are *of* time, and time has vanished” (*Zauberberg* 824/*Magic* 546; emphasis mine). The use of the genitive here, “du bist *der Zeit*,” only emphasizes the equation that links both Castorp and Dasein with time as such. Time is thus not something in which they move or to which they are externally related; rather time is something to which they essentially belong.

outset of the novel as he winds his way to the magic mountain – in fact, the incongruity he hopes to forget when he arrives there is precisely the incongruity to which he is all along being introduced, that is to say, toward which he is heading, and which is the certain object of his *Bildung*. As he ventures up the mountain, he stands poised between “home and regular living,” where death has no place in the everydayness of his concerns, and the unknown, where death will rule his thoughts and thus, too, the processes of his self-formation. Consequently, the idea that the perception of time at the Berghof threatens to dispense altogether with the experience of duration is not so much the case after all. Instead, if we accept that Dasein itself *is* this duration and that the object of Castorp’s *Bildung* is to discover himself *as* this duration, then it is precisely an authentic duration which he *finally* encounters at the Berghof and that he is *finally* prepared to engage when he is thrust out of the gates by the outbreak of war.

While one sort of time-perception indeed falls away, the sort “[daß] mit dem Lebensgeföhle selbst so nahe verwandt und verbunden ist, daß das eine nicht geschwächt werden kann, ohne daß auch das andere eine kümmerliche Beeinträchtigung erföhre” (*DZ* 159),⁴⁶ another is given back, disclosed, and this must be the sort of time that is so closely bound up with the consciousness of death or the [un]known. However, as long as Castorp’s burgeoning consciousness of death is contrasted to the time-sense of “Heim und Ordnung” and an everyday, inauthentic “consciousness of life,” the productive capacity of the former remains inaccessible. And it is Heidegger that helps to explain both the reason and the difference when he writes: “Die erzwungene Unbekümmertheit des Sorgens des Lebens um seinen Tod vollzieht sich in der Flucht in die welthaften Besorgnisse. Das Wegsehen vom

⁴⁶ “that is so closely bound up with the consciousness of life that the one may not be weakened without the other suffering a sensual impairment” (*MM* 104).

Tode ist aber doch so wenig ein Ergreifen des Lebens an ihm selbst, daß es gerade ein Ausweichen des Lebens vor sich selbst und seinem Seinscharakter wird” (PA 244).⁴⁷ The sort of time-perception that calls for a “looking [toward] death” in the midst of life mustn’t be associated with a lack of duration or atemporality when in fact all the vitality of the coming-towards and *Sein zum Tode* can be attributed to it. Similarly, Heidegger explicitly distinguishes the inauthentic, measurable, calculable time of ordinary life – the time of “Heim and Ordnung,” which in its measuring evades death and thus, too, life itself – with the authentic “unangemessenen Sphären” of primordial temporality, the ontological basis of which is being-*towards*-death.

In fact, an important moment in Castorp’s *Bildung* is his arrival at precisely *this* understanding as he contemplates his cousin, Joachim’s, imminent death. Here Castorp comes to understand, much like Heidegger, “daß also [auf der einen Seite] zwischen uns und dem Tode gar keine reale Beziehung besteht und er ein Ding ist, das uns überhaupt nichts [...] etwas angeht, -- weshalb, denn auch alle Wesen ihm mit großer Ruhe, Gleichgültigkeit, Verantwortungslosigkeit und egoistischer Unschuld, entgegenblicken” (DZ 801).⁴⁸ Castorp not only clearly suggests a distinction between his own awakening toward an authentic knowledge of death, at the heart of which is his acknowledgement of its mutual entanglement with life, and the various ways in which others flee inauthentically (though quite necessarily and thus understandably, according to both Castorp and Heidegger) in the face of its irrevocability. He also appears to recognize his proper obligation to treat death neither with

⁴⁷ “The forced absence of anxiousness about death in caring for life gets actualized in the flight into world-laden concerns. Looking-away from death, however, is so little a seizing of life in itself that it becomes precisely life’s own evasion of life and an evasion of life’s proper character of being” (PA in *Becoming* 163).

⁴⁸ “[that on the one hand] between death and us there is no rapport; it is something with which we have nothing to do [...]. And that is why all living creatures can contemplate it with composure, with indifference, unconcern, with egoistic irresponsibility” (MM 532).

“Gleichgültigkeit” nor “Verantwortungslosigkeit,” but rather with an authentic and sensitive reverence inasmuch as it is always bound up with his continuing, which is to say, with his life. Moreover, there is certainly no evidence that with the crack of the *Donnerschlag* Castorp recovers his time-piece or his calendar or, for that matter, a sense of time unbound to death – in fact, just as the cigar evenly consumes itself toward smoke-white ash, so, too, is Castorp thrown toward his end at the end of the novel, consumed in the smoke-white mist of battle and comported toward his own death and, thus, too, toward his own impossibility.

For Heidegger, the coming-towards of authentic being-towards-death is an active, hermeneutical task “vouchsafed” [“bestimmt”] to Dasein, and well beyond the complicated temporality of Castorp’s “arrival” at the Berghof, indeed throughout the drawn-out process of Castorp’s *Gewöhnung* to life on the magic mountain, he is made progressively receptive to this task, especially with respect to his education in death and its accompanying temporality. We have only to consider Castorp’s disquiet, disguised as naïve laughter, in learning that the dead bodies are delivered from the mountain on bob sleds: “Ihre Leichen? Ach so! [...] Auf dem Bobschlitten! Und das erzählst du mir so in aller Gemütsruhe?” (DZ 20) – in what can only be called a dream-wish (given both Joachim’s and Castorp’s actual fate), Castorp later imagines his cousin Joachim riding down the mountain on a bobsled stricken with a “dislocated attitude” [“sonderbare verrenkter Lage”] (an interesting picture of what Heidegger would call *Nichtmehrdasein*); or that the young hero’s first night at the Berghof finds him suddenly awakened to the awareness that he is already lying in *his* death-bed; or that the narrator finds it necessary to interweave with Castorp’s arrival at the Berghof rare but influential thoughts of death in his dream-recollection of Castorp’s parents’ and grandfather’s deaths (and thus, too, an even earlier prevision of Castorp’s own death): “Denn

es war ja nun schon das drittemal binnen so kurzer Zeit und bei so jungen Jahren, daß der Tod auf den Geist und die Sinne [...] des kleinen Hans Castorp wirkte” (DZ 45); or that the “prevaillingly horizontal” [“horizontale Art” (DZ 131)] way of being at the Berghof as well as the early somatic symptoms of Castorp’s habituation signal that he is, in a sense, already dead: “Aber wenn einem das Herz nun ganz von selber klopft, grundlos und sinnlos und sozusagen auf eigene Hand [...] wie eine toter Körper” (DZ 111); or even his recognition much later on in the novel that time on the magic mountain is not so much “contracted” into timelessness (as the critical emphasis often claims) but rather extended, especially through the facility of older patients to distend time forward by putting it behind them in a rush toward the end, where holidays, for instance, were treated as “Turngeräte, woran sich über leere Zwischenzeiten behende hinwegvoltageieren ließ. Sie hatten alle Fieber, ihr Stoffumsatz war erhöht [...] beschleunigt – es mochte am Ende wohl damit zusammenhängen, daß sie die Zeit so rasch und massenhaft durchtrieben” (DZ 409); or, finally, that in the passive waiting condemned by Settembrini there is at the same time always an active anticipation, where, for instance, Castorp’s expectant waiting for the Sunday *Postverteilung* is described as a “Voraneilen” [“hurrying ahead”] and an excited “überspringen” [“leaping over”] (DZ 364/MM 239), which is also always the coming-towards of possibility – in the case of the *Postverteilung*, this means both the possibility of Castorp’s encountering Pribislav Hippe/Clavdia Chauchat and of the utmost impossibility she represents, namely, death.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ ““Their bodies? Oh, I see, Imagine!” [...] ‘On bob-sleds! And you can tell it me just like that, in cold blood!’” (MM 9); “thus for the third time in so short a space and in such young years did death play upon the spirit and senses [...] of the lad” (MM 26); “when the heart palpitates all by itself, without any reason, senselessly, of its own accord, so to speak [...] like a dead body (MM 71); “vaulting-pole[s], with which to leap over empty intervening spaces. They all had fever, their metabolism was accelerated [...] keyed up – all this perhaps accounted for the wholesale way they could put time behind them” (MM 270).

It is also no coincidence that upon his “arrival” at the Berghof the young Castorp’s first spoken words in the novel not only defer his arrival but also point ahead toward it – “[B]ut I’m not there, yet” [“Ich bin aber noch nicht da”] – or that the *there* to which he refers, if we accept that the goal of his *Bildung* is the arrival at a mature understanding not only of who he *is* but also of the place toward which he is destined, i.e. his fate, lies in the novel’s repeated conflation of Castorp’s identity with the essential plot traced not so much in the story of time’s decomposition at the Berghof but in the truth revealed in the inescapable biological teleology of the x-ray – what Settembrini explicitly calls Castorp’s “identity card” (*MM* 241) [“einen Ausweis” oder “ihre Legitimation” (*DZ* 367)] – a clear and palpable expression of the object of his *Bildungsreise* that is and has always been underway, namely, the authentic encounter with his own being-towards-death (*MM* 222, 233, 241) “vouchsafed” to him as a glimpse into his own grave:

Das spätere Geschäft der Verwesung sah er vorweggenommen durch die Kraft des Lichtes, das Fleisch, worin er wandelte, zersetzt, vertilgt, zu nichtigem Nebel gelöst, und darin das kleinlich gedrechselte Skelett seiner rechten Hand, um deren oberes Ringfingerglied sein Siegelring, vom Großvater her ihm vermacht, Schwarz und lose schwebte: ein hartes Ding dieser Erde, womit der Mensch seinem Leib schmückt, der bestimmt ist, darunter wegzuschmelzen, so daß es frei wird und weiter geht an ein Fleisch, das es eine Weile wieder tragen kann. Mit den Augen jener Tienappelschen Vorfahrin erblickte er einen

vertrauten Teil seines Körpers, durchschauenden, vorrausehenden Augen, und zum erstenmal in seinem Leben verstand er, daß er sterben werde. (DZ 333)⁵⁰

This is arguably the correlate to the *Teufelsvertrag* scene in *Doctor Faustus* or even to the moment when Adrian Leverkühn willingly seals his fate by engaging his love for Esmeralda, the moment when Castorp, our “little” Faust, is suddenly enlightened as to the terms of the contract that has been inherited from his past and that had already been agreed upon at his birth, long before he even thought of his journey to the Berghof. It is thus no coincidence that Castorp’s realization in the passage recalls both his paternal ancestry and the *Taufschale* scene as well as his maternal, Tienappel “Vorfahren” or that the passage is also accompanied by the “awkward affection[s]” of his childhood, which is to say, by the erotic presence of Pribislav Hippe/Clavdia Chauchat, who follows Castorp into the x-ray room for a private glimpse into the future of her own being-towards.

This scene is also arguably the most important moment in the novel with respect to its treatment of that *unausgesprochene Zeit* that Heidegger finds such a compelling “statement” on the nature and character of Castorp’s *Bildung*. It is thus because it confirms the temporality of death as one which is grounded in a resolute anticipation of the protagonist’s certain demise – “for the first time in his life he understood that he would die” [“zum erstenmal in seinem Leben verstand er, daß er sterben werde”] – and it is such a growing resolve – “how there grows in the young man, out of the experience of [...] death, [...] the idea of man” [“wie dem jungen Mann aus dem Erlebnis von [...] Tod, [...] die Idee des

⁵⁰ “The process of decay was forestalled by the powers of the light-ray, the flesh in which he walked disintegrated, annihilated, dissolved in vacant mist, and there within it was the finely turned skeleton of his own hand, the seal ring he had inherited from his grandfather hanging loose and black on the joint of his ring-finger – a hard, material object, with which man adorns the body that is fated to melt away beneath it, when it passes on to another flesh that can wear it for yet a little while. With the eyes of his Tienappel ancestress, penetrating, prophetic eyes, he gazed at this familiar part of his own body, and for the first time in his life he understood that he would die” (*MM* 218-19).

Menschen erwächst”] – that colors the entire course of Castorp’s analytical receptiveness, his *Bildung*, throughout the novel from beginning to end despite all the meandering, otherwise irresolvable inquiries into the character of time as such (i.e., whether it be short or long, measurable or immeasurable, private or public, finite or infinite, etc.) on which so many traditional analyses of modernist time in the novel focus their attention.

It is true, of course, that Settembrini warns Castorp against the sort of morbid analysis prompted by the unprecedented access to the x-ray; in fact, Settembrini claims that, although analysis in one sense promotes the impulse to freedom and is thus “an instrument of enlightenment and civilization” [“ein Werkzeug der Aufklärung und Zivilisation”], it also may very well “belong to death” [“der Tod, zu dem sie denn doch wohl eigentlich gehören”] in so far as it “stands in the way of action” [“die Tat verhindert”] (*MM* 222/*DZ* 338). This paradox is indeed the same paradox that guides traditional readings of the novel, but what is typically overlooked is the way in which being-towards-death as analysis resolves the so-called dilemma between action or duty and the mere waiting for death at the Berghof that Settembrini despises. For even though it may be said that Castorp’s glimpse is yet another milestone along the path toward his habituation into the morbid rhythms of Berghof existence, it is not only an active glimpse and hermeneutical resolve that characterizes the experience for him, but it also exposes something like a truth, which is, after all, the privileged virtue of both enlightenment and civilization, as Settembrini tells us.

In this passage, death, or what is called from the very beginning of the novel *das Unbekannte*, is on its way toward becoming the *known* and becoming integrated into Castorp’s feeling for “Heim und Ordnung.” Moreover, since Castorp’s *Bildung* is synonymous with the processes of this “enlightenment” (as is the x-ray itself, which, after all,

is revealed precisely through the process of “enlightenment”), and since his own death is clearly linked in this passage with both his past – the ring of his paternal grandfather and the gift of prevision inherited from his Tienappel “Vorfahrin,” whose own x-ray vision allowed her to see the images of the skeletons of those who were about to die [“die baldigst sterben sollten”] – and the future – the glimpse into his own grave [“er sah in sein eigenes Grab”] – it may be argued that what is forcefully revealed or exposed by this material epiphany or “photographic truth” (Downing) is not only being-towards-death as such but also the being-towards that Castorp *is* and *has always been*, as well as Castorp’s emergent recognition of this identification or otherwise “plötzliche Klarheit” [“sudden enlightenment”] (MM 218-19/DZ 332-3).

Thus does Heidegger’s being-towards-death allow us to interpret Castorp’s glimpse into his own grave and the resolute, anticipatory knowledge that it discloses *as* Castorp’s being-towards the possibility of his own impossibility. In *After Images*, Eric Downing shows us how Castorp’s revelation in this scene serves to displace the teleology and thus, too, the conventional temporality of the *Bildungsroman*: “The x-ray photograph [...] disassociates both the moments of truth and death from the end point and relocates them, along with their joint authority, elsewhere and earlier on (and on)” (59). While Downing’s claim is especially informed by Freud, Benjamin and Barthes and while he probably does not have Heidegger anywhere in view, his recognition certainly encourages a Heideggerian interpretation.

Being-towards-death does indeed betray a relentless teleology *toward* the end, but as we have seen this teleology is grounded in a fundamental impossibility. Thus *Bildung bis zum Tode* can not simply be accounted for in the traditional telos of the *Bildungsroman*, in which the end “impart[s] a structure of analeptic closure to a life” (59). In fact, for

Heidegger, being-towards-death disperses the end in precisely the way Downing describes, and we have already considered plenty of examples of this dynamic in *The Magic Mountain*. With Castorp's glimpse into his ownmost impossibility he begins to understand that he *is* and always *has been* his own end, the living possibility of his own death. Just as it is the sound of death that echoes from the Castorps' *Taufschale*, Castorp here identifies himself early on with "the flesh in which he walked [...] that is fated to melt away" and with the "hastening while" that he is and that could be called Mann's would-be correlate or response to Dasein's *Erstreckung*. The end is always already there precisely because it is always a possibility; it is that which Dasein is relentlessly coming-towards *as* itself. Thus Settembrini inquires awkwardly, because much too early on, whether Castorp *already* knows his fate (*MM* 57); and the body emerges here under the analytical flash of the x-ray and thus in all of its illuminated specificity as a likely answer to Castorp's question: "Den Raum nehmen wir doch mit unseren Organen wahr, mit dem Gesichtssinn und dem Tastsinn. Schön. Aber welches ist denn unser Zeitorgan?" (*DZ* 103).⁵¹ Given Castorp's fundamental identification with the "photographic truth" of the x-ray, the distinction between mind and body collapses here in such a way that exposes the body *as* the self and thus exposes the self or *Dasein* as being-towards-death, as being-towards the possibility of its own impossibility.

Consequently, when Hans turns from the apparently irresolvable "subject of time" toward more ordinary matters, namely, the concerns of the body, he is not turning *away* from time but *toward* it, as the encounter with his x-ray later bears out. And it is *Dasein*'s authentic engagement with this recognition that constitutes its *Bildungsweg* and motivates the processes of its *Steigerung*, which, we are told by Mann, is, after all, an "alchemistic"

⁵¹ "Space we sense with our organs, with our senses of sight and touch. Good. But which is our organ of time – tell me that if you can?" (*MM* 66).

process that Heidegger would certainly identify with *Dasein*'s coming-towards its own otherness, i.e. the possibility of its *Nichtmehrdasein*. Thus it is no surprise that the most salient and fundamental aspect of Heidegger's conception of being-towards-death is exposed not only in Castorp's awakening upon the occasion of his cousin's death but also in the Hofrat's confirmation of it. Where Castorp stumbles across the core wisdom of Heidegger's concept, namely, that "Solange wir sind, der Tod nicht ist, und daß, wenn der Tod ist, wir nicht sind" (DZ 801)⁵² and that as a result "unser Sterben mehr eine Angelegenheit der Weiterlebenden, als unserer selbst" (DZ 801),⁵³ the Hofrat reminds us that this amounts to a hermeneutical slippage precisely because death is something "we do not experience" [man erlebt ihn nicht] (MM 537/DZ 809), even though, as Heidegger points out, it is one of the few experiences that authentically belongs to us in the first place: "Das Sterben [...] wesentlich und unvertretbar das meine ist" (SZ 336-7).⁵⁴ Thus, both Castorp and the Hofrat Behrens would appear to mark both the deferral and ultimate negation that death *is*, but also, and perhaps even more importantly, the Heideggerian recognition that insofar as death is always more of a concern for the living, the living are thus always along the way *toward* it, or better, that life *is* being-towards-death, just as Heidegger knows that *Dasein is for* the end, but its end *is not* for it (Stiegler).

We are also told that only the dead are timeless and thus bear witness to another attempt by Mann to equate life itself, and consequently something like *Dasein* or being-there, with time as such. Again, the question of atemporality and of a "life without time," or even whether Castorp's *Bildung* issues in action, is made more complicated precisely because of

⁵² "So long as we are, death is not; and when death is present, we are not" (MM 532).

⁵³ "a man's dying is more the survivors' affair than his own" (MM 532).

⁵⁴ "Dying [...] is essentially *mine* in such a way that no one can be my representative" (BT 297).

this reconfiguration, in which time as such emerges as the primary object of the protagonist's active interest and pursuit. With the combined strength of these revelations it is revealed that the impossibility of time can only coincide with the impossibility of the self, which is anticipated all along, not only in being-towards-death as being the possibility of the impossibility of Dasein, but also in the decompositional strategies of the x-ray, which likewise serve to emphasize the possibility of Castorp's death. Consequently, for Mann time occupies the same privileged position as the self in conventional and classic examples of the *Bildungsroman* genre, and this helps to clarify, too, not only Heidegger's insistence on *Dasein* as a function of time but also Mann's innovative reconfiguration of *Bildung* in *The Magic Mountain*.

Likewise, the famous ending of the novel also reasserts the temporality of being-towards-death, especially in so far as it is, as Heidegger aptly puts it, "eine Ende ohne Ende." Castorp's death is so clearly anticipated that the matter is considered resolved in Mann scholarship, although he does not technically speaking die at all; his is a purely rhetorical death and the only sort of death narrative is capable of providing: "Lebewohl, Hans Castorp, des Lebens treuherziges Sorgenkind! Deine Geschichte ist aus. Zu ende haben wir sie erzählt; sie war weder kurzweilig noch langweilig [...]" (DZ 1085).⁵⁵ It is here that Castorp emerges as the seeker, the eternal quester and Faust figure that is the foundation of the *Bildungsroman* as a novel of adventure, but the ending of the novel emphasizes not so much the epic but rather the temporal aspect of the adventure novel as *Zeitroman* (in the Heideggerian sense). The seeker indeed passes through his encounter with death and disease while at the Berghof and emerges with a new knowledge of its affinity with life, but not merely to dispense with

⁵⁵"Farewell, honest Hans Castorp, farewell, Life's delicate child! [Echo?] Your tale is told. We have told it to the end, and it was neither short nor long [...]" (MM 715).

it, but rather to relate this knowledge of having passed through with that toward which he is *still* heading when the novel ends, or put another way, that *for the sake of which* he has passed through. And it is thus certainly not an escape from the abstract timelessness of life up above to a measured, healthy time of action and duty down below, but rather an escape *from death to death* and one filled with the sort of open-ended anticipation that perfectly describes his coming-towards his most extreme impossibility: “und die uns bestimmen könnte, zart mit der Fingerspitze den Augenwinkel zu tupfen bei dem Gedanken, daß wir dich weder sehen noch hören werden in Zukunft” (DZ 1085).⁵⁶ Despite the ironic and incredulous sentimentality of the narrator, nowhere else does the novel more clearly conflate the limits of the possibilities of both life and narrative and thus, too, emphasize the temporality of being-towards-death both *in* and *as* narrative, which, after all, it was Mann’s goal from the outset in structuring the equation between the form and content of the novel.

The problem of the timeless, then, or better yet the well-known conflict between time and eternity that constitutes the familiar polarities of his *Bildungsfrage*, emerges as a derivative of our reckoning, both Mann’s and Castorp’s reckoning, with the question of what it means to be *in* time, which is also to say, what it means to *be-towards-death*. Consequently, the substance of the novel’s treatment of time lies not so much in how quickly or slowly time appears to move for those up above or those down below but rather, as both Heidegger and Mann would have it, in that “for the sake of which” time appears to move at all: death.

*

So far I have attempted to establish the correspondence between Heidegger’s description of death “as a possibility of life,” and thus, too, as a fundamental being-towards

⁵⁶ “which could even lead us to press a finger delicately to our eyes at the thought that we shall see you no more, hear you no more for ever” (MM 716).

that not only dominates Dasein's essential temporality but that also may be identified with Dasein's *Erstreckung* between birth and death – indeed, with Dasein itself – and Mann's portrayal of Castorp's *Bildung* in *The Magic Mountain* as something very much like his own being-towards just such a recognition. Nevertheless, if I have shown how being-towards-death as a temporality of possibility stands opposed to what has been called the threat of atemporality and stagnation that is typically associated with the sort of time lived out on the magic mountain, we mustn't forget that for Heidegger death is always the possibility of an *impossibility*, and though I have been obliged to touch upon the nature of this insistence above, I have yet to elaborate the fullness of its character or the nature of its significance for alternative readings of time and death in *The Magic Mountain*. I have demonstrated, for instance, how Castorp's authentic "hurrying ahead" toward death suggests a resolute and anticipatory Dasein coming-towards the possibility of its uttermost impossibility – its death, the moment of its passing over into *Nichtmehrdasein* or no-longer-being-there, but Heidegger's evaluation of being-towards-death as being-towards-an-impossibility resonates with Mann's narrative in other compelling ways, all of which serve to illuminate the character and nature of what has been called the "dilemma of closure" in *The Magic Mountain*. Consequently, being-towards-death as being-towards-an-impossibility must be viewed as a critical aspect not only of Heidegger's modernist reformulation of time and the subject but also of Mann's modernist reconfiguration of the *Bildungsroman*. Suffice it to say that in as much as being-towards-death is positively expressed in the teleology of *The Magic Mountain's Bildung bis zum Tode*, there is a subtractive quality to its telos, a negative certainty and value that insinuates itself upon and completes the necessary 'circularity' of this tragic insight.

As I showed earlier Castorp's struggle to achieve closure is introduced as soon as the novel begins when his arrival at the Berghof is deferred by his paradoxical insistence that he is *not yet* there, and it is reiterated again in what Heidegger's calls the novel's "Ende ohne Ende." But this *not yet* does more than simply bookend the novel; in fact, it is dispersed back over the course of the narrative in much the same way that Dasein's end – what is for it the absolute impossibility of itself – is displaced and redistributed back over the course of Dasein's life in such a way, Heidegger claims, that Dasein *is* the living possibility of its own death.

The dilemma of closure in *The Magic Mountain* is reconfirmed very soon after Castorp's arrival when the narrator relates the story of young Castorp's experience at his grandfather's wake, which serves mainly both to obscure and defer rather than settle the meaning of death for him and to further emphasize the problem of closure and of endings, more generally. As a result, Castorp's encounter with his grandfather's corpse is a milestone on the path toward his recognition of death as both a possibility and impossibility – indeed, a (im)possibility that both belongs to him and that he *is* – and thus it lies at the core of the novel's *Bildungsweg*. What the narrator calls the dual aspect of death that haunts Castorp's dream and that is signaled in Castorp's reflections upon his grandfather's corpse – "Es hatte mit dem Tod eine fromme, sinnige und traurig schöne [...] and zugleich eine ganz andere, geradezu gegenteilige, sehr körperlich [...] die man weder als schön, noch als sinnig, noch also fromm, noch auch nur als traurig eigentlich ansprechen konnte" (DZ 46)⁵⁷ – involves what Heidegger would call the inherent hermeneutic slippage that occurs upon encountering

⁵⁷ "[O]ne aspect of death was possessed of a certain mournful beauty. In another it was [...] precisely the opposite, it was very physical [...] [and] could not possibly be called either holy, pensive, or beautiful" (MM 27).

another's death. As Heidegger explains it, death is first and foremost *my* death, and Dasein never *is* the Other: “den Anderen *bin* ich nie” (BZ 115/ BZ in *Becoming* 206).

Castorp contends that the corpse of his grandfather (which will become as the novel progresses a repetitive image for Castorp himself) stands in for what was once his flesh-and-blood grandfather. Regarding the substance of the corpse, Castorp marvels at the “face and hands of what *had been* [his] Grandfather” [“des *ehemaligen* Großvaters” (MM 27/DZ 47); emphasis mine]. The illusion is a trick played by death, and properly integrating and interpreting it is portrayed as among the first serious challenges of Castorp’s *Gewöhnung*, which this scene certainly reminds us has already begun long before Castorp’s “arrival” on the magic mountain. But this challenge is not so much, as it is often understood to be, a contest between the Apollonian and the Dionysian, between the aesthetic and the physical or vital, but rather the challenge involves the confirmation of their inextricability. Thus it is in the veiling of death that the corpse manages to confirm death. The corpse, after all, is the artistic representation of the grandfather, linked as it is with his portrait, and it essentially refers, according to the narrator, to the realm of substance, to an utter materiality void of spirit, and only to it – “He who lay there – or, more correctly, *that* which lay there – was not Grandfather himself, but a shell [of his former Grandfather]” [“Der da lag, oder richtiger: *was* da lag, war also nicht der Großvater selbst, sondern eine Hülle [des *ehemaligen* Großvaters]”] (MM 27/DZ 47). Consequently, the question of the grandfather’s authenticity, indeed of his very possibility, is what disturbs Castorp “in the depth of his being” [“[im] Grund seines Wesens”]:

und auch da nur flüchtig gesehen hatte, konnte er, wie wir sagten, nicht umhin, dies seine bildhafte Erscheinung als seine eigentliche und wirkliche zu

empfinden und in dem Großvater des Alltags sozusagen einen Interims-Großvater, einen behelfsweise und nur unvollkommen angepaßten zu erblicken. [...] [D]as Ergebnis aber, vor das er sich im Saale gestellt fand, ließ sich dahin zusammenfassen, daß der Großvater der Interimsanpassung nun feierlich überhoben und in seine eigentliche und angemessene Gestalt endgültig eingekehrt war [...] (DZ 43-4).⁵⁸

On the one hand, the artistic aspect that veils the physical, lowly side of death suggests an eternal, authentic grandfather frozen in the greatness of a perspective, continually suggestive of the authentic *possibility* of the grandfather; on the other hand, such authenticity serves to remind one only of that which *once was* the grandfather but *is* no longer, or put differently, the nothingness the grandfather *is*, his *having been*, the authentic *impossibility* of the grandfather, as Heidegger would have it. As a result of Castorp's identification with his grandfather's corpse/portrait, we see him simultaneously engaged with the question of his own authenticity, which is of course also to say, with the possibility of his own impossibility.

Castorp's other encounters with death in the novel not only reinforce the certainty of death as an impossibility that belongs to Castorp and toward which he is always already destined, but these encounters also perfectly underscore Heidegger's description of the way in which an inauthentic Dasein interprets and evades death in its ordinary, everyday life and thus, too, the way in which its life is always comported towards death *as* an impossibility:

Der Tod begegnet in der Alltäglichkeit täglich. Wir erfahren ihn, wissen um das Sterben, das aus-der-Welt-gehen des Menschen in einer gewissen

⁵⁸ "But he could not help feeling that this presentment [i.e. the portrait] was the genuine, the authentic grandfather, and the everyday one merely subsidiary, not entirely conformable – a sort of interim grandfather, as it were. [...] Thus he was glad from his heart that it should be the authentic, the perfect grandfather [i.e. the corpse] who lay there resplendent on that day when he came to take last leave of him" (MM 25-6).

Gleichgültigkeit als etwas, das uns *vielleicht* auch einmal treffen kann. In dieser Gleichgültigkeit liegt ein Moment des sich selbst Abdrängens vom Tode. Das Dasein weicht dem Tode aus, es schiebt ihn als Möglichkeit weg. [...] Die Alltäglichkeit sucht dies unbestimmte Gewißheit abzudrängen. Sie rechnet mit dem, was dem Dasein noch bleibt. Sie drängt die Unbestimmtheit in die Verschiebung, und die Gewißheit in ein Nicht-daran-denken. [...] In diesem Fliehen vor dem Tode zeigt sich gerade sein Da-sein. Im Wovor des Fliehens zeigt sich der Tod. (DF 167)⁵⁹

Closely connected to these observations, and in order to further demonstrate that the distinction between a time up above at the Berghof and a time down below in the flatland is not as determinate as it is often assumed to be, we have only to consider the observations of Paul Ricoeur or Dorritt Cohn, for instance, both of whom recognize that even those at the Berghof, including Castorp, have creative (and dutiful) ways of marking the passage of time, a behavior and capacity associated throughout the novel with the time-sense that prevails in the flatland.⁶⁰ As Heidegger shows us, these creative ways of marking time's passage at the Berghof amount squarely to an avoidance of death's sympathy with life. Like Dasein, who in its "inauthentic way of standing-before-death" simultaneously evades it ["Das uneigentliche Vor-dem-Tod-stehen ist also das Ausweichen"], the inhabitants of the Berghof involve themselves daily in creatively and actively excluding and deferring death, even as their entire

⁵⁹ "Death is encountered daily in everydayness. We experience it and know, in a rather indifferent way, that dying is a human being's departure from this world that can *perhaps* even affect us one day. In this indifference lies the moment of our pushing death aside. Here Dasein evades death and pushes it aside as a possibility. [...] Everydayness seeks to thrust aside this indefinite certainty. It underscores all that still remains for Dasein. It pushes the indefiniteness of death away into the state of postponement and suppresses its certainty in an attitude of 'not thinking about it' [...] It is precisely in this flight from death that the being-there [...] of death shows itself. Death shows itself in the *from-which* of our fleeing"" (DF in *Becoming* 264).

⁶⁰ See Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, vol. 2 and Cohn, "Telling Timelessness" in *Casebook*, Vaquet, ed., 2008.

being, like Dasein's, is also caught up in "waiting" for it. In their fascination with death they, too, Castorp learns, both wait for it and escape it, clean up after it and replace it. When early on Castorp asks his cousin Joachim whether many patients had died during the latter's time at the Berghof, his cousin answers:

'Mehrere sicher,' [...] 'Aber sie werden diskret behandelt, verstehst du, man erfährt nichts davon oder nur gelegentlich, später, es geht im strengsten Geheimnis vor sich, wenn einer stirbt, aus Rücksicht auf die Patienten und namentlich auch auf die Damen, die sonst leicht Zufälle bekämen. Wenn neben dir jemand stirbt, das merkst du gar nicht. Und der Sarg wird in aller Frühe gebracht, wenn du noch schläfst, und abgeholt wird der Betreffende auch nur solchen Zeiten, zum Beispiel während des Essens.' (DZ 83)⁶¹

Important, here, is the way in which a culture so thoroughly associated with death in traditional readings of the novel rather clearly attempts to have nothing to do with death. For most of the inhabitants at the Berghof (Castorp is the most poignant exception), death is precisely the comic figure Mann describes it as (see *Letters to Ponten*) – it comes down mountains on bobsleds, and gives the ladies quite a shock, and takes place while others are eating, etc. The authenticity of Castorp's character and development lies precisely here in the distinction between his emergent understanding of authentic death as the possibility of his very own *impossibility* and the inauthentic obsession with it that characterizes the attitudes and determines the routine of the cure for the bulk of the Berghof's inhabitants, including

⁶¹ "Several, certainly' [...] 'But they are very discretely managed, you understand; you hear nothing of them, or only by chance afterwards; everything is kept strictly private when there is a death, out of regard for the other patients, especially the ladies, who might easily get a shock. You don't notice it, even when somebody dies next door. The coffin is brought out very early in the morning, while you are asleep, and the person in question is fetched away at a suitable time too – for instance, while we are eating'" (MM 53).

Joachim, namely, those who willfully exclude death from their lives and for whom it is ‘*gar nicht*’ *etwas* that should impose upon their routine.

Such flight, like its opposite – one’s resolute anticipation of one’s own death – is for Heidegger always a matter of interpretation. In fleeing from death Dasein interprets death as somehow hostile to life, and it is in this way that readings of *The Magic Mountain* that oppose the atmosphere of death at the Berghof with a life-affirming atmosphere in the world down below in their own way also flee from the authentic possibilities called for in the novel’s treatment of the subject – possibilities, moreover, as I have shown, of which Mann and Heidegger were acutely aware. As Mann put it earlier, it is only *through* death that the highest possibilities of life are made available to his hero: “[*Der Zauberberg*] zeigt, wie dem jungen Mann aus dem Erlebnis von Krankheit, Tod, Verwesung die Idee des Menschen erwächst, des “Hochgebilds” organischen Leben.” Likewise, as we have already seen, Heidegger, too, embraces the productive weight of this correspondence: “Das Wegsehen vom Tode ist aber doch so wenig ein Ergreifen des Lebens an ihm selbst, daß es gerade ein Ausweichen des Lebens vor sich selbst und seinem Seinscharakter wird” (*PA* 244).⁶²

Castorp’s question to Joachim that provoked the response above – “[H]ave there been many deaths since you came?” [“Sind sonst schon viele Todesfälle vorgekommen, seit du hier oben bist?”](*MM* 53/*DZ* 83) – is precipitated by the knowledge that his room was made conveniently available by a “case” that had just passed away before his arrival. As is the case with the ring of his grandfather’s that he now wears, the clear suggestion (one which Castorp’s *Bildung* will certify as time goes on) is that he has simply replaced the Dasein which *had been* there before him and that he, too, will one day be replaced – Castorp will one

⁶² “Looking-away from death, however, is so little a seizing of life in itself that it becomes precisely life’s own evasion of life and an evasion of life’s proper character of being” (*PA* in *Becoming* 163).

day be forced to hand over the ring, so to speak, “so daß es frei wird und weiter geht an ein Fleisch, das es eine Weile wieder tragen kann.” In fact, the litany of names and histories shared with Castorp by his grandfather around the family *Taufschale* and obviously meant to sweep him up into the *thrownness* that he *is*, into the *being-towards* of both his heritage and his destiny, like his emotional reaction to this newly acquired insight regarding the “case” before him, betrays the temporal and, and thus, too, authentic nature of his recognition: “ein schon erprobtes Gefühl kam ihn an, die sonderbare, halb träumerisch, halb beängstigende Empfindung eines zugleich Ziehenden und Stehenden, eines wechselnden Bleibens, das Wiederkehr und schwindelige Einerleiheit war” (DZ 40).⁶³ And perhaps it goes without saying that such a temporality betrays nothing like a “Life without time” but rather a forceful and irrevocable *coming-towards* in the Heideggerian sense of the term.

For the most part, the interpretive measures taken by Dasein upon encountering another’s death facilitate an inauthentic looking-away (in so far as *this* death is not *mine*); on the other hand, these encounters prepare the ground, so to speak, for a more authentic understanding of death’s imminent relation to life, and such is the case with Hans Castorp, and in my opinion, at the very heart of his *Bildung* in the matters of time and self. This fleeing, for both Mann and Heidegger, conceals a more authentic understanding of the meaning of time and death in the novel. For instance, having told Castorp of the way death is covered up for the benefit of the other patients, Joachim explains to the new arrival of the one time he had a glimpse “behind the scenes” [“Hinter den Kulissen”] of this staged avoidance (MM53/DZ 83). Such language clearly anticipates the analytical depth of the x-ray into which Castorp *reads* his own death and suggests precisely what I think Heidegger can bring to a

⁶³ “A familiar feeling pervaded the child: a strange, dreamy, troubling sense: of change in the midst of duration, of time as both flowing and persisting, of recurrence in continuity” (MM 23).

rereading of time and death in the novel, namely, that “behind the scenes” at the Berghof, scenes which typically dictate conventional readings of death in the novel, there moves *eine unausgesprochene Zeit*, an unexpectedly authentic background and depth to the supposed atemporality and stagnation of life there, an authentic life behind the veil that comports itself *toward* death as the possibility of the absolute impossibility of Dasein.

Of course, the impossibility which Dasein *is* and toward which it is headed *as* itself is closely connected to what has been called the crisis of narrative closure in *The Magic Mountain*. The impossibility that Dasein confronts in attempting to identify with the death of others and the concomitant impossibility of experiencing its own death meaningfully resonates with Mann’s own recognition of the impossibility of narrating the end and of thus bringing the story of Castorp’s “life” to a close. For Heidegger death is precisely that which cannot be told through because it is “in each case *mine*”: “Darum vermag das Dasein der Anderen nicht Dasein im eigentlichen Sinne zu ersetzen, wenn anders die Jeweiligkeit als meinige festgehalten werden soll. Das Dasein des Anderen habe ich nie in der ursprünglichen Weise, der einzig angemessenen Art des Habens von Dasein: den Anderen *bin* ich nie” (BZ 115).⁶⁴ It is, after all, Castorp’s story, and this specificity is key to understanding conventional readings of both *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus* since it may be the singularity of Castorp’s and Leverkühn’s characterization that authenticates their redemption or at least undermines the traditional way of condemning them.

⁶⁴ “the Da-sein of others cannot substitute for Da-sein in its proper sense, if in any case its particular whileness as in each instance mine is to be maintained. I never have the Da-sein of the other in an original way [...]: I never *am* the other” (*Becoming* 115). In the next section of this chapter (and even moreso in the fourth chapter) I elaborate the relation Heidegger establishes between the *whileness* that belongs to Dasein (and is in such a way that Dasein *is* this *whileness*) and the problem of Dasein’s ever encountering itself as a *whole*. The problem of closure suggested by this comparison not only explains the “waiting” that takes place at the Berghof and thus informs my reading of Castorp’s authentic recognition in *The Magic Mountain*, but it also and even more convincingly characterizes the problem of the temporality of the *strenger Satz* in *Doctor Faustus* (see *Becoming* 262-3).

As a result, the most striking examples of Castorp's authentic confrontation with death *as impossibility* in the novel bring us around full circle, once more to the moment when Castorp is "vouchsafed" a glimpse which "it is not permitted for man to see" – thus "[Castorp] looked into his *own* grave" (*MM* 218) and once more to the novel's end, where the full weight of this significance is finally gathered. That it is his *own* grave into which he stares is precisely what is ontologically prohibited – an impossibility, I would argue, that it is precisely the point of his *Bildung* to confirm. Hans Castorp's seeing through is always also a seeing-toward; moreover, it is a seeing toward an impossibility, in this case, the literal impossibility of experiencing death at all, for as Heidegger so aptly insists, "Wie aber soll dieses Seiende in seinem Sein erkannt werden, bevor es zu seinem Ende gekommen ist? Bin ich doch mit meinem Dasein immer noch unterwegs. Es ist immer noch etwas, was noch nicht zuende ist. Am Ende, wenn es soweit ist, ist es gerade nicht mehr. Vor diesem Ende ist es nie eigentlich, was es sein kann; und ist es das, dann ist es nicht mehr" (*BZ* 115).⁶⁵ And this is precisely what is meant by the dilemma of closure in *The Magic Mountain* and what the ending of the novel recapitulates, where both the narrator and our hero dissolve away at the moment of truth/revelation.

That which Castorp is headed towards is neither the timelessness of the Berghof nor the time of the flatland but the temporality viciously concealed by both – if in the novel those down below are ignorant of it, those up above flee more consciously in the face of it. It is the authenticity of a time marked not by divisions but only by the finitude that, according to Heidegger, is in each case *mine* – this is an indivisible, unmarked time characterized not by

⁶⁵ "Yet how is this entity to be known in its be-ing before it has come to an end? After all, I am always still under way with my Dasein. It is still always something that is not yet finished, at an end. In the end, if it really has gone that far, it *is* no more. Before this end, it never really, properly, is what it *can be*; and when it is that, then it is no more" (*Becoming* 206).

contraction, stagnation or timelessness but by a clear and strongly felt being-towards described in the novel as a passing, running, and flowing onward [“verfloß,” “verrann,” “strömte...immer fort”] (*MM* 541/*DZ* 816). In the end, and given the narrator’s casual dismissal of his hero and tale, readers are encouraged to ask themselves how Castorp’s death can, in fact, be narrated at all: “We even confess that it is without great concern we leave the question open” [“Ehrlich gestanden, lassen wir ziemlich unbekümmert die Frage offen”] (*MM* 716/*DZ* 1085), for isn’t such a task clearly the possibility of an impossibility in the sense intended by Heidegger. Thus the narrator of *The Magic Mountain* allows his hero to disappear into the mist to experience his death, however and whenever it may come, on his *own*.

Doctor Faustus

I have said that the trajectory which takes us from *The Magic Mountain* to *Doctor Faustus* is one that leads toward a progressively more-felt and conspicuously Heideggerian recognition. In this final chapter section I argue that the ontological status of death, as I claim it is disclosed in *The Magic Mountain* as a sort of coincidental literary correlate to Heidegger’s fundamentally paradoxical conception of death as at once “a possibility of life” [“eine Möglichkeit des Lebens”] and “a possibility of the impossibility of Dasein” [“eine Möglichkeit der [...] Daseinsunmöglichkeit”], is reconfirmed with even more urgency in *Doctor Faustus*. The connection(s) that bind the novels in a formidable kinship have been elaborated – if *The Magic Mountain* is about the *beginning* of an idea of the end in Thomas Mann, and so also an idea of impossibility, then *Doctor Faustus* is at least about the confirmation of this idea insofar as it is about the end of modernism, the end of art, and the

end of an idea of Germany, too, all of which are cast in and through the narrative of Adrian Leverkühn's life and death as it is narrated by his lifelong friend, Serenus Zeitblom.

