ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: EARLY INNOVATIONS IN
                                      SHAKESPEAREAN PERFORMANCE:
                                      LUDWIG TIECK, WILLIAM POEL, AND
                                      THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO THE
                                      NAZARENES AND PRE-RAPHAELITES

                                      Natalie Marie Tenner, Doctor of Philosophy,
                                      2012

Directed By: Professor Franklin J. Hildy
                                      Department of Theatre and Performance Studies

This dissertation attempts to reanalyze the Elizabethan stage work of Ludwig Tieck and

William Poel through a historically cultural lens, instead of within the frame of

Shakespearean performance. Connecting these men personally and idealogically to two

artistic groups, the Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites, reveals, through their respective

productions of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Measure for Measure,* their positions as

Romantic artists in changing societies. The German Romantics used their art to progress

towards a unified German nation. Tieck, who knew Novalis, the Schlegel brothers, and

Schleiermacher, exhibited more political awareness than he is usually give credit for. His

production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* on an attempted recreation of an Elizabethan

stage can be read as a theatrical event in which Tieck displayed, both by product and by

procedure, his ideal nation in which all classes are connected intellectually and culturally, but at the same time understand the specific role they must fill in society.

Poel's production of *Measure for Measure* on an Elizabethan stage, when viewed in relation to Pre-Raphaelite thought, reveals a tension in Poel's work between his pristine Victorian aesthetic and his appreciation for the flawed human being. This manifested itself in Poel's producing a play with sexually explicit and morally difficult themes, which he then heavily cut to soften some of the discomfort. Under the influence of Ruskin and the Pre-Raphaelites, Poel would have been exposed to ideas which praise humans over machines, and accept a wider range of human emotion and expression than was typically acceptable to his Victorian society. If Poel did not share some of the Pre-Raphaelite fascination with more difficult subjects, he could easily have stayed far away from this difficult play. His choice of the play, and his connections with the Pre-Raphaelites, cause me to question the typical view of Poel as overly prudish. I argue instead that he was negotiating a new place for the artist in society, using Shakespeare and Elizabethan practices, which exalted the full range of human capacity through such tools as the noble grotesque, while keeping the ultimate goal of elevating and improving his audience.

EARLY INNOVATIONS IN SHAKESPEAREAN PERFORMANCE: LUDWIG TIECK,
WILLIAM POEL, AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO THE
NAZARENES AND PRE-RAPHAELITES

By

Natalie Marie Tenner

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2012

Advisory Committee:
Dr. Franklin J. Hildy, Chair
Dr. Heather S. Nathans
Dr. William L. Pressly
Dr. Gary Jay Williams
Dr. Kristen A. Messer

Dedication

To the many doctors in my family, and my mother
who supports us all.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my committee members Dr. Franklin Hildy, Dr. Heather Nathans, Dr. William Pressly, Dr. Gary Jay Williams, and Dr. Kristen Messer for their time and help with this project.

I would also like to recognize Claudia Mastriana, a graduate student in the German language department for her help in editing my translation.

I am indebted to some of my fellow students for their support, generous resource sharing, and participation in writing groups. Ashley, Erin, Matthew, and Ara helped to make this possible.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

This dissertation grew from two questions, which appear at first glance to be basic and to have very little in common. 1. Why did Ludwig Tieck, a German theatre practitioner, devote so much of his life to the English poet Shakespeare and feel it was necessary to perform Shakespeare using Elizabethan methods? 2. Why did William Poel in 1893 choose *Measure for Measure*, a little known Shakespeare play at the time, which relies on themes that in appearance seem completely opposed to Victorian middle-class values, as the inaugural production on a reconstructed Elizabethan stage? Ludwig Tieck, often referred to as the "father of Romanticism" is mostly remembered for his novels and contributions to literary criticism, but he was also a fervent lover of Shakespeare and the first person known to have advocated for performing Shakespeare on a reconstructed Elizabethan stage. He was working in the early nineteenth century, before Germany was a nation and at a time when Goethe, Schiller, and other artists were trying to establish a German theatre tradition as opposed to theatre modeled after the French. Tieck was also interested in establishing German theatre as representative of the 'German spirit', and yet turned to Shakespeare, not Goethe or Schiller, as his model playwright. William Poel was working in England later in the nineteenth century and was the first Englishman to attempt Shakespeare on a reconstructed Elizabethan stage. Although he was working well after England was established as a country, the Industrial Revolution and imperial expansion were causing English citizens to question who they were and what was important to their identity. The human being was taking a subordinate position to industrial technology, and Poel, along with

other artists, was trying to reposition art and the importance of the human being in an industrial society.

The specific choices of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* for Tieck and *Measure for Measure* for Poel also suggest some interesting possibilities. Tieck chose this play for a performance commissioned by King Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia, using August Wilhelm Schlegel's translation and including Felix Mendelssohn's full score. The spectacle of the event, the talent involved, and the audience for which it was produced made this production a display of national pride.[1] Why was Shakespeare, an English playwright, involved in this event at all? And what does national pride mean to a people who were not yet a political nation? Poel had been experimenting in England for twelve years with Elizabethan performance practices before his production of *Measure for Measure*, including an early production of the first quarto version of *Hamlet*. However, *Measure for Measure* was the first production for which Poel was able to use a fairly complex reconstructed Elizabethan stage. His company for that production became the founding Elizabethan Stage Society a year later. This was an important production for his career, which makes his choice of *Measure for Measure* difficult to reconcile with his treatment of the text. The play deals explicitly with issues of sex, prostitution, pregnancy out of wedlock, and corruption, all of which Poel apparently felt were inappropriate material for the stage, causing him to cut the text to make it more palatable, even though part of his mission for the Elizabethan stage was to perform the full Shakespeare text. There are several elements that do not match up here, and that is why I have chosen this production to help understand Poel's relationship to Shakespeare, the theatre, and the larger Victorian society.

---

[1] Gary Williams, *Our Moonlight Revels:* A Midsummer Night's Dream *in the Theatre* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1997), 104. Williams argues that the production was not just an early instance of an attempted reconstruction of an Elizabethan stage, but also converted Shakespeare into "German currency."

In exploring these two initial questions individually, similarities in the two stories kept presenting themselves, until it appeared that these two paths might in fact be part of the same discussion. This dissertation still seeks to answer the two first questions, but doing so has necessitated understanding the "cultural poetics"[2] surrounding both events, which in turn has led to examinations of artistic theories, social and political events, and artists working in theatre, literature, and the visual arts. The nature of this topic then resists a typical structure that might examine the occurrences within certain dates or the analysis of an artist's biography. Instead, this dissertation will focus on two theatrical moments, Tieck's 1843 production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and Poel's 1893 *Measure for Measure* not only as important examples of the earliest productions of Shakespeare on an attempted reconstruction of an Elizabethan stage, but also, and more importantly, as theatrical events that facilitate a better understanding of how these and other artists were using their art in response to quickly-changing social and political times.

My initial discovery of an intriguing similarity between Ludwig Tieck and William Poel was their respective connections to two different artistic groups, the Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites. In the same way that Tieck and Poel desired to return their theatrical style to an Elizabethan stage, the Nazarenes and Pre-Raphaelites both modeled their artistic style, mostly through painting, on the late-medieval, early-Renaissance painters up to and including Raphael. Tieck was connected ideologically to the Nazarenes, and also through mutual acquaintance, and Poel modeled for some of the Pre-Raphaelite painters as a young boy and remained friends with artists in their influence when he grew older. The two groups of

---

[2] Stephen Greenblatt, "The circulation of social energy," in *Modern Criticism and Theory*, ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood (Harlow, England: Longman, 2000), 499.

painters were also connected through personal visits by some of the English Pre-Raphaelites to the studios of the German Nazarenes.

So a tidy arc connecting Tieck to the Nazarenes, the Nazarenes to the Pre-Raphaelites, and the Pre-Raphaelites to Poel was formed, an arc which spans across a long nineteenth century and several geographical areas. But how tidy is this arc really? Was there an ideological through-line for these artists? Did they directly influence each other? Were the same factors causing them to look to the same periods in history for inspiration? What were those factors? The following work is an attempt to answer these questions.

Searching for similarities in the artists' thinking, I looked immediately to similarities in their environment, in both large scale and everyday factors that could influence not only their artistic outlooks, but their social and political outlooks as well. The following work is constructed as a cultural history, highly indebted to Stephen Greenblatt's ideas of cultural poetics and social energy.[3] In trying to understand the motivations behind and potential effects of Tieck's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and Poel's *Measure for Measure*, I am examining the productions as texts within a larger historical context. I would not, however claim this as a new historicist analysis. Although I want to understand these productions in their historical moment, and will look to a broader cultural picture to do that, I will still be focusing on major artistic works, mostly by artists in the same school of thought or social class as Tieck and Poel.[4] This study does not involve close readings of personal letters and

---

[3] I will also utilize the work of Raymond Williams, Pierre Bourdieu, and Gertrude Himmelfarb. The first two take a similar approach to Greenblatt in their understanding of artwork and artistic events as products of their particular culture. Art is a product of and related to its environment and context and therefore can reflect that context as well. Himmelfarb does not take this approach, but her emphasis on 'great men' provides useful material for some of the intellectual trends I will be examining.

[4] Cathering Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), 9. The authors suggest an important element of a new historicist approach is not to focus on art in the canon, but to look outside of tradition and see the importance in minor works of art as well.

diaries, but instead focuses on the major cultural and political works of the time, ideas that would form the larger environment within which the artists were creating. I am looking for patterns, for repetition, for ideas that seem pervasive in the social and intellectual groups of the artists in question. I am interested in Greenblatt's 'circulation of social energy', the study of "how collective beliefs and experiences were shaped, moved from one medium to another, concentrated in manageable aesthetic form, offered for consumption."[5] Greenblatt's attempt to define social energy leaves it open to a wide possibility of uses and conforms to my desire to study not the entire culture of Western Europe, but instead the social energy surrounding these particular artists. To be more specific, Greenblatt gives three qualifications for what he calls aesthetic social energy.[6] The first requires "minimal predictability – enough to make simple repetitions possible." I have already outlined the repetition of inspiration for the artists under discussion, and more will come later. The second description of social energy calls for "a minimal range: enough to reach out beyond a single creator or consumer to some community, however constricted." Several communities will come into play in this dissertation: Romantics, nationalists, painters, philosophers, artistic theorists, theatre practitioners, Germans, and the English. Finally, social energies are "characterized by a minimal adaptability – enough to enable them to survive at least some of the constant changes to social circumstance and cultural value that make ordinary utterances evanescent." The energies I intend to identify travel from the German States of the late eighteenth century to Victorian England, and survive intact enough to be considered manifestations of the same principles. In a different way, the aesthetic social energy that all four artists and groups are

---

[5] Greenblatt, "Circulation of Social Energy," 498.

[6] The following definitions are from Greenblatt, "Circulation of Social Energy," 499.

trying to tap into, what the Romantics might call the spirit or essential truth, travels from

Raphael and Shakespeare through to the late nineteenth century English artists. This study

encounters social energies that can be both transcendent through art and particular to their

historical time.

In order to understand the social energy circulating through the art I will discuss here,

a better understanding of the cultural poetics of the nineteenth century in Europe will be

necessary. Greenblatt defines cultural poetics as the "study of the collective making of

distinct cultural practices and inquiry into the relations among these practices."[7] The making

of, and determining the relationship between, the cultural practices in question here

necessitates a look at the larger social, political, and intellectual trends in Germany and

England in the nineteenth century. I ultimately suggest motives behind Tieck's and Poel's

Elizabethan productions that run counter to their usual characterizations. I am arguing that

Tieck's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was a Romantic nationalist production, aimed at the

proper education of a diverse German audience to help them on their way to national unity.

This idea runs counter to the typical view of Tieck as a novelist stuck in fantasy and idealist

realism, easily influenced by the people he worked with, and separated from the political and

philosophical issues of his day.[8] In a similar way, I am arguing that Poel's production of

Measure for Measure reveals, despite his typical description as a "high-minded Victorian,"[9]

Poel's inherent appreciation of humans as beings of nature, complete with flaws and

---

[7] Greenblatt, "Circulation of Social Energy," 499.

[8] René Wellek, *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750-1950: The Romantic Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955), 93-100; Roger Paulin, *Ludwig Tieck: A Literary Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 98-99; Edward Mornin, introduction to *Outpourings of an Art-Loving Friar*, by Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder and Ludwig Tieck, trans. Edward Mornin (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing, Co., 1975), xv-xvi.

[9] Robert Speaight, *William Poel and the Elizabethan Revival*. (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1954), 90.

occasional immorality. This appreciation highlights the superiority and acceptance of the

beautiful but flawed human being as a response to the overwhelming industrialization of

society. I am not necessarily suggesting that Tieck and Poel were cognizant of the motives I

am assigning them, but by examining the cultures of which both were a part, I am sharing in

Greenblatt's and Catharine Gallagher's "hermeneutical presumption that one can occupy a

position from which one can discover meanings that those who left traces of themselves

could not have articulated."[10] I am setting out to describe in this dissertation how Tieck's

and Poel's productions fit into the existing cultural conversation of nineteenth century

Germany and England.

Tieck comes first chronologically, born in 1773 in Berlin, but his production of *A

Midsummer Night's Dream* happened late in his life, when he was 70. He discovered

Shakespeare as a boy and devoted much of his life's work to studying him. He did not bring

Shakespeare to Germany, but he did greatly add to scholarly knowledge about the

performance practices in Shakespeare's time. Shakespeare was already a part of German

culture, having been admired by Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe, among others. German

culture at this time however was a tricky thing to determine. Germany as a united political

nation would not exist until 1871, after Tieck's lifetime, but Tieck did witness major changes

in the organization and politics of the German States. When he was born, Germany consisted

of at least 350 independent states as part of the Holy Roman Empire. The empire was

abolished and the number of German States reduced to just under 40 when Napoleon invaded

and took over. From years 1806 to 1815 most of the German States were under French

---

[10] Gallagher and Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism*, 8. Although I argue later that Tieck was actively
promoting German art forms, I do not go so far as to say he was hoping for a direct connection between what
happens in the theatre and the forming of a new German nation. While his idealistic intent was to mould
educated German citizens, he had no specific plan and articulated no clear system for utilizing the theatre for
political change.

influence. During some of this time, Tieck was at Jena with Friedrich and August Schlegel

and the seeds of German Romanticism were planted. An important characteristic of these

early Romantics was the promotion of German culture in the face of heavy French influence.

Napoleon was defeated and expelled from the German States in 1815, but the German nation

remained divided, its two major powers, Prussia and Austria, unable to find common ground

on which to build the State. The desire for national unity and the search for an essential

German culture remained part of the intellectual world of the Germans throughout Tieck's

life. The Nazarenes, who joined together in 1808, existed in the same social and political

period, but the group moved to Rome in 1810 and some of the artists remained there for

many years. Their search was still for German culture, but they approached it from a

different perspective.

England had been established as a nation for centuries at this point, but the nineteenth

century brought with it changes that caused social instead of national identity angst. The

Industrial Revolution, population growth, urbanization, scientific discoveries, and the

expansion of the empire rapidly changed English society and threatened the people's

traditional lifestyle. By the time the Pre-Raphaelites formed (1848) and Poel began to work

in the theatre, Victoria was queen, and the age of stylized Victorian sensibilities had begun.

The theatre was popular and a new emphasis on visual and material culture existed. The

Romanticism of Wordsworth and Coleridge is considered to have ended[11] but remnants of it

remained, particularly in the Pre-Raphaelites and in the discussions of the art critic John

Ruskin. Problems of Victorian social identity were not found only in discussions of the

public and private sphere, gender relations, or class conflict, but extended to speculation

---

[11] Nicholas Roe, ed., *Romanticism: An Oxford Guide* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 6-7.

about the inner makeup of man, about his relation to the spiritual and to his fellow

Englishmen, and about the morals and values that English society traditionally relied on, a

way of life that many theorists felt was diminishing into national ruin.[12]

Though on the surface the German and English situations in the nineteenth century

seem disparate, there were underlying factors they shared in common, and several cultural

crossovers occurred. Both peoples were transitioning into the modern world and feeling the

effects of the changes right on their front doorsteps. For both peoples, the Middle Ages held

a new fascination as a time of simplicity, when individuals knew their roles in society and

could find nobility in performing them adequately, no matter what that position was. And if

nothing else, England and Germany could unite in their mutual animosity towards the

French.

Several cultural crossovers occurred which strengthened the bond between the two

peoples.[13] Queen Victoria herself came from the German Hanover line and married her

cousin, Prince Albert, also of German heritage. When he came to England in 1841 he was

---

[12] Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes* (London: Routledge, 1997) discusses religion, economics, and gender in terms of the middle class and focuses on how those topics changed throughout the century. Eric J. Evans, *The Shaping of Modern Britain: Identity, Industry and Empire, 1780-1914* (London: Pearson Education Limited, 2011) gives a detailed description of the economic and political situation throughout the nineteenth century, with particular emphasis on the affects of industrialization. John Gardiner, *The Victorians: An Age in Retrospect* (London: Hambledon and London, 2002) takes more of a personal history approach, and focuses less on major shifts and political events, and more on the themes that would have affected the everyday lives of all classes.

[13] See René Welleck, *Confrontations: Studies in the intellectual and literary relations between Germany, England, and the United States during the nineteenth century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), 11-12. He argues that based on his previous work and the work of others that he can "assume, however rashly, that the basic argument has been won, that there is a common core of Romantic thought and art throughout Europe." He cites "common antecedents in history, e.g. the very general similarity between the thought of Wordsworth and Coleridge and that of Schelling and thus generally of the German Romantics is marked even before Coleridge had read Shelling. It is due to the common background in the tradition of 'Neo-Platonism, in mysticism such as Böhme's, and in varieties of pietism. Rousseau and hence Goethe's *Werther* supply the common ancestry for the two groups in eighteenth-century sensibility and sentimentality. The Gothic tradition can be found in Coleridge, Shelley and Scott as well as in Tieck, Arnim, Brentano and E.T.A. Hoffman. Ideas and folk themes migrate most easily and form a common European heritage."

made president of the Fine Arts Commission and hoped to employ German artists. Among those involved was Peter Cornelius, a Nazarene artist, who "did not even think that there was a serious national issue at stake, for he argued that the English and Germans had similar racial and cultural origins."[14] Cultural similarities, or the desire for them, seem to have been the motivating factor for Tieck's adoption of Shakespeare. German artists such as Tieck and Lessing felt that Shakespeare accurately described their own German spirit and presented a suitable German artistic style.

Physical transfers of culture across the sea were numerous. Tieck visited England in 1817 to see the London theatre. Wordsworth and Coleridge traveled to Germany where they met August Wilhelm Schlegel in 1828, and Coleridge also met Tieck, in Rome in 1806 and again in London in 1817.[15] The Nazarenes became known in England in the late 1810s and 1820s when many of their paintings were purchased by English collectors.[16] German literary work was also gaining popularity, resulting in the publication of the *German Museum*, a "'monthly repository of the literature of Germany.'"[17]

These artists, in some variation or another, knew of each other and in some cases were personally connected. I am not arguing, however, for a direct line of influence that passes between these artists, but instead I am suggesting that on a theoretical level, they are all responding to the changes of their world in the same way. The changing world of Germany meant coping with the difficulty of finding a German identity and working towards a German nation when no overall governing German body existed. The English were

[14] William Vaughan, *German Romanticism and English Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), 7.

[15] Wellek, *Confrontations*, 7.

[16] Vaughan, *German Romanticism and English Art*, 36.

[17] Vaughan, *German Romanticism and English Art*, 25.

fighting to understand the role of art and the human being in an overcrowded, industrial world. All of these artists found solace in an earlier time, and in earlier artistic methods.

The story told by these artists, then, is that the nineteenth century was a century of crisis. Whether they were national, social, moral, political, tyrannical, or individual, the crises of that century in Germany and England caused artists to rise up in opposition, whether subtly or outrageously. None of these artists were soldiers, and so they fought with the weapons at hand, their artistic talent and a knowledge, or desire for a knowledge, of where they came from. The present was uncertain, the future foreboding, and so these artists looked to the past, to values they saw reflected in artists of nature, and to their methods, which stemmed from the inner truth of the individual, not from instruction or method. While often vastly different in the final product, their work had important similarities: the work both in style and in subject was located in the past, it had an element of strangeness to emphasize the moment of reception, it fostered a special and self-conscious connection between the artist and receiver, and it highlighted the uniqueness of the human individual. All of this served to make the receiver hyper-aware of his or her surroundings in that present moment, but also to transport the receiver back to a (usually) unspecified but clearly historical time, in order to emphasize some strange or unsatisfactory element of the present, and finally to create a neutral space within which the future could be devised.

Time and space, then, are the basic elements that tie all of these artists together. Critical analyses of paintings by the Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites have already been examined by scholars in these terms,[18] but the same analysis has not been applied to the work

---

[18] Stuart Sillars, *Shakespeare, Time and the Victorians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) and Mitchell Benjamin Frank,*German Romantic Painting Redefined: Nazarene tradition and the narratives of Romanticism* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001). I discuss their arguments further in the *Manipulation of Time* sections about the Nazarenes and Pre-Raphaelites.

of Tieck and Poel. The theatre practitioners' connections to the painting groups and their own recognition of working against the same problems support my suggestion that in their respective countries, these artists used the same methods, but different mediums, to combat the same problems. The methods are based in Romanticism, and the possibility of finding solutions to current social and political issues is based in an idealistic view of the place and ability of art in society. The influences that caused the artists to make these decisions, and the practical as well as idealistic outcome of their work will be the subject of the following chapters.

In the work that follows, I will provide examples of the argument I am making about space and time as it works in the to the Elizabethan productions by looking at analyses of work from the painters. In his discussion of time in Victorian treatment of Shakespeare, Stuart Sillars touches on some of these elements, as does Mitchell Benjamin Frank in his close analysis of some of the Nazarene works. Time is the key to both of these discussions, in all of the senses suggested above: history working together with the present to suggest the future. In the work of both of these artistic groups, there usually exists some element that makes the work strange, that cause the viewers – in some cases necessarily well-informed viewers – to pause in their reception of the work, thus taking them out of the constructed world around them into a phenomenological moment of engagement with the painting. The strangeness forces them to be present in the moment of viewing. Both the content and form of the work transfers the viewer back to a historical time, while at the same time emphasizing the fact that that time is gone, irretrievable. And yet something about the way the historical time is depicted highlights an element of the present that is missing, some element of

contemporary time that now seems unsatisfactory. The viewer then has two options: retreat

back into the contemporary time, ignoring the new sense of dissatisfaction with the present,

or, within that space of engagement with the artwork that exists between the present and past

times, devise some plan for the future that addresses the best of both worlds. This follows

with "the Romantic notion that art is not imitation, but transformation."[19] Art which simply

mirrors life, imitates exactly what can be perceived by the eye, allows no room for

contemplation. As Franz Pforr, a Nazarene painter suggests "'The artist must transport us

through Nature to a higher idealised world; if he neglects this and does not go beyond

Nature, he is not going nearly far enough.'"[20]

       The practice of artists emulating methods of the past in order to recreate that

environment or to experience something they feel is now lost is not unique to the artists in

this dissertation. Neoclassicism, which attempted to recreate Greek and Roman art and

artistic methods, coincided for a time with Romanticism. This dissertation is not suggesting

that these artists are unique for their antiquarian fervor, but instead desires to understand their

own version of this trend and how it manifested itself in their particular context and time.

The Romantics' own historicism would urge a nuanced reading of their actions as particular

to their own time and worldview. In an attempt to define what is unique about these artists

and their recreation of the past I would suggest the following. Their historicism was self-

conscious of the fact that while they were recreating historical methods and imitating past

artists, at the same time they were creating a history of their own. Their awareness of the

relationship of past to present to future caused their particular historicism to not only involve

---

[19] Petra ten-Doesschate Chu, *Nineteenth-Century European Art* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2006), 164.

[20] Keith Andrews, *Nazarenes: A Brotherhood of German Painters in Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 21.

a study of the past, but a self-reflective look to the future, in a way that Neoclassicism, particularly in theatre with its rigid adherence to Aristotle, did not. This dissertation, however, is not a comparative analysis of these trends but instead an exploration of a particular instance of this trend among two specific groups of artists in their time. This consciousness of time is what ultimately draws all of these artists together and sets them apart from artistic trends that had come before. It will be difficult to provide useful examples, however, without much of the historical context in the following chapters. Therefore at the end of each chapter, I have provided an epilogue of sorts, each entitled *Manipulations of Time*, which takes the theory suggested above and relates it in very concrete ways to the artwork of the Nazarenes and Pre-Raphaelites, and the productions of Tieck and Poel. Each of these artists also had very specific and practical relations to their own society, and it would not do to forget that these men had to eat, to make a living off of their work. They were also subject to the whims of their commissioners and audiences. However, their own soaring idealism asks for an analysis of their work that goes beyond the mundane, that understands the transcendental possibilities that perhaps they did not even understand themselves.

Literature Review

The current literature relevant to my topic treats each of my four artist groups individually, or at most in groups of two. My project is unique in that it will look at all four of these artistic individuals and groups – Tieck, the Nazarenes, the Pre-Raphaelites, and Poel – to understand why, in their different contextual situations, they arrived at the same solutions. However, the

current studies on the individual elements of my project will be extremely useful in providing a starting point upon which my own work can expand.

The current literature on Ludwig Tieck varies in its approach, focusing at different times on his position as a German romanticist, as an author of both literature and plays, and as an early proponent of Elizabethan productions of Shakespeare's plays. The scholarship on the last approach is most useful to me here, although I will also be discussing German romanticism and German theatre history to a significant extent. Roger Paulin's biography *Ludwig Tieck: A Literary Biography* discusses Tieck's place as a poet, playwright, critic, and novelist within the German Romantic movement. Paulin goes into detail about Tieck's early life, the artists he encounters, his work at theatres in Germany, and his work on Shakespeare. Edwin Zeydel's scholarship on Tieck is indispensible. He also wrote a biography about Tieck, *Ludwig Tieck, The German Romanticist* and extensively about Tieck's relationship to English learning in *Ludwig Tieck and England*. Accounts of Tieck's stage for *A Midsummer Night's Dream* appear in various sources. Both Michael Patterson in his "'Contributing Our Half': Ludwig Tieck's Shakespeare Productions in Dresden and Berlin, 1820-1843" and Gary Williams in his book *Our Moonlight Revels:* A Midsummer Night's Dream *in the Theatre* describe the production in terms of its similarities and differences to Tieck's own ideas about what elements were necessary to recreate Elizabethan theatre practices. Williams also argues the grandeur and spectacle of the production made it a triumph of national talent. Simon Williams looks more closely at Tieck's Elizabethan performance ideas and their influence on later productions in Germany in his "The 'Shakespeare-Stage' in Nineteenth-Century Germany," found in Richard Foulkes *Shakespeare and the Victorian Stage*. He

discusses Karl Immermann and Jocza Savits who were working with or influenced by Tieck and his ideas to create more attempts at Elizabethan performances of Shakespeare's plays.

In order to understand why Tieck's work is important, it is necessary to describe what type of theatre Tieck was working against. In 2008 Simon Williams and Maik Hamburger edited *A History of German Theatre* which contains essays covering German theatre history from the tenth century to present day, including discussions of Tieck's Shakespeare productions as well as a consideration on nationalism and its effects on the German theatre. Michael Patterson's book *The First German Stage* includes German theatre from its beginnings to Georg Büchner, with a separate chapter on Tieck. Marvin Carlson has also published a history of German theatre, *The German Stage in the Nineteenth Century*. Most useful to my project in this book is Carlson's discussion of the Romantic Period, which he places from 1800 to 1830. He situates Tieck and his work in a line of German Romanticists including early Goethe and the Schlegels. George Brandt's *German and Dutch Theatre 1600-1848* is a useful resource for primary sources translated into English.

Works specifically on Shakespeare in Germany include Simon William's *Shakespeare on the German Stage, Volume 1: 1586-1914* and Roger Paulin's *The Critical Reception of Shakespeare in Germany: 1682-1914*, which traces the relationship of German artists to Shakespeare beginning with the German appreciation of English things in the 1600s, Gottsched's advocacy of Shakespeare's poetry, through the 19th century up until 1914. The intricate relationship that German artists have had with Shakespeare is important to my discussion of Tieck's work on Shakespeare and its connections to German nationalism.

Although the Nazarenes were not as interested in artistic methods other than painting as the Pre-Raphaelites were, their theories about art and overall artistic agenda closely

resembles that of Tieck. Mitchell Benjamin Frank's book, *German Romantic Painting Redefined: Nazarene tradition and the narratives of Romanticism*, provides information on the origin of the Nazarene group, their thoughts on art, and their reception by the German artistic and public community. It also provides information on Johann Friedrich Overbeck, one of the key players of the group. By outlining the important elements of German Romantic painting, Frank helps to situation the Nazarenes within their artistic cultural context, highlighting similarities between the artistic groups and determining where they diverge. Keith Andrew's *The Nazarenes: A Brotherhood of German Painters in Rome* provides a close look at the individual artists, as well as outlining their motivation and providing examples of their work. William Vaughan's *German Romantic Painting* covers the wide variety of types of Romantic painters, from the well-known Caspar David Friedrich to the Nazarenes. Vaughan situations the Nazarenes within the context of the larger movement. Carol Lynn Kefalas attempts to connect the English and German artistic groups in her dissertation entitled *The Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites: A Comparative Analysis*. She claims that the two schools "evolved through similar reactions to the aesthetic dictates of Rationalism and Classicism, practiced by the Academies in Western Europe and England."[21] This connection is important because it helps to provide a connection between the artistic groups in the different countries.

Studies of the Pre-Raphaelites, like the Brotherhood itself, have been short lived and sporadic. *Pre-Raphaelite Poets* by Harold Bloom, *The Pre-Raphaelite Imagination 1848-1900* by John Dixon Hunt, and *The Pre-Raphaelites and their Circle* by Cecil Y. Lang provide thorough overviews of both the tenets of Pre-Raphaelitism and the artists that made

---

[21] Carol Lynn Kefalas, "The Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites: A comparative analysis." PhD diss., University of Georgia, 1983, ii.

up this group. Bloom's work also contains critical essays on the poets and their work, whereas Lang's book is an anthology of representative pieces by the poets. Hunt's work, after beginning with an explanation of Pre-Raphaelitism, continues on to explain five aspects of this school, including a continual reference to the Middle Ages and images of women and femininity. Hunt explains that the adherents to these ideas "share the same confidence that through the visible world the invisible is best apprehended."[22] This agrees with Bloom's description of the early painters' mantra of "'Back to nature!'"[23] But, as Bloom explains, the Pre-Raphaelites as a school had shaky ideological beginnings, and "[a]bout the only common characteristic of English Pre-Raphaelite painting was its obsession with naturalistic detail, rendered so artificially as to make it not natural but phantasmagoric."[24] Publications on the Pre-Raphaelite paintings often come from exhibition catalogues, such as that held at the National Gallery of Art, Washington in the Fall of 2010 entitled *The Pre-Raphaelite Lens: British Photography and Painting, 1848-1875*. The work in this exhibition compared Pre-Raphaelite paintings to photography and discussed the influence the Pre-Raphaelites had on certain photographers of the period and the theoretical similarities and problems that arose from the connection between the two artistic mediums. Elizabeth Prettejohn created her work *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites* in order to examine the changes in Pre-Raphaelite Studies that occurred between the exhibition at the Tate Gallery in 1984 and the publication of her book in 2000.

---

[22] John Dixon Hunt, *The Pre-Raphaelite Imagination 1848-1900* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1968), 30.

[23] Harold Bloom, ed., *Modern Critical Views: Pre-Raphaelite Poets* (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1986), 1

[24] Bloom, *Pre-Raphaelite Poets*, 1.

Most recently, Joe Falocco's book *Reimagining Shakespeare's Playhouse: Early Modern Staging Conventions in the Twentieth Century* demonstrates the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood's influence on William Poel and his ideas on the Elizabethan staging of Shakespeare. Sources for information on William Poel and his production ideas come most readily from his own work *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, in which he discusses the form of the Elizabethan playhouse and the players, changes that editors have imposed upon the play text, a few productions he had seen, and contemporary theatres in London. In his section on productions, he describes *King Lear* directed by Jocza Savits, in which he saw "the whole play correctly rendered … in the Court Theatre at Munich." [25] Robert Speaight's biography *William Poel and the Elizabethan Revival* describes the development of Poel's work, outlines major productions, and describes his relationship to other artists of the time, including Holman Hunt and Algernon Charles Swinburne. Franklin J. Hildy's *Shakespeare at the Maddermarket: Nugent Monck and the Norwich Players* discusses the dissemination of Poel's ideas throughout England through the work of Nugent Monck, who had directed many of Poel's productions and was the most successful of those who attempted to apply Poel's principles to the stage.

More general information on Victorian theatre Russell Jackson's *Victorian Theatre*, which is a collection of primary source material referring to all aspects of the theatre. Tracy Davis and Peter Holland edited *The Performing Century: Nineteenth-Century Theatre's History*, which includes essays that discuss performance of all forms in the Victorian period, both inside and outside of the theatre, as well as performances of identity among particular groups. Volumes one and two of Gail Marshall and Adrian Poole's *Victorian Shakespeare*

---

[25] William Poel, *Shakespeare in the Theatre* (New York: Benjamin Blom, Inc., 1913), 177.

provides essays on theatre, drama, performance, literature, and culture, relating to Shakespeare in that period.

To get a better sense of the larger context within which the artists were working, I turned to several more general history books, which for Germany focused mostly on political events and ideas of nationalism, and for England the focus was on social changes both in the family and the labor force. Michael Hughes' book *Nationalism and Society in Germany 1800-1945* is particularly useful in its discussion of political and military events in terms of nationalist perspectives. Other more straightforward histories such as Stefan Berger's *Social Democracy and the Working Class in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Germany*, and Eric Brose's *German History 1789-1871: From The Holy Roman Empire to the Bismarkian Reich* have been helpful reference works.

For the larger context in England, Leonor Davidoff and Catherine Hall's *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850* looks at major changes in economics and society in relation to changing gender roles and changing concepts of the family. These themes often intersect with the role of theatre in society. David Morse's *High Victorian Culture* examines the affect of social and political changes on the major intellectuals and artists of the period as well as their affects on the different classes. Eric Evan's *The Shaping of Modern Britain: Indentity, Industry and Empire, 1780-1914* focuses on the political and economic shifts that took Britain from a pre-industrial nation, through industrialization, and to the expansion of the empire.

The main argument of this dissertation is to place two specific productions within their historical and cultural context, but in order to do so, it is important to take into account the artists' lives before and after those moments. Chapter two will provide biographical information about Tieck and Poel, as well as describe the formation and works of the Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites. I will outline the connections between the groups and highlight the intellectual influences they may have shared. The epilogue of chapter two will discuss select Nazarene paintings in terms of space and time.

All of the artists important to this dissertation could be, and have been, labeled 'Romantic,' and therefore it makes sense to define that term. Unfortunately, clear cut definitions of Romanticism are impossible to determine. For this dissertation, it is most accurate to say that Tieck, the Nazarenes, the Pre-Raphaelites, and Poel were romantic artists, and so that is how I am defining it. This tautology, however frustrating, nevertheless falls in line with the romantic emphasis against rules and methods and in support of the individual artist's ability to create art that is uniquely his or her own. Scholars have attempted to delineate the term 'romantic,' and I will include some of those attempts in this dissertation, but the most useful descriptions will be based on specific information from and about the artists important to my argument. In chapter three, I will discuss some of the issues with defining Romanticism as well as the aspects of the movement that most affect the artists under discussion here. I have identified four areas that seem to tie Tieck, the Nazarenes, the Pre-Raphaelites, and Poel together and to the Romantic Movement. These are national unity, nature vs. industry, the importance of the individual, and imitation. All of these combine together to form an idealized view of a past in which life was somehow better, which

accounts for each of their attempts to return to an artistic past.   I will discuss these four areas

in relation to the artists in an attempt to better understand the Romantic movement as

exhibited by these artists.   The epilogue to this chapter will discuss Pre-Raphaelite paintings.

Having provided the intellectual and historical context in chapters two and three, I

will use chapters four and five to explore the relationship between this context and the

specific productions mentioned above. Chapter four will explore the social energies of

Romanticism and ideas of national unity, as well as take a broader look at the theatre in

Germany that Tieck was working within. I will argue that his ideas for an Elizabethan stage

and his production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, although originally an English play,

attempted to show his German audience what a German art form could be, and through that,

instruct his audience how to be better Germans. I will then use the epilogue to discuss this

production in relation to ideas of time and space in Tieck's production.

Finally, I will turn to Poel and his production of *Measure for Measure* in chapter five.

Although Poel found relative success with his Elizabethan Stage Society, many of his

production choices were controversial, and that certainly is the case with this production. It

is also curious that although Poel claimed to have wanted to perform Shakespeare's full text,

he chose a play like *Measure for Measure* which he felt needed to be cut to be appropriate for

Victorian audiences. Why choose this play, when there are others which would have needed

less pruning? I use Poel's relationship to the Pre-Raphaelite artists and the Victorian concept

of the Grotesque to argue that Poel's Elizabethan interests were not just antiquarian curiosity,

and that his quirkiness as a director was not indecisiveness or some strange eccentricity.

Instead, I posit Poel as a late Romantic who was struggling to find the place of the artist in a

world where the humanism and nature of Shakespeare's plays were losing stock to large

spectacle and idealized images of a pure Shakespeare in an increasingly industrialized world. The epilogue of this chapter will examine Poel's production techniques in terms of space and time.[26]

---

[26] A Note on Translations: With the exception of a selection from *Der junge Tischlermeister* in the appendix, the German works consulted in this study are English translations. The works of the Romantic artists and theorists important to this dissertation have long been recognized as important figures and so English translations of their works are easy to come by. My own German has been useful in my work, but the complexity of some of the theoretical writings and the experience of the translators made me choose to make use of available translations.

Chapter 2: The Artists in Their Context

Ludwig Tieck, the Nazarenes, the Pre-Raphaelites, and William Poel are all important and well-documented figures in history and the arts. Books, criticisms, reviews, and letters exist for most of these artists. Their contributions to their fields have been analyzed on many different occasions, and they are often discussed in relation to their contextual time periods. However, they have never all been examined as characters sharing in the same cultural story, and the possibilities which that analysis could uncover have never been suggested. This chapter is dedicated to describing these artists, discussing their biographies and work, and also illustrating some of the important events occurring in nineteenth century Germany and England.

I suggested a framework for this dissertation based on cultural poetics. The political, social, and intellectual events and ideas of the long nineteenth century in Germany and England all are part of the poetics within which Tieck and Poel were working. The discussion in this chapter about the political situation in Germany, including the French cultural influence, and the ways in which the artists responded all contribute the cultural poetics of the period. The same is true of the English and the intellectual writings against the effects of industrialization. This chapter outlines the main events that punctuate the world of the artists. The next chapter will discuss the social energies surrounding these events.

German History

The claim that Tieck's 1843 production of _A Midsummer Night's Dream_ expressed a nationalist purpose, which is the subject of chapter three, requires some explanation and

delineation of terms and ideas. I will start, however, by making it clear that I am not arguing

a nationalist purpose based on my own convictions of how the German nation formed and

what I understand a nation to be, but instead I am basing my understanding of the theatrical

event and its place in nation-building on contemporary ideas of the German nation expressed

in Tieck's time, and to which he would have been exposed. Stefan Berger, among others,[27]

highlights the importance of understanding nineteenth century German nationalism not as

"one overarching story" but as a "multitude of possible inventions."[28] There are, of course,

numerous movements with nationalist agendas including the liberal, conservative and ethnic

movements, but Tieck himself was most closely aligned with the Romantics. Michael

Hughes, in his book *Nationalism and Society: Germany 1800-1945,* suggests several

different nationalist approaches existing in Germany at the same time, including "nationalism

from below… and official nationalism" as well as a "mass nationalism [that] appeared

spontaneously in a xenophobic negative form."[29] Based on the variety of forms nationalism

seems to have taken in the German States, it is worth taking a quick look at some of the basic

theories of nationalism.

Anthony Smith, in his book *The Cultural Foundations of Nations*, spends time in his

introduction explaining current theories of nationalism. He divides them into three

categories: modernism, neo-perennialism, and primordialism. Since the modern nation is

most useful to this discussion, I will briefly explain the other two before looking more

---

[27] Stefan Berger, *Social Democracy and the Working Class in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Germany* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2000), 7 ; Eric Dorn Brose, *German History, 1789-1871: From the Holy Roman Empire to the Bismarckian Reich* (Providence: Berghahn Books, 1997), 69-72; Michael Hughes, *Nationalism and Society: Germany 1800-1945* (London: Edward Arnold, 1988), 22-23.

[28] Berger, *Social Democracy and the Working Class*, 7.

[29] M. Hughes, *Nationalism and Society*, 16.

closely at modernism. The fundamental question for all of these theories is whether a nation is a man-made construction or an innate and always-present characteristic of a people. Did nations come first or did nationalists? The neo-perennialists do not necessarily claim that nationhood is an innate phenomenon, but they certainly claim the existence of nations long before modernity. The nation arises, they argue, from "ubiquitous but fluid oral ethnicities as the result of the introduction of a written vernacular, because a literature fixes the field of a vernacular language and defines its reading public, or nation."[30] Particularly in countries like England, who shared a language and literature well before the eighteenth century, the neo-perennialists argue for the existence of a nation defined by a common literature. The primordialists, on the other hand, look to intrinsic instead of extrinsic elements to define a nation, hence suggesting the formation of a nation is simply the revelation of an innate structure. The nation is not mainly a political body, but instead necessarily relies on "'primordial' attachments to certain social and cultural 'givens,' – of kinship, race, religion, custom, language, and territory.'"[31] This concept of nationalism relies on tradition, belief, and family.

It is the idea of the modern nation, however, that has most relevancy to the present topic. This theory claims that the modern nation was developed by the rise of modernity, and as Germany is a modern nation, and certainly did develop during the early stages of modernity, this is the light in which I will discuss German nationhood. Many aspects of modernity can affect nation-building, including "industrial capitalism, … the rise of the centralized, professional state, and … the nature of modern mass communications and

---

[30] Anthony Smith, *The Cultural Foundation of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant, Republic* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 4.

[31] Smith, *Cultural Foundation of Nations*, 9.

secular education."[32] These aspects of modernity led to both the modern nation and the

modern concept of what a nation is. Of course, none of this actually defines the boundaries

and makeup of the nation. Anthony Smith argues for seven aspects generally cited as a

modern nation.

> 1 a well-defined territory, with a fixed center and clearly demarcated and monitored
> borders;
> 2 a unified legal system and common legal institutions within a given territory,
> creating a legal and political community;
> 3 participation in the social life and politics of the nation by all the members or
> 'citizens';
> 4 a mass public culture disseminated by means of a public, standardized, mass
> education system;
> 5 collective autonomy institutionalized in a sovereign territorial state for a given
> nation;
> 6 membership of the nation in an 'inter-national' system of the community of
> nations;
> 7 legitimation, if not creation, of the nation by and through the ideology of
> nationalism.[33]

While this may be true of Germany today, and of other modern nations, there is another

aspect of German nationalism that is important to this study, which defines a much less

rigorous, more idealistic nation, and that is Romanticism. Therefore when I discuss

nationalism in this dissertation, I mean romantic, modern nationalism.

I will be more explicit about the term 'romantic nationalism' shortly, but first I want

to expand on modern nationalism. Two of its perhaps most recognized supporters are Ernest

Gellner and E.J. Hobsbawm.[34] In his *Nations and Nationalism*, Gellner cites the

development of modern nationalism starting in the transition between agrarian and industrial

---

[32] Smith, *Cultural Foundation of Nations*, 2.

[33] Smith, *Cultural Foundation of Nations*, 12-13.

[34] E.J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 3. Although I will only expand on Gellner here, Hobsbawm claims "The modern sense of the word [nation] is no older than the eighteenth century, give or take the odd predecessor."

societies. In the agrarian society, Gellner places the "emergence of literacy and of a

specialized clerical class or estate, a clerisy."[35] This creates an agro-literate society, in whose

structure "the ruling class forms a small minority of the population, rigidly separate from the

great majority of direct agricultural producers, or peasants.   Generally speaking, its ideology

exaggerates rather than underplays the inequality of classes and the degree of separation of

the ruling stratum. "[36] In this early stage, nationalism has very little stable ground on which

to stand. A wide-spread acceptance and support of high culture is necessary, Gellner argues,

to the development of nationalism, and the agro-literate society simply does not have the

basis for this. It is not until industrialization, with its need for a division of labor and its

increase in human mobility, that ideas of nationalism can begin to spread. Gellner argues

"the age of transition to industrialism was bound, according to our model, also to be an age

of nationalism, a period of turbulent readjustment, in which either political boundaries, or

cultural ones, or both, were being modified, so as to satisfy the new nationalist imperative

which now, for the first time, was making itself felt."[37] The Germany of Romanticism and of

Tieck exists within the model Gellner puts forth. Early in Tieck's life, the German States

were divided into small, agrarian communities, the high culture of the Romantics and

intellectuals different from the culture of the common people. As industrialization came to

the German States, so did eventually national unity. I am not arguing that Gellner's evolution

of nationalism perfectly explains the path to Germany, but it does provide an interesting

background to the issues that will be discussed here.

---

[35] Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), 8.

[36] Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 9-10.

[37] Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 40.

I have also suggested the idea of a Romantic nationalism. In chapter three I will outline the ideas of some of the German Romantic nationalist theorists, but here I would like to discuss briefly the differences between Romantic nationalism and Liberal nationalism. For the Germans, Liberal nationalism "held that the nation, like the individual, should be allowed to develop to the limit of its potential in a framework of freedom."[38] It also emphasized that "free individual and economic development would ultimately produce a strong nation."[39] Individual liberty as opposed to absolute rule was foremost among its goals. This did not, however, necessarily mean democracy, but instead "a vision of a classless bourgeois society."[40]

Romantic nationalism shared some common characteristics with Liberal nationalism, in that they both grew out of the aftermath of the failed French Revolution and they both tended to be idealistic. However, Romantic nationalism was more reactionary and attempted to recreate an idealized version of the past instead of looking to a new form for the future. It was "susceptible to irrationality and metaphysics and … glorified an idealized German past of wise and powerful Emperors, fatherly princes and happy peasants and townsmen."[41] As opposed to Liberal nationalism, where the nation was a vehicle for the people, Romantic nationalism seemed to subordinate the individual to the good of the state, and "longed for the

---

[38] M. Hughes, *Nationalism and Society,* 23.

[39] George Mosse, *The Culture of Western Europe: The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1988), 67.

[40] M. Hughes, *Nationalism and Society*, 23.

[41] M. Hughes, *Nationalism and Society*, 24.

past when society had ignored the claims of equality and when proper weight had been given to the differences between men."[42]

Hughes, in discussing nineteenth century German nationalism in particular, divides opinions on the origins of nationalism into two categories.[43] The first view begins from "the premise that the sentiment of nationality is essentially spontaneous, unforced, and in some sense, voluntary." The nation occurs naturally from some hidden essence and is the desirable end product of community formation. The second view sees "the sentiment of nationality as essentially artificial." In this sense, the nation is a constructed reality, tied in with Marxist ideology which sees the nation as a "temporary phase in the development of the bourgeois economic and social system." The nation, therefore, is not the end product but instead a stepping stone on the way to a better social construction. Whether either or none of these theories is ultimately superior does not matter; only how the people involved in the nation-building felt connected to their nation is important. Hughes argues for the former understanding of a nation: "the 'German' concept saw a man's nationality as predetermined by his culture or blood regardless of his own wishes."[44] Indeed this is how the Romantics often wrote about nation building, as will be discussed later.

