Reactions in Europe

The French reaction to the Jubilee must be viewed against the background of Garrick’s visit to France in 1765, for in France as a rule the Jubilee was seen not as an iconoclastic event but as a continuation and intensification of attitudes already adopted four years before. The visit was a well-timed and well-staged affair. The war had kept Englishmen from the French salons and they had been missed there. Those who had come since the war—Walpole, Sterne, Hume, Wilkes—had been feted, but they only whetted French appetites. In the theaters of Paris there was no shortage of competent performers, but no really great personality. The plays of Shakespeare were provoking inquiry and were becoming involved in the cause of the bourgeois drama. Those who espoused that cause—Diderot, Grimm, Baculard d’Arnaud, Saurin—opposed the established stage conventions, and the revolutionary spirit of Beaumarchais had joined the aesthetic rebellion. Garrick found an insatiable curiosity awaiting him. He was consulted on problems of managing, writing, staging. His acting technique was subject for study both practical and philosophical.

Long ago he had made common cause with Shakespeare, and now the two names became one in the salons. “Mon cher Shakespeare” they called him. Cast for the role, Garrick did his excellent best to act the part. He talked Shakespeare, argued Shakespeare, acted Shakespeare. Leisurely salon life gave opportunity for leisurely pleasures. Over and over he went through
the favorite scenes for an applauding haut monde. He was of French lineage and his command of the language was good, but he did not attempt translation. He sketched the scenes briefly in French, then relied on the sound of Shakespeare as spoken by Garrick to supply a higher form of communication than any transliteration. All these favorable circumstances were turned to good account, and Garrick’s conquest of France was complete. Court, church, stage, Academy, salons, and journals succumbed. Ducal hauteur, neoclassical censure, ecclesiastical reserve, and professional jealousy went down before his genius and his charm.

England had praised him, but this was adulation. Kitty Clive’s “Damn him! He could act a gridiron!” was wrung from the heart, but it formed a contrast with the tenderness of Mlle Clairon, the dignified yearning of Mme Riccoboni, the devotion of Mme Necker. Adulation did not cease with his departure. Visits were made to England. Rousseau went with Hume to Drury Lane. Suard and Mme and M. Necker made the pilgrimage. The Chevalier de Chastellux came. Beaumarchais brought with him Le Barbier de Séville for Garrick’s revision. Morellet, visiting Lord Shelburne, shared with Garrick and Benjamin Franklin the position of guest of honor at Wycombe. France mourned the eclipse of her gaiety when Garrick died, and later, when dukes and bishops and court actors fell on evil times, they looked wistfully back to Garrick’s visit as a summation of the good old days. In 1816, in another era, Campenon went to the home of the aged Ducis and found the old fellow tottering on a chair, crowning with evergreen two portraits on a high shelf, portraits begged from Garrick in 1765. Shakespeare and Garrick had formed an altarpiece for half a century.

So for France the Jubilee was only natural. The French greeted with joy the news of what they always thought was a great national festival in honor of their two heroes.
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Continent the event was reported as a glorious occasion of devotion, and no word of satiric dispraise registered on the French national consciousness. "A festival worthy of ancient Athens," Suard called it, and Grimm gave stirring accounts of it in his Correspondence litteraire. The Journal Anglais translated the songs of Shakespeare's Garland. The Mercure de France was delighted. Mercier, Marmontel, Morellet, and Bonnet rejoiced.

Frankly riding the wave of Jubilee enthusiasm, the Comte du Catuelan, Fontaine-Malherbe, and Pierre Le Tourneur announced that an integrated translation of Shakespeare was in preparation. By courtesy the noble name came first, but the man who was chiefly responsible for the organizing and performing of the translation was Le Tourneur. He was a man of high character and considerable ability. He spent most of his professional life making known in France the works of foreign authors, especially those of England. Young's Night Thoughts was one of his earliest translations, Clarissa Harlowe one of his latest. During the time he was at work on the edition of Shakespeare he was also translating Ossian. The edition was dedicated to the king. The list of subscribers was dazzling. Twelve hundred copies were sent to eight hundred impressive addresses all over the world. The queen, members of the royal family, the nobility, dignitaries of the church, officers in the army and the navy, and members of the Academy were subscribers. From England there were subscriptions from the king, the Prince of Wales, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the heads of the universities, Garrick, Sir Horace Walpole, John Henderson. All sections of France were represented, as were Russia, Vienna, Parma, Liverpool, Edinburgh, Algiers, Denmark, Jamaica, Lisbon, Brussels, Dublin, Wales, North America, Venice, Amsterdam.