Whereas it was necessary in the first sections of the chapter, for the sake of clarity and classification, to carefully distinguish between being-towards-death as, on the one hand, the ontological source of life's possibilities, and, on the other hand, as yet absolutely heir to an ultimate impossibility toward which life or Dasein is always teleologically oriented (consequently, we described the temporality of Hans Castorp's *Bildung* on the magic mountain as one in which the protagonist's richest possibilities lay in his progressive self-awareness that he himself *is* this coming-towards his own eventual impossibility), their inextricability has been dutifully established, and in the analysis of *Doctor Faustus* that follows they will be properly dealt with in terms of their natural proximity. Thus we will continue where we left off with *The Magic Mountain*, at the question of how these *possibilities* have their basis in an utter impossibility, and it will be the point of this section not only to trace the various ways in which an atmosphere of impossibility shrouds the entire surface of the novel and thus begs the question(s) I undertake to answer in the analysis that follows, but also to explain just how *Doctor Faustus* represents the temporality of this impossibility and how Heidegger's notion of being-towards-death can help to illuminate the urgency of such a representation.

Toward this end I will first situate my analysis within the fold of contemporary critical readings of the novel (e.g. Susan von Rohr Scaff's 'dilemma of closure' and Evelyn Cobley's 'infinite semiosis') and within the context of more or less contemporary critical engagements with the sorts of problems introduced in the novel (e.g. Frank Kermode's *The Sense of an Ending*) with respect to the intersecting questions of narrative, temporality and

impossibility. Secondly, I respond to and elaborate these arguments by bringing Heidegger's notion of being-towards-death as Dasein's being-towards "die Möglichkeit der [...] Daseinsunmöglichkeit" ["the possibility of the impossibility of Dasein"] to bear upon the interpretation and analysis of several key temporalities in the novel: the temporality of the infamous *Teufelsvertrag* and of the *strenger Satz*, the temporality of Adrian's evolution toward his final composition, *The Lamentation of Dr. Faustus*, and, finally, the temporality of its inspiration in the "moment" of Echo.

For both Mann and Heidegger one is always more or less proximate to the end, and this proximity not only begs the comparison but also determines the authenticity of Dasein's being-in-the-world just as it determines narrative meaning in *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus*. Because *Doctor Faustus* is situated even closer to this end, both imagined and real, it may be said that the significance of being-towards-death and the problem of closure that accompanies it is even more relevant to readings of the later novel, where the question of closure, which is also to say, the question of endings, is thematized in a way that moves well beyond (though still very much in the same direction) what was merely a leitmotif in *The Magic Mountain*. One can plainly see that what is aptly sustained as an approach toward an idea of endings in *The Magic Mountain* finally arrives only with the publication of *Doctor Faustus*. One almost needn't repeat, for instance, Mann's famous explanation, most notably in his 1948 letter to Karl Kerényi, but also scattered elsewhere throughout the author's correspondence about the "central idea" ["vorgetragenen Werk-Idee"] (*Story* III.30/*Entstehung* III.31) or the "fundamental motif" ["Grundmotiv"] (*Story* VI.64/*Entstehung* VI.60) of the novel, that *Doctor Faustus*, just as *The Magic Mountain* proposed to be that which it is about – a novel about time – is first and foremost "ein Buch

des Endes” [“a Book of the End”] (*Briefe* 12/9/1948) – a book which both *is* and is about the problem of the end and endings. As we have already seen, however, to come to the end, according to both Mann and Heidegger, is rarely the same as *arriving* in the sense of having finished.

Even in *Doctor Faustus* the idea of the end is still infused with the dynamism of something like what Heidegger calls Dasein’s being-towards [*Zukommen*]. The being-towards of the novel is built into and everywhere apparent in the narrative itself, especially inasmuch as *Doctor Faustus* is an even more transparently Faustian narrative, in which the essential content of the story involves the revelation or exposure of a public and private anxiety surrounding the anticipation of a bargain and a fate that is always *already* known. In the following passage from *The Story of a Novel*, Mann describes the shifting and accelerating temporality of the novel following Adrian’s infamous meeting with the Devil, and in it he clearly conflates the coming-towards of history with the coming-towards of the narrative he is involved in writing as well as the coming-towards of the fate of his protagonist that it is the task of his composition to elaborate:

Damals entstanden die Partien des Romans, welche, die zeitliche Ebene wechselnd, die vormalige Katastrophe Deutschlands mit der schrecklicher heranwachsenden kontrapunktierend, das Schicksals des Helden und anderer Bewohner des Buches [...] weitertreiben [...], [und] das Gefühl des Endes in jedem Sinn accelerando heraufzubeschwören und im Grunden mit jedem Wort

auf Leverkühns entscheidendes und repräsentatives Werk, das apokalyptische Oratorium hinstreben. (*Entstehung* 117)⁶⁶

If we accept what we have already established with respect to *The Magic Mountain* and Heidegger's insistence on being-towards-the-end as Dasein's coming-towards the possibility of its own impossibility, then latent in Mann's description of this narrative expectation in the novel is the clear suggestion of the same temporality, one in which the feeling of the end, the impossibility prefigured by it, is made manifest in the coming-towards it, the impossible fate toward which the novel "heranwachsenden [und] weiterrreiben [und] hinstreben." This distinctly Heideggerian reading of the above passage is neither forced nor can it any longer be merely coincidental, but rather it is confirmed everywhere in Mann's own intuition of the novel's deepest symbolic implications.

Such implications clearly lie somewhere in the novel's complex and symbolic network of contradictions – consider the possibility of a "Buch des Endes" that proposes to account for a devastating history in which "[i]n Wahrheit endete nichts, sondern ein unaufhaltsamer Prozeß [...] Weltveränderung, der von einem Menschenalter begonnen hatte, rollte abenteuerträchtig ohne wirkliche Unterbrechung weiter" (*Entstehung* 118),⁶⁷ or the possibility of the fate of a protagonist whom the author finds it "mysteriously forbidden" and "impossible" ["unmöglich"] to describe – "Wie leicht wäre das gewesen! Und wie geheimnisvoll unzulässig, in einem noch nie erfahrenen Sinn unmöglich war es doch wieder!

⁶⁶ "During this period I was at work on those parts of the novel where the temporal plane is forever being shifted, so that the downfall of Germany is counterpointed by the catastrophe that draws ever and more balefully closer. I was also pushing forward the fate of the hero and other inhabitants of the book [...] to conjure up *accelerando* the feeling of the *end* in every sense. Fundamentally, every word in them guides the mind toward Leverkühn's decisive and representative work, the apocalyptic oratorio" (*Story* 131).

⁶⁷ "In reality, nothing ended; rather, an inexorable process [...], which had begun throughout the world a generation before, rolled on without any actual interruption, pregnant as ever with fantastic possibilities" (*Story* 133).

Unmöglich auf andere Art, als es die Selbstbeschreibung Zeitbloms gewesen ware. Ein Verbot war hier einzuhalten – oder doch dem Gebot größter Zurückhaltung zu gehorchen bei einer äußeren Verlebendigung, die sofort den seelischen Fall und seine Symbolwürde, sein Repräsentanz mit Herabsetzung, Banalisierung bedrohte” (*Entstehung* 81)”⁶⁸ – and, of course, most famously, the possibility of an art working itself out at the very edge of its own impossibility as the narrator Zeitblom claims – “Ja, Bewunderung und Traurigkeit gingen beim Anschauen dieser Musik ganz eigentümlich ineinander [...] als indem ich sie ein nie entspanntes und spannend halsbrecherisches Spielen der Kunst am Rand der Unmöglichkeit nenne (*Faustus* 293).⁶⁹

Doctor Faustus places life and existence itself, what Heidegger calls Dasein, under the harrow of impossibility, and insofar as I claim Dasein is disclosed in the coming-towards of history, narrative and in the coming-towards of Adrian Leverkühn’s fate, so, too, is this coming-towards linked with fundamental prohibitions that make Dasein what it is, namely, the possibility of its own impossibility. Just as for Heidegger, where Dasein’s authentic possibilities are said to lie in its utmost impossibility, the fates of Adrian Leverkühn, modern art, and post-war Germany are intimately linked up with the question of their own impossibility. As such, the very theme of impossibility and the temporality that accompanies it is as much engaged by Mann’s novel as it is in Heidegger’s philosophical conception of being-towards-death.

⁶⁸ “How easily that could have been done! And yet how mysteriously forbidden it was, how impossible, in a way that I had never felt before! Impossible in a different sense from the impossibility of Zeitblom describing himself. Here there was a prohibition to be kept – or, at any rate, a commandment of maximum restraint. To depict Adrian’s outer appearance was instantly to threaten him with spiritual downfall, to undermine his symbolic dignity, to diminish and render banal his representativeness” (*Story* 89).

⁶⁹ “Yes, in the contemplation of this music, admiration and sadness mingled in the most peculiar way [...] – which I do not know how to characterize other other than to call it an unrelenting, tense, breakneck game played by art at the very edge of impossibility. And that was what made one sad. But admiration and sadness, admiration and *worry*, is not that almost [...] love?” (*Faustus* 233).

*

Two well-known illustrations of the critical debate over the question or problem of closure in *Doctor Faustus* are Evelyn Cobley's "Closure and Infinite Semiosis in Mann's *Doctor Faustus* [...]" (1989) and Susan von Rohr Scaff's chapter from *Myth and Music: Thomas Mann's Timely Fiction* (1998) entitled "Unending Apocalypse: The Crisis of Musical Narrative in *Doctor Faustus*."⁷⁰ Of these only the latter makes the question of time as such central to a discussion of the problem of closure, and so even though both will serve as references as I describe the nature and significance of this so-called dilemma in the novel, it is Scaff's analysis of the crisis of musical narrative that will form the primary basis of my analysis in the final section of this chapter.

According to Scaff, the crisis of musical narrative in *Doctor Faustus* is symbolic of a broader historical crisis in which a sense of time essential to human progress has been overwhelmed by a more threatening atmosphere of historical stasis and impossibility:

In the contemporary "Faustian" era music has declined to stasis, and Mann hopes that the striving musician may reinstate the sense of time that is the foundation of narrative, music, and life itself. In fact, the salvation of modernity rests symbolically upon the composer's disengagement from a spatializing tendency and return to the age-old art of storytelling. (67)

In the novel this spatializing tendency clearly points to the culmination of musical stasis in the "strict," twelve-tone style of Adrian Leverkühn's *Apocalypsis cum figuris* and to the historical impasse at which Germany had arrived by the mid-1940s. According to Scaff, though the Devil offers Adrian the gift of narrative time, it is ultimately life-negating, and the

⁷⁰ Scaff's chapter appeared originally in *Germanic Review* 65 (1990): 30-9.

Devil does not follow through with his part of the bargain but rather allows Adrian to become mired in the static objectivity and repetitive atemporality of the Apocalypse oratorio. And any recovery from this crisis will require a recovery of narrative possibility, or more specifically, the recovery of a sense of time upon which narrative depends. Accordingly, Scaff explains, although Adrian's Apocalypse oratorio leaves the reader with the feeling that "there will be no more new stories for the civilized world to tell," his final effort, *The Lamentation of Dr. Faustus* "delivers humankind from an apocalyptic state of mind and [...] ushers in new times" (Scaff 70). Thus, Scaff claims, it is up to Adrian himself, in the *Lamentation*, to "burst the devil's snares and tell a tragic story through to its end" (Scaff 79), and as Zeitblom tells us, in fact, in the *Lamentation* Adrian for the first time manages to generate from the strict formalism of the piece an emotional intensity and life-affirming narrative time that reanimates and escapes the atemporality of the musical form and thus, according to Scaff, moves history forward again by reinstating the life-force of narrative form and possibility (88).

For Scaff, even though this dilemma is apparently less urgent in the earlier novel, the proposed resolutions in both novels amount to the same thing. For instance, just as she reads Castorp's fate as unproblematically resolving the well-known conflict between time and timelessness in *The Magic Mountain* – the recovery of a sense of time upon which narrative depends, the time of history with "a beginning and end" and in which "there is always something going on, and every moment has a certain meaning" ["so daß immer was los ist und jeder Augenblick einen gewissen Sinn bekommt"] (*MM* 114/*DZ* 175) enables Castorp's self-renewal and is restored to Castorp when he is set free from the spell of his seven year sojourn on the mountain and reenters history – Adrian and Germany are delivered from their

Teufelsvertrag in very much the same way, according to Scaff, and Mann successfully brings his novel to a close.

Yet Scaff admits that her redemptive reading may in fact be countered by the novel itself. In the final section of her chapter on *Doctor Faustus* entitled “The Dilemma of Closure” she mentions in particular the way in which Leverkühn’s almost certain damnation may in fact preclude the glory of his sacrifice and, perhaps even more convincingly, the way in which the formal, thematic and narrative structure of the novel, insofar as it is bound to multiple cycles of inescapable doublings and repetitions, would seem to reinforce the “eternal crisis” of time and history and “lock itself into the fateful circularity” of the Apocalypse oratorio (91).

Scaff’s ultimate ambivalence with respect to the severity of this historical “crisis” is confirmed by Frank Kermode’s *The Sense of an Ending*, in which modern individuals are said to endure under the myth of “eternal transition, perpetual crisis” that has modern civilization literally “suspended in fear” (Scaff 69; Kermode [101]93-124). Following Kermode and Peter Brooks, among others, Scaff claims that the cultural apprehension precipitated by this myth of “intemporal agony” is ultimately mediated by the closure of the text: “[...] it is the conclusion that provides meaning. The end point offers a retrospective glance over all that has gone before and transforms a random series into a pattern” (Scaff 76). More importantly, perhaps, is the human effort required to counter the threat of this modern myth: “plot is the [...] ‘active shaping force, the product of our refusal to allow temporality to be meaningless, our stubborn insistence on making meaning in the world and in our lives’” (qtd. in Scaff 76).

Despite Kermode's and Brooks's insistence that literary endings comprise the very hope guaranteed by endings, they also point squarely to a "lack of confidence" in *real* endings and thus posit both as distinctly modern anxieties about time itself: "In Kermode's terminology [modern individuals] comprehend their historical crisis as a stage of revelation that is formally a transition to catastrophe but in reality an endless waiting" (Scaff 69). While it is customary to cite Kermode's faith in narrative endings to interrupt and assuage the "endless waiting" of modernity, one shouldn't overlook the fact that for Kermode narrative closure is always a catachresis, a metaphor or *Ersatz* ending, that is grounded in what is fundamentally Dasein's constant relation to death – "Men fear it, and as far as we can see have always done so; the End is a figure for their own deaths. (So, too, perhaps are all ends in fiction [...])" (7) – a relation that is based as much in the tragic certainty of human finitude as it is in the infinite deferral of this certainty. The end, according to Heidegger, and as we shall see, according to Mann, too, is precisely that which cannot be "told through." It is that *impossibility* only the edge of which may be encountered. And though Scaff clearly recognizes the character and implications of this tragic deferral at the ground of modern experience, rather than solving the dilemma of closure her theory of narrative time, indeed narrative time itself, actually constitutes and reiterates it.

Following Zeitblom's own interpretation of *The Lamentation*, Evelyn Cobley explains how the possibility of narrative closure paradoxically opens up experience to something like an infinite signification or what she calls "a liberation from all constraints" and thus only reinforces its own impossibility:

In 'The Lamentation of Dr. Faustus,' [...] the formal organization has thus become so totalized that there are neither free notes nor unthematic elements;

nothing accidental, incidental, or contingent is tolerated so that everything spontaneous has been thoroughly repressed by a calculated rational pattern. Paradoxically, though, this rigidly controlled and highly artificial form allows for the most spontaneous outcry of human suffering and despair. Leverkühn's lament represents a return to the most elemental human expression, the primitive and barbaric state of howling from which culture is meant to have liberated humanity through the imposition of form and order. The effect of Leverkühn's extreme semiotic closure is thus a liberation from all constraints. (353)

Scaff explains this paradoxical result as the consequence of Adrian's deeply felt love for his nephew, Echo, and the suffering felt by Adrian at the child's premature death: "The difference [between the *Apocalypse* and the *Lamentation*] is that [in the latter] Leverkühn is moved by love. Without the inspiration of love, Leverkühn would never have been able to transmit deep feeling in dodecaphonic music or in any other style" (88). To help explain how an unconstrained love is able to grow from a formalism that systematically prohibits it, Cobley goes on to describe the dialectical nature of a semiotics of narrative closure by which "an extreme semiotic closure generates an unconstrained proliferation of the excluded other" (354). Thus, on the one hand, along with Scaff, Cobley agrees that insofar as in *The Lamentation* Adrian comes to terms with his profound love for Echo and the even more profound loss his death represents, Adrian's lament and the sort of pre-musical "spontaneous outcry of human suffering and despair" it signifies escapes the burden of "form and order" the *strenger Satz* would otherwise demand. On the other hand, where Scaff sees in Adrian's lament the overcoming of the strict limitations of the *strenger Satz* and, consequently, too,

the promise of narrative closure, Cobley clearly associates narrative as such not with the possibility of closure but rather with an “unconstrained” signification or *disclosure*. In fact, that Adrian *knows* this, or better, that a large part of his own *Bildung* involves the coming toward precisely this acknowledgement, seems to be communicated not only in the formal expressivity of the *Lamentation* but even more strongly in his description of his own unique, and decidedly modern, path to salvation put forward during his conversation with the Devil, where Adrian imagines: ““A sinfulness so hopeless that it allows its man fundamentally to despair of hope is the true theological path to salvation”” [““Eine Sündhaftigkeit so heillos, daß sie ihren Mann von Grund aus am Heile verzweifeln läßt, ist der wahrhaft theologische Weg zum Heil””] (*DF* 262/332).

Heidegger’s conception of being-towards-death as Dasein’s being-towards the possibility of its own impossibility helps to reconcile or at least explain the temporality of this apparent impasse represented in the readings of Scaff, Cobley and Kermode, where the question remains how the impossibilities described and enforced by the *strenger Satz* are able to give way to the possibilities that Adrian’s final monumental effort is thought to unleash. Scaff is certainly not wrong in her recognition that at stake in *The Magic Mountain* is at least in part this contest between the life-affirming teleology of narrative time and the death-wish of a timeless waiting, which corresponds quite readily with the sort of worlds sanctioned, respectively, by the flatland and by the Berghof. And if it is fair to say that the latter time-perspective is “suspect” [“verdächtig”] in *The Magic Mountain*, then it is, on the surface, at least, outright charged in *Doctor Faustus*. And if anything is in dispute it is certainly not the significance of the end or of the problem of narrative closure; rather, as was the case for *The*

Magic Mountain, it is the temporality of the end and of the promise of closure, i.e. the temporality of impossibility, that calls out for reconsideration.

*

If we accept the link that binds Adrian's musical *Bildung* to his eventual fate, then the temporality of that *Bildung* can be found where that fate is once and for all confirmed in the novel – in Adrian's conversation with the Devil. It is often overlooked, for instance, that time is both the subject and object of the Devil's infamous conversation with Adrian Leverkühn. The *Teufelsvertrag* is in this sense also very much a *Zeitvertrag*, and as I have shown, this is in keeping with a Faustian temporality, more generally speaking, whatever version the reader has in view. Moreover, the function of time in the novel demonstrates that the sort of time thrust upon Adrian is the authentic temporality that his music seeks to represent. It is here at the very literal center of the novel that the relationship between time, death and the end of art, and thus, too, that the character of the so-called 'dilemma of closure' in the novel is situated or "displaced," as Downing might emphasize, away from the *end* of the novel and reoriented *toward* the end.

When Adrian's mocking arrogance begins to wear on the patience of his dark visitor, the Devil interrupts him and reminds Adrian of the true reason for the unexpected visit:

Zeit ist das Beste und Eigentliche, das wir geben, und unsere Gabe das Stundglas, -- ist ja so fein, die Enge, durch die der rote Sand rinnt, so haardünn sein Gerinnsel, nimmt für das Auge gar nicht ab im oberen Hohlraum, nur ganz zuletzt, da scheints schnell zu gehen und schnell gegangen zu sein, -- aber das ist so lange hin, bei der Enge, daß es der Rede und des Darandenkens nicht wert ist. Nur eben daß das

Stundglas gestellt ist, der Sand immerhin zu rinnen begonnen hat, darüber wollt ich mich gern mit dir, mein Lieber, verständigen [...]

Ist alles eine Sache der Reife und der lieben Zeit. Eben darüber möcht ich ja mit dir reden. (DF 306)⁷¹

According to Scaff, what the Devil gives to Adrian is the “gift of time” (79): “Well before Leverkühn writes the *Apocalypse*, the devil proffers release from the hopelessness that engenders such despairing art. To the artist struggling to narrate humanity’s joys and sorrows Sammael offers the ground of story-telling, time itself” (75). Scaff here is merely reiterating her analysis of the temporal problem exposed by and in *The Magic Mountain*, where narrative (and, consequently, history as well) is said to organize time in such a way as to provide its infinite “flowing, [...] succession [...], [its] one thing after another” with significance and determinate meaning within the confines of a narrative whole that first and foremost admits the possibility of closure (qtd. in Scaff 67; *MM* 541). However, although the Devil does indeed offer something like “the ground of story-telling, time itself” – such a time is probably not meant to assuage the “hopelessness of a despairing art” or to revitalize a nonnarrative universe; rather, as I will argue, such a time is meant to confirm that the temporality of the ground of narrative lies in the possibility of its own impossibility, including the impossibility of closure.

In the passage above, for example, what the Devil gives is again that familiar symbolic relic from *The Death in Venice* and *The Magic Mountain*: the *Stundglas*. The

⁷¹ “Time is what is real, the best we give, and our gift is the hour-glass – indeed ‘tis subtly narrow, that bottle neck through which the red sand runs, so hairlike its trickle that the eye beholds no diminishment in the upper chamber, and only at the very end does it appear to go fast and fast be gone. But that is yet so distant, what with the narrowness, that it deserves nor mention nor thought. Simply that the hour-glass *has been turned*, that the sand has begun to run – about that would I come to an understanding with you, dear boy [...]

[...] It is all a matter of ripeness and sweet time. And for that reason would I speak with you” (DF 243; emphasis mine).

difference is that here the *Stundglas* is much more than a symbol or metaphor; rather it is passed off as a matter of *fact*. The language itself, in fact, testifies to an important distinction between narrative time and an *eigentliche Zeit*: the deceptive drama of the hour-glass sand in its development from a “hairlike” trickle to a quickening completion, rendered poetically in the passage above, is purely derivative of the ontological and thus more primary truth of its *having been turned*, which is rendered much more matter-of-factly at the end of the passage and is forcefully suggested as the *real* matter about which the Devil has come to speak with Adrian. Thus the sort of time described by the Devil in the passage above is precisely *not* bound to narrative but rather to something more fundamental and primary than narrative or so-called *historical* time. The high-flying time of genius that Adrian is promised, the passage of which “ist ja so fein, die Enge, durch die der rote Sand rinnt, so haardünn sein Gerinnsel, nimmt für das Auge gar nicht ab im oberen Hohlraum,” is always countered by the fact of the contract’s finite terms expressed not so much in the terms themselves, which call for Adrian to sacrifice love and life, but in his being-towards those terms, his very literal coming-to-term, so to speak.

The *Sanduhr* passage from Chapter XXV demonstrates the critical nature of the sort of impossibility about which the Devil has come to *remind* Adrian, and it provides an excellent example of what Heidegger means when he claims that Dasein, in authentically acknowledging itself as being-towards-death, also acknowledges itself as the possibility of an utter impossibility. Just as Hofrat Behrens provided Hans Castorp the opportunity of looking into his own grave, the Devil’s appointed task is to enlighten Adrian as to the nature of the time he has been given. Like Castorp, then, Adrian is provided a glimpse into his fundamental predicament, which it would ordinarily not be “vouchsafed” for him to see:

“[es] nimmt für das Auge gar nicht ab im oberen Hohlraum.” Insofar as the hour-glass has been turned, the terms of the bargain and, thus, too, Adrian’s inevitable death, are not only confirmed and predicted at this moment in the novel, but even more importantly, Adrian’s dying is said to be already underway: “Nur eben daß das Stundglas gestellt ist, der Sand immerhin zu rinnen begonnen hat, darüber wollt ich mich gern mit dir, mein Lieber, verständigen.” In this way, Adrian, like Dasein, is revealed as something quite like being-towards-death, as *being* the coming-towards his own impossibility, an impossibility, moreover, which it is not only in every sense forbidden for Dasein to see but even, as Heidegger insists and as the Devil more subtly manages to suggest, it is also prohibited to interpret in the midst of life – “[Der Tod, das Ende] ist so lange hin, bei der Enge, daß es der Rede und des Darandenkens nicht wert ist” – or to experience at the moment of its occurrence – “nur ganz zuletzt, da scheints schnell zu gehen und schnell gegangen zu sein.” It is in this way that the temporality of the *Sanduhr* prepares the ground for an idea of impossibility toward which not only Adrian but also modern narrative, art and Germany are always already headed in the novel. In other words, that the *Sanduhr schon gestellt ist* both unleashes the possibilities of Adrian’s future *Durchbruch* even as it certifies Adrian’s *already having been* delivered over to his own death, which is also to say, even as it describes his coming-towards the possibility of his own impossibility.

The contact here between the themes of time, suffering, and the end of art is anything but coincidental. In fact, where Scaff would contend that the reinvocation of narrative time redeems Adrian Leverkühn, the Devil is clear on one point: to understand Adrian’s predicament the reader must first concede the specificity of the historical moment being described in which such a time is precisely what is fundamentally prohibited. Indeed, as it

stands in the novel fiction is no longer possible: “Zulässig ist allein noch der nicht fictive, der nicht verspielte, der unverstellte und unverklärte Ausdruck des Leides in seinem realen Augenblick. Seine Ohnmacht und Not sind so angewachsen, daß kein scheinhaftes Spiel damit mehr erlaubt ist” (DF 323).⁷² Time, too, the Devil insists, is what is *real*. It is in this sense that it is precisely *not* narrative time which is given but rather a time that is “*not* fictitious, *not* a game,” a plot which does not seek to mitigate eternal transitions but to narrate these transitions directly. In short, as the *Sanduhr* analogy suggests, what *is* a game “[ist] die Enge, durch die der rote Sand rinnt, so haardünn sein Gerinnsel, nimmt für das Auge gar nicht ab im oberen Hohlraum, nur ganz zuletzt, da scheint schnell zu gehen und schnell gegangen zu sein”; what *isn't* a game at all is the irrevocable fact that the *Stundglas* “[schon] gestellt ist.”

Not only does this distinction remind us of Heidegger’s distinction between an inauthenticity which backs away from this fundamental recognition and an authentic being-towards-death which takes over the possibilities that are released by the prohibition itself, but one could also argue that Heidegger’s conception of authentic being-towards-death corresponds precisely with what the Devil says it is the distinct provenance of modern art to comprehend: the “unfeigned and untransfigured expression of suffering in its real moment.” Of course, just as Heidegger’s being-towards-death belongs to no moment per se but rather to the very literal *stretching-along* [*Erstreckung*] that Dasein always already *is*, so, too, for Mann the “real moment” of suffering belongs to the course of life itself, the fundamental teleology of which, along with the telos of modern art, narrative and history, involves a

⁷² “Only what is *not* fictitious, *not* a game, is still permissible – the unfeigned and untransfigured expression of suffering in its real moment. For suffering’s impotence and affliction have swelled till illusion’s games can no longer be endured” (DF 256).

process of clarification whose closest kin is death: “Freilich ist diese Klärung etwas dem Tode sehr Nahes oder auch erst nach ihm sich Vollziehendes. Leben ist Pein, und nur solange wir leiden, leben wir” (*Entstehung* 128).⁷³ Consequently, while the authenticity of Dasein/Adrian may be measured by the degree to which they admit themselves as the coming-towards their own impossibility, the authenticity of modern art is to be measured by the degree to which it records the circumstances of its own *untergehen* [“going under”].

It can be argued that it is only in terms of the temporality disclosed in the moment of the pact that the temporality of Adrian’s most important musical compositions can be fully elaborated. Consequently, before we analyze the temporality of Adrian’s music and the impossibilities it stages and presents, we will continue our interpretation of the Faustian terms of Adrian’s bargain and, thus, too, the ultimate suggestiveness of the “gift” of the *Stundglas*. The goal, of course, will be to show that Adrian’s redemption in *The Lamentation of Dr. Faustus*, which Scaff sees as the promise of closure in the text, is certification not of the possibility of closure but of its impossibility, and that the path toward this recognition begins with the Devil’s insight, not with Zeitblom’s – for now it is sufficient to note that the fundamental prohibitions contained in the terms of the contract are those to which the Apocalypse oratorio and the *Lamentation* are creative musical responses and stagings. The Devil’s description of the End and of “Hell’s horrid hole” reiterates this dynamic:

Mit Symbolis, mein Güter, muß man sich durchaus begnügen, wenn man von der Höllen spricht, denn dort hört alles auf, -- nicht nur das anzeigende Wort, sondern überhaupt alles, -- dies ist sogar [...] was der Neukömmeling dort zuerst erfährt, und was er zunächst mit seinen sozusagen gesunden Sinnen gar

⁷³ “To be sure, this clarification is something very close to death, or comes about only after it. Life is pain, and we live only as long as we suffer” (*Story* 144).

nicht fassen kann und nicht verstehen will [...] weil es unglaublich ist, unglaublich zum Kreideweißwerden, unglaublich, obgleich es einem gleich zur Begrüßung in bündig nachdrücklichster Form eröffnet wird, daß 'hier alles aufhört', jedes Erbarmen, jede Gnade, jede Schonung, jede letzte Spur von Rücksicht auf den beschwörend ungläubigen Einwand 'Das könnt und könnt ihr doch mit einer Seele nicht tun': es wird getan, es geschieht, und zwar ohne von Worte zur Rechenschaft gezogen zu werden, im schalldichten Kellar, tief unter Gottes Gehört, und zwar in Ewigkeit. Nein, es ist schlecht davon reden, es liegt abseits und außerhalb der Sprache, diese hat nichts damit zu tun, hat kein Verhältnis dazu, weshalb sie auch nie recht weiß, welche Zeitform sie darauf anwenden soll und sich aus Not mit dem Futurum behilft, wie es ja heißt: 'Da wird sein Heulen und Zähneklappern'. Gut, das sind ein paar Wortlaute [...] aber eben doch nur schwache Symbole und ohne rechte Beziehung zu dem, was 'sein wird' – rechenschaftslos, in Vergessenheit, zwischen dicken Mauern. [...] Darum, zu deiner Beruhigung sei es gesagt, wird dir denn auch die Hölle nichts wesentlich Neues, -- nur das mehr oder weniger Gewohnte, und mit Stolz Gewohnte, zu bieten haben. Sie ist im Grunde nur eine Fortsetzung des extravaganten Daseins. (DF 329-31)⁷⁴

⁷⁴“One must, my good man, be entirely content with *symbolis* when one speaks of hell, for there all things cease – not only the signifying word, but everything altogether – that is, indeed [...] what the newcomer first experiences and what he at first cannot grasp [...] because it is unbelievable, so unbelievable that it turns a man chalk-white, unbelievable, although in the very greeting upon arrival it is revealed in a concise and most forcible form that ‘here all things cease,’ every mercy, every grace, every forbearance, every last trace of consideration for the beseeching, unbelieving objection: ‘You cannot, you really cannot do that with a soul’ – but it is done, it happens, and without a word of accountability, in the sound-tight cellar, deep below God’s hearing, and indeed for all eternity. No, it is bootless to speak of it, for it lies apart from and outside language, which has nothing to do with it, has no relation to it, and that is also why language never rightly knows which tense to apply to it and makes shift perforce with the future, for as it is said: ‘There shall be wailing and

This long passage affords us the opportunity to recall in more detail its significance alongside the trajectory I have described that leads from *The Magic Mountain* to *Doctor Faustus*. Just as *The Magic Mountain* was a time-novel or a novel of time in the double sense that it both *belonged* to time and proposed to be a novel *about* time, Mann calls *Doctor Faustus* a book of endings, which may, of course, also be read in this double sense of being on the one hand a novel *about* endings and on the other hand a book which itself *belongs* to the end. This affinity between an ontology of time and one of endings is precisely the crux of what makes Mann's and Heidegger's treatment of the subject so critical to a revised and updated evaluation of a late modernism's understanding of time, which it is after all the overarching goal of my project to illuminate. Simply put, the shift from a focus on time to a focus on the end is much less a shift *away from* a preoccupation with time than it is a progressive *coming toward* a tragic idea of time *as* the end, and in this case, in particular, an idea of time *as* being-towards-death.

Consider the heightened awareness (since *The Magic Mountain*) of the nature of endings described in the above passage, in which both the finality of no-longer being-there as well as the policy of deferral so critical to an understanding of Heideggerian finitude and being-towards-death are powerfully emphasized and reinforced. On the one hand, in the end *toward* which Adrian, and not *just* Adrian, is headed "all things cease – not only the signifying word, but everything altogether – that is, indeed [...] what the newcomer first experiences and what he at first cannot grasp [...]." This emphatic end, of course, resolutely

gnashing of teeth.' Good, those are a few quoted words [...], but for all that, mere weak symbols and with no real connexion to what 'shall be' – unaccountable, in oblivion, between thick walls. [...] Therefore, to your consolation, let it be said that hell will have nothing essentially new to offer you – only that to which you are more or less customed, proudly customed. In its fundament it is merely a continuation of your extravagant existence" (*DF* 262).

includes Adrian himself, or, as Heidegger would certainly maintain, it describes the radical impossibility of Adrian as such. On the other hand, such an idea of the end signals other impossibilities, including the impossibility of the end itself. As in Heidegger, the end proffered by Mann's Devil cannot be expressed in language; it is essential to it that it is precisely what cannot be "told through." Just as Dasein is always out ahead of itself in coming towards its end, an end which it can never know, the Devil claims "it is bootless to speak of it" – insofar as mankind is to speak of the end at all, he must always refer to it in the tense to which it belongs, namely, the future tense. Consequently, Adrian emerges out of this correspondence, if not with the knowledge, then at least having been warned not only that he *is* his own coming-towards this end in which *he* and "everything altogether" will cease – *he is the possibility of his own impossibility* – but also that this end is not *for* him. Instead, its arrival and judgment will offer no insight, so Adrian is left with the awkward and perplexing consolation that the end "will have nothing essentially new to offer you – only that to which you are more or less accustomed, proudly accustomed. In its fundament it is merely a continuation of your extravagant existence."

Perhaps it is no surprise that the Devil's pronouncements on the character and nature of death and the *afterlife*, which is also to say, the fatal consequences of the blood-pact, refigure the subject as it is imagined in Goethe's version of the myth; accordingly, and more specifically, the Devil in *Doctor Faustus* singles out *time* as the basis of the pact. According to Mann's 1938 essay on Goethe's *Faust*, "[Faust und Mephistopheles] reden einander vorbei, zeitlich und auch moralisch. Der Bund wird auf der Grunde verschiedenartige

Vorstellungen geschlossen [...]” (GW.IX.1960. 611).⁷⁵ Elaborating the “temporal” and thus, too, as both Heidegger and Mann would likely argue, the “moral” aspect of this misunderstanding, is precisely the essential distinction and innovation of Mann’s re-vision of the Faust myth and yet another justification for calling the novel, like *The Magic Mountain*, a modernist *Zeitroman*.

Whereas Goethe’s Mephisto inhabits the afterlife of the popular and primitive imagination and calls for Faust’s eternal service there, Faust represents the incredulous scientific spirit of modern man unconvinced by metaphysical notions of the afterlife and thus, too, naively fearless of Mephisto’s warning – Heidegger, of course, describes this incredulity in terms of Dasein’s backing away in flight from the truth of this possibility, the possibility, remember, of its own impossibility. Like Goethe’s Faust, Adrian Leverkühn “verschreibt sich dem Teufel aus demselben menschlich hohen Streben, dem Wissenschaft, Geist, Erkenntnis nicht Genüge tun konnten; mit derselben unbedingten und niemals zu sättigenden Leidenschaft, die ihn am Denken und Wissen verzweifeln ließ, wird er sich dem Genuß ergeben [...]” (GF 611)⁷⁶ and with no thought toward the implications of its terms, which he arrogantly takes for granted, namely, that he will die. Both Faust’s and Adrian’s attitude toward the seemingly primitive terms of the contract is characterized by an ironic condescension and contempt:

Schon der Blut-Pakt, den Mephistopheles, weil er eben in Gottes Namen
wirklich der Teufel ist, doch notwendig braucht, ist Fausten so widrig wie

⁷⁵ “Neither [Faust nor Mephisto] understands the other – either temporally or morally. The bargain is struck on the basis of two different conceptions” (*Essays* 31, Trans. H.T. Lowe-Porter).

⁷⁶ “makes his pact with the devil out of the same high and human aspiration that mind, science, knowledge had been unable to satisfy; with the same absolute and insatiable passion that made him despair of thought he gives himself to pleasure” (*Essays* 31).

altvertraut, er nennt ihn verächtlich eine ‘Fratze’. Was braucht es der abergläubischen Floskel und Formalität der Blut-Unterschrift? Da es doch ein haltendes und haltbares Versprechen nicht gibt im Fluten des Geschehens, wenn auch der edle Mensch festhalten möchte an dem Wahn der Treue. (*GF* 610)⁷⁷

Like Faust’s Mephistopheles, Mann’s Devil is interested in precisely that which does not interest Faust or Adrian: the end, or more to the point, *their* end. For Goethe, Mann claims, “[Mephistopheles] speaks of the hereafter as an actuality in the popular mind and his own [...]. But Faust answers him as a humanist and earth-bound human spirit, who does not believe in a hereafter, or at least is not interested in one” (30); and, indeed, at the end of *Faust*’s second part Faust’s ascension to heaven confirms such a conception; it is, after all, a place in which they “find themselves” *after* the pact has run its course:

Ich will mich hier zu deinem Dienst verbinden
Auf deinen Wink nicht rasten und nicht ruhn:
Wenn wir uns drüben wiederfinden,
Dann sollst Du mir das Gleiche tun (qtd. in *Essays* 30)⁷⁸

The important difference lies precisely in the nature of the temporality of this end, the temporality of the “hereafter.” Mann’s Devil not only describes a very different “hereafter” but insists throughout the dialogue from beginning to end on its being precisely the reason

⁷⁷ The blood-pact – vital to Mephisto because after all, he really *is* the Devil – Faust knows about that, too, it is as familiar as [it is] repulsive to him; he refers to the pact with contempt, as a piece of tomfoolery. Why must they have such a superstitious flourish as the signature in blood, when after all, in the eternal flux of things, there can be no such thing as a binding promise, however much a high-minded man would wish to cling to the delusion of truth?” (*Essays* 30).

⁷⁸ Here I bind myself unto your service,
Ever at your beck and call to be;
When we find ourselves in the hereafter,
Then you shall do the same for me. (*Essays* 30)

for his visit: “‘darüber wollt ich mich gern mit dir, mein Lieber, verständigen [...] [e]ben darüber möcht ich ja mit dir reden’” (*DF* 306).⁷⁹ For Mann, it would appear, the Devil is even more forcefully and resolutely a spirit of negation -- his description of the end negates not only Adrian but himself, too; it is, after all, “where all things cease.” And he criticizes Adrian’s faith in an afterlife as a derivative illusion that belongs to a vulgar, earthly sense of time (*DF* 260). In Mann’s modernist version of the tale, not only have both secular and theological considerations of the true nature of the before and after of death appear to have become fused in such a way as to suggest their ontological basis in a temporality of impossibility like that described by the Devil in the passage above, but it is also the Devil’s recognition and clarification of Goethe’s original “temporal” misunderstanding, one brought to Mann’s attention under the pressures and vicissitudes of history, that rather explicitly echoes Heideggerian conceptions of temporality and being-towards-death as being towards the possibility of an impossibility.

In fact, it is fair to say that what distinguishes the entire dialogue in *Doktor Faustus* is precisely this temporality of impossibility as well as the detailed discourse that surrounds it. The elaboration of what Mann calls Mephisto’s and Faust’s misunderstanding with respect to time and its moral aspect, which Goethe left unexplored, or at least subtly concealed, is exactly that which is highlighted and made a leitmotif in *Doctor Faustus*. As the Devil says to Adrian: “Daß wir zum Ende und zum Beschluß kommen, wird dir genehm sein. [...] Kurzum, zwischen uns braucht’s keinen vierigen Wegschied im Spesser Wald und keine Zirkel. Wir sind im Vertrage und im Geschäft, -- mit deinem Blut hast du’s bezeugt und dich gegen uns versprochen und bist auf uns getauft – dieser mein Besuch gilt nur der

⁷⁹ “‘about that would I come to an understanding with you, dear boy [...] And for that reason would I speak with you’” (*DF* 243).

Konfirmation” (*DF* 333).⁸⁰ Given the running commentary on the nature of the end and of endings that makes up the bulk of the conversation between him and Adrian, the way in which the Devil concludes the whole affair is at the very least suggestive insofar as in “com[ing] to an end” the Fiend not only brings his conversation with Adrian to a conclusion, but he also demands agreement with and acknowledgment of, regardless of Adrian’s willingness to grant it, the clearly ontological (and biological) truth of the promise involved, namely, that Adrian *will* end when the *Zeitvertrag* has come to term.

Yet the promise of closure is the promise of an impossibility with which Adrian and Dasein are not just merely related but rather identified. The problem of closure is at the same time the problem of Adrian, and his promise lies *before* him, so to speak; it only magnifies what he *always* has been and thus, too, *already* is: ““Darum, zu deiner Beruhigung sei es gesagt, wird dir denn auch die Hölle nichts wesentlich Neues, -- nur das mehr oder weniger Gewohnte, und mit Stolz Gewohnte, zu bieten haben. Sie ist im Grunde nur eine Fortsetzung des extravaganten Daseins.””⁸¹ In this way, Mann insists, along with his Devil and in strict opposition to Goethe’s Faust, that there are indeed such things as “binding promises” – long before the conversation with the Devil, Adrian had already made the promise, which lives itself out *in his body*, in the “soft, silent” industry of the disease, which works continuously away at and *toward* its morbid task and goal well beneath the surface of Adrian’s public life and persona. Consequently, Adrian’s very continuation, and the creative, productive possibilities for which this continuation allows, remain bound to the course of his disease, to

⁸⁰ “That we come to an end and a conclusion is surely agreeable to you. [...] In short, betwixt us there need be no four crossway in the Spesser Forest and no circles. We are in league and in business – with your blood you have certified it and promised yourself to us and are baptized ours – this visit of mine is intended merely for confirmation” (*DF* 264).

⁸¹ “Therefore, to your consolation, let it be said that hell will have nothing essentially new to offer you – only that to which you are more or less customed, proudly customed. In its fundament it is merely a continuation of your extravagant existence.”

