

Richard C. Spuler

### *Wilhelm Tell* as American Myth

To this day, Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* remains a popular and frequently performed work in the repertoire of German-language theaters. As the play became an increasingly important component of school and university curricula during the second half of the nineteenth century, it also secured a place within the German notion of *Bildung und Kultur* emanating from that time; a disproportionate number of lines from *Tell* became *geflügelte Worte*.<sup>1</sup> In 1973, Heinz Tischer commented that the decade-long reading of *Tell* as a canonized classic has done more harm than good: The work has long been used to demonstrate and to "drill" basic concepts of dramaturgy in a relatively superficial manner.<sup>2</sup> Beyond that, the reception of *Tell* has established interpretations of the play which derive less from the work itself than from pedagogical and, more important still, ideological objectives. In fact, with *Tell* one can trace the formation of a literary canon, the institutionalization and enshrining of a few core works to the exclusion of others, particularly evident in the reception of German classicism within Wilhelminian Germany.

The sixteen different American editions of *Wilhelm Tell* prior to 1905 are symptomatic of the nearly wholesale assimilation of German classicism by American *Germanistik*. For the American student, reading eighteenth-century German literature was (and remains) problematic, both in terms of linguistic comprehension and historical acculturation. Noted Germanists of the years around the turn of the century complained of the misuse of these works by subjecting them to "grammatical formalism." The issue continued to generate dissatisfaction with regard to the pedagogical role of German classics within the American curriculum. By 1911, Starr W. Cutting admitted that "we have all been distressed at the signal failure attendant upon the use of eighteenth century classics as an introduction of American learners to German literature."<sup>3</sup>

This sentiment was at odds with another force of the literary canonization of *Tell*: Any canon tends to codify works as exemplary, to invoke from them aesthetic and even ethical norms. The larger view of

German classicism was elaborated by Julius Goebel in 1887, when he wrote that

the study of the German classics has to be made the means of a "higher education," as Goethe expresses it, and fortunately German classical literature contains the material necessary for this purpose. It furthermore represents in its historical development a gradual realization of the modern human ideal which finally culminates in the maturest productions of Goethe and Schiller.<sup>4</sup>

As one investigator has assessed, prior to 1870 in America, "*Tell* was the favorite of all the plays, not only because it celebrated the theme of political liberty but also because it retold a story long popular in America."<sup>5</sup> The preface to an edition of *Tell* in 1854 claimed that

of all the German literary productions there is perhaps not one with which Americans sympathize so completely as with Schiller's great Drama [sic] of *Wilhelm Tell*: the unity of action, the spirit of liberty which pervades every line, the simplicity of the scenes, the few difficulties which its language presents, when compared with other works of equal worth, all combine to make this a general favorite with those who study the German language.<sup>6</sup>

In general, the play appears to have accommodated the American reader; *Tell* was the most frequently edited of Schiller's works. Robert W. Deering's edition of 1895 acknowledged that "There is, perhaps, no German play better suited to the needs of students than Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell*. Its noble theme, its simple style, lofty poetic tone and wonderful dramatic power make it in every way an admirable text for class use."<sup>7</sup> *Tell*, "so often the first classical German drama to be read in our schools,"<sup>8</sup> was given preferential treatment, and from Palmer's edition in 1906 we can infer that *Tell* had indeed been acclaimed as the paradigmatic "classical" work: "*Wilhelm Tell* is not only in the best sense the most popular of German dramas, but also a work of art characteristic of the classical age of German literature and a monument of the cooperation of Goethe and Schiller."<sup>9</sup>

What standards of evaluation did critics apply to *Tell*? How did they form judgments as literary critics or, as teachers of the play, how did they encourage student response? Frederick Steuber, for instance, aimed at "getting pupils in the right attitude to 'enjoy' *Tell*," and he assured readers that

an earnest teacher, thoroughly familiar not only with the drama as a whole, but also with the content of every scene, as well as with the very language in which it is expressed; a teacher who is moved by the sentiments of liberty and patriotism in the drama, and can visualize the scenes with their setting in the Forest Cantons, cannot help passing on to his pupil that appreciative spirit which will never cease to glow and illuminate.<sup>10</sup>

Steuber proposed fundamentally characteristic attitudes with respect to the reading of *Tell*. One concerns evoking an empathetic response in the reader. Richard A. Minckwitz' edition of 1905 advised seeking a