Drama and dramatic theory pale in comparison with a living drama played as a result of this manifestation of Jubilee
enthusiasm. Voltaire's attacks on Shakespeare heretofore had been many and highly publicized. Yet his service to Shakespeare also had been noteworthy. He had made the plays known in France and had praised them as poetry, although by neoclassical standards in France he could not praise them as drama, for he could not perceive in Shakespeare any dramatic form. From the first announcement of the Jubilee, Voltaire's attitude is a contrast to the general feeling described above. He recognized it for what it was—an aggregate of all he held false and dangerous in attitudes toward drama. He had condemned it and had said he welcomed the scorn of those participating. And he never in any allusion to the Jubilee associated it with Garrick. He never spoke of Garrick as being in any way responsible for the affair, and from first to last there was no derogation of him. Rather, his praise of Garrick grew with his bitterness toward Shakespeare, for the greatness of the actor explained to him the all-but-inexplicable popularity of Shakespeare's plays in England. He gave Garrick's acting as the reason for Shakespeare's supposed greatness, ignoring the fact that the plays had been loved long before Garrick. The entire reading public of England knew that Garrick was responsible for the Jubilee, but Voltaire never connected him with it in any public statement.

In England Voltaire's name had figured largely in Jubilee controversy, both sides claiming to be his sworn enemy. Satirists represented the event as an instrument in Voltaire's hands for the degradation of the Bard and his authorized critics, with Garrick and the Stratford bumpkins as puppets in his machinations. On the other hand, those who supported the Jubilee claimed it was to be a crushing blow to this archenemy of the poet, and that a figure representing Voltaire would be led in chains in the procession, and that he would be burnt in effigy in the street. I don't suppose that Garrick made any such plans;
if anyone did, the rain made the streets unfit for burning anything. The prefatory material in Garrick’s *Ode to Shakespeare* was plainly antagonistic to Voltaire; at some date Garrick sent a copy of the ode to him. The undated letter that accompanied it is in his correspondence (I, 365). Boaden conjecturally dated the letter 1776, which would be the year Voltaire publicly drew Garrick over to his side of the controversy. The late Dr. David Little suggested to me that the letter and ode might have been sent in 1769, but he know of no reply, and Boaden prints none.

Voltaire’s friends in France felt at the time that a Voltaire jubilee would be the best form of consoling gesture, but the plan was dropped for lack of popular support. It was suggested that a column be raised in his honor, but that plan was abandoned for the same reason. In 1770, by popular subscription Pigalle was commissioned to make a statue of Voltaire—a commission carried out with difficulty because he was too restless to pose and a substitute sitter had to be found for the modeling of the body. There the matter rested until the *Le Tourneur* translation was announced, and it was brought home to Voltaire with a shock that France was giving official sanction to Jubilee idolatry. His attack on *Le Tourneur* was as ludicrous in some aspects as it was serious in its profound implications. Certainly his exaggerated rage and grief, his violent terminology and epithets indicate that offended senile vanity may have been a factor in the case. His antics during the battle are justly famous. In justice to the lean old warrior, however, it should be said that he knew what he was fighting, and by every standard natural to him all was fair in that war.

The dedicatory epistle to the king represented a challenge to Voltaire’s tenets. It began with a general plea for recognition of foreign literature in France, especially that of Shakespeare, the writer who surpassed all other writers in penetration of the
depths of the human heart. Born of lowly parents in a barbarous age, he miraculously divined that Nature should be the only model for dramatic art. In the present day in France, a day of enlightened and impartial justice, Shakespeare should have from the French that glorious tribute to his genius that Corneille, Racine, and Molière would have given him. The political teachings of the historical plays were commended to the notice of a liberal monarch. Far from apologizing for the scenes of low life, Le Tourneur held them up as a special beauty for the admiration of a King who loved and regarded all classes of people, and came down from his throne to have fellowship with laborers and artisans.

The pages that follow the dedication systematically quote and refute Marmontel’s criticisms of Shakespeare. The preliminary discourse of Marmontel’s *Chef-d’oeuvres dramatiques* (1773) is cited with page references. One by one Le Tourneur lists the strictures, then bluntly begins, “La vérité est. . . .” Marmontel had said that the English as a nation lacked imagination, but it was Le Tourneur’s opinion that imagination was, on the contrary, the dominant trait of English writing and of the people as a whole.

Jubilé de Shakespeare came next, the mulberry tree in the first sentence, its fall in the second, its symbolism in the third. The account is taken in part without acknowledgment from the rapturous report of Benjamin Victor in *A History of the Theatres of London*. Some of the songs appear: “Que la beauté se lève avec le soleil,” and “Ici Shakespeare se promena, ici chanta Shakespeare.” Quite unaware even five years after the event that any satire had assailed it, Le Tourneur ascribed the triumphant Drury Lane play *The Jubilee* to Samuel Foote. He anticipated two possible objections to the Jubilee: excess of enthusiasm, and extravagance in the expenditure of government
funds (completely convinced that it was paid for by the national government). To the first he answered that Frenchmen heretofore had had no translations good enough to make it possible for them to judge the merits that prompted such a demonstration—a double blow at Voltaire, who had made the translations and had told Frenchmen what the merits were; but Voltaire's name is never mentioned. To the second possible objection Le Tourneur answered that it was the duty of a government to encourage poetic genius; it was not profusion that France should fear, but the avarice and niggardliness which withheld due praise to the arts.

*Vie de Shakespeare,* which followed, is based on the Jubilee biography from the *London Magazine,* an emotionalized version of Rowe, to which Le Tourneur added emphasis to such ideas as he wanted to underline—the lowly origin, the charm of rural life—and added philosophical comment.