Adrian's so-called *Illumination* – Adrian's unrelenting biological march toward death, which is to say, toward his very own impossibility. Thus, as the Devil pointed out earlier, what it is important for Adrian to know is not so much the certainty of what is, after all, the most certain even as it is at the same time the least available, namely, that Adrian will cease to be when the terms of the bargain are up, but rather only that the "sand has begun to run," the *Stundglas* "gestellt ist," the fate or *Illumination*, which Adrian essentially *is*, is already underway.

*

For Heidegger the problem of closure and deferral, which for Kermode is restricted to the surface area of modern history as a primarily psychological and theological phenomenon, reaches deep into what Heidegger calls the primordial finitude of Dasein's existence, or being-towards-death. It is no surprise, then, that the chapter of *Being and Time* that focuses most explicitly on the phenomenon of being-towards-death also takes up the question of the possibility of Dasein's *being-a-whole*. Heidegger, of course, would argue that the dynamics of closure are among the basic expressions of the temporality of being and the very ground of what he understands as tragic experience (Gover). According to Heidegger, it is not *in* time that we suffer but rather *as* time. Consequently, whether narrative or static time make or unmake the possibility of closure is not the question so much as whether the end both makes and unmakes the possibility of time, which is also to say, the possibility of Dasein.

Death, Heidegger says, is that which both wholly belongs to the individual as its ownmost possibility and which is at the same time never possessed: "Das Erreichen der Gänze des Daseins im Tode ist zugleich Verlust des Seins des Da. Der Übergang zum Nichtmehrdasein hebt das Dasein gerade aus der Möglichkeit, diesen Übergang zu erfahren

und als erfahrenen zu verstehen” (SZ 316).⁸² This is precisely why language cannot articulate the ‘es wird’ and why the Devil urges Adrian not to dwell on the end but rather upon the truth of the temporality suggested by it, namely, his being-towards-the-end or the fact that the sand has already begun to run into the bottom chamber. As we shall also see, when Dasein’s utmost possibility is its being thrust toward an end it can never know, the problem of closure transcends and at the same time subsumes the merely narrative or historical. Thus whether we are dealing with the endless waiting of the strict style or the graceful transitions of narrative time we are always dealing with an ontology of endings and with a strict policy of tragic deferral of which narrative and history are iterations, not resolutions, which should bring us, finally, and also quite naturally, to the relevance of Heideggerian time for a rereading of the problem of the *end* in *Doctor Faustus*.

Bernard Stiegler’s description of Heideggerian deferral bears repeating here:

Dasein is the being who [...] defers. [...] The being who defers by putting off till later anticipates: to anticipate always means to defer. Dasein has to be: it is not simply – it *is only* what *it will be*; it *is* time. Anticipation means being-for-the-end. Dasein knows its end. Yet it will *never* have knowledge of it. Its end is that toward which it is, in relation to which it is; yet its end is what will never be *for* Dasein. Dasein *is for* the end, but its end *is not* for it. Although it knows its end absolutely, it will always be that in relation to which it will never know anything: the knowledge of the end always withdraws, is concealed in being deferred. The end of Dasein is the indeterminate. [...]

⁸² “When Dasein reaches its wholeness in death, it simultaneously loses the Being of its ‘there.’ By its transition to no-longer Dasein [...], it gets lifted right out of the possibility of experiencing this transition and of understanding it as something experienced” (BT 281).

This never-being-finished constitutes the mark of Dasein's finitude, the infinitude of the finite, that is, of the radical end as what can only be completed in being deferred [...]. (231)

Scaff, of course, following Kermode, recognizes the problem of deferral that underlies the Devil's contract, but in stressing the ironic paradox of its simultaneously finite conditions she fails to recognize that her loophole, the alleged coming to closure achieved by Adrian in the *Lamentation*, reveals that such a policy is anything but ironic; rather, as both the Devil and Heidegger point out, it is to be expected, just as the Devil tells Adrian his coming was to be expected: "Zeit hast du von uns genommen, geniale Zeit, hochtragende Zeit, volle vierundzwanzig Jahr ab dato recessi, die setzen wir dir zum Ziel. Sind die herum und vorüber gelaufen, was nicht abzusehen, und ist so eine Zeit auch eine Ewigkeit, -- so sollst du geholt sein" (*DF* 333).⁸³ Here the strict, definitive terms of Adrian's finite existence are apparently released, opened up to eternity, and in such a way that forcefully links the problem of closure and the question of Adrian's salvation in the novel with Heidegger's description of Dasein's never-being-finished.

For Heidegger the crucial peculiarity of Dasein's death is that it is both certain and indefinite, infinite and finite, and in *Doctor Faustus* Mann offers a tempting literary expression of this problem. Dasein is certain of its death insofar as it *is* only in relation to its end (Stiegler), yet this certainty is concealed from it inasmuch as neither the moment of its death nor the certainty with which such a moment is invested can ever be translated into an experience *for* Dasein or grasped by its understanding. Instead, Dasein in its everydayness

⁸³ "Time you have taken from us, a genius's time, high-flying time, full XXIV years *ab dato recessi*, which we set to you as the limit. When they are finished and fully expired, which is not to be foreseen [...], and such a time is also an eternity [...] – then you shall be fetched" (*DF* 264; qtd. in Scaff 72).

flees from this certainty and thus consciously defers what is already ontologically deferred. Likewise, the Devil explains to Adrian, whose sole concern is precisely how and when it will end for him, that despite the “uncertainty and haphazard of the moment when it will be time to think on the end” [“Die Unsicherheit und Beliebigkeit des Augenblicks, wo es Zeit wird, ans Ende zu denken”] (DF 245/308), that he *will* end nevertheless “demands agreement” [“das will ausgemacht sein”] (DF 246/309).

The sort of time proffered by the Devil – “Great time, mad time, most devilish time, in which to soar higher and higher still” [“Große Zeit, tolle Zeit, ganz verteufelte Zeit, in der es hoch und überhoch hergeht [...]”] (DF 246/309) – is also an “abundant, immeasurable time,” which in Heidegger’s vocabulary is precisely the mistaken eternal that flows out of an ordinary, *vulgäre Zeit*, an everyday sense of time that is here clearly associated with the time *in* which Adrian accomplishes his public *Durchbruch* and “may plainly and honestly deem himself a god” [“daß er sich schlecht und recht für einen Gott halten mag”] (DF 246/309). Such a time, according to Heidegger and the Devil, only reinforces the concealment of the end, makes it difficult if not impossible to think on the end – “How would such a man ever come to be fretted by the point in time when it is time to think on the end!” [“Wie kommt so Einer dazu, sich um den Zeitpunkt zu kümmern, wo es Zeit wird ans Ende zu denken!”] (DF 246/309) – and thus also makes thinking on the end always somehow *untimely*.

For example, even while he demands to hear of the end, Adrian speaks of what comes *after* the end, of what “*life* [will be] like in Old Scratch’s house” [“Wie lebt sich’s in Klepperlins Haus?”] (DF 260/328; emphasis added) and of what awaits him there. Thus does Adrian practice the art of deferral that Heidegger describes. This sort of thinking on the end the Devil calls thinking *unhistorically*, for – and here Mann seems to be in complete

agreement with Heidegger's revaluation of history as an ontological phenomenon – an authentically *historical* thinking demands an entirely different disposition toward the past and the future, that is to say, toward the truth of the hour-glass's *having been* turned, that "his bill [will] be presented him" ["die Rechnung endlich präsentiert wurd"] (*DF* 252/318) at the end, which of course both constitutes and is contested by Dasein's very being.

In other ways, too, Heidegger's analysis of the temporality of Dasein, like Mann's novel, is heavily invested with a particularly Faustian ontology. Heidegger admits that the possibility of Dasein's being-a-whole is seemingly inconsistent with what Heidegger calls *die Sorge* or *care*, the temporalizing structure at the ground of Dasein's being that expresses itself in the unity of being-already-, being-alongside-, and being-ahead-of-itself-in-the-world. Being-ahead-of-itself in particular is not only what makes possible being-towards-death but it is also that which lies at the foundation of the dilemma of closure:

'Solange es ist', bis zu seinem Ende verhält es sich zu seinem Seinkönnen.

Auch dann, wenn es, noch existierend, nichts mehr 'vor sich' und 'seine

Rechnung abgeschlossen' hat, ist sein Sein noch durch das 'Sichvorweg'

bestimmt. [...] Diese Strukturmoment der Sorge sagt doch unzweideutig, daß

im Dasein immer noch etwas *aussteht*, was als Seinkönnen seiner selbst noch

nicht 'wirklich' geworden ist. Im Wesen der Grundverfassung des Daseins

liegt demnach eine *ständige Unabgeschlossenheit*. (*SZ* 313)⁸⁴

⁸⁴ "As long as it is', right to its end, [Dasein] comports itself towards its potentiality-for-Being. Even when it still exists but has nothing more 'before it' and has 'settled [...] its account', its Being is still determined by the 'ahead-of-itself'. [...] The 'ahead-of-itself' tells us unambiguously that in Dasein there is always something *still outstanding*, which, as a potentiality-for-Being for Dasein itself, has not yet become 'actual'. It is essential to the basic constitution of Dasein that there is *constantly something still to be settled* [...]" (*BT* 279).

Consequently, Dasein cannot know that in relation to which it is and thus cannot come to closure about itself. Self-knowledge is always deferred, rendered unavailable, so that Dasein's richest possibility lies in the very impossibility of its being anything at all. As a result, and as the Devil points out for Adrian, indeed it is the primary reason for his visit, the Devil has come to *remind* Adrian of that *toward* which he is headed and of that which has *already* been established: "this visit of mine is intended merely for confirmation" ["mein Besuch gilt nur der Konfirmation"] (*DF* 264/333).

As we have seen, according to the Devil, what remains to be settled with respect to Adrian's bargain is *not* the "price in pence and farthings" of the deal itself but rather the disclosure of the truth of the meaning of the bargain, which lies not in the coming to term of the twenty four years but rather in the more fundamental fact of the hour-glass's having-already-been-turned. The verbal complicity of the passage from Mann with Heidegger's well-known reliance upon verbal etymologies suggest here a useful correlation with the temporal structure of *die Sorge*: not only is the turning *already* the case when the Devil arrives so that his visit serves essentially as a *Konfirmation*, but it is very obvious to the reader and to the narrator that Adrian's existence *alongside* this turning has also been the case, a fact that very clearly justifies the solitary and frigid anxiety with which he lives his life and invests his musical works.

But perhaps most importantly for our arguments here, the having-been-turned suggests the element of anticipation that grounds Dasein's existence – being-ahead-of-itself and being-towards-death – insofar as what is disclosed in the fact of the hour-glass's having-been-turned is both the certainty of Dasein's finiteness as well as the alethic concealment of this disclosure. In Heidegger's vocabulary this amounts to both an ontic concealment insofar

as the “eye beholds no diminishment in the upper chamber, and only at the very end does it appear to go fast and fast be gone [...]” and an ontological one inasmuch as in being-towards-the-end this having-been-turned is bound together with the never-being-finished that “constitutes the mark of Dasein’s finitude, the infinitude of the finite, that is, of the radical end as what can only be completed in being deferred [...]” (Stiegler). Consequently, when the Devil points out to Adrian that he is not alone and that “Everywhere the hour-glass has been turned,” he simultaneously suggests not only the ubiquity but also the elemental permanence of this *turning*; the only settlement that is offered is one that lies in the impossibility of settlement, in the infinite deferral of the finite limits of Dasein (and history), or more precisely, in the “*Seeming Impossibility of Getting Dasein’s Being-a-whole into our Grasp*” [“*Die scheinbare Unmöglichkeit einer ontologischen Erfassung und Bestimmung des daseinsmäßigen Ganzseins*”] (BT 279/SZ 314).

Furthermore, it is no mere coincidence that both Mann and Heidegger bring to bear upon the dilemma of *closure* and the problem of *wholeness* the closely related question of *ripeness* (and thus, too, the authenticity of what in *Doctor Faustus* could certainly be called a sort of ‘organic’ time). As the Devil reminds Adrian and the readers, “[I]t is all a matter of ripeness and sweet time.”⁸⁵ Heidegger also examines the various meanings of the term in order to show firstly that the character of that which is always still outstanding for Dasein is formally analogous to the organic process of ripening and not at all like the character of the remainder owed in order for a debt to be cancelled – this latter model, by the way, is particularly relevant to our reading of *Doctor Faustus* since it is usually the one that guides

⁸⁵ “Ist alles eine Sache der Reife und der lieben Zeit” (DF 306); we may also want to recall Zeitblom’s lament much later on that Echo was “subject to time and fated to ripen” (DF 489).

traditional interpretations of the Faustian bargain; and secondly to show that the formal analogy of ripeness with the type of ending that belongs to Dasein can only be taken so far:

Die unreife Frucht zum Beispiel geht ihrer Reife entgegen. Dabei wird ihr im Reifen das, was sie noch nicht ist, keineswegs als Noch-nicht-vorhandenes angestückt. Sie selbst bringt sich zur Reife, und solches Sichbringen charakterisiert ihr Sein als Frucht. Alles Erdenkliche, das beigebracht werden könnte, vermöchte die Unreife der Frucht nicht zu beseitigen, käme dieses Seiende nicht *von ihm selbst her* zur Reife. (SZ 324)⁸⁶

On the one hand, it is precisely this temporality that I think the Devil means to impart to Adrian in their conversation. The “not-yet” of Dasein’s end is that toward which it is always already headed; as such, the debt, as balance and remainder, is always already “included in the very being of [Dasein], not as some random characteristic, but as something constitutive” (BT 288). In this way being-towards-death and the having-been-turned of the *Stundglas* are intimately connected:

So wie das Dasein vielmehr standing, solange es ist, schon sein Noch-nicht *ist*, so *ist* es auch schon immer sein Ende. Das mit dem Tod gemeinte Enden bedeutet kein Zu-Ende-sein des Daseins, sondern ein *Sein zum Ende* dieses seienden. Der Tod ist eine Weise zu sein, die das Dasein übernimmt, sobald es

⁸⁶ “When, for instance, a fruit is unripe, it ‘goes toward’ its ripeness. In this process of ripening, that which the fruit is not yet, is by no means pieced on as something not yet present-at-hand. The fruit brings itself to ripeness, and such a bringing of itself is a characteristic of its Being as a fruit. Nothing imaginable, which one might contribute to it, would eliminate the unripeness of the fruit, if this entity did not come to ripeness of its own accord” (BT 287).

ist. ‘Sobald ein Mensch zum Leben kommt, sogleich ist er alt genug zu sterben’ (SZ 326)⁸⁷

On the other hand, what distinguishes the ripening of the fruit from that of Dasein is precisely the problem of fulfillment that Heidegger clearly describes as a problem of closure and which is, of course, the Faustian predicament in the novel. In ripening the fruit is fulfilled, but as Heidegger points out, Dasein often dies without reaching fulfillment, without “having exhausted its specific possibilities” or even “passes its ripeness before the end” (BT 288). Here the translators of *Being and Time* note an important distinction between the variable meanings of ripening as *bringing to an end* or *terminating* versus *bringing to a state of completion* or *perfection*. Whereas the fruit needn’t tarry with the question of its coming to ripeness, for Dasein this is a hermeneutical dilemma of the first rank insofar as its being is always an issue for it, as Heidegger is fond of saying. Since Dasein, however, ends for the most part inauthentically in unfulfillment or else by “having disintegrated and been used up” (BT 288), it can grasp itself in its wholeness only in a very limited and negative sense, which is to say, in and through the *authenticity* [“Eigentlichkeit”] with which it relates to its own death, so that coming to any sort of closure has to do with Dasein’s disposition or way of being towards its end as “the possibility of the impossibility of Dasein.” This certainly doesn’t solve the dilemma of closure, but it does highlight it as a formidable preoccupation of Heidegger’s own analysis and thus more strongly synthesizes the fundamental concerns of *Doctor Faustus* with Heidegger’s concerns in *Being and Time*. It also brings us full circle,

⁸⁷[...] just as Dasein *is* already its ‘not-yet’, and is its ‘not-yet’ constantly as long as it is, it *is* already its end too. The ‘ending’ which we have in view when we speak of death, does not signify Dasein’s Being-at-an-end [...] but a *Being-towards-the-end* [...] of this entity. Death is a way to be, which Dasein takes over as soon as it is. ‘As soon as man comes to life, he is at once old enough to die.’ (BT 289). The author of the final line of the passage is said to be Der Ackermann aus Böhmen, and it is interesting to note (given my own preoccupations) that Heidegger pulls the quotation from a contemporary (1917) history of the tradition of German *Bildung* from the Middle Ages to the Reformation.

which is to say, back to Adrian's musical ambitions, to Mann's struggle to end the novel, and to the question of Adrian's salvation and the fulfillment it either or both promises and/or problematizes.

*

It seems to me the question of grasping the wholeness of Dasein as being-towards-death and Mann's struggle to narrate Adrian's salvation amount to similar dilemmas. As we have seen, according to Scaff the *Apocalypse* oratorio mirrors the infinite deferral or protracted crisis of modernity described by Kermode, a crisis which can be overcome only by recovering the meaningfulness of time provided by a successful coming to closure, which is to say, by ending. The *Apocalypse* is called a "consummate 'a-temporal' experience" that in its inescapable circularity "jars and frustrates the aesthetic sensibility with harsh chords 'endlessly'" (Scaff 73) as well as a "musical model of 'non-narration' that in its strict uniformity, lacking both a beginning and an end and "persisting without hope for either salvation or damnation," exemplifies what Hans Castorp says dissolves the "'experience of time' that is 'so closely related and bound to our feeling for life'" (qtd. in Scaff 75). In an effort to reinstate this life-force, after writing the *Apocalypse* all of Adrian's compositions, including a violin concerto and several pieces of chamber music, seek with varying degrees of success to reinstate narrative and historical possibility by bringing a tale to its end and successfully narrating humanity's joys and sorrows (Scaff 85). Ironically, it is with his masterpiece *The Lamentation of Dr. Faustus*, a work even more totalizing and subject to an even stricter formalism than the *Apocalypse*, that Adrian finally achieves his breakthrough and salvation. Scaff describes how the stringency of the *Lamentation* that formerly repressed music's potential for narrative expressivity now paradoxically enables such feeling, and thus

we witness in the *Lamentation* Leverkühn fulfilling his “youthful dream of [achieving] a calculated whole” (88).

This overtly optimistic reading, however, fails to register the temporality of the *strenger Satz* but rather carefully denies and avoids it; specifically, it overlooks the temporality of the anxiety the *strenger Satz* describes and that is its very basis. Bringing Heidegger’s philosophy of time to bear upon a discussion of music in *Doctor Faustus* will at least be unexpected, if not outright suspect, but there are reasons for doing so. To begin with, Howard Eiland, in an insightful review of George Steiner’s *Martin Heidegger* (1979), criticizes Steiner for underestimating the potential of the musical analogy to elaborate Heidegger’s notion of *Sorge* [care] from *Being and Time* as well as the “theological charge” of fundamental concepts from Heidegger’s later writings. Though Eiland never develops this connection between Heidegger and music, his brief acknowledgment of the correspondence resonates powerfully with my purposes here. Eiland writes:

In the interaction of melody and rhythm, we find a paradigm of *entelecheia*. Like the circular being of Dasein, melody is futural: in its beginning is its end. Musical meaning or dimension [...] involves a stretching and turning through time-space that recalls Heidegger’s delineation of ‘*geschehen*’ in *Being and Time* [...]. In particular, the analogy of music reminds us of the crucial section in Division Two of *Being and Time*, ¶ 65, ‘Temporality as the Ontological Meaning of *Care*’ [...]. In my opinion, the finite, spherical conception of temporality, of existence at once anticipatory and recapitulatory, [also] contains the germ of Heidegger’s later preoccupation[s] [...]. (313)

According to Eiland, a hermeneutic circularity forms the conceptual core of the correspondence he forges between Heidegger's notion of *care* and fundamental aspects of music and musical narrative. In fact, however, the correspondences that connect *Sorge* with the narrative and musical world of *Doctor Faustus* reach far beyond a decidedly incomplete description of *Sorge* as "at once anticipatory and recapitulatory." Even Eiland overlooks the potential of his own insight, in particular, the relevance of the connection Heidegger maintains between *Sorge*, anxiety and conscience.

In the section of *Being and Time* entitled "Conscience as the Call of Care," Heidegger quite naturally employs an explicitly aural, if not musical, analogy to describe *Sorge* as essentially a matter of Dasein's anxiety and conscience and in the process (and certainly inadvertently) situates the general thrust of his temporal ontology well within the range of Mann's own preoccupations with music in *Doctor Faustus*. Heidegger writes:

Unheimlichkeit ist die [...] Grundart des In-der-Welt-seins. Das Dasein selbst ruft als Gewissen aus dem Grunde dieses Seins. [...] Der durch die Angst gestimmte Ruf ermöglicht dem Dasein allererst den Entwurf seiner selbst auf sein eigenstes Seinkönnen. [...] [Deshalb] [*d*]as Gewissen offenbart sich als *Ruf der Sorge*: der Rufer ist das Dasein, sich ängstigend in der Geworfenheit (Schon-sein-in...) um sein Seinkönnen. [...] Der Ruf des Gewissens, das heißt dieses selbst, hat seine ontologische Möglichkeit darin, daß das Dasein im Grunde seines Seins *Sorge* ist. [...] Das rechte Hören des Anrufs kommt dann gleich einem Sichverstehen in seinem eigensten Seinkönnen, das heißt

dem Sichentwerfen auf das *eigenste* eigentliche Schuldigwerdenkönnen. (SZ 368-81)⁸⁸

Heidegger's insistence that Dasein's authenticity can be measured by the degree to which it "hears" the call of conscience forcefully reminds us not only of the musical analogy more generally but also of the endings of both novels under consideration here, the "dream of love" and the "light of hope," as well as of Mann's 1938 essay on Goethe's *Faust*, where Mann describes the possibility of Faust's and modernity's redemption as follows: "[W]ir wollen an dem anti-teuflischen Vertrauen festhalten, daß die Menschheit im Grunde ein *feines Gehör* hat, und das Worte, die, aus eigenem Bemühen geborgen, ihr zugute kommen möchten, in ihrem Herzen nicht untergehen werden" (GF 621).⁸⁹

Even more importantly, perhaps, Heidegger in one fell swoop forges the constellation that links Dasein's conscience and its potentiality-for-Being, which it could be argued is Heidegger's answer to the tradition of *Bildung*, with the already musical temporality of *Sorge* and the musical analogy, more generally. Dasein's authenticity is said to be "attuned" through anxiety, and the temporality by which it is always already determined is said to be guided by a conscience described as a calling to be "heard correctly." Though the full impact of its acknowledgement will be elaborated in the next chapter, for now it is important to emphasize that whether it inauthentically flees from death or resolutely anticipates, Dasein's

⁸⁸ "Uncanniness is the basic kind of Being-in-the-world [...]. Out of the depths of this kind of Being, Dasein itself, as conscience, calls. [...]. The call whose mood has been attuned by anxiety is what makes it possible first and foremost for Dasein to project itself upon its ownmost *potentiality-for-Being*. [...] [Thus] [*c*]onscience manifests itself as the call of care: the caller is Dasein, which in its thrownness (in its Being-already-in), is anxious about its potentiality-for-Being. [...] The call of conscience – that is, conscience itself – has its ontological possibility in the fact that Dasein, in the very basis of its Being, is care. [...]. Hearing the appeal correctly is thus tantamount to having an understanding of oneself in one's ownmost potentiality-for-Being – that is, to projecting oneself upon one's *ownmost* authentic potentiality for becoming guilty" (BT 322-34).

⁸⁹ "But let us hold fast to the anti-diabolic faith, that mankind has after all a keen hearing, and that words born of one's own striving may do it good and not perish from its heart" (GF in Essays 42; emphases mine).

conscience is determined not only by the anxiety and guilt associated with its own death – that which for Dasein is *always* outstanding and still to be settled – but Dasein is also always already guilty because it is always already *thrown* into a world behind which it can never go. Out of its *thrownness* emerges another type of unavailability that, like its own death – for which it *is*, but which is not *for* it – determines its ontological guilt.

Interestingly, one way of explaining Heideggerian guilt, if only superficially for now, is by recalling exactly what Castorp learns on his walk with Joachim just before the latter dies and what Hofrat Behrens says to Joachim's mother in "consolation". Castorp not only admonishes the "Gleichgültigkeit, Verantwortungslosigkeit und egoistischer Unschuld" of those who dare not admit the intimate relation between life and death and concurs with Hofrat Behrens that death is much more a matter of thought for the living than it is for the deceased, but the Hofrat himself goes on to playfully confirm the ontological negation at the ground of this anxious flight and in the process echoes Heidegger: "But about death – no one who came back from it could tell you anything [...]. We come out of the dark and go into the dark again, and in between lie the experiences of our life. But the beginning and the end, birth and death, we do not experience" (MM 536-7). The in-between of our life experiences, of course, Heidegger calls the *Erstreckung* that Dasein *is*, and Dasein's being-guilty lies in the darkness out of which Dasein comes and into which it goes, as the Hofrat puts it, but which it is forbidden for Dasein to experience. Thus Dasein always begins *in media res* and for that it *is* guilty, according to Heidegger. In drawing these connections it is at least fair to say that Heidegger here creates powerful correspondences with Mann's ambivalent and challenging temporality that also guides the *strenger Satz*. In anxiety Dasein turns towards its own authentic temporality: "Dasein itself, as conscience, calls." Anxiety is the mood that

opens Dasein to the fullness of its suffering, or what amounts to the same thing – “Hearing the call correctly” opens Dasein to the fullness both of its own time and of the time that it is: in a word, *Sorge*.

Thus it is no mere coincidence that Adorno begins his preface to *Philosophy of Modern Music* with the claim that modern music is both the form and expression of a modern anxiety that has its basis in what can only be described as a distinctly Heideggerian temporality, a concurrence that, given the close proximity of Adorno’s theory of modern music to the musical analogy in *Doctor Faustus*, more than justifies the comparison with Mann: “How disordered is life today at its very roots if its shuddering and rigidity are reflected even in a field no longer affected by empirical necessity, a field in which human beings hope to find a sanctuary from horrifying norms, but which fulfills its promise to them only by denying to them what they expect of it” (*PMM* xiii). The twelve tone reflects the temporality of Dasein’s anxious waiting towards death, its constant waiting under the threat of impossibility: “Today the only works which really count are those which are no longer works at all....[Twelve-tone] conceptions are portrayal[s] of anxiety...The security of form establishes itself as a medium for shock absorption...These impulses do not permit lasting resolution” (30-2).

That the twelve-tone is an expression of anxiety contradicts the limits of its form, which excludes anticipation and expectation, which of course are the very material of anxiety, and it is my aim to reveal the temporality of this contradiction and bring this temporality to bear upon a rereading of Adrian’s fate and self-development in light of the *strenger Satz* [the strictly organized form of twelve-tone compositions]. Thus, in the same way that Adrian’s excessive sin prepares him for salvation, the critique of progress inherent

to the twelve-tone system, its disdain for endings and its embrace of stasis and inescapable circularity, is simultaneously the authentic and sincere expression of Dasein's temporality. This seemingly paradoxical relationship is of course the key to both Heideggerian authenticity, as I've already shown, and Adorno's convictions about the autonomy of art, in which art, despite the restrictions placed upon it by history and the finiteness of musical material, subsists by always pointing to something outside itself, beyond itself, or what is quite simply not itself (*PMM* 49). Like the twelve-tone and the anxiety it figures, *Sorge* signifies Dasein's having-been *thrown* out of and toward an impossibility – it denies and negates even while it promises and prohibits lasting resolution.

We might say of the proposed resolutions to this dilemma that they offer little consolation to the reader and typically *end* like the music described by Adorno. But these offerings certainly highlight the complexities of the ontological-historical predicament Mann is trying to narrate. We might say, for instance, that the dodecaphonic style that Scaff claims makes it impossible to end cannot disavow itself of the intentionality that makes narrative form and development possible and that must therefore inevitably move towards itself. Not only can the *strenger Satz* not dispense with the endings it seeks to avoid, it cannot but *be* this end insofar as, like Dasein, it *is* its own ending. Thus it is not that the twelve-tone musical style obviates the beginning and the end but rather that the beginning and the end are bound to one another in a circularity that likewise constitutes the stretching-along [*Erstreckung*] of Dasein; it needn't manifest itself as a narrative development or progression but merely as a stretching-along or turning which Dasein itself *is* prior to and alongside any notion of the former. And it is perhaps in this way that the musicality which “scorns extension *in time*” should be understood, not as somehow destroying narrative possibility but

grounding it, conditioning the very possibility of what Heidegger would call the derivative experience of being-*in-time*.

For Adorno, the anxiety portrayed by the twelve-tone is also its material; as a result, the twelve-tone not only describes the fate of music but is at the same time the fate of music itself (67-8). When considered in terms of narrative, then the relationship between narrative possibility and the so-called atemporality described by the narrative is not one of opposition but is rather an equation of mutual and consistent interdependence, simultaneity and duration. This equation, of course, clearly recalls the way in which Dasein is itself the temporality it describes, and thus the constellation of history, music and fate as it is portrayed in both *Philosophy of Modern Music* and *Doctor Faustus* begs a comparison with Heidegger's description of temporality as *Sorge*, and not surprisingly, the acknowledgement of this correspondence necessarily returns us to the questions of being-towards-death as Dasein's coming towards itself as the possibility of impossibility, that is, its dilemma of closure.

Music, as Adorno demonstrates, and in particular the twelve tone compositional technique, not only the negation of an idea, it is also the fate of an idea of negation. In the extremity of the twelve tone, we witness music's turn toward itself as that which "fulfills its promise to them only by denying to them what they expect of it." Just as for Heidegger Dasein is described as the very unfolding of a fate, the authenticity of which is measured by the degree to which Dasein turns toward its own impossibility, the possibility of an authentic art and of an authentic music in *Doctor Faustus* involves their turning towards their own impossibility, what literary scholars and cultural critics have conceded to call *modernism*. The passive emergence of this correspondence in *The Magic Mountain* is engaged by *Doctor Faustus* with a technical, which is also to say a "timely" specificity that, like modern music

itself, according to Adorno, not only reflects the very coming-to-be of the fate of music and even demonstrates that musical evolution undergoes the same fate of which it is an expression, but it also exposes the coming-to-be of an idea of modernist time – namely, that in its negation of time, in staving it off, so to speak, the twelve-tone, rather than dispensing with time actually engages time in a way that narrative music cannot. Such an idea of modernist time also encourages us to emphasize the development of this correspondence from the relatively threadbare relationship between Castorp and music in *The Magic Mountain* to the virtual identity Mann establishes between the fate of Adrian Leverkühn and the fate of modern music in *Doctor Faustus*. In addition, it clearly situates discussions of the *strenger Satz* within the orbit of philosophical approaches to the novel that hope to take Heidegger's account of temporality into consideration.

Doctor Faustus is both the story of Adrian's fate and the story of his development toward such a fate; it is also permeated by a narrator's anxiety that is itself grounded in the anticipation of the fate he describes. According to Heidegger, the authenticity of such a fate is measured precisely by the degree to which this fate turns resolutely toward itself, that it is to say, by the degree to which both Adrian and music anticipate their own end. Consequently, this tragic development is told through both the vehicle of the musical analogy insofar as the fate of music is bound up with the fate of the protagonist as well as through the evolution of an idea of time toward/for which the protagonist and the world he inhabits are being prepared.

Leverkühn's now infamous description and justification of the twelve-tone form and its anticipated development from the Brentano cycle through to the *Lamentation* perfectly

exposes the nature and limits of both music's and his own temporality as Heidegger would have it:

Das ist ganz aus einer Grundgestalt, einer vielfach variablen Intervallreihe, den fünf Tönen h-e-a-e-es abgeleitet, Horizontale und Vertikale sind davon bestimmt und beherrscht, soweit das eben bei einem Grundmotiv von so beschränkter Notenzahl möglich ist. Es ist wie ein Wort, ein Schlüsselwort, dessen Zeichen überall in dem Lied zu finden sind und es gänzlich determinieren möchten. Es ist aber ein zu kurzes Wort [...]. Man müßte von hier aus weitergehen und aus den zwölf Stufen des temperierten Halbton-Alphabets größere Wörter bilden, Wörter von zwölf Buchstaben, bestimmte Kombinationen und Interrelationen der zwölf Halbtöne, Reihenbildungen [...]. Jeder Ton der gesamten Komposition, melodisch und harmonisch, müßte sich über seine Beziehung zu dieser vorbestimmten Grundreihe auszuweisen haben. Keiner dürfte wiederkehren, ehe alle anderen erschienen sind. Keiner dürfte auftreten, der nicht in der Gesamtkonstruktion seine motivische Funktion erfüllte. Es gäbe keine freie Note mehr. Das würde ich strengen Satz nennen. (DF 258)⁹⁰

⁹⁰ "It all comes from one basic figure, from a row of intervals capable of multiple variation, taken from the five notes B-E-A-E-E-flat – both the horizontal and the vertical lines are determined and governed by it, to the extent that is possible in a basic motif with such a limited number of notes. It is like a word, a key word that leaves its signature everywhere in the song and would like to determine it entirely. It is, however, too short a word [...]. One would have to proceed from here and build longer words from the twelve steps of the tempered semitone alphabet, words of twelve letters, specific combinations and interrelations of the twelve semitones, rows of notes – [...]. Each tone in the entire composition, melodic and harmonic, would have to demonstrate its relation to this predetermined basic row. None would dare recur *until* all have first occurred. No note would dare appear that did not fulfill its motif function within the structure as a whole. Free notes would no longer exist. That is what I would call a strict style" (DF 205).

The prohibitions on function and freedom that inhere in the structure of the twelve tone mirror the temporal prohibitions in Heideggerian temporality, namely the nullity that is Dasein's basis or the being-guilty that in coming-towards only brings Dasein back to itself, so to speak, to that which it *has always been*, that is to say, being-towards-death. And yet balancing out this prohibition is its opposite, the anticipation of the being-towards that constantly awaits the *until*, which has its basis in the infinite deferral of endings and in the paradoxical risk and freedom of repetition. In addition, the twelve-tone, insofar as it is imagined as music stripped to its fundamental basis, without ornament, reveals not the antithesis or enemy of musical development but rather its ground, which, as we have seen, is time itself (Scaff).

The sanction on musical "freedom" by the *strenger Satz* or "strict style" is also the sanction of traditional ideas of human subjectivity as the "tonal" center of experience, a move mirrored of course in Heidegger, for whom Dasein may be described as a comparable rejection or overcoming of traditional (Kantian/Hegelian) notions of freedom and subjectivity. Dasein replaces the tonal center with a temporal-spatial construct, not unlike a musical row, *along* which time as such works itself out according to the fundamental requirement that insofar as it has begun it must also end. Though the twelve-tone certainly obscures the possibility of conclusions, it nevertheless emphasizes endings. As Adorno puts it, the *strenger Satz* not only anticipates its own end but it stages this end and thus is revealed as the fate of music itself. Consequently, in the tragic waiting described by Adrian's music, readers are given a very clear idea of the infinite deferral associated with being-towards-death and modernist anxieties about the end of time and history (Kermode).

This is clearly the case with the repetitive and anticipatory function of the *Haetera Esmerelda* motif, which not only helps to illustrate Adrian's compositional strategy but also thoroughly determines the structure of his fate and the narrative itself. *Hetaera Esmeralda* is, in fact, the *name* that incorporates the punishment in the sin, "das Schlüsselwort" that "haunts his work like a rune" ["geistert runenhaft [...] durch sein Werk"] (*DF* 165-6/*DF* 208). Just as every aspect of Adrian's mature compositions (from his earliest experimentations with the theme in the Brentano songs to his final masterpiece, *The Lamentation of Doctor Faustus*) is organized absolutely around this tonal theme, to the extent that every possible variation is a mere derivative of it, the same is true of the organizing principle that motivates his life and being. As we can see, this is neither a trivialization of historical development (Scaff 71) nor a failure to recognize history (Adorno 60) but rather a coldly passionate indictment of it. And this is the crux of Adrian's frustration with the limitations imposed upon both musical material and the possibilities of musical narrative at the end of a history in which method and content have been *exhausted*. Moreover, such a predicament desperately recalls the significance Heidegger attaches to the way in which being-towards-death and historicity collaborate to form the "essential content" of Dasein's experience as being-towards-death or *Sorge*.

It will also be remembered that the *Teufelsvertrag* [Devil's pact] was served merely to *remind* Adrian of his fate, not to inaugurate it. The pact constitutes neither beginning nor end but functions rather as a technical, literary device to establish the thematic leitmotif of the novel, the development of Adrian's infection in which his fate *is* and always *has been* inscribed (H-A-E-T-E-R-A). The "Illumination" that this motif is meant to facilitate and that would ordinarily correspond to Adrian's anticipated enlightenment is rather the conspicuous

yet always hidden somatic indicator of his very literal coming-towards what he *already* is and always *has been*, which is to say, the very site of his own stretching-along and the ongoing working-through and working-toward of his own mortality: “Die Illumination [...] liegt bereits in deiner Natur, wir auferlegen dir beileibe nichts Neues, die Kleinen machen nichts Neues und Fremdes aus dir, sie verstärken und übertreiben nur sinnreich alles, was du [schon] bist” (DF 334-5).⁹¹

Insofar as this is the case, the atonal polyphonic crisis of the twelve-tone, with its lack of a tonal center and so-called atmosphere of impotence and stagnant repetition, betrays in its “lettered symbol” a vital tonal center that is dispersed throughout the composition and points much less to impotence and stagnation than it does to movement and desire and the mortal resolve of human being over the *moment* of its lifetime. Thus out of the brevity of the highly compact musical moment grows the revelation of the nature and character of time’s passage as *Sorge*. In the tightly woven compositional form, the moment of significance pervades the entire length of the composition, remains the same even amidst its multiple variations and rather than returning/repeating itself in a surrender to stagnation comes toward itself out of its having been which itself arises out of the coming towards of the fate of the moment. The decisive moments of Adrian’s *Bildung*, whether his encounter with Esmerelda or his commitment to the blood-pact, are thus, strictly speaking, not moments at all; rather, they constitute a reverberation of the same motif that has always guided Adrian’s development and will ultimately determine his future and fate – a fate, by the way, which, as the possibility of his own impossibility, remains an irrevocable judgment that Adrian (and, of course, Dasein) is unable to decipher because its deciphering is tantamount to his *ending*.

⁹¹ “The Illumination [...] already lies in your nature, verily, we impose nothing new, the small folk make nothing new and strange to you, they do but deftly bolster and magnify all that you [already] are” (DF 265).

All of this is especially significant if critics such as Howard Eiland are correct in associating this description of time not only with the musical analogy as such but also with Heidegger's description of *Sorge* and with what Heidegger calls *geschehen* or the historicity of Dasein that, along with being-towards-death, is a constitutive element of Dasein's temporal being. This, I think, is the meaning of the repetitive mantra "I am Kaisersaschern" that haunts the novel's possibilities and that will be explored in more detail in the following chapter. The possibilities toward which Dasein is always already headed are fundamentally limited by Dasein's past, to its being-already-in-the-world, to the extent that its futural disposition or its coming-towards is anything but wide open, but rather it is always forced into a conservative return. This return, essential to Dasein's historicity, and its interdependence with the coming-towards of Dasein or being-towards-death, is also essential to Heidegger's conception of Dasein's guilt. Though the full impact of this recognition and of what the being-guilty of Dasein insures will become clearer later on, for now it should be noted only that Dasein's ontological guilt is replicated in the so-called atemporality of the twelve-tone composition, and as such this compositional formalism is anything but atemporal. According to Heidegger, the twelve-tone would suggest a highly temporalized expression of Dasein's being-guilty, and so it is not surprising that Scaff and others recognize its obvious relationship to history since the question of Dasein's guilt is as much connected with Dasein's historicity as it is to the problem of care and being-towards-death just as the question of Adrian's guilt is intimately linked with the transgressions of German history.

*

It has not been my aim to solve the dilemma of closure in *Doctor Faustus* but rather to bring to bear upon it Heidegger's notion of being-towards-death in order to explain why it

is first and foremost a dilemma. My first objective was to show that, according to Heidegger's analytic of Dasein and the theory of time that informs it, the opposition of time and eternity that defines Scaff's analysis of the novel is ultimately misguided. Both the stagnant atemporality of the *Apocalypsis cum figuris* and the promise of narrative development that inheres in the *Lamentation*, rather than mutually excluding each other, actually constitute together deeply felt responses to what Heidegger calls primordial temporality or being-towards-death, the essential character of which lies in its being both absolutely certain and at the same time always unavailable to Dasein. Thus the promise of salvation at the end of the novel, the "miracle that goes beyond faith," rather than solving the dilemma of closure actually demonstrates it. My second and final objective was to clarify the nature of the tragic deferral at the foundation of Heidegger's notion of being-towards-death and to show that as a result the sort of closure described by Scaff is plainly impossible, for Dasein's richest possibilities *always* lie precisely in its impossibility, and the same may be said of narrative. The reinstatement of narrative potential allows not for closure but only for continuation, and the salvation it suggests is neither an answer to the dilemma of closure nor closure itself but rather the very expression of its deferral. Consequently, the possibility of grasping itself as a whole is denied to Dasein and causes it to flee in the face of the anxiety produced by the certainty that it will one day *not be*.

This is, however, not quite the whole story. Although Heidegger's notion of being-towards-death would appear to preclude both the possibility of closure as well as the possibility of being delivered from the finality of death, he is reluctant to admit completely to such outright prohibitions. If Adrian is indeed saved at the end of the novel, having reached his intended fulfillment or moment of ripeness, then the vehicle for this salvation must lie in

what Heidegger calls *authenticity or Eigentlichkeit*, for it is only authentically that Dasein may grasp itself as whole and comport itself with resolute anticipation rather than flee that towards which is thrown – its own death. Thus to be authentically disposed towards one’s ownmost possibility is to embrace that which is still outstanding, the possibility of the impossibility of one’s existence (or even of one’s art). Heideggerian authenticity describes the manner in which Dasein “heightens the possibility, which Dasein is, to its extreme limit where it becomes boundless impossibility, namely, the impossibility of any existing as a definite potentiality-for-being” (Pöggeler 44). And one could certainly argue that in Adrian’s diabolical pact, in his coldness and isolation, in his morbid preoccupation with death and his feverish distance from society that he embodies a Dasein poised in resolute anticipation of its own end.

