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Abstract and Keywords
The distinction between lived time as it is subjectively experienced by individuals and wider events that affect communities, collectives, and nations is a complex and significant aspect of time as it is presented in narrative. This chapter considers the tension between the time of individual experience and the time of collectively marked events in Doctor Faustus, Felix Krull, Mario and the Magician, as well as Günter Grass’s The Tin Drum, and Art Spiegelman’s graphic novel, Maus. The wide range of times and media afforded by these works allows an analysis of the ways in which references to historical events have a significant effect on the temporality of individual tales. In the case of the works discussed here, history presented through myth, metaphor, and magic realism further complicates the flow of time by thickening it into multiple layers of storytelling.
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Unlike the preceding four, this chapter is not really about the way in which the theme in question is used as a tool for furthering narrative time. This is because, unlike space, performance, symbols, or myth, it is impossible to speak of history simply as a ‘theme’ or a ‘tool’. Historical events, in the works discussed in the course of this book, and perhaps unavoidably in any narrative, are inextricable from, and yet also somewhat beyond, the individual stories of fictional characters. The characters in the works considered here are exemplars or emblems or metonyms of historical experience at best. History’s effect on individuals is of course what makes it matter. But at the same time, these individual tales can only ever tell fragments of the story. Reinhart Koselleck asks,

"What is historical time? This is a question that historical science has difficulty with […] The sources of the past do inform us about thoughts and deeds, plans and events, but they provide no direct indication of historical time. […] Chronology is an auxiliary speciality that deals with questions of dating, reducing the countless calendars and forms of temporal measurement used throughout history to a common temporal scale calculated on the basis of the physical-astronomical time of our planetary system. This unitary, natural time is equally (p.156) suited to all on our planet, taking into account the inverse seasonal cycles of the northern and southern hemispheres and the progressive variation of day and night. There is likewise a limited variability and general similarity in the biological time of humans lives that medical intervention can do little to alter. But whoever considers the relationship of history and time, and where there is such a thing as ‘historical time,’ is not thinking of such natural conditioning of our conceptions of time."
Koselleck’s thinking here in part recalls Elias’s concept of social time, but it also points to the complex distinction between the life of an individual and aspects of time that are incontrovertibly shared by all human beings. Ricoeur too highlights this distinction, which arises, he says, ‘from our rumination on the aporias of the phenomenology of time’, and allows us to reflect upon ‘the place of historical time between phenomenological time and the time phenomenology does not succeed in constituting, which we call the time of the world, objective time, or ordinary time’. In a vein similar to Koselleck, Ricoeur continues:

History initially reveals its creative capacity as regards the refiguration of time through its invention and use of certain reflective instruments such as the calendar; the idea of the succession of generations—and, connected to this, the idea of the threefold realm of contemporaries, predecessors, and successors; finally, and above all, in its recourse to archives, documents, and traces. These reflective instruments are noteworthy in that they play the role of connectors between lived time and universal time.

The philosophical debates on the complex interrelation between lived time and historical time are manifold, but both Koselleck and Ricoeur raise a pertinent question for the discussion here: how is the subjective sense of temporal momentum for individuals affected by events that happen to a wider collective? Although we may not easily speak of ‘universal’ or ‘objective’ time, Ricoeur’s use of the terms highlights an important point, and returns to one of the main tenets of this book. In the famous phrase of Johann Gottfried Herder, ‘history is geography set in motion’ (‘Geschichte ist Geographie in Bewegung’). This recalls the first chapter in this book, in which I analysed the relationship in narrative between space and time. Where that chapter considered the ways in which depictions of external spaces influence the sense of time passing, this chapter explores the effect of external events of significance to wider collectives on the individual’s sense of time. In this respect, I do not seek to further the debate on ‘historical time’, but instead to analyse the relation between historical events that affect collectives, communities, and nations, and lived time as subjectively experienced by individuals.
Like the chimes of Big Ben in Virginia Woolf’s *Mrs Dalloway* intermittently calling the disparate characters back onto the same temporal plane, mentions of historical events, dates, or periods—or even iconic images that conjure shared moments in cultural memory—halt the free flow of subjective temporal experience and bring it back to a kind of ‘real time’ or what Ricoeur (borrowing from Nietzsche) calls ‘monumental time’. Of *Mrs Dalloway*, Ricoeur says:

the official time with which the characters are confronted is not only this time of clocks but all that is in complicity with it. In agreement with it is everything that, in the narrative, evokes monumental history, to use Nietzsche’s expression, and to begin with, the admirable marble décor of the imperial capital (the ‘real’ place, in this fiction, of all the events and their internal reverberations). This monumental history, in its turn, secretes what I will venture to call a ‘monumental time’, of which chronological time is but the audible expression. To this monumental time belong the figures of authority and power that form the counterweight to the living times experienced by Clarissa and Septimus.6

In Ricoeur’s sense, monumental time is represented not only by literal monuments of history (Big Ben, for example) but also by authority figures that maintain hierarchical traditions and dominate the time and existence of others (such as Sir William Bradshaw, the eminent doctor who pushes Septimus to suicide precisely through his attempts to relegate Septimus’ time). As Ricoeur indicates, the interweaving of history into individual tales interrupts, widens, and regulates the sense of a personal, unique time going by because it represents a wider, more ‘authoritative’ regulation of time that dominates individual, subjective senses.
Mann and many of his contemporaries, precursors, and successors show a deep interest in, awareness of, and engagement with historical developments in their depictions of personal narratives. These works are of value as historical documents (quite apart from anything else), but they also explore the intricate interaction of the individual subjective (p.158) experience of time and the wider collective historical context. Considering the multifarious forms of this interaction sheds further light on the complex mechanisms of narrative time, not just in works with an obvious historical emphasis, but also more widely in terms of the overlapping of individual and collective.

For this discussion, I take *Doctor Faustus, Confessions of Felix Krull, Confidence Man*, and *Mario and the Magician*, and compare them to Grass’s *The Tin Drum* and Art Spiegelman’s graphic novel *Maus*. *Doctor Faustus* and *Mario and the Magician* are both well-known allegories of historical contexts. Here I suggest that their different viewpoints alter the temporal drive of the works: Mann wrote *Doctor Faustus* between 1944 and 1947, meaning that he witnessed the end of the war while writing, whereas he wrote *Mario* in 1929 not knowing where the fervour of Fascist feeling in Europe would lead, meaning that we as readers have greater hindsight than the narrator: *Felix Krull* has not traditionally been seen as a novel of historical significance, but I argue that, when read in the light of my analysis of myth, the work may be seen as a politically complex allegory for Germany’s failed development. *The Tin Drum* forms a logical comparison: not only does it offer a close examination of Nazi Germany, but it also echoes aspects of *Doctor Faustus* and *Felix Krull*, creating a (somewhat critical) intertextual dialogue with Mann’s works. Spiegelman’s *Maus* might appear to be a less obvious text for comparison. As a graphic novel depicting people as animals, it is certainly distinct from the more traditional novel form used by Mann. But it is also a work about personal time and universal history. The narrator, Artie (the author’s own name), prompts his father to relate his life story, including his survival of the Holocaust. In committing his father’s story to narrative, Artie also addresses his relationship with his father, his own sense of loss (particularly about his mother’s post-war suicide), and his personal sense of identity. The shift to visual media also has a logic in terms of the preceding chapters and the overall thesis of this book. In Chapter 1 on Space, I
referenced Lessing’s distinction between the so-called temporal import of the narrative arts and the spatialization of the visual arts. The graphic novel, or what Spiegelman and ‘the underground cartoonists of the 60’s used to call [...] “commix”—a co-mix, or blend, of image and words’, is precisely that: a combination of different media. The graphic novel allows the intermingling of art forms traditionally aligned with space or time respectively, in a manner, moreover, that nevertheless in (p.159) part maintains the stasis of painting or photography as opposed to the immediately palpable temporal dynamism of cinema. This thread recurred too in Chapter 3 on Symbols and Motifs, where I considered Storm’s response in the mid-nineteenth century to the brand new medium of photography through his technique of visualization in comparison with Mann’s injection of temporal movement in his reference to the images of horses gradually changing and thereby conveying a sense of time. Both Storm and Mann in different ways narrativize visual art in these works (and we saw this too in other forms in the intradiegetic paintings of The Magic Mountain and the emphatically visual descriptions in Death in Venice). Maus also brings another medium to the discussion beyond that of visual culture: it is an autobiography, or at the very least a biography. Despite its comic book appearance, Spiegelman was insistent on its classification as non-fiction and wrote a letter of protestation to the editor of the New York Times when Maus II appeared on the fiction bestsellers’ list. The questions of time, history, narrative, and representation that arise from an analysis of Spiegelman’s work shed light too on the working of time in the more traditional narrative forms discussed here.
First, then, I consider the ways in which history in these narratives crops up ‘now and then’, and also, in the telling of the tale, splits time between ‘now’ and ‘back then’. Here I build on Todorov’s theories about the temporal forces at work in the thriller and the whodunnit to suggest that these are complicated by the hindsight we as readers have about universal events in the case of the historically conscious narrative. Second, with these particular texts, the allegorical function of individual tales is central. *Doctor Faustus* and *Mario and the Magician* both overtly act as allegories for historical circumstance, in *Felix Krull* the mould of ‘The Judgement of Paris’ is crucial in the novel’s engagement with history, *The Tin Drum* uses ‘magic realism’ to present the farce of Nazi Germany, and *Maus* depicts the story through the almost fairy-tale logic of comic book animals, with Jewish characters drawn as mice and Nazis as brutal cats. We therefore have multiple temporal layers at work in these texts: individual tales, historical realities, and allegorical mirrors.

