Goethe’s *Faust*, its two parts published almost a quarter of a century apart, is comparable only to Shakespeare’s dramas in its capacity to speak anew to every age and culture. This is confirmed by the book under review, whose fifteen chapters, each by a different hand, cover a very wide area – geographically, culturally, linguistically, temporally, and in terms of performance practice. The list of contributors is impressive: all can claim expertise, and many distinction, in their field. Yet, given the continuing tradition of excellence in British Goethe studies, one may regret that only one – a specialist in English, not German – hails from the UK.

After an introduction noting that the volume focuses on the adaptation, reception, and translation of Faustian discourse in global cultural traditions including those of China, Africa, India, Japan, Brazil, and Canada, as well as Europe, the book is divided into five parts: I, ‘Anteriorities’ (texts preceding Goethe’s); II, ‘Faust in Context’ (aspects of Goethe’s text); III, ‘Romantic Intertexts’ (Byron and Coleridge); IV, ‘Asia’ (the Middle East as well as countries mentioned above); and V, ‘The Americas, Europe, Africa and Britain’, the latter presented as an island entire of itself. In general, this is a viable structure, although Parts I and II might usefully have been reversed.

This is chiefly because the first two chapters, which together constitute Part I, are (leaving aside the specific difficulty posed by Coleridge) the weakest of the volume. The latter’s intention to ‘engage previously neglected Faustian materials’ (1) means that, rather than established antecedents, more questionable forerunners have been sought. The conceptual flaws in these chapters are inevitably reflected in the argument. In the first, by Arnd Bohm, supposed references to Alexander the Great in Marlowe’s and Goethe’s dramas are illustrated (or rather, not illustrated) by quotations from other texts of dubious relevance. In the second, by Jane Curran, later puppet texts, plainly influenced by Goethe’s drama, are made to appear as its antecedents. Despite some interesting material, these chapters do not carry conviction.

Part II, by contrast, includes Ehrhard Bahr’s ‘Faust and Satan’: Conflicting Concepts of the Devil in *Faust I*, essential for understanding how variants on these figures discussed in later chapters accord with or diverge from Goethe’s conception of them. Had this been the opening chapter, the volume would have rested on a reliable basis. Particular attention should be paid to Bahr’s comments on Faust’s salvation (98–101), as later chapters (210, 247) give a one-sided view of this. The other two chapters in Part II, by Alan Corkhill and Claudia Brodsky, show that the interpretative potential of Goethe’s original text is far from exhausted.

Part III, the essay by Fred Parker, the only UK contributor, on *Faust* and Byron is lucid, focused, and elegantly written. The understanding of Goethe’s text shown by this Anglist is faultless. The same may be said of Frederick Burwick, but not of his overstated claim in Chapter 7 – identical with the introduction to his edition of an English *Faust* translation – to have found ‘Goethe’s *Faust* Translated by Coleridge’. The resultant controversy makes it imperative to state here that those who have questioned this claim are Germanists of the highest integrity with no axe to grind, but rather with a genuine concern for standards of evidence in scholarly publication.

The remaining two parts of the volume concern the reception and adaptation of *Faust* in the twentieth century, particularly in non-Christian and/ or non-European contexts. It is fascinating to see how the richness and openness of Goethe’s text facilitates its productive adaptation for Hindu, Muslim, Chinese, and postcolonial African and Brazilian audiences, utilising a variety of artistic forms and media including opera, rock musicals, Japanese-style puppetry, traditional dance, music, speech rhythms, and film, and to discover how Part II of
Faust, difficult to stage or even to understand in ‘normal’ Western dramatic terms, generates new meaning in innovative, intermedial productions which also demonstrate how drama can help to change the world. That broadly Brechtian principles inform some of the productions underlines this point.

Despite some unevenness, this is a worthwhile addition to Faust literature, albeit one rather heavily weighted towards Anglophone reception. Although the introduction cites the ‘traditional, European focus of Faust studies’ (4) to justify neglecting this area, there is in fact more to say about it, as shown, for instance, by Lea Marquart’s recent study of the French reception of Faust, Goethes ‘Faust’ in Frankreich (2009), which is accessible only to German speakers. Had the weaker chapters of the present volume been omitted, there might have been room for new material in this area. There is certainly scope for a companion volume, in English, on Faust’s fortunes in Europe.
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