Thus the only way for Dasein to get around the infinite deferral of the end is to anticipate it or to bring it to oneself; like the fruit which never goes unfulfilled, Adrian brings himself to ripeness through his willing self-destruction (and yet, like the ripening fruit, despite himself). This dynamic is especially evident in the fact that even Zeitblom sees some measure of authenticity in both Esmerelda’s choice to warn Adrian against himself and in Adrian’s resolve to embrace the “ill-fated creature” of his imagination, *Haetera Esmerelda*, the name which corresponds to the dominant musical motif around which both his twelve-tone expressions as well as Adrian’s life are organized: “a trace of love’s purification” [“Einschlag von Liebesläuterung”] (DF 164/205) and “the bond of love [that lent] some shimmer of human soul” [“einer Liebesbindung [...], was [...] einen Schimmer des Seelenhaften verlieh”] (DF 164/206-7) to Adrian’s fateful choice and interaction. According to Zeitblom, this trace saves Adrian from certain damnation, and the musical motif in which

this potential is inscribed can thus not be said to represent either irresolution or atemporality but rather signals the active resolve of a *human* spirit deeply concerned with the time which it essentially *is*. Such an authentic temporality is also displayed in the tale of Nepomuk Schneidewein, or Echo, Adrian's nephew; and the return here of the question of ripeness is not unimportant, for the theme itself returns when Zeitblom relates the story of Echo's death (*DF* 489) – the event, remember, that Scaff associates most explicitly with facilitating Adrian's salvation by evoking within him the powerful love that had until that moment been denied him.⁹²

Like the infection growing in Adrian's body, the true impact of such a temporality remains latent throughout most of Adrian's career. It gathers its fullest clarity and significance only with his final composition, *The Lamentation of Doctor Faustus*, and with the death and transfiguration of his nephew Echo, which inspires both its success and completion. It is well known that *The Lamentation* is Adrian's breakthrough. However, it is not in spite of the twelve-tone that Adrian escapes the diabolical circularity of the Apocalypse oratorio, as most critics of the novel suggest it is, but through it, because of it. Moreover, the musical motif that guided the Brentano lieder guides *The Lamentation* even more decisively and has its narrative parallel in the story of Echo and in the ongoing affinity between love and death that signals for Heidegger the very essence of *Sorge*. Indeed, the crisis of representation in modern art, the truth about the relationship between art and reality, between art and life, is for Mann all too real, and his awareness of it is crystallized in the tragic events that describe the coming and going of Adrian's angelic young nephew.

⁹² See John Fetzer's "Music, Love, Death, and Mann's *Doctor Faustus*" for a closer look at the intersection in the novel between music, love and death.

The little boy's name is mentioned very early on in the novel and tactically throughout as a prelude to his symbolic significance. Echo's death effectively closes the novel – it can be argued that nothing happens after that, there is no more talk of art; what follows Echo's death is Adrian's less than triumphant attempt to introduce the world to his most accomplished effort, *The Lamentation of Dr. Faustus*, which ends, tragically, in silence, failure and the final onset of Adrian's ultimate decay. Echo's life and fate are of course closely linked with both Adorno's and Mann's speculations on the fate of art in modern culture. What is personified in the character of Echo is both the mortality of art, which, like the young nephew, must age, become rigid, and die (*AT* 6) and also the impossibility of art in the modern world, a prohibition upheld in the Devil's insistence upon Echo's death and his being stripped away from Adrian. Echo is like the little servant in the story told to him by Adrian, the "little spirit [who] had no age, but was the same delicate child of the air both before and after his imprisonment" ["der Kleine habe kein Alter gehabt, sondern sei vor und nach der Gefangenschaft immer dasselbe zierliche Kind der Lüfte gewesen"] (*DF* 493/621). "Yes, he comes from a long way off" ["Ja, der ist weither"] (*DF* 492/619), Adrian says, emphasizing the *untimely* nature of the boy, who, like the work of art itself, is at once an autonomous thing of beauty and an object constrained by the "imprisonment" of history (of having-been), both free to anticipate its own immortality and subject to disintegration over time, "fated to ripen and fall prey to things of this earth" ["der beschieden war, zu reifen und dem Irdischen zu verfallen"] (*DF* 489/615). Nepomuk is often described as an object of beauty "new to this earth" ["auf Erden noch Neuen"] (*DF* 487/614) and yet somehow "strikingly finished and definitive" ["Ausgeprägt-Fertiges und Gültiges"] (*DF* 484/609). His musical voice and archaic manner of speech, according to Zeitblom, "although utterly charming often tended to

make his meaning seem obscure and enigmatic” [“eher verwischenden und verfremdenden und dabei höchst anmutigen”] (*DF* 484/609).

In the end Echo is indescribable, calling to Zeitblom’s mind “language’s inadequacy at making things visible” [“Untauglichkeit der Sprache [...], Sichtbarkeit zu erreichen”] (*DF* 484/609); in fact, rather than attempting a portrait of Echo, Zeitblom, like the cherub who gazes into the “abyss of God’s eternal resolve” (*DF* 172) simply states that “tears well up in [his] eyes at the thought of him” [“die Tränen mir in die Augen treten beim Gedanken an ihn”] (*DF* 484/609-10). For Zeitblom there was something in Nepomuk Schneidewein “that made one incapable of believing in time, in its vulgar work and its power over this gracious presence [...] That presence could not deny the inevitability of growth, but it found refuge in a conceptual sphere that is mythic and timeless, where all things are simultaneous and abide in parallel” (*DF* 489).⁹³ Zeitblom’s optimism here is certainly not shared by Adrian, who is completely disconcerted by his very deep love for Echo and who knows that both the love itself as well as the object of that love are forbidden by history, which is perhaps the reason why, as time passes in the novel, Adrian relinquishes his arrogant propensity for coldness and laughter and betrays instead a rather alarming warmth and seriousness, especially with respect to Echo, around whom, Adrian says, “There is no reason to laugh” [“Ist auch kein Grund zum Lachen”] (*DF* 485/611). In short, the possibility of art and love in the modern world are at least in one sense violently negated in Echo’s premature death.

Echo, then, is symbolic of art, life, desire and mortality personified in the *process* by which beauty is deformed, love denied, and art made the study of the impossible. Nepomuk

⁹³ “was einen außerstand setzte, an die Zeit und ihr gemeines Werk, an ihre Macht über diese holde Erscheinung zu glauben [...] Sie konnte die Unvermeidlichkeit des Wachstums nicht leugnen, aber sie rettete sich in eine Vorstellungssphäre des Mythisch-Zeitlosen, Gleichzeitigen und neben einander Bestehenden” (*DF* 616).

is many things: a young nephew, a muse, and insofar as Adrian covets him like an object, not involving himself in the actual *care* of the child, who after all is a real boy, Echo is the work of art. But then it is not his illusory qualities, not his similarities with the artwork or art in general, that give him his true significance; it is the reality of Echo – the tragic beauty that more than any other confirms the *human*, a beauty that is situated squarely in the world of time and exists very well right in front of one in the flesh and blood of this dying child; such a beauty is the truth of one’s inability to protect the beloved, to alter the outcome of its destiny and the impossibility of art to ever assuage the reality of its own disappearance. The story of Echo reflects in pristine clarity the Devil’s pronouncement on the state of artistic possibility in the modern period, on the negation of art by life, that “[o]nly what is not fictitious, not a game, is still permissible – the unfeigned and untransfigured expression of suffering in its real moment.”

Echo is indeed a reminder that the game is no longer permissible, that the authenticity of Adrian’s encounter with Echo is certified in its revocation, but only *because* and not in spite of his love, both the prohibition placed upon it and the irrevocable will *toward* it. And since Echo is himself characterized by a distinct temporality, like the temporality of Adrian’s wound, the pact between love and death is, too. Isn’t this what is meant when the Devil says that art has its conscience set against illusions and games, that art wants to stop being illusion and to become, rather, *comprehension*, and isn’t this precisely what art does when it takes the form of Adrian’s beloved Echo, art as no longer a game, art as “unfeigned” and “untransfigured”? And isn’t this what Adrian is trying to accomplish with the twelve-tone, too, a stripping bare of ornamentation and of illusion that makes his final work, *The Lamentation*, a masterpiece and breakthrough, a breakthrough in which art merges so

imperceptibly with the reality of its loss? According to traditional readings of Echo's significance in the novel, among them Scaff's and Cobley's, Adrian's love for Echo is fundamentally opposed to the general thrust of the twelve-tone – the love is guided by narrative, whereas the musical style (inspired as it is by the Devil) is said to prohibit both love and any temporality associated with it, but it seems more likely that it is the prohibition that provokes the love, the prohibition out of which the love grows. This is a subtle distinction but one that nevertheless has ramifications for understanding and interpreting the complexity of Mann's "most beloved character."

In conclusion, the authentic meaning of narrative time must be found within the strict style itself, a plausible claim given the infamous ambiguity of its status in the novel; it is itself a "timely" *caring* on the end for the sake of humanity. When critics argue that the problem of narrating time in both novels is a matter of "engaging the soul in recognizable experiences apart from the aesthetically ordered psychological impulses of dodecaphony" (Scaff 82) or of portraying "a human being's (a character's) moment-to-moment experience" (Cohn 210), they fail to appreciate the way the *strenger Satz* in the one novel and the idea of *Bildung* in the earlier novel function *as* history and *as* fate or the way these tropes "secrete" historicity (Ziarek) and a psychology of *Sorge*. Consequently, Dasein's *caring*, both for its own time and for the time that it always already *is*, is exposed in the "psychological impulsion" of the *strenger Satz* and in the so-called "timelessness" that permeates *The Magic Mountain*. As a result, these readings also fail to register the authentic meaning of temporality as grounding rather than negating or destroying the so-called narrative impetus that motivates meaning in the novels. Furthermore, when Scaff claims that "[Adrian's] arrogance provokes him to configure the twelve-tone chromatic tones in a superhuman

‘cosmic’ order, but a deep longing to make human contact also keeps alive a latent melodic impulse,” she misses the crucial point that the development and the compositional form itself is grounded in precisely such a deep longing, as the novel reiterates many times, a longing that is far from being the opposite of that diabolical tendency which frightens Zeitblom, but at every moment is complicit with it and, in fact, refigures its devilry into something very different; remember, too, that what strikes Zeitblom most about his friend’s life and fate is the greatness and intensity of his deep love for the world, that both the most angelic and the most disturbing aspects of Adrian’s character and predicament are somehow always grounded first and foremost in this love, or better perhaps, in something very much like what Heidegger calls *Sorge*.

Adrian’s unconditional love forcefully recalls the prohibition and limit it has always stood for, the prohibition of human finitude and being-towards-death, of which the story of Echo is the novel’s most dramatic example. On the one hand, as Adrian’s emotional response to Echo’s death, the *Lamentation* has its source in an extreme anxiety over both the premature loss of the nephew as well as the remorse attached to Adrian’s responsibility for that loss. In this way, too, Echo’s death serves as another reminder of Adrian’s certain fate even while the *Lamentation* functions as a narrative deferral of this certainty because it translates and embodies the guilt that is bound up with his survival and continuing. On the other hand, Adrian’s freedom towards death is clearly communicated in and through the *Lamentation* inasmuch as in it he looks forward to the moment when he will be delivered from the suffering that he essentially *is*. Echo *is* indeed impossible, and the *Lamentation* is an ode to this loss and the guilt that it signifies and leaves behind as a remainder.

Chapter IV

Authenticity and the Jargon of History

Historicism's ardent distrust of Heideggerian essentialism, a legacy of suspicion that includes the full scope of the Heidegger controversy as well as extended evaluations, such as Adorno's influential critique of Heidegger's metaphysics, poses many challenges to a reading that hopes to treat Heidegger's theory of history as if its interpretive potential had not been exhausted, as if the whole matter of Heidegger had not yet been decided. And it is no less interesting, though perhaps it *is* mere coincidence, that the same confidence (of closure, of having reached an end) suffuses the entire atmosphere of Mann criticism, especially where *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus* are concerned (Fetzer et al.). Nevertheless, since Heidegger's idiosyncratic interpretation of history has never been read against the contemporary background of Mann's celebrated historical novels (nor has it ever been explained in terms of its own historical contingency), it is my aim in what follows to show how at least one opening can be found in a reading that juxtaposes the two and explains one in terms of the other.

Just as in the previous chapter, where I ventured to interpret Hans Castorp's and Adrian Leverkühn's fate and the problem of closure in the novels in terms of being-towards-death, my purpose here is to show that Mann's novels also help to illuminate Heidegger's theory of historicity [Geschichte, Geschichtlichkeit], a theory which in turn helps to reopen

the question of history in the novels. Among other things, the novels appear to stage and potentially reconcile, in their own way of course, the conflict between historical materialism, which requires that historical conditions of specificity guide and accompany any authentic (i.e. critical) understanding of the past, and the so-called metaphysical “jargon” of an altogether different sort of authenticity that Heidegger describes as flowing out of the basic historicity of the individual. The novels answer, along with Heidegger, that these historical conditions of specificity tend always to confirm rather than contradict the specificity of what it means to *be* historical in the first place (and precisely in the sense indicated by Heidegger).

But first I must lay out separately (and briefly recall), as I do in my introductory chapter, both the historical context from which any reading of Mann’s and Heidegger’s respective concerns with history must necessarily emerge as well as the character and nature of Heidegger’s understanding of history and of what it means to *be* historical. For Heidegger’s part, this means providing a brief explanation of both his advancement of Dilthey’s sense of *life* and history as well as his break from Husserlian phenomenology and a Bergsonian and Einsteinean relativity; and for Mann’s part, this means providing a brief explanation of his narratives’ changing disposition with respect to history and historical meaning during the period that begins with *The Magic Mountain* and ends with the publication of *Doctor Faustus*. The changes that make up this evolution are generally attributed to the influence of Mann’s readings of Benjamin and Adorno and to the accompanying development of Mann’s own peculiar brand of historicism, which is why scholars typically see the “[nur] *einmal* historisch” approach of the earlier novel as giving way to a more thoroughly material, *durchdringendes* historicism in the later novel (e.g. Bergsten et al.).

Scholarly approaches that insist on the correspondence between Adorno's and Mann's shared understanding of history during the composition of *Doctor Faustus* (an insistence, by the way, that I know is not only justified and productive but at the same time historical and attested) nevertheless risk overlooking that aspect of Mann's engagement with history that resonates with a Heideggerian conception of history. To articulate the link between Heidegger's historical ontology and Mann's treatment of history in *The Magic Mountain* and (especially) *Doctor Faustus* is in fact at the same time to acknowledge the Adorno-Heidegger debate, the key features of which must at some point be acknowledged in any contemporary critical analysis of Heidegger. Consequently, it may be shown that the problematic relationship between Mann's and Adorno's ideas of history helps to illuminate Adorno's famous critique of Heidegger's *jargon of authenticity* and that Mann's treatment of history in the novels under consideration, instead of slavishly describing an Adornian historicism, may be said to operate somewhere between a Heideggerian and Adornian conception of history. Moreover, a rereading of Mann's representation(s) of history may serve us to dispense with the debate altogether by helping to show that the presumed opposition between history and ontology is somehow always already resolved and in such a way, in fact, as Heidegger had already emphasized with his persistent claim that history is not only *not* the enemy of being, but that being as such is first and foremost *historical*.

Most critical assessments of Heidegger's understanding of history rightly begin with his detailed exposition of the Dilthey-Count Yorck correspondence from 1877-97, from which Heidegger borrows one of his most emphatic and significant claims, namely, that we *are* history ["Wir *sind* Geschichte"] (*DF* 174), or that Dasein *is* history ["Dasein *ist* Geschichte"] (*BZ* 86). For Heidegger, however, although Dilthey was certainly right to

emphasize the essentially historical nature of human existence [Dasein], Dilthey never ventured to explain the ontological conditions that such a historicity presumes, which is to say, what it means to *be* historical. This task, Heidegger thought, was left to him and would be emphasized in both his lectures on *The Concept of Time* and the subsequent *Being and Time* as well. The impact of Dilthey's insight, according to Heidegger, in addition to being valid in its own right, also helped Heidegger to establish the significance of his own philosophical efforts with respect to rewriting time and history over and against the views of his mentor, Husserl, as well as the other subjectivist intellectual currents of his day, namely, those set in motion by Bergson and Einstein.

For Heidegger, Husserlian phenomenology was marked by a "Geschichtlosigkeit und –feindlichkeit" ["lack of history, even an animosity toward [it]]" (DF 176) and fell short precisely in so far as it dispensed with the past (and thus, too, with history) in its limited emphasis on the immediate data of consciousness, which by its very nature appeared to exclude or bracket out the past. Heidegger also offered up his own radical notion of history in opposition to Bergsonian conceptions of time. According to Stephen Kern, "Bergson based his theory of knowledge on the way we know ourselves in time [...] and our ability to integrate the past in the present is one source of our freedom" (45-6). Time, for Bergson, which includes a past that is capable of being lost *behind* us, is something that both happens outside of us, or, even better, something *in* which we happen to be, and which only an authentic apprehension of duration enables us to recover and subsequently integrate: "It is into pure duration that we plunge back, a duration in which the past, always moving on, is swelling unceasingly with a present that is absolutely new... We must, by a strong recoil of our personality on itself, gather up our past which is slipping away, in order to thrust it,

compact and undivided, into a present which it will create by entering” (qtd. in Kern 46; *CE* 219). Furthermore, as the passage above indicates Bergsonian duration privileges only the private, psychic past of the individual and takes little notice of the *historical* context of the ontological and material processes that such an apprehension presupposes. Bergson’s primary oversight, according to Heidegger, lies in his misunderstanding this mobility as something *in* which being happens as opposed to being as this happening itself, being as a sort of duration-*in-the-world*. According to Heidegger, time is neither something *in* which human being takes place nor is the past merely that which *is no longer* but which is capable of being reified and integrated into one’s present experience. In a much more fundamental sense, the past is always already integrated insofar as Dasein *is its own past* [“eigene Vergangenheit”](*DF* 174) and the private past of the individual is thoroughly determined by and inseparable from the historical processes *in* the world (in) which Dasein always already *is*.

Thus, too, according to Heidegger, the real discovery uncovered by Einstein’s theory of special relativity is the conflict that arises when time is said to be both local, i.e. to depend upon the place where it is measured, as well as constitutive of universal motion and change (*DF* 172-3/*Becoming* 269-70). But for Heidegger this exposes not so much an impassable obstacle but rather a truth of a very different nature. Whereas for Einstein the place from which the relative motion of time must be measured is the position of a stationary subject in the world, for Bergson the psychic motion of that observer is itself characterized by constant flux and a pure and ongoing qualitative mobility; consequently, one could argue that in seeking to reconcile this apparent contradiction Heidegger proposes time as relative to the movement of a subject that is not within time but that is time itself. This is why I pointed out

earlier that Einstein's oversight (due in part to his own goals and motives) was not to consider the relative motion of the subject from which an authentic time was supposed to be measured. For Heidegger, the motion of being-there (Dasein) is always relative to a future – in being towards the future, Dasein *is* this future; moreover, claims Heidegger, and in stark opposition to a Bergsonian line of argumentation, it is not so much that we “gather up our past which is slipping away, in order to thrust it, compact and undivided” into the future; rather, it is the future out of which any idea of the past must emerge:

Das Vorlaufen ist eine Bewegung, die das Dasein in seiner eigenen Zukunft ausführt. Dies Vor-sich-selbst-gehen ist die Grundbewegung, aus der Geschichte entsteht, denn durch es wird die Vergangenheit aufgedeckt. [...] Unsere Zukunft legt aus der Vergangenheit heraus. Wir tragen an der Vergangenheit” (DF 174).⁹⁴

This is, I believe, the best way of describing the way Heidegger moves beyond both Bergson and Einstein as well as Dilthey and Husserl to prepare the way for a radical new conception of time and one that radically opens new ways of reading the past and thus, too, not only Thomas Mann but narrative more generally. So this is where Heidegger stood in 1924 when Mann, too, was on the verge of publishing his self-described time-novel *The Magic Mountain*, which would become, along with Joyce's *Ulysses*, Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past*, Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway* and Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*, a model example of the genre. Nevertheless, it can be shown that Mann's treatment of time and history in *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus* helps to illuminate Heidegger's response

⁹⁴ “Anticipatory running forward is a movement that Dasein carries out in its own future. This getting-ahead-of-itself is the basic movement from which history arises, for it is by way of its going-forth that the past is uncovered. [...] Our future is lived out of the past. We carry the past with us” (*Becoming* 268-271).

to and reevaluation of these conventional modernist approaches to time and history and vice-versa, and thus Heidegger and Mann may be read together in this context as venturing a more radical conception of time and history than is usually assumed to be the case.

It would be difficult to argue that Thomas Mann in 1924 did not also take history seriously. T. J. Reed's classic study *The Uses of Tradition* better than perhaps any other lays out the complicated way in which *The Magic Mountain* traces Mann's own shifting political "education" (the title of Reed's chapter on the novel) with respect to the historical events in Germany during the long period of its composition (1912-1924) before, during and after the great war which erupts at the ending of the novel. The distinction between the representation of history in *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus* lies rather in the complexity of its function within both novels. In 1924, Mann states that *The Magic Mountain* is only on the one hand a historical novel in so far as it sought to throw into relief the inner life of the pre-war European society whose "Dionysian coziness" (interestingly described as such in *Doctor Faustus*) left it both vulnerable, unprepared and also somehow responsible for the unprecedentedly violent historical actuality it was unconsciously preparing. But it is clear that the relationship of historical reality to the narrative world of the novel was a merely analogical one and that history as such is marginally present in the novel and takes a sort of backseat to the novel's abstract disputations on *die reine Zeit selbst* and the *Bildung* of its protagonist. In a sense, then, as the title of Reed's chapter on *Doctor Faustus* suggests, the portrayal and function of history in the later novel constitutes a "reckoning" with the ultimate consequences both of misapprehending the true potential of those inchoate historical forces that erupted in 1914 and thus, too, with the naiveté and incompleteness of that earlier part of

the author's and protagonist's "education" in the matters of history, in particular, German history.

Coupled with the historical urgency of the rise of National Socialism and Mann's growing proximity to the historical events themselves (despite his ironic distance from them – since the novel was written in America) was Mann's continuing education in philosophies of history during the composition of *Doctor Faustus*. His readings of Adorno and Benjamin, among others, not only influenced his treatment of the subject in *Doctor Faustus* but also, as the author himself points out, only augmented and reinforced his own developing understanding of the dialectical forces at work in history (*Entstehung* 46). Thus it bears repeating that although the two novels clearly are dealing with the same threat at various stages of its historical development, i.e. the conservative psychological and cultural forces that underlay the historical emergence of National Socialism, including the cult of death dramatized in the ritual cure of the Berghof, the latter novel certainly proffers a more direct and intimate relation between history and narrative. And several scholars, among them Ehrhard Bahr, describe this shift as moving from a Nietzschean to an Adornian perspective (145-6).

The influence of Adorno's *Philosophy of Modern Music* on Mann's composition is well-known, but Benjamin's *The Origin of German Tragic Drama* on *Doctor Faustus* also shaped Mann's thinking on the function of history. In fact, Adorno introduces *Philosophy of Modern Music* with a respectful recognition of Benjamin's work. Among other things, what Adorno and Benjamin set out to do is to show that neither music nor the idea of the tragic, respectively, are governed by natural laws that operate independently from historical processes, and their revelations are directly related with what Mann in *Doctor Faustus* sets

out to do with his allegorical conflation of Adrian's musical compositions and Germany's historical fate.⁹⁵

The attempt, unthought in *The Magic Mountain*, where Mann's intentions with respect to history were purely representative insofar as the novel was "[nur] einmal historisch, indem er das innere Bild einer Epoche, der europäischen Vorkriegszeit, zu entwerfen versucht" (GW.XII.441) and meant to serve as a sort of "Schwanengesang [einer] Existenzform" and in which music functioned only as a formal leitmotif and sensual ornamentation (GW.XII.435), was to demonstrate that historical necessity lies latent in the material of history and music itself (Adorno [Schoenberg] 41), that there are irreversible historical tendencies present both in the work of art and in the cultural attitudes that produce it. Just as Mann recognizes his own preoccupations in Benjamin's acknowledgement that the Baroque *Trauerspiel* and Elizabethan tragedy necessarily preserve traces of medieval religious dogma and ritual (*Entstehung* 187), he sympathizes with Adorno's insistence that "the twelve-tone system is a product of historical necessity. Its origin was the next logical step following late nineteenth-century chromaticism" (Mitchell and Blomster ix). As a result of this shift in Mann's understanding of history, it becomes clear that *The Magic Mountain* can not be the "Schwanengesang" it was meant to be and that, in fact, within this "Existenzform" that Mann claims in 1939 is no longer liveable lie latent the historical forces that erupt in that same year and that eventually provoke Mann's taking up the task of writing *Doctor Faustus*. Insofar as this task involves an elaboration of these radical new proposals about the function of history and his exploration of the fundamental inextricability of

⁹⁵ See *The Story of a Novel/Die Entstehung des Doktor Faustus* (XIV, 187/165).

historical, social and aesthetic forces, *Doctor Faustus* is said to be a historical novel through and through, and thus “[nicht nur] *einmal* historisch.”

But again this is not to say that with *Doctor Faustus* Mann dispenses with his interest in time as such. Although Mann’s move toward a dialectical reading of history is typically said to do just that, it is my point here that despite the well-known debate between Adorno and Heidegger on the subject of history, what Mann achieves in *Doctor Faustus* is certainly not the doing away with a focus on *die reine Zeit selbst* in favor of a purely material history. Rather *Doctor Faustus* seems to suggest that even the idea of time as such, distinguished sharply from the author’s “*einmal historisch*” intentions in *The Magic Mountain*, is shown to be inextricably bound to the same historical necessity that lies concealed in its material content. And the way in which Mann goes about describing this inextricability in the novel not only echoes and helps to elaborate Heidegger’s claim that “*Dasein is history*,” but it also helps to explain why Adorno’s philosophy of history confirms rather than contradicts Heidegger’s. And it is also why Reed’s statement about the paradoxical relationship between German history and Mann’s private past is really not paradoxical at all: “It is paradoxical that a body of work [...] so narrowly preoccupied with the problems of the writer’s self [...] should also contain so much history” (Reed, “History” 1). Reed’s rather benign recognition is also taken up by critics of Heidegger’s historical ontology, such as Adorno and Eagleton,⁹⁶ for whom a Heideggerian metaphysics of history dispenses with actual historical conditions and by critics, such as Lukacs, who makes the claim in a postscript to the 1953 edition of *The Historical Novel* (1937), of which *Doctor Faustus* is treated as a prime but unique example, that the only true path toward understanding the human character of a work is first and

⁹⁶ See Adorno’s *Jargon of Authenticity*, *Negative Dialectics*, and *Metaphysics*, especially. See also Terry Eagleton’s *Literary Theory* (Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 2003. 53-7).

foremost through laying bare the “objective connections and material content” of the larger matrix of material social conditions in which this character was cultivated and made possible (306). Nevertheless, as I will attempt to explain below, the rigid distinction between the collective (social, political, etc.) forces of history and the private history of the individual for Heidegger (and Mann, too) collapses under the weight of Heidegger’s insistence that “History happens to *me*. I *am* this happening” [“Geschichte geschieht mit mir selbst; ich bin dieses Geschehen”] (*DF* 174).

Heidegger, *Geschichte, Eigentlichkeit*

Although it was appropriate to begin a Heideggerian reading of the dilemma of closure in *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus* with a detailed examination of being-towards-death, being-towards-death is only one of the critical moments in the complex triadic structure of Heideggerian temporality. Being-towards-death cannot be adequately interpreted outside of its interdependence with the other so-called ecstases of temporality – *thrownness* or being-already-in-the-world and *fallenness* or being-alongside-the-world, all of which together form the tripartite unity of *die Sorge*. This chapter deals with the first of these moments and its entanglement with being-towards-death and both narrative and historical possibility in *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus*.

If the existential possibility of authenticity is based upon the disclosure of Dasein to itself as being-towards-death (*BT* 294), then this possibility is essentially and always a *thrown* possibility, and as such conceals from Dasein its having *already* been “delivered over to its [own] death” (*BT* 295). The be *thrown* into a world is one of the cornerstones of a Heideggerian temporality; by *having been thrown* Heidegger means to say that the remotest

origins of our past lie shrouded in mystery and that we ourselves, without having made the choice to be, are thrust into the trajectory of this world, our world, unawares and always underway. What Heidegger calls *thrownness* is indicative of Dasein's *a priori being-there*, which finds Dasein always already an entity in the world which cannot possibly get behind itself to a point in time in which it *was* not already Dasein. Instead, it remains the thrown projection of its own past, "eine Erstreckung" ["a stretching along"] prohibited from knowing either its beginning or its end (SZ 427). And this *thrownness* [Geworfenheit] is also the basis of a Heideggerian theory of history, for it is only because Dasein has been thrown into a world, the momentum of which gathers up more and more of its past as it comes towards its future, that Dasein must grasp itself as "human, *historical* Dasein," and it is precisely the history *that it is* that Dasein in its authenticity must dare to interpret and engage: "Die Zugangsmöglichkeit zur Geschichte gründet in der Möglichkeit, nach der es eine Gegenwart jeweils versteht, zukünftig zu sein. Das ist der erste Satz aller Hermeneutik" (BZ 123).⁹⁷

In his Kassel lectures of 1924 (which constitute the earliest expression of themes that would eventually surface with even more fanfare and a much broader audience in *The Concept of Time* and then, ultimately, *Being and Time*), Heidegger set for himself two tasks. The first was to reinterpret the Dilthey-Yorck correspondence in such a way as to illuminate and advance his own distinctive views of time and history, and the second was for the first time to describe what he saw as a sharp and all important distinction between two typically synonymous German terms: *Geschichte* and *Historie*. These two tasks were of course very

⁹⁷ "The possibility of access to history is grounded in the possibility according to which a particular present each time [jeweils] understands how [...] to be futural. This is the first principle of all hermeneutics" (*Becoming*, "Concept of Time," 212).

closely related in so far as *Geschichte* was intended to denote precisely that lived history which Heidegger understood Count Yorck to indicate with his claim that Dasein is in fact its own history, while *Historie* would suffice to refer to that history which is supposedly lost and recovered in being written about, recorded, even remembered – in short, the sort of history that is the basis of both our everyday way of remembering the past and of historical science. *Geschichte* refers to what Heidegger understands as the ontological basis for both private memory as well as any public consent over and preoccupation with the scientific interpretations of the past; it is what is meant by being-historical, and it is only because Dasein is *a priori* temporal in this way that it has a past for memory to recall or a past that makes the development of historiology as a science both possible and probable (SZ 381, 389). Dasein's historicity or historizing is an ongoing happening which Dasein at all times *is* (Kisiel, *Becoming*, 239-40), and a Heideggerian *Geschichte* thus refers to the “historical existence that we *happen* to be and are thus called upon to be and to live out” (Kisiel, *Becoming*, 487).

That this distinction first appears in the Kassel lectures delivered around the same time as the publication of Mann's *The Magic Mountain* is certainly not a mere coincidence. As Theodore Kisiel points out, the title of the lectures themselves, “Wilhelm Diltheys Forschungsarbeit und der gegenwärtige Kampf um eine historische Weltanschauung” [“Wilhelm Dilthey's Research and the Current Struggle for a Historical Worldview”], demonstrates that Heidegger's goals are “not motivated by antiquarian interests, but always in relation to the ‘current struggle’ on the intellectual front” in Germany” (*Becoming* 241). Consequently, Heidegger's intentions and the historical specificity with and in which they are invested coincide quite meaningfully with the historical context, atmosphere and

narrative thrust of Mann's novel(s) during the period that begins and ends with *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus*, respectively. What Kisiel calls the "practical upshot" of the lectures lies in their emphasis on bracketing and redefining what a historical worldview might mean in light of a post-war German world in which the First World War was generally regarded by intellectuals, including Mann, as a battle of contending worldviews, including the well-known contest between Mann and his brother Heinrich, which was very literally played out during the entire period of the *The Magic Mountain's* composition. In fact, it may be said that Castorp's *Bildung* involves in part negotiating the historical worldviews thrust upon him by Naphta and Settembrini and in the end being resolved to submit to neither (Reed). Just as Mann wished to attribute the historical crises of pre-war European society to these irreconcilable worldviews and the static impasse they described, Heidegger, too, understood the crisis of the European sciences immediately following the war as lying first and foremost in its lack of insight into the ontological ground that make such historical worldviews possible in the first place. In other words, Mann and Heidegger were not only interested in the conditions that underlay the aggressive interpretations of history that comprised either side of the political and intellectual debates of the day, but, more generally speaking, both were responding to the same cultural-historical milieu, the currency of which punctuates the urgency of their work.

Heidegger remarks, for instance, that the sort of historical thinking that gives way to the potential of a *historische* worldview always already presumes an ontological sense of being-historical that the history of philosophy had yet to elaborate or even recognize:

Historische Weltanschauung ist eine solche, in der das Wissen um die
Geschichte die Auffassung von Welt und Dasein bestimmt. Sie gründet in

dem geschichtlichen Charakter der Weltentwicklung und des menschlichen Daseins. – Kampf besagt Kampf um die Erringung einer solchen Position aus dem Wissen um den geschichtlichen Charakter von Welt and Dasein. Er geht darauf, die bestimmenden Mächte der Geschichte zu den primären für die Überzeugungsbildung und das Daseinsbewußtsein zu machen. Das ist nur da möglich, wo die Geschichte als eigene Wirklichkeit in das menschliche Bewußtsein [schon] getreten ist. [...] Erst wenn Geschichte so gesehen wird, daß die eigene Wirklichkeit in diesen Zusammenhang mit hineingesehen wird, kann man sagen, daß das Leben um die Geschichte, in der es steht, weiß, daß ein historisches Bewußtsein da ist. Die eigene Epoche wird erfahren als Situation, in der die Gegenwart selbst steht, und das nicht nur gegenüber der Vergangenheit, sondern zugleich als Situation, in der sich die Zukunft entscheiden wird bzw. entschieden hat. So ist das Wachwerden und Wachsein des historischen Bewußtseins nicht selbstverständlich und dem Leben gegeben. Es ist vielmehr eine Aufgabe, es zu entwickeln. (DF 145)⁹⁸

The analysis that follows will hope merely to show that, with respect to the earlier novel, what Castorp learns in his time at the Berghof is the inauthenticity of the historical (*historisches*) worldview, which he exchanges for a more authentic historical

⁹⁸ A *historical* worldview is one in which the knowledge of history determines our conception of the world and of existence, Dasein. It is based on the historical sense of the development of the world and of human Dasein. *Struggle in this context* means a struggle to attain a position based on our knowledge of the historical character of the world and of Dasein. It is a matter of making the determining forces of history primary in the shaping of convictions and in the consciousness of Dasein. That is possible only when history has [already] pervaded human consciousness as its most unique reality. [...] There is historical [geschichtliche] consciousness only when one's own reality is viewed within its historical context such that human life knows about the history in which it stands. One's own epoch is experienced as a situation in which the present itself stands, and this not merely by standing over against the past, but at once standing in a situation in which the future will be decided or has been decided. Thus the awakening and vigilance of historical consciousness is not obvious and given in life. It is much more a task to be cultivated (*Becoming* 243-4).

(*geschichtliches*) self-knowledge in which what is disclosed to him is his own historicity in the Heideggerian sense, and this insight, I believe, is at least in part what Mann was hoping to achieve through the experience of his “kleiner Vorkriegsdeutscher” [“little, prewar German”] (*Briefe* 238); in fact, Heidegger explicitly states that “Es gehört zum Sinn des Menschen, nicht nur Bewußtsein von der Welt zu haben, sondern darin mitbegriffen ein Wissen um sich selbst. Historisches Erkennen ist eine ausgeprägte Form des Wissens um sich selbst” (*DF* 153).⁹⁹ One of my aims in what follows is to show that Heidegger’s view of history *as* Dasein and his view of historical knowledge *as* self-knowledge provide us with a useful lens through which to read Mann’s own conceptions of history, *Bildung*, and narrative subjectivities in *The Magic Mountain* just as Mann’s novels will help us to grasp the scope, significance, and, to borrow a phrase from Nietzsche, the *usefulness* of Heidegger’s distinctive brand of history.

As Heidegger points out, “time always temporalizes itself only at one time, as human, *historical* Dasein” (*BT* 89). This accords to time both a fundamental position with respect to any reference of history to the past as well as what Paul Ricoeur has called an “ontological density” that certifies the historicity of Dasein insofar as the past is always bound up with being-towards-death and thus makes the future a precondition of historical experience (*Memory* 347). As the previous chapter helps to explain, both Heideggerian temporality and the fundamental temporality of both novels under consideration here are grounded in the projected course of Castorp’s *Bildung* and in the decisiveness of Adrian Leverkühn’s fate as it is narrated by his lifelong friend, Zeitblom, and thus, too, in being-towards-the future, a

⁹⁹ “It belongs to the sense of being human not only to have a consciousness of the world [history] but also a knowledge of itself as an inherent dimension of this consciousness. And *historical knowledge* is a prominent form of *self-knowledge*” (*Becoming* 250).

coming-towards that is described in the very anticipation of such a fate, which is also the anticipation of Germany's fate and, in the latter novel in particular, the fate of modern art. Yet, as I have already pointed out (and this is Heidegger's most original insight into the nature of time), the past does not precede this future or coming-towards; rather, it is Dasein's being-ahead-of-itself, its constantly coming towards its ownmost possibilities (the most extreme of which is its own death) out of which its past is uncovered and revealed: "*Das eigentliche Sein zum Tode, das heißt die Endlichkeit der Zeitlichkeit, ist der verborgene Grund der Geschichtlichkeit des Daseins*" (SZ 410).¹⁰⁰

Consequently, in this coming towards Dasein is never really past:

'Solange' das Dasein faktisch existiert, ist es nie vergangen [...] Und es *kann* nur gewesen *sein*, solange es ist. Vergangen dagegen nennen wir Seiendes, das nicht mehr vorhanden ist. Daher kann sich das Dasein existierend nie als vorhandene Tatsache feststellen, die 'mit der Zeit' entsteht und vergeht und stückweise schon vergangen ist. Es 'findet sich' immer nur als geworfenes Faktum. In der *Befindlichkeit* wird das Dasein von ihm selbst überfallen als das Seiende, das es, noch seiend, schon war, das heißt gewesen ständig *ist*. (SZ 434).¹⁰¹

Heidegger cites at least two possible reasons for the derivation of historicity from the having-been of primordial temporality. The first has to do with Dasein's constant alienation

¹⁰⁰ "Authentic Being-towards-death – that is to say, the finitude of temporality – is the hidden basis of Dasein's historicity" (BT 438).

¹⁰¹ "As long as' Dasein factually exists, it is never past [...] And only as long as Dasein is, can it be as having been. On the other hand, we call an entity 'past', when it is no longer present-at-hand. Therefore Dasein, in existing, can never establish itself as a fact which is present-at-hand, arising and passing away 'in the course of time', with a bit of it past already. Dasein never 'finds itself' except as a thrown Fact. In the state-of-mind in which it finds itself, Dasein is assailed by itself as the entity which it still is and already was – that is to say, which it constantly is as having been" (BT 376).

from itself over what appears to be “the course of time.” Here Dasein recognizes that it is both the self it has always been and yet so changed, so distant from that “earlier” version of itself, and yet at the same time it lives unaware of its existential and temporal proximity to the future, unaware of its always coming towards itself. That Dasein *ist nie vergangen* means that for Dasein, like Being itself, the past must always be an issue for it; moreover, this being an issue is always closely connected with Dasein’s understanding, with its projection toward its ownmost possibilities; thus Dasein’s past becomes for it the history that it has been and is yet to come.

The second reason for the supposed derivation of historicity from primordial time is intimately tied to Dasein’s understanding of its own *Erstreckung*, or its situation in the interval between the “‘now’ of the beginning and that of the end” (Ricoeur, *Time* 72). In fact, Heidegger writes, “Als Sorge *ist* Dasein das ‘Zwischen’” [As care, Dasein *is* the ‘between’] (*SZ* 495/*BT* 427). It is in this stretching-along of life that Dasein sees the implicit and explicit connectedness of itself with the past and can anticipate its connectedness with a future, both of which culminate for Dasein in the possibility of historical narrative. But through his analysis of historicity, Heidegger shows that it is only because Dasein historicizes itself that history in the ordinary sense is meaningful for Dasein: “[Dasein *ist*] nicht ‘zeitlich’ [...], weil es ‘in der Geschichte steht’, sondern daß es umgekehrt geschichtlich nur existiert und existieren kann, weil es im Grunde seines Seins zeitlich *ist*” (*SZ* 498).¹⁰² When, for instance, the time between birth and death is resituated within the context of *die Sorge* and primordial temporality, it ceases to be an interval between two distinct points of human experience, but rather it is seen to constitute and enable the very

¹⁰² “[Dasein] is not ‘temporal’ because it ‘stands in history’, but that, on the contrary, it exists historically and can so exist only because it is temporal in the very basis of its Being” (*BT* 428).

possibility of that experience. Ricoeur explains: “Dasein does not fill up an interval of time but, by stretching-along, constitutes its true being as this very stretching-along, which envelops its own beginning and its own end, and gives meaning to life as ““between”” (*Time* 72; *BT* 426). This stretching-along that constitutes Dasein and which emerges as a sort of Being-towards-the-beginning and in so doing at least partially usurps from the future its primacy in Dasein’s everyday disposition toward itself, is what Heidegger calls historicity, and its complicated situation within the hierarchy of temporal levels as both equiprimordial yet degraded only attests to the entanglement characteristic of Heidegger’s philosophy of time.

In Being-towards-the-beginning, Heidegger specifies three processes of historicity that serve to both distinguish it from the ordinary understanding of history and historical science and also to further unite historicity with primordial temporality and the authentic meaning of care as such: these are heritage [*Erbe*, *Erbschaft*], repetition [*Wiederholung*] and destiny [*Geschick*]. Just as “[t]here is no impetus toward the future that does not turn back toward the condition of finding itself already *thrown* into the world” (Ricoeur, *Time* 74), nor can any impetus toward the past avoid coming toward itself as it is. Thus, as with the authentic future of Dasein, the coming-towards, whereby in resolute anticipation the future is ordained through conscience, responsibility and action, so too is the past or the having-been ordained by what Heidegger calls heritage, that source, Ricoeur explains, of “the innermost and most permanent possibilities held in reserve” (*Time* 74) that are handed down from Dasein to itself in the moment of fate and to a group or nation in the deliverance of destiny. For this reason, when it is said that in the anticipation of its future Dasein returns only to find itself *thrown* into *the* world, it would be more accurate and compelling to say *a* world, a

particular realm of possibilities forcefully conditioned by the specificity of Dasein's own spatio-temporality. Put another way, Pöggeler writes, "To be historical means to have a destiny, to anticipate death, to let oneself be *thrown* back upon the factual There and its finitude, to surrender to traditional possibilities, and thus to exist 'in an insightful moment' for one's own time [...]" (46).

The priority accorded to authentic being-towards-death is unique in that the future or coming-towards for Heidegger is always bound to and includes the past as having-been in all of its concreteness. This is clearly the case with the inextricable relationship that semantically and etymologically links authentic history, *Geschichte*, with the future-oriented coming-towards of fate, *Schicksal*, and destiny, *Geschick*. As Ricoeur explains, "The passage from the future to the past no longer constitutes an extrinsic transition because 'having-been' appears to be called for by the future as 'coming-towards,' and in a sense, to be contained within it" (*Time* 69). More specifically, in authentic being-towards-death, it is shown that Dasein's anticipatory resoluteness, essentially its freedom, is delimited by its having already been *thrown* into a world towards which Dasein is always moving insofar as it is always ahead-of-itself. But for Heidegger to be authentic means also to be Self-constant and resolute, which is to say that, although Dasein cannot get behind its *thrownness*, it is able to take it over through a constant returning (repetition) to that which it already was or that which it always has been (*BT* 373; Ricoeur, *Time* 69-70, Pöggeler 46):

Wenn zum Sein des Daseins das eigentliche bzw. uneigentliche *Sein zum Tode* gehört, dann ist dieses nur möglich als *zukünftiges* [...]. 'Zukünftiges' meint hier nicht ein Jetzt, das, *noch nicht* 'wirklich' geworden, einmal erst *sein wird*,

sondern die Kunft, in der das Dasein in seinem eigensten Seinkönnen auf sich zukommt. [...]