(p.160) History now and then
Intertwining the narration of universal historical events with individual, personal fictions complicates the subjective experience of time in narrative. In Chapters 1 and 2 of this book, in which I explored time in the light of space and performance respectively, the discussion focused mainly on the character experience of narrative time. And this, in turn, is what dominates the reader’s sense of time. In Chapter 3, the analysis of symbols and motifs suggested ways in which different parts of a narrative may commune with one another through symbolic foreshadowing or echoing or through motific repetition. In Chapter 4, on myth’s effect on narrative time, I considered a more structural approach that operates largely beyond the consciousness of intradiegetic character conceptions of temporality. The narration of historical events twists these distinctions even more, as becomes evident through analysis of some contrasting works. In Mann’s novel *Doctor Faustus*, his novella *Mario and the Magician*, Grass’s *The Tin Drum*, and Spiegelman’s graphic novel *Maus*, we have several distinct modes of narration and narrative perspectives. We may also contrast these works with *Mrs Dalloway* and Ricoeur’s reading of its historical temporality. *Doctor Faustus, The Tin Drum*, and *Maus* are all retrospective narratives, while *Mrs Dalloway* instead demonstrates a ‘contemporaneous narrative’. This difference profoundly impacts both what the effect of intertwining history and fiction actually is and whom exactly it affects. Ricoeur’s proposal of ‘monumental time’ provides an interesting initial model for considering the interrelation of history and fictional narrative, but in terms of the overall approach of this book, we need to take it a step further.

With *Mrs Dalloway*, where the narrative moves fluidly in and out of various character consciousnesses but does not look back from a point in the future with privileged information, we move in step with the characters and are unable to anticipate the ending. Indeed, in a sense the climax, where Septimus Warren Smith commits suicide, comes as a shock precisely because of the seemingly ‘safe’ post-war context. History and its effect on narrative time in *Mrs Dalloway* is very different from its working in *Doctor Faustus, The Tin Drum*, and *Maus*. In Woolf’s novel, the traumatic history of the past continues to shape lives in the present. As the characters exist in the shadows of immediate post-war London, the reverberations of immense, recent national and personal trauma echo through
the narrative. The characters’ memories are also those of the narrator, whereas in *Doctor Faustus* and *The Tin Drum*, the narrators remember and know more than the characters can at any given point in (p.161) the narrative (until of course they catch up with the time of narrating). In *Maus*, we have a different split altogether. This is very much a ‘howdunnit’ in temporal terms. Artie, the intradiegetic narrator of his father’s oral memoirs and the self-aware author of the graphic novel, attempts to piece together the personal story of his parents’ original meeting, developing relationship, early family life, and then the way in which this was torn asunder by the Nazis and the Holocaust. Artie and the reader obviously know that Artie’s father, Vladek, survives the Holocaust, but we do not know how exactly or what it was like for him to live through it. But this alone would be a simplistic way of viewing either the content or the temporal movement of the work. This narrative is almost as much about the present as it is about the past. While we read about Vladek’s story, we also witness Artie’s developing relationship with his father and own personal second-generation *Durcharbeitung* (the process of working through). As a graphic novel, the presentation of time and history inevitably operates differently here too. Spiegelman makes distinctions between different temporal locations in part visually by changing character appearances and recreating past spaces to conjure times gone by, and also by giving Artie’s father, Vladek, different command over language; in the recreated past of Vladek’s memory, his language is fluid and idiomatic (as though he were speaking in his native tongue), while in the present he speaks to Artie in a broken and ungrammatical English. This linguistic divergence supports what we already see through the visual change in appearance and location. Spiegelman also uses the graphic aspect of the novel to place images on top of others, therefore giving them greater immediacy and visual emphasis. The differences between *Maus* and the more traditional works also serve to highlight some common workings of narrative temporality. In all of these works, history is not just about what happened to collectives or nations in the past, but also about how it continues to haunt individuals in the present, and this focus is reflected in the multiple, interwoven, and intricate strands of narrative time.
Ricoeur’s analysis of *Mrs Dalloway* offers a useful guide for the broad temporal function of history in these works in general. He comments:

Chronological time is, quite clearly, represented in the fiction by the striking of Big Ben and the other bells and clocks, as they ring out the hours. What is important is not this reminder of the hour, striking at the same time for everyone, however, but the relation that the various protagonists establish with these marks of time.\(^{10}\)

**Big Ben**, an ironic representation of Nietzschean ‘monumental history’, the humbling reminder of the transitoriness of each of us as individuals, and simultaneously the creator of temporal community in the present, is a way of marking ‘real time’. The link to the House of Parliament, and the symbolism of the Law also add to the sense of regulating time—over and above individual experience—on a monumental scale. The chimes bring everyone into the present in a narrative precariously split between memories of war or of carefree youth in the past and anticipations of the future with Clarissa’s party that evening.
In *Doctor Faustus*, *The Tin Drum*, and *Maus*, history to a limited extent marks the time of individual lives, while also situating these lives within a wider collective sense of time. Ricoeur’s meaning, however, is not simply about the ticking of universal time and individual time, but also about juxtaposing the chimes of Big Ben with the subjective experiences of the distinct characters. Big Ben has a different function from the mention of historical dates and events in the other narratives also in part because *Mrs Dalloway* presents multiple consciousnesses—more than that, what Annalee Edmonson observes as an ‘intersubjectivity’, ‘the consciousness of other consciousnesses’. The chimes therefore serve to bring together all the disparate characters within the novel, rather than attempting to encompass a whole people or nation. To speak of a ‘national’ sense of time is problematic because the concept rests on what Benedict Anderson suggests is an ‘imagined community’. But a ‘monumental time’ that is marked by the tangible symbols of tradition and authority (e.g. Big Ben) or the personifications of tradition and authority (e.g. the knighted doctor in *Mrs Dalloway*) does impact on the individual’s experience of time. So too do events of national significance mark time for a national community: although, as Anderson’s argument indicates, all members of a ‘community’ may not share the same experience, historical events do inform a wider experience of time as constructed in collective memory.

*Mrs Dalloway*, then, differs from *Doctor Faustus*, *The Tin Drum*, and *Maus* in that it is told from the omniscient third-person perspective rather than involving an intradiegetic narrator who recalls and participates in the events of the story. Furthermore, its involvement of multiple consciousnesses means that the registering of ‘monumental time’ or historical events draws multiple characters back to the same plane. In *Doctor Faustus*, *The Tin Drum*, and *Maus*, by contrast, a single consciousness is prioritized and the narrators do not lay unreasonable claims (with the occasional exception of Serenus Zeitblom) to intimate knowledge of minds other than their own. So while these novels are ‘about’ history, history does not have the same all-encompassing function in relation to subjective experience in these works. And yet it still plays a crucial role with regard to the subjective temporal experience that we, as readers, receive, rather than that of the characters themselves.
First, we need to return to Todorov’s distinction, cited in Chapter 4, between the time of the thriller and the time of the whodunnit. The former moves forwards, and the narrator and the reader effectively travel in sync with the characters, anticipating, fearing, wondering what might happen next just as much as they do (think James Bond). To a large degree our knowledge of events is shared. The whodunnit, however, moves backwards. The detective attempts to piece together past events leading towards the denouement, which acts (à la Hercule Poirot) as a time machine that returns to the moments leading up to and of the original crime. Currie observes that ‘[t]he experience of reading the whodunit is characterised by curiosity, since it proceeds from effect to cause, whereas the thriller is characterised by suspense and proceeds from cause to effect’. The effect of the whodunnit model is the doubling of narrative time, as Todorov suggests: ‘This novel contains not one but two stories: the story of the crime and the story of the investigation’.

But in these historical narratives, we have an amalgamation of these two times, occurring on various different levels. The retrospective narrators act as historians or detectives returning with hindsight to events of the past; the characters of the past effectively experience time as a kind of thriller narrative, moving forwards to what is for them an as yet unknown future. As for the reader, we are split awkwardly between the two. As readers of history, we view time in the manner of the whodunnit, or more precisely in this instance, the ‘howdunnit’; we know where the countries, characters, and events must broadly speaking end up, but we do not know in detail how they will get there. As readers of individual stories, we perceive temporal movement in the manner of the thriller. As Currie puts it:

The idea that moving forwards in time involves a backwards narration is more than just a novelistic structure, and might be thought of […] as the shape of time itself. […] The detective and the historian share this structure of moving forwards by knowing the past.

This combination of historical fact and individual fiction therefore constructs competing tensions, dragging us in multiple temporal directions.
There are two other theoretical approaches that are also worth considering in the context of the historical narratives. First, our perception of time in the present in the ‘real world’ is, according to Husserl, informed by the concomitant processes of retention and protention. Every moment in the present is shaped by the memory of what has immediately come before and the expectation of what is likely immediately to follow. Music provides an instructive analogy. Each note and each chord has meaning primarily because of its placement within the succession of notes and chords: the whole mood of a piece is created by the relationship between the notes and the way in which memory and expectation commune with one another. While a note is being played, we perceive it; as soon as it stops, we have only the memory.

