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INTRODUCTION

Comparative and critical studies of Lessing and the romanticists, especially the older romanticists, can always find justification: first, in the fact that Lessing is the best representative of eighteenth century criticism, and the romanticists give direction and character to the criticism of the nineteenth century; and second, because Lessing is the chief exponent of the modern objective critics while the romanticists are the foremost subjective critics. It is unfruitful and unsatisfying, of course, to try to establish which of the two schools is critically more accurate, which finds a greater success in pointing and clarifying for the reading public the great works that are to grow into the thought and the heart of the nation.

With the beginning of greater literary production in Germany, it was imperative that intelligent, tolerant critics establish some sort of order amongst the works being poured out on the public, that they check any enthusiasm that threatened to become harmfully wayward. The first group of literary critics, Gottsched and his school, went to the other extreme of wilfulness by setting up rules numerous enough to choke free growth. Although the rationalists and the sentimentalists helped tear down some of these rules, they would probably have gone just as far in other directions had it not been for the leadership of Lessing. He
became the critical genius of the new movement, judging ably and fearlessly but basing his judgment on historical standards and aesthetic conventions. The romanticists, led by the Schlegels, threw conventions to the winds; they trusted to their feelings more than the rationalists; they tried to catch the spirit of the whole work and to characterize the author. In one word, they were subjective.

Walzel says of the two groups or schools: "Gewiss hat Lessing stark vorgearbeitet; er hat die Kritik um mehr neue Gesichtspunkte bereichert als die Schlegel. Dennoch hat sich die literarische Kritik des 19. Jahrhunderts in den Bahnen der Schlegel, nicht in denen Lessings bewegt." It is a problem to determine whether the romanticists owe any great debt to Lessing, and if they do, just how much of their critical apparatus is borrowed. That is an issue that may be settled with some accuracy. The question as to the relative merits of the two schools is one that must be settled by every individual reader. Walzel, in his introduction to the selection from the Schlegels, complains that the romantic critics were somewhat too eager to enter into the individuality of the writer criticized "um ihr die Wege klarzustellen, die sie unbewusst gewandelt war, um ihre Träume ihr zu deuten." As we shall see in Friedrich's criticism of Lessing, there is grave danger in a critical procedure of this sort; and it does seem that the later school too often gives the reader only another viewpoint, another angle of the same subject without actually getting at the book or the man to be judged. It is the age-old conflict between the objective and the subjective, between
science on the one hand and inspiration and instinct on the other.

Although the two schools, Lessing and his followers and the romanticists, stand next to each other chronologically, (the classicists who stand between them, Goethe and Schiller, are a combination of the romantic and the rationalistic) there is a tremendous distance between them. Even in the ways that they went about the work of instructing and leading their ages, is there a difference; a characteristic difference according to Gundolf. He says of this work: "Er (Lessing) nahm sie auf sich, ohne sich ironisch, metaphysisch oder theosophisch nach Romantikerweise auf das dahinterliegende wohlige Apeiron zu verlassen. Dass der Weg unendlich war, hielt ihn nicht ab, jeden Schritt genau zu bedenken und markig zu setzen, die kleinsten Steine aus dem Weg zu räumen und so zu wandern, als müsse er die Strasse bahnen für künftige Siedler. Auf die Gnade hat er nicht gewartet, wie Romantiker, die Hände im Schoos, die Augen im Spiegel."

Since the two schools were, however, so close to each other in point of time and since Lessing was such a big figure in his age, there is bound to be a definite relationship between the two, and a question as to just how far the romanticists differed in certain vital problems and in what ways, if there be any, they were influenced to approve of Lessing or to borrow from him. In their views on critical method, on the relationship of the arts, on the drama, and on religion and philosophy there is seemingly a deep chasm between them; on the other hand, the romanticists often praised Lessing for the work that he had done and for the fearless way in which he had done it. It is the aim of this study to
determine the attitude of the older romanticists - Friedrich and August Wilhelm Schlegel, Novalis, Tieck and Wackenroder - towards Lessing, especially in regard to the above questions, and also to add a little to the levelling out of the contradictions in this attitude.

The problem has excited some interest previous to this study. On the relationship between Friedrich and Lessing there are already two studies: one by Bernhard Bolle, in 1912, on Friedrich's attitude towards Lessing, and another by Johanna Krüger, one year later, which traces Friedrich's "conversion to Lessing." Because both of these studies, in the main, are written from the standpoint that there is a close relationship, even an influence on Friedrich, it seems justified to represent the other viewpoint, that Schlegel had himself in mind mostly and his feud with Nicolai, when he wrote on Lessing and that perhaps all his early sketches on Lessing were more influenced by a desire for gain rather than a deep interest in Lessing. In this direction the study takes us into an examination of the fundamental differences between the two schools of criticism. The attitude of August Wilhelm towards Lessing is clearer, more consistent, more on the surface. Margarete Wolff has a study on the relationship between the two men that is rather exhaustive; if anything, it goes too far into the question. August Wilhelm borrowed much from the authors he read; it is therefore difficult to determine exactly what is taken directly, what is entirely his own, and what has been changed slightly and incorporated into his thought, influencing the pattern of it. As a critic of the drama, August Wilhelm
necessarily touched on many points with Lessing. There are two other short studies, besides the one above which takes all fields into consideration, which touch on this relationship: one, by August Vollmer, treats of the difference in the conception of the drama as seen in the works of the two men; another, by Rudolph Schwill, on A. W. Schlegel and the French theatre, touches slightly on the views of the two men in this problem. Tieck has not yet been treated; there are several rather interesting angles in his relationship to Lessing. The contact between Wackenroder and Lessing and Novalis and Lessing is negligible. The former was slightly touched by the Laocoon, as one would expect in view of his interest in art, and the latter by Lessing's religious writings, especially the Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts. There is no more than a casual interest, however, at least as far as their works give evidence.
I. Friedrich Schlegel

Section A. The previous studies.

It is our universal custom, carried to extremes at times, to compare the leaders of parties and movements for differences and similarities. And, if possible, an effort is made to prove that one leader has profited by adopting certain of the methods of the other. Lessing and Friedrich Schlegel, as the undoubted leaders of their respective critical schools, the objective and the subjective, are exposed to the same comparison; and here the facts have truly been stretched to the breaking-point to support a theory. Long studies have been written showing that the younger writer felt a deep affection for the older, that in his youth he was influenced to objectivism by him, and that he always did remain under his spell and influence and somewhat in his debt for certain critical principles and articles of faith.

We have already mentioned the two studies by Bolle and Johanna Krüger that deal with the relationship between the two men; before examining them closely it might be well to characterize them briefly. Bolle's, which is first in point of time only, deals more exclusively with the alleged influence of Lessing on Schlegel than the one that came out shortly after it, that by Johanna Krüger. She considers it her problem to determine just when Schlegel began reading Lessing intensively and when he swung over to Lessing, if ever. Both studies somewhat overdo the marshalling of facts and quotations to prove a close relationship and an
intellectual kinship. The first ascribes entirely too much importance to Schlegel's early essay on Lessing in 1797; the latter too often mistakes Schlegel's comments on Lessing for actual criticisms of Lessing, whereas they are, more accurately, rather clever self-analysis.

A more detailed examination of the two studies, though dangerous insofar as there will be some repetition necessary later in the body of this study, brings out certain other misapprehensions and misinterpretations that could not be touched upon in a general characterization. A more detailed examination of these two studies is perhaps justified in that my refutation of certain details and contentions will foreshadow the method that is later to be employed in proving my views concerning the relationship; views that are not altogether in harmony with those of Bolle and Johanna Krüger.

Bolle sees the relationship beginning with Schlegel's deep veneration for the man Lessing, this veneration finally breaking down a prejudice against his works. At about the time of the Lessing essay, this respect or veneration for the man finally changes (why or how Bolle does not say) to a deeper interest in his works, which from now on influence Schlegel in his own views: "Lessing hatte auf Fr. Schlegel befreiend gewirkt, in ihm hatte er sich und sein Streben wiederzufinden geglaubt." He finds, in short, that the Lessing essay is the best that has been said about Lessing in such a short space. And Bolle comes to such a view in spite of the evidence in the essay - evidence that he overlooks - that it is full of distortions to prove Schlegel's
contention that Lessing did not belong to the age of rationalism, and in spite of the absolutely subjective treatment of Lessing as a poet and critic, a treatment that does not take into account the services that he rendered with these works and the virtues and excellences that do lie in them. However, since Bolle agrees heartily with Schlegel that Lessing was no poet and no critic but merely a writer of polemics, he would naturally feel an intense admiration for the essay and be apt to overlook the fact that it is a distorted portrait, with no deep understanding of Lessing; and that it is an explanation of Schlegel's own views rather than an analysis of Lessing and his views. By 1804, in the Lessing anthology, (commonly called the Lessingbächlein) Bolle finds Schlegel almost entirely in accord with Lessing's views; which is not the case, as is proved rather conclusively by Schlegel's introductions to the various sections and by his other writings of that time, not on Lessing. We shall revert to this in the chapter on the anthology. Altogether there is too much emphasis on personal respect - this did play some role - and on artistic influence; both have a very small basis in fact. The gravest mistake is the undue importance Bolle ascribes to the Lessing anthology as showing the close relationship between the two men.

Johanna Krüger, in her study, pays too much attention to the early views of Schlegel on Lessing, especially as expressed in his letters to his brother. The young Friedrich was reading omnivorously in the years 1792-93, and a classification of Lessing with Garve and other lesser lights, to which Krüger points, although of some importance, does not necessarily mean that
Schlegel felt any active aversion towards Lessing. The early unfavorable attitude towards Lessing (Bolle, we have seen, found a tremendous respect for the character of Lessing in the young Schlegel) was due, probably, not so much to a disdain for Lessing's personality, as Johanna Kräger believes, but altogether to a contempt for the school to which Lessing's name was linked as leader. This contempt Johanna Kräger admits, but she does not think Friedrich's early aversion towards Lessing due to it. This misunderstanding, the judging of Lessing by the ill-repute of the school to which he belonged, naturally would be increased by the fact that Schlegel was interested primarily in ancient literature and probably had not yet read much in Lessing's works. She further points out that Schlegel did not read the works of Lessing carefully because he felt in himself a tendency towards rationalism and feared to strengthen it; and because he did not see a striving for the Whole in Lessing. This latter contention is disproved by Schlegel himself in his essay on Lessing. The first contention, that Schlegel felt in himself a tendency to be a reasonable being and critic rather than an imaginative one, is perhaps over-emphasized. Even as early as the first years in Leipzig he shows a leaning towards subjective criticism, a leaning most apparent in his judging the man first and through the man his works. He is already seeking the spirit of the work, the Whole, rather than the aesthetic values of it or the historical justification. The rationalists, especially Lessing, criticized more from the historical standpoint and it is this that would eventually antagonize Friedrich, who was later to have so much affection for
Charakteristiken. Johanna Krüger continues, that as soon as Schlegel came under the influence of Caroline he is supposed to have been cured of sentimentalism and subjectivism, the cure bringing him nearer the unsentimental Lessing. Through Fichte and his polemic force he is brought still closer. At any rate, applying her reasoning, he now turns to Lessing for the same reason that he had earlier turned away from him, because he feels a similarity in natures. All this happens in a remarkably short time. It may be pertinent to state here that in all of Schlegel's course of development there was never any such doubling back on earlier views; the entire growth is logical, never inconsistent or unnatural. Johanna Krüger finishes the chain of deductions about the early relationship by postulating that Schlegel did not yet know Lessing's religious works and felt inimical only towards the critic and the poet. This seems true enough and perhaps later he was turned to Lessing because of the religious writings that he studied carefully before writing the essay; but the influence did not strike very deeply, as we shall find in this essay of 1797. Even after Schlegel knew the religious writings, and after he thought to grasp the "central Idea" in Lessing, he admired the man Lessing more than his works; the recognition of the "central Idea" was probably a projection of his essentially religious pre-occupation into the life and works of Lessing. Also accepted in her study is Schlegel's statement that his interests in the reading of Lessing kept him from writing the essay. The truth is that Schlegel was so busied at the time with all the irons that he had in the fire that he did not even have time to study Lessing as
intensively as he claimed to be doing. Friedrich, who usually mentioned his plans for writing to his brother, did not mention the essay on Lessing until 1796 and then with no great enthusiasm. It was merely another job and it may be that Reichardt ordered it for his Deutschland, suggesting the subject himself; there is no proof to the contrary. It must not be forgotten that it was Reichardt who, in 1796 or '97, suggested the title Herzenergossungen eines Kunstliebenden Klosterbruders to Tieck and Wackenroder, because the monk in the collection of essays reminded him of the monk in Nathan. He was evidently deeply interested in Lessing. At any rate, Johanna Krüger carries the idea of influence too far when she lists sentences that Schlegel is supposed to have written with Lessing in mind. Reminiscent, she claims, of Lessing's famous Niemand opening of the 17th Literaturbrief are these two sentences: "Diese gedehnte Erzählung muss verborgne Reize haben, weil sie, wie man sagt, vielen gefällt. Ich bin keiner von diesen vielen," and "Hier ist sie." Things of this sort are hardly ever positive proof. She goes even farther afield in her reasoning about the conclusion to the essay of 1797, the Abschluss des Lessing-Aufsatzes that appeared in 1801: "Der Grund, weshalb Schlegel solange zögerte, den Aufsatz zu vollenden, war nicht Gleichgültigkeit. Dies erhellt daraus dass in den Veröffentlichungen zwischen 1799 und 1801 immer wieder von Lessing die Rede ist." She adds a number of references to Lessing in the works, but it is in the letters of this period that the lack of interest in Lessing is most evident. Lessing is mentioned often enough, but only in connection with the finishing
of the essay; even the passages on which she bases her contention show only a casual interest. The essay, after all, was written more because of an enmity for living rationalists than to glorify a dead rationalist. Johanna Kräger closes her treatment of the period of the essay with a remark that shows the real reason for the tone of Schlegel's study. "Er (Schlegel) glaubt der einzige zu sein, der wirkliches Verständnis für Lessing habe, und mit dem fanatischen Eifer eines Neubekehrten geht er daran, seinen 'epigrammatischen Dithyrambos', wie Novalis den Aufsatz über Lessing nannte, zu schreiben." This idea was, of course, conceit on Schlegel's part. In the conclusion to this essay, appearing, as we have mentioned, four years later and concerned very little with Lessing, she does not fail to see the ego of Friedrich clearly shining forth. But Johanna Kräger also attributes too great an importance to the Lessing anthology that Schlegel compiled; she cites Dilthey as authoritative support. He says: "1804 liess Friedrich Schlegel drei Bände: 'Lessings Gedanken und Meinungen' drucken, welche eine schlecht maskierte Buchhändlerspekulation sind, trotzdem aber das Beste enthalten was bis dahin über Lessing gesagt worden ist." This in spite of Herder's excellent comments on Lessing and in spite of the fact that the various introductions are so evidently, for the most part, Schlegel's own views on criticism, art, philosophy, and religion. Like Bolle, Johanna Kräger here finds that Schlegel has radically changed his former opinion of Lessing, considering him highly now as critic and philosopher. We shall see that he does not do so. But she does recognize the debt that Schlegel owes to Lessing for
a few ideas from the Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts. Altogether, her study is more even than Bolle's. She sees that much of Schlegel's occasional preoccupation with Lessing lies in Schlegel's egoism, in his tendency to step on the stage in the guise of the great rationalist, whom he endows with characteristics that were more truly his own.

In the discussion of these two studies I have intimated the points on which I disagree; the following general remarks are further discussions of these same points; they likewise show the path that I shall follow in my study. Beginning with 1792, when Schlegel was 20 years old, the time to his death is divided into three periods: 1792-97, 1798-1804, 1805-29. Into the first period, at the close, falls the essay Ueber Lessing, that has already been mentioned; into the second fall the Abschluss des Lessing-Aufsatzes (which is the conclusion to the 1797 essay) and the Lessingbüchlein; the third period is that of Schlegel's short discussion of Lessing in the Geschichte der alten und neuen Literatur, a series of lectures held in 1812 in Vienna and called, for convenience, the Wiener Vorlesungen. With these lectures Lessing's picture becomes fixed for Schlegel; it undergoes no more radical changes, just as Schlegel underwent no further changes. The divisions are logical in that in each of them Schlegel's idea of Lessing is a different one, determined, as we shall see, by Schlegel's own spiritual adventures and changes.

The case for the studies of Bolle and Johanna Krüger is strengthened by the fact that Schlegel was or seemed to be tremendously taken with the objective Greek literature in his youth.
and that he did write several studies on Lessing. But, unfortu-
nately, proof of any influence does not hold, either in the essays
on Lessing themselves, or in the general essays; nor is the state-
ment about Schlegel's early classicism altogether true. His
personal admiration for Lessing is hardly a true understanding of
him. Schlegel, we have already intimated, thought to see himself
in Lessing; there was consequently some distortion of Lessing's
image. In truth, and the proof is not overly difficult, he never
was close to Lessing personally or critically - or in his relig-
ious concepts. In 1804 Schleiermacher wrote to Friedrich that it
would take a German rather than a Frenchman to teach Hindu philos-
ophy most excellently, (Friedrich was busied with Sanskrit and
Persian at the time) and among the Germans he, Friedrich, was the
best fitted to teach, "wenn Du nur nicht mit einer zu grossen
Vorliebe für Deine a priori entworfene Construction die Quellen
beschaust und untersuchst." Schlegel, however, did just that
with Hindu philosophy, as he had done earlier with Lessing and
other subjects.

To return briefly to Schlegel's early classicism, which may have brought him nearer Lessing; he was a lover of
classic literature, but there was no feeling of kinship for the
Greek writers, as there was in Lessing; no feeling for the form
and the direct simplicity. It was, even at first, a romantic
classicism, like Hölderlin's, without the latter's warmth. A
romanticist born, though having the seeing eye, has also a vivid
imagination, a sixth sense, that is not satisfied with the clear
beauty of external objects but needs to see or feel a symbol
a spiritual something behind and beyond. This would explain Schiller's trend towards romanticism - it was evident in Schlegel when he wrote of classic literature; the difference immediately puts a wide gulf between him and Lessing.

The study of Lessing that appeared in 1797 was written to show the greatness of Lessing; Schlegel felt a similarity in natures and it was, consequently, a queer Lessing that stepped out of the picture, a Lessing who was for all the world like the author. Walzel has expressed this very nicely: "Freilich schillert letztlich dieser Lessing stark ins Friedrich Schlegelsche. Ist schon Lessings energische Leichtigkeit und Beweglichkeit mit Friedrichs apathischem Cynismus nicht zu vergleichen, der endlich in bare Faulheit ausartet, so ist die Zeichnung des Dichters Lessing ganz verfehlt." Dorothea writes to Schleiermacher concerning the same tendency in Friedrich to neglect the subjects of his essays for himself, a tendency, we shall see, that is painfully evident in all his writings on Lessing: "Ich freue mich ganz unendlich mit dem "Herkules Musagetes." Sie wissen, oder wissen Sie nicht, dass diese Elegie den Aufsatz 'über Lessing' in den 'Charakteristiken und Kritiken' beschliessen soll? Ich finde diesen Titel sehr wohl ausgedacht. Wilhelm und Friedrich haben sich darin charakterisirt und alles übrige kritisirt."

In my study, then, I shall try to justify more in detail the points that I raised in differing from certain views of the two previous studies and to bring out more clearly, also, Friedrich's tendency to self-portraiture and self-analysis. Further, I shall try to show that Schlegel was never particularly
interested in Lessing; that there is very little trace of any influence; and that the chasm between Schlegel as a romanticist and the rationalist Lessing remained unbridged to the time of the former's death.
Section B. 1792-1797.

After the misfortunes and debts in Leipzig, Schlegel moved to Dresden firmly determined to study Greek and Roman literature and here in Dresden came the decision to make literature his calling. Consequently he read much more than just Greek and Roman literature and in the chaos of new books, new impressions, there was bound to be a confusion of ideas, an inability to be true to his own convictions, because they were as yet hazy and the new impressions were numerous and strong. Writing to his brother concerning the latter's affection and loyalty to Bürger, whom Friedrich criticizes as harshly as did Schiller, he says of poems in general: "Klarheit, Bestimtheit, Kürze, Leichtigkeit u.s.w. kurz alle negativen Tugenden der Rede erheben sie noch nicht zur Poesie." A true classic scholar or devotee would have found no fault with such virtues; at least he would not consider them negative. Further in this same letter he says, in answer to his brother's suggestion that he read Don Carlos: "Ich habe Schiller nie geliebt, Klopstock lange gar nicht sehr geachtet; vielleicht bin ich eben deshalb um so mehr gerecht gegen sie, seit der Zeit, da ich auch andre Dichter verstehe, als die meinem eigenthümlichen Geschmack besonders analog sind."

But this tendency to find something analogous in the life and the works of certain poets did persist, and it was partly this that led him later to write so warmly of Lessing. For he was cool, not to say cold and unjust, in his early remarks about Lessing and his coldness did not change until he busied himself
with the essay in 1797. In his literary confessions to his brother he stated that he admired only Goethe among the modern German poets; that with the exception of Klopstock, German critics, among them Lessing, have only a cold sharpness and elegance.

Just before moving to Dresden in 1792, he wrote to his brother from Leipzig concerning a novel by Wezel: "Es herrscht überall eine gewisse Lessingische Kälte darin; man hört oft den feinen Beobachter." A little later, from Dresden, he became yet more harsh: "Ich sondre mir oft die deutschen Schriftsteller in Schulen ab, nach Art der italienischen Maler; und da setze ich ihn (Garve), Lessing, Engel, dann Wezel u.s.w. zusammen. Ihr Charakter ist geistlose kalte Correctheit." Even this early there is evidence of his weakness for the a priori judgments that Schleiermacher and others censured so sharply in him later. In 1795-96, his Über das Studium der Griechischen Poesie was published, a few months after Schiller's Über ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen. By many it was thought to be a pendant to the latter work. Schiller, as a Kantian, saw an extraordinary progress in the work of the moderns, because they created through natural impulses. But for Schlegel, in his sentimental attachment to Greek literature, Sophocles was at that time the height of all development and, as Walzel says, "als Kantianer weiss er sogar einen Beweiss zu konstruiren, vermöge dessen sein Griechenideal selbst den rigorosen Forderungen des Königsberger Weltweisen genügt." We shall find that Schlegel persisted in forcing his subjects, especially Lessing, into a pre-conceived mold.
There is much questing for the cause of Schlegel's changed attitude towards Lessing, the change that occurred between 1793 and 1797, the latter the date of the Lessing essay. Lessing could not have meant very much to Schlegel or he would have left a record of his growing fondness in his letters to August Wilhelm, to whom he usually expressed quite firmly and enthusiastically his likes and dislikes. There is, however, only one brief, unimportant mention of Lessing between 1793 and the announcement to his brother, in 1796, that he had finished an essay on Lessing. Nor is there a record of this change in any of his other letters. If any change came about, it was caused by the essay itself; the Lessing that Schlegel created in the essay converted him to Lessing himself, as it were, if we can call his attitude in the essay a conversion. Johanna Krüger stresses the fact that Schlegel was already favorably inclined to Lessing in his review of Jakobi's Woldemar, a review that appeared in 1796. In this piece of work there is praise for Lessing's style and a comparison of his liveliness of spirit with that of Plato and Spinoza. But this review in all probability was written after the essay on Lessing. To his brother Friedrich wrote in July of 1796: "Ich kann nicht gut an ihn (Reichardt) schreiben, bis ich den Lessing mitschicke, welches leicht noch ein acht Tage dauern könnte. Reichardt hat mir eine Recension des Woldemar angetragen, die ich angenommen." Bolle ascribes the change as coming through Schlegel's close reading of Fichte; he could have been swayed
by Fichte's patriotic essays and by Fichte's high regard for Lessing. This enthusiasm for things German, however, was already in flame in 1792, long before meeting or reading Fichte and long before he turned to Lessing. Moreover, the work in which Fichte most clearly expressed his admiration for Lessing, Friedrich Nicolai's Leben und sonderbare Meinungen, did not appear until 1801. In the passage referred to above, Bolle, it is true, claims that it is the striking similarity between Fichte and Lessing, which Friedrich is supposed to have noticed, that led Schlegel eventually to raise Lessing up to Fichte in his estimation; this is building on a very intangible foundation, to be sure. Haym also sees the influence of Fichte in Schlegel's changed attitude towards Lessing, except that he bases it rather largely on personal contact with Fichte, a contact that did not take place until after the essay, as Rouge has proved. And when Friedrich did meet Fichte, the regard for his writings did not extend, in any large measure, to the man himself, as a letter to Körner shows rather clearly. A deep personal influence, even later, is therefore open to question.

Perhaps the hunt is on the wrong path. We know that at this time both Friedrich and his brother were doing very much reading and, like all youths who read very much, they were deeply prejudiced against some writers, whom they did not know well, and boundlessly enthusiastic about others. Their criticisms were often enough wayward and false. There is a certain cloudiness, indefiniteness, that Friedrich, at least, was never to
overcome. While the youthful criticisms of Lessing, who was always more rational than Schlegel, are not taken very seriously, yet those of Schlegel are studied thoroughly and analyzed even more carefully than his later, maturer writings.

Rather than hunt so long and so vainly for a reason for the change in Schlegel's attitude towards Lessing, it may be nearer the truth to say that there is no decided change in the attitude. The other writings of the time of the essay show how far Schlegel was from Lessing, and the internal evidence of the essay itself - we shall examine both sources later - shows that Schlegel still misunderstood Lessing and that he saw characteristics, gifts, and qualities in him that he did not possess, but that Schlegel did possess.

There were three other reasons, apart from the imagined deep affection and respect, which prompted him to write this essay of 1797: three solid reasons that weigh rather heavily. First of all, Schlegel needed money badly to pay his old and new debts and to live well; second, he was at this time beginning to sacrifice learning and unprofitable study to a desire for popularity and monetary rewards rather than the thin unsubstantial rewards of mental satisfaction; and finally, there was his contempt for the rationalists of Berlin and the enmity between the two camps. The rationalists made no secret of their bitterness towards the romanticists; the romanticists directed their blows and their derision against living and dead. They did not consider
Ramler a great poet nor Mendelssohn a great philosopher; they criticized harshly Engel and the two Nicolais, especially the father, who at that time was the leader of a small, insignificant, rapidly diminishing group of rationalists in Berlin. It was against the older Nicolai that Friedrich directed most of his blows.

To show the rationalists how sadly they misunderstood their idol, Lessing, Schlegel was doubly enthusiastic about him and endowed him with the same romantic, Schlegelian qualities which the rationalists had denounced so bitterly in Schlegel and in the other romanticists. And once Schlegel had blown the breath of life into this new, romantic Lessing, it was easy for him to wax more and more enthusiastic about him. That the affection did not go much more deeply than this, that it was based on a false enthusiasm, is shown by Schlegel's quick neglect of Lessing after he had done the Lessing anthology, which grew easily and profitably out of the work for the essay; for it is accepted that he made most of the excerpts from Lessing while he was writing the first essay, and that he wrote much of the introductory material to the 1804 anthology or Lessingbuchlein, as false starts towards the un-Lessingian conclusion to the 1797 essay, the conclusion that appeared as late as 1801.

Before examining the 1797 essay for evidence to prove that Schlegel had not turned with such deep affection, respect, and understanding to Lessing, we shall discuss the three sound
reasons for writing the essay. Later we shall examine some of
the works of the period of the essay to show how far apart the
two men were in their views.

In Dresden (1794-1796) Friedrich was in constant need
of money, for expenses and for the payment of debts contracted
while in Leipzig. He turned to all sides for help, especially to
his brother; more important, he became more and more determined
to earn quick money, with essays that could be sold immediately
and with translations. As an example of his terrific eagerness
to do anything to earn money, he even proposed to Reichardt (who
at that time was his publisher and who later published the essay
in his periodical Deutschland) to translate Don Quixote, at a
time when he did not even know any Spanish. Concerning this,
Reichardt wrote to Eschen, who was regarded as the logical man
to do the translation - which Tieck actually did a little later:
"Ich kam mit mein. Vorschl: noch so eben zu rechter Zeit, um
Schlegel dafür zu schätzen, dass er nicht zu den viel zu übereilt
übernommenen und auf nahe Zeit zugesagten Arbeiten auch noch
diese unternahm." Besides giving a good idea of the multiplicity
of Schlegel's engagements at this time, the letter, with its
mention of übereilt übernommenen Arbeiten, gives the idea that
the subjects were, at least to a certain extent, suggested by
Reichardt. At this time also Friedrich advised his brother to
translate and edit excerpts from Italian and Spanish authors, an
easy work that would bring him a large income and, at the same
time, furnish him material for small essays growing naturally out of the work of collection. Friedrich himself did something like this in the Lessing anthology. In 1795 Friedrich was forced to drop his Greek studies and writings entirely because of pressing debts: "Ausserdem werde ich aber wohl aus der Noth eine Tugend machen, die Graeca für ein Halbjahr ruhen lassen, und einen alten Plan vor die Hand nehmen - eine Kritik der kantischen Philosophie." He already had the material for this, and he mentioned further a Geschichte der Menschheit and the Philosophie der Geschichte, for both of which he had ready most of the material. He was again victim of the old helter-skelter of plans that his brother had criticized in his Leipzig years. He was taking the easiest road, the road to quick money, at a sacrifice of plans that he had now cherished for some years; the further study and treatment of Greek literature, architecture, manners, and so forth. In all this time there is no mention of Lessing, not to speak of the essay. Suddenly in 1796 he wrote to Reichardt that he could perhaps bring him the essays on Schiller's aesthetic works and on Lessing, adding "Jedoch muss ich, was diese Arbeiten betrifft, noch erinnern, dass meine Lage es mir zur Pflicht macht, keine Schriftstellereyen, welche einen beträchtlichen Aufwand von Zeit forderten, ohne Honorar zu übernehmen, welches ich Ihrer Bestimmung ganz anheimstelle. Jedoch versteht's sich von selbst, dass ich den Versuch über den Republikanismus sehr gern und am liebsten in Deutschland gedruckt sähe, wenn auch in diesem Journal
The essay is evidently no labor of love.