[Aber] Nur sofern Dasein überhaupt *ist* als ich *bin*-gewesen, kann es zukünftig auf sich selbst so zukommen, daß er *zurück*-kommt. Eigentlich zukünftig *ist* das Dasein eigentlich *gewesen*. [...] Dasein kann nur eigentlich gewesen *sein*, sofern es zukünftig ist. Die Gewesenheit entspringt in gewisser Weise der Zukunft. (SZ 430-31)¹⁰³

Moreover, the essence of this interdependence in Heidegger between the future and the past is bound to notions of conscience and guilt. Otto Pöggeler writes:

Conscience attests to the fact that Dasein can be itself in an authentic manner. By the 'call' of conscience, Dasein calls itself forth into its unique potentiality-for-being, into 'resoluteness.' It is thereby understood that Dasein is 'guilty' [schuldig]. This 'Being-guilty' [Schuldigsein] does not indicate moral guilt, but is meant in an entirely formal manner as 'Being-the-basis for a being which is determined by a not [...]' [T]his nullity arises from the fact that Dasein has not itself *thrown* the *thrownness* which is its basis, and yet it must accept this *thrownness*. Dasein is not master of its Being; its possibilities stem from an ultimate impossibility [...]. Dasein is not only generally null because of its *thrownness* but also null because of its concrete

¹⁰³ "If either authentic or inauthentic *Being-towards-death* belongs to Dasein's Being, then such *Being-towards-death* is possible only as something *futural* [...] by the term 'futural', we do not here have in view a "now" which has *not yet* become 'actual' and which sometime *will be* for the first time. We have in view the coming in which Dasein, in its ownmost potentiality-for-Being, comes towards itself [...]"

"[But] Only in so far as Dasein *is* authentically as '*having-been*', can Dasein come towards itself futurally in such a way that it comes *back* [to itself as *it already was* or as *it always has been*]. As authentically futural, Dasein *is* as '*having-been*'. [...] The character of 'having been' arises, in a certain way, from the future" (BT 372-3).

projection, that is to say, insofar as the latter is a choice which can choose one alternative only by rejecting the other. (Pöggeler 44-45; see also Ricoeur, *Time* 69-70)

For Heidegger, conscience attests to the fact that Dasein can be itself in an authentic manner, and “becoming-guilty is nothing more than carrying the past” within ourselves; thus, to become guilty means to *be* the past authentically (Kisiel and Sheehan 267). The importance of Heidegger’s notions of heritage, repetition, conscience and Dasein’s being-guilty for a comprehensive understanding of Heideggerian temporality or *die Sorge* cannot be overstated. Moreover, readers will already begin to see how the subject of this chapter, Heideggerian *Geschichtlichkeit* or *having-been*, is so closely bound up not only with the notion of being-towards-death elaborated in the previous chapter but equally so with Dasein’s being-alongside-the-world, which completes the triadic constellation of *die Sorge* and Heideggerian time. Thus it may be appropriate at this (mid)point to share with readers how Heidegger himself summarizes the dynamic temporality that Dasein *is*, which is also to say, how we have arrived at this point and in which direction we intend to go from here:

Dies Vorlaufen in die äußerste Möglichkeit meiner selbst, die ich noch nicht bin, aber sein werde, ist Zukunft-sein. Ich bin selbst meine Zukunft durch das Vorlaufen. Ich bin nicht in der Zukunft, sondern die Zukunft meiner selbst. Schuldig-werden ist Vergangenheit-Sein. Die Vergangenheit ist im Schuldig-Sein festgehalten und sichtbar. Und damit kommt das menschliche Dasein eigentlich in die Gegenwart, ins Handeln. Im Entschlossen-Sein ist Dasein seine Zukunft, im Schuldig-sein seine Vergangenheit und im Handeln kommt

es in die Gegenwart. Dasein ist nicht anders als Zeit-Sein. Die Zeit ist nichts, was draußen in der Welt vorkommt, sondern was ich selbst bin. (DF 169)¹⁰⁴

This is the full scope (albeit only superficially considered) of Heidegger's original conception of *Geschichte* and its place within his temporal ontology, but it nevertheless adequately prepares us for the literary analysis that follows and which will from time to time necessitate the substantive elaboration of key aspects of a Heideggerian history merely outlined above. In fact, it is partly my goal to demonstrate that only through such analysis, and in particular the analysis of Mann's contemporary historical novels, can Heidegger's otherwise nearly inaccessible and categorically idiosyncratic approach be adequately explained and/or justified. Suffice it to say for now that when Heidegger describes *Geschichte* (and the authentic repetition that is its basis) as "[Der Modus] [...] durch den das Dasein ausdrücklich als Schicksal existiert" (SZ 510),¹⁰⁵ and that inasmuch as "Schicksal die ursprüngliche Geschichtlichkeit des Daseins konstuiert, dann hat die Geschichte ihr wesentliches Gewicht weder im Vergangenen, noch im Heute und seinem 'Zusammenhang' mit dem Vergangenen, sondern im eigentlichen Geschehen der Existenz, das aus der *Zukunft* des Daseins entspringt," (SZ 510),¹⁰⁶ or when he contends that "Nur wenn im Sein eines Seienden Tod, Schuld, Gewissen, Freiheit und Endlichkeit dergestalt gleichursprünglich zusammenwohnen wie in der Sorge, kann es im Modus des Schicksals existieren, das heißt

¹⁰⁴ "This anticipatory running forward into the most extreme possibility of my self, which I am not yet but will be, means *to be futural*. I myself am my future by way of this anticipatory forerunning. I am not in the future, but rather am the future of myself. Becoming guilty is nothing but carrying the *past* within myself: to become guilty means *to be my past*. In the state of being guilty, I hold onto the past thus made visible to me. Human Dasein thus comes properly [i.e. "authentically" or "eigentlich"] into the *present*, into action. In being resolved Dasein is its future, in being guilty it is its past, and in acting it comes into the present. *Dasein* is nothing other than *to be time itself*. Time is not something that occurs out there in the world, it is rather what I myself am" (*Becoming* 266).

¹⁰⁵ "the mode by which Dasein exists explicitly as fate" (BT 438)

¹⁰⁶ "But if fate constitutes the primordial historicity of Dasein, then history has its essential importance neither in what is past nor in the 'today' and its connection with what is past, but in that authentic historizing of existence which arises from Dasein's *future*" (BT 438).

im Grunde seiner Existenz geschichtlich sein” (SZ 509),¹⁰⁷ he comes very close to describing the ongoing preoccupations of Mann during the turbulent years that saw the publication of both *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus*, and he certainly and at the very least opens the door for radical new readings of Mann’s representation(s) of time and history in both novels.

The Magic Mountain

As I pointed out at the beginning of my last chapter, that history remains a point of entry into any critical interrogation of the novels is always guaranteed by the author’s own insistence on the dual meaning of *The Magic Mountain* as a *Zeitroman*, i.e. as “einmal historisch,” and on the essentially *historical* character of *Doctor Faustus* as well as the chronological matrix that many describe as the most remarkable quality of the latter’s narrative structure (Bergsten et al.). When compared to *Doctor Faustus*, the treatment of history in *The Magic Mountain* is generally seen as a superficial yet overarching preoccupation of the earlier novel.

As I have already discussed, the description of the novel as “einmal historisch” refers almost exclusively to two facets of its structure and themes, both of which Stephen Kern’s brief analysis of the novel from *The Culture of Space and Time* may be said adequately to repeat and summarize. First, there is the question of the contending worldviews of which the novel, in particular the lifestyle and atmosphere of the Berghof, is suggested as an allegory. The sanatorium is said to be a microcosm of Europe’s historical situation before the First

¹⁰⁷ “Only if death, guilt, conscience, freedom, and finitude reside equiprimordially in the Being of an entity [...] can that entity exist in the mode of fate; that is to say, only then can it be historical in the very depth of its existence” (BT 437).

World War, where rigid divisions separate the guests along diplomatic, national lines and there is a steady, exaggerated emphasis on the cultural differences between East and West. Secondly, there is the question of death and its penetration into historical life and reality. With this second example, of course, I mean the equation that links the individual's so-called sympathy with death that prevails on the mountain with the broader and thus even more dangerous cultural sympathy with death that is played out in the morbid routine of the cure, Castorp's infatuation with disease, the "politically suspect" lure of German Romanticism (Vaget et al.), as well as in the cultural debates between Settembrini and Naphta that are said to exert such a powerful influence on the young Hans Castorp.

But these aspects of the novel's *Geschichtsdeutung* are well-known and have been elaborated through and through within Mann scholarship. Given the nuances of a Heideggerian history, which I have already described, it is fair to say that my goal will be to show how Heidegger's views of history, contemporary with *The Magic Mountain*, point to what I would like to argue is a shared, or, at least, sympathetic understanding of time and history in Mann's novel. Thus we can begin with the claim, as we did in the previous chapter, that, as far as *The Magic Mountain* is concerned, the authentic significance of history in the novel lies first and foremost not in the political worldviews it describes or in the allegory of a nation's romantic sympathy with death, but rather somewhere else, and this somewhere else, I will argue, is in the narrator's anxiety over the history he proposes to narrate and in the private-public nexus of Castorp's personal past, both of which a Heideggerian reading asks that we not attempt to extricate from their essential relationship to the future-oriented teleology of the narrative itself or of its protagonist's *Bildung*.

The strange and forceful way in which the past insinuates itself so very early on in a novel otherwise meant to advocate for the progressive self-development of its protagonist helps to demonstrate what I mean. Not only does the narrator's foreword begin with an uncomfortable description of the unintelligible qualia of *pastness*, but the unexpected intrusion of the past again and so early on in the second chapter of the novel also already complicates the novel's awkward relationship to its genre.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, this forceful intrusion is often overlooked as central to the nature and character of that history the novel is said to engage and describe and *toward* which the foreword is literally leading the reader, and it is a Heideggerian temporality which perhaps best helps us to explain this intrusion and its meaning within the scope of Mann's composition.

While the second half of the novel's foreword, in which the narrator deliberately describes the complicated temporality that binds the time of the narrative with the time taken up in reading it, is more often cited in scholarly references to the opening of the novel, and thus it is generally well-known, too, that with *The Magic Mountain* Mann set out to write a novel which in its structure mirrors its themes and in which the experience of reading very much parallels the experience of the protagonist on the magic mountain "as he sits spun round in his spell" ["während sie ihn umspinnen hält"] (2).¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless, it is with the first half of the foreword that this chapter is interested. There, the narrator, in attempting to

¹⁰⁸ The second chapter of the novel is divided into two sections, each dealing, respectively, with Castorp's paternal (*Von der Taufschale und vom Großvater in zweifacher Gestalt*) and maternal (*Bei Tienappels. Und von Hans Castorps sittlichem Befinden*) ancestry and heritage.

¹⁰⁹ It is interesting to note that the translation provided neglects to mention the ambivalence of the agent that casts the so-called "spell," a word which doesn't appear in the original text. The referent of the German *sie* is unclear, which explains the radical difference in the translation; it could refer, it seems to me, to either "die Erdenzeit," "die Tagen," "die Jahren," oder "[Castorps] Geschichte." Either way, the clear suggestion is that Castorp is "spun round in his spell" both *of/by time*.

situate the temporality of the launching point of his narrative, describes something like the problem of the past as it was at the time also being imagined by Heidegger:

Die Geschichte Hans Castorps [...], die uns in hohem Grade erzählenswert scheint (wobei zu Hans Castorps Gunsten denn doch erinnert werden sollte, daß es *seine* Geschichte ist, und daß nicht jedem jede Geschichte passiert): diese Geschichte ist sehr lange her, sie ist sozusagen schon ganz mit historischem Edelrost überzogen und unbedingt in der Zeitform der tiefsten Vergangenheit vorzutragen.

Das wäre kein Nachteil für eine Geschichte, sondern eher ein Vorteil; denn Geschichten müssen vergangen sein, und je vergangener, könnte man sagen, desto besser für sie in ihrer Eigenschaft als Geschichten und für den Erzähler, den raunenden Beschwörer des Imperfekts. Es steht jedoch so mit ihr, wie es heute noch mit den Menschen und unter diesen nicht zum wenigsten mit den Geschichtenerzählern steht: sie ist viel älter als ihre Jahre, ihre Betagtheit ist nicht nach Tagen [...], nicht nach Sonnenumläufen zu berechnen; mit einem Worte: sie verdankt den Grad ihres Vergangenseins nicht eigentlich der *Zeit*, -- eine Aussage, womit auf die Fragwürdigkeit und eigentümliche Zwienatur dieses Geheimnisvollen Elementes im Vorbeigehen angespielt und hingewiesen sei.

Um aber einen klaren Sachverhalt nicht künstlich zu verdunkeln: die hochgradige Verflossenheit unserer Geschichte rührt daher, daß [...] sie spielte und hat gespielt vormals, ehemals, in den alten Tagen, der Welt vor dem großen Kriege, mit dessen Beginn so vieles begann, was zu beginnen wohl kaum schon

aufgehört hat. Vorher also spielt sie, wenn auch nicht lange vorher. Aber ist der Vergangenheitscharakter eine Geschichte nicht desto tiefer, vollkommener und märchenhafter, je dichter ‘vorher’ sie spielt? (DZ 9-10).¹¹⁰

Of course, with this beginning, we see Mann’s famous irony especially hard at work, for the relationship of the actual historical past to the narrative attempt at representing it and to the private past of Hans Castorp that is called into being through the representation is anything but a “plain matter” [“eine klaren Sachverhalt”]. Indeed, as both Heidegger and Mann seem to agree, the very pastness of the past is altogether a matter of difficulty and mystery that is always as much of an issue for Dasein as it is for both “den Erzähler, den raunenden Beschwörer des Imperfekts” as well as for the young Castorp, to whom the “Geschichte” belongs, and for narrative as such insofar as “Geschichten müssen vergangen sein.” For the sake of my argument, several key ideas are worthy of note here.

First, the reader is told that the past recounted by the narrative belongs to Hans Castorp alone: “daß es *seine* Geschichte ist, und daß nicht jedem jede Geschichte passiert.” Just as the narrator must dismiss him in the end *toward* his own death, which Heidegger tells us is in each case *mine* and thus never available in any original way to another, Castorp’s

¹¹⁰“The story of Hans Castorp [...], which seems to us highly worth telling – though it must needs be borne in mind, in Hans Castorp’s behalf, that it is his story, and not every story happens to everybody – this story, we say, belongs to the long ago; is already, so to speak, covered with historic mould, and unquestionably to be presented in the tense best suited to a narrative out of the depth of the past.

That should be no drawback to a story, but rather the reverse. Since histories must be in the past, then the more past the better, it would seem, for them in their character as histories, and for him, the teller of them, rounding wizard of times gone by. With this story, moreover, it stands as it does to-day with human beings, not least among them writers of tales: it is far older than its years; its age may not be measured by length of days [...]. In a word, the degree of its antiquity has noways to do with the passage of time – in which statement the author intentionally touches upon the strange and questionable double nature of that riddling element.

But we would not willfully obscure what is a plain matter. The exaggerated pastness of our narrative is due to its taking place [...] – in the long ago, in the old days, the days of the world before the Great War, in the beginning of which so much began that has scarcely left off beginning. Yes, it took place before that; yet not so long before. Is not the pastness of the past the profounder, the completer, the more legendary, the more immediately before the present it falls?” (MM 1).

past, essentially the story itself and the *history* of which the story is supposedly a record, is *his* and thus incapable in an authentic sense of being made available to the narrator or to the reader in all of its fullness. The problem or question, however, does not thus become a matter of trust between reader and narrator or of the competency of the latter or of the relationship between reality and fiction but rather of how one narrates what is essentially an unavailability. To paraphrase Doritt Cohn, the problem is not so much a matter of narrating time, as the narrator claims it is, but rather it is a matter of narrating “timelessness” (Cohn). In a similar way, Cohn argues, the narrator of *The Magic Mountain*, as omniscient as he is vis-a-vis the *Historie* of Hans Castorp, cannot adequately narrate the sort of time which has cast its spell over the protagonist, a time that of course includes the fullness of Castorp’s *Geschichte*, or better, Castorp’s *gewesen sein* [his having-been], precisely because it is not *his* time.

Secondly, that the story belongs to both Castorp and “the long ago” immediately and surreptitiously equates the protagonist with his very own past in such a way as to suggest *before* the story even begins the possibility of an authentic history, which is precisely *never* past, so that what belongs to the “long ago” also belongs to the ongoing, in this case, both the narrative which is about to (but which has not yet) begun as well as the history which has already begun – it is even past, in one sense of the word – but which has also “scarcely left off beginning,” i.e. both Castorp’s and Germany’s. Consequently, the story of Hans Castorp is covered with the patina of history [“historischem Edelrost”] not only because it has already happened but because it *is* always already historical. One, for instance, may ask whether, or better, *how* Castorp is configured in the time of the forward. On the one hand, he *isn’t* at all in the sense that the story takes place *after* him and from the historical perspective of a world

in which he no longer is living, or as Heidegger would certainly put it, in which he *is* no longer [*Nichtmehrdasein*]. Thus it is precisely his *having-been* that makes Castorp, the protagonist, possible, and insofar as it is *his* Geschichte that is being told, it is Hans Castorp as the *coming-towards* the history that he *is* that the forward promises to share with the reader.

Finally, the reader is confronted with the viciously original “Aussage,” precisely in line with Heidegger’s own thoughts on time and history, that “the degree of [the narrative’s] antiquity has noways to do with the passage of time” [“sie verdankt den Grad ihres Vergangenseins nicht eigentlich der *Zeit*”]. Here, the narrator, and presumably Mann as well, appears to draw a distinction between a notion of history that treats the past as if it were finished, as if it had been left behind by time’s passage, a past measured “nach Tagen [und] Sonnenumläufen,” and an entirely different conception of the past – what Heidegger might call an authentic idea of history as *Geschichte* – in which, although “denn Geschichten müssen vergangen sein” [“histories must be in the past”], they needn’t ever *not be* because stories, like *Dasein*, are precisely *nie vergangen* [“never past”]: “je vergangener, könnte man sagen, desto besser für sie in ihrer Eigenschaft als Geschichten und für den Erzähler, den raunenden Beschwörer des Imperfekts.”

Consequently, the narrator suggests, Castorp’s past arises out of the future of his tale. In the last chapter, and in response to Eric Downing’s claim with respect to the symbolic and actual function of the x-ray in the *The Magic Mountain* – “The x-ray photograph [...] disassociates both the moments of truth and death from the end point and relocates them, along with their joint authority, elsewhere and earlier on (and on)” (59) – that being-towards-death displaces *Dasein*’s end in much the same way, dispersing it backwards over the course

of Dasein's existence precisely the way that Castorp's "sudden glimpse into his own grave" is vouchsafed to him much too early on. But if a Heideggerian temporality requires that death is *thrown* backwards as a shadow over Dasein's entire life or *Erstreckung*, then it equally requires, as we have seen, that Dasein's past (and, as I of course will argue, Castorp's past, too) is displaced or dispersed forward, and as such the past constitutes the very passage that Dasein/Castorp *is* and *toward* which he is always heading in the novel itself. Thus we are given a young hero, both at the beginning and at the end of the novel, heading toward his future and at the same time coming toward his past, which would at least offer one explanation for the narrator's wonder at the fact that the depth of the past lies in its proximity to and not its distance from the present: "Aber ist der Vergangenheitscharakter eine Geschichte nicht desto tiefer, vollkommener und märchenhafter, je dichter 'vorher' sie spielt?". In this way the foreword helps prepare the ground for a rereading of the novel's treatment of time altogether, a reading in which the complicated temporality described in the novel's opening pages is illuminated in and through the narrative itself.

To begin with, the narrator's recognition in the foreword that the depth of the past has nothing to do with the passage of time should recall Heidegger's insistence in his letter to Hannah Arendt that time in the way it is typically understood is not the way into the novel, and it is clearly *this* riddle ["die Fragwürdigkeit und eigentümliche Zwienatur dieses Geheimisvollen Elements"] that the novel is set up to unravel if not to resolve. But if the passage of time is *not* the key to the understanding of the novel's treatment of time, as it is so often said to be, then the full answer to this famous mystery must lie elsewhere, somewhere outside or alongside the alleged absence of time's passage on the mountain and its allegorical correspondence to the diseased cultural atmosphere of Germany before the war ("Sympathie

mit dem Tode,” “das Leben ohne Zeit,” etc.). It is interesting to note that here in the foreword no thought is given to these powerful associations. Thus I believe this riddle is a suitable basis from which to launch a Heideggerian reading of the novel’s portrait of the past, in which the so-called absence of time’s passage certainly doesn’t dispense with time but rather marks its authentic disclosure.

Just as the author promises to make his novel read like that which it is about, the tale of Castorp that follows bears out in fundamental ways the narrator’s striking thoughts on time and history in his foreword, and it is not very long after the beginning of the novel, after Castorp’s “*Ankunft*” (emphasis mine) at the Berghof, that the reader is thrust again out of the present and “back” into the protagonist’s past. In the previous chapter I discussed how the scene of Castorp’s memory of his grandfather’s wake served to underscore the meaning of Castorp’s *Bildung* as being-towards-death. On the one hand, I argued it was the first serious challenge of his Faustian quest in as much as the encounter with the grandfather’s corpse was not only a premonition of his own death but it also forcefully established very early on in the novel the telos of his self-development as oriented toward an authentic confrontation with death as such, which I suggested is the very point of his time on the magic mountain. On the other hand, I argued that the encounter was also much more than the young Castorp’s meeting with the possibility of his own death, but as such it was also the encounter with his own impossibility, an encounter with death *as* impossibility, and that the measure of the authenticity of Castorp’s *Bildung* lay in the degree to which he absorbs this truth about the nature and meaning of death while at the Berghof. Whatever the case, I have already made much of the fact that for Heidegger the possibility of authentic being-towards-death is always also a *thrown* possibility, and that this *thrownness* is the basis of authentic historical

existence; in other words, for Heidegger it is not only the case that in order for there to be a future at all a past must first be gathered up behind it, but there is in Dasein's approach toward death a physics at work in which the momentum that drives Dasein towards its future has its source in Dasein's past. As such, in so far as Castorp's memory of his grandfather's corpse serves to underscore the double meaning of being-towards-death, a futural prospect that defines his sojourn on the magic mountain, it also discloses the idiosyncratic nature of Heideggerian *Geschichte*, which, as we have seen, remains closely connected in its essence to *Sein zum Tode*.

Such a fundamental entanglement is clearly present in Castorp's memory of his grandfather, where the young boy recalls the moment when his grandfather relates the history of his family's christening basin ["Taufschale"]:

Auf der Rückseite aber fanden sich in wechselnder Schriftart die Namen der Häupter einpunktiert, die im Gange der Zeit des Stückes Ingaber gewesen: Es waren ihrer schon sieben, versehen mit der Jahreszahl der Erb-übernahme, und der Alte in der Binde wies mit dem beringten Zeigefinger den Enkel auf jeden einzelnen hin. Der Name des Vaters war da, der des Großvaters selbst und der des Urgroßvaters, und dann verdoppelte, verdreifachte und vervierfachte sich die Vorsilbe 'Ur' im Munde des Erklärers, und der Junge lauschte [...] auf das Ur-Ur-Ur-Ur, -- diesen dunklen Laut der Gruft und der Zeitverschüttung, welcher dennoch zugleich einen fromm gewährten Zusammenhang zwischen der Gegenwart, seinem eigenen Leben und dem tief Versunkenen ausdrückte und ganz eigentümlich auf ihn einwirkte: nämlich so, wie es auf seinem Gesichte sich ausdrückte. [...] [G]eistliche Empfindungen

mischten sich mit denen des *Todes* und der *Geschichte* beim Klang jener dumpfen Silbe, und dies alles mutete den Knaben irgendwie wohltuend an [...]. (DZ 38-9; emphasis mine)¹¹¹

The Castorp legacy is part of that world into which the young Hans has been *thrown* in the Heideggerian sense (the other part, of course, belongs to his maternal Tienappel ancestry with which his *prophetic* eyes are constantly associated throughout the novel), and the exaggerated, receding pastness conjured up by the repetition of that “somber syllable” (like the lost but always deeply-felt origins of Joseph’s ancestry in the novel that would follow *The Magic Mountain* and for which this section of the novel serves as a definitive model and premonition) is a *thrownness* which Castorp cannot get behind, so to speak. Castorp cannot get behind it because, quite literally, he *is* this thrownness, and as long as he *is*, according to Heidegger, neither he nor his past is ever truly past. Thus it is here in this passage that Castorp first begins to learn the truth of what it means to *be* historical as well as the Heideggerian truth that an authentic being-towards-death is the “hidden basis of historicity.”

The point of this passage, then, not only serves as a basis for describing the commercial heritage out of which our protagonist emerges for the sake of forming an impression of his character and disposition, nor is it meant merely to emphasize the bottomlessness of a mythic past to which Castorp is forever linked; rather, and most

¹¹¹ “On the back, engraved in a variety of scripts, were the names of its successive owners, seven in number, each with the date when it had passed into his hand. The old man named each one to his grandson, pointing with beringed index finger. There was Hans Castorp’s father’s name, there was Grandfather’s own, there was great-Grandfather’s; then the great came doubled, tripled, quadrupled, from the old man’s mouth, whilst the little lad listened [...]. The great-great-great-great – what a hollow sound it had, how it spoke of the falling away of time, yet how it seemed the expression of a piously cherished link between the present, his own life, and the depth of the past! All that, as his face showed, made a profound impression. [...]. Religious feeling mingled in his mind with thoughts of death and a sense of history, as he listened to the somber syllable; he received therefrom an ineffable gratification – [...].” (*MM* 22).

importantly for our purposes here, this moment signifies for both the author and reader an important milestone in the protagonist's emergent understanding of the ontological entanglement and proximity of death and history, or, more precisely, the way the essentially historical emerges out of being-towards-death and thus betrays the depth not so much of Castorp's past but more so the depth of his future. In this very important moment, both the lesson of the Taufschale and young Castorp's encounter with the grandfather's corpse, among other things, signifies the "ontological density" of the past that Ricoeur attributes to Heidegger's theory of historicity – "something in the depth of [Castorp's] being responded to it" ["es lag etwas darin, was er aus dem Grund seines Wesens billigte"] (*MM* 20/*DZ* 36)) – and it is fair to say that insofar as Castorp's approach toward an authentic understanding of death on the magic mountain has at this point already begun, the intrusion of the past is not so much an intrusion but a clear example of how his past, rather than being recovered, has been called forth as a result of his *Bildung* or of what amounts to the same thing, his *approach* toward himself, which is to say, out of his future. And, as such, it is also fair to say, along with Heidegger, that "In the state-of-mind in which it finds itself, Dasein is assailed by itself as the entity which it still is and already was – that is to say, which it constantly is as having been" (*BT* 376).

Consequently, what Castorp's vision of his time with his grandfather (what I wish to call his first encounter with what it means to *be historical*) suggests is a very different temporal dichotomy than is usually associated with the novel's treatment of historical and eternal time, where *historical* time is typically attributed to the time of the flatland and sharply distinguished from *die reine Zeit selbst* or eternal time that is attributed to the sort of time lived out at the Berghof. In fact, just as Heidegger describes Dasein as constitutive of a

stretching-along [Erstreckung] that enables it to know a past and anticipate a future, Castorp recognizes, not only in the script itself and in the repetition of the “somber syllable” but also in his literal proximity to the man who utters it, that he is indeed an expression of this *Erstreckung*; moreover, he realizes or at least has begun to realize Heidegger’s important recognition about time and history as such, namely, that he himself is not temporal because he stands “in history” or “in time” but rather that he exists amidst this historical stretching along because he himself is first and foremost an expression of this temporality, and it is as such an expression that he is able to identify, to the point of “ineffable gratification,” with the heritage which he is, already was, and is in the course of still becoming. It is in this very real sense that the opposition between the *einmal historisch* and the *reine zeitlich* dissolves away and becomes something very different than even Mann himself may have anticipated— in short, history here emerges not as a mere window onto a worldview but rather as an ontological density associated with time and Dasein itself, both of which are associated not with a stagnating, negative sympathy with death (that the bulk of the novel is said to describe) but rather with a progressive, dynamic temporality that Castorp is at first not fully cognizant of in the stirred memories of his grandfather’s wake but with which he is beginning to identify and to integrate into his developing maturity.

The hollow sound of the “great-great-great-great” is on the one hand empty precisely because of its blank narration, its insistence on the “falling away” or “passage” of time and thus makes no strong impression on the young Castorp. Its hollowness may be compared to what Heidegger calls an inauthentic *Historie* in which the past is recited as if it were merely no longer there, no longer a part of lived reality. But there is another sort of narration in operation here which is of the authentic sort, and this is what makes the profounder

impression and inaugurates the young Castorp's *Bildung*. As we are told early on, this sort of time has "noways to do with the passage of time" but rather with its persistent and ongoing disclosure.¹¹² The force of this narration lies in the memory of the voice itself and in the extreme love had by young Castorp for his grandfather as well as in the feeling of proximity that the voice and the *Taufschale* make possible between past, present and future, between beginning (birth) and end (death). The question of authenticity that is raised by the scene of the memory of his grandfather is not only relevant to Heidegger's interpretation of the question, but it is of course, as I pointed out in the previous chapter, raised by Mann as well since Castorp's memory of the wake provokes similar concerns about authenticity.¹¹³ For Mann, or rather for Castorp, like for Heidegger, there is a sharp distinction between the everyday, living grandfather and the powerful suggestiveness of his corpse; thus it is no surprise (and completely in line with Heidegger's own thoughts on the subject) that the *authentic* grandfather is the one who is gone, the one who is on the one hand represented in the painting in a magisterial guise and on the other hand vacated in the corpse – in short, in the being that once was the grandfather, the grandfather as *having been* (*MM* 25-6).¹¹⁴ It is in this sense, then, that readers may interpret Castorp's profound spiritual response to this emergent consciousness, where "[r]eligious feelings mingled in his mind with thoughts of death and a sense of history" ["geistliche Empfindungen mischten sich mit denen des Todes und der Geschichte"] (*MM* 22/*DZ* 39). The problem is not simply that the authenticity of the grandfather lies, ironically, in the artificiality of his image or the ornate dressing of his

¹¹² With respect to this problem, Heidegger asks, for instance, "Why do we say that time passes away, when we do not say with just as much emphasis that it arises?" (*BT* 478).

¹¹³ For the most part, Mann deploys the same term as Heidegger to indicate "authentic" and "authenticity" – "eigentlich" and "Eigentlichkeit" – but from time to time he uses other terms, including "wahre," "richtig," and "Vollkommenheit."

¹¹⁴ E.g. "Der kleine Hans Castorp betrachtete [...] das Gesicht und die Hände des *ehemaligen* Großvaters," "der Großvater nur noch Körper und *nichts weiter mehr war*" (*DZ* 46-7, emphasis mine).

lifeless body, but rather in the impossibility that this artificiality and lifelessness suggest, and the recognition of this impossibility that is handed down to Castorp as his heritage and which he is bound to repeat (in the Heideggerian sense). This is precisely why, I believe, this scene is so explicitly recalled in the famous section in which Hans is provided a view into his own grave, i.e. a view toward his own impossibility, and in which Hans marvels at the way the ring on his finger, inherited from his grandfather, is destined to remain even while the flesh it adorns is fated to melt away beneath it.

As we have seen a Heideggerian *Geschichte* is always linked to the concepts of heritage, repetition and conscience, but in Heidegger all three have very different meanings than are usually assigned to them, a difference, moreover, that typically stands in the way of understanding what Heidegger intends with these concepts. With respect to Castorp's *Bildung*, heritage and repetition refer not only to the concrete generational inheritance of the Castorp and Tienappel lineage (the eyes, habits, disposition, features, names, etc. that define him) but also to the ontological heritage and repetition of what the grandfather bequeaths to his grandson during this exchange with his grandfather's body, namely, the inheritance of a knowledge of death, "a larger, even [...] fervid comprehension" ["*einem gewissen allgemeineren und sogar eindringlichen Verstande*"] (*DZ 43/MM 25*) of being-towards-the-end and of the certainty that he, too, will eventually take his place amidst the historical line of those Castorps who *have been*. When Pöggler writes, "To be historical means to have a destiny, to anticipate death, to let oneself be *thrown* back upon the factual There and its finitude, to surrender to traditional possibilities, and thus to exist 'in an insightful moment' for one's own time [...]" (46), he perfectly describes what Mann intends for Castorp to remember with the memory-picture of this moment of his past.

Moreover, it is in this early surrendering that the young Castorp is able to begin to authentically take over, which means resolutely, that *thrownness* behind which he cannot go, but which he can approach through a constant returning (repetition) to that which he already is or that which he always has been. And it is through his gathering of this recognition that he *becomes guilty* in the Heideggerian sense, which means only that it is in this moment that he begins to witness and bear the past within himself and identify himself with it for the first time. Such a guilt, according to Heidegger, lies not only in his *thrownness*, in the tragic negation that underlies all the possibilities available to him (that is to say, that he cannot get behind his thrownness or ever stand *before* his past because he has always been *already* underway *as* this past and because his most extreme possibility lies in an utter impossibility – being-towards-death or *Nichtmehrdasein*). In addition, as Pöggler suggests, his guilt lies in resolutely taking his place amidst the names that both fall away and gather upon the *Taufschale*, which is also to say, in bearing his past authentically, and in the concrete restriction that, in so far as he *will* soon choose to remain on the mountain, he closes off all other possibilities for his future. But now we risk getting ahead of ourselves and of Castorp, for the encounter with his grandfather's corpse affords him only a glimpse into these realities and form only a very early part of the self-development the novel describes.

The relevance here of Eric Downing's essay, "Photography and *Bildung* in *The Magic Mountain*," about the influence of photography on the novel's conception of the modernist subject and the tradition of *Bildung* cannot be overlooked.¹¹⁵ It will prove useful not only for

¹¹⁵ This essay can be found in Hans Vaegter's edited collection *Thomas Mann's The Magic Mountain: A Casebook* [Oxford UP, 2008]. It is a revised, abridged adaptation of a much earlier essay entitled "The Technology of Development: Photography and *Bildung* in Thomas Mann's *Der Zauberberg*" [*Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, 77 (2003): 91-129] as well as of a more recently published chapter from Downing's book *After Images: Photography, Archaeology, and Psychoanalysis in the Tradition of Bildung* [Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2006].

illuminating the connections already uncovered but also for helping to demonstrate what will become even more important later on in the discussion of *Doctor Faustus* that follows, namely, how one may venture to reconcile Heideggerian and historicist readings of Mann's treatment of time and history in *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus*. Downing's study manages such an approach primarily because it perfectly describes the way in which the technical medium of photography, precisely as a result of its historical specificity – its accidental invention, its novelty and its unpredictable category, applications, and potential – discloses a fundamental relation of human being to *its* time and thus, too, (I think Heidegger would maintain) alters the meaning of what time *is* for the historical *being-there* of *Dasein*. Because Downing emphasizes the way in which photography's historical emergence coincides with the historical advent of psychoanalysis in such a way that the former provides critical insight into the latter and vice-versa, Downing's argument would also appear to allow for a certain emphasis on the fundamental relation between photography and a Heideggerian historical ontology in which what is disclosed in and through the technology of the photographic process is the temporality of being, which is to say, of the time of *Dasein*.

Downing argues that insofar as *The Magic Mountain* is a *Bildungsroman* it is also an *Entwicklungsroman* and that the "insinuation" of the emergent technical medium of photography and the photographic process upon Mann's conception of *Bildung* effectively refigures the traditional character of the subject of *Bildung*. Whereas traditional conceptions of *Bildung* proffer the subject-protagonist as a *tabula rasa* upon which the truth is to be simply and opaquely inscribed by the narration, in *The Magic Mountain* the self-formation of the young Castorp is rather developed or "exposed" through a complex dynamic of

repression and revelation that Downing associates with the photographic process and the concomitant discoveries of contemporary psychoanalysis. Downing writes:

The blank page or *Blatt* of the self has been refigured as much like a photographic plate or *Platte*; the clean slate or *tabula rasa* has become, so to speak, the only seemingly opaque tablet (*Täfelchen*) of a photographic negative, with all its invisible ‘script’ (cf. 540/382). As such, the subject, rather than being simply inscribed or painted (*gebildet*), is to be developed (*entwickelt*); or, more precisely, having first been ‘exposed’ and taken on or in its impressions from the outside world – and in this respect we must understand the sustained emphasis on Hans Castorp as ‘receptive’ (*aufnahmelustig* or *aufnahmefähig*) – the subject is then to be developed, brought out and, finally, potentially, ‘fixed’ or *befestigt* (cf. 139/96). (46-7)

As evidence for this recognition, Downing notes the sharp distinction between the narrator’s early description of Castorp as “an unwritten page” (*dies unbeschriebene Blatt*, 55/35; qtd. in Downing 46) and Settembrini’s much later reassessment of Castorp as precisely the opposite: “This gifted young man is no unwritten page, but rather one on which everything has [already] been inscribed, so to speak, with invisible ink, the good with the bad. And it is the educator’s task decisively to develop (*entwickeln*) the good, but forever to obliterate the false that would come forth (142/98)” (46).

Before we return to the novel in order to see how this photographic process of development works itself out in the text and begs the comparison with a Heideggerian temporality, we should first venture a brief explanation of the way in which Settembrini’s assessment of young Castorp in the above passage as “a page on which everything has been

inscribed, so to speak, with invisible ink” and Downing’s reasons for referencing the passage in his study resonate meaningfully with Heidegger’s own and earliest conceptions of history influenced by his reading of the Dilthey-Yorck correspondence. Briefly elaborating the correspondences that link the development of Heidegger’s own views of history with the critical tradition to which Mann was heir will not only prepare us for reading Downing’s claims about modernist refigurations of the subject in terms of Heidegger’s conception of history, but, perhaps even more importantly, it will help to justify a reading that claims from the beginning to want to describe the proximity of Heidegger’s thought to the specific treatment of notions of the past and history in *The Magic Mountain*. Yorck explains his understanding of history in the following passage, and it is within his assessment here that we find what Heidegger calls “the germinal point of [Daseins] *historicality*” [der Keimpunkt der *Geschichtlichkeit*] (SZ 530), namely, that authentic history lies “in the character of Being which human Dasein possesses” [“des Seinscharakters des menschlichen Daseins selbst”] or better, that history not only lies in what is “invisible” [“unsichtbar”], like the script in which Settembrini claims Castorp is written, but it is primarily something “one *lives*” [sondern lebt]:

[Unsere historische] Erkenntnis [hat sich] bis zur Aufhebung ihrer selbst fortgeschritten, der Mensch so weit seiner selbst entrückt, daß er seiner nicht mehr ansichtig [in der Geschichte] ist. Der *moderne Mensch* [...] ist fertig zum Begrabenwerden. [...] Alle wahrhaft lebendige und nicht nur Leben schildernde *Historie* [...] ist zum besten Theile Kenntniß der verborgenen Quellen. Mit der Geschichte ists so, daß was Spektakl macht und augenfällig

ist nicht die Hauptsache ist. Die Nerven sind unsichtbar wie das Wesentliche
[von der Geschichte] überhaupt unsichtbar ist. [...] (qtd. in SZ 529-30)¹¹⁶

Count Yorck's reformulation of history and historical understanding is not only in keeping with the Nietzschean tradition of historical critique, but it also anticipates the historical views of Freudian psychoanalysis and, coincidentally, also reflects Mann's own conceptions of history in *The Magic Mountain*. Yorck, for instance, was likely aware of Nietzsche's own review of history in, for example, *The Birth of Tragedy* [*Die Geburt der Tragödie*] (1872) and his essay "On the Uses and Abuses of History for Life" ["Von Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben"] from *Untimely Meditations* [*Unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen*] (1874). According to Yorck, it is precisely the protagonist of history, namely, Dasein, that historical narrative has left behind. And just as he explains the problem of history in terms of modernity's progressive veiling of "[eine] lebendige [...] Geschichtskennntnis" by "[eine] nur Leben schildernde *Historie*," a sort of forgetting that has modern man already ready for the grave, so, too, Nietzsche likens the predicament of modern man to "a starving man's greedy grasping for food" ["das gierige Zugreifen und Nach-Nahrung-Haschen des Hungernden"] (*BT* 110/*GT* 141) who has abandoned the wholesome nourishment of myth for what he calls "history and criticism" ["Historie und Kritik"] (*BT* 109/*GT* 141) and thus given up any viable means of resolutely and vitally interpreting mankind's "life and struggles" ["sein Leben und seine Kämpfe"] (*BT* 109/*GT* 140). In *Untimely Meditations*, Nietzsche again describes conventional historical understanding as a

¹¹⁶ "[Our historical] knowledge has progressed to the point of canceling itself out; that man has withdrawn so far from himself that he no longer sees himself [in history] at all. The 'modern man' [...] is ready for burial. [...] All history that is truly alive and not just reflecting a tinge of life [...] is, for the best part, knowledge of the hidden sources. With history, what makes a spectacle and catches the eye is not the main thing. The nerves are invisible, just as the essentials [of history] in general are invisible" (*BT* 452-3).

“disease” and “excess” and claims that modern man suffers under the burden of “too much” of a certain kind of history. Thus he famously offers as an “antidote” to this sort of inauthentic history – the idea of history *as and for* life, history as a process of becoming pressed into the service of life and action, while Count Yorck (and consequently, Dilthey and Heidegger, too) believes the possibility of modern man’s recovery lies in his rediscovery of the *lebendige* historicity that he essentially *is*.

Freud, too, offers up a similar paradigm, which proves perhaps even more useful for our study here since, according to Downing, the Freudian model of memory and the unconscious helps to illuminate Mann’s refiguration of *Bildung* and the modernist subject in *The Magic Mountain* in terms of the photographic process. Freud’s distinction between the conscious and unconscious not only mirrors the relation Downing establishes, respectively, between the positive image and its negative master-plate the positive, but the same distinction may also be usefully compared to Heidegger’s own differentiation between an inauthentic and authentic way of interpreting life and history. On the one hand, the inauthenticity, so to speak, of the Freudian conscious lies in its essential quality as a surface phenomenon and expression, just as Count Yorck describes an inauthentic *Historie* as being grounded merely in “was Spektakl macht und augenfällig ist.” On the other hand, the essential aspect of the unconscious is that it remains by its very nature either hidden from view or actively repressed. And since the former “nicht die Hauptsache ist,” the point of both a Freudian and Heideggerian view of history is the bringing into the light or the alethetic exposure of that hidden history; according to Heidegger, this is the the history that we *are*, just as the the authentic history of the individual, according to Freud, lies in the unconscious. Thus it is no surprise that Settembrini’s description of the young Castorp also bridges such a

recognition or that Downing's reasons for referencing the passage also correspond with my tasks here.

