

Ancients, Moderns, and the Future:
the Querelle in Germany from Winckelmann to Schiller

Ritchie Robertson

We now know that the Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes was not purely a French affair. Certainly it rocked the French literary world, with its epicentre the poem *Le Siècle de Louis le Grand* which Charles Perrault read to the French Academy on 27 January 1687. But it had many antecedents in Italy, where Alessandro Tassoni, author of the mock-heroic poem *La secchia rapita*, and the critic Paolo Beni declared that Homer and Virgil had been surpassed by Ariosto and Tasso. In Britain, William Wotton's *Reflections on Ancient and Modern Learning* (1694) argued that modern learning was so much superior that we knew more about the ancients than they knew about themselves. He was replying to the chief defender of the ancients, Sir William Temple, who asserted their pre-eminence in his 'Essays upon the Ancient and Modern Learning' (1690). In due course the cause of the ancients would be taken up by Swift and Pope.¹

Germany entered the fray only late in the eighteenth century. For a long time, indeed, it was thought that the Querelle found virtually no resonance in Germany. A tradition of scholarship, dating back to the nationalist historiography of the Wilhelmine Empire, maintained that the German literature and thought of the classical period – stretching roughly from the birth of Goethe in 1749 to the death of Schiller in 1805 – formed an autonomous movement that owed nothing to French influences. This construction of literary and intellectual history was motivated in large part by a desire to separate Germany from an Enlightenment which was seen as principally a French phenomenon. The triumphant Germany, unified in 1871, could owe nothing to the shallow thinking, cold, superficial rationality, and witty phrase-making of the French, who had met their deserved defeat in the Franco-Prussian War. While the French pursued an Enlightenment which culminated in the catastrophe of the Revolution, the Germans were preparing much greater achievements. Their classicism, pioneered by the art historian Johann Joachim Winckelmann, rested on a profound elective affinity with the spirit of ancient Greece, quite different from the merely external imitation of classical forms by the French. And their exploration of feeling, of nature, of primitive poetry, of the spiritual depths of the German people,

proclaimed by Johann Gottfried Herder, found expression in the drama and poetry of the Sturm und Drang, which was itself a prelude to Romanticism.²

The task of rewriting German literary history so as to remove its nationalist bias and recover the real and strong interconnections between eighteenth-century Germany and the wider culture of Europe, particularly France, is not yet complete. An important landmark in the rewriting of literary history is the essay by Hans Robert Jauss, first published in 1967, which shows that the *Querelle* was still alive in Germany in the 1790s.³ Jauss examines two famous critical treatises that appeared almost simultaneously in the mid 1790s, Friedrich Schlegel's *Über das Studium der griechischen Poesie* and Friedrich Schiller's *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung*, and argues that both are creative responses to the *Querelle*. In what follows, I shall, inevitably, be arguing along the same lines as Jauss, though I want to highlight aspects of the two treatises that are somewhat different from those that Jauss chooses to foreground. I also want to explore an issue that receives little attention from Jauss: the ways in which both Schlegel and Schiller, after offering their respective definitions of the differences between ancient and modern literature, imagine those differences as being resolved at some time in the near, or more likely remote, future.

Caylus and Winckelmann

Around 1750 the *Querelle* flared up in France in a new guise, with repercussions in Britain and Germany.⁴ The antagonists now were not just the Ancients versus the Moderns, but, more specifically, the Greeks versus the Romans. The Ancient side maintained that the Greeks had reached the highest pinnacle of art, and that the Romans had managed only to imitate them and thereby to begin a period of artistic decline; if any modern artists achieved truly great things, they did so by following the example of the Greeks. In France, the leading figure in this phase of the *Querelle* was the connoisseur Anne-Claude-Philippe de Tubières, Comte de Caylus (1692-1765); in Britain, the spokesmen of the Greek Revival, notably James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, who were sent by the Dilettanti Society on an architectural tour of Greece in 1751-55; and among German writers, the art historian Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-68).

Although his reputation has since been obscured by Winckelmann's, Caylus was an important figure in the history of taste, and has been claimed as a significant

pioneer in archaeology for rejecting the philological study of texts in favour of examining and describing objects.⁵ Caylus had travelled in Greece and the Levant, and had daringly visited the ruins of Ephesus with a guard provided by a local bandit. In Paris, he was an active member of the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture and of the Académie des inscriptions. Independently wealthy, he devoted himself to the study of antiquities and the patronage of artists. His main work was the seven-volume *Recueil d'Antiquités* (1752-67) which contained illustrations of many items from his large collection of gems, coins, statues, and other classical works of art, with a commentary.

In Caylus's scheme of art history, each nation borrowed its art from another but developed it in a distinctive way. Thus the arts developed first in Egypt, passed to Etruria, then to Greece, where they attained their supreme perfection, and then to Rome, where they depended entirely on foreign models (Caylus i. ix-x). The Romans were too preoccupied with warfare to have the leisure required for cultivating the arts. When their victorious armies brought the treasures of Greece and Asia Minor back to Rome, the Romans were astonished, without understanding these works of art or being able to produce any of their own. They were like people who have suddenly come into a fortune but have no idea how to use it except for vulgar ostentation:

Semblables à ces hommes nouveaux qui sont eux-mêmes étonnés de se voir riches et comblés d'honneurs, il voulurent posséder, sans s'appliquer à connoître; & incapables de travailler à faire fleurir les Arts, en les étudiant, ils firent briller l'or & l'argent aux yeux des Artistes étrangers, & les Grecs accoururent en foule.⁶

Unable to create art, the Romans bought it in. They showed themselves to be barbarians inasmuch as they left the practice of the arts to their slaves, who in turn, being deprived of the freedom that had enabled the arts to flourish in Greece, could produce nothing of great worth. Roman art tended to be heavy and crude, and, though it rallied briefly under the enlightened patronage of Trajan and Hadrian, it faded away, and, with the transference of the imperial seat to Constantinople, disappeared entirely.