The summary of English criticism as interpreted by Le Tourneur was made into an even more effective polemical weapon. The method of presentation was masterly for his purpose. He claimed to be giving extracts from the prefaces of English editions, adding only the phrases needed for continuity. The names of Rowe, Pope, Warburton, Theobald, Hanmer, Johnson, and Sewell were mentioned. The quotations are not attributed to the various authors but are cleverly slanted and embedded in a background calculated to controvert the canons of French criticism. It is an interesting comment on English neoclassicism that so much material of this nature could be selected from the writers named, but actually it is difficult to identify many passages. Toward Aristotle he takes the point of view of the Jubilee oration—that he would have approved of Shakespeare. He defends the mingling of comedy and tragedy, genres ordinarily seen as incompatible in France, and proves
that the highest genius can combine the two by citing the mystic union of the spirits of comedy and tragedy as embodied in Garrick.

Cette méthode est sans doute contraire aux préceptes établis par Aristote, à l'exemple constamment suivi par les anciens; mais vouloir condamner Shakespeare d'après ces règles, c'est juger un Républicain sur les loix d'une Monarchie étrangère. Si ce grand homme étiot né dans Athènes, & qu'il eût osé introduire sur la scène ces représentations plus grandes, plus vaste que celles d'Euripide & de Sophocle, à la vue de ces imitations si fidèles, si ressemblantes au spectacle du monde, est-il certain qu'Aristote n'eût encore voulu adopter d'autres principes, que ceux de Sophocle & d'Euripide? Et quand il se seroit égaré jusqu'à méconnoitre ce genre nouveau, en seroit-il moins beau, moins conforme à la nature?

C'est par un véritable abus, que la critique s'est emparée de l'empire des Lettres, & qu'elle s'arroge le droit de subjuguer les opinions, de consacrer un genre, & de proscire tel ou tel autre à son gré: c'est une superstition que de s'assujettir à cette chimérique autorité, & il est toujours permis d'appeller du tribunal du critique qui impose des loix, aux loix mêmes de la nature (I, xcvi-xcvi).
Reactions in Europe was only the English nation which, as he thought, promulgated a movement nation-wide in approbation and iconoclastic in import, he merely derided it and deplored any French acceptance of its principles. But when it was evident that France was giving regal and philosophical approval to the sinister affair, his grief and indignation were boundless. Two names on the list of subscribers stabbed him to the heart. "M. Diderot, pour six Exemplaires." His old friend so extravagantly treacherous! And on the first page the great name of his own patroness, "Sa Majesté l'Impératrice de toutes les Russies."

Exponent of free speech as he was, he attempted to have the volumes suppressed. His private letters, often made public in the periodicals, adopted the terms of total war. They spoke of treason, treachery, betrayal, international intrigue. D'Alembert was his chosen lieutenant in the war; he agreed to read before the Academy Voltaire's letter of protest. He insisted on deletion of some of the obscenity in the letter and Voltaire reluctantly acquiesced. He was loath to dilute the wine of his wrath, thinking the situation should be presented in all its vileness so the youth of the country might be saved from the slough into which their elders had precipitated themselves. D'Alembert assured him that his own national pride was involved, and that he would rush into battle shouting "Vive Saint-Denis Voltaire et meure George-Shakespeare!" He read the letter to a great assembly on the Day of St. Louis. A few days later he wrote to Ferney in shocked surprise. Voltaire's letter had been placed under royal proscription as injurious to the cause of religion, and the Academy had been made to feel the royal displeasure.

It was testimony to Voltaire's power that Le Tourneur, although he answered Marmontel, did not once mention the name of Voltaire in open defiance. Further testimony of his strength is seen in the fact noted by M. Paul van Tieghem that no direct answer to Voltaire was made by the French. In a
nation of newly converted Shakespeare idolators, not one crossed swords with him, whether from fear, indifference, respect, disdain, or ignorance. An indirect answer of sorts was made by Le Tourneur when he published a translation of Mrs. Elizabeth Montagu's Essay on the Genius and Writings of Shakespeare, which had not appeared in France until then, although Eschenberg had brought it out in German translation in 1771 and Herder had summarized it in German in 1773. Baretti, well-known Italian critic, published in French his Discours sur Shakespeare et sur M. Voltaire (1777), a retort that questioned Voltaire's knowledge of English. "Chevalier Rutledge," son of an Irish Jacobite to whom the Pretender had given a baronetcy, published an answer, respectful and courteous in contrast to Baretti's wit, but no French voice was raised.

Mrs. Montagu, already committed to the cause against Voltaire, added to her rather weak defense of Shakespeare published in 1769 two quips which were really more effective in France than her book. She was in France at the time of the furor. Voltaire's letter to D'Alembert of July 19, 1776, spoke of Shakespeare's writings as an enormous dung heap. Mrs. Montagu retorted with reference to the use Voltaire himself had made of Shakespeare in his own plays, that it was a dung heap that had fertilized an ungrateful earth—the French word carrying even more overtone of "unpromising, unfruitful" than the English. The jest became the insignia of her attacks on Voltaire. The single sentence was given as a summary of her criticism in the nineteenth century, and in little dramatic skits one was supposed to recognize her by that sentence without further identification. She attended the reading of the letter at the Academy. Suard, also present, asked if it distressed her. She answered publicly, "Not at all. I have never professed myself to be a friend to Monsieur de Voltaire." Her calm assumption of Voltaire's defeat delighted French bardolators and was quoted...
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in the salons as proof of Shakespeare's victory on the Day of St. Louis.