In fact, latent in both Settembrini's evaluation of the young Castorp as well as in Downing's description of the refiguration of a distinctly modernist subjectivity in terms of the photographic procedure is also a temporality, or, what is especially important to us here, an idea of history. While the conceptual leap from subjectivity to history as a purely objective phenomenon may require some convincing, the relationship between *Dasein* and history is not one of difference but of equivalence, and would thus help to explain and justify the figurative connection between Castorp and the photographic negative or *Platte* with which he is identified. As I have already shown, this process of identification is emphasized in key moments throughout the novel, including the moments of his earliest identification with the grandfather, in which "Religious feeling mingled in his mind with thoughts of death and a sense of history" ["[G]eistliche Empfindungen mischten sich mit denen des *Todes* und der *Geschichte*"]. In particular, Castorp emerges out of this memory with the "sense" that he himself is caught up in this "mingling" in which the normally distant prospects of death and history are invited into the orbit and proximity of Castorp's subjectivity and that they are, in the Heideggerian sense of the terms, both *his* heritage (past) and *his* destiny (future):

Der Name des Vaters war da, der des Großvaters selbst und der des Urgroßvaters, und dann verdoppelte, verdreifachte und vervierfachte sich die Vorsilbe 'Ur' im Munde des Erklämers, und der Junge lauschte [...] auf das Ur-Ur-Ur-Ur, -- diesen dunklen Laut der Gruft und der Zeitverschüttung, welcher dennoch zugleich einen fromm gewährten Zusammenhang zwischen

der Gegenwart, seinem eigenen Leben und dem tief Versunkenen ausdrückte
[...]" (DZ 38-9).¹¹⁷

This merely emergent though powerful moment in his *Bildung*, however, prepares the way for the even more striking example of this identification in Castorp's encounter with the x-ray image of his hand. As I suggested in the previous chapter, the primary difference between Castorp's earlier encounter with the grandfather and his seeing into the truth of the x-ray is that in the latter he is provided an authentic encounter with his *own* death. If, as Downing suggests, this illuminated *Platte* exposes a certain refiguration of Castorp's subjectivity, then it may be said that what this x-ray evidence illuminates for the subject is the "larger, fervid comprehension," only sensed in the memory of his grandfather, that this death and the "sense of history" with which it is mingled are precisely *his*.

Moreover, just as Settembrini claims that Castorp is a page on which everything, which must include both his past and his future, his history and his fate, has already been written in "invisible ink," Heidegger, following the views of Dilthey and Yorck before him, argues that an authentic *Geschichtskennntnis* lies in "verborgene Quellen" and not in "was Spektakl macht und augenfällig ist." According to Downing, it is this "invisible script" that Castorp *is*, which, having first been exposed, must be developed in order to be revealed and potentially "fixed." Likewise, what makes the encounter with the x-ray authentic in the Heideggerian sense is that in this case "was Spektakl macht und augenfällig ist" is precisely that which in the everyday, inauthentic sense remains "invisible," or, as Count Yorck says,

¹¹⁷ "There was Hans Castorp's father's name, there was Grandfather's own, there was great-Grandfather's; then the great came doubled, tripled, quadrupled, from the old man's mouth, whilst the little lad listened [...]. The great-great-great-great – what a hollow sound it had, how it spoke of the falling away of time, yet how it seemed the expression of a piously cherished link between the present, *his own* life, and the depth of the past!" (MM 22).

“unsichtbar” – “Hans Castorp sah [...] was aber eigentlich dem Menschen zu sehen nicht bestimmt ist” (DZ 333).¹¹⁸

Finally, along with this logic of development presented by Downing is the assumption, central to Heidegger’s conception of Dasein’s being-historical, that the past is precisely never *past*. The past cannot be said to refer simply to a time that has passed and that *is* no longer, or to the mere “falling away of time”; rather, it refers to a certain inexorable availability and potential, albeit a negative one (this I will elaborate in a moment). Insofar as the past has by its very nature always already been exposed, it is always, too, in line for development, or what Settembrini above calls the “educator’s task.” In Heideggerian terms, in order for Dasein to be anything at all, it must first have already been exposed, which is also to say, it must have already been *thrown* into a world – thus Dasein always exists as a *thrown* Fact. And we will remember that insofar as Dasein is *thrown* into its world, Dasein’s history is always the history that it has been and that it is still to become. While it cannot get behind the thrownness that it is, which is also to say, while it cannot ever find itself in a time in which it was not already exposed, Dasein can authentically take over the possibilities of its past only insofar as it carries the burden of the past within itself, a carrying and becoming-guilty that makes the potential of Dasein’s past always available for what Downing refers to as development. Consequently, insofar as we are given a protagonist whose photographic relation to his past is one in which the past is always already written/exposed and whose *Bildung* requires that this invisible script be developed and disclosed out of his future, then what we also have is a temporality and a particular idea of

¹¹⁸ “Hans Castorp saw [...] what it is hardly permitted man to see, and what he had never thought it would be vouchsafed for him to see” (MM 218).

history at work that suggests not only a photographic relation but also, Heidegger would claim, an *a priori* ontological relation of Dasein to the temporality that it always already *is*.

In addition to the correspondences noted above, it is significant, too, to note other ways in which Downing's insights into the mechanisms of photography and *Bildung* in *The Magic Mountain* are confirmed in Heidegger's analytic of Dasein, especially with respect to the latter's conception of history and the historicity of Dasein. For instance, one can certainly admit that the relationship of history to being-towards-death, which is also to say, the relationship between past and future in Heidegger, certainly resonates with Downing's claim that the "positive-additive" tropes of the conventional *Bildungsroman* are countered in *The Magic Mountain* by a "subtractive-negative" apparatus made possible and visible through the photographic process:

[T]he new metaphorical regime [...] certainly stresses how *Entwicklung* or development is always somehow a matter of repression: not the simple additive or expressive procedure of *Bildung*, but rather necessarily subtractive or censorious. Or to draw the distinction less radically, we might say [...] that the desired manifest image-of-the-self is not simply a positive product, nor for that matter a release of a potential but oppressed and occulted self, but is rather itself somehow a negative product, a matter of repressive (non)production. (48)

Although it may be said that Castorp's past, like Dasein's, is *developed* out of his future, it is always a negative potential that is developed. In other words, although Castorp is provided a glimpse into his grave and consequently positively enlightened by the "electrical storm" that discloses his future, it is not only a *forbidden* glance, but it is the disclosure of impossibility

as such. As Heidegger insists, being-towards-death not only always already includes but it also gains its momentum precisely because of Dasein's *having already been thrown into its world*, something very much like the having-already-been-exposed that Downing attributes to Mann's radical-modernist characterization of Castorp's *Bildung*. As I have already mentioned, both Dasein's *thrownness* and its coming-towards itself as the possibility of impossibility are grounded in a fundamental negation at the core of Dasein's being – on the one hand, the negation that is Dasein's being-guilty and the thrownness behind which it can never go; and, on the other hand, the ultimate negation toward which it is always headed, namely, the possibility of its no-longer-being. Likewise, Castorp's glimpse into his future is, on the one hand, filtered through the negative image of his grandfather's ring that now adorns *his* hand and the "penetrating, prophetic" eyes of his maternal ancestors, and, on the other hand, oriented toward his very own death. And just as Downing claims that the goal of Castorp's *Entwicklung* (and thus, too, of the Mannian conception of *Bildung*), is to expose and integrate this negativity into a positive self-image, so, too, according to Heidegger, is Dasein's goal to confront the negativity which is its basis in order to apprehend itself authentically.

Moreover, the bringing out of this exposure, that is, the disclosure of this negative certainty, which one might venture to call the goal of a Heideggerian conception of *Bildung*, is the potentiality of Dasein's coming towards being *fixed*, which in its most extreme manifestation refers very literally to Dasein's death, to the possibility of *Nichtmehrdasein*, and, to use Downing's terminology, may be said to refer, figuratively speaking, to the positive fixation of the photographic image. Although Downing is working explicitly within a model of reproducibility and repetition inherited from Freud, Benjamin (and, too, Barthes),

the slippage that he associates between the positive and negative potential of the photographic image may be said to repeat a Heideggerian temporality in photographic terms. As we have already seen, the image of the grandfather's corpse is a suitable case in point. Insofar as the grandfather is positively fixed in the frozen aspect of death, the image serves only to impress upon the young Castorp the negative apprehension of what *had been* his grandfather, that is to say, the apprehension of what is not only *not* captured by his *Bild* but that is also incapable of being captured, as well as that toward which the young Castorp *is* already coming-towards as himself, namely, the being-guilty that he *is* and the possibility of his ownmost impossibility, i.e. his death. Thus we have both in Castorp's encounter with his grandfather's corpse and with the image of his own death in the x-ray an example of Castorp's *becoming* his grandfather, which is to say, an example of Castorp's coming-towards himself *as* having-been: "Even as the grandfather develops into his *Bild* through the chemical metabolic workings of death, so, too, does Hans develop into the same *Bild* by the chemical metabolic workings of the Mountain, which brings out the resemblance to the grandfather through an *Entwicklung* of one of Hans's stored unconscious impressions (or "scripts"), recasting the present image through the background negative cliché" (Downing 53).

Likewise, as Downing points out with respect to photography, the fixation is only potentially positive; its meaning is always deferred because of the inevitable finiteness of the image itself, which is always prone to decay. Given what has already been established with respect to Heidegger's notion of being-towards-death and its vital entanglement with the *having-been* of Dasein, it is no surprise that Downing's insistence upon this deferral occurs alongside what he calls the inevitable certainty of the death of the photographic image:

“[T]he fading away, vanishing, even dying of the photograph, can only be deferred, not denied” (66). Consequently, even the photographic image itself shares with Dasein the essential features of being-towards-death, namely, what I called in the previous chapter the indefinite certainty of its very literal being towards its own impossibility.

Moreover, Downing’s essay helps to both illuminate and at the same time challenge familiar, yet incomplete, views of the way the advent of photography helped to reshape the human experience of time under modernism. Consider, for instance, Stephen Kern’s claims from *The Culture of Space and Time* that the final positive image, the picture as *Bild*, stands in as a metaphor for death and essentially stops time insofar as the image comprises a slice *out of* time. But this assessment of the temporality of the photograph, Downing’s argument suggests, fails to account for the dynamic telos of the photograph, which is to say, it fails to account for the process that leads towards its becoming (only potentially) fixed, or for the process of *Entwicklung* as such, for its *having-been-exposed*. Nor does the static temporality described by Kern account for the future portended in every photograph; for example, in the case of Castorp’s grandfather, inasmuch as the memory-picture of his wake belongs to the hero’s past, it arises out of his future on the mountain and is even made possible by it (Downing 53), and it clearly initiates the progressive development of the young Castorp’s *Bildung*, which is also to say, the future toward which Castorp himself is coming-towards as *having-been*. In this sense, the development of the negative into the “positive” refers only to Castorp’s journey toward his own death, which the end of the novel anticipates. In short, if we interpret Downing’s findings in terms of Heideggerian temporality, then both being-towards-death and Dasein’s having-been emerge as something very much like what Downing may be apt to call being-towards-the-negative in the double sense intended by Heidegger –

being towards death as the possibility of Dasein's impossibility *and* being towards the beginning, being towards Dasein's own authentic *Geschichte*, toward the past and the *having-been*, which is always also to say, toward history as the "unsichtbaren," "verborgenen Quellen" of Dasein as such, of which the photographic negative as it is described by Downing is a very suitable analog.

Although his primary aims and the details of his compelling analysis of the theme of photography are beyond the scope of my concerns here, Downing's subsequent emphasis on the relationship between Pribislav Hippe and Clavdia Chauchat in Castorp's imagination and the impact of this relationship upon the trajectory of Castorp's *Bildung* is anything but coincidental and in even more forceful ways helps to illuminate and confirm my own objectives. With respect to the relation between Hans Castorp's memory-image of his grandfather and the even more strikingly photographic relation between Hippe and Chauchat and their interconnectedness with the novel's treatment of *Bildung* and modernist subject-formation, Downing writes:

[...] only once [Castorp] has retrieved and worked up the negative, unconscious *Urbild* of [Pribislav] Hippe does the figure of or image of Clavdia Chauchat emerge in all its clarity. Thus, even as Hans Castorp here – precisely here – develops into the *Bild* of his grandfather, succumbing to a certain logic of reproducibility, of belated reproduction of the unconscious cliché, so does Clavdia Chauchat develop out of the negative unconscious cliché of Pribislav Hippe, reproducing in her image the generic features of the master-template [...]. Thus memory qua photography and self-formation qua

Entwicklung come doubly to further and to refigure the traditional thematics of *Bildung*. (54)

Downing describes this distinctly photographic relation that links the figures of Pribislav Hippe and Clavdia Chauchat according to a Bergsonian model of memory, in particular a form of memory Bergson calls *spontaneous recollection*, which the relation, Downing argues, does of course imitate. Nevertheless, when he goes on to note the way in which this particular relation complicates the more facile binary opposition between model and copy as it is upheld in the relationship between Castorp and the *Bild* of his grandfather, Downing implicitly suggests precisely what Heidegger viewed as the most striking omission of Bergson's theory of time and memory, namely, the omission of the future's primacy as well as its inextricable entanglement with the essentially historical character of Dasein. In other words, what for Bergson (and Husserl, too, in fact) was a more straightforward, even transparent matter of storage and retrieval was for Heidegger a matter of the past's *Entwicklung out of a future*; thus, Heidegger's model of temporality even more forcefully supports Downing's assertions about the photographic model of time and *Bildung* displayed in the novel.

For instance, when Downing claims that "the relationship between Hippe and Clavdia is [...] conceived in terms even more challenging to the standard mimetic relation of model and copy than that posed by the grandfather and his *Bild*, terms that again draw on the photo-relation of negative and positive, but in such a way as to challenge their oppositional relation. That is, there is an emphatic sense in which Hippe and Clavdia are the same figure, the same image [...]; and similarly, a sense in which there is no stable or secure way of fixing on one as the source or prior term for the other [...]," he not only notes the "major repercussions"

this recognition has for Mann's reconception or revision of the traditional schematics of *Bildung*, but he also underscores precisely what it is I have hoped all along to demonstrate, namely, how Heidegger's theory of historicity may help to illuminate the novel's insistence on an historical ontology.

As Downing points out, this identity of past and future not only renders the storage-retrieval model inadequate to the truth suggested by the narrative, but it also suggests a revised conception of the relation between past and future as such – a revision accounted for by a Heideggerian conception of *Geschichte* and being-towards-death, where the authentic meaning of the past (Pribislav Hippe, insofar as he is the historical source of those possibilities held in reserve) is made manifest not in the form of a recollection but rather in Castorp's authentic, future encounter with Clavdia, which, as Heidegger would have it, comprises the very coming-towards of Castorp's fate or, put another way, that which Castorp still is and already was or constantly is as having been. Thus what Downing calls the *Urbild* of Hippe and the grandfather function not so much as images of the past but rather as images of the future, images of anticipation and the coming-towards, which, not unlike the magic atmosphere of the mountain itself, pull Castorp unrelentingly and inevitably toward himself and the uttermost possibility of his certain fate. Moreover, as Downing admits, "Hans's spontaneous recollection of the image of Hippe and his pairing of it with the present image of Clavdia occurs in the same chapter – indeed at the same moment – in which he also develops the trembling chin, or cliché, of his grandfather" (53). It is in this sense that the past not only becomes the future but more importantly that the future becomes the past and, even more explicitly, that Castorp authentically *becomes* the history that he *is*. For this reason, midway through the novel Castorp concedes that the *Erinnerungsbild* of Pribislav Hippe no longer

appeared to him except to draw his attention to the “gläsernde Angebinde” and x-ray tablet [“Täfelchen”] or, what Downing might call the photographic plate or *Platte* of Clavdia, and thus Castorp acknowledges, and naively so, that “the progress of his acclimatization was over.” This progress, however, as Downing shows us, is only potentially “complete” or “fixed.” Castorp has not merely exchanged his earlier fascination with Hippe for the currency of his love for Clavdia; rather, Downing claims, “[w]hile the positive, manifest image fades, the *Bild* is nonetheless retained in the ‘negative’ space of Hans Castorp’s unconscious, where it remains stored, latent, awaiting, like the memory-image of the grandfather, its subsequent development and duplication. And it finds this [...] in the figure of Clavdia Chauchat” (54). In this way, Downing’s photographic relation mirrors Heidegger’s exegesis of Dasein’s fundamental relation to its past in which Dasein’s coming-towards itself as having-been is clearly indicated in the way Castorp’s past is continually absorbed or, even better, *developed* into the dynamic and anticipatory tension that makes up his future – whether by future I mean to refer to the erotic pull toward Clavdia’s *Platte* or to the equally ecstatic pull toward his own *Platte*, the truth of which, as we have already established, lies not only in the “vouchsafed” glance into his own grave but also in his recognition that he has in a sense *become* his grandfather.

This future by necessity is never permitted to become *fixed* in any positive sense since throughout and to the end of the novel and beyond the negative *Urbild* of Hippe and the grandfather remains undeveloped – for Downing as a repressed feature of the unconscious and for Heidegger as the coming-towards of Dasein’s being-guilty in which something is always left unsettled. It is important to remember here that for Heidegger Dasein’s being-guilty indicates something very different than a moral guilt, but refers rather explicitly to the

nullity at the core of Dasein's being. First of all, such a guilt coincides with Castorp's unconsummated desire for Clavdia. Castorp does go marching toward his death *still* thinking of her, after all – *the* aspect of the ending, remember, that made the strongest impression on Heidegger because it is “an end without an end” [“eine Ende ohne Ende”] in which the love between Castorp and Hippe/Chauchat is never resolved or fully assimilated. Secondly, such a guilt refers to the “negative” basis of this desire, in which the x-ray *negative* of Clavdia remains, in the end, the most powerful evidence of Castorp's otherwise positive eroticism vis-à-vis Clavdia.

Consequently, Downing's recognition that neither Hippe nor Clavdia can be distinguished temporally as the source of or prior term for the other only reconfirms Heidegger's account of the past's authentic relation to the future, namely, that both are always already out ahead of Castorp and the measure of their authenticity for Castorp lies precisely in this mode of repetition that is peculiar to a Heideggerian conception of history, where both history and the future exist quite explicitly as concomitant forms of possibility which comprise the entire orientation of Castorp's radical *Bildung*. As Downing rightly points out, the significance of Clavdia's x-ray “portrait” is that it is, in the end, not a portrait at all but rather a photograph. Thus it follows that logic of development described by Downing, as well as its accompanying temporality, according to which the negative image of Clavdia Chauchat is developed out of the *Urbild* of Pribislav Hippe, which is also to say, that Castorp's future involves nothing short of his coming-towards the “innermost and most permanent possibilities” of his past. And the same may be said, I believe, and perhaps even more forcefully so, of the relationship between Hans Castorp and his grandfather, according to which the *lebendiges* history that Castorp *is* involves nothing short of Castorp's

progressive taking over of the possibilities that lie “stored, latent, awaiting [...] development and duplication” in the *Urbild* of the grandfather and that are quite literally handed down and transmitted to Castorp. It is in this sense that Mann’s narrative helps us to better understand Heidegger’s admittedly opaque claim that “[o]nly in so far as Dasein *is* authentically as ‘*having-been*’ can Dasein come towards itself futurally in such a way that it comes *back* [to itself]. As authentically futural, Dasein *is* as ‘*having-been*’” [“Nur sofern Dasein überhaupt *ist* als ich *bin-gewesen*, kann es zukünftig auf sich selbst so zukommen, dass es *zurück*-kommt. Eigentlich zukünftig *ist* eigentlich *gewesen*”] (*BT* 373/*SZ* 431), where Dasein’s coming back to itself signals much more than “a mere mechanical repetition or an attempt to reconstitute the physical past; it means rather an attempt to [...] retrieve former *possibilities*, which are thus ‘explicitly handed down’ or ‘transmitted’” to Dasein (qtd. in *BT* 437).

Before moving on to a discussion of the portrayal of history in *Doctor Faustus* and the way it, too, resonates with Heideggerian conceptions of history, I would like to say a few words about the ending of the novel and way in which what Heidegger might call an authentic *Geschichte* collides with its inauthentic counterpart. Much has been made in Mann scholarship of the “Donnerschlag” that occurs at the end of the novel, the outbreak of the first world war and the “shock that fired the mine beneath the magic mountain, and set our sleeper urgently outside the gates” [“der Donnerschlag, der den Zauberberg sprengt und den Siebenschläfer unsanft vor seine Tore setzt”](*MM* 709/*DZ* 1075). Conventional wisdom describes this moment as the moment in which the hermetic and suspect allure of the mountain is broken loose and Castorp is returned to the ordered world of life and history. Nevertheless, and here we should recall Ricoeur’s formidable analysis of the novel, the *historical* time into which Castorp and the rest of Europe are thrust with the outbreak of war is something very

different from either the so-called *timeless* world of the Berghof or the measured, orderly, chronological time of the flatland. And given our analysis of what I have already described as the *authentic* history traced by the novel, we may well read this suddenly *historical* time in the same light.

Consider, for instance, the narrator's problem at the end of the novel of narrating this portion of his protagonist's *past*. On the one hand, he is ready to condemn Castorp for having allowed himself to be lured by the narcotic and illusory charms of the Berghof, "der sich zwar von den geistigen Schatten der Dinge regierungsweise das eine und andere träumen ließ, der Dinge selbst aber nicht geachtet hatte und zwar aus der Hochmutsneigung, die Schatten für die Dinge zu nehmen, in diesen aber nur Schatten zu sehen" (DZ 1075).¹¹⁹ On the other hand, the narrator is self-aware enough a few pages later to admit his own guilt for participating in this same game of shadows, the game of narrative as such:

O Scham unserer Schattensicherheit! Hinweg! Wir erzählen das nicht! Ist unser Bekannter getroffen? Er meinte einen Augenblick, es zu sein. [...].
[Aber] [e]r macht sich auf, er taumelt hinkend weiter mit erdschweren Füßen, bewusstlos singend:

'Und sei-ne Zweige rau-uschten,

Als rie-fen sir mir zu –'

Und so, im Getümmel, in dem Regen, der Dämmerung, kommt er uns aus der Augen. (DZ 1084)¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ "[Castorp preoccupied himself] with this or that among the subjective shadows of things; but the things themselves he had not heeded at all, having the willful tendency to take the shadow for the substance, and in the substance to see only shadow" (MM 709).

¹²⁰ "Shame of our shadow-safety! Away! No more! – But our friend? Was he hit? He thought so, for the moment. [...]. [But] [u]p he gets, and staggers on, limping on his earth-bound feet, all unconsciously singing:
'Its waving branches whi – spered

Is it too much of a reach to believe that the message, which is *unspoken* [*unausgesprochen*], is nevertheless, and perhaps precisely because of the narrator's inability to transmit it, *authentic*? Or put another way, is it only coincidence that it is precisely here at this moment that we find Castorp courting not shadow but rather the substance of his past, the *authenticity* of which lies in his coming-towards himself? – his coming-towards both the object of his desire, his still burning love for Clavdia, and his coming-towards the possibility of his own impossibility that is anticipated in his march toward death, which is always also to say, that he is coming toward authentic *historical* possibilities that cannot be handed down by the inauthentic shadow-safety of narrative but only by a resolute Dasein to itself, which of course helps to explain the solitary, fading figure of Hans Castorp as he disappears *toward himself* at the end of the novel.

Doctor Faustus

Over the last three decades debates over the question of history in *Doctor Faustus* have fallen, more or less, into three recognizable categories. First, there is the question of whether the story of Adrian Leverkühn evokes one Germany, in which “the good and bad components [are] so inextricably and homogenously mixed [...] that National Socialism appears inborn,” or two Germanies, “the one good [rational] and the other evil [irrational, diabolical]” (Fetzer 64).¹²¹ The second debates whether the novel's account is even

A mess – age in my ear –
and thus, in the tumult, in the rain, in the dusk, vanishes out of sight” (*MM* 715).

¹²¹ For one or another variant of this approach to the novel's treatment of history, see, for example, Vaget's “Kaisersaschern als geistige Lebensform. Zur Konzeption der deutschen Geschichte in Thomas Manns *Doktor Faustus*” in *Der deutschen Roman und seine historischen und politischen Bedingungen* [ed. Wolfgang Paulsen, Berne: Francke, 1977.200-35]; Wiegand's *Thomas Manns 'Doktor Faustus' als zeitgeschichtlicher Roman*

commensurate with or adequate to actual history. For instance, Helmut Koopmann doubts whether the novel is capable of shedding much light on historical events the author himself did not witness, and along with others, including Martin Travers, goes even further when he claims (following Adorno it would seem) both that the historical events in question exceed language and that the use and function of the Faust myth and the analogical treatment of music and literature betray a symbolic vision that is ahistorical, anachronistic and otherwise incompatible with contemporary German history (Fetzer 66).¹²² And finally, there are those which debate the decidability of the text's treatment of history.¹²³ Typically, such readings end by repeating the claim that the novel ends in the *Zweideutigkeit* with which it began, a "frustratingly familiar concept that, with Thomas Mann, always has the last word" (Fetzer 131).¹²⁴ Of course, as John Fetzer rightly points out, *Zweideutigkeit* in *Doctor Faustus* is never meant to indicate a "lack of clarity" but rather a "double valency" and thus he calls for future readings of the novel to overlook the "threadbare concepts of equivocality and ambivalence [...] in favor of something resembling a definitive commitment" (131).

[Frankfurt: Fischer, 1982]; Wißkirchen's *Zeitgeschichte im Roman. Zur Thomas Manns 'Zauberberg' und 'Doktor Faustus'* [Berne: Francke, 1986]; and Kreutzer's "Fausts Weg vom Wissenschaftler zum Künstler oder Thomas Manns Deutung der deutschen Geschichte" in *Zeitschrift für deutsche Studien* [8 (1989-90): 79-85].

¹²² See Koopman's "Der Krieg als Höllensturz: Zu Thomas Manns Kriegsberichterstattung und seinem *Doktor Faustus*" in *Krieg und Literatur* [2.3(1990): 13-32] and Travers's "Doctor Faustus and the Historians: The Function of 'Anachronistic Symbolism'" in *The Modern German Historical Novel* [ed. Roberts and Thomson, New York: Berg, 1991].

¹²³ See, for example, Ryan's *The Uncompleted Past* [Detroit: Wayne State, 1983]; Copley's comparative essays "Political Ambiguities in *Under Western Eyes* and *Doctor Faustus*" in *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* [10 (1983): 377-88] and "Closure and Infinite Semiosis in Mann's *Doctor Faustus* and Eco's *The Name of the Rose*" in *Comparative Literature Studies* [26 (1989): 341-61]; and Barnouw's "Fascism, Modernity, and the Doctrine of Art from *Mario and the Magician* to *Doctor Faustus*" in *Michigan Germanic Studies* [18 (1992):48-63].

¹²⁴ The novel begins with Serenus Zeitblom's self-deprecating and mild-mannered admission that he may in fact not be the right one to narrate the tale of Adrian Leverkühn: "[...] gerade dadurch dem Leser Zweifel zu erwecken, ob er sich auch in den richtigen Händen befindet, will sagen: ob ich meiner ganzen Existenz nach der rechte Mann für eine Aufgabe bin, zu der vielleicht mehr das Herz als irgendwelche berechtigende Wesensverwandschaft mich reizt" (*DF* 7). And ends with his famously impossible "Wunder, das über den Glauben geht" und "Das Licht der Hoffnung [in] "letzter Hoffnungslosigkeit" (*DF* 672).

These separate but interrelated trends in Mann criticism, however, rarely consider the text's radical undecidability as an essential commitment to a particular idea of time and history, and this is something even Fetzer overlooks when he casually admits without further emphasis or explanation that Mann was "accustomed to viewing history as a function of his own fate" (65). Understanding what Fetzer may have been on the verge of establishing with his description of Mann's treatment of history in *Doctor Faustus* as a "function of his own fate" is not only critical to a deeper understanding of the portrayal of the potentiality of history in *Doctor Faustus*, but it is also a matter of emphasizing Mann's commitment to something like a Heideggerian understanding of history and to a historical understanding made legible perhaps *only* through the filter of Heideggerian temporality. The various positions that make up these debates over the function of history in *Doctor Faustus* rarely engage the aporias of historical life and understanding that make these conversations possible, even likely, and which, I maintain, the novel ultimately registers. Consequently, I will forego an extensive commentary on the dilemma of whether there are one or two Germanies, perhaps a truly undecidable question, and focus the bulk of my attention on unraveling the more compelling question of the text's adequacy to the history it attempts to narrate and the question of what some scholars have called the "radical undecidability" of this relationship. With such a focus I intend to show that Mann's portrayal of history in *Doctor Faustus* is not only commensurate with what Heidegger calls an authentic *Geschichte* but also that what I refer to above as Mann's "commitment to radical undecidability" is not at all unlike Heidegger's conception of authenticity as such, in which Dasein's fundamental interpretive task (through which we may say Dasein is *gebildet*) involves the resolute and anticipatory taking over of the possibilities it inherits from this undecidability, namely,

being-towards-death, history – in short, *die Sorge* – all of which Dasein itself *is* in constantly coming towards itself as having been.

It is no coincidence, it seems to me, that in the very same passage in which Heidegger recalls Count Yorck's emphasis on the "verborgenen Quellen" and "unsichtbares" essence of history – the passage, remember, which in the previous section of this chapter I linked with Settembrini's description of the "invisible ink" in which the entirety of Castorp's past was (and already had been) written – Yorck also makes a telling reference to Goethe's *Faust*. For Yorck, as for Heidegger, an authentic encounter with the history that Dasein *is* is an encounter with a mode of invisibility that is also a laying bare *out of the future*, or as Downing might explain it, an *Entwicklung* of the hidden secrets of the past, which is also to say, a sort of communing with what Yorck calls "der Geist der Geschichte" ["the Spirit of History"] (*SZ* 530/*BT* 453). And both Yorck and Heidegger, knowing their situation much further along the historical path of modernity, find it both curious yet understandable that "the Spirit of History" "is one [Spirit] who did not appear to Faust in his study, or to Master Goethe either" ["Der ist in seiner Klause dem Faust nicht erschienen und auch dem Meister Goethe nicht"] (qtd. in *BT* 453/*SZ* 530).

That the Spirit of History was omitted from Goethe's version of the tale is significant because it may be argued that it is precisely *this* spirit that appears to Adrian in his study in Palestrina in Mann's decidedly modernist account of the myth in *Doctor Faustus*. Readers need only recognize that the Devil's part of the conversation involves the repeated insistence on the nature of history and the past as they directly relate to Adrian's crisis. In fact, when Adrian notes early on the irony of the Devil's having appeared to him in Italy, where the latter "enjoys no popularity," rather than in the Germany of Adrian's childhood, namely,

Kaisersachern, where a “medieval dread of sin” and the figure of the Devil remain alive and well, the Devil goes so far as to suggest that their meeting and thus, too, the bargain itself, would not even be necessary if only Adrian would admit the fundamental link between his own fate and the history that is his: “Had you but courage to say to yourself: ‘Where I *am*, there is Kaisersachern,’ why then, of a sudden the matter would be in accord [...]” [“Wenn du den Mut hättest, dir zu sagen: ‘Wo ich bin, da ist Kaisersachern’, gelt, so stimmte die Sache auf einmal”] (*DF 242/DF 304*).

Not only does Adrian’s lack of courage, or better, his lack of acknowledgement, enforce the necessity of the pact, it is also the basis of the Devil’s continuing his history lesson (which, I maintain, is precisely the lesson of the pact itself), which in turns, takes up the history of Germany, German art and music, Adrian’s private past, etc. In addition, it is clear that Kaisersachern is much more than a place but forcefully equated with Adrian’s being as such and that this, too, is what Adrian is unable to grasp. Thus Kaisersachern is one of the boldest terms in the invisible script of that composition which *is* Adrian. Though Adrian speaks of Kaisersachern as if it belonged to the long ago, it is clearly the Devil’s premise that history “*nie* vergangen, *nie* vorbei ist,” that in fact it *is always* where he is as being-there or Dasein, and inasmuch as this is the case, he recalls not only Heidegger’s famous question – “Why do we say of time that it passes away but do not say with just as much emphasis that it arises?” – but also the claims of his Goethean counterpart, who at the end of *Faust* denounces the lemur chorus, just as the Devil denounces Adrian, for their *unhistorical* thinking, for “if it *had not been*, then it would make no difference” (MacNeice; emphasis mine):

Vorbei! ein dummes Wort.

Warum vorbei?

Vorbei und reines Nicht, vollkommenes Einerlei!

Was soll uns denn des ew'ge schaffen!

Geschaffenes zu nichts hinwegzuraffen!

'Da ist's vorbei!' Was ist daran zu lesen?

Es ist so gut, als wär' es nicht gewesen.¹²⁵

Given the particularly strong correspondence between Mephistopheles's claims above and the extended account of this historical dynamic throughout the XXV chapter of *Doctor Faustus*, one is tempted to say that Mann's Devil appears to take over precisely where Goethe's Mephisto leaves off, i.e. with the task of elaborating this question, or better, the temporality of *das Vorbei*, what Heidegger calls the having-been or Dasein's *Gewesenheit*.

According to Downing, the development of the photographic negative into the fixed, positive image does not merely refer to an explicit transition from one term to the other, but rather it describes a fundamentally revelatory process in which the negative is hidden precisely through the process of its development (into the positive) even as it remains the very content of the positive and the condition of all its possibilities, including the possibility of its impossibility. And although Downing does not venture a discussion of *Doctor Faustus*, both his and Mann's emphasis on the photographic temporality of *Bildung* resonates meaningfully with what Heidegger may agree is the authentic *having-been* exposed of Dasein

¹²⁵ Gone by! A stupid phrase.

Why say gone by?

Gone by – pure naught – complete monotony.

What use these cycles of creation!

Or snatching off the creatures to negation!

'It is gone by! – and we can draw the inference:

If it had not been, it would make no difference [...]

to what Downing calls the “negative” image of itself. Consequently, Downing’s analysis would appear to offer a promising point of reentry into the problem of history in the later novel (61), and as I have already begun to explain, one of the more remarkable examples of this problem and its accompanying temporality in the novel lies in the dynamic role played by Kaisersaschern in the narrative of Adrian’s life and fate as well as in Zeitblom’s imagination.

We are, of course, very familiar by now with Heidegger’s claim that the past, like Being itself, must always be an issue for Dasein insofar as Dasein is itself never, strictly speaking, *past*, and this being an issue is always closely connected with Dasein’s understanding of itself, with its projection toward its ownmost possibilities – Dasein’s past is for it the history that it has been and that it is yet to come. As a result, Kaisersaschern is much more than the place from which Adrian receives his musical education, but it is also much more than the source of the diabolical elements that infect Adrian, his music and his homeland, i.e. the edge of that dangerous and precarious balance between “petit bourgeois morality and [...] [the] medieval dread of sin” [“teils kleinbürgerlich-moralisch, teils mittelalterlich-sündenscheue”] that even Zeitblom admits does not adequately “serve the truth” [“Das würde die Wahrheit sehr unzulänglich gerecht und hätte nicht ausgereicht”] of its significance in the novel (*DF* 157/198). Kaisersaschern is the burden and potential of the past itself – which, as the novel forcefully suggests is for Adrian precisely *never* past – and it thoroughly determines Adrian’s and Germany’s historical ambition and predicament. In fact, Adrian’s fate *is* the fate of Kaisersaschern coming towards itself and is portrayed as such throughout the novel by Zeitblom:

[...] denn ist nicht der Augenblick des Flüggewerdens und anbrechender Freiheit, wenn das Tor der Schule hinter uns schließt, das Stadtgehäuse, in dem wir herangezogen worden, sich auftut und die Welt uns offen liegt, der glücklichste oder doch der erregend erwartungsvollste in unser aller Leben? [...]. War es so? Hat Kaisersaschern [Adrian] jemals freigegeben? Hat er es nicht mit sich genommen, wohin immer er ging, und ist er nicht von ihm bestimmt worden, wann immer er zu bestimmen glaubte? Was ist Freiheit! Nur das Gleichgültige ist frei. [...] nachträglich fragte ich mich, was ich denn sonst erwartet hatte. Er widmete sich später der Komposition. Aber wenn es sehr kühne Musik war, die er schrieb, -- war es etwa 'freie' Musik, Allerweltsmusik? Das war es nicht. Es war die Musik eines nie Entkommenen [...] [es war] Musik von Kaisersaschern. (DF 114-15)¹²⁶

In addition to its moral and psychological significance, Mann gives to Kaisersaschern an ontological weight that Heidegger's philosophy of history helps to elaborate. It is clear from the passage above that it is precisely a lack of indifference toward the past, its 'being an issue' for both the narrator and the protagonist, that motivates not only the narrative of Adrian Leverkühn but also the narrative impulse itself. It is, for example, no surprise that Adrian's initial theological pursuits are so closely linked with his musical *compositions*. And this is the real reason for Adrian's so-called indifference, which in the end is not indifference

¹²⁶ "For is not that fledgling moment of dawning freedom, when the school door closes behind us, when the shell of a town in which we have grown up cracks open, and the world lies before us – is that not the happiest or at least the most excitedly expectant in all our lives? [...] Was that true? Did Kaisersaschern ever really set [Adrian] free? Did he not take it with him wherever he went, and was he not controlled by it whenever he thought himself in control? What is freedom? Only what is indifferent and detached is free. [...] Looking back I ask myself what else I should have expected. He later took up composing. But even if it was very bold music that he wrote – was it in any sense 'free' music, music for one and all? That it was not. It was the music of someone who had never escaped; it was the music [...] of Kaisersaschern" (*Faustus* 91-2).

at all but rather a devoted attentiveness: the “excited expectancy” of the future is replaced by a colder understanding that what can be expected of the future is only the coming to ripeness of a past. Thus in the end Adrian’s musical achievement, despite all of its boldness and novelty, nevertheless comes toward the “edge of impossibility” and remains bound to its repetition of what *has been* and *already is*. It is in this stretching-along of life, which Dasein essentially *is* (later in the novel Adrian finally and explicitly admits this recursive temporality when he claims: “Ich *bin* Kaisersaschern” [“I *am* Kaisersaschern”]), that it is able to apprehend the implicit and explicit connectedness of itself with the past and to anticipate its connectedness with a future, and it is only because Dasein historicizes itself in this way that history in the ordinary sense is meaningful. With respect to the novel, this interdependency of the future with the past and the amplitude of the future in the past is what first opens it for a Heideggerian reading of history.

It is certainly no coincidence that the temporality activated in Kaisersaschern’s role in the novel is reflected again in the temporality of the *strenger Satz*. As the Devil points out, and here he explicitly echoes Adorno’s claims in *Philosophy of Modern Music*, the twelve tone cannot *be* the “freies Spiel” [“free play”] of “permutations and derivations” it proposes to be precisely because it is fundamentally comprised of material handed down to it not only from history but also *as* history, including the history of the “work” [Aufgabe] (as opposed to the “play”) of the small folk, who long before Adrian’s conversation with the Devil are *already* busy at their morbid task. In fact, one of the fundamental characteristics of Schönberg’s twelve-tone system (and thus, Adrian’s, too) is that “none of the tones is to be repeated until the other eleven *have been* heard” (Mitchel and Blomster x). Here we should recall my claim in the previous chapter that this strict consistency certainly doesn’t, as it is

frequently alleged, need to indicate a static atemporality. Although it is said to “scorn extension *in time*” it nevertheless insists upon a formula *of* temporality: on the one hand, a future is always already promised by the term-limit of the prohibition; on the other hand, this future consists fundamentally of a series of repetitions. Consequently, twelve-tone music seeks to describe an elemental musical temporality that may be called a mirror image of Dasein’s own, in which Dasein is said to authentically come-toward itself as having-been.

Even while it seeks to avoid repetition and cut the edge of art by presenting one unprecedented chord after another with no appeal to a past or future (and thus, according to Scaff, rejecting both the time and humanity of narrative development), the *strenger Satz* remains bound essentially to something very much like a Heideggerian repetition, which is always also to say, it is bound to its material content and the historical specificity of those material conditions whose source is always its past; just as Dasein *remains* bound to the concrete heritage of its own having-been, the advancing musical row is bound to those possibilities, the “permutations and derivations,” released by its own material having-been or the series of musical notes (and the repetitions of these notes) of which it is made. And yet the temporality of the twelve-tone, like the temporality that Dasein *is*, in coming-towards itself as having been nevertheless approaches what is still very much a prohibition. And as the Devil advises Adrian, it is in the taking over of these possibilities that Adrian is said to be authentically *historical*, keeping in mind, of course, that in this taking over of the possibilities that are his inheritance (in the sense of the term indicated by Heidegger), Adrian *chooses* the terms of the *Teufeslvertrag* and thus literally signs off on the meaning of what it is to *think historically*, which means, as we have already shown in some detail, knowing what it means to *be* toward death, toward one’s uttermost impossibility: “Das ist es, du denkst

nicht an die Läufe, du denkst nicht historisch, wenn du dich beklagst, daß der und er es *ganz* haben konnte, Freuden und Schmerzen unendlich, ohne daß ihm das Stundglas gestellt war, die Rechnung endlich präsentiert wurd” (DF 318).¹²⁷

Many of the novel’s critics claim in one way or another that the history recounted by the novel was “beyond the limits of language to express or even to approximate” or that it was unwise for Mann “to persist in operating within the confines of German intellectual and cultural history (music, for instance) when seeking an objective correlative for the Nazi period or to make the mythic background (for example, the Nietzschean prototype) the vehicle through which to come to terms with contemporary historical events” (Fetzer 67). These critical responses are heir, however indirectly, to the broader cultural and institutional influence of Adorno’s critique of both Heidegger’s metaphysics and the theory of authenticity that is so central to it.

In *The Jargon of Authenticity*, Adorno clearly implicates Heidegger as having committed to a blank but influential nominalism that overstrains and dehistoricizes language and its possibilities; such a jargon, according to Adorno, leaves Heidegger’s charged rhetoric of authenticity “untouched by history” (8). And while the basis of Adorno’s criticism is his insistence on the interpenetration of history and language, the corruption of the one by the other and the laying bare of language’s motives and recommendations amidst the material content of history, in Heidegger, Adorno claims, language takes refuge from history and resonates with the “theological addictions” of German culture in the years leading up to WW II. Heidegger’s authenticity becomes a space of deferral and distraction where a burgeoning

¹²⁷ “That’s the thing – you are not thinking historically when you complain that some one or another could have it entire, joys and pains unending, without that his hour-glass had been turned or that at the end his bill be presented him” (DF 252).

fascism is nurtured (rather than critiqued) (5). Heidegger's failure to account for his complicity in the historical developments of the mid-twentieth century in Germany and the policy of deferral underwritten in and by the jargon of authenticity means that Heidegger's irresponsibility lies in his ambivalence and in the ambivalence of his language with respect to actual history and that as a result both Heideggerian history and Heidegger in history fail.

It should immediately strike readers that the situation of Heidegger (especially as he appears when in Adorno's grip) resonates not only with the situation of Adrian – the “most beloved creature of [Mann's] imagination” – and thus, too, with the situation of the author himself, but it also resonates meaningfully with traditional currents in Mann criticism in so far as Mann's novel is deemed problematic and controversial for the same reasons as Heidegger's philosophy.¹²⁸ And it is no less important that Adorno, who himself had a say in the novel's composition, emerges here not merely as an antagonist but rather as the most productive and appropriate point of contact for a comparison of Mann's and Heidegger's theories of history.