Caylus' case for the supremacy of Greek art was supported especially by Julien David Leroy, who was financed by the French Academy to pay a short visit to Greece and in 1758 brought out *Les Ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce*. In

Britain, the Dilettanti Society enabled James Stuart and Nicholas Revett to make a more thorough tour of Greece in 1751-54; their drawings eventually appeared as *The Antiquities of Greece*, which began publishing in 1762, though it was not completed until 1830. They firmly assigned artistic supremacy to ‘Athens, the mother of Elegance and Politeness, whose magnificence scarce yielded to that of Rome, and who for the beauties of a correct style must be allowed to surpass her, as much as an original excels a copy’.⁷ The Romans found a passionate defender in Giovanni Battista Piranesi, whose four-volume *Antichità romane* (1756-60) celebrated the creative genius of the Romans. After its completion, Piranesi issued a polemical volume, *Della magnificenza et architettura de’ Romani*, with thirty-eight plates, in which, as a patriotic Italian, he maintained that Roman art was indigenous to Italy and owed nothing to the Greeks. If the Romans had learnt from anyone, it was from the Etruscans, who were an older race than the Greeks and had perfected painting, sculpture, and the technical arts, at a much earlier date. Their art, and hence the Roman art inspired by it, had a grandeur and austerity similar to that of the Egyptians and much superior to the ‘vain prettiness’ of Greek art.⁸

Although Caylus is now recognized as having made a serious contribution to the study of ancient art, his work is inevitably overshadowed by the remarkable career and massive achievement of Winckelmann, who placed art history on a new basis. As David Constantine has written: ‘Nobody did more for the Idea and the Ideal of Greece than Johann Joachim Winckelmann. Through him, who never went there, the idea of the classical achievement clarified and became for much eighteenth-century artistic endeavour a polestar of nearly blinding brilliance.’⁹ Born in modest circumstances, the son of a cobbler, in the Prussian town of Stendal, Winckelmann attended grammar-school and university, but owed most to his own efforts.¹⁰ Working reluctantly as a schoolmaster, he sat up most nights studying Greek, and attained an exceptional mastery of the language. In 1748 he became librarian to a Saxon nobleman, Count von Bünau, at Nöthnitz near Dresden, and had access to the copies of Greek and Greco-Roman statues displayed in the cast gallery at Dresden. Thereafter Winckelmann navigated the world of patronage – the eighteenth-century equivalent of today’s grant-awarding bodies – with great skill.¹¹ He became a Roman Catholic in order to gain the support of highly-placed Catholics in Dresden, including Cardinal Alberico Archinto, the papal nuncio to the court of Saxony. A stipend from the Saxon court enabled him to move to Rome in 1755, just after publishing his short

but epoch-making essay, *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst* (1755).

In Rome Winckelmann studied ancient art with the help of the painter Anton Raphael Mengs, who likewise had a stipend from the Saxon court. He was librarian first to Cardinal Archinto, who by now had become papal secretary of state, then, after Archinto's death, to Cardinal Alessandro Albani, the greatest collector of antiquities in Rome, who built the Villa Albani (now the Villa Torlonia) to house his collection. Albani obtained for Winckelmann the sought-after position of *Prefetto dell'antichità di Roma* (superintendent of antiquities in Rome), and he also became German-language secretary for the Vatican. Besides many short studies, he wrote a monumental *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (1764). Winckelmann collected further material which appeared as *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (1767), and also published at his own expense a two-volume catalogue of Roman antiquities which he thought were insufficiently understood or appreciated, *Monumenti antichi inediti spiegati ed illustrati* (1767). In 1768, on his way back to Germany, he was murdered in an inn at Trieste; the circumstances are unclear, and the murder has sometimes been linked to Winckelmann's well-known homosexuality, but in fact the motive appears to have been simple robbery.¹²

During his Dresden period, Winckelmann read deeply in the literature of the French Enlightenment, and his aesthetic criteria, as Martin Fontius argues, owe much to French classicism.¹³ In particular, he was sharply conscious of the Querelle as the background to his own endeavours. Before writing the *Gedanken*, as Élisabeth Décultot has shown, he not only read widely in the history of painting and sculpture but acquired a comprehensive knowledge of the Querelle, including the English contribution by Wotton. Décultot finds implicit references to Perrault's *Parallèle* at many points in the *Gedanken*.¹⁴ It was in a hidden dialogue with Perrault, therefore, that Winckelmann, like Caylus, but even more emphatically, assigned the supreme place in art to the Greeks. This is already stated in his early essay on the imitation of Greek works. The Greeks had the advantage of having beautiful bodies, shaped by strenuous physical exercises and a moderate diet in a beneficent climate; unlike modern Europeans, they were not afflicted by smallpox or venereal diseases. However, their art was not simply an imitation of nature, as in modern Dutch realism. By selecting and combining the best features from various bodies, they produced images of the human form that reflected the ideal. The hallmark of the finest Greek

statues is beauty of soul, as Winckelmann says in this much-quoted and hugely influential passage: ‘The general outstanding feature of Greek masterpieces is finally a *noble simplicity* and *quiet grandeur*, both in posture and expression. As the depths of the sea always remain calm, however much its surface may rage, so the expression of Greek figures, despite their passions, reveals a great and composed soul.’¹⁵

The moderns cannot surpass the Greeks. All we can do is to imitate them. ‘The only way for us to become great, indeed inimitable, is the imitation of the ancients, and what someone said about Homer, that whoever has learnt to understand him also learns to admire him, applies also to the works of art produced by the ancients, especially by the Greeks.’¹⁶ There is, however, more than one kind of imitation. The Romans, lacking any artistic originality, simply produced pallid copies of Greek models. Their statues stand in the same relation to Greek sculpture as Virgil’s Dido does to her model, Nausicaa in the *Odyssey*. The great modern artists, among whom Winckelmann counts Raphael and Michelangelo, followed the Greeks by going back to the ideal source of beauty; Winckelmann quotes a letter from Raphael in which he claims to be following an idea rather than copying reality (p.68). In his own time, Winckelmann considered the leading artist to be his friend Mengs, whom he later described in his *History* as ‘the German Raphael’.¹⁷

This view of the Greeks, and the consequent disparagement of the Romans, is further developed in Winckelmann’s *History of Ancient Art*. By the time he wrote it, Winckelmann had hugely extended his knowledge of ancient sculpture. In Dresden he had seen only plaster casts, so crowded together that it was impossible to study them properly. More classical statues were to be seen in Rome than anywhere else. Winckelmann, like Caylus, believed that art history should deal only with works that the historian had actually seen, in contrast to earlier antiquaries who often based their accounts on written descriptions of works they had not seen. Unlike Caylus, who did not know the ancient languages, Winckelmann was an excellent philologist and was able to use written sources to supplement his visual inspection of works of art. His notes on Caylus’ *Recueil*, now kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale, contain many comments on Caylus’ inadequate learning.¹⁸

