

Chapter 3

FROM SHAKESPEARE TO GOETHE

German Golden Age Literature and Silver Screen Literacy in Trans/national Times

Bridget Levine-West

Released in the United States as *Young Goethe in Love*, Phillip Stölzl's *Goethe!* offers viewers a semi-fictionalized account of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe in his twenties by intertwining biographical events with scenarios mined from his *Sturm und Drang* output, particularly *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* (The Sorrows of Young Werther).¹ Playfully entitled *Goethe!* in German, this biopic/adaptation appears to represent yet another Hollywood-inspired, escapist, and ostensibly apolitical German entertainment film. Upon the film's release in 2010, critics singled it out as flawed for focusing too much on the intensity of a tragic love story set against picturesque eighteenth-century landscapes with insufficient attention to historical accuracy. Writing for *Der Tagesspiegel*, Jan Schulz-Ojala characterized the director's approach this way:

For as lovingly as Stölzl and his production team depicted—albeit digitally—the court in Wetzlar, Lotte's Wahlheim, and Goethe's Frankfurt, he was equally cavalier in how he dealt with history . . . For Stölzl it's not so much about unavoidably subjective coloring that would crop up even with the most scrupulous treatment of the source material, rather about indulging in a somewhat coarse approach and in cinematic clichés.²

Notably tongue-in-cheek, Schulz-Ojala locates the film's sole saving grace in its ability to enthrall school students whose teachers take them to the film in the (in his view mistaken) hope of fleshing out the lived experiences of the poet. "But it doesn't matter," he writes, "if German school classes storm the movie theaters en masse in order to grab hold

of the true, rakish, handsome Goethe; at least the theater owners will be overjoyed.”³

If understood as box-office fare meant to entertain at the expense of edification, *Goethe!* would neatly join the ranks of a cadre of German films created during a period of post-Wall “cinematic normalization.”⁴ This trend, first labeled by Eric Rentschler as a move toward a “cinema of consensus”⁵ and seen in its later manifestations as a strategic “transnational turn” per Randall Halle’s analysis, results in films that ostensibly diminish their factual and historical contexts and instead emphasize melodramatic plots to captivate heterogeneous audiences around the world lacking a shared collective memory.⁶ As Halle explains, this recalibration of filmmaking practices for global circulation entails the loss of the national pedagogical agendas that had shaped earlier German film productions. Whereas pedagogical concerns had been reflected in and were constitutive of films like Wolfgang Staudte’s *Die Mörder sind unter uns* (The Murderers are Among Us, 1946) and Fassbinder’s *Die Ehe der Maria Braun* (The Marriage of Maria Braun, 1979), which criticized Germany’s engagement in World War Two, as well as Fassbinder’s *Fontane Effi Briest* (1974) and Egon Günther’s *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* (The Sorrows of Young Werther, 1976), which condemned the overly rigid social conditions that led to the death of their films’ protagonists, Halle sees in the post-national period the stark absence of these influences and elements, precisely those that Schulz-Ojala bemoans as lacking in *Goethe!*⁷ Halle instead locates nation-state projects of education, which continue with or without indexical filmic representation, as relegated to venues separate from, and only ancillary to, the film product itself. He points here to government agencies and media conglomerates who step in post-production and retool these popular products for the edification of national audience members via *Filmhefte* (film booklets), providing background information, ready-made lesson plans, and classroom activities that support the teaching of contemporary films.

The linear progression implied by Halle, in which films are first produced for transnational entertainment purposes and later become reworked to address national pedagogical concerns, as well as the dichotomy between the descriptors “entertaining” and “educational” advanced by critics and scholars alike, deserve reconsideration given a more pervasive pedagogical mission undergirding recent adaptations of Golden Age German texts in films such as *Goethe!*⁸ While we can trace the origins of this “Goethe boom” back to a global trend that had picked up speed roughly a decade earlier in Britain and the United States,⁹ these adaptations of German literary works were created, at

least in part, in relation to a robust pedagogical agenda advanced by the German federal government. Put another way, while media literacy education initiatives in Germany certainly do affect the post-production dissemination and reception of some films, they also provide social and economic impetuses for the films' creation, and often inform their look and mission. In the German film context, education and entertainment are intriguingly interconnected components. These intertwined components are interesting because, as I unpack here, they represent a poignant focal point for insights into contemporary German culture as it negotiates the transnational turn; they also offer implications for research into heritage film productions globally.

To shed light on this phenomenon, I open with an analysis of government-driven media literacy incentives in twenty-first-century Germany. While the incentives affect *German* film productions and co-productions, I situate these developments within the broader framework of a transnational trend: namely, the active collaboration between European national governments and film industry professionals to bolster film literacy among the school-age demographic. I demonstrate how these initiatives implicitly, at least in the context studied here, spur the inclusion of adaptations in educational contexts,¹⁰ and then shift the focus to two case studies from what I elsewhere have labeled the "Goethe boom" trend:¹¹ Leander Haußmann's *Kabale und Liebe* (Intrigue and Love, 2005), based on Schiller's eponymous play, and Stölzl's *Goethe!* I situate the production of these films at a three-way nexus of commercial trends, media literacy discourses, and anxieties about the legacy of national products in transnational times. Close readings of the films and their *Filmhefte* reveal the imagined ideal viewer(s) of the works, the value systems that the films support, and the promotion of media literacy skills with which they are tasked. What emerges through these examples is a self-reflexive stance that Goethe boom films take toward adaptation, which not only channels national discourse on film literacy but in turn promotes adaptation as a skill, even if the situational constraints of *Filmbildung* (film education) praxis prevent the educational materials for these films from wholly tapping into their progressive potential.

***Filmbildung* and the Worldwide Shakespeare Boom**

During the 1990s and early 2000s, British heritage film productions and Hollywood adaptations of Shakespeare created an international splash.

As a result, modernizations of Anglo-American canonical texts, most especially works by Shakespeare, began popping up worldwide. For instance, localized emulations of this trend emerged in Mexico (Fernando Sariñana's *Amar te Duele*, 2002), Korea (Won-guk Lim's *Nalnari jongbujeon*, 2008), Brazil (Bruno Barreto's *O Casamento de Romeu e Julieta*, 2005), and Italy (Volfango de Biasi's *Iago*, 2009), with directors adapting and/or modernizing Shakespeare's plays in line with their own national audiences' tastes, customs, cultures, and languages. Yet in Germany, the foreign market where the Shakespeare boom films were most well-received (as measured by ticket sales, film profits, and number of continued or repeated showings), the hype surrounding the Hollywood films sparked a noticeably different trend. Working in the land that had long ago laid claim to the English bard,¹² German directors instead turned their efforts to creating adaptations and modernizations of their country's own canonical literary works, dismayed that, while modernizations of German plays succeeded on the German stage, these same works rarely received treatment in German post-Wall cinema.¹³ The resulting group of films ranges from studio films to independent productions, including works such as Uwe Janson's *Werther* (2005), Rolf Teigler's *Penthesilea Moabit* (2008), Sebastian Schipper's *Mitte Ende August* (Sometime in August, 2009), and Dominik Graf's *Die geliebten Schwestern* (Beloved Sisters, 2014).

That a film trend largely centering on Shakespeare (and other iconic writers) in the 1990s resulted in German canonical literature appearing on the silver screen in the early 2000s to some extent parallels the type of productive appropriation of Shakespeare undertaken during the *Sturm und Drang*, when writers in German-speaking principalities engaged with Shakespeare's output in a similar way. With the aim of creating national-theater productions that could vie with those of other countries, authors such as Bodmer, Wieland, Lessing, Lenz, and, of course, Goethe identified Shakespearean *emulation*, as opposed to the translation or mere imitation of his works, as a means of bringing stories of assumed German origin to the stage. The result of this decades-long undertaking spurred the creation of numerous original works that channeled a certain Shakespearean spirit but were distinctly "German" in nature. In short, the very works that were revisited for the twenty-first century originally emerged because of creative Shakespeare appropriation in the eighteenth century.