The volumes of Le Tourneur's translations continued to appear, the subscription lists continued to grow. A second edition was brought out in 1777. Individual plays were translated from his versions into other European languages. The books were popular until the time of the Napoleonic Wars, when all things English fell into disfavor, but were reissued in 1821, and from 1827 on were very popular. Voltaire was vanquished in his fight for the Rational Man, and he fumed about the Jubilee even on his deathbed. Paris, in the meantime, on March 30, 1778, had given him a jubilee, crowning him and his statue with laurel. And in the meantime he had used the Jubilee of Shakespeare as a weapon as well as a target. Actors in France could not be buried in consecrated ground. Their dead bodies had even been disposed of in the common sewer. In 1730, when the lovely Adrienne Lecouvreur was buried secretly and at night in wasteland with no stone to mark the grave, Voltaire had begun a long, unselfish fight for decency and justice. The Shakespeare Jubilee gave him his greatest example of how England honored two actors. It was not senile vanity alone that prompted him to oppose idolatry, while at the same time he fought for rational justice.

Certain developments in France show parallels with English reaction to the Jubilee. The amateur presentation and criticism of Shakespeare in England had a reflection in a rising French vogue for private theatricals. The director of the Academy adapted Romeo and Juliet for presentation in the salon. He left out the comic elements but compensated for the loss by giving the play a happy ending. The Chateau de Chevrette among others was lavishly equipped for amateur theatricals to suit the new mode, and the mistress of the chateau, the Marquise de Gléon, studied Shakespearean acting under Garrick's tutelage
by correspondence and played in adaptations made by Suard. On the professional stage Jean François Ducis displayed in 1769 his adaptation of *Hamlet*, the first of many Shakespearean adaptations from his pen. His great love of Shakespeare was not based on a perfect understanding of the elements an English reader values. He knew no English at all, but felt that the outstanding traits to be preserved in adaptation were three: the pathetic, the somber, and the same interpretation of good cheer that led the Chevalier de Chastellux to save Romeo and Juliet. To make Ophelia more pathetic, he gives her to Claudius as a daughter, so that Hamlet, like the Cid, kills his sweetheart's father in avenging his own. Events are reported rather than represented on stage, but many horrors are added to the messenger's reports to increase the somber element. The ghost is both visible and audible on stage, and extremely audible off stage. Gertrude has a confidant named Elvire. The low characters are omitted and the unities are observed. Hamlet catches the conscience of the king with a narrative, not with a play. Polonius is kept in the cast as Claudius' confidant, and Claudius in his confiding shows himself more open and more naïve than we had thought him. He and Polonius sound like the intriguers in Sheridan's heroic drama in *The Critic*. But Hamlet happily survives to reign in Denmark and to comment on the recent unpleasantness in moving lines addressed to Ophelia, who also survives.

Professional adaptations were made by Baculard d'Arnaud, Douin, Butine, and Collot d'Herbois, and within French drama the borrowing of incidents made Shakespeare almost as rich a source as Molière was for English comedy. The importance of the Shakespeare adaptations in France lay not in their literary merit but in their office in establishing a middle ground between comedy and tragedy. These genres were losing the clear line of demarcation. In 1769 a play was first called a *drame* in France,
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a word that is as significant in its implications as the introduction of the word Romantique. Garrick’s portrait had been painted in France with a blue, tragic Garrick symbolically merging with a red, comic Garrick. The very inability of Ducis and the other adaptors to comprehend the nature of Shakespearean tragedy, to feel as we do the inevitable leading of the total action toward death, entered into the change. “Nature”—with strong overtones of Rousseau—was absorbing old stage conventions. Every type of human being was now becoming appropriate for dramatic presentation and for critical study.

Before this merger, class lines had been firmly drawn. Comedy, tragedy, and the rising bourgeois drama were clearly divided. Playwrights were committed to one or another. Actors were typed in one group or another. Tragedy was played by Mlle Dumesnil, Mlle Clairon, Mlle Gaussin, Le Kain, and Brizard. Mlle Dangeville and Préville played comedy. Molière starred in the plays of Diderot, Saurin, and de Falbalair, a type of play considered beneath the dignity of tragedians and foreign to the gifts of comedians. Some good actors, like Grandval and Bellocourt, could play rôles à manteau in any play, courtiers, princes, or financiers, but even these sedate roles were played differently in the different types of drama. In view of the rigidity of class lines, one could adduce no better proof that France regarded Shakespeare as a meeting place of the tragic, the comic, and the sentimental than the fact that, from 1769 on, Le Kain, Préville, and Molière appeared in the same casts of Shakespeare’s plays.