The *History* places Greek art within a historical scheme, and also distinguishes a historical development within Greek art itself. Winckelmann’s first three chapters describe the art of the Egyptians, Phoenicians, Persians and Etruscans. Turning to Greece, he elaborates his earlier account of the preconditions of Greek art: the Greeks

had not only a pleasant climate and physical culture which produced beautiful bodies, but also enjoyed political freedom and gave artists an honoured place in their society. Their art passed through four stages: the early style, powerful but hard; the grand or high style, achieved with Phidias; the beautiful style, which softens the high style by adding 'grace' or 'loveliness'; and finally an imitative style, when, as all ways of representing gods and heroes had been exhausted, artists had to fall back on imitating their predecessors and adding trivial elaborations. There follows a chapter on the Romans, which repeats Caylus' argument that they failed to develop any distinctive artistic style: 'It is indeed the case that the Roman artists would have developed no style of their own, for in the earliest times, they probably imitated the Etruscans, from whom they adopted many customs, especially religious ones; and in their later and flourishing periods, the few Roman artists would have been students of the Greeks.'¹⁹

In the renewed dispute between Ancients and Moderns, therefore, Winckelmann scored a decisive victory for the Ancients by establishing the Greeks as supreme in the arts. The Romans, whatever they might have accomplished in war and government, inaugurated a period of artistic decline which lasted through the Middle Ages until the recapture of the Greek spirit by the great artists of the High Renaissance. The arguments of the *History* were supported by Winckelmann's other writings and in particular by the rediscovery of the gigantic Greek temples at Paestum, which Winckelmann was the first German to see and describe. His enthusiastic response to Paestum contrasts with the frosty reactions of other travellers for whom the temples did not match their narrow conceptions of Greek art. James Adam, visiting Paestum in 1761, found them 'inelegant'.²⁰ Goethe, reaching them after an arduous journey through marshes frequented by water-buffalo, could not at first accommodate them within a view of classical architecture defined by Palladio: 'Our eyes and, through them, our whole sensibility have become so conditioned to a more slender style of architecture that these crowded masses of stumpy conical columns appear offensive and even terrifying.'²¹

Winckelmann's openness to unfamiliar forms of classical art is no doubt connected with his view of Greek art as embedded in its wider social and political setting. He insists that the supremacy of Greek art was linked to Greek freedom. In doing so, he idealized ancient Greece in a way that would be characteristic of the Romantic Hellenists he helped to inspire. They admired the Athenians' resistance to the power of Persia and the supposed freedom of Athenian democracy. In the more

jaundiced but probably more accurate account given by Jacob Burckhardt a century later, Athenian democracy was filled with chicanery, corruption, and denunciations, 'reminiscent of conditions under the Terror of 1793-4 in France'.²² He also introduced a twofold instability into his scheme. First, the division of Greek art into a number of phases, only one of which counted as ideal, reduced its authority. It was not Greek art as a whole that was supreme, but only one comparatively brief phase in its development. Second, by ascribing the qualities of Greek art to social and political circumstances, he historicized it and thus undermined his own claims for its suprahistorical, normative status. This applies equally to the 'Gedanken' and the History. As Décultot sums up, referring to the latter: 'Divisée en deux parties distinctes, l'une consacrée à l'art "selon son essence" et l'autre à l'art selon les "circonstances extérieures de l'époque", c'est-à-dire d'une part à l'idéal, d'autre part au tableau historique de son évolution, elle ne cesse de creuser le conflit entre historicité et normativité exacerbé par la Querelle.'²³

Winckelmann's depreciation of the Romans illustrates a change in eighteenth-century taste which directed attention away from Latin and towards Greek literature. Latin of course remained central to the school curriculum. But as the study of Greek developed at universities, Greek literature gained in interest and prestige. Just as Winckelmann considered Roman art derivative from Greek, so Herder thought Roman literature dependent on Greek: 'Roman poetry was only a foreign flower, which continued to flourish in Latium and occasionally acquired a subtler shade, but could not really generate any seeds of its own.'²⁴ Seneca, whose drama had inspired the Baroque theatre of the previous century, never recovered from the charge of bombast ('Schwulst') laid against him by Gottsched.²⁵ Herder disparages Latin poetry, even that of Catullus and Horace, as 'only an after-echo of the Greek lyre'.²⁶ Above all, Virgil was eclipsed by Homer. Homer was seen as an authentic primitive poet who presented the natural emotions and noble simplicity of a heroic age; Virgil was a court poet who modelled the first part of the *Aeneid* on the *Odyssey*, the second on the *Iliad*, in order to curry favour with his master Augustus.²⁷ The only enthusiast for Virgil among German writers of this period was Schiller, who translated parts of Books II and IV of the *Aeneid* into *ottava rima*.

Friedrich Schlegel

An ingenious attempt to define the difference between the Ancients and the Moderns was made by Friedrich Schlegel in his essay *Über das Studium der griechischen Poesie* (written in 1795, published in 1797). It is presented specifically as a contribution to the Querelle. Schlegel undertakes ‘to resolve the long quarrel between the partisan supporters of the ancient and the modern poets’.²⁸ In doing so, he is hardly even-handed, for he believes as firmly as Winckelmann in the supremacy of the Greeks’ achievement. However, he also thinks that modern literature has not yet realized its full potential, and suggests what a great work of modern literature might look like. To that extent, his essay deals not only with the past and the present, but also with the future – a threefold structure which, as we shall soon see, is much more clearly visible in Schiller’s contemporaneous essay *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung* (1795).

Like Winckelmann, and still more like Herder, Schlegel ascribes the Greek achievement to the unity of their culture, in which art, manners, and politics were all intimately and inseparably linked. Within this framework, their achievement rests on their relative simplicity and on their freedom. They retained the advantages of naturalness but also operated freely; they were not primitive people.