Although German directors' engagement with the Shakespeare boom follows an intriguing cultural precedent in the German-speaking context, several political and industrial factors coincided to make

the recirculation of Golden Age works highly attractive at this time. Specifically, the release of the Shakespeare boom films occurred as the German government was increasing its support for film production, with a particular emphasis being given to enhancing school students' media literacies through film study. The interventions and initiatives detailed below, themselves a local manifestation of a global phenomenon, shed light on how German educational concerns and, eventually, policies led to a nationalization—rather than a mere localization or emulation—of Shakespeare boom film strategies and aesthetics.

To put this development into a historical and global context, we must look back to 1998, a year when several seemingly separate issues converged, leading to the production of the films in focus in this chapter. First, in January of that year, the British Film Policy Review Group, commissioned by Britain's secretary of state for media, culture and sport, proposed that the state engage in a media literacy project with the British film industry in order to "boost film education" in schools.¹⁴ Second, in October, Germany's chancellor, Gerhard Schröder, established the position of *Beauftragte für Kultur und Medien* (Federal government commissioner for culture and media, BKM), centralizing tasks that until then had—unlike in Britain under the aforementioned secretary of state—occurred disparately across Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development, and Federal Ministry of Education and Research. Third, in early December, Madden's *Shakespeare in Love* was released in the United States; some months later, it opened worldwide, receiving great acclaim, including in Germany in particular. While these three events occurred in geographically different locales, together they create an intriguing backdrop for understanding how, when, and why German directors started to create films foregrounding Germany's literary heritage.

By establishing the position of BKM, Schröder put Germany on a course of updating and aligning national media policy activities with practices already established elsewhere in Europe. Just as the aim of the recommendations put forth by Britain's Film Policy Review Group in January 1998 was to "build the infrastructure of a self-sustaining, commercial film industry . . . [that will] lay the foundations of a healthy and diverse film culture, allowing a wide range of film-making, from the shoestring budget to the blockbuster, to flourish throughout the UK,"¹⁵ so too was Schröder's establishment of the BKM later that same year, which itself was prompted by a range of economic and pro-film-industry incentives that he hoped would positively influence the Ger-

man cultural landscape. He presented the move as a way to make cultural policy a central task of European domestic policy,¹⁶ a prioritization of cultural production that was immediately reflected in an increase in federal funding for artistic production,¹⁷ with a sizable portion specifically earmarked for German filmmaking.¹⁸ While financial assistance offset production and distribution costs, within a few short years the BKM had increased the government's reach of their media policies, expanding their work into the arena of reception by targeting the school-aged demographic.

To accomplish their goal of integrating film literacy into the national school curriculum, the BKM created several initiatives and hosted a number of key events between 2001 and 2003. As detailed below, the BKM's work ranged from the creation and online distribution of individual *Filmhefte* aimed at assisting teachers with the integration of film into school curricula to the establishment of a central organization tasked with overseeing and managing film education events across the country; intriguingly, many of these strategic moves closely followed British precedents.

To outline several aspects of this project, in 2001, BKM Julian Nida-Rümelin presented a five-point film policy plan with the aim of enhancing German cinema's position as a cultural asset.¹⁹ A new BKM was then appointed to spearhead this mission: Christina Weiss,²⁰ a specialist in childhood visual processing. Supporting their identification of school students as a target demographic, she and her office claimed that young people suffered from a *Filmleseschwäche* (weakness in the ability to interpret film),²¹ a result of a national approach to media literacy which, she claimed, lagged behind that in other European countries.²² For instance, an ambiguous policy in 1994 had resulted in teachers deciding independently whether or not to incorporate film into their curricula, with those teachers who wanted to engage their students with film finding little access to formal training to support them in the endeavor.²³ To address these deficits, Weiss developed a framework to support *Filmbildung* nationwide, declaring the skill of understanding the history and grammar of film essential "for the preservation of basic democratic values and the strengthening of one's own opinion."²⁴ Weiss thereby outlined the highest of stakes in cultivating media literacy in the German educational system.

By 2002, a branch within the Federal Agency for Civic Education (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, bpb) was established for the purpose of bolstering *Filmarbeit* [film literacy] across the country. In March 2003, the first "Kino macht Schule" [Cinema goes to school] con-

vention took place, sponsored by the bpb and the German Federal Film Board (Filmförderungsanstalt, FFA), bringing together 320 participants and 30 experts across all levels of the film industry, as well as those in politics, education, and the university academic community.²⁵ The immediate outcome of this multi-day event was threefold. First, a mandate was released requesting film competence be fostered in primary and secondary schools throughout Germany, and that instructors at all levels receive training in media analysis. Second, an annual *Schulfilmwoche* (school film week) was inaugurated, to be financially supported by the bpb, the FFA, private film distributors, and all sixteen German federal states, extending the reach of an independent pilot project that had been undertaken, successfully, in Cologne a year prior.²⁶ Finally, a “film canon” was created, consisting of thirty-five works chosen from roughly a hundred years of film history by a committee of filmmakers, film historians, film critics, and film pedagogues.²⁷ The explicit aims of creating this canon were, as articulated by the bpb: (a) to preserve and make widely accessible the cultural heritage of film history, thereby paralleling the work that libraries undertake for the preservation and dissemination of written works, and museums for that of the visual arts; (b) to raise awareness among instructors of films worthy of integration into curricular subjects; and (c) to help students develop a historical understanding of the film medium.²⁸ As a final step in the “film canon” project, the bpb created a *Filmheft* that didacticized each film for instruction in the classroom, thereby setting a precedent that continues today upon the release of films deemed important for study.

Given the success of these initiatives, the non-profit agency Vision Kino was founded in 2005 to oversee film education initiatives and programs, and to bring together individuals working in cinema operations with German media pedagogues, other members across the film industry, and educators. Starting in that year, Vision Kino took over the production of film education instructional materials, and, in collaboration with bpb, relaunched the film pedagogy portal *kinofenster.de*, which increased accessibility to and the diversity of the many *Filmarbeit* materials available.²⁹

Considered together, the approach taken by German government in the name of national film literacy mirrors much of that undertaken in Britain; for example, in Germany’s nationwide *Schulfilmwoche* we see the same type of upsizing and federalizing of an existing media literacy program that, in the UK resulted in the “Into Film Festival.”³⁰ And, with the establishment of Vision Kino as an organization that would streamline film education work and create a plethora of teaching ma-

terials housed online, we find a parallel to the British Film Institute's educational charity Into Film. Finally, even the approach taken to the didacticization of films undertaken by the bpb and Vision Kino reflect, in structure and objectives, materials created in and for UK schools.³¹ Thus, while the start of Germany's media literacy enterprises can be traced back to the inaugural "Kino macht Schule" convention in Berlin in 2003, many developments, both preceding and following this event, inform the film education landscape during the very period when directors in the UK, the US, and later Germany were producing adaptations of canonical texts.

The chronology outlining German film education activities provided above is neither comprehensive nor inclusive of the most recent developments in film education.³² Nevertheless, it is important to note that despite the numerous directions film education work has taken over the past two decades, there has long been, and continues to be, a prioritization of literary adaptations within *Filmbildung*. At the inaugural "Kino macht Schule" convention, the bpb reported on how schools across the sixteen German federal states had been integrating films into the curriculum to date, noting that the four states that already incorporated film somewhat systematically did so explicitly through adaptations.³³ The report further specifies that in eleven of the twelve states that dealt with film less systematically,³⁴ *Filmbildung* occurred in the classical media-pedagogical subjects: German, art, foreign languages, and music.³⁵ Given the emphasis on literature in two of the four named subject areas, the implication is that, also here, adaptations constituted a large share of the instructed films.