"heightened . . . interest and appreciation," and suggested "that the student in approaching a masterpiece of literature should have some acquaintance with the estimation in which it is held by the most eminent critics."<sup>11</sup> It is probably neither correct nor fair to maintain that independent reading of the work was altogether discouraged. More precise would be to suggest that individual analysis was attenuated and rechanneled so that the student was encouraged to respond to the work above all in an "emotional" manner, empathetically rather than critically. Minckwitz appears to argue for a knowledge of the reception of the work, of the "secondary literature," in order to assist in and form a corrective to the individual's potential understanding (or more likely, misunderstanding) of the play. But this is true only in part. Nowhere does he speak of a discriminating purview of the literature on *Tell*, only a familiarity with, an assimilation of, "the most eminent critics." The priorities of his ideal reception ("heightened interest and appreciation") and that of Steuber ("appreciative spirit") suggest a curtailment of discriminating and differentiated analysis. This attitude is summed up in Bayard Taylor's quixotic claim that *Tell* "has that exquisite beauty and vitality which defy criticism."<sup>12</sup>

Steuber's proposed disposition for the reading of *Tell* ("that appreciative spirit which will never cease to glow and illuminate") points to another aspect of *Tell*'s intermix with American myth: Part of creating an empathetic environment for the play's reception meant evaluating the play within a context meaningful to the American student. Concepts of freedom and patriotism thus formed a natural locus of these evaluations, and *Tell* became a suitable instrument for fostering not only a sense of German nationality, but also of American patriotism. America's foremost Schiller scholar at the turn of the century, Calvin Thomas, wrote that patriotism was a sentiment "worthy of a lasting reverence, it is that one which attaches men to the motherland and leads them to stand together against an alien oppressor."<sup>13</sup> Daniel B. Shumway spoke of being "thrilled by the patriotic fervor of Wilhelm Tell," and noted that "Schiller is popular because he is so intensely patriotic at large."<sup>14</sup> And W. H. Carruth knew that

despite all technical faults, *Wilhelm Tell* has remained one of the most popular pieces on the German stage, and has had an incalculable effect on the cultivation of national feeling. Its popularity has always been greatest in periods of national consciousness, as in 1813-15, 1848, and 1870.<sup>15</sup>

The larger implications of the play's effect were not lost on Carruth, who predicted that *Tell* would replace the *Aeneid* in school and university curricula: "And who can compare the two with reference to their suitability to the rearing of American youth without admitting that the change will be a gain?"<sup>16</sup>

These responses to *Tell*, stemming from the 1890s and the early 1900s, are noticeably different from Bayard Taylor's enraptured awe for the play in 1879 ("that exquisite beauty and vitality which defy criticism") and, also in 1879, J. K. Hosmer's subjective myth-making (he

narrated his thoughts while wandering through the Forest Cantons: "My mind was full of thoughts of *Tell*; I obstinately rejected the mythical explanation of the story; I insisted upon believing it in all its length and breadth."<sup>17</sup> To be sure, as the nineteenth century came to a close, a current of nationalism ran through America, instigated by a series of imperialistic ventures. Following the Spanish-American War in 1898, the United States took control of the Spanish islands of Cuba and Puerto Rico, and of the Philippines. In the same year the Pacific islands of Hawaii were annexed, and in 1903 the United States government supported revolution in Panama to assure control of the Panama Canal. The administration of Theodore Roosevelt from 1901 until 1909 spearheaded these territorial acquisitions. And one cannot ignore the fact that these were the years, throughout the Western world, of surging nationalism and empire ideologies.

Within this nexus, it became common to view *Tell* in terms of an "American analogy." Richard Hochdoerfer wrote in 1905 that "to an American college student [*Tell*] is usually a source of inspiration. Witnessing the revolt of a brave people against foreign oppression, he is reminded of the great conflict of his own country."<sup>18</sup> Those who espoused the drama's intent of national unity found in *Tell* a "drama of liberty"<sup>19</sup> particularly adapted to the American audience. Most critics recognized in *Tell* "not a revolution, but an insistence upon constitutional rights within the empire."<sup>20</sup> It was not uncommon to view this "message" of the play as the realization of a development within Schiller's dramas which finally culminated in his "classical works": "The effort of individual fanatics or revolutionaries to overthrow all law and order in attaining an imaginary freedom [in Schiller's early dramas] has become in *Tell* the uprising of a whole brave and patient people to defend and preserve their real liberty from the attacks of foreign tyrants."<sup>21</sup> The distaste for fanatical revolutionaries betokens a conservative view of social change. But the specific historical causes of the "development" noted above generally were not treated. Eventually, then, even notions of liberty and national union, as concretely as they may be manifested in given political and economic institutions, became "abstractly stated the theme of Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell*."<sup>22</sup> Attention did not focus on the unique concretizations of polity suggested by the play, whether they be the conservative charter of the Forest Cantons urging *unmittelbare Reichsangehörigkeit*, or the patriarchal bureaucracy of Schiller's Weimar, or the *Kleinstaaterei* of larger Germany during Schiller's time. Instead, the play's individuality became secondary to its perceived "universality." Its "message" was instrumentalized:

Here is heard the outcry of a whole century battling for the restitution[!] of popular freedom and lawful government. And with it there mingle the voices of other ages and other countries, the voices of the old Germanic freeholders, of medieval burghers, of Luther, of Hampden, and of the minute-men of Lexington.<sup>23</sup>

To be sure, the play was criticized for failing to meet the standards of the classical unities.<sup>24</sup> Occasionally its characterization was considered

weak, and almost always the final act was viewed as superfluous. But as Kuno Francke suggested, "who would not rather silence these and similar objections, and give himself up with undivided heart to reverent delight in this immortal apotheosis of lawful freedom?"<sup>25</sup> "Lawful freedom" is representative of an attitude toward democracy that occurred again and again in discussions of *Tell* and German classicism by scholars of American *Germanistik* around the turn of the century. It reflects a conservative assimilation of the "revolutionary" *Tell*, an assimilation which played down the revolutionary aspects of the work while trumpeting the patriotic sentiment behind it. *Tell* was viewed not at all as a revolutionary, but as a patriot. It was only logical that there should follow an association of *Tell* with the American Revolution. But revolution per se was not prized; it was qualified to conform to the prevailing reverence of the status quo. The interpretation of *Tell* in this context was expressed by W. W. Florer, who saw the "essential theme" of the play as "no longer the greatest possible freedom of the individual within the state, but the capability of the people to defend itself, yea to govern itself within certain bounds. The history of the United States certainly must have made a definite impression upon Schiller."<sup>26</sup>

This "American analogy" paramount in *Tell*-interpretations between 1895-1905 represents a significant shift from the earlier view of *Tell* within American *Germanistik*. The Oehlschlager edition of *Tell* in 1854 noted that

in truth there are but few productions of genius which give so faithful a picture of what they pretend to delineate: for whether on the mountain top, on the stormy lake, or in the narrow defile, not a word is uttered, not a sound is heard, that could destroy the illusion; whoever has seen a good performance of Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* has been in Switzerland.<sup>27</sup>

In 1879 Boyesen experienced the play much as a mountain idyll: "It is like a breath of fresh Alpine air flowing into our faces." Boyesen also praised its embodiment of the artistic ideals of classical antiquity, noting the "Heroditian simplicity and singleness of character in the *dramatis personae*," and the "local idioms and Homeric phrases," exclaiming then: "It is all so vivid, so real, so marvelously convincing."<sup>28</sup> And Hosmer spoke of being "charmed back into the age and country."<sup>29</sup> What these remarks reveal is the idealistic tradition which made the play "real" for critics of much of the nineteenth century. Regarded largely as a mountain idyll, "genteel" critics were able to visualize in the play a utopia which corresponded to what they perceived as "reality." This "drawing-room" perspective of the play considered "local idioms and Homeric phrases" to be qualities of mimetic verisimilitude. While this attitude is still discernable around 1900, it is uncontestedly overshadowed by sentiments of American patriotism, instilled by an era of widespread maneuvers toward colonization, which formed a tangible but differently motivated psycho-link to *Tell*.

At the same time it should be noted that the association of *Tell* with the American context was only an analogous one. The immediate connection was of course to Germany. Schiller and *Tell* were made the

heralds of German unification, and this rendition typifies the *nationales Wunschdenken* predominant in Germany between 1835 and 1883. A politicized view of literary history created this national myth to prepare the way, both culturally and politically, for Germany's unification. The closer the goal came, however, the more the true contours of the epoch blurred.<sup>30</sup>

The need to mythologize Schiller as a national hero began to dissipate after unification.<sup>31</sup> Calvin Thomas welcomed the depoliticization of Goethe and Schiller as it took hold during the last three decades of the nineteenth century. He defused the political implications of *Tell* altogether:

The effect of the play does not, after all, depend mainly upon its vindication of any political doctrine. We are nowhere in the region of abstraction. The sympathy that one feels for the insurgents is in no sort political, but purely human; it is of the same kind that one might feel for a community of Hindu ryots in their efforts to rid themselves of a man-eating tiger. Only in the play this sympathy is very much intensified by the picturesque loveliness of the afflicted population.<sup>32</sup>

Curiously, Thomas insisted on using the term "insurgents" even while denying all polity within the play. His response to the work was empathetic. This liaison to the work bridged the historical gulf between past and present and, in its search for "the effect of the play," subordinated historical considerations. Since politics were banned from the play, there could be no real treatment of history, no solution to the problems which the play does indeed pose. The work became instead a vehicle for cathartic relief. In this connection, Thomas' sources are worth noting. He deferred to August Friedrich Christian Vilmar's work to dispel "the unreason that men could once be guilty of through their habit of regarding Schiller as a political poet." Vilmar, "whose history of German literature enjoyed popularity half a century ago" (Thomas), wrote about German national literature for the middle classes in a popularized manner. His *Geschichte der deutschen Nationalliteratur* (1843) was reissued repeatedly in the following seventy years. A Protestant theologian, Vilmar portrayed German language and literature in its historical development in order to disclose the essence of the German *Volkseele*. He explained that his basic approach was—and the similarity to Thomas' views is evident—"die Sachen selbst in ihrer Wahrheit und Einfachheit zu den Gemütern Unbefangener reden zu lassen."<sup>33</sup>

One point of contention within the play is the death of a political figure. An examination of the responses to this scene in *Tell* will allow for further elaboration on the specific nature of its reception by American *Germanistik*.

Preoccupied with the *genius loci* of the play, most American commentary on *Tell* prior to the 1890s failed to see Geßler's death as problematic; the sequence of events was simply narrated. The nuances of Boyesen's interpretation in 1879, however, situate him at a turning point in *Tell*-commentary. He wrote:

As far as the conspirators of the Rütli are concerned, it is purely accident that Tell kills Geßler, thereby freeing his country from its

oppressor. Tell was not present at the Rütli, and in his soliloquy before the slaying repeatedly emphasizes the idea that it is the necessity of protecting himself, his wife, and his children which forces him to take the law into his own hands. The fact that Tell has knowledge of the conspiracy, and is in sympathy with it, is hardly an adequate solution of the problem; it indicates an identity of interests, but not a logical sequence of coherent events.<sup>34</sup>

Underlying Boyesen's interpretation is the notion of *Selbsthilfe*, which dissociates Tell, as Boyesen observed, from the Rütli "conspiracy." On the one hand, the differentiation of Tell and the Rütli group harkens back to a criticism of the "illogical sequence" of these "coherent events." The liberalism of the *Vormärz*, exemplified by Ludwig Börne, reacted strongly against this segregation of "political" action from personal revenge. For Börne, Tell's aloofness and *Philosophie der Schwäche* (Börne's interpretation of Tell's statement: "Der Starke ist am mächtigsten allein") make Tell not a hero, but a philistine.<sup>35</sup> In the fourth edition of his *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur seit Lessing* (1858), where he remained critical of German classicism's *Weltfremdheit*, Julian Schmidt responded similarly: "Was nutzt der nur aus individuellen Verhältnissen hervorgegangenen That des Tell, daß sie nebenbei auch im allgemeinen Interesse geschieht? Sittlich wird dadurch nichts geändert, und außerdem kann im Drama dies Interesse nicht deutlich gemacht werden." For the still liberal-minded Schmidt, Tell's killing of Geßler remained "immer ein Mord," unworthy of praise or admiration.<sup>36</sup> In 1876, Hettner's interpretation offered a compromise: He agreed with Börne et al., that the mode of assassination was unbecoming, but the scene with Parricida was viewed as exculpatory.<sup>37</sup>