Only the development of pure humanity is true cultivation [*Bildung*]. Where else has free humanity attained such thorough predominance in the mass of the population, than among the Greeks? Where else was cultivation so genuine, and genuine cultivation so public? – Indeed, there is in the whole course of human history hardly a more sublime spectacle than that offered by the great moment in which suddenly and as though spontaneously, by the sheer development of the inner vital force, republicanism appeared in the Greek constitutions, ardour and wisdom in their manners, while in their scholarship the mythical order of the imagination was replaced by logical and systematic coherence, and in the Greek arts the ideal made its appearance.²⁹

Modern poetry cannot attain this ideal. By modern poetry Schlegel does not mean the literature of his own day. He means the literature resulting from the events that separate us from the ancient world: the rise of Christianity, the fall of the Roman Empire, the incursions of the Germanic barbarians, the medieval feudal system, the institutions of chivalry and courtly love. Often he defines post-classical literature as ‘romantic’ (*romantisch*). As exemplars of modern literature he refers to Dante and Shakespeare.

Among the features of modern literature Schlegel lists, the following are particularly important. First, while the poetry of the Greeks is natural, modern poetry is artificial. It depends on the intellect, on concepts, on theory, as Schlegel illustrates from Dante.

Thus it was dominated by concepts; and however meagre and obscure these might be, the intellect was still the guiding principle of aesthetic cultivation. – Dante's colossal work, this sublime phenomenon in the gloomy night of that iron age, is a new document proving the artificial character of the oldest modern poetry. In detail, nobody will mistake the omnipresent features of greatness which can only have sprung from that force of originality which can neither be taught nor learnt. But the eccentric construction of the mass, the extraordinary articulation of the whole gigantic work, derives neither from the divine bard, nor from the wise artist but from the Gothic concepts of the barbarians.³⁰

Schlegel is presumably alluding to the construction of the *Divine Comedy*, which consists of three parts, with 34, 33 and 33 cantos respectively, making a total of a hundred. This structure proceeds not from creative inspiration, nor from an artistic sense of symmetry, but is artificially imposed by the intellect ('Verstand'). Even when modern literature has put behind it the eccentricities of a medieval Gothic taste and, since the Renaissance, learnt aesthetic lessons from the classics, it remains dependent on the intellect. For since artistic creation by the moderns requires the prior study of the ancients, and the absorption of the rules and standards that they prescribe, modern literature must in part be an intellectual exercise. That is one form of the dominance of theory in modern literature.

Second, Schlegel conveys the character of modern culture in a very condensed sentence which needs to be carefully unpacked: 'Nothing can explain and confirm the artificiality of modern aesthetic cultivation better than the great *predominance of the individual, characteristic, and philosophical* in the whole mass of modern poetry.'³¹ Fortunately, he soon afterwards discusses *Hamlet*, which may help to explain the meaning of all three concepts. Clearly *Hamlet* is about an individual. In calling it 'characteristic' (*charakteristisch*), Schlegel means something like 'realistic': Hamlet is a particular person living in a particular setting, the court of Denmark, which is evoked in considerable detail. And this realistic or characteristic detail is a feature of modern literature from Dante, whose *Divine Comedy* is a parade of individuals, down to Fielding, Sterne and Wieland. As for philosophy, Schlegel remarks how much

modern literature is a vehicle for philosophical ideas. 'The tendency of the best and most famous modern poems is philosophical. Indeed, modern poetry seems here to have reached a certain perfection, the highest in its kind.'³² For this and other reasons, Shakespeare is the pre-eminent modern poet:

Of all artists, however, Shakespeare is the one who most fully and aptly characterizes the spirit of modern poetry in general. He unites the most charming blossoms of romantic imagination, the gigantic greatness of the Gothic heroic age, with the deepest and richest poetic philosophy.³³

All this, however, this makes Shakespeare very different from an ancient poet. For an ancient poet like Homer is 'objektiv', whereas Shakespeare is 'interessant'. Homer, as is well known, never intrudes his personality into his poems, whereas with Shakespeare we are conscious of his individual, subjective way of looking at things. His individuality comes across in what Schlegel calls his 'Manier', his manner.³⁴ The term 'manner' (*maniera*) goes back to Vasari, who applies it to painting based not on immediate observation but on the artist's recollection of the object, and hence with more scope for the artist to reveal his individual manner. It was given currency by Goethe, who on his return from Italy published in 1789 an essay entitled 'Einfache Nachahmung der Natur, Manier, Styl', in which 'manner' denotes the artist's individual slant and is inferior to the higher objectivity of 'style' (but does not yet have the negative connotations of present-day 'mannered', 'manieriert').³⁵ Schlegel operates with a similar contrast when he maintains that Greek poetry is not individual but 'allgemeingültig', appealing to everyone, with no individuality to put some people off.

This lack of universal appeal, this dominance of the mannered, characteristic and individual, itself explains the complete orientation of the moderns' poetry, indeed of their entire aesthetic cultivation, towards the interesting. Every original individual is *interesting* that contains a large quantum of intellectual content or aesthetic energy.³⁶

Schlegel is not content with this development. In 1795 he still thinks that Greek art sets an absolute standard. Art ought to be ideal, abstracted from particular local and characteristic and individual features. It should be objective. Its appeal should be universal ('allgemeingültig'), directed to what Kant called the

‘Gemeinsinn’. Despite the vast expanse of time separating us from the Greeks, we must appreciate them in their own right, not regard them with nostalgia or mistakenly project back onto them our standard of the ‘interesting’. His example of nostalgia is the hero of Goethe’s *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* (*The Sorrows of Young Werther*, 1774, revised 1787). In a famous episode, Werther, having been asked to leave a social gathering of aristocrats because he is a commoner, goes in his carriage to a nearby hill and reads the *Odyssey* in the light of the setting sun, enjoying the passage where Odysseus finds refuge with a swineherd. Schlegel warns, however, that we should not project onto Homer our yearning for the simpler life of the past:

On the whole, however, the real modern criterion of aesthetic value is still the *interesting*. To project this standpoint onto Greek poetry means *modernizing* it. Anyone who finds Homer merely interesting, profanes him. [...] Such a Werther-like view of the venerable poet is neither a pure enjoyment of the beautiful nor a pure appreciation of art.³⁷

However, Schlegel thinks it possible that modern literature may still develop beyond the merely individual, mannered, or ‘interesting’. And he sees signs of hope in Goethe’s *Faust*. The full text of *Faust*, Part One, would not appear till 1808, but in 1790 Goethe had published an incomplete version as *Faust. Ein Fragment*. Schlegel thinks that in Goethe we have the dawn of a new art. ‘Goethe’s poetry is the dawn of genuine art and pure beauty.’³⁸ If *Faust* were completed, it would surpass *Hamlet*, for Goethe is aiming at the objective. One can see what Schlegel means if one reflects that Faust is an individual, but not ‘charakteristisch’ or realistic. What little we learn of his biography (that he is a university professor, and the son of a doctor) is quite different from the information given about a character in a realistic novel such as *Tom Jones*. So remote is *Faust* from realism that its protagonist can sign a pact with the Devil, and become thirty years younger in the ‘Witch’s Kitchen’ scene, without being essentially changed. If *Faust* were completed, therefore, it might embody the art-work of the future, the modern counterpart to the ancient Greeks, starting from an individual basis but nevertheless rivalling their artistic objectivity.