Adaptations continue to play a central role in film education today, a phenomenon that is not necessarily an intended outcome of the push for increased film literacy, but a by-product of the way *Filmbildung* is systematized within Germany specifically. As Petra Rockenfeller, chairperson of the advisory board for Vision Kino, lamented at 2021's "Kino macht Schule," film still takes a back seat in German educational contexts, with the medium used to bolster "traditional" school subjects. Rockenfeller argued that "while countries such as France, Sweden, and the UK have already established film as a school subject . . . even in 2021 film in German schools has a niche existence."³⁶ Instead, "film is currently used as a means of analysis or illustration in art and German language and literature, or in other subjects such as history,"³⁷ meaning that "film as a unique seventh art form, with all its many facets, is absent both from instruction as well as from teacher education, which transnationally should in fact include dedicated education in the areas

of film and media."³⁸ From Rockenfeller's reflections we recognize that, given the ways in which film has been integrated into the curriculum, adaptations will continue to be a popular genre in schools, at least until the medium attains a status as a curricular subject of its own, as teachers face pressure to "fit" film into these other subjects. As *Die Welt* reporter Thomas Vitzthum maintains in an article entitled, "College-bound students hardly ever read Goethe or Schiller," teachers working in the German school system in the 2000s did welcome the flexibility to work with film adaptations.³⁹ He quotes Beate Kennedy, chairperson of the Fachverbands Deutsch im Germanistenverband, writing:

The teacher from Schleswig-Holstein [Beate Kennedy] does not even consider complaining let alone bemoaning this development. She acquiesces to it and considers how the works might be integrated into her teaching better than through conventional lessons. [Kennedy reports that she has] "had very positive experiences with the engagement of multimedia." In this way, new films based on old books, documentaries, eyewitness accounts, a visit to a museum, and many other things, can be made more palatable.⁴⁰

Additional factors that Vitzthum outlines as making adaptations appealing in recent years include the loosening of government-mandated reading lists for the *Abitur* (secondary school comprehensive graduation exam) and the shortened amount of time students spend in the *Gymnasium* in the early 2000s as a result of a G8 reform. To this we might add a general pushback against conservative understandings of literary canons in recent years. A key compounding factor, however, is not mentioned by Vitzthum, namely, *Filmbildung*, which reinforces the teaching of adaptations made with this demographic in mind.

Put another way, if film directors, production companies, and distributors had somehow not been aware of the richness of Germany's school-age market for film adaptations going into the inaugural "Kino macht Schule" convention—from the report detailing the prevalence of adaptations in instructional settings, to the unveiling of numerous initiatives that would further support productions in this genre, and plenty of examples between Hollywood and Britain of successful films in this genre—by the end of the convention they were certainly assured of a market moving forward.

It is unsurprising, then, that some of the same filmmakers that up until that point had been producing successful adaptations of contemporary literary works, such as Haußmann with *Herr Lehmann* (2003), began turning their attention to canonical literary texts at precisely this

juncture. Even more telling, directors and distributors were clear about their intentions with these films. Emblazoned across the dust jacket of *Kabale und Liebe*, for instance, is the proclamation, “more easily comprehensible than generations of pupils perhaps remember,”⁴¹ implying that today’s young people will be more satisfied with this adaptation than either the literary original or any of the ten previous adaptations of Schiller’s work.⁴² Similarly, speaking about *Goethe!*, Stölzl proclaims confidence in his film’s reception by young viewers, stating, “I believe . . . that through schools the film has the chance to reach a young audience that would otherwise never go to a historical period film.”⁴³

Since 2005, then, works across German literary history have found a new life on the silver screen as result of these concomitant forces: from Margarete von Trotta’s biopic of Hildegard von Bingen (*Vision*, 2010) to Burhan Qurbani’s recent reworking of Döblin’s masterpiece in *Berlin Alexanderplatz* (2020). A closer look at *Kabale und Liebe* and *Goethe!*, members of a distinct subset of these films, illuminates how contemporary canonical adaptations respond to film literacy initiatives by valuing popular culture above and even as predecessors of canonical originals.

Kabale und Liebe: Adapting Media Literacy to and from the Screen

Like many films from this genre, Hausmann’s *Kabale und Liebe* was released in response to a commemorative event, namely the 200th anniversary of Schiller’s death, and represents the first large-scale attempt in the twenty-first century to adapt an eighteenth-century German text for the screen.⁴⁴ With the tagline “*es geht also doch*” (so it works after all), the film’s promotional message distanced it from the rather unflattering legacy of arthouse adaptation flops, such as the films of the “adaptation crisis” of the 1970s.⁴⁵ To attract audiences, the film was announced as the German manifestation of the successful Hollywood formula for resurrecting literary classics, the DVD cover proclaiming: “Schiller was never this close to Shakespeare—or to Hollywood. *Kabale und Liebe* is Hausmann’s answer to *Shakespeare in Love*.”⁴⁶ The film was groundbreaking: upon Hausmann’s receipt of a 2006 DIVA award, the director of ZDF’s *Theaterfilm* channel correctly interpreted the recognition as a sign that more contemporary canonical adaptations were on the horizon, proclaiming, “This . . . will inspire the creation of future made-for-television adaptations of classical theater pieces that promise to be successful; there will be a desire for more.”⁴⁷ Reviews confirmed

positive reception among school students, labeling it, “the juiciest, most emotional, school-friendly, bourgeois, and light-hearted contribution to the Schiller jubilee.”⁴⁸ Indeed, the “school-friendly” film targeted this demographic through *Filmhefte* as well as modifications made to its appropriated Shakespeare boom aesthetics reflecting exactly those media literacy aims that films like these are tasked to promote.

Kabale und Liebe takes a distinctly self-reflexive stance as a contemporary canonical adaptation. Across both aural and cinematographic tracks, filmic strategies nullify presumed hierarchies across artistic media, time periods, and cultural spheres. Aurally, Haußmann pairs antiquated dialogue with a modernized soundtrack, not unlike Luhrmann; however, instead of contemporary pop songs, Haußmann’s score involves modernized period pieces. In introducing a modernized, electric guitar rendition of the 1807 German *Volkslied* “Kein Feuer, Keine Kohle” as its *Leitmotif*, a song that had been transformed during the *Sturm und Drang* from folklore into *Volkspoésie*, *Kabale und Liebe* flags its program of blurring divisions: between high and popular culture, and between past and present. As a work that already straddled the divide between low and high cultural spheres, and indeed is positioned to do so yet again, its inclusion reflects the film’s desire to overlap presumed disparate cultural spheres and to relativize various persistent hierarchies, including those Rockenfeller bemoaned: the hierarchy in the arts through which media are instrumentalized to relay more traditional subject matter. In addition, by foregrounding a modern-sounding soundtrack, the aural track aligns with the visual spectacle of this made-for-television film, allowing a wider variety of audience members domestically, as well as potentially internationally, to enjoy the work, regardless of familiarity with Schiller’s text, *Volkslieder*, or the *Sturm und Drang* epoch.

