Four Hundred Years of Shakespeare in Europe, ed. A. Luis Pujante and Ton Hoenselaars. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003. 26-39.

Constructing Shakespeares in Europe

Balz Engler

In 1758 a collection of plays appeared in Basel, entitled *Neue Probstücke der englischen Schaubühne, aus der Ursprache iibersetzet von einem Liebhaber des guten Geschmacks* [New specimen plays from the English stage, translated from the original by a devotee of good taste].[1] It offered translations into German of nine English tragedies, largely from the post-Restoration canon. In the second of the three volumes is *Romeo and Juliet,* in David Garrick's adaptation, the first translation of a Shakespeare play into German blank verse.

The editor and translator of the collection was Simon Grynäus (1725-99).[2] He had studied theology, traveled in England, and at the time of publication (1753-61) worked as an assistant to the Protestant parson of Strasbourg.[3] This list of more than fifty publications consists mainly of translations, many of them from English, among them Milton's *Paradise Regained* (1752), Young's *Satires* (1755 and 1756), and Thomson's *The Seasons* (1768), as well as a number of religious writings.[4]

His translation of *Romeo and Juliet* is obviously the one that is of most interest here. I need not discuss its quality (as his output indicates, Grynäus translated rather quickly).[5] Rather, I will note that the play appears in a collection of mainly

---

[1] Simon Grynäus, *Neue Probstücke der englischen Schaubühne, aus der Ursprache übersetzet von einem Liebhaber des guten Geschmacks* (Basel: J. J. Schorndorff, 1758). The collection contains mainly tragedies. In volume 1: Edward Young, *The Revenge* (1721), Joseph Addison, *Cato* (1713), Edward Young, *Busiris* (1719). In volume 2: John Dryden and Nathaniel Lee, *Oedipus* (1678), Thomas Otway, *The Orphan* (1680), William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet* (Garrick adaptation, 1748). In volume 3: William Congreve, *The Mourning Bride* (1697), William Mason, *Elfrida: A Dramatic Poem* (1752), Nicholas Rowe, *The Fair Penitent* (1703).

[2] He was a distant relative of the Renaissance scholar of the same name. See Hans Küry, *Simon Grynäus von Basel 1725-1799, der erste deutsche Uebersetzer von Shakespeares Romeo und Julia* (Riehen/Basel: Schudel, 1935).

[3] Later he was deacon in the parish of St. Peter in Basel.

[4] Küry offers a list of these (Simon Grynäus, 15-17

[5] As a reviewer wrote on Grynäus's Shakespeare translation: the lines are "sometimes so stumbling, the euphony and the caesuras so much missing, in brief, so-Swiss, that we should much prefer harmonious prose to such verse" [bisweilen so holpricht, die Harmonie und der Abschnitt so verabsäumt, kurz, so schweizerisch, dass wir eine wohlklingende Prose diesen Versen weit vorziehen würden]. Review in *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften* 6 (1758), 60ff (quoted by Küry, *Simon Grynäus,* 67).

eighteenth-century plays associated with middle-class culture. *Romeo and Juliet,* a play without kings and queens, with a setting among rival families of equal position and a conflict between social convention and love, is perhaps the Shakespearean tragedy most appropriate to a collection of this kind.

But why did Grynäus include it at all? In his preface he explains: "So far I have included only one play by Shakespeare in this collection, in order to find out whether a translation of his plays, complete and as literal as possible, would be welcome."[6] In other words, Grynäus was testing the waters for a complete translation of Shakespeare's plays, one that was as literal as possible, and one that **<27>>** would also take into account his verse. Grynäus made his test very cautiously; he used Garrick's adaptation to contemporary tastes rather than the originals. Obviously it was too early; Grynäus did not translate another Shakespeare play into German blank verse. Instead, Christoph Martin Wieland's prose translation of twenty-two plays began to appear four years later (in 1762) with a Zurich publisher, under the auspices of the critic Johann Jakob Bodmer.

This episode may serve to remind us of a time when Shakespeare's position was still uncertain; when the way he was to be presented had to be carefully adapted to the readiness of people to accept certain of his features; when the texts as originally published would as much harm Shakespeare's fame as help it.