Germany eventually became a nation in 1871, but the history of nationalist ideas has been cited as reaching back as far as the 11th century.[45] More typically, however, scholars refer to modern nationalist sentiment as springing up in Germany from the French

---

[42] H.S. Reiss, ed., *The Political Thought of the German Romantics: 1793-1815* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 8.

[43] The following discussion comes from M. Hughes, *Nationalism and Society*, 9-10.

[44] M. Hughes, *Nationalism and Society,* 12.

[45] M. Hughes, *Nationalism and Society*, 18.

Revolution in 1789. The revolution inspired autonomous ideas in German thinkers, but they became disillusioned with its failure, as did most of Europe. The entrance of Napoleon into the German States and the imposition of French rule caused mixed responses. Politically, certain German states and Prussia were at war with Napoleon. On the other hand, 1806 saw the formation of the *Rheinbund*, a geographical area in which sixteen princes joined together[46] and fostered the view of Napoleon as "not a French despot colonizing Europe, but a cosmopolitan citizen of the world freeing the European nations from despotism."[47] The difference in response and changes of allegiance might point to the fact that after the fall of the Holy Roman Empire and Napoleon's invasion, no clear path to a German nation was visible.

The invasion of Napoleon brought with it an invasion of French culture, but even before this time, expressions of German national sentiment were based around the common language of the German people,[48] which led in turn to a cultural connection, and therefore the imposition of French art led to a backlash against the foreign influence and to a newly developed desire to establish a strong German culture based on their own history. German intellectuals began emphasizing myth, language, important historical German men, and education, the latter of which would consist of all of these elements. It was important now that German people knew where they came from and understood what it meant to be 'German'.

---

[46] Brose, *German History*, 51. Brose argues that Napoleon "forced" this formation.

[47] Berger, *Social Democracy and the Working Class*, 31.

[48] Berger, *Social Democracy and the Working Class*, 24. Friedrich Carl von Moser argued in his 1765 pamphlet *Of the German National Spirit* that a nation must be created by uniting the *Reich*. However, he was opposed by those that argued that since "the *Reich* incorporated many non-Germanic tribes and people who did not speak the German language, the idea of the *Reich*… could not be squared with the idea of the nation."

The myths that led to German unification were both political and artistic. Political myths included the tale of German tribes fighting against the Romans and the development of the Napoleonic wars becoming known as the 'wars of liberation', which Berger points out only meant liberation from France, but not from the "crowned heads of the German state." [49] Artistic myths sparked a return to folk stories and reworkings of myths like the *Nibelungenlied* which highlighted stories based in the German experience. Publications attempting the codification of the diverse German language appeared in the early 1800s as well, advancing an important step in the journey to unification. [50] Johann Gottlieb Fichte, a public and out-spoken proponent of German nationalism, gave a series of speeches entitled "Addresses to the German Nation" in 1807-8, in which he "praised Germans as a people bound together by a common language and a mission to redeem human culture." [51] Fichte posits German culture not only as important for Germans, but as important for all of humanity. While the Germans may not have made successful political attempts at arousing feelings of national unity during the Napoleonic years, they took important steps towards establishing and elevating German culture over French influence.

The creation and spread of German culture continued after the "Wars of Liberation." In 1815 Russia, Prussia, and Austria defeated Napoleon and forced him to retreat out of the German states. While Napoleon's retreat led to an increase in nationalist feeling among some groups, the Germanic nation that could have formed at this time never did. Austria and Prussia emerged as the most powerful of the German states, but while Prussia looked forward

---

[49] Berger, *Social Democracy and the Working Class*, 37.

[50] Berger, *Social Democracy and the Working Class*, 34.

[51] Brose, *German History*, 71.

to change and reform, Austria continued much as it had before the wars.[52] Unification under

these two powers, then, was impossible. Instead, the German states, which now numbered

between 37 and 39 depending on the year, instead of over 350, joined together in an alliance

structure called the Confederation, which existed from 1815 – 1848, and then again from

1850 – 1866. Prussia and Austria were the largest powers within the Confederation, but had

no direct control over the smaller states. In the Confederation, Prussia extended over some

of present day Poland and northern Germany, as well as some area over Westphalia in

western Germany. Austria moved out of present day Germany and controlled land in

northern Italy, current day Austria, Hungary, and further south and east. Bavaria was a larger

state in the South and the other states existed mostly within the perimeter created by Prussia

and Austria. Twenty of the states had populations less than 100,000.[53] A *Diet* which met in

Frankfurt was the main governing body, and though Austria held the presidency, all member

states were represented. This type of governing structure led to smaller, regional feel that

spread throughout the German states, and though the desire for a single German nation still

existed, it manifested itself in small organizations, created on a local scale. These groups,

national in purpose, were not political in their makeup, but instead appeared more like social

clubs. Friedrich Jahn founded a gymnastics club, in order to "encourage young Germans to

make themselves fit to liberate their country."[54] This idea caught on and 150 of these

---

[52] Brose, *German History*, 76.

[53] David Blackbourn, *History of Germany, 1780-1918: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1997), 70.

[54] M. Hughes, *Nationalism and Society*, 27.

gymnastics clubs appeared in 1810.[55] Choral groups also formed throughout Germany, with a purpose of spreading German culture through song.[56]

Many of these groups and societies were disbanded, or at least had to move underground, after the Karlsbad decrees of 1819, which primarily were "common policing measures aimed at the repression of the liberal-democratic and national movement in the German lands."[57] These decrees were first implemented under Metternich in Austria, but soon spread to other monarchies in the German states, who pressured anyone showing resistance into compliance.[58] They imposed censorship on written work as well as plays, causing, among other incidents, a drastic reworking of Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell*.[59]

The Napoleonic Wars and the German Confederation were the reality of the German world for both Tieck and the Nazarenes. Tieck did much of his writing on Shakespeare and his theatre work within the midst of Germany's shift from French rule to the unsure formation of German alliances. The political situation of the Confederation did not change much during Tieck's life, until of course the Revolution of 1848, which was five years before Tieck died. But in that five years, Tieck saw the recreation of the Confederation after the revolution failed. In the earlier form of the Confederation, the political bodies changed gradually with reforms, but life on the regional level was experiencing irreversible changes. Industrialization was beginning to affect the German states, although its main influence

---

[55] Berger, *Social Democracy and the Working Class*, 44.

[56] Berger, *Social Democracy and the Working Class*, 44.

[57] Berger, *Social Democracy and the Working Class*, 45.

[58] Brose, *German History*, 95-96. King William of Württemberg allowed newspapers to continue to print in support of certain southern states uniting in opposition to Vienna and Berlin. Metternich and other princes pressured William to ban those newspapers.

[59] Brose, *German History*, 95.

would not be felt until the second half of the century. The social and class structure of rural

Germany was changing with the peasant emancipation that occurred variously in the first few

decades of the nineteenth century.[60] The Confederation underwent many economic changes,

including a few depressions, in this period, but there was also a development of liberal and

other nationalist strains. In 1848, the Liberal nationalists led revolts to attempt to gain

national unity.[61] But again, arguments over what type of government a unified Germany was

to have, not to mention where the boundaries of that nation would be, slowed the

revolutionary fervor. Two years later the revolution was over, and political power returned

to the status quo.

Clearly the story of German unification continued, and Germany was formed in 1871.

The period described above, however, delineates the political and national situation within

which Tieck and the Nazarenes existed, and therefore it is not necessary to this argument to

move further ahead in history. Having provided a picture of the larger context, the following

descriptions of Tieck and the Nazarenes will focus the story around their particular work and

place them within the larger artistic culture.

Ludwig Tieck

Shakespeare as a young boy has gotten lost in the woods and decides to rest before turning

back. When he falls asleep, he is visited by Titania and Oberon, newly reconciled, and by

the mischievous spirit Puck. Because of Titania's good mood, she convinces Oberon not to

harm the boy, but instead they bless him with gifts. From Titania:

---

[60] Blackbourn, *History of Germany,* 80.

[61] M. Hughes, *Nationalism and Society*, 84.

Let golden visions wreathe thine inner sense;
O sing, as none before thee ever sung,
As never mortal after thee shall sing!
…A Poet shalt thall be,
The greatest earth has known – whose altitude
No after spirit shall have power to reach.[62]

From Oberon:

… Thou shalt know
A strange delight, when midnight tempests roar,
When storms uproot the huge Oaks from the hill,
And hurl them crashing to the vale below. –
On nature's terrors, thou with fearless joy
Shall gaze; thy heart throb with wild ecstasy…[63]

And charmingly from Puck:

… I can breathe
A merry humour into thee. – Be thine
The power, whene'er thou will'st, to drive away
Black melancholy from each human breast![64]

The boy Shakespeare wakes up, heart beating wildly, overcome by ecstatic wonder at the earth.

This is the story Tieck tells in his "Die Sommernacht," which he wrote at the age of sixteen. Titania tells the boy Shakespeare to remember her and Oberon, and to tell the story of their reconciliation, which is to become his *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the play Tieck chooses for his only successful Elizabethan practices production fifty-four years later. This short tale is the young Tieck's imagining of how Shakespeare got his poetic power, and the blessing each spirit bestows on him reveals Tieck's and the Romantics' relationship to Shakespeare. Titania gives Shakespeare the power of poetry and vision, Oberon gives the

---

[62] Ludwig Tieck, *The Midsummer Night, or Shakespeare and the Fairies, From Tieck*, trans. by Mary C. Rumsey (London: C. Whittingham, 1854), 27.

[63] Tieck, *The Midsummer Night*, 28.

[64] Tieck, *The Midsummer Night*, 32.

wonder of nature and delight in its terrors, and Puck gives the boy humor and the ability to lighten the hearts of his audiences. Genius and nature, gifts which Shakespeare possesses, make him a Romantic idol. Humor and merriment, mixed in with the terror of the human condition, arguably make Shakespeare relatable to a wide variety of ages and people.

Tieck's tale shows his devotion to Shakespeare at an early age, as well as revealing a particular understanding of the position of this poet in what would become Romanticism. His devotion would last for the rest of his life and make Tieck an important advocate of Shakespeare in German literature. As much time as he spent with Shakespeare, however, Tieck's interests were varied. Tieck was a romantic novelist and playwright, as well as dramaturg, actor, and theatre practitioner. He is not today widely known as an artistic genius, or even as a great contributor to western theatre history, but he knew and collaborated with some of the greatest German artists of the time and was instrumental in the growth and spread of Romantic ideas. He was part of the original Jena Circle (1797-1802) with Friedrich and August Wilhelm Schlegel, where it is commonly understood German Romanticism began.[65] Also part of this group were Novalis and Schleiermacher, two Romantic nationalist writers, Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand Solger, a German philosopher, and Wilhelm Wackenroder, a close friend of Tieck's and collaborator on "the first work of German literature to which the label 'Romantic' has been unanimously applied,"[66] *Herzensergiessungen eines kunstleibenden Klosterbruders* ("Outpourings of an Art-loving Friar") in 1797. The work appears to have sprung, in part, from the two friends' travels together, during which "their impressions of old German art in Nuremberg, convinced them of the dual importance of

---

[65] Frederick C. Beiser, ed. and trans., *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), xi-xii.

[66] Mornin, *Outpourings of an Art Loving Friar*, vii.

religious feeling and national inspiration for the creation of great art."[67] Among this old

German art were included paintings by Albrecht Dürer, who was one of the few German

artists who was an inspiration for both the Romantics and the Nazarenes.   Wackenroder died

a year after the appearance of the literary work , but Tieck continued and published *Franz*

Sternbalds Wanderunben in 1798, which has for its hero a disciple of Dürer. These two

works provided examples of the Romantic life to young readers and appear to have greatly

influenced the direction of the Nazarenes, which I will discuss shortly.

Tieck's beginnings in the Jena Circle introduced him to friends and ideas that would

stay with him throughout his life. Although his two closest friends Novalis and Wackenroder

died when they were young, in 1801 and 1798 respectively, he kept acquaintance with the

Schlegel brothers until the end of his life, and he and Solger traded letters until the latter's

death. These friendships would remain important to Tieck and his work that came long after

the Jena Circle disbanded.

By the end of his life, Tieck's oeuvre was varied and extensive, ranging from short

plays to extensive essays on art. Tieck wrote novels, promised sweeping books and essays

that were never published, and even attempted to start a journal with his name in the title,

based on his own thoughts about art. His mammoth *Buch über Shakespeare* was never

completed, but his collection of essays *Kritische Schriften* fills four volumes. He had a

reputation for not delivering on promised work, for having too many grand ideas at one

time,[68] and for relying too heavily on the support and opinions of those he worked with.[69]

---

[67] Mornin , *Outpourings of an Art Loving Friar*, xii.

[68] Paulin, *Ludwig Tieck,* 129. Paulin calls this "suspiciously feverish."

For these reasons, Tieck's work is usually not considered on a philosophical level, nor is he thought to be making any serious commentary on life, but instead appears to be "satisfied with the creation of a beautiful world of imagination."[70] Although Tieck's work often explored the world of fantasy and imagination, he did write practical and grounded essays on literature, and seemed to hope for a greater purpose for his work than just entertainment.

While Tieck expressed a desire for a German nation[71] and was a great friend of the nationalist writer Novalis, he did not limit his inspiration to German artists. He was, of course, a great admirer of Dürer, and he spent a portion of his career studying German poets from the Middle Ages and presenting their work to the public,[72] but he also studied the classicism of the Greeks, translated Calderon and Cervantes, and of course, brought Shakespeare even further into the German speaking world. His initial contributions to the spread of Shakespeare in Germany came to the page, before he began to produce Shakespeare for the stage. He edited translations of Shakespeare from Wilhelm August Schlegel, which, along with the additions of translations from his daughter Dorothea Tieck and Wolf von Baudissin, resulted in the 'Schlegel-Tieck' edition of Shakespeare. This edition was the "most often read for the next one hundred and fifty years"[73] after its

---

[69] Wellek, *A History of Modern Criticism,* 89. Wellek describes Tieck as "an eclectic who reflects, almost year by year, the aesthetic theories of his contemporaries, beginning with Wackenroder and ending with a long attachment to the theories of his friend Solger."

[70] Ernst Rose, *A History of German Literature* (New York: New York University Press, 1960), 212.

[71] E. H. Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck, the German Romanticist* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1971) 184. "Had he not told Solger that a poet must have a fatherland? To Friedrich Schlegel he expressed the hope in March 1813 that Germany would soon be free."

[72] Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck*, 167. Tieck published *Die altdeutschen Minnelieder* in 1803 which consisted of "two hundred and twenty German minnesongs."

[73] Kenneth E. Larson, "The Origins of the "Schlegel-Tieck" Shakespeare in the 1820s," *The German Quarterly* 60, no. 1 (Winter, 1987), 19.

appearance between 1825 and 1833.[74] The importance of this translation is that it allowed the reader access to "the plays as they actually appeared in the First Folio, without omissions, contractions and radical alterations that had marked all productions and publications of Shakespeare during the last decades of the eighteenth century."[75] The increasingly literate German people now could read Shakespeare in translation in as close to the original as it was possible to get. He also contributed to German scholarship of Shakespeare in several of his works, including *Der junge Tischlermeister* and *Alt-Englische Theater.*

Tieck made great strides towards the implementation of Elizabethan theatre practices later in his career. His plans for a reconstruction of the Fortune Theatre were completed with Gottfried Semper in 1836,[76] he published *Der junge Tischlermeister* in 1836, and of course his *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was staged in 1843. Tieck seems to have worked in stages on different topics throughout his life, at one moment focused on Spanish literature, at another on medieval poetry, and so the amount of work created on Shakespeare in these years is most likely due simply to his preference at the time. It is worth noting however, that these publications also all come after his trip to England, in which he was most disappointed to find that the tradition of Shakespearean style performance died with Shakespeare.

---

[74] Frederick Burwick, "Shakespeare and Germany," in *Shakespeare in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Gail Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 318. Incidentally, the Schlegel-Tieck remained a German institution into the twentieth century, when "In 1936 Adolf Hitler's propaganda minster Joseph Goebbels issued the edict 'that no other than the old Schlegel-Tieck translation was thenceforth to be admitted on the German stage.'"

[75] Simon Williams, "The 'Shakespeare-Stage' in Nineteenth-Century Germany," in *Shakespeare and the Victorian Stage*, ed. Richard Foulkes, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 211.

[76] For a detailed description of the architecture and Tieck and Semper's interpretations of the contract, see Franklin J. Hildy, "Reconstructing Shakespeare's Theatre," in *New Issues in the Reconstruction of Shakespeare's Theatre* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc., 1991), 3-8.

Tieck travelled to England in 1817 with his friend Wilhelm von Burgsdorff.[77] The

trip lasted four months, although some of that time was spent travelling through Germany

and to Paris. On their way out of Germany, they met the Grimm Brothers in Cassel.   While

in London, Tieck had many enviable theatre experiences. He saw John Kemble in

Cymbeline, *Julius Caesar*, *Henry VIII*, *Hamlet*, and *Coriolanus* and Edward Kean in

Macbeth, *Hamlet*, *Richard III*, and *Coriolanus.* Although Tieck found some aspects of the

theatre pleasurable, he was overall disappointed by its similarity to the French style of

theatre. Instead of being "true to nature, simple, more or less colored by caprice and irony

and the opposite of the false pathos and declamatory fervor introduced by the French,"[78] as

Tieck imagined Elizabethan theatre was, he found it similar to the disappointing theatre he

had experienced in Germany, which he also attributed to the far-reaching influence of French

theatre. Having experienced the English theatre first-hand, Tieck now could be certain that

the Elizabethan-style theatre he desired did not yet exist.

His return to Germany brought him to Dresden, where he became dramaturg of the

theatre there in 1824, and encouraged the production of Shakespeare's plays which had not

yet been seen on the German stage.[79] Tieck's period in Dresden was marked more by

contributions to the literary criticism world than to the improvement of German theatre, and

this is indeed when most of his writings on the Elizabethan stage appeared. Tieck did not

have a chance to put his ideas into practice, however, until he was called to Berlin by King

---

[77] The information here comes from Zeydel's account in *Ludwig Tieck: The German Romanticist* and Paulin's *Ludwig Tieck.*

[78] Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck,* 213.

[79] Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck,* 258.

Friedrich Wilhelm IV, who was known as the "'Romanticist on the throne.'"[80] The king

tried to create a new Romantic circle in Prussia, with Berlin at the center. He invited the

Grimm brothers, Peter Cornelius, a later addition to the Nazarenes, Felix Mendelssohn, and

several other important German artists and thinkers.[81] Artistically Friedrich Wilhelm IV

supported revivals of Greek and Elizabethan theatre as well as encouraged German culture.

Politically, he hoped to "restore the personal links between the crown and the people which,

he believed, had been eroded by bureaucratic rule."[82] In keeping with the king's romantic

outlook, Hughes argues that "he seems to have dreamed of a recreation of some form of the

Holy Roman Empire under a Habsburg Emperor with the king of Prussia as hereditary arch-

general in charge of the armed forces."[83] His early years in Berlin were an attempt at

recreating the early Romantic period, which had been lost to new artists and new ideas. Even

Tieck had become more realistic than fantastic in his literary style, but here he was immersed

in a community where those original romantic ideas were reinvigorated, and where German

national unity could be based on a family model, each individual important as a contributor

to the whole. It is important to remember that this is the environment in which Tieck created

his *A Midsummer Night's Dream.*

Nazarenes

In examining the lives of Tieck and the painters who came to be known as the Nazarenes,

one finds few similarities of lifestyle – the former a theatre practitioner with large ideas but

---

[80] Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck,* 324.

[81] Paulin, *Ludwig Tieck,* 333.

[82] M. Hughes, *Nationalism and Society*, 81.

[83] M. Hughes, *Nationalism and Society*, 81.

sporadic follow-through, the latter a group of men so devoted to their art that they adopted a monastic, communal lifestyle in order to commit themselves fully to their art. The Nazarenes were not trying to model themselves after Tieck, but instead after his idea of the romantic artist as outlined both in *Outpourings of an Art-loving Friar* and *Franz Sternbald's Wanderings.* The religious devotion to art as a purveyor of truth connects the Nazarenes to Tieck's characters. The devout Catholicism, the idealization of medieval art as truth, and the desire to discover an art form authentically German by returning to past masters all connect the Nazarenes to Tieck himself.

The Nazarenes were connected in several ways with literary figures, both past and present. Many of the members seem to have had close associations with Friedrich Schlegel; Franz Pforr painted scenes from Shakespeare's plays as well as Goethe's *Götz von Berlichingen*; Peter Cornelius sent illustrations of Goethe's *Faust* to the author himself for his opinion,[84] created illustrations for the *Nibelungen*, and also was with Tieck in Berlin under the rule of King Friedrich Wilhelm IV in the 1840s. They knew German intellectual culture and were part of that creative circle. Friedrich Schlegel in particular was a great supporter of the Nazarenes, and they in turn were influenced by him. Early Nazarenes like Friedrich Overbeck modeled their art on Schlegel's 'Letters of Christian Art,'[85] and Schlegel's step-son Phillip Veit joined the Nazarenes later in Rome. Tieck never seems to have met the Nazarenes in person, but they modeled themselves after his hero Sternbald, and

---

[84] William Vaughan, *German Romantic Painting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 177. Goethe was apparently impressed with Cornelius's talent but warned against "too close an imitation of the cramped style of the old Germans."

[85] Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 103.

it seems likely that he knew of their work through reputation and his connections with Friedrich Schlegel.

The Nazarenes began to meet as students at the Viennese Academy in 1808, where they called themselves the *Lukasbund*, Brotherhood of St. Luke. Their mission was written out clearly on the diplomas they received once they joined: "'In lasting memory of the guiding principle of our order, truth, and of the promise to remain true to this principle all our lives, to work towards it with all our strength, and to work enthusiastically against every academic manner'".[86] Four of the original group, Friedrich Overbeck, Franz Pforr, Konrad Hottinger, and Ludwig Vogel, left Vienna for Rome in 1810 and soon moved into a monastery. While they did not join a monastic order, they spent their time in solitude working on their art, and met in the evenings to discuss what they had accomplished.[87] It is in Rome that the group received their nickname 'the Nazarenes', which scholars variously attribute to the archaic way that they dressed or to their long hair.[88] Pforr died in 1812 and the other original members left Rome, leaving only Overbeck behind. New members soon followed however, including Phillip Veit, Friedrich Schlegel's stepson, and Peter Cornelius, who, along with Overbeck, led this next phase of the brotherhood.[89]

Often German Romantic painters are divided into two groups, the dramatic, aggressive landscape painters of North Germany and the feminine, Catholic painters of South Germany. The former have won in the historiography of the period and emerge as the

---

[86] As translated in Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 12.

[87] For descriptions of early Nazarene life in Rome see the following: Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 11- 22; Andrews, *Nazarenes*, 23- 30. Lionel Gossman, "Beyond Modern: The Art of the Nazarenes" in *Common Knowledge* 14, no. 1 (Winter 2008): 60-67.

[88] Vaughan, *German Romantic Painting*, 163; Norbert Wolf. *Romanticism* (London: Taschen, 2007), 66.

[89] Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 22.

representative Romantic group.[90] In the contemporary view, however, this was not the case.

William Vaughan begins his chapter on the Nazarenes in his book *German Romantic Painting* by stating, "That a book on German Romantic painting should give pride of place to landscape would have seemed highly perverse to contemporaries."[91]   And yet the elements that are now commonly associated with Romanticism, particularly the over-flowing of emotion, are not necessarily recognizable in the art of the Nazarenes. Lionel Gossman's description of the Nazarene style hardly seems to fit into the Romantic aesthetic:

> conscientious, beautifully balanced, but undramatic compositions, in which movement, physical and psychological, often seems either held in suspension or highly conventionalized. With their use of flat local colors and their eschewing of all dramatic or sensuous light and color effects, the Nazarenes seem to want to deny the materiality of the painting and to direct the viewer's attention instead to more abstract and 'spiritual' qualities, like line, composition, color harmonies, and, ultimately, moral and religious meaning.[92]

This has none of the flashes of lightning or sensational aspects that often identify Romantic poetry and painting, and yet the fact that Romantic painting was most associated with the Nazarenes at the time suggests a different understanding of the form of Romantic art. Nazarene paintings do not overwhelm the viewer with movement and scale in the way that, for instance, Caspar David Friedrich's *Wanderer Watching a Sea of Fog* might.[93] And yet in the early 1800s the Nazarenes "received greater international attention than any other

[90] Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 1.

[91] Vaughan, *German Romantic Painting,* 163.

[92] Gossman, 'Beyond Modern," 53.

[93] Wolf, *Romanticism*, 50. This painting shows a solitary figure standing on a craggy rock in the foreground, looking into a distance filled with fog pierced by mountains and landscape features. Wolf describes the painting as showing the "tendency in Friedrich's work after 1816 to create continuous transitions between near and distant spaces, between the finite and the infinite." See page 45.

movement in German Romantic art."[94] They were known in Russia, France, and the United

States, and artists from these countries were "frequent visitors to Overbeck's studio in

Rome."[95] The aspects of Romanticism, then, that must have appealed to their admirers were

the spiritual qualities of the painting, the moral message held within, and the idea that the

painting was in fact more than itself, more than just a painting. It had a message to deliver.

For the Nazarenes, the work of art was both the medium of a hidden message and a

message in itself. The point of rejecting the current academy and working in the style of

medieval painters was to "reunite art and life through the revival of a historical model (the

Middle Ages) in which art and life had been as one."[96] In the Nazarene's perception of

medieval art, the painters were guided not by rules and practiced skill, but instead by

emotion, by their inner self, and so the resulting work was a depiction of truth, a discovery of

"their true and original self."[97] The Nazarenes looked back to earlier artists for inspiration,

not to copy the artwork, but to experience an artistic process that they felt would allow them

to tap into their emotions and discover a truth hidden beneath the surface. This is a fairly

typical Romantic idea, and for the Nazarenes that truth was related to Catholicism and had a

moral flavor. Gossman argues "They would have objected strenuously to any radical

distinction between aesthetic values and traditional moral or religious ones."[98] The

Nazarene's idealization of the Middle Ages as well as their emphasis on morality through art

---

[94] Wolf, *Romanticism*, 16.

[95] Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 5.

[96] Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 21.

[97] Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 100.

[98] Gossman, "Beyond Modern," 97-98.

emulates the Romantic national philosophers who will be discussed in chapter three. Even from Rome, the Nazarenes were involved in this larger cultural circle.

Like Tieck, the Nazarenes were not always overtly political in their writing or art. They belonged to the Romantic school which thought that art should have a moral purpose, should improve the recipients of the artwork somehow, but often their desired outcome remained in the idealized world of fantasy, with little thought to the practicality of the world they desired. Their own self-cloistering shows the extreme nature of their views and reveals how difficult it would be for the average person to follow. Their model for the world they hoped their art would help bring about was, again, the Middle Ages. The early Brotherhood of St. Luke formed in the likeness of a guild,[99] and the artists strove to create and display their art on a local level, such as through the painting of frescoes. Their hope was to expand the reception of art from the wealthy few to all of the members of a community, the way a public work of art like a fresco is able to do. Art historian Gossman comments on a letter the Nazarene painter Cornelius wrote in 1814 that he

> speculated that through this revival it might be possible to restore the older, healthier relation between art and the people that had obtained in the Middle Ages, so that art, instead of adorning the private chambers of the well-to-do, would again speak to the German people 'from the walls of our high cathedrals, our peaceful chapels and solitary cloisters, from our town halls and warehouses and markets.'[100]

Art could become a democratizing influence among the people, but this does not then imply that democracy was the German nation the Nazarenes were hoping for. The artists hoped to spread truth through their art but they did not expect all people to receive it equally. In the Middle Ages, everyone had a place, from the ruler to the guild members to the peasants, and

---

[99] Gossman, "Beyond Modern," 61.

[100] Gossman, "Beyond Modern," 56.

when people performed in their own position, the system worked. The Nazarenes wanted to reveal truth about the inner human and nature and God, and to have that truth accessible to all people. This was not, however, a cry for equality.

What they did hold to be true was the great superiority of God over all humans, and this was reflected in their paintings. Revealing again their tendency to idealize, the way they often painted their figures shows the importance of every individual:

> All the figures in a Nazarene painting or drawing, while firmly held together in a single composition, retain their independence and clarity of outline. …the canvas is often divided by strong verticals into relatively distinct spatial units and groups. Secondary figures are drawn and painted with the same meticulous care and distinctness as primary ones.[101]

This method of painting reveals the same concern the Romantic nationalist philosophers held, that is, the tension between valuing the individual but also subordinating him/her to the community. It is, perhaps, easier to accomplish this in a painting than in a government.

I will have occasion to discuss particular paintings from the Nazarene circle later, but here I will provide a quick overview of their art. There is no particular 'method' that the Nazarenes taught or used, which follows from their decided rejection of the academy which was trying to teach particular techniques. Each painter could follow his or her own inspiration. For Overbeck, it was Raphael and Italian art, for Pforr the German Middle Ages, for Cornelius a revival of religious paintings, for others something else.[102] The important element to a Nazarene work of art was that it portray or be inspired by truth. What the term 'truth' means was and should be individual to each artist, so that each individual piece is something only that particular artist could have created. However, the general desire to

---

[101] Gossman, "Beyond Modern," 97.

[102] Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 83.

return to an earlier style of painting, that of Dürer and Raphael, caused a similar style in the paintings of the brotherhood. Gossman argues the main aspect of Nazarene technique is a desire for unity, which they accomplish through "showing that the order and significance of the principal theme or action and the centrality of the leading figures can be maintained without sacrifice of the relative autonomy of accessory figures or actions, and that artistic form and spiritual meaning are not mutually exclusive."[103]

The Nazarenes share many ideas about the creation and purpose of art with the Pre-Raphaelites, as will shortly be analyzed. First, however, a larger contextual background of English history is necessary.

English History

Political shifts are not the main elements of English history that I will explore in this time period, since Victoria and Albert ruled for most of the century. There were in this period, however, major changes in labor, class relations, and society. This is also, of course, the age of empire, and the stretching of power and contact with new and exotic worlds caused those at home to question their own. However, for the discussion of English artists I would like to focus more on cultural and intellectual poetics. As Gertrude Himmelfarb described it, "The truly momentous events in this period were not crises or riots but books and ideas."[104] Even though the German Romantics were political, in the end their thinking was not about government for government's sake, but instead about finding the best way for people to live together that would allow them personal satisfaction and allow their 'inner spirit' to succeed

---

[103] Gossman, "Beyond Modern," 98.

[104] Gertrude Himmelfarb, *The Spirit of the Age* (New Haven: Yale University, 2007) 9.

each according to his own ability. In England, this same desire underscores the early

Romantic writing, and indeed can be traced through English intellectuals from Wordsworth

to Ruskin. Here, as with the Germans, democracy is not the ideal situation. All men are not

created equal, although all men do have the same right to the opportunity for happiness. In

the ideal society of both Thomas Carlyle and John Ruskin, two important critics of their age,

"The ruling class must be the existing aristocracy, properly trained in its function."[105] The

advent of industrialism brought with it new formations in class and therefore class relations.

While the industrial working class was never, in the romantic view, to be given the same

responsibilities and status as the aristocracy, they had a right to personal fulfillment and

livable working conditions, and this is what the artists advocated.

Before discussing the details of the anti-industrialism and artistic ideas of the

Romantic artists, it is necessary to describe who falls under the label 'Romantic.' Typically

the English Romantics are identified as certain literary artists from around 1800 to the 1830s

like Wordsworth, Coleridge, Blake, Byron, Shelley, and Keats. As I mentioned before some

of these artists were influenced through contact and written materials from the German

Romantics, and they shared some of the same artistic tendencies. The 1830s, again as

traditionally described, is the start of the Victorian Period, which lasts through the end of the

century. Scholars argue about the time divisions of the Victorian Period, but usually feel the

need to divide it as least into two, if not three fairly distinct periods.[106] Those who divide it

---

[105] Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society, 1780-1950* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), 146.
[106] Himmelfarb, *The Spirit of the Age*, 9, 10. Himmelfarb divides the Victorian period into three phases, the first starting with the Reform Bill of 1832, the second with the Great Exhibition of 1851, and the third could variously be at several moments, all occurring in the late 1860s or 1870s. John Gardiner, *The Victorians: An Age in Retrospect* (London: Hambledon and London, 2002), 4. Gardiner describes the traditional separation of the Victorian age in the following way: "the early Victorian period (1837 to around 1850) as a rather turbulent time of adapting to industrial life; the mid-Victorian period (around 1851 to 1870) as a time of relative peace and prosperity; and the late Victorian period (after around 1870) as a time in which all was subject again to challenge and change."

into three usually take as their markings the Reform Bill of 1832, "which extended the franchise to the middle classes,"[107] as the beginning of the early Victorian period, even though this date is before 1837, the start of Victoria's reign. The Great Exhibition of 1851 is the transition into the mid-Victorian period.[108] This is important to the artists I am discussing here, but does not necessarily mean a change in opinion or outlook for them. I will argue in the following paragraphs that the Pre-Raphaelites in the mid-Victorian period and Poel, as a late Victorian, were familiar with and feeling the effects of artistic and social theory from the early English Romantics and can be considered members of the same Romantic tide.

Thomas Carlyle, a social theorist working in the transition from Romanticism to the early Victorian period published his essay "Signs of the Times" in 1831. In this work Carlyle reveals a deep anxiety about the industrial and mechanical situation of England – sentiments later to be shared by the Pre-Raphaelites and Poel – while at the same time echoing romantic ideas of organic growth and a search for transcendence. In the next chapter I will be more explicit about the artistic characteristics of the Romantics and how they relate to the artists under discussion.

The main argument of Carlyle's piece is the unfortunate prevalence of industrialization, which has extended beyond the factory. Carlyle suggests of man and society that "Not the external and physical alone is now managed by machinery, but the internal and spiritual also."[109] This reach of machinery into every aspect of English life has

---

[107] Himmelfarb, *The Spirit of the Age*, 6.

[108] Himmelfarb, *The Spirit of the Age*, 8.

[109] Thomas Carlyle, "Signs of the Times" in *The Spirit of the Age,* ed. Gertrude Himmelfarb (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 35.

caused, in Carlyle's view, "a mighty change in our whole manner of existence."[110] This

change is a result of the collision between past and present, what he terms a "deep-lying

struggle in the whole fabric of society; a boundless grinding collision of the New with the

Old."[111] The relationship of the old and the new, the ancient and the modern, is a thread that

moves through all of Romanticism and certainly comes into play with the Pre-Raphaelites

and Poel. Already Carlyle is concerned about the loss of the 'old', of tradition and humanity,

in light of the 'new', mechanization.

The Great Exhibition, in 1851, was all about the new. The reality of the Victorian

world was that the physical and material world was changing, and the people of England had

to find a way to change with it. Charlotte Brontë describes what she experienced at the Great

Exhibition.

> Whatever human industry has created you find there, from the great compartments
> filled with railway engines and boilers, with mill machinery in full work, with
> splendid carriages of all kinds, with harness of every description, to the glass-covered
> and velvet-spread stands loaded with the most gorgeous work of the goldsmith and
> silversmith, and the carefully guarded caskets full of real diamonds and pearls worth
> hundreds of thousands of pounds.[112]

This description not only reveals the vast scope of the materials and inventions on display,

but also captures the excitement, the awe of the spectacle. The descriptors Brontë uses for

what she saw, "splendid", "gorgeous", point to an important aspect of the Great Exhibition; it

was not simply about science or invention, but also about art. The products on display, as

Patrick Brantlinger describes, were new not only in invention, but also in concept: the idea of

---

[110] Carlyle, "Signs of the Times," 36.

[111] Carlyle, "Signs of the Times," 49.

[112] Clement Shorter, *The Brontes' Life and Letters, Vol. II* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), 216.

"industrial art."[113] The combination of the two, the idea that art could be created by the newest advances in industry, has its obvious benefits. The same product could be exactly reproduced many times over, making it available for numerous people to purchase and have in their homes. The machinery could create 'perfect' lines and angles, and do so much more consistently than any hand-made work of art. But of course, this consistency and ease brought with it several potential problems, and raised the question of "whether industrialism itself was creating a more beautiful and virtuous society, or the reverse."[114]

Interpretations of the Great Exhibition are numerous and varied. Himmelfarb describes its importance in the following way:

> At home and abroad, the Exhibition appeared as a triumphal demonstration of England's industrial ingenuity and superiority. And it testified to something else as well: a political and social stability that was seen as the precondition of economic progress. While the Continent was still suffering the aftermaths of the political revolution of 1848, England congratulated itself on having achieved an industrial revolution – indeed, having emerged to enjoy an agreeable sense of well-being…[115]

This is, no doubt, a large motivating factor behind the exhibition, an outward display of wealth, progress, and well-being. Predictably, it was not seen this way by all. John Ruskin, one of the most important art critics of nineteenth century England, expresses his thoughts on the exhibition this way:

> 'The quality of bodily industry which the Crystal Palace expresses, is very great. So far it is good. The quantity of thought it expresses is, I suppose, a single admirable thought… that it might be possible to build a greenhouse larger than ever greenhouse was built before. This thought and some very ordinary algebra are as much as all that glass can represent of human intellect.'[116]

---

[113] Patrick Brantlinger, "Household taste: Industrial Art, Consumerism, and Pre-Raphaelitism," in *The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies* 9 (Spring 2000), 84.

[114] Brantlinger, "Household taste," 84.

[115] Himmelfarb, *The Spirit of the Age*, 8.

[116] Ruskin as quoted in Martin Weiner, *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 29.

Ruskin is considered, as mentioned above, a mid-Victorian intellectual. His critique of art and society often follows along similar thoughts as Carlyle's work. Ruskin distrusted industry and felt the human aspect of individual beings was lost in the industrial society. Raymond Williams describes Ruskin's concern with society in terms of function, which he defines as "the fulfillment of each man's part in the general design."[117] Again, this is not democracy or equality, but certainly the opportunity for each man to succeed according to his own abilities. Williams continues with Ruskin's concern with function in his contemporary society: "… a system of production geared only to the laws of supply and demand made regulation impossible, for it reduced men to available labour and thus made impossible any 'whole fulfillment' of their ultimate function as human beings."[118] Essentially, the industrial economy, which was based on making the most product for the least expense, was debasing the human experience and ability to be more than a mechanized producer. Ruskin follows Carlyle in this, in "revolt[ing] against the classical school of mercantile economics which postulated 'economic man' without the social and moral elements in human nature."[119] Ruskin follows this theme in his important essay "The Nature of the Gothic," of which more will be said in chapter five. In this work Ruskin argues for the superiority of humanity, with all of its flaws, over industry, and of products created by the human hand over the perfection that a machine can create.

---

[117] R. Williams, *Culture and Society*, 143.

[118] R. Williams, *Culture and Society*, 143.

[119] Samuel C. Chew and Richard D. Altick, *The Nineteenth Century and After (1789-1939)*, vol. 4 of *A Literary History of England* ed. Albert C. Baugh (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967), 1341.

Ruskin was important to the artistic development of the Pre-Raphaelites and Poel, more of which will be discussed below. I have spent time outlining some of the ideas prevalent in the early and middle Victorian periods to provide a connection between the Pre-Raphaelites and Poel and the early English Romantics. Much of what the Pre-Raphaelites and Poel were hoping to achieve through their art necessitated not only a look back to the late-medieval and Elizabethan times, but also was a continuation, or revival, of Romantic ideas and goals that for other areas of society were long gone. I will provide more basic information about who the Pre-Raphaelites and Poel were, and later discuss their work in terms of Romanticism.

Pre-Raphaelites

The initial purpose of the creation of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood models very closely on the artistic theories of the Nazarenes. Both groups of painters were dissatisfied with the prevalent ideas of artistic taste and technique as promulgated by the governing Academies and so formed small groups of painters dedicated to art as a depiction of nature and a harbinger of truth. To this end, both groups turned to medieval and early Renaissance painters for inspiration. The similarities between the two groups may be the result of direct, personal connections. Both William Dyce in the 1820s and Ford Madox Brown in the 1840s visited Rome and met with the Nazarene painters there at those times, and their relations of what they witnessed when they were back in England "may have been an element in the formation of the group's identity."[120] Other members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood probably had heard about the Nazarenes in other contexts as well. Competitions to find

---

[120] Elizabeth Prettejohn, *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites* (London: Tate Publishing, 2000), 25.

artists to decorate the Houses of Parliament, which would necessitate painting on large walls instead of smaller canvases, encouraged artists to look "to recent German mural projects in the public buildings of Munich and Berlin, executed on a grand scale by the former Nazarenes and their followers."[121]

The origins of the two groups are not the only area they have in common. In her dissertation, Carol Lynn Kefalas examines the similarities between the two groups of artists, both in their personal relationship and in the connections existing in the art they created, particularly in the iconography. Kefalas determines several images repeatedly used by both groups to the same symbolic purpose and claims only a few "'missing links' in which the symbols appear in the paintings of one group and not in the other."[122] Some of these images are the peacock, "signifying immortality and totality,"[123] clocks and other timepieces which "stress the importance of the moment,"[124] and colors, where "purity and clarity"[125] are characteristic of both groups, and, incidentally, also play heavily in Pre-Raphaelite poetry. The contexts of the paintings are also very similar, the most popular being "classical subject

---

[121] Prettejohn, *Pre-Raphaelites*, 45.

[122] Kefalas, "The Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites," 198.

[123] Kefalas, "The Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites," 169. The image of the peacock is important to the Nazarenes and Pre-Raphaelites through its connection to Christianity. The peacock as a Christian symbol represents immortality and the resurrection. This would have appealed to the Nazarenes simply for its religious significance, but for both of these artistic groups the idea of divine resurrection helped to support their own agendas. The art of the Middle Ages and early Renaissance had died, passed away. It was the task of these artists to resurrect this missing, and in a way divine, art form. For an explanation of the peacock's connection to the resurrection, see Rachel Ross, Curator of Art, "The Foundation for Sacred Arts: Recovering Beauty in the Christian Sacred Arts," http://thefoundationforsacredarts.blogspot.com/2010/05/lessons-in-iconography-peacock.html (accessed May 25, 2012).

[124] Kefalas, "The Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites," 173.

[125] Kefalas, "The Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites," 170.

matter…Old English/Old German history [and] Biblical stories."[126] As Kefalas notes, however, instances of Biblical context are more prevalent in the Nazarene's work, whereas the Pre-Raphaelites deal mostly in contemporary issues.[127] As far as technique, Kefalas finds similarities in that the "predominant composition is the frontal/horizontal composition,"[128] and in the use by both groups of painting a frame into the composition, making it part of the work.[129] These similarities speak to the self-conscious recognition the members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood would have had of their German ancestors. However, the English painters soon created a bold identity that was all their own.

Although the instigating factors were different, the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood formed in reaction to many of the same changes the Nazarenes were facing, and they sought refuge in similar places. The Pre-Raphaelites were not overtly concerned with national identity, but they were very concerned with the direction that England and its people were going as influenced by industry, urbanization, and the destruction of England's natural landscape. Their concern was not so much with saving green spaces, however, as with saving the influence of nature upon the artist's soul. In a similar way to the Nazarenes, the Pre-Raphaelites were disappointed with the teachings of the artistic academy and with the changes affecting the aesthetics of life.

As with the Nazarenes, the original brotherhood quickly dissolved, but new artists joined as old members left, and the idea of a 'Pre-Raphaelite aesthetic' continued.[130] The

---

[126] Kefalas, "The Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites," 166.

[127] Kefalas, "The Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites," 166.

[128] Kefalas, "The Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites," 201.

[129] Kefalas, "The Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites," 204.

[130] Hunt, *The Pre-Raphaelite Imagination*, 3.

original members, William Holman Hunt, John Everett Millais, and Dante Gabriel Rossetti, were trained in the Royal Academy and met at school, much as the Nazarenes had. Later artists associated with the brotherhood, but not necessarily members, were William Morris, Edward Burne-Jones, Algernon Charles Swinburne, and Walter Pater. The shifting in membership and the individual focus of the artists has caused some difficulty in specifying what the term 'pre-raphaelite' actually means. Cecil Y. Lang, begins his literary anthology entitled *The Pre-Raphaelites and Their Circle*, by stating "Pre-Raphaelitism … is meaningless as a literary term because, properly, it belongs to the history of painting."[131] And yet, while his anthology does contain sixteen plates displaying Pre-Raphaelite painting, the rest of the over 500 pages is devoted to the poetry of the literary Pre-Raphaelite artists. And while some scholars, Lang and Harold Bloom[132] for example, argue that this 'meaningless' term does not have clearly defined characteristics or boundaries, others protest that describing something as Pre-Raphaelite can pinpoint specific meanings. John Dixon Hunt believes that "the idea of a Pre-Raphaelite movement … implies a 'continuity of admiration', in which initial ideas are adjusted to individual talents, modified perhaps by each expression of them, but still maintaining some direct imaginative connection with the original inspirations and principles."[133] Richard Foulkes feels confident enough in the term to argue its influence in an article entitled "Charles Kean's *King Richard II*: A Pre-

---

[131] Cecil Y. Lang, ed., *The Pre-Raphaelites and their Circle* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), xi.

[132] Bloom, *Pre-Raphaelites*, 1.

[133] Hunt, *Pre-Raphaelite Imagination*, 3.

Raphaelite Drama."[134] His overarching understanding of the Pre-Raphaelite mission comes

from John Ruskin's *Modern Painters*, which he quotes at length. According to Ruskin,

"'Pre-Raphaelitism has but one principle, that of absolute, uncompromising truth in all that it

does, obtained by working everything, down to the most minute detail, from nature, and from

nature only'."[135] Nature and detail are the key components to Ruskin's description and are

concepts that typically appear in discussions of Pre-Raphaelite art.

Since this discussion, too, will find it necessary to delineate the term Pre-Raphaelite

in order to attempt to connect it to the theatre, I will use Pre-Raphaelite first to refer to the

members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood and secondly to describe two characteristics.

The first is Ruskin's 'uncompromising truth … from nature only.' Lang argues that the Pre-

Raphaelites used the word 'nature' to mean "the visible world, not 'Mother Nature' or

'external nature'."[136] This characteristic results in the extreme attention to detail found in

Pre-Raphaelite painting, as well as the "intensity, concentration and self-repression"[137] as

opposed to the large gestures and unnatural outpourings of other artistic movements. The

intense and introverted style of the paintings can also be found in the poetry. The second

characteristic to which the term Pre-Raphaelite will refer is the idea on which the whole

movement was founded, the idea of returning to an artistic period before creativity had been

stunted by precedence. Their mini-revolution was based on the idea that "[a]ll painting *after*

---

[134] Richard Foulkes, "Charles Kean's *King Richard II*: A Pre-Raphaelite Drama," in *Shakespeare and the Victorian Stage*, ed. Richard Foulkes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

[135] Foulkes, "A Pre-Raphaelite Drama," 46.

[136] Lang, *The Pre-Raphaelites and Their Circle*, xiii.

[137] Foulkes, "A Pre-Raphaelite Drama," 46.

Raphael … had been so dominated by the great master that the very art had stagnated."[138]

Their attempts to break away from this trend resulted in their desire, as has been said, "to paint, not according to the rules … but according to nature."[139]

The brotherhood started in 1848 in reaction to the style taught by the School of the Royal Academy, which produced art that the Pre-Raphaelites found "offensive, contemptible, and even scandalous."[140] William Rossetti, early member of the brotherhood, historian of the group, and brother to the group's leader D. G. Rossetti, described the aims of the original brotherhood in his later introduction to *The Germ*, official journal of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, first published in 1850. He describes their original mission as follows: "Nature was to be their one or their paramount storehouse of materials for objects to be represented; the study of her was to be deep, and the representation (at any rate in the earlier stages of self-discipline and work) in the highest degree exact."[141] Typical of their early paintings were the following characteristics: "definiteness of contour, an avoidance of *chiaroscuro*, and a deliberately novel use of color, applied on a luminous ground."[142] The detail of their paintings, which applied to both background and foreground objects, connected them to the newly emerging art of photography, and marked their paintings with the characteristic of a photograph in which "every part of a picture vies for attention with all the other parts."[143] Their paintings and the comparisons to photography immersed the artists in a circular

---

[138] Lang, *The Pre-Raphaelites and Their Circle,* xii.