Beyond aurally and visually modern tracks that appear aimed at making *Kabale und Liebe* accessible to a variety of audiences, the film further agitates against culturally constructed divisions by eschewing viewer immediacy in ways that invert Hollywood aesthetics. Unusual camera angles and zooms replace the medium-length, eye-level shots used in Luhrmann’s *Romeo + Juliet* (1996), thereby positioning Haußmann’s viewer above the unfolding action or outside of rooms within which action occurs. This alteration is most striking in those sequences that otherwise visually quote Luhrmann’s film. For example, both investigate their female protagonist’s bedroom as the locus of an illicit love affair that dooms the main characters. However, while the props in Luise’s boudoir closely mirror those found in Juliet’s bedroom, with

clothes suggestively strewn about the room in juxtaposition with dolls, music boxes, and stuffed animals, *Kabale und Liebe's* viewers are positioned as investigators of the room, suggesting that they possess an analytical stance that *Romeo + Juliet's* viewers do not. While Luhrmann frames his investigation of Juliet's bedroom through a shot that places viewers directly across from her bed and, therefore, directly involved in the chaos of the scene, Haußmann's exploration of space occurs through a camera that twists throughout the room, investigating objects from a high angle before zooming in on the bed. In comparison to Luhrmann, Haußmann's cinematographic choices place his audience in a position of greater authority and knowledge, looking down upon and closely inspecting the room (Figure 3.1). The alteration indicates that, in a film otherwise rife with deception, conspiracies, and mistaken identities, the audience will remain "on top of it all," able to interpret events better than the characters themselves. In terms of a connection to the didactic dimension of the film, *Kabale und Liebe's* cinematography sows the seeds of interpretation that the BKM's media literacy initiatives hope to reap.

Narratively, the film further marks media literacy as essential: plot twists routinely result from main characters' failures in written and visual interpretation. They are duped not only through written materials providing false information (as in Schiller's original drama), but by their own misinterpretations or misunderstanding of visual cues. At one climactic point, Ferdinand mistakes an elderly woman to be his beloved Luise. He confides in her and even proposes before looking more closely and realizing his blunder. The viewer, however, is positioned to register Ferdinand's mistake almost immediately; both Luise and her *Doppelgänger* are revealed in a wide-angle shot that expands the viewer's gaze beyond Ferdinand's limited perception. This sequence, a notable modification of Schiller's drama, highlights the stakes of correctly interpreting visual information. In this way, the film confronts and offers us an alternative way to remedy the purported *Filmleseschwäche* of individuals by having them engage with materials, such as this film, that reveal the pitfalls and promises of visual interpretation.

While *Kabale und Liebe* promotes adaptations as texts well-suited for media literacy development, a close analysis of the *Filmhefte* circulated for the film reveals cultural assumptions and prejudices that work to diminish the "originality" and "worth" of adaptations. The *Filmheft* created by the Sächsische Kinder- und Jugendfilmdienst, e.V., for example, frames *Kabale und Liebe* as a gateway to reading the original text.⁴⁹ Activities here position viewers as passive spectators, the film instrumen-



Figure 3.1. Shots of the protagonist’s bedroom in Luhrmann’s *Romeo + Juliet* and Haußmann’s *Kabale und Liebe*. Screenshots by Bridget Levine-West.

talized to spark their interest in the original author’s biography, the historical period, and the main themes of the original text—all topics treated in the booklet. While Schiller and his drama are thus discussed in depth, the film is thematized solely via biographies (of the director and actors) and a one-page interview with lead actress Paula Kalenberg. Tellingly, the interview foregrounds the appreciation Kalenberg herself gained for Schiller while working on the film: although she found his works “rather grim” as a school student, she reports, post-shooting, that she now finds them “particularly intense.”⁵⁰ Schiller’s style, previously “very abstract and distant from daily life” now feels “more familiar” to her.⁵¹ The transformation the interview traces provides an idealization of what students, as imagined in the approach taken in this *Filmheft*, might experience: a greater esteem for Schiller via the vehicle of adaptation.

By contrast, some pedagogical treatments of early Goethe boom films more openly embrace the transmedial practices and transna-

tional reach of the films. A *Filmheft* released by the film's distribution and production companies invites students to engage critically with Hausmann's *Kabale und Liebe* both in relation to, and separately from, the original text.⁵² For example, one activity asks students to write a film review that addresses the strategies implemented by Hausmann to adapt the original text for the screen. Another prompts students to draw connections between this film and other popular films, engaging them more broadly with contemporary adaptations and world cinema. Other tasks position students as active participants in the field of pop culture reworkings in ways that mirror Hausmann's approach in *Kabale und Liebe*; for example, students are prompted to script an alternative ending for the adaptation prior to seeing the film—something Hausmann actually does in the film—and then write a continuation of that story from the first-person perspective of one of the main characters (which Hausmann incidentally also produced in a later-published epistolary novel).⁵³ In this *Filmheft*, then, both literary adaptation and direct participation in pop culture are positioned as edifying acts that foster students' creativity and, in line with the goals of the BKM, critical media literacies. In summary, while the one *Filmheft* in fact denigrates adaptation culture by structuring activities in ways that perpetuate and reinforce long-standing prejudices against adaptations, the other upholds adaptation as a critical process that can activate students' existing knowledge and literacies, and then enhance their media literacy development. Here, then, we witness a rather ambiguous stance toward the transnational, both as an aesthetic and a filmic practice, that we might understand in relation to the television medium's position at a near crossroad: aware of its national past, becoming more global in scope and tradition, and having a not-yet-fully-known-but-impending future as transnational via streaming platforms. In other words, across the two booklets for teaching *Kabale und Liebe* we see a conservative national stance as well as a more open, global one.

Golden Age Boom: *Goethe!*

Fast-forward five years and, as predicted by Bergmann, several other contemporary adaptations of eighteenth-century German canonical texts circulate, with Stölzl's *Goethe!* emerging as the pinnacle of this trend. Like *Kabale und Liebe*, this film also closely parallels a Shakespeare boom predecessor in content and form, namely Madden's *Shakespeare in Love*.⁵⁴ And while reviews attempted to pigeonhole the adaptation

as a gateway to Goethe's original texts, this film—and similarly *Kabale und Liebe*—takes a more progressive stance regarding its position as an adaptation. Unlike *Kabale und Liebe*, however, the programmatic mission of the film appears to be better apprehended and exploited in its various *Filmhefte*.

After a successful run in Europe, Stölzl's film enjoyed a limited release at art house cinemas in North America. While the film grossed \$5.6 million worldwide, reception in the United States was notably underwhelming, with receipts totaling just \$162,000.⁵⁵ Most US reviews saw the film as Germany's contribution to the transnational biopic/adaptation/costume film trend, a less successful but still charming continuation of films like *Amadeus* (1984), *Shakespeare in Love*, and *Bright Star* (2009). The film was nevertheless deemed valuable, not for its approach to the subject matter or cinematography, but for its potential to encourage viewers to pick up copies of Goethe's original texts. The cinema blog *Film Forward* proclaimed, "It won't match *Amadeus* in popularity, but if this often ridiculous romance gets one viewer to read Goethe, then it will have served its purpose."⁵⁶ *The Hollywood Reporter* similarly declared, "*Goethe in Love* falls close enough to [*Shakespeare in Love*] to inspire some guilt in any literature student seduced by its charms."⁵⁷ However, while critics in the United States saw little more in the film than an attempt to cash in on a trend, the *Filmhefte* distributed in Germany began to unpack the more nuanced aspects of the film. Across these materials we see reflected the very questioning of the mythos of originality that the Golden Age German writers themselves embody culturally and historically, but that both *Kabale und Liebe* and *Goethe!* subvert.