The second theoretical approach that proves useful for the discussion here is posited by Meir Sternberg (and touched upon by Currie in the citation above). Sternberg argues that the ‘three master roles’ of narrative drive are ‘curiosity’, ‘suspense’, and ‘surprise’. The idea here is that curiosity drives the narrative backwards to events that have already occurred (as in Todorov’s detective model), suspense drives the narrative forwards in step with the characters (like a Hitchcock film—we have no idea if the hero will get there in time or what the heroine might find behind the locked door), and surprise confounds expectation by leading us into an unanticipated new direction, setting off new chains of events.

The model I would like to suggest for considering historical narratives unites these various theories and is diagrammatically envisaged in Figure 5.1.

This model inevitably varies according to the precise make-up of the text. Indeed, *Doctor Faustus*, *The Tin Drum*, and *Maus* all offer different case studies. In the case of *Doctor Faustus*, the narrator tells the story of his friend rather than
his own personal memories, frequently resorting to conjecture and hearsay to fill in gaps in his own experience and knowledge. In *The Tin Drum*, Oskar is both the retrospective narrator and the agent of original experience. In *Maus*, we have a third version again as Artie relates rather than straightforwardly narrates his father’s recollected life story. Artie, like us, has a rough knowledge of historical events but does not know all of the details of his father’s personal experience (although he does, of course, have more knowledge than the reader on this front). The dotted sections in the narrator and character axes in Figure 5.1 represent the fact that character and narrator experience may be one and the same (as in *The Tin Drum*) or may temporally overlap (as in *Doctor Faustus*) or be completely distinct (as in *Maus*). The thin arrows stipulate degrees of knowledge: the narrator knows about both the individual stories and the historical circumstance; the reader knows something about history but as yet nothing of the individual tale; the characters witness history as it evolves contemporaneously with their own stories. The overall temporal force presented to the reader is subject to multiple narrative drives. In conjunction with this, the narrator is linked to multiple different temporal axes, which are then gradually imparted to the reader. In the first instance, we begin from the point of historical hindsight. We are then driven by two distinct forces. First, we have curiosity (as Sternberg identifies) about the characters’ pasts, and our retrospective anticipation of what may happen (or rather what may have already happened) to them in the past is coloured by our knowledge of wider historical events. Second, we are subject to the force of suspense in the narrating present: in all these works, the narrators’ standpoints are of interest in themselves, we wonder where they might go and how they might develop, and the retrospective tales are repeatedly interrupted by the narrators’ ‘metaleptic’ comments, regularly bringing us back to the ‘present’. On top of these forces and tensions, there also exist the processes of retention and protention in any given moment of the various relative presents. The perspectival and experiential differences thus have varying effects on the presentations of time in the works.
Maus is distinct from Doctor Faustus and The Tin Drum in part because the agent of historical experience does not narrate the story. Doctor Faustus and The Tin Drum both have retrospective narrators; while it is true that Grass’s Oskar tells his own story whereas Mann’s Zeitblom professes to tell the story of his friend, they both largely and purportedly base their stories on personal memory (Zeitblom of course pieces together Adrian’s life through various documents, hearsay, and unsubstantiated conjecture too, and Oskar’s ‘magic realism’ does not make any great claims either to accuracy or to authenticity). But in Maus, Artie attempts to tell Vladek’s experience of history rather than his own. And this different perspective in the context of a historical and focalized-retrospective narrative (a secondary retrospection in effect) complicates narrative time. Erin McGlothlin offers an interesting analysis of the complex interworking of past and present in Maus, proposing that

The comic images of Maus, rather than clearly marking off the past from the present, contribute to a problem in which the present and the past are intimately interconnected and difficult to separate from one another, for the past is revealed as constitutive of the present, and the present makes demands on the ways in which the past is represented.21
There exists much discussion of the blurred temporality of *Maus*, but what my analysis seeks to offer is a more intricate structural approach, identifying the changing and often oppositional temporal directions. In *Maus*, one scene in particular helps illustrate the operations of the complex, competing temporal directions of the narrative as a whole. This scene moreover is not only ‘of time’ but also ‘about time’.

Here Artie makes a conscious effort to piece together the precise chronology of his father’s time in Auschwitz. He seeks simultaneously to tell time through calendars and to reflect on the problem of graphic narrative temporal presentation. Most of the page involves the dialogue between Artie and Vladek. Juxtaposed with this is the calendar timeline running down the right-hand side. This timeline appears visually pasted on top of the character panels, lending it an extradiegetic, authorial definitiveness, and it is vertical where the panels run horizontally. Despite its right alignment, the presentational factors draw our eye to it at once, almost prioritizing it over the chronological reading of the strip. Here, we walk in step with Artie, and we generally face him while looking over Vladek’s shoulder. He is driven by the Sternberg idea of curiosity, working back in the manner of Todorov’s theory of detective fiction, interrogating Vladek with almost startling composure given the subject (and this emotional distance adds to the temporal disjuncture between the past of experience and the now of narration).

Vladek delves back into his memory, but this page is not about these memories to the same degree as much of the novel; it focuses on the dialogue, on the act of questioning and recollecting, and there are no visual returns or recreations of Auschwitz. In so doing, Spiegelman emphasizes the fallibility of Vladek’s memory: he makes it more precarious by concentrating on the struggling process of uncertain recollection with the old Vladek of now, rather than imbuing it with authority through the concrete recreation of the experience back then.
Artie’s wife Françoise then interrupts the dialogue and her interruption jumps out of the panel and over the timeline of Vladek’s incarceration in Auschwitz. Life in the present breaks up the discussion of the past, while also giving a vagueness to the final months of the past—where Vladek’s memory of time fails him—by covering them up. Vladek’s response pithily undercuts the effort of the page: ‘So? Take less time to the black work. In Auschwitz we didn’t wear watches.’ This underlines the whole point of the narrative: it seeks to present experiential authenticity rather than offering factual accuracy. Françoise’s arrival makes the present of narration even more ‘present’ with the discussion of the sandwiches that she has just made, and which Artie anticipates eating with great enthusiasm. This abrupt shift from the attempt to reassemble the time in Auschwitz to the immediate past of sandwich-making and the immediate future.
of sandwich-eating, shifts the narrative back to a Husserlian idea of present experience commanded by retention and protention. The dominant temporal force thereby moves from curiosity to a kind of suspense—not in the Hitchcockian thriller sense, but still an intrigued anticipation of the characters’ stories now. McGlothlin notes: ‘The boundary between the two narrative levels, the level of Vladek’s Holocaust story and the level of Artie’s witnessing, is […] both blurred and highlighted by the abundant visual metalepses that occur throughout the text.’ And here I have attempted to identify the specific trajectories of these metalepses. The narrative drags us in multiple and continually changing directions, which is, I would suggest, what lends the work the sense—repeatedly identified by critics—of having an inextricably linked past and present. We are shaken up in narrative as Artie and Vladek dart around in memory, experience, and dialogue.
In *The Tin Drum*, we witness a change over time in the very marking of time. In the early years of his ‘memoirs’, Oskar marks time with reasonable *(p.168)* regularity through the annual mention of his birthdays. As dependable and regular occurrences, birthdays allow Oskar to situate these early experiences within a calendar conception of ‘real time’. But the marking of birthdays is, after all, an inevitably personal conception of time. We know that Oskar has reached the age of three, at which point he *(p.169)* receives his first tin drum, and we know that a year has passed by the time of his fourth birthday. This much is obvious. We could mathematically plot the quantity of narrative time consumed versus that of narrated time if this were something we wished to do. But it does not really affect our sense of time going by in the narrative. Over time, Oskar increasingly develops his mode of narrative time-telling, however. As he grows a little older, he shifts instead to the mention of specific dates and seasons. Although Oskar’s childhood self could not know what might lie around the temporal corner, as the retrospective narrator he knows precisely what is to come. And, in terms of history, so do we as readers. The chapter entitled ‘Shop Windows’ (‘Schaufenster’) plays with our historical knowledge, ironizing the very notion of hindsight. This chapter offers an example of Sternberg’s ‘surprise’, but the surprise requires a knowledge of history. The title inevitably conjures images of the ‘Night of Broken Glass’ (‘Kristallnacht’) and then Oskar crystallizes this expectation by specifying his temporal location:

For a long time, till November of thirty-eight to be exact, crouching under grandstands with my drum, with greater or lesser success I broke up rallies, reduced speakers to stutters, and turned marches and hymns into waltzes and foxtrots.

(Längere Zeit lang, genau gesagt, bis zum November achtunddreißig, habe ich mit meiner Trommel unter Tribünen hockend, mehr oder weniger Erfolg beobachtend, Kundgebungen gesprengt, Redner zum Stottern gebracht, Marschmusik, auch Choräle in Walzer und Foxtrott umgebogen.)