[139] Lang, *The Pre-Raphaelites and Their Circle*, xii.

[140] William Michael Rossetti, ed. *The Germ: Thoughts towards Nature in Poetry, Literature, and Art* (New York, AMS Press, 1965), 6.

[141] W. Rossetti, *The Germ*, 6.

[142] Lang, *The Pre-Raphaelites and Their Circle*, xii.

[143] Lang, *The Pre-Raphaelites and Their Circle*, xii.

controversy about art and truth. Photography was often understood to capture true images of life, unimpeded by an artist's interpretation, and photographers that created fictionalized portraits or scenes "impinged directly on photography's status as a medium of truth."[144] And yet at the same time, the ability of a photo to capture details of far away objects as well as of those in the foreground, as the Pre-Raphaelites attempted to do in their paintings, often was not desirable because "it was not true to the human perception of nature."[145] Clearly visual truth in art was an important topic among these artists and their receiving public.

While the art of the Pre-Raphaelites was revolutionary in the same way as that of the Nazarenes, they were not connected to religion and the ascetic life in the same way, and indeed often were accused of quite the opposite. They were radical in their art, "the particularity of color, shape, surface, pattern, and outline, which aimed to truthfully represent visual facts, was considered new and daring for its time."[146] As W. Rossetti describes, "They meant revolt, and produced revolution."[147] But they also were controversial and daring in their lifestyle, or at least in how their lifestyle was perceived. Chief culprits in this were D.G. Rossetti and Swinburne, bolstered both by elements of their personal lives and by the art they created. I will discuss this more in chapter five, but it is important here to note that these artists were not necessarily valued or beloved by their contemporaries. In fact, their earliest exhibition was largely ignored, but after a fairly benign debut in 1849, the next year was not as passive. Reviews that year of the Pre-Raphaelite work used terms that "became

---

[144] Diane Waggoner, "Introduction: Uncompromising Truth: Photography and Pre-Raphaelitism," in *The Pre-Raphaelite Lens: British Photography and Painting, 1848-1875*, ed. Emily D. Shapiro (Surrey: Lund Humphries, 2010), 13.

[145] Waggoner, "Introduction," 10.

[146] Waggoner, "Introduction," 4.

[147] W. Rossetti, *The Germ*, 6.

abusive: adjectives such as 'loathsome', 'revolting', 'disgusting' recurred in review after review. The violence of the language is exceptional in English art criticism of this date."[148] Their reputation began to shift, however, when they were championed by John Ruskin, an important art critic and theorist, who had already written extensively on a new focus for English art that was very much in line with what the Pre-Raphaelites were hoping to achieve. In fact, it was Ruskin's support after this turn that caused the group to be "hailed as an artistic avant-garde."[149]

William Poel

William Poel's connection to the Pre-Raphaelites is both personal and theoretical. As a child, he sat as a model for Pre-Raphaelite William Holman Hunt's painting "The Discovery of Christ in the Temple,"[150] and he cites the beginning of his direction towards Elizabethan Shakespeare practices as influenced by Pre-Raphaelite methods:

> The solemn impression which the beauty of the Cathedrals of Northern France once made on Morris and Burne- Jones was the means of stimulating their ambition to return to the ideals which had inspired the great works of the past. And it was the genius of the poet-dramatist, Shakespeare, and that of the actor, Salvini who so finely interpreted some of his characters, which urged me to labour in the cause of the theatre.[151]

Poel also cultivated a friendship with Swinburne, which manifested itself in professional collaboration. Swinburne wrote introductions for two of Poel's productions, *Dr. Faustus* and *The Spanish Gypsy*, which were read aloud before the performance, and Poel also produced

---

[148] Prettejohn, *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites*, 46.

[149] Jan Marsh, *The Pre-Raphaelite Circle* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2005), 11.

[150] Speaight, *William Poel*, 16.

[151] William Poel, *Monthly Letters*, ed. by A.M.T. (London: T. Werner Laurie LTD, 1929), 2. Banham, ed., 866. Tommaso Salvini was an Italian actor-manager who toured England in 1876 and was famous for some of his Shakespearean characters, including Hamlet and Othello.

Swinburne's play *Lucrine*. They not only worked together but were also close friends. Poel

also directed an illustrated recital of D.G. Rossetti's *The King's Tragedy* and produced *Love*

is Enough or The Freeing of Pharamond by William Morris. From his early beginnings,

Poel seems to have had contact with important members of the Pre-Raphaelite influence

throughout his career.

Poel's devotion, however, was not to the Pre-Raphaelites, but to Shakespeare, and so

he also collaborated with Frederick James Furnivall and the New Shakspere Society,[152]

despite the bitter feud between Furnivall and Poel's friend Swinburne, which is the subject of

chapter five. The New Shakspere Society devoted itself to an intense and thorough study of

the Shakespearean text, an idea that appealed to Poel as an alternative to the heavily modified

productions of Shakespeare popular at the time. The integrity and supremacy of the text

factored into Poel's theories of Elizabethan practices, although as I will discuss later that

desire was not always fulfilled in Poel's productions. One of Poel's followers and a fellow

actor in his *Measure for Measure*, Sir Lewis Casson, delineated other of Poel's aims for his

Elizabethan productions:

> 1. The full text in its proper order without interpolation or rearrangement.
> 2. Continuity of speech from scene to scene without breaks between 'acts.'
> 3. A permanent architectural set with at least two levels, and an inner stage covered by traverse curtains.
> 4. A wide platform stage projecting into the audience.
> 5. Elizabethan dress (with a few period modifications).
> 6. Rapid, highly coloured, musical speech, of great range and flexibility.[153]

---

[152] Frederick James Furnivall and John Munro, *Shakespeare Life and Work* (London: Cassell and Co. Ltd., 1908), 9f – 10f. Furnivall was a Shakespearean scholar who founded the New Shakspere Society in 1874. The society insisted on spelling the poet's name 'Shakspere,' which is "taken from the only unquestionably genuine signatures of his that we possess, the three on his will, and the two on his Blackfriars conveyance and mortgage."

[153] Franklin J. Hildy, *Shakespeare at the Maddermarket: Nugent Monck and the Norwich Players* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1986), 9.

Poel based his ideas for a Shakespearean stage on his own study of Shakespeare performance history, theatre he had seen in Germany, and as performance in opposition to the popular theatre of his day. For his 1893 production of *Measure for Measure*, he claimed to have attempted a recreation of the Fortune theatre, although, like Tieck's *Midsummer Night's Dream*, he was working within the confines of an existing proscenium theatre. The existence of the proscenium was not the only problem however. As Franklin J. Hildy suggests in his description of Poel's stage, the "partial reconstruction had nothing to do with the Fortune contract and was clearly intended to reproduce the Swan theatre as depicted in the de Witt/van Buchel sketch."[154] Whether Poel knew that he was following in Tieck's footsteps is unclear, but he certainly was aware of Baron Karl von Perfall, intendant of the Royal Court Theatre in Munich, and his Shakespearean productions because it was there that he saw *King Lear*, directed by Jocza Savits in 1889, which he described as "'the most stimulating performance of the tragedy I have ever seen.'"[155] Regardless of which artist Poel credited for the ideas, he was aware of the German practice of Elizabethan staging.

One of Poel's earliest attempts at a more authentic Shakespeare performance did not take place on a reconstructed Elizabethan stage, but instead on a "bare, draped platform."[156] The stage was not the only significant aspect of this production. Poel produced *Hamlet*, but used the First Quarto text, which was not the text his audience was familiar with. Robert Speaight argues this production "announced the birth of a new idea."[157] The production

---

[154] Hildy, "Reconstructing," 9.

[155] Richard Foulkes, "Preface," *Shakespeare and the Victorian Stage,* ed. Richard Foulkes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 208.

[156] Speaight, *William Poel*, 50.

[157] Speaight, *William Poel*, 51.

occurred in 1881 before the establishment of the Elizabethan Stage Society, and Poel turned

to Furnivall for assistance. In Poel's understanding of the discrepancies between the earliest

printed versions of the play, the Folio version was the acting edition of the play from the

Globe Playhouse, the Second Quarto was printed from Shakespeare's manuscript, and the

First Quarto is the text as it was prepared by the theatre practitioners, meaning that this text is

the most playable, but the language "had all the marks of being Shakespeare's language

imperfectly reported."[158] Although there are many arguments now against Poel's delineation

of the texts, his understanding of their relationship is important for his choice to produce the

First Quarto text. Poel was not, as Swinburne was, fully concerned with accuracy in

presenting what Shakespeare wrote, but instead he wanted authenticity in terms of the

performance the actors produced. Poel believed that the stage directions in the First Quarto

were written from what occurred on stage, not what the author imagined might happen in

performance. Poel also felt that the smaller text of the First Quarto might have been

tampered with by the actors because it was necessary to have a shorter version with which to

tour.[159]

 This was the text, then, that he chose for his first attempt at reproducing an

Elizabethan performance, and while it did not necessarily make the splash that perhaps Poel

was hoping it would, the novelty of the event was not lost on the audience. Joseph Knight, a

reviewer for "Theatre," commented that "If we are unable to attach any great value to the

performance, we are at least glad to have seen it."[160] Knight understood the significance of

---

[158] Speaight, *William Poel*, 49.

[159] Speaight, *William Poel*, 49.

[160] Joseph Knight, "Performance of the First Quarto 'Hamlet,'" *Theatre* (May 1881): 289.

performing the First Quarto text and seemed to feel that the idea had value, but he was distracted by the 'amateur' actors and Poel's performance as Hamlet, which he said "failed to assign any distinct individuality to the rôle."[161] He was, however, impressed by the delivery of the text, which "was spoken with a cultivated delivery which is not common upon the stage, and to which accordingly it is pleasant to listen."[162] Knight is presumably referring to the methods Poel used and encouraged in his actors of attempting to speak Shakespeare's language the way he felt the Elizabethans must have, with more "variety of rhythm and emphasis"[163] Overall, the production itself was received as mediocre, with no memorable performances. Historically, however, the production opened a door for many more Elizabethan performance attempts, and over time Poel's understanding of how to make these methods successful in performance improved, as did the audience's reception of them.

Although Poel had been attempting Elizabethan stage practices in productions from the 1880s, he formed the Elizabethan Stage Society in 1894, about which he later said "My original aim was just to find out some means of acting Shakespeare naturally and appealingly from the full text as in a modern drama. I found that for this the platform stage was necessary and also some suggestion of the spirit and manners of the time."[164] The Elizabethan Stage Society continued to produce Shakespeare using Elizabethan methods throughout the rest of the century with varying levels of success. Their performance of *Twelfth Night* in 1895 was described as "a most praiseworthy performance" although the reviewer confessed to a "preference to see our great author produced with a background, even if it be not so closely

---

[161] Knight, "Performance of the First Quarto 'Hamlet,' 289.

[162] Knight, "Performance of the First Quarto 'Hamlet,' 289.

[163] Speaight, *William Poel*, 49.

[164] Speaight, *Willliam Poel*, 90.

following the Elizabethan model."[165]   The consensus of most of the reviews is that Poel had

a nice idea to show them Shakespeare as Shakespeare might have seen it, but that in

execution, the productions left little to get excited about.

Poel's greatest success was arguably for his 1901 production of *Everyman,* which was

"the only one of Poel's productions to make money."[166] The movement was pleasingly

stylized: "'We have never seen actors grimace less, or stand so still. This simplicity and

reticence never lapsed into insipidity of lifelessness. It nearly always gave the right tragic

effect of outward expression purged and refined down to its pure essentials by the stress of

intense feeling.'"[167] Poel also seems to have employed his particular ideas about pitch and

line delivery, which was received less positively by the same reviewer: "'About the wisdom

of the extent to which the dialogue was intoned we are not quite sure; but in one case, that of

Good Deeds, there was a rather overdone plaintiveness, and the words of a few of the

speeches were not clearly audible.'"[168] Poel apparently was uneasy about the success of this

play. His ultimate desire was to bring his audiences into the world of Shakespeare, not the

world of medieval morality plays. Speaight describes his difficulty with the success of the

play as "the dilemma of a man who was naturally both radical and religious…. He distrusted

the alliance between the Church and the stage…. The audience comes to criticize, to discuss,

and to applaud; the congregation comes to listen and to obey."[169] The major artists that Poel

admired, including Shakespeare and the Pre-Raphaelites, stressed the importance of

---

[165] "Elizabethan Stage Society," *Town and Country Notes*, July 4, 1895.

[166] Speaight, *William Poel*, 165.

[167] Speaight, *William Poel*, 163.

[168] Speaight, *William Poel,* 163.

[169] Speaight, *William Poel,* 166.

humanity and the individual power of choice. While Poel might have found a personal

connection with "the old morality,"[170] he was uncomfortable using the power of the theatre to

spread those ideas to his larger-than-expected audience. Speaight attributes his discomfort as

"the dilemma of a man who was naturally both radical and religious."[171] This also seems like

an appropriate way to describe his production of *Measure for Measure*, radical in its

appearance on stage, religious in the way Poel cut the text.

Like Tieck, Poel was never able to perform on his perfect idea of a reconstructed

Elizabethan stage, although he certainly got closer to it than Tieck in Berlin. He also

encouraged several production ideas that were more quirky than Elizabethan, for instance

employing all female casts and his specific guidelines about verse-speaking. Poel clearly had

opinions on every aspect of a Shakespearean production, but as with Tieck, it is not

ultimately important here how his productions were or were not Elizabethan, but instead how

they fit into the larger cultural and social context within which Poel was working. Two

themes exist beneath the surface of many of Poel's ideas for the stage: the importance of the

human over machinery, and enrichment of the audience over the commercialism of theatre.

The former ties in directly with the "Pre-Raphaelite anguish at the alienation endemic to

industrial society"[172] which may have come from Poel's early relation with members of the

Pre-Raphaelites, and the latter comes from the perception Poel had of the early modern

audience as temporarily united English body that received both moral and education value

---

[170] Speaight, *William Poel,* 161.

[171] Speaight, *William Poel*, 166.

[172] Joe Falocco, *Reimagining Shakespeare's Playhouse: Early Modern Staging Conventions in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010), 13.

from the theatre.[173] Poel's education goals for the theatre and his anti-industrial tendencies

will be further discussed in chapter five.

Conclusion

These are the major artists important to this dissertation. Although their methods and

mediums varied, their ultimate goal was the same, to examine and return to an earlier artistic

time and to emulate the methods of those artists in their own contemporary context. The

hope for all of them was that both the artwork and the method they used to produce it would

reveal to them a truth that they believed was accessible in that earlier time period. The aims

of these artists can be better explained through the tenets of Romanticism, to which they all

adhered. That is the subject of chapter three.

Manipulation of Time - Nazarenes

As I suggested in the Introduction, the common link between the artists in this dissertation is

the manipulation of time in their work to open up neutral spaces where the possibilities of the

future can be imagined. I have suggested they do this in four ways: locating the work in the

past, including some element of strangeness in the work, emphasizing the relationship

between the artist and the viewer, and highlighting the uniqueness of the human individual.

The artists have several tools for succeeding in these endeavors, and I will discuss each of

them in turn. This section will focus on the Nazarenes.

As I described above, the work of the Nazarenes was varied depending on the

individual artist's tastes and interests, but all of the Nazarene painters used subject matter

---

[173] Poel, *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, 27.

from the past in their paintings, and most tried to paint in an older style as well. Frank

identifies a common characteristic among the paintings however that also supports the thesis

of this dissertation.

> All Nazarene paintings, however, share the characteristic of making the viewer aware
> of the passage of time as an irreversible process: the effect is to estrange one from as
> well as connect one to certain forms of thought and perception. In other words,
> Nazarene painting necessarily creates in the viewer the recognition of a tension
> between the possibility of reviving an earlier era through its pictorial tradition and the
> impossibility of gaining access to that period.[174]

What Frank describes here is exactly the tension that opens the space for creation. A closer

look at Franz Pforr's *Shulamit and Mary* and Overbeck's *Triumph of Religion in the Arts* will

help elucidate this process.

Pforr's painting *Shulamit and Mary* (1811) is an earlier manifestation of the

importance of historical time to the reading of the painting. Pforr created the painting as an

allegory of his friendship with Overbeck, who also returned the sentiment, and whose

painting later exhibited nationalistic overtones. Both artists' paintings contain the two

figures, Shulamit and Mary, but Pforr's is created as a diptych, with the two women

occupying different space but in a related setting. Shulamit, a woman from the Old

Testament, sits in the figure of a Madonna holding a child with an Italian landscape in the

background. Mary, from the New Testament, sits "in a Renaissance interior not unlike the

ones seen in some of Dürer's prints."[175] In Petra ten-Doesschate Chu's interpretaion of this

work, she suggests that Pforr "contrasts his own preference for northern European painting

---

[174] Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined,* 109.

[175] Chu, *Nineteenth Century European Art*, 165.

with Overbeck's love of early Renaissance art in Italy."[176] Indeed, the figure approaching Shulamit in the background, supposed to be her husband, is Overbeck himself.

Pforr's painting exhibits some of the criteria I have outlined above, but not all. This painting would not have the phenomenological effect on the viewer that I argue is ultimately important to these artists' mission. The painting certainly does locate itself in the past, both through the content of the painting and through the style, which is medieval in structure and painted alternately to imitate Italian Renaissance painters and Dürer, but it does not carry with it the element of strangeness or the relationship between the artist and individual that would engage the viewer in a suspended moment. The painting was created to represent the friendship of two men, and the product appears to be a closed, finished work. The viewer does not need to complete the story or fill in any blanks. The comparison that the painting is asking the viewer to make has all of its elements contained therein. The viewer does not need to complete meaning, only to understand it. The painting as a message exists with or without an audience.

The same is not necessarily true of Overbeck's later painting, *Triumph of Religion in the Arts* (1840), which I argue causes a suspension in space and time for the viewer. This painting is a very similar representation to a painting by Raphael, *Disputa*. The differences in the details of the painting are what lead to different levels of engagement with the viewer. Frank describes the similarities between Overbeck's *Triumph of Religion in the Arts* and Raphael's *Disputa*, which from a very surface view are clearly meant to resemble each other. Both paintings feature strong and clear horizontal and vertical axes, with a figure high on the vertical axis backed by a circular frame. Figures occupy the space above and below the

---

[176] Chu, *Nineteenth Century European Art*, 166.

horizontal axis, which in both paintings is the horizon between heaven and earth. The figures, however, are different.

In Raphael's painting, Christ sits in the position of honor, with God above him and an altar below. Overbeck's shows the Virgin Mary in the position which Christ filled. In this painting, she symbolizes poetry, "the centre of all arts."[177] Overbeck surrounds the Virgin Mary Poetry with saints and biblical figures, but not the same that appear in Raphael's painting. Instead, he chooses those who are related to Christian art, such as "Luke (representing painting) and John (representing architecture)."[178] Frank argues that both paintings deal with origins, one of the Eucharist, the other of Christian painting.[179]

Overbeck's painting, like Pforr's, highlights a past time both in subject and form. But Overbeck's painting includes an element of strangeness and a specific place for the viewer in relation to the painting. An important, but perhaps not immediately noticeable, difference between Overbeck and Raphael's paintings is the painted frame within which the subject of the work exists. Raphael's painting features a semi-circular frame which is completely enclosed in the painting and meets the floor in the corners to form a complete unit. In Overbeck's painting, the top of the semi-circular arch is visible, but the viewer cannot see the sides or the bottom. Frank explains the significance of this difference.

> Here there is a greater call for viewer participation: the opening in the foreground of the painting assumes the presence of the viewer, who stands before the picture and completes its circular composition. In closing the circle the viewer is removed to a past world. It must be noted however that this world, which includes artists from various time periods and places, is ahistorical, as is Overbeck's theme of Catholic redemption through devotion to art. In the *Triumph* Overbeck thus makes claims to

---

[177] Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 101.

[178] Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 101.

[179] Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined,* 108.

the past in order to put forth the universal and ahistorical message of Catholic salvation.[180]

The element of strangeness in Overbeck's painting could be several components: one, simply the historical style of the painting which clearly imitates Raphael; two, the use of the Virgin Mary and Christian iconography in a painting that is ultimately about art, not religion; three, the clear historical nature of the painting but the lack of a solid reference for its subject, in that it does not reference a biblical or actual historical moment; and four, the open construction of the scene which forces the viewer to occupy space within the moment of the painting. This last element is what creates the important relationship between viewer and artist that Pforr's *Shulamit and Mary* and Raphael's *Disputa* do not have. This in turn highlights the importance of the viewer as an individual necessary to complete the painting, but certainly to complete it in his or her own way, as a unique individual.

This painting then has the elements necessary to create the neutral space discussed above. The time of the painting is historical yet ahistorical. Strange elements of the work cause the viewers to engage with the work in a way that takes them out of the contemporary time into a historical space, but not a recognizable one. In the case of this painting, the problem of the contemporary world being challenged is the distant relationship between religion and art. This painting calls for the recognition of a symbiotic relationship between the two by calling attention to a time that never was, asking why that should be the case, and providing a space in which a different reality for the future can be imagined.

---

[180] Frank, *German Romantic Painting Redefined*, 108.

Chapter 3: Romanticism

Romanticism as a movement is often cited as beginning at the end of the eighteenth century in reaction against the Enlightenment and in response to the French Revolution. Where it began is contested, since some of its ideas seem to have started forming well before the artists took up the mantle, but it certainly existed early in the German States and England, and then to some extent in Italy and France. The Romantic artists did not necessarily self-identify as 'romantic.' Although the term shows up in some of the early theories and descriptions, it is unclear when the term actually began to refer to a movement, and this is complicated by the fact that the term was rarely used to mean the same thing by different people.[181] There is no 'romantic method,' nor are there rules to be followed. As Hugh Honour argues about major romantic works, "diversity is their most obvious characteristic, yet they all present attitudes to art and life which differ fundamentally from those previously expressed."[182] Romanticism as something different was understood in its contemporary day as it is today. Though no coherent theory can be attached to its works, certain theorists are associated with the movement. In Germany these include Friedrich and August Wilhelm

---

[181] "… one common belief held by [German Romantic artists] was a disregard for academic training and rule-governed activities." Frank, *Redefined*, 38; "The term [romantic] covered a range of ideas: that nature was informed with the divine spirit and that the individual human imagination could immerse itself in the universal fabric; but also that the creative mind, being profoundly solitary, would yearn for harmony between man and nature." Wolf, *Romanticism*, 6; "But if we ignore the question of self-awareness and conscious advocacy of a romantic creed, I think we must recognize that we can speak of a general European romantic movement only if we take a wide over-all view and consider simply the general rejection of the neoclassical creed as a common denominator." Mosse, 29; "The Romanticism which became all pervasive in modern European culture was a 'mood' which escaped any rigid scheme of classification. That was part of the strength of the movement, for it could change from person to person and combine with various political and social ideals." Wellek, *The Romantic Age*, 1-2.

[182] Hugh Honour, *Romanticism* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979), 14.

Schlegel, Wackenroder, Novalis, Tieck, early Goethe, and Herder, who pre-dated the others but was influential to their work. As I will discuss below, many of these romantics theorized politics as well as art, showing the close connection between the two different areas for the German romantics. In England the theorists include Wordsworth, Coleridge, Carlyle, and Ruskin, although the latter two come towards the end of the period and often are described as transitioning Romanticism into the Victorian period. Both Wordsworth and Coleridge spent time studying in Germany where they encountered German Romantic artists, and as described above, Coleridge met Tieck on at least two occasions. Although the Romantic period in England is typically considered to have ended in the 1830s, the tradition and ideas of the romantic spirit were kept alive in England by the painter Turner and the art critic John Ruskin, and several of the ideas behind the work of the Pre-Raphaelites and Poel coincide with ideas from the earlier Romantics. As I quoted from Honour above, these Romantic artists are not all working with the exact same goals in mind, but certainly they are a change from what came before. My discussion of the Pre-Raphaelites and Poel will highlight their romantic tendencies as part of the cultural poetics of their era.

As varied as the works and artists of Romanticism could be, there are certain threads, or social energies, that seem to connect many of the artists in this movement. I have identified four that are apparent both in romantic theory and in the artists important to this work. I call these social energies because they seem to have permeated varied, if still distinct, areas of society. They are certainly found in the intellectual writings of the period, but also appear in the political theories. They existed in the art of the period, some of which was accessible to a range of classes. Most of the four energies relate to how people identified and related to each other, necessitating a mobility by their very nature. These are not ideas

pondered within one's own private moments, but instead are energies that circulate, and therefore exist in society. I am arguing that these energies, through the medium of Romanticism, spread through the German States, Rome, and England, affecting Tieck, Poel, the Nazarenes, and the Pre-Raphaelites.

The first, and perhaps most important, stems from an organic theory of art, with the emphasis on Becoming instead of Being,[183] and posits that art is expressive of the innermost essence of a person and should not be subjected to outside factors in its creation. M.H. Abrams argues that "The momentous historical shift from the view that the making of a work of art is a supremely purposeful activity to the view that its coming-into-being is, basically, a spontaneous process independent of intention, precept, or even consciousness, was the natural concomitant of an organic aesthetics."[184] This is Wordsworth's "spontanteous overflow of powerful feelings"[185] direct from the inner spirit of man. The art is original, pure, unstudied, and free. This focus on the individual is the first romantic characteristic shared by Tieck, the Nazarenes, the Pre-Raphaelites, and Poel.

The second important aspect of romanticism is the focus on nature, both the inner nature of the person, which ties in with the first element, and nature as the wilderness existing in the outside world, especially in relation to the new industrial cities emerging in the nineteenth century. In Germany, nature and the landscape could reveal an essentially German character, and in England, the natural landscape was being destroyed by advances in

---

[183] M.H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic theory and the critical tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953), 219.

[184] Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, 187.

[185] William Wordsworth, "Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*," in *The Longman Anthology of British Literature, Volume Two*, ed. David Damrosch (New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc., 2003), 357.

industry, and the English spirit was disappearing with it.[186]   Nature ties in closely with the

third aspect of Romanticism, which is the artist's view and use of imitation. Like the term

'nature,' imitation can have different meanings. It can refer to the attempt to copy directly

from the outside world, in a neoclassical mimetic way, in which the artist attempts to create a

mirror-like image,[187] or it can refer to imitation of an artistic style, an accusation that does

not necessarily carry with it a negative connotation. The intricacies of what is considered

imitation, what is original, and what is acceptable as the source for imitation, will be

discussed in more detail later. And finally the fourth aspect of Romanticism that relates to

the work of Tieck, the Nazarenes, the Pre-Raphaelites, and Poel is a desire for a defined

national identity. The Romantic emphasis on history and the natural landscape lead logically

into a desire to understand from where one comes and how that shapes his or her inner spirit,

and consequently how one person's inner spirit relates to another's.

Importance of Individual

Romantic art arises from the outward expression of a person's inner soul, it is "the

internal made external, resulting from a creative process operating under the impulse of

feeling, and embodying the combined product of the poet's perceptions, thoughts, and

feelings."[188] The artist is all important here. Unlike in a mimetic theory of art, the

Romantics were not concerned with representing the world in a way true to human

perception or experience but instead desired to look underneath or beyond the reality existing

---

[186] Mosse emphasizes the "innate correspondence between the individual and nature," and describes that in
Germany "The native landscape thus provided a firm center for attempts at personal and national regeneration."
Mosse, *The Culture of Western Europe*, 34, 26.

[187] Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp,* 31-5.

[188] Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, 22.

around them. Perception and the individual experience with the world became the focus over a universal or objective understanding of reality.

The emphasis on the individual artist and his or her perception existed in the theory behind romantic thinking before it existed in the art produced.   In his work, "Fichte Studies," Novalis, Tieck's closest friend in the original Jena Circle, discusses the concept 'I' and 'Non-I', or the other: "In order *to determine* the I we must refer it to something. Referring occurs through differentiating – both occur through the thesis of an absolute sphere of existence, which is mere being – or chaos."[189] In this discussion, which is a response to Fichte's discussion of 'I', Novalis argues that one's understanding of the self always must be in relation to the Non-I, a thesis and an antithesis, and the realm in which these two oppositions meet is the synthesis, the "absolute I."[190] The absolute I exists in a "sphere that encompasses" both the I and the Non-I, and for Novalis "this sphere can be called God and I."[191] Novalis's absolute I is connected to God.

In this same section Novalis also theorizes communication, how the I relates to the Non-I. These beings become the first signifier and the second signifier, and in an explanation which seems to preempt semiotic theory, Novalis discusses communication as a transfer of signifieds and signs through a system compatible for the two communicators. Inherent to this discussion however is the necessity that each individual is free in his or her understanding of the relationship between the signified and the sign: "To the extent that the

---

[189] Novalis, "Fichte Studies" in *Theory as Practice*, ed. Jochen Shulte-Sasse et al. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 91.

[190] Elizabeth Mittman and Mary R. Strand, "Introductory Essay: Representing Self and Other in Early German Romanticism," in *Theory as Practice*, ed. Jochen Shulte-Sasse et al. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 51.

[191] Novalis, "Fichte Studies," 92.

signifying person is *completely free* either in the effect of the signified or in the choice of signs, and not even dependent on this internally determined nature – to that extent, the two [sign and referent] are interrelated for the signifying person alone, and neither of them has a relationship of necessity to the other for another signifying person."[192] It follows then that "it is only by chance or miracle that the signified comes across to the second signifying person by means of such a sign."[193] However, communication between the two beings can exist when the sign transfer is based upon a homogeneous system, an agreed upon system of signs. This relates to the present topic in two ways: first, an artist's interpretation of the world comes from his own understanding of his experience with the realm around him and second, the communication of that experience can only be successful if the employed sign system is understood by others as well. These ideas may seem commonplace and even obvious to scholars today, but they represent a profound change from the Enlightenment desire to categorize the outside world and determine man's universal place within the system.

A Romantic who accepted Novalis's ideas behind communication and who, for instance, desired to know Shakespeare and his work more intimately, would need to first acknowledge Shakespeare's plays as creations of art unique to his particular inner spirit, and then attempt to understand what system of signifieds and signs Shakespeare was working within. I cannot say with certainty that these specific ideas were in Tieck's agenda for his Elizabethan performances, but his friendship with Novalis and his own historicism indicate that the possible motivation might have been a discovery of Shakespeare's system of representation.

---

[192] Novalis, "Fichte Studies," 93.

[193] Novalis, "Fichte Studies," 93.

Novalis's discussion of the unique identity of an individual, which can only begin to be grasped by understanding a being in relation to a negative being, follows a similar theme as works by Fichte and Friedrich Schlegel. The need for a new understanding of the individual and the idea of that individual as completely unique and also impossible to fully determine was pervasive throughout German Romantic philosophy. A similar sense of the individual exists in the early English Romantics as well.

Abrams describes the use of the lyrical poem in the English Romantics as an expression of the self, highlighting both the importance of the artist in his own work and the desire to attach an artwork with an "I", with an identifiable being. The English Romantic poet often "chose to project himself in the medium of verse,"[194] the poetry "circles out from the poet as center."[195] The artist as an individual then is absolutely important to the final project, as it is a reflection of himself.

This refers back to Abrams argument of the rise of the expressive theory of art in this period:

> …once the theory emerged that poetry is primarily the expression of feeling and a state of mind – and even, in its extreme form, that poetry is the fictional gratification of desire – a natural corollary was to approach a poem as a revelation of what Carlyle called the 'individual specialties' or the author himself.[196]

Art was no longer a process to mirror nature separate from the perspective of the artist, but instead was either wholly rooted in the artist's particular mind, or was an imitation of nature through his or her particular lens.

---

[194] Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, 98.

[195] Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, 99.

[196] Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, 227.

There are, of course, several implications for the artist and the art-receiver in this new conception of how the artist can be found in his or her art. Artists have the ability to choose how much, and what aspects, of themselves to reveal through their art, the reception of which can vary depending on what is revealed. As might be expected, Wordsworth's thoughts on sibling love and nature at Tintern Abbey might have better reception than D.G. Rossetti's "Jenny," in which the narrator contemplates the prostitute asleep on his knee. The relationship between the artwork and its receiver becomes much more intimate because the receiver is now also forming a relationship with the poet as an individual being. A level of trust must be formed that the artist will not lead the receiver down a dangerous path, but the receiver also must be trustworthy, as now he holds the secrets to the artist's innermost being. This idea of art and the relationship that can be formed coincides with romantic thoughts on government and society, as have been mentioned above. As Raymond Williams describes, the poet began to think of himself as "a specially endowed person, the guiding light of common life."[197] Hence the morality of the artist becomes important as he "reveals his moral character in his art,"[198] and could potentially pull his reader in his moral or amoral direction.

The revelation of the poet through his or her art also had important historical possibilities. If artists created from themselves, put themselves into their work, then they could be revealed through their work. Suddenly, a poet who had lived in a different age, like Shakespeare, could come back to life through his writing and with the right interpretive

---

[197] R. Williams, *Culture and Society*, 36.

[198] Abrams argues that this opinion was held by "Goethe, Coleridge, Shelley, Carlyle, Ruskin, Arnold, and others in the nineteenth century." Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, 229.

approach, "furnished with the proper key,"[199] could be revealed to his readers. This idea is

important for the discussion on Poel in chapter five, and I will return to it then.

The Romantic emphasis on the individual and inner spirit relates to the discussion of

Tieck, the Nazarenes, the Pre-Raphaelites, and Poel by providing a new angle from which to

connect their work. One way the importance of the self manifests in the Nazarene paintings

has already been described above. In their tendency to give each figure in a painting its own

space and to complete it in equal detail, no matter if it is the subject of the painting or a

background figure, the Nazarenes express a respect for the human being, regardless of status.

Their own self-portraits also highlight the intricacies of the individual. Frank argues for

Overbeck's self-fashioning through his self-portraits, an identity which mainly manifested

itself in two roles, the monk-artist and the independent man.[200]   Overbeck was working on

Self-Portrait with the Bible when he received an important commission as an artist, and

Frank argues that new sense of self-worth and responsibility can be seen in the portrait:

> Overbeck depicts himself holding the bible, from which he will draw inspiration, and
> sitting in front of a blank canvas. Behind him are the signs of classical learning (the
> column, the bust of Goethe, and perhaps the books)…. The classical training in this
> painting suggests that he still considers antiquity part of his artistic inheritance.[201]

Frank contrasts this portrait, in which Overbeck has a serious look on his face and is not quite

making eye contact with the viewer, with Overbeck's earlier portraits in which "an intimacy

is established between the painter and the viewer."[202] In contrast to the 'independent man'

portrayed in these portraits, Overbeck's performance of self highlighted his monk-artist

---

[199] Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, 229.

[200] Frank, *Redefined*, 49.

[201] Frank, *Redefined*, 51.

[202] Frank, *Redefined*, 51.

persona. During the week, he cloistered himself away to work on his art. On Sundays, he

emerged, allowing visitors to his studio where he would discuss with them his theories on art

and his methods. Again from Frank,

> …everything about these Sunday afternoons was controlled by Overbeck in order to
> create a certain impression. The decoration of the rooms was Spartan and austere.
> His appearance and speech conveyed humility and religious passion. His
> draughtsmanship, in its neatness, connoted deliberation and control.[203]

Through his art, and his personal performance, Overbeck relies on the Romantic idea that one

can portray one's inner character through art. The duality of the personas Overbeck creates

perhaps shows the tension between what Overbeck wants to be, and what his inner Romantic

spirit determines he must be.

I am highlighting the Nazarenes in this dissertation because of what I am arguing is

their ideological relationship to Tieck and how it relates to his hopes for an Elizabethan

stage. The self-portraits completed by the Nazarenes show how, when one understands the

code of an art work, one can more fully understand both the subject and the artist. My

argument is that this relates to Tieck's desire for an Elizabethan stage. The more in tune he

and his audience could be with the "code" of Elizabethan performance, the more they could

understand the true essence of the plays. In Novalis's description of communication,

Shakespeare is the first signifier and the German audience is the second signifier. Tieck then

becomes the intermediary who is trying to match up the systems of signs.

The focus on the individual and inner spirit for the English artists has a slightly

different focus. The similar goal for Poel of understanding Shakespeare more fully is still a

factor, but it seems as though a more important consequence of the greater focus on the

individual self is the permission for a respectable Victorian to *feel*, to experience emotion, the

---

[203] Frank, *Redefined*, 60.

way an Elizabethan or a Romantic had permission to feel. So much of the art the Pre-Raphaelites were creating was censured as inappropriate, but as I will argue in chapter five, the Pre-Raphaelites and Poel looked to Shakespeare and valued the individual artist as flawed and feeling human beings, not moralizing rule-givers.

Nature vs. Industry

Nature is another concept that is relevant to this discussion and prevalent throughout Romantic art and theory. Much like the term 'romantic,' however, the definition of 'nature' varies greatly. Certainly the nature caught in a landscape by Caspar David Friedrich is very different from the nature exhibited in a Pre-Raphaelite painting. Some of the difference relates to differing concepts of imitation, but that is the topic of the next section. In general, the artists in this discussion understood nature to indicate the living world around them, the organic, not man-made world, in which they variously find evidence of God, spirituality, or animalian mysticism. For both the German and the English Romantics, nature became an untamed space, untainted and unaltered by human intervention, which made it fertile ground for revealing the essence both of German and English identity. Mosse describes the German relation to the natural landscape as a place where people "encountered their ancestors, whose healthy and vigorous lives were passed in intimate contact with nature, an eternal fountain of purity as over against the vice-ridden city."[204] Untainted nature held the history of the people, the stories of where they came from, and provided an escape from the urban life-style in which people could get to know the land, and themselves, more intimately.

---

[204] Mosse, *The Culture of Western Europe*, 26.

The period of German history under discussion here, the early nineteenth century, was not a heavily industrial time for Germany, but in England, by the time Poel is working, the Industrial Revolution has swept through and changed the face of England. Therefore in England, in a way that had not yet happened in Germany, nature also is held up in opposition to industry. Many of the theorists surrounding the Pre-Raphaelites and Poel discuss exactly this problem, including Ruskin.

Ruskin had a moral, almost spiritual awe of nature, by which term I mean not only the natural earth, trees, rivers, etc., but also a mythological, spiritual force which connects the natural world of reality to an underlying, essential truth. Understanding one could lead to illuminating the other. His disdain of industry because of its danger to nature is then expected, but Ruskin's fears of this new world run deeper than that. It is not the building of societies or the advancements in labor that are the problem, but instead specifically the *way* in which the work is completed. The problem with industry, and with industrial art, is that it turns men into slaves, into machines themselves, and they can be freed only by allowing them to think. Instead of showing a worker how to do one job, repetitively throughout the day, Ruskin suggests that he be asked to think about the problem himself, find a new or better way to do the job. There will be mistakes, but "you have made a man of him for all that. He was only a machine before, an animated tool."[205]

In Ruskin's discussion of Gothic architecture, it is exactly this imperfection that makes the buildings beautiful. Ruskin sees in a Gothic building the Christian idea of "the individual value in every human soul,"[206] and with that the embracing of the imperfections of

---

[205] John Ruskin, "The Nature of Gothic," in *Selected Writings*, ed. Dinah Birch (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 40.

[206] Ruskin, "The Nature of Gothic," 39.

the human endeavor. If the lines of the building are not straight, the angles only close approximations, and every window set at a slightly different height, the building is beautiful, perhaps not in an aesthetic way but in a natural way, possessing a beauty that stems from the power and the life of the building.[207] The consistency and mechanical perfection of items created by industry lose the thought and the life of the human responsible for the creation, and therefore they lose the natural, unique beauty of art and become soulless objects.

An important issue for Ruskin and the artists he influenced was over the intersection of art and industry. The mass production of aesthetically pleasing items called into question the nature of art and the agency of the artist. Although the original Brotherhood formed separately from the influence of Ruskin's theories,[208] the same anxiety about industry and art exists in their early work, and certainly as Ruskin and the Pre-Raphaelites became more aware of each other, their theoretical paths began to cross. At its formation in 1848, the Pre-Raphaelites came together as a group of artists whose express purpose it was to return to the study and imitation of nature, in direct opposition to the academy of art as it then existed. From a removed view of their group, their ideas in theory and in practice seem to be contradictory. They named themselves based on their desire to return to an artistic style that existed before the Renaissance, that is, up to and including Raphael, but at the same time they were producing quite revolutionary art. In the same contradictory way, their desire for truth to nature led to the creation of very detailed and meticulously painted landscapes which portrayed a realism that at times rivaled photography.[209] And yet those landscapes often

---

[207] Ruskin, "The Nature of Gothic," 34.

[208] W. Rossetti, *The Germ*, 7.

[209] Waggoner, *The Pre-Raphaelite Lens*, 3.

provided the background to a fictional or mythological scene, containing actions and characters that are from a romantic more than a realistic genre. The Pre-Raphaelite truth to nature sometimes passed over the "real for the ideal."[210]

Imitation

Imitation, which first led me to study these artists, is perhaps the most complicated element of Romanticism that connects them. There are several precarious issues that need to be settled in this discussion: romantic imitation as opposed to neoclassical imitation, the ultimate goal of the imitation, which subjects are being imitated and why, and finally, is imitation merely copying or can a work be imitation and original at the same time. I would like to look at the Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites together in this section since they seem to share the same position with regard to this topic.

On the subject, A.W. Schlegel, an important and influential German Romantic theorist in the late eighteenth, early nineteenth century, wrote "mere imitation is always fruitless; even what we borrow from others, to assume a true poetical shape, must, as it were, be born again within us."[211] Instead of discouraging the Nazarenes, however, this was the view of imitation that they share. Their aim was not simply to copy earlier works or imitate an artistic style of painting, but instead to imitate the theory and the method. This did, however, often lead to paintings that do indeed seem to be copies of earlier work,[212] but the Nazarenes always viewed the result as an original work. The academy members, like other artists such as Goethe, thought that creating art should be a "rule-governed activity and

---

[210] Hunt, *The Pre-Raphaelite Imagination*, 22.

[211] August Wilhelm Schlegel, "Lecture 1", in *Dramatic Art and Literature, Vol. I*, trans. John Black (London, 1840), 7.

[212] See *Manipulations of Time – Nazarenes,* 69.

imitation of the proper models, nature and classical art (the work of antiquity and the high

Renaissance), is essential for its survival. The art of the Nazarenes, because of the models

they follow, is thus antithetical to progress."[213]   Imitation, then, was not the issue, but

instead the choice of imitation. Ironically, however, imitation was exactly the problem from

the Nazarenes' point of view. They were not attempting to paint like their influences, but

instead through the same process. The way they understood the medieval and early

Renaissance art, "the execution originated in the artist's feeling, rather than in his skill. Pre-

Reformation art moved the viewer through religious feeling, while academic art, because it

was so distanced from its original character, was decadent and frivolous."[214] By imitating the

early Renaissance artists, the Nazarenes were allowed to paint from within themselves, as

they felt those early painters had done, and thus their art came from a place of truth,

producing an original artwork because it sprung from each of their unique inner selves,

hence, an imitation and an original. As Overbeck explained it in a letter to his father, "'One

painting over which one has to create oneself, over which one suffers agonies until

something decent emerges, teaches one just as much as another person would learn from

copying twenty pictures even if they are by Raphael, Titian, Correggio, Van Dyck…. If only

one day I become an Overbeck!'"[215]

The Pre-Raphaelites struggled for the same authenticity while also working through

imitation. Their influences were many of the same artists, but whereas the Nazarenes strove

for truth, the Pre-Raphaelites desired truth to nature. Their imitation then was not just of past

---

[213] Frank, *Redefined*, 91.

[214] Frank, *Redefined*, 106.

[215] Quoted in Andrews, *Nazarenes*, 6-7.

artists, but also resulted in meticulous attempts to capture every detail of nature. The

landscapes and the natural backgrounds of some of their paintings capture the detail of every

leaf, every stem of grass. John Everett Millais's *Ophelia*, for example, is well-known for the

meticulous attention to detail exhibited in each flower and leaf which comprise the

background of the painting, and in the same artist's *Mariana*, not only is the attention to the

slightly awkward body position of the main figure arresting, but also the details surrounding

her, such as the mouse running across the floor, the autumn leaves that have blown inside,

and the creases in a seemingly unimportant piece of cloth, which in fact "give a sense of

urgency to the looking process: we are asked to attend carefully to this particular cloth and no

other."[216] It is of interest to note here that the subjects of both of Millais's paintings are

characters from Shakespeare's plays, *Hamlet* and *Measure for Measure*, and also that the

amount and types of flowers blooming at the same time in Millais's *Ophelia* would be

impossible in nature.[217] Therefore the Pre-Raphaelites, artists whose sole mission is truth to

nature, are creating works that deal with fictional stories and place them in fictional settings.

How is this to be reconciled? The key point here is that the Pre-Raphaelite conception of

truth is romantic, not neoclassical. That is, truth to nature aims at a 'higher' or 'inner' truth,

one which is possible in the natural world of existence but not necessarily visible nature. The

Pre-Raphaelite attention to detail was not mimetic, not restricted to imitation of what actually

exists and can be tangibly experienced by humans, but instead hoped to imitate, to display,

truth that can be found in a different, spiritual realm. Ruskin provides the theory to support

---

[216] Prettejohn, *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites*, 11.

[217] Prettejohn, *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites*, 172.

this idea. In Raymond William's words, "Art *is* 'imitation', in the older sense of an embodiment of aspects of the universal, 'ideal' truth."[218]

A similar idea, I will argue in subsequent chapters, drives both Tieck's and Poel's attempts at imitations of Elizabethan theatres, except that instead of aiming directly at a universal truth, they try to get to it through Shakespeare. For Tieck as a Romantic and Poel as a radical Victorian intellectual, Shakespeare's plays provided full and varied pictures of humanity and spanned the spectrum of human emotion. Shakespeare was a genius, in the Romantic sense, and therefore had a special connection to a transcendental truth. The hope that the Nazarenes and Pre-Raphaelites carried for the transcendent power of their art also existed in Tieck and Poel. Through the power of Shakespeare's plays, done as Shakespeare intended, Tieck and Poel would be able to bring their audiences closer to Shakespeare, closer to genius, and closer to a transcendental truth.

National Unity and National Identity

The final element of Romanticism I am highlighting in this work is a desire for, and attempted discovery of, national identity and national unity. The discovery and articulation of national identity has come to be a complex and sensitive issue, and one can look to several scholars for explanations and theories of what should be involved in this discussion, some of whom have already been mentioned. For this work, however, it is not my intention to guess or extrapolate what early-nineteenth century national identities were according to my own understanding, but instead to explore ideas of national unity from the perspective of the contemporary writers.

---

[218] R. Williams, *Culture and Society*, 135.

A quest for national identity and unity was a large part of the Romantic mission, and therefore plays in either directly or through potential influence to the artists important to this discussion. Tieck himself may not have been an outwardly patriotic writer, but some of his close colleagues were. During the formative years of the Romantic movement at Jena, Tieck developed friendships with Novalis, Schleiermacher, and the Schlegel brothers, and although Fichte was not part of the original group, a mutual exchange of influence connected him to them.[219] These three men were important proponents of a unified German national identity based on Romantic notions. Tieck clearly adhered to the general Romantic sentiments, as he was part of their earliest developments, and so it is reasonable to assume that while he might not have been as outwardly patriotic as his colleagues, he would have shared the same basic views of national unity.

