Hans-Dieter Zimmermann’s essay on ‘Kafkas Prag und die kleinen Literaturen’, for instance, covers much of the same ground as Andreas B. Kilcher’s more general piece on Kafka and Judaism in the same section. The fact, finally, that less than a quarter of the volume is dedicated to Kafka’s individual works is curious and rather disappointing, and it is in this section that the lack of a more binding framework is most noticeable. Ultimately, then, the volume’s title is something of a misnomer, for in conception and structure the new handbook is closer to the English format of the companion. While offering a stimulating and broad-ranging snapshot of Kafka criticism in the twenty-first century, the new *Kafka-Handbuch* is unlikely to replace its predecessor as a standard reference work.
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Peter-André Alt differentiates his book from Hanns Zischler’s *Kafka geht ins Kino* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1996) in terms of his own focus on the ‘fictional’ instead of the ‘autobiographical’ texts. He presents numerous new insights even into texts that have been critically analysed as often as *Der Proceß*. For example, the author convincingly argues that the Doppelgänger structures of two contemporary films help us understand Josef K.’s situation. Kafka turns the films’ explicitly fantastical ‘Spaltungsgeschichten’ into a subtler and more realistic story of psychological self-division: ‘Aus der Doppelgänger-Erzählung des Films [Max Mack’s *Der Andere*] macht Kafkas Roman eine Geschichte, die im Zeichen des Unbewuβten steht’ (p. 116). Alt also persuasively presents the early collection *Betrachtung* as experimental sequences of ‘Bewegungsbilder, Lichteffekte und Momentaufnahme’ (p. 47) as found similarly in early film. He makes good use of manuscript changes to demonstrate how Kafka either made the connections to film more explicit or (more commonly) made them less conspicuous, as part of the process of adaptation and assimilation.

However, the book raises one essential question which it never answers: is Kafka really influenced by film (his texts being ‘Reflexe des frühen Films’, p. 11), or are both his writing and contemporary film influenced by wider cultural changes? Especially in the chapter on ‘Verkehr und Film’, the author seems at times almost to acknowledge that the posited causal connection is a fragile one: ‘die filmästhetischen Referenzen [. . .] erschlieβen sich jedoch nur über Umwege, die wiederum zum Thema der urbanen Wahrnehmung zurückführen’ (p. 74). The ultimate inspiration here seems to be not modern film but perception in the modern world—to which Kafka responds (‘der Text ahmt eine menschliche Wahrnehmungspraxis nach’, p. 73) as film-makers do.


*Kafka und der Film* is a concise and readable book, whose declared intention is to illuminate the ‘cinematographic’ structures and contents of Kafka’s narratives through an analysis of the (silent) film of his era, in order ‘die innere Logik seiner Geschichten aus ihrem filmischen Organisation verständlich zu machen’ (p. 11).

Peter-André Alt differentiates his book from Hanns Zischler’s *Kafka geht ins Kino* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1996) in terms of his own focus on the ‘fictional’ instead of the ‘autobiographical’ texts. He presents numerous new insights even into texts that have been critically analysed as often as *Der Proceß*. For example, the author convincingly argues that the Doppelgänger structures of two contemporary films help us understand Josef K.’s situation. Kafka turns the films’ explicitly fantastical ‘Spaltungsgeschichten’ into a subtler and more realistic story of psychological self-division: ‘Aus der Doppelgänger-Erzählung des Films [Max Mack’s *Der Andere*] macht Kafkas Roman eine Geschichte, die im Zeichen des Unbewuβten steht’ (p. 116). Alt also persuasively presents the early collection *Betrachtung* as experimental sequences of ‘Bewegungsbilder, Lichteffekte und Momentaufnahme’ (p. 47) as found similarly in early film. He makes good use of manuscript changes to demonstrate how Kafka either made the connections to film more explicit or (more commonly) made them less conspicuous, as part of the process of adaptation and assimilation.

However, the book raises one essential question which it never answers: is Kafka really influenced by film (his texts being ‘Reflexe des frühen Films’, p. 11), or are both his writing and contemporary film influenced by wider cultural changes? Especially in the chapter on ‘Verkehr und Film’, the author seems at times almost to acknowledge that the posited causal connection is a fragile one: ‘die filmästhetischen Referenzen [. . .] erschlieβen sich jedoch nur über Umwege, die wiederum zum Thema der urbanen Wahrnehmung zurückführen’ (p. 74). The ultimate inspiration here seems to be not modern film but perception in the modern world—to which Kafka responds (‘der Text ahmt eine menschliche Wahrnehmungspraxis nach’, p. 73) as film-makers do.
The author’s claims about Das Schloß in relation to Murnau’s Nosferatu (1922) manifest this equivocation: the film was first shown in Prague too late to have influenced Kafka’s novel, but Alt claims that the location of the filming was the same place that inspired Kafka’s castle. Here again, then, both media respond to something in the real world, rather than one to the other: it is ‘nicht der Film, sondern die reale Erfahrung, die hier prägend wirkte [. . .]. Die Arsenale der Einbildungskraft, die Literatur und Kino belieferten, schienen hier identisch’ (p. 172). In relation to this, it is also not clear whether the author is claiming that Kafka’s engagement with film was deliberate or not: words like ‘aufmerksam’ and ‘programmatisch’ appear rather surprisingly towards the end, given that a more complex interaction has hitherto been posited.

Alt’s conclusion, that Kafka’s writing inhabits ‘[den] Bereich eines neuen Sehens von Bewegungsvorgängen innerhalb unterschiedlichster sozialer Topographien’ (p. 194), seems not to need film as explanans for text: the ‘produktive Interaktion’ he mentions is not the same as an influence of one upon another, and the most plausible conclusion seems ultimately that the two media ‘sich auf ein gemeinsames Drittes [stützen]’ (p. 187). Correlation and causality are never systematically distinguished.
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First published in 1981, Das gespaltene Bewusstsein brought together in a single volume Hans Dieter Schäfer’s pioneering work on the cultural history of Germany in the mid-twentieth century. In addition to the title essay documenting everyday culture under National Socialism, the volume included Schäfer’s two ground-breaking articles from the 1970s, ‘Die nichtnationalsozialistische Literatur der jungen Generation im Dritten Reich‘ and ‘Zur Periodisierung der deutschen Literatur seit 1930’. All three essays remain, empirically and methodologically, pieces of lasting scholarly significance which question stubbornly persistent assumptions about cultural practice under National Socialism. Their republication in a substantially revised and extended version of the book is a welcome reminder of that significance, but their contrasting treatment in this new edition is also a telling indicator of the development of Schäfer’s thinking in the last thirty years. While the last two are relegated to an appendix and their polemical claims largely retracted, the first opens the collection and provides the central analytical category which runs through the volume: the ‘schizophrenic’ mentality which Schäfer diagnoses as symptomatic of the German response to National Socialism. That notion is developed further in the only previously unpublished piece in the book, a self-reflective ‘Nachwort’ which explores the split consciousness of prominent post-war intellectuals and politicians, principal among them Ludwig