He immediately then jumps back to the relative present of narration:
Today, as a private patient in a mental institution, when all that’s past history, still being eagerly forged but from cold iron, I’ve achieved a proper distance from my drumming under grandstands. (111)

(Heute, als Privatpatient einer Heil- und Pflegeanstalt, da das alles schon historisch geworden ist, zwar immer noch eifrig, aber als kaltes Eisen geschmiedet wird, habe ich den rechten Abstand zu meiner Trommelei unter Tribünen. (157))

Oskar’s narrative appears to undermine the theories that I outlined above. Where we might expect some knowledge of history to allow us to anticipate (albeit to a limited and general degree) narrative events, Oskar here evokes the now iconic image of window panes in the context of Nazi Germany, coupled with the date of November 1938, and then tells us (p. 170) about his own misdemeanours, carefully and calculatedly breaking shop windows and watching petty thefts (including one by his presumptive father Jan) occur as a result. He then—in almost Zeitblomian style—makes a direct address to the reader:

If you were to ask, was it Evil that bade Oskar to increase the already strong temptation of a brightly polished shop window by adding a hand-sized opening, I would have to reply, it was Evil. It was Evil by the very fact that I stood in dark doorways. For as we all know, a doorway is Evil’s favourite spot. (117)

The irony here is evident: the mention of the ‘polished shop window’ (‘gutgeputzte[n] Schaufenster’), the questions of evil, the fairy-tale dark doorways—quite the opposite of the brazen, often highly visible attacks on Jewish shops—suggest that Grass is playing with the idea of historical hindsight. We are taken back to a past in a historically well-known context, but then he confounds expectations by forcing the individual story in front of the historical one. History in *The Tin Drum* then is intertwined with the individual story in a way that challenges and toys with narrative temporal expectation.

In *Doctor Faustus*, the narrator Serenus Zeitblom mentions historical events in part, I would argue, as a way of moving closer to the reader but further from his biographical subject, Adrian Leverkühn. In the novel’s opening, Zeitblom is primarily in the position of what Genette calls the ‘subsequent’ narrating instance: ‘the classical position of the past-tense narration’, creating distance between his time as narrator and Adrian’s faraway childhood. But these childhood days are also Zeitblom’s, so as a character he exists alongside Adrian. Although predominantly employing the ‘subsequent’ narrating instance, Zeitblom also switches intermittently between the ‘prior (predictive narrative generally in the future tense)’ and the ‘simultaneous (narrative in the present contemporaneous with the action)’. Such moments relate to his time of narrating rather than Adrian’s time of experience. In the novel’s second sentence, Zeitblom emphasizes his location as ‘prior’ narrator by addressing a hypothetical future reader, ‘since at the moment there is still not the slightest prospect that my manuscript will ever see the public light of day’ (5) (‘denn für den Augenblick besteht ja noch nicht die geringste Aussicht, daß meine Schrift das Licht der Öffentlichkeit erblicken könnte’) (11). Despite the novel’s subtitle, Zeitblom’s mention of the historical context from which he is narrating prioritizes the suspense/thriller temporal direction of the novel over the curiosity/detective trajectory. This is jarring: we read because we are intrigued by Adrian’s life, but Zeitblom in the relative present is still surrounded by bombs and destruction, and this precarious historical context and our knowledge of it continually forces us back to Zeitblom’s time rather than simply Adrian’s past.
Zeitblom’s inclusion and framing of Adrian’s alleged dialogue with the devil demonstrates the effect of the intertwining of individual experience and universal time as marked by historical events, as well as different modes of telling the time in narrative. He first highlights his temporal authority as ‘biographer’, choosing when to share this most central piece of ‘evidence’ for Adrian’s ‘satanic’ tendencies: ‘The biographical moment for its inclusion has come’ (237) (‘Der biographische Augenblick seiner Einschaltung ist gekommen’ (323)). Crawford observes that Zeitblom deliberately stages this revelation by ‘strategically plac[ing] the text at the center of his biography and suggest[ing] throughout the preceding chapters that Adrian is demonic’. But Zeitblom’s framing is particularly interesting precisely because of its temporal uncertainty: he does not actually know when the dialogue was transcribed or indeed when it was supposed to have occurred.

If my own conviction is of any value, it definitely cannot have been composed after our first visit to the little mountain town or during our stay there. […] That the experience on which the manuscript is based already lay behind him when we arrived, that Adrian had already had the following conversation by then—of that I am certain; just as I am sure he put it in writing immediately after the encounter, the very next day presumably.

(238)

(Soll meine Überzeugung etwas gelten, so ist es keinesfalls nach unserem Besuch in dem Bergstädtchen oder während unseres Aufenthaltes dortselbst abgefaßt. […] Daß zu der Zeit, als wir einsprachen, das dem Manuskript zugrunde liegende Erlebnis bereits zurücklag, daß Adrian damals das folgende Gespräch schon geführt hatte, ist mir eine Gewißheit; ebenso, daß die schriftliche Niederlegung unmittelbar im Anschluß an die Erscheinung, am nächsten Tage vermutlich, geschah. (324))
(p.172) He opens both sentences with the subordinate clause. The first contains the admission of subjectivity, 'If my own conviction is of any value' (‘Soll meine Überzeugung etwas gelten’), which is simultaneously an address to the reader. The second sentence, however, uses the opposite formula. Zeitblom’s claims are now described in multiple subordinate clauses, and as he repeats the ‘that...’ (‘daß...’) structure, tension rises calling on the main clause to complete the sentence. Time is therefore arrested before reaching the declaration of certainty: ‘of that I am certain’ (‘ist mir eine Gewißheit’). After having established—with no evidence at all—his pretentions of certainty, Zeitblom adds an afterthought, suggesting the probable time at which Adrian transcribed the dialogue.
Genette observes that ‘it is almost impossible for me not to locate the story in time with respect to my narrating act, since I must necessarily tell the story in a present, past, or future tense’. In surmising the document’s potential time of origin, Zeitblom actually draws attention to its lack of temporal location. By speculating as to the probable or even merely possible time frame, he emphasizes the dialogue’s ‘non-time’, effectively imbuing it with an almost mythological sense of timelessness. After presenting Adrian’s letter, however, Zeitblom considers it ‘proper’ (‘richtig’) to tell us ‘that since I began this account almost a year has come and gone and April 1944 arrived during the writing of the latest chapters’ (267) (‘daß, seit ich diese Aufzeichnungen begann, schon fast ein Jahr ins Land gegangen und über der Abfassung der jüngsten Kapitel der April 1944 herangekommen ist’ (366)). Zeitblom not only situates us within a specific, and—for contemporary readers in particular—recognizable historical context, but also constructs a specific, universal temporal standpoint: he tells us how long his story is taking to tell. He thereby ensures that we are on the same temporal plane regardless of when we read the narrative. Henning proposes that one of the main functions of Zeitblom’s direct address is ‘to allow the reader to see immediately because it is a way of making the testimony present’ (‘den Leser unmittelbar miterleben zu lassen, da sie eine Form zur Vergegenwärtigung von Aussagen ist’). Here, the narration of history acts quite palpably as a way of drawing us closer to Zeitblom and operates in contrast to the temporal instability of Adrian’s time. Despite our growing curiosity about Adrian’s fate, given the apparent encounter with Satan, the narrative is pulled abruptly back to the suspense of the present. The fact that this is now in 1944 also means (p.173) that—unlike in Maus—the reader’s historical hindsight is greater than the narrator’s. Zeitblom may know what happens to Adrian, but he does not know what will happen to Germany. This creates a strange kind of dramatic irony. For us, seeing a narrator surrounded by bombs in 1944 increases the suspense of the narrative present. The narration of specific historical dates and events in Doctor Faustus almost forces us to care more about the individual story and, in particular, its narrator, by increasing the temporal drive towards the immediate future. It is as though Zeitblom wishes this to be as much a thriller about him as a who/howdunnit about Adrian.
Telling history in these works thus creates a further level of temporal complication. It gives the reader greater knowledge of circumstance and context than most narratives generally offer. We are provided with a broad degree of hindsight. This means that when Oskar approaches the late 1930s or increasingly mentions the rising presence of Nazism, we are filled with a sense of foreboding; yet this is not necessarily a foreboding focalized by the individual characters of The Tin Drum. We know that Oskar survives the war and lives, literally, to tell the tale, but there is curiosity about how exactly events will play out for Oskar and the more peripheral characters, and what part Oskar’s family might play in the war. His evasiveness also adds temporal tension. Our curiosity about the past extends to the almost ‘whodunnit’ element about his fathers’ deaths (did he or didn’t he kill them?) as well as his paternity (is his father Alfred Matzerath or Jan Bronski?). Neither of these questions are answered definitively, but they do serve to drag time in another direction. The effect of historical hindsight in Doctor Faustus is somewhat distinct as it provides us with knowledge more of Zeitblom’s time of narration and somewhat more distantly of Adrian’s time of original experience, which means that our suspense about what may happen next is focalized by Zeitblom ‘writing’ in the context of war rather than recounting events safely from the post-war period. The combination of curiosity about the individual past and knowledge of the general past therefore has subjective and varying effects in each work. In Maus, Spiegelman highlights the impossibility of telling the time in the unimaginable context of Auschwitz. The emotional contrast between Artie’s cool, almost impatient questioning of his father about the division of weeks and months and Vladek’s plain reply creates a more telling and more powerful seismic temporal shift than a deliberate narrative analepsis might have done. In Doctor Faustus, I would argue, Zeitblom employs historical context partly in an actively manipulative manner. The specificity of his dates and events in the present, and our knowledge of this highly precarious moment of German history, mean that not only are we able to locate ourselves within a recognized time frame (thus reducing a temporal gap between us and Zeitblom) but also that our reading experience repeatedly turns to the nervous suspense about Zeitblom in the narrating present rather than—or as well as—as us being intrigued and curious about Adrian’s story in the more distant past. History in The Tin Drum
operates to differing effect again. Yes, the increasing shift in the 1930s towards explicit dates and political tides escalates the tension for the reader, but Grass also toys with any superiority provided by historical hindsight that we may initially feel; Oskar’s mode of narration—despite also having historical hindsight himself—his choice of titles, analysis of his actions, temporal locations, juxtapositions with his narrating present, and so on, exhibit a desire to confound and confuse us, emphasizing that, even if we think we know what happened back then, we do not really have a clue.