Although not part of the Jena Romantic circle, Fichte, a turn of the century philosopher inspired by the theories of Immanuel Kant, writes about the nation using Romantic ideas. Fichte believed that the nation grew naturally out of a common society, and because this is a national act, "the state becomes endowed with a mystical quality."[220] Fichte also believed that the nation existed to make "the moral law possible."[221] In other words, the nation was not just a political body, but also a force for moral governing. In his "Addresses to the German Nation," which he published in 1808 in response to Napoleon winning the Battle of Jena, he discusses the sad state of Germany as it existed then and his hopes for its

---

[219] Reiss, *Political Thoughts*, 11.

[220] Reiss, *Political Thoughts,* 16.

[221] Reiss, *Political Thoughts*, 19.

future self-governing. Much of his reasoning for nationhood sounds Romantic in origin. For instance, on the origins of nations he writes,

> The first, original and truly natural frontiers of all states are undoubtedly their inner frontiers. Those who speak the same language are linked together, before human intervention takes a hand, by mere nature with a host of invisible ties… they are by nature one indivisible whole.[222]

The nation, then, is connected by three ideas important to romanticism: language, one's inner self, and nature. The nation is not an arbitrary matching that one can choose to join or not, but instead people are bound to their nation by their inner nature.

Fichte believes this to be the case for Germans, but because of their geographical position within Europe, the other European countries have manipulated them to keep them from power. Fichte laments that the German nation could not stay united because if it had, "it would have been dependent upon itself in the centre of the civilized worlds just like the sun in the centre of the cosmos; it would have kept itself and hence its environment in peace."[223] The state of the German nation was not just important for German people then, but as Fichte argues, it could have been a powerful peace-keeping nation for all of Europe. Another Romantic idea comes into play here, that is, the importance of morality to the German nation. That is where Fichte feels the focus of the German nation should have been, now that they had lost the battle with Napoleon. Fichte accepts defeat on one front to focus on another: "The war with arms is decided; now a new war of principles, of morals and of character begins, and this is a war we want."[224] Much like the Romantic's emphasis on a

---

[222] Johann Gottlieb Fichte, "Address to the German Nation," in *The Political Thought of the German Romantics*, ed. H.S. Reiss (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 107.

[223] Fichte, "Addresses to the German Nation," 106.

[224] Fichte, "Addresses to the German Nation," 110.

cultural nation, Fichte looks to a strength that does not involve weapons, but instead a characteristic of the 'inner man'.

Schleiermacher, who actually was in the Jena circle with Tieck, shares many of the same views on the origins of a nation as Fichte. He also maintains that states are not manmade, but instead are "historical formations of nature."[225] And it is most important for Schleiermacher that nations be understood from their origins, as each develops differently. In his essay "On the Concepts of Different Forms of the State" (1814), he discusses the historical classifications that science has tried to put on different forms of nations – democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy – none of which he finds satisfactory. In this work he does not outline what his ideal state formation is, but instead describes historically how certain states arise and how that affects what traditional form of government develops within that state. Factors that affect the origin of a nation vary from the size of the initial community to the number of people that gain political consciousness at the same time. Political consciousness is key to the nation for Schleiermacher. A group of families living together in a space does not make a state, but Schleiermacher pinpoints the moment of change: "What existed before is now expressed, the unconscious unity and equality, and this arising of the consciousness of belonging together exists merely in opposition to the consciousness of existing in each individual."[226]

Schleiermacher concludes that the highest order for a state is one in which a single monarchic figure has full power. Here, however, Schleiermacher reveals his Romantic tendencies, because he makes it clear that this monarch does not need to be and should not be

---

[225] Friedrich Schleiermacher, "On the Concepts of Different Forms of the State," in *The Political Thought of the German Romantics*, ed. H.S Reiss (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 175.

[226] Schleiermacher, "On the Concept of Different Forms of the State," 184.

a despot. It is the personal responsibility of the monarch to allow his subjects to participate

in the law-making of the region. For a monarch to resist becoming a despot, he must "allow

his subjects the right of petition; and it can be said in all cases where they produce their

wishes, whether he grants them or refuses them, as long as he merely considers them the

subjects have begun to make the law."[227] In what seems typical of Romantic views of

national unity, Schleiermacher presents a glorified view of a society that closely resembles a

medieval balance of power, but one in which if each individual accepts personal

responsibility for his role, the nation will run smoothly.

Novalis, who was Tieck's closest friend at Jena, agrees with Schleiermacher in this

last sentiment. Much of Novalis's writing on the form of the nation highlights the

importance of religion, specifically Christianity, to the smooth interaction of the people.

Like Schleiermacher, Novalis glorifies the medieval structure in which the church was

powerful and pervasive, and people were joined together through the church and through

organizations like the guilds. The emphasis was not on the individual, but on the community.

And like Schleiermacher, Novalis puts the responsibility of the success of society on the

individual's recognition and acceptance of his place in society. In his "Political Aphorisms,"

written in 1798 but not published until 1846, Novalis argued that a successful nation starts

from the bottom: "But does not reason demand that every one should be his own lawgiver?

Man should obey only his own laws."[228] It is necessary, however, that these laws be the laws

of human nature, not the product of an enlightened self-discovery.

---

[227] Schleiermacher, "On the Concept of Different Forms of the State," 199.

[228] Novalis, "Political Aphorisms" in *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*, ed. and trans. by
Frederick C. Beiser (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 55.

Novalis is aware, however, that a "natural, perfect human being is a poetic fiction,"[229] and therefore his ideal state of harmonious living also must be a fiction. He turns, then, to what he considers the least evil form of government, which is monarchy.

> If people were that which they should be and can become, then all forms of government would be the same; humanity would be governed in one manner, everywhere according to the original laws of humanity. Then one would choose the most *beautiful, poetic*, and natural form, the form of the family, monarchy. Several masters – several families; one master – one family![230]

But Novalis does not see this type of state forming on its own. Instead he calls for the necessity of a spiritual element, the recognition of the inner man, and the inclusion of nature. He sees the beginnings of this nation building in the Germans who are developing their culture while other nations are at war. He sees in the beginnings of a German nation that "A powerful intuition of creative willfulness, of boundlessness, of infinite diversity, of sacred originality and the omnipotence of inner humanity appears to stir everywhere."[231] And Novalis does not limit his ideas to the creation of a German nation, but like Schleiermacher, sees Germany as a possible peace-making force in Europe. He hopes for the end of war and the connection of all European states, but he claims that "It is impossible that worldly powers come into equilibrium by themselves; only a third element, that is worldly and supernatural at the same time, can achieve this task."[232] Novalis finds this supernatural element in Christianity, which can "become the mediator of the old and new world."[233]

---

[229] Novalis, "Political Aphorisms," 56.

[230] Novalis, "Political Aphorisms," 57.

[231] Novalis, "Christianity or Europe," in *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*, ed. and trans. by Frederick C. Beiser (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 74. Beiser explains that Novalis wrote this essay in 1799 and presented it to the Jena Circle that year.

[232] Novalis, "Christianity or Europe," 77.

[233] Novalis, "Christianity or Europe," 79.

Novalis's view for Germany and for Europe is based on the Romantic emphasis on nature, the inner man, and morality. Again, he presents an idealized version of a nation which will be led to common goals of society and morality by a strong centralized religion. If people follow the laws of that religion, which ultimately should be based on the natural law of the inner, spiritual man, then the people of that nation should be able to live in harmony, each according to his own place, and that harmony would have the potential to spread throughout Europe and create peace.

Friedrich Schlegel, an early Romanticist who converted to Catholicism and wrote more on politics than his brother, expressed ideas on nation building that fall closely in line with Novalis and Schleiermacher, and he refers to them often in his writing. He has the same reverence for religion, inspiration from the Middle Ages, and connection with history. For Schlegel, the artist is the bearer of all of these elements and can be instrumental in bringing them to the German nation.

The individual soul and talents of a person are important to Schlegel, but as with Novalis and Schleiermacher, the community is most important. Artists are members of the community who are centered and can see the divine around them.[234] This makes them good mediators for others who are not able to see the divine. According to Schlegel, a good mediator "is whoever perceives the divine in himself, and whoever sacrifices himself to preach, proclaim and present the divine to everyone through morals and actions, words and deeds."[235] Artists are not only able to bring man to the divine, but "Through artists humanity

---

[234] Friedrich Schlegel, "Ideas," in *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*, ed. and trans. by Frederick C. Beiser (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 129. This essay appeared in *Athenaeum* in 1800.

[235] F. Schlegel, "Ideas," 128.

will become one individual, since they connect the past and future with the present."[236] The

artists will be instrumental in bringing individuals together into one community.

Religion and history are essential for F. Schlegel's nation. Schlegel discusses

Christianity as an important force, but he qualifies it by writing "The new Christianity must

be *catholic* without any further ado, but old catholic, not the papacy."[237] As is the case with

Novalis, the discussion of religion and Christianity seems removed from the reality of those

institutions during the time, and instead seems to long for the mysticism and community of

the medieval church. Schlegel idealizes that time period: "Never was there more freedom,

equality and fraternity than in the Middle Ages – and these were their best in Germany."[238]

Just as Novalis thought the only true nation could be a poetic nation, F. Schlegel also

connected art to the new German nation. He discusses man as containing part intellect, part

fantasy, both of which contribute to the search for freedom.[239] He hopes for the continuation

of the spirit of German heroes, including Dürer, Lessing, Goethe, and Fichte.[240] Like the

theorists above, history was very important to Schlegel, who claimed "There is no self-

knowledge other than the historical. No one knows who he is who does not know who his

fellows are, especially the highest fellow of the brotherhood, the master of masters, the

---

[236] F. Schlegel, "Ideas," 130.

[237] Friedrich Schlegel, "Philosophical Fragments from the Philosophical Apprenticeship," in *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*, ed. and trans. by Frederick C. Beiser (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 167. These fragments come from a series of notebooks written between 1796 and 1803.

[238] F. Schlegel, "Philosophical Fragments," 165.

[239] Friedrich Schlegel, "Philosophical Lectures: Transcendental Philosophy," in *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*, ed. and trans. by Frederick C. Beiser (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 154. These lectures were given at the University of Jena in 1800-1801.

[240] Schlegel, "Transcendental Philosophy,"135, 137.

genius of the age."[241] Morals, the inner human, nature, and education are other romantic

ideas that come up in Schlegel's philosophy of the nation. Politics for Schlegel stems from

the relationship between morals and religion and determines "the form of *how people can be*

one."[242] Like Novalis, Schlegel determines that "*Family* and *hierarchy* are the only forms of

true society"[243] and favors that formation over a Republic.

I have treated the authors and documents referred to here as coherent and consistent

political theorists and their writings, but it would be inaccurate to claim that these

descriptions are comprehensive. Several scholars have delved into the intricacies of each of

these theorists and show changes and contradictions in their theories over time. What I have

provided here are some of the main ideas of the theorists, some of the ideas about nationhood

what were circulating in the Romantic group and would have reached both Tieck and the

Nazarenes. The important aspects of their political theories for this argument are those that

line up with Romantic aesthetic thought: the idealization of feudal society in the Middle

Ages, the importance of the individual within the family and community, and moral

education. These ideas were both part of Romantic political theory and important to the

Romantic artists like Tieck and the Nazarenes.

The romantic nationalist philosophers described above were well-known among elite

and literary circles of the German states. As I outlined at the beginning of this dissertation, I

am arguing for these ideas as part of the cultural poetics of the people and groups I am

discussing. Tieck spent much of his time at Jena not only in the same literary circle, but in

---

[241] F. Schlegel, "Ideas," 138.

[242] F. Schlegel, "Transcendental Philosophy," 156.

[243] F. Schlegel, "Philosophical Fragments," 167.

the same room as these philosophers. And the Nazarenes revealed, through the guiding

principles of their artwork, an affinity with the ideas presented by the Romantic circle.

I will argue in more detail in chapter four that Tieck did indeed share his early

Romantic friends' thoughts on the German nation, but I want to provide just a few thoughts

on this topic here. Edwin Zeydel, who is one of the best sources in the English language on

Tieck's life and work, attributes Tieck's important literary criticism to his

> constant striving to promote what seemed to him noble in literature and art and to
> combat baseness, triviality and vileness; to regard every work of art in its larger
> aspects rather than in its details; to further a healthy national growth in matters of the
> spirit; to tolerate no blind idolatry; and, in studying literature historically, to approach
> it from the international point of view.[244]

Here the spirit, history, morality, and national growth determine Tieck's work. While he

may have written plays and novellas that existed in the fantasy, fairy tale world, some of his

work was satirical,[245] and his criticism seems to have had substance, and to have followed

fairly rigorously along early romantic lines.

Zeydel also discusses Tieck's desire for "a strong 'Nationalbühne',"[246] a national

stage. Michael Patterson argues that for Tieck, the Elizabethan theatre provided his "model

of a great theatre which had evolved 'naturally' from the common populace itself, bringing

together all strata of society in the kind of theatrical community for which attempts to

establish a German National Theatre had striven."[247] The advocacy for a national stage

before Germany actually existed as a nation is not unique to Tieck. The first theatre to be

---

[244] Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck*, 265.

[245] Ludwig Tieck, *Puss-in-Boots*, ed. and trans. Gerald Gillespie (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1974), 12.
Gillespie argues that Tieck's play is a "mockery of the Berlin National Theatre under Iffland."

[246] Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck*, 262.

[247] Michael Patterson, *The First German Theatre: Schiller, Goethe, Kleist and Büchner in Performance*
(London: Routledge, 1990), 120.

called a national theatre in the German states in 1767 was at Hamburg during Lessing's tenure, but it only lasted two years.[248] Other national theatres were created throughout the rest of that century, including at Berlin, Mannheim, and Vienna. These theatres were funded by public funds, as opposed to the court theatres, which were supported by the ruling figure of the area but were open to the public.[249] The point of the national theatres was not necessarily to promote a nationalist agenda, but instead to promote that "German theatre could and should improve both in the quality of performances and in the quality of the material presented."[250]

Like Tieck, the Nazarenes also displayed romantic and nationalist tendencies through their work, if not in overtly political writing. The Nazarenes' relocation to Rome did not seem to detract from their German identity, particularly since Napoleon controlled many of the German States at that time. Rome was a typical destination for painters seeking to improve their skill,[251] but for the Nazarenes it was both an escape from Napoleon and the center of their new Catholic faith. The relationship between German and Italian art for some of the Nazarene painters is perhaps best exhibited in Overbeck's painting *Italia and Germania*, which started in 1811 as an allegorical representation of his friendship with Franz Pforr, but by the time it was completed and renamed in 1828, it became a visual description of the Nazarene's desire for the relationship between German and Italian art. As Overbeck describes, "'That I straightaway chose Germania and Italia sheds light on my special position

---

[248] Lesley Sharpe, *A National Repertoire: Schiller, Iffland and the German Stage* (Bern: Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers, 2007), 24.

[249] Marvin Carlson, *The German Stage in the Nineteenth Century* (Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1972), 75.
.
[250] Sharpe, *A National Repertoire*, 24.

[251] Vaughan, *German Romantic Painting*, 17.

here as a German in Italy'."[252] The Nazarenes never abandoned their connection to German identity in Rome, but instead studied art there to enhance their sense of what German art could be.

The painting *Italia and Germania*, in its initial conception, depicted two women rendered in the preferred painting styles of Pforr and Overbeck and also each of their idealized version of a woman they would want to marry.[253] The final version of the painting shows a dark-haired, Italian woman (Sulamith) sitting next to a lighter-haired, German woman (Maria) and the landscape behind them corresponds to their heritage. Sulamith, the Italian woman, is Overbeck's muse, whereas Maria, a "Düreresque ideal"[254] is Pforr's. Although this painting was completed after Pforr's death, the initial concept of creating friendship paintings based around the same idea of Sulamith and Maria resulted in the version from Pforr which I have described already in Epilogue One. In 1828 Overbeck renamed the women in his painting. Sulamith became Italia and Maria Germania. The loving relationship between the women that had symbolized Overbeck's deep friendship with Pforr now connected the artistic muses of the German and Italian people.

After Pforr's death, when Cornelius joined the Nazarenes, both he and Overbeck, along with Wilhelm Schadow and Phillip Veit (Friedrich Schlegel's step-son), had the opportunity to decorate the reception room of Salomon Bartholdi, who was a Prussian diplomat living in Rome. They chose to paint frescos outlining the life of Joseph, a biblical theme. This project won fame in some of the German states as "the 'rebirth' of German

---

[252] Frank, *Redefined*, 68.

[253] Andrews, *Nazarenes*, 27.

[254] Frank, *Redefined*, 15.

101

art."[255] Critics of the Nazarenes called their art "neo-German religious-patriotic"[256] work, which serves to show the spirit in which their art was viewed, although the opinion of the speaker of that phrase would do much to determine in what spirit it was said.

Outside of Romantic philosophy, real changes in the makeup of German society were affecting how the Germans saw themselves as a people. Along with a new interest in the German middle ages came an interest in what Mosse calls the "concept of the natural man"[257] which he argues led directly to the idea that "the peasant represents the greatest virtues in a society which is growing ever more industrial and urban."[258] In Germany, this peasant and his lifestyle became the idealized *Volk,* a sort of mythologized working class who revered nature and the human soul, and who could trace their origins back to the Teutonic tribes that allegedly stood strong against the corruption of Ancient Rome.[259] This group of people embodied the ideas that existed at the very center of romantic thought: emotion, individual freedom, the inner spirit, and nature. The emphasis was away from structure, hierarchy, and class, and in fact the existence of the industrial middle class raised suspicions for some nationalists.[260] The emerging construction of the Volk by artists led to a kind of folk-revival, which included folk songs, "folktale, saga, and myth."[261] If a German essence existed, it was

---

[255] Vaughan, *German Romantic Painting*, 179.

[256] Vaughan, *German Romantic Painting*, 179.

[257] Mosse, *The Culture of Western Europe*, 30.

[258] Mosse, *The Culture of Western Europe*, 31.

[259] Brian Vick, "The Origins of the German Volk: Cultural Purity and National Identity in Nineteenth-Century German," *German Studies Review* 26 no. 2 (May 2003): 242.

[260] Mosse, *The Culture of Western Europe*, 57.

[261] Michael Perraudin, *Literature, the Volk, and Revolution in Mid-Nineteenth Century Germany* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2000), 6.

to be found in these people. Romantic artists came to view these people in a particular way and saw it as their duty to bring the *Volk* into their sphere of influence in order to create the best nation possible. For the Romantics, and other artists of the time, the stage was the way to do this. The responsibility of the artist then was to allow their audience members, the receivers, access to the Romantic ideals, and indeed the Germanness that the art hoped to convey. As a proponent of these ideas, Tieck found the French stage unsatisfactory at accomplishing these goals. Much of Tieck's work with the theatre suggests in fact that he revered the *Volk*, although admittedly an idealized version of that class, and hoped to include them in his vision of an Elizabethan theatre. More will be said on this in chapter four.

It was vitally important that the stage not only please the audience while they were in attendance, but that it also "combat mistaken systems of education"[262] and give tools to the audience with which they could go out and improve their lives. If the German nation was to succeed as a unified whole, the Romantics felt that its members must share a unified, collective presence, which included a call to Germans to do what was moral and right for themselves and for their nation. And if the nation was to be founded on a cultural community, as the early Romantics hoped for, the art must include not only nationalistic feeling, but moral instruction. This is perhaps best exemplified by Friedrich Schiller's lecture from 1784, "The Stage viewed as a Moral Institution."

As one of the founders of Weimar Classicism, Schiller is more aligned with the classicist tradition than the Romantic Movement, but his treatise provides a modified view of moral instruction from the same neoclassical concept. Many Romantics eventually adopted Schiller's ideas of the moral value of the theatre because of the emphasis on the choice of the

---

[262] Friedrich Schiller, "The Stage as a Moral Institution," in *Aesthetical and Philosophical Essays* (Charleston: Bibliobazaar, 2007), 338.

individual. The focus of the Romantics on the "inner man" gave the individual autonomy

over his own moral decisions, whereas neoclassical theatre, with its typical purpose 'to teach

and delight', followed the rules in order that there could be no question left to the audience to

answer. The dramatist's main responsibility, according to Schiller, was to present material

where "virtue and vice, joy and sorrow, are thoroughly displayed in a truthful and popular

way."[263] As individuals of emotional and intellectual character, the audience members

carried the responsibility of choosing.

In his work, Schiller highlights the importance of the theatre in a turbulent political

climate, claiming that "the uncertain nature of political events … demands the stage as a

moral force."[264] His main support for the stage is that "Sight is always more powerful to man

than description"[265] and therefore the condemnation of vice occurs more effectively on the

stage, as a visual medium, as opposed to a stated law. Schiller focuses on more than the

individual morality,[266] however, and like the Romantics that come after him, ties the theatre's

importance into national themes. He calls for a permanent theatre, one that "would have a

great influence on the national temper and mind by helping the nation to agree in opinions

and inclinations."[267] And he calls for the development of a national theatre as an important

---

[263] Schiller, "Moral Institution," 334.

[264] Schiller, "Moral Institution," 334.

[265] Schiller, "Moral Institution," 335.

[266] Phillip B. Zarilli, Bruce McConachie, Gary Jay Williams, and Carol Fisher Sorgenfrei, *Theatre Histories: An Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 288. G. Williams argues that in Schiller's *Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man*, he expands his view on art and morality, and "looked to the potential of art to heal what he believe to be the fragmented psyche of modern humankind, to restore the once natural balance between reason and feeling, between intuitive and rational processes."

[267] Schiller, "Moral Institution," 338.

step in building the foundation of a nation.[268]

Tieck shows a similar connection between art and morality. His involvement in the Romantic movement, his connections to Catholicism, and his emphasis on the relationship of the art to the audience of its time all suggest that Tieck was not simply interested in entertaining, nor was he willing to present 'German' art to his audience, without giving them guidelines with which to understand it. As a leader of the early Romantic Movement, Tieck emphasized harmony with nature and the integrity of the human spirit, the emotional inner man. In his early writings, particularly his contributions to *Outpourings of an Art-Loving Friar,* he expresses a belief in the Catholic religion which he has been brought to through art. It is the music and the theatricality of the Mass that elicit an emotional, spiritual response in the narrator who "could not withstand the power which had been awakened in me."[269] Most important though, is the emphasis that Tieck placed on art, the artist, and the reception by the audience (society) in the time the art was created. Tieck not only believed that studying poetry or drama within its original context would illuminate the time period of the art as well as information about the artist, but indeed he posits a "strong, reciprocal connection… between the writer and his audience."[270] In other words, the reception of art by the audience, their demands and expectations, determine the art of the era. A necessary conclusion then for Tieck's theory is that "a change in prevailing literary styles always indicates not only a new conception of beauty, but also a changing conception of morals and ethical values."[271] The

---

[268] Schiller, "Moral Institution," 339.

[269] Wackenroder and Tieck, *Outpourings of an Art-Loving Friar*, 85.

[270] Frauke Gries, "Two Critical Essays by Ludwig Tieck: On Literature and its Sociological Aspects," *Monatshefte* 66, no. 2 (Summer, 1974): 157.

[271] Gries, "Two Critical Essays by Ludwig Tieck," 162.

change in theatre supposedly instigated by the English Renaissance poets then in fact would have been in part a creation demanded by the audience. The power here lies in the audiences' ability to sway the artists to give them what they want. The clear question that arises about Tieck's desire for Elizabethan practices and follows from his theory is whether Tieck hoped to change the form of his contemporary theatre because he felt a 'changing conception of morals' in his audience, or if he felt that by the process of changing the theatrical form, he could create a new culture of morality, perhaps one akin to his view of the Elizabethan theatre, which allowed an ordered joining together of all levels of society. This idea mirrors Schiller's hope that in the theatre, "'men of all ranks, zones, and conditions, set free from the bonds of convention and fashion, merge back into a single race, forgetting themselves and the world as they approach their heavenly source.'"[272] It is possible that Tieck felt he could instigate a change for the better in his audience by changing the theatrical form, and if the created audience followed, they would be able to share in the instigation of something new and empowering, just as the Elizabethan audience did. It would be a self-affirming creative process, resulting not only in new forms of theatre but in a new, unified audience.

England of course had been a country for centuries before this time and because of that had a strong, established cultural history. And while concerns of national unity were not prevalent concerns to Victorian society (at least not as concerned England proper; issues of empire and expansion come into play elsewhere), issues of national identity pop up with Poel, the Pre-Raphaelites, and related artists. As with the Germans, English artists were concerned about their contemporary society and the changes being made to the English

---

[272] Marvin Carlson, *Theories of the Theatre: A Historical and Critical Survey, from the Greeks to the Present* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 174.

landscape, and the solution for many of these artists was to reminisce about an idealized

English past in the hopes of altering the current state of English society. Again in a similar

way to the Germans, art played a large role in defining what 'Englishness' was and

portraying those ideas to a larger audience. And once again, Shakespeare rose as a hero of

English culture and as a model for what an Englishman could be.

John Ruskin, one of the most influential art critics of the Victorian period, focused

much of his attention on architecture, both in England and elsewhere.   In his work "The

Lamp of Memory" from *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, Ruskin argues that architecture,

the physical presence of structures built in a historical time, provides a window for the

present day onto the past. Not simply revealing construction methods or materials available,

the architecture of a building suggests a past time's aesthetic and indeed provides a physical

imprint on current time by human beings now dead. The structure is a vital artifact of the

past. Both the physical and mental are important to Ruskin. He writes

> there are but two strong conquerors of the forgetfulness of men, Poetry and
> Architecture; and the latter in some sort includes the former, and is mightier in its
> reality: it is well to have, not only what men have thought and felt, but what their
> hands have handled, and their strength wrought, and their eyes beheld, all the days of
> their life.[273]

For Ruskin, architecture is about the nation and the past. The experience of a building allows

a visceral connection to history in a way that no other art can. One's present circumstances

affect one's reading of a poem or novel. A painting can be experienced in a personal, quiet

way, but does not necessarily carry with it the circumstances of its creation. Architecture,

---

[273] John Ruskin, "The Lamp of Memory," in *Selected Writings*, ed. Dinah Birch (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 18.

however, provides both the art and the context, the aesthetic and the utility. The architecture of a building somehow carries with it its own history:

> And if indeed there be any profit in our knowledge of the past, or any joy in the thought of being remembered hereafter, which can give strength to present exertion, or patience to present endurance, there are two duties respecting national architecture whose importance it is impossible to overrate: the first, to render the architecture of the day, historical; and, the second, to preserve, as the most precious of inheritances, that of past ages.[274]

Remembrance and history are Ruskin's major themes here, but there also must be an eye to the future, a consideration that the artifacts of the present day will one day be the artifacts of history. Ruskin seems to impose the responsibility of legacy onto contemporary artists.

William Holman Hunt, an early member of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, was familiar with some of Ruskin's work. It is perhaps too much of a generalization to say that Ruskin's desires for history and remembrance appeared in all of the Pre-Raphaelite artists' work, but they certainly shared the notion of a desirable influence from past geniuses on their own work and hoped that a return to the past might enhance the prospects of the future.

In the discussions of past artists and English history, it probably comes as no surprise that Shakespeare's name often arises, amongst artists, critics, and even politicians. In his chapter "Shakespeare in the Music Hall", Richard Schoch argues that encouragement of incorporating Shakespeare into a more popular entertainment venue was supported by the English government.[275] The explosion of industry in England in the last half of the nineteenth century caused an influx of working class labor to enter London, and about "80

---

[274] Ruskin, "The Lamp of Memory," 18.

[275] Richard W. Schoch, "Shakespeare and the Music Hall," in *The Performing Century: Nineteenth-Century Theatre's History*, eds. Tracy C. Davis and Peter Holland (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 245.

percent of adult males earned a living… by manual labour."[276] Theatre, as a popular form of

entertainment available to most people, became potential level field for the meeting of a

variety of Londoners. Introducing Shakespeare to the music halls, and hence to the vast

majority of the working class, would also allow access to the morals and life lessons that

Victorian people associated with Shakespeare. This is the topic of chapter four, but here I

want to stress that Shakespeare was associated both with patriotism and with the notion that

Shakespeare was viewed as a national hero whose art would help improve Englishman.

Much of the association of Shakespeare and patriotism stemmed from a growing

awareness that Shakespeare was no longer England's playwright, but that he was being

discovered and used by other European countries. An article in *Daily News* entitled

"Shakespeare as a Hero", describes a lecture on patriotism given by Mr. Sidney Lee at the

Royal Institution. Lee stresses the importance of Shakespeare to the nation and the danger of

having that taken away. As the reviewer describes,

> Patriotism, he declared, manifests itself in many ways, but it manifests itself nowhere
> more safely or more securely than in the due recognition of those heroes of a nation's
> past whose achievements have helped to build up the nation's good repute, and confer
> on it its title to the respect of other nations. A large part of this nation's intellectual
> prestige was, he claimed, due to its blood relationship with Shakespeare, and
> intellectual prestige was as much worth having as the world-wide extension of
> Empire. … Unhappily, the opportunity of studying Shakespeare in the English
> theatre, instead of increasing with the growth of population was actually decreasing,
> while at the same time the theatrical interpretation of Shakespeare was steadily
> growing in foreign countries – to a slight extent in France, and to a very large extent
> in Germany.[277]

---

[276] Eric J. Evans, *The Shaping of Modern Britain: Identity, Industry and Empire, 1780-1914* (London: Pearson Education Limited, 2011), 254.

[277] "Shakespeare as a Hero," in *Daily News* 16891(1900).

Shakespeare had become an international commodity. For their country, Englishmen needed

to claim that 'blood relationship' and give Shakespeare the honor he deserved.

Frederick James Furnivall, founder of the New Shakspere Society, more of which will

be said later, expressed a similar desire for a stronger study of Shakespeare among

Englishmen. In his address at the opening meeting of the society in 1874, he claimed not

only a national desire for Shakespeare study, but indeed a hope for all English-speakers:

> We are gathered together to pay honour to our greatest man; not in any way to glorify
> ourselves, but to lead as many of our nation as we can, and as many English-speaking
> worlds around us as we can, to a more intelligent and appreciating, as well as a more
> reverent study of Shakspere than has hitherto been carried on. [278]

Whether Furnivall meant the Empire acquisitions, or perhaps America, he certainly was

excluding Germany and France from participation in 'paying honour to our greatest man.'

Poel ran into some difficulty on exactly this front with his Elizabethan Stage Society.

Poel, like Tieck, admired poets from other countries and ages as well, Calderon being one of

them. The Elizabethan Stage Society did not only perform Shakespeare, but also other

English poets like Webster, Ben Jonson, and even Swinburne. They also occasionally

performed a foreign playwright. At a time when the society was not financially faring well, a

critic blamed the difficulty on this aspect of their production choices.

> But, at all events, no more wares of Spain and Ind! Let us be patriotic in every
> department of life. For patriotism is a virtue that is spreading and as it spreads
> acquires new value. So, in these days of Imperial England, if the society goes to the
> country with an appeal headed "English Plays on an English Stage" who dares doubt
> the generosity of a patriotic public?"[279]

---

[278] Frederick James Furnivall, *The New Shakspere Society's Transactions* (London: Alexander Moring, The De La More Press, 1874), X.

[279] "The Elizabethan Stage Society," in *The Pall Mall Gazette* 10718 (1899). By 'wares of Spain and Ind,' the author is referring to earlier productions that year of Calderon's *Life is a Dream* and Hindu Kalidasa's *Sakuntalá,* adapted by Sir William Jones.

Although Poel seems to have viewed his work as benefitting the English nation, his society was not English-enough for some critics.

The turn to patriotism and Shakespeare as a vehicle for exemplifying English possibilities all seems to have been an attempt to improve the individual audience members and then England as a whole. Poel, however, no longer felt the theatre in England was able to complete this mission.   He accused the theatres of a "succession of the most extravagant spectacles which, with false glare, misled and debauched the public taste."[280] The emphasis on spectacle in the theatre angered Poel for the way it affected a Shakespearean play, which is in part what led to his promotion of the Elizabethan stage, but he also seems to have been concerned with the effect the spectacle theatre had on his audience. In his short treatise titled "What is wrong with the stage," he wrote "If the general public is not altogether deceived as to the character of the entertainment it is expected to enjoy, it is in absolute ignorance as to the danger to itself of the present theatre system which regards the moral and educational needs of the playgoer as an entirely negligible quantity."[281] One aspect of Elizabethan theatre that Poel admired was its emphasis, as he saw it, on the educational well-being of its audience, and the benefit the artist received in turn. He describes his ideal view of the Elizabethan situation as a time when "the dramatists were not hampered by demands from the audience to have its social, political, or aesthetic fancies humoured, and from the actor to have his egotism flattered, the drama flourished as an art as well as a business."[282] In other

---

[280] William Poel, *What is wrong with the stage* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1920), 7.

[281] Poel, *What is Wrong with the Stage*, 9.

[282] Poel, *Shakespeare in the Theatre,* 27.

words, Poel believed the theatre can be financially successful and still improve the audience through education. As a theatre practitioner himself, he understood the importance of the business side of the theatre and did not lose sight of the monetary goals.

In this view, Poel was putting a great deal of faith in the abilities of his audience, and, although his view of the audience was not consistently so optimistic, he was hoping to provide them the help they needed to be the ideal audience he wanted. There was, of course, the benefit of education. Furnivall called for "a really national study of Shakspere; which we have never had yet, which I am sure we ought to have, and which if we could but have, - all our young fellows being trained on Shakspere's thoughts and words, - we should have a much finer nation of Englishmen than we have now."[283] Poel's approach, however, was to let the education come through Shakespeare. He established the Elizabethan Stage Society "with the object of reviving the masterpieces of the Elizabethan drama upon the stage for which they were written, so as to represent them as nearly as possible under the conditions existing at the time of their first production."[284] Poel, like Tieck, felt that by presenting the plays as Shakespeare would have done, by allowing the audience to see what the Elizabethan audience would have seen, and to experience the plays in the same way, artists and audience alike would come to a new and fuller understanding of all that Shakespeare had to offer.

Manipulation of Time – Pre-Raphaelites

The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood shared much in common with the Nazarenes, and it is certainly possible that some of these similarities were self-consciously created. They

---

[283] Frederick James Furnivall, "Director's Opening Speech," in *New Shakspere Society's Transactions* (London: Trübner & Co., 1874,) ix.

[284] Poel, *Shakespeare in the Theatre,* 203-4.

emulated the same painters, elevated the importance of working from nature, rejected the teachings of their respective Academies, and looked to historical times and stories for inspiration. The Pre-Raphaelites were also interested in the possible ways in which art could affect or change the larger society. While the Nazarenes were hoping to use their art to support German nationalist feelings and greater unity between the German people, the Pre-Raphaelites had their own agenda. Their devotion to nature was in direct opposition to both the industrialism that was changing English society and Victorian strictures on what was considered appropriate artwork. Pre-Raphaelite art elicited passionate responses, which was, in the end, a specific goal of their work. They were not interested in passive art that followed accepted rules. Their art was radical exactly for the purpose of engaging their audience, and, as I am arguing with all of the artists in this work, the engagement with the audience was important for encouraging them to question their current society and imagine how it could be different.

Stuart Sillars argues along similar lines in his discussion of Pre-Raphaelite paintings of Shakespeare's plays. He argues generally of early and mid-Victorian intellectuals that "whether perceived as a consolatory refuge from industrialised society or a moral signpost towards a regeneracy, history was essentially a dialogue in which the present anxiously examined the past and sought its own identity."[285] The paintings of the Pre-Raphaelites certainly fit into this concept of the relationship between history and contemporary time. Sillars discussion of Hunt's *Claudio and Isabella* illustrates his theory of time in Pre-Raphaelite paintings and also, conveniently, provides a rare example of a reference to the play *Measure for Measure* in nineteenth century artistic society.

---

[285] Sillars, *Shakespeare, Time and the Victorians*, 5.

The painting, presented in 1853, depicts the moment in Shakespeare's play when Isabella visits her brother Claudio in jail and tells him of Angelo's offer to spare his life in return for Isabella's virtue. The precise moment within the scene of the play that Hunt has painted is revealed by two lines of text which are inserted above the painted frame of the picture, but within the artwork as a whole. The lines are the following:

> Claudio – Death is a fearful thing.
> Isabella – And a shamed life a hateful.[286]

In the painting, Claudio looks off in a direction away from his sister while fingering the shackle on his ankle. Isabella has her hands on his heart and looks sadly and imploringly in his face, waiting for a reply. This is not a moment of action or progression, but a thoughtful moment of decision. As Sillars argues, "it occupies a meditative space outside the play's progression."[287] The argument between death and virtue quite literally hangs over the heads of the characters in the painting, and the moment of the play is suspended forever in the composition, or as Sillars suggests, "Time is thus held in abeyance while the moral dilemma central to the play is given visual statement."[288]

In terms of the four elements present in the artwork that I argue connect the artists important to this dissertation, all of them are present in this work. The time of the painting is in the past, as evidenced by the clothes the characters are wearing, as well as by the fact that the painting takes the moment out of fiction so that it "floats free of the temporal rhythm of

---

[286] William Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, The Arden Shakespeare, ed. J.W. Lever (London: Thomson Learning, 2006), 73.

[287] Sillars, *Shakespeare, Time and the Victorians*, 79.

[288] Sillars, *Shakespeare, Time and the Victorians*, 79.

its events when staged."[289] The element of strangeness in this painting is tied in with the other elements, that is emphasis on the relationship between the artist and the viewer, and the uniqueness of the human individual. The strangeness of this painting is exactly in its forced suspension of a moment that within the context of a play, can never be drawn out in the same way. For a viewer who knows the play, or one who understands that the words beneath the painting, **"**Measure for Measure", refer to a play, the painting creates a sense of uneasiness. This moment in a play must come to an end, a decision must be made, but in the painting, no such closure occurs, or can ever occur. Instead the viewer is caught in a never-ending cycle of the decision process. Does Claudio agree to give up his life for Isabella? Will Isabella submit to Angelo for her brother's life? The painting presents a dilemma to the viewer that can never be answered.

In posing this question through the eternal painting, Hunt is forcing his audience either to live with the dissatisfaction of the moment, or to make the decision themselves. 'Death is a fearful thing. And a shamed life a hateful.' Which, in the end, is worse? A viewer of this painting cannot help but consider the question, if not actually answer it for herself. Therefore a third important character in the story of the painting is the viewer, the individual, who brings her own personal and valid approach to the picture. Only she can make the decision, finish the storyline.

Like the Nazarene paintings described in *Manipulations of Time - Nazarenes*, this painting also references a historical time in order to suggest a problem with the present and open up space to alter the future. The literal question this painting asks makes the viewer choose between death and a shameful life, perhaps a familiar question to some of the painting's viewers but one so personal it would be impossible to make that argument here.

---

[289] Sillars, *Shakespeare, Time and the Victorians*, 98.

What might be extrapolated from this, however, is the competition between inner, moral truth and the constructed norms of society, a question certainly relevant to the Romantic outlook on life, and one which certainly could be prevalent in a society in which class relations and societal roles were rapidly changing. Hunt's painting could cause his viewers to weigh the value of human life over the demands of society.

Two other paintings that exhibit similar characteristics to Hunt's *Claudio and Isabella*, but perhaps more so to the Nazarenes' work, are John Everett Millais' *Christ in the House of His Parents*, which was completed in 1850, and Dante Gabriel Rossetti's *Ecce Ancilla Domini!*, from the same year. These paintings both treat biblical subjects, which can be seen as fictional, but for Millais, and less so for Rossetti, the scenes were historical. Millais' painting shows the biblical family in a room of their house which doubles as Joseph's carpentry workshop. Mary kneels in front with the Christ child, who has cut his hand which drips blood onto his foot, suggesting the crucifixion. Joseph and two others, a young man and elderly woman, are at work in the background. John, later John the Baptist, brings "the water of baptism"[290] to his cousin, Christ. Millais' Pre-Raphaelitism can be seen in the meticulously painted wood shavings strewn across the floor. The painting was originally presented without a title, but accompanied by a quotation from the Bible: "'And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? Then shall he answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends.'"[291]

Rossetti's painting *Ecce Ancilla Domini!* which is Latin for 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord', takes as its subject the Annunciation, the moment when the angel reveals to Mary

[290] Robert Hewison, Ian Warrell, and Stephen Wildman, *Ruskin, Turner and the Pre-Raphaelites* (London: Tate Gallery Publishing, 2000), 30.

[291] Prettejohn, *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites*, 47.

that she is to be the mother of God. Mary sits awkwardly on her bed as the news is revealed, and the angel presents her with a lily. Both this painting and Millias' *Christ in the House of His Parents* depict moments or information from the Bible, and yet both met with criticism that other paintings of these subjects did not because of their treatment of the subject. The figures in Millais' painting are meticulously rendered but in a way that suggests they are poor and malnourished. Mary has dirty fingernails and her head sits at an awkward angle, all of which combine to make a painting that "art critics of 1850 found … almost unbearable to look at."[292] A similar problem exists in Rossetti's painting of Mary, in that her body position seems awkward, unsure, and frightened, and her response to the news of the angel as exhibited in her face is submissive and unsure. There certainly is no joy in this revelation.

Both of these paintings manipulate time and space in the same ways as Hunt's *Claudio and Isabella*. Their historical period is the based in biblical time. In Millais' painting, however, that time is not a specific biblical story, but instead a combination of events, a converging of Christ's childhood and death. In Rossetti's painting, the historical moment is similar to Hunt's painting, in that the moment portrayed is directly before a momentous decision must be made. In Rossetti's painting, the girl Mary forever contemplates whether she will accept the angel's offer, or if indeed she has any other choice.

The element of strangeness which makes the viewer more aware of her engagement with the painting is both the awkwardness of the bodies in each painting and their reference to moments that both exist and do not exist in the Bible. Millais' painting depicts what one can assume to be true, that is, that Christ and his family would often be in the workshop together, but it does not have a corresponding biblical story. Rossetti's painting seems to show a very specific moment in the Bible, but like Hunt's Shakespeare work, Rossetti's

---

[292] Prettejohn, *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites*, 53.

figure of Mary never has to make a decision, never has to commit to her life the way the Mary of the Bible must, and does immediately.

Again, the viewer is necessary to complete these paintings. For Rossetti's, the viewer can decide if this Mary accepts her charge and becomes the Virgin Mary, or if she instead remains the small, awkward figure in the painting who does not seem fully convinced she wants that life. The viewer is necessary in Millais' painting to complete the reference of the bleeding Christ child. As the painting stands, the child simply has a wound from some earlier activity. The viewer must make the connection between the child's bleeding hand and Christ's crucifixion.

The viewer, then, is engaged in the painting, taken out of her contemporary moment. What questions is she then asked to contemplate? They seem to suggest, within the context of religion, that the viewer should think more closely about the relationship between the human and the divine. In Millais' painting, Christ's family is not a group of divine beings, elevated above everyone else, but instead their bodies show signs of weariness, but also of inner strength and nobility. Rossetti's Mary shows a very human response to the spectacular event unfolding before her. In both of these paintings, the humanity of the figures is highlighted, both in its strength and weaknesses. This is an important Romantic idea, and one which come up again in the later discussion of Poel. The Pre-Raphaelites here are exhibiting the beauty of a truthful depiction of a real human being, not some idealized character. I would argue that these paintings tie in with Romanticism in their prompting of the viewer to accept humanity as something different from the divine, something flawed and at times weak. In these paintings, it is in those moments of human weakness that beauty shines through.

Chapter 4: German Unity and Shakespeare: Ludwig Tieck's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*

"Take it for all in all, it was a day never to be forgotten, it was a day when before the eyes of an art-loving monarch, a poet revealed the miracle of a representation, and superbly proved that it was no impossibility to those who were devoted to art."[293]

This is the high praise Tieck received from Feodor Wehl, a German theatre practitioner who was present at opening night of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* on October 14, 1843. The poet he speaks of is of course Tieck, the art-loving monarch Friedrich Wilhelm IV, and the impossibility was the staging of Shakespeare's play *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. As I have already mentioned, this was the only opportunity Tieck had to put his Elizabethan staging ideas into practice. It was a spectacular event, that featured not only the inauguration of Tieck's Elizabethan stage, built into the proscenium space of Potsdam's Court Theatre, but also the first performance of Mendelssohn's full score to accompany the action.[294] Wehl enthusiastically wrote "Verily, we seemed to be transported to the age of Versailles in the days of the Louises. It was a gala-day for the realm, fairer and more brilliant than any hitherto in its history."[295] His indication is clear that this event was not only a triumph in theatre and artistry, but indeed was momentous for the political state of Prussia. Gary Williams argues the importance of the production for "establishing German cultural identity

---

[293] Feodor Wehl, as appears in William Shakespeare, *A Midsommer Nights Dreame*, ed. Horace Howard Furness, Variorum, Vol.10 (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippencott Company, 1895), 330.

[294] G. Williams, *Our Moonlight Revels,* 103-4. Williams explains that Mendelssohn's overture to the play had premiered in 1827 in Stettin and also had been performed in London in 1829.

[295] Furness, *A Midsommer Nights Dreame*, 330.

and status"[296] and cites the production as "a contribution to the validization of German culture."[297] The production was a successful display of German talent, and certainly the outward show of culture spoke on a nationalist level, but I want to understand this production from a slightly different nationalist perspective.   Tieck was a Romantic artist, Friedrich Wilhelm IV the Romantic king. As I outlined above, Romantic artists were not interested only in the outward show, but in the inner man, in nature, in imitation, and in national unity. I will argue in this chapter that all of these elements were considered in Tieck's production in a self-conscious way that would fulfill a Romantic agenda. Specifically, I am suggesting that Tieck's imitation of an Elizabethan stage was an attempt to allow the audience to more fully access and understand Shakespeare as an individual being, an artistic genius, which then would stimulate the 'inner spirit' of each audience member, leading eventually to large groups of spiritually in tune, culturally similar people who could lead to the formation of a strong, advanced German nation.

Access seems to be the key to Tieck's work on Shakespeare and its relationship with the Romantic idea of national unity. Tieck's participation with A. W. Schlegel in the Schlegel-Tieck translations of Shakespeare's plays, his own theatrical work, and his advocacy for Elizabethan stage practices all reveal that Tieck was dissatisfied with both the theatre and the way Shakespeare was represented in Tieck's time. And yet Tieck's own representation of Shakespeare is problematic. In one way, Tieck, along with the Romantics, held Shakespeare up as the poet of nature, an icon of the Romantic spirit. For these reasons, Tieck hoped to eliminate any elements of the representation of Shakespeare that had been erroneously added over time. The Schlegel-Tieck translations provided texts that were more

---

[296] G. Williams, *Our Moonlight Revels*, 104.

[297] G. Williams, *Our Moonlight Revels,* 109.

accurate to the Folio and Quarto versions. This, combined with his work on the Elizabethan stage, all aimed towards finding the 'true' Shakespeare. But at the same time that Tieck was promoting Shakespeare as the ultimate poet of nature, the publication of the translations turned the venture into a wide-spread, commercial project, which helped to introduce Shakespeare into the consumer and middle class realms. Tieck's work with Shakespeare seems always to teeter on the line between esoteric, restricted art and larger commercial, popular ventures, and seems to have the potential to fall at any moment into either side. I am arguing in this chapter that Tieck's balance was deliberate, and indeed intended to remain in the restricted, elite artistic sphere, while at the same time providing access to those people who shared the German spirit, but did not have the tools or standing to be a part of the elite artistic arena. If Tieck could somehow usher those groups of the German public into that arena, he could in turn strengthen the overall make up of the German classes, pull them all into a position of power, and create the German nation that the Romantics idealized.