All the letters of this period show a rather queer and amusing mixture of doubt, contradiction and, at times, shame for having stooped down from the Greeks to works on the modern writers. To Körner, Schiller's friend, he boasted of the amount of work he had done on the moderns and hoped that it would save him from the petrification that he was in danger of because of the continued study of antique writers; he added that the only important fruit this study of the moderns had born thus far "ist eine Rezension des Woldemar, welche in Rücksicht der Länge ein Seitenstück, in jeder andern Rücksicht aber ein Gegenstück der Humboldschen ist. Ich hoffe Sie werden damit zufrieden seyn und auch keine Langeweile dabey haben. Ich habe mein Möglichstes gethan, den niedrigen Stoff zu würzen." The moderns, comprised of mean material, were nevertheless good money-making material. He vowed, however, not to lose himself in the moderns, to refresh himself at times with the writers of antiquity. And these essays on the moderns found a much readier market in the many periodicals of the time.

In his review of the Charakteristiken und Kritiken, Schleiermacher confessed to a disappointment in the second part of the Lessing essay, the conclusion of 1801 which was attached immediately to the first essay in the above publication, because it did not contain much about Lessing and he added, that considering
the failure of the second part, the first part would have been sufficient as a fragment, "wiewohl darin gegen manche Urtheile über Lessing, die wohl nicht so viel Autorität haben als der Verfasser zu glauben scheint, zuviel polemisirt wird." This refers to Schlegel’s constant recurrence to the rationalists, especially the Berlin rationalists with Nicolai at their head. Practically the whole essay, we shall see, is a polemic against these rationalists, and it seems to be more a blow directed at them than a just estimate of Lessing himself. There will be further reference to this in the discussion of the essay. For the present it is sufficient to point to the natural enmity between the two groups, between the younger romanticists and the rationalists centered in Berlin, and to state briefly Friedrich’s opinion of these rationalists as formed through personal contact with them, especially with the leader, Nicolai.

After the death of Lessing, Nicolai had begun to regard all literature as his domain. He was the spirit and the voice of the Montagsklub in Berlin; he patronized all the younger writers, giving them rationalistic advice and trying to draw them into the fold of the rationalists; and he strenuously battled the wolves of mysticism, Jesuitism, poetic freedom, and romanticism by preaching rationalism to them from the housetops. Further, the romanticists could not easily forget the fact that Nicolai had even preached the religion of reason (Vernunftsreligion) in Sebaldus Nothanker. Naturally enough Friedrich, who always desired to be something of
an oracle himself in literary matters and questions of religion and philosophy, objected to this. His contempt for Nicolai, however, did not date from his acquaintance with him. In Nicolai's Reisebeschreibungen (1783-96), Friedrich had been grouped with the literary Querköpfe and had further been warned against the misuse of Kantian terminology. Nicolai added to the injuries in his Sempronius Gundibert which appeared in 1798, after the appearance of Friedrich's essay on Lessing. Here Nicolai attacked both August Wilhelm and Friedrich, the latter for the criticism he voiced in the essay of Lessing's poetic powers. There is no doubt that all this rankled and it is not surprising that Friedrich's contempt should find expression. In a letter to Wilhelm, shortly after the essay on Lessing, Friedrich wrote: "Ich habe einige schwere Diners und Soupers bey dem alten Californier, Nikolai zu überstehen gehabt. Es ist possierlich, dass der Mann so vornehm eingerichtet ist, da er doch selbst so furchtbar gemein ist, war und seyn wird.---Drollig ists, wie er immer alles heraussagt, was ich längst unter die Grundsätze und Kennzeichen der Platteitslehre aufgenommen." It is this same hatred of Aufklärungsberlinism, as he called it, that led to the break with his publisher, Reichardt, shortly after the appearance of the 1797 essay on Lessing in the latter's Deutschland. And when we consider further that it was at this period that Schlegel became more and more interested in problems of religion, in mysticism, Catholicism, revelation, it is easy to see how much
more distasteful than all his platitudes Nicolai's religion of reason would be to him.

In summary, then, it would seem that Schlegel wrote the essay on Lessing because he needed money and had determined to gain it by writing popular articles; and, more important, he found this a good opportunity to turn their own greatest figure, Lessing, on the Berlin rationalists and to show them in this stroke how mistaken they were in claiming him as their own. Further, there is no doubt that a closer reading of Lessing increased Schlegel's respect to some extent, but here again the increase may have been due primarily to the fact that Schlegel read his own personality and views into Lessing's works and found romantic qualities in them that existed only in his own imagination. This assertion will become clearer with the discussion of the essay. At any rate, the desire to offend the rationalists determined the tone of the essay rather than a profound respect for Lessing's writings. A fairly close study of the essay makes this fact rather evident. But first, before discussing the essay, it may be pertinent to examine the writings done around 1797, the date of the essay, to find how far apart the two men were in questions of art and criticism.

The greatest divergence from the critical views of Lessing - a divergence that militates against any fancied fundamental influence, or even sympathy - occurs in Schlegel's Über das Studium der Griechischen Poesie. Here he advocated the
imitation of the purely objective poetry of the Greeks, and at the same time he decried too slavish obedience to rules, as if Greek drama did not attain its objectivity, its calmness through an obedience to rules; as if it did not unconsciously follow rules laid down by experience, dramatic requirements, and a certain restraint that comes to true artists with age. But the essay as a whole is shot through with the struggle between the objectivity of the Greek poetry which he studied and a personal inclination for the "interesting"—as opposed to "objective"—poetry of Shakespeare and of the late 18th century writers who also wrote in the "interesting category." To these he had formerly been unjust because of his determination to enjoy only antique writers, a determination that he does not express in so many words, but which is all too evident in all his early writings.

That Schlegel was not at all sure of his views concerning Greek poetry and its objective strength as opposed to the lawless interest of modern poetry, is shown by the fact that he first grouped Shakespeare with the modern "interesting" writers, praised them, and then tempered the praise by adding: "Sie (moderne Poesie) macht nicht einmal Ansprüche auf Objektivität, welches doch die erste Bedingung des reinen und unbedingten Ästhetischen Werths ist, und ihr Ideal ist das Interessante d. h. subjektive Ästhetische Kraft. — Ein Urtheil, dem das Gefühl laut widerspricht! Man hat schon viel gewonnen, wenn man sich diesen
This occurs in the introduction to the essay proper (the essay being written in 1795-96 and the introduction in the year of publication, 1797, which is the year of the study on Lessing) and it shows more than a tendency towards the complete subjectivism of Schlegel's later years, and as such - it opposes Lessing theoretically. The chief value of this plainly evident tinge of subjectivism lies in the fact that it shows the weakness of Schlegel's earlier conviction, that Greek poetry was supreme in the quality of beauty. It shows that the early objectivism, that is pointed at to prove Lessing's influence, was temporary and never deeply rooted. The introduction is partly a refutation of the body of the essay, as Walzel has pointed out. He adds: "Jetzt sucht er der modernen Poesie gerechter zu werden; diese Tendenz kommt in seinen folgenden Aussagen immer mehr zum Durchbruch, bis die interessante Poesie in dem Begriff der romantischen von ihm apokaleptisch wird."

There is a yet more definite romanticism in an earlier essay, Über die Homerische Poesie. Characteristically romantic is his remark that epic poetry is a flowing painting. Of Homer's work he says that the poet has not pictured for us the infinite, but he adds: "Jeder Freund Homers weiss es aber, dass er gleichsam eine grenzenlose Aussicht eröffnet, und die Erwartung ins Unendliche anregt. Er erregt nehmlich keine bestimmte Erwartung nach der Entwicklung eines Keims ... sondern eine durchaus unbestimmte und also ins Unendliche gehende Erwartung..."
blosser Fülle überhaupt." This is certainly a romantic conception; as in the case of Lessing, Homer here takes on certain of Friedrich's features.

We find very little, in all the works appearing before the Lessing essay, to show the objectivity that Lessing, in part at least, is said to have influenced.

Coming finally to the essay itself, the nature of which has already been touched upon in the discussion of Johanna Krüger's study, we find that it is contradictory even in its praise of Lessing; that it is too much a polemic against the Berlin rationalists to be good criticism of Lessing; that, as in all polemics, there is too much exaggeration for the sake of effect; and that there is finally too great an effort to make a Schlegelian figure, a near-romanticist, of Lessing.

The limitations of the essay can be felt even in a rapid survey. Schlegel begins with an explanation of his reasons for writing the essay. No one had yet made the effort to grasp the spirit of Lessing, the whole man. Further, Lessing had so long been believed the leader of a party that was characterized by prejudice, benightedness, insipidity, and triteness that it was almost a holy duty to rescue him from these mediocre rationalists. This he stresses over and over again in the essay; it is his war-cry, and repeated so often that the reader never loses the early-formed suspicion that the essay was written more because of the feud than because of Lessing. Next Schlegel takes issue
with the common belief that Lessing is a great poet, dramatist, and a sharp critic of poetry by discussing some of his works in these fields and finding them negligible, true flowers of an arid period and fit only for that period. Emilia Galotti and Miss Sara Sampson are altogether bad, while the Laokoon and the Dramaturgie are important not as good criticism but as works that give a glimpse into the spirit of Lessing. This vague, cloudy conception of these two critical works he does not explain in the essay; nor does he state his reasons for dismissing Lessing as a critic. Later, in the 1801 conclusion to this essay, he does revert to the question but again very briefly, without giving any satisfaction. As a religious writer, continues Schlegel, Lessing stands far above his age, and it is just in this respect that the age had most misunderstood, plagued, and misrepresented him. The praise of Lessing as a religious writer necessarily leads Schlegel to a discussion of what in his estimation is Lessing's outstanding work not only in this field but in his entire career. This is Nathan, which Schlegel discusses at great length. Characteristic for his quest of the romantic in Lessing, he calls it "ein dramatisirtes Elementarbuch des höheren Cynismus." To the Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts, which played so great a role in Schlegel's subsequent idea of Lessing, he does not devote any space.

This outline of the contents of the essay sets the tone of it; it is largely a polemic against the Berlin rational-
ists, against rationalism in general. A discussion of certain characteristic passages will show that the essay delineates a very Schlegelian Lessing; that it is not good criticism of Lessing; that it shows no warm sympathy or understanding of Lessing.

Soon after the opening of the essay Schlegel disclaims Lessing's poetic gift, his excellence as a critic of poetry and art, and his universality. The mediocre rationalists, he adds later, "haben denn auch natürlich seine dramaturgischen und sonst zur Poetik und Theorie der Dichtarten gehörigen Fragmente und Fermente, die er wohl selbst so nannte, fixirt, und zu heiligen Schriften und symbolischen Büchern der Kunstlehre erkieset." Schlegel rants against these mediocre writers time and again: "Geckerei darf es doch wohl zum Beispiel genannt werden, wenn man Lessing zum Ideal der goldnen Mittelmässigkeit, zum Helden der seichten Aufklärung, die so wenig Licht als Kraft hat, erheben will." But he himself, we shall see, makes a mediocre figure of Lessing in the later writings, to some extent even in this essay. He quotes Lessing's judgment of himself as being no poet, agrees with it, and then devotes a long section to the proof of the statement. He bases his proof on the charge that the greatest work of his strictly poetic genius, Emilia Galotti, is a very poor tragedy, although built up according to all the rules of which Lessing approved. There is no depth to the play, contends Schlegel, and entirely too much coldness: "Unstreitig ein grosses
Exempel der dramatischen Algebra. Man muss es bewundern dieses in Schweiss und Pein producirtes Meisterstück des reinen Verstandes; man muss es frierend bewundern und bewundernd frieren; denn ins Gemüt dringt's nicht und kanns nicht dringen, weil es nicht aus dem Gemüt gekommen ist."

Minna von Barnhelm is entirely disregarded.

Although he is unenthusiastic about the true plays, Schlegel is warm and loud in his praise of Nathan, its power and depth. One is almost tempted to think that Schlegel praised this play so highly because it was directed quite sharply against Lessing's own age, against the rationalists, some of whom had outlived him and now claimed him as their leader and oracle. Schlegel calls Nathan the most Lessingian of Lessing's writings, a continuation of Anti-Götze. He adds: "Es schwebt und lebt doch ein gewisses heiliges Etwas in Nathan, wogegen alle syllogistische Figuren, wie alle Regeln der dramatischen Dichtkunst, eine wahre Lumperey sind." This romantic appreciation Schlegel maintains to the time of the Wiener Vorlesungen, and his admiration for some other of Lessing's philosophic-religious writings is equally intense; he discusses these other works in the anthology. Although the judgment of Nathan is truly romantic, Friedrich long remains alone in it. It was only after the appearance of the essay that the other romanticists embraced this judgment.

The Laokoon Schlegel, in his youth, had put down unsatisfied because, he confesses, it had given him no magic key to
theories of art or criticism; he read it with more appreciation, he adds, after he had grasped the spirit of Lessing. The reader is forced to wonder just what this appreciation amounted to and just how far Schlegel penetrated into the mysteries of Lessing's spirit, the more so when he ponders Schlegel's remarks on the Laokoon in the 1804 anthology. There Schlegel, we shall see, refutes most of Lessing's theories; he dismisses the book with the censure that Lessing did not have the proper understanding for the problem and that lacking it, he "schloss sich an das Gründlichste und Beste an, was sein Zeitalter ihm darbot; und wenn der Scharfsinn, mit dem er weiter daraus folgerte, nicht so glücklich zum Ziele gelangte, als man nach dem Maass dieses Scharfsinnes hätte erwarten sollen, so waren daran eben jene Umstände Schuld; die herrschenden Vorurtheile, und dass alle wahren Kunstbegriffe so gut als verloren waren, und erst von neuem wieder entdeckt werden mussten, welches anfangs nur mühsam und unvollkommen von Statten ging, vor allen Dingen aber der nie zu ersetzende, überall fühlbare und nicht genug in Rechnung zu bringinge Mangel an eigner Anschauung." This can scarcely be called positive praise or excellent, sympathetic criticism, in spite of the fact that Schlegel picked many fragments out of the body of the book. When Dorothea writes in her diary, "Es ist doch unstreitig im Laokoon von Lessing viel Spiegel - und Wortfechterei," we can take it, as we can so very much of what she writes, as an echo of Friedrich's fundamental views.
For the polemic writings and their fragmentary style, Schlegel is again all fire and enthusiasm. He is mocking in his comments on those who condemned these things in Lessing: "Seine böse Polemik beklagt man fast einmütig recht sehr, so wie auch, dass der Mann sogar fragmentisch schrieb, und trotz alles Anmahnens nicht immer lauter Meisterwerke vollenden wollte." Here, however, Schlegel is answering his own rather than Lessing's critics; and the fact that he had already chosen some of the fragments for inclusion in his later anthology, which was largely a collection of fragments, does not prove Lessing a writer of fragments. As Enders clearly reveals, it was only when Schlegel thought of himself through Lessing that he felt an affectionate, high regard for the rationalist critic. He early recognized a certain excellence of form in Lessing and felt a certain kinship for him because the public had misunderstood some of Lessing's writings as it now misunderstood his own. In the essay, Schlegel confesses that in his youth he had had small regard for the works of Lessing; but of the man himself he had thought highly: "Er selbst war mehr werth als alle seine Talente. In seiner Individualität lag seine Grösse." This is somewhat exaggerated considering Schlegel's early coldness towards Lessing, a coldness manifested in the passages from the letters to his brother. It sounds much more like a surrender of truth for the sake of epigrammatic cleverness than the truth itself as Schlegel felt it. To realize how far Schlegel read himself into Lessing's writings
as well as into his life, it is necessary only to see the words with which he characterizes Lessing's manner of writing: "Worte, in denen was die dunkelsten Stellen sind im Gebiete des menschlichen Geistes, oft wie vom Blitz plötzlich erleuchtet, das heiligste höchst keck und fast frevelhaft, das allgemeinste höchst sonderbar und launig ausgedrückt wird. Einzel und kompakt, ohne Zergliederung und Demonstration, stehen seine Hauptsätze da, wie mathematische Axiome; und seine bündigsten Räsonements sind gewöhnlich nur eine Kette von witzigen Einfällen." This is a rather freakish mixture of true and false; on the whole it sounds more like a program for Schlegel's Fragmente than a true picture of Lessing's style.

There are many such passages throughout the essay; passages in which we see Schlegel quite clearly and hear him defend himself against the rationalists, all the time using Lessing as a shield.

In the year of the publication of the Lessing essay Schlegel moved to Berlin, and here, among the brilliant young romantic radicals, he founded the Athenäum, assumed the editorship, easily stripped off the few chains of objectivity that had bound him so loosely, and tilted against a fancied host of evils, the evils of objectivity, even if he did not call them that in so many words. The critical weapon that he adopted was that of the Fragmente, of the Ideen, so well adapted to his nature and
his alternately brilliant and cloudy comments on art, religion, philosophy, and so forth. Even the method constitutes a break with Lessing, who did delight in pointed sentences, but demanded clear, logical thinking. Schlegel was now swinging away from the Greeks in questions of art. Lessing was put aside for several years; the conclusion to the 1797 essay - Abschluss des Lessing-Aufsatzes (1801) - has practically nothing to do with Lessing and the anthology was truly only a "publisher's venture," in spite of the tendency to swell its importance. Johanna Krüger, we have seen, denies the fact that the collection shows Schlegel to be under the influence of Lessing; but she does consider the introductions to be good criticism of Lessing, even as Dilthey had done. In the anthology Bolle sees Schlegel deeply influenced by Lessing and would show this influence cropping out later. The anthology and the conclusion to the essay do show that Schlegel is still warm in his praises of Lessing as a religious writer; but a careful examination of the views of the two men in matters of religion will show how far apart they are, at this time and in Schlegel's later years. Schlegel's idea of Lessing as philosopher undergoes some remarkable, characteristic changes, which appear most clearly in the Lessingbüchlein and in the Wiener Vorlesungen. We shall consider these writings in their chronological order.
Section C. 1798-1804.

In the Athenäum period, it is true, Schlegel still harks back to the objective Greek poets; but there are two influences in this period that, with regard to this study, far outweigh all others in importance. One is the friendship with Novalis and the preoccupation of the two men with questions of religion. In the fall of 1798 Friedrich writes to Novalis: "Ich fange eigentlich erst an, Dich zu verstehn. Ich habe in der letzten Zeit manche Offenbarung gehabt, und ich würde Dich nun besser verstehn, da ich die Religion verstehe ........ Was mich betrifft, so ist das Ziel meiner literarischen Projekte, eine neue Bibel zu schreiben, und auf Muhameds und Luthers Spuren zu wandeln." This preoccupation strengthened the hold that Lessing (as a religious writer) had on Schlegel, for in a later discussion of this desire to write a new Bible, Friedrich writes: "Lebte Lessing noch, so brauchte ich das Werk nicht zu beginnen. Der Anfang wäre dann wohl schon vollendet. Keiner hat von der wahren neuen Religion mehr gehaßt als er. Nicht bloss Kant ist hier weit zurück, sondern auch Fichte und Jacobi und Lavater. Einige Millionen der letzten Sorte in den Schmelztiegel geschütet, geben noch nicht soviel solide Materie und reinen Äther der Religion, wie Lessing hatte." This warmth and respect for Lessing as a religious writer, evident already in the essay of 1797, persisted in Friedrich, although in his later development he grew
further and further away from a fundamental agreement with Lessing. For although at first there was a closer relationship with him, this development was in the direction of mysticism, ultimately a divergence from Lessing. The mystic trend was further strengthened by Tieck, with whom Schlegel struck up a close friendship at this time, and by Tieck's ardent championship of Jakob Böhme.

The other important influence of this time, the one that determined his artistic and literary development, was Fichte, whom Schlegel studied increasingly carefully.

As early as 1798, in the essay on Lessing, Schlegel says about Nathan: "Nathan der Weise ist nicht bloss die Fortsetzung des Anti-Götze, Numero Zwölf: er ist auch und ist eben so sehr ein dramatisirtes Elementarbuch des höheren Cynismus." The passages he quotes as evidence constitute no particularly good proof, but the effort to find this quality even then would make him receptive to the vague doctrine or conception of romantic irony that assumed shape in the romantic mind in Berlin. According to Walzel, he is wholly converted by Goethe and Fichte: "Auf Goethe und Fichte baut Friedrich sein Glaubensbekenntnis auf.


Of the modern poets Schlegel finds Goethe the greatest, as Fichte
is greatest among the philosophers; and Schlegel believes further
that irony binds Goethe and Fichte together to form the new
romantic ideal. The Fichte conception of the Ego and its crea-
tion, the Non-Ego, Schlegel applies to poetry. The poet should
stand above and be superior to the world of his creation. "Je
ruhiger und kühler ein Mensch dieser beengenden Welt gegenüber
steht, je weniger in seinen Dichtungen die Spuren eines unter
den Einschränkungen der Welt leidenden Individualität erscheinen,
um so freier, um so unabhängigter wird er erscheinen." This is
a view of art and life many years removed from the ideas, the
philosophy of Lessing. Because the world of the Non-Ego is a
creation of man, there are no boundaries to it and no bounds
within it other than those set up arbitrarily by the creator; and,
if his fancy so dictates, set up anew and differently each day.
Lessing's world had a more solid foundation and there were in it
bounds set up by the limitations of matter and by the universal
laws of beauty as established by the operation of the five senses.
Most of the romanticists went even a step farther from Lessing,
in that they substituted a whimsical subjectivity for the ironic
objectivity of Goethe, in Wilhelm Meister, and of Fichte. Even
Schlegel turns from Goethe and Wilhelm Meister as the high points
of romanticism, to Tieck; for he, like the other romanticists, was
distressed that Goethe found the answer to his problems here on
earth. From Tieck Schlegel turned to Shakespeare and Dante;
finally, in the Gespräch über die Poesie (1800), he lays down the
rules that are now accepted in speaking of romanticism in the 19th Century.

Into this period of change and religious preoccupation, from 1797 to 1804, fall the Abschluss des Lessing-Aufsatzes (1801) and the anthology chosen from Lessing's writings, published in 1804. (This three volume anthology is generally designated as the Lessingbüchlein, for convenience.) An examination of these two pieces of work brings out a few new facets of the relationship between the two men, but mostly it strengthens the convictions already formed by the Lessing essay, that Schlegel has made Lessing over into a Schlegelian character and that he seldom judges Lessing's works justly, in spite of the claims made for the insight and the power of his criticism of Lessing.

The close of the essay needs only a short discussion; it adds very little to our knowledge of Schlegel's attitude towards Lessing, being again, as was the beginning of the essay, an arbitrary defense of Lessing from the rationalists and, for the most part, an examination in detail of Schlegel himself.

Schlegel planned to write this conclusion to the Lessing essay immediately after the appearance of the first part; it actually appeared four years later. One recalls the fable of the mountain in labor.

Discussing the make-up of the first number of the Athenäum with August Wilhelm, in December of 1797, Friedrich says: "Wenn das erste Stück - wir sind uns auch in diesem Gedanken

This Lessing is the conclusion to his earlier essay. As in this, it is easy to find in all the letters to August that, above all, Friedrich is anxious to make of the Athenäum a popular success. It is to be a magazine for the public and, as such, it must have contributions of a popular, modern tone. In January, 1789, Friedrich speaks again of the conclusion; it is still unwritten, but he encourages August to expect it soon: "Es wird Dir tröstlich seyn können, dass ich den letzten Bogen des Anfangs im Lyceum, der doch grade das beste und beträchtlich enger gedruckt ist, in einem Nachmittage und halben Vormittage geschrieben habe."  

This last part, by the way, is the long analysis of Nathan, the play's recognition and justification of many religions, Friedrich's recognition in it of a sharp cynicism, and a statement to the effect that this cynicism has escaped the rationalists who have so little feeling and mind for Lessing. It is precisely this section which is especially directed at the Berlin rationalists, who had set up such a distorted image of Lessing, one which displeased Schlegel to the utmost. They had even recognized in Nathan an anti-religious drama. It is this part that Schlegel wrote so easily.

Again at the beginning of 1798 he writes to his brother that he should give him more time to finish the essay.
and then, a week later, he writes again: "Dass Du mich von der Mittheilung des Lessing vor dem Druck dispensirtest wäre sehr gut, ja fast nothwendig. Du kannst es um so mehr, da durchaus keine Beziehung auf jetzige Litteratur, oder lebende Litteraten drin vorkommen wird." This implies that it was yet to be written and not in the popular manner that he had promised before. The earlier letter had inferred that a certain part was already complete. Towards the middle of the year he writes: "Ich muss zum Lessing noch einige Sachen lesen: aber geschrieben wird er sehr schnell." Here again it evidently remains unwritten. If Friedrich had read any more for the second part, it would show evidences of the further reading. There are no signs of it, however. Finally in November of 1800 he turns again to the oft mentioned, long neglected Lessing, this time intending it for the Charakteristiken und Kritiken. The Lessing essay was to begin the collection; Friedrich writes: "Ich habe in Rücksicht auf diese Behauptung, den Aufsatz vorgenommen, zur Verbesserung und mich in Bereitschaft gesetzt, ihn in den Abendstunden zu vollenden." This time he finally did write the conclusion, a characteristic product that is chiefly about Schlegel with a few passages devoted to Lessing. Again one might suspect that it was not a great respect and admiration for Lessing that drove him to finish the essay, but the desire to make money quickly, in order to ease an uncomfortable financial pressure. The conclusion and the 1797 part of the essay appeared as a whole in the Charakteristiken und Kritiken, from which Friedrich, at
least, expected a considerable profit.

The introductory sentence of the conclusion links back to the 1797 essay: "So schrieb ich vor beinah vier Jahren, mit der vorläufigen Absicht, den Namen des verehrten Mannes von der Schmach zu retten, dass er allen schlechten Subjecten zum Symbol ihrer Plattheit dienen sollte; und mit der tieferen, ihn wegzurücken von der Stelle, wohin ihn nur Unverstand und Missverstand gestellt hatte, ihn aus der Poesie und poetischen Kritik ganz wegzunehmen und hinüber zu führen in jene Sphäre, wohin ihm selbst die Tendenz seines Geistes immer mehr zog, in die Philosophie, und in dieser, die seines Salzes bedurfte, zu vindiciren."

This beginning portion, besides stating the object of this concluding essay, shows also that Schlegel had changed somewhat in his view of Lessing. At the time of the essay he had praised the writer of Nathan, the religious writer. Of his philosophy, "welche freilich wohl unter allen Fragmenten, die er in die Welt warf, am meisten Fragment geblieben ist," of this philosophy he said in 1797: "Für die Philosophie war seine Anlage zu gross und zu weit, als dass sie je hätte reif werden können; wenigstens hätte er das höchste Alter erreichen müssen, um nur einigermassen zum Bewusstseyn derselben zu gelangen." This statement is hard to reconcile with his claims in the conclusion to the essay and in the Lessingbüchlein, that Lessing had a philosophic grasp of the Whole, and that it was his fragmentary view of philosophy which contributed to his grasp of the Whole.
In 1797, we have seen, Schlegel's interest in religion and mysticism was stimulated by Novalis, Schleiermacher, and, later, Tieck. The closer study of Fichte, begun in Berlin after the Lessing essay, led him deeply into the field of philosophy, as did also his lectures on philosophy in Jena, in the years 1800 and 1801, and the consequent study of many other systems of philosophy. But the close application to philosophy, rather than strengthening his affection for it, led him into greater confusion and towards the ease and consolation of religion and mysticism. Haym has characterized well both his confident, supercilious early attitude towards his philosophical studies and the later retreat into the vague realms of mysticism. Of the first he says: "Er hatte eben viele Lieblingsbeschäftigung und bildete sich immer von Zeit zu Zeit ein, dass er nur durch die Umstände von der Erfüllung seines eigentlichen Berufes abgehalten werde. Fast genau wie mit der Poesie erging es ihm mit der Philosophie." But his lectures towards the end of the Jena period showed "nicht sowohl irgendwelchen Fortschritt an philosophischer Bildung als vielmehr seine wachsende Neigung zur Mystik, um nicht zu sagen seine wachsende Unklarheit und Verwirrung."

We can easily trace Schlegel's development and his interests in the writings on Lessing. In 1797, when Schlegel was interested most in religion, Lessing was primarily a religious writer; now, at the time of the close of the essay, Schlegel
is busied with philosophy and therefore Lessing is primarily a philosopher; but, in addition to the fact that he is a philosopher, he is a fragmentary philosopher because Schlegel does not believe in or adhere to any system. This view Schlegel retains to the time of the Lessingbüchlein, where his defense of Lessing as a fragmentary philosopher is quite warm. But more than a philosopher, he is again a powerful religious writer with a trend towards mysticism. It must not be forgotten that Schlegel was, in these years, also turning from systematic philosophy to the philosophy of the Catholic church - to mysticism. Later, at the time of the Wiener Vorlesungen in 1812, Schlegel has undergone another change (a change towards an emotional religion, towards an acceptance of divine revelation and a resignation to divine power) and again his view of Lessing has kept step. A discussion of the Wiener Vorlesungen will bring out this change more clearly.

In the Abschluss des Lessing-Aufsatzes Schlegel explains his reason for writing the essay and then proceeds to the unjust charge that he had made in the 1797 essay: the charge that Lessing is no poet, has no feeling for poetry and is therefore no critic. "Es sollte nun dem Plane gemäß in diesem Versuch der ausführlichere Beweis folgen, auch die Meinung sei irrig, Lessing für einen Kunstrichter zu halten; gegründet auf das Factum, dass es ihm an historischem Sinn und an historischer Kenntniss der Poesie fehlte. Und wie ist Einsicht auch bei kritischem Geiste in diesem Gebiete möglich, wenn es so ganz an Gefühl und Anschaung gebracht?" He adds: "Hört doch endlich
auf, an Lessing nur das zu rühmen, was er nicht hatte und nicht konnte, und immer wieder seine falsche Tendenz zur Poesie und Kritik der Poesie, statt sie mit Schonung zu erklären und durch die Erklärung zu rechtfertigen, sie nur von neuem in das grellste Licht zu stellen."

Having thus with a few short paragraphs saved Lessing from the rationalists, and having stripped him of his undeserved poetical and critical mantle, Schlegel clothes him anew with of his own fragments, chosen from the Fragmente and the Ideen of the Athenäum. They are supposed to be in the spirit of Lessing and included in this conclusion as a sort of offering. Then he further clothes Lessing with the vague garments of romantic wit, romantic irony, and mysticism. For a time then, he digresses and launches into a defense of fragments; tells of his own plans and his own philosophy; and defends polemics, subjective criticism and unsystematic philosophy - none of which have any, or at the most very little, direct connection with Lessing.