Like *Kabale und Liebe*, *Goethe!* dismantles dichotomous hierarchies by calling attention to their cultural constructedness, narratively and visually. On the film's narrative track, we see that several quotes and plotlines credited to Goethe, and today emblematic of German high culture, are framed in the film as having themselves been appropriated, adapted, or even stolen by the bard. For example, the film indicates that Werther, the titular character of Goethe's epistolary novel, derives not from the poet's own mind, but from an adjective that Lotte, the female lead, ascribes to the young Johann when she addresses him, repeatedly, as "*mein wert(h)er Herr*" (my esteemed Sir). Similarly, the inclusion of a prosecution scene for Marthe Schwerdtlein, for which Johann prepares the court documents as part of his work in Wetzlar, gestures toward Goethe's adaptation of this individual's story and fate in his later-penned work *Faust*. Moreover, the whole tragedy of *Faust* is

presented in this film as Goethe's direct co-opting of folk entertainment more broadly. The film identifies the source of Goethe's inspiration for this work not as part of an intellectual exchange with like-minded, well-educated peers,⁵⁸ but rather as the result of his experience of street-fair culture, where he, intoxicated, happens upon a marionette production of the medieval legend. The repeated presentation of plot elements and quotations from Goethe's works—seemingly not first invented or penned by the author himself as per the film—dismantles the ostensible mythos of Goethe's originality among viewers, many of whom are intended to enjoy, in these moments, something akin to an "aha" moment, along the lines of "so this is where Goethe got that famous line!" While Crespo Steinke interprets these intertextualities as generic markers that allow the film to address a "double audience,"⁵⁹ their integration also works more self-reflexively: through these (fictional) relocations of textual origins, the film presents Goethe as a writer who channels, or even consciously adapts, popular/folk culture. By subverting the assumed pure genius of Goethe in this way, the implication for the media-savvy viewer is that genius may in fact reside in the collective, that artistic works emerge from adaptation and borrowing (or stealing), and that the adaptation can and should stand on at least equal ground with the text that it adapts.

This understanding of "originality" is further underscored by Stölzl's cinematographic choices. Drawing upon strategies employed in *Shakespeare in Love*, *Goethe!* presents mundane, quotidian events in Goethe's life through a flat color palette that represents the lackluster mediocrity that society often assigns to such items and events. Throughout the film, daily exchanges, turmoil, joyous moments, and occasions that (as we are to infer) will later make their appearance in Goethe's creative output are presented through a dull bluish or brownish filter. For example, the soirée in Wetzlar where Johann and Lotte experience their meet-cute is filled with dusty browns; the only notable color in the sequence is the stain from the red wine Lotte spilled on Johann's cravat (Figure 3.2).

This presentation of daily life in the film as somewhat humdrum, even at decisive moments, contrasts with the spectacular visual quality of sequences that show Johann as an artist performing his poetry, such as when he spontaneously bursts out in rhyme with (what the audience recognizes as) the poem "Willkommen und Abschied." Here, increased saturation and a vibrant palette dominate; the camera portrays Johann strolling alongside Lotte across a verdant, grassy field under a bright sky, the crisp navy, yellow, and white of the couple's finery on display.⁶⁰



Figure 3.2. Contrast between muted and bright palettes in Philip Stölzl's *Goethe!* Screenshots by Bridget Levine-West.

Stölzl's use of such divergent palettes forces the viewer to recognize the separation between quotidian events and moments of creativity as artificially constructed and, relatedly, as itself an artificial cultural construct. Indeed, the entire plot goes to painstaking lengths to indicate that the former always informs and prompts the latter, underscoring how the mundane and the artistic—and by extension the original and the adaptation—should not manifest hierarchically, rather side by side and intertwined.

Appearing several years into the prolific Goethe boom trend, and at a time when *Filmhefte* were more fully established in both public and private spheres, the tension between the original work and its film adaptation, and in turn between the national and the transnational that split the approach taken in the two *Filmhefte* for *Kabale und Liebe* discussed earlier, seems to have been largely resolved in approaches taken to didacticize *Goethe!* With increased acceptance of adaptations as original cultural products, and perhaps also in relation to the film's

US release as *Young Goethe in Love*, we see a balance struck between prompting students' consideration of the original text and engaging them in analyses of the film's formal elements, either with or without reference to literary predecessors. Several activities prompt comparisons between media or engage students in acts of transmediation themselves, an indication of the cultural value the materials clearly ascribe to the process of adaptation. Additionally, both pedagogical booklets circulated for *Goethe!* (one created by a government entity, the other by a commercial venture, and both distributed via kinofenster.de) invite students to consider the roles letters play in the epistolary novel versus the film, to detail how the film recreates landscape paintings from the *Sturm und Drang* through the *mise-en-scène*, camera angles, and shots, and to parse similarities and differences between the representation of Goethe as presented across the film and in his literary texts.

Most intriguing for our analysis is how both booklets repeatedly frame national literary and contemporary cultural heritage by contextualizing them in relation to a network of national and transnational products. This occurs through activities such as one in the bpb/Vision Kino booklet that contrasts the film's classical musical score with music used in Sofia Coppola's *Marie Antoinette* (2006) and Luhrmann's *Romeo + Juliet*, both of which feature contemporary rock and electronic scores. Another activity encourages students to investigate the presentation of the author as genius in *Goethe!* in relation to its presentation in Jane Campion's *Bright Star*, Milos Forman's *Amadeus*, and John Madden's *Shakespeare in Love*. Finally, across both *Filmhefte*, suggestions for further reading and viewing listed at the end underscore how the viewer is positioned as an active participant in a vast web of intertexts. For instance, the transnational biopics *Pollock* (2000), *Sylvia* (2003), and *Capote* (2005), all co-produced by multiple countries and with a reach that lies far beyond the countries directly involved in their making, stand alongside adaptations of canonical German literature from German film history. Moreover, this network of intertexts is expanded back into the literary realm, through references to works ranging from Homer's *Odyssey* to J.D. Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye* and Per Nilsson's *So Lonely*, in a move that further breaks down divisions and hierarchies across the arts. As I discuss below, although there are differences between how the bpb/Vision Kino and Warner Bros.' materials engage their student viewers of *Goethe!*, both sets of materials place central emphasis on Goethe, Schiller, their works, and these adaptations of their works, as products that—in their continued circulation and recirculation—transcend and address audiences across geographical spaces, time periods, cultures,

and media forms. In both, young viewers are positioned as individuals who actively engage with past national products by channeling them through contemporary, international remakes, mash-ups, adaptations, and remixes.

That said, despite the more transnational and film-positive approach both *Filmhefte* take to contextualizing the various source text(s) and prior adaptations of *The Sorrows of Young Werther*, they do remain somewhat divided as to the role national literary history can or should play in our era of transnational media exchange. In comparison with the Warner Bros. Germany *Filmheft*, several activities in the bpb/Vision Kino *Filmheft* still direct students' attention back to the original Golden Age German texts. One such task prompts students to research statements made in the eighteenth century regarding gender and class in Germany, and to find how these are expressed in the literary works *The Sorrows of Young Werther*, *Emilia Galotti*, and *Kabale und Liebe*. Additionally, in a move that calls to mind the more conservative *Filmheft* for *Kabale und Liebe*, this booklet includes another interview with the director that explicitly challenges students to turn their attention back to Goethe and his writing. Here, Stölzl is quoted as crediting his successful career trajectory as stage and screen director and filmmaker with his engagement with Goethe's texts during his school years:

I had a super German teacher. He was a hippie and a fan of Goethe, and he brought Johann Goethe to life in all his genius, his humor, and also his human weaknesses. We then saw *Faust* in the *Kammerspiele* in Munich, with Helmut Griem in the title role. It banged and smoked, and girls in garters rode around on broomsticks—I found it wonderful, and after that wanted to be in the theater.⁶¹

In contrast to these literature-centric activities and texts, the Warner Bros.' expansive forty-four-page treatment of the film places no expectation on students to engage with Goethe's original texts: each activity is accessible whether they read the originals or not.⁶² Rather than gesturing back to the past, activities here prompt discussion outward in the present, toward the cultural status and role of adaptors in contemporary times more generally, with provocative questions such as "Am I also an artist as a remixing DJ, or is the artist only or primarily the composer of the original piece of music?"⁶³ While the commercial incentives for film companies to highlight their own products in their didactic treatment cannot be denied as one potential reason why the Warner Bros.' *Filmheft* treats the film itself more centrally, it nevertheless remains somewhat ironic that in the name of increasing *film* literacy,

with all its historical and transnational dimensions, the government-sponsored materials issue treatments of films that frame the reading of canonical texts as essential for success, not just with the booklet's own activities, but, by way of Stölzl's own assertions, possibly also for one's later career. It appears that, for as much as the film industry and the bpb collaborate to promote film literacy in Germany, different priorities influence the shape and scope of the learning objectives.