History as myth, metaphor, and magic realism
Intertwining personal stories with the narration of history inevitably has an effect on narrative time. But these novels also are interpretatively rich. Not merely the mention of objective historical chronology but also the exploration of historical significance has an effect on the temporal processes at work. Arguably, *Doctor Faustus*, *The Tin Drum*, and *Maus* all to different degrees and in different ways create historical allegories, as does Mann’s *Felix Krull*. The allegorical aspects of these works complicate the already complex intertwining of history in narrative and temporal experience in narrative. In one respect, they add a further temporal layer by constructing stories alongside the individual tales and historical contexts. Also, they construct a higher metalevel of interpretation. In the preceding chapters of this book, we have seen that the sense of time going by shifts with changes in perspective, and different characters’ subjective experiences are reflected in different experiences of time. This is the time that we, the reader, perceive. But what occurs with the addition of myth, metaphor, or magic realism in the case of narratives about history is that another layer appears beyond that of character experience, and draws explicit attention to the works’ artifice and thus to the extradiegetic authorial project beyond the realm of character experience. Peter Arnds defines ‘magic realism’ as ‘a genre in which magical elements appear seamlessly within a realistic setting’. \(^{31}\) Exemplars of the genre, which \((p.175)\) was originally used in the context of Latin American writers, ‘perceive history as so grotesque that they resist operating within realistic paradigms of representation and resort to other genres steeped in myth, legends and fairy tales’. \(^{32}\) With the use of myth in *Doctor Faustus*, allegory in *Mario and the Magician*, and metaphor in *Maus*, we can see in these narratives too an allusion to the ‘grotesque[ness]’ and farce of history that is expressed in the magic realism of *The Tin Drum*. 
Initially, we have two times operating simultaneously: the individual stories and the universal historical events. Myth in *Doctor Faustus*, the animal metaphors in *Maus*, and the mode of magic realist narration in *The Tin Drum* help convert the individual stories to historical allegories, thus thickening time to a further degree, as shown in Figure 5.3. This then means that we perceive multiple stories—individual and universal, realistic and allegorical—occurring at the same time. Reading the allegorical layer of the works, however, in certain cases casts the superficial historical-political significance of the works in a new light, and this in turn alters the way in which we read the individual stories. This also is perhaps best illustrated with a diagram: see Figure 5.4.

**Figure 5.3.** Time thickening with allegorical representations of history.

**Figure 5.4.** The interpretative process of history and allegory.
In *Doctor Faustus* and *The Tin Drum*, the protagonists mirror Germany’s history in the first half of the twentieth century. The characters’ lives are intertwined with, shaped by, and often reflect wider national events and experiences. To this we might also add Mann’s novella *Mario and the Magician*. Both formally in its brevity and thematically in terms of the content and narrated time covered, *Mario* offers more of a postcard (p.176) snapshot view of a historical atmosphere. The narrator senses the rising tide of Fascist feeling while on holiday in Italy with his family, and their encounter with the conjuror allegorically suggests the persuasive whipping up of collective fervour threateningly combined with unempathetic, sadistic, and manipulative showmanship. This allegory does not, in the same way as those in the other works, convey historical developments over time but rather depicts a shorter moment, albeit one filled with threat and foreboding, and foreshadowing what is to come. In *Doctor Faustus* and *The Tin Drum*, the analogies with Germany and its disastrous history in the first half of the twentieth century are well known. Martin Swales summarizes the temporal coincidences between Adrian Leverkühn’s life in *Doctor Faustus* and wider German history:

The first German intervention in Morocco (Tangier) occurs in 1905, the year of Adrian’s visit to the brothel. A year later, Germany extracts concessions at the Algeciras conference, and Adrian, at his second meeting with Hetaera Esmeralda, contracts syphilis. In 1911 there is the Agadir crisis, and the Devil appears to Leverkühn. Germany is defeated at the end of the First World War in 1918, and Adrian’s health collapses. The Treaty of Locarno and the attempted wooing of Marie Godeau both occur in 1925. In 1930 there is the dissolution of Germany’s parliament, and Adrian loses his sanity. Zeitblom’s last visit to his friend is in 1939, at the outbreak of war; and Adrian dies in 1940, the year in which the Western Front is opened.33

The characters in *The Tin Drum* conceivably also have an allegorical function as is argued by Alan Frank Keele, who maps various pivotal events in Oskar’s life onto key moments in Germany’s history.34 Oskar mirrors the unstable identity of Danzig in his uncertainty surrounding (p.177) paternity, both as to the identity of his father and as to the question of whether or not he is himself a father. As Michael Minden says,
'No more fundamental indication of the breakdown of familiar order could be imagined'. Oskar has stunted physical and mental growth; one of his presumptive fathers is killed by the Nazis for seemingly participating in a shoot-out in the Polish post office, and the other symbolically dies trying to swallow his Nazi Party pin on the arrival of the Russians, who then proceed to shoot him dead; Oskar’s own possible son rejects his authority and adamantly refuses to follow in his footsteps; Oskar is continually weighed down by the guilt of indirect complicity in various deaths, and after the war he confesses to a murder he privately says he did not commit, goes on trial, and is committed to a mental institute whence he narrates his story. Keele suggests: ‘Oskar is more than a mere individual. He is a pathological personification of his times.’ Although the novel may not be quite as straightforwardly allegorical as Keele argues, there are arguably certain parallels between the protagonist and a nation that is immature, unempathetic, dangerous, and lacking reliable and responsible figures of authority: when Oskar makes the decision to grow—notably at the end of the war—he does so only a little and with a deformity; his post-war experiences—though now ostensibly as an adult—are marked by impotence; and ultimately the security of his metal bed in his mental institute seems much more inviting than assuming responsibility in the post-war world. Unlike, for example, Mrs Dalloway, where the characters recall and live through and beyond universal, historical events, Mann’s protagonist Adrian and Grass’s Oskar to a degree represent historical events as well as witnessing them. But these are not, as with Maus or Mrs Dalloway, stories just about characters in real historical circumstance; both Mann and Grass blend in mythological tales too, creating a further layer of metaphor and metafiction. This places a wider, universal sense of time in parallel with that of the individual tale we read; it thickens time, every event plays two roles—one in Oskar’s story and one in historical terms. But the ambiguous nature of the allegorical aspect means that this doubling of time is neither straightforward nor obvious in The Tin Drum. Just as Oskar believes he sees patterns, we too seek mirrors in Oskar’s life for German history, without necessarily finding them. We expect the shape of Oskar’s life to reflect that of history, but then find ourselves confounded.
In Chapter 4, I suggested that *Doctor Faustus* does not straightforwardly present the ‘Faustian’ nation’s pact with the ‘satanic’ Nazi Party, but instead shows a more complex attempt at *Durcharbeitung* by a narrator who cannot come to terms with the past or his own feelings of guilt. And this rereading of the novel’s historical significance also subtly calls us to reassess interpretations of time. In *The Tin Drum*, Grass creates an astute commentary on *Doctor Faustus* through his own allegorical narrative. In my rereading of *Doctor Faustus*, I attempted to show that Adrian may be seen as Gretchen, the innocent but naïve victim of a seductive manipulator, rather than as Faust, agent of his own downfall. As a parody of *Doctor Faustus*, *The Tin Drum* in many ways supports this reading, and a co-reading of both suggests a rather different view of German history.
In Grass’s work, there is no mythological demon, but instead Oskar conjures ‘Satan’ himself. Notably too, Oskar’s self-imposed Satan appears after the war, situating the very idea within the realm of post-war interpretative imposition rather than actual historical demonic tendencies. After months of romantic interest in his neighbour, a nurse called Sister Dorothea, without ever having seen her, Oskar surprises her one night in the bathroom. Scared and unable to see in the dark, Dorothea asks if Oskar is the devil, which amuses him and so he plays along. He then personifies his penis as Satan, calling upon it to act, which it fails to do. So Dorothea leaves and Oskar never sees her again (678–82). Well, not quite. Towards the end of the novel, Oskar’s hired dog, Lux, brings him a dismembered finger complete with a ring. Hiding the finger and the ring in his pocket, Oskar then encounters Vittlar, a man sitting in an apple tree. Vittlar is not immune to the suggestive symbolism of lying in an apple tree: ‘you might think I’m the snake, straight from Paradise, since there were already cooking apples even then’ (538, adapted) (‘Sie könnten mich für die paradiesische Schlange halten, denn auch damals gab es schon Kochäpfel’ (743)). Oskar realizes or perhaps instinctively knows that this finger belonged to Sister Dorothea (Eng. 545; Ger. 753). Oskar shapes himself as a would-be Faust and a would-be Adrian Leverkühn. He calls upon the ‘devil’, but receives no reply. He tries to consummate his long-held attraction for Dorothea, but misses the chance. Dorothea, as a nurse with religious resonance in the ‘Sister’ title—Oskar notes the syntactic link between nurses and nuns (Eng. 523; Ger. 723)—is a far cry from the prostitute Esmeralda, whose occupation and illness represent the opposite of the healing and chaste nurse/nun identity. Where I suggested that Esmeralda’s very name links her with Mephistopheles’ seductive gift of jewellery to Gretchen, Dorothea is the diametric opposite, meaning ‘God’s Gift’.