Schiller

Although Schlegel wished to ignore the temporal distance between the ancients and the moderns, Schiller in his treatise *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung* accepts this distance as a central and irreducible fact. He builds around it a scheme of the relation between ancient and modern literature which is his response to the Querelle and which also, much more emphatically than Schlegel's essay, is oriented towards the future.

Schiller's starting-point is the tension between culture and nature. Humanity lives in culture, but feels a yearning for nature. In the natural world, in landscapes, in animals, in children, we see something natural, for which Schiller uses the word 'naive'.

We then see in irrational Nature only a happier sister who stayed in the maternal home from which we stormed forth exulting in our freedom. With painful desire we long to be back there as soon as we begin to feel the constraints of culture, and we hear the appealing voice of our mother in the distant land of art.³⁹

But Schiller knows that we cannot really get back to nature. He rebukes Rousseau for his attachment to an imagined past golden age. He knows and says that the naive is a quality that we project into nature. Estrangement from nature is part of our humanity, which moves from a lost unity via estrangement to an ultimate restitution of unity: 'Nature makes him one with himself, art divides and separates him, he returns to unity through the ideal.'⁴⁰ The poet cannot really go backward; he must go forward. Poetry should judge the present, not by the standard of a lost Arcadia, but by that of a future Elysium.

However, some people, and some writers, are simpler, more natural, less sophisticated and artificial, than others, and it is in such writers that we feel the charm of the natural. In fact all poets are the preservers of nature, 'die *Bewahrer der Natur*'.⁴¹ But they may be so in one of two ways. They may themselves share the simplicity of nature. In that case they are naive (in no disparaging sense).⁴² Or they may feel the attraction of natural simplicity and at the same time be acutely conscious of their estrangement from it. These are the 'sentimentalisch' poets. To avoid the negative connotations of the English word 'sentimental', I shall use Schiller's word 'sentimentalisch'.

Schiller was moved to propose this dichotomy by the Querelle, to which he too alludes. But he points out that the argument was circular. For if you take from the ancient poets the criteria by which poetry is to be judged, then by these criteria the moderns are bound to fall short.⁴³ It is equally wrong to judge ancient poets by modern standards. So for Schiller the naive and the 'sentimentalisch' are not qualities bound to particular epochs, and hence not coextensive with Ancients versus Moderns, but qualities poetry can exhibit at any time. There were 'sentimentalisch' poets in the ancient world, and there are naive poets in our day. His main example of the latter is Goethe, and it is curious that while Schlegel praised Goethe for restoring the objectivity typical of ancient art, Schiller praises him for recreating naive simplicity in the midst of the modern world. He calls Goethe a poet 'in whom Nature works more faithfully and purely than in any other, and who, of all modern poets, is perhaps least removed from the sensuous truth of things'.⁴⁴

Nevertheless, Schiller's scheme is historical. Sharing the tendency to disparage the Romans in favour of the Greeks which set in with Winckelmann, he makes Homer the supreme example of a naive poet, while most of the Roman poets – Virgil, Horace, Propertius, and to a lesser extent Ovid – are 'sentimentalisch'.⁴⁵ The Greeks, compared to their successors, were closer to nature and found it easier to assume a naive attitude. That does not mean, however, that they wrote about nature. They were not particularly interested in nature as such, because it was all round them. It is modern people, estranged from nature, who find it attractive, and this estrangement and yearning are the hallmarks of the sentimental.

They felt naturally; we feel the natural. The feeling that filled Homer's soul when he made his divine swineherd entertain Ulysses was without a doubt quite different from what stirred the soul of young Werther when he read this poem after a disagreeable social occasion. Our feeling for nature resembles an invalid's feeling for health.⁴⁶

One can amplify Schiller's contrast by noting that Werther's return to nature is itself artificial: he takes a carriage, goes to a particular scenic viewpoint to watch the sun setting, and experiences nature with the aid of a book. Odysseus enjoys simplicity, Werther reads about it.

Thus, though the difference is one of degree, naive poetry puts us more directly in touch with nature, sentimentalisch poetry connects us with it in a multiply

mediated way. One of these mediations is of course through the poet himself. In naive poetry, the poet disappears behind the work. We know nothing of Homer's personality, and very little about that of Shakespeare, who for Schiller is a great naive poet of modern times. Schiller contrasts how similar situations are treated by Homer and by a reflective modern poet, Ariosto. In Book VI of the *Iliad*, a Greek and a Trojan warrior discover that they are linked by ties of guest-friendship, so stop fighting and exchange armour, with no comment whatever from Homer. In Canto I of the *Orlando Furioso*, a Christian and a Saracen find that they are both pursuing the same girl, so stop fighting and set off after her on a single horse. Ariosto adds a stanza of comment, emphasizing the difference between behaviour in his time and the 'noble chivalry of knights of yore'.⁴⁷

More generally, modern literature introduces ironic, reflective distance between the narrated events and the narrator. For, Schiller tells us, sentimentalisch poetry is pre-eminently reflective. The naive poet depicts his material, and the material itself moves us. The 'sentimentalisch' poet reflects on his material, and the effect on our emotions comes via his reflections.

