Shakespeare's Reception in German, 1682-1800

James W. Harrison
Southern Utah University

One of the things that make great poets great is their ability to look beyond the moment and connect with the prime radical of human nature. While Homer wrote for eighth-century B.C. Greece, he touched on concerns that still resonate with us today. Two thousand years after Caesar Augustus, Virgil's epic of the founding of Rome seems peculiarly modern. And who has not been personally drawn to these words: "In the middle of the journey of our life I came to myself within a dark wood where the straight way was lost. Ah, how hard a thing it is to tell of that wood, savage and harsh and dense, the thought of which renews my fear! So bitter is it that death is hardly more"?[1] I can only assume that Dante must have been the Language Department Chair at Southern Florence University. While the historical peculiarities of literature are enough to separate every great work from every other great work, the deeper human concerns remain remarkably constant, regardless of time and place. Time, nationality, and historical circumstance, while important, fade before the muse of great poets, and we find ourselves seduced by the beauty of works which are separated from us by time and place.

However, even allowing for these facts, it is still remarkable how completely German culture gave itself to Shakespeare. Roger Paulin in his book, The *Critical Reception of Shakespeare in German 1682-1914*, an excellent work upon which I have relied heavily in preparing this essay, states, "Shakespeare can without further ado be called a German classic, akin to Goethe or Schiller,"[2] and Georg Gottfried Gervinus writing in the 19th century observed that Shakespeare "has become a German poet almost more than

any of our native writers."[3] In 1911, a mere three years before the beginning of World War I, when relations between Germany and England were rapidly deteriorating, Friedrich Gundolf, one of the last of the great German Jewish intellectuals of the *fin de siecle* wrote *Shakespeare und der deutsche Geist*, a work in which the author argues that the affinity uniting Shakespeare and German culture is at least as great as, if not greater than, that between him and his native country.[4]

Of course, Germany is not the only country to adopt Shakespeare into its pantheon of great poets. For those of you who are *Star Trek* fans, you will remember the scene in *Star Trek VI* when a Klingon officer who is on board the Enterprise for a state dinner says that it's impossible to really enjoy Shakespeare unless one hears it in the original Klingon. Something like this seems to have found its way into German culture, especially in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This devotion to Shakespeare was not immediate in Germany. It took over a hundred years after the poet's death for him to become part of Germany's poetic landscape. When it does occur, however, Germany devotes itself to the Bard wholeheartedly.

While there is no denying that Shakespeare touches the German soul in an unusually powerful way, there are other reasons why his reception in that culture occurs when it does and with such force. Shakespeare dies two years before the beginning of one of the most difficult periods in German history. From 1618 until 1648, several different wars were fought on German soil. Collectively, these have become known as the Thirty Years' War. But referring to these conflicts in the singular oversimplifies what happened. The conflict began in Prague. The Catholic Emperor Matthias designated his cousin, Ferdinand of Styria, as his heir and successor on the Bohemian throne, thus violating the elective principle which had always determined the Bohemian succession. Count Heinrich von Thurn, a Protestant prince, pleaded with the Protestant leaders to block the ascension, all to no avail. On May 23, 1618, Thurn and his supporters led a group of Protestants to the Hradschin Castle in Prague, climbed to the floor where two governors sat, and threw them and their secretary out of the window. They landed in a heap of manure with little injured except their pride, but the event was enough to trigger the first

of the conflicts that would ravage Germany over the next three decades. Thurn then formed a revolutionary directory, which declared Ferdinand dethroned and expelled the Archbishop and the Jesuits. All of this led to the battle of White Hill the next year, where the imperial forces defeated the Protestants.

With the Catholic forces gaining strength in central and northern Germany, the protestant states of Denmark and Sweden became nervous. Christian IV of Denmark and his protestant forces invaded Germany in 1625. They were defeated by imperial troops and the Peace of Lübeck settled the issue in 1629.

Seeing his Scandinavian protestant allies defeated by the Catholic imperial forces, the Swedish king, Gustavus Adolphus, invaded Pomerania with the aid of the French. Louis XIII's minister, Cardinal Richelieu, had been waiting to exploit this religious war for his own purpose, which was to secure absolute power in Europe for his liege, the King of France. The fact that France, a Catholic country, had to make common cause with Sweden, a Protestant state, gave Richelieu no pause whatsoever. Initially the protestant forces led by Gustavus Adolphus pushed the imperial troops aside and got as far south as Munich, but in the battle of Lützen, near Leipzig, Gustavus Adolphus was killed. Although the Swedes won the battle, the death of their king proved to be a fatal injury to their cause. Gradually the war changed from a religiously motivated struggle to one in which Germans, regardless of their religion, fought for Germany against France.