For the film industry, increasingly marked by transnational means of production, reception, and distribution, these processes and the products associated with the transnational are foregrounded to increase cultural awareness and media literacy, thus supporting a positive reception for the films they make. At the same time, however, for the BKM and the bpb, confronted with an increasingly transnational media sphere, and one often dominated by Anglophone influences (whether by Hollywood or more recently Netflix), their approach tends to foreground German identity, history, and heritage as a means to counter the ever-looming specter of Americanization via the media, which, according to former BKM director Nida-Rümelin (author of the aforementioned five-point film policy from 2001), was beginning to "flatten out" the diversity of European cultural identity in the early 2000s. It was feared that, if left unchecked, such Americanization would lead to the erosion of German cultural identity, particularly among the country's youth—the very same demographic addressed by the *Filmhefte*.⁶⁴

Conclusion

Over the past two decades, *Filmbildung* initiatives have brought works from world cinema into German classrooms in systematic and profound ways. They have done this directly through the promotion of cross-disciplinary discourse among directors, film pedagogues, and secondary-school teachers, as well as through the promotion, creation, and circulation of numerous *Filmhefte* for select films, compiled on the open-source website kinofester.de. And they have done so implicitly by contributing to the contemporary German film-culture landscape that dynamically interweaves entertainment, education, and media literacy.

While the impulses of *Filmbildung* certainly influence how and to what extent contemporary canonical adaptations are ascribed cultural value today, and at times inform how the cultural value of adaptations plays out in the aesthetics of some of the films and their reception, there are additional, concrete ways in which *Filmbildung* participates in sup-

porting and shaping such works. Alongside the creation of ancillary teaching materials, the bpb offers workshops, teacher education programs, and related events throughout the year, events that do not solely target adaptations but that certainly include them. While these events go beyond the scope of this chapter, the ways in which they inform and interact with the production and reception of film adaptations in the German context points toward an expansion of Simone Murray's conceptualization of the "material adaptation industry."⁶⁵ To the six branches she outlines—namely, the author as a transmedial brand; the literary agent and intellectual property rights; book events; the role of literary prizes in the world of film; the screenwriter; and the strategies for marketing adaptations—I propose a seventh: the educational apparatus.

This educational apparatus, made up as it is of participants and stakeholders across the film industry, education sector, and the government, has to date, at least when it comes to adaptations of canonical works, been marked by an enduring and perhaps even healthy ambivalence, but an ambivalence worthy of further scholarly exploration. While this educational apparatus has increasingly addressed and constructed school-age viewers as individuals who today experience national culture(s) and literature(s) through popular, global, and transnational forms, and who must, therefore, learn to navigate an increasingly complex transnational media landscape, the same system has historically diminished some of the profound cultural work that contemporary canonical adaptations perform and would otherwise be poised to contribute to film literacy efforts. Indeed, *Filmhefte* for these works have, over the years, questioned outdated hierarchies of high culture over popular culture, and of the source text over the adapted film; yet they often stop short of upending long-standing and, as I have indicated in this chapter, inaccurate preconceptions facing this genre. With Netflix's global expansion into Europe in 2017, including the company's recent involvement in two feature-length film adaptations from the German literary canon, the US circulation of Qurbani's *Berlin Alexanderplatz* (2020) and the production of Edward Berger's *Im Westen nichts Neues* (2022), it remains to be seen how the film and television industries, streaming platforms like Netflix, and the BKM/bpb frame and negotiate the transnational turn in national educational settings. While there is reason to be optimistic with these more recent developments in the European audiovisual sector, given the structures of the very system within which adaptations in Germany are taught and studied, the more progressive notions such films might champion

will likely continue to be thwarted by overriding prioritization of the national, the ostensible original, and the literary, simply because these works usually point back to, and demand engagement with, literary precursors rather than encouraging students to make connections to other films and/or media forms that often inform the films themselves. When it comes to canonical works, and perhaps especially Golden Age literature, the versions on the silver or digital screen will likely remain subordinate to those literary sources, even in venues intended to foster media literacy. Yet, I hope that the foregoing analysis has uncovered just how unwarranted and even unnecessary that hierarchy is, at a time when transnational media literacies of an informed audience form the perfect nexus for interpreting an adaptation in relation to its various sources across time and space.

A final word about the timeliness of this endeavor: although the Goethe boom film trend in Germany seems to have largely run its course, sociocultural conditions similar to those that supported the emergence of that trend continue to inform German literary adaptations, not least because they serve as vehicles for new insights into social, political, and cultural trends and changes. Ranging from the Black Lives Matter movement to Germany's (and Europe's) ongoing struggle with issues such as gender identity, racism, migration, populism, and political polarization, film adaptations remain an exciting creative arena at the discursive intersection of cinematic art, canonical as well as contemporary literatures, the film industry, and educational institutions. Just as eighteenth-century creative practices and sensibilities breathed new life into contemporary adaptations in the Goethe boom years, German literary adaptations from other eras and genres will continue to peel back layers of past discourses to grant these works new meanings for film audiences in general and school students in particular. How these adaptations will translate and, in turn, themselves contribute to future trends in transnational adaptation practices and media literacy educational measures remains an open question.

Bridget Levine-West is Assistant Professor of German and Film & Television Studies at the University of Vermont, where she also serves as the German language program director. Her research focuses on theoretical and educational dimensions of contemporary German film culture, language pedagogy, and curriculum design. Recent publications have appeared in *Second Language Research and Practice*, *Language Education and Multilingualism: The Langscape Journal*, and *The Goethe Yearbook*. She

is also co-author of the non-profit introductory/intermediate German textbook *Augenblicke: German through Film, Media, and Texts* (American Association of Teachers of German, 2021).

Notes

Many thanks to Stephan Ehrig, Benjamin Schaper, and Elizabeth Ward for their insightful guidance on this project. I further thank Glenn Levine-West, for his invaluable comments on draft versions of this chapter, and Kristin Francoeur for her careful editing of the final manuscript.

1. The US title plays on John Madden's box-office hit *Shakespeare in Love* (2000), a film that serves as an important intertext for Stölzl's work.
2. Schulz-Ojala, "Bei aller Liebe: Goethe!"
3. Ibid.
4. Cooke, "Abnormal Consensus?" 224.
5. Rentschler, "From New German Cinema to the Post-Wall Cinema of Consensus."
6. Halle, *German Film after Germany*.
7. Schulz-Ojala, "Bei aller Liebe: Goethe!"
8. Following Pizer and others, I use the term "Golden Age" to refer to German literary works of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, roughly from the period of the Enlightenment through the German Romantic and *Vormärz* epochs. Pizer, *Imagining the Age of Goethe*, 1.
9. Baz Luhrmann's *Romeo + Juliet* (1996), John Madden's *Shakespeare in Love* (1998), Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet* (2000), and Tim B. Nelson's *O* (2001) are but a handful of the successful Hollywood Shakespeare film adaptations that emerged in this decade. For additional titles associated with this trend, see French, *Selling Shakespeare to Hollywood* and Burt and Boose, *Shakespeare, The Movie II*. Examples of the British heritage films are Ang Lee's *Sense and Sensibility* (1995) and Douglas McGrath's *Emma* (1996). As Andrew Higson argues, one should consider both the US Shakespeare and British heritage films that emerged during this period as Hollywood fare, given that the British films were also largely financed and distributed by Hollywood (Higson, *Film England*, 153). In this chapter, I understand both groups of films as signaling the start of a transnational heritage trend that is later picked up and localized in many parts of the world, with an interesting twist that occurs in the German-speaking context.
10. While beyond the scope of this chapter, it would be productive to look at possible associations between the beginning of government-sponsored media literacy education in the UK and the increase in modernized heritage films and literary adaptations of British works in the 1990s, which—as with the context studied here—seem to have occurred nearly concurrently.
11. Swanson, "'Goethe Boom' Films: *Bildung* Reloaded," 351–57.
12. Schlegel, *Sämtliche Werke*, 38.
13. Pascal Ulli, producer of and actor in *Emilia* (2005), opines as follows: "Artists on German stages repeatedly deal with the classics, deconstruct them, modernize them, fail because of them or grow with them . . . I have never understood why the Americans and the English adapt 'their' Shakespeare six ways to Sunday, sometimes classic, sometimes modern, sometimes experimental, while hardly anyone today makes films of Goethe, Schiller, or Lessing." Ulli, "Vorwort."