(p.179) In readings of Doctor Faustus, the standard interpretation is that Adrian’s mysterious admirer, Frau von Tolna is none other than Esmeralda and ‘the key piece of evidence that establishes the identity’ of these characters is the emerald ring that Frau von Tolna gives Adrian.37 The first to propose this link was Victor Oswald, who suggested that the ring’s serpent, with its Apollonian dart-like tongue, alludes to Esmeralda’s syphilis, another ‘gift’ to Adrian.38 This is interesting in terms of the connection between Doctor Faustus...
and The Tin Drum. Apples were the sacred fruit of Apollo, and he was often depicted reclining in a tree. Once again then, Grass’s version of the modernized Faustian tale, in its tributes to Mann’s telling, effectively debunks the myth. Where neither Adrian nor the reader ever ‘see’ Frau von Tolna (except arguably in her previous life as Esmeralda), Oskar similarly never properly meets Dorothea (except in the invisibility of darkness and the ignominy of a toilet visit). Frau von Tolna’s emerald, with its emblem as a ‘winged, serpent-like monster’ (413) (‘geflügelt-schlangenhaft[en] Ungeheuer’ (570)), appearing almost disembodied as a kind of fetishized replacement for her, is echoed by Dorothea’s aquamarine ring on a lone finger, witnessed and then worn by Vittlar, the serpent-like man sitting in the Apollonian apple tree. In response to the apparently crass symbolism of the serpent in the apple tree, Oskar (‘angrily’ (‘wütend’)) says: ‘Allegorical rubbish!’ (538) (‘Allegorisches Geschwätz!’ (743)), and the jibe stretches back to Mann’s ostensibly Faustian reading of history. There is no devil, no redemption, no mythically laden explanation of the Holocaust; instead, Oskar presents an immature, selfish, unempathetic, and often dangerously indifferent view of national identity, an identity imbued with guilt through indirect culpability and implicit association, never quite confessing in full, but only at his own convenience and with caveats and inconsistencies. I suggested that the ‘secret’ of the ‘identity’ between Mann’s narrator, Zeitblom, and his protagonist, Adrian, might be that they both depict aspiring Faustian subjects, and as numerous critics have observed, they are effectively two parts of one character. 39 Similarly, Oskar represents a divided self. Even in the very grammar of his narrative, his constant and unstable oscillation between ‘ich’ and ‘er’ echoes the difficulty of unifying different parts of a self, between culpability and denial, while looking explicitly back to incomprehensible ruin and implicitly forwards to an uncertain time beyond these ruins. Although Grass is perhaps tacitly criticizing Mann’s superficial presentation of history in Doctor Faustus, I would suggest that in fact Mann’s deeper reading, where Satan is also a fabrication and a symptom of failed Durcharbeitung on the part of someone who—like Oskar—is an unreliable narrator, is in subtle consensus with Grass’s reading. Mann may have appeared to be mythologizing history (and when beginning the novel in 1943 perhaps this was his plan), and fitting with this interpretation, Grass may have
attempted to demythologize Mann’s reading; but my interpretation proposes that Mann, like Grass, also presented an attempt in the post-war present to come to terms with horrendous national trauma rather than suggesting mythological roots for the Holocaust. The use of myth in *Doctor Faustus* as well as its ironic echo in *The Tin Drum* therefore force us to reread the historical ramifications of historical narrative.

I have spent a while explicating the effect that rereadings of the mythological aspects of these works have on their interpretations of history. Historical interpretation is of course an element of narrative temporality, but we can also take it a step further in the context of narrative time. In Figure 5.3, I suggested that a cyclical process occurs in the interpretation of these historical-allegorical narratives. Ritchie Robertson says of *Doctor Faustus* that ‘throughout the novel, a Realist portrayal of German history, focused by Zeitblom, runs alongside an allegorical portrayal of German history in the person of Leverkühn’. Although he argues that ‘[t]hese analogies […] should not be overestimated; they serve to supplement the overall correspondence, but in themselves they are external and uninformative’, and this may be true to a degree in terms of the political point, the analogies do have an effect on the temporal experience of the novel. As outlined in Figure 5.3, once we have reconsidered the intricate linguistic construction of the mythic parallels, a different way of reading the historical significance of the novel comes to light. If there is no Faust, there is no devil, and there is no pact (and *The Tin Drum* supports this view), then two points of temporal note arise. First, there also no longer exists the notion of mythological inevitability, any sense of ‘fate’ is washed away, and agency becomes a matter of active choice; Germany may have been ‘seduced’, but allowing Hitler to come to power was nevertheless a *choice*, and Gretchen’s seduction does after all occur with a man (Faust) rather than a mythically powerful being (Satan) as in the case of Faust’s pact. Second, this shift in interpretation, seeing Adrian now as Gretchen rather than Faust, also leads to a rift between what is claimed by Zeitblom and what is presented to the reader through plot, imagery, and action. This rift means that attention is refocused onto Zeitblom and his narration. Why does he paint the whole story—including the title—in a way that demonizes his friend? I contend that the story becomes as much about the guilt,
regret, and bitterness of the troubled narrator facing a future in ruins (emotional and literal), and his attempts to come to terms with a traumatic past, as it is about the factual events of that past. Oskar echoes the satanic dialogue in an ironic and absurd way (what could be more absurd than the failed seduction of a nun-like nurse on the loo?), but only in the post-war part of the novel also emphasizes the narrating process and interpretative aspect of *The Tin Drum*, moving it ever further from historical specifics and bringing it closer to the retrospective standpoint of narration. The analogical aspect of *Doctor Faustus* and *The Tin Drum* ultimately shifts the temporal focus of the novels and realigns the perspective from which we read onto the relative present of narrating and away from the past of experience, thereby altering not only perceptions of time but also perceptions of character sympathies and subjective experience more generally.

The intertwining of myth and history has another significant effect on narrative time, exhibited in both *Felix Krull* and *The Tin Drum*. Although both novels appear to correspond to the structure of the *Bildungsroman*, with young males growing up and going through formative experiences and education in life on the path towards adult maturity, the mythic–historical readings of the works stagnate any sense of development, thus slowing time. In Chapter 4 of this book, in which I considered the effect of mythic structures on the narration of time, I proposed a new interpretation of *Felix Krull*. I suggested that Felix's character may superficially echo Hermes, but that less obviously, and yet crucially, Mann also moulds the plot of the novel around the Greek myth of ‘The Judgement of Paris’. This is by no means a straightforward echo and its complications elevate it to a subtly political-historical novel, which in turn will affect temporal interpretation. This facet of *Felix Krull* has interesting parallels with *The Tin Drum* because they both act as anti-*Bildungsromane*, and this failure to develop not only stagnates narrative time, but also reflects on authorial time by drawing attention to the works’ contemporary political commentaries.
There are, as has been widely noted, numerous mythological allusions in *Felix Krull*. And as Hans Wysling puts it, ‘all half work and half don’t’ (‘Alle treffen halb zu, halb nicht’). The plot may echo the ‘Judgement of *Paris*’, but as a character Felix is likened to Hermes. Moreover, even in plot terms he is not simply the mythological Paris, but also a Paris with unresolved Oedipal tendencies. It is in these complications, however, that the political-historical meaning of *Felix Krull* may be found. Although Mann may have taken his literary cue from Goethe in his employment of the Paris myth, particularly when starting the book in 1910, it was also a favourite subject of the Nazis, as it allowed ‘the male gaze to make its selection from three specimens of female beauty’.

The scene was famously painted by two Nazi artists, Adolf Ziegler in 1937 and Ivo Saliger in 1939. Hitler even acquired Ziegler’s picture, hanging it in his Munich residence, and postcards and reproductions were widely sold. It is therefore plausible that Mann would have known of the Nazi appropriation of this myth in particular and made use of it in his development of the novel. In 1941 he wrote to Kerényi (and then repeated the sentiment in his talk on the *Joseph* novels in 1942) that ‘myth plus psychology’ (‘Mythos plus Psychologie’) was required in order ‘to take myth out of the hands of the fascist obscurantists and to “convert” it into the humane’ (‘den Mythos den fascistischen Dunkelmännern aus den Händen zu nehmen und ihn ins Humane “umzufunktionieren” ’). Not only did he do this in the *Joseph* novels, and in a very different way in *Doctor Faustus*, but arguably he was also developing this project in *Felix Krull*. Felix, like Mann, was born ‘only a few years after the glorious founding of the German Empire’ (4) (‘wenige Jahre nur nach der glorreichen Gründung des Deutschen Reiches’ (10)). And, almost as precursor to the historical tide of *Doctor Faustus* and *The Tin Drum*, in several respects we may think of him as a kind of allegory for the young Germany: immature, with delusions of grandeur (comically play-acting the Kaiser as a child (9; Ger. 16)), and ultimately—following the structure of ‘The Judgement of Paris’—apparently beginning a war he is destined to lose. The Trojan War, which Mann’s Paris might have subsequently started (had the novel been completed), could have been an echo of Germany’s responsibility for unleashing war, and Felix’s narrative standpoint from a prison cell might metaphorically point to the significance of rethinking and representation from a position of defeat and punishment.
All of this is of course speculation. But there are several contextual details that may indicate the complexity, depth, and historical significance of Mann’s use of myth in *Felix Krull*. As early as 1926, Mann observed that the return ‘into the mythic-historic-romantic mother’s womb’ *(p.183)* (‘in den mythisch-historisch-romantischen Mutterschoß’), as proposed by the (ultimately Nazi) philosopher Alfred Baeumler building on the theories of Bachofen, could be seen as a part of a Fascist tendency:

This erudite fiction must be identified for what it is, namely just as a fiction full of the current tendencies, which have less to do with the spirit of Heidelberg than the spirit of Munich.