It might be helpful to think of this structure in terms of Bourdieu's fields of cultural production. Imagine, as he did, the field of artistic production as lying within the dominant side of the field of power, which in turn exists in the dominant side of the field of class relations. In this structure, anyone who participates in the field of artistic production, which includes not just artists but audiences and critics, also has a place in the fields of power and a coveted place in the field of class relations. Therefore, if an artist like Tieck can reach out to those people who do not have the cultural capital to enter the artistic field, and then create an accessible way into that arena for them, they not only enter the cultural field, but also the field of power. The implication of this "position-taking"[298] is that more German people

---

[298] Bourdieu defines the structure of the literary field as a group of positions, and " each position … is subjectively defined by the system of distinctive properties by which it can be situated relative to other

would exist within the field of cultural production, which puts them in a position of power and ranks them high on the class spectrum. A nation built off of these types of people would necessarily be strong and have a reasonable chance at success.

There are four ways in which Tieck's theatrical work at large and his Elizabethan work in particular attempt to bridge the gap between art for the elite and the working classes, or at least the working classes as the Romantics understood them, which as has already been discussed was as the people who were closest to the German spirit, least affected by foreign influence.   These will all be discussed in detail in what follows, but I will state them all here. First, an Elizabethan stage works much more like the early traveling theatre companies that were the beginning of German theatre, so a return to an Elizabethan stage is similar to returning to the roots of German theatre, to something more authentically German. Second, Tieck reintroduced the German stock character Hanswurst back into his plays. Hanwurst represented street theatre and slapstick as opposed to literary theatre and had been symbolically banished from the German stage in 1737, more of which will be said shortly. His return in Tieck's plays shows again a reverence for early German theatre as well as sympathy with working class audiences. Third, Tieck was aware that in an Elizabethan theatre, several different classes of people attended and existed in the same space together. It was a more egalitarian system than the sharply divided court and public theatres of the turn of the century German States, and an aspect of the English theatre that Tieck admired. Fourth, the choice of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* itself is significant in its treatment not only of the different classes, but also in what appears to be harmonious class divisions in the

---

positions" and that "every position, even the dominant one, depends for its very existence, and for the determinations it imposes on its occupants, on the other positions constituting the field." The field then is made up of positions, and the process of artwork, authors, and audiences moving into and around in the field is fluid and related to the whole field. Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production,* ed. Randal Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 30.

play. I will discuss each of these in turn, but first I would like to discuss the production

itself.

<u>*Tieck's* A Midsummer Night's Dream</u>

Although this production is far from what we today would consider Elizabethan, it did

include some of those elements which would have been unusual for the German audience.

Considering that in the time Tieck was working "it became common for the décor itself to be

applauded and for the scene painter to be called out,"[299] Tieck's desire for a completely bare

stage would probably have been too stark of a contrast for the regular theatre attendee.

Therefore, Tieck had to compromise between a stage that allowed for a quick flow between

scenes and his audiences' reliance on illusionistic spectacle. His final stage design reveals

this compromise. He had to build his Elizabethan stage structure inside the proscenium

Potsdam court theatre, so that in the end his three playing levels connected by stairs on either

side of the 'inner stage' sat behind the proscenium arch. The stairs appeared in Tieck's

imaginings of the Elizabethan theatre both in his drawings with Wolf von Baudissin and in

his novel *Der junge Tischlermeister*, and perhaps might have even survived into the present

conception of the Elizabethan stage except for the discovery of the copy of the de Witt

drawing in 1888. Tieck's structure essentially created "two tiers or stories and a gallery on

top. Each tier consisted of three square sections, in which different scenes were played. The

two side sections of the lower tier consisted simply of stairways."[300] The use of the different

levels and curtains to hide the inner stage allowed Tieck to "present the action with a fluidity

---

[299] Patterson, *First German Theatre*, 112.

[300] Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck*, 328.

unique to the time."[301] A large permanent backdrop represented the woods where the

majority of the play takes place, and the court scenes were represented in the foreground.[302]

The mechanicals, however, did not have a specific area on stage to represent their work

space, so a realistically rendered backdrop was lowered for their scenes.[303]

The vertical nature of the stage and the almost uninterrupted flow of performance it

allowed make up the sum total of Tieck's realization of an Elizabethan stage. He still used

realistically painted backgrounds, lowered columns onto the stage for the palace scenes, and

included incidental music by Mendelssohn which brought with it a ballet and a full orchestra

to fill the pit in front of the stage.[304] The costumes were a compromise of "Greek, old

German, and sixteenth-century Spanish elements."[305] And unlike an Elizabethan company,

Tieck employed over 100 actors and had more than 30 rehearsals,[306] all of which was

necessary for this production because of Mendelssohn's score, which dictated long

procession scenes, fairy marches, and of course the Wedding March.[307] While Tieck's

structure did not fulfill his concept of an Elizabethan stage, he found a successful

---

[301] S. Williams, "Shakespeare Stage," 215.

[302] Michael Patterson, "'Contributing Our Half': Ludwig Tieck's Shakespeare Productions in Dresden and Berlin, 1820-1843," in *The Globalization of Shakespeare in the Nineteenth Century* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellon Press, 2003), 93.

[303] S. Williams, "Shakespeare Stage," 215.

[304] G. Williams, *Our Moonlight Revels*, 105.

[305] G. Williams, *Our Moonlight Revels*, 105.

[306] Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck*, 328.

[307] G. Williams, *Our Moonlight Revels*, 108.

compromise between his vision and the audience's demands, and the production "moved to Berlin and was performed a total of 169 times before being abandoned in 1885."[308]

Along with this production, other sources for Tieck's vision of an Elizabethan stage are his own novel *Der junge Tischlermeister*, a published conversation between Tieck and Karl Immermann, and a work by Baudissin which contains illustrations of reconstructed Elizabethan theatres and "owed much to the suggestions and corrections of Tieck, who had supervised successive drafts and given his approval to the final version."[309] While all of these sources are important in providing a fuller understanding of Tieck's production ideas, I would like to focus on the first, Tieck's own work, which, though a fictional account in the form of a novel, provides perhaps his most idealistic, and most accurate, staging of a Shakespeare play. In the novel that he began writing in 1795 and continued working on through 1836, Tieck describes some of his hopes for the theatre. The basic story of the novel centers on a group of people, including Baron Elsheim, Professor Emmrich, and Leonard, a master carpenter, all of whom make a journey into the country to produce a play. The Baron Elsheim wants to perform Goethe's *Götz von Berlichingen* and asks the master carpenter Leonhard to build the stage. After performing and discussing the play, the group in the novel decide that "Goethe… was not a dramatist; he did not write for the stage at all."[310] At this point the professor steps in and requests that they perform *Twelfth Night*, but not in the contemporary German way. Instead the professor suggests that "if you want to bring out the harmonious unity of its components, to effect quick changes and to enable the actors to step

---

[308] G. Williams, *Our Moonlight Revels*, 109.

[309] Ulrich Suerbaum, "A Theatre for Shakespeare: The Early History of the Inner Stage Myth," in *Shakespeare: Text, Language, Criticism, Essays in Honour of Marvin Spevack* (Hildesham: Olms-Weidmann, 1987), 289.

[310] Suerbaum, "A Theatre for Shakespeare," 290.

forward and to recede into the background as occasion demands, you need a new stage, the

stage of Shakespeare and his contemporaries."[311] So the stage is rebuilt with the necessary

changes, including widening the stage and reducing its depth, creating a raised inner stage

and an upper terrace, and adding two staircases on either side of the inner stage that lead up

to the terrace. In the discussion of this stage, the characters outline in detail how some of

Shakespeare's characters could use its different parts, such as the king and queen in Hamlet

sitting elevated on the steps leading up to the inner stage, and in *King Henry VIII*, the king

would sit in the inner stage with the Parliament lining the steps on either side of him. Tieck

even suggests that

> This older theatre … participates in every scene, it may even be counted among the
> main characters, it also facilitates each performer, it helps him, it supports him, he
> stands not left in an empty, confusing square but instead can mentally and physically
> lean himself everywhere and like a painting step into its frame.[312]

The play staged in this type of space was successful.

If this text is put "back into the context from which it was generated,"[313] the different

social classes that make up the group become significant as they are working together to

create what is essentially German literary theatre. It is important to note here that the lower

middle class master carpenter and Baron Elsheim are good friends, and that "[w]ith regard to

their mental and moral capacity Tieck here represents both classes as potentially equal."[314]

The fact that Goethe becomes the unstageable playwright whereas the production of

Shakespeare with the new stage is a success suggests that even Goethe's contributions to

---

[311] Suerbaum, "A Theatre for Shakespeare," 290.

[312] See Appendix 1.

[313] Dwight W. Hoover, "The New Historicism," *The History Teacher* 25, no. 3 (1992), 361.

[314] John A. Spaulding, "The Lower Middle Class in Tieck's Writings," in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 21 no. 2 (Apr. 1992), 270.

126

German theatre did not help to create a theatre experience that synthesized text and performance or that allowed the audience the satisfactory experience that Shakespeare did. Shakespeare is the chosen playwright for this event, not as produced in the contemporary way, but instead in the Elizabethan manner. The result is a production relatively simple to stage, and in which the stage itself becomes an important aspect of performance.

This description of Tieck's ideal Elizabethan stage coincides almost precisely with his designs for a reconstruction of the Fortune Theatre which he attempted, but never completed, with architect Gottfried Semper. The illustrations show some of the elements that Tieck was able to incorporate in his *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, but many more that were not possible. The drawings show the three playing levels, which include the main stage area – platform but not thrust –, a slightly raised level consisting of an inner stage and two large staircases on either side leading up to the third level. In the illustrations Tieck and Semper created, the existence of curtains is unclear, but an illustration from Baudissin's *Ben Jonson und seine Schule*, which appears to have been a collaboration with Tieck,[315] shows curtains covering the side staircases and the upper playing areas.[316] Tieck and Semper's Fortune reconstructions are square, in accordance to the Fortune Contract, whereas Baudissin's theatre is more polygonal. Baudissin's theatre is also indoor, apparently lit by a chandelier above the stage, whereas Tieck and Semper's Fortune is of course open air. Neither stage appears to be a thrust but there does appear to be seating in the balconies to the side of and above the stage, if not also on the stage floor itself. Comparing these drawings to the

---

[315] Patterson, "Contributing Our Half," 91.

[316] These illustrations are reproduced in Patterson, "Contributing Our Half,."

illustration of Tieck's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*,[317] the stairs and levels appear in all, but there does not seem to have been any opportunity in Tieck's Berlin set for seating beside or behind the stage. The audience was separated from the action by the presence of the orchestra pit at the foot of the stage. The different playing levels and staircases also appear to have been camouflaged by "permanent woodland scenery,"[318] representing the woods outside of Athens.

Based on the evidence scholars have today, Tieck's production was not Elizabethan. A playgoer in Shakespeare's day might very well have been as shocked by Tieck's production as a German from 1843 would have been by the Globe Theatre. But how important Tieck's production was to the state of Shakespeare scholarship today is not the focus of this discussion. Instead I would like to speculate on the real time consequences of Tieck's production as it was, not as it was meant to be. As stated above, I am arguing that this production was the culmination of a Romantic desire for unity, inner moral strengthening, and discovering something that can be considered uniquely German. How this production relates to the sixteenth century English stage is not the issue, but instead how it could be read in its own time.

I have suggested above four ways in which Tieck's work and specifically his 1843 production stem from a desire to make literary theatre more accessible to all classes while not compromising its artistic integrity, but have not yet explained why Tieck would be interested in this. Tieck's Romantic background exposed him to different ideas about the relationships of class in society, about the purpose of art, and about art's responsibility to promote national unity. An exploration of these ideas will suggest Tieck's position more clearly.

---

[317] Patterson, *The First German Theatre*, 120.

[318] Patterson, "Contributing Our Half," 93.

Romantic National Artists

The theatre in Germany was commonly tied in with ideas of national unity, not only in the Romantic tradition but also in the other theatrical genres. Maik Hamburger and Simon Williams divide these genres into Romanticism, Classicism, and Realism, the latter of which includes sentimental drama, in their *A History of German Theatre*. National identity is a part of all of these theatre styles, as is Shakespeare, showing that these movements are more interconnected than they seem by such a clear cut division. In this section I am attempting to highlight the Romantic theatre artists' ideas about national unity and art, as well as the purpose of theatre, but to do so I will have to venture beyond the sometimes arbitrary boundaries delineating the Romantic Movement from other theatrical experiments. This will hopefully serve, however, to underscore the prevalence of thinking about and attempting to define not only the place of art in society but also how art serves to establish what that society should be.

In the early nineteenth century, when ideas of Romanticism were well into their development, Hegel wrote that "The idea of each epoch always finds its appropriate and adequate form."[319] He was discussing the prevailing argument between classicism and modernism, but his statement also serves to accurately portray the relationship between Romanticism and the condition of the German people and States. Like the ideas of many of the Romantics so far discussed, this statement points to the necessity of Germans to discover their own voice, their own art form, and to stop emulating the French and other foreign influences, except of course for those foreign artists who shared the German spirit, such as Shakespeare for Tieck and medieval painters for the Nazarenes. The Romantic contribution

---

[319] Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, "Symbolic, Classic, and Romantic," in *Dramatic Theory and Criticism*, ed. Bernard F. Dukore (Heinle, Thomson Learning, 1974), 526.

to the new German nation could center on this, the development of German art forms to express the German soul. As Mosse suggests, German nationalism "was not concerned with boundaries or even with blueprints for a government, but with 'culture' as a whole."[320] The artistic theorists and practitioners important in the context of this dissertation to the nationalist movement in art are Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, A.W. Schlegel, and Tieck. Although Lessing was pre-Romanticism and Goethe and Schiller ended their careers as Classicists, they all to some extent shared two important ideas in common. The first was that German art should find a German form, and the second was that art could, and indeed had the responsibility to, influence audiences in positive ways in order to help them to be better individuals, in terms of spiritual and moral concepts of being 'good.'

The first nationalist ideal for art, that German art could find a German form, was problematic, first because the term 'German', not being connected to a political nation, was elusive, and second because the lack of a German artistic tradition encouraged many artists, even those with nationalist goals, to turn to foreign models for inspiration. The search for a German form ultimately then did not derive from what was already German so much as create, self-consciously, several ideals of what German culture should be. These ideals ranged from an imitation of the French court to the roots of German existence as seen in folk culture and the rural classes. Tieck looked to an English playwright, and the Nazarenes to both Italian masters and the German painter Albrecht Dürer. Lessing and the Romantics in particular spoke out against imitations of French art, which they saw in the neoclassicism of Johann Cristoph Gottshed, an early German theatre practitioner whose ideas for the moral reform of theatre will be discussed shortly, and in the later classicism of Goethe and Schiller.

---

[320] Mosse, *The Culture of Western Europe*, 59.

The Romantics were not necessarily against influence from the classics themselves, but they believed the Neoclassicists had twisted and misread Aristotle, and that ideas of form did not need to be so rigid.

Lessing argued that Gottsched's work had been geared toward "'Frenchifying' the German stage, while ignoring the fact that German taste leans more naturally in the direction of England."[321] In his position as dramaturg at the Hamburg National Theatre,[322] Lessing created the *Hamburg Dramaturgy* in 1769, in which he invokes the influence of Aristotle, but in a very different way than Gottsched's neoclassical ideas. Although the French claimed to follow the guidelines of Aristotle, Lessing argued that their theatre was "in fact often founded on misapprehensions and distortions of Aristotle's ideas. … The English, unaffected in general by the pedantic French misreadings, have produced works both more vital and truer to the real spirit of the Greek theorist."[323] Lessing turned to Shakespeare as the ultimate example of English theatre and established Shakespeare as the dramatist who would provide the best model for German playwrights.

As chapter three discussed, imitation was a challenging concept for the Romantics. For Lessing and A.W. Schlegel, as well as Tieck, imitation was not in itself problematic, but one must choose carefully who to imitate and of course, make the final product accessible to one's particular time and place. A. W. Schlegel's first lecture of his series of *Lectures on Dramatic Literature* takes up the issue of imitation, both in what should be imitated and the proper way to do it. Some of this has been discussed earlier but it will be useful to look at it

---

[321] Samuel L. Macey. "The Introduction of Shakespeare into Germany in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century" *Eighteenth Century Studies* 5, no. 2 (Winter, 1971-1972), 263.

[322] Although Germany would not actually become a country until 1871, there were several attempts to establish 'National theatres' in hopes of creating the idea of a national culture.

[323] Carlson, *Theories of the Theatre,* 168.

in a slightly different way here. Schlegel's description of the term 'romantic' focuses on its

etymology, claiming it is "the name of language of the people which was formed from the

mixture of Latin and Teutonic, in the same manner as modern cultivation is the fruit of the

union of the peculiarities of the northern nations with the fragments of antiquity."[324] He

argues that, as opposed to the "poetry of enjoyment" which the ancients created, Romantic

poetry is of desire, it "hovers betwixt recollection and hope."[325] So for Schlegel, inherent in

the Romantic artistic mission is a tension between old and new, past and present, ancient and

modern. Therefore some sort of imitation, or at least influence, must occur. The Romantic

creation of art, according to Schlegel, did not attempt to strike out and create new, radical

forms of art, but instead to create "a form which contains whatever is truly poetical in all

these theatres,"[326] including the Greek, English, French, and Spanish. But whatever

combination of forms the German theatre takes, "the German national features ought

certainly to predominate."[327] The character of the theatre must be built off of German culture

and German understanding. In this case, it is acceptable to write in imitation of Shakespeare

or Calderon, but the cultural idiosyncrasies and particularities of the English and Spanish

people should not be retained. German audiences should be able to recognize the artwork as

belonging to their own culture.

Schlegel's lectures continue with a discussion of form, which became a difficult area

for the Romantics. They revered genius and felt that in the theatre genius was exhibited

through playwrights like Shakespeare. However, Shakespeare's plays do not necessarily

---

[324] A.W. Schlegel, "Lecture 1," 8.

[325] A.W. Schlegel, "Lecture 1," 16.

[326] A.W. Schlegel, "Lecture 1," 30.

[327] A.W. Schlegel, "Lecture 1," 30.

follow any particular form, and certainly do not hold to the tenets of neoclassicism. It is

unthinkable, for Schlegel, that a work of genius "be permitted to be without form"[328] because

that would allow "the poetic spirit … [to] evaporate in boundless vacuity."[329] How, then, can

this form be described? Schlegel, with other Romantics, argues that these new forms cannot

be understood by the ancient terms tragedy and comedy, but instead must be known as

romantic dramas. They maintain the unity of action that Aristotle called for, but not in the

same way. Schlegel does not mean the neoclassical idea of one single action, but instead

calls for "a deeper, more intrinsic, and more mysterious unity than that with which most

critics are satisfied."[330] The form that describes artwork like a play by Shakespeare is, in

Schlegel's terms, organic. As opposed to mechanical form, which "is communicated to any

material merely as an accidental addition without reference to its quality," the organic form

"is innate; it unfolds itself from within, and acquires its determination along with the

complete development of the germ."[331] Enforcing arbitrary rules of form will only hinder a

work of art.

Romanticism was not the only movement in which artists attempted to reconcile

inherited artistic tradition with new German expressions. *Sturm und Drang*, a precursor to

the Romantic Movement, and Weimar Classicism, also sought German forms through the

combination of old and new theatre traditions. *Sturm und Drang*, or storm and stress,

emerged from the philosophical writings of Johann Gottfried von Herder, and agreed with

---

[328] A.W. Schlegel, "Lecture 22," in *Dramatic Theory and Criticism: Greeks to Grotowski*, ed. Bernard F. Dukore (Heinle, Thomson Learning, Inc., 1974), 510.

[329] A.W. Schlegel, "Lecture 22," 510.

[330] A.W. Schlegel, "Lecture 17," in *Dramatic Theory and Criticism: Greeks to Grotowski*, ed. Bernard F. Dukore (Heinle, Thomson Learning, Inc, 1974), 508.

[331] A.W. Schlegel, "Lecture 12", 98.

some of Lessing's theories to break with neoclassical rules. Although Lessing discusses

theatre in terms of classical ideas – unity of action, tragedy arousing pity and fear, and the

decorum of characters – he claims that neoclassical ideas like those of the French theatre

have misunderstood and misinterpreted the ideas of the classics, and therefore the theatre of

French authors such as Corneille and Racine was doing harm to tragedy.[332] Lessing seems to

have still felt there was value in the ideas of the classic authors, but he did not approve of the

strict way some of the inaccurately understood rules were followed.

Marvin Carlson suggests that Herder and his instigation of the *Sturm und Drang*

movement provided the "clear break with this tradition"[333] of enlightenment ideals and

neoclassical rule. Like Lessing, Herder admired Shakespeare's writings and felt that it was

important that Shakespeare did not follow the rules of the Greeks, as those "'rules may have

been natural for them but become artificial when transplanted to alien surroundings."[334]

Shakespeare created with the rules that were natural to his time period. Similarities between

these pre-Romantic thinkers and A.W. Schlegel are clear. Both appreciated not only the

organic creation of art but also felt that Shakespeare shared their same German spirit, and

therefore emulating his works would allow them to find their own personal self-expression.

Although Goethe would go on to found Weimar Classicism, he began his career more

sympathetic to Romantic sensibilities. As one of the founding authors of *Sturm und Drang*,

Goethe wrote two important works that solidified some of the abstract philosophical ideas

present in Herder's writing. Goethe, and other members of the *Sturm und Drang* movement,

---

[332] Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, "Hamburg Dramaturgy," in *Dramatic Theory and Criticism: Greeks to Grotowski*, ed. Bernard F. Dukore (Heinle, Thomson Learning, Inc., 1974), 435.

[333] Carlson, *Theories of the Theatre,* 171.

[334] Carlson, *Theories of the Theatre*, 172.

"idealised strength and genius, but also expressed deep sympathy for the trodden down and dispossessed."[335] Goethe's novel presented a model of a romantic hero named Werther, and Goethe's play *Götz von Berlichingen* became one of the few *Sturm und Drang* dramas to be successfully performed.[336] In an attempt to emulate Shakespeare's form instead of French neoclassicism, Goethe created the play with "54 scenes … in 31 different locations, with a cast of 24 named characters."[337] The influence of Herder's nationalism can be seen in Goethe's choice to use German history as his subject, and A. W. Schlegel praised the play in terms of nationalism, stating that Goethe "evoked 'the very language in which our ancestors themselves spoke. Most movingly has he expressed the old German cordiality.'"[338] The *Sturm und Drang* period also hosted a large revival of performances of Shakespeare. As with Romanticism which was soon to follow, *Sturm und Drang* incorporated outsides artists who exhibited the essence of this distinctly German creative outlook.

The implications of the Romantic Movement on the theatre and dramatic literature were not necessarily significant in terms of new works produced for the stage, but for the world of literature and for the theories of acting, romantic ideals caused significant changes. While Goethe wrote for the stage, it is his novel, *Sorrows of a Young Werther*, that created a model for Romantics. Werther's greatness was internal, not recognized by society, and in the end he commits suicide, suggesting to the readers that a "romantic hero must inevitably

---

[335] Anthony Meech, "Classical theatre and the formation of a civil society, 1720-1832," in *A History of German Theatre*, eds. Simon Williams and Maik Hamburger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 76.

[336] Marvin Carlson, "The realistic theatre and bourgeois values, 1750-1900," in *A History of German Theatre*, eds. Simon Williams and Maik Hamburger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 95.

[337] Meech, "Classical theatre," 77.

[338] StephenWilmer, "Nationalism and its effects on the German theatre, 1790-2000," in *A History of German Theatre*, eds. Simon Williams and Maik Hamburger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 224.

expect to be misunderstood by society."[339] Again the emphasis is placed on the inner worth

and feelings of the characters placed in opposition to the oppressive society. Also suggested

by Goethe's book is the idea that "only through suffering could a person really deepen his

sensibility, his emotional experience."[340] I think it is not unreasonable to wonder whether the

German people as a whole felt a connection to the idea of the worthy hero who is

misunderstood by the larger, established society. Artists like Tieck found parallels to

Germany in *Hamlet*, ruled by a king with no right to rule, threatened by an outlying army,

hoping for the rightful heir to rise up and take over.[341] It is possible others hoped for

recognition as a nation parallel to Werther's hope for freedom to express himself.

The period of *Sturm und Drang*, which only lasted about ten years, was finished by

the mid-1780s, well before Goethe and Friedrich Schiller worked in Weimar together in

1798. The period in between proves to have been a time for Goethe to change his direction

in theatre from the proto-romantic movement of *Sturm und Drang* to a more conservative

mixture of classicism and romantic ideals. His veneration for Shakespeare continued, as he

felt the English poet was the only author who "avoided the degeneration by combining the

virtues of the old and new, allowing destiny the advantage but keeping it in balance with the

will,"[342] but even while he admired Shakespeare's writing, he began to think that

Shakespeare's plays only had value as literature and could not be sufficiently staged. This

opinion would be challenged by Romantics such as Tieck and suggests one of the differences

---

[339] Mosse, *The Culture of Western Europe*, 40.

[340] Mosse, *The Culture of Western Europe*, 40.

[341] Roger Paulin, *The Critical Reception of Shakespeare in Germany: 1682-1914*. (Hildesheim: Olms, 2003), 422-5.

[342] Carlson, *Theories of the Theatre*, 181.

136

between Goethe's theatre and the theatre of the Romantics. Goethe also eventually denies that the theatre could have "a beneficial effect on the audience of either a moral or an emotional nature,"[343] but he expresses this opinion after the height of Weimar Classicism, and his partner at Weimar, Schiller, would certainly have disagreed with him on that front.

Goethe and Schiller joined together at Weimar in 1798 and turned to Classicism for their model, though they were not Neoclassicists. As with other German artists, they tried to find an artistic model from which to create their own work, but here that model was a different attempt to return to the classics than Neoclassicism. Weimar Classicism was not an emulation of French Neoclassicism, but instead relied on Goethe's and Schiller's own choice of influence from the classics. This influence mostly manifested in plays based on classical stories, and an attempt to "create a high theatrical style, an outstanding feature of which would be the noble delivery of verse."[344] Goethe published his "Rules for Actors" which, though based in his Weimar Classicism, shows the beginnings of Romantic ideas as well. The actor should "not only imitate nature but also portray it ideally, thereby, in his presentation, uniting the true with the beautiful."[345] Goethe emphasizes the lack of a fourth wall and the purpose of the actors as being for the audience. While some of his suggestions do not necessarily spring from a theoretical base, such as his advice that the players should not blow their noses or spit, other theoretical ideas foreshadow things to come. Goethe's idea that the "stage and the auditorium, the actors and the spectators, together represent the

---

[343] Carlson, *Theories of the Theatre*, 182.

[344] George Brandt, ed. *German and Dutch Theatre, 1600-1848* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 12.

[345] Johann Wolfgang Goethe, "The 'Rules for Actors," in *A Source Book in Theatrical History*, ed. A.M. Nagler (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1952), 429.

theatrical entity"[346] suggests Wagner's later theory of the total work of art. Goethe's suggestion that actors must behave off-stage with the same sense of decorum that they do on the stage contributed to Goethe's making "a significant contribution to the raising of the status of the actor."[347] While Goethe's hopes for the theatre seemed at most times to incorporate the German idea of *Bildung*, educating them in morality and life, he also hoped to "elevat[e] their aesthetic sense of what the theatre could achieve as an art form."[348]

Schiller certainly seems to have been influenced by Neoclassicism when he arrived at Weimar, but quickly betrayed a romantic influence. He wrote a preface for *The Robbers* publication in which he "in apparent sincerity apologized for its deficiencies by neoclassic standards."[349] According to the preface, Schiller's goal was to do "no more than literally copy nature."[350] So here is an admittance that he still feels he should be writing by certain accepted standards, but the copying of nature is a very Romantic statement, different from neoclassical decorum. Carlson attributes Schiller's shift in theories to his study of Immanuel Kant, and the references to nature in this 1781 preface suggest that his mind was already shifting towards Romantic ideas.

The second goal that Romantics had for a national art was based on the idea of *Bildung*, a German concept of education and cultural and spiritual formation which is difficult to translate into English. In the theatre, it refers to the ability "to make audiences

---

[346] Goethe, "'Rules for Actors,'" 432.

[347] Meech, "Classical theatre," 83.

[348] Meech, "Classical theatre," 83.

[349] Carlson, *Theories of the Theatre*, 174.

[350] Friedrich Schiller, "Preface to *The Robbers*," in *Dramatic Theory and Criticism*, ed. Bernard F. Dukore (Heinle, Thomson Learning, Inc., 1974), 438.

not only into better citizens but into complete human beings with a capacity to live with confidence, even serenity in a conflicted world."[351] Even in the melodramas and *Familienstücke* (family plays) of the popular theatre, the goal was never simply for entertainment. The tradition of theatre for a moral purpose tracks back to Gottsched, a professor of poetry at Leipzig, who worked in close contact for a period of time with Caroline Neuber and her traveling theatre company. Gottsched's ideas about theatre clearly had been influenced by French neoclassical trends, and his hope above all for the theatre was to use it as an instrument for moral improvement. Gottsched, along with Caroline Neuber, worked throughout the eighteenth century to move theatre from its status as touring groups catering to the tastes of the audiences to a "refined, poetic theatre, whose aims would extend beyond the merely entertaining to include the moral improvement of its audience."[352] Although Gottsched was aware of Shakespeare's work, it had no place in his plan for the theatre. Based on the neoclassical principles he derived from the French, he "dogmatically rejected Shakespeare because of 'his neglect of the rules.'"[353] He was also unhappy with the repertoire of the traveling companies, which he described as "fustian political melodramas mixed up with Harlequin entertainments, unnatural romances and love intrigues, vulgar farces, and obscenities."[354]

Lessing, and later the Romantic theorist A.W. Schlegel, viewed Shakespeare's neglect of neoclassical forms as an asset to his poetry and also to his ability to show the full human, not just an idealized version. Simon Williams argues that Shakespeare had no place

---

[351] Hamburger and Williams, *A History of German Theatre*, 4.

[352] Meech, "Classical theatre," 69.

[353] W. H. Bruford, *Theatre, Drama and Audience in Goethe's Germany* (London: Routledge, 1950), 68.

[354] Brandt, "The inadequacy of the German repertoire, 1724," 188.

on the German classical stage because "his plays challenged the generally-held idea of the actor as moral preceptor or social model for the audience. Instead they encouraged him or her to explore character free of any moralistic bias that might otherwise stand in the way of an unalloyed representation of character."[355] Schlegel agreed that the stage was a site for the potential moral improvement of the audience, and indeed took that responsibility very seriously. He was aware of the influential power of the theatre, and warned against the abuse of that power:

> Hence the privilege of influencing an assembled crowd is exposed to a most dangerous abuse. As we may inspire them in the most disinterested manner, for the noblest and best of purposes, we may also ensnare them by the deceitful webs of sophistry…. Under the delightful dress of oratory and poetry, the poison steals imperceptibly into the ear and the heart. Above all things let the comic poet take heed, as from the nature of his subject he has a tendency to split on this rock, lest he afford an opportunity for the lower and baser part of human nature to exhibit themselves without any disguise…[356]

And yet, as opposed to advocators of classical styles, Schlegel did not see Shakespeare as posing a danger to his audiences.

These Romantic artists all were working towards establishing a German culture, but not simply for the outward result. These artists stressed the importance of the individual being, of nature, and of the *Volk*. Therefore their focus was not confined to one class or group of people, but strove to include the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie, and, in Tieck's case, the lower middle class.[357] As has already been mentioned, Romantic art was meant to be spiritual and transcendent, not that it would take all people to the same place because, again, for many of the Romantics, not all people were equal, but they were all capable of becoming

---

[355] S. Williams, *Shakespeare on the German Stage*," 131.

[356] Schlegel, "Lecture 2", 36.

[357] Spaulding, "The Lower Middle Class," 259.

better versions of themselves. In the same way that the Nazarenes painted frescoes in the hopes of reaching more people with their art and providing more opportunity for transcendence, Tieck would be able to accomplish that same Romantic goal if he could make a more authentic Shakespeare accessible to all classes.

Although Tieck was much less theoretical in his writing on the theatre, he shared some of the same ideas for the purpose of the theatre as his Romantic colleagues. He felt a strong connection between artist and audience, which is the running theme of Frank Gries's dissertation. Gries examines the essays in Tieck's *Kritische Schriften* and discovers a constant concern with the relation between artist and audience. He describes it in the following way: "Not only does the writer form and educate the reader, but, by complying with the taste of the people, the poet, in turn, is formed and determined by his audience."[358] Tieck believed in the existence of "an actual causal relationship between the emotional and cultural needs of the public and a literary work."[359] The artist had a responsibility to write for the audience, whose influence determined the type of art being created. John A. Spaulding's article about Tieck and class argues that the "writings of Ludwig Tieck abound in evidences of lively interest in the lower middle class,"[360] both for the reason above, the relationship that necessarily exists between artist and audience, and because of the high esteem in which Tieck seems to have held this class.[361]

---

[358] Frauke Gries, *Ludwig Tieck as Critic: Sociological Tendencies in His Criticism*, PhD diss., Stanford University, 1967, 44-5.

[359] Frauke Gries, "Two Critical Essays," 158.

[360] Spaulding, "The Lower Middle Class," 259.

[361] Spaulding, "The Lower Middle Class," 259-292.

As I have already mentioned, Tieck argues in an essay in his *Kritische Schriften* that changes in literary styles reflect changes in the makeup of society. [362] The inception of the Romantic Movement, and the subsequent changes Romanticism went through in Tieck's life, would then have accompanied some major cultural shift. Meech argues for just such a shift in the middle of the eighteenth century which would have affected turn of the century society, "a burgeoning self-confidence of the German bourgeois, mercantile class, whose influence and social importance increased with their wealth."[363] Meech argues that this class, well-traveled from their business ventures, would be familiar with the theatre of other nations, and therefore desire the same of their own. The support from this class, their desire for "a theatre to which they felt they could take their families for an enlightening cultural experience,"[364] made the new German literary theatre possible.

Tieck's support for the working class follows from his Romantic background and the renewed interest in German history and the folk revival. As with the Romantic political theorists, who typically denied democracy as a structuring tool because of its dependence on equality of all people, Tieck supported the "strict maintenance of outer class distinctions."[365] This did not, however, indicate that Tieck preferred the ruling class, but instead "in his last period of activity Tieck regarded the lower middle class as the mental and moral superior of the nobility."[366] Spaulding traces characters from the working class who appear in Tieck's plays and novels and discusses the care with which he treats them. While Tieck's earlier

---

[362] Gries, "Two Critical Essays," 162.

[363] Meech, "Classical theatre," 66.

[364] Meech, "Classical theatre," 66.

[365] Spaulding, "The Lower Middle Class," 268.

[366] Spaulding, "The Lower Middle Class," 275.

work praises the laborer for his self-sufficiency, his later work, probably spurred on by the increasing industrialization spreading into Europe, is marked by his "contrasting handicraft with the soulless machine, which robs the laborer of spiritual and physical nourishment alike."[367] These are, of course, sentiments that would be repeated by English Romantics and, later, Ruskin.

Tieck's sympathy for the lower middle class and his desire for a national stage, mentioned in chapter two, fall in line with the ideas that have been outlined in this section. German art needed a German form and would have the ability to morally instruct the audience members in the formation of a desired German culture. Tieck considered his theatre audience in a more practical way than other artists, who seem to have had little thought for the actual staging, but it seems he considered them from a moral standpoint as well. There is no reason to assume he would depart from this trend for his *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. It simply remains to understand how that production fits into his pattern.

Unser Shakespeare

An obvious question that arises from the previous section is that, if Tieck's and the Romantic's goals were for German national unity, why would they turn to an English artist to create German art? While this does seem counterintuitive, the German relationship with Shakespeare by this point was so strong that these artists did not see Shakespeare as English, but instead as a carrier of a German soul.

In Roger Paulin's book, *The Critical Reception of Shakespeare in Germany, 1682-1914*, he provides a detailed account of the many ways Shakespeare crossed into Germany and how he was received there. Paulin suggests that Shakespeare first entered Germany with

---

[367] Spaulding, "The Lower Middle Class," 286.

traveling English Comedians in the late sixteenth century. There are steady, though not numerous, references to Shakespeare through the seventeenth century, but it is really in the eighteenth century that Shakespeare is rediscovered, and taken as the German people's own. The previous section has already mentioned Gottsched's negative reaction to Shakespeare, and also Lessing's support of his work as an alternative to the French. Johann Elias Schlegel, a student of Gottsched's and uncle to Friedrich and August Wilhelm Schlegel, was also an early supporter of Shakespeare for the German stage. Shakespeare's neglect of neoclassical rules, his exotic locations, and his complex characters did not bother J. E. Schlegel, as he emphasized a play's purpose for pleasure over moral instruction.[368]

Shakespeare found more support from the *Sturm und Drang* movement, but not enough to make him a major feature on the stage. One of the first German theatres to include Shakespeare's plays as a substantial part of its repertoire was Hamburg under Friedrich Ludwig Schröder. Schröder was an actor, director, and adaptor. Between 1776 and 1779, Schröder staged nine of Shakespeare's plays, but he was more interested in providing the audience with sentimental drama that they would understand and enjoy than with presenting accurate Shakespeare texts. Much like the versions of Shakespeare's plays that were happening at this time in England, the adaptations the Germans were seeing at Hamburg were changed to cater to an audience who "'was intellectually still entirely under the sway of rationalism, and accordingly could not understand Shakespeare as art'."[369] Schröder rearranged the text, cut characters, added a confession from the Queen to her part in the murder of King Hamlet, and in the end, Hamlet lives triumphant. The play was a success.

---

[368] Carlson, *Theories of the Theatre*, 166.

[369] Bruford, *Theatre, Drama, and Audience*, 194.

Two months later, however, Schröder staged *Othello* with Shakespeare's original ending. A report of the audience's reception describes that "'box doors were heard opening and shutting, people left or were carried out of the theatre [if they had fainted], and according to well-authenticated reports, more than one Hamburgerin was so affected by seeing and hearing this over-tragic tragedy that premature labour was the result'."[370] Even after that quite serious, however implausible, reaction, Schröder staged the play one more time before changing the third performance to '*Othello*, with alterations,'[371] in which both Desdemona and Othello live. Despite the changes, however, Schröder's *Hamlet* was really the only Shakespeare play that Schröder successfully staged. Schröder continued to stage literary theatre in the form of altered Shakespeare and *Sturm und Drang* pieces, but he had to supplement them with more popular theatre in order to satisfy his audiences.[372]

At approximately the same time that Goethe was developing classicism at Weimar, August Wilhelm Iffland, at the theatre in Mannheim, was finding a degree of success with his *Familienstück* (family plays) which offered his audiences "relief by their careful exclusion of any possibly disturbing references to politics, social problems, or history."[373] Along with the plays of August von Kotzebue, Iffland's work at this theatre "shows the first flowering of a commercial theatre for the middle class in Germany."[374] These sentimental plays catered to the demands of the audience. When Iffland moved to the Berlin National Theatre in 1796, two years before Schiller would join Goethe in Weimar at the height of its classicism, he

---

[370] Bruford, *Theatre, Drama, and Audience*, 196.

[371] Bruford, *Theatre, Drama, and Audience*, 196.

[372] Bruford, *Theatre, Drama, and Audience,* 198.

[373] Marvin Carlson, *The German Stage*, 37

[374] Meech, "Classical theatre," 76.

continued to stage his sentimental and middle-class dramas, and added to the repertoire

"lavish productions of plays by Schiller, Shakespeare, and Goethe, with elaborate scenery

and large casts."[375] At the same time that Goethe was denying Shakespeare's ability to be

staged, Iffland was presenting him to the bourgeois audience of the Berlin theatre.[376] Iffland

had the advantage, however, of staging a text that a German audience had never before seen.

Before 1797, the German theatre had to rely on translations and adaptations of

Shakespeare's plays that were similar to the versions that emerged from the English

Restoration period. The texts were drastically cut, with changes in characters and altered

endings, the type of adaptations that Schröder had used.[377] Between 1797 and 1801 eight

volumes of translations by A.W. Schlegel, became available for use. The full set of

translations was completed in 1833 under the editorial eye of Tieck, with new translations

from his daughter Dorothea and Baudissin, the man who also helped him make drawings of

hypothetical Elizabethan stages. Dirk Delabastita suggests three characteristics of these

translations that later translators tried to imitate: "it should be source-text oriented; it should

attempt to reproduce the prosodic features of the original; it ought to avoid the *page/stage*

dilemma (do you translate for the reader or for the stage?) by aiming for an 'integral'

rendition."[378] These translations brought Shakespeare to the German people in as close to the

original as any translation had, and they allowed for Shakespeare's works to appear "on the

shelves of almost every middle-class home, in editions that were neither abridged nor

---

[375] Meech, "Classical theatre," 84.

[376] Carlson, *The German Stage,* 98.

[377] Macey, "The Introduction of Shakespeare into Germany," 266.

[378] Dirk Delabastita, "Notes on Shakespeare in Dutch Translations: Historical Perspectives," in *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Rui Manuel G. de Carvalho Homem and A.J Hoenselaars (New York: Rodopi B.V., 2004), 111.

adapted."[379] Through his connection to sentimental and middle class drama in Iffland's

theatre, and through the dispersal of the Schlegel-Tieck translations, Shakespeare became

even more closely linked to the aesthetic worldview of the German people. Tieck's work

with Schlegel on the translations took positive steps towards introducing a more accurate

understanding of Shakespeare to the German people, but in performance, the plays still

emulated French theatre.

Tieck's Theatre Inheritance

Before discussing how Tieck's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* set out to rectify the situation of

Shakespeare on the German stage, something must be said on the state of theatre up to and

as it existed in Tieck's Germany. The earliest theatre in Germany consisted of traveling

companies who would assemble their own stages in "great halls of castles, in tennis courts,

orangeries, town halls, fencing academies, monasteries, or wherever."[380] These assembled

stages imitated the Elizabethan stage in their lack of a proscenium, in their downstage acting

space, and in a lack of large scenery pieces. The English traveling companies, which had

been performing in the German states since the sixteenth century, greatly influenced the

development of theatre in Germany. George Brandt argues that the "German actors were the

heirs of the English both in terms of repertoire and performance conditions."[381] These

conditions were necessary for companies that traveled without a home base and often played

in non-traditional theatre spaces. Since there were very few purpose-built theatres in early

---

[379] Macey, "The Introduction of Shakespeare," 268.

[380] George Brandt, "German baroque theatre and the strolling players," *A History of German Theatre,* edited by Simon Williams and Maik Hamburger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 56.

[381] Brandt, "German Baroque Theatre," 58.

eighteenth century Germany, they developed certain stage practices to facilitate their movement. The productions used very little scenery to make for easy transporting and adaptability to a wide variety of spaces. Often there were no scene changes, but those that occurred had to be completed quickly in order not to lose "the attention of the spectators" [382] who, because they were not in a theatre, could easily be distracted by other aspects of their surroundings. Often these performances occurred in the market place or outside, making them very public and extremely accessible. Even after the development of purpose-built theatres, which could be found in most German cities by the end of the eighteenth century, many were still "oriented toward touring … using one or two cities as a base."[383] However, influences from France and Italy began to change the structure of the theatre into elaborate scenery in a proscenium space.

As with most theatre practitioners, Tieck inherited a theatre system that he was forced either to work within, or to reject in favor of something better. At the beginning of his career, two almost separate systems existed, which were of course divided along class lines. The court theatre for the upper classes had been heavily influenced by French theatre, an influence which both the Romantics and Tieck were hoping to reject. The lower class theatre was less elaborate, but in some ways more German than the court theatres, since their theatre featured German troupes performing in German, instead of a French repertoire in French. In his rejection of the proscenium and elaborate scenery and staging of the court theatre, Tieck was not only expelling the French influence, but indeed turning to the earliest German theatre for inspiration. In a compelling way, the Elizabethan theatre that Tieck advocated was in fact

---

[382] Patterson, *The First German Theatre,* 3.

[383] Marvin Carlson, *The German Stage,* 2.

more like early German theatre, and so by producing something inspired by the English, Tieck was in fact recreating something that was also authentically, and at this time exclusively, German.

A large part of satisfying the audiences that gathered in the early outdoor theatre spaces centered on Hanswurst, the German clown. A variation on the *commedia* Arlecchino, Hanswurst was "a gluttonous, lazy, lustful, and greedy character"[384] whose antics and slapstick comedy dominated the show. Gottsched and Neuber disapproved of Hanswurst, who provided a "stark contrast … between a vulgar, base, and 'uncivilized' peasant, on the one hand, and a reasoned, restrained, and 'civilized' bourgeois citizen, on the other."[385] Gottsched in particular felt that the stage had more to offer than simply entertainment. Gottsched worked to move German theatre away from simple entertainment and wanted to use it as a force for good and for moral improvement. Hanswurst, in Gottsched's eyes, was chief among the violators of theatre for improvement. Gottsched described a performance by a traveling company in Leipzig in 1724 by writing the following: "It was full of pompous, coarse history plays, mixed with Harlequin's antics, full of crude practical jokes and love intrigues: uncouth grimacing and obscene jokes were all that one could find in that place."[386] All aspects of these performances were disagreeable to Gottsched's desire to make the theatre a site of moral teaching, but the initial attack focused on Hanswurst. As a solitary figure, the Hanswurst was an easy target, his demise a quick change that could occur without revamping the entire theatre system. So in a famous performance staged by the theatre

---

[384] Karen Jürs-Munby, "Hanswurst and Herr Ich: Subjection and Abjection in Enlightenment Censorship of the Comic Figure," *New Theatre Quarterly* 23 no. 2 (May 2007),, 127.

[385] Jürs-Munby, "Hanswurst and Herr Ich,"126.

[386] Michael J. Sosulski, *Theater and Nation in Eighteenth-Century Germany* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007), 73.

troupe under the direction of Karoline Neuber, the "Hanswurst was cast off the stage, supposedly never to return again."[387] In examining German theatre history, it is clear that the Hanswurst did not in fact disappear, but its presence on the stage now had an altered meaning. Because this moment in Neuber's performance was "meant to signal the end of improvised slapstick comedy… and the beginning of a new tradition of literary theater in Germany,"[388] the Hanswurst's presence now signified that his performances were low-brow, art made for the common people, not the artistically-minded. Letters by Neuber and Gottsched reveal that they must have anticipated disapproval of this move from the lower class audiences. In 1730, before the actual moment of banishment, Neuber's company had already started to marginalize the character. Neuber's description of the audience reception forecasts the split that would characterize German theatre for the next one hundred years. Neuber describes the reaction her company troupe experienced in Hanover:

> These have so much disgusted people that on our first arrival we had very poor audiences. These other companies had conducted themselves so badly too that no one would give us a taler's credit. But when we began our so-called verse plays, and put on the new costumes, things soon changed. The privy councilors of the Court of Appeal here were the first to come, and as they liked the performances the rest of the nobility and all the better-class people soon followed, and now everyone admits that they have never seen anything like it. But of course the mob who kept the earlier troupes going are not won over yet, because we don't give them enough opportunities of playing the fool.[389]

From the beginning of these new developments, the lower classes seem to have been resisting the changes. Neuber herself turned against Gottsched later in their acquaintance, when he chose a different company to carry on his work at improving the theatre. Once the

---

[387] Sosulski, *Theater and Nation*, 73.

[388] Sosulski, *Theater and Nation*, 73.

[389] Bruford, *Theatre, Drama and Audience*, 51.

150

break occurred, she not only brought back the character of Hanswurst by playing him herself, but also by writing a curtain-raiser that "put Gottsched on the stage in the character of The Fault-Finder."[390] Regardless of Neuber's later portrayals of Hanswurst, however, the split had been made. A psychological difference now existed between literary, moral theatre, and the theatre for the masses.