The final stage of the war was fought between the Spanish Hapsburgs and the French. It was fought for the most part on German soil, and the misery it brought in its wake etched itself forever on the German psyche. By 1637 the emperor, Ferdinand, began the process of bringing the war to an end. However, wars being much easier to start than to stop, this process was not complete until 1648.

While accurate figures are not available, the best estimates are that the population of Germany and Austria, reckoned at twenty-one million before the war, fell to thirteen and one-half million. Of 35, 0000 villages existing in Bohemia in 1618, 29,000 were destroyed by war's end. Famine was widespread. Cannibalism was common in many areas, and everywhere men, women, and

children competed with dogs and ravens for the rotten flesh of dead and diseased animals.[5]

The important part of all of this for the present topic is that Germany was defeated not only militarily, but culturally as well. The treaty of Westphalia, which concluded the war, partitioned Germany into over 300 separate sovereign states. Thus, the German countries' ability to conduct foreign policy or to influence European politics in any way was greatly reduced. Germany became a French protectorate.[6]

While the seventeenth century was a disaster for the Germans, it was for the French their great classical age. Racine, Corneille, Moliere, Lully, Descartes, and other cultural luminaries insured that what the French troops had won on the battlefield, French culture would promulgate in the universities and salons of Europe. This was the age of normative literary theory. Boileau's concern for cleansing French poetry of all that was vulgar, and doing for French verse what Pascal and Descartes had done for French prose predisposed him against Shakespeare. Eventually these highly prescriptive literary theories became more of a burden than a help in establishing guidelines for a national literature, but they served some purpose at the beginning for the French.

Since French culture became the standard to be emulated throughout Europe, those who did not inculcate it into their art were not taken seriously. Unfortunately for Germany, its recovery from the horrors of the Thirty Years' War left little room to embrace the French Enlightenment. Given France's role in Germany's sufferings, this is not difficult to understand. But there is more at work here than anger and a desire for revenge and vindication. Those familiar with German culture, especially from the Reformation onward, understand that the German spirit, if one may speak about something so abstract, is not at its core a classically oriented aesthetic. While the French always look to formal perfection, the German muse looks beyond to spiritual implications which cannot be analyzed or quantified. French aesthetic theory moves inexorably toward the classical, while the German is drawn to the romantic. This does not mean, of course, that there are not French romantics or German classicists. But there is a world of difference between Racine's *Phaedra* and Goethe's *Iphigenia*, or between Chateaubriand's *Atala* and Novalis's

Heinrich von Ofterdingen. The classicism of Goethe and Schiller tends to be more romantic than that of Racine and Corneille, just as the romanticism of Chateaubriand is more classical than that of Novalis.

It is this fact as much as any that explains Shakespeare's early reception into German culture. Boileau's three unities of time, place and action, which he borrowed from Aristotle's *Poetics*, were of little use in analyzing Shakespeare's plays. German dramatic theory in the early part of the eighteenth century was highly influenced by French criticism, not because it spoke to the German condition, but because for a nation to align itself with French culture was to announce its appearance on the stage of European culture. The very first mention of Shakespeare in German letters is found in Daniel Georg Morhof's *Unterricht von der Teutschen Sprache und Poesie* of 1682: "Und der John Dryden hat gar wohl gelehrt von der Dramatica Poesi geschrieben. Die Engelländer/ die er hierinnen anführt/ sind Shakespeare, Fletcher, Beaumont, von selchen ich nichts gesehen habe. Ben. Johnson hat gar viel geschrieben/ welcher/ meines Erachtens kein geringes Lob verdienet." [And John Dryden has written very learnedly of dramatic poetry. The English poets he lists there are Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, of whom I have read nothing. Ben Johnson has written much and I believe he deserves no little praise."[7] For the rest of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, Shakespeare's name, when it came up in Germany, was one of several English authors mentioned en mass. Those English authors who were singled out for individual praise were generally those whose works were more closely related to the Enlightenment: Pope and Addison especially.[8] This interest in English literature was more pronounced in those areas that had an English presence, such as Danzig, Hamburg, and Hannover. The Hanoverian King of England, George II, wished for the university in Göttingen to have a professor of English. Accordingly that university created the first chair of English studies anywhere (including England). While the first occupant of that chair, John Thompson, did not mention Shakespeare, he did create an intellectual climate that would help to assess the Bard and place him on the international stage of important writers.