After this long digression, he returns to Lessing with a statement of his reasons for respecting him: "Ich ehre Lessing wegen der grossen Tendenz seines philosophischen Geistes und wegen der symbolischen Form seiner Werke." This, too, is something for which he himself was striving and which he defended in himself. There follows a long defense of the two above virtues, a defense that is best summed up in his own definition:

"Das Wesen der hohen Kunst und Form besteht in der Beziehung aufs Ganze. Darum sind sie unbedingt zweckmässig und unbedingt
zwecklos, darum hält man sie heilig wie das Heiligste, und liebt
sie ohne Ende, wenn man sie einmal erkannt hat. Darum sind alle
Werke Ein Werk, alle Künste Eine Kunst, alle Gedichte Ein Gedicht.
Denn alle wollen ja dasselbe, das überall Eine und zwar in seiner
ungetheilten Einheit." With this romantic definition and its
connection with Lessing - a connection that is as vague as the
definition - and with a long poem, "Herkules Musagetes," he closes
the essay. The poem is supposed to be a tribute to Lessing's
memory, as were also the fragments that he earlier included. What
Caroline, writing to August Wilhelm, says of this elegy may well
be applied also to the entire conclusion, as well as to the earli-
er essay of 1797: "ich dachte, die Elegie sollte Lessingen ganz
besonders gelten - nun hast du aber recht, sie drückt ganz be-
sonders Friedrich Schlegeln aus." To Schleiermacher's objec-
tion that the second part of the Lessing essay is without form,
Schlegel answers: "Da musst Du paradoxe Ansichten von Form haben.
Du scheinst das für Notbehelf zu halten, was ich für den Triumph
der Beredsamkeit, wie ich sie in solcher Sphäre geben kann,
ansehe. Denn der Lessing formlos ist, dann ist es die Elegie
gewiss auch. Die Form des Ganzen ist ganz wie die des alten
Bruchstücks, nur in größerem Maassstabe und, alles Individuelle
bei Seite gesetzt, dieselbe wie die Grundlinien von Lessing's
Form." One need only think of Lessing's clear thought and his
sharply outlined form to realize how far Schlegel has read him-
self into Lessing. The same objection, among others, can be made
to Schlegel’s idea and criticism of Lessing in the introductions to the Lessingbäcchlein.

With Schlegel arrived at the stage in his development that was briefly suggested in the introduction to this section, it seems somewhat remarkable to ascribe to the Lessingbäcchlein the importance that it is said to have had in the life of Schlegel at the time of collection and publication. It has already been mentioned that Kräger thinks the introductions to the various sections good criticism of Lessing, referring in her statement to Dilthey, who holds the same opinion. Bolle ascribes still more importance to the venture; he accepts at face value Schlegel’s statements concerning his thorough study of Lessing and he believes that Schlegel actually was much busied with Lessing during his stay in Paris, during 1802 and 1803. This is not so, as we shall see in the discussion of the genesis of the anthology. In addition, Bolle objects warmly to Dilthey’s statement that the anthology was a "schnell zusammengearbeitete Buchhändlerspekulation." Before his discussions of Schlegel’s introductions, Bolle says: "Das Lessingbäcchlein enthält aber nicht nur ein Porträt von Lessings geistiger Individualität, zugleich - und darin besteht die eine Absicht der Einleitungen - versucht Fr. Schlegel, Lessing hineinzustellen in den Gang der geschichtlichen Entwicklung und seine Bedeutung für Schlegels eigene Zeit zu bestimmen." This he does not prove, however, and it is incapable of proof. That the introductions give a good
portrait of Schlegel and of Schlegel's own period may be demonstrated with ease. They are not especially good criticism of Lessing; but they are excellent self-criticism. Writing to her friend Karoline Paulus, Dorothea makes a statement that is again, probably, an echo of Friedrich: "Dies Buch (Lessingbüchlein) müsste eigentlich den Friedrich sehr empfehlen in Bayern, wenn es dort bekannt wäre; weil in den Commentaren und den Zusätzen die von ihm selber darin sind, seine Ansicht von dem jetzigen Zustande der Philosophie und der Litteratur in Deutschland deutlich und bestimmt genug entwickelt ist, dass man wohl daraus ersieht, wie ganz anders seine eigne Philosophie, und wie er so gar nicht Schellingsch ist." After his discussion of the various introductions, Bolle again emphasizes their importance as criticism of Lessing: "Seine feinsinnigen Bemerkungen über Lessings Kritik, Polemik, Stil, Sprache enthalten trotz ihrer Kürze doch das Wesentliche, was sich darüber sagen lässt. Die spätere Lessingforschung brauchte sie sich nur noch zu eigen machen." It would be more appropriate to urge the students of Schlegel to turn to these introductions for good expressions of Schlegel's own views. As such, the introductions may well be praised.

Very little is known of the history of the Lessingbüchlein; Friedrich, who was wont to write of all his literary projects to August, did not discuss the anthology with him.

The first mention of it occurs in August of 1799, in a letter from Friedrich to the book-dealer Frölich, who was then
publishing the *Athenium* and had already issued Friedrich's *Lucinde*. Schlegel writes, amongst other business matters:

"Recht sehr wünsche ich aber auf jeden Fall, dass es bey unserer Verabredung über Lessing p p bleiben mag, da mir sehr gelegen ist an dieser Unternehmung." For Josef Körner this is conclusive proof that the Lessing anthology was in no way a mercantile speculation during the time of financial pressure in Paris, but that it was an old idea. The age of the idea makes it no less a mercantile project, however. One is more apt to agree with Krüger and Dilthey in this respect: "Dafür, dass die Lessingausgabe eine merkantilische Spekulation war, spricht, dass Schlegel in Paris sich in der größten Geldnot befand und immer darauf bedacht war, einen Ausweg daraus zu finden." Neither Krüger nor Bolle had access to the Frölich letter and they both find first mention of the idea in a letter of November 13, 1802, from Schlegel to Tieck, in which Schlegel writes: "Mahlmann hat meine alte Idee, Lessings philosophische Schriften zu ediren, angenommen; es macht mir eigentlich grosse Freude, dem Volke diesen Possen spielen zu können. Ich bitte Dich aber, es ja nicht weiter auszubreiten, sonst möchte die alte Verlagshandlung versuchen, uns zuvorzukommen." Mahlmann is the book-dealer who finally published the anthology; the idea, however, dates back to the time when Friedrich was looking for popular subjects himself and suggesting to his brother popular projects, such as anthologies. That this was a popular idea is shown by his fear of losing it.
At any rate, Krieger need not have limited the time in which Friedrich needed money to the Paris years; he always needed money and especially so at the time of the first discussion of the plan with Frölich, in August of 1799, for this was shortly after his union with Dorothea, and even his old Leipzig debtors were still pressing him for payments. Friedrich usually borrowed from his brother, but just prior to this he had even turned to Novalis: "Da ich nun in Gemeinschaft der Götter mit ihr (Dorothea) trete und von nun an unzertrennlich mit ihr lebe: so ist es freilich sehr notwendig, dass ich mich auch rangiere, darüber sind zwei Reste von meinen alten Schulden, jeder zu 90 Taler so alt, dass sie nun nicht viel länger warten können. .........

"Übrigens kannst Du nun gewiss sein, dass der merkantilische Geist mir hold sein will, da ich nun nicht mehr bloss für mich zu sorgen habe, da mein Leben nun nicht mehr ein Chaos ist, sondern es Mittelpunkt und Form hat und neu auf festen Boden angeht. Damit muss ja aller Erwerb und Handel, ja das Eigentum selbst anfangen: mit der Familie." It sounds almost as if Schlegel himself had furnished the words for the accusation that the anthology was "eine merkantilische Spekulation."

Much of the collection of excerpts was made before the time of the first essay on Lessing. In that essay he says that he has to smile when he thinks how long he has put off having printed "was ich über Lessing gesammelt und aufgeschrieben hatte." As for the various introductions, some of them may
have been written during the period when he was trying to write the conclusion to the first essay, and others shortly before publication. This stretch of years would account for a few views that conflict with those he holds at the time of publication. In Jena he was too busy preparing his philosophy lectures and working on the second part of Lucinde, (which remained unfinished). From Paris his letters teem with plans, projects, and work done to raise money quickly. He plans dramas, an anthology of Provençal poetry. He visits the art galleries and works a little on the translation of Plato, which was eventually given over completely to Schleiermacher because Friedrich could not get much beyond the point of offering suggestions and making a few feeble starts. He writes rapid, popular articles for his periodical Europa and works many hours of the day on his Sanscrit and Persian. It is about this time also that he is about to lose the rest of Dorothea's fortune, on which he had counted so confidently - that he might be free of care and anxiety concerning money matters. He writes to August on May 15, 1803: "Die Sorge hat mir nicht nur viel Zeit gekostet sondern auch oft alle Lust am Guten und Erfreulichen vergift." An additional source of anxiety at this time was the fact that Hannover was in danger of being occupied by French troops - a state of affairs which would cut off the mother's pension. Friedrich writes to August: "Man muss ja dafür sorgen, ich will auch gern meinen Theil tragen, und zu diesem Zweck allenfalls noch mehr Schulden machen als ich schon habe."
During all this time there is no mention of Lessing; he is still busy with his philology and he writes to August of all other plans and work, but the anthology is not mentioned in the letters. This would prove, (if proof were needed) rather conclusively, that much of the work was done; besides pointing to this fact, it shows how little Friedrich was concerned with Lessing and his writings at this time. And yet Schlegel makes these remarkable claims for the selection, especially of the fragments, in the introduction to the second volume of the anthology: "(eine Auswahl), welche das endliche Resultat einer nach allen Richtungen unzählig oft wiederholten Lecture ist, einer immer von neuem der Prüfung unterworfenen Durcharbeitung; so dass ich glaube behaupten zu dürfen, dass kein wichtiges Fragment meiner Aufmerksamkeit entgangen ist, und wenn einige der aufgenommenen manchen Lesern vielleicht der Aufnahme unwürdig scheinen mögen, so ist doch gewiss keines, für dessen Aufnahme oder Nichtaufnahme die Gründe oder Gegengründe nicht mehrmals sorgfältig wären abgewogen worden. Ich habe mich dieser mühevollen Arbeit mit Liebe unterzogen, und glaubte, es verlohe sich wohl der Mühe." This is somewhat exaggerated.

In January, 1803, Dorothea even writes to a Count von Schlabrendorff for help, that Friedrich might obtain an easy position. She complains: "Niemand hat je etwas für ihn gethan." This is unkind, at least to August, when all his help is considered. She closes by revealing that he has promised to deliver
numerous articles for which he has already been paid. If the Lessingbüchlein was amongst these articles already paid for, as well it might, that might offer an explanation for Friedrich's lack of interest in carrying out the work.

The introductions to the various sections are in the same vein as Schlegel's other writings on Lessing. They are more an exposition of Schlegel's own views than those of Lessing; they give a fair picture of the romantic period but not of the age of rationalism; they are again unfair criticism of Lessing as a poet and as a critic. Lessing, the philosopher and writer on religion, is again a romanticist because Schlegel finds himself in Lessing. The effort to spite the rationalists by showing their hero to be a romanticist is renewed. These introductions are not, in short, the keen criticism of Lessing that Kräger, Dilthey, and Bolle claim. However, they do afford a good means for a comparison of the rationalists and the romanticists, of Schlegel and Lessing. This latter comparison silences any claims of deep sympathy for Lessing on the part of Schlegel and it practically negates any question of influence, except for a few minor debts in the field of religion. Even a cursory reading of the connective essays in the Lessingbüchlein would make it evident that here is no disciple or humble student looking up to a master. There are too many touches of superiority, of condescension.

In the first introductory essay Schlegel starts with praise of free form and of the disregard of method, both of which
virtues he sees in Lessing. He takes his customary rap at the rationalists when he says of Lessing's efforts to rise above his age, an effort that lies partly in Schlegel's imagination:

"Nichts lehrt besser, für uns selbst den rechten Weg zu finden, als wenn wir sehen, wie ein thätig strebender Geist sich allmähig aus den Vorurtheilen herausarbeitet, die er, weil sie bei denen, die er für die bessern hielt, allgemein gelten, auf Glauben angenommen hat." In praising Lessing's keen flights from one literary field into another, Schlegel recurs to the matter of form and method, claiming that Lessing's disregard of them was only an apparent one, was only surface disregard. In reality, what gives especial strength to Lessing's writings "liegt noch weit mehr in der Form des Ganzen; wenn anders trotz der anscheinenden Formlosigkeit desselben mit Recht Form genannt wird, was den Geist des Ganzen ausdrückt durch eine eigenthümliche Verknüpfung des Einzelnen." This, we have seen, was Schlegel's defense against the charges of formlessness in his own writings, especially the fragments. The defense was not necessary for Lessing. At the very beginning of the introductions, then, Schlegel was already seeing not Lessing and his age, but himself and his own problems and his enmity towards the few rationalists who had persisted on into the romantic period.

Coming next, in the general introduction, to Lessing's critical service, Schlegel praises his work in separating clearly the fields of art, because, to Schlegel's mind, a certain amount
of lenient restriction is necessary. It must not, however, be
too strict, he adds, because there are already too many fields
and divisions. "So mancher Berichtigung also auch Lessings
Begriffe von der Kunst bedürfen mögen, so führte doch seine
Aesthetik wenigstens auf den rechten Weg; denn die Sonderung der
Gattungen führt, wenn sie gründlich vollendet wird, früher oder
später zu einer historischen Construction des Ganzen der Kunst
und der Dichtkunst. Diese Construction und Erkenntnis des Ganzen
aber ist von uns als die eine und wesentliche Grundbedingung
einer Kritik, welche ihre hohe Bestimmung wirklich erfüllen soll,
aufgestellt worden." Schlegel's demands for the artist to
recognize and consider the Whole are so vague, allow such a wide
latitude, that even his partial recognition of Lessing is effaced.
For the sake of precision and the conception of the Whole,
Schlegel advocates the bounding of the different fields of art;
but the entire idea of the Whole is purely subjective. Schlegel
adds a little later: "und doch kann man nur dann sagen, dass man
ein Werk, einen Geist verstehe, wenn man den Gang und Gliederbau
nachkonstruiren kann." This effort to understand everything
about a work of art (not merely its position in the field of
literature or whatever field it belongs to) will lead back again,
it seems, to a consideration of other arts, for the writer's
impressions and shadings must all be made clear, and he receives
them from all the fields to which he is exposed. Thus, the
critic ranges first only in the field of literature and judges
the work objectively, and secondarily to a subjective criticism
for a deeper appreciation of the work. With this subjective judgment all the facets of the work must be studied and understood; therefore all the fields must be considered that gave anything to the work as a whole. The virtues of Lessing's requirements for division become evident when the work of Schlegel and the body of the entire romantic literature is considered; and when the relationship between the romantic practices and those of the men whom Lessing criticized is realized.

Schlegel does admit Lessing's critical sharpness and insight, the gifts that enabled him so surely to recognize and weed out the bad. But even here it is his polemics in the field of religion that Schlegel sets up as the flower of his critical genius, as he later picks those passages of Lessing's letters which show his religious tendencies. "Lessings Briefe enthalten nicht nur in der früheren Zeit die ersten Anfänge und Versuche seines Nachdenkens über Leidenschaft und Darstellung, sondern auch in der späten, besonders manche vertrauliche Äußerungen über die wahre Absicht seiner theologischen Streitschriften."

It was fairly clear that at the time Schlegel wrote the 1797 essay on Lessing he was interested mainly in proving Lessing a sort of romanticist, to spite Nicolai and the rationalists. At the time of the Lessingbüchlein, Schlegel is on the turn to Catholicism, away from the Idealism of the Berlin and the Jena years. This change is more clearly evinced in the later introductions. At any rate, his preoccupation with matters of belief
is mirrored in practically all of the introductions, while there is pre-eminent concern with his own ideas rather than any delineation of Lessing.

In the introduction to the letters, or the fragments from the letters, Schlegel gives a picture of literature and thought at the time of Lessing's activity; he traces the corrupting effect of French influence, again to show (as he did in the general introduction) from what depths Lessing had to work himself. "Alles dies ist, und sey nur gesagt, um zu erklären, warum alles, was Lessing that, bildete, schrieb und wollte, nur Tendenz geblieben ist, Versuch und Bruchstück; nur Tendenz bleiben konnte. Dieses aber nicht zu vergessen, ist von der nussrersten Wichtigkeit. Denn es bestimmt den eigentlichen Standpunkt, aus welchem seine Schriften beurtheilt werden müssen." Although Lessing's spirit rose high above his age, the age is so ever-present and stifling and potent in its vicious effects that not one of his works may be regarded as a work of art, because "auch dann noch, wenn man die Grundsätze, nach denen man misleitet worden war schon ganz durchschaut und ganz verworfen hat, zwar nicht der Denkart selbst, aber doch in manchem minder Wesentlichen, Spuren der Misleitung sichtbar seyn können." This can hardly be regarded as excellent criticism of Lessing. Schlegel warns the reader that there will be found some things that are trivial, ignoble, and even tainted with error of judgment. But there are many authors who have created works of art in spite of the vicious
circumstances of the age, and Lessing has done so, in spite of Schlegel. Schlegel merely condemns the age rather than evaluating Lessing justly; it is not the actual Age of Enlightenment that he sees, either, but the age or the atmosphere of the rationalists of Berlin, in whom the positive strength and the fearlessness of the former age had degenerated into dogmatism and bombast.

Schlegel's introduction to the selections from the Laokoon is short; it is itself a collection of fragments rather than a unified essay. In it he resumes the question of the separation of the arts; but this time he diverges sharply from Lessing.

Lessing had devoted long introductory chapters to the consideration whether the sculptor took the idea from the poet or the poet from the sculptor, he himself deciding in favor of the first. Then he pointed out how wisely the sculptor had limited the poet's conception to keep within the bounds of artistry and beauty. For Schlegel the question is not especially important; however, he is certain that the sculptor took the idea from poetry and, unlike Lessing, he develops this contention to the conclusion that the sculptor took the idea from the poet in order to compete with him. The difference in the views of the two men, Schlegel and Lessing, might be more clearly demonstrated by a short discussion of Schlegel's introduction.

"Wichtiger aber dürfte die Frage seyn, ob der Gegenstand zwar nicht von diesem oder jenem einzelnen Dichter, wohl aber von der Poesie überhaupt entlehnt, ob es wirklich ein wahrhaft
plastischer oder nicht vielmehr bloss ein poetischer Gegenstand sey: da die Poesie natürlich in Rücksicht des Darzustellenden keinerlei Schranken kann unterworfen seyn; wohl aber die materiellen an bestimmte Bedingungen gebundenen Künste, vor allem eine solche wie die Plastik, deren eigentliche Würde in der Einfachheit besteht. Es ist dieses auch wohl in andern, ja in allen Künsten der Fall, und geht natürlich genug aus der eigenthümlichen Denkart des Künstlers hervor, dass ein kühner Meister seine Neigung und Wahl gerade auf einen solchen Gegenstand wirft, der mehr dem Gebiete einer andern Kunst als dem der seinigen angehört, und in ihm einheimisch zu seyn scheint, um auf solche Weise nicht an dem, was das Erste und Natürlichste ist, sondern an dem Schwierigern und Entferntern seine Kraft und seine Tiefe zu offenbaren." This is an absolute refutation of Lessing's views and shows the full development of a tendency that was already evident in the Athenäum fragments of 1798, especially in fragment 372, where Schlegel says: "In den Werken der größten Dichter athmet nicht selten der Geist einer andern Kunst. Sollte diess nicht auch bey Mahlern der Fall seyn; mahlt nicht Michelangelo in gewissem Sinn wie ein Bildhauer, Rafael wie ein Architekt, Correggio wie ein Musiker."

Continuing his argument, Schlegel states that plastic art developed from a union of sculpture and architecture. The objects were first large and grew gradually smaller, as human figures were substituted for the earlier fabulous figures. The human figures were those of heroes and athletes, touched with the
character and the nobility of the old gods. Because the models were then these figures of athletes (and of heroes with the grace and the strength of athletes), it was only natural that the later plastic art should strive "auch da, wo das Leben von Schmerz ergriffen und mit Leiden ringend dargestellt erscheint, gleichwohl die höchste Anmuth zu erreichen." This grace and strength would be imitated not only in single figures but in groups that represented entire stories and actions, "gleichwie die Malerei oder die Poesie." Thus, in taking stories and actions, the sculptor dared "mit dem Reichtum dieser Künste, selbst in derjenigen, die von Natur die einfachste ist, zu wetteifern."

In this short introduction, in these few observations, Schlegel shows that the whole system of Lessing's Laokoon, based as it is on the operation of the laws of beauty and the limitation of the fields of art, is unnecessary to him. At first his deduction is a matter of pure imitation. In the conclusion he not only disregards the limits of the different arts, but encourages a disregard of them. The introduction simply does not attempt to evaluate justly Lessing's work; it merely presents Schlegel's own views.

To the same selection of fragments from the Laokoon, Schlegel also adds a conclusion in which he again enumerates his own views on art. He judges the failure of Lessing's thoughts and investigations on art to lie "unstreitig eines Theils in der
grosse Verbildung der freilich auch jetzt noch vorhandenen, damals aber doch noch allgemeiner herrschenden Denkart ........ , andern Theils aber auch in dem Mangel an hinlänglicher Anschauung, da er doch seinem Scharfsinn und seiner Neigung zur Gründlichkeit gemäß, sehr in das Einzelne einzugehen strebte." In this charge he harks back to the old feud with Nicolai and with rationalism in general. The second charge is a partial contradiction of his praise in the general introduction, where Lessing's grasp of the Whole is praised so highly. Neither of the two charges can be called good criticism, because they are based on prejudices rooted in romanticism. Schlegel continues with the supposition that Lessing started with Harris' treatment of the differences between the arts as they are a matter of successive or co-existent media or symbols. This was the right road to the secret of the differences, but the two men did not go far enough; they should have continued until they reached the spirit of the arts: "Wenn man nämlich nicht bloss auf die äusserlichen Bedingungen bei diesem Unterschiede sehe, sondern auf den Geist der Künste selbst, ob diese mehr progressiv, oder mehr substantiell, ob das Werdende, Bewegliche in einer Kunst herrschend sey, oder das Seyende, Ruhende; so würde dieser Unterschied zusammenfallen, mit der grossen Scheidung alles höhern menschlichen Thuns und Denkens in Dualismus und in Realismus, je nachdem die Freiheit, das unendliche Leben, oder die unbedingte Einheit überwiegend ist." The arts, he continues, to which Lessing's distinction
is most appropriately applied, are music and painting, that is, motion and rest. But any separation is in no way to be taken as final; the two extremes, Dualism and Realism, should be united: "wodurch erst Zusammenhang in die Idee gebracht, und die höhere Ansicht vollständig gemacht wird, welche in ihrer Vollständigkeit Idealismus nicht nur genannt wird, sondern auch wirklich ist, weil im Mittelpunkte des Geistes, des vollständig gewordenen Bewusstseyns die Täuschung, als gäbe es eine Realität ausser ihnen, von selbst wegfällt." This unification to produce the Ideal is the great problem and object of human culture and thought. Even music must not be content to be successive but must strive to attain some rest; and the plastic arts should have something of the life and the movement of music. Again, painting can hardly be said to deal with co-existent symbols, as Lessing says. Rather we see the painting in parts, the artist consciously conducting our gaze from point to point, in the order of importance, and it is only later, after the parts, that we get the idea of the Whole. In the eleventh chapter of the Laokoon Lessing says concerning this: "Von dem ersten Blicke hängt die grösste Wirkung ab, und wenn uns dieser zu mühsamen Nachsinnen und Rathen nöthiget, so erkal tet unsere Begierde gerühret zu werden." The difference between the views of the two men is easily evident. Finally, continues Schlegel, the poet has the means of giving a picture or idea of the Whole even with symbols that follow one another, in that he hints at the future, at what is to come, while
he is describing or telling of the present. Schlegel utters one final protest against limitation of the arts; it should not be tolerated, "Wenn eine so umfassende vielseitige Kunst wie die Malerei aus Missverständnis beschränkt werden soll, oder wenn gar von Gränzen der Poesie die Rede ist, da es doch eben das Wesen dieser Kunst ist, schlechthin universell zu seyn, nicht so wohl eine bestimmte Gattung und Art der Kunst, als vielmehr der allgemeine Geist, die gemeinschaftliche Weltseele aller."

These views on the arts are all radically, if not diametrically, opposed to those of Lessing. The distinctions of Schlegel, fluctuating as they do between material and spiritual symbols, are not clear and logical; they could be called a somewhat vague chart for subjective criticism, as Lessing marked a path for objective criticism with his Laokoon. Schlegel's system seems to be badly "symphilosophized" (to use a word beloved of Schlegel) from Lessing, Winckelmann, Fichte, and Herder.

The second volume contains dramaturgic, literary, and polemic fragments taken from all the works of Lessing that do not have an especial section in the anthology. They were chosen, according to Schlegel, after a long and careful consideration, reading, selection, and pruning. He warns the reader that they must not be regarded singly; just as he had insisted that his own fragments were systematically arranged with a definite goal in mind. These fragments, he continues, must be regarded as a Whole and the spirit informing them is Wit. Wit, for Schlegel, is the
cement that holds a man's works, his fragments together; it is
the spirit of the Whole. It must not be forgotten that it is
Schlegel who has chosen these fragments and that it is he who
has arbitrarily determined on the substitution of a Spirit of the
Whole and of a very un-rationalistic romantic wit for what in
Lessing was logical, rather definitely objective criticism. The
introduction is, in short, a program for and a defense of frag­
ments and of romantic wit. Words like Bruchstücke, blitzartig,
keck, launig, sonderbar are favorites with Schlegel; his works and
his correspondence are replete with them. He applies all of these
expressions to Lessing now. But Schlegel's wit all too frequently
falls short of its aim (if indeed, he were ever capable of aiming)
and in his later years he becomes altogether too conciliatory to
aim any witticisms at anyone. Lessing's wit has a keener, a
satiric edge; it is mortal because Lessing first tears down,
systematically, the defense of his opponents. Schlegel's recog­
nition of a similarity, of an affinity in this respect, is rather
far-sought.

After the defense of the fragments, Schlegel follows
with a long explanation of the functions of criticism. In classic
times criticism was practised after the best works had been
written; therefore it was less difficult and more exact. In
modern times there is as yet no great literature; criticism must
therefore destroy the bad and lay the foundation for the good by
inspiration, organization, and a careful testing. This is the
work of the combinative spirit, which is another name for the wit that combines or cements all into a system. This was Lessing's service: "Die Kunst und Fantasie war nicht sein Fach, auch in der eigentlichen Speculation mögen ihm viele übertreffen; aber sein Witz ist sehr speculativ, und gewiss auch besonders in der späten Zeit sehr fantastisch." Is this the actual Lessing as he reveals himself in his works and letters; or is it a Lessing who has undergone a metempsychosis?

The last volume of the anthology begins with the Vom Charakter der Protestanten, which is to be an analysis of Lessing's steps in the last half of his career. For Schlegel, Catholicism is the poetic religion, Protestantism the philosophic and polemic. But Protestantism had stopped in its progress and canonized some of its doubts as sternly as the Catholics from whom they had split. Not so Lessing, he is the true Protestant, the true disputant, who does not stop: "Die wahre Polemik ist unendlich, nach allen Seiten hin unaufhaltsam progressiv."

Lessing continues his fight for truth even against the Protestant party that had stopped in its search for the truth, and he defends those Catholic tenets that are based on truth and experience. The religious controversialist must fight against the negative, the finite, the letter as long as God's word is not universal; when, however, God's love has become all-pervading, then he must destroy himself. From this picture of Lessing as a writer of polemics Gundolf turns away: "Er (Fr. Schlegel) hat Lessing aus
der sittigen Aufklärung übergeleitet in die romantische Polemik, ja recht eigentlich Lessing, den grenzensetzenden Lehrer, verwandelt in den Polemiker Lessing. Er hat den dogmatisch missverstandenen Vernünftler ausgelegt als einen rastlosen Zieler über alle Ziele hin."

Schlegel is not incorrect, of course, in defining Lessing as a polemic writer, insofar as he was primarily interested in seeking out and revealing the truth. Great divergence of the views of the two men is evinced by the mere fact that the one would have polemic writers destroy themselves once the quested period has arrived - when God's word has become universal. For Lessing the search for truth is its own reward and in this search man is ever active; in Schlegel, we shall see more clearly later, man does search for the truth; in the search he is more or less a tool, and eventually he is altogether passive and loses himself in a mysterious, divine guidance and revelation.

As a whole, Schlegel's introduction to this third volume is largely an essay on religion with occasional glances at Lessing. Schlegel was himself going through a period of change and, though this essay still finds some fault with the Catholic Church, it does so affectionately; it is actually a definite turn to this church. The Protestants have developed outwardly; the Catholics, intensively. There is still a third step possible: "Doch noch einen dritten Weg giebt es, den einzig wahren, die Rückkehr zum Primitiven und Positiven. Das Ursprüngliche in allen Dingen ist gewiss das beste, und allen Neuerern, wenn sie das Alte oft nicht mit Unrecht verwerflich finden, kann man sagen: Geht nur noch weiter zurück und
setzet an die Stelle des Alten, das noch Aeltere, das AllerAelterste
und Erste, und ihr werdet sicher das Rechte und Wahre finden."
This return to the old necessarily embraces the Catholic religion,
the Church as it existed before the Protestant break; many of the
romanticists turned back to the Middle Ages and met Catholicism
on the way. Lessing had also entered upon this path, according to
Schlegel. "Diesen von dem zwiefachen Untergange allein rettenden
Rückweg in der Religion wenigstens eingeschlagen, unter den
Protestanten vielleicht zuerst eingeschlagen zu haben, das ist
Lessings Verdienst, und keines seiner kleinsten." He adds:
"Trotz dem Aergernisse, was er seinen Anhängern damit gab, da den
seynwollenden Aufkläerern das die ärgste aller Ketzerien zu seyn
pflegt, wenn ein Denker den alten Glauben vertheidigt." Here,
perhaps, Schlegel is more concerned with dealing another blow to
the rationalists than with arriving at a just judgment. Lessing
rather went forward, far beyond his age, to the period when
reason would set up a religion.

There follow a few general remarks on tolerance and
Protestantism, all leading to an eulogy of Lessing as being
essentially religious and praise for his prophecy in the Erziehung
des Menschengeschlechts concerning the third step in the develop-
ment of religion. It is probable that the Erziehung des Menschen-
geschlechts influenced Schlegel to adopt the idea of three stages
in the religious development of mankind; but it is just the dif-
ference in the conception of this third step that measures most
accurately the divergence between the two men, - a convincing instance, further, that Lessing, even here, did not influence Schlegel fundamentally. Schlegel adopted the outline of development but filled it in himself. This will be discussed later.