In the following pages I shall propose a framework in which European Shakespeare reception may be conceptualized.[7] After a brief discussion of concepts, I shall sketch three types and three phases of reception. These will serve as a basis for suggesting directions in which, in my opinion, the study of Shakespeare reception in Europe should be moving.

If we are to look at "four hundred years of Shakespeare in Europe," the very notion involves concepts of increasing difficulty; and there is an additional term that needs to be mentioned in this context: *reception.* Only the first of these four may be undisputed. *Four hundred years:* It was on September 21, 1599, that Thomas Platter recorded seeing *Julius Caesar* in London,

---

[6] Küry, *Simon Grynäus,* 11. "Ich habe nur ein einziges Stück von dem Shakespeare dieser Sammlung bisher beygefüget, um zu erfahren, ob man es für gut halte, desselben Stücke allso ganz, und so viel als möglich buchstäblich in das Deutsche zu übertragen."

[7] In doing exploratory work for this essay, I have found A. Luis Pujante's work particularly useful. See A. Luis Pujante, "Spanish and European Shakespeares: Some Considerations," in *Actas del XXI Congreso Internacional AEDEAN,* ed. F. Toda Iglesia et al. (Sevilla: Secretariado Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla, 1999), 17-33. Reprinted in *Folio* (Shakespeare Society of the Low Countries), 6, no. 2 (1999), 17-38.

an important record of a contemporary Shakespeare performance, and one by a Continental—a European?—observer.[8] I should note, perhaps, considering the status that Shakespeare would later acquire, that the name of the author is not even mentioned.

But even this date may be questioned. Depending on one's perspective, it may be tempting to take as a starting point the first critical opinion on Shakespeare ever published outside England, which seems to have been in the preface to Antonio Conti's tragedy *Il Cesare,* published circa 1726—"Sasper è il Cornelio degl'Inglesi" [Shakespeare is the Corneille of the English].[9]

Shakespeare is a more difficult concept. Does the term refer to a person, to a set of printed texts, to a cultural icon, to a theatrical tradition, or to a combination of all of these? I take the position that it should definitely refer to all of these, and should additionally take into account the way they are related to each other. In recent decades, the focus of criticism may have been on the printed texts and on theatrical tradition, but this need not be so.

Reception is a useful term because it suggests less passivity on **<28>>** our part than *influence*—perhaps the kind of politeness we show to an honored guest. It also suggests less violence than the notion of *appropriation,* which suggests kidnapping rather than welcoming, as it is clearly meant to do in the title of Brian Vickers's controversial study.[10]

But do all these concepts describe what is actually going on? They are based on the notion of an encounter with something fixed and well-defined But "Shakespeare" only comes into being when performed, whether on the page, on the stage, or elsewhere. Instead of influence, reception, or appropriation, I would therefore prefer *production,* and, in the case of something that has a tradition, *reproduction.*

Europe is perhaps the most difficult term. It cannot simply be defined in terms of square miles. Like the concept of "Shakespeare," it is something constantly re-produced. This is most obvious, perhaps, when we consider its borders. The concept of its eastern border being in the Ural Mountains was introduced by a Russian geographer in the eighteenth century in order to make Russia a European country.[11] And in the west the border still seems to be uncertain. In England, people still cross the

---

[8] On the Platter family, see Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Le Siècle des Platter, 1499-1628,* 2 vols. (Paris: Fayard, 1995-2000).
[9] Antonio Conti, *Il Cesare* (Faenza: G.A. Archi, 1726), 54-55.
[10] Brian Vickers, *Appropriating Shakespeare: Contemporary Critical Quarrels* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993).
[11] Eric J. Hobsbawm, "Welchen Sinn hat Europa?" *Die Zeit,* 4 October 1996, 40.

English Channel to get to what they think of as "Europe." And to what extent should our use of the concept take into account the way it has changed over time? To what extent should it be taken into account as a political projection, as something we are helping to create by talking about it? [12] The legacy of nationalism both resists a definition of Europe and is a characteristic part of it, especially in literary study, which was often employed as a handmaiden in the founding of nations

Linking the four terms, *Four centuries—Shakespeare—reception—Europe,* no matter what definitions one uses, produces an area so vast, so various, so ill-defined, and so important at this particular historical moment, that the task of giving an account of it is daunting. But people have tried.