Daniel Georg Morhof, 1639-1691, the author of this first

reference to Shakespeare in German letters, is a polymath, one of the last great encyclopedists of this earliest age of Shakespeare reception in Germany. His goal is to show the place of the German language among the other languages in Europe. He is in the same general class as Martin Opitz, the great normative critic of the early Baroque who spends so much time trying to do for German what Boileau tries to do for French. Just as Opitz attempts to show the German language's "ability to use the poetic forms of both ancients and moderns, and to encourage purity and correctness in their employment,"[9] so too Morhof calls for the same care with the language but with one great difference. Morhof calls for "restraint in the practices established by Opitz, sensing that the full-use of invention may be leading away from the *aptum*, the proper norms and proprieties of expression."[10] Gottsched will sound the same note of caution in the early eighteenth century.

This period of Shakespeare reception, which lasts from 1682 to 1740, is a time when German scholars are taking stock of what their culture had to offer rather than producing any significant works of art. There is no one, for example, like Addison, Pope or Voltaire. It has few champions even today. Goethe referred to it as the "nulle Epoche," or the zero age.[11] Seen another way, this era was an attempt to cleanse the German palate from the excesses of the Baroque period. The resultant attacks on the literary canon of their own country mounted by German scholars form the backdrop for the reception of Shakespeare. Certainly one of the things that contribute to this aspect of Germany's reception of Shakespeare can be found in the fact that the German lands had no recent national tradition of literature to celebrate. The German Baroque, which lasted from approximately 1600 to 1720, constitutes one of the major epochs of that culture's literary output. However, as a literary movement, it was for the rest of Europe an anachronism. And even at its height, it did not have a geographical center such as London or Paris. The literary impulses in Germany are more varied and less focused than their counterparts in France and England.[12]

No sustained discussion of Shakespeare in Germany is possible until the Wieland translation of 1762. Until then, what Germans know of Shakespeare is snippets of scenes or monologues from the famous plays, especially *Hamlet*, *Julius Caesar*, and *Richard III*.

These, in turn, find their way into the German world of letters via French translations. The French, and to a lesser extent the Italians, provide the conduit for all things English into German culture through works such as the French translation of the *Spectator*, the *Guardian*, and the *Tattler*.[13] As has already been noted, the French were not sympathetic to Shakespeare's works. The best they could say about him was that he represents a rude beginning of English literature and that "under a shapeless and bizarre exterior there was a kernel of human truth."[14]

The three most important critics in Germany who espouse this view are, Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700-66) in Leipzig, Johann Jacob Bodmer, and Johann Jacob Breitinger, both of whom wrote in Zürich. Gottsched is impressed with Voltaire and Pope and "recommended their intellectual curiosity, critical argutia, their common sense, but also their neo-classical elegance and wit as models that the German republic of letters might . . . strive to attain."[15] He believes that the Baroque style could not "provide a model in any redefinition of German national literature."[16] The *Schwulst* (inflated rhetoric) of the Baroque style must be replaced with the economy and elegance of the Enlightenment. He is usually thought of as the self-appointed *praeceptor Germaniae*, who was a little too anxious to criticize all he saw and read. Yet he was the undisputed critic of German letters for a generation, more highly thought of in his hometown of Leipzig than the other great German artist in that city, Johann Sebastian Bach, his contemporary. It was Gottsched who sheltered Voltaire when he fled Frederick II's ire. Both Maria Theresa and Frederick II received him as one of the leading scholars of the day.[17] The Baroque style could not satisfy his need for the clarity and congruity of French neo-classical criticism.

Initially Gottsched can only see those elements in Shakespeare that remind him of the Baroque. His ideal of the theater, which he hoped to graft into German culture, is based on the French classical dramas of Racine, Corneille and Moliere. It is largely because of Gottsched and his wife, who is one of the first prominent female literary critics in Germany, that a growing awareness of the needs of a German theatre establishes itself. Eventually this would lead many to Shakespeare. If the Gottscheds were not advocates of the Bard, they did prepare the German reading public to engage him.