In this third volume, the introduction of which has just been examined, Schlegel includes the Erziehung des Menschen-geschlechts, the first and second dialogues of Ernst und Falk, and Nathan. He closes with a dialogue of his own: Ernst und Falk, Bruchstück eines dritten Gesprächs über Freimaurerei. The dialogue proper, which is a discussion of a new philosophy that has arisen, is early interrupted to give way to an essay concerning this new philosophy, Ueber die Form der Philosophie. This is altogether a statement of Schlegel's own philosophy and has nothing to do with Lessing. Erich Schmidt says of this sketch:
"Geistreich und paradox trat F. Schlegel an Ernst und Falk heran, auch hier Lessing, mehr noch sich selbst in Lessing suchend."

Here in his own dialogue Schlegel again demonstrates his trend towards Catholicism and mysticism, a trend away from Lessing.

At a time, he begins, when all is chaos, when even the memory of divine origin is forgotten, it is philosophy alone that can lead man back to the light; but this philosophy is fundamentally religious, divine, it is a "bestimmte und tief-gegründete Erkenntnis des höchsten Wesens und aller göttlichen Dinge." This philosophy was at hand in Idealism. In continuing, however, Schlegel inclines both from Lessing and from
Idealism itself; he accepts Catholicism. "Die Natur der Sache bringt es mit sich, dass dieser neue bloss menschliche, d. h. durch Menschengeist und Menschenkunst erfundene und gebildete Idealismus, je höher gesteigert je künstlicher vollendet, je reiner geläutert er seyn wird, von allen Seiten zurückführen muss zu jenem alten, göttlichen Idealismus, dessen dunkler Ursprung so alt ist wie die ersten Offenbarungen." A step is here taken into an entirely different system; man's reason is entirely subject to God and man passively accepts divine revelation. "Zu diesen ältesten Geheimnissen göttlicher Wahrheit führt die vollendete Wissenschaft nothwendig zurück, und so dürfen wir mit kühner Hoffnung alle die weiteren Entwickelungen erwarten." This philosophy is mystic and, in spite of continued examination, the essence of it, the answer, cannot be found. This is akin to Lessing's everlasting search for truth differing in that Schlegel's search finds a romantic, ironic goal: "Ihr Wesen aber besteht eben in dem schwebenden Wechsel, in dem ewigen Suchen und nie ganz finden können; dass unserer Wissbegierde immer etwas gegeben wird, aber immer noch weit mehr zurückzubleiben scheint; und in jedem guten philosophischen Gespräch muss wenigstens einer seyn, der wissbegierig die Geheimnisse der höchsten Forschung zu enthalten strebt, und einer, der im Besitz derselben, sie gern mittheilend immer mehr verrät, aber wenn man glaubt, er werde es, was er weder kann noch darf, nun ganz thuri und ganz aussprechen, dann plötzlich abbricht, und
For Lessing, each man seeks for the truth himself; for Schlegel, religion and philosophy - the two terms have become synonymous - are again to be taken out of profane hands, as they were in the earlier church: "Ein schönes Geheimniss also ist die Philosophie; sie ist selbst Mystik, oder die Wissenschaft und die Kunst göttlicher Geheimnisse. Die Mysterien der Alten waren in der Form vortreflich; wenigstens ein Anfang der wahrhaften Philosophie; die Christliche Religion selbst ward lange nur als das Mysterium eines geheimen Bundes verbreitet, und wie manches Verderben in ihr mag sich nicht gleich aus der ersten Zeit ihrer öffentlichen Bekanntmachung oder Profanirung her- schreiben." Nearing his conclusion Schlegel makes a statement which is decidedly un-Lessingian and manifests his reactionary tendencies of this time: "Nur allzu deutlich hat uns erst die Reformation und mehr noch die Revolution gelehrt, was es auf sich habe mit der unbedingten Öffentlichkeit, auch dessen was anfangs vielleicht recht gut gemeint und sehr richtig gedacht war."

All in all, it is impossible to form a clear picture of Lessing in this critical hodge-podge of introductory essays; but the Schlegel of the period from 1801 to 1804 (and later) is portrayed distinctly and vividly. The last volume of the anthology completed, the reader reflects upon a queer Lessing; he is somewhat like Friedrich himself but he is also a symbol of defeated effort, in whom only the struggles to rise above his age and...
the mystic tendencies of his religion (tendencies that turned their back on rationalism) are notable. He is deprived of his poetic and critical gifts and given a large measure of romantic, combinative, ironic wit. He becomes an apostle of revelation - but, Schlegel first draws the teeth of his Erziehung des Menschen­geschlechts that it may fit well into a romantic, mysterious, altogether divine revelation that brings man's search for the truth to a standstill and leaves him sitting passively, with his hands folded.

Schlegel's preoccupation with revelation and allied problems is yet more manifest in the next utterances on Lessing, in the Wiener Vorlesungen of 1812. In the discussion of them (they are the last direct treatment of Lessing) and in the discussion of the passages and chapters in the later books that bear on this question, it will be seen that Schlegel is still slightly, but never fundamentally, influenced by Lessing. The differences in the characters and ideas of the two men - they are different, in spite of Schlegel's Schlegelian picture of Lessing - preclude any profound influence.
Section D. 1805-1829.

The next actual treatment of Lessing after the Lessingbäuchlein is to be found in the Wiener Vorlesungen of 1812, a series of lectures in which Friedrich weighs the literatures of all times and all nations. Unlike his brother, he sets up no arbitrary standards nor does he judge books and writers so much as he marks the effects of books or writers on the national life and on the growth or decay of civilizations in general. As Walzel says: "Friedrich will die Litteratur in ihrem Einflusse auf das wirkliche Leben, auf das Schicksal der Nationen darstellen." Besides adopting this Herderian conception of literature, Schlegel's romantic borders have widened to include oriental philosophy and religion, primitive poetry, and the Catholic Church. Literature, as such, drops more and more into the background as mysticism and theology step to the fore.

Schlegel had never thought well of Lessing as poet or critic; his opinion of him in these respects is unchanged in this short treatment. He had, we have seen, formerly admired the spirit of the Laokoon and of the Dramaturgie; here he does not even mention these works and he has forgotten the spirit. He now subscribes entirely to his brother's estimate of Lessing as an atomistic critic. Friedrich also believes that Lessing is better fitted to minutely analyze than to judge a work as a whole: "Ein Werk von hoher Vollkommenheit so zu betrachten und zu bewundern,
wie etwa Winkelmann, dazu hatte er nicht Ruhe genug. Lessings Kritik geht mehr auf die Grundsätze als auf die Charakteristik des Vollkommenen; und mehr auf Widerlegung der falschen Grundsätze, als auf die Begründung der wahren. Er ist auch in der Kritik mehr Philosoph als Kunstbetrachter. In this respect Schlegel seems to reason badly; surely a philosopher-critic would be much more apt to grasp the whole, than to busy himself with details. We shall find, however, that Schlegel's conception of Lessing as a philosopher goes hand in hand with this criticism, and that there is no contradiction. This latest estimate of the critic Lessing is as queer as Schlegel's former ideas on the subject had been. It is noteworthy, insofar as explaining his attitude towards Lessing as critic and insofar as giving his own critical ideal, that he turns now to Hamann as one of the great critical geniuses of the age. In 1813 he writes to his brother that Jacobi had sent him an excellent essay by Hamann, "der in der Tat ein ganz andrer Philosoph wie Kant war und ein besserer Kritiker wie Herder."

This same tendency towards the vague and irrational is obvious also in his changing conceptions of philosophy and religion. In his earlier works philosophy had meant to him the rounding out of the ego, the realization of the ideal, of the infinite. This we found in the Lessingbüchlein. In the eight years that have intervened between that book and the Wiener Vorlesungen, he has turned to the Catholic Church and to mysticism
and revelation and passivism. Lessing he now ranks far above Kant as philosopher—because he penetrated more deeply than Kant. It is not to be denied, he says, "dass Lessing auf seine Art tiefer, wenn gleich nicht so systematisch als Kant in das Innere der Philosophie eingedrungen ist." What this inner sanctum of philosophy is, becomes clear when he groups Lessing, Lavater, and Hamann as three men who pursued the traces of the lost truth, of divine revelation, in an ungodly age: "Er (Lavater) ist aber meines Bedünkens, unter den Suchenden des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts, wie ich diejenigen nennen möchte, welche den Spuren der verlorenen Wahrheit unermüdlich nachgingen, nach Hamann und nebst Lessing der vortrefflichsten und der merkwürdigsten einer." Here then (as earlier in the Lessingbüchlein) Schlegel has arrived at that point where all philosophic doubt and questioning is resolved in a vague mysticism and religion. It is no longer Lessing's search for truth, but merely a happy acceptance of mystery.

It is as philosopher and religious writer that Schlegel treats Lessing most exhaustively in the lectures. "Lessing legte, da sein Geist die Höhe der männlichen Reife erreicht hatte, die antiquarischen Untersuchungen, Theater und Kunstkritik, denen er sein früheres Leben gewidmet hatte, gleich wie Jugendübungen bei Seite. Die philosophische Erforschung der Wahrheit ward das Ziel aller seiner spätern Bestrebungen, denen er sich mit einem Ernst, einer Begeisterung für die Sache hingab, wie vorher keinem andern Geschäft." He states further that
the critical work done before this earnest work was only a genial playing; that his true gift lay in philosophy. He insists that Lessing is a true philosopher because he had no strict system, because he remained paradoxical, paradox being the essence of philosophy. He again presents a distorted image of Lessing, to say the least. Continuing, Schlegel states his belief that German philosophy would have developed more happily had Lessing's influence persisted instead of Kant's. He adds: "Lessing äusserte seine eigentlichen philosophischen Gedanken fast gar nicht öffentlich; alles was er etwa gelegentlich davon hinwarf, fiel auf, als eine allen ausdruck übersteigende Paradoxie." This sounds so truly romantic, so much like the Schlegel of the Fragmente and of the essay on Lessing, that we can with no difficulty detect Schlegel himself, rather than Lessing.

But Schlegel's philosophy has completely taken on a religious tone; therefore, Lessing's likewise becomes more religion than philosophy. Lessing touches, says Friedrich, "in der Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts und in den Freimaurergesprächen, wie in allen seinen philosophischen Streitschriften Punkte, welche die eigentlichen Hauptgegenstände der höhern Philosophie viel näher angehen, welche aber den damaligen Denkern fast ganz aus ihrem Gesichtskreise entschwunden waren." The belief that Schlegel is again seeing himself in Lessing is strengthened by this extreme praise of the Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts as a work leading back to the religion of feeling and
mystery. We shall see that Schlegel was influenced by the Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts to adopt certain ideas and terms from it, but that he misinterpreted the work rather oddly in order to have it conform with his pre-conceived picture of Lessing, a picture that bore a striking resemblance again to Schlegel and very little resemblance to the rationalist and the disciple of truth. Lessing, continues Schlegel, had carried Protestantism past the unlimited freedom of thought advocated by Luther and had led it back to become a religion of feeling again: "Lessingen selbst hatte die hohe Kühnheit seines Forschergeistes zurückgeführt zum Glauben an die älteste Philosophie, und zur Anerkennung der Tradition und ihrer gesetzlichen Kraft in der Kirche." This is not at all the Lessing of the Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts; it is the Friedrich Schlegel who had found his truth in the Catholic Church. And, as proof that Lessing was not a follower of Spinoza, Schlegel again refers to the theory of transmigration of souls as expressed in the Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts: "Der entscheidende Beweis dafür ist, dass Lessing an die Seelenwanderung glaubte, und unter allen besonders Lieblingsmeinungen scheint diese besonders tief bei ihm gewurzelt zu haben. Diese Meinung aber ist mit Spinozas System ganz unverträglich, da weder eine Verwandlung der Individuen noch eine persönliche Fortdauer derselben nach diesem System statt findet. Vielmehr scheint aus diesem Umstande deutlich hervorzugehen, dass Lessing überhaupt zu der Ältern orientalischen Philosophie sich
Schlegel himself was an ardent devotee of oriental philosophy at this time, it must not be forgotten.

Both Schlegel and Lessing express most clearly their conceptions and ideas of religion by their views on revelation and metempsychosis; in the former problem, as has already been intimated, Schlegel received a first impetus from Lessing and borrowed some of the terms and ideas. But, as it was bound to happen, the views of the two men, even though starting from a common basis, diverged more widely than ever and, in the final analysis, they remain - the one rationalist, the other mystic or romanticist.

For the short discussion of Lessing's *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts* and its slight influence on Schlegel, the following works of Schlegel are considered:

(1804) *Über die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier*,
(1828) *Philosophie der Geschichte*.

However, we shall see that the comparison soon leaves the narrow spheres of influence and shows rather plainly how far apart the two men stood here, even though Schlegel had viewed the *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts* as a work truly mystic, romantic, and Schlegelian. We shall find, especially in the later work of Schlegel, a growing spirit of narrowness, of intolerance, of a passive reception of and belief in mysteries and miracles, in glaring contrast to the clear, wise writings that Lessing produced.
in his last years, the whole tendency of these last writings being summed up in the *Erziehung des Menschen­geschlechts*; and this difference holds for the entire older romantic school, even though it was reverent in its attitude towards this late writing of Lessing on revelation.

In paragraph four of the *Erziehung des Menschen­geschlechts* Lessing says: "Erziehung giebt dem Menschen nichts, was er nicht aus sich selbst haben könnte: sie giebt ihm das, was er aus sich selber haben könnte, nur geschwinder und leichter." Man is here in a world in which he keeps on striving, mostly alone. In order to understand at the start the complete difference in the conceptions of the two men, one need only cite a few passages from Schlegel's *Philosophie der Geschichte*, passages that are typical of the entire work. Schlegel, discussing the Age of Enlightenment, criticizes it for its vanity and godlessness: "nur ein sehr kleiner Theil aus dieser Aufklärung des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts war aus der schon früher positiv gegebenen göttlichen Grundlage der Christlichen Wahrheit, nach dem reinen Lichte des wahren Glaubens, wirklich und richtig abgeleitet; alles Übrige, und diess war bei weitem das meiste, war auch nur Menschenwerk, eben daher eitel und nichtig, oder wenigstens gebrechlich, im Einzelnen verkehrt, im Ganzen aber ohne festen Grund, daher auch nicht von bleibender Dauer und Haltbarkeit." All progress, adds Schlegel, comes about through God, and man must guard
against meddling and spoiling "was der grossmuthige Monarch des Weltalls im vollen Ueberflusse der gotlichen Liebe Uber seine Erde ausschuttet." But Schlegel goes still further. Not only are the creations of man vain and of short duration, but man himself must not question any part of revealed religion. In Lessing's Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts the stories of creation, of the tower of Babel, and others are allegorical, part of the simple lessons for the early years of man. Schlegel begins his investigations and discussions of these subjects with an injunction: "Man muss nicht alles erklaren wollen." To him the story of creation is true; even the heathens and the pagans have it, and his deduction, therefore, is that it must be based in fact. The romanticists, as a whole, were content to accept religion as something mysterious, transcendental, that allowed a certain amount of adoration but very little questioning. For Lessing, human reason does not want to be employed merely with problems concerning bodily welfare, which would dull it, but "er will schlechterdings angeistigen Gegenstanden geubt seyn, wenn er zu seiner volligen Aufklarung gelangen, und diejenige Reinigkeit des Herzens hervorbringen soll, die uns, die Tugend um ihrer selbst willen zu lieben, fahig macht." It seems a direct challenge to Schlegel's injunction that one should not inquire into the mysteries of religion, when Lessing says: "Es ist nicht wahr, dass Spekulationen Uber diese Dinge jemals Unheil gestiftet, und der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft nachtheilig geworden." And there is furthermore paragraph 78
in which he says that these elementary secrets were given to be solved.

Lessing's Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts is a triumph of reason working surely and modestly to the point at which it must stop because it is not yet developed to the full. The romanticists adopted an emotional interpretation and idea of the world and life, because their philosophy, being so purely personal, balked at the many bounds that hemmed in their thought, and they substituted for reason, therefore, a resignation to mystery and religion. The rationalists taught virtue for its own reward on earth; the romanticists looked to heaven. Lessing cited three stages in the education of man: the early allegorical teachings of the Old Testament, with virtue being rewarded already on earth; the second stage, with the appearance of Christ, who taught the immortality of the soul and the consequent rewards in heaven, the Jews now having outgrown their primer, the Old Testament; the third stage has already been intimated, being the one of love of virtue as its own reward. The third stage was no idle dream for Lessing; he greeted it already in his day: "Sie wird kommen, sie wird gewiss kommen, die Zeit der Vollendung da der Mensch, je Überzeugter sein Verstand einer immer bessern Zukunft sich fühlet, von dieser Zukunft gleichwohl Bewegungsgründe zu seinen Handlungen zu erborgen, nicht nöthig haben wird; da er das Gute thun wird, weil es das Gute ist, nicht weil willkührrliche Belohnungen darauf gesetzt sind." Schlegel likewise cites three stages; their clarification is the goal
that he sets up for himself in his *Philosophie der Geschichte*:

"Die Wiederherstellung des ganzen Menschengeschlechts zu dem
verlorenen göttlichen Ebenbilde nach dem Stufengange der Gnade in
den verschiedenen Weltaltern, von der anfangenden Offenbarung,
bis zum Mittelpunkte der Rettung und der Liebe, und von diesem
bis zur letzten Vollendung, historisch zu entwickeln, bildet den
Gegenstand für diese Philosophie der Geschichte." It is easy
to see Schlegel's similarity to Lessing in the idea of the three
stages, but Schlegel's third stage - that of all the romanticists-
is not a new one. It is rather a combination of the blind,
implicit faith in the allegorical revelations of the first stage
and the heavenly rewards of the second. We have seen already
that he objected to the dependence of the 18th century on reason,
because such a dependence tears down the structures of society
and of the church. Man must not seek to explain everything.
Pure justice is in the hands of God. "Sobald der Mensch aber,
oder irgend eine irdische Macht an dieses Werk Hand anlegen, sich
diese Absolute Gerechtigkeit zum Ziele setzen und darnach alles
zu beurtheilen und zu modelln und die Welt dem gemäß neu einzu-
richten sich anmassen wollte; so könnte daraus nur eine gänzliche
Umwälzung aller menschlichen Verhältnisse und vollkommene Zer-
störung aller bestehenden Ordnung hervorgehen." All judgment
must therefore be left to the day of judgment: "Denn auf den
ersten Ursprung und letzten Grund alles Rechts und aller
Gerechtigkeit zurückzugehen, dass muss allein Gott als dem ewigen
Weltrichter vorbehalten bleiben, der es wie über die Individuen,
so auch über die Staaten und Völker ist, der ohnehin jedes grosse politische Unrecht an dem zur Rechenschaft bestimmten Tage historisch zu vergelten, unerwartet zu bestrafen, und in oft furchtbarer Weise auf sein Nichts zurückzuführen weiss."

Schlegel has become a reactionary, and he closes his book with a vague, indefinite expression of hope "dass in der vollendeten religiösen Wiederherstellung des Staats und auch der Wissenschaft, die Sache Gottes und das Christentum vollständig auf Erden siegen und triumphiren werde."

Linking closely with their attitudes on revelation and the differences of opinion and conviction in respect to it, are the expressions of the two men concerning transmigration of souls. Again Schlegel may have been influenced somewhat by Lessing's Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts, although his study of Indian philosophy during the Paris stay (and later) probably furnished the strongest starting point. However much influence Lessing may have had on Schlegel in this question, the attitude of the two men towards it is again widely at variance, again shows the deep cleft between rationalism and the romanticism that turned into mysticism and passivism in Schlegel.

As early as 1804, in the essay Über die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier, Schlegel had dealt at length with the subject of metempsychosis, but with no sympathy for it. To him it was all a mistake and a superstition; the only virtue in it was the fact that it proved the worship of the true God. In this
direction it was, for Schlegel, closely related to the idea of revelation; because the fact that the Hindus recognized the true God, proved the universal revelation of God to man. It may be allowed to digress, in order to show how this early idea of revelation differed from the later that we have already discussed. The revelation here would seem to fit into Lessing’s conception, although it may have been influenced by the idealism and the unrestrained ego of those years. He says of the revelation: "Nicht als Unterricht des Vaters in Bild und ausdrücklichem Worte denke man sich diese ursprüngliche Offenbarung, wiewohl auch dies kein ganz leeres und unwürdiges Gleichniss wäre; sondern als ein Aufgehen des inneren Gefühls."

However, in the *Philosophie der Geschichte* of 1828, he has long since ceased to adhere to this earlier view. He does not yet believe fully in the Hindu metempsychosis, which holds that the souls of the dead return to the bodies of animals as punishment for sin, but that in a few cases of extreme virtue, after a sufficient number of migrations to animal bodies, the soul again lodges in a human body, this human then being a Brahman - a being near to God. But he recognizes certain virtues in this system: "Das bessere, und noch auf Wahrheit ruhende Element darin, ist das tiefe Gefühl, wie es, nachdem der Mensch einmahl so weit von Gott abgekommen war, und von Ihm entfernt steht, nun eines weiten, langen, mühsamen Weges und grossen Kampfes bedürfe, um sich Ihm als der Quelle alles Guten, wieder zu nähern." The tremendous difference between the old Lessing
and Schlegel is again evident here. For Lessing the transmigration of souls means progress; it means the rise of man to a more and more intelligent state. Schlegel sees in it only a vague sort of return to God. In this same *Philosophie der Geschichte* he expresses his views on some of the other eighteenth century exponents of metempsychosis in a tone not especially favorable or appreciative: "Wenn auch in unserem Jahrhunderte etwa einmahl Einer, aus Überruβss und Ekel an allen andern bekannten und neuen Systemen, oder den gewohnten Lehren, aus Hang zur Paradoxie, auf diese uralte Hypothese von der Seelenwanderung verfallen war; so ist damit mehr nur ein blosser Wechsel der Naturformen gemeint gewesen." When we recall that Schlegel had previously considered Lessing a paradoxical philosopher trying to rise above the faults, the platitudes, and the rationalism of his age, we are practically convinced that he refers here to Lessing. If so, he actually did realize the difference between their respective ideas of metempsychosis, except that he still fails to recognize the rationalistic element in that of Lessing and still considers him to be a master of paradox. He has the same idea of Lessing that he expressed in the 1797 essay, in the conclusion of 1801, in the *Lessingbüchlein*, and in the *Wiener Vorlesungen*. Lessing is still partly mysticist, and partly a romanticist born too early and exiled among rationalists, who pulled him down artistically despite his efforts to flee from them. He does not read the *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts* open-mindedly enough to see that the transmigration of souls means a joyful sign of human
progress to Lessing. As in the early years, he approaches Lessing with the firm determination to find in him an actual enemy of rationalism.

This conviction, that he still thinks of Lessing in terms of his own early writings about him, becomes more strongly entrenched by his reference to him in the Philosophie der Sprache und des Wortes (1828-29), his last work. In this book he believes he recognizes a certain similarity in his style and that of Lessing. It is only a casual reference. Altogether, in all the writings of Schlegel after 1812, if we except the probable allusion to him in the Philosophie der Geschichte of 1828, Lessing plays no role whatever; he is not even mentioned. The same is true of the letters of these years. Surely, if Lessing had become so deeply ingrained in Schlegel's affections, sympathies, and ideas as we are led by some to believe, there would be more evidence of it, in the early years and in the period between 1812 and Schlegel's death in 1829.
Section E. Conclusion.

In a speech on Lessing, Gundolf expressed very clearly the nature of Schlegel's work on Lessing and, incidentally, stated the characteristic difference between the rationalists and the romanticists: "Friedrich Schlegel hat Lessing in einem Gedenkenwerk dem Missbrauch der hurtigen und fertigen Benützer zu entrücken gesucht, indem er ihn umdeutete zu einem romantischen Sucher, dass heisst für ihn: Spieler. Doch auch hierin lag ein Missbrauch (wenn man überhaupt den unvermeidlichen Umsatz der grossen Kräfte in dünnere, seichtere, matte, das notwendige Verebben aller Fluten einen Missbrauch nennen darf.) Lessing hat sich niemals wie die Romantiker aus dem 'Unendlichen' einen pflichtlosen Rausch gemacht, ein gnädiges Fest, ein verantwortungsloses Spiel im Glauben, wenn man seinen eigenen Geist blindlings oder genüsslich ihm anvertrau, sei man darin aufgehoben und werde schon, ja, müsse, gut fahren." In spite of the fact that the various works of Schlegel on Lessing have been cited as good criticism of Lessing, and have been examined to find positive proof of a close sympathy on the part of Schlegel for Lessing - and even an influence - the findings should rather be called negative.

The first three works on Lessing - the 1797 essay, the 1801 conclusion, and the Lessingbächlein of 1804, we have seen, were written primarily to make money and to show the
rationalists that their hero, Lessing, was, after all, a Schlegelian figure, endowed with such romantic qualities as cynicism, a fragmentary style, and mysticism. Schlegel especially praised, in these early writings, the things that the rationalists of Lessing's day had objected to, namely Nathan and some of the polemics; and he pronounced the poetic, the critical, and the dramatic works of Lessing, which the rationalists had admired and held up as standards and models, as being unimportant and insignificant. Köpke praises Schlegel for his efforts to save Lessing from Nicolai and his group, but he adds: "Aber zugleich sprach er auch Lessing nicht die Poesie allein, auch die Befähigung zu ihrer Kritik sprach er ihm ab, um ihn auf ein unerklärliches Gemisch von Polemik, Witz, und Philosophie, als seinen wahren Gehalt zurück zu führen." He is not certain after reading Schlegel's works on Lessing, whether Schlegel is an admirer or an opponent.

To show further that Schlegel made a Schlegelian figure of Lessing, it is only necessary to examine the virtues that he found and admired in Lessing, and to observe the changes that the picture of Lessing underwent with the years. Nathan is a work of higher cynicism to Schlegel; the letters and the polemic works are supposed to abound in ironic, paradoxical sentences and to fall naturally into fragments, just such fragments as Schlegel himself wrote and as he picked out of the writings of Lessing in the Lessingbüchlein; and the Erziehung des
Menschengeschlechts is a return to the old revelation, the first faith, whereas it is more truly a rational work that glorifies reason and continued striving rather than a romantic sitting-back and bowing to the decrees and the mysteries of God. Moreover, the picture that Schlegel draws of Lessing changes with the years, the change, curiously enough, corresponding to a similar change in Schlegel himself. At the time of the 1797 essay, Schlegel was interested primarily in religion and in the creation of a new religion; Lessing is in that essay primarily a religious writer, the author of *Nathan*, a play that practically creates a new religion based on tolerance and the truths of many religions. When Schlegel, however, wrote the conclusion of 1801, his interests were primarily in philosophy but, his own efforts to create a system having come to grief in his Jena lectures, his philosophy is a vague creation compounded of fragments, of paradox, and brilliant, airy words about the spirit of things and about the Whole. Such a philosopher is Lessing in the 1801 conclusion. In the *Lessingbüchlein* Schlegel's philosophic concepts are slowly resolving themselves into mysticism and Catholicism; we have seen that Schlegel's Lessing again keeps step with this change. In the final treatment of Lessing, in the *Wiener Vorlesungen* of 1812, Lessing is primarily a seeker of the old mystic truth of the first Christian religion, along with Hamann and Lavater; here he is still on the path that he entered
with Schlegel in the Lessingbächlein. Considering the make-up of Lessing and of the romanticists, it is ridiculous that there ever should have been any question of influence or deep sympathy. The fact that the romanticists despised the rationalists, and that the rationalists had persecuted Lessing because of his tolerant religious views, gave the romanticists a common ground on which they could meet Lessing, even though they misunderstood his most characteristic religious writings. And they could further use him against the rationalists, both because of this matter of religion and because the rationalists so enthusiastically praised his poetical and critical gifts. Friedrich Schlegel was especially quick to take advantage of the two opportunities; to make the most of the opportunity he had to create a romantic figure of Lessing because in that form he could use him most effectively against the rationalists. But there remained a wide chasm between Lessing and Schlegel in spite of that, and not the least trace of any significant influence anywhere. In critical method, where there might have been some influence, Schlegel was subjective, even in the early years when he was supposed to have been influenced to objectivism by the Greeks and, partly, by Lessing. He recognized no bounds in art and judged a work largely through the writer. Lessing is an objective critic, recognizing strict bounds, and judging a work by the canons of beauty, experience, and artistry, altogether rationally, in other words.
In religion there was greater field for influence. The romanticists' idea of beauty, before they transformed it into a mysterious religion, was akin to the everlasting striving for truth in Lessing. Schiller and Goethe and the Greeks thought of beauty as living in the world of Being; the romanticists thought of it as something unattainable, although constantly pursued. It is not surprising that both the romanticists and Lessing should find refuge in religion, for it is in religion that loose, unattainable ends resolve themselves into a mystic solution. But even here, in religion, the romanticists and Lessing were not on a common footing, and this is especially applicable again to Schlegel, for Schlegel turned most frequently to the religion of Lessing and found in it a mystery and a return to the first religion that undeniably smacked of romanticism. Lessing's religion, however, was one of reason. In his *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts* it is reason that is glorified. Both men recognized three steps in the religious development of man, but we have seen already what a tremendous distance there was between their third steps.

With all these differences between the men, with the strong proof that Schlegel felt no deep sympathy for Lessing, did not judge him honestly and did not write good, fair criticism of Lessing because he made a Schlegelian figure of him and had the feud with Nicolai more in mind than the desire to be just to Lessing, it seems justifiable to deny any deep significance to
all the writings of Schlegel on Lessing, to deny all the claims that have been made for these writings as good criticism of Lessing, and finally to deny that any sort of influence, except the most superficial, could have been imprinted upon Schlegel by his study of Lessing.
II. Ludwig Tieck

Section A. Introduction.

Concerning the difference between Tieck and Lessing as critics, Haym says: "Eine Natur wie die Tiecks konnte unmöglich Sinn haben für Lessing. Keine Spur eines Einflusses Lessings da, wo er, wie in den Musenalmanachrezensionen, selber den Kritiker spielte." The reviews that Haym mentions are of the years 1796-98. Even in these early years there are certain characteristics in Tieck's works that already show the complete indifference to the teachings of Lessing in the fields of art, criticism, and the drama, an indifference that he was to maintain in all the works of his later years.

And yet, there is in Tieck's early years, during his boyhood in Berlin and his student-years, a sincere respect for Lessing as one of the great literary figures of Germany. In his boyhood the impression was strengthened by the fact that he probably saw many performances of Lessing's plays, Berlin being, at that time, the stronghold of rationalism. In the universities the theories and works of Lessing were being given full credence and stress.

This early respect was not without its influence on some of Tieck's first works, especially the critical works. We see in them Tieck's romantic tendencies, his subjectivism, held
in check, even though only slightly, by rationalistic theories such as those set up by Lessing. At times there is a direct reference to Lessing as authority.