To explain this further, Schiller distinguishes two poetic modes which depend on this reflective distance from the object presented: elegy and satire. Both depend on the distance between the real and the ideal. Both find the real wanting by the standard of the ideal. The elegiac poet dwells on the lost ideal, while the satiric poet attacks the deficiencies of the real. Satire may be humorous or savage. Elegiac writing too has subdivisions. If the poet laments the loss of the ideal, he writes elegy; if he represents the ideal as actually existing, he writes an idyll:

Either Nature and the ideal are objects of mourning, the former being represented as lost, the latter as unattained. Or both are an object of joy, being presented as real. The first gives the *elegy* in its narrow sense, the latter the *idyll* in its broadest sense.⁴⁸

Schiller has much to say about both genres, with some acute criticism especially of eighteenth-century poets, and his account of the idyll is particularly remarkable. He means in part the pastoral idyll of Theocritus and Virgil, and he talks about the eighteenth-century idylls of Salomon Gessner. The idyll is more than a pretty poem about shepherds. Its pastoral setting simply serves the purpose of depicting humankind in a state of innocence.

But the pastoral idyll also gives us a hint of a higher poetic task. For innocence and harmony with one's surroundings are not only the imagined past of humanity; they are also its ultimate goal. And so the task of the poet might be to imagine a future idyll in which simplicity is reconciled with complexity, in which man is not an empty vessel waiting to be filled at the beginning of the culture, but full, complete, replete, and in a state of repose at the end of culture.

The prevailing impression given by this poetic mode would be *repose*, but the repose of completion, not of indolence; a repose resulting not from the stasis of forces but from their balance, from fullness, not from emptiness, and accompanied by the feeling of infinite potential.⁴⁹

As there is no way back to Arcadia; the poet should guide us on the way to Elysium.

Let him undertake an idyll which will present pastoral innocence in the subjects of culture and under all the conditions of the most vigorous, passionate life, the most extensive thought, the most ingenious art, the utmost social refinement, which, in a word, leads humanity, since we cannot return to Arcadia, forward to Elysium.⁵⁰

The artwork of the future, which Friedrich Schlegel anticipated in the completed *Faust*, is for Schiller something much more remote and difficult: a combination of extreme innocence and extreme sophistication. Gessner's pastorals, hugely popular in the mid-eighteenth century, fall between two stools by making Arcadian shepherds talk the language of eighteenth-century sensibility, and thus appear neither fully natural nor fully ideal. Milton achieves more when he depicts the still unfallen Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost*, which Schiller calls 'the most beautiful idyll known to me in the *sentimentalisch* genre'.⁵¹ But the poem combining the naive with the 'sentimentalisch', the sophisticated and reflective idyll, is still to come. And since it is only anticipated, it forms the third term in a triadic structure, where previous versions of the *Querelle* had only a dyad. Instead of the binary of Ancient and Modern, Schiller gives us the threefold scheme of naive, 'sentimentalisch', and their reconciliation in the still unknown future.

Schiller thus transfers the *Querelle*'s opposition between Ancients and Moderns into a different historical scheme, one that was to become standard among German thinkers of the Romantic generation. As Peter-André Alt points out, many of

Schiller's younger contemporaries, among them Hölderlin, Novalis, Schelling and Hegel, conceived of history as a three-stage process. An initial period of cultural unity and harmony was succeeded by an era of fragmentation, accompanied by an increase in philosophical reflection, and finally the two would be reconciled by the restoration of innocence under the changed conditions of aesthetic modernity.⁵² This triadic scheme is in turn a secularized version of the Christian narrative of the fall and redemption of humanity.⁵³ Thus the Querelle, after its emigration to Germany, ends by being absorbed into the master narrative of Western culture.

¹ For an introductory survey, see Ritchie Robertson, *Mock-epic poetry from Pope to Heine* (Oxford, 2009), p.75-85.

² This version of literary history, which is still standard though without its nationalist bias, found perhaps its most authoritative statement in Friedrich Meinecke, *Die Entstehung des Historismus* (first published in 1936; edited with an introduction by Carl Hinrichs, Munich, 1965).

³ Hans Robert Jauss, 'Schlegels und Schillers Replik auf die "Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes"', in his *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation* (Frankfurt a.M., 1970), p.67-106.

⁴ See Norbert Miller, 'Winckelmann und der Griechenstreit. Überlegungen zur Historisierung der Antiken-Anschauung im 18. Jahrhundert', in *Johann Joachim Winckelmann 1717-1768*, ed. Thomas W. Gaehtgens (Hamburg, 1986), p.239-64.

⁵ See Alain Schnapp, *Discovery of the past: the origin of archaeology*, tr. by Ian Kinnes and Gillian Vardell (London, 1996), p.238-42.

⁶ Caylus, *Recueil d'Antiquités égyptiennes, étrusques, grecques et romaines* (Paris, chez Desaint & Saillant, 1752), vol.1, p.158.

⁷ Quoted in J. Mordaunt Crook, *The Greek Revival: neo-classical attitudes in British architecture 1760-1870* (London, 1972), p.16.

⁸ See Hugh Honour, *Neo-Classicism* (Harmondsworth, 1977), p.50-57; John Wilton-Ely, *The Mind and art of Giovanni Battista Piranesi* (London, 1978), p.65-67.

⁹ David Constantine, *Early Greek travellers and the Hellenic ideal* (Cambridge, 1984), p.104.

¹⁰ For this biographical sketch I have drawn especially on Alex Potts, 'Introduction', in Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *History of the art of antiquity*, tr. Harry Francis Mallgrave (Los Angeles, 2006), p.1-53.

¹¹ On Winckelmann's management of his career, see Katherine Harloe, *Winckelmann and the invention of antiquity: history and aesthetics in the age of 'Altertumswissenschaft'* (Oxford, 2013).

¹² See Lionel Gossman, 'Death in Trieste', *Journal of European studies* 22 (1992), p.207-40.

¹³ Martin Fontius, *Winckelmann und die französische Aufklärung* (Berlin, 1968): 'In der Tat kann Winckelmanns Ästhetik eine Reproduktion der wesentlichsten Lehrsätze der französischen Klassik genannt werden' (p.7).

¹⁴ Élisabeth Décultot, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: enquête sur la g n se de l'histoire de l'art* (Paris, 2000), p.92.