The large trends of the reporting of the Jubilee in the French press have been outlined. The influence of the French periodicals was international, and Europe felt the impact of the Jubilee largely through that medium. M. Paul van Tieghem has recorded various evidences of that impact in other countries. In Italy, Holland, Sweden, Russia, Denmark, and Spain there
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were accounts of the Jubilee, productions on the stage of Shakespeare's plays, translations, critical essays, and discussions of literary theory with reference to Shakespeare. Most of the translations were made from the French of Ducis or Le Tourneur; the scattered reactions came as a result of the cultural centrality of France, and they emphasize the importance of the bardolatry of France. But France was not all-powerful.

Rebellion was brewing in Germany against French domination. News of the Jubilee there gave pretext for open revolt. Some basis for mutiny had already been provided by Lessing's aesthetic theories, Gerstenberg's letters on literature, and—unintentionally—by Wieland's translation of Shakespeare. In the Alsatian city of Strasbourg, where French and German influences met in sharp contrast, news of the Stratford Jubilee gave force to a movement tangential to French cultural centrality. The writings on Shakespeare connected with the Jubilee celebrations in Germany form a composite manifesto of the movement later to be called *Sturm und Drang*.

Johann Gottfried Herder came to Strasbourg in September, 1770, at the age of twenty-five. His precocious professional success and his scholarly attainments drew to him a group of young intellectuals connected with the university. Like satellites they revolved around him at varying distances, the nearest orbit being that of Goethe, a law student aged twenty-one. Other members of the group were students of theology or philosophy, but Herder's interests charted for them a variety of extra-curricular studies: Gothic architecture, Shaftesbury, Lessing, Diderot, Ossian, Kant, Swift, Young, Hume, Locke, George Lillo, Rousseau, the *Knittelvers* of Hans Sachs, German folk song, theories of language and of national education, primitive religion, even magic. Shakespeare was their idol, subject of their most serious study and companion of their recreation. They translated scenes, they modeled their smart university-
student conversation on the quips and puns of Toby Belch and Malvolio. Shakespeare, as they interpreted him, strangely aligned all their diverse interests.

Accounts of the Jubilee had come to them first through France. “Fête de Shakespeare” from the Mercure de France of December, 1769 (pp. 180-186), was copied in eight pages of manuscript and bound into Goethe’s copy of Wieland’s translation of Shakespeare. Members of the group refer familiarly to material not found in French periodicals, and refer to it in English, so it is apparent that they read English periodicals also. Ernst Beutler finds an echo of Garrick’s morning serenade in an early poem by Goethe to Friederike Brion:

Erwache, Friederike,  
Vertreib die Nacht,  
Die einer deiner Blicke  
Zum Tage macht.\textsuperscript{11}

Like the French, they overlooked any evidence of English disapproval of the Jubilee and unanimously regarded it as a dramatization of their own ideals; but their interpretation of its significance is removed from the French interpretations by the distance between Sturm und Drang ideals and the principles then current in France. For the German idolators, the Jubilee was a true folk movement with emphasis on medieval pageantry, honoring a primitive poet in a primitive setting, yet operating within the framework of the theater, that great institution they hoped to see used for the inculcation of national ideals. Prompted by Goethe, they felt they could do no less than emulate an event corresponding so closely to their ideals for Germany.

In August, 1771, Goethe returned to his father’s home in Frankfurt. At his urging, two festivals were held simultaneously on October 14, the Protestant name day for “William.” Goethe presided and gave the oration at Frankfurt. The actor Friedrich
Rudolph Salzmann presided under his direction at Strasbourg. Franz Christian Lerse, then a student of theology at the university, gave the oration at Strasbourg. The gay mood of the preparations can be seen in Goethe's letters to Herder urging him to join the fine crowd that would gather to honor the Warwickshire with great pomp. The first toast would be to "The Will of all Wills," the second to Herder. Goethe's sister added her greetings. Herder did not accept the invitation, and his letters in reply are not preserved. Goethe omitted from his autobiographical writings any mention of the Frankfurt Jubilee; possibly at a later date he was not proud of his Sturm und Drang oration. Neither it nor Lerse's oration was published during their lifetimes, but both survived in manuscript, Goethe's in a manuscript which by its appearance caused Max Morris' conjecture that it had been sent as a round-robin letter to any of the Strasbourg group that were absent from the celebrations. A letter from Goethe to Johann Gottfried Röderer seems to indicate that the oration was known and praised by the Strasbourg group. Lerse's oration was found among Röderer's literary remains and is printed in part with the omitted sections summarized in August Stöber's book J. G. Röderer von Strassburg und seine Freunde (Colmar, 1874).