(diese Gelehrtenfiktion muß als das gekennzeichnet werden, was sie ist, nämlich eben als eine Fiktion voller Tagestendenz, bei welcher es sich nicht sowohl um den Geist von Heidelberg, als um den von München handelt.)

Helmut Koopmann notes:

For Thomas Mann the way to the mother cult and into the unconscious-dynamic, darkness of the Romantic, as Baeumler had understood it, was a way back, which was all the more questionable as the way from the mother cult to the father principle had been the religious and cultural-historically decisive step in the evolution of humanity.

(Für Thomas Mann war der Weg in den Mutterkult und in das Unbewußt-Dynamische, Dunkle der Romantik, wie Baeumler sie verstanden hatte, ein Weg zurück, der umso bedenklicher war, als der Weg vom Mutterkult zum Vaterprinzip der religions- und kulturgeschichtlich entscheidende Schritt in der Entwicklung der Menschlichkeit gewesen war.)
Interestingly, too, Bachofen’s theory of society’s development begins with Aphrodite, who, he suggests, embodies the initial, matriarchal stage. That Mann has Felix repeatedly choose mother figures, or representations of maternal dominance (and they do dominate Felix as well as implicitly removing power from their husbands through their adultery), suggests a comic play on the figure of the matriarch. In this train, Felix’s father dies early in the novel and his godfather soon disappears from the main action. In his echoes of the mythological Paris, furthermore, Felix also effectively chooses ‘Aphrodite’, the goddess who offers the most beautiful woman as the bribe. In his employment of the Paris myth, Mann already makes use of a well-trodden Nazified myth. And through his particular Oedipal spin on Paris, Mann constructs Felix as embodying what Mann perceived to be a particularly Fascist view of social development.

If this reading is plausible, then Felix Krull casts further light on the historical significance of The Tin Drum. From the very opening of the novel, Oskar is transfixed with the idea of returning to the womb and is only dissuaded from doing so at once by the promise of a tin drum for his third birthday. There is a strong echo of Oedipal feelings here too, with Oskar’s lack of definitive father figure and repeated erotic interest in mother figures. Furthermore, the dichotomy between maternal fixation and paternal lack has specific political and aesthetic ramifications:

For Oskar, the mother fixation is positive, but the source of (almost) overwhelming anguish, whilst the events of the day are simply expressions of the eternal undifferentiated cycle of (masculine) violence, betrayal and ideologically-inspired cruelty. The subjective view predominates, the historical one shades off into myth, an imaginary appropriation of the world.47
But the point here is that both Felix and Oskar present ostensible novels of development yet the protagonists fail to develop. Oskar, like Felix, leaves a home where there seems to be no figure of paternal authority he could respect, and—among other things—travels to Paris (like Felix) to serve the troops rather than the hotel guests. Although Felix is beguiling and Oskar is grotesque, they both combine precocious sexual abilities (Felix allegedly experiencing a degree of arousal at his wet nurse’s breast and having his first sexual encounter with the family maid, and Oskar being initiated into sexual maturity, he says, by his then babysitter, Maria, who later becomes his stepmother, further emphasizing the maternal element—and her name is also, of course, emphatically maternal), and throughout their ‘memoirs’, they construct a pattern of sexual experiences, to which I referred in Chapter 4. Both characters start life with pretentions of maturity, but both then fail to overcome their childish desires and develop fully into adulthood.

These repeated oedipal resonances have a stagnating effect. In his analysis of the German *Bildungsroman*, Minden suggests that

the *successful negotiation* of the Oedipal stage is [...] a sort of *Bildungsroman*. The Oedipus Complex is also, after all, the story of how a middle-class European male can combine the love of the mother with succession to the father without ultimately destructive rivalry or reabsorption into a pre-individuated state. Just like the *Bildungsroman*, it is a highly precarious compromise which strives at the same time to establish itself as a norm.48
Felix Krull and The Tin Drum in these terms depict failed processes of Bildung. In Mann’s novel, the narrative prolepsis to Felix’s prison cell (p.185) indicates that he does not adequately mature into his role as adult male, while in Grass’s work Oskar is similarly not the mature and trustworthy adult narrator given his confinement to an insane asylum. Combined with the Fascist echoes—at least as Mann understood them—of the matriarch, Felix Krull presents an anti-development, much as Mann predicted for the theories of Baeumler and Bachofen, and this is in many respects echoed in The Tin Drum. The more intricate ramifications of the mythological allusions in Felix Krull therefore turn it into a novel with historical-political significance. Moreover, the way in which this is played out not only specifically harks back to proto-Nazi philosophical ‘thinking’, but also links Mann’s novel to The Tin Drum, which similarly presents an unstable protagonist/narrator with an unresolved Oedipal complex. As forms of a kind of pseudo-Bildungsroman, both novels in fact show stunted development, which in turn halts the traditional momentum of narrative time. Again the superficial historical thread must be reconsidered in the light of the novels’ mythological allusions, which in turn affect the way in which we perceive the temporal momentum of the individual’s story.
The use of metaphor in *Maus*, where different communities are depicted as different types of animal, emphasizes the work’s artifice as an artistic product and also impacts on the temporal perspective by disrupting the distance between reader, narrator, and protagonist. The magic realism of *The Tin Drum* and the outspoken mythological parallels of *Doctor Faustus*, mould the works first and foremost as aesthetic creations rather than as historical artefacts. And the title and immediate visual impact of *Maus* at once indicate the prioritization of authenticity over factuality. At the start of the novel, Artie, whose name is also obviously the author’s own, says to his father: ‘I still want to draw that book about you’; for all the evident fiction of talking animals, we are told immediately that we are effectively reading a kind of biographical account (14). I say ‘kind of’ because this is as much about the dialogue between father and son in the recent past (the time of Vladek’s recounting), the *Durcharbeitung* of Artie’s own family history and personal memories, and the act of transcribing stories, as it is about his father’s life before, during, and after the Holocaust. In several notable scenes, Spiegelman draws explicit and self-conscious attention to the artistic process, reminding us that these cartoon animals are metaphors for communities defined by Nazi classification. And the inclusion of such scenes not only disrupts narrative time in plain chronological terms but also challenges the function of history in the work, again prompting us to reconsider the specific personal story.
Artie opens Volume II of *Maus* with doodled attempts to depict his wife Françoise (Figure 5.5). He has sketched various types of animal, all with (p.186) the same stripy top and jaunty scarf (stereotypically French). The intradiegetic Françoise then appears and asks Artie what he is doing. His answer shakes up the time equilibrium of the whole graphic novel. He tells Françoise that he is trying to work out how to draw her and they then discuss the possibilities together and agree that she should also be a mouse. (p.187) Since we see her arrive on the scene as a mouse, and indeed have done so throughout Volume I of the novel as well, the narrative illusion is disrupted. What we are reading in Artie’s account is obviously anterior to the time at which he experienced it as narrator. Not only, then, is his father’s recollected experience the time of the past, but so is Artie’s time of artistic production. Where does this leave us? We are no longer in step with the narrator: this is neither thriller nor detective fiction (in temporal terms), but demonstrates that everything we have thus far read was all an authorial decision—and clearly a highly subjective one—that dictated the adoption of ways of depicting ‘racial’ groups conforming to Nazi stereotypes. At this point in the work, the opening of Volume II, we are sent back interpretatively to the whole preceding volume. What it means is that Artie has been narrating the time of his father’s recounting, rather than the time of his narrating. This readjusts the perspectival standpoint once again. Where Oskar and Zeitblom, as well as Felix in fact, all seem to be on a relatively stable plane in the narrating present, here we discover—and it should have been evident—that Artie is recollecting the time of his father’s recollection, creating multiple mise en abyme memories, rather than existing in some recognizable relative present. The symbolic fact of the right to be a mouse through identification with the victims in turn raises multiple questions about identity. The allegorical function of the work means that individual and historical time merge—the individual characters have literally been typecast and very clearly belong to collectives—but they also conflict in the sense that history continues and supersedes these tales, while the individual lives are not timeless.
The problematic question of identity and the narrative process disrupts perceptions of time in another scene shortly after the one depicted in Figure 5.5. The title of the panel is ‘Time flies’ (Figure 5.6). Artie sits at his work desk—as a man in a mouse mask—and whips through notable dates, backwards and forwards at an uneven rate. He juxtaposes his family life and forthcoming baby with the statement ‘Between May 16, 1944, and May 24, 1944 over 100,000 Hungarian Jews were gassed in Auschwitz’, before describing the publication and success of his book. Spiegelman specifically uses time here—the simple mention of dates (no recreation, no metalepses, no memory or anticipation)—to create identity in the present and recolour what we have read of the past. The panels eventually zoom out to identify the source of the flies (the symbolism of the stench of the past continuing to haunt is palpable): piles of dead, naked mice.