¹⁵ 'Das allgemeine vorz gliche Kennzeichen der griechischen Meisterst cke ist endlich eine *edle Einfalt* und eine *stille Gr  e*, sowohl in der Stellung als im Ausdruck. So wie die Tiefe des Meers allezeit ruhig bleibt, die Oberfl che mag noch so w ten, eben so zeigt der Ausdruck in den Figuren der Griechen bei allen Leidenschaften eine gro e und gesetzte Seele.' Johann Winckelmann, *S mmtliche Werke*, ed. Josef Eiselein (1825; Osnabr ck, 1965), vol.1, p.30-31. Emphasis in the original. This and other translations from German are mine unless otherwise stated.

¹⁶ 'Der einzige Weg f r uns, gro , ja, wenn es m glich ist, unnachahmlich zu werden, ist die Nachahmung der Alten, und was jemand von *Homer* gesagt, da  derjenige ihn bewundern lernt, der ihn wohl verstehen gelernt, gilt auch von den Kunstwerken der Alten, sonderlich der Griechen.' Winckelmann, *Werke*, vol.1, p.8.

¹⁷ Winckelmann, *History*, p.213.

¹⁸ See  lisabeth D cultot, 'Winckelmann et Caylus: enqu te sur les rapports de l'histoire de l'art au savoir antiquaire', in *Le comte de Caylus: Les Arts et les Lettres*, ed. Nicholas Cronk and Kris Peeters (Amsterdam and New York, 2004), p.59-78 (p.61).

¹⁹ Winckelmann, *History*, p.284. Cf.: 'Die r mischen K nstler sind als Nachahmer der Griechen anzusehen, und haben also keine besondere Schule und keinen eigenen Styl bilden k nnen': *Geschichte*

der Kunst des Altertums, in *Winckelmanns Werke*, vol.5, p.265. On how far Winckelmann drew on earlier authors, particularly Vasari, for his historical scheme, see Alex Potts, *Flesh and the ideal: Winckelmann and the origins of art history* (New Haven and London, 1994), p.72-81.

²⁰ Quoted in Constantine, *Early Greek travellers*, p.114.

²¹ J.W. Goethe, *Italian Journey*, tr. W.H. Auden and Elizabeth Mayer (Harmondsworth, 1970), p.218. For the original, see Johann Wolfgang Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke: Briefe, Tagebücher und Gespräche*, ed. by Friedmar Apel and others, 40 vols (Frankfurt a.M., 1986-2000), vol.15/1, ed. by Christoph Michel and Hans-Georg Dewitz (1993), p.236-37.

²² Jacob Burckhardt, *The Greeks and Greek civilization*, tr. Sheila Stern (London, 1998), p.303.

²³ Décultot, *Winckelmann*, p.93.

²⁴ 'Die Poesie der Römer war nur eine ausländische Blume, die in Latium zwar schön fortgeblühet und hie und da eine feinere Farbe gewonnen hat; eigentlich aber keine neuen eignen Fruchtkerne erzeugen konnte.' Johann Gottfried Herder, *Werke*, ed. Günter Arnold and others, 10 vols (Frankfurt a.M., 1985-2000), vol.7: *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, ed. by Martin Bollacher (1989), p.616.

²⁵ For his influence on Lessing, however, see Wilfried Barner, *Produktive Rezeption: Lessing und die Tragödien Senecas* (Munich, 1973).

²⁶ nur ein Nachhall der griechischen Lyra'. Herder, *Werke*, vol.7, p.446.

²⁷ See Kirsti Simonsuuri, *Homer's original genius* (Cambridge, 1979); Theodore Ziolkowski, *Virgil and the moderns* (Princeton, 1993), p.77-79.

²⁸ 'den langen Streit der einseitigen Freunde der alten und der neuen Dichter zu schlichten'. 'Über das Studium der griechischen Poesie' in *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe*, ed. by Ernst Behler and others, 35 vols (Paderborn, 1979--), vol.1: Studien zum klassischen Altertum, ed. by Ernst Behler (1979), p.207. For a study of Schlegel's essay in relation to the Querelle, see Ernst Behler, *German Romantic Literary Theory* (Cambridge, 1993), p.95-108.

²⁹ Nur Entwicklung der reinen Menschheit ist wahre Bildung. Wo hat freie Menschheit in der Masse des Volks ein so durchgängiges Übergewicht erhalten als bei den Griechen? Wo war die Bildung so echt, und echte Bildung so öffentlich? - In der Tat, kaum gibt es im ganzen Lauf der Menschengeschichte ein erhabeneres Schauspiel, als der große Augenblick darbietet, da mit einem Male und gleichsam von selbst, durch bloße Entwicklung der innern Lebenskraft, in den griechischen Verfassungen Republikanismus, in den Sitten Enthusiasmus und Weisheit, in den Wissenschaften, statt der mythischen Anordnung der Phantasie, logischer und systematischer Zusammenhang, und in dem griechischen Künsten das Ideal hervortrat.' *Ibid.*, p.286.

³⁰ 'Sie stand also unter der Herrschaft von Begriffen; und so dürftig und dunkel diese auch sein möchten, so war doch der Verstand das lenkende Prinzip der ästhetischen Bildung. - Das kolossalische Werk des Dante, dieses erhabne Phänomen in der trüben Nacht jenes eisernen Zeitalters, ist ein neues Dokument für den künstlichen Charakter der ältesten modernen Poesie. Im einzelnen wird niemand die großen, überall verbreiteten Züge verkennen, die nur aus jener ursprünglichen Kraft gequollen sein können, welcher weder gelehrt noch gelernt werden kann. Die eigensinnige Anordnung der Masse aber, den höchst seltsamen Gliederbau des ganzen Riesenwerks verdanken wir weder dem göttlichen Barden, noch dem weisen Künstler, sondern den gotischen Begriffen der Barbaren.' *Ibid.*, p.233.

³¹ 'Nichts kann die Künstlichkeit der modernen ästhetischen Bildung besser erläutern und bestätigen, als das große *Übergewicht des Individuellen, Charakteristischen und Philosophischen* in der ganzen Masse der modernen Poesie.' *Ibid.*, p.241.

³² 'Die Tendenz der meisten, trefflichsten und berühmtesten modernen Gedichte ist philosophisch. Ja, die moderne Poesie scheint hier eine gewisse Vollendung, ein Höchstes in ihrer Art erreicht zu haben.' *Ibid.*, p.242-3.