In addition to these records there is a line of Latin in the daybook of Goethe's father concerning expenditures.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Dies Onomasticus Schacksp.} & \quad \text{fl. 6. 24 . . .} \\
\text{Musica in die onom. Schacksp.} & \quad 3 \text{ fl.}
\end{align*} \]

This notation helps to define Goethe's phrase "mit grosem Pomp," but it raises more questions than it answers. The Imperial Rath of Frankfurt regarded the unrhymed verse of Klopstock as a vulgar innovation, and presumably would have sided with his admired Voltaire on the subject of Jubilees for
the "drunken barbarian." By some means—possibly Meine Schwester did the trick—his co-operation was secured. Either insensitive to the Zeitgeist or in resignation to it, neoclassical conservatism paid the bills for the first Shakespeare festival ever held on German soil. One could wish to have seen Garrick at Stratford reduce friends and enemies to maudlin unintelligibility with his oration and ode in one of the greatest performances of his life. The vision of Goethe on the evening of Shakespeare Day equally fires the imagination. Genius paid tribute to genius in the brightly lit rooms on the first floor of the Goethe home. With music and dancing, with toasts and festive garments, the Great Pagan hailed Shakespeare as the Great Pagan and in impassioned words acknowledged him master.

Along with the orations known to have been delivered at the two celebrations, two other writings of dubious Jubilee association should be considered, for the connection by internal evidence is obvious. Herder's Briefe an Gerstenberg is the first of three extant drafts of his essay on Shakespeare, the third of which was published in Von Deutsche Art und Kunst in May, 1773. The first draft was written before Goethe left Strasbourg. Twice in his letters he asked Herder to send it to Frankfurt to be read as part of "our liturgy" for the celebration, but it is not known that he did so. The Anmerkungen übers Theater of J. M. R. Lenz was begun about September, 1771, but it is impossible to ascertain in what form it existed on October 14 of that year, despite brilliant conjectural analysis by Theodor Friedrich and later by M. N. Rozanov. It may be that neither of these works was read at the celebrations, but both may have been. For the purpose of generalization the four writings may be considered together, with more detailed study of the two orations known to have been Festreden zum Schäkespearstag.

General similarities of style are at once apparent. The reader is constantly aware of the tone of intimate speech addressed to
a small discerning group in a crass and tasteless age; but for the
speakers there is an air of hope that the group may serve as
leaven for the lump. It is their accepted duty to reinterpret
Shakespeare, whom all praise but few understand, for social
and political reasons as well as for artistic ends. The style is
what they considered bardic. It is exclamatory, full of sudden
ejaculations—"Ha!" "Freiheit!" "Natur!"—inserted apparently at
random. The verbal structure is prominent and many verbs have
intensive prefixes. The syntax manifests deliberate revolt against
Lessing's almost tabular clarity; in Lerse this is least apparent,
more in Herder, with Goethe exaggerating Herder, and Lenz,
who was called "Goethe's ape," exaggerating Goethe's bardic
style into complete incomprehensibility at times. Garrick's bardic
ectasy seems, on paper at least, very neat and orderly by com­
parison. But disorder was considered appropriate to the spirit
of the day. Goethe spoke with youthful abandon: "Do not
expect me to write much or write in orderly fashion; peace of
the soul is no proper dress for a feast day."18

They unite in wholehearted idolatry for the great primitive
genius, whose name is linked with Ossian and Homer, the other
two great primitives. The historical plays and their social mes­
 sage are emphasized. Lenz, in a striking passage, describes
Shakespeare as an almost Christlike figure unwinding the grave­
clothes from the noble dead, breathing his spirit into their
mummified bodies and bidding the heroes of history arise in
transfigured beauty to bless the eyes that behold them.17 Shake­
speare's Germanic genius is set in opposition to the spirit of
France. Unser Shakespeare here made his debut, claimed as
their own, allied with medieval Germany and Greek simplicity
against all Frenchified folk and spoilt Germans, sogar Wieland.
Goethe's spelling of the name Schakespear and even his father's
abbreviation Schacksp. lay claim to a German genius. Aristotle
is attacked with varying violence. Voltaire is roundly accused
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of both plagiarizing and debasing Shakespeare. Drama is elevated above epic and lyric in the hierarchy of the genres (although Lenz confuses the issue by insisting that Dante be classified as a dramatist) because drama is best suited for the promulgation of social and political ideals.

The obvious literary sources of Goethe and Lerse present a segment of the reading list of the Strasbourg group: Wieland’s translation of Pope’s preface to his edition of Shakespeare (which included Rowe’s biography), the biographies of Garrick and Shakespeare published for the Jubilee, Shaftesbury, Mandeville’s Fable of the Bees, Young’s paradox of the imitation of the ancients, Lessing, Greek legend, and predominantly Herder himself. The influence of the Jubilee oration is pervasive.

Both Goethe and Lerse condemn their own age, but with characteristic contrasts. Lerse, drawing on the biographical material mentioned, converts his description of Shakespeare’s idyllic times into a scathing condemnation of contemporary Germany, in its very social structure inimical to poetry. The social and political well-being of a country, he says, is tested by its poetry and its criticism. He suggests no positive program for the group, but implies that there was hope in the purified and unbiased taste of the small group he was addressing. Despairing of middle-class stupidity and optimism, Lerse pins his hope on the sensitive, imaginative, complex intellectual, and at the same time on a paradoxical demand for a return to the simple, sturdy folk ways and folk poetry inspired by Shakespeare, simple scholar of Nature only as he was.