With his return to Berlin from Göttingen in 1794, however, Tieck was exposed to other influences that soon brought about a change in his earlier convictions. The first of these new influences - negative this time - was a discontent with the Nicolais, father and son, and with the rationalists, that grew stronger and stronger, changing slowly into contempt and hatred. This feeling was strengthened by his acquaintance-ship with Friedrich Schlegel and Novalis. We shall see that the former's essay, *Über Lessing*, helped formulate and determine his hatred of rationalism. And Tieck likewise adopted Schlegel's picture of Lessing, that of a figure trying to rise above his age and notable mostly for this effort and for his polemics against the group that now, ironically enough, held him aloft as leader. We shall see that to the time of Tieck's death in 1853 this idea of Lessing remained practically constant, with only certain minor modifications. Novalis had no direct influence on Tieck's idea of Lessing but he did strengthen Tieck's tendency towards mysticism, as he had Schlegel's. In spite of this mysticism, however, Tieck, as Schlegel before him, still professed intense admiration for the *Erziehung des Menschen-geschlechts*, a rational work. While Tieck's efforts to make a romantic figure of Lessing are not as pronounced as those of
Schlegel, he does try to do so, nevertheless.

Although the relationship between Tieck and Schlegel cooled rather quickly, the influence of the essay persisted a rather long time. A change is first noticeable about 1828-29. In these years Tieck published his collected works, with three long introductions (in volumes one, six, and eleven) that give an idea of his critical development. In these introductions Tieck's opinion of Lessing as critic and dramatist is no longer quite as harsh as in his earlier statements concerning Lessing's activity in these fields. On the whole, however, the nature of it, although the tone is modified, is still the same as that of the early years. In the last expressions about Lessing there are no deviations of any importance from the views as expressed in the three introductions of 1828-29.

It is to be expected that Tieck, like Schlegel, would naturally disregard Lessing as critic, poet, and dramatist. The difference in the nature of the two men extends to and conditions their work as artists. The views of Lessing are familiar to everyone. Before actually tracing Tieck's attitude towards Lessing as it is found in his remarks on Lessing, we shall give a quick outline of Tieck's fundamental ideas and rules in the matters of the drama, the limitation of the arts, and criticism.

In the introduction to the first volume of his collected works, Tieck gives interesting accounts of the
evolution of Genoveva and of Kaiser Octavianus. By these accounts we are given a glimpse of his ideals and theories of dramatic composition, theories that are as far removed from those of Lessing as the plays themselves differ from any that Lessing ever wrote. And we see further that he believes in no limitations of the fields of art and that his critical method is subjective altogether.

In 1797 Tieck had read in manuscript Maler Müller's play on Genoveva, of which he remembered only a haunting refrain: "Mein Grab sey unter Weiden." In the following year he read the folk-book, in which the loneliness of Genoveva is so simply and touchingly depicted. As he at that time was busied with Spanish, with the translation of Don Quixote and the study of Calderon and Lope de Vega, he became more and more converted to the Spanish type of play. Concerning this period and his studies, he says in the introduction: "Diese mir neue Art, künstliche Versmasse, lyrische Ergüsse in das Drama einzuführen, schien mir für gewisse Gegenstände trefflich. Ich glaubte, man könne noch auf andre Art wie die Alten die Erzählung und Lyrik in den Dialog einführen, und wohl auf seltsame Weise Fels und Wald, die einsame Natur, die Gefühle der Andacht, die Wunder der Legende, im Gegensatz mit der bewegten Leidenschaft, und das Unglaubliche in Verbindung mit der nächsten und überzeugendsten Gegenwart vortragen." 173 Here is much that
Lessing would have looked at askance, but Tieck oversteps still more bounds in discussing his program of construction: "Ich hatte mich vorsätzlich von allem Theater und dessen Einrichtungen entfernt, um größern Raum zu gewinnen, um einige Stellen ganz musikalisch, andere ganz malerisch behandeln zu können. Die Begeisterung des Kriegers, die Leidenschaft des Liebenden, die Vision und das Wunder sollte jedes in einem ihm geziemenden Tone vorgetragen, und das Ganze durch Prolog und Epilog in einem poetischen Rahmen traumähnlich festgehalten und auch wieder verflüchtigt werden, um auf keine andere Wahrheit, als die poetische, durch die Phantasie gerechtfertigte, Anspruch zu machen."

In the spring of 1801 Tieck began Kaiser Octavianus, led to the work by the finding of the folk-book and by the pleasure that he took in the charming tale. He had learned more of the Middle Ages since writing Genoveva, and it is this more exact knowledge that kept him at work on the play for eighteen months. In it he again observes romantic precepts: "es war in Deutschland vom Charakter des Romantischen so viel die Rede gewesen, und vom Calderon für die allegorische Poesie begeistert, versuchte ich es in diesem wundersamen Märchen zugleich meine Ansicht der romantischen Poesie allegorisch, lyrisch und dramatisch niederzulegen." Influenced further by Calderon, he employed assonance to add to the lyric color of the play, and he again used different metres to express particular moods.
and feelings, including prose as the only medium for certain purposes. But for such a fantastic mixture a new stage, a romantic theatre was a necessity: "Hier war nur eine phantas­
tische Bühne zu gebrauchen, die alles zulässt, und wo .......
die Natur selbst erscheinen soll." The play was altogether
closely grown to Tieck's heart and he touched and re-touched it
lovingly. "Im Octavian habe ich vieles oft geändert und um-
gearbeitet, vorzüglich den Prolog. Ich stelle dieses Gedicht
darum an die Spitze der ganzen Sammlung, weil es meine Absicht
in der Poesie am deutlichsten ausspricht." It is this pro-
logue that comes to mind first whenever there is any mention of
romantic poetry or drama.

Lessing's dramas are built up logically, often coldly,
with a katharsis clearly in mind. The actors, the staging, the
scenery, all are to contribute to the arousing of pity and fear.
Tieck, however, has no distinct method and does not wish to
build up any.

In Lessing, for instance, the actor's art, lying be-
tween poetry and the plastic arts, must not be too violent:
"und der Grund ist leicht zu finden, warum auch da, wo der
Dichter nicht die geringste Mängelung beobachtet hat, dennoch
der Schauspieler sich in beiden Stücken mängeln muss." The
actor, in other words, must contribute his share to the total
effect on the audience by observing such rules as would detract
from the effect of the play, were they broken. We shall see that
the early ideas of Tieck were similar to this; but in his later discussions of plays the actor often rises superior to the play; he may even add or delete certain parts.

Lessing's judgment of a play is objective, an application of rules; Tieck is the most subjective of all the romantic critics, especially in his writings on the theatre. To appreciate Shakespeare properly, he advocates that we forget "die Regeln der Asthetik, mit allen Begriffen unsers aufgeklärteren Jahrhunderts .........., und uns ganz dem Wahnsinn des Dichters überlassen." But at the same time that he advocates the disregard of all rules, he would draw up rules for each individual work of genius. In a discussion of Hamlet, he says: "Die ·ächte Kritik wird der Poesie nie zu nahe treten, sie stärkt und kräftigt diese vielmehr; aber sie selbst weiss es auch, dass ein jedes neue Werk des Genies auch neue Regeln und Gesetze gebiert; diese sucht sie, und ist wahrlich, wenn sie ihren Beruf erfüllt, ebenfalls von schaffender, dichterischer Kraft." This is subjective criticism, pure and simple; it is not the criticism of Lessing.

Further, in the introduction to the first volume of his collected works, he classifies the critical schools, giving first the philosophic, which is often too much philosophy and not much understanding of art, and then the objective, into which Lessing would fall: "Wenn diese Art (philosophic criticism) der Kritik neu ist, so ist eine andre, die fast eben so willkürlich verfährt, schon ziemlich alt. Aus den Mustern der
Alten, aus Gedichten verschiedener Zeitalter von ungleichem Werthe, und aus einzelnen kurzen, oft unverständlichen oder vieldeutenden kritischen Aussprüchen weiser Meister hatte man für die neuere Zeit und alle Fälle eine Art von Kunsttheorie entworfen, deren Gesetze in manchen Ländern und zu manchen Zeiten immer noch wieder citirt werden. Die Kritiker aus dieser Schule setzen voraus, dass die Kunst schon längst beschlossen sei, und also nur Nachahmung der Werke, die für Muster gelten, statt finden könne. Ein Missverständniss, durch welches Kunst und Geschichte gleich sehr verkannt wird. Nur aus der Erfahrung, dem lebendigen Erkennen und der künstlerischen Begeisterung kann die echte Kritik hervorgehen, die dann freilich auch die Grundsätze finden und aufstellen, so wie die Aussprüche eines Aristoteles verstehen und mit den neueren Erfahrungen ausgleichen wird."

This is an obvious rejection of Lessing's school of criticism and a definite statement of Tieck's own views concerning critical method.

In general it may be said that the spiritual predecessor of Tieck and Friedrich Schlegel in the field of criticism is not Lessing but Herder. Herder is likewise subjective, treating each book from the standpoint of the individuality, of the soul. It is creative criticism that he and the romanticists practise. Lessing and the other critics of the Age of Enlightenment are objective, judging by certain definite rules; it is the criticism that is proper to and comes from men who have carefully
considered the problems of art and literature with strong, clear minds; it is rationalistic criticism and not criticism of the feeling, that establishes new standards with each new book. If the men of the former group are restrained in their enthusiasms, they are usually more just in their opinions. The men of the latter group make no effort to check their ardent enthusiasm and they often make critical blunders because they depend too greatly on the feelings, on the heart.

If one adds to these differences as critics and dramatists the fact that Tieck never admitted Lessing's reasons for observing the bounds of the different arts, there is a chasm already that seems incapable of being bridged.

In addition, Tieck early tended towards mysticism, while Lessing remained a rationalist in religion. It is, however, this last difference that Tieck refused to accept; as Schlegel had made a romanticist of Lessing in the matter of religion, so does Tieck.

In the matters of the drama, criticism, and the arts, the chasm between the two men remains throughout Tieck's life with, as we have said, the exception of a few years during Tieck's student days.

In tracing the attitude of Tieck towards Lessing, we shall divide the years beginning with 1787 (Tieck was then 14 years old) into three periods: 1787-1793, 1794-1827, 1828-1853.
In the first period there is definite evidence that Tieck was slightly influenced by Lessing, especially by the Laokoon, the Dramaturgie, and the dramas. The influence, of course, did not go very deeply; the youth was more impressed by the name, perhaps, than by the works. There are evidences of a sincere interest in the characters of Lessing’s dramas at this period. And it is in two essays - Die Kupferstiche nach der Shakspeare-Galerie in London and Shakspeare’s Behandlung des Wunderbaren - that there are traces of the influence of the Laokoon and the Dramaturgie. It was also in these same two essays that Tieck showed most clearly a definite rejection of rationalism; Shakespeare became the great name for him and the great model.

The second period (1794-1827) is that dominated by the views that Schlegel expressed in the essay, Über Lessing, in 1797, which Tieck, due to his intense admiration for Friedrich, read and adopted. The adoption was whole-hearted and colored his views of Lessing to his death. It is this quick readiness to accept Schlegel’s views of Lessing that shows most clearly how slight was the influence of the earlier years. The way to this acceptance of the essay of Schlegel on Lessing was paved by his growing dislike for rationalism. From the time of Tieck’s return to Berlin from Göttingen in 1794 there was a growing bitterness between him and the rationalists of Berlin, the two Nicolais, Falk, Merkel, and others. Into this second
period fall a number of works that show Tieck's judgment and picture of Lessing most vividly, as they show also how far apart the two men had finally grown. The chief of these works are:

185 Phantasien über die Kunst, Der Autor, Bemerkungen über Parteilichkeit Dummheit und Bosheit. None of these works are directly on Lessing, but there are passages that show clearly and unequivocally just where Tieck stood. Later in this period appear the Dramaturgische Blätter, which are reviews of a great variety of plays, with a few comments on Lessing. These reviews fall between the years 1821 and 1827, part of which time Tieck was closely connected with the Dresden Hoftheater.

The last period, from 1828 to his death in 1853, shows a less harsh attitude towards Lessing; but his idea of him formed in his early years, as we have said, persists. Into this period fall the introductions to volumes one, six, and eleven of his collected works; which appeared in 1828 and 1829; the conversations with Köpke in 1849-53, as they appear in Köpke's life of Tieck; and a few single, short discussions of or references to Lessing in the essays of this period.

The divisions, however, are rather arbitrary, because there is very little change in Tieck's attitude towards Lessing from youth up, if we except the very early years.

To summarize my purpose in this chapter on Tieck, I shall strive to show that in the early years Tieck felt a sincere respect for Lessing and for his dramas and was even influenced to
some extent by the *Laokoon* and the *Dramaturgie*. This influence, however, vanished with his study of Shakespeare and even the respect threatened to change to contempt as he turned more and more from the rationalists after his return to Berlin in 1794. Because of his friendship with the romanticists, especially with Friedrich Schlegel, he actually broke with the rationalists; and it was Schlegel's *Über Lessing* that determined his own attitude. Lessing is no longer poet, critic, or dramatist for him; instead of being a rationalist he has become a romanticist, especially in religion and in his polemic writings. This is exactly the Lessing that we find in Schlegel's 1797 essay. Furthermore, Tieck also tries to take Lessing away from the rationalists by pointing out just how sadly they misunderstood and misjudged him. This is again as in Schlegel's essay. It is this idea of Lessing that Tieck upholds after 1797 in all his writings referring to Lessing; except that in the later years he is, as it has already been said, less harsh in his criticisms of Lessing as a dramatist.
Section B. 1787-1793.

In the introduction to volume six of his works, Tieck recalls his youthful understanding of literature: "Ist das Bedürfniss erwacht, Wahrheit zu suchen und sich anzueignen, so folgt von selbst, dass das Verständniss der Kunst und Poesie anfangs nur mangelhaft und einseitig seyn kann, weil die ganze Energie der Seele sich eben am Verstehen einiger Lieblinge erschöpfen wird." Amongst these early favorites, about whom he here seems somewhat embarrassed, Lessing ranked rather high in Tieck's estimation.

During his boyhood in Berlin Tieck attended the theatre as frequently as possible. He had become an intimate friend of Wilhelm Hensler, a stepson of Reichardt, and consequently, a frequenter of the latter's home. From the director, Engel, Reichardt obtained for him a pass to the Nationaltheater in 1787. At this time there were being played the favorites of the period of rationalism, among whom Lessing certainly stood very high, if not foremost. Tieck even established a little theatre himself, with a troupe composed of his sister, the young Wackenroder, and others. Amongst the many plays they produced themselves were Lessing's Schatz and Philotas. It may be surmised that Reichardt suggested these plays to them, even as he may have suggested the subject for Schlegel's first essay on Lessing. Tieck here developed a great affection for the characters of Lessing's dramas, but of any influence on his own
dramatic efforts there is no trace. Regener, however, in his studies on Tieck, traces a slight tinge of rationalism in Tieck's early plays, even as late as 1796. Nevertheless, he confesses that the prevailing tone even in the earliest plays is romantic: "Tieck ist schon von Jugend an in allem, was das künstlerische Gefühl in Frage zieht, durch und durch Idealist und flieht das Nächterne, wo er nur immer kann." In his conversations with Köpke in his last years Tieck says of his early years: "Ich hatte mir als junger Mensch meine eigene Welt gebildet, die freilich der alten fern lag. Auch blieben mir die wiederholten Anpreisungen der antiken Größe und Kunst, die ich auf der Schule immer wieder hören musste, unverständlich."

It is not surprising that these early influences, rationalistic and classic, did not leave a deeper trace in him when we consider that as early as 1793 he threw himself so enthusiastically into the study of Shakespeare. In Shakespeare he even found an answer to his youthful questions of religion: "Was meine Kindheit in der Religion suchte und ahndete, glaubte ich jetzt in Poesie und Kunst gefunden zu haben."

If we accept at face value his reminiscences in the Köpke biography concerning his youth, the early tendency towards idealism and romanticism even turned him away from the critics of that time, the rationalists who stood so high in Berlin critical circles: "Beschränkt waren die Kritiker, welche in der Poesie und Litteratur in meiner Jugend das grosse Wort führten; alles
beurteilten sie nach ihrer Aufklärung und auch Goethe wollten sie
nicht anerkennen. Von dem neuen Geiste, der durch die deutsche
Poesie ging, hatten sie keine Ahnung, und in ihrer Beschränktheit
meinten sie ganz unbefangen, wenn sie nur wollten, würden sie
dasselbe und Besseres als Goethe haben können. Sie standen ihrer
persönlichen Anlage nach im vollsten Gegensatze zur Poesie über­
haupt, und darum konnte man ihre Anmassung nicht entschieden
genug bekämpfen." When one considers Lessing's somewhat harsh
criticisms of the young Goethe, this general condemnation of the
rationalist critics might also include Lessing. This passage,
however, is evidently the opinion of the old Tieck, and not of
the young. In his criticism, although he early evinced his sub­
jective tendencies, Tieck came under the influence of the ration­
alists - insofar as rules are concerned - and especially under
the influence of Lessing's Laokoon and his Dramaturgie. His later
dramas considered, it becomes immediately obvious that the influ­
ence did not extend far beyond his youth. In his early letters to
Wackenroder and in his two essays on Shakespeare (which have been
mentioned and which will be discussed in this chapter) there are
traces of this influence, clearer traces, perhaps, than one would
expect to find, considering the difference in the natures of the
two men and the accepted opinion that there exists in reality
very little influence. It may be stated generally that in Tieck's
early creative works there is no sign of any influence; but that
in the critical works there are very definite traces.
In Tieck’s letters to Wackenroder, there are occasional passages referring to Lessing. A few of these show the respect which Tieck felt for the characters of Lessing’s plays. Most of them, however, are either direct references to the Laokoon and the Dramaturgie, or discussions that clearly point to a thorough comprehension of these two works.

In 1792, replying to Wackenroder’s contention that the great and noble does not arouse our tears, Tieck defends the opposite point of view—stating that noble actions, coming when we are at odds and entirely disgusted with man, reconcile us to him and the consequent recognition of his nobility, through the reconciliation, brings us to tears. Here, incidentally, there is already a variance from Lessing, in that the effect of the play depends more upon the mood of the observer than upon the efforts of the dramatist. Tieck declares that the effect depends largely upon the characters of the play: "Wir lieben sie mehr oder weniger, nachdem der Dichter sie mehr oder weniger aus unserer Seele genommen hat, daher kommt die grosse Gewalt, die der dramatische Dichter über die Herzen der Menschen haben kann. Wir lieben oft einen Graf Appiani oder einen Just und Tellheim mehr als Menschen, mit denen wir umgehen und die wir täglich sehen, und bloss darum, weil wir mit diesen nicht sympathisieren und sich in jenen unsere eigenen Seelen spiegeln." This indicates an intimate knowledge of the plays of Lessing, a knowledge that we naturally expect.
In the eighteenth chapter of his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* Lessing had defended the *Hanswurst* of the old German plays. In 1795 Tieck wrote his *Hanswurst als Emigrant* (it is thus christened by Köpke) in which *Hanswurst* relates his history, saying amongst other things: "Sie wissen, Gottsched vertrieb mich, weil er allein meine Rolle spielen wollte, die Gelehrten machten gemeinschaftliche Sache mit ihm, weil ich ihnen im Wege stand. Lessing und einige andere gute Leute nahmen sich meiner an, allein es half nichts: die Stimmung war gegen mich, ich musste fort. Traurig verliess ich mein Vaterland."

There exist earlier traces of Tieck's knowledge of the *Dramaturgie*. Since Tieck wrote little but drama in his early years, it is as a dramatist that he first draws up his own standards, rules that are not those of the *Dramaturgie* of Lessing. The *Laokoon* serves him for a longer period; in *Franz Sternbald* there appears the first crystallization of an independent view concerning the division of the arts. It was not until the time of the *Phantasien* (published in 1799) that he has taken a definite stand against the *Laokoon*.

It is in his letters to Wackenroder that we can see how early he turned against some of the fundamental ideas of the *Dramaturgie* but accepted those of the *Laokoon*. In 1792 he writes: "Das Schauspiel sei schön in allen seinen Theilen, der moralische Nutzen ist blosz zufällig, und insofern jede Schönheit unsern Sinn für Schönheit verfeinert und veredelt, insofern hat
This is a definition of romantic drama, formulated long before the first truly romantic play was written.

The following passage reminds us somewhat of the seventieth chapter in the *Dramaturgie*, in which Lessing objects to too rapid interplay of the comic and the tragic: "Das Komische und das Schreckhafte gränzen überhaupt vielleicht näher an einander, als man glaubt. Der komische Schauspieler müsste nach meinem Urteil alles zu auffallende, sowohl in der Kleidung als Sprache, als den Geberden vermeiden, wenn er dies zu sehr sucht, so macht es ihm gar einige Augenblicke, zu einem fremden Wesen, und dies stört immer die Illusion. Nach meinem Gefühl muss sich das Komische erst nach und nach hineinlegen, der Zuschauer muss gleichsam durch den Schauspieler allmählich hineingeführt werden, so wie es auch der Dichter tut." The last part of this passage recalls a similar passage concerning acting in the fifth chapter of the *Dramaturgie* - where Lessing says of the "fire" of an actor's art: "Wenn Geschrey und Kontorsionen Feuer sind, so ist es wohl unstreitig, dass der Akteur darinn zu weit gehen kann. Besteht aber das Feuer in der Geschwindigkeit und Lebhaftigkeit, mit welcher alle Stücke, die den Akteur ausmachen, das ihrige dazu beytragen, um seinem Spiele den Schein der Wahrheit zu geben; so müssten wir diesen Schein der Wahrheit nicht bis zur "äussersten Illusion getrieben zu sehen wünschen."

Both Lessing and Tieck demand here that the actor remain within
the bounds of the play. As already intimated in the introduction, Tieck later changed his idea of acting; he very often even praised the actor for adding lines to the play to enhance the effect.

Further in the same chapter of the *Dramaturgie* Lessing warns against violent gesticulation and screaming, even in the more impetuous scenes; he concludes with a passage that is decidedly reminiscent of his *Laokoon*: "Die Kunst des Schauspielers steht hier, zwischen den bildenden Künsten und der Poesie, mitten inne. Als sichtbare Mahlerey muss zwar die Schönheit ihr höchstes Gesetz seyn; doch als transitorische Mahlerey braucht sie ihren Stellungen jene Ruhe nicht immer zu geben, welche die alten Kunstwerke so imponirend macht."

Tieck says of the acting of comedies: "Vielleicht ist das wahre komische Spiel, so wie Unzelmann es giebt, alles so leicht, so übergehend, keine Periode, keine Idee, keine Stellung möglichst festgehalten, keine Grimasse in Stein verwandelt." Here we are reminded more immediately of the *Laokoon* than of the *Dramaturgie*. It is more than a probability that Tieck had Lessing in mind during the entire letter to Wackenroder. He is decidedly opposed throughout to caricatures in all kinds of dramatic productions, which please, he continues: "nur einem kalten nördlichen Volke, dessen Gefühl für den feinen Stachel der stillen Schönheit zu grob ist, oder die schon die Schule der Schönheit durchgegangen sind, und deren übersatten Magen nur noch die
gewürztesten Speisen reizen können, die es daher gern sehn, wenn die Schönheit dem Ausdruck aufgeopfert wird, weil sie in der Schönheit keinen lebenden Ausdruck mehr finden. Du wirst sehn, dass ich hier nicht bloss von der komischen Karrikatur spreche, sondern von jedem Ausdruck irgend einer Leidenschaft, der die Schönheit ausschliesst; der Maler und Bildhauer liefern Karrikaturen, wenn sie die höchsten Affekte darstellen, (siehe darüber den Laokoon) eine komische Bildnerei darf es gar nicht geben ........ It is noteworthy that Tieck judges a play by the laws of beauty and not by dramatic laws - that he refers to the Laokoon more often than to the Dramaturgie. But this turn is one we should expect, considering the fact that he judges the play as a whole not by its moral but by its aesthetic effect.

In this same letter, however, in criticising one of Wackenroder's lyrics, he says of the choice of subject: "Ein lyrischer Dichter, aber, der sich eine ganz neue Situation fingirt und darüber seine Empfindungen ausgiesst, scheint mir eben so wenig seinen Vorteil zu verstehen, als ein Maler, der unbekannte Gegenstände und eine fremde Fabel wählt, wenn man ihn auch endlich versteht, so hat doch der andre immer das voraus, dass er eher verstanden und mehr Eindruck machen wird." This is a conclusion similar to that of Lessing in the eleventh chapter of the Laokoon: "In der That hat der Dichter einen grossen Schritt voraus, welcher eine bekannte Geschichte, bekannte Charaktere behandelt. Hundert frostige Kleinigkeiten, die sonst zum
Verständnisse des Ganzen unentbehrlich seyn würden, kann er übergehen; und je geschwinder er seinen Zuhörern verständlich wird desto geschwinder kann er sie interessiren. Diesen Vorteil hat auch der Mahler."

It may be that Tieck was so greatly occupied with the subject of Laokoon at this time because he had had to read it to assemble material for a paper he was to read to the Thursday Club at the University of Halle - a paper entitled Vom Entstehen des Widrigen der Karrikaturen (of which he likewise apprises Wackenroder in this letter.) If so, the interest and influence carry over at least into 1793, being evident in the two essays of that year: Die Kupferstiche nach der Shakspeare-Galerie in London and Shakspeare's Behandlung des Wunderbaren.

The first essay is a criticism of the collection of prints of scenes from Shakespeare, done in his honor. Tieck wrote it, so he says, because the collection seemed to have been unduly praised: "Es war mir anstössig, in allen Zeitungen diese Kunstblätter so übertrieben gelobt zu sehen." The mere fact that he wrote these letters (which actually constitute a defense of Shakespeare - defending him from artists who, for the most part, completely failed to understand him,) indicated how very enthusiastically he had already turned to him. Nevertheless, there are among the descriptions of the prints, several general passages on the drama and on art, that show his obligation to
Lessing, even though the debt is slight. Concerning this work of Tieck, Haym says: "Ein Lessing steckt in dem jugendlichen Kritiker nicht: ja, keine Spur fuhrt darauf dass er fur sein aesthetisches Urteil bei dem Verfasser des Laokoon in die Schule gegangen." We have seen, however, that he had already taken up the Laokoon quite assiduously shortly before these sketches on the Boydell collection (the letter to Wackenroder in which he mentioned and copied Lessing so exactly being dated December 1792.) There are likewise several passages in this essay that remind one unmistakably of Lessing; just as there are others which clearly demonstrate his trend away from the Laokoon. G. H. Danton, in his study on this essay, says of the Lessingian influence: "The general theoretical standpoint upon which the essay was written is that of Lessing, and a careful perusal will show that Haym was wrong when he postulated no Lessing influence on the article." The proper position concerning this influence would seem to be somewhere between Haym and Danton. To ascribe a system to the essay would be attributing a virtue which it lacks. It is a discursive article, with little system, a few sections that point to the influence of Lessing, and a few others that point away from him.

Lessing protested against changing a laugh into a grimace by chiseling it into marble - he protested against immortalizing anything ugly by sculpturing it. This is the one teaching of the Laokoon that evidently made deep impression on
Tieck. He referred to it in the letters and again here: "Im Trauerspiele ersteigen meistentheils gerade die schönsten Scenen eine Höhe des Affekts, die der Maler schwerlich ausdrücken kann. Der Schauspieler verliert schon oft jene Grazie, die jedem Kunstwerke nöthig ist, wenn er manche Scenen der tragischen Kraft so wiedergeben will, wie er sie im Dichter findet; doch kann die Mimik hier noch das Unangenehme vermeiden; der Malerei ist es aber meist unmöglich, denn jene Verzerrungen, die auf der Bühne nur vorübergehend sind, werden hier bleibend gemacht; dort erschrecken sie durch ihr plötzliches Entstehen und Verschwinden, hier werden sie ekelhaft, weil durch das Feststehende und Bleibende des Widrigen der dargestellte Mensch zum Thier herabsinkt." This is a view repeated exactly in the Laokoon, in the entire idea of it. Reminding us again of Lessing, is Tieck's praise for the artist who has skillfully concealed the stumps of the arms on a figure.

Opposed to these agreements, however, there are so many passages no longer evincing the spirit of the Laokoon, that one is almost tempted to feel that the interest Tieck expressed for it (in his letters to Wackenroder) was of short duration. In that it crystallized for both Tieck and Wackenroder their hatred of the ugly, it did render them a service. As for any deep or lasting influence otherwise, there can be no question whatsoever.

Tieck complains that the characters can be recognized only by the symbols, a property of sculptures that Lessing
found permissible in the Laokoon.

In addition, Tieck says: "Da diese Gemälde seinen Kunstwerken gewidmet sind, so kann man auch fordern, dass der Maler sich bis auf die kleinsten Umstände nach dem Dichter richte, ihm aber nicht offenbar zu widersprechen suche."

Lessing makes no such demands; he advocates rather the choice of scenes that are not described at length by the author, that the fancy of the artist may have some free play.

Again Tieck says: "Jedes Subjekt hört auf komisch zu sein, sobald ich es in einen hohen Grad von Leidenschaft versetze." This deviates from Lessing, because for him comic characters are at times more so by reasons of expressions of anger and passion. In the twenty-fourth chapter of the Laokoon, he says: "Darf die Mahlerey, zu Erreichung des Lächlerlichen und Schrecklichen, sich hässlicher Formen bedienen? Ich will es nicht wagen, so grade zu mit Nein hierauf zu antworten."

All of these disagreements with, or exceptions to, individual parts of the Laokoon are outweighed by another statement that is as radically opposed to the fundamental idea of the Laokoon as Tieck's insistence on beauty had been in the spirit of the Laokoon. In the matter of lighting, Tieck declares painting must be absolutely natural: "weil bei den bildenden Künstlen eine Art der Täuschung stattfinden kann, sobald ich irgend eine auffallende Unnatürlichkeit entdecke; denn die Nachahmung der Natur ist der Zweck des Künstlers."
This statement contradicts some of Tieck's earlier views and there is no analysis or quotation necessary to bring out the absolute variance with Lessing.