**Figure 5.5.** ‘Trying to figure out how to draw you.’ (p. 171)

piled up to Artie’s feet, over which journalists and agents, hungry for a share in his success, thoughtlessly clamber; the final bubble at the bottom of the page creates another ironic juxtaposition through the pun on ‘shoot’, where—in the context of all the dead mice—the word ‘shoot’ obviously has more deadly connotations. Artie feels like a fraud. As with the previous (p.188) doodles of Françoise, this scene draws attention to the fact that Artie, having Jewish heritage, chose to identify himself with the mice of the Holocaust. But here, he demonstrates that he was not a victim like they were—they are after all piled around his desk (and they are real mice, not humans disguised as mice). The mouse mask links him to the victims (p.189) through connection and identification, while distancing himself from them through experience. The use of metaphor therefore prompts a rereading of the work’s historical significance, while also further emphasizing its self-conscious artifice. The particular form of Spiegelman’s use of metaphor and the timing of his self-reflective scenes on the artistic process serve to shift the boundaries between reader, narrator, and protagonist. We discover that we are not on the same temporal plane as the narration (as appears to be the case in Doctor Faustus, The Tin Drum, and Felix Krull), while Artie also emphasizes his experiential and temporal distance from his father. This creates several degrees of alienation as the intricate construction of time in the work reflects the complex, multiple subjective tensions of distinct characters.
Mario and the Magician offers an interesting contrast to the models outlined above. One major respect in which it differs from Doctor Faustus, The Tin Drum, and Maus is the specific time in which it was written in relation to the historical context on which it focuses. That is, Mann wrote Mario in 1929 and in it sought to comment on the contemporary political climate rather than past historical events. Although the narrator uses the traditional narrating instance of retrospect, looking back with personal hindsight, he cannot have real historical hindsight about the shape of national and international developments thereafter. When we read Doctor Faustus, The Tin Drum, and Maus, the narrators’ historical knowledge overlaps to a considerable degree with our own (although Mann began Doctor Faustus before the end of the Second World War, he finished it afterwards). This is not the case with Mario. Here we know far more than the narrator about the effect of tyrannical, inhumane, ‘cult of the
personality’ dictatorships. The narrator’s retrospective voice in fact belies what is essentially a historically *prophetic* tale. Mann takes the sense of foreboding sweeping Europe in the late 1920s with the whipping up of extreme politics and collective bewitchment, and allegorically suggests a possible future outcome. The egotistical, mindlessly cruel construction of charisma and dominance, and the combination of the enthralling and the threatening embodied in Cipolla strongly suggests the ‘rhetorical prowess and theatrical swagger’ of Mussolini, who ‘exercised the privilege of keeping the audience waiting for his appearance, as does Cipolla’ and, like Cipolla, ‘was initially not taken seriously, and resorted to sadistic measures to intimidate the opposition’. But the ‘unexpected event’ (*unerhörte Begebenheit*) at the end, where a humiliated young waiter, Mario, emerges from the crowd to shoot Cipolla dead, is almost just wishful thinking in historical terms. Mario’s own motivations are moreover profoundly personal; the collective audience may experience an increasing sense of discomfort but it is not sufficient to shake them from their complacency and encourage them to put a stop to the increasingly concerning show, whereas Mario’s personal embarrassment provides the catalyst needed to stop Cipolla. The narrator tells his children, ‘that was the end’ (‘das war das Ende’), and continues for the reader, ‘A terrifying end, a most fatal end. And yet even so a liberating end’ (‘Ein Ende mit Schrecken, ein höchst fatales Ende. Und ein befreiendes Ende dennoch’). But no such end transpired in Italy or Germany. Does Mann then simply offer a revolutionary story that calls the reader to awake from their political stupefaction and become aware of the dangers of Fascism? Perhaps the ending is more generally symbolic of the breakdown of law and order, and the necessity of violence in the face of the seemingly relentless tide of evil.
In terms of the temporal analysis of history in narrative, however, *Mario* necessitates further nuance for our overall model. The diagram I presented in Figure 5.1, indicating the impact of historical hindsight on our reading experience, does not quite work for this novella. *Mario*, like *Doctor Faustus*, *The Tin Drum*, and *Maus*, concerns itself with historical events—in the sense that they were of universal importance. But the narrator does not know where Fascism in the 1930s will go and how the Second World War will develop, unlike the other works, which concern themselves predominantly with the past. The anticipation of future events based on historical circumstance in the present results in a significant disjuncture between the temporal experience of contemporary readers and readers today. Historical hindsight in *Doctor Faustus*, *The Tin Drum*, and *Maus* allows us to interpolate; that is, we know the shape of history so we can anticipate the path of the individual characters moving through this context. In *Mario*, however, Mann extrapolates; in other words, he takes his knowledge of the present context and draws an imaginary line into the future, suggesting the possible form it might take.

Initially then, as the unnamed narrator of *Mario* describes the unsettling nationalistic atmosphere in the holiday resort, which is metonymic rather than metaphorical, our temporal experience is driven by curiosity: we know the outcome of nationalistic fervour and the atmosphere of exclusion and alienation brewing at this stage of history, and we wonder how the characters in this particular story will experience the context. But then Cipolla’s (p.191) performance shifts the political function of the narrative from metonym to metaphor: Cipolla stands in for fascist, dictatorial, and ruthless leaders, obsessed with their own egos while disregarding the dignity of others. At this point the temporal force driving our reading experience (and this is shared by readers then and now) becomes suspense rather than curiosity. Mann moves into the unknown: what *might* happen if we heed the allure and rhetoric of tyrannical performers (be they political or theatrical). But this is not all. Our knowledge of what actually happened at such historical moments jars with what we read here. Time is therefore thickened; we compare the metaphorical prediction with our own historical retrospection, which moves time simultaneously forwards and backwards. *Mario* therefore requires a slightly different diagram, as shown in Figure 5.7.
Here, I just consider the reader’s relation to the historical thread of the story. The temporal drives move differently for post-war readers from how they would have done for readers at the time of the novella’s publication in 1930. Where contemporary readers would have been driven by curiosity about the retrospective story and suspense about the anticipation of future developments, the suspense that drives us today about Mann’s anticipation of future developments is complicated by our knowledge of historical reality. The contemporary reader moved in a linear direction broadly in step with the narrator, whereas we experience two times at the same time: that of Mann’s allegorical prediction for historical developments and our hindsight about what was actually to come. These times are clearly incompatible and therefore create a temporal tension as we implicitly compare Mann’s outline for history with the reality. *Mario* presents just an instant in comparison to the novels discussed above. Just a short holiday trip, eventually zooming in on one evening in particular. This is a temporal snapshot, showing the character but not the form of the political tide at the time. It therefore combines history in the contemporary present (p.192) with the anticipation (from Mann) as to what might occur in the future, while the narrative voice misleadingly casts it all in the past.

*Figure 5.7. Temporal drives of pre-war v. post-war reader.*
In these four works, the use of allegory and the metonymic function of individual stories effectively thicken time. We read not only the characters’ personal narratives, but also the wider historical contexts for which they stand allegorically. With *Doctor Faustus*, *The Tin Drum*, and *Maus*, the narrators have hindsight about the historical events they relate: they know the outcomes and therefore can situate the personal tales within wider historical contexts. With *Mario*, however, we are in the strange position of knowing more than the narrator about the wider meaning of the events they describe. Time is therefore thickened by the allegorical aspect of the novella, but then jarred by the disjunction between history as anticipated by Mann and as it actually occurred. The novella begins as metonym, showing one family’s experience in one resort as a kind of exemplar for the wider political tide. By the end, it has shifted from metonym without moving straightforwardly to metaphor; the enthralling but dangerous conjuror on stage may resemble the character of power-hungry, sadistic dictators, but the events do not fit into this metaphor. Time in the novella may progress in a linear fashion, but in terms of its wider allegorical function, it jumps abruptly from the character of events in the present at the time of writing to an extrapolated expectation of the violence this may provoke in the future and in turn suggests that such violence may be required to put a stop to this tide of events.

**Conclusion**

The age through which Mann lived was one of such colossal and turbulent change that a consideration of his works with an emphasis on ‘history’ might seem to reduce the scope of the discussion to moments of extreme historical crisis in the twentieth century. Grass, a key literary successor to Mann, powerfully engages with a similar time period in a very different way, and in his intertextual references he opens a kind of dialogue with Mann’s writing. Spiegelman’s *Maus* provides a myriad of further points of comparison and contrast: a second-generation perspective on the Holocaust, the lives of survivors rather than perpetrators, an autobiographical rather than fictional point of view, and the additional visual element. Although *Felix Krull* and *Mario and the Magician* do not engage directly with the Holocaust, they too are concerned with the upheavals of twentieth-century history.
So what is the wider point of this discussion? The juxtaposition of history—in the sense of wider events that affect collectives, communities, (p.193) countries, nations—with time as it is subjectively lived and experienced by each of us as individuals raises a point of perennial significance beyond the confines of a single historical period. The very notion of history here returns to Norbert Elias’s concept of social time. In one respect, history might be no more measurable than subjective time. But precisely because of its importance for collectives rather than individuals, the marking of historical events calls for some collectively agreed mode of measurement. Although this chapter focused on works with a pronounced historical engagement, there are several points beyond this question that arise: the distinction between collectively marked time and subjectively felt time; readers’ pre-existing degrees of knowledge of timelines, dates, events, historical context that they bring to the work; and the use of myth, metaphor, and allegory as mediating functions between history and its telling. These are all aspects that complicate the temporal experience of narrative, while also bringing in further threads of discussion about human experience and its narrative reflection more generally. Because much of this book has concentrated on the ways in which time is experienced by individual characters or by the reader, this chapter necessarily adds the dimension of how individuals fit into a wider collective. To return to Herder’s idea that there are as many times in the universe as there are objects, places, and people:51 in a subjective sense this may well be true, but it is worth reconceiving the concept of social time as subjectively felt temporality within a collectively measured whole. (p.194)
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