Goethe condemns his day also, but includes himself in the condemnation. This is less a social document, more a personal testimony. He expresses his criticism of Shakespeare in terms of his own reaction to his first reading of a play. “I stood as one born blind to whom a miraculous hand had given instantaneous sight.” Then for the first time he knew his own potentialities,
for the first time realized he "had hands and feet." Before the creativity of Shakespeare he was ashamed of his own "soap-bubble characters," and of living in an age that made artistic creation all but impossible.

At Stratford Garrick’s key word had been Nature. The same word in Goethe is far from any definition of nature consciously intended by Garrick. It has been said that Garrick did not understand the oration when he spoke it. He may have been playing with fire when he bowed gracefully to those who saw his mystical kinship with Shakespeare proved by the ability possessed by them alone to excel both in comedy and in tragedy, but he did not entertain any idea that this aptitude resolved or even commented on the paradox of man, a creature of free will, and man, a creature acting under necessity. Goethe’s literary influences are complex, but the Rede stands closer to Faust than to any of its "sources."  

An account of the Jubilee in England is incomplete without its aftermath in the theaters and a consideration of total effects of the popularizing of the ideas implicit in the event. So in Germany the account should include reference to books that gave news in Germany of this aftermath. England und Italien, the influential book by Johann Wilhelm von Archenholz, has been discussed in the account of the theaters. His story of twenty-eight trips to Drury Lane to see The Jubilee gave Europe a popular version of Jubilee idolatry in its most concentrated and dramatic form. Georg Lichtenberg left a vivid description of Garrick’s acting; in his letters, widely read in the Deutsches Museum, he told of his pilgrimage to Stratford. He was amazed to see the idolatry of Shakespeare at all levels of the populace with which he came in contact, even all ages, for the children, he said, learned "To be or not to be" before they learned their ABC or the Creed. The use made of Shakespeare in Parliamentary debate impressed him. He constantly linked the names
of Garrick and Shakespeare in praise, drawing an analogy that might strike a foreigner more forcibly than a citizen of London who takes his city for granted. Both, he said, had gone to school to that great city, had learned from London herself of beauty and wonder and hope and fear.\textsuperscript{20} Another popular German account of bardolatry in England was written by Karl Philip Moritz; "Pastor" Moritz also made the Stratford pilgrimage.\textsuperscript{21}

These popular writers seized upon the dramatized metaphor of the poet as creator. Simply as a metaphor it had been used in Germany as it had been used in England. Lessing had applied the term to a process of rational selectivity similar to Shaftesbury's usage.\textsuperscript{22} Gerstenberg spoke of Shakespeare's "world," but he was comparing the poet to no higher being than the painter Raphael.\textsuperscript{23} I do not find the metaphor in the writings of Herder before the \textit{Briefe an Gerstenberg}. For him, the analogue became the controlling metaphor of his critical writings. By it Friedrich Gundolph characterizes his criticism of Shakespeare.\textsuperscript{24} By it Alexander Gillies interprets not only his criticism but his philosophy of history also. "Shakespeare led Herder to history," Gillies says, and Herder, once having convinced himself that all Shakespeare's plays were history (the thesis of the \textit{Briefe}), convinced himself in his \textit{Ideen} that the equation was reversible. "Just as Shakespeare was a kind of miniature creator, so God could be looked upon as a kind of superdramatist and the world as a stage."\textsuperscript{25} Herder did not wait until the \textit{Ideen} to give an inkling of that reversal of the metaphor. In the first draft of the essay on Shakespeare, which may have been part of the Jubilee "liturgy," he wrote:

\begin{quote}
Shakespeare, son of nature, intimate of deity, interpreter of all tongues and passions and characters, controller and manipulator of the threads of all events that can touch the human heart—what do I see when I read you! No theater, no stage set, no actor, imitation has vanished: I see a world, men, passions,
truth! I, who have never in my life seen Garrick play; I see in Lear and Macbeth, Hamlet and Richard themselves, no imitator, no declaimer, no mere artist! Even down to the meanest of your creations all are whole, individual beings, every one taking part, working together, acting from his character and his page in history; every one as if for his own end and aim, and only through the creative power of the poet as ends are at the same time means; as aims are at the same time the collaborators of the whole! So, perhaps, in the course of the great world a higher unseen Being plays with a lower class of its creatures: all run their course to their end and produce and work; and lo! unwittingly they become thereby just a blind tool for a higher plan, and the Whole of an unseen Poet! 

Herder in 1771 was master and his disciples followed him, Goethe by linking the metaphor with the myth of Prometheus as Shaftesbury had done but with a meaning other than Shaftesbury's, Lenz by using the metaphor for refuting Aristotle's theory on the source of poetry in a passage that shows similarity to the twentieth-century aesthetic theory of Einfühlung. Carlyle and Coleridge, looking for inspiration to Germany, where the idea had spread from Herder's influence, brought back to English critical statement the concept of the elevation of the poet to the level of creative divinity. Garrick's Jubilee oration, whatever he intended it to mean, played into the hands of Sturm und Drang vitalism, and gave substance to the vision of the poet as creator, prophet, and national idol. In France the Jubilee fused with revolutionary ideas and stirred up total war between the old and the new. But on British soil the compromise was peaceably effected with concessions on both sides.