Accompanying this new moral agenda for the theatre were a few other changes, occurring variously through the end of the eighteenth century, which worked to discourage the working class from attending. First, the performances were now given in either court or purpose built theatres, which necessitated the audience going to the theatre, as opposed to the theatre coming to the audience. Secondly, the performances were moved from the middle of the afternoon to later in the evening, a change that "was partly due to improvements in theatre lighting, but was more an indicator of the establishment of theatre as an element of bourgeois social life instead of its former role as a sideshow in the market place."[391]

Eventually Hanswurst returned to the middle class stage, but specifying when this happened is difficult. He never disappeared totally from German theatre, and perhaps, as Lessing suggested from the moment of banishment, "'they had got rid of the party-coloured jacket and the name, but the clown remained.'"[392] In his biography of Tieck, Roger Paulin suggests that Tieck was one of the first playwrights to bring Hanswurst back to the bourgeois stage as a development of Romantic comedy.[393] An anthologist writes in 1854, only a short time after Tieck's theatrical years, that Tieck "defends and restores the pristine honor of the

---

[390] Brandt, "Frau Neuber attacks Gottsched from the stage, Leipzig, 18 September 1741," 192.

[391] Patterson, *First German Theatre*, 17.

[392] Bruford, *Theatre, Drama, and Audience* 61.

[393] Paulin, *Ludwig Tieck,* 62-3.

droll figure of the ancient gourmand-type"[394] and cites Lessing and Moser as fellow

supporters of Hanswurst. A.W. Schlegel also comments on the banishment. It is clear from

his lectures that Schlegel was not a supporter of Gottsched, saying his "writings resemble a

watery beverage, such as was then usually recommended to patients in a state of

convalescence, from an idea that they could bear nothing stronger."[395] Gottsched's

banishment of Hanswurst was part of this diluting of the stage. Schlegel seems to have

supported Hanswurst not simply in an effort to disagree with Gottsched but because he

genuinely sees a purpose for his presence. He conceded that Hanswurst, or Punch as one

translator calls him, might at times extemporaneously have expressed a base humor, but

overall, "Punch had, undoubtedly, more sense in his little finger, than Gottsched in his whole

body. Punch, as an allegorical personage, is immortal; and however strong the belief of his

burial may be, he yet pops, unexpectedly, upon us in some grave office-bearer or other

almost every day."[396]

Tieck seems to have agreed with Schlegel and included Hanswurst in two of his early

creations, one which was performed; the other was not. In 1795, he wrote a puppet play

entitled *Hanswurst als Emigrant* (*The Clown as Emigrant*). The play remained unpublished

and unperformed, despite its being "burlesque but stageable."[397] Two years later, however,

Tieck again introduces Hanswurst to the literary stage, this time in human form, in *Der

Gestiefelte Kater*, or his version of "Puss-in-Boots." In the play, Hanswurst introduces

himself as "a poor banished refugee, a man who, a long time ago, was once in his wits, but

---

[394] George Adler, *Handbook of German Literature* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854), 362.

[395] A.W. Schlegel, "Lecture 15," 370.

[396] A.W. Schlegel, "Lecture 15," 370.

[397] Paulin, *Ludwig Tieck*, 62.

has now become foolish."[398] Tieck explicitly reminds his audience, if it was indeed

necessary, of Hanswurst's banishment:

> My countrymen became so wise at a certain point that they formally forbade all fun
> under penalty. Whenever someone caught sight of me, I was given unbearable
> nicknames such as tasteless, indecent, bizarre – those who laughed at me were
> persecuted like myself, and so I had to go into exile. [399]

Tieck's entire play is metatheatrical, so it is not outside of the world of the play for

Hanswurst to be referring to historical events in German theatre, nor was it out of place for

Tieck to include a reaction from an audience he wrote into the play, who were shocked to see

"'A clown, Jackpudding!'"[400] Based on Tieck's admiration for the lower middle class and his

Romantic idealism of German folk history, it is likely that Tieck, like Schlegel, saw

Hanswurst as an essential part of German theatre, which would help to dispel the

demarcation between literary and popular theatre.

Although there are no descriptions of the characterization of Bottom in Tieck's *A

Midsummer Night's Dream*, I would like to suggest the possibility that Tieck brought

elements of Hanswurst to this production as well. A comment by Tieck on an earlier

adaptation of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* suggests that Tieck did not see the clumsy, lower

class Bottom as an insulting representation of the character, but instead as a possible part of

the German theatrical tradition. A play entitled *Peter Squentz* by Andrea Gryphius appeared

in Germany prior to Tieck's own production, and although it did not have a large impact on

German theatre, Tieck was familiar with it. He described, in his *Deutches Theater*, this text's

relationship with the original: "'Titania was omitted, Bottom changed into Pickleherring, and

---

[398] Tieck, *Puss-in-Boots*, 85.

[399] Tieck, *Puss-in-Boots*, 85.

[400] Tieck, *Puss-in-Boots*, 85.

much added to the fun, and many phrases literally retained from Shakespeare, with whose play [the playwright] was not acquainted."[401] The term 'pickleherring' is another name for Hanswurst, and Tieck seemed to think the portrayal of Bottom as this character worked well in the performance. I cannot be certain if Tieck chose to portray Bottom this way in his own performance, but given his history of putting Hanswurst on the stage and his seemingly positive response to this choice in production, I think it is likely that his Bottom was at least influenced by, if not an imitation of, this German clown character.

The increasing power and influence of the middle class in the German States led to their increasing participation in the theatre, which meant that throughout Tieck's career, the strict lines between court and public theatre that Hanswurst signified were breaking down, and an increased amount of German literature was being produced for the German stage. A push for the establishment of national theatres in the middle of the eighteenth century was the result of a middle class desire to combine the popular and the court theatres.[402] J.E. Schlegel argued that a national theatre was a "central, formative institution of a society that prized moral rectitude and valued good taste."[403] As we have seen earlier, Tieck supported the national theatre venture, and Schiller argued that if poets could join together to write about national topics, as he did in his *Wilhelm Tell*, the result would be "a national stage, and we should become a nation."[404]

As mentioned earlier, the Mannheim court theatre was not the earliest national theatre, but lasted much longer than its earlier counterpart at Hamburg. Over the last few

---

[401] Furness, *A Midsommer Nights Dreame*, 336.

[402] S. Williams, *Shakespeare on the German Stage*, 47.

[403] S. Willians, *Shakespeare on the German Stage*, 47.

[404] Shiller, "The Stage as a Moral Institution," 339.

decades of the eighteenth century, both Schiller and Iffland contributed their talents to the theater. The use of the term 'national' when no nation existed is confusing, and does not necessarily mean that these theatres were funded by state money, but the term did indicate a theatre that produced German, as opposed to French, theatre, that had an audience "primarily composed of members of the bourgeoisie,"[405] and that had a goal "to raise the level of the art of the theatre and the status of the acting profession."[406] These theatres, however, still relied on box office support, and so their repertoires often were a mix of sentimental, family dramas and literary theatre such as Shakespeare.

A description of the court theatre at Weimar gives a sense of the stratification of classes who attended the theatre: "Each social class had its own designated place – the court in the balcony, the working class in the gallery, students and the bourgeoisie in the pit."[407] An account of the Berlin theatre from an English visitor in 1842, just a year before Tieck's *Dream* production premiered at the Potsdam Court Theatre, describes the makeup of the house in more detail:

> You see the travelling [sic] strangers and the young people of the middle class when any celebrated actor or play appears, and on opera nights the upper classes, but the real people… you never see…. If this lower class ever come to the theatre at all, they sit as quiet as mice in the little hole allotted to them. A German theatre is a true picture of the social state of Germany – princes and functionaries occupying the front boxes – the educated and middle classes looking up to them from the pit below, in breathless awe and admiration, and the people out of sight and hearing of these two masses of the audience.[408]

---

[405] Carlson, "Realistic Theatre and Bourgeois Values," 94.

[406] Bruford, *Theatre, Drama, and Audience*, 250-1.

[407] Carlson, *The German Stage,* 14.

[408] Bruford, *Theatre, Drama, and Audience*, 358, 361.

This description suggests that the number of people attending the theatre who are not of the bourgeois class or higher is infinitesimal, and suggests that part of this reason is their discomfort in an environment that, according to this traveler, feels unnatural and distant to them.

This description of the theatre in mid-nineteenth century Germany refers to opera and to those performances showcasing 'celebrities.' Presumably these were the performances this writer attended, suggesting that perhaps his choice of performances dictated the different classes of people he saw attending, as opposed to assuming the lower classes had nothing to do with the theatre. Another description of the theatre in Berlin suggests that the director Iffland was more aware of the diversity of potential audiences and therefore adjusted his repertoire to accommodate this: "He gave the masses primitive fare, served up everyday realism and homely sentiment to the clerks and tradesmen, and appealed to the aristocracy's love of elegance and refined sensuality."[409] According to this description, a wide variety of theatrical events provided entertainment for audience members seeking different types of satisfaction.

German audiences then could see sentimental drama as well as Shakespeare. In some theatres the Schlegel-Tieck translations made the text of the play more connected to the English original, but other theatres were still showing cut and altered texts. In all of these theatres, however, public and court alike, a common factor was spectacle and elaborate scenery, modeled on the French theatre. Tieck's desires to perform Shakespeare on an Elizabethan stage would bring his audiences even closer to a truer understanding of Shakespeare and also dispel any French influence. Tieck's Shakespeare stage could have the

---

[409] Bruford, *Theatre, Drama, and Audience*, 357.

same effect as the Hanswurst character, who "does not adhere to the division between stage and auditorium: dramaturgically he is often positioned at the threshold between spectators and performance space, continually destroying any illusion by extemporizing and addressing himself directly to the audience."[410] Tieck employed Hanswurst in exactly this way in his *Puss-in-Boots*, so it makes sense that he would find this aspect of the Elizabethan stage appealing also. It is exactly this division between the stage and auditorium that Tieck wants to get rid of, and this is also the element, as I will describe in the epilogue at the end of this chapter, that opens up a neutral space for creative possibilities.

Conclusion

I have argued so far that Tieck considered his theatre for all classes of 'Germans' through the influence of his Romantic background, which exposed him to ideas of respect for each individual's inner being and the importance of individuals joining together to form a strong, cultured German nation. I suggested at the beginning of this chapter four examples of how Tieck's consideration for the lower classes is portrayed in his work on the theatre, and in particular in his 1843 production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. I would like to come back to those ideas now.

First, I am arguing that returning to an Elizabethan stage is similar to returning to the earliest, and in a sense, original, form of German theatre. With its lack of large set pieces, proscenium, and stage mechanics, the Elizabethan stage allowed for a flow and simplicity which was not an aspect of the French-influenced contemporary theatre, but was instead more like the early German traveling companies, which necessarily used very little scenery and had a more intimate relationship with the audience because of the lack of the

---

[410] Jurs-Munby, "Hanswurst and Herr Ich,"131.

proscenium. While it is true that Tieck's production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* would not have been accessible to a range of classes at the Potsdam Court Theatre, in might have when it moved to Berlin. A wider acceptance of Elizabethan stage practices could have led to producing public theatres in ways that would have been reminiscent of the traveling theatre companies, and that could have been accessible to more people because a purpose-built theatre would not have been necessary, nor would the expensive machinery for the stage mechanics. Here Tieck would also have been capable of making a German cultural reference. Instead of continuing the French tradition of theatre, he would have been utilizing an English form to aid in a return to what actually was German theatre history, the theatrical styles of the earliest German theatre companies. An Elizabethan performance, while referencing something English, was nonetheless completely unique to Germany in the early nineteenth century, and therefore was a chance for the Germans to jump ahead in their experimenting with and understanding of Shakespeare.

Second, I am positing Tieck's inclusion of Hanswurst in his plays as a similar nod to both German theatre history and a theatrical element that the lower classes would have been familiar with and related to. As part of the Romantic Movement, Tieck and his work would have been considered part of the literary theatre movement, which typically catered to the aristocracy, court, and upper middle class. Although Hanswurst had never really left the stage after Neuber and Gottsched's banishment, he certainly was not a typical feature of upper class entertainment. Tieck, however, felt a need for him in his plays, which again is an inclusion of early German theatre elements and a feature of the folk life that entered his work.

The third reason I cite for Tieck possibly looking for a more egalitarian structure in the theatre is because of his knowledge of the social structure of Shakespeare's theatre, and his desire for the same. Once again, this was not possible at the Potsdam Court Theatre, but had Tieck been able to fulfill his ideas for a reconstruction of the Fortune Theatre, this type of audience relationship might have been possible. He, too, might have created a theatre like the Elizabethan, which involved almost all classes of the community. If the different strata of society could join together, enjoy the same theatrical entertainment, and receive the same moral and national message, they would be one step closer to joining together to create a culturally and politically unified nation.

Finally, the choice of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* for this event fits in with Romantic ideas of class relations. This is a play which gives stage time to Theseus, king of Athens, all the way down to the mechanicals – tinkers, carpenters, joiners. While the text encourages laughter at the Mechanicals, they are given enough personality to keep from being stereotypes, and therefore that laughter is not necessarily mean-spirited. At the same time, however, the play does not challenge the divisions between the classes. In a carnivalesque night, Bottom is allowed to sleep with the Fairy Queen, but there is no question that this is only temporary and in the morning, everything will go back to the status quo, to as it should be. This is a very Romantic view of human relationships. In the same way that the political Romantics were not looking for democracy, but did hope for equal opportunity for happiness, Shakespeare's play never claims that Bottom and Theseus should be equals, but it does encourage acceptance and support of all classes of characters. The play asks the audience to hope for each group's success, according to its own abilities.

Unlike the public and court theatre of Tieck's day, an Elizabethan stage encourages a connection with the audience that is not present in other theatre forms. Along with this relationship comes a responsibility from the audience to be present in the action and the moment. Tieck desired this responsibility from his audience, particularly with the Elizabethan stage. As he wrote, "'for a performance to become real the imagination of the spectator must contribute half'."[411] The theatre is an education in participation, in a communal effort to complete the stage performance. Each individual is responsible, in his or her imagination, to contribute to the experience of the theatrical event, but this relationship cannot happen without the community of the theatre. In this way the theatre becomes a little nation, based on cultural experience and togetherness in the moment, reliant on the community as a whole but also on each individual contribution. Their leader in this is the great poet of nature, Shakespeare. I mentioned earlier access as a key to Tieck's work on Shakespeare. The responsibility of the audience to contribute their imagination to the bare stage of Tieck's Elizabethan theatre is also the privilege of the audience member to "freer access to Shakespeare's imaginative world,"[412] a world which itself, according to Tieck, must "originally lie in the soul of the artist."[413] If this transformation could happen in the small 'O' of the theatre, why could that experience not be transferred outside to the larger national experience?

By the time Tieck produced Shakespeare using his Elizabethan stage, the Romantic Movement he had helped to found had changed beyond recognition. Tieck was old,

---

[411] Patterson, "'Contributing Our Half,'" 92.

[412] S. Williams, *Shakespeare on the German Stage* , 179.

[413] S. Williams, *Shakespeare on the German Stage*, 178.

rheumatic, and cranky.[414] His production, though successful, was not his ultimate vision for

Shakespeare and did not encourage his contemporaries to continue his work. While the

production could be read in all the ways I have described above, there also is a sense of an

era lost about this production, an attempt by King Friedrich Wilhelm IV to recreate a

Romantic community that could no longer exist. Only five years after this production, the

revolutions of 1848 occurred and failed within a few years, and Tieck died in 1853. In this

way, Tieck's production seems more like a eulogy to what might have been, instead of a

possibility of what could be. It was not just an attempted recreation of an Elizabethan

theatre, but also the early Romantic era, of which Tieck was one of the few remaining

participants.

Manipulation of Time – Tieck

The previous chapter has argued that the purpose for Tieck's production of *A Midsummer

Night's Dream* was to suggest a new German art form while encouraging the participation of

a wide variety of Germans in a more communal nation. In the earlier examinations of the

manipulation of time, I have used scholarship by Frank and Sillars to support my claim that

Tieck, Poel, and both groups of painters were manipulating time in their art in similar ways

to produce similar results. As with the Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites, Tieck turned to

history to help his audience see a new way for the future.

Tieck's use of history in his production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was both in

content and form. The play itself is set in the Athens of Theseus, and classicism was enough

a part of the artistic culture in the German States for his audience to understand that the play

---

[414] Paulin, *Ludwig Tieck*, 168, 332. In his thirties, Tieck suffered illnesses that left him with "a lop-sided gait and a hunching of the shoulder."

is set in a historical golden age. Tieck's historical emphasis of this production was not, however, only in the content of the play but in the form the play took. In terms of the four elements I am identifying in these epilogues, Tieck's historical emphasis is also the element that makes the work strange. The aspect of Tieck's production that would have made his audience hyperaware of the moment of reception was its attempt at historical methods. Of course, how successful Tieck's production would have been at this versus Tieck's written imaginings of this type of theatre is hard to say, but the Tieck's Elizabethan staging would have ideally have caused his audience to be more in focus on the theatrical event than they were when watching theatre they were more familiar with. The style of the Elizabethan theatre would have also made it easier for Tieck to emphasize the relationship between his actors and the audience, and his reliance on a more accurate translation increased the relationship between the playwright and the audience. In the Elizabethan theatre, as Tieck understood, the audience was more involved in the event and shared more responsibility for being present in the production. Tieck's use, or desired use, of Elizabethan staging would have shared responsibility of the production with the audience, relied on their imaginations, therefore facilitating their entry into the artistic moment. Once Tieck pulled them into that space, that neutral space separate from contemporary time and not quite grounded in a historical moment, he could make suggestions for the future. As I have argued previously, this future was one of cooperation, unity, and transcendence.

The Romantic focus on history and the individual, as well as a rejection of rules led the Nazarenes and Tieck to the same point. They both chose an artistic time in the past which they thought was somehow better, more authentic, more in tune with nature and inner truth, and they suggested this time to their audience, but without implanting the desire

actually to recreate that time. The neutral space created, or intended to be created, with Tieck's Elizabethan stage could foster some of the most important questions raised in the previous chapter. The drawing of the audience into the artistic event, allowing them to participate by 'contributing their half', as Tieck suggested, makes every individual's personal experience valid and important. While the audience members will have different abilities and levels of what they are able to 'contribute', all classes and all variants of intellect are encouraged to participate. This places a great deal of responsibility on the audience members, but also elevates them to co-creator status. In the same way that the Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites needed their viewers to complete some of their paintings, Tieck's idea for an Elizabethan production cannot be fully realized without a participating audience.

Chapter 5: Full Emotion and Bare Platform: Poel's Pre-Raphaelite
Understanding of the Human in Art

Poel's attempts to discover an authentic way of performing Shakespeare began in 1881 when

he produced *Hamlet* using the first quarto text,[415] but his "apparent antiquarian fidelity"[416] to

Elizabethan practices was most recognizable during the period of the Elizabethan Stage

Society, which formed in 1894 and lasted for about a decade. Poel was not always able to

recreate his idea of an Elizabethan stage, but for his 1893 production of *Measure for Measure*

at the Royalty Theatre, he directed and performed for the first time on a stage altered to

create the structure he desired. *Measure for Measure* had been produced previously in

London, but rarely enough that it was still "a work practically unknown to Victorian

playgoers."[417] Although, as I mentioned in chapter two, one of Poel's tenets was to perform

Shakespeare's text without alterations, the extant prompt copy of the play reveals that the

text was highly edited, excluding both sexual material and gory events. Some of the sexual

themes, however, are integral to the plot. This seeming contradiction in the treatment of the

text makes his choice of this particular play a mystery. On one hand, Poel was trying to

bring an 'authentic' experience of Shakespeare to his audience by performing a rarely seen

play in an Elizabethan style. On the other hand, Poel cut the text heavily to fall in line with

---

[415] I am using the word 'authentic' here to refer to Poel's desire to allow his audience to see and hear what Shakespeare's first audiences would have seen and heard. His desire for authenticity variously, and controversially, refers to the text, the theatre architecture, the scene design, the costuming, the composition of the audience, and the flow of performance.

[416] Falocco, *Reimagining Shakespeare's Playhouse*, 10.

[417] Speaight, *William Poel*, 90.

his own ideas about Victorian morality and 'legitimate'[418] theatre. However, as the basis of

the play deals with sensitive issues, it would be impossible to cut out every offending

moment and still keep any semblance of storyline. So why even choose this play in the first

place? If Poel's main priority was a play's appropriateness for the stage, he could easily have

chosen another play that would require less pruning. His persistence to perform *Measure for

Measure* for such a seminal production suggests that, while the text was heavily cut,

something about that particular play was important to his artistic mission. Poel's choice is

symbolic of specific cultural tensions within his historical context, such as the prevailing use

of Shakespeare as a moral life coach and national icon, while at the same time large portions

of his plays were deemed inappropriate for many of his audience members.[419] The choice of

the play itself reveals the influence of artistic thinkers like Ruskin, and Pre-Raphaelite artists

like Rossetti and Swinburne, in their constant recognition of human beings for all of their

aspects, including their more emotional and raw desires. Despite Poel's treatment of the text,

the play still asked difficult questions and dealt with delicate subject matter. In this chapter, I

will explore some of the main factors that make Poel's choice of *Measure for Measure*

unusual, and suggest that, with the influence of Pre-Raphaelite thinkers, Poel was attempting

a radical new negotiation of the artist's role in an increasingly industrial society by his subtle

acceptance of art which promoted the importance of the human over the machine, and

accepted all aspects of human nature. In the same way that Tieck walked the line between

---

[418] The term legitimate refers to the legal term used to describe certain types of drama in certain theatres. A Select Committee of the Parliament in 1832 spent much of its time arguing over the exact meaning of this term, which usually was described by listing playwrights like Shakespeare. The term was necessary to define because until 1843, only certain theatres were licensed to perform it. Therefore, to prevent other venues from using legitimate drama, the committee had to define what legitimate drama was. This will be discussed further on pages 176-177.

[419] This can be seen in some of the popular editions that are published in this period, discussed on pages 189-190 as well as in the 'improved' texts from the eighteenth century that continued to be performed.

academic and popular theatre, Poel tiptoed between theatre that elevated the audience and that which appreciated the natural and flawed human.

<u>*Poel's* Measure for Measure</u>

Before discussing the factors that might have led to Poel's choice of *Measure for Measure* I first want to discuss the text that Poel staged and how it affected the performance. The contradictions outlined above cause me to question Poel's motives. One of Poel's goals for his Elizabethan productions was to perform "'Shakespeare naturally and appealingly from the full text',"[420] not the chopped and rearranged versions still being performed in other playhouses. But the choice of *Measure for Measure* necessitated, as it appears by the cuts Poel made to the text, major alterations in order for Poel to present it to his audience. It would, of course, be impossible for Poel to cut any of the main storyline of Claudio being sentenced to death for impregnating his betrothed, which then leads to his novitiate sister being propositioned by the Duke's stand-in to trade her virginity for her brother's life. However, as his biographer Robert Speaight puts it, "he did his best to conceal the fact."[421] Poel's audience members might already have been familiar with the story through other means, such as paintings by Pre-Raphaelite artists William Holman Hunt and Millais.[422]

Most of the changes Poel made to the text involve replacing words or cutting 'dirty' jokes, although other cuts seem to have been prompted by the removal of violence or simply to keep the play from running too long. As to the former, Speaight suggests, and the prompt book reveals, that "it is very difficult to play *Measure for Measure* without mentioning the

---

[420] Speaight, *William Poel*, 90.

[421] Speaight, *William Poel*, 99

[422] See Illustrations 6,7,and 9.

word 'bawd'; but Poel did so fairly successfully, except at one point where 'bawd' had perforce to do service for 'whoremaster'."[423] Speaight takes particular issue with Poel's replacement in Angelo's proposition speech to Isabella of the word "body" for "self", which he argues destroys the rhythm of a speech flowing with "the momentum of a passion and a purpose which can no longer be held in check."[424] In the case of Angelo's speech, the content, however inappropriate, was too important to the storyline to be cut, but Poel cleaned it up where he could. The same is true of Juliet's pregnancy, which Poel changed from "for getting Madam Julietta with child" to "for love of Madam Julietta" and in another place, "He hath got his friend with child" was replaced with "Fair Juliet's in trouble through him." Poel removed, to the great loss of the audience, such lines as Lucio's "Why, what a ruthless thing is this in him, for the rebellion of a codpiece to take away the life of a man!" and the description of Angelo that "it is certain that when he makes water, his urine is congealed ice."[425]

For the most part, Poel left the storyline intact, but in a few instances he left out what he apparently thought were superfluous plot points, or if he included them, he cut much of the description that helped to clarify what was really happening. For instance, his audience would have been aware that Lucio had a relationship with Mistress Kate-Keepdown, but not that she "was with child by him in the Duke's time." The gory details of the plot to send the head of a prisoner to Angelo in place of Claudio's head are cut, and only what is necessary to the story remains. The Duke no longer says "Quick, dispatch, and send the head to Angelo,"

---

[423] Speaight, *William Poel*, 99.

[424] Speaight, *William Poel*, 100.

[425] The descriptions of changes to the text are from my own analysis of Poel's promptbook in the Victoria and Albert National Theatre Archive in London, except where otherwise specified. *Measeure for Measure* Promptbook. The William Poel Collection, V&A Theatre and Performance Collections, Blythe House, London.

nor does the Provost say "Here is the head; I'll carry it myself." And finally, perhaps in the

interest of time, Poel cuts what can be the most poignant moment of the play, when Isabella,

at the request of Marianna, pleads with the Duke to spare Angelo's life.

While it seems clear that most of the above examples of alterations were made

because of inappropriate subject matter, other cuts seem simply to have occurred in an

attempt to shorten the time of the show, which Poel insisted run the "two hours traffic of our

stage," and which in turn led to reports of hurried, and often unintelligible, line delivery.[426]

Some of these cut sections, however, directly affected the interpretation of the characters,

namely Angelo, the Duke, and Isabella. Poel had strong views on these characters and not

only cut the text to help support his interpretations, but also took on the role of Angelo

himself.

The motivations of Isabella, the Duke, and Angelo are unclear and contentiously

discussed by scholars, but for Angelo, unlike the other two, there is little in the play to

redeem his actions. This, however, is the character that Poel chose to play.   In a letter to W.

Bridges-Adams many years later in 1931, Poel argues, based on what other characters say

about him, that Angelo "'fell while contemplating virtue',"[427] and therefore must not be

played as a fully fallen character. Poel gave a paper on *Measure for Measure*, a description

of which appeared in the periodical *Academy* in 1893. This article describes Poel's argument

that "Angelo is a sympathetic part … whose story we follow with a personal interest."   He

---

[426] "If the dialogue sometimes seemed to be spoken too hurriedly, that was, probably, because the amateur, with all their good intentions, had not learnt completely how to be both swift and intelligible.", "Stage Notes," *Academy* 1124 (1893), 446. ; "Most of the company simply gabbled through their lines in order that the references to the 'two hours' traffic of the stage' might be justified; but even in Elizabethan days, the audience must have wanted to hear what was said.", "The Drama," *The Speaker* 8 (1893) 552. ; The author of this review claimed about Poel "I never heard blank verse worse delivered than by him. He uttered his lines with intense rapidity and much wrong emphasis….", "At the Play," *Hearth and Home* 132 (1893), 42.

[427] Speaight, *William Poel*, 90.

suggests a forgiving view of Angelo because "In the early scenes, Angelo, with his self-righteous cruelty, is farther from salvation than Mistress Overdone…. But that, at the close of the play, the old self is dead we must credit, by the Duke's words: 'Your evil quits you well,' and the 'quickening in his eye'."[428] In the letter to Bridges-Adams, he argues that Isabella is not yet a member of the convent and therefore should not be wearing a habit.[429] This detail is important for Angelo's character because he then does not appear to be trying to persuade Isabella to renege on her vows but instead is asking for the love of an unclaimed woman. These are small but important changes for both of these characters.

For the Duke, Poel makes some major alterations. His argument for the character of the Duke is that he must be perceived as a benevolent and wise protector, so that "'To the spectator the righteous indignation of Isabella, the tears or Mariana, or the fears of Claudio do not arouse painful emotions since the Duke watches over them and will not let them be injured through the shortcomings of his deputy'."[430] The Duke's character as written in the text is not that straightforward, however, and so Poel altered the text to eliminate the moments where the Duke does something questionable. In the fifth act, after Angelo and Mariana leave to be married, the Duke inexplicably prolongs Isabella's agony by continuing with the story that her brother has been executed. This moment, which could easily be read as heartlessness on the side of the Duke, was cut in Poel's version. But the Duke has an even greater possible stain on his character that Poel chose not to deal with, which is described by Lucio when he argues about the Duke, "Ere he would have hanged a man for the getting of a

---

[428] "Reports of Societies," *Academy* 1125 (1893), 468.

[429] Speaight, *William Poel,* 91.

[430] Speaight, *William Poel*, 92.

hundred bastards, he would have paid for the nursing a thousand. He had some feeling of the sport."[431] Here, and in the discussion that follows, Lucio is quite clearly accusing the Duke himself of taking liberties with women and possibly fathering several children out of wedlock. One cannot too quickly judge the Duke at this point because Lucio reveals himself to be an untrustworthy liar, but his accusations at least raise questions about the Duke, who already seems a little questionable because of his unexplained desire to secretly watch Angelo rule in his place. In Poel's production, this accusation never occurred, and so his audience never had reason to question the Duke's morality.

I have discussed the most significant changes Poel made to the text in order to provide a better understanding of the experience that the early audience had with these characters and with this storyline. There are, of course, many problems with Poel's changes to the text here and in other instances of performance in light of his own claims about returning to the full Shakespearean text, which again makes the choice of this play confusing. I am arguing in this chapter that Poel chose *Measure for Measure* specifically because of its difficult themes, but perhaps was not ready to fully commit to the project. His choice to play Angelo can also be telling, particularly since he viewed him as a man overcome by his human desires but absolved by his repentance at the end. Could this have been a message he felt was important to deliver to his audience? Before fully making this argument, it will be helpful to understand more fully some of the issues with which Poel was dealing, including the representation of Shakespeare available in the theatre, how the Victorians viewed Shakespeare outside of the theatre, the tension between science and art, and the subordination of the human to the machinery of stage and spectacle. Poel's Elizabethan performance endeavors address all of these issues.

---

[431] Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, 87.

Shakespeare in the Theatre

Poel's new ideas for the production of Shakespeare did not have an immediately recognizable place within the spectrum of Victorian theatre, a system which seems quite insistent on labels. The place of Shakespearean performance within that system also did not neatly fit into one place, but instead was conveniently employed for different purposes. The debates throughout the nineteenth century about how to define 'legitimate drama' – an argument which typically involved Shakespeare – and which venues could perform that drama reached from the working classes attending the music halls all the way through to the parliamentary agenda, showing the significance and breadth of theatre's position in that society. Poel's Elizabethan performances then had the potential to radically change Shakespeare in the theatre by opening up a new space in which a different actor-audience relationship could exist, as well as a new relationship to Shakespeare.

Theatre in England from Shakespeare's day onwards had been connected with government control and policy. Regulations on what could happen on the stage as well as censorship of the plays performed were part of the theatre during Elizabeth's reign. The Puritan government closed the theatres during the Interregnum, and then later the Licensing Act of 1737 legally asserted the duopoly between the two patent houses Drury Lane and Covent Garden. This last act remained nominally effective until the Theatre Regulation Act of 1843, which finally allowed other theatrical venues access to legitimate drama as a response to an already wide-spread bending of the rules.

In 1832, over a decade before the Theatre Regulation Act changed the patent theatre laws, the British Parliament formed a Select Committee to discuss two main issues, first,

"theatrical quality, particularly in the context of defining the regular or legitimate drama," and second, "the role of the State in the reform project generally and implications for theatre."[432] Julia Swindells discusses some of the important aspects of the committee's findings, particularly in relation to defining 'legitimate' theatre, which, for both witnesses and interviewers, simply came down to Shakespeare.[433] Some attempts were made to define the term apart from using Shakespeare, for instance when playwright Douglas Jerrold gave the following definition of legitimate drama: "I describe the legitimate drama to be where the interest of the piece is mental; where the situation of the piece is rather mental than physical." The follow up question from the interviewer is "A piece rather addressed to the ear than to the eye?" to which Jerrold replies "Certainly."[434] This is the most cohesive definition given, but regardless of the nuances of each individual's idea about legitimate theatre, it is on the whole associated with Shakespeare. Therefore when the minor theatres attempted to produce Shakespeare, or when a later Select Committee in 1866 suggested performing Shakespeare in the music halls, the sensitivity over what was legitimate and where it could be performed led to heated discussion. Legitimate theatre as a concept existed well beyond this committee, even after the theatre licensing laws changed.

The Theatre Regulation Act of 1843 allowed different venues to host legitimate drama, whereas before it was restricted to the patent theatres. What the 1843 act did not

---

[432] Julia Swindells, "Behold the Swelling Scene! Shakespeare and the 1832 Select Committee," in *Victorian Shakespeare Vol. 1*, ed. Gail Marshall and Adrian Poole (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 29.

[433] Swindells, "1832 Select Committee," 33. Swindells describes how "Many of these witnesses take Shakespeare unquestioningly as a byword for the regular or legitimate drama." When trying to describe legitimat drama, the witnesses often gave a list of names, usually beginning with Shakespeare, instead of providing a useful definition. Swindell sums up this tendency by the following: "How do you define 'the regular drama'? What is it? Shakespeare."

[434] Swindells, "1832 Select Committee," 40.

account for, however, was the regulation of music halls, for the very reason that they did not yet exist. The music halls emerged in the 1850s from pubs that would bring in entertainment for their patrons. The popularity of this maneuver eventually led to the establishment of large halls built for entertainment, in which eating, drinking, and smoking were permitted.[435] As with the minor and the patent theatres before, a feud developed between the theatre venues, all now licensed by the Lord Chamberlain, and the music halls, which were under the jurisdiction of the local magistrates. The theatres now able to perform legitimate drama were threatened by the growing popularity of the music halls, as they were increasingly performing "entertainment of the stage," which came dangerously close to the restricted "stage play."[436] The theatres were concerned that the music halls would steal their audiences because patrons would not only be able to see the same repertoire, but also would be able to eat and drink.[437] Other, less economic concerns, centered on the behavior that the music halls, if not encourage, at least allowed. As Dave Russell describes, the music hall's "close links with the drink trade and its attraction of prostitutes, the perceived lewdness of some of its performers and its popularity with large numbers of young and boisterous members of the working class were the major courses of grievances."[438] The issue at stake was not simply

---

[435] Dave Russell, "Popular Entertainment, 1776-1895," in *The Cambridge History of British Theatre, Volume 2, 1660 to 1895*, ed. Joseph Donohue (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 377.

[436] Tracy C. Davis, *The Economics of the British Stage, 1800-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, 63.

[437] Schoch, "Shakespeare and the Music Hall," 239.

[438] Russell, "Popular entertainment," 381.

lewdness, but also that 'the halls made a mockery of middle-class interpretations of 'Victorian values' and set up their own alternatives in opposition."[439]

Another Select Committee of Parliament was called in 1866 to address the issues of regulating the music halls and the theatre. Richard Schoch suggests that the importance of this committee lies not in its final findings, which were ambiguous and ineffective, but instead in the push throughout from the committee to include Shakespeare in the music hall repertoire. [440] As has been mentioned, the music halls normally presented more popular entertainment in the form of music and dancing. Shakespeare was not part of the music hall culture at that time, nor did any of the music hall proprietors seem to desire that he should be.[441] Schoch suggests that the committee's goal of introducing Shakespeare performance to the music hall audience was "the promulgation of a shared national culture through the performance of Shakespeare in a popular place of recreation for the urban working class."[442] Schoch connects the desire for a 'shared national culture' with political changes that were allowing more working class men to participate in the government. Shakespeare, in this case, became the national icon that working class men as well as the more affluent theatre-going public could share in common.

The suggested introduction of Shakespeare into the music hall would not be a simple task. Many prejudices from both sides against the repertoire of both the legitimate theatres and the music halls existed, and certainly raised the question what is so legitimate about

---

[439] Dagmar Kift, *The Victorian music hall: Culture, class and conflict*, trans. Roy Kift (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 2.

[440] Schoch, "Shakespeare and the Music Hall," 236.

[441] Schoch, "Shakespeare and the Music Hall," 243.

[442] Schoch, "Shakespeare and the Music Hall," 245.

legitimate theatre. On one side, the proponents of legitimate theatre were appalled at what they saw as a dismissal of moral society in the music hall performances. As late as 1871 Robert Buchanan attacked this type of art in his pamphlet "The Fleshly School of Poetry." His main issues were with the Pre-Raphaelite poets Rossetti and Swinburne, but he did not limit his horror to just that medium. Instead he charges his readers to "Turn your eyes to the English stage. Shakspere is demolished and lies buried under hecatombs of Leg! … Enter a music-hall – Leg again, and … the Can-Can."[443]   Another contributor to the committee argued that "Shakespeare would suffer indignities in a music hall, because while Hamlet whispered one of his immortal soliloquies, a man in the audience might shout to the waiter for 'potatoes and a kidney'."[444] Schoch argues that this reverence for Shakespeare from the theatre managers is fake, born out of a desperate attempt prevent the music halls from competing for their audiences. This testimony, however, was not shrugged off as absurd, which suggests that it catered to some truth of feeling at the time.

The opposing argument, however, to the degradation of Shakespeare by music hall audiences suggested that refining the entertainment available at the music halls would also refine the audience. An article discussing the report from the Select Committee in 1866 suggested that "much of our vice has arisen from want of sufficient amusement."[445] By making the music halls more family friendly places, men would spend the evenings with their families watching suitable shows, instead of drinking while enjoying less desirable entertainment. While this is the direction in which the music halls went, their more family

---

[443] Robert Buchanan, *The Fleshly School of Poetry* (London: Strahan and Co., 1872), 4.

[444] Schoch, "Shakespeare and the Music Hall," 242-3.

[445] Russell Jackson, ed., *Victorian Theatre: The Theatre in Its Time* (Franklin, NY: New Amsterdame Books, 1994), 41.

friendly atmosphere was not from the introduction of Shakespeare, who in the end was not included in the music hall repertoire. Another Select Committee in 1892 restricted spoken drama in the music halls to "twenty minute sketches with no change of scenery, no more than four performers, and no prior licensing of the text."[446] Even if the music hall proprietors wanted to perform Shakespeare, a sketch adhering to these limitations would not be comparable at all to the plays in the legitimate theatres.

In the conversation about the restriction of legitimate drama to theatres, the music halls are not singled out as the only morally reprehensible forms of entertainment, but in fact the legitimate theatres themselves seem to have sparked some controversy. In a response to the first Select Committee meeting in 1832 on the topic of the patent theatres, a responder in the *Westminster Review* boldly claims "If there are any places in the world where indecency is openly and shamelessly exhibited, it is within the walls of the great monopolist houses, sacred to the holy worship of the 'legitimate' drama."[447] He even goes so far as to call the Lord Chamberlain, whose role it was to monitor and approve both the theatre houses and the plays they chose to perform, "the first he-bawd in Christendom, grand Pandarus."[448] The author does not give any specifics as to what these immoral, bawdy acts are, but certainly the legitimate theatres were changing to cater to new tastes in their audience, so that while the music halls became cleaner, the legitimate theatres "yielded to the demand of spectacle and sensation."[449] Both types of entertainment, not to mention the minor theatres and other

---

[446] Davis, *Economics*, 67.

[447] "ART. II. Report from the Select Committee on Dramatic Literature, with the Minutes of Evidence: Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 2nd August, 1832," *Westminster Review*, 18 no.35 (Jan. 1833), 36.

[448] *Westminster Review*, 37.

[449] George Rowell, *The Victorian Theatre: A Survey* (London: Oxford University Press, 1956), 11.

places of entertainment, began to converge on a fine line that existed, or was thought to exist, between the audiences' desire for spectacle and appropriate treatment of the subject.

Although the legitimate theatres claimed allegiance to Shakespeare, they did not understand 'Shakespeare' to mean the quarto and folio texts or any sort of theatrical practice, but instead the name referred to the tradition of Shakespeare performance since the eighteenth century.   Starting with David Garrick, a self-conscious awareness of Shakespeare performance developed to such an extent that "plays without a stage tradition to challenge were seldom produced."[450] The nineteenth century saw a continuation of the play versions performed in the earlier centuries, but also developed a desire for historically accurate staging. This new claim to historical authenticity is related to, but certainly not the same as, Poel's own historical tendencies. This historical accuracy was aimed at the story within the play, not with the way in which the play was produced. Several theatre practitioners and actor-managers were involved in the popularization of this new historical focus, particularly J.R. Planché, Charles Kean, and Herbert Beerbohm Tree .

Planché, a designer who worked with Charles Kemble and Benjamin Webster, also wrote extravaganzas for the Olympic, Covent Garden, and the Lyceum.[451] In 1823 he designed the costumes for Kemble's *King John*. He researched and consulted with specialists to produce designs historically accurate to the time within the play, and even documented the sources for individual costumes in the playbill.[452] He also designed the set for Benjamin Webster's production of *The Taming of the Shrew* in 1844, which was played

---

[450] Alan Hughes, *Henry Irving, Shakespearean* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 22.

[451] Michael Booth, *Theatre in the Victorian Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). 194.

[452] Nancy J. Doran Hazelton, *Historical Consciousness in Nineteenth-Century Shakespearean Staging* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1987), 37.

with "two screens and two curtains,"[453] a minimalist staging that referenced the Elizabethan theatre. In 1834 he published *The History of British Costume* which "transformed the theatre's view of 'wardrobe'"[454] by its emphasis on research and accuracy to the historical time period within the play. His work on costumes continued to influence design throughout the century.

Charles Kean's work at the Princess Theatre in the 1850s was built around creating lavish and highly detailed scenes that were true both to the historical time period of the play and to what Kean thought Shakespeare's intentions would have been. Kean's mission to create historically accurate sets and costumes involved "calling in experts, studying documents, writing his programmes like textbooks."[455] In a strange way, and one which highlights the Victorian artist's struggle to reconcile new and old, Kean's ultimate goals for his productions were the same as Poel's. Nancy Hazelton describes them as follows:

> As an antiquarian, a patriot, and a man of the theatre, Charles Kean regarded Shakespeare as a great national treasure, as Britain's most important antique. That the 'antique' [Shakespeare] depicted in his plays antique times of great national consequence made the lessons Shakespeare taught doubly valuable: art and history in the same classroom. The 'truth' of Shakespeare, Kean firmly believed, could be got at through detail, through the accretion of facts and historical specifics.[456]

Until the last sentence, this quotation could have been about Poel, who also received the moniker 'antiquarian' and also desired entertainment and instruction from his theatre. This description also sounds peculiarly like a description of a Pre-Raphaelite painting in the idea

---

[453] J.L. Styan, *The Shakespeare Revolution: Criticism and Performance in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 20.

[454] Martin Banham, ed., *The Cambridge Guide to World Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 772.

[455] Styan, *The Shakespeare Revolution,* 21.

[456] Hazelton, *Historical Consciousness,* 98.

that extreme attention to and imitation of detail will lead to the revelation of truth.[457] I

persist, however, in likening the Pre-Raphaelites to Poel instead of Kean because their

imitation, like Poel's, was of an earlier method, historical accuracy in the *production* as well

as the product. Clearly, however, there is some overlap.

Kean's 'antiquarian' interest continued with Poel's contemporary, Herbert Beerbohm

Tree, who also put considerable effort into researching time periods for historical accuracy,

and also chose "plays which gave opportunities for scenic spectacle, magic effects and

splendid processions, and made time for these by working from acting editions which cut out

some scenes and shortened or altered the order of others."[458] Poel and Tree were often in

competition and existed on complete opposite ends of the spectrum, although Tree did invite

Poel to produce *Two Gentlemen of Verona* on his stage in 1910.[459] As with Kean, Tree's

ultimate intention was the same as Poel's, to understand more accurately Shakespeare's

performance intentions. Poel's view on this is, of course, that Shakespeare wrote his plays

for the Elizabethan stage, and so to fully grasp their meaning as Shakespeare intended it, they

must be presented in an Elizabethan style. Tree, on the other hand, argued, based on the

Henry V opening speech, that Shakespeare was not laying the scene for his audience's

imagination, but instead envisioning a time when the theatre would be able to accommodate

---

[457] Richard Foulkes argues for the similarities in Pre-Raphaelite paintings and Kean's theatre in his article "Charles Kean's *King Richard II*: A Pre-Raphaelite Drama."

[458] Jean Chothia, "Varying Authenticities: Poel, Tree and Late-Victorian Shakespeare," in *Victorian Shakespeare Volume 1* eds. Gail Marshall and Adrian Poole (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 163.

[459] Chothia, "Varying Authenticities," 171.

all of the grandeur he wished for but could not achieve with his stage.[460] Therefore Tree's

elaborate spectacle was the fulfillment of Shakespeare's ultimate stage dreams.

The lengths to which these men went to create elaborate historical productions, not to

mention other actor-mangers such as Henry Irving who, though less interested in historical

staging, produced incredible spectacle,[461] were seen by some as destroying Shakespeare.

Poel certainly was one of these, but he was not alone. Schoch argues in his book, *Not

Shakespeare*, that much of the burlesque Shakespeare culture in the Victorian period

developed to facilitate "a triumphal reinstatement of Shakespearean loyalties at the precise

moment when those loyalties seemed imperiled by legitimate culture."[462] These burlesques,

such as *Hamlet Travestie* and *Shylock: or, the Merchant of Venice Preserved*, both from the

1840s, parodied Shakespeare's text, rewrote soliloquies as lyrics to famous songs, and

featured the "ludicrous re-enactment of classic scenes."[463] The burlesque plays based on

Shakespeare's originals were never cited as adaptations; they clearly were a different animal.

However, their agenda for Shakespeare in many cases was not disrespectful or belittling, but

instead was a commentary on the current production trends for Shakespeare's plays. In his

discussion of *Macbeth Somewhat Removed from the Text of Shakespeare*, Schoch argues that

---

[460] Chothia, 168. Tree felt that Shakespeare's Prologue to *Henry V*, wtih questions like "can this cockpit hold / The vasty fields of France? Or may we cram / Within this wooden O the very casques / That did affright the air at Agincourt? / O, pardon!", were Shakespeare's lament about the restrictions of his stage instead of a plea for the audience to fill in the missing images. "Prologue," *Henry V*, The Literature Network, http://www.online-literature.com/shakespeare/henryV/2/ (accessed May 2, 2012).

[461] A. Hughes, 16. Hughes describes the "operatic" scale of Irving's productions at the Lyceum: "More than a hundred supernumeraries were frequently used…. The Lyceum had a chorus, a ballet, and a thirty-piece orchestra…. at various periods there were as many as 90 'carpenters' (stage hands), 32 props men, 19 gas and 20 limelight men."

[462] Richard Schoch, *Not Shakespeare: Bardolatry and Burlesque in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 73.

[463] Schoch, *Not Shakespeare*, 12.

the play is designed "not to overthrow Shakespeare but to overthrow Kean's unfounded claims of legitimacy, thereby restoring the rightful order of succession in the House of Shakepseare."[464] In other words, the burlesque did not make fun of Shakespeare but instead how Shakespeare and his greatest characters were appropriated and changed by some of the Victorian theatre's leading actors. Schoch also argues that the tradition of burlesque has precedents in early modern theatre, and the Victorians would use Shakespeare in "defending their work from charges of vulgarity and impropriety."[465] Their use of established texts and stories, their frequency of highlighting contemporary events in their plays, and their emphasis on theatrics and farcical comedy all, they argued, modeled after what Shakespeare and his contemporaries had done. Therefore the burlesques were more Shakespearean than the productions at the legitimate theatres.