14. Film Policy Review Group, "A Bigger Picture." The report was released in January 1998, and by June a number of these efforts were already well underway.
15. *Ibid.*, 10.
16. Deutscher Bundestag, *Stenographischer Bericht* 3.
17. The priority of this goal would be reflected in state investment in the arts: federal expenditure for culture rose from 944 million euros in 1995 to 1.3 billion in 2012, with the most dramatic increase—nearly 25 percent—occurring between 2005 and 2011. See: Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder, "Kulturfinanzbericht 2014," 34.
18. Since 2007, 60 million euros annually have been earmarked for the direct support of film production. See Wenzel, "Deutscher Film wird mehr gefördert."
19. Filmförderungsanstalt, "Kulturelle Filmförderung der BKM."
20. Weiss and her office closely studied the strategies that had proven successful in European nations as they worked to launch their own mission. The report detailing the inaugural "Kino macht Schule" convention repeatedly stresses Germany's engagement with media literacy at the federal level as belated in comparison to other European nations, particularly the UK. While a historical and comparative analysis of the British and German media-literacy projects would exceed the scope of this chapter, it is important to note two issues: (1) the project of media literacy itself is a transnational phenomenon that likely results in a plurality of localized manifestations extending beyond the German and British examples noted here; and (2), given the intertwined nature of government-driven media literacy projects, which socioculturally and financially support the film industry, more research should be undertaken as to how these issues affect the production, aesthetics, and reception of films on a broader scale.
21. Unger, "Cultivating Film Audiences," 8.
22. The Federal Agency for Civic Education (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, bpb) indicates that this approach was shaped initially by an ambiguous policy from 1994 that sought to integrate media literacy into curricular subjects, but it did not emphasize film literacy specifically. See Kaden, "Filmerziehung im europäischen Vergleich," 28.
23. Hahn, "Filmbildung," 20.
24. Weiss, "Vortrag," 8.
25. Holighaus, "Filmkompetenzerklärung," 4–6.
26. Weiss, "Vortrag," 9.
27. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, "Der Filmkanon."
28. Weiss, "Vortrag," 7–11.
29. The website, run solely by the bpb as of 2017, is still active, and regularly publishes news about current cinema events, provides detailed film reviews with links to ancillary background texts, interviews, and teaching materials, and announces film pedagogy workshops.
30. In the UK, Film Education, which existed from 1985 until it closed in 2013, had sponsored the annual "National School Film Week" since at least 1998 (as mentioned in "A Bigger Picture"). The film week for students that has since replaced this event, labeled the "Into Film Festival," has been hosted annually since 2013 by the British Film Institute.
31. Katrin Wilmann (Media branch director, Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung), interview by Bridget Swanson, Berlin, 7 July 2016.
32. This includes initiatives undertaken by filmmakers and private distribution companies that directly engage constituents in the film industry with students and teach-

- ers, such as those undertaken by the non-profit entity Neue Wege des Lernens, e.V., which routinely offers presentations and workshops for teachers, or the work of the private initiative Film macht Schule, which brings together early-career filmmakers and cinephiles who offer practical and experiential workshops to school-age children in Bavaria, Berlin, Brandenburg, Hamburg, and Leipzig.
33. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, "Filmerziehung in deutschen Lehrplänen," 12–17.
 34. The exception is Bremen, which the bpb reports as having focused media work on computer literacy, rather than film. Ibid., 14.
 35. Ibid., 13–15.
 36. Here Barbara Schuster is citing Rochenfeller indirectly. Schuster, "Vision Kino 21."
 37. Petra Rockenfeller, cited in Schuster.
 38. Here Barbara Schuster is citing Rochenfeller indirectly. Ibid.
 39. Vitzthum, "Goethe und Schiller lesen selbst Abiturienten kaum."
 40. Vitzthum, "Bedrohte Klassiker: Fack ju Göhte!"
 41. Leander Haußmann's *Kabale und Liebe*, 2005.
 42. Friedrich Fehér's *Kabale und Liebe* (1913), Carl Froehlich's *Luise Millerin* (1922), Curt Goetz-Pflug's *Kabale und Liebe* (1955), Harald Braun's *Kabale und Liebe* (1959), Martin Hellberg's *Kabale und Liebe* (1959), Erich Neuberger's *Kabale und Liebe* (1965), Gerhard Klingenberg's *Kabale und Liebe* (1967), Heinz Schirk's *Kabale und Liebe* (1980), Piet Drescher's *Kabale und Liebe* (1982), and Achim Scherf's *Kabale und Liebe* (2001).
 43. Cited in Bühler et al., "Film des Monats: Goethe!"
 44. A number of anniversaries of canonical German writers' birthdays and deaths that were celebrated in the early 2000s also helped fuel the turn toward Germany's literary canon, as they provided occasions for celebration of their literary output, which was explicitly promoted by public events.
 45. Rentschler, *West German Film in the Course of Time*.
 46. Dössel, "Unsterblich groß."
 47. ZDF, "Leander Haußmann für *Kabale und Liebe*."
 48. Dössel. "Unsterblich groß."
 49. Sächsische Kinder- und JugendfilmDienst e.V., "*Kabale und Liebe*."
 50. Ibid., 14.
 51. Ibid.
 52. Pool Filmverleih, "*Kabale und Liebe*: Unterrichtsmaterial."
 53. Haußmann and Naujoks, *Die wahre Geschichte von Kabale und Liebe*.
 54. Crespo Steinke, "Traveling through the Centuries." Here, the author locates parallels in how the three films intentionally integrate anachronisms and various literary intertexts to address audiences both familiar and unfamiliar with the source texts referenced.
 55. IMDbPro.com, "*Young Goethe in Love*."
 56. Filipowski, "*Young Goethe in Love*."
 57. *The Hollywood Reporter*, "*Young Goethe in Love*: Film Review."
 58. Literary history tells us that G.E. Lessing had earlier proposed to like-minded writers that the folk-based Faust legend should serve as material for the building of a national literary culture aimed at the middle-class population. See Lessing, "Siebzehnter Brief," 73.
 59. I agree here with Crespo Steinke, who argues that such citations "bridge . . . the canonical author's era and that of the present movie audience thanks to the hindsight it has of the writer's entire literary output, including the works not yet written at the time the film is set," but I wish to underscore how these citations also function to

- frame the writer as an adapter. Crespo Steinke, "Traveling through the Centuries," 73.
60. In their analysis of the film, Jürgensen and Kaiser note that Johann's poetic production in the film most frequently occurs outdoors, in natural settings, rather than indoors. They interpret this as Stölzl portraying the *Sturm und Drang* writers in ways that they self-styled themselves, as *Naturkinder*. While I agree with this interpretation, I believe that the starkly disparate visual quality between the two spheres flags the constructedness, or artificiality, of this stylization. See Jürgensen and Kaiser, "I hope I die before I get old."
 61. Bühler et al., "Film des Monats: Goethe!" 4–5.
 62. Warner Bros., "Goethe!: Material für Schulische und Außerschulische Bildung."
 63. *Ibid.*, 38.
 64. Nida-Rümelin, "Rede von Staatsminister Nida-Rümelin."
 65. Murray, *The Adaptation Industry*.