Gottsched felt that there was need for the Germans to "catch up."[18] In his *Beyträge zur Kritischen Historie der Deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit*, one detects his belief that Germans were guilty of a "dearth of correctness and purity of language and expression."[19] This again leads back to his dislike of the Baroque *Schwulst* mentioned above. Gottsched is correct in his diagnosis of the unfortunate bombast of Baroque prose. His remedy is to clean up the language, and one of the methods he prescribes is translation from both the French and the English.

He is not the only one in Germany who is concerned about Germany conforming to the standards of the Enlightenment. The translations of the *Spectator* and *Tattler* had been warmly accepted by the German reading public and had given birth to German periodicals, such as *Der Vernünftler*. These periodicals print translations of some of the most important works of English literature, and among these are some scenes from Shakespeare. Initially they repeat the common wisdom of the French, and to a certain extent the English themselves, that "despite his imperfections and disregard for the rules, his fellow-countrymen referred to the Bard as the 'divine' Shakespeare." Eventually, however, one detects a growing awareness that "true characters and real moral seriousness" in drama, as one finds in Shakespeare, may "require an unbending of the rules."[20]

Gottsched's critical work gains luster from his wife's translations. Luise Gottsched established a very impressive record as a first-rate translator of *The Spectator* and the *Guardian*. This meant, of course, dealing with Addison and Steele, and with those two authors available in German, the reception of Shakespeare could begin in earnest.[21] She also tried her hand at Shakespeare and was the first to attempt a translation of Shakespeare into German iambic pentameter, a verse form with which the Germans were unfamiliar. Here is her translation of Theseus's short speech from act 4 of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in *Spectator* 116:

> Vor Sparter Zucht sind meine Hund erzeugt,
> Voll Schweiss und Staub; von ihren Köpfen hängt
> Das Ohr herab, und streicht den Thau hinweg.
> [My Hounds are bred out of the Spartan Kind,
> So flu'd, so sanded; and their heads are hung

With Ears that sweep away the Morning Dew.][22]

Bodmer's and Breitinger's position is very similar to Gottsched's. The difference was one of degree not substance.[23] Bodmer and Breitinger are figures of considerable importance in the German literature of the mid-eighteenth century. It is Bodmer who first tells the Germans that the *Nibelungenlied* is an epic on par with Homer. He is the mentor of Wieland, the first important Shakespeare translator, and his house in Zürich is a place of pilgrimage for the young Goethe. Both Bodmer and Breitinger become highly critical of Gottsched, even though the latter's *Critische Dichtkunst* remains to this day the basis of most German systematic poetics and aesthetics.[24] They share much with Gottsched: "their common concern for the reform of the theater, their disapproval of the opera, their rejection of the Baroque style, and their search for models inside and outside of their national tradition."[25] Their difference with Gottsched lies in the latter's inability to give his assent to what he saw as Shakespeare's "inconsistency in aesthetic, and ultimately in philosophical, terms."[26] Bodmer's and Breitinger's falling out with Gottsched has the primary result of moving the center of literary criticism in Germany from Leipzig to Zürich.

Although Luise Gottsched and others had tried their hand at translating passages from Shakespeare, the first translation of an entire Shakespeare play is not completed until 1781. In that year Caspar Wilhelm von Borck translates *Julius Caesar*. This would remain the only Shakspeare play translated in its entirety into German for the whole decade. By comparison, the French by 1749 would have ten Shakespeare plays, either complete or summarized, translated into their language.[27] This disparity could be due to any number of reasons. One might surmise that the French were more interested in Shakepeare than the Germans, but subsequent developments mitigate against that. One might also question the quality of Borck's translation and that it had a chilling effect on the tempo of other translations. This seems to have more merit. Gottsched was not happy with it.[28] Wieland's subsequent translation of Shakespeare is such an improvement that Borck's version was soon forgotten.