After 1880, however, a new strategy of justification evolved. In Scherer's influential history, for example, Tell is portrayed as eminently guiltless, as an exemplum of the man of few words and much action. The literary histories and textbook editions of the play from American *Germanistik* between 1890 and 1905 shared this response. For Wells (1895), Tell was "a type of natural independence."<sup>38</sup> Francke (1896) still wished "that some nobler way had been found for Tell to strike his blow against Geßler than from out of an ambush," but, in contrast both to Börne and the early Julian Schmidt, he categorically dismissed the possibility of Tell rebelling against the "tyrant on the village green of Altorf immediately following Geßler's savage attack against Tell's paternal feeling."<sup>39</sup> Francke's esteem for the "lawful freedom" of the play militated against viewing Tell as a rebel. After the time when Schiller's *Tell* was regarded as the drama of national unity *par excellence* and as healthful pabulum for the people, when Tell's deed was celebrated as the *primum mobile* of freedom, this new strategy of justification shifted the focus from political concerns. In 1901, Thomas diagnosed "a reversion to primitive conditions in which 'man stands over against man' . . . Tell does what he must do. . . . His conduct is not noble or heroic, but natural and right."<sup>40</sup> Thomas' appeal to a context of "pre-civilization" where people deal according to what is "natural and right" insisted on unambiguous clarity at the most

fundamental level. The suggestion that Tell perpetrated murder was thus anathema. Deering wrote in the introduction to his edition of the play that "Tell is no coward, no assassin; he merely planned his attack in a manner certain to succeed." Here Deering made Tell appear to be the level-headed pragmatist, but in his notes to the text he reinforced the idea that "Tell's shot must be justified as righteous self-defense, lest it appear as murder."<sup>41</sup> This addendum clearly assigns the deed a different and more significant dimension. Tell's act is seen as the expression of righteousness, the symbol of a larger transcendent approval, and as such beyond reproach: "The provocation of Tell's deed is his own defense, he needs no further justification."<sup>42</sup> The problem of the individual committing a socially offensive act—not only Geßler's inhumane treatment of Tell and his son, but Tell's questionable *modus operandi* of revenge as well—was no longer considered. While the interpretations extol Tell's act, they belie a predilection of the liberal humanist. Whereas Börne (and even Boyesen) regarded the disjunctive motivations of Tell and the Rütli entourage as an inappropriate response to oppression, the interpretations of American *Germanistik* between 1890-1905 preferred to magnify and exalt the isolation of Tell. The discontinuity of plots was viewed only as a formal problem, as a failure to conform to the classical unities. For the pragmatic American mind, the play became a portrayal of "the suffering and the termination of it through sturdy self-help."<sup>43</sup> Regard for the status quo, for the original idyllic quietude, pre-structured the interpretive framework. The work's status within the tradition of *Germanistik* as a prime component of the canon did not accommodate controversy, and the myth held intact.

Tell was seen to require "no further justification" for his assassination of Geßler because the "lawful freedom" resulting from his actions was associated with the American context of justifiable "revolution" and exemplary democracy. Interpretations of *Tell*, more pronounced as the nineteenth century drew to a close, aligned with the prevailing conservative esteem for the status quo. They read, in fact, as much like a justification of the Monroe Doctrine and inalienable right to self-determination as a defense of the Swiss Cantons' desire for *unmittelbare Reichsangehörigkeit*.

University of Houston  
Houston, Texas

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> See *Erläuterungen und Dokumente: Friedrich Schiller/Wilhelm Tell*, ed. Josef Schmidt (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1969), p. 94.

<sup>2</sup> Heinz Tischer, *Schillers Wilhelm Tell. Anmerkungen über eine kritische Behandlung im Unterricht* (Hollfeld: Beyer, 1973), pp. 11-12.

<sup>3</sup> Starr W. Cutting, "The Teaching of German Literature in High Schools and Academies," *School Review*, 19 (1911), 219. For a detailed discussion of the reception of German classicism, see R. Spuler, "*Germanistik*" in *America: The Reception of German Classicism, 1870-1905* (Stuttgart: Akademischer Verlag H. D. Heinz, 1982).

<sup>4</sup> Julius Goebel, "A Proposed Curriculum of German Reading," *Modern Language Notes*, 1 (1887), 12.



<sup>5</sup> Henry Pochmann, *German Culture in America: Philosophical and Literary Influences 1600-1900* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1957), p. 680, note 41. For the reception of *Tell* in American magazines up to 1880 see the bibliographies in the studies of S. H. Goodnight, "German Literature in American Magazines Prior to 1846," *Bulletin of the Univ. of Wisconsin, Philology and Literature Series*, 4 (1908), 1-264; and M. H. Haertel, "German Literature in American Magazines: 1846-1880," *Bulletin of the Univ. of Wisconsin, Philology and Literature Series*, 4 (1908), 265-452. Pochmann (p. 355) lists the performances of the play between 1804 and 1840. A positivistic account of Schiller's reception through 1859 is given by E. C. Parry in *German American Annals*, NS 3 (1905).