Bibliography

- Bühler, Philipp, Kirsten Taylor, Michael Kohler, and Burkhard Wetekam. "Film des Monats: Goethe!" *Kinofenster.de*, 4–5 October 2010. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://www.kinofenster.de/download/monatsausgabe-10-2010-arbeitsblatt.pdf>.
- Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. "Der Filmkanon." 29 March 2010. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://www.bpb.de/lernen/filmbildung/filmkanon/>.
- . "Filmerziehung in deutschen Lehrplänen." In *Materialsammlung zum Kongress: Kino macht Schule*. Berlin: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 2003.
- Burt, Richard, and Lynda E. Boose. *Shakespeare, the Movie II: Popularizing the Plays on Film, TV, Video and DVD*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Cooke, Paul. "Abnormal Consensus? The New Internationalism of German Cinema." In *German Culture, Politics, and Literature into the Twenty-First Century: Beyond Normalization*, edited by Paul Cooke and Stuart Taberner, 223–36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Crespo Steinke, Carolin. "Traveling through the Centuries: The Intertextual Relationship between *Shakespeare in Love*, *Molière*, and *Young Goethe in Love*." *English Text Construction* 10, no. 1 (2017), 59–77.
- Deutscher Bundestag. *Stenographischer Bericht 3. Sitzung*. Plenarprotokoll 14/3, 10 November 1998. Bonn: Bundestag. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://dserver.bundestag.de/btp/14/14003.pdf>.
- Dössel, Christine. "Unsterblich groß. Im Rhythmus der Herzen: Leander Haußmann verfilmt den Klassiker *Kabale und Liebe*." *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 1–3 October 2005.
- Filipski, Kevin. "Young Goethe in Love." *Film Forward*, 3 November 2011. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://film-forward.com/foreign/young-goethe-in-love>.
- Filmförderungsanstalt. "Kulturelle Filmförderung der BKM." Retrieved 17 March 2022 from <https://www.ffa.de/kulturelle-filmfoerderung-der-bkm.html>.
- Film Policy Review Group. "A Bigger Picture." Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 1998. Retrieved 30 November 2022 from <https://bigpictureresearch.typepad.com/files/a-bigger-picture.pdf>.
- French, Emma. *Selling Shakespeare to Hollywood: The Marketing of Filmed Shakespeare Adaptations from 1989 into the New Millennium*. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2006.

- Hahn, Natalie. "Filmbildung im deutsch- und im DaF-didaktischen Handlungsfeld: Eine kontrastive Perspektive." In *Film im DaF/DaZ Unterricht*, edited by Tina Welke and Renate Faistauer, 13–38. Vienna: Praesens Verlag, 2015.
- Halle, Randall. *German Film after Germany: Toward a Transnational Aesthetic*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008.
- Haußmann, Leander, and Boris Naujoks. *Die wahre Geschichte von Kabale und Liebe*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 2007.
- Higson, Andrew. *Film England: Culturally English Filmmaking since the 1990s*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2011.
- Holighaus, Alfred. "Filmkompetenzerklärung." In *Materialsammlung zum Kongress: Kino macht Schule*, 4–6. Berlin: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 2003.
- IMDbPro.com. "Young Goethe in Love." Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://pro.imdb.com/title/tt1440180/>.
- Jürgensen, Christoph, and Gerhard Kaiser. "'I hope I die before I get old': Überlegungen zur Inszenierung von Autorschaft beim jungen Goethe und in Philipp Stölzls Film *Goethe!*" *Goethe-Jahrbuch* 129, edited by Jochen Golz, Albert Meier, and Edith Zehm, 152–63. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2013.
- Kaden, Michael. "Filmerziehung im europäischen Vergleich: Filme in europäischen Lehrplänen." In *Materialsammlung zum Kongress: Kino macht Schule*, 17–41. Berlin: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 2003.
- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. "Siebzehnter Brief." In *Werke*, edited by Herbert G. Göpfert. Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1973.
- Murray, Simone. *The Adaptation Industry: The Cultural Economy of Contemporary Literary Adaptation*. London: Routledge, 2012.
- Nida-Rümelin, Julian. 2001. "Rede von Staatsminister Nida-Rümelin auf einem Forum der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Berlin am 19.02.2001 zum Thema Verleih und Verleiher." *German Political Speeches Corpus*, edited by Adrien Barbaresi. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://politische-reden.eu/BR/t/229.html>.
- Pizer, John D. *Imagining the Age of Goethe in German Literature: 1970–2010*. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2011.
- Pool Filmverleih. "*Kabale und Liebe*: Unterrichtsmaterial." Vienna, 2005.
- Rentschler, Eric. "From New German Cinema to the Post-Wall Cinema of Consensus." In *Cinema and Nation*, edited by Mette Hjort and Scott Mackenzie, 260–77. London: Routledge, 2000.
- . *West German Film in the Course of Time: Reflections on the Twenty Years since Oberhausen*. Bedford Hills, NY: Redgrave Publishing Company, 1984.
- Sächsische Kinder- und JugendfilmDienst e.V. "*Kabale und Liebe*: Pädagogisches Begleitmaterial zum Film," 2005.
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm. *Sämtliche Werke*, edited by Eduard Böckig. 12 vols. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1846–47.
- Schulz-Ojala, Jan. "Bei aller Liebe: *Goethe!*" *Der Tagesspiegel*, 12 October 2010. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://www.tagesspiegel.de/sport/kinokritik-bei-aller-liebe-goe-the/1955646.html>.
- Schuster, Barbara. "Vision Kino 21: Film (besser) verstehen." *Blickpunktfilm.de*, 9 June 2021. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://beta.blickpunktfilm.de/details/460847>.
- Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder. "Kulturfinanzbericht 2014." Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt, 2015. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from https://www.statistisch-ebibliothek.de/mir/servlets/MCRFileNodeServlet/DEHeft_derivate_00015973/Kulturfinanzbericht_2014.pdf.

- Swanson, Bridget. "'Goethe Boom' Films: *Bildung* Reloaded." *Goethe Yearbook* 28, 351–57. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2021.
- The Hollywood Reporter*. "Young Goethe in Love: Film Review." 1 November 2011. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/movies/movie-reviews/young-goethe-love-film-review-256037/>.
- Ulli, Pascal. "Vorwort." *Emilia—Der Film*. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from http://www.emilia-der-film.ch/pages/02_03.htm.
- Unger, Susanne B. "Cultivating Film Audiences: *Filmbildung*, Moral Education, and the Public Sphere in Germany." PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, 2011.
- Vitzhum, Thomas. "Bedrohte Klassiker: *Fack ju Göhte!*" *Die Welt*, 26 June 2016. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://www.welt.de/print/wams/politik/article156568648/Fack-ju-Goehte.html>.
- . "Goethe und Schiller lesen selbst Abiturienten kaum." *Die Welt*, 27 June 2016. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://www.welt.de/politik/deutschland/article156561037/Goethe-und-Schiller-lesen-selbst-Abiturienten-kaum.html>.
- Warner Bros. "Goethe!: Material für schulische und außerschulische Bildung." 2010.
- Weiss, Christina. "Vortrag. Bewegte Bilder: Bilder Bewegen: Filmpolitik in Schulen und Universität." In *Materialsammlung zum Kongress: Kino macht Schule*, 7–11. Berlin: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 2003.
- Wenzel, Tobias. "Deutscher Film wird mehr gefördert." *Deutschlandfunk Kultur*, 6 September 2006. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://www.deutschlandfunkkultur.de/deutscher-film-wird-mehr-gefoerdert-100.html>.
- ZDF. "Leander Haußmann für *Kabale und Liebe* mit Regiepreis ausgezeichnet," 27 January 2006. Retrieved 1 March 2022 from <https://www.presseportal.de/pm/7840/778859>.