It is Tieck's uncertainty which stands out most clearly in this, his earliest critical essay. It is this uncertainty that disappointed Friedrich Schlegel. Lessing's influence is still slightly evident as we have said, but to no great extent. Lessing's insistence that no effects be driven to the point of ugliness was in sympathy with Tieck's idea of beauty. That certainly accounts for Tieck's ready acceptance of the idea in the Laokoon. The cult of beauty was kept alive by Tieck and Wackenroder but became something soft, became at times merely a passive hatred of ugliness. That Wackenroder was also interested in the Laokoon is obvious in his description of Raphael's Madonna. He warmly praises the conception of the picture and adds: "Hier ist ein merkwürdiges Beyspiel des Grundsatzes, den Lessing auf Laokoons schmerzgefülltes Antlitz anwendet; hier ist's, wo die Kunst den Anfang, den ersten Schritt der Empfindung zeigt, und eben dadurch die Phantasie des Bewunderers ihre Kraft tiefer fühlen lässt."

In the next essay of 1793, Shakspeare's Behandlung des Wunderbaren, there is to be found a slight similarity to Lessing's views, especially as he gives expression to them in the eleventh piece of the Dramaturgie. Hans Röhl has
recognized this relationship without examining it: "Er be-
schäftigt sich zunächst mit einer Betrachtung über des Briten
Behandlung des Wunderbaren, einer der seltenen Fälle, wo er
wenigstens im Stoffe sich Lessing annähert."

The relationship is just a little more than one be-
tween the material. In the eleventh chapter of the Dramaturgie
Lessing treats of the appearance of spirits in the works of
Voltaire and Shakespeare. Voltaire's spirits are ineffective
because they are poorly introduced; Shakespeare introduces his
dramatically and consequently sets the observer's hair on end -
even though the observer is certain that spirits never have
existed. Tieck makes a statement much in the same tone in his
essay. Both Tieck and Lessing claim that Shakespeare's
effectiveness lies in his keen knowledge of human nature; that
he could appeal so realistically and so directly that childish
belief in ghosts would throng back to the memory so vividly
that even the most enlightened could be momentarily carried
away.

Tieck, however, carries the idea even farther in
his comedies; here his views are no longer those of Lessing -
they have become purely romantic, in that he states that the
whole comedy in which anything supernatural or extraordinary
occurs must in itself be extraordinary or supernatural: "Wir
glauben das Abenteurliche eben deshalb, weil Alles abenteurlich
ist; weil nichts uns an unsere gewöhnliche Welt erinnert."
This is Tieck's first requirement of the author who would win us over to his supernatural world. Second, he must create a manifold scene. Third, he must introduce comic elements. Fourth, music should be employed, because it is effective in creating an atmosphere of the supernatural. The comic figures can also arouse terror: "Man wird sehr häufig finden, dass ohne dieses Lächerliche das Entsetzliche den größten Theil seiner Stärke verlieren würde, und eben so oft, dass eben das, was uns in dem einen Augenblicke zum Lachen reizen kann, uns bei einer exaltirten Phantasie ein Grauen erregt. Kinder fürchten sich vor gezeichneten Caricaturen eben so leicht, als sie darüber lachen." Lessing expresses the same thought - that comic figures might unexpectedly frighten: "Aber Voltairens Geist ist auch nicht einmal zum Popanze gut, Kinder damit zu schrecken; es ist der bloße verkleidete Komödiant, der nichts hat, nichts sagt, nichts thut, was es wahrscheinlich machen könnte, er wäre das, wofür er sich ausgibt."

The second part of the essay concerns itself with the means of obtaining effect in tragedies characterized by the supernatural. He requires, first, that the supernatural be less easily grasped. In his own words: "Der Zweck des Trauerspiels ist Furcht und Mitleid." This is not unlike Lessing's conception. His idea of fear, we soon see, is more like that of the French - the very conception that Lessing opposed. He continues: "Das Wunderbare tritt hier in den Hintergrund zurück; wie ein
Blitzstrahl bricht es dann plötzlich hervor; und eben darum ist hier die Kunst des Dichters, es wahrscheinlich zu machen nicht so nothwendig; wenn er es nur dahin bringt, dass es nur eintritt, uns zu erschrecken und zu erschüttern, so wird schon dadurch unsere Illusion völlig gewonnen, denn der Schreck, den wir empfinden, lässt den richtenden Verstand nicht zur Sprache kommen."

In the introduction of terror, Lessing could see a diminution of effect; a defeat of the idea of tragedy, in that the passions, fear and pity, could not purify the lesser passions.

The second way to obtain the proper effect in tragedies dealing partly with the supernatural is by causing the appearance of the spirit to be anticipated - by means of "atmosphere," by some phenomenon, or by some tale about it. Otherwise, if the spirit enters without first having the stage set, terror is too immediate, too overwhelming, and the effect is doubtless destroyed. "Wenn das Furchtbare dieser fremdartigen Erscheinungen in dem Dunkeln, Rätselhaften und Unbegreiflichen besteht, so kann dies, wenn es zu plötzlich, zu unvermuthet eintritt, schwerlich anders als durch einen plötzlichen Schreck wirken, der alle übrigen Ideen und Empfindungen verschlingt; oder es ist ganz ohne Wirkung. Der dramatische Dichter muss sich überhaupt hätten, das Schreckliche nicht ohne alle Vorbereitung eintreten zu lassen, und es überhaupt nicht zu seltsam, zu rätselhaft zu machen, so dass es zu sehr allen unsern Begriffen widerspricht; denn sonst fällt er leicht ins abgeschmackte und Kindische."
This is the conclusion, we have seen, that Lessing reached about Voltaire's ghost.

Lastly, Tieck demands that the poet make provisions for some natural explanation of the ghosts - through the condition of the person who sees the ghost. The ghost is therefore an allegorical figure. Lessing makes no such demand, except as we have seen, that the appearance be natural. "Shakespeares Gespenst kommt wirklich aus jener Welt; so dünk't uns. Denn es kommt zu der feierlichen Stunde, in der vollen Begleitung aller der düstern, geheimnisvollen Nebenbegriffe."

It is a question in this second essay - as in the first, just how far the Laokoon and Dramaturgie influenced Tieck. That they were not without their influence is fairly evident. At any rate, there is in Tieck, as yet, no active or violent dislike for Lessing as poet, critic, or dramatist. He was only in his university years when the two essays were written. In 1794, however, he returned to Berlin and began his journalistic career by editing the Straussfedern for the Nicolais. The more the contacts he formed with the rationalists in Berlin, the more grew his contempt for their principles. Meanwhile his own romantic leanings and tendencies grew apace. There exists no medium for tracing the actual change in his opinion of Lessing as dramatist, poet, and critic. It may be assumed that as his contempt for the rationalists increased, he quite naturally turned from the books esteemed by them, amongst which were Lessing's dramatic and critical works.
While Tieck was working under Nicolai he forced his resentment of the rationalist, although heartfelt, to remain silent. There is no doubt that he did feel this resentment; his nature was absolutely opposed to that of the publisher. In the introduction to volume eleven of his works, he writes of his relations with the Nicolais: "Auch war nicht zu vermeiden, dass sich mein Verhältniss mit ihm (the son, Karl) und seinem Vater in den Jahren 1797 und 98 völlig auflöste. Man hatte mich aufgemuntert, mein Talent gelobt, aber in der gutmütigen Voraussetzung, weil ich nicht hart und eigensinnig widersprach, ich sei mit jener Tendenz der Aufklärung, nüchterne Poesie, und was damals jene berlinische Zeit charakterisirte, als Eingeborner und Mitbürger völlig einverstanden. ....... Was mich von diesem Zirkel entfernte, war dasselbe, was mir anderswo Freunde und Wohlwollende gewonnen hatte."

The rationalists, especially the two Nicolais, undoubtedly flattered themselves that they had a convert to rationalism in this brilliant young man, Tieck. With the appearance of Der gestiefelte Kater in 1797 and its mockery of the rationalists, they were sadly disabused. The more so as Tieck turned more and more to the romanticists and had already struck up a close friendship with Friedrich Schlegel, also in the year 1797. The two schools, among other things, were bitterly divided.
about the greatness of Goethe, the younger group holding him to be a true genius who belonged to the German people and posterity. The older group, the rationalists, were angry at this self-deception of the youngsters and, as Tieck mockingly observes, "Nicolai berief sich auf seine deutsche Bibliothek und Lessing."

The fact that the rationalists repeatedly referred to Lessing, in this matter as well as in others, for final judgment, would already tend to lower Lessing in Tieck's esteem.

Tieck was attracted very much by Schlegel's stronger nature and his brilliance, the more so as this new force was an antidote to Wackenroder's dependence and weakness. Lüdeke characterizes this attachment well: "Seine neurasthenische Natur verlangte aber ihrerseits eine Stütze, einen Stärkeren, an dem sie sich emporranken könne, und in Friedrichs genialischer Selbstsicherheit und in der starken Männlichkeit seines herrischen Geistes konnte Tieck finden, was er unbewusst suchte." In 1829, when he had already grown away from the Schlegels and their influence, Tieck still writes warmly of this early friendship: "Sie haben späterhin oft für mich, so wie ich für sie gelitten, da die ähnliche Gesinnung uns verband."

Schlegel, on the contrary, was not greatly impressed either by Tieck's critical ability or by Tieck himself. Concerning this new friend, he writes to his brother in October of 1797: "Er ist recht häufig bey mir, und interessiert mich recht sehr, ungeachtet er immer aussieht, als ob er fröre und an Geist
A little later he asks Wilhelm to find a good publisher for Tieck, since the latter was so cordially disliked by the Berlin publishers and all the others wanted his services too cheaply because they knew that Nicolai had paid him so very little. He says further: "Er kommt oft zu mir, und äußert viel Zutrauen zu mir und meinem Urtheil. Er ist recht kindlich ungeschickt und unschuldig im merkantilischen Theil der Schriftstellerey." 

It is in this period that Friedrich wrote so disrespectfully of Nicolai and the rationalists to his brother. It must be considered further that Friedrich had just finished the Lessing essay and was even then dealing with Reichardt about the conclusion (which, by the way, did not appear until 1801.) The rationalists, who uttered all their opinions, good and bad, in the name of Lessing were, as we saw in the chapter on Friedrich Schlegel, incensed over Schlegel's misinterpretation of Lessing. Nicolai may perhaps have expressed himself somewhat harshly about this to Tieck. At any rate, we may assume, that during these many visits of Tieck to Schlegel, the conversation often turned to Lessing and the rationalists. It is these probable conversations and Schlegel's essay, at least, that determined Tieck's own views on Lessing. These views, as colored by Schlegel's, are expressed fully and clearly in three works of Tieck's that were written in 1800: Bemerkungen über Parteilichkeit, Dummheit und Bosheit, and Der Autor, ein Fastnachts-
In these the influence of Schlegel is unmistakable.

Before treating these opinions of Lessing it may shed some light on Tieck's views concerning criticism and the limitation of the arts, to take a few characteristic passages from his contributions to Wackenroder's *Phantasien* (1799) and also from Tieck's novel, *Franz Sternbald* (1798). In both there are opinions on limitation and on criticism which show that Tieck still had the *Laokoon* in mind, but that he now disagreed most radically with it, whereas formerly, as we have seen, there were even certain points of agreement.

In a characterization of Watteau's paintings in the *Phantasien* Tieck says: "Ich habe ihm innerlich schon oft für seine Romanzen, für seine Tanzlieder Dank gesagt, für seine allerliebsten Weingesänge; ich habe oft nach Betrachtung seiner Gemälde die Regung des Lebens um mich lieblicher gefühlt."

This is a true mixture of the arts. In the essay *Die Farben* he states his views still more definitely: "Die menschliche Kunst trennt Skulptur, Malerei, und Musik, jede besteht für sich und wandelt ihren Weg. Aber immer ist es mir vorgekommen, als wenn die Musik für sich in einer abgeschlossenen Welt leben könnte, nicht aber so die Malerei; zu jeder schönen Darstellung mit Farben gibt es gewiss ein verbrühtertes Tonstück, das mit dem Gemälde gemeinschaftlich nur eine Seele hat." Painting, therefore, needs music to enliven and explain it. "Darum ist es
so schwer, ja fast unmöglich, ein Gemälde zu beschreiben, die Worte bleiben tot und erklären selbst in der Gegenwart nichts; sobald die Beschreibung echt poetisch ist, so erklärt sie oft und ruft ein neues Entsinnen, ein fröhliches Verständnis aus dem Bilde hervor, weil sie wie Musik wirkt, und durch Bilder und glänzende Gestalten und Worte die verwandte Musik der Töne ersetzt.

In the essay Symphonieen Tieck not only expresses the same view and more clearly, but he refers critically to those who would limit the arts: "Ich halte dafür, dass alles nebeneinander bestehen könne und müsse, und dass nichts eine so engherzige Verleugnung der Kunst und Hoheit ist, als wenn man zu früh scharfe Linien und Grenzen zwischen den Gebieten der Kunst zieht. Diese Verehrer teilen ein Land, das ihnen nicht gehört, ja in welchem die meisten nicht einmal die Landessprache verstehen." Tieck certainly has the rationalists and Lessing in mind here. Art has become a religion to Tieck, and criticism he likewise comes to regard not as a judgment by rules but a judgment by feeling: "Wie es in der Religion ist, so ist es auch in allen hohen und übermenschlichen Dingen, ja man könnte sagen, dass alles grosse und Höchstvortreffliche Religion sein müsse. Das Göttliche ist so beschaffen, dass der Mensch es erst glauben muss, ehe er es verstehen kann; fängt er aber mit dem Verstehen, das heisst, mit dem Beurteilen an, so verwickelt er sich nur in Labyrinthe, in denen er tückrlicherweise sein Herumirren für die
wahre Art hält, weise zu sein." Tieck continues, advocating the understanding of art through the emotions, through faith rather than with the intelligence. This leads us into a quiet land of peace and happiness: "die schönste Zufriedenheit ent­springt und beruhigt uns hier ohne Urteil und Vernunftschluss, nicht durch eine Reihe mühsam zusammengehängten Beobachtungen und Bemerkungen gelangen wir dazu, sondern es geschieht auf eine Weise, die der Uneingeweihte, der Kunstlose niemals begreifen wird. Es geschieht hier, dass man Gedanken ohne jenen mühsamen Umweg der Worte denkt, hier ist Gefühl, Phantasie und Kraft des Denkens eins." In another essay Ein paar Worte über Billig­keit, Mäßigkeit, und Toleranz Tieck expressed this more emphatically: "Können wir denn die Göttlichkeit der Kunst, das Höchste, was die menschliche Seele hervorbringen kann, nach der Elle des Kaufmanns messen oder nach Goldgewichten abwägen?"

Here we are no longer in the critical realms of Lessing; it is not surprising then that Tieck should ascribe so readily to the same judgment of Lessing that Schlegel expressed in his essay Über Lessing.

This view of art and criticism was, of course, not formed through his contact with Schlegel. It is a tendency that grew with the years; it is evident in the letters to Wackenroder, most of them dated during the year 1792; it is further evident in the two 1793 essays which we have considered; it lay in the nature of Tieck to have such a conception. In his Franz Stern-
bald, which he began in 1793 and had published in 1798, there occur a number of passages on the limitation of the arts in which he turns against the conceptions of Lessing as expressed in the Laokoon. The whole book, in fact, is a plea for subjective criticism of art. And Franz clearly expresses Tieck's own view when he says to Rudolph: "mein Freund, ich glaube darum doch, dass sich Musik, Poesie, und Malerei oft die Hand bieten, ja dass sie oft ein und dasselbe auf ihren Wegen ausrichten können."

But, if Tieck's trend in art and criticism were not influenced by Schlegel, the direction that his criticism of Lessing took was determined by Schlegel, through the many conversations to which we have alluded and through Schlegel's essay of 1797. Tieck, like Schlegel, denies Lessing's poetic, dramatic and critical gifts. He rescues Lessing from the rationalists, just as Schlegel had done, and claims that the rationalists misunderstood him and held him up as a leader in fields in which he had no gifts. Like Schlegel, he sees in Lessing a man trying to rise above his age. And finally, again like Schlegel, he praises him for his wit, his polemics, his Nathan, and Ernst und Falk and the Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts. This is the Lessing who persisted in Tieck's mind, with some modifications, until his death.

This Schlegelian Lessing we find, to repeat, in three works of 1800: Der Autor, Briefe über Shakspeare, and
Bemerkungen über Parteilichkeit, Dummheit, und Bosheit.

The first is a little dramatic sketch in which a great number of people, amongst them Lessing, appear in the room of the author of the title. This author is a romanticist (Tieck); most of the people that appear at first are rationalists. A reviewer returns one of the author's books, saying:

"Alles was sie suchen ist excentrisch,
Alles was sie wollen ist unverständlich,
Alles was sie schreiben ist ohne Verstand,
Und drum kann man nur vor der Hand
Sie warnen, dass Sie werden ein anderer Mann."  

With this bit of rationalism he departs. The author bitterly explains the nature of critics to his nurse, who is hiding in the room. They are men who try to break all that is great and noble into little pieces, that they might grasp it.

The next to appear is an old man, who is very evidently Nicolai. He advises the author always to do only that which is proper and right:

"Man muss auf ebnen Strassen bleiben,
Fein gründlich, doch verständlich schreiben,
Den Plan von allen Seiten überlegen"

This is the formula for authors to rise in their profession. To this recipe for rising, the author replies somewhat wryly:
"Das kann ich mir wirklich so ziemlich denken,
Es geht fast so, wenn sie einen henken,
Doch hat's ein solcher noch keinem gedankt,
Wenn er zu solcher Höh' gelangt."

The author tells the old man that he has hunted for experience inside himself; the old man answers in a truly rational fashion:

"Ich muss die Ehre haben, Ihnen zu sagen,
Im Innern spüre ich nur den Magen,
Und außerdem die schreckliche Phantasie,
Und, wenn Sie wollen, ein Bischen Genie."

To the author's surprise concerning his admission of Phantasie he replies:

"Das ist nur eine Art sich auszudrücken.
Ich habe eine lebhafe Phantasie,
Und sehn Sie, darum bild' ich mir ein,
Es musste eine Phantasie in mir sein."

The old man would put poets to something useful, put them to work in factories. He complains that his writings are more and more forgotten and that the world will probably come to an end when he dies. Towards the end of the conversation he wishes that Lessing might come back:

"Der zeigte den Leuten, wie dumm sie wären,
Und sie mich recht müssten verehren."

And with that, Lessing comes crashing through the roof in a cloud. The author complains about having to repair the roof,
but upon seeing Lessing, he adds:

"Bewirth ich einen so grossen Herrn,\textsuperscript{269}
So trag' ich auch die Kosten gern."

Lessing explains why he has come down:

"Ich komme durch die Wolken nieder,
Weil Ihr mir gar zu sehr zuwider,
Verschont doch meinen guten Namen,
Nie war ich eine Krücke für die Lahmen,
Nie nicht ein Esel für die Zahmen."

The old man, and here it is certainly Nicolai speaking for the rationalists, tells him they wished to uphold and increase his honor. To which Lessing retorted that they who themselves were not thinking beings (and who were unable to understand a thinking being) should not use his name so freely - because it pained him even in eternity: he continues:

"Die ihr nicht kriegen könnt, haltet Friede,
In der Dummheit Namen, seid ihr's noch nicht müde,
Das alte Spiegelfechten fortzuführen,
Bei jedem Quark meinen Namen zu zitieren?
Ihr behauptet kein noch so dummes Ding,
Keine Albernheit sei sie noch so gering,
So wird die Schwerfälligkeit selber flink
Und schreit: grade so meint es Lessing."
With the Spiegelfechterei (Dorothea in discussing Laokoon had used this same expression, Spiegelfechterei, which she, in turn, had adopted from Fr. Schlegel) Lessing condemns also his own activities; but he adds that they never understood him during his life, did not know at what he aimed, and still misunderstood him in that they considered him and wrote of him as their chief.

The old man complains that even on earth he had never been so angry; Lessing informs him that it is in Heaven that one first learns to be truly angry, because on earth the earthly holds people in bonds. He adds, moreover, that the rationalists were doomed to eternal punishment because they had repeatedly sinned against the holy spirit. To this the old man replies that they did not believe in such things - that they should not be harshly condemned, because, after all, no others had done so much to show mankind Lessing's excellence as a dramatic poet. Lessing then answers him much as if he had himself read Schlegel's essay and Schlegel's complete denial that he was a poet or dramatist:

"Das ist es, was ihr von mir wisst,
Alles andre ist euch verborgen blieben.
Ich hatte immer ein heimlich Gefühl
Die Schöne der Poesie zu lieben,
Doch wollte sie mir ihren Genuss nicht gönnen,
Drum durft' ich die Holde niemals erkennen."
"Ich war eines Predigers Stimm' in der Wüst,
Doch kehrte sich keiner an mein Ermahnen,
Ging jeder fort auf seinen Bahnen,
Ich wollte, wie vieles, die Poesie verkünden,
Ich wusste, sie musste sich bald entzünden,
Drum tauft' ich mit Wasser und mit Verstand
Einige Wesen, Schauspiele genannt.
Nach mir ist ein anderer größrer erschienen,
Bestimmt als Priester den Musen zu dienen,
Der hat getauft mit Feuer und Geist,
Wie all sein Wirken und Dichten beweist,
Er wandelt unter euch in Göttlichkeit,
Doch wer erkennt sein strahlend Ehrenkleid?"

With the last reproach in which it is evidently Goethe who is the great writer - Lessing disappears. Again, as in Schlegel's essay, Lessing is decked out with romantic trimmings, and it is the ideas of romanticism that he utters, as it was the romantic wit and irony in him that Schlegel had praised. We know that in his lifetime Lessing never had such praise for Goethe as Tieck now puts into his mouth. The author is much confounded by this severe appearance but the old man, Nicolai, quiets him:

"Es ist nicht sein Ernst, er liebt das Uebertriebne,
Das beweist so manches von ihm Geschriebne.
Er war ein ganz vorzüglicher Mann,
Doch wandelte ihn schon oft im Leben die Grobheit an,
"Dass er seine besten Freunde nicht wollte erkennen, "
Und ihnen nicht auch die gehörige Grösse gönnen."

One of the last characters to appear then is der Altfrank, who tells the author to hold up his head, to be justly proud because he is a German, but:

"Doch bist du allzusehr verdrossen
Und steckst voll dummer irdscher Possen,
So steck die Nas' in ein gutes Buch,
So wirst du wieder gesund und klug,
Da schau von unserm deutschen Mann
Das Gedicht vom Faust mal wieder an."

Furthermore, he should read -

"Den grossen deutschen Jakob Böhme,
Dass er von dir die Schwermuth nähme."

He advises him, in addition, to turn back to the past:

"Wenn dir die neue Zeit nicht gefällt,
So gedenk der braven alten Welt."

If, however, he again becomes faint of heart and whimpers and complains, the old German will leave him to find new friends:

"Dann such in der Aufklärung Schutz und Schirm,
Und treib' es wie das modernste Gewürm;
Sieh über das Bessere höhnisch hinweg
Und liege bei Memmen und Narren im Dreck."

In 1829 Tieck discussed this sketch in the introduction to volume eleven of his works. He says that it was written at a time "als man heftig über Goethe, Poesie, Auf-
Many of the arguments, he continues, have been settled, while others have sunken to insipidity: "ein Irrthum löst immer nur den andern ab, um wieder zu schildern und pedantisch auf und ab zu gehen; und darf jetzt Nicolai nicht mehr mitsprechen, oder hört man sogar auf Lessing nur selten mehr hin, so heben sich aus allen Gegenden neue Gottschede hervor, die in der Physiognomie jenem Urälvtvater völlig gleich sehn, nur dass sie dessen Gelehrsamkeit und Fleiss nicht besitzen." Tieck goes on in the introduction to praise Lessing's struggle against the bad taste and the reactionary cliques of his day. This is all very much in the tone of Schlegel's essay on Lessing, as is also the following judgment concerning the relationship between Lessing and the rationalists: "Lessing ward vor dieser scheltenden Faktion, die der neueren Bildung, ohne sie zu kennen, unbedingt entgegenstrebte, immer als Verbündeter und Schutzpatron bei jeder armseligen Behauptung, selbst bei den Gemeinheiten, die man sich erlaubte, vorgeschoben. Jetzt sieht wohl jeder ein, wie wenig dieser Heros neben jenen Kritikern genannt werden muss, und ich erlaubte mir, der ich längst mich an Lessings weniger gelesenen Schriften, vorzüglich dem Briefwechsel, erbaut und gestärkt hatte, dies in Lessings Erscheinung auszusprechen." We know that Schlegel emphasized particularly the importance of the letters and of the smaller, less-known writings for a true understanding of Lessing.
from the above passage that Tieck's interest followed the same path as that of Schlegel. In 1838 he even suggests to Brockhaus, his publisher, a collection of Lessing's correspondence, adding, "Diesen Briefen habe ich seit vielen Jahren eine besondere Aufmerksamkeit, ein Studium gewidmet." Due to the reluctance of Brockhaus, the plan did not materialize. Tieck writes again, a little later: "Der Lessingische Briefwechsel, zu welchem ich seit vielen Jahren vorgearbeitet habe, müsste ein sehr gutes Buch werden. Auch kann es mit meinen Einleitungen und Erklärungen für keinen Nachdruck gelten, so wenig wie vor Jahren die Arbeit von Friedrich Schlegel." The work referred to here is the Lessingbüchlein of 1804; it is this work that may have given him the idea for a collection of Lessing's correspondence, for it is here that Schlegel most warmly praises the letters of Lessing. It is more likely that the two men discussed the letters during their frequent meetings in 1797-98.

The same year that Der Autor appeared, Tieck published in the same periodical (Poetisches Journal) his Briefe über Shakspeare in which his theory of the drama breaks with whatever vestiges of rationalistic influence yet remained from his early play-going in Berlin and from his reading of the Dramaturgie.

In the very earliest of his plays and fragments of plays, Tieck had imitated the popular successes, as he saw them
on the Berlin stage. There are imitations of domestic tragedies, of Shakespeare, Schiller, Goethe, and others. In 1797, with Der gestiefelte Kater, he definitely turned to the romantic drama, at least in comedy. However, it is the tragedy, Leben und Tod der heiligen Genoveva, of 1799 that shows most clearly to what extent Tieck had broken with the dramaturgical rules of the rationalists. The play treats of legendary material; the characters are either very good or very wicked; and it covers the entire span of one lifetime. These are characteristics that are purely romantic. It is reminiscent of the moral rationalistic plays that the tragedy arises through the suffering of innocence. But there is no question of fate, of katharsis.

In the Briefe über Shakspeare, Tieck develops other ideas that are purely romantic; there is no trace of Lessing's Dramaturgie or of the Laokoon, as there was in the 1793 essays on Shakespeare that we have already discussed. The emphasis here is on feeling, as in the Phantasien. Tieck complains at the very beginning of the essay (it is in the form of letters) about the people "die alles trennen und sondern wollen." Tieck is entirely converted to Shakespeare; indeed, much of the beginning of the essay is a championship of Shakespeare as the greatest of all dramatists. In one of the letters he writes to his imagined correspondent's complaint that he, Tieck, seems to imagine that he understood Shakespeare better than anyone before
him: "Hierauf kann ich sehr leicht und sogar mit aller Bescheidenheit antworten, dass ich gewiss überzeugt bin, dass noch keiner seine Gedichte so oft gelesen hat, dass noch keiner mit diesem Glauben zu Shakspeare getreten ist, dass noch Niemand so in ihm die ganze Kunst gefunden und sich daher so befriedigt gefühlt hat." An affection as great as this would preclude any deep reverence for Lessing's plays. Incidentally, a comparison of Lessing as the chief exponent of rationalistic drama with Shakespeare is actually made in this year, in the first outline of Das Buch über Shakspeare, which Tieck never finished, although he worked on it again in 1820. In this first concept, Tieck jots down of Lessing: "Es ist ein Dichter, den sein Zeitalter hervorgebracht hat. Seine Stücke mehr Commentare über die Vollendung, die er sich in der Schauspielkunst dachte, als Stücke. Schrieb nichts unwillkürlich; alles mit der höchsten Besonnenheit. Genie geheimnisvoller, daher wirkt Lessing bestimmter und künstlicher auf uns. Vom wahren Dichter aber lässt sich Inspiration unmöglich trennen." This is again in the spirit of Schlegel.

Turning, in the essay, from the praise of Shakespeare, Tieck outlines his ideal of what German drama should be. It should be based on the old marionette plays and the tragedies of the wandering comedians, which are exactly those plays "die unser eigentliches deutsches Nationaltheater formiren, weil sie so echt deutsch, ganz aus der Mitte unserer Begriffe hervorgekommen sind
und durch die allegorische Art der Behandlung doch eine Allge-
meinheit erhalten, die jedem wahren Dichter und Künstler unend-
llich viel an die Hand gegeben hätte, wenn es ihnen beliebt hätte,
hier fortzubauen und wenn diese Geister überhaupt nur existirt
hätten." This indicates the direction in which Tieck has
turned; for him there is now nothing very praiseworthy in the
earlier German drama, especially of the period of rationalism.
As Shakespeare's plays naturally grew out of the allegorical
moralities of the earliest English dramas, so Tieck would have the
Germans build on the early allegorical plays of the German people
and of the travelling comedians.

As in the play, Hanswurst als Emigrant, Tieck again
bewails the fact that Hanswurst has been shown out of the land,
because with him a good national comedy could have been created.
He no longer, however, remembers Lessing's defense of Hanswurst.
According to Tieck, two ironic events occurred after the exile of
Hanswurst. One was the fact that he was replaced by dramatists
who are externally grave and internally ludicrous, unlike
Hanswurst, who was ludicrous on the outside but serious and
thoughtful inside. "Eine zweite und fast noch größere Ironie
ist den beiden geistreichsten und revolutionairsten Köpfen
unserer Zeit begegnet, dem französischen Diderot und dem deutschen
Lessing, die mit edlem Eifer so gern das Verschrobene einrichten,
das Alberne zerstören wollten: dass man diese mit Recht als die
Erfinder und Einrichter unsers gegenwärtigen, häuslichen,
Tieck has forgotten his early liking for Lessing and his own efforts at domestic dramas; or, perhaps he remembers them with a horror that adds to the harshness of his criticism. Considering the plays that grew out of Tieck's worship of Shakespeare, however, it is only natural that he should arrive at such a viewpoint, as the above, concerning the drama of the Age of Enlightenment. That he at least praises Lessing's efforts, though they resulted in failure, is a concession that may again be due to Schlegel's essay on Lessing.