These source materials would provide the starting point for what could be a continuation of the analysis carried out in this essay: namely an examination of the editorial commentary that accompanied the play in the many small and larger towns across the nation where *Wilhelm Tell* was performed again and again.

<sup>6</sup> J. C. Oehlschlager, ed., *Wilhelm Tell*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Weik, 1854), p. iii.

<sup>7</sup> (Boston: Heath, 1895), p. iii.

<sup>8</sup> Arthur Palmer, ed., *Wilhelm Tell* (New York: Holt, 1906), p. iv.

<sup>9</sup> Palmer, p. xxv.

<sup>10</sup> F. Steuber, "When and How to Teach Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* in the High Schools," *Monatshefte*, 10 (1909), 101-02.

<sup>11</sup> (New York: Merrill, 1905), p. 17.

<sup>12</sup> Taylor, *Studies in German Literature* (New York: Putnam, 1879), p. 296.

<sup>13</sup> Thomas, *The Life and Works of Friedrich Schiller* (New York: Holt, 1901), p. 405.

<sup>14</sup> Daniel B. Shumway, "Schiller's Message to the Twentieth Century," *German American Annals*, NS 3 (1905), 195, 199.

<sup>15</sup> Carruth, ed., *Wilhelm Tell* (New York: Macmillan, 1902), p. xxvi.

<sup>16</sup> Carruth, "Schiller and America," *German American Annals*, NS 4 (1906), 146.

<sup>17</sup> J. K. Hosmer, *A Short History of German Literature*, 2nd ed. (St. Louis: Jones, 1879), p. 458.

<sup>18</sup> Hochdoerfer, *Studies in German Literature* (Chautauqua, NY: Chautauqua Press, 1904), p. 188.

<sup>19</sup> Palmer, p. xii.

<sup>20</sup> Carruth, ed., *Wilhelm Tell*, p. xxxv.

<sup>21</sup> Robert Deering, ed., *Wilhelm Tell* (Boston: Heath, 1895), p. xxxix.

<sup>22</sup> Palmer, p. xxvii; italics added.

<sup>23</sup> Kuno Francke, *Social Forces in German Literature: A Study in the History of Civilization* (New York: Holt, 1896), p. 397.

<sup>24</sup> Much of this sort of criticism appears indebted to Carlyle's remarks that the fifth act is an "inferior animation" and that in terms of the play as a whole "a certain want of unity [is its] sole . . . deficiency." See his *Life of Friedrich Schiller* (1825; rpt. New York: Crowell, n.d.), p. 183.

<sup>25</sup> Francke, pp. 394-95.

<sup>26</sup> Florer, "Schiller's Conception of Liberty and the Spirit of '76," *German American Annals*, NS 4 (1906), 111.

<sup>27</sup> Oehlschlager, p. iv.

<sup>28</sup> Boyesen, *Goethe and Schiller: Their Lives and Works* (New York: Scribner, 1879), pp. 417f.

<sup>29</sup> Hosmer, p. 460.

<sup>30</sup> See Klaus L. Berghahn, "Von Weimar nach Versailles. Zur Entstehung der Klassik-Legende im 19. Jahrhundert," in *Die Klassik-Legende*, eds. Reinhold Grimm and Jost Hermand (Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1971), p. 75.

<sup>31</sup> See Berghahn, *passim*.

<sup>32</sup> Thomas, p. 413.

<sup>33</sup> Vilmar, quoted in *Germanistik und deutsche Nation*, ed. Jörg J. Müller (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1974), p. 236.

<sup>34</sup> Boyesen, pp. 415-16.

<sup>35</sup> In *Erläuterungen und Dokumente*, pp. 98-99. It should be noted that even in Börne's virulent harangue against the play, *Tell* "bleibt aber doch eines der besten Schauspiele, das die Deutschen haben," p. 99.

<sup>36</sup> (Leipzig: Herbig, 1858), p. 506.

- <sup>37</sup> Hettner, *Goethe und Schiller*, 3rd rev. ed. (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1876), pp. 325-26.
- <sup>38</sup> *Modern German Literature* (Boston: Roberts, 1895), p. 285.
- <sup>39</sup> Francke, p. 395.
- <sup>40</sup> Thomas, p. 419.
- <sup>41</sup> Deering (1895), p. xxxciii and p. 228.
- <sup>42</sup> Deering, p. xxxciii.
- <sup>43</sup> Thomas, p. 410.