In contrast to Walter Jackson Bate's study of the change From Classic to Romantic, my study deals with much that is nearer festival than philosophy, moving from Garrick in holiday mood to Goethe in similar mood, even Voltaire's letters having a strong flavor of schoolboy game, serious as they are. Whenever the philosophers of the period lapse into vagueness, it is Professor
Bate’s special gift that his sympathies and his power of analysis are such that he can understand and clarify their utterances. I well could have used that gift, and an ear attuned like his to the true meaning of words, in my effort to draw a clear outline from the helter-skelter writings of anonymous correspondents with a typical determination to use the language as they jolly well please. For it does seem to me that “The Romantic Compromise in England” as he has heard it, can be heard when a multitude of voices spoke to the basic issues. “Nothing is beautiful in itself” is the decree of extreme subjectivism; but this was modified by common acknowledgment of Shakespeare’s intrinsic beauty. The extremes of mere emotionalism were modified by the disciplines of explication and the study of literary history. In the daily press is manifested that characteristic British thought which “is especially the product of individuals rather than the collective architectural achievement of a movement or an age,” and the “enviable capacity to reconcile apparently inconsistent elements.”

Just after the Jubilee was announced, the Public Advertiser printed a letter from someone who signed himself “A. Z.” He wrote to caution the public against going to extremes at Stratford. Earnestly and with unconscious paradox, he begged for “moderation in idolatry.” And England, who has effected so many compromises, effected that one also.

1. Frank A. Hedgcock, *David Garrick and His French Friends* (1911), pp. 153–237, gives a detailed account of this visit.
3. A letter printed in the *London Chronicle* (XXVI, 482) tells of dinner with Voltaire that summer, at which time he said he was no more insulted by being burnt in effigy at Stratford than by being “damned by a Consistory of Cardinals.” The letter seems to be genuine.
5. The satirists, however, were not unaware of Le Tourneur. George
Garrick’s Jubilee


7. See Lounsbury, pp. 385-88, for an account of the attempt.
8. Voltaire, Œuvres Complètes (52 vols.; 1877-85), L, 58, 64, 83, et passim.
11. Ernst Beutler, Goethes Rede Zum Schäakespeare Tag (1938), p. 16. “Es ist nicht nur die gleiche, für die Literatur jener Zeit noch ungewöhnliche, romantische Situation der Morgenserenade, sondern die erste, dritte und vierte Zeile zeigen auch einen Parallelismus des Gedankens und der Bilder, der sich nicht übersehen lässt: Let beauty with the sun arise; / To Shakespeare tribute pay; / With heav’ly smiles and speaking eyes, / Give grace and luster to the day.”
13. The date of the letter, however, is in doubt. Michael Bernays dated it September 21, 1772; August Stöber dated it September 22, 1772; Morris dated it without indication of doubt September 21, 1771, as did Beutler.
16. The oration is printed in Beutler, and in Der junge Goethe, II. “Erwarten Sie nicht, das ich viel und ordentlich schreihe; Ruhe der Seele ist kein Festtagskleid” (II, 137).
18. Paul Hiffernan in Dramatic Genius (1770), an extravagant Jubilee eulogy, found the common root in comedy and tragedy (as seen in Garrick and Shakespeare) in the most universal of human traits—pride; pleasure arises from pride that we have escaped the embarrassments of the comic situation and the disaster of the tragic.
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neue Weltbild wird gerühmt als Natur . . . und sie ist keinesfalls das Rousseausche Stichwort, das in erlösendem Gegensatz zur Zivilisation steht. . . .

Von Strassburg kehrte er heim, durchdrungen von einem neuen Kraft- und Weltgefühl, und eine Feier und Rede verkündete den Anbruch einer neuen Morgenröte."


27. The statement is scattered, but there is a concentration of ideas, pp. 226–28. Aristotle understood only one of the two sources of poetry. In all art, the artist and the thing observed in nature will interpenetrate one another; within the artist’s soul, the sensual concepts received by this process must be simplified and brought under control of the poet’s master concepts, else they will wander aimlessly and dangerously, as Bunyan described the confused soul of man in The Holy War. When this process is instantaneous, comprehensive, intuitive, we call it “genius,” and thus far Aristotle understood art. This is “imitation of nature.” Voltaire and Rousseau have this form of art. But if art stops at this level, the artist has only his personality for subject matter (because, I judge, the domination by master concepts has converted sense impressions into himself in the process of interpenetration). Man’s soul, like his body, must work successively; but man has a deep desire to act and comprehend instantaneously rather than successively. Shakespeare could do this, and the result was not imitation but the creation of another world which was not product of his personality, but existed apart from it. Lenz, then, postulates three categories of poets: the laborious organizer of the observed world, the “genius,” and the creator, whose work cannot properly be called imitation of nature. Georg Büchner, in his story “Lenz,” taken in part from Oberlin’s diary of Lenz’s stay in his home, attributes to Lenz a more fully developed idea of the Einfühlung, an interesting analogue to the Anmerkungen. Büchner’s Gesammelte Werke, ed. Carl Seelig (Zurich, 1944). See especially pp. 172–74.