Adorno urges us never to forget the terrible specificity of modern German history and famously announced the end of art after Auschwitz in order to suggest, among other things, the limits of language and art when faced with the task of representing this specificity. In *Adorno and Literature*, a recent collection devoted to exploring the scope and breadth of Adorno's aesthetic theory, more than one essay takes up the question of forgetting in Heidegger and Adorno, in particular the question as it relates to the myth of Faust. These readings are useful primarily because they suggest an important historical link between

¹²⁸Readers will remember from the preface that Rüdiger Safranski begins his biography of Heidegger, *Between Good and Evil*, with a direct comparison of Heidegger with Adrian Leverkühn and throughout the text even models the controversy of Heidegger's life and fate after the controversy surrounding Mann's protagonist.

Heidegger's philosophy and contemporary readings of the Faust myth, but they are also useful for bringing the Heidegger-Adorno debate into closer proximity with the complexities of reading Mann's *Doctor Faustus*.

Adorno reads the problem of Faust's and history's salvation in terms of forgetting. Forgetting must be combated, endured and passed through; it is the necessary precondition of both a return and the possibility of transformation (Fleming). But this return, according to Adorno, is the return of an immanent freedom tied to concrete historical conditions and involves "making historical processes intelligible in such a way as to liberate specific possibilities from the structures [...] that suppress them" (Macdonald 123). And for Adorno the so-called "extra-historical" emphasis with which Heidegger approaches the question of forgetting (that is to say, his tying it to the forgetting of Being) irresponsibly overlooks or avoids the historically concrete nature of forgetting (Macdonald 123). Thus Adorno's most convincing criticism of Heideggerian history and the jargon of authenticity that accompanies it is that "the move from beings to being [essentially, too, the basis of the difference between an inauthentic and authentic history] suppresses the real, determinate historical needs that motivate thought [...] [and] requires that real existing conditions [...] be left unanalyzed – entailing that they are merely accepted as is and thereby condoned" (Macdonald 123; *ND* 99).

However, when critics insist on reading the key differences between Adorno and Heidegger as a struggle between a historical materialism and an abstract metaphysics – in terms of forgetting this amounts to a difference between "the forgetting of the truth of being" on the one hand, and the complex entanglement of a purely material guilt on the other – they fundamentally miss the point. At least, they miss Heidegger's point – an oversight that at the

very least short-circuits potentially dramatic re-readings of Mann's novel(s) as well as the potential of literature, more generally, to give substance to Heidegger's abstractions. Given what we have already established with respect to a Heideggerian conception of history, it should be very evident that a Heideggerian temporality does not allow for the sort of transcendence indicated by Adorno and his followers, especially of the past. In fact, it is fair to say that it is precisely through what Adorno calls the material insufficiency, guilt and suffering of Dasein that it is first opened not only toward the forgetting of being [Seinsvergessenheit] but also toward the question of its being as such, which is also always a question of *its* time, or more precisely, the time that it *is*. Put differently, what Adorno (and historicism, more generally) refers to as the real, historical conditions which Heidegger's historicity allegedly dispenses with is actually *the* content of the world into which every Dasein finds itself always already *thrown* as being-in-the-world; moreover, every Dasein is either inauthentically or authentically disposed toward this world – as we have seen, it either flees from that in the face of which it has been *thrown* or it confronts this world and itself in the authentic taking over of its guilt, its having been, and in so doing comes towards itself authentically.

On the one hand, guilt, as it is understood by Heidegger, is certainly grounded in an ontological insufficiency, with which it probably is in fact beyond the capacity of language to correspond in any decisive way, although Mann doesn't hesitate to make the attempt. In *Doctor Faustus*, for example, it is precisely such a guilt that is hinted at in the irrevocability of the Faustian pact. Adrian is *thrown* toward a fate which he cannot get behind because he has not himself "*thrown the thrownness* which is [his] basis." It is despite himself that Adrian is lured into his *Teufelsvertrag* and signs it with his blood and lust, an encounter the Devil

tells us is in the end only an afterthought and not the real source of his infection or the fate it foreshadows, for such a fate had been decided well *before* Adrian's private decision to consummate his destiny and thus condemn his body to the same agony that had always been his intellectual heritage. In *The Magic Mountain*, in fact, it is this same atmosphere of expectation and inevitability that fills Hans Castorp's seven years atop the magic mountain despite his insistence that he is only there to pay his cousin a brief visit before embarking on his professional career. And, as we have already discovered, the most salient moments of Castorp's acclimatization to what is ultimately at stake in his *Entwicklung* (Downing) are moments in which he comes to terms with his past *as* the ecstatic release or "exposure" of his future possibilities – this, it was shown, is the meaning of the temporality that accompanies his love for Hans Lorenz Castorp and for Pribislav Hippe/Clavdia Chauchat. It is fitting, too, that Adrian's introduction in the novel carefully conceals the circumstances of his youth and discloses rather the circumstances of his family's *Herkunft* and the character of those places that most shaped his nature, the historical specificity of the past he has inherited and of which he is an expression. So just as he in coming toward his fate and thus, too, himself, also *comes toward* his past, i.e. the past of Buchel and Kaisersaschern, Adrian is described as the singular emergence [*Entstehung*] of a constellation of historical forces "thrown" toward a fate, and as an abyss of private and public meanings, all of which point to the fact that Adrian "is not [only *not*] master of [his] Being" but that "[his] possibilities stem from an ultimate impossibility," which for Heidegger is the very basis of the being-guilty that *Dasein is* insofar as it resolutely and authentically comes toward itself *as* having-been.

On the other hand, though such an understanding of guilt is purely formal in one sense and thus does not 'indicate' a moral guilt, it does make possible and give way to such a

guilt insofar as it is brought to the surface of the present as *action*, which is also to say, as the essentially concrete projection expressed in every moment of choosing. As a result, Adrian's choice not only involves the physical consummation of his fate, but his choice is also always Germany's and is thus bound up with the concrete political character and consequences of its historical rendezvous with evil. Even more importantly, perhaps, rather than becoming guilty, in choosing to embrace the "ill-fated creature" (*Faustus* 164) – Hetaera Esmeralda (the woman from whom he contracts his fatal infection) – Adrian, like Germany, *remains* guilty, both generally and concretely, by closing off and at the same time deciding the possibilities of his future, which at the same time is the mere confirmation of his *becoming* precisely what Zeitblom fears he had always been. Here we have only to consider that Hetaera Esmeralda refers not only to the gypsy girl with whom Adrian violates his pact long before his conversation with the Devil nor only to the motif that underlies and inspires all of his musical compositions, but it refers first to the mysterious butterfly introduced to Adrian and Zeitblom in their youth by Jonathan Leverkühn, Adrian's father, whose own mystical leanings prefigure Adrian's demise. Just as the butterfly's camouflage allows it at once both to conceal and present itself in nature – "its wings smudged with just a dark splash of violet and pink, so that in flight, with nothing else visible, it imitates a windblown petal" ["Nur einen dunklen Farbfleck in Violett und Rosa hatte Hetaera auf ihre Flügeln, der sie, da man sonst nichts von ihr sieht, im Flug einem windgeführten Blütenblatt gleichen läßt"] – the past, which this symbol represents throughout the novel, follows the same logic of "defensive mimicry" [Schutz-Nachahmung] (*DF* 17/*DF* 21).

All of this, of course, gives new meaning to the infamous circularity of the novel, which finds Adrian in very much the same place at the end of his life as he was at the

beginning: “Der landschaftlich-häusliche Rahmen, in den Adrian später, als reifer Mann [...] stand zu demjenigen seiner Kindheit in der seltsamsten Ähnlichkeits- und Wiederholungsbeziehung, anders gesagt: der Schauplatz seiner späteren Tage war eine Nachahmung desjenigen seiner Frühzeit” (DF 36).¹²⁹ Of course, as with Heideggerian repetition, what is suggested here is not the mere repetition of Adrian’s past in his future but rather a much more meaningful and influential recursiveness, which is alluded to in the musical analogy with which Zeitblom invests his recognition: “Ich weiß nicht, wie weit Adrian damals etwas ‘merkte’, ob er sofort oder erst allmählich, nachträglich und in errinnerndem Abstand gewisse Verhältnisse, in eine andere, aber nicht ferne Tonart transponiert wieder erkannte” (DF 276)¹³⁰ or in Zeitblom’s even more deliberate claim that in Adrian’s deteriorating health, for which his settlement at Pfeiffering is the decisive venue, one can not only trace certain correspondences with the deteriorating situation in Germany, but may also be witnessing the “fulfillment of something long expected” (DF 360). This circularity is typically viewed as a negative symbol of historical stasis or even backsliding precipitated by or at least served up as an analogy for the cultural primitivism that is associated with the historical atrocities of National Socialism; however, it can also be viewed as a dynamic narrative expression and example of authentic repetition and being-guilty, or simply what it means to *be* historical in Heidegger’s description of Dasein’s fundamental temporality – Dasein’s coming towards itself as having been.

¹²⁹ “The framework of landscape and house where Adrian later established his life as a mature man [...] very strangely resembled, even replicated, the framework of his early childhood [at Buchel]; or put another way, the setting of his later years curiously imitated that of his youth” (DF 29).

¹³⁰ “I do not know to what extent Adrian ‘noticed’ anything that day, whether he immediately or only gradually, in the afterthought of memory, recognized certain relationships, transposed here [in Pfeiffering] in a different but not too distant key” (DF 219).

This becoming the past or being-guilty (though on the surface of history it produces an excessive, if corrupt, creativity and the semblance of health in Adrian) is grounded squarely in both an ontological and material insufficiency that is the basis of Dasein's suffering. And it is this sort of suffering that the novel gives to Adrian and with which Zeitblom has such difficulty coming to terms. Indeed, as I am trying now to show, the novel itself is Mann's own attempt [as the myth *has always been* Germany's attempt] at coming to terms with the temporality of what Heidegger calls *thrownness* and the guilt that accompanies it. Of course, Mann's original plans for the novel underscore the importance of the role of moral or spiritual guilt in the novel's conception,¹³¹ but his later emphasis on the relationship of guilt to both the private past of the individual and the public past of the nation – namely, *history* – exposes an even more deeply felt correspondence with Heideggerian temporality. Such a temporality infuses the biographical structure of the novel as well as the narrative world it presents because the novel's historical architecture is bound to the idea of the past and history as a problem of guilt. It presents itself for the novelist and narrator as a problem not only of “reckoning” (Reed) with the ontological weight of history but also with Heidegger's question of what it means that “time always temporalizes itself only at one time, as human, *historical* Dasein.”

As I have demonstrated, it is because Dasein is always already historical that it can have a history at all, and the novel's most substantive task, it seems to me, lies in negotiating the dynamic gap between the history that Zeitblom and Adrian, in fact, *are* and the history

¹³¹“Novella oder zu ‘Maja’. Figur des syphilitischen Künstlers: als Dr. Faust und dem Teufel Verschriebener. Das Gift wirkt als Rausch, Stimulans, Inspiration; er darf in entzückter Begeisterung geniale, wunderbare Werke schaffen, der Teufel führt ihm die Hand. Schließlich aber *holt ihn der Teufel*: Paralyse [...]” [“Story or for ‘Maja’. Figure of the syphilitic artist: as Dr. Faust who has sold himself to the Devil. The effect of the virus is intoxication, stimulus, inspiration; in transports of exaltation he is allowed to create wonderful works of genius, the Devil guides his hand. But in the end *the Devil carries him off*: paralysis [...]” (qtd. in Reed 361).

(of Adrian) that Zeitblom literally suffers to articulate. Thus we are given Zeitblom, for instance, whose being-historical first calls him to his task in so far as he is both embedded in and identifies himself with the history he narrates and in which he narrates, and he at the same time acknowledges the unavailability of that history which is the basis of his own guilt or, better, his perceived inadequacy for the task to which he has been called. For Heidegger it is only through such guilt that we authentically encounter the truth of being as forgotten or concealed; in fact, it is in the disclosure of this truth that we are said to authentically suffer, and it is in this way that authenticity discloses itself to Dasein as being-guilty and is directly tied to an engagement with the so-called concrete, material insufficiencies of history that Adorno describes and upon which he insists. On the one hand, both Adrian and Zeitblom are guilty in so far as they both *are*, which is always to say, in so far as they *are* their own coming towards as having been; on the other hand, their authentic taking over of this guilt occurs in their actively *choosing* the guilt that is theirs. Where Zeitblom takes over his guilt in the very undertaking that *is* the story of Adrian's fate, Adrian *chooses* his guilt in the signing of the *Teufelsvertrag*. It is for this reason that the answer to Mann's alleged dilemma, framed in the moral ambivalence attached to Adrian's choices and fate, lies in Heidegger, who describes the authentic being-guilty of Dasein not so much as a choosing either the side of guilt or that of innocence, of choosing between condemnation or redemption, but rather as preparing the way to hear the appeal of this fundamental being-guilty in "wanting [first and foremost] to have a conscience" ["*Gewissen-haben-wollen*"] (BT 334/SZ 382).

Mann expertly narrates the tale of the "small folk," the biological agents of Adrian's disease and the protagonists of the novel's hidden narrative, whose furtive labor in *Doctor Faustus* is fundamentally heir to the hidden marks of the "silent sister" or to the secrecy of

Downing's negative(s) in *The Magic Mountain*. While Adrian enjoys his high-flying time (though, technically speaking, Adrian was incapable of joy) as well as the productive and prodigious 'free play' of his intellect, it is the small folks' *Aufgabe* [*Arbeit, Werke*] that carries the weight of the novel's significance. As I have ventured to explain already, the history of their *Aufgabe* is the alternate history of the novel, which Heidegger's theory of history (and Downing's analysis, too) helps us to better understand or at least gives us reasons to reconsider. As we discussed with respect to *The Magic Mountain*, Castorp's *Bildung* (his coming towards himself as a positive, *befestigt* image) is tantamount to his becoming guilty or coming towards himself as having been (what Downing might call his own negative cliché and the hidden basis of his *Bildung* or, as Downing rightly shows, his *Entwicklung* [self-development]). In *Doctor Faustus*, it is likewise the positive image of Adrian's excessive creativity that is not only fostered by but developed out of the negative cliché of his infection. The final taking over of the negativity that Adrian *is* – something akin to Castorp's way of *becoming* his grandfather, his coveting of the x-ray negative of Clavdia or of the gramophone at the end of the novel – occurs, not coincidentally, in his last musical work, *The Lamentation of Dr. Faustus*, in which Adrian finally attests to what the Devil calls thinking *historically*. Such a moment, while representative of Dasein's authentic taking over of its own coming towards as having been, coincides with the authentic disclosure of Dasein's uttermost impossibility, and thus has as its essential function the laying bare of impossibility as such, the radical unavailability that is both Dasein's *thrownness* and the possibility of its *Nichtmehrdasein*.

With respect to the narrative itself, this moment, really a non-moment (as we established in the previous chapter), occurs when the time of writing intersects with the time

that is being written about. This intersection, so central to the composition of *Doctor Faustus*, amounts essentially to the seemingly impossible encounter between the *Geschichte* that we *are* and the *Historie* that we *write*, an encounter thoroughly conditioned by its entanglement with the temporality of conscience, the being-guilty that is grounded in Dasein's first of all being-historical and which more perfectly than most accounts describes the reasons for Mann's and Zeitblom's ambivalence not only with respect to the question of Adrian Leverkühn's life and fate but also with respect to the narrative attempt to reckon with a historical past that not only includes the author – that is also to say, a past which the author in a sense *is* – but also a past which is *never* yet, strictly speaking, *past*.

As in *The Magic Mountain*, where the narrator shamefully acknowledges the “shadow-safety” of the narrative world that conceals and mitigates the violent actuality of history (715), the essential meaning of the past and history in *Doktor Faustus* is partly and necessarily lost to Zeitblom, and Mann's emphasis on its hiddenness is apparent everywhere in the novel. Most notably, it appears in the hesitancy and mistake-prone introduction to the novel, in the equivocality about the life narrated, in the gaps and qualifications that guide the account of Adrian's life, in the certain dramatic projection of Zeitblom's historical analogies and in the tragic structure of his interpretations, and most importantly perhaps, in the uncertainty that thoroughly overshadows the reciprocity of his love for Adrian and the authenticity of his love for his homeland in whose history he shares a great part of himself. As Anne Hall points out, for example, Zeitblom does not so much believe in the Faustian meanings he reads in Adrian's biography as cling “pathetically” to their possibility (442). In this way Mann calls attention to the limits and inevitable failures of language and memory to

comprehend the history it narrates and, for lack of a better term, stores, and thus admits the difficulty of his undertaking with respect to narrating history.

In *Doctor Faustus*, and this is what has always served to problematize the frequent trope in Mann criticism that is called Zeitblom's failure, an authentic repetition is precisely what Zeitblom's biographical impulse requires. In so far as the tale is cultivated as a project of *care* and infused from the beginning with the weight of conscience, it testifies to the authenticity of Zeitblom's effort and character, to his resolutely continuing the project for which he claims he is not suited. It is thus out of a confrontation with what is not himself that he reveals the potential of the having been in the coming towards of an individual's and a nation's fate.

Ricoeur describes authentic repetition in this way:

[R]epetition is the name given to the process, by which, on the derived level of historicity, the anticipation of the future, the recovery of fallenness, and the moment of vision in tune with 'its' time reconstitute their unity [...] The cardinal function of the concept of repetition is to reestablish the balance that the idea of a handed-down heritage tipped to the side of having-been, to recover the primacy of anticipatory resoluteness at the very heart of what is abolished, over and done with, what is no longer. Repetition thus opens potentialities that went unnoticed, were aborted, or were repressed in the past. It opens up the past again in the direction of coming-towards. By sealing the tie between handing-down and resoluteness, the concept of repetition succeeds at once in preserving the primacy of the future and in making the shift toward having-been." (*Time* 76)

Perhaps it goes without saying that this predicament corresponds meaningfully with the situation of both the narrator and the protagonist in *Doctor Faustus* and likely underlies the mysterious identity they share in the novel as well as in the author's imagination. In the first place, Adrian's coldness and sterility, for which he is both punished and saved in the novel, is first and foremost his authentic response to the inauthenticity of a certain kind of history and the cultural and political life it hands down to Germany in the first half of the twentieth century. He rejects the pettiness of the political possibilities, even the political tone, of both Zeitblom's bourgeois humanism as well as his other friends' and acquaintances' antiquated views on the future of Germany; as Zeitblom points out, Adrian's work "confirms and realizes' their discussions 'on a higher, creative plane'" (qtd. in Reed, 377-8; *DF* 470) and as such is said to be free from the critical judgments of history that recognize, fear and condemn in the views upheld by the likes of the Kridwiss circle the dangerous, barbaric origins and potential of totalitarianism and the inevitable destruction wrought by National Socialism. Secondly, but most importantly, at the heart of Leverkühn's indifference (and, too, Zeitblom's anxious concern) is the very emergence of the being-guilty that accompanies Dasein's authentic having-been and the resolute coming-towards that lies at the basis of both being-towards-death and Heideggerian historicity. Both Adrian and Zeitblom, unlike most of the other characters in the novel and although in admittedly different ways, seem to be acutely aware of something like the Heideggerian recognition of what it means to *be* historical.

They come to understand, for instance, that just as "[t]here is no impetus toward the future that does not turn back toward the condition of finding itself already *thrown* into the world," nor can any impetus toward the past avoid coming toward itself as it is. Just as

Adrian's music flirts with the edge of the future, it remains the music "eine nie Entkommene," the music of Kaisersaschern and Buchel, and just as the telos of his infection moves forward at a steady rate toward its certain end, it owes its momentum to Adrian's having been *thrown* into the world that is only *his*; as was the case with Castorp's *becoming* his grandfather, so, Adrian's suffering is but the futural expression and outcome of his father's boldest intellectual propensities and the authentic repetition of his fatal illness which Adrian inherits long before the Devil arrives to *remind* him of and to "confirm" his fate. Jonathan Leverkühn is not only the most critical source of Adrian's suffering, the Devil claims, but his father also discovered the organic "wizardry" that explains the biological telos (temporality) of what would become his son's fatal infection:

'Oh, dein Vater ist in meinem Maule gar nicht so fehl am Ort. Er hat es hinter den Ohren, mochte immer gern die elementa spekulieren. Das Hauptwee, den Ansatzpunkt für die Messerschmerzen der kleinen Seejungfrau, hast du auch von ihm...Im Übrigen, ich habe ganze recht gesprochen, um Osmose [...] handelt sich's bei dem ganzen Zauber. Ihr habt da den Lumbalsack mit der pulsierenden Liquorsäule darin, der reicht ins Zerebrale, zu den Hirnhäuten, in deren Gewebe die schleichende venerische Meningitis am leisen, verschwiegenen Werke ist' (DF 316).¹³²

Likewise, we have Zeitblom, our narrator, who wonders whether there isn't some "characteristic authenticity" to Adrian's life, his music, and his fate. This wondering takes

¹³² "Oh, your father is not at all misplaced upon my tongue. He is sly, aalways wanting to speculate the elements. From him you also have hat megrim in your head, the starting place for those knifing pains the little mermaid knows...I spoke quite rightly, by the way, sicne the whole wizardry is osmosis, a diffusion of liquor, a proliferous process. You have there the spinal sac, a pulsing column of liquor within, reaching to cerebral regions, to the meninx, in whose tissue the furtive venereal meningitis goes about its soft, silent work" (DF 251).

the form of the narrative as such, in which Zeitblom's "impetus toward the past" reveals the apparent inevitability of the past as it comes toward itself in the future (namely, fate) as something like that "characteristic authenticity" he searches for in the meaning of Adrian *for* him and *his* life – a meaning, not coincidentally, which he discovers in the last pages of the novel when it is disclosed to Zeitblom that his *Geschichte* is also Adrian's, indeed that Zeitblom's "essential content" lies not in him alone but in Adrian; it is in this sense that Zeitblom, like Adrian (or *as* Adrian) comes toward himself as authentic having been.

My aim has not been to undermine the accepted premise of the novel – the parallel between aesthetic creativity and political barbarism that Zeitblom ponders throughout – rather, the goal has been to expose the temporality of the narrative framework's limitations with respect to the history it intends to describe and for which it hopes to account. Moreover, a Heideggerian reading of the novel's treatment of history would appear to admit a certain positive potential in Zeitblom's inadequacy for the tale, which is usually read as a failure of moral or political courage. Of Zeitblom, Herbert Lehnert writes:

[H]e does not know why his enmeshing of the time of which he reports with the time in which he narrates fascinates him [...]. Zeitblom may have an inkling that his friend's artistic anti-conventionality may be analogous to the amorality of the regime from which he himself withdrew and the violent end of which he describes. But he is prevented from recognizing the analogy because the code of the bourgeois culture by which he lives and understands his world gives such a high value to creative art that he has to stop short of realizing its destructive potential. The readers have to break his silence, and

decode the text by comparing the fictional world with its real historical horizon.

Such decoding engages the reader with the question of whether or not the fall of Germany also meant the fall of its culture [...] or whether the highest level of artistic achievements, fictionally represented by Leverkühn's compositions, remain above and untouched by National Socialist crimes. (3)

I think Mann, at least, knew why the enmeshing of the times fascinated Zeitblom. Because the task of decoding that Lehnert assigns to the reader is both an impossible and a tragic one. The reader can no more decode the nature and absorb the implications of this comparison than Zeitblom can reconcile it in the narrative. The central question of the text, then, remains a question, albeit a decisive one. And for my purposes here it is less a question of the relationship between German art and the historical evolution and psychological origins of Nazi Germany, since that question is more or less answered on the text's surface in the text's central thesis, than it is a question of how to narrate the difference between an inauthentic *Historie* and an authentic *Geschichte*, a problem of the weight and scope of memory and of the past. Thus, too, the problem of whether the destructive potential of art and history lies in transcending the limits of morality, in not being *at home* in one's historical circumstances and revolting against these circumstances, gives way to a more fundamental problem of whether it is possible to transcend the limitations of one's historical horizon and the problem of what it means to be *at home* in one's historical situation. It is thus not only a question of historical specificity but a question of the ontology of such specificity.

Zeitblom's shared guilt and complicity with contemporary historical events, namely, the atrocities of National Socialism, is said to lie in his inability to irrevocably condemn

Adrian's artistic hubris, and thus, too, contemporary German history and the violence it unleashed on the world (Lehnert). Even if this is true, which I suspect it is to a certain extent, it does not preclude an altogether different reading. Such helplessness is also grounded in the identity that is established between the narrator and the protagonist as well as in Zeitblom's inability to adequately "know" that for which Adrian is to be condemned.¹³³ Lehnert claims that "[i]f the novel would carry the analogy of high art and evil as a message to its conclusion, it would offer closure. But it is merely suggested in the play between the symbolical deep structure and Zeitblom's realistic biography [...] It is [left] up to the reader to recognize an analogy to the ideal of the National Socialist cultural policies [...]" (8). We have already explored (in the previous chapter, for instance) the mechanisms by which Mann and Heidegger claim to dispense with the problem of closure, but the importance of that discussion rightly resurfaces here with respect to the question of history and authenticity. As Lehnert and others, including myself, have pointed out, the modernism of the novel resists narrative closure, but as I have made it a special point to articulate, this is much less a matter of narrative technique or a modernist experimentalism than a symptom of the very temporality Mann and Heidegger are trying to explain and accommodate. If we consider for the moment Zeitblom's account of Nepomuk Schneidewein, where words fail him just as he undertakes to "describe" the little boy – "Wieviele Schriftsteller vor mir schon mögen die Untauglichkeit der Sprache beseufzt haben, Sichtbarkeit zu erreichen, ein wirklich genaues

¹³³ What is prohibited to Zeitblom is one of the most overlooked leitmotifs of the novel, for he, too, makes a fateful bargain and in return for something that is never settled him. Thus he is not only prohibited Adrian's love and in a sense also prohibited to love Adrian, but he is also prohibited from ever "knowing" whether he is adequate to his task, namely, sharing with the reader the "essential content" of his life. I believe this, by the way, to be the meaning of being-guilty for Heidegger, yet another explanation for *why* one *is* always already guilty. Moreover, the authentic taking over of this guilt (as Adrian does with his musical compositions and as Zeitblom attempts to do in his tale) is what Heidegger (and I think Mann, too, would agree to) call a running after conscience and understanding (which is precisely the temporal thrust of *die Sorge* and thus, too, the unity of the temporal ecstases).

Bild [...] hervorzubringen! Das Wort *is* geschaffen für Lob und Preis, es ist ihm verliehen, zu erstaunen, zu bewundern, zu segnen und die Erscheinung durch das Gefühl zu kennzeichnen, das sie erregt, aber nicht, sie zu beschwören und wiederzugeben" (DF 609)¹³⁴ – it seems clear enough that the analogy cannot be maintained because it is first and foremost an analogy, a *Historie*, and thus non-identical with and perhaps as a result also inadequate to authentic historical experience, especially of the sort that provokes the narrative effort in the first place, namely, the having been of both Adrian's love for Echo and the narrator's complex love and sympathy for Adrian. In the case of the former, in particular, Echo is much too young to have a history and prohibited a future because of Adrian's love for him – consequently, he underscores the authenticity of both being-towards-death and the having-been in the strange impossibility which he essentially *is*.

Consequently, even if we ignore for the moment Adorno's warnings about the language through which it is expressed, the issue of Heideggerian authenticity is problematic on its own terms. But these warnings are hard to ignore, and in the end are presupposed, I believe, by Heidegger himself. Authenticity is an encounter with the ground of being, which in the end is always a question. It is fundamentally an encounter with the question of what it means to have been. To recover what has been there for the future, to restore what has been cast aside by history, is to engage the specific possibilities inherited from the past, but such an engagement always takes place at the "edge of impossibility," as Mann might describe it, because, as I've already demonstrated, for Heidegger *Dasein* is always a *thrown* possibility. It is never past, and as such can never get behind the *thrownness* which it has not itself

¹³⁴ "How many writers before me have lamented language's inadequacy at making things visible, at calling forth a truly precise likeness [...]. Words are made for praise and tribute, they have been granted the power to admire, to marvel, to bless, and to characterize a phenomenon by the emotion it arouses, but not to conjure it up, not to reproduce it" (DF 484).

thrown; its having already been “delivered over to its [own] death” is always already concealed. The recognition and taking over of this unavailability (guilt) both completes the moment of authenticity and describes the way an authentic history is revealed to us or is brought out of concealment in history. But this turn also brings our discussion back to the problem of representability since Adorno as well as Heidegger describe language as being, in one sense, at least, and especially with respect to history, a barrier to either a critical or ontological authenticity.

Krzysztof Ziarek views the work of art as being grounded in the very impossibility of representation; following Heidegger’s claims in *The Origin of the Work of Art*, Ziarek explains how the work of art “default[s] from history and historicism in order to keep in view the historicity of being” (224). As I explain above, the analogy that haunts the entire novel, that binds Adrian’s creative efforts with the political consequences of National Socialism and that would bring closure to the novel by committing to an indictment of history and to the idea of a nation’s failure belongs in part to a fictional world that the Devil in the novel tells us is no longer possible. Thus when the Devil insists that thinking *historically* means thinking of time in its courses – a thinking on the end in which historical change itself emerges as a series of finite intervals, which is also to say, a series of endings – the other sort of dwelling on history as “praise and tribute [with] the power to admire” and presumably, too, to condemn or regret, etc., is certainly not adequate to the deeper weight of the past for which these circumstances are meant to invoke our understanding and sympathy. And this is the primary claim the following and final section of the chapter hopes to demonstrate – to complete the analogy would mean to fall short of the authentic response to history the novel wishes to be because it inevitably casts aside the hope and possibility

invested in Adrian's character by Zeitblom and Mann, for whom Adrian, remember, was his most "beloved" character, and it is this same sort of hope that Heidegger invests in his own idea of authenticity and *die Sorge*.

When Zeitblom wonders whether National Socialism isn't "nach Worten und Taten nur die verzerrte, verpöbelte, verschleißlichte Wahrwerdung einer Gesinnung und Weltbeurteilung, der man charakterliche Echtheit zuerkennen muß [...]" (DF 636),¹³⁵ he not only (and rightly) condemns the *historische* course taken by Germany in the first half of the twentieth century, despairs at the means available to him for "coming to terms" with that history, but he also complicates the matter of his judgment by pointing to a "characteristic authenticity" that throughout the novel is associated with Adrian, who is said to live out the aborted promises of a corrupt National Socialism on a higher, more creative plane.

This authentic encounter would only appear to be revoked by history itself. Just as Germany, according to some, ignored and permitted the only retrospectively transparent telos of National Socialism, Adrian in one sense dismisses and evades the confirmation of his guilt and fate that the Devil's visit is said to be. Likewise, in Zeitblom's forgetting, Mann explicitly throws into question not just the reliability of his narrator but the very possibility of his task and undertaking. Adrian, on the other hand, in his authentic being-guilty (and in a sense, Mann, too) represents what it means to "know" (in the Heideggerian sense of the term) the temporality that always already accompanies such a series of (im)possibilities. Thus the impossibility of the analogy that would provide the reader with closure is grounded in the historicity not only of the artwork as such, as Ziarek suggests, but also in the historicity of the contemporary past the novel attempts to comprehend and narrate. The history to which

¹³⁵ "both in word and deed, merely the distorted, vulgarized, debased realization of a mindset and worldview to which one must attribute a characteristic authenticity [...]" (DF 506).

the analogy cannot authenticate a response is the historicity of the *event* [*Ereignis*], which is precisely never *past*, and as such it can never get behind the *throwness* which it has not itself *thrown*; its having already been “delivered over to its [own] death” is always already concealed, which, according to Ziarek, forcefully releases thought from the burden of signification and narrative closure that the analogy is meant to facilitate (225).

Ziarek points to avant-garde literature as embodying/enacting such a displacement: avant-garde writings are said to be “deliberately set up against interpretation, they disallow it, or, to put it differently, they release literature from the grasping power of interpretation. Temporality and event underpin [...] [this] idiosyncratic writing, a writing that does not ‘use’ language but instead invents or refigures it as it goes along. It functions as a writing not *in* language but *of* language” (225). Such writing “stages” and “transcribes” the temporality of the artwork rather than defines or describes it. One may be tempted to ascertain from this that since *Doctor Faustus* is anything but an avant-garde novel and since it very consciously, like all of Mann’s novels, avoids the sort of radical experimentalism typical of Stein, Joyce, and others in the modernist tradition (remember Lukács’ special admiration for Mann’s critical sort of modernist realism), that it falls short of such a performance. But this could not be further from the truth. In fact, I think it is safe to say that *Doctor Faustus* attempts to narrate the confrontation between *Geschichte* and *Historie* that the writing of the avant-garde supposedly demonstrates, and in this attempt directly engages the struggle as it really is, that is, as necessarily and intrinsically historical and as first and foremost a matter of history.

If, according to Ziarek, historicity is the basis of the social figure of art, then it is also, according to Heidegger, the basis of the ontological figure of history. Ziarek writes:

As the event-constitution of occurring, historicity marks a remainder over the linear temporality, a kind of residual happening, giving presence but itself withdrawn from it and, thus, always already without place or presence in the present, the past, or the future. Historicity is what, composing or writing at any moment the relations between the three dimensions of time, does not belong to those dimensions: it does not constitute a past origin, a present instant, or a future presence. Without a dimension of its own, it marks the futurity of the present, that is, it unfolds the present as coming from what has been and dislocated toward what is to come. The work of art secretes this historicity [...]. (224)

This is a precise description of what I have always thought a Heideggerian temporality could bring to a rereading of Mann's novel and especially the complex understanding of history that it describes. If traditional readings fault Mann's portrayal of history as an anachronistic, overly simplistic portrayal of the linear, historical development of Germany's tragic fate and as inadequate to the contemporary history of the novel, they thereby overlook the ontological foundations of a more fundamental historicity of which the novel is both a commentary and a staging.

Doctor Faustus is, after all, a book of remainders, which testify to both the unavailability and the insistence of the having-been.¹³⁶ It is not so much that in employing the mythic background, or by remaining squarely within the confines of German intellectual and cultural history, Mann anachronistically neglects or distorts contemporary history, but

¹³⁶ As I show in the previous chapter, in so far as it is a book of remainders, *Doctor Faustus* is also a book of endings, in the sense of an authentic being-towards-death, where the inevitability of death is always accompanied by the remainder of its impossibility, its existential deferral, that something which is always still to be settled, even in death: "Although it knows its end absolutely, [*Dasein*] will always be that in relation to which it will never know anything: the knowledge of the end always withdraws, is concealed in being deferred" (Stiegler 231).

rather that he actively engages the ontological depth and comprehensive temporality of authentic being-as-having-been. With Adrian and Zeitblom we have shown how the past as having-been withdraws from presence in precisely the way that Heidegger suggests, but we have also measured the way in which historicity opens up the possibilities of what remains of the past in its continued unavailability. Just as Adrian's bargain is the "residual happening" toward which he "dislocated," Adrian is Zeitblom's, which, even as his "essential content" withdraws from the surface of his life, simultaneously marks the limits of his past and the "futura" of his suffering. To say, then, along with many of the novel's critics, that the myth no longer obtains in history or that German history is *not* the *only* place from which to launch an authentic investigation into its historical fate is to overlook the force, temporality, and what I want to call the *historical* specificity of this unavailability.

This alethic structure in the novel signifies and demonstrates the potential for knowing (or disclosing) that which is concealed in and by an inauthentic history, namely, the essential historicity of Dasein. According to Ziarek,

[I]t is a knowing that takes the form of preserving the strife figured in the work of art, of the space of deciding, in which one confronts the temporality and undecidability of the identities – material and 'spiritual' – at play in art. [...]. The work of art opens up history, which means that in art one comes face to face with the *essenceless* occurring of what is, with the fact that being does not give stable identity, truth, or knowledge but keeps displacing them, always singularly. Historicity marks the withdrawal from presence and manifests the undecidability opened up by this retraction as what is *decisive*

about being – a decisiveness of de-presencing, which art keeps staging in its figure. (227)

Isn't what is usually taken as Mann's equivocality and ambivalence with respect to his willingness to condemn the events that unfolded in the mid-20th century in Germany really more of a formidable statement on this decisive question of Dasein's historicity? Isn't what the novel offers a "space of deciding, in which one confronts the temporality and undecidability of the identities at play" in history between an inauthentic and authentic having-been, between the various representative modes of bringing history to presence and "the essenceless occurring of what is"? Whereas historicism "covers the 'presenting' or the occurring and evacuates the historicity of what it presents" (Ziarek 229), historicity reveals this occurring as an ever-present accompaniment to everyday being-in-the-world. What is decisive about Being, then, is still the decisiveness of its withdrawal both in and as history.

And, as I have pointed out all along, this alethic "play" of being is not just the provenance of art. Even more immediately than the work of art, the historical event itself "secretes" historicity; it is what is "at play" in history, and this is why the historical novel is perhaps the most appropriate place to analyze its significance. Historicity exceeds language even while the history we write is excessive in it. Contrary to conventional views of the novel, Mann would far from disagree that an authentic history exceeds the limits of language; in fact, he dramatizes this excess throughout his writings. For instance, Zeitblom writes on April 25, 1945, of an American general who leads the residents of Weimar past the crematoria at Buchenwald

[und] erklärt diese Bürger, die in scheinbaren Ehren ihren Geschäften nachgingen und nichts zu wissen versuchten, obgleich der Wind ihnen den Stank verbrannten Menschenfleisches von dorthin in die Nasen blies – erklärt sie für mitschuldig an den nun bloßgelegten Greulen, auf die er sie zwingt, die Augen zu richten. Mögen sie schauen – ich schaue mit ihnen, ich lasse mich schieben im Geiste von ihren stumpfen oder auch schauernden Reihen. (DF 634)¹³⁷

Nowhere else in the novel does contemporary history more clearly and emphatically intersect with Mann's allegorical portrayal of it. The passage that follows this one in the novel both reckons with the problem of authenticity [Eigentlichkeit] and then returns to that most creative and seductive period of Adrian's life and work that, according to Zeitblom, may have in fact finally prepared the way for the somber line past Buchenwald, the time period in which the time of writing "closes ranks with [the] frame of this biography" ["schließen sich [mit dem] Raum dieser Biographie"] (DF 507/636).

Zeitblom's description of the Weimar citizens' encounter with historical actuality is in one sense the lack of an encounter, and not only for the citizens but for Zeitblom and Mann as well. It thus very consciously reminds the reader (and in this sense is also an authentic repetition) of the final pages of *The Magic Mountain*, in which Hans Castorp literally disappears amidst the distant cries of his fellow soldiers. The specificity of the encounter, its final disclosure, amounts to the withdrawal of experience, not to the

¹³⁷ "[in order to demonstrate] that they, citizens who went about their business in seeming honesty and tried to know nothing, though at times the wind blew the stench of burned human flesh up their noses – [...] that they share in the guilt for these horrors that are now laid bare and to which he forces them to direct their eyes. Let them look – I shall look with them, in my mind's eye I let myself be jostled along in those same apathetic, or perhaps shuddering lines" (DF 505-6).

withdrawal of specificity but the disclosure (out of withdrawal) of an altogether different sort of historical meaning [*Geschichtsdeutung*]. It may be understood as a moment of Heideggerian and Mannian authenticity, in which what is confronted, what returns, is much more than an abstract, forgotten truth of being ungrounded in and unresponsive to “real, determinate historical needs” and thus inadequate to historical actuality. Rather what returns is the very being of these conditions in their unmediated having-been, which is also to say, what is preserved is the strife of Dasein’s fundamental historicity. Put another way, what returns is not so much the historical meaning of this specificity (in the sense of an inauthentic historiographical account that would propose to record the unavailability of the event, to write it down and thus not have to repeat it as the adage goes), but rather the specificity of historical being as such, the specificity of what it means to *be* historical, which both the novel and the Weimar image intend to communicate. Heideggerian historicity shows us that being and history withdraw even as they are disclosed, and what better describes not only the way Weimar confronts and is confronted by its own history but the way, too, that Mann (and Zeitblom) anxiously approach their subject or even the way that we readers typically encounter the oblivion of the histories that we *are*.

In conclusion, although Heidegger has shown us that an authentic encounter is an encounter with impossibility, this doesn’t mean authenticity is impossible. When Zeitblom visits Adrian for the last time, he is encouraged to approach the bedside of his dying friend with the ironic, painful (for Zeitblom) invitation: “Come on in, he won’t notice you” [“Kommen Sie nur, er bemerkt Sie nicht!”] (*DF* 533/*DF* 671). Yet like the citizens of Weimar and even Hans Castorp, Zeitblom shudders at his witnessing what it is not *his* to witness, and he wonders, precisely as Castorp had wondered at his grandfather’s corpse, at

the “trick of nature [...] [that] is able to create the image of highest spirituality where the spirit has departed!” [“Welch ein höhnisches Spiel der Natur [...] daß sie das Bild höchster Vergeistigung erzeugen mag, dort, wo der Geist entwichen ist!”] (*DF 533/DF 671*). Any chance of authenticity in this encounter would appear to be negated in Adrian’s aloofness and in the certainty of his death and the final judgment handed down to him and his nation for keeping the pact they had “signed with [their] blood.” And it is easy enough to confirm this following the terms of Adorno’s critique of Heideggerian authenticity, where authenticity evacuates the world of spirit even while it assures the world it is guided by it. It is also easy enough to read Adrian’s fall and the fall of Germany as something like the failure of Heideggerian authenticity – the taking over of the possibilities of the past in the handing-down of heritage, the “authentic” repetition of elemental forces recovered and erupting in the present only to bring about the destruction of an age in the coming-towards of the destiny of an individual and his homeland.

Nevertheless, as I have tried here to argue, this sort of closure casts aside something, too, leaves something unfigured. Among other things, it casts aside that deep, life-sustaining love which the novel prohibits to Adrian as well as the reciprocity of that love which is both prohibited to Zeitblom and yet which gives his life its essential content. It also conceals Adrian’s profound love for humanity, which he himself stages and confesses in his only and final performance of the *Faust* cantata, in which Adrian takes upon himself the burden of the past and the burden of guilt that his audience (and thus, too, Germany), like the citizens of Weimar, are unable or unwilling to acknowledge.

In the end, then, it is a matter of recalling the narrator’s final wish in *The Magic Mountain*, that “Out of this universal feast of death, out of this extremity of fever [...] may it

be that Love one day shall mount?” [“Wird aus diesem Weltfest des Todes, auch aus der schlimmen Fieberbrunst [...] einmal die Liebe steigen?”] (*MM* 716/*DZ* 1085) and of emphasizing the echo of this earlier plea in Zeitblom’s insistence that “[d]ie unvermeidliche Anerkennung der Heillosigkeit ist nicht gleichbedeutend mit der Verleugnung der Liebe. [...] der oft verschreckten, der immer bangen, aber in Ewigkeit getreuen Liebe zu einem bedeutend deutschen Menschen- und Künstlertum geweiht, dessen geheimnisvolle Sündhaftigkeit und schrecklicher Abschied nichts über diese Liebe vermögen, welche vielleicht, wer weiß, nur ein Abglanz der Gnade ist’ (*DF* 597).¹³⁸ Thus do the prohibitions that would appear to preclude authenticity disclose themselves authentically in the very undertaking the novel represents. In this sense what is cast aside by one reading is another reading which recovers what the other leaves behind, and the taking over of *this* past for the future is called for in Zeitblom’s final wish for “a miracle that goes beyond faith” and that will one day “bear the light of hope” and in what is ultimately the Heideggerian task to which both Dasein and Mann have called themselves. For in so far as the novel narrates the historical demise of Zeitblom’s friend and homeland (and in this sense it may be said to narrate the failure of authenticity), Heideggerian temporality also certifies the historicity of Zeitblom’s (and Mann’s) effort. This effort, then, demands an inquiry into the possibility of authentically engaging a having-been that *now* includes the damaging, totalizing effects of world war and genocide and its bringing to bear on existence a difficult heritage with which to “authentically” come to terms. The possibility of such an inquiry lies, according to Mann it would seem, only in taking over the being-guilty that Dasein is, in the so-called “reckoning”

¹³⁸ “The ineluctable recognition of hopeless doom is not synonymous with the denial of love. [...] the often terrified, always fearful, but eternally faithful love of a significant German human being and artist, whose mysterious sinfulness and horrible end have no power over this love – which perhaps, who knows, is but a reflection of grace” (*DF* 474).

the novel is said to stage, and in the possibility that some part of that *having loved* and *having been loved* may be preserved for recovery.