Even though the Germans lag behind in their translation of

Shakespeare, the critical interest in the Bard continues to increase. In 1749 Johann Elias Schlegel completes the "first sustained piece of German Shakespearean criticism," *Vergleichung Shakespears und Andreas Gryphs*."[29] Schlegel comes from a literary family. He is the uncle of August Wilhelm and Friedrich Schlegel, two of the leading authors of the early German romantic period. In his essay, Johann Schlegel investigates two topics that others deal with over and over: Shakespeare and the rules of drama and Shakespeare's ability to create full-drawn characters. It is the latter that recommends Shakespeare as a major author in Schlegel's opinion. It is Shakespeare's *Schwulst* that suggests to this German critic's mind a comparison with him and Gryphius, one of the most important of the German Baroque poets. Schlegel charges Shakespeare with "crudity, barbarity, uncouthness, and obscurity."[30] He compares Shakespeare with Jonson, Corneille, and the Greeks. Since Schlegel is a disciple of Gottsched, one might suspect that he would follow his teacher's sentiments concerning Shakespeare. However, it turns out that he moves away from Gottsched. He believes pleasure, not instruction, to be the primary goal of literature. By writing a serious critical work about Shakespeare, Schlegel suggests that there "might be relative value in all kinds of literary products from places other than Aristotle's Athens or Corneille's Paris."[31]

Schlegel also has some good things to say about Shakespeare. First, he notes the absence of love intrigues, which are ubiquitous in French literature. He is also impressed with Shakespeare's approach to and use of history. Both Schlegel and Gottsched believe history to be a reputable source for drama. However, Schlegel points out that Shakespeare's plays are more than histories. Shakespeare takes the individual character from history and invests that character with universal human qualities. His characters are therefore his own creations. Sometimes, as in Julius Caesar, this urge to embellish historical facts is taken too far. To Schlegel's neo-classical mind this suggests over-indulged pathos and hyperbolic rhetoric. Nonetheless, he approves of Shakespeare's passion and allows for the circumstance that great genius cannot always be kept within the bounds of aesthetic propriety. And it is this insight that sets in motion a process that will reverse Gottsched's anti-Shakespearian prejudice.[32]

All of what has occurred to this point with the reception of

Shakespeare in Germany finds its final resolution in the work of Lessing. With his contributions to Shakespearean scholarship in Germany, the first part of Germany's reception of Shakespeare is complete. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing is one of the most important of the Enlightenment authors and at the same time one of the most important critics of the Enlightenment. He helps to move German literature beyond that movement toward the classical era of Goethe and Schiller. He is the first German poet of the eighteenth century whose works are still presented on the German stage and is also the founder of the *Bürgerliche Trauerspiel* (tragedy of the middle class), with *Miss Sara Sampson* and *Emilia Galotti*. His play *Nathan der Weise* is the best example of the tolerance of other religions espoused by the Enlightenment.

Concerning his stand on Shakespeare, one need look no further than the seventeenth letter in his *Briefe der neusten Literatur betreffend*. There he states unequivocally that Gottsched's critical praise of the French theater and his desire to construct the German theater along the same lines is absolutely wrong. Lessing begins his letter by quoting a critic who says, "No one will deny that the German stage owes much to Gottsched for its improvement." Lessing continues, "I am that no one; I deny it categorically."[33] He then continues in his best German polemical style to excoriate Gottsched. While he admits that the German theater at the time of Gottsched stood in need of reform, he says that it took no great mind to understand that and criticizes Gottsched for his remedy: transporting French dramas to Germany and expecting them to be accepted by the Germans as they were the French. He says that Gottsched threw together a play of his own, *Cato*, with scissors and paste. He wanted not to cleanse the old German theater, but to create his own theater. And what kind of theater would that be? A French theater. He did not bother to consider whether that would fit a German audience. Had he looked more carefully at what he rejected, he would have seen that the German audiences had more in common with English taste than with French audiences, and that Germans, when they viewed tragedies on stage, wanted to see and think more than the awful French plays allowed them to do. Germans are more interested in greatness, the terrible and the melancholy, rather than the showy, the delicate and the amorous. Too great a simplicity tires Germans

more than too much complexity. Lessing accuses Gottsched of being too impressed with Addison and not impressed enough with Shakespeare, Johnson, Beaumont and Fletcher. Had Gottsched translated Shakespeare rather than Corneille and Racine, he would have come closer to the true taste of German audiences. He would also have awakened among German dramatists far more substantial talent. For, as Lessing says in one of his most often quoted phrases, a genius can only be awakened by a genius. Lessing believes that a genius is born, not made. Education and hard work may polish what is there, but unless the talent naturally inheres in a person, that person will never be a genius.

Further, Lessing maintains that Shakespeare's gifts far exceed Corneille or Racine. The latter, he says, although familiar with the Greek dramatists, never approach their abilities, while Shakespeare, who is almost totally ignorant of the Greeks, come far closer to the substance of their ability. Next to Sophocles' *Oedipus* only are Shakespeare's *Othello*, *King Lear*, and *Hamlet*.