The third work of 1800 to be discussed is the essay entitled Bemerkungen über Parteilichkeit, Dummheit und Bosheit, a polemic against the rationalists, especially Falk, Merkel, and the Nicolais, in which Lessing is given a fairly long treatment. This treatment is entirely in the tone of Schlegel's essay; it is altogether a condemnation of Lessing as critic, dramatist, and poet but at the same time it praises Lessing's religious writings, his polemics, and lauds his superiority to the rationalists who now claimed him as leader and used his name to back their ridiculous claims and statements. Tieck excuses the sharp tone of his essay on the grounds that it is employed because of the vulgarities of his opponents. He adds: "Und in diesem Tone sind alle polemischen Blätter eines Mannes geschrieben, dessen Name jetzt von jedem Unwissenden gemisbraucht..."
wird, ich meine Lessing's; denselben Ton braucht Fichte und mit Recht, weil es in diesem Gebiete keinen andern geben kann und darf." In his essay on Lessing Schlegel has a similar comparison. Schlegel there claims that if Lessing's polemics were not so slightly known, many would already have noticed "wie ähnlich die Fichtische Polemik der Lessingschen sei, nicht etwa in etwas Zufälligem, im Kolorit oder Styl, sondern grade in dem, was das wichtigste ist, in den Hauptgrundsätzen, und in dem was am meisten auffällt, in einzelnen schneidenden und harten Wendungen."

Lessing's dramas, continues Tieck, are not actually dramas and were not intended as such by Lessing; they are merely experiments, efforts to lead others into the right path. He continues in a long passage which again sounds as if it were taken from Schlegel's essay: "Aber weil diese Versuche keine Gedichte und Kunstwerke sind, ist ihnen darum alles Verdienst abzusprechen? Kann ich die Arbeit und das Bestreben nicht ebenso gut und besser einsehen als jene unbefugten Lobredner, die sich ordentlich, was eine Wehmuth erregen könnte, einbilden, sie müssten den grossen Mann in Schutz nehmen und vertheidigen? Es ist betrübt dass der Schutt und Staub der Dummheit schon so früh dieses grosse Monument der Ewigkeit zu verschütten angefangen haben, dass es schon jetzt wie eine Ruine unter uns steht, und dass Jedermann, wenn Lessing genannt wird, von der Emilia, der Minna oder den Fabeln spricht, seine eigentliche göttliche Natur
nicht kennt, oder wol gar, wie ich dies oft habe mit anhören müssen, bedauert, dass er sich in so viele unnütze Wortklaubereien eingelassen, und nicht mehr von seinem Genie und seiner Zeit auf das Theater gewandt hat, wie wir denn auch dergleichen frommen Ermahnungen sogar in dem Briefwechsel mit seinen Freunden an­treffen. Aber sie nennen ihn unaufhörlich und kennen ihn nicht."

In his essay, Schlegel had also called attention to the fact that the rationalists complained of Lessing's polemics.

Finally, Tieck rejects the Dramaturgie and the Laokoon as criticism and seeks in them the spirit of Lessing, again as Schlegel had done in the essay. Tieck says: "Ich muss sagen, dass ich bei Lessing's meisterhaften Dramaturgie immer die Dramaturgie vergesse, und ich glaube dass sie dazu geschrieben wurde. Oder meint der Satiriker (Falk), was er aus den Antiquarischen Briefe lernen könne, sei Etwas über den oder den Stein, über eine Statue, das Verständniss eines Schrift­stellers bei den Alten? Nebenher auch das; die Hauptsache möchte aber wol bleiben, Lessing zu verstehen."

In these three works, then, of 1800 and their evaluation of Lessing, Tieck definitely accepts Schlegel's ideas. And these ideas remain unchanged fundamentally during the next twenty-five years. In 1825 the review of a performance of Emilia Galotti shows a certain modification in his idea of Lessing as dramatist. He has become less severe in his judgment of the dramas because he again finds them effective on the stage,
as he had found them in his youth, in Berlin. But the change is more definitely explained in the introductions of 1828-29, which are to be discussed in the last section of this chapter. In all other respects the attitude remains unchanged to the time of Tieck's death in 1853.

There were, of course, a few minor citations and discussions of Lessing before the introductions of 1829-29 and the review of _Emilia Galotti_ in 1825. These deserve treatment, but in none of them is there the slightest evidence of any change from the position of 1800.

Shortly after 1800 Tieck began the serious study of medieval literature. In the 1803 essay, _Die altdeutschen Minnelieder_, he acknowledges Lessing's occasional work in this field and praises his scholarship. That Lessing had also worked with the older, half-forgotten figures of German literature and English would naturally increase Tieck's respect for him.

But for the plays of Lessing his criticism during the years between 1800 and 1825 seems to have remained unchanged. He judges them as a romanticist and as an intense admirer of Shakespeare's plays naturally would judge them - harshly. Writing to Solger in 1815 he even classifies Lessing with Iffland and Kotzebue and Werner: "Meine deutschen Tragödien schreibe ich wohl einmal, wenn ich nicht bald sterbe; aber es wird mir sehr gleichgültig seyn, ob unser undeutsches Theater sie spielt,
gegen das ich, seit meinem dreiundzwanzigsten Jahre, nach einer Periode von übertriebener Anbetung, vielleicht eine eben so übertriebene Verachtung gefühlt habe. Nicht gegen die Schauspieler (außerhalb Berlin), die stehen immer noch über dem Publicum und dem Dichter; aber wir glauben noch zwanzig und mehr Jahren, Lessing, Iffland, Kotzebue, zuletzt Werner entflohen zu seyn" and still, he continues, in spite of a pretended admiration for Goethe and Schiller, the Germans turned much more readily and avidly to Schuld.

Likewise romantic is his judgment of Lessing in 1821, as he expresses it in a review of a performance of Kleist's Prinz von Homburg: "Lessing's Scharfsinn spielt in seinen Dramen mit dem Zuschauer, und was dieser errathen muss, ist zuweilen das Beste, ja Nothwendigste." He claims further that there is a little too much mechanical perfection in Lessing.

It is from 1821, however, that we should probably date the change in his views of Lessing as dramatist, although the change is not expressed until 1825. In 1821 he became more or less closely connected with the Dresden Hoftheater, at first as critic and adviser, and then as dramaturgist. In these capacities he again had the opportunity to renew his acquaintance with Lessing's characters, and to find them admirably drawn, just as he had found them in his youth, in Berlin. If we recall, in addition, Tieck's tendency to forget the play in the observation of the characters and the acting, and remember further his predilection for reading dramatic parts, it is not surprising that
the people of Lessing's plays should again impress him favorably. And from the characters it would be a short step to an admiration for the plays themselves, even if he could never group them with those of Shakespeare and the other favorites of the romanticists.

That he does not place them as highly as that is evident immediately at the start of the review of *Emilia Galotti*, that we have mentioned as giving the first hint of a change in his attitude. He begins it by saying: "Es gab eine Zeit in Deutschland, wo es nothwendig war, darauf aufmerksam zu machen, dass Lessing, nach dem wahren Sinne des Wortes, kein Dichter genannt werden könne, weil eine einseitige Bewunderung des grossen Mannes fast nur den grossen Dichter in ihm sehen, und in dieser Tragödie, trotz einiger Mängel, das vollendetste Trauerspiel unserer Nation erkennen wollte." This reminds one immediately of the program Schlegel had set up against the rationalists. But Tieck praises the play, rather the tendency of it and the language, highly, as a good model for Tieck's own generation, itself suffering from a dearth of good plays, to follow. He praises especially highly the characterization, the wit, and the sharpness, adding: "Wer das Theater studiren will, muss durchaus den Bemühungen Lessing's, auch seinen Schauspielen, eine wiederholte Aufmerksamkeit widmen."

A little later, after discussing the acting during the performance, he refers to Nathan, expressing his satisfaction that it had been withdrawn from the boards. Nathan truly expressed Lessing's nobility of spirit most exactly, but it was not
adapted for presentation and it was, moreover, just as grievously misunderstood as it had been in Lessing's day. He closes with the repetition of his advice that Lessing be often played, as a model for young dramatists. "Jede Bühne, aber, die sich achtet, sollte immer wieder zu Zeiten Emilie und Minna mit ihren ange-strengtesten Kräften darstellen." In 1827, in the essay Das deutsche Drama, Tieck utters the same judgment of Nathan as the one given above.

Schlegel had closed his essay on Lessing with the statement: "Nathan der Weise ist die beste Apologie der gesammten Lessingschen Poesie, die ohne ihn doch nur eine falsche Tendenz scheinen müsste." Tieck is still in agreement with Schlegel's estimate of Nathan, but there is now an ever growing difference in their judgment of the other dramas. Tieck expresses himself still more favorably about the dramas in this same essay, Das deutsche Drama, and, in addition, he shows the first signs of a more independent judgment of Lessing as a critic. "Ein anderer Sachse, und einer der grössten Deutschen und Männer aller Zeitalter, Lessing, erhob sich bald, um der deutschen Literatur zu einer festen Grundlage und einer grossen Wirkung auf das ganze Leben zu verhelfen. Sein Scharfsinn, Muth und seine Redlichkeit hob völlig den Kleinhandel und stürzte die Wechseltische nicht nur der Gottschedianer, sondern anderer Kleinmeister im Tempel des Geschmacks und der Kritik um. Mit Vorliebe nahm er sich der Bühne an, und sein Bestreben hätte wol
mit einem besseren Erfolge gekrönt werden sollen, da wir nach
so langer Zeit statt vorzudringen, wieder so bedeutend hinter
seine Zeit zurückgeschritten sind." Schlegel, we know, also
praised Lessing's defeat of Gottsched and his school of criticism
and taste; but he returned more repeatedly to the charge that
Lessing had no true critical gifts than to an enumeration and a
just appreciation of his services for German literature.

Lessing's efforts to clear the way for a German
drama were dimmed, Tieck continues, by the fact that he paved
the way for the "natural," the domestic drama.

We are reminded again of the earlier view as condi-
tioned by Schlegel's essay when Tieck says, in closing his brief
evaluation of Lessing's services for German literature: "Eine
wunderliche Verknüpfung von Missverständnissen veranlasste es
sogar, dass der Name Lessing auf lange das Feldgeschrei anderer
Gottschedianer war, wenn sie gegen das Mächtige und Uberirdische
in Poesie, Wissenschaft und Philosophie zu Felde zogen."

Altogether, Tieck shows a tendency to cut his own
critical path in the judgment of Lessing. He is no longer as
dependent upon Schlegel as he had been in 1800, although many of
the views of that time have carried over into this period of
critical independence. It is probably only the fact that Tieck
had other, more immediate literary heroes, that prevented him
from forming an entirely independent and unprejudiced opinion of
Lessing.
Into the last chapter fall the introductions of 1828-29 and two conversations with Köpke, in which Tieck gives the views on Lessing that he held the last twenty-five years of his life. There are, besides these, a few essays that make slight mention of Lessing.

In one of the introductions, we shall see, Tieck definitely determines Lessing’s position as a dramatist. In the conversations there is still a fluctuation between the early views that were probably influenced by Schlegel and Tieck’s own independent views, which are modifications of the earlier ones.
Section D. 1828-1853.

In a letter to Dorothea written at the time of Friedrich's death in 1829, Tieck makes clear his early dependence on Schlegel as well as the subsequent critical independence:

"Ich brauche es Ihnen auch nicht zu sagen, da Sie doch wohl manche meiner andern Schriften gesehen haben, dass die Geister, die, wie alle einstimmenden, immer nur auf eine gewisse Nähe sich berührten und verstanden, zuletzt in den wichtigsten Angelegenheiten sich sehr voneinander entfernt hatten." At the time of his friendship with Schlegel, Tieck was inclined to go to extremes in his judgments; that was evident in his judgment of Lessing at that time. Now, in 1829, he seems increasingly inclined to adopt the golden mean in life as well as in criticism; in the 1829 introduction to the eleventh volume of his works, he decries the tendency towards extremes in Schlegel's career: "Fr. Schlegels heftiger Geist war von je an geneigt, die Extreme zu suchen, und das in allen Dingen so nothwendige Maas nicht zu beobachten, so wie er auch die Form für manche seiner Werke nicht finden konnte oder zu suchen verschmähte."

With this growing conservatism in criticism, it is not surprising that we should find Tieck finally judging Lessing as a dramatist more justly and correctly. In other words, he no longer ranks him with Werner and Kotzebue and Iffland, but with Ben Jonson.

In the introduction to the eleventh volume he begins his discussion of this relationship with a thorough analysis of
Jonson's merits and defects. Jonson seems mechanically perfect to Tieck; he understands the ancients very well, has a definite plan, fits characters, action, and language well together. He produces, in short, a play "in welchem der Dichter so wie der verständige Beschauer nun auch jedes Wort rechtfertigen, jede Beziehung erklären, jedes auffalende und seltsame Ereigniss im Organismus des Ganzen, so wie jede Episode und scheinbare Ausschweifung als nothwendig nachweisen, und dadurch das Sinnreiche, Tiefe, Kluge und Weise des vielfach verschlungenen Räthsels auflösen kann." Jonson's comedies are excellent, but the tragedies are cold and lifeless because they lack the fire and the inspiration of genius. Everything in Jonson's plays can be probed and arranged and explained by rules, "da sich im Gegentheil ein echtes Kunstwerk in seiner Unendlichkeit niemals erschöpfen lässt." Tieck concludes by placing Jonson at the head of the non-poetic dramatists: "Und so ist Ben Jonson als das verständige und regierende Haupt jener Schule von Poeten anzusehen, die im Dichten selbst ihren kleinen oder grossen Krieg gegen die eigentliche Poesie geführt oder fortgesetzt haben."

In this criticism there prevails the same tone as in Schlegel's essay on Lessing, especially in the criticism of the latter's Emilia Galotti. Schlegel concluded that the play had absolutely no soul; that, in observing all dramatic laws and rules, it was a good example of "dramatic algebra."
Tieck is more just to the second rate dramatists, as he calls them, in that he is ready to recognize their excellent characterization and construction, and the effectiveness of their plays, as a whole, on the stage.

At the close of his characterization of Jonson, Tieck ranks Lessing alongside him and discloses a striking similarity both in their conceptions of the drama and in their creative works for the stage: "Selbst Lessing schien mir in seinen Aufsätzen, so gross er die Kunst aufzufassen strebte, mehr wie einmal das Wesen der dramatischen Poesie in diese mechanische Vollendung zu setzen. Als ausübender Künstler hat er selbst auf diese Art vieles in seinen Schauspielen angelegt und gearbeitet."

Meanwhile Tieck refuses to acknowledge Lessing's poetic gifts and excellence, but he no longer condemns his dramas as harshly as he did, for instance, in Der Autor of 1800.

That Tieck would naturally be rather unresponsive to Lessing's strict obedience to rule, follows out of his discussion (in the same introduction) of romantic opera. He welcomes the mixture of poetry and music: "Vielleicht lässt die romantische Oper so viel Mannigfaltigkeit der Formen, so verschiedene Elemente zu, als die romantische Komödie, in welcher auch bei weitem noch nicht alles versucht ist, was sich der ahndenden Phantasie darbietet. Dass der Witz selbst sich musikalisch aus sprechen kann, haben wir in Figaros Hochzeit gelernt, wie so manches was uns vorher wohl jede Theorie würde haben ableugnen
In an essay of 1831, Die geschichtliche Entwicklung der neueren Bühne und F. L. Schröder, there is a brief account of Lessing's work as a dramatist. Tieck praises Miss Sara Sampson as surpassing its model, Lillo's The London Merchant, especially in the character of the temptress, Marwood. Concerning his other dramas and his rank as a dramatist, he continues: "Später übertraf er sein jugendliches Werk in einem ernsten Charakterlustspiel, so wie in einer Tragödie, die man, obgleich ein Fürst die Verwickelung veranlasst, eine bürgerliche nennen muss. Unter den Dramatikern, denen die strengere Kritik den Namen der Dichter versagen muss, steht Lessing noch immer oben. Beobachtung, Scharfsinn, Witz, Menschenkenntniss und treffliche Charakteristik, Meister Dialog und Gedankenreichthum sind die Vorzüge der Werke, auch der schwächeren, die uns dieser grosse Mann hinterlassen hat."

This view of Lessing as a dramatist Tieck maintains to the end; in Köpke's Unterhaltungen mit Tieck, held in the years 1849-1853, Tieck again praises Lessing's dramatic characters quite enthusiastically. He dismisses the early dramas summarily until he comes to Miss Sara Sampson; for it he confesses a sincere affection, admitting further that he had wished to stage it in Dresden, where it had been rejected because it was oldfashioned. He dwells on the characters: "Die Marwood ist ein höchst bedeutender Charakter, und meisterhaft ist namentlich
die Verführungsscene. Der Vater und die übrigen Charaktere sind schwach; aber eine bedeutende Schauspielerin als Marwood würde das Stück gehalten haben."

In Emilia Galotti he again admires the characters more than the play. Marinelli and the prince - a part which he never saw well played - are the two outstanding characters for him, although the others are also good. For Emilia he expresses the least praise because she uses a language that is too unmaidenly; Tieck compares her with Shakespeare's heroines and asserts, "So hätte Shakspeare kein junges Mädchen reden lassen."

He believes, furthermore, that Emilia actually loved the prince. The play as a whole he condemns, as he had repeatedly done before: "Ueberhaupt ist das Stück bei aller Trefflichkeit zu sehr ein zugespitztes Intriguenspiel, um eine Tragödie zu sein; beides verträgt sich nicht miteinander."

Minna von Barnhelm he regards as one of the most admirable of German plays; however, even here he dwells on the characters.

In the judgments of Nathan and Die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts Tieck echoes the ideas of his youth, which were those of Schlegel. If Nathan, as a play, does not rank high, "so offenbart sich doch Lessing's eigenthümlicher Geist darin." The Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts is profound and mysterious. Tieck copies Schlegel in making a mysticist of Lessing, rather than regarding him as a true rationalist.
And Tieck again strikes at the rationalists as he had done in 1800 and as Schlegel had done in the essay on Lessing in 1797: "Von seinen Zeitgenossen wurde Lessing nicht verstanden. Sie überschätzten ihn als Dichter, was er nicht sein wollte, und hatten von seiner wahren Größe und der Tiefe seines Geistes keine Ahnung. Er war nicht nur ein kritisches Genie, sondern mystisch, tiefssinnig, und nie hat es eine reinere und edlere Skepsis gegeben als die seine. Er stand unendlich hoch über seinen sogenannten Freunden, die seinen Namen stets im Munde führten. Ihr Briefwechsel beweist, dass sie häufig gar nicht begriﬀen, was er will. Was konnte ihm Nicolai sein oder sein Bruder? Was ist selbst Moses Mendelssohn, den er doch hoch stellt, gegen ihn?" This is all in the spirit of Schlegel, except that Tieck again refers to Lessing's "critical genius."

One wonders just how sincerely this expresses Tieck's actual opinion of Lessing as a critic. Once before, as we have mentioned, in the 1827 essay Das deutsche Drama, he had seemed to tend towards a more just estimate of Lessing as a critic. But in 1828, in an essay Goethe und seine Zeit, he had commented rather bitterly on the fact that Lessing, after he had laid the foundations for a truly great literature, had joined Nicolai in denouncing the first great book of the new era, Werther. He added: "da nun das Rechte kam, erschien es ihm in zu grosser Gestalt; und er wendete sich unwillig ab." It may be that this deficiency in judgment had early prejudiced him against Lessing's critical gifts. It may be that he actually changed his opinion of Lessing as critic just as he had come to esteem Lessing the
dramatist more highly.

At any rate, in the conversation with Köpke he praises Lessing's *Antiquarische Briefe* as interesting criticism although "manches unbedeutend, veraltet und zum Theil unrichtig ist." We have seen that Schlegel, in the *Lessingbüchlein*, came to exactly the same conclusion concerning the *Antiquarische Briefe*.

And finally, in the conversations with Köpke, Tieck finds fault with Lessing's theory of katharsis: "Lessing's Auseinandersetzung der tragischen Theorie genügt im Vergleiche mit seiner sonstigen Schärfe eigentlich nicht. Er wird fast weitläufig und kommt zu keinem festen Resultate." This misunderstanding may be explained by the fact that Tieck has rather a peculiar idea of katharsis. In Lessing's theory the passions of pity and fear purify the baser passions. For Tieck, however, there remains much that is base even about pity and fear: "Auch sie haben eine Seite, von der sie gemein erscheinen können, aber es liegt in ihnen etwas Höheres. Das Gemeine fällt durch die Reinigung von ihnen ab, und das Göttliche kommt in uns zur Ahnung. Dies ist das Ergebniss des tragischen Reinigungs-processes." In this theory katharsis has become a kind of mysterious, divine revelation. It has become some other than the problem that Lessing had considered.
Section E. Conclusion.

In tracing the attitude of Ludwig Tieck towards Lessing, we find then that on the whole, if we exclude the early period of Tieck's life in which Lessing exercised a passing influence, there is no evidence that Tieck was ever fundamentally affected by Lessing's writings, creative or theoretical. It is true that Lessing's plea in the *Laokoon*, that sculpture depict only the beautiful, may have awakened and given direction to Tieck's own dormant feeling for the beautiful. But even in this direction Tieck went far beyond the limits set by Lessing; he finally recognized no bounds whatsoever in art. The quest for beauty excused any disregard of bounds. It is significant that as early as the two essays on Shakespeare in 1793 - *Die Kupferstiche nach der Shakspeare-Galerie in London* and *Shakspeare's Behandlung des Wunderbaren* - he judged the plays more by the aesthetic laws established by Lessing in the *Laokoon* than by the dramatic rules as he had found them in the *Dramaturgie*, although he evidently was familiar with this work. If anything, there is even a positive disagreement with Lessing's dramatic theories in these early essays, whereas there is a perfect agreement with such aesthetic theories of the *Laokoon* as Tieck happened to touch on in his two essays.

Tieck's attitude, irrespective of the question of influence, falls into three periods, differentiated by certain
variations in his judgment of Lessing's work.

In the early period from 1787 to 1794, the time of his boyhood in Berlin and youth in the university, Tieck had, as we have seen, not only a sincere respect for the rationalist Lessing, but he was, to a certain extent, influenced by him. What undoubtedly awakened the early respect for Lessing was his admiration for the characters in the plays of the latter. This admiration extended to the plays themselves, for a short time, although the study of Shakespeare precluded any possibility of his writing such plays himself. In the universities, which were dominated by the teachings of rationalism, Lessing was probably a name high among the leaders of thought, and Tieck was consequently taught rationalistic doctrine. At any rate, it is in a letter to Wackenroder from Göttingen that we find the first enthusiastic adoption of certain portions of the Laokoon. This influence, as we have already stated, extended over into the essays of 1793 on Shakespeare.

On returning from the university, Tieck found himself in a rationalistic Berlin dominated by the older Nicolai. At first Tieck even worked for Nicolai, as editor of the Straussfedern, but the early amicable relationship soon changed to contempt on the part of Tieck. This contempt extended to the teachings of rationalism and as this school held Lessing up as the model and authority for their platitudinous theories, Tieck's
contempt for them at first probably included Lessing. We have seen that he twice alluded bitterly in his later writings to Lessing's cold reception of Goethe's early works.

Into this period of discontent falls the friendship with Friedrich Schlegel, who was to dominate his critical opinions for years to come. Schlegel at this time had just finished his 1797 essay on Lessing, and he felt a contempt for the rationalists that amounted to hatred. It is certain that Tieck was deeply influenced by Schlegel in his idea of Lessing; for the next twenty-five years his judgment of Lessing coincides exactly with that of Schlegel.

Tieck's new Schlegelian Lessing is first evident in three works of 1800 in which Lessing is given short treatment: Der Autor, Briefe über Shakespeare, and Bemerkungen über Parteilichkeit, Dummheit und Bosheit. In these Lessing has assumed the same romantic qualities that he had received from Schlegel in the 1797 essay. In these, also, he is no poet, critic or dramatist. His religious polemics, his Nathan, and the Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts are the works that measure how far he stood above his age, above the men who now mistakenly regarded him as leader. In Der Autor, Tieck even has Lessing come to earth again to denounce Nicolai, as leader of the rationalists, for claiming him as the authority behind the false and stupid teachings of rationalism. And Lessing, in this sketch,
further takes particular pains to disclaim any poetic or
dramatic abilities for himself.

From 1800 to 1825 Tieck maintained an unchanged
opinion of Lessing. In 1821 he had become connected with the
Dresden Hoftheater as critic, adviser, and dramaturgist. In
these capacities his youthful affection for Lessing's characters
was again aroused. This renewed admiration found its first ex-
pression, we have seen, in a review of a performance of Emilia
Galotti in 1825. It is at this time also that his high opinion
of Schlegel changes to an estimation of him as an extremist in
creation and criticism. He is himself turning to an increas-
ingly conservative judgment of literature, religion, and men.

At any rate, with the 1829 introduction in volume
eleven of his collected works, he modifies his judgment of
Lessing as dramatist and places him with Jonson at the head of
the non-poetic school of dramatists. There are at this time
even a few hints of a change in his opinion of Lessing as critic;
this change does not, however, strike the reader as being heart-
felt or sincere. In all other respects Tieck's attitude in this
last period (1828-1853) remains as it had been in 1800. It is
still the Lessing of Schlegel that we see in the conversations
with Köpke in 1849-53, except that in these conversations he is
still very appreciative in his judgment of the plays and very
enthusiastic about the characters in the plays. In this last
treatment of Lessing he alludes particularly to the mystic qualities of the Erziehing des Menschengeschlechts. Lessing had remained for Tieck a writer of polemics and a mystic, as he had for Schlegel.

We sense, finally, a fair amount of interest for Lessing early in Tieck's life and again during the latter half of it. From 1800 to about 1825 his interest seems to wane and become merely occasional. There is no sign of any warm, sincere affection, just as there had been none in Schlegel.

Influenced by Schlegel, Lessing became, to some extent for Tieck also, a weapon for use against the rationalists. There is very little life in the figure that the two romanticists create. The criticism of Lessing by both Tieck and Schlegel is unjust and unfair because it was determined by the contempt that the romanticists felt for the great works of rationalism. In Schlegel's treatment of Lessing and his occasional remarks about him, it soon becomes evident that Lessing is no longer considered primarily as a writer, but as a figure in the warfare between the romanticists and the rationalists, useful, in this case, to both parties. This was also the attitude of Tieck until he again recognized the actual merits of Lessing as a dramatist and creator of dramatic figures. In this his attitude differs quite markedly from that of Schlegel, as it likewise had in the period of the early influence during his university years.
From Heinrich von Ofterdingen, the poems, and the fragments of Novalis, we may deduce that poetry is for him a union of all earthly sciences, philosophies, and beauties into a Whole that will lift man above earthly things. It is to him a religion that must not be too closely examined and analyzed to determine the truth and beauty of its units; but it must be felt to discover the Whole, to find the mystery in it. This is a conception of poetry that developed with the years, finding its fullest expression in the creative works of the years beginning shortly before 1798 and continuing to his death in 1801.

With such a view of literature, it was impossible that Novalis should actually find much in common with Lessing. Haym has pointed to the wide chasm between the two men, basing his claim on a fragment that we shall discuss later, after the citation of Novalis' early references to Lessing and an account of Novalis' friendship for Friedrich Schlegel and Tieck, which probably colored his attitude towards Lessing in the last years, after the blossoming of the friendship. In Die Romantische Schule, Haym says: "Das Wort von Novalis, Lessing habe zu scharf gesehen und darüber das Gefühl des undeutlichen Ganzen, die magische Anschauung der Gegenstände verloren, ist zwar treffend, verrät aber zugleich den ganzen
Before the beginning of the close friendship with Tieck and Schlegel, Novalis refers only two times to Lessing. Writing to Professor Reinhold of Jena in 1791, Novalis confesses to the deep effect that Schiller's works have had on him and he adds: "Die Nachwelt zeigt ihm seinen Platz unter den kraftvollen Männern, die zur treffendsten, bittersten Charakteristik unserer Zeiten beinahe vergessen sind oder doch vernachlässigt unter ihrer Würde. Welcher Edle stimmt mir nicht bei, wenn ich Franklin, Linne, Haller, Bacon, Luther, Hutten, Galilei, Lessing, Leibniz, Spinoza, Michelangelo, d'Alembert und Machiavell nenne." From the character of the list, it seems to be more nearly a catalogue of great names that have caught Novalis' fancy than anything else. It must be remembered that in 1791 Novalis was only nineteen years old.

Between 1795-1797 he jotted down fragments that he entitled Philosophische Studien. Among these is a short broken passage on Lessing's Laokoon, in which Novalis accuses Lessing of not having dealt deeply, fundamentally enough with the question concerning the extent to which the poet is allowed to depict the ugly.

As in the case of the other romanticists, the Laokoon did not make as deep and lasting an impression on Novalis as it did, for instance, on Goethe.

In 1798 Novalis made the acquaintance of the Schlegels in Dresden. The acquaintance soon ripened into a friendship, especially with Friedrich, and Novalis often came
to Jena from Weissenfels to visit Friedrich. On one of these visits - in 1799 - Novalis also met Tieck and these two immediately recognized their kinship in literary and religious matters. Haym expresses the relationship well: "In Novalis hatte Tieck einen Ersatz für seinen Wackenroder gefunden; in Tieck fand jener zum ersten Male einen Freund, der sich nicht bloss, wie Friedrich Schlegel, auf seinen Geist, sondern, selber ein Dichter, auf sein dichterisches Gemüt verstand."

In the same year, 1799, Tieck even moved down to Jena with his wife. Novalis now had more reason than ever to visit this city. This friendship for Tieck eventually cooled that with Friedrich.

But during these frequent visits, the conversation of the circle (composed of the two Schlegels, Novalis, and Tieck) often, undoubtedly, turned upon the work that the men were doing or had already published. We know that Schlegel had just completed his essay on Lessing. And if there was anything said about the rationalists, as there certainly must have been, Lessing undoubtedly figured therein.

We have seen already that in their works dating from this period (around 1800) Tieck and Friedrich Schlegel, in spite of their praise of Lessing as showing non-rational, romantic qualities, find his criticism too much concerned with details, too scharf; and they charge him with being unable to grasp the spirit of poetry because he was himself no poet. August Wilhelm Schlegel, in the first part of his
Vorlesungen über Schöne Litteratur und Kunst, held in 1801-1802, censures Lessing for the same faults as a critic: "Lessing ... war eigentlich ein kalter Kritiker, es fehlte ihm an Sinn und Empfänglichkeit für Poesie, er wollte alles mit seinem scharfen Verstande ausmachen, daher war er sehr glücklich in seiner Polemik gegen Kunstwerke, die bloss mit dem Verstande mangelhaft, unbefriedigend zusammengesetzt sind; aber gar nicht, wo er das Wesen echt genialischer Hervor-bringungen zu entwickeln versuchte." And finally Novalis, in the Neue Fragmentensammlung of 1798, says, in the fragment to which Haym alludes: "Lessing sah zu scharf und verlor darüber das Gefühl des undeutlichen Ganzen, die magische Anschauung der Gegenstände zusammen in mannigfacher Erleuchtung und Verdunklung."