Chapter V

Conclusion

Critical *Care*, or *Care* as Critique: Thomas Mann and the Adorno-Heidegger Debate

The time has come to bring this comparison to a satisfactory *end* and conclusion, a pivotal moment, really, if we take to heart what has already been said about the nature of the end and endings in the works of Mann and Heidegger and for the world(s) they both inhabit and essentially *are*. It is at the very least a time to reestablish the overarching significance of my study and to situate that discussion within the scope of other important and related questions relevant to the ongoing study of modernism and modernist time and temporality. These important and related questions include what Fredric Jameson has called the “end of temporality” and what Eva Geulen rightly refers to as the “rumor” of the end of art, both of which find distinct and comparable expression in the works of Mann and Heidegger during the late modernist period under study here.

The End of Time

Just as the essential meaning of art and tragedy lies somewhere in the interstices of reality and representation, so does the meaning of the question of time, and the problem of knowing what time *is* has to some extent also always existed. We have only to take into account St. Augustine’s famous version of the problem in Book Nine of his *Confessions*, where he asks, “What then is time?” and goes on to answer, “If no one asks me, I know: if I

wish to explain it to one that asketh, I know not.” (qtd. in Ricoeur; Miller; and Kavaloski).

Likewise, Paul Valery writes:

It is almost comical to ask oneself exactly what is the meaning of a term that one uses all the time with full satisfaction. For example: I catch the word Time as it flies by. This word was absolutely limpid, precise, honest, and faithful in its service, as long as it played its part in a proposition, and as long as it was spoken by someone who wanted to say something. But here it is, all by itself, seized by its wings. It takes revenge. It makes us believe that it has more meaning than it has functions. It was only a means, and now it has become an end. It has become the object of a frightful philosophical desire. It changes itself into enigma, into abyss, into torment of thought. (qtd. in Miller)

And like tragedy, time only carries with it the stability of meaning when it is represented, as in the regimented yet fluid movements of the hands of a clock, but when the various modes used to represent time are stripped away from it, it emerges as an untransfigured, “unfathomable enigma” (Miller). And yet this unknowable thing *time* carries with it a name, and it can be argued that it is precisely because of its unknowability that it calls out for a name in the first place and demands to be figured, as Paul de Man argues in *The Rhetoric of Temporality*, where “The word ‘time’ is a trope. To be more exact, it is a catachresis, or ‘abusive transfer,’ for something that remains unknown and therefore has no literal name. The word ‘time’ is posited, without authority or possibility of verification, as a figurative expression for something unknowable” (qtd. in Miller). Despite the essential instability of the term, critical analyses of modernist time typically agree about the significant position occupied by time in modernism’s coming to terms with its own historical specificity and

otherness, and it has been the primary aim of this study to show how the instability of the term is much less a barrier to literary and philosophical speculations on time than it is the essential way *toward* a concrete apprehension of the fullness and complexity of its character and nature under the pressures and vicissitudes of modernity. In other words, the dynamics of its instability, portrayed as an *end* in itself in traditional readings of modernist time, really functions more as the ground or *means* of preparing a way *toward* what Heidegger insists upon calling an idea of time *as* the possibility of an impossibility, the essential instability of which is the fundamental basis, according to both Heidegger and Mann, for venturing an understanding of the concomitant volatility of the modernist world, the modernist *cogito*, the modernist narrative and modernist art, and both modernist history and the history of modernism.

It has been the secondary aim of this study to challenge head-on traditional readings of modernist time as well as more contemporary claims that, in view of the limits of these readings, would want to dispense with time altogether. Perhaps the best way to illustrate this evolution, or better, the current state of feeling with respect to scholarly engagements with the subject of time, is by recalling J. Hillis Miller's and Fredric Jameson's more or less recent insistence on the *untimely* nature of contemporary critical approaches to both modernist time, more generally, and the question of time as such.¹³⁹ J. Hillis Miller writes unequivocally in "Time in Literature" (2003) that "All literature is about time. Yet concern with time in literature today is untimely. It comes at the wrong time. These two contradictory propositions should govern all contemporary reflection about time in literature. [...] [T]he topic seems these days somewhat outmoded, old hat, vieux jeu. [...] In these days of focus on class, race,

¹³⁹ See J.H. Miller's "Time in Literature," *Daedalus*, 132.2 (Spring 2003): 86-98; and Fredric Jameson's "The End of Temporality," *Critical Inquiry*, 29.4 (Summer 2003): 695-718.

and gender, the subject would seem to many literary scholars far too abstract, artificial, philosophical, and formalistic to be worth pursuing” (Miller 86). Likewise, Jameson’s essay “The End of Temporality” (2003) lays out the generally accepted version of this overcoming and in the process makes a telling but rather incomplete reference to both Heidegger and Mann:

After the end of history, what? No further beginnings being foreseen, it can only be the end of something else. But modernism already ended some time ago and with it, presumably, time itself, as it was widely rumored that space was supposed to replace time in the general ontological scheme of things. At the very least, time had become a nonperson and people stopped writing about it. The novelists and poets gave it up under the entirely plausible assumption that it had been largely covered by Proust, Mann, Virginia Woolf, and T.S. Eliot and offered few further chances of literary advancement. The philosophers also dropped it on the grounds that although Bergson remained a dead letter, Heidegger was still publishing a posthumous volume a year on the topic. And as for the mountain of secondary literature in both disciplines, to scale it once again seemed a rather old-fashioned thing to do with your life.

Was aber war die Zeit?

What is time? A secret – insubstantial and omnipotent. A prerequisite of the external world, a motion intermingled and fused with bodies existing and moving in space. But would there be no time, if there

were no motion? No motion, if there were no time? What a question!

[...] ¹⁴⁰

In any case, neither phenomenology nor Thomas Mann offered promising starting points for anything calculated to fire the imagination. (695-96)

Here Jameson describes Mann's apparent recognition in *The Magic Mountain* that the irresolvable paradox of time must eventually exhaust itself as a valid preoccupation of writers and philosophers, and he clearly assumes that with *The Magic Mountain* the topic, and not only for Mann, had by this time been "largely covered" by modernist literature and philosophy. Yet while this realization makes perfect sense when understood from within the contemporary limits of Jameson's perspective, that is from the perspective of a scholarly climate in which, as Heidegger might say, time, like being, is no longer the issue, the historical context of Mann's passage at the time it was written poses an immediate challenge to Jameson's sweeping claim.

First, as I have I hope already demonstrated, Mann's own preoccupation with time certainly doesn't end with the publication of *The Magic Mountain* but deepens quite radically over the next two decades of his career, and despite the monumental scope of *Being and Time* and Heidegger's persistent engagement with the subject, Heidegger's work has never been properly addressed either with respect to modernism as such or with a view toward the specific "time-obsession" of modernist narrative(s). And secondly, while the passage above certainly reiterates the seeming impossibility of comprehending or narrating time and certainly appears to be responding in earnest to its contemporaries' experiments with time in

¹⁴⁰ "Was ist die Zeit? Ein Geheimnis, -- wesenlos und allmächtig. Eine Bedingung der Erscheinungswelt, eine Bewegung, verkoppelt und vermengt dem Dasein der Körper im Raum und ihrer Bewegung. Wäre aber keine Zeit, wenn keine Bewegung wäre? Keine Bewegung, wenn keine Zeit? Frage nur! [...]" (ZB 521/MM 339, Trans. John Woods; qtd. in Jameson's "The End of Temporality").

literature and philosophy, of which *The Magic Mountain* is typically said to be an example, it is perhaps more apt and urgent to say that here Mann seeks explicitly to move beyond and to acknowledge both the limits of modernist narrative's experimentations with time as well as the methods of its inquiry. Moreover, both Stephen Kern and T. J. Reed would appear to confirm this when they point out that the various excursions on time in *The Magic Mountain*, of which the above passage is a perfect example, merely recapitulate modernism's frustrated attempts to reckon with the question of time rather than actually illuminate its character or value *for life* (Kern 106; Reed).

But this needn't indicate a sort of surrender, neither on Mann's part nor on the part of modernist narrative; rather, as I have sought to argue, it signals a need to overcome the hermeneutic limits of conventional approaches to time, which insist upon breaking time up into the familiar oppositional categories of active/passive, change/rest, plural/singular, linear/nonlinear, fluid/discrete, homogenous/heterogeneous, public/private, time/timelessness, etc. and consequently always find themselves in the end caught up in a web of circular logic not unlike the one in which Castorp finds himself above. Recent examples of this predicament can be seen in Joshua Kavaloski's monograph *The Fourth Dimension: Time in the Modernist Novel* (2004), which, although it proposes to revitalize critical approaches to modernist time, merely reiterates these well-known obstacles, as evidenced not only in his total dismissal of Heideggerian temporality but also in the preoccupations of each chapter, which focus explicitly on time's dissolution, arrest, discontinuity and nonlinearity in the works of Mann, Kafka, Woolf, and Faulkner, respectively.

In another example, even J. Hillis Miller ignores the contradiction he insists readers and critics take into account when tackling the question of time in literature by merely refashioning what we already know about modernist time, namely, that it is depicted as private, relative and pluralistic. Thus he ends with the revelation that time in Faulkner is an “all-at-onceness or always-already” that he reductively describes as “simultaneity” or that “W. B. Yeats’s [...] [work] expresses a quite different conception of [...] time from Faulkner’s. For Yeats, time is neither a simultaneity (as it is for Faulkner) nor a seamless continuum between past, present, and future. It is, rather, a flow punctuated rhythmically by violent instantaneous interruptions” (96). It is precisely these sort of reductivist and cliché approaches to time that have led to their *untimeliness* and to the question of their *usefulness* because, as Heidegger would certainly insist, they tell us so little any more about either Faulkner or Yeats or the worlds their characters inhabit. As we have seen, both Mann and Heidegger break through this impasse by more closely identifying time’s disclosure not with the perhaps truly irresolvable questions of time’s “number, direction, texture and division”¹⁴¹ but with the concrete (because *lived*) categories of death, history and subjectivity *in* the world, the world, moreover, from which the subject can neither extricate nor distinguish itself: Dasein, remember, *is* time. [“Dasein ist die Zeit”].

Jameson very interestingly concludes his essay, “The End of Temporality,” with the claim that the end of time in which he wants to believe and that he seeks to demonstrate in his description of the historical-epochal shift from modernism to post-modernism as simultaneously a shift from a temporal to a spatial ontology cannot in the end be upheld. In

¹⁴¹ These are the categories, each one comprised of its own polemical binary – e.g. the *direction* of time as reversible or irreversible or the *division* of time into private and public – around which Stephen Kern organizes *The Culture of Space and Time*.

fact, Jameson recognizes that latent in the claim itself is the inexorable imposition of a movement and activity that is not only historical-epochal but that as a result is also fundamentally generated by the “structural effect of the temporality [...] of postmodernity” (718), in which every postmodern space is one, too, in which a fundamental and specific temporality is always already produced (Geulen 133). Although I agree wholeheartedly with the openness of the question, which Jameson finally admits, namely, the difficulty if not the impossibility of dispensing with the subject of time, as one would expect given my comparison of Heidegger and Mann above, I certainly disagree that Heidegger’s phenomenology and Thomas Mann’s novels aren’t precisely the place to launch a renewed investigation into the question(s) of time and modernism. In fact, following my study it may be said that the best chance of reinvigorating the value of time as a conceptual tool for literary, cultural and self-analysis and interpretation lies squarely in Thomas Mann, in particular, and in the modernist *Zeitroman* [time-novel], more generally, as well as in Heidegger’s “hermeneutic phenomenology,” neither of which Jameson ever respectfully or comprehensively engages, but which I try to do above in order to show that a reading which takes both into account and reads the one in terms of the other and vice-versa does indeed offer a promising start for something “calculated to fire the imagination” and to revitalize literary and philosophical evaluations of time.

If this, then, is what I hope to have *accomplished* with my comparison of Mann and Heidegger above, then in venturing at this late stage to engage the tragic question of the end of art I hope merely to outline the potential scope and significance of my discussion of time and temporality with respect to these other interrelated discourses that are so critical to explorations of modernism and modernity. Thus I do not intend in what follows anything

demonstrative or complete but rather something that is merely suggestive, something perhaps “calculated [only] to fire the imagination.”

The End of Art

The temporality of the end of art is readily acknowledged in most critical discussions about it, but it is also varied and complicated and carries with it a long history that I cannot treat in any way comprehensively here. As a result, I will limit my comments to those that most directly concern my reading of Heidegger and Mann above, which is to say, to the temporal determinations of what Eva Geulen calls “a reading in a rumor after Hegel” and to the potential implications of such a temporality for understanding Mann’s and Heidegger’s later works within the broader context of modernism and modernity. It is no accident that I referred above to the question of the end of art as a tragic one; the question(s) of the end of tragedy and of the possibility of the tragic are of course closely connected to the broader question of the end of art, the very *asking* of which is often said to have signaled the onset of modernity. Moreover, and however paradoxical it may sound, the end of either is not only a thoroughly temporal *and* tragic recognition but, even more to the point, the tragedy lies in the specific temporality assigned to it. If the work of art, in which the potentialities of Dasein’s past are said to be held in reserve, is said to be one the bedrocks of a historical recovery, then what do they mean, Mann and Heidegger, when they speak of the end of art and of the sort of world in which such an end can be imagined? And this will mean dealing, respectively, with the situation of the end of art in the wake of modernity with a view toward the perceived function of art and the very real question of what is needful in history with respect to this situation.

In many respects I have already elaborated the connection that binds Mann's portrayal of the "critical" situation of art in *Doctor Faustus* with Adorno's own discussions of it in *The Philosophy of Modern Music*, which is to say, the situation of art at the "edge of [its own] impossibility." But Adorno's continued preoccupation with the question of art's impossibility only serves to elaborate and deepen the dilemma as it was depicted in Mann's *Doctor Faustus*. Echoing Adorno's own views on the subject from *The Philosophy of Modern Music*, in *Doctor Faustus* we are confronted with the image of modern art standing on the threshold of its own *untergehen* [going under] in the double-sense of both its imminent loss and disappearance and its overcoming or radical reestablishment as something both more originary and original:

An einem Werk ist viel Schein, man könnte weitergehen und sagen, daß es scheinhaft ist in sich selbst, als 'Werk'. Es hat den Ehrgeiz, glauben zu machen, daß es nicht gemacht, sondern entstanden und entsprungen sei. [...]

Ich habe [Adrian] sagen hören: 'Das Werk! Es ist Trug. Es ist etwas, wovon der Bürger möchte, es gäbe das noch. Es ist gegen die Wahrheit und gegen den Ernst. Echt und Ernst ist allein das ganze Kurze, der höchst konsistente musikalische Augenblick...' [...]

Ich habe ihn ebenso sagen hören: 'Schein und Spiel haben heute schon das Gewissen der Kunst gegen sich. Sie will aufhören, Schein und Spiel zu sein, sie will Erkenntnis werden. (DF 242-3)¹⁴²

¹⁴² "There is a great deal of illusion in a work of art; one could go farther and say that it is illusory in and of itself, as a 'work.' Its ambition is to make others believe that it was not made but rather simply arose. [...]"

I have heard [Adrian] say: 'The work! It's a sham, something the bourgeois want to believe still exists. It is counter to truth and counter to all seriousness. Only the briefest, highly compact musical moment is genuine and serious...' [...]"

Written well before Adorno's famous dictum on the impossibility of art after Auschwitz, both the passage above and its place within the broader goals and context of *Doctor Faustus* clearly anticipate Adorno's now famous claim from "Cultural Criticism and Society" (1951). Even Zeitblom, on a separate occasion, recognizes this tendency of art toward its own overcoming in his own narrative attempt to adequately render the complex history and fate of his subject matter, its tendency toward the serious and the tragic and away from the liberation of the illusory *Spiel* with which it had always been identified:

Habe ich nicht mehr als einmal gesagt, daß das Leben, von dem ich handle, mir näher, treuer, erregender war, als mein eigenes? Das Nächste, Erregendste, Eigenste ist kein 'Stoff'; es ist die *Person* – und nicht danach angetan eine künstlerische Gliederung von ihr zu empfangen. Fern sei es von mir, den Ernst der Kunst zu leugnen; aber wenn es Ernst wird, verschmäht man die Kunst und ist ihrer nicht fähig. (*DF* 236).¹⁴³

As the novel certainly attempts to explain, Auschwitz is a powerful historical example of "things get[ting] serious," and in its wake Adorno does indeed scorn the barbarity of an art that would offer up precisely that which he believed made the atrocities of Auschwitz possible, namely, illusion – and here we may want to recall Zeitblom's description of those Weimar citizens being led through Buchenwald following the Allied victory, those "who

I have likewise heard him say: "Illusion and games have art's conscience opposed to them nowadays. Art wants to stop being illusion and games; it wants to become *comprehension*."

But if something has ceased to conform to its definition, does it not cease to exist altogether? And how will art live as *comprehension*" (*DF* 193; emphasis mine).

¹⁴³ "Have I not said more than once that the life with which I am dealing was closer, dearer, more intriguing to me than my own? And what is closest and most intriguing, most truly my own, is not mere 'material', it is the person himself – and so hardly suitable for artistic segmentation. Far be it from me to deny the seriousness of art; but when things get serious one scorns art and is no longer capable of it" (*DF* 187).

went about their business in seeming honesty and tried to know nothing, though at times the wind blew the stench of burned human flesh up their noses.”

According to Adorno and Horkheimer, the miscarriage of humanity that was the Holocaust was made possible by what both famously refer to as the ‘dialectic of enlightenment’ in which progressively “enlightened” social activity, including art, gives way to a progressively “unenlightened” and unreflective barbarism:

We are wholly convinced – and therein lies our *petit principii* – that social freedom is inseparable from enlightened thought. Nevertheless, we believe just as clearly to have recognized that this very way of thinking – no less than the actual historical forms (the social institutions) with which it is interwoven – already contains the seed of the reversal universally apparent today. If enlightenment does not allow reflection on this regressive element, it seals its own fate. (qtd. in Dallmayr 170)

In other words, where reason would like to free itself from its reliance upon nature, it in turn infers from this accomplished liberation its concomitant right to dominate nature and to bring this ‘otherness’ into the fold of its own jurisdiction and power:

[T]he regressive counterpoint of enlightenment – its dialectical underside – derives from the streamlining of rational thought into a calculating, instrumental form of rationality, a process that underscores the growing division between human beings and nature, between cognitive power and its external targets. [...] In expelling or cleansing itself of qualitative differences, cognitive rationality inevitably prepared the ground for the ‘systematization’

or homogenization of social life and thus for the establishment of increasingly effective social controls and disciplines. (Dallmayr 170)

And it is precisely because art is made complicit in this barbaric reversal that Adorno prohibits it and demands its end. As in *Doctor Faustus*, where the future of art is oriented toward the *comprehension* of this reversal and away from art's reliance upon *illusion*, which conceals the violent undercurrents of enlightened thought, in Adorno's view, according to Fred Dallmayr:

Only through critical reflection – one mindful of its tendentious complicity with power – is reason able to break the spell of (ancient or modern) mythology and reification. [...] [T]he only way to rupture this self-enclosure [of reason] is through thought's attentiveness to non-thought or reason's turn toward the (conceptually) 'non-identical' [...]. [...] [O]nly a negative dialectics holds out both intellectual and social promise: by being attentive to the 'otherness' or underside of reason as well as to the social-political underside of modernity [...] (172-3).

Perhaps it goes without saying at this late moment in my study that it is precisely such a reflective power and attentiveness that in *Doctor Faustus* characterizes Zeitblom's narrative attempt to comprehend the meaning of his friend's life and fate and that is attributed to Adrian himself in what I called his *becoming-guilty* in the Heideggerian sense, which is also to say, in his having always *already* comprehended his guilt. More importantly for now, however, we need only note the temporality of Adorno's plan for the preservation of art and the proximity of this plan to Heidegger's own.

According to Eva Geulen, Adorno's claim about the end of art after Auschwitz was rescinded almost as quickly as it was uttered. That it was rescinded is of course not only clearly apparent in the fact that many of Adorno's writings after Auschwitz revolve squarely around the question of art and aesthetics, e.g. *Aesthetic Theory* and *Negative Dialectics*, but his famous statement is qualified almost immediately after it is made in "Cultural Criticism and Society," where Adorno adds: "And this corrodes even the knowledge of why [art] has become impossible [...] today" (qtd. in Geulen 94). Moreover, and with a view toward this alleged contradiction in Adorno's thought, Geulen is right to point out the disclosure of "two poles between which the innumerable negativities of Adorno's aesthetics are suspended" (95): what she calls the formulae of "afterthought" [Nachspiel] and "process" [Vorgang] (95). To help to explain the former, Geulen refers to Adorno's considerations of the possibility or impossibility of art after Auschwitz as "an index of survival and afterlife," and she quotes a stirring passage from *Negative Dialectics* to illuminate her claim:

[I]t may have been wrong to say that after Auschwitz no poem can be written. But it is not wrong to raise the [...] question whether after Auschwitz it is possible to go on living, whether someone who accidentally escaped and by rights should have been killed still can genuinely live. His mere survival calls for the emotional coldness, the fundamental principle of bourgeois subjectivity, without which there could have been no Auschwitz. (Geulen 95)

Elsewhere Adorno extends the reach of this impossibility to include not only the lives of the perpetrators of history but also his own life and art, more generally, where art, too, must content itself with always already being an "afterthought," an always already mediated response, i.e. bound to *a priori* determinations that necessarily precede it (Geulen 95).

“Process,” on the other hand, Geulen associates with the inner workings of the work of art itself and forms the basis of art’s “autonomy” that Adorno elaborates in *Aesthetic Theory* and elsewhere. The artwork always stands in relation to what it isn’t, to what is not itself, whether we mean by this other works, genres, or the artist himself, the social framework in which it is created or the interpretations imposed upon it: “Art requires something quite heterogeneous to it, in order to be art” (“Art and the Arts,” qtd. in Geulen 96), and as a result, the processes in which the development of art unfolds are always synonymous with the processes of its ending or “collapse” (qtd. in Geulen 96).

The correspondences here between the temporality of “afterthought” and “process” and the temporal ecstasies of Heideggerian temporality should immediately strike the reader. Of the former Geulen says: “the end always already lies behind us and condemns what survives to an endless afterlife, whereby afterlife signifies both the temporal *post finem* as well as the fatal compulsion to repeat. The dictum against art after Auschwitz is [...] an expression of the fact that after Auschwitz there can be no *before* Auschwitz” (96) – and in the process reiterates a Heideggerian *thrownness*. We will remember, for instance, that Dasein is in a sense also tragically “condemned” to an endless afterlife insofar as it is always out ahead of itself in precisely this way and inasmuch as its future possibilities are always constricted by a past behind which it cannot go. As I said earlier, Dasein can never return to a place in time in which it was not always already Dasein in the same way that *after* Auschwitz there can no longer be any *before* it. But in contrast to Geulen, for whom the situation of art and experience as “afterthought” also leads to fatal compulsion to repeat, we must also remember that for both Heidegger and Adorno, the concept of repetition always leaves room for the possibility of authentic experience (*ND* 144); indeed, according to Adorno what has

been “cast aside” or “forgotten” in history may be retrieved by the present in a transformative political moment whereby a future is ordained and freedom of consciousness is asserted “[...] as what is needful within history” (Macdonald 121). Thus at the end of the previous chapter I conclude my discussion of history and authenticity in Mann and Heidegger with the claim that the only means of authentically or genuinely living (and of producing an authentic mode of art) in the aftermath of the Holocaust requires a historical-critical stance on the part of Dasein that first and foremost must absorb the *having-been* of Auschwitz into the current of its own *thrownness*. It is only insofar as Dasein can manage this feat that it can *come-towards itself authentically as having-been*.

Likewise, the so-called “process” of the interior workings of art, which Geulen attributes to the other side of what she calls the double-logic of Adornian aesthetics would seem also to beg for Heideggerian interpretation. Like the temporality that Dasein essentially *is*, art is an end in itself that betrays not so much a hermetic self-enclosure (as is often claimed to be the case in Adrian Leverkühn’s twelve-tone style, for example), but as I have shown a temporally dynamic process or *Erstreckung* that fundamentally refigures the end as that “for the sake of which” it exists (Walker 100), namely, possibilities and potentials that lie outside of it, or more specifically, out ahead of it, and with which it is not identical – the most extreme example of such a constant relation, of course, is art’s relationship to its own end in the same way that Dasein’s most extreme possibilities lie in the possibility of its being nothing at all, in its own impossibility. Thus it can be seen how these “two poles in which the innumerable negativities of Adornian aesthetics” are situated correspond quite meaningfully with the temporalities, based in their own way in negation and impossibility, that bookend the stretching-along of Dasein’s existence, i.e. being-towards-death and historicity or

thrownness, and, moreover, how Adorno's extended critique of the end of art is critical to understanding the relationship I have already forged between *The Magic Mountain* and, especially, *Doctor Faustus*, and Heideggerian temporality.

Even more pertinent, perhaps, than these temporal correspondences (because it is neither intuitive nor predictable) is the way in which both Adorno's and Mann's call for what is needful in history with respect to the possibility of art and life after Auschwitz echoes Heidegger's own. As I pointed out above, the conceptual core of Adornian critique and thus, too, of the reinstatement of art's "right to exist" (AT 251) lies in his conception of critical reflection. Just as Adrian Leverkühn's musical breakthrough with *The Lamentation of Doctor Faustus*, in which the highly codified prohibitions of the twelve-tone and the *Teufelsvertrag* [blood-pact] provoke the very love that transgresses and negates these prohibitions, the sort of genuine, i.e. critical, reflective posturing called for by Adorno first requires as its object the very threat it wishes to overcome – in the case of both Mann and Adorno, this is the threat of that barbaric, regressive reversal called the "underside" or "dialectic" of enlightenment, which is said to be embodied in Adrian's character and music and that is associated by Zeitblom (and thus, too, Mann) and Adorno with the rise of fascism in 20th century Germany. At any rate, this "underside" or totalitarian expression of modern rationality, according to Fred Dallmayr, results in the "alienation of reason from the target of knowledge or, more precisely, the isolation of reason from possible learning experiences induced by its targets. Among these learning experiences are the lessons provided by human sensuality and affectivity (that is, the realm of 'inner' nature)" (171). And an authentic critical reflectiveness or consciousness in Adorno is described here and there as "a distinctive way of disclosing truth" (Walker 97), as a way of "allowing things 'to be' and [of] giving a

hearing to voices otherwise excluded by modern reason” (Dallmayr 174), as a “willingness to ‘heed a potential slumbering in things’ and thereby ‘make amends’” to them for the violent “incursions” of an instrumentalized modern rationality that wants to or has already cast them aside (Adorno, qtd. in Dallmayr, 174), and, finally, as “an authentic form of experience” very different from but nevertheless a radical response to the one that places not only art but life as such under the harrow of impossibility in a post-Auschwitz world, all of which should remind us not only of Mann and Heidegger but also of the pressing significance of temporality for an understanding of the closely related question of the end of art.

Heidegger’s speculations on the situation of the end of art are likewise heir to the same Hegelian tradition to which Adorno and Mann are responding. And, as with Adorno, the question of the end of art in Heidegger has multiple variations and expressions. For instance, on the one hand, Heidegger takes up the idea of the end of art precisely as Hegel had but within the specific context of 20th century aesthetics and metaphysics. Insofar as Heidegger sought to describe the end of metaphysics in the closing stages of the long philosophical tradition of the West that begins with the Greeks, can be traced through Hegel and German Idealism and that culminates in Nietzsche, “the last metaphysician,” he also sought to articulate and herald the end or overcoming of philosophy itself and hence, too, of art and aesthetics. In another sense, and one much more closely connected to the issues taken up in *Being and Time*, the backing away from art, in the authentic sense of art as the place in which we witness “the truth of beings setting itself to work” (*BW* 162), is at the same time a backing away from the question of Being as such since art is privileged, at least in Heidegger’s later works, such as his well-known essay *The Origin of the Work of Art* (1936),

as the site at which Being is opened up just as Dasein occupies this privileged position in *Being and Time*.

In *The Origin of the Work of Art*, Heidegger defines the function of art as “*the becoming or happening of truth*” precisely inasmuch as in the work of art what is laid bare is being itself [aletheia]. As with Adorno, Heidegger’s insistence on art as origin stems from his recognition of his own historical circumstances in which, according to Heidegger, art is not only no longer possible but it is also, and paradoxically, precisely what is needful in history:

Whenever art happens – that is, whenever there is a beginning – a thrust enters; history either begins or starts over again. [...]

Why do we inquire in this way? We inquire in this way in order to be able to ask more properly whether art is or is not an origin in our historical existence, whether and under what conditions it can and must be an origin.

Such reflection cannot force art and its coming-to-be. But this reflective knowledge is the preliminary and therefore indispensable preparation for the becoming of art. Only such knowledge prepares its space for art, their way for the creators, their location for the preservers. (BW 202)

The specific historical conditions that prompted this question for Heidegger are precisely those that prompted Adorno’s own reflections on the subject both *before* and *after* Auschwitz. In *Contributions to Philosophy [Beiträge zur Philosophie]* (1936) and *Meditative Thinking [Besinnung]* (1938-9), Heidegger launches an equally and undeniably forceful polemic against the totalizing effects of ‘power’ [Macht], ‘violence’ [Gewalt] and the concomitant rationalization and assimilation of these forces in modern technology and politics. This for the most part unexplored region of Heidegger’s thought, unleashed in the

middle of the Nazi period in Germany, Fred Dallmayr refers to as Heidegger's decisive 'inner emigration' away from whatever faith he may have had in the regime and its ambitions in 1933 (175).

Nevertheless, for my part, what is important for now as I venture to end this report, is the recognition that in looking to either Mann, Adorno or Heidegger for an answer to the question of whether art is possible in modernity we are confronted with the same thing. In explaining what is "needful in history," Heidegger only recalls the most formidable challenge for thinking in *Being and Time*, namely, *Sorge*, and just as Adorno calls upon a critical attentiveness to history in order to preserve both art and the freedom of consciousness it signifies, Heidegger calls on *Sorge*. In *Besinnung*, in particular, Heidegger "urges a more reflective rethinking of human being-in-the-world, a rethinking [that opens] human hearts and minds again to the 'call of being' (which guides them into a more careful and caring mode of living). [...]" (Dallmayr 177). Dallmayr's insistence on the correspondence here between "a more reflective rethinking of human being-in-the-world" and "a more careful and caring mode of living" cannot be properly, i.e. authentically, grasped outside of the context of its use and function in *Being and Time*, where, it must of course be remembered that *care* or *Sorge* is not only the name for the temporality that Dasein essentially *is*, but where *Sorge* is defined as that "for the sake of which" Dasein *is* (BT 235). Thus it is no surprise that I chose to end my analyses of Mann's *The Magic Mountain* and *Doctor Faustus* with an emphasis on the significance of *love*, since to a large extent, the possibility of a historical and human recovery as well as the possibility of recovering an authentic art and aesthetics, whether we consult Mann, Adorno or Heidegger, involves something very much like what Heidegger might be wont to call Dasein's *being-towards-love*, or as Mann so famously

wonders at the end of *The Magic Mountain*: “Augenblicke kamen, wo dir aus Tod und Körperunzucht ahnungsvoll und regierungsweise ein Traum von Liebe erwuchs. Wird auch aus diesem Weltfest des Todes, auch aus der schlimmen Fieberbrunst, die rings den regnerischen Abendhimmel entzündet, einmal die Liebe steigen?” (1085).¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ “Moments there were, when out of death, and the rebellion of the flesh, there came to thee, as though thou hadst drawn from thyself, a dream of love. Out of this universal feast of death, out of this extremity of fever, kindling the rain-washed evening sky to a fiery glow, may it be that Love one day shall mount?” (*MM* 716).

Works Cited

- Adorno, Theodor. Aesthetic Theory. Eds. G. Adorno and R. Tiedemann. Trans. C. Lenhardt. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.
- . Notes to Literature, vol. II. Tiedemann, ed. NicholSEN, trans. New York: Columbia UP, 1992.
- . Philosophy of Modern Music. New York: Continuum, 2004.
- . Jargon of Authenticity. Trans. Knut Tarnowsky and Frederic Will. Evanston, Northwestern UP, 1973.
- Atkins, Kim. "Ricoeur's 'Human Time' as a Response to the Problem of Closure in Heideggerian Temporality." Philosophy Today. 44.2 Celina: 2000. 108+ (15 pp.)
- Bahr, Ehrhard. "Art Desires Non-Art." Lehnert and Pfeiffer, 145-60.
- Ball, David. Thomas Mann's Recantation of 'Faust': 'Doktor Faustus' in the Context of Mann's Relationship to Goethe. Stuttgart: Hans-Dieter Heinz Akademischer Verlag, 1986.
- Bergson, Henri. Time and Free Will. Trans. F.L. Pogson. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1950 [1910].
- Bergsten, Gunilla. Thomas Mann's Doctor Faustus. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1969.
- Cobley, Evelyn: "Closure and Infinite Semiosis in Mann's Doctor Faustus and Eco's The Name of the Rose." Comparative Literature Studies 26 (1989): 341-61.
- Cohn, Dorrit. "Telling Timelessness in *Der Zauberberg*." Veget, Casebook, 2008. 201-18.
- Corngold, Stanley. "Sein und Zeit: Implications for Poetics." boundary 2 4.2 (Winter 1976): 439-454.
- Cunningham, David, and Nigel Mapp, eds. Adorno and Literature. London: Continuum, 2006.
- Dallmayr, Fred. "Adorno and Heidegger" (Review of Hermann Mörchen's Adorno und Heidegger: Untersuchung einer philosophischen Kommunikationsverweigerung, Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981). diacritics. 19.3-4: 82-100.
- . Between Freiburg and Frankfurt. Amherst, MA: Massachusetts UP, 1991.
- Downing, Eric. "Photography, Psychoanalysis, and Bildung in Thomas Mann's *The Magic Mountain*." After Images. Detroit: Wayne State, 2006.17-85.

- . "Photography and Bildung in *The Magic Mountain*." *Vaget, Casebook*, 2008.45-70.
- Eagleton, Terry. Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
- . Literary Theory. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1983.
- Eiland, Howard. "Prophetic Heidegger." boundary 2 8.3 (Spring 1980): 309-319.
- Fetzer, John. Changing Perceptions of Thomas Mann's 'Doctor Faustus': Criticism 1947-1992. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1996.
- Fleming, Paul. "Forgetting – Adorno and Kommerell." *Cunningham and Mapp*, 2006. 133-144.
- Geulen, Eva. The End of Art. Trans. James McFarland. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2006.
- Goethe. Faust. Hamburg: Wegner, 1963.
- Gover, Karen. Heidegger and the Question of Tragedy. Dissertation [Penn State U] (May 2005): 149 pp.
- Hall, Anne. D. "The Political Wisdom of Cultural Poetics." Modern Philology. 93.4 (May 1996): 423-444.
- Heidegger, Martin. Der Begriff der Zeit. (BZ) Gesamtausgabe. Bd. 64. Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 2004.
- . Briefe, 1925-1975 (Hannah Arendt). Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 1998.
- . Einführung in der Metaphysik. Gesamtausgabe. Bd. 40. Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 2004.
- . "Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles (Anzeige der hermeneutischen Situation)". Dilthey-Jahrbuch. Herausgegeben von Hans-Ulrich Lessing. 6(1989): 235-69.
- . Sein und Zeit. (SZ) Gesamtausgabe. Bd. 2 Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977.
- . Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1960.
- . "Wilhelm Diltheys Forschungsarbeit und der gegenwärtige Kampf um eine historische Weltanschauung." 10 Vorträge (Gehalten in Kassel vom 16.IV.-21.IV. 1925). Dilthey-Jahrbuch. Herausgegeben von Frithjof Rodi. 8(1992-3): 143-80.

- . Being and Time. (*BT*) Trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- . The Concept of Time. Kisiel and Sheehan, 2007. 196-213.
- . Introduction to Metaphysics. Trans. Gregory Fried and Richard Polt. New Haven: Yale UP, 2000.
- . Letters, 1925-1975 (to Hannah Arendt). Ludz, ed. Shields, Trans. London: Harcourt, 2004.
- . On Time and Being. Stambaugh, trans. New York: Harper and Rowe, 1972.
- . "The Origin of the Work of Art." Basic Writings. (*BW*) Ed. David F. Krell. New York: Harper Collins, 1993.
- . "Phenomenological Interpretations with Respect to Aristotle: Indication of the Hermeneutical Situation." Kisiel and Sheehan, 2007. 150-184.
- . "Wilhelm Dilthey's Research and the Current Struggle for a Historical Worldview." Kisiel and Sheehan, 2007. 238-274.
- Kavaloski, Joshua. The Fourth Dimension: Time in the Modernist Novel. Dissertation [University of Virginia] (May 2004): 202 pp.
- Kermode, Frank. The Sense of an Ending. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1967.
- Kern, Stephen. The Culture of Time and Space. Cambridge: Harvard, 1983.
- Kisiel, Theodore and Thomas Sheehan. Becoming Heidegger. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 2007.
- Lehnert, Herbert and Peter Pfeiffer, eds. Thomas Mann's Doktor Faustus: A Novel at the Margins of Modernism. Columbia: Camden House, 1991.
- (and E. Wessell). A Companion to the Works of Thomas Mann. Columbia: Camden House, 2004.
- Lukács, Georg. The Historical Novel. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell, trans. Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1983.
- . Essays on Thomas Mann. Trans. Mitchell. New York: Merlin, 1964.
- Mann, Thomas. Briefe, 1889-1936. ed. Erika Mann. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1961.
- . Doktor Faustus. (*DF*) Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1967.

- . Die Entstehung des Doktor Faustus. Bermann-Fischer: Amsterdam, 1949.
- . "Freud und die Zukunft." Reden und Aufsätze. Gesammelte Werke. Bd. 9. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1960. 478-501.
- . "Über Goethe's *Faust*." Reden und Aufsätze. Gesammelte Werke. Bd. 9. Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer, 1960. 581-621.
- . Der Zauberberg. (DZ) Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 2002.
- . Doctor Faustus. (DF) Trans. John E. Woods. New York: Vintage, 1999.
- . "Einführung in den Zauberberg." Gesammelte Werke. Bd. 12. Berlin: Aufbau, 1956. 431-46.
- . "Freud and the Future." Essays of Three Decades. H.T. Lowe-Porter, trans. New York: Knopf, 1948. 411-28.
- . "Goethe's *Faust*." Essays of Three Decades. H.T. Lowe-Porter, trans. New York: Knopf, 1948. 3-42.
- . Letters of Thomas Mann, 1889-1995. Clara and Richard Winston, trans. and eds. Berkeley: California UP, 1970.
- . The Magic Mountain (and "The Making of the Magic Mountain"). (MM) Trans. H. T. Lowe-Porter. London: Minerva, 1996.
- . The Story of a Novel. Trans. Richard and Clara Winston. New York: Knopf, 1961.
- Macdonald, Iain. "Returning to the 'House of Oblivion': Celan between Adorno and Heidegger." Cunningham and Mapp, 2006. 117-132.
- . Adorno and Heidegger. With Krzysztof Ziarek. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2008.
- Mehring, Reinhard: "Apokalypse der deutschen 'Seele': Thomas Manns Doktor Faustus als Zeitroman." Weimarer Beiträge: Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft, Ästhetik und Kulturwissenschaften 51.2 (2005): 188-205.
- Mendilow, A.A. Time and the Novel. New York: Humanities P, 1972 [1952].
- Nielson, S. Weber. Exact Imagination, Late Work. Cambridge: MIT, 1997.15-58.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. Birth of Tragedy. Ed. Tanner. Trans. Whiteside. New York: Penguin, 1993.

- Oates, Joyce Carol. The Edge of Impossibility. New York: Vanguard P, 1972.
- Pater, Walter. *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*. Norton Anthology of English Literature. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, Carol T. Christ and Catherine Robson. 8th edition. Vol. E. New York: W. W. Norton, 2006. 1507-1513.
- Pöggeler, Otto. Martin Heidegger's Path of Thinking. Trans. Daniel Magurshak and Sigmund Barber. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities P International, 1987.
- Reed, T.J. Thomas Mann: The Uses of Tradition. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1996.
- . "Mann and History." Cambridge Companion to Thomas Mann. Ed. Ritchie Robertson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 1-21.
- Ricoeur, Paul. Time and Narrative. Vol. 3. Trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1988.
- . Memory, History, Forgetting. Trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2004.
- Robertson, Ritchie. "Accounting for History: Thomas Mann, *Doktor Faustus*." The German Novel in the 20th Century. David Midgley, ed. Edinburgh: St. Martin's P, 1993.
- Schneider, Helmut. "Response to Ehrhard Bahr." Lehnert and Pfeiffer, 161-6.
- Stiegler, Bernard. Technics and Time. Vol. 1. Trans. Beardsworth and Collins. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998.
- Travers, Martin. "Death, Knowledge, and the Formation of Self." Vaeg, Casebook, 2008. 31-44.
- v. Rohr Scaff, Susan. History, Myth, and Music: Thomas Mann's Timely Fiction. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1998.
- Vaeg, Hans, ed. Thomas Mann's The Magic Mountain: A Casebook. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.
- . "'German' Music and German Catastrophe: A Re-reading of *Doktor Faustus*." Lehnert and Wessell, Companion, 2004. 221-44.
- . "Politically Suspect": Music on the Magic Mountain. Casebook, 2008. 123-42.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin. "Philosophical Antecedents to Ricoeur's Time and Narrative." On Paul Ricoeur: Narrative and Interpretation. David Wood, ed. New York: Routledge, 1991. 34-55.

Vogel, Harald. Die Zeit bei Thomas Mann. Dissertation. [Münster] 1970.

Wolin, Richard, ed. The Heidegger Controversy. Cambridge: MIT, 1993.

Woolf, Virginia. "Modern Fiction." Norton Anthology of English Literature. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, Jon Stallworthy, and Jahan Ramazani. 8th edition. Vol. F. New York: W. W. Norton, 2006. 2087-2092.

Ziarek, Krzysztof. "The Social Figure of Art: Heidegger and Adorno on the Paradoxical Autonomy of Artworks." Between Ethics and Aesthetics. Dorota Glowacka and Stephen Boos, eds. Albany, NY: SUNY P, 2002. 219-238.