So much for Lessing's estimation of Shakespeare. Two things are important for this seventeenth letter. First, it shows a first rate and well-respected German critic stating in the most unequivocal terms that Shakespeare is the equal of the ancient Greeks and therefore a model worthy of admiration and replication; second, and perhaps more important for the history of German literature, it shows a complete break with the French Enlightenment tradition which Gottsched had lionized and which now Germany's literature was mature enough to throw off.

From this point on, Germany's reception of Shakespeare becomes more varied and rich. Goethe and the Romantics raise the reputation of the Bard to heights that are seldom found anywhere else, including England itself. The translations of August Wilhelm Schlegel and Dorothea Tieck, daughter of Ludwig Tieck, the great author and theoretician, not only secure Shakespeare's reputation in Germany, but also do much to establish new norms for translation for all countries. It is these translations that almost persuade the reader to wonder if they may not capture the original intent of Shakespeare better than the Bard's own English version—at least that's what many well-intended Germans who were seduced by Shakespeare would have us believe.

The connection between Goethe and Shakespeare requires several books by themselves. Suffice it to say here that Goethe's

great novel, *Wilhelm Meister*, deals extensively with *Hamlet*. Wilhelm himself travels with a troop of actors during this work, and one of the plays they present is Hamlet. In incorporating the scenes that deal with *Hamlet* in his novel, Goethe is making a statement about his veneration of Shakespeare, just as he did when composing his famous *Sturm und Drang* drama *Götz von Berlichingen*, which, while not quoting Shakespeare, is written so completely in the Bard's style that all who saw the play knew immediately the source of Goethe's inspiration.

Shakespeare continues to be a major influence in German literature throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century. Germans seem to react almost instinctively to Shakespeare's corpus of works. The affinity not only to their literature, but to their very nature is undeniable. Certainly it has been, is now and will continue to be one of the most felicitous melding of two cultures in the history of literature.

Notes

1. Dante Alighieri, *The Divine Comedy*, vol. 1, *Inferno*, trans. John D. Sinclair (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961), 23.
2. Roger Paulin, *The Critical Reception of Shakespeare in Germany* 1682-1914 (New York: Georg Oms Verlage, 2003), 1.
3. Georg Gottfried Gervinus, *Shakespeare Commentaries*, trans. F. B. Burnett, 2 vols. (London: Smith Elder, 1875), 1:xv.
4. Friedrich Gundolf, *Shakespeare under deutsche Geist* (Habilitationsschrift, 1911); quoted in Paulin, 1.
5. Will and Ariel Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, vol.7, *The Age of Reason Begins* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961), 568.
6. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. 2 (Munich: Carl Hanser, 1959), 290. All translations from the German are mine.
7. Daniel Georg Morhof, *Unterricht von der Teutschen Sprache und Poesie*, ed. Henning Boetius (1682; Bad Homburg v.d.H.: Gehlen, 1969), as quoted in Paulin, *The Critical Reception*, 12.
8. Paulin, *The Critical Reception*, 15.
9. Ibid., 32.
10. Ibid.
11. Johann Wolfgang Goethe, *Werke*, Herausgegeben im Auftrage der Grossherzogin Sophie von Sachsen, 143 vols. (Weimar: Böhlau, 1887-1919), 27:88.
12. Paulin, *The Critical Reception*, 20.
13. Ibid., 22.

14. Ibid., 23.
15. Ibid., 33.
16. Ibid., 35.
17. Ibid., 35, 36.
18. Ibid., 43.
19. Johann Christoph Gottsched, *Beyträge zur Kritischen Historie der Deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit* (Leipzig: Bey Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf, 1733); quoted in Paulin, *The Critical Reception*, 43.
20. Paulin, *The Critical Reception*, 42.
21. Ibid., 40.
22. K. A. Richter, *Shakespeare in Deutschland in den Jahren 1739-1770* (Oppeln: Muschner, 1912), 9-17, identifies and talks about this and other *Spectator* passages.
23. Paulin, The Critical Reception, 50.
24. Ibid., 37.
25. Ibid., 50.
26. Ibid., 52.
27. Ibid., 53.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid., 55.
30. Ibid., 58.
31. Ibid., 59-61.
32. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Gesammelte Werke*, 2:52.
33. Ibid.