In the same collection of fragments, Novalis says of Lessing's fables: "Die gewöhnliche Fabeln mit ihren Moralen gleichen den Bildern, unter die der Zeichner schreiben muss, was sie bedeuten sollen. Bei Lessing ist es oft ein Epigramm unter der Fabel, und da ist es willkommen." Schlegel, in the essay on Lessing, had also praised Lessing's wit and epigrammatic style. Novalis seemingly echoes Schlegel in this point. We know that Tieck maintained his praise of Lessing's wit and epigrammatic keenness until his death. In 1797 August Wilhelm writes to Falk: "Ich sehe wohl ein, dass der Witz entweder einer Einkleidung bedarf, oder gelegentlich vorgebracht werden muss, wie in einigen Kritiken Lessings.
With all these agreements among the four members of the circle, it seems almost as if the attitude towards Lessing had been determined during the years of friendship in Jena, the years 1798 and 1799.

In the Dialogen und Monologen of 1798-99, Novalis makes use of one of Lessing's epigrammatic remarks in a passage concerning introductions to books and reviews of books. The introduction, says Novalis, is more difficult than the book itself, "denn, wie der junge revolutionäre Lessing sich ausdrückte, so ist die Vorrede Wurzel und Quadrat des Buchs zugleich, und ich füge hinzu, mithin nichts anders als die echte Rezension desselben."

In another collection of fragments of these years, 1798-99, which Novalis called Das allgemeine Brouillon, he notes down some ideas, in one of the fragments, concerning the sculpture of the Laokoon group. There is no direct reference to Lessing's Laokoon. He does, however, indirectly disagree with Lessing concerning the choice of the moment for sculpturing: "Sollte der Bildhauer nicht immer den Moment der Petrefaktion ergreifen - und aufsuchen - und darstellen - und auch nur diesen darstellen können."

That he disagrees with the fundamental idea of the Laokoon is clearly manifest in all his works. However, he expresses it just as clearly in a fragment from the years 1799-1800, Fragmente der letzten Jahre, when he says: "Der Dichter..."
hat bloss mit Begriffen zu tun. Schilderungen usw. borgt er
nur als Begriffszeichen. Es gibt poetische Musik und Malerei
- diese wird oft mit Poesie verwechselt, z. B. von Tieck, auch
wohl von Goethe.

All four members of the Jena circle completely disagreed with the central idea of the Laokoon, the limitation of the fields of art.

In these same fragments of 1799-00, there appear, in addition, two references to Lessing's prose. In the first he groups him, with respect to style, among writers like Goethe, Lavater, Friedrich Schlegel, Luther and Tieck. This is in harmony with Friedrich Schlegel's praise of such elements in Lessing's prose as would make him a romantic writer, a Friedrich Schlegel, at least in point of style. The second reference is merely a laconic notation: "Dr. Luthers Sprache. Lessing."

In December of 1798 Friedrich wrote a long letter to Novalis about a new Bible that he contemplated writing, which would not need to be written were Lessing still alive. We have seen in the chapter on Friedrich Schlegel how highly the latter ranked Die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts as a mystic, romantic work that prophesied and promised a new gospel. Novalis, in the Fragmenten der letzten Jahre, refers twice to the same work, the first time merely a notation of a second part to Lessing's work. In the second reference he gives "Data zum zweiten Teil von Lessings Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts."

Two of the notations are reminiscent of Lessing: "In den Evangelien liegen die Grundzüge künftiger und höherer Evangelien,"
and "Vernunft, Gemüt, Ernst und Wissenschaft sind von der Sache Gottes unabtrennlich." The work of Lessing evidently struck root in Novalis as in Schlegel, but, as in the latter, the resultant growth was mystic and romantic rather than rational. Altogether Novalis is so slightly concerned with Lessing that there can hardly be reference to any particular attitude. Like Schlegel and Tieck he praises Lessing's wit, his pointed, epigrammatic prose style, and his Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts. In the main he seems to agree with the romantic stricture that Lessing was no poet and that he was a critic of details and unable to grasp the Whole, the spirit of a work, because he was no profound subjective critic and, to repeat, no poet.
In the case of Wackenroder there can be even less possibility of defining an attitude towards Lessing than in the case of Novalis.

The fact that Wackenroder died in 1798, in the very year in which the older romanticists actually began to join forces to form a school, accounts, perhaps, for the fact that he was not more deeply interested in Lessing and in the feud with the rationalists. It is even doubtful whether the gentle, peace-loving soul of Wackenroder would ever have become violently engaged in the struggle between the two schools.

In all his own essays -- in the two books that he wrote in conjunction with Tieck, *Herzensergiessungen eines Kunstliebenden Klosterbruders* (1797) and *Phantasien über die Kunst*, published by Tieck in 1799, after the death of Wackenroder, there is no trace of any critical system. He feels the spirit of a work of art, a book, or a musical composition and the essays are efforts to recapture the feeling in words. His ideas of criticism would seem, as Haym has pointed out, like those of Herder, only softer, less declamatory, and less forceful. Haym remarks concerning his system or manner: "Diametrisch wieder liegt sie der scharfen kritischen Weise gegenüber, mit welcher der grosse Verstand Lessings die Grenzen der Kunst abzustecken suchte."
We know that in 1792 Tieck wrote a long letter to Wackenroder that was so replete with allusions to and echoes of the *Laokoon* that it cannot but be assumed that he had just then read it. Wackenroder was probably fired to read it also, the more so as his interests were primarily in the fields of art and music. In the study of it he must have been particularly impressed by two of the ideas; that of choosing the right moment for paintings and sculptures, and the theory that warns the artist against fixing smiles or expressions of pain in marble or on canvas, lest they become grimaces. It is these two ideas that we find repeated in Wackenroder's essays. There is no indication of an acceptance of the central idea of the *Laokoon*, however, that the fields of the different arts should be limited. Wackenroder has in mind not limitation but an insistence on beauty, on an avoidance of the ugly in all forms of art.

As early as 1793, in the account of a trip taken with one of the teachers at Erlangen, he refers to Lessing's work, while describing Raphael's Virgin. He praises the execution of the painter, and the fact that he chose the time, the expression that would best tell what had gone before and what was yet to come. "Hier ist ein merkwürdiges Beyspiel des Grundsatzes, den Lessing auf Laokoons schmerzgefüllt Antlitz anwendet; hier ist's, wo die Kunst den Anfang, den ersten Schritt der Empfindung zeigt, und eben dadurch die Phantasie des Be- wunderers ihre Kraft tiefer fühlen lässt."
All his life Wackenroder was obsessed and tortured by the hatred of ugliness, and it is perhaps this hatred that explains why those chapters of the *Laokoon* that deal with the inadvisability of depicting ugliness became so firmly rooted in his mind. As early as 1792 he writes to Tieck of the Scandinavian gods and books: "Es ist doch gar nicht zu leugnen, dass bei aller vortrefflichen, grossen Simplizität, bei aller der erhabenen und feurigen Phantasie, die die alten nordischen Dichtungen zeigen, dennoch so viel Ungeheures, was ans Lächerliche und Ungereimte grenzt, so viel Schwerfälliges, so viele entsetzlich harte, unschmackhafte Bilder vorkommen, dass man, wenn man beständig sein Auge auf die eingepelzten Götter Skandinaviens heften wollte, allen Sinn für ein sanftes griechisches Profil verlieren würde." This was probably before he read the *Laokoon*. We see in this dislike of the harsh and the ugly why he might turn so avidly to a theory that recommended the depiction of the beautiful.

In the *Herzensergiessungen*, in the essay on Leonardo da Vinci, his attitude is, in one instance, precisely that of Lessing. He approves of da Vinci's custom of having music played to a person sitting for him: "Er wusste nur zu wohl, dass bei Personen, welche zum Malen sitzen, sich gewöhnlich eine trockene und leere Ernsthaftigkeit auf ihrem Gesichte einzufinden pflegt, und dass eine solche Miene, wenn sie im Gemälde in bleibenden Zügen festgehalten wird, ein ungefälliges oder wohl gar finsteres Ansehen gewinnt."
Throughout the essays, Wackenroder describes music by means of colors. In the essay *Wesen der Tonkunst*, he says: "Der einfarbige Lichtstrahl des Schalls ist ein buntes, funkelndes Kunstfeuer zersplitten, worin alle Farben des Regenbogens flimmern."

In the essay *Von den verschiedenen Gattungen in jeder Kunst* he decries the fact that most artists delight in covering only their own field, and feel at home only in it. He adds: "so kann ich doch nicht begreifen, wie eine wahre Liebe der Kunst nicht alle ihre Gärten durchwandern, und an allen Quellen sich freuen sollte." And in an essay on Michelangelo he affirms: "Die Malerei ist eine Poesie mit Bildern der Menschen."

The essay, *Wesen der Tonkunst*, he closes with the words: "Aber, was streb' ich Törichter, die Worte zu Tönen zu zerschmelzen? Es ist immer nicht wie ich's fähle."

Although Wackenroder undoubtedly saw many plays with Tieck and even took part in some of Tieck’s amateur productions, as we have seen, he was never particularly interested in the drama. In 1792 he sent Tieck a list of plays then on the stage in Berlin, among them being *Emilia Galotti*. He had seen none of them, because of lack of interest. There exists no relationship of any sort between him and Lessing in the field of the drama.
In fact any relationship is slight, even with the *Laokoon*. Wackenroder, being interested in music and art almost to the exclusion of all else, would naturally read Lessing's *Laokoon* and be impressed by the older man's admiration of the beautiful in the great works of art. And, as we have seen, he adopted some of the lesser theories of the book. But whereas Lessing did not altogether object to ugliness in art, Wackenroder insisted on beauty. **All ugliness, without exception, distressed him.**
While A. W. Schlegel did not enter as closely into the friendships of the group that gathered in 1798 - 99 in Jena, he undoubtedly took full part in their discussions. It was ever his nature to be deeply influenced by the opinions of others, especially those of Friedrich and Caroline in these years. Whether he was or was not influenced by the discussions—probably anti-rationalistic—of this period and by Friedrich's essay on Lessing, he does have practically the same attitude towards Lessing that Friedrich, Tieck and Novalis have.

This attitude was that established by Friedrich in the Lessing essay of 1797. There arose from that essay a Lessing who was no poet, no critic because he did not feel the spirit of a work or grasp the whole, and no dramatist. His effort in the Laokoon to limit the fields of art was disregarded in the essay and displaced in the Lessingbüchlein by Friedrich's own theory of art without any limitations. The Lessing who appeared in the essay was romantic in his epigrammatic, fragmentary, ironic style and romantic in such alleged mystic works as Nathan and the Erziehung des menschengeschlechts.

Tieck and Novalis, we have seen, adopted the same attitude towards Lessing as that expressed in the essay. And finally, to complete the circle, August Wilhelm held the same views. This is ably proved by Margareta Wolff in her dissertation: August Wilhelm Schlegels Verhältnis zu Lessing.
She bases her study on Schlegel's two most important works: Vorlesungen über Schöne Litteratur und Kunst, commonly called the Berliner Vorlesungen, and the Vorlesungen über Dramatische Kunst und Litteratur, briefly called the Wiener Vorlesungen. The former lectures were delivered in 1801 - 1804, the latter in 1808. Through them, she says, "soll gezeigt werden, dass Schlegel und Lessing zwei grundverschiedene Auffassungen der Kunst, des künstlerischen Schaffens, der einzelnen Künste vertreten." An examination of Schlegel's other occasional utterances on Lessing has shown no essential variation from the opinions of these two books. From the proof it becomes clear that Schlegel did not consider Lessing to be a poet, dramatist, or critic; that he agreed with Friedrich and Tieck and Novalis in finding romantic elements in Nathan, and agreed with them likewise in his praise of Lessing's trenchant, ironic, romantic style.

This chapter is a summary of her dissertation, following her division of the problem into five main parts.

In the first part she clearly shows different methods of creation that underlie the works of the two men. In the Wiener Vorlesungen, Schlegel had hurled the charge at Lessing and Aristotle and Diderot that they merely copied nature, and were therefore no poets and could not understand poetic creations. Margarete Wolff points out that Lessing always strove to imitate nature in order that the effect on the hearer or reader, the katharsis, should be greater and more immediate.
And since the parts determine the effect of the Whole, they are of the utmost importance. Further, as it is the observation of rules that determines whether a work is vague or has a clear effect, the rules should, above all, be observed.

For Schlegel, however, the artist, the ego, is the centre of all artistic creation. He does not imitate nature, he re-creates it, building the parts around and subordinate to the Whole, the spirit underlying the work. Margarete Wolff sums up the difference in the following passage: "Lessing ging von dem Kunstgegenstand aus, für Schlegel stand die Schöpferkraft des Künstlers im Vordergrund. Lessing nahm seinen Ausgangspunkt von aussen, Schlegel von innen. Darum hat für Schlegel das Kunstwerk eine organische Einheit und gehört in eine höhere Wirklichkeit, für Lessing dagegen nur eine mechanische. Es bleibt im Bereich des Verstandes."

The next general division treats the dramatic rules that the two men observed, theoretically and practically. Margarete Wolff summarizes briefly at the beginning Schlegel's criticism of Lessing as dramatist, Schlegel again basing his condemnation of Lessing's ideas and works on the fact that Lessing was no creator: "Was Aristoteles in der Poetik über die Einheit der Handlung gesagt hat, nennt Schlegel bloss zergliedernde Begriffe, die zu wesentlichen poetischen Forderungen nicht heranreichen.......... Lessing konnte nach Schlegels Meinung Aristoteles zustimmen, weil er auch nur ein scharfsinnig zergliedernder Kritiker sei."
For Schlegel the drama is a mixture of the epic and the lyric; there is no actual drama as such. As it is primarily poetic, it should show its higher poetic nature by being in verse and not in prose as were most of Lessing's dramas. Schlegel adds concerning this deficiency in Lessing: "Er ist dadurch mittelbar auch Schuld an den platten natürlichen unserer dramatischen Schriftsteller, welche der allgemeine Gebrauch der Versification etwas mehr würde im Zaum gehalten haben."

Lessing considers the drama a separate, individual form of art. It must treat well-known material because novelty of plot might draw the attention of the audience from the purpose of the play, which is not primarily entertainment but moral betterment. And it must be imitative, natural, that the audience be more deeply affected.

Lessing, in other words, judges the excellence of a drama by its effect on the audience. The lesser passions of the audience are purified through pity and fear, and therefore there must be tragic guilt that the feeling of fear may be aroused.

In Schlegel the problem is not one of tragic guilt at all, because the play is not based on pity and fear. He even censures Aristotle and Lessing for harboring such concepts. A play with a basis on pity and fear would give the audience no pleasure; therefore it is rather the action on the stage that brings joy to the observer. The action, in its turn, is inspired by the successful efforts of the characters to retain their inner freedom in the struggle with oppressive powers.
This effort of the characters to maintain their inner freedom, which is the purpose of the play, also gives it its unity.

In her analysis of Schlegel's theory of the drama, Margarete Wolff indicates that Schlegel permitted many plots or actions within a play, although not all of them were true plots based on the struggle for inner freedom. "Da aber in jedem Stück mehrere Personen sind und sie all Willen haben und Entschlüsse fassen, so sind damit mehrere Handlungen möglich. Aber auch nicht jedes menschliche Handeln kann schon als wirkliches Handeln bezeichnet werden, sondern nur ein solches, das sich auf die Idee der sittlichen Freiheit bezieht. Erst dann handelt der Mensch frei, d.h. er ist Urheber seiner Entschlüsse und damit handelt er erst wirklich." This explains August Wilhelm's admission of many subordinate plots into the romantic drama; the only requirement is that they add to the poetic effect. And it explains also Schlegel's predilection for Spanish drama, which has so many sub-plots.

To attain greater poetic effect Schlegel suggests a more extensive use of music and painting in plays. He suggests further the mixture of the tragic and the comic, to show the ironic balance of life and the undercurrent of sadness in it.

Lessing seeks unity in the total effect on the audience. There must be no mixture of the poetic and the dramatic and no sub-plots, because such mixtures and sub-plots will detract from the total effect. This is the reason for his rejection of Spanish drama. And finally, in full contrast to Schlegel, Lessing
judges the effect of a drama not as much by the joy given as by the moral, the kathartic effect on the audience. Margarete Wolff cites Lessing's wish that he had written Lillo's *The London Merchant*, not because of its excellence as a drama but because of the many tears that had been shed over it.

The third main division treats of epic poetry. Schlegel agrees that the epic must be progressive, a succession of symbols in time. He adds however: "Lessing im Laokoon hat diese Beschaffenheit der homerischen Beschreibung richtig bemerkt, sie aber irril für die Poesie überhaupt wesentlich, und für die einzige erlaubte Art zu beschreiben ausgegeben." Successive symbols are applicable to the epic because epics deal with successive actions. But descriptive and didactic poetry, Schlegel concludes in contrast to Lessing, are also species of the epic and are justifiable not as they treat of actions but as the teachings, the pictures come successively into the mind of the listener. Lyric and dramatic poetry do not fall into the category of the successive at all.

In the fourth section, on the plastic arts, Schlegel agrees with Lessing's idea of limitation. But there are so many exceptions to this acceptance that it is, in truth, a virtual disagreement. *We have seen this already in the division on the epic.*

Schlegel would have the artist depict both beauty and expression. The beauty of a figure does lie partly in the form, but he adds: "Die menschliche Bildung ist darum überhaupt die
schönste, weil sie am vollkommensten symbolisch, und weil ihre Bedeutung die höchste unter allen ist; und so besteht die höchste Schönheit in ihr wiederum in dem reinsten Ausdruck des edelsten wahrhaft menschlichsten Charakters, wobey aber nicht an das eigentlich sittliche zu denken ist." This again changes the objective view of Lessing into the subjective view of the romanticists. In Lessing the beauty would be disturbed by an expression of pain, and such expressions must therefore be avoided. Margaret Wolff sees this same difference: "Für beide liegt die Schönheit in objektiven Verhältnissen, aber für Schlegel darin, dass mit den Verhältnissen des Körpers sich der Ausdruck einer göttlichen Seele verbindet." Schlegel therefore allows the artist expressions of pain, if they are expressive of the soul.

There is still a greater difference between the two men in the choice of the moment to be fixed. The fruitful moment for Lessing is that from which the imagination may move forwards or backwards in time. In Schlegel it is the one moment that absolutely fixes the imagination of the observer, neither allowing it to drop back into the past nor to project itself into the future.

In the fifth main division painting is considered. Schlegel objects first that Lessing included it with sculpture. His distinction is that of Herder; a piece of sculpture may be appreciated by the sense of sight and touch. Paintings are purely for the eye.

Further, both Herder and Schlegel admit, even demand, ugly figures in the paintings for the sake of truth. Lessing
insisted on beauty unless the purpose was humor or satire. In this respect A. W. Schlegel opposes even the views of the other members of the Jena group, especially Tieck. Tieck and Wackenroder, we know, were more in sympathy with the Laokoon. A. W. Schlegel's Berliner Vorlesungen were delivered from 1801 to 1804, shortly, therefore, after the years in Jena. This early difference in a matter so fundamental is only one of the many signs pointing to the early disintegration of the school.

Schlegel agrees, in the main, with Herder, Margarete Wolff points out; but she adds: "im Unterschied zu Herder unterscheidet Schlegel zwischen musikalischer und plastischer Malerei. Plastisch wird sie da, wo sie einzelne Gegenstände, Tiere, Blumen usw. darstellt, während sie musikalisch da wird, wo sie das Gemüt zu unbestimmten Phantasien anregt und in eine unennbare Sehnsucht verstrickt." This is a purely romantic conception. More romantic is Schlegel's delight in landscapes, which Lessing rejected because for him the human body was the utmost in beauty. Landscapes arouse a romantic longing, according to Schlegel. Therefore they need not be actual; the artist must, however strive to attain unity, the unity consisting in the fact "dass alle Teile eine einheitliche Stimmung hervorrufen können. Durch diese Stimmung wird das Gemüt, wie bei der Musik, in einem gewissen Schweben erhalten."

With this last concept, Schlegel shows most clearly that his agreement with Lessing's idea of limitation was merely apparent, not actual.

Margarete Wolff concludes: "In der Auffassung des
künstlerischen Schaffens, in der Bestimmung des Dramas, des Epos, der Plastik, der Malerei stehen Schlegel und Lessing im Gegensatz zu einander."

In that August Wilhelm denies Lessing’s poetic gifts, shows his faultiness as a dramatist and as a true critic, he agrees with the other members of the Jena circle of the years 1798 - 1799. There is a further agreement in that he praises the style of Lessing, finding in it the same qualities that his brother had found before him. He further finds, like Friedrich and Tieck, romantic qualities in Nathan. Finally, he also calls attention to the fact that the rationalists misunderstood Lessing in holding him up as their leader: "Lessingen haben sich die Seichten ganz eigends zu ihrem Vorsteher gewählt, und in seinen Schriften Bannsprüche gegen echte Poesie und Philosophie zu finden geglaubt ausserdem dass er auf das dramatische Fach sehr retardirend gewirkt hat."

In the main then, A.W. Schlegel's attitude towards Lessing is the same as that of the other older romanticists, especially of the small group that met so often in Jena in the years 1798 - 1799.
The older romanticists, especially Friedrich Schlegel, have been praised for their excellent criticism of Lessing; a few critics, two in particular (Johanna Krüger and Bernhard Bolle) have even found Lessing to have influenced the works of these men. It is true that the older romanticists had praised Lessing, but at the very time that they praised him, they denied his worth as poet, critic, and dramatist. There is a contradiction, therefore, in their praise, a contradiction that resolves itself rather easily when the opinions of this older group are considered.

They seemed to express an interest in Lessing, but their Lessing was a romantic figure, created by them to combat the rationalists. Lessing became a polemic weapon for their use in the controversy with the rationalists who, under the leadership of the older Nicolai, held Lessing up as a leader and as the authority for their critical doctrines and theories. The criticism of the romanticists was, therefore, swayed by their contempt for the rationalists; the gifts and virtues that the latter praised most in Lessing - his dramatic, critical, and poetical powers - were denied by the former. To make the figure of Lessing still more effective against the rationalists, the romanticists praised such works as Nathan, Die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts, and Ernst und Falk. In them they claimed to find those romantic qualities that the rationalists most bitterly condemned in the romanticists: their irresponsible irony, their mysticism, and
the fragmentary style that strove more for irony, wit, and brilliance than for the truth.

It was Friedrich Schlegel who first created this romantic Lessing, a Lessing who had many of Friedrich's own qualities and, queerly enough, experienced the same developmental changes as Friedrich.

In spite of the occasional approval the romanticists have received for their criticism of Lessing, it would seem to be nearer the truth to subscribe to the views of Gundolf, Haym, and Walzel, who totally negate the excellence and the justice of their criticism, and who, furthermore, fail to ascertain any Lessingian influence upon the romantic school.

Since it was Friedrich Schlegel who gave direction to the criticism of Lessing among the romanticists and created that figure of Lessing which was to appear repeatedly in the criticism of the other men of the school, it is the examination of his attitude that reveals most clearly the misinterpretation of Lessing and the actual value that the romanticists placed on Lessing's teachings and works.

Friedrich published three works dealing directly with the subject of Lessing: an essay in 1797, Über Lessing; the conclusion to this essay, which appeared four years afterwards, Abschluss des Lessing-Aufsatzes; and finally, an anthology of Lessing's works, the Lessingbüchlein of 1804.

The 1797 essay is the one work that most clearly revealed the nature of Friedrich's criticism and most particularly
influenced the other members of the school in their conception of Lessing. Up to the time of the essay, Friedrich had occupied himself with classical subjects; in the letters to his brother his early comments on Lessing had even been cold. Suddenly, in the essay (which was written to earn money quickly and to gain popularity) Lessing appeared as an hero, sadly misjudged, even persecuted, by the rationalists, in that they misinterpreted his works to serve their own purpose. Most of the essay is a diatribe against these rationalists.

Schlegel stripped Lessing of his laurels as poet, critic, and dramatist, but lauded him for his fragmentary style, his romantically ironic and mystic Nathan, and the Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts, which he alleged was also truly romantic.

The conclusion of 1801 Schlegel devoted to an exposition of his own views and to a revival of the polemic against the rationalists. He again commended the so-called mystic works of Lessing and, this time, called him a great philosopher because his philosophy was fragmentary and maintained no strict system.

In the Lessingbüchlein Schlegel recommenced the feud with the rationalists. Lessing's whole life, he asserted, was devoted to the effort to rise superior to the rationalist group which was, in truth, the very influence that had clipped his wings as poet and obscured his critical perception. In one of the various introductions, Schlegel treated Lessing's false ideas of the delimitation of the arts, and set up a system of his own,
opposed to that of Lessing.

In a later brief treatment of Lessing, in the *Wiener Vorlesungen* of 1812, Schlegel's views were, in the main, unchanged. He did, however, esteem Lessing more highly as a mystic religious writer, grouping him with Lavater and Hamann, and citing the *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts* as a splendid manifestation of mystic philosophy.

In all these treatments he lends more effort to creating a Schlegelian Lessing rather than to judging Lessing correctly and objectively for the actual work that he did. The *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts*, in which Lessing clearly expressed his faith in reason, was interpreted by Schlegel as being a mystic work that pointed back to the original child-like faith in an inscrutable, all-powerful God.

It is significant that in the 1797 essay Lessing was primarily a religious writer; at that time Schlegel himself had become increasingly interested in religion and even had visions of writing a new Bible, the germ of which he saw in *Nathan* and in the *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts*. The closer study of Fichte begun after the essay of 1797 led him more into the field of philosophy, as did also his lectures on philosophy at Jena, in the years 1800 and 1801, and the consequent study of many systems of philosophy. In the 1801 conclusion, Lessing also became a philosopher; but in addition to the fact that he was now a philosopher, he was a fragmentary philosopher, without any system, because Schlegel, too, held to no system. In the *Lessingbüchlein* of 1804, he eloquently defended Lessing as a fragmentary philoso-
pher. But more than a philosopher, he was a powerful religious writer, with more than a trend towards mysticism. It must not be forgotten that Schlegel was, in these years, also turning from actual philosophy to mysticism and the Catholic Church. At the time of the Wiener Vorlesungen, in 1812, Schlegel was converted to Catholicism, completely a mystic; Lessing, grouped with Hamann and Lavater, had also assumed the vague mantle of mysticism.

The years 1798 - 1799 saw the beginning of the friendship between the Schlegels and Tieck and Novalis. The Schlegels were in Jena; Tieck also eventually took up residence there and Novalis often came over from Weissenfels for visits. It is the first time that there was anything like an actual romantic school. The men undoubtedly discussed their works and their feud with the rationalists. With the latter subject, the conversation doubtlessly turned to Friedrich's Über Lessing, especially since Schlegel had at this time contracted to deliver the conclusion to Reichardt.

That they actually formed a school is apparent in the fact that their criticism of Lessing after these years in Jena is uniform, except for a few modifications on the part of Tieck, who gradually grew away from the Schlegels.

In his boyhood and university years Tieck had certainly been influenced by Lessing to a measurable extent. He admired the characters of Lessing's dramas; and in the two essays of 1793 - Die Kupferstiche nach der Shakspeare-Galerie in London
and Shakspeare's Behandlung des Wunderbaren - he revealed a certain dependence on the theories of the Laokoon.

On returning from the university he edited the Straussfedern for Nicolai. However, Tieck slowly turned from rationalism, and the relationship between the two men became increasingly strained. A complete break with rationalism was caused by Tieck's friendship with Friedrich, the declared enemy of the rationalists. Through this friendship and the frequent conversations in Jena, Tieck was influenced in his opinion of Lessing.

This influence is first evident in three works of 1800, in which Lessing is given short treatment: Der Autor, Briefe über Shakspeare, and Bemerkungen über Parteilichkeit, Dummheit und Bosheit. In these, Lessing had assumed the same romantic qualities that he had received from Schlegel in the 1797 essay. Like Schlegel, Tieck also denied Lessing's merits as poet, critic, and dramatist. His religious polemics, his Nathan, and the Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts are the works that show, according to Tieck, how far he stood above his age and the men who falsely regarded him as leader. Tieck's diatribe against the rationalists was just as keen as Schlegel's and his comparison of Lessing's and Fichte's polemic style was precisely that of Schlegel. This view Tieck maintained to his death, modified once - after Tieck had publicly turned against Schlegel as being an extremist. This was a modification in his regard for Lessing as dramatist, and may be traced back to his activities as dramaturgist and critic for the Dresden Hoftheater, beginning about 1821.
He realized once more how effective were Lessing's characters and it was only a short step from an appreciation of the characters to the recognition of the excellence of the plays themselves. In the 1829 introduction to volume eleven of his works, he ranked Lessing with Ben Jonson at the head of the non-poetic school of dramatists. His high regard for the dramatist Lessing persisted; it was once again expressed in a conversation with Köpke, in the latter's life of Tieck.

Novalis makes almost no reference to Lessing. From the few fragments that are devoted to him, it is clear that he had also adopted the view of Friedrich Schlegel, valuing especially the mystic qualities of the *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts*, and the epigrammatic, fragmentary style of Lessing.

Wackenroder died before the Jena group had actually become a unit. He had, however, early read the *Laokoön* and in his writings several passages indicate that he was profoundly impressed by Lessing's plea that the artist should not change a smile or an expression of pain into a grimace by eternizing it in marble or on canvas.

In Margarete Wolff's study, *August Wilhelm Schlegel Verhältnis zu Lessing*, she proves very ably that August Wilhelm and Lessing were almost diametrically opposed in matters of poetry, drama, and criticism. August Wilhelm, like his brother, denied Lessing's poetic gifts, and censured Lessing for his imitative, detailed dramatic art and criticism. He did, however, commend him for his cutting, epigrammatic style; and for the
romantic qualities he had recognized in the drama *Nathan*. Like the rest of the Jena group, he declared that the rationalists misunderstood Lessing in choosing him as leader.

On the whole, the romanticists disregarded Lessing's efforts to limit the fields of art and they failed to recognize his poetic, critical, and dramatic genius. They interpreted *Nathan*, the *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts*, and the polemics as being romantic in intention. Furthermore, they commended such qualities in Lessing's style as had most angered the rationalists in the style of the romanticists themselves.

The romanticists, in other words, distorted the picture of Lessing more than a little in order that he, the leader of the rationalists, would be more effective as a weapon against these very rationalists. Their Lessing evidently grew out of Friedrich Schlegel's 1797 essay and the frequent meetings at Jena in the years 1798 and 1799.
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