³³ 'Shakespeare aber ist unter allen Künstlern derjenige, welcher den Geist der modernen Poesie überhaupt am vollständigsten und am treffendsten charakterisiert. In ihm vereinigen sich die reizendsten Blüten der romantischen Phantasie, die gigantische Größe der gotischen Heldenzeit, mit den feinsten Zügen moderner Geselligkeit, mit der tiefsten und reichhaltigsten poetischen Philosophie.' *Ibid.*, p.249.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p.251-52.

³⁵ 'Einfache Nachahmung der Natur, Manier, Styl', in Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke*, vol.18: *Ästhetische Schriften 1771-1805*, ed. by Friedmar Apel (1998), p.225-29. For a translation, see *Goethe on Art*, ed. and tr. John Gage (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1980), p.21-24.

³⁶ 'Aus diesem Mangel der Allgemeingültigkeit, aus dieser Herrschaft des Manierierten, Charakteristischen und Individuellen, erklärt sich von selbst die durchgängige Richtung der Poesie, ja der ganzen ästhetischen Bildung der Modernen aufs Interessante. Interessant nämlich ist jedes

originelle Individuum, welches ein größeres Quantum von intellektuellem Gehalt oder ästhetischer Energie enthält.' Schlegel, 'Über das Studium der griechischen Poesie', p.252-3.

³⁷ 'Im Ganzen aber ist noch immer das *Interessante* der eigentliche moderne Maßstab des ästhetischen Werts. Diesen Gesichtspunkt auf die griechische Poesie übertragen, heißt sie *modernisieren*. Wer den Homer nur interessant findet, der entweicht ihn. [...] Eine solche Werthersche Ansicht des ehrwürdigen Dichters ist kein reiner Genuß des Schönen, keine reine Würdigung der Kunst.' Schlegel, 'Über das Studium der griechischen Poesie', p.346.

³⁸ 'Goethens Poesie ist die Morgenröte echter Kunst und reiner Schönheit.' Schlegel, 'Über das Studium der griechischen Poesie', p.260.

³⁹ 'Wir sehen alsdann in der unvernünftigen Natur nur eine glücklichere Schwester, die in dem mütterlichen Hause zurückblieb, aus welchem wir im Übermut unserer Freiheit heraus in die Fremde stürmten. Mit schmerzlichem Verlangen sehnen wir uns dahin zurück, sobald wir angefangen, die Drangsale der Kultur zu erfahren, und hören im fernen Auslande der Kunst der Mutter rührende Stimme.' Friedrich Schiller, *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung*, in his *Werke und Briefe*, ed. by Otto Dann and others, 12 vols (Frankfurt a.M., 1992-2005), vol.8: Theoretische Schriften, ed. by Rolf-Peter Janz (1992), p.722.

⁴⁰ 'Die Natur macht ihn mit sich eins, die Kunst trennt und entzweiet ihn, durch das Ideal kehrt er zur Einheit zurück.' *Ibid.*, p.735.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p.728.

⁴² On previous uses of 'naiv' and its cognates as critical terms, see Peter-André Alt, *Schiller: Leben – Werk – Zeit*, 2 vol. (Munich, 2000), vol.2, p.211-12. Schiller may have known how Diderot uses it in *Pensées détachées sur la peinture*: 'Pour dire ce que je sens, il faut que je fasse un mot, ou du moins que j'entende l'acception d'un mot déjà fait – c'est *naïf*. Outre la simplicité qu'il exprimait, il y faut joindre l'innocence, la vérité et l'originalité d'une enfance heureuse qui n'a point été contrainte.' Quoted in Schiller, *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung*, ed. by W.F. Mainland, Blackwell's German Texts (Oxford, 1957), p.106.

⁴³ Schiller, *Werke und Briefe*, vol.8, p.736.

⁴⁴ '[ein Dichter] in welchem die Natur getreuer und reiner als in irgendeinem andern wirkt, und der sich unter modernen Dichtern vielleicht am wenigsten von der sinnlichen Wahrheit der Dinge entfernt'. *Ibid.*, p.760.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p.727-28.

⁴⁶ 'Sie empfanden natürlich; wir empfinden das Natürliche. Es war ohne Zweifel ein ganz anderes Gefühl, was Homers Seele füllte, als er seinen göttlichen Sauhirt den Ulysses bewirten ließ, als was die Seele des jungen Werthers bewegte, da er nach einer lästigen Gesellschaft diesen Gesang las. Unser Gefühl für Natur gleicht der Empfindung des Kranken für die Gesundheit.' *Ibid.*, p.727.

⁴⁷ Ludovico Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, tr. Barbara Reynolds, 2 vols (Harmondsworth, 1973), vol.1, p.122. See Schiller, *Werke und Briefe*, vol.8, p.730.

⁴⁸ 'Entweder ist die Natur und das Ideal ein Gegenstand der Trauer, wenn jene als verloren, dieses als unerreicht dargestellt wird. Oder beide sind ein Gegenstand der Freude, indem sie als wirklich vorgestellt werden. Das erste gibt die *Elegie* in engerer, das andere die *Idylle* in weitester Bedeutung.' *Ibid.*, p.748..

⁴⁹ '*Ruhe* wäre also der herrschende Eindruck dieser Dichtungsart, aber Ruhe der Vollendung, nicht der Trägheit; eine Ruhe, die aus dem Gleichgewicht, nicht aus dem Stillstand der Kräfte, die aus der Fülle, nicht aus der Leerheit fließt und von dem Gefühl eines unendlichen Vermögens begleitet wird.' *Ibid.*, p.775-6.

⁵⁰ 'Er mache sich die Aufgabe einer Idylle, welche jene Hirtenunschuld auch in Subjekten der Kultur und unter allen Bedingungen des rüstigsten feurigsten Lebens, des ausgebreitetsten Denkens, der raffiniertesten Kunst, der höchsten gesellschaftlichen Verfeinerung ausführt, welche, mit einem Wort, den Menschen, der nun einmal nicht mehr nach *Arkadien* zurückkann, bis nach *Elysium* führt.' *Ibid.*, p.775..

⁵¹ 'die schönste mir bekannte Idylle in der sentimentalischen Gattung', *ibid.*, p.774.

⁵² Alt, *Schiller*, vol.2, p.216.

⁵³ See M.H. Abrams, *Natural supernaturalism: tradition and revolution in Romantic literature* (New York, 1971); Schiller's essay is discussed on p.213-16.