From the information given above, it is clear that Shakespeare did not belong to one class or one theatre tradition. It also is clear that exactly what 'Shakespeare' meant to the theatre was much debated. He was legitimate theatre; he was a potential bridge between legitimate theatre and music hall culture; he was being destroyed by the legitimate theatre tradition and needed to be reclaimed by those who understood his humor and contemporary relevance. This is the theatrical world that Poel was part of. Where did he fit in?

Poel certainly was not a supporter of the music halls, but neither did he approve of the way the legitimate theatres handled Shakespeare, and as far as the burlesques, Poel would not have counted them as Shakespearean productions. Poel's issues with the contemporary staging of Shakespeare centered mainly on the damage they did to the text. The theatres

---

[464] Schoch, *Not Shakespeare*, 65. Schoch makes a larger metaphorical comparison relating the Kean to Macbeth and the burlesque play to Malcolm, which prompts his phrase 'House of Shakespeare'.

[465] Schoch, *Not Shakespeare*, 22.

were proscenium stages, therefore had curtains, therefore found interesting ways to use the curtains. Poel was very adamant that the curtain was destroying Shakespeare, not simply for the long intervals of closed curtain when the scenery was changed, sometimes up to forty-five mintues,[466] but also because it meant an "adjustment of act-endings and reshaping of the plays' momentum to facilitate the 'pictures' or 'tableaux' in which a crisis of the play's story was expressed."[467] This rearranging of the plays, cutting of major scenes, and subordination of the actor to the scenery, all have a part in Poel's essay "What is Wrong with the Stage,"[468] more of which will be discussed later. At the same time, Poel was not interested in turning Shakespeare into burlesque or farce. He professed to be interested in Shakespeare's original text, and in a theatre that changed the relationship between the audience and the performers. He wanted the intimacy and realness theoretically possible in music hall but the legitimacy and potential for improvement theoretically possible in the theatre. He hoped for his own Elizabethan stage to be a meeting of the two.

Shakespeare as 'legitimate'

Part of my argument for Poel's relationship to Shakespeare relies on the power Poel felt Shakespeare had to change the artist-audience relationship. It was Shakespeare's already integral place in English society that made Poel's transcendent hopes possible. Theatre artists, members of the select committees, and audiences seem to have accepted almost without question that Shakespeare was legitimate drama, that his plays were mental rather

---

[466] Chothia, "Varying Authenticities," 165.

[467] Russell Jackson, "Actor-Managers and the Spectacular," in *The Oxford Illustrated History of Shakespeare on Stage*, eds. Jonathan Bate and Russell Jackson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 115.

[468] William Poel, *What is wrong with the stage* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1920).

than physical. Shakespeare was, however, not only esteemed in the theatre, but had various

uses outside of the theatre as well. Some of these, which were distributed through

periodicals and family editions of his works, were as a national hero, a life coach, almost as a

god. And yet that did not mean that his readers and audiences were to emulate the free style

with which he wrote, or the balance between good and evil, decorum and rebellion that exist

in many of his most famous characters. In fact, this was not the Shakespeare that many

Victorians knew at all. For as useful to the English citizen as the arts and media tried to

make Shakespeare, the man they presented was often only tangentially related to the

evidence of the artist we have today.

       Kathryn Prince discusses how the presentation of Shakespeare to a literate audience,

which was rapidly becoming a larger sector of society,[469] encouraged young men, young

women, and especially the working classes to consider how Shakespeare might help them to

be better people. The Shakespeare presented by different periodicals was tailored to their

particular needs and therefore different than the Shakespeare the readers might have

encountered in school or in the theatre. As Prince points out, the periodicals tended to focus

on Shakespeare as "a model for the ambitious working-class intellectual because he

[Shakespeare] was himself a member of that class who had risen through the ranks by virtue

of his own innate talents combined with hard work."[470] Shakespeare was not simply the

property of the upper classes, nor of theatre attendees. The periodicals provided the working

---

[469] Kathryn Prince, *Shakespeare in the Victorian Periodicals* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 17.

[470] Prince, *Victorian Periodicals*, 16.

classes with "alternative ways of understanding Shakespeare and in so doing, alternative ways of articulating their own place within the hierarchies of their culture."[471]

Shakespeare was also introduced to children at an early age, both in time spent at home reading and in the classroom. Special editions of Shakespeare's plays emerged throughout the nineteenth century to cater to the needs of particular groups of people and for very specific reasons. In 1822 Reverend R.J. Pitman edited *The School-Shakespeare; or, plays and scenes from Shakespeare, illustrated for the use of schools, with glossarial notes, selected from the best annotators*,[472] and in 1868 *The Clarendon Press Series of Shakespeare's Select Plays* was published by Oxford University Press.[473] Some of the individual editions, such as those edited by Reverend John Hunter included examination questions at the end, such as "'Write a brief sketch of the life of Cardinal Wolsey.'"[474] As Andrew Murphy describes, the use of Shakespeare in schools was not simply a convenient pedagogical tool, but indeed some educators were of the belief that English literature would, for the reader, "'make him feel the force and beauty of which the language is capable [and] refine and elevate his taste.'"[475] English literature, and Shakespeare in particular, would contribute to a more ideal country of Englishmen.

Shakespeare also appeared in schools for girls, but to a different purpose. Gail Marshall suggests three motivations for the inclusion of Shakespeare in their curriculum:

---

[471] Prince, *Victorian Periodicals*, 18.

[472] Andrew Murphy, *Shakespeare in Print: A History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 184.

[473] Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 195.

[474] Murphy, *Shakespeare in Print*, 182.

[475] Murphy, *Shakespeare in Print*, 182.

> …the pedagogic ambitions which sought to allow girls to emulate their male counterparts as far as possible; the notion that Shakespeare was ineluctably a part of a Victorian cultural inheritance; and the less articulable but nonetheless absolutely pervasive sense that Shakespeare could educate for female citizenship in the nineteenth century.[476]

The ideas that Marshall outlines sound rather progressive, but other ways in which the Victorians saw Shakespeare as relevant to women would serve more to keep women in a particular, domestic realm. The editions of Shakespeare that many of the middle and upper class women would encounter first were not in school, but instead those that would be read to them by family members as an evening's entertainment. In 1807, two editions debuted which deliberately did not include sections of the plays which might cause "'extreme awkwardness, and even distress… from suddenly stumbling upon such expressions, when it is almost too late to avoid them, and when the readiest wit cannot suggest any paraphrase, which shall not betray, by its harshness, the embarrassment from which it has arisen.'"[477] That quotation describes the *Family Shakespeare* by Henrietta Bowdler, later to be assisted by her brother, Thomas Bowdler, which included highly edited versions of some of the plays, while omitting entirely some plays which apparently could not be salvaged.[478] Charles and

---

[476] Gail Marshall, *Shakespeare and Victorian Women* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 22.

[477] *Edinburgh* review as printed in Murphy, *Shakespeare in Print,* 170.

[478] Thomas Bowdler, ed. *The Family Shakespeare: in ten volumes; in which nothing is added to the original text; but those words and expressions are omitted which cannot with propriety be read alound in the family, Vol.II* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1818), 2. *Measure for Measure* was not one of these. In the 1818 edition which is credited to Thomas Bowdler's editorship, Bowdler admits that "the indecent expressions with which many of the scenes abound, are so interwoven with the story, that it is extremely difficult to separate the one from the other." He has included the play, however, presumably because "This Comedy contains scenes which are truly worthy of the first of dramatic poets." In this edition, Bowdler reprinted the edition used by Kemble at the Theatre Royal. He suggests that if readers still think the play is too rough to be included, they should compare it to the original version to see how many changes actually were made. In comparison to Poel's cut version this text retains many words and turns of phrase which Poel decided to take out. It does omit sections such as in 2.1where Escalus claims that Pompey is a bawd and they discuss how that is illegal in the city. In place of the line "what a ruthless thing is this in him, for the rebellion of a codpiece to take away the life of a man!", which Poel cut, the Bowdler edition says "Why, what a ruthless thing

Mary Lamb's *Tales from Shakespear* also came out that year, directed mainly at young girls who were not "'permitted the use of their fathers' libraries'"[479] at the same early age as their brothers.[480] A few decades later, in the 1840s to 1860s, Mary Cowden Clarke published essays, novels, and a *Complete Concordance to Shakspere*, in which she stressed the benefit that reading Shakespeare could have on a young woman: "'To the young girl, emerging from childhood and taking her first steps into the more active and self-dependent career of woman-life, Shakespeare's vital precepts and models render him essentially a helping friend.'"[481] These women were exposed to Shakespeare at a young age and throughout their schooling, not just to learn literary criticism and reading comprehension, but to learn how to be ideal women. The young men, in the same token, were to learn how to be refined and enjoy the beauty of the finer things in life. Shakespeare was not just an artist, but indeed improved the lives of his English readers.

The elevation of Shakespeare to iconic status carried with it the very real problem of how to deal with the moments in his plays that fall short of this ideal of art and life, like the moments Poel cut from *Measure for Measure*. For children's editions the problem was easier to handle, as evidenced by the popular versions of the Lambs and the Bowdlers, but what was appropriate for Shakespeare's adult readers and audiences? Often when Shakespeare was evoked, it was easier to ignore the controversy rather than engage with it,

is this in him, to take away the life of a man for – would the duke, that is absent, have done this?" The Bowdler version does leave in the lines where Lucio accuses the Duke of fathering several children out of wedlock, the section that Poel cut. Most of the changes to the text however seem to be in rearranging the scenes, which presumably was done to make the play easier in performance.

[479] Marshall, *Shakespeare and Victorian Women,* 18.

[480] Charles Lamb and Mary Lamb, *Tales from Shakespeare* (London: Puffin Books, 1994), 214. This version of Shakespeare summarizes the stories from the plays in prose form, so the editing is not a question of cutting text but of choosing how to present the story. For example, the Lambs set up the story by explaining that there "was a law dooming any man to the punishment of death, who should live with a woman that was not his wife."

[481] Marshall, *Shakespeare and Victorian Women,* 20.

hence the cut texts for the theatre and the careful selection of material mentioned in the periodicals. However, some artists and theorists of the age where not satisfied with ignoring portions of Shakespeare's plays. These artists either tried to explain away the 'darkness' and make excuses for Shakespeare's humanity, or they embraced the playwright's works as a whole and used them to support their own ideas about morality and aesthetics. Algernon Charles Swinburne, an inheritor of Pre-Raphaelite views on art, is part of the latter group and will be discussed in the next section. He is diametrically opposed to Furnivall, the founder of the New Shakspere Society, who, along with Thomas Carlyle, falls into the first category, a lover of Shakespeare who tried to explain away the darkness. I am choosing Swinburne, Furnivall, and Carlyle as examples of the ways intellectuals tried to understand and use Shakespeare because of their different approaches – Carlyle took a Romantic view, Furnivall an analytic, scientific view, and Swinburne an art-for-art's-sake approach – and also because of their connections to the Pre-Raphaelites and Poel, as I have already begun to outline and will do so more in this chapter.

Carlyle theorized the "hero as poet" in a series of lectures he gave in 1840, which according to Abrams illustrates the influence of the shift around 1800 from the dominance of pragmatic theories of art to expressive theories of art.[482] As I discussed in chapter three, in expressive theories of art "the artist himself becomes the major element generating both the artistic product and the criteria by which it is to be judged."[483] The poet, or artist, himself becomes central to understanding the meaning and intention of art. The receiver is affected by this new view of art as well. Carlyle's poet, "through the degree of homage he evokes,

---

[482] Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, 21. Abrams marks Wordsworth's *Lyrical Ballads* as the point of this change.

[483] Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, 22.

serves as the measure of his *reader's* piety and taste."[484] In other words, the readers and

audiences, by choosing the 'correct' artist, can display their own personal worth in matters of

artistic sensibility. In this type of value system, it is imperative that the artist be objectively

good and moral in order for his work to be so. Carlyle argues that Shakespeare was exactly

this moral man-poet not through the moral code found in his work, but because he was "the

greatest of Intellects"[485] and, according to Carlyle, for a man "without morality, intellect

were impossible for him; a thoroughly immoral man could not know anything at all!"[486] In

this case, Shakespeare's intellect, as suggested by his work, testifies to his grasp of morality.

But for Carlyle, Shakespeare amounts to more than the greatest of intellects, more than a

national poet: "For myself, I feel that there is actually a kind of sacredness in the fact of such

a man being sent into this Earth. Is he not an eye to us all; a blessed heaven-sent Bringer of

Light? – And, at bottom, was it not perhaps far better that this Shakspeare, everyway an

unconscious man, was conscious of no Heavenly message?"[487] Carlyle here seems to be

elevating Shakespeare to messiah status, but it is this 'unconscious message' that keeps

Shakespeare human and makes him a poet of romanticism. For, as Carlyle admits, and

struggles with, Shakespeare had faults, and he knew sorrow, traits that existed because he

was a poet of nature. Unaware of the depth from which his poems sprung, Shakespeare

created as nature did, truthfully and in balance. Carlyle claims that Shakespeare's work

---

[484] Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, 26.

[485] Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History,* Electronic Classics Series (Hazelton, PA: Pennsylvania State University, 2001), 93.

[486] Carlyle, *On Heroes*, 92.

[487] Carlyle, *On Heroes*, 96.

"grows up from the deeps of Nature, through this noble sincere soul, who is a voice of Nature."[488]

Having made a bold claim both for Shakespeare's origin – heaven-sent – and his inspiration – the depths of Nature, it was now his task to excuse those moments of Shakespeare's plays that would debase either of these elements. Carlyle focused on two explanations. The first excuses Shakespeare on the basis of his humanity: "Doubt it not, he had his own sorrows: those Sonnets of his will even testify expressly in what deep waters he had waded, and swum struggling for his life; - as what man like him ever failed to have to do?"[489] Carlyle does not elaborate on what these sorrows were, does not claim to know or even hazard a guess, but he takes Shakespeare's tragedies as evidence: "how could a man delineate a Hamlet, a Coriolanus, a Macbeth, so many suffering heroic hearts, if his own heroic heart had never suffered?"[490] Carlyle suggests here that Shakespeare had dark times, and from these he understands and can create realistic characters that also experience that darkness. But what hero does not struggle? Shakespeare would not be much of an idol if he had it easy all of his life. Going through difficulties and coming out stronger on the other side is exactly the type of hero people should be encouraged to emulate. Shakespeare's temporary difficulties make him even more awe-inspiring.

That, then, explains why Shakespeare could write sorrow and darkness, not because of some twisted desire to expose his audience to pain, but instead he wrote from his own triumphant success. What about the scatological humor then? It would be difficult to forgive

---

[488] Carlyle, *On Heroes*, 93.

[489] Carlyle, *On Heroes*, 93.

[490] Carlyle, *On Heroes,* 94.

the sex jokes because Shakespeare had been through some traumatic times. Carlyle's

response is elitist, but not uncommon among his contemporaries.

> Alas, Shakspeare had to write for the Globe Playhouse: his great soul had to crush itself, as it could, into that and no other mould.... The sculptor cannot set his own free Thought before us; but his Thought as he could translate it into the stone that was given, with the tools that were given.[491]

Carlyle's response suggests two things that are important to this discussion. First, he paints

the audience as helping to create the drama through their taste, and Carlyle understood the

early modern audience to have a variety of taste levels. This provides a telling contrast with

Poel's view of the audience, which will be shown later to elevate that audience to an ideal

status. Second, Carlyle clearly places Shakespeare as an artist within his own time. The

materials and tools given to Shakespeare by his audience and time period clearly determined

how he created. The artist then must be examined within the confines of his own time

period, not judged on contemporary notions. This again ties in with Poel's desire to

understand Shakespeare in the frame of his own historical time by recreating the theatrical

conditions Shakespeare would have worked within. Carlyle's views on the poet and his

relation to his own time and audience also emulate the ideas of the German Romanticists, of

whom Carlyle was a great admirer.

Carlyle was not alone in his efforts to connect Shakespeare's writing to his own life

experiences, but whereas Carlyle attempted to explain Shakespeare's writing based on

assumed details of his life, other theorists like Furnivall tried to discover the details of his life

through a close examination of his writing. Furnivall was not only a theorist of

Shakespeare's life and works, but also the founder of The New Shakspere Society formed in

1873, whose goal was to scientifically study Shakespeare's playtext in order to determine

---

[491] Carlyle, *On Heroes*, 95.

which plays and parts were written by Shakespeare and in what order the plays and poems where written.[492] Long after the society disbanded, Furnivall expressed the hope that

> the method I have pursued is that of the man of science, comparisons, noting of differences and identities of expression, subject, character, mood, and temper of mind; and that this method and its results do bring a fresh element of certainty into the order of Shakspere's plays, and the groups into which they fall.[493]

Terence Hawkes describes the society as "the very model of Victorian scientism. Its central project was nothing less than Darwinian."[494] Furnivall's mathematical and analytical approach, a method championed by his colleague Frederick Fleay, focused on the numerical meter of the lines, the masculine and feminine endings, the recurrence of certain common words.[495]

The focus of Furnivall's and Fleay's analytical approach was the same as Carlyle's more emotional explanations, to find greater understanding of Shakespeare the poet, Shakespeare the man. In the end, it is the artist as man that Furnivall hopes to discover through the scientific dissection of his art. Despite criticism, Furnivall "refuse[d] to separate Shakspere the man from Shakspere the artist. He himself, his own nature and life, are in all his plays, to the man who has eyes, and chooses to look for him and them there."[496] By counting word occurrence and allusions in the plays, Furnivall hoped to tap into Shakespeare's subconscious and discover the secrets of his life. And to those scholars who

---

[492] Furnivall, *Shakespeare,* 60.

[493] Furnivall, *Shakespeare*, 149.

[494] Terence Hawkes, *Shakespeare in the Present* (London: Routledge, 2002),119.

[495] Furnivall, *Shakespeare*, 66. In ordering the plays chronologically, Furnivall looked to outside sources such as publication of plays and allusions to the plays from other sources. When that information was not available, Furnivall turned to "Evidence from Within, the Style and Temper of the works."

[496] Furnivall, *Shakespeare*, 159.

questioned this process, Furnivall responded, "Surely they forget that a poet *must* write what he learns from experience, that the types he portrays, the beauties he delights in, and his intellectual equipment for his task, depend always on the land and the era in which he lives."[497] Like Tieck and the Romantics, these Shakespeareans wanted more accurate information about Shakespeare and to know his art more fully in order to understand the artist.

Furnivall, with the help of Fleay and other members of the Society, created a list of the order in which they believed the plays had been written and by whom, taking into account that some plays were begun and finished at different times and that other plays possibly had several different hands in their creation. Through their scientific inquiry, they used lists and numbers and counting to impose a structure onto Shakespeare's body of work. The tables themselves are an impressive result of meticulous and time-consuming work, but Furnivall's next controversial step is a departure from the strictly analytical methods he had used so far. In Furnivall's refusal to separate 'Shakespeare the man from Shakespeare the artist,' he believed he could find the man in his art, not in the romantic sense of finding the emotional inner man, but instead Furnivall tried to map the actual events of Shakespeare's life by certain patterns in the plays. The scientific approach to the plays allowed Furnivall to divide Shakespeare's work into four periods, which he then mapped onto Shakespeare's personal life, suggesting that they "represent his own prevailing temper of mind, as man as well as artist, in the succeeding stages of his life."[498] This idea in itself is not revolutionary

---

[497] Furnivall, *Shakespeare*, 157.

[498] Furnivall, *Shakespeare*, 154.

and perhaps not controversial, but as Furnivall became more specific in his analysis, the

problems grew.

> Shakspere tells me, too, he's felt hell: and in his Othello, Macbeth, Lear, Coriolanus, Timon, I see the evidence of his having done so. … I see him grow in knowledge and experience of life from Period to Period, … fighting the deepest questions which puzzle the will, getting convinced of the sternness of the Moral Ruler of mankind, of the weakness of his own nature, of the suffering that sin brings. [499]

This idea echoes Carlyle's argument that Shakespeare must have felt sorrow to write the way

that he did, but Furnivall goes further by outlining when those sorrows came into

Shakespeare's life. Although some of these claims seem possible from Shakespeare's

biography, the extent to which Shakespeare was convinced of a 'Moral Ruler' or of his own

weakness certainly cannot be known simply through the study of his plays. Furnivall claims

to trace the progress and meaning of Shakespeare's mind,

> its passage from the fun and word-play, the lightness, the passion of the Comedies of Youth, through the patriotism (still with comedy of more meaning) of the Histories of Middle Age, to the great Tragedies dealing with the deepest questions of man in Later Life; and then at last to the poet's peaceful and quiet home-life again in Stratford, where he ends with his Prospero and Miranda, his Leontes finding again his wife and daughter in Hermione and Perdita; in whom we may fancy that the Stratford both of his early and late days lives again, and that the daughters he saw there, the sweet English maidens, the pleasant country scenes around him, passt [sic] as it were into his plays.[500]

It has of course been tempting for several generations of scholars to see an older, wiser

Shakespeare reflected in the magician Prospero as he breaks his staff and gives up his art,

and Furnivall thought that by his divisions of the plays and the development he traced of the

artist, he had provided enough evidence to suggest that this in fact might be the case.

---

[499] Furnivall, *Shakepseare*, 159.

[500] Furnivall, *Transactions,* vi.

Similar to Carlyle's defense of Shakespeare as a moral messenger of God, despite the unsavory moments in his plays, Furnivall also illustrates Shakespeare as a man who had endured sorrow and struggle during his life and came out better on the other side. But Furnivall does not excuse Shakespeare based on his life, but instead compares him to his contemporary playwrights. He argues that Shakespeare

> liked his cakes and ale, and took enjoyingly the pleasures sensuous and sexual that the fates provided. (It is absurd to try and make him out, in this regard, a Milton or a Wordsworth. The unneeded double-ententes, the broad jokes, in his early plays, his *Venus*, &c., show that he had the allowable enjoyment of his time in an amusing splash of dirt. But it is all wholesome coarseness; and he has far less of it than his dramatic contemporaries have.)"[501]

Once again, Furnivall examines Shakespeare within his own time period, which he argues reveals that Shakespeare, as a product of his own time, would have enjoyed the 'dirt' more than a Victorian would, but not more than was 'allowable' and certainly not more than the other, lesser playwrights.

In both Carlyle's and Furnivall's estimations of Shakespeare's character, they do not deny that Shakespeare included bawdy moments and base humor, but they felt it necessary to find a way to justify those moments while still holding Shakespeare to a higher standard. It is not difficult to make a comparison between this view of Shakespeare and the Christian Jesus, two men viewed as both human and divine, carriers of a divine spirit stuck within a human body. There were other admirers and writers during this period however who, while fervent students of Shakespeare, saw more beauty in the baseness than Carlyle and Furnivall, and argued that this baseness was indeed what made Shakespeare such a superior artist. Algernon Charles Swinburne was undeniably one of these, and I argue that, despite his treatment of the *Measure for Measure* text, so was Poel.

---

[501] Furnivall, *Shakespeare*, 164-5.

So far I have described examples of Victorian artists and culture elevating Shakespeare to teacher and prophet and giving him a place in the everyday events of people's lives. Carlyle and Furnivall recognized Shakespeare's faults but explained them away as the result of outside influences over which he had no control. Algernon Charles Swinburne, true to his Pre-Raphaelite connections and Ruskin's influence, took a different approach. Swinburne and his colleagues of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood were at the forefront of English artists supporting alternative representations of artists and the creation of art. In many cases their views directly opposed the mainstream sensibilities of morality and aesthetics, and for these reasons their work was both praised and berated. The importance to this argument of the Pre-Raphaelite approach to aesthetics and Shakespeare lies in its take on the Victorian concept of the grotesque.

The grotesque as a concept in Victorian England seems to have been as varied and malleable as the idea of legitimate drama. The term was used, not surprisingly, to describe Pre-Raphaelite art, but also some of Charles Dickens' characterizations.[502] Thomas Carlyle employed the term and was also described by it. It alternatively referenced German art and the industrial English middle-class.[503] The term was prevalent in Victorian criticism, but seems to have often been employed for convenience, without a rigorous understanding. On a basic level, however, the Victorian grotesque describes a thing or event in which the

---

[502]Colin Trodd, Paul Barlow, and David Amigoni, "Introduction: Uncovering the grotesque in Victorian culture," in *Victorian Culture and the Idea of the Grotesque* ed. Colin Trodd, Paul Barlow, and David Amigoni (Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1999), 10-12.

[503] Colin Trodd, et al., "Introduction," 8,13.

"presence is made alienating, or absurd. The grotesque is that which is aberrant in matter; that which is disordering; that which causes temporal and spatial agitation; that which is deformed or deforming."[504] Ruskin also theorizes the grotesque, but he takes it in a different direction. Since the Pre-Raphaelites, Swinburne, and Poel are the subject here, the grotesque as theorized by Ruskin is the version that will be most useful.

Ruskin's theories of the grotesque appear in his discussions on the architecture of Venice and in his voluminous work *Modern Painters*. In neither of these instances does he specifically focus on theatre, and rarely does he cite literature, but he uses Dante, and occasionally Shakespeare, to provide examples for his arguments. Ruskin apparently felt that the recognition of the grotesque in Shakespeare was not a new revelation – "Of the grotesque in our own Shakspeare I need hardly speak"[505] – nor did he feel the necessity of excusing it, since "it will be found, at all periods, in all minds of the first order."[506] Ruskin refers to Shakespeare on a few occasions in his discussion the grotesque, mostly as an example of the noble grotesque, for which Ruskin claims "in its highest forms there is an infinite tenderness, like that of the fool in Lear."[507] Ruskin's work was well-known and respected in his time, and so it is important to understand how his ideas could be translated onto Shakespeare by later artists of that period.

Ruskin claims several uses for the grotesque, but does not outline exactly what he means by the term. However, it carries with it a deeper philosophical and spiritual purpose

---

[504] Colin Trodd, "Culture and energy: Ford Madox Brown, Thomas Carlyl, and the Cromwellian grotesque," in *Victorian Culture and the Idea of the Grotesque*, ed. Colin Trodd, Paul Barlow, and David Amigoni (Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1999), 66.

[505] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 144.

[506] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 144.

[507] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 136.

than simply a description of deformity: "Thus there is a Divine beauty, and a terribleness of sublimity coequal with it in rank, which are the subjects of grotesque art."[508] The grotesque is as necessary to life as the beautiful, and in the same way can allow humans to see through what is visible to the greater truths underneath. The grotesque as described in *Stones of Venice* arises from play, which can be serious, mindful play, necessary play, or wasteful play. All grotesque deals with exaggerations, terror, imagination, and monstrosities, but depending on the type of play it arises from, it can be either noble or ignoble. The ignoble grotesque becomes "absurd without being fantastic, and monstrous without being terrible."[509] Far superior to this is the noble grotesque, which "is only employed by its master for good purposes, and to contrast with beauty,"[510] and which Ruskin deems a necessary and beneficial part of every society, every artistic era. In a way, Ruskin's artist of the grotesque is similar to Carlyle's sorrowful Shakespeare in that "the dreadfulness of the universe around [the artist] weighs upon his heart… and therefore through the whole of it we shall find the evidence of deep insight into nature. His beasts and birds, however monstrous, will have profound relations with the true."[511] The difference for Ruskin between the noble and ignoble grotesque is not the subject matter but its treatment. He argues that

> the master of the noble grotesque knows the depth of all at which he seems to mock,
> and would feel it at another time, or feels it in a certain undercurrent of thought even

---

[508] John Ruskin, "The Stones of Venice III" in *Selected Writings*, ed. Dinah Birch (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 67. For many Romantic artists, beauty, the sublime, and the grotesque are interconnected. The sublime, according to Edmund Burke, is "Whatever is fitted in any sort to excite the ideas of pain, and danger, that is to say, whatever is in any sort terrible, or is conversant about terrible objects, or operates in a manner analogous to terror." The sublime and the grotesque are explanations of the aesthetic appeal of 'ugliness' and the pleasure of terror. Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful*, edited by Adam Phillips (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 36.

[509] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 123.

[510] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 135.

[511] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 130.

while he jests with it; but the workman of the ignoble grotesque can feel and understand nothing, and mocks at all things with the laughter of the idiot and the cretin.[512]

Ruskin understands the grotesque to be always present, in strong and weak minds alike, but in order to dispel its harmful nature, artists and creators must be encouraged to develop it, "the minds of our workmen are full of [the grotesque], if we would only allow them to give it shape. They express it daily in gesture and gibe, but are not allowed to do so where it would be useful."[513] The cultivation of the grotesque is, however, wholly dependent on

the tone of the minds which have produced it, and in proportion to their knowledge, wit, love of truth, and kindness; secondly, according to the degree of strength they have been able to give forth; but yet, however much we may find in it needing to be forgiven, always delightful so long as it is the work of good and ordinarily intelligent men.[514]

Hence the importance of education, because the serious, religious man undertakes the correct amount of play and from this arises the noble grotesque. Shakespeare is an ideal producer of this noble grotesque. The bowdlerization of his work is for the benefit of the weaker minds that encounter him, those who cannot see into the depths of the grotesque, but instead become stuck in the surface reading. However, those artists and thinkers who encounter the full Shakespearean text, that experience all aspects of his art, can rely on Ruskin's theory of the noble grotesque to enter into Shakespeare's world. This difference between the noble and ignoble grotesque might help explain Poel's treatment of *Measure for Measure*. While some of the bawdy, 'monstrous' moments in the play might contribute nothing to the theatrical experience, it is possible that Poel felt that the morally terrifying questions at the

---

[512] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 128.

[513] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 148.

[514] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 120.

base of the play could in fact act like the noble grotesque, elevating both the artwork and its audience.

The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood and its associates, specifically Algernon Charles Swinburne, embraced Ruskin's ideas on the grotesque, and often on art in general. The response in *The Times* to Pre-Raphaelite exhibition works in 1852 betrays an uneasiness about their work, "referring to the 'grotesque illuminations of Mr. Millais and his friends'."[515]Although their critics were not always convinced of the 'noble' nature of their work, the Pre-Raphaelites posited themselves as an alternative (radical) artistic group that challenged academic ideas about the creation of art, and in the process questioned contemporary views of canonical artists.

The Grotesque, for Ruskin, was a necessary aspect of art, and understanding it meant "an understanding of the connection between art, ethics and the nation in nineteenth-century culture, for what the grotesque constitutes is a test of judgement whereby the choice is good or evil, truth or lie, and the reward is moral or sensual."[516] The presence of the grotesque in works by an artist like Shakespeare emphasizes the responsibility of the receiver, the audience, to recognize not only the presence of the grotesque elements, but also their purpose. Ruskin defended Swinburne on exactly this basis when his publication of *Poems and Ballads* was being lambasted by reviewers. According to Ruskin, the lack of success of the publication was not Swinburne's fault, but instead the public's, "who must learn to

---

[515] Colin Trodd, et al., "Introduction," 15.

[516] Lucy Hartley, "'Griffinism, grace and all': the riddle of the grotesque in John Ruskin's *Modern Painters*," in *Victorian Culture and the Idea of the Grotesque* eds. Colin Trodd, Paul Barlow, and David Amigoni (Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1999), 83.

interpret and apply his prophecies."[517] Ruskin, Swinburne, and the Pre-Raphaelites were not strangers to criticism, even ire, about the inappropriate, and perhaps 'grotesque,' elements of their art. While morality was important to some of the artists in their works, an important aspect of that morality was, again, truth to nature, which did not allow for moral caricatures. It was, perhaps, this acceptance of the whole human, of the flawed body, that attracted these artists to Shakespeare.

Swinburne was a critic, as well as a poet, and he, like many of the artists under discussion, greatly admired Shakespeare and his works. His devotion to Shakespeare may be for the simple, yet profound reason that he believed "Of good and evil, in all their subtlest and sublimest forms of thought and action and revelation, he knew more than ever it has been given to any other man to know."[518] Robert Sawyer however, suggests an ulterior motive. He terms Swinburne's criticism of Shakespeare in the work *A Study of Shakespeare* as "alternative-voiced discourse,"[519] through which, he argues, Swinburne attempts to use Shakespeare to support his own agenda. Sawyer suggests that Swinburne's criticism could be read through two lenses, "the larger audience who heard it simply as a championing of a new avant-garde movement in literature, and the minority group who heard, as we shall see, allusions to homoerotic desire."[520] Sawyer bases his interpretation of the text on knowledge of and comparisons to Swinburne's other writing. Swinburne's poetry, for instance, rejects Christian morality in favor of a pagan existence that often draws from elements of Ancient

---

[517] Judith Stoddart, "The Morality of *Poems and Ballads*: Swinburne and Ruskin," in *The Whole Music of Passion: New Essays on Swinburne*, eds. Rikky Rooksby and Nicholas Shrimpton (Aldershot, England: Sholar Press, 1993), 101.

[518] Algernon Charles Swinburne, *Shakespeare* (London: Oxford University Press, 1909), 6.

[519] Robert Sawyer, *Victorian Appropriations of Shakespeare* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson Press, 2003), 51.

[520] Sawyer, *Victorian Appropriations of Shakespeare*, 51.

Greece and Rome. Swinburne advocates a more decadent, body-centered lifestyle that many

of his Victorian readers condemned. One of those readers, the critic Robert Buchanan, could

not accept the subjects in the poetry of the Pre-Raphaelites and fingered Dante Gabriel

Rossetti, the movement's founder, and Algernon Charles Swinburne as the most immoral of

these. In describing their poetry he claims "I find decency outraged, history falsified, purity

sacrificed, art prostituted, language perverted, religion outraged, in one gibbering attempt to

apotheosize vice and demolish art with the implements of blasphemy and passion."[521]

Buchanan was only one of many who viewed Swinburne's poetic work as offensive, and

often it was because of the homoerotic undertones of many of his poems.

     With this knowledge, Sawyer analyzes Swinburne's literary criticism work as an

extension of the themes found in his poetry. Sawyer argues that in his section on *King Lear*,

Swinburne "inverts traditional readings of the play by promoting agnosticism over

Christianity, aestheticism over morality."[522] But the section that seems to stand out the most

to both Sawyer and the book reviewers is Swinburne's section on the character Falstaff in the

two plays of *Henry IV.* Falstaff has historically been a controversial character for critics to

analyze. Swinburne engages with that criticism and sets about to defend Falstaff from

accusations of being a worthless character. In the play, Falstaff appears to be cowardly, a

drunkard, and an abuser of other people's generosity. Swinburne argues, however, that these

qualities in fact make Falstaff the ideal comic character, greater than Rabelais's Panurge and

Cervantes' Sancho, two other characters of the same type as Falstaff, and who often are

associated with the grotesque. In conclusion of this argument, Swinburne states "'And now

---

[521] Robert Buchanan, *The Fleshly School of Poetry* (New York: Garland, 1986) 68.

[522] Sawyer, *Victorian Appropriations of Shakespeare,* 50.

abideth Rabelais, Cervantes, Shakespeare, these three; but the greatest of these is Shakespeare.'"[523] This statement in itself carries significant weight in the Victorian context because it compares Carlyle's hero-poet to other writers of grotesque humor. Sawyer takes the analysis even further though by claiming that "Swinburne's criticism seems to champion the homoerotic view of Falstaff, one that most critics ignore, and a critique that could only speak its name one hundred years after the publication of *A Study of Shakespeare*."[524] In the underlying layers of Swinburne's criticism, the hero-genius Shakespeare not only is the creator of grotesque clown characters, but also is displaying homoerotic relationships. Sawyer argues that Swinburne is using Shakespeare to gain "cultural currency to promote his own radical agenda."[525] Many reviewers of Swinburne's work seem to miss or simply ignore the connections Swinburne is making in his study. Either Swinburne's message was veiled enough not to arouse suspicion except in those who were already in tune to his message, or the difficulties in engaging with these controversial topics was too great for the reviewers to attempt.

In his criticism of Shakespeare, Swinburne did not dismiss or explain away bawdy moments of Shakespeare's plays, but instead embraced them. In terms of Ruskin's noble grotesque, the uncomfortable, dark elements of Shakespeare's plays exposed their greater humanity and elevated the whole. For Swinburne, whose own art and life contained aspects unacceptable to high Victorian morality, such as homoeroticism and sadomasochism, championing Shakespeare, an accepted national icon, as a poet of human nature could work

---

[523] Algernon Charles Swinburne, *A Study of Shakespeare* (New York: AMS Press Inc., 1965), 109. Here Swinburne is mischievously referencing 1 Corinthians 13:13, "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity."

[524] Sawyer, *Victorian Appropriations of Shakespeare*, 74.

[525] Sawyer, *Victorian Appropriations of Shakespeare*, 55.

to elevate Swinburne's own reputation. Sawyer claims, as do other reviewers, that in *A Study of Shakespeare* "we learn as much about Swinburne as we do about Shakespeare."[526]

Perhaps it is because of the personal nature of Swinburne's criticism of Shakespeare, or simply because Shakespeare had become an important commodity to the Victorians, that Swinburne and Furnivall, whose approaches to Shakespeare were so vastly different, fell into a nasty and public feud. The fight, which centered on Furnivall's meticulous, almost scientific study of Shakespeare's plays versus Swinburne's focus on the emotional and human characteristics, was symbolic of a larger tension in society between scientific empiricism and instinctive, natural feeling. Swinburne most directly opposed the New Shakspere Society in the introduction of his book *A Study of Shakespeare*, published in 1880. In this section he sets up the purpose of his book in direct opposition to the aims of the New Shakspere Society, claiming that "it is impossible to fix or decide by inner or outer evidence the precise order of production, much less of composition, which critics of the present or the past may have set their wits to verify in vain."[527] Swinburne does agree, however, that Shakespeare's plays can be divided into "classes which may serve us to distinguish and determine as by landmarks the several stages or periods of his mind and art"[528] and these "certain demonstrable truths as to the progress and development of style, the outer and the inner changes of manner as of matter, of method as of design"[529] are the aim of Swinburne's work.

---

[526] Sawyer, *Victorian Appropriations of Shakespeare*, 76.

[527] Swinburne, *Study of Shakespeare*, 14.

[528] Swinburne, *Study of Shakespeare,* 14.

[529] Swinburne, *Study of Shakespeare*, 13.

In the same way that Furnivall's approach to the Shakespeare text stems from his scientific background and influences of new scientific discoveries, Swinburne's approach to the poetic text reflects his background relationships with members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. The view of Pre-Raphaelite artists on Shakespeare as well as Swinburne's own personal discussions of the poet help to explain the bitterness of this fight, which moved beyond name-calling to serious accusations of ignorance and scholarly worthlessness. Furnivall felt he could discover Shakespeare the man through the analysis of his poetry. For Swinburne, the stakes were higher, and a mundane counting method would not suffice. For Swinburne, the best poets were giants or gods, and Shakespeare belonged in the latter category. The giants were talented poets, but because they set out rationally to be poets, they "have placed the limits of human reason on their work" as opposed to the poets who are gods, and become poets not by choice but by necessity, so that "they are co-creators with nature of their own poetic beings or essences."[530] Therefore the poetry from god poets like Shakespeare contributed to the world something beyond human knowledge, something in a way divine. Even had Swinburne agreed, which he did not, that the life of Shakespeare could be revealed through his poetry, it would not have mattered. Swinburne's attempt to outline general categories of progression for Shakespeare's plays, as opposed to a specific order and date for each one, was for the purpose not of "the literal but the spiritual order… the periods which I seek to define belong not to chronology but to art."[531] It is not the man, but the craft

---

[530] Thomas E. Connolly, *Swinburne's Theory of Poetry* (New York: State University of New York, 1964), 31.

[531] Swinburne, *Study of Shakespeare*, 16.

that is important; not the life but the spiritual revelation.[532] David G. Riede suggests that

Swinburne takes his theory of poetry so far as to believe that there is in fact a church of poets

that pass down a "cosmic Apollonian song,"[533] and that by attaching himself to these poets,

he appropriates their authority for his own work. As Riede describes it, Swinburne tried to

establish "an apostolic succession of poet-priests and a canonical body of texts for his

'church of rebels.'"[534] It seems, based on the outlook of the two scholars, that Swinburne

believed Furnivall was missing the point. Swinburne refers to the New Shakspere Society as

"the most pestilent swarm of parasites that ever yet settled on the name and text of

Shakespeare,"[535] a description that indicates more of an annoyance than an actual legitimate

opposing force. If one considers that Swinburne felt like his Shakespeare criticism was equal

to working within a scholarly religious context, his overzealous and demeaning response to

the mundane peskiness of the New Shakspere Society's work seems less outrageous.

In this argument with Furnivall, Swinburne was not only fighting *for* his belief in the

transcendent nature of Shakespeare's poetry, but also *against* the increasing trend of science

and industry that so worried the Pre-Raphaelites. I have already discussed Ruskin's fear of

industry and mentioned that same distrust as an essential aspect of Pre-Raphaelite thought.

Furnivall's approach to a Shakespearean text removes all emotion, all spirituality from the

poetry, relegating it to a mundane, mortal status. His arithmetic and empirical approach to

---

[532] Of course in all of this discussion of gods and the spiritual, nothing Christian is here implied. Swinburne was notorious for his anti-Christian, medieval pagan tendencies. These, along with his "obscene" poetry caused trouble for him with critics and other artists.

[533] David G. Riede "Swinburne and Romantic Authority," in *The Whole Music of Passion: New Essays on Swinburne*, eds. Rikki Rooksby and Nicholas Shrimpton (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1993), 29.

[534] Riede, "Swinburne and Romantic Authority," 29.

[535] Algernon Charles Swinburne, *Letters*, ed. Cecil Y. Lang, vol. 3 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), 162.

the material makes an equation out of the poetry, and the point of an equation is that it can be reproduced to reveal the same results by anyone who applies it properly. Shakespeare becomes then, not a purveyor of transcendental truth, but a mathematician. The industry and empiricism of the New Shakspere Society's methods are, in a romanticist view, destroying Shakespeare.

The proliferation of the Victorian hero image of Shakespeare could only exist so long before inviting criticism and new ways of approaching the playwright and his works. Although others were problematizing the Shakespeare image, Swinburne and Poel stand out for their solution which, instead of trying to understand Shakespeare through a nineteenth century English perspective, looks at his writing and productions in his own terms, with a specific goal of contextualizing the work and understanding it through what might have been Shakespeare's sixteenth century worldview. At the same time, however, both Swinburne and Poel were trying to bring some element of that historical moment into the present time. For Swinburne, this may have been homoeroticism, but certainly was a greater acceptance of the range of human emotions. For Poel, it was the relationship of the audience to the poet and to the work of art itself.

Poel, Shakespeare, and the Grotesque

I have spent the time in this chapter discussing several different representations and constructions of Shakespeare in order to suggest the discourse that Poel may have encountered as he was developing his ideas of Shakespeare in performance. On one side, Shakespeare was a model citizen, a hero, an ideal Englishman; on the other, Shakespeare was a poet of nature who had experienced sorrow and terror and therefore could not keep those

out of his work. On one hand, Shakespeare sacrificed the goodness of his soul to cater to the

taste of the Globe audience; on the other, Shakespeare exposed his audience to the noble

grotesque in order to deepen their experience of life. Shakespeare is as much a hero to one

man as an enabler of homoerotic tendencies to another. While other scholars of Poel's work

may overlook these intricacies, I instead see them reflected in the decisions of Poel's

theatrical productions. Poel was familiar with Ruskin's criticism, he was good friends with

Swinburne and acquainted with other Pre-Raphaelite artists who knew Carlyle's work. He

was also a contributor to Furnivall's New Shakspere Society and seemed to respect his

work.[536] He wrote admiringly of the diverse theatre audience in Shakespeare's day and in

support of returning to the original text, but he also in practice edited the text to fit more into

his idea of Victorian sensibilities. Poel is a point of convergence of all of these events, and

his work is a manifestation of his synthesis of them. His desire to perform on a

Shakespearean stage in an 'authentic' Elizabethan way was not simply a desire to return to

antiquity, nor was it only a radical new way to create theatre. Instead it was a tense

negotiation between the stabilizing, prophetic image of Shakespeare necessary to the

education of a Victorian member of the English nation and the destabilizing, questioning soul

of an artist that challenges the values important to the human as a member of the spiritual,

natural world.

Recent scholars on Poel and his work have begun to look further than the simple

revivalist aspects of his Elizabethan productions, and instead examine them based on the

---

[536] *Frederick James Furnivall: A Volume of Personal Record* (London: Oxford University Press, 1911), 144.
Although Poel admitted that Furnivall "was not altogether in sympathy with my notions about Shaksperian
representation," he did admit that Furnivall was "'The Master' whom I [Poel] revered and loved."

"new Edwardian radicalism."[537] Cary Mazer and Joe Falocco argue for Poel's political

position as a radical based on this opposition to "a Liberal, positivist ideology, which saw all

technological and scientific advancement as inherently good."[538] Tied in with this is the idea,

as Mazer describes it, that "man is as much shaped by his institutions as he shapes them, and

that these institutions are therefore neither sacrosanct nor permanent, but valuable only to the

extent that they are utile."[539] Therefore, Poel's motivations for the Elizabethan stage are not

simply based on antiquarian interest, but instead based in the belief that the contemporary

stage can no longer support the needs of society. Poel's theory for a new Victorian

Elizabethan stage stems from three premises: 1. Shakespeare is necessary to English society.

2. The current theatre system destroys the potential of Shakespeare's work by altering the

original text and debasing the role of the human in the theatrical structure. 3. Because

Shakespeare was creating art for his own time, reviving those production techniques can lead

to a fuller understanding of the essence of Shakespeare's plays, and therefore to a more direct

relationship with the genius and nature contained therein. Each of these premises has a direct

relationship to the phenomena so far outlined in this chapter, and I will discuss each of these

in turn now.

(1) Although it seems evident by Poel's life-long work on Shakespeare and his

steadfastness to his often controversial ideas of performance that he felt Shakespeare was

important to his society and his time, he rarely says why he was so devoted. It is as if he has

already taken for granted that Shakespeare is, of course, a necessary part of English life, and

---

[537] Cary Mazer, *Shakespeare Refashioned: Elizabethan Plays on Edwardian Stages* (Ann Arbor: UM Research Press, 1981), 55.

[538] Falocco, *Reimagining Shakespeare's Playhouse,* 15.

[539] Mazer, *Shakespeare Refashioned*, 55.

his mission is not to prove that but instead to improve the way in which his contemporaries receive Shakespeare. Poel wrote plenty about what he felt was wrong with his contemporary theatre, and his work with the Elizabethan Stage Society attempted to combat those problems, but pronouncements of Poel's love for Shakespeare, independent of his ideas for an Elizabethan stage, are few and far between.

One must assume then that Poel's devotion to performing Shakespeare in an Elizabethan manner in an attempt to reform English theatre amounts to a certain level of believing Shakespeare is important to the English stage. Later in his career, Poel worked to help establish both a National Theatre and a Shakespeare Memorial, two separate projects which eventually were condensed into one, the idea being to establish "a National Theatre as a memorial to Shakespeare."[540] Poel is happy with this idea on the surface, but less so with how the theatre is to be governed. A standing committee would oversee all operations, but they would appoint a single director to make the everyday decisions. Like the actor-managers of the large theatres with which Poel was competing, "all the direction of what is vital to the dignity and permanency of the institution is put under the control of one man, when no single person can possibly have the knowledge and experience to cover so large a variety of work."[541] This runs counter to Poel's idea of a National Theatre, which he models on an idealistic Elizabethan theatre, in which a "unique coterie of playgoers, consisting of playwrights, philosophers, courtiers, citizens and peasants"[542] all attended, and influenced, the theatre together.

---

[540] Poel, *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, 232.

[541] Poel, *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, 238.

[542] Poel, *What is Wrong with the Stage*, 5.

(2) Poel was very critical not only of the current state of Shakespearean performance, but also of the state of English theatre as a whole. In his essay "What is Wrong with the Stage," he outlines several problems with the current state of theatre that echo other criticisms of the time as well as the thoughts of some of the artists so far discussed in this chapter. Themes in these criticisms include the degradation of theatrical material aimed at pleasing a common audience, the elevation of industry over art, and the specific destruction of Shakespeare due to star culture and unquestioned theatrical tradition. Poel enters the debate about legitimate theatre and music hall culture, but does not find any good in either. As a "high-minded Victorian,"[543] one might anticipate that Poel's thought that "the Music-Halls were largely responsible for keeping the working-class in a perpetual state of squalid wretchedness,"[544] but his opinion of the patent houses Drury Lane and Covent Garden might be more unexpected. He viewed them as making "a miserable struggle for popularity" which led to the production of "a succession of the most extravagant spectacles which, with false glare, misled and debauched the public taste."[545] Although Poel congratulates Shakespeare's audience for contributing to that golden age of theatre,[546] Poel does not condemn the modern audience for the faults of the theatre houses. Instead, he suggests that the modern audience "is in absolute ignorance as to the danger to itself of the present theatre system which regards the moral and educational needs of the playgoer as an entirely negligible quantity."[547] It is quite clear here that Poel does not view his current theatre system, or indeed Shakespeare's

---

[543] Speaight, *William Poel*, 90.

[544] Poel, *What is Wrong with the Stage*, 9.

[545] Poel, *What is Wrong with the Stage*, 7.

[546] Poel, *What is Wrong with the Stage,* 5.

[547] Poel, *What is Wrong with the Stage,* 9.

theatre system, as simply for entertainment, but indeed attaches to it a moral and educational role. This accounts at least in part for the changes he made to Shakespeare's plays, including *Measure for Measure* discussed earlier in this chapter.

Another aspect of the second premise of Poel's work is the fear of debasing the human as part of the theatrical process. Tied in with this is Poel's Pre-Raphaelite fear of industry, a term which takes on two different meanings in this discussion. The first is industry as a commercial, production/consumption endeavor, and the second is industry as in mechanizing the processes and events occurring on the stage. Poel, as a "twentieth century heir to Pre-Raphaelitism,"[548] witnessed with anxiety the changes occurring to England as an industrialized society, and those changes seem to have been reflected inside of the theatre. Russell Jackson describes nineteenth century British theatre as "almost exclusively commercial and … central to popular culture and to what may be called the entertainment industry of an urban industrial society."[549] Poel saw his theatrical era as the bottom of a long descent, accounting for the present position of theatre at

> its lowest level on record. The reason is not far to seek. The public has for so long seen theatrical amusements carried on as an industry, instead of as an art, that the disadvantage of applying commercialism to creative work escapes comment, as it were, by right of custom.[550]

The commercialism of the theatre, that is, the catering to the lowest common denominator and the "star" system, which had started by encouraging altered plays to highlight talents like Garrick and Sarah Siddons,[551] was in part responsible for the disappointing state of late-

---

[548] Falocco, *Reimaging Shakespeare's Playhouse*, 3.

[549] Jackson, *Victorian Theatre*, 1.

[550] Poel, *What is Wrong with the Stage*, 9.

[551] Poel, *What is Wrong with the Stage*, 7.

nineteenth century English theatre. Poel sees the entire theatre system as a type of conspiracy because, as he argues, "those in possession of our theatres do not need good plays or good acting, for such would assuredly oust the worser quality of work from the market and the men who were responsible for producing it."[552] In this commercial view of the theatre system as a market, Poel suggests an unspoken agreement that no theatre create anything that might shed a light on how unsatisfactory the entire system is.

Poel was also concerned with industry in terms of replacing the realistic, human experience with a mechanized, artificial one. One of Poel's arguments for Elizabethan practices was the inherent realism of its performance, by which of course he does not mean an Ibsenian realism but instead a focus on the human event on stage. He blames the theatre design for the devaluation of the actor. In an article from 1916, Poel describes this problem: "'When you have a frame such as that formed by the proscenium arch … you must have a picture to put behind it. And realism is not possible on the pictorial stage where, instead of scenery serving as background to the actors, the actors are background to the scenery.'"[553] In his book *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, Poel quotes Addington Symonds, who describes a similar concept: "'[Elizabethan staging] acquired a special kind of realism which the vast distances and manifold artifices of our modern theatres have rendered unattainable. This was the realism of an actual event, at which the audience assisted; not the realism of a scene in which the actor plays a somewhat subordinate part.'"[554] Despite the great efforts to which designers of this age went to construct realistic, and often meticulously historically accurate

---

[552] Poel, *What is Wrong with the Stage*, 11.

[553] "First Purely Elizabethan Production in U.S.," The New York Times, December 31, 1916.

[554] Poel, *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, 9.

sets and costumes, Poel did not find any truth in the productions, but instead saw the human being subordinated to the mechanization of the stage.

Poel's concern about the actor led to his disagreement with Edward Gordon Craig about scenography and the theatrical experience, and Ruskin seems to be everywhere in Poel's arguments. Poel compares Craig to Turner, the artist who inspired Ruskin's *Modern Painters*, faulting Craig not for his artistic ability but instead for a focus that is inappropriate for theatre. Whereas Poel's concept of the Elizabethan theatre is to bring the audience into a tangible world existing in the moment, Craig's "passion is for airy landscape, unsullied by the presence of the concrete; and Turner's palaces, boats and men seem shadowy things beside the splendor of Turner's sunshine."[555] Poel continues with his argument that "the central interest of drama is human, and it is necessary that the figures on the stage should appear larger than the background, or let the readers of Shakespeare remain at home."[556] Character interpretation and the human endeavor are central to the performance of Shakespeare on the stage, but Poel concludes "there is no room for man in Mr. Craig's world."[557]

Poel's claims for the importance of man in the theatre system echoes the arguments for the human touch that Ruskin makes in his discussion of architecture in "The Stones of Venice." In his section on 'The Gothic', Ruskin argues that although current technologies allow for precision and perfection in creating buildings, the evidence of human thought and artistry that is so prevalent in gothic structures is lost. Ruskin does not bemoan the end

---

[555] Poel, *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, 223.

[556] Poel, *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, 223.

[557] Poel, *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, 223.

product of mechanically manufactured buildings, but instead he regrets the process that is lost when human thought is taken out of the creation. He provides the following as an example:

> You can teach a man to draw a straight line, and to cut one;…but if you ask him to think about any of those forms, to consider if he cannot find any better in his own head, he stops; his execution becomes hesitating; he thinks, and ten to one he thinks wrong; ten to one he makes a mistake in the first touch he gives to his work as a thinking being. But you have made a man of him for all that. He was only a machine before, an animated tool.[558]

For Ruskin, beauty exists in imperfection because he can see the human touch and human thought in the end result. Ruskin pleads with his readers to "rather choose rough work than smooth work."[559] The alternative, "refinement of execution," is, for Ruskin, "slaves' work."[560] The elevation of the human as artist then is not simply an aesthetic matter but speaks to the freedom of the soul.

(3) The final premise from which Poel was working was the idea Elizabethan practices would lead to a fuller understanding of Shakespeare which would bring the audience closer to the poet as man and to his grasp of nature. Poel made it clear that he did not believe the current state of theatre could elucidate anything about Shakespeare as he was, and in the same way the Victorian tendency to relate to Shakespeare as if he were one of their contemporaries only made Shakespeare seem like an inadequate playwright. Again, he turns to Ruskin for guidance:

> To those dilettante writers who believe that a poet's greatness consists in his power of emancipating himself from the limitations of time and space, it must sound something like impiety to describe Shakespeare's plays as in most cases compositions hastily

---

[558] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 40.

[559] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 46.

[560] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 46.

written to fulfil the requirements of the moment and adapted to the wants of his theatre and the capabilities of his actors. But to persons of Mr. Ruskin's opinion this modified aspect should seem neither astonishing nor distressing; for they know that 'it is a constant law that the greatest poets and historians live entirely in their own age, and the greatest fruits of their work are gathered out of their own age.[561]

Poel's mission, and the mission of the English Stage Society was, as has already been described, to recreate Shakespeare's plays as close to the first conditions as possible, to take the plays out of the Victorian theatre and a nineteenth century context to try to understand them in their own time, which follows Ruskin's suggestion. Elizabethan practices would provide a modern audience access to an early modern experience which should help them delve deeper into the 'original' meaning of Shakespeare's plays. However, the extent to which Poel was concerned about complete historical accuracy has been controversial amongst Poel scholars. Early discussions of Poel often refer to him as 'antiquarian,' and indeed some aspects of his production practices seem that way. As Falocco argues, however, Poel was not simply interested in reproducing a historical event, but instead he "was more concerned with his work's impact on contemporary audiences than with how well his productions reproduced early modern practices."[562] As the different perceptions of Poel might suggest, he was a difficult artist to pin down in terms of his theoretical perspective. He spoke about returning to Elizabethan production practices, changing the speaking patterns of his actors to be both more rhythmical and faster paced, and using Shakespeare's original text, but either the way he attempted these changes or his inability to do so, depending on the situation, caused problems not only with his contemporary critics but with later scholars of his work.

---

[561] Poel, *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, 5.

[562] Falocco, *Reimagining Shakespeare's Playhouse*, 8.

Poel was of course known in his time for this Elizabethan experiments, and he received mixed but mostly positive reviews for the attempts. Some of Poel's 'innovations,' however, left critics confused by their contradictory nature. The first is that, in order to create the Elizabethan experience more fully, Poel hired actors and actresses and dressed them in Elizabethan costumes who sat on the stage during performance of *Measure for Measure*, as it is conjectured some patrons might have in Shakespeare's day. His choice to use actors instead of actual audience members, however, was problematic in that it could detract from the experience of the audience. Another claim Poel made was to the original Shakespeare text, but as has already been discussed, Poel was just as guilty of cuts and amendments to the text as the eighteenth century artists who came before him. He was aware, however, of the textual uncertainty that surrounds Shakespeare's work and therefore appears to have felt more leniency when dealing with the text. He presented the First Quarto text of *Hamlet* in 1881 and suggested more than once that if cuts were to be made to the text, they should be done by a committee of scholars and some practitioners.[563]

Another aspect of Elizabethan staging that today has caused discussion, if not controversy, is the use of all male casts. This Poel did not do, but instead he was fond of using all female casts. Poel felt the female voice was more suited to speaking Shakespeare's text than a male one, but there was more to it. In one of his Monthly Letters, a series of pamphlets he wrote on the theatre, he discusses his penchant for female actors in terms not of theatrical ability, but instead national characteristics:

> … on the English stage girls are needed to act the boy lovers; for here young men fail lamentably. There never has been a good Romeo on the English stage in the sense that the French and Italian stages are famous for their male impersonators of lovers. In the Englishman the necessary quality of voice is wanting to give physical

---

[563] Poel, *Shakespeare in the Theatre*, 175.

expression to words of love. In real life his lovemaking is comic and hopelessly unromantic because unemotional. But there are no similar drawbacks in the Englishwoman, whose voice is / capable of expressing delicate feeling, while at the same time it is flexible enough to delineate passion, and to indicate the masculine traits of emotion.[564]

Poel did not deny, however, that some of his practices were not only unorthodox but also not very Elizabethan. However, despite his initial hopes of Elizabethan authenticity, Poel seems to have softened on some of his original aims for the Elizabethan Stage Society. Poel's idiosyncrasies in performance have confused scholars and in a way discredited the authenticity of Poel's mission, but if Poel is understood as part of the larger discourse on art, theatre, and society of which he was a part, I argue that his apparent confusion mimics the uncertainty of English artists as they moved into the modern period, and that his resulting position is the product of a new negotiation of the artist and his place in society.

And finally, I would like to return to the question of why Poel chose *Measure for Measure* as the play for Poel's first chance to perform in a space made to look like an Elizabethan theatre. Poel's own ideas about Shakespeare in performance, as shown above, are often contradictory and confused, which seems to follow his response to the larger cultural and social issues of his day, and I think plays prominently into his production of *Measure for Measure*. The grotesque as a concept was prevalent in the artists Poel knew, and had already often been associated with Shakespeare's work. Poel's claims to authenticity of text and performance, and his reference to Ruskin's ideas of historicism, lead me to believe that Poel understood the use of the grotesque in Shakespeare. His friendship with Swinburne surely would have been hard-pressed to survive if Poel approached Swinburne's work in the same way he approached the text of *Measure for Measure*, which leads me to believe that it was not the themes of the play that Poel found problematic, but

---

[564] William Poel, *Monthly Letters*, 28-29.

instead some of the specific language used. At the same time, however, Poel contributed to Furnivall's society, which seemed determined to remove all emotion from the plays and instead focus on charts and tables. One cannot find the sublime and the grotesque in charts and tables. All of this comes together to suggest that Poel was a confused artist, torn between his Pre-Raphaelite upbringing and a more utilitarian approach, distanced from the emotion of the piece. The choice of *Measure for Measure* for Poel's Elizabethan stage production then perhaps is a nod to the grotesque, to the subversive art Poel had been exposed to by his friendship with Swinburne and his reading of Ruskin. His treatment of the text, however, shows a hesitancy to follow through. But perhaps as with Swinburne's treatment of Shakespeare, one can read an 'alternative-voice discourse' in Poel's production and, in doing so, catch a glimpse of the Romantic behind the antiquarian veil.

Manipulation of Time – Poel

I have described manipulations of time in the work of the Nazarenes, the Pre-Raphaelites, and Tieck, and have shown that in some of their works, and in Tieck's case, his idea which was never quite realized, their relationship to historical time resulted in the same attempts to suggest changes to contemporary time in order to improve the future. Poel, who completed more fully than Tieck did his Elizabethan stage reconstruction, provided the same opportunity for his audience.

I have described above the trend towards historicism in nineteenth century productions of Shakespeare, but the works of Planché, Kean, and Tree did not require the audience to take part in the moment. The structure of the theatrical event was familiar to the audience, and only on the surface, costumes and set pieces, would it perhaps seem different.

But there was nothing jarring, nothing strange to pull the audience out of their contemporary moment. Poel, however, changed the structure of both the theatre and the event. Like Tieck, his historical setting was both in the play and in the method of staging. The element of strangeness in his production was the way in which he presented the play and the new responsibility of the audience to be a part of the creation. J.L. Styan describes this phenomenon in the following way:

> Careless of time and place, the audience concentrated upon the persons of the play and what they did; there was a single place, which was 'here', and a single time, which was 'now'. Continuity of playing not merely restored the text, but it also restored the authentic experience of a play's form, and allowed the non-illusory mode of the drama to re-assert its control over the audience's self-awareness of its role.[565]

This is Tieck's elicited contribution from the audience. This is Overbeck's requirement that his viewer enter the enclosure of his painting's frame. This is Hunt's request that his viewer make the decision between Claudio's death and Isabella's virtue. Poel is asking his audience members to enter the theatrical moment, to be aware of their existence as a creative being and to acknowledge that existence in others. Although the content of the production, the play being produced, might raise its own set of questions, Poel's overall contemporary issue raised by his understanding of Elizabethan practices is about the place of the human in the industry of theatre, as well as in the industry of society. Poel's choice of the Elizabethan theatre, versus for instance Craig's scenography, respects the individual and asks for human contribution, regardless of faults and flaws. The danger of industry and the loss of respect for the intricacies of human emotion are the contemporary issues to be challenged in the neutral space created in Poel's theatre.

---

[565] Styan, *The Shakespeare Revolution*, 51.

Conclusion

The artists in this study are unique not only in the fact that they existed in a liminal time when the old was not quite gone and the new only just visible, but also in their self-awareness that this was the nature of their contemporary time. Tieck and the Nazarenes were witnessing the destruction of the Holy Roman Empire, an institution that suggested medieval structure, and the beginnings of a possible united German political nation, though no one could yet foresee what shape it might take. Poel and the Pre-Raphaelites witnessed the increasing mechanization and industrialization of not only society but also of art. The days of hand-made objects, unique products from a well-trained artisan, and respect for an individual's abilities were being overshadowed by the efficiency and predictability of machines, or at least by a change in manufacturing that used humans like machines.

The direction in which both the German and English people were moving was unsettling for these artists, and none of them seemed to be able to reconcile their own beliefs with their current state of being. Romanticism as a movement describes their guiding principles, even for the English artists who technically came after the Romantic period. The idealism and historicism of Romantic thought caused Tieck, Poel, and the painters to look back in time to find inspiration and to suggest ways in which they might improve their current, unsatisfactory situation. These artists were unique however in that they sought not only to imitate the artistic product, but also the artistic procedure. True to organic theories of art, they were not only interested in being but also in becoming. This aspect of their method elevates their artwork from being simply imitative to instead being transformative and radical in its time. They were not working out of simply antiquarian interest, but instead desired to

rekindle the fire that burnt within the soul of past artists, artists who somehow had access to the inner truth of humans and nature.

Shakespeare's status as a revered Romantic artist made him a popular choice among Romantic artists, including Tieck and Poel. The wide range of characters in his plays, the spectrum of human emotions shown, and his truth to both the good and bad of human nature appealed to both Tieck and Poel, since those elements were lacking in their societies. I have argued that Tieck used Shakespeare and the Elizabethan stage to suggest a possible future of united Germans to his audience. In a similar way, Poel used Shakespeare and Elizabethan performance to encourage his audience to see and appreciate the human being as a complete, but beautifully imperfect creature. Although both of these men seem to have admired Shakespeare independent of their work with Elizabethan practices, the nature of the Elizabethan stage allowed them to combat the problems with their contemporary theatre. It was the close nature between the performers and the audience, as well as the range of emotion and human characters in the plays that allowed Tieck and Poel to create a new theatrical experience for their audience, one that brought them into the event and gave them something familiar from their own lives and experiences to latch on to.

The Nazarenes and Pre-Raphaelites help to elucidate the cultural poetics at work in the societies of these artists. In the epilogues at the end of each chapter, I suggested that Tieck and Poel's mission could be more clearly understood in comparison to the work of the Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites. All of these groups fought against the status quo, believed in Romantic principles, and hoped their art could lead to a change in society and a better future. They all did this by locating their art in an undefined past time, which by some element of strangeness drew the audience into the moment, and then allowed the audience

member to collaborate on solutions for the future based on his or her own experience and ideas. While these artists most likely were not aware of the similarity of their work, the same social energies coursing through their societies brought them to the same places. Tieck's and Poel's productions and work on Elizabethan theatre then can be understood as something more than just important to Shakespearean performance history. Viewing them as artists with a similar mission and methods to the Nazarenes and Pre-Raphaelites adds significance to their work in their own time period, and helps modern day scholars to understand the relationship of these artists to their own society. In the face of irreversible change, Tieck, the Nazarenes, the Pre-Raphaelites, and Poel used their art to make a final stand against modernity, a final plea for nature and the natural human being, and a final push for the elevation of art in society.

Appendix 1: Translated Selection from Tieck's *Der junge Tischlermeister*

He was very surprised, that Emmrich approached him immediately with the suggestion to rearrange the theatre and to put it in the full length of the hall, instead of what it takes now, half of the oblong room. "We gain the advantage," said the Professor, "that all of the audience members sit much closer to us, and that we get a much wider proscenium. The depth of the stage of course is lost through this, but it is the depth also that annoys me at other theatres and that makes acting endlessly more difficult for good actors. Goethe said once in *Meister*, one would wish the players would move on the narrow strip of a line. Certainly they come significantly closer to the goal if we get rid of the useless depth of our stage. Of course then the talk cannot be about the unsuccessful coronation train that marches around the entire rectangle of the stage, in order to crawl in the low portal of a powerful cathedral in the background. Those sorts of trains, if they then should be them, must proceed in front of the first or second flats in profile to the opposite opening, and only in this way can it with reason and a sense of art happen; as we also, when we have the choice, rent those windows, which a real parade or procession in this way passes by.

With the help of the workers, the parts of the stage were immediately pushed together so that they occupied the space, which Emmrich had intended.

"We have on this occasion also the advantage," said the Professor, "that we use the door in the middle, which leads out the hall into the Cabinet there, and can furnish the dressing rooms behind the stage; exits are right and left as well, so that the whole theatre can comfortably be used for the performance." Hereupon he handed a drawing to the attentive Leonard, on which in the middle of the stage, only a few feet from the last line of the proscenium, two columns should be erected, which at ten feet height should carry a sizable,

wide balcony. The pillars stood on three wide steps, which narrowed the depth of the proscenium even more.

"You see," said Emmrich, "how my efforts seek to push all the players in the foreground close to the spectators. These three steps lead up to an inner small stage, which at times is concealed by a curtain, sometimes it is open; it provides an opportunity for a field, a cave, or in front of a room; in our play it is first a room, where the drunkards make noise, and later the pergola, in which the teasers listen in on Malvolio's great monologue. The upper balcony we do not need in our comedy, even though it was indispensable to Shakespeare and his contemporaries; quite wide steps lead up to it left and right. On these sat the advising committees and Parliaments, and with even a few figures the stage appeared almost full, because the room was limited left and right, and one could imagine the extended benches.

On the steps in front and on the sides fall the dying and are naturally much more picturesque than on our theatre; and the melancholy ones and the brooding ones lean against the free pillars; Macbeth uses the steps right or left, as well as Falstaff in the Merry Wives; on the upper balcony stood the bourgeoisie and discussed with King John and Philipp August; here below, elevated by the steps, sat the King and Queen in Hamlet; here was Macbeth's table, where Banquo appeared. Without extensive explication the advantages of this stage reveal themselves. Right and left of the proscenium two clearly separate groups could stand; the one stood back a bit, so then the fiction would seem very natural, that those opposite no longer noticed them; with two different individuals was the case even more natural. A third group stood or sat here higher, on the small inner stage, which through this set up was still very close to the audience. No person covered another, all were free and framed in the context, whereby the pictorial and painterly emerged even more clearly. If it

was necessary, as in historical pieces, acting and talking figures would appear; in Henry VIII the Parliament occupied the steps right and left, on the step in the middle sat Wolsey, and over him on the inner stage King Henry. Thus, in all circumstances, may the stage picture consist of many or few figures, the grouping always was about the same, as how Raphael and the good painters arrange their paintings. In this way the stage constituted approximately the same demands similar to that of Sophocles; but I maintain, one cannot understand everything in Shakespeare and his contemporaries, some things remain unclear, if one does not have enough knowledge of the matter, in order to envision the authentic European, or at least English, stage. France, even Germany, as well as Spain initially had a similar establishment; when the French, apparently enlightened, modeled their drama after the ancients, as they imagined it, they built the newer stage, which was completely adequate for tragedies and comedies, in which only a few people speak, in which groups never need to stand, where there are no crowds gathering, sieges and the like. We Germans have now given up this conventional, narrowly limited performance. Now the adopted stage does not suit us, this old English or European form is forgotten, and therefore we torture ourselves most inartistically with decorations, erecting in the interval hills and fortresses, galleries and terraces, and feel, that text and theatre hinder one another, argue with each other, everything comes out difficult, time consuming, and awkward, and the director feels relieved, when he once again directs a drama, which can be played without wooden trestles and boards, balconies and fortress. This older theatre however, which we here imitate on a small scale, participates in every scene, it may even be counted among the main characters, it also facilitates each performer, it helps him, it supports him, he stands not left in an empty, confusing square but instead can mentally and physically lean himself everywhere and like a painting step into its

frame. If we want to now really perform Shakespeare, without distorting him, we must begin by setting up a theatre that is similar to his own."

"So these decorations that were recently painted are completely unnecessary," said Leonard.

Emmrich answered, "If we dress and decorate the rooms appropriately, if the curtains that conceal the inner stage close and open properly, if in this small theatre the rear wall is made of silk or cloth, they are certainly unnecessary. Meanwhile, we can set up individual pieces of woods, fields and gardens inside in order to more specifically suggest some scenes."

"A much wider curtain than this one will however be necessary," said Leonard. "We do not even need one, which closes the front of the entire stage," answered Emmrich, "as Shakespeare did not have such at his theatre. Let us only make sure, that through the stage decorations, the stage tastefully and not too distractingly joins with the rest of the hall. The whole building for the English was a rotunda or a square, and the rows of boxes stood in relation to the balcony here; this was almost a continuation of the same, so that the stage in itself was a beautifully organized entity, and the audience at the same time belonged to the players, quite similar to the Greek theatre. For us, the sharp separation of the stage from the theatre is completely inartistic and barbaric. Already before, but especially when the curtain is raised, the house looks no different than if one half was thrown away. We prefer precisely this, that stage and spectators should not be at all connected. Leonard took off with the drawing to develop a more accurate one, so on the following day the beginning could be made to arrange the stage after this new idea.[566]

---

[566] Ludwig Tieck, *Der junge Tischlermeister* in *Ludwig Tieck: Works in four volumes, volume 4* (Munich, 1963), 392-397.

Bibliography

Abrams, M.H. *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic theory and the critical tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Adler, George. *Handbook of German Literature: containing Schiller's* Maid of Orleans*, Goethe's* Iphigenia in Tauris*, Tieck's* Puss in Boots, The Xenia *by Goethe and Schiller, with Critical Introductions and Explanatory Notes; to which is added an appendix of specimens of German prose from the middle of the sixteenth to the middle ofthe nineteenth centuries.* New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854.

Andrews, Keith. *Nazarenes: A Brotherhood of German Painters in Rome*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Banham, Martin ed., *The Cambridge Guide to World Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Barlow, Paul. "Thomas Carlyle's grotesque conceits," in *Victorian Culture and the Idea of the Grotesque*, 97-118. Brookfield, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1999.

Beiser, Frederick C. ed. and trans. *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Berger, Stefan. *Social Democracy and the Working Class in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Germany.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2000.

Blackbourn, David. *History of Germany, 1780-1918: The Long Nineteenth Century.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1997.

Bloom, Harold. ed. *Modern Critical Views: Pre-Raphaelite Poets*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1986.

Booth, Michael. *Theatre in the Victorian Age.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production,* edited by Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Bowdler, Thomas ed. *The Family Shakespeare: in ten volumes; in which nothing is added to the original text; but those words and expressions are omitted which cannot with propriety be read alound in the family, Vol.II.*(London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1818.

Brandt, George, ed. *German and Dutch Theatre, 1600-1848*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Brantlinger, Patrick. "Household taste: Industrial Art, Consumerism, and Pre-Raphaelitism."
    In *The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies* 9 (Spring 2000), 83-100.

Brose, Eric Dorn. *German History 1789-1871: From The Holy Roman Empire to the
    Bismarkian Reich*. Providence: Berghahn Books, 1997.

Bruford, W. H. *Theatre, Drama and Audience in Goethe's Germany.* London: Routledge,
    1950.

Buchanan, Robert. *The Fleshly School of Poetry.* New York: Garland, 1986.

Burke, Edmund. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the
    Beautiful*. Edited by Adam Phillips. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Burwick, Frederick. "Shakespeare and Germany." In *Shakespeare in the Nineteenth Century*,
    edited by Gail Marshall, 314-331. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Carlson, Marvin. *The German Stage in the Nineteenth Century.* Metuchen, NJ: The
    Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1972.

Carlson, Marvin. *Theories of the Theatre: A Historical and Critical Survey, from the Greeks
    tothe Present.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Carlson, Marvin. "The realistic theatre and bourgeois values, 1750-1900." In *A History of
    German Theatre*, edited by Simon Williams and Mark Hamburger, 120-145.
    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Carlyle, Thomas. "Signs of the Times." In *The Spirit of the Age,* edited by Gertrude
    Himmelfarb, 31-49. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Chew, Samuel C. and Richard D. Altick. *The Nineteenth Century and After (1789-1939).*
    Volume 4 of *A Literary History of England.* Edited by Albert C. Baugh. New York:
    Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Chothia, Jean. "Varying Authenticities: Poel, Tree and Late-Victorian Shakespeare," in
    Victorian Shakespeare, Volume 1: Theatre, Drama and Performance, 161-177.
    Edited by Gail Marshall and Adriane Poole. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Chu, Petra ten-Doesschate. *Nineteenth-Century European Art.* Upper Saddle River, NJ:
    Pearson Prentice Hall, 2006.

Connolly, Thomas E. *Swinburne's Theory of Poetry.* New York: State University of New
    York, 1964.

Davidoff, Leonore and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English
    Middle Class 1780-1850.* London: Routledge, 1997.

Davies, Cecil W. *Theatre for the People: The story of the Volksbühne*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1977.

Davis, Tracey C. *The Economics of the British Stage, 1800-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Delabastita, Dirk. "Notes on Shakespeare in Dutch Translations: Historical Perspectives." In *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Rui Manuel G. de Carvalho Homem and A.J Hoenselaars, 99-116. New York: Rodopi B.V., 2004.

Evans, Eric J. *The Shaping of Modern Britain: Identity, Industry and Empire, 1780-1914*. London: Pearson Education Limited, 2011.

Falocco, Joe. *Reimagining Shakespeare's Playhouse: Early Modern Staging Conventions in the Twentieth Century.* Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010.

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. "Address to the German Nation." In *The Political Thought of the German Romantics*, edited by H.S. Reiss, 102-117. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

Fleay, Frederick Gard. *Introduction to Shakespearian Study.* New York: AMS Press, 1970.

Foulkes, Richard, "Charles Kean's *King Richard II*: A Pre-Raphaelite Drama," in *Shakespeare and the Victorian Stage.* Edited by Richard Foulkes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Frank, Mitchell Benjamin. *German Romantic Painting Redefined: Nazarene tradition and the narratives of Romanticism.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001.

Frederick James Furnivall: A Volume of Personal Record. London: Oxford University Press, 1911.

Furness, Horace Howard. *A Midsommer Nights Dreame.* A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1895.

Furnivall, Frederick James and John Munro. *Shakespeare: Life and Work.* New York: AMS Press, 1971.

Furnivall, Frederick James. *The New Shakspere Society's Transactions.* London: Alexander Moring, The De La More Press, 1874.

Gallagher, Catherine and Stephen Greenblatt. *Practicing New Historicism.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Gardiner, John. *The Victorians: An Age in Retrospect.* London: Hambledon and London, 2002.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. "The 'Rules for Actors." In *A Source Book in Theatrical History*, edited by A.M. Nagler, 428-432. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1952.

Gossman, Lionel. "Beyond Modern: The Art of the Nazarenes." In *Common Knowledge* 14, no. 1 (Winter 2008):45-104.

Gossman, Lionel. "Unwilling Moderns: The Nazarene Painters of the Nineteenth Century." *Nineteenth Century Art Worldwide* 2, no. 3 (2003). http://www.19thc-artworldwide.org/autumn_03/articles/goss.shtml (accessed May 5, 2012).

Greenblatt, Stephen. "The circulation of social energy." In *Modern Criticism and Theory*, edited by David Lodge and Nigel Wood, 495-511. Harlow, England: Longman, 2000.

Gries, Frauke. *Ludwig Tieck as Critic: Sociological Tendencies in His Criticism*, PhD diss., Stanford University, 1967.

Gries, Frauke. "Two Critical Essays by Ludwig Tieck: On Literature and its Sociological Aspects." *Monatshefte* 66, no. 2 (Summer, 1974): 157-165.

Gurr, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Harbage, Alfred. *Shakespeare's Audience*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.

Hartley, Lucy. "'Griffinism, grace and all': the riddle of the grotesque in John Ruskin's *Modern Painters.*" In *Victorian Culture and the Idea of the Grotesque,* edited by Colin Trodd, Paul Barlow, and David Amigoni, 81-96. Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1999.

Hawkes, Terence. *Shakespeare in the Present.* London: Routledge, 2002.

Hazelton, Nancy J. Doran. *Historical Consciousness in Nineteenth-Century Shakespearean Staging*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1987.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. "Symbolic, Classic, and Romantic." In *Dramatic Theory and Criticism*, edited by Bernard F. Dukore, 526-532. Heinle, Thomson Learning, 1974.

Hewison, Robert, Ian Warrell, and Stephen Wildman. *Ruskin, Turner and the Pre-Raphaelites.* London: Tate Gallery Publishing, 2000.

Hildy, Franklin J. "Reconstructing Shakespeare's Theatre." In *New Issues in the Reconstruction of Shakespeare's Theatre.* 1-37. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc., 1991.

Hildy, Franklin J. *Shakespeare at the Maddermarket: Nugent Monck and the Norwich Players*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1986.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude. *The Spirit of the Age*. New Haven: Yale University, 2007.

Hobsbawm, E.J. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hodges, C. Walter. *Enter the Whole Army: A pictorial study of Shakespearean Staging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Holmes, T.M., and H.M. Waidson, "The Shakespeare Strain." *The German Theatre: A Symposium*, ed. Ronald Hayman. London, 1975, 27-58.

Honour, Hugh. *Romanticism.* New York: Harper and Row, 1979.

Hoover, Dwight W. "The New Historicism." *The History Teacher* 25, no. 3 (1992), 355-66.

Hortmann, Wilhelm. *Shakespeare on the German Stage: The twentieth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Hughes, Alan. *Henry Irving, Shakespearean.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Hughes, Michael. *Nationalism and Society in Germany 1800-1945.* London: Edward Arnold, 1988.

Hunt, John Dixon. *The Pre-Raphaelite Imagination 1848-1900*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1968.

Jackson, Russell. "Actor-Managers and the Spectacular." In *The Oxford Illustrated History of Shakespeare on Stage*, edited by Jonathan Bate and Russell Jackson, 112-127. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Jackson, Russell, eds. *Victorian Theatre: The Theatre in Its Time*. Franklin, New York: New Amsterdam Books, 1994.

Jürs-Munby, Karen. "Hanswurst and Herr Ich: Subjection and Abjection in Enlightenment Censorship of the Comic Figure," *New Theatre Quarterly* 23 no. 2 (May 2007), 124-135.

Kefalas, Carol Lynn. "The Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites: A comparative analysis." PhD diss., University of Georgia, 1983.

Kift, Dagmar. *The Victorian music hall: Culture, class and conflict*. Translated by Roy Kift. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Lamb, Charles and Mary Lamb. *Tales from Shakespeare.* London: Puffin Books, 1994.

Lang, Cecil Y. ed. *The Pre-Raphaelites and their Circle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Larson, Kenneth E. "The Origins of the 'Schlegel-Tieck' Shakespeare in the 1820s," *The German Quarterly* 60, no. 1 (Winter, 1987), 19-37.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. "Hamburg Dramaturgy." In *Dramatic Theory and Criticism: Greeks to Grotowski*, edited by Bernard F. Dukore, (Heinle, Thomson Learning, Inc., 1974), 429-436.

Lodge, David. Introduction to Stephen Greenblatt, "The circulation of social energy," in *Modern Criticism and Theory*, ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. Harlow, England: Longman, 2000.

Macey, Samuel L. "The Introduction of Shakespeare into Germany in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century." *Eighteenth Century Studies* 5, no. 2 (Winter, 1971-1972), 261-269.

Marsh, Jan. *The Pre-Raphaelite Circle.* London: National Portrait Gallery, 2005.

Marshall, Gail. *Shakespeare and Victorian Women.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Mazer, Cary. *Shakespeare Refashioned: Elizabethan Plays on Edwardian Stages.* Ann Arbor: UM Research Press, 1981.

Meech, Anthony. "Classical theatre and the formation of a civil society, 1720-1832." In *A History of German Theatre*, edited by Simon Williams and Mark Hamburger. 65-91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Mittman, Elizabeth and Mary R. Strand. "Introductory Essay: Representing Self and Other in Early German Romanticism." In *Theory as Practice*, edited byJochen Shulte-Sasse, Haynes Horne, Andreas Michel, Elizabeth Mittman, Assenka Oksiloff, Lisa C. Roetzel, and Mary R. Strand, 47-67. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Morse, David. *High Victorian Culture* (New York: New York University Press, 1993.

Morton, Marsha. "German Romanticism: The Search for 'A Quiet Place.' In "Negotiating History: German Art and the Past," *Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies* 28, no. 1, (2002): 8-23.

Mosse, George L. *The Culture of Western Europe: The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1988.

Murphy, Andrew. *Shakespeare in Print: A History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Novalis. "Christianity or Europe." In *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*, edited and translated by Frederick C. Beiser, 59-80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Novalis. "Fichte Studies." In *Theory as Practice*, edited byJochen Shulte-Sasse, Haynes Horne, Andreas Michel, Elizabeth Mittman, Assenka Oksiloff, Lisa C. Roetzel, and Mary R. Strand, 90-111. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Novalis. "Political Aphorisms." In *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*, edited and translated by Frederick C. Beiser, 51-58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

O'Gorman, Francis. "'The Clue of Shakespearian Power over Me': Ruskin, Shakespeare, and Influence." In *Victorian Shakespeare, Volume 2: Literature and Culture*, ed. Gail Marshall and Adrian Poole, 203-18. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Patterson, Michael. "'Contributing Our Half': Ludwig Tieck's Shakespeare Productions in Dresden and Berlin, 1820-1843." In *The Globalization of Shakespeare in the Nineteenth Century,* 85-96. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellon Press, 2003.

Patterson, Michael. *The First German Theatre: Schiller, Goethe, Kleist and Büchner in Performance*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Paulin, Roger. *The Critical Reception of Shakespeare in Germany: 1682-1914*. Hildesheim: Olms, 2003.

Paulin, Roger. *Ludwig Tieck: A Literary Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,1987.

Perraudin, Michael. *Literature, the* Volk*, and Revolution in Mid-Nineteenth Century Germany*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2000.

Pettitt, Clare. "Shakespeare at the Great Exhibition of 1851," in *Victorian Shakespeare, Volume 2: Literature and Culture*, 61-83. Edited by Gail Marshall and Adrian Poole. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Poel, William. *Monthly Letters*. Edited by A.M.T. London: T. Werner Laurie LTD, 1929.

Poel, William. *Shakespeare in the Theatre*. New York: Benjamin Blom, Inc., 1913.

Poel, William. *What is wrong with the stage.* London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1920.

Poulson, Christine. "A Checklist of Pre-Raphaelite Illustrations of Shakespeare's Plays." *The Burlington Magazine* 122, no. 925 (April 1980): 244-250.

Prettejohn, Elizabeth. *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites.* London: Tate Publishing, 2000.

Prince, Kathryn. *Shakespeare in the Victorian Periodicals*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Reiss, H.S., ed. *The Political Thought of the German Romantics: 1793-1815.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

Riede, David G. "Swinburne and Romantic Authority." In *The Whole Music of Passion: New Essays on Swinburne*, edited by Rikki Rooksby and Nicholas Shrimpton, 22-39. Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1993.

Roe, Nicholas, ed. *Romanticism: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Rose, Ernst. *A History of German Literature.* New York: New York University Press, 1960.

Ross, Rachel, Curator of Art. "The Foundation for Sacred Arts: Recovering Beauty in the Christian Sacred Arts." http://thefoundationforsacredarts.blogspot.com/2010/05/lessons-in-iconography-peacock.html (accessed May 25, 2012).

Rossetti, William Michael ed. *The Germ: Thoughts towards Nature in Poetry, Literature, and Art.* New York, AMS Press, 1965.

Rowell, George. *The Victorian Theatre, A Survey*. London: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Ruskin, John. "The Lamp of Memory." In *Selected Writings*, edited by Dinah Birch, 16-27. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Ruskin, John. *The Stones of Venice*. Vol. 3. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1907.

Ruskin, John. *Unto This Last and Other Writings*. Edited by Clive Wilmer.   New York: Penguin Putnam, 1997.

Russel, Dave. "Popular entertainment, 1776-1895," in *The Cambridge History of British Theatre*, Vol. 2, edited by Joseph Donohue, 369-387. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Sawyer, Robert. *Victorian Appropriations of Shakespeare.* Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson Press, 2003.

Scherer, Wilhelm, Mary Emily Conybeare, and Friedrich Max Müller. *A History of German Literature*. trans. Mary Emily Conybeare, New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1886.

Schiller, Friedrich. "The Stage as a Moral Institution." In *Aesthetical and Philosophical Essays.* Charleston: Bibliobazaar, 2007), 334-339

Schiller, Friedrich. "Preface to *The Robbers.*" In *Dramatic Theory and Criticism*, edited by Bernard F. Dukore, 437-440. Heinle, Thomson Learning, Inc., 1974.

Schlegel, August Wilhelm. *Dramatic Art and Literature*. Vol. 1. Translated by John Black. London, 1840.

Schlegel, August Wilhelm. *Dramatic Art and Literature*. Vol. 2. Translated by John Black. London, 1840.

Schlegel, Friedrich. "Ideas." In *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*, edited and translated by Frederick C. Beiser, 123-140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Schlegel, Friedrich. "Philosophical Fragments from the Philosophical Apprenticeship." In *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*, edited and translated by Frederick C. Beiser, 159-168. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Schlegel, Friedrich. "Philosophical Lectures: Transcendental Philosophy." In *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*, edited and translated by Frederick C. Beiser, 141-158. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "On the Concepts of Different Forms of the State." In *The Political Thought of the German Romantics*, edited by H.S Reiss, 173-202. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

Schoch, Richard W. "Not Shakespeare: Bardolatry and Burlesque in the Nineteenth Century." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Schoch, Richard W. "Shakespeare and the Music Hall." In *The Performing Century: Nineteenth-Century Theatre's History*, edited by Tracy C. Davis and Peter Holland, 236-249. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Schoch, Richard W. "Shakespeare Mad," in *Victorian Shakespeare, Volume 1: Theatre, Drama and Performance*, 73-81. Edited by Gail Marshall and Adriane Poole. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Schoch, Richard W. "Theatre and mid-Victorian society, 1851-1870," in *The Cambridge History of British Theatre*, Vol. 2, edited by Joseph Donohue, 331-351. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Schrickx, Willem. "'Pickelherring' and the English Actors in Germany.' *Shakespeare Survey*. 36 (1983), 135-47.

Schulte-Sasse, Jochen. *Theory as Practice: A Critical Anthology of Early German Romantic Writings*. Coedited, translated, and introduced by Haynes Horne, Andreas Michel, Elizabeth Mittman, Assenka Oksiloff, Lisa C. Roetzel, and Mary R. Strand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Shakespeare, William. *Measure for Measure*. The Arden Shakespeare, edited by J.W. Lever London: Thomson Learning, 2006.

Shapiro, Emily D., ed. *The Pre-Raphaelite Lens: British Photography and Painting, 1848-1875*. Surrey: Lund Humphries, 2010. Published in conjunction with the exhibition "The Pre-Raphaelite Lens: British Photography and Painting, 1848-1875" shown at the National Gallery of Art in Washington DC and Musée d'Orsay.

Sharpe, Lesley. *A National Repertoire: Schiller, Iffland and the German Stage*. Bern: Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers, 2007.

Shorter, Clement. *The Brontës' Life and Letters, Vol. II.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907.

Sillars, Stuart. *Shakespeare, Time and the Victorians.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Smith, Anthony. *The Cultural Foundation of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant, Republic.* Oxford:Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

Sosulski, Michael J. *Theater and Nation in Eighteenth-Century Germany.* Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007.

Spaulding, John A. "The Lower Middle Class in Tieck's Writings." In *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 21 no. 2 (Apr. 1992), 259-292.

Speaight, Robert. *William Poel and the Elizabethan Revival*. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1954.

Stoddart, Judith. "The Morality of *Poems and Ballads*: Swinburne and Ruskin." In *The Whole Music of Passion*, edited by Rikky Rooksby and Nicholas Shrimpton, 92-106. Brookfield, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1993.

Styan, J.L. *The Shakespeare Revolution: Criticism and Performance in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Suerbaum, Ulrich. "A Theatre for Shakespeare: The Early History of the Inner Stage Myth." In *Shakespeare: Text, Language, Criticism, Essays in Honour of Marvin Spevack,* 280-303.Hildesham: Olms-Weidmann, 1987.

Swinburne, Algernon Charles. *The Age of Shakespeare*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1908.

Swinburne, Algernon Charles. *Contemporaries of Shakespeare*. London: William Heinemann,   1919.

Swinburne, Algernon Charles. *Letters*. Edited by Cecil Y. Lang, vol. 3. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.

Swinburne, Algernon Charles. *Shakespeare.* London: Oxford University Press, 1909.

Swinburne, Algernon Charles. *A Study of Shakespeare*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1880.

Swindells, Julia. "Behold the Swelling Scene! Shakespeare and the 1832 Select Committee," in *Victorian Shakespeare, Volume 1: Theatre, Drama and Performance*, 29-46. Edited by Gail Marshall and Adriane Poole. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Taylor, Gary. *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Tieck, Ludwig. *Der Junge Tischlermeister.* Berlin, 1836.

Tieck, Ludwig. *Puss-in-Boots*. Edited and translated by Gerald Gillespie. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1974.

Tieck, Ludwig. *The Midsummer Night, or Shakespeare and the Fairies, From Tieck*. Translated by Mary C. Rumsey. London: C. Whittingham, 1854.

Trodd, Colin. "Culture and energy: Ford Madox Brown, Thomas Carlyle and the Cromwellian grotesque," in *Victorian Culture and the Idea of the Grotesque*, 61-80. Brookfield, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1999.

Trodd, Colin, Paul Barlow, and David Amigoni. "Introduction: Uncovering the grotesque in Victorian culture." In *Victorian Culture and the Idea of the Grotesque,* edited by Colin Trodd, Paul Barlow, and David Amigoni. (Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1999), 1-20.

Vaughan, William. *German Romantic Painting.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Vaughan, William. *German Romanticism and English Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979

Vick, Brian. "The Origins of the German Volk: Cultural Purity and National Identity in Nineteenth-Century German." *German Studies Review* 26 no. 2 (May 2003): 241-256.

von Klenze, Camillo. *From Goethe to Hauptmann: Studies in a Changing Culture*. New York: The Viking Press, 1926.

von Schwerin-high, Friederike. *Shakespeare, Reception and Translation: Germany and Japan*. London: Continuum, 2004.

Wackenroder, Wilhelm Heinrich and Ludwig Tieck. *Outpourings of an Art-loving Friar*. Edited and translated by Edward Mornin. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1975.

Waggoner, Diane. "Introduction: Uncompromising Truth: Photography and Pre-Raphaelitism." In *The Pre-Raphaelite Lens: British Photography and Painting, 1848-1875*. Edited Emily D. Shapiro. Surrey: Lund Humphries, 2010.

Warner, Eric and Graham Hough, eds. *Strangeness and Beauty: An Anthology of Aesthetic Criticism, 1840-1910.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Wellek, René. *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750-1950: The Romantic Age.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.

Welleck, René. *Confrontations: Studies in the intellectual and literary relations between Germany, England, and the United States during the nineteenth century.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Wiener, Martin. *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Williams, Gary. *Our Moonlight Revels:* A Midsummer Night's Dream *in the Theatre.* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1997.

Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society, 1780-1950.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

Williams, Simon. *Shakespeare on the German Stage: Vol. 1: 1586-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Williams, Simon. "The romantic spirit of the German theatre, 1790-1910." *A History of German Theatre*. Ed. Simon Williams and Mark Hamburger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 120- 145.

Williams, Simon. "The 'Shakespeare-Stage' in Nineteenth-Century Germany." In *Shakespeare and the Victorian Stage*, edited by Richard Foulkes, 210-222. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Williamson, George. *The Longing for Myth in Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Wilmer, Stephen. "Nationalism and its effects on the German theatre, 1790-2000." In *A History of German Theatre*, edited by Simon Williams and Maik Hamburger, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 222-247.

Wolf, Norbert. *Romanticism*. London: Taschen, 2007.

Wordsworth, William. "Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*." In *The Longman Anthology of British Literature, Volume Two*, edited by David Damrosch, 356-361. New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc., 2003.

Zarelli, Phillip B., Bruce McConachie, Gary Jay Williams, and Carol Fisher Sorgenfrei. *Theatre Histories: An Introduction.*New York: Routledge, 2010.

Zeydel, E. H. *Ludwig Tieck, the German Romanticist*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1971.