Surveys are bound to be selective, superficial, or reductive. I should like to mention a few representative examples of studies that cover more than one country: J. G. Robertson, in his account of 1910, does not include Britain and juxtaposes only France and Germany. [13] Augustus Ralli, in his two-volume *History of Shakespeare Criticism* (1932) covering the period from the beginnings to 1925, organizes his evaluative summaries into chapters devoted to three countries: twenty-one to England (conveniently including the *U.S.* as well), six to France, and eleven to Germany. [14] In his groundbreaking anthology *Shakespeare in Europe* of 1963, Oswald **<29>>** LeWinter offers us critical texts by writers from various Continental nations, including Russia. From the perspective of somebody born in Europe but living in the United States, he takes the existence of Europe as an entity for granted.[15] Klaus Peter Steiger's entertaining short account, *Die Geschichte der Shakespeare-Rezeption* [The history of Shakespeare reception], published in 1987, concentrates on episodes mainly from English and German history, but including two pages on Voltaire's rejection of Shakespeare ("Monsieur de Voltaire *vs.* Billy the Kid").[16]

---

[12] Another issue: Speaking of European Shakespeare reception, where does the United States come in? To what extent should it be considered as a product of Europe, to what extent has Europe been shaped as a counter-image to the United States in recent years? The scope of my paper does not allow me to discuss this question.

[13] G. Robertson, "Shakespeare on the Continent," in *The Cambridge History of English Literature,* ed. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller, vol. 5, part 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), 282-308.

[14] Augustus Ralli, *A History of Shakespeare Criticism,* 2 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1932).

[15] This is how we have to read the first sentence of his introduction: "The history of Shakespeare criticism on the Continent is the history of the development of European consciousness since the sixteenth century." See Oswald LeWinter, ed., *Shakespeare in Europe* (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1963), 15.

[16] Klaus Peter Steiger, *Die Geschichte der Shakespeare-Rezeption* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1987), 75-77.

Often such surveys have been the effort of collectives and have been restricted to specific areas or periods. I am thinking in particular of Delabastita and D'hulst's *European Shakespeares: Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age,* Bauer's *Das Shakespeare-Bild in Europa zwischen Aufklitrung and Romantik,* or—a book that brilliantly catches a specific moment—Hattaway, Sokolova, and Roper's *Shakespeare in the New Europe.*[17]

Where these accounts cover a longer historical period they usually offer a genealogy, rooted in Shakespeare's works in English and dividing into national limbs and branches. In Robertson's account, for example, France and Germany are seen as dependent on England, the Romance countries, Poland and Russia as dependent on France, and Scandinavia on Germany—the Balkans, also complex in this case, are left out. But there is evidence that already at an early stage there, were what one might call European correspondences across these lines. Voltaire's comparison of Shakespeare with Corneille, for example, almost literally repeats what Conti had said before in Italian,[18] and Johann Jakob Bodmer, who was influential in German Shakespeare reception, may have taken his idiosyncratic spelling *Sasper* from the same Italian source. And in case you are, in good European fashion, getting suspicious, it is an English not an Italian critic who has made these claims.[19]

There is also a fascinating moment in the round table at the end of *European Shakespeares,* where Michael Windross comments on the "almost monotonous regularity about the way Shakespeare entered the various national literatures." He suggests that this may have happened within other literary trends, as part of the Enlightenment interest in historical writing: "We have heard how translators of Shakespeare frequently

---

[17] Dirk Delabastita and Lieven D'hulst, eds., European Shakespeares: Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993); Roger Bauer, ed., Das Shakespeare-Bild in Europa zwischen Aufklärung und Romantik (Bern: Peter Lang, 1988); and Michael Hattaway, Boika Sokolova, and Derek Roper, eds., Shakespeare in the New Europe (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).

[18] "Sasper è il Cornelio degl'Inglesi, ma molto più irregolare del Cornelio, sebbene al pari di lui pregno di grandi idee, e di nobili sentimenti" [Shakespeare is the Corneille of the English, much less regular than Corneille, even though equal to him where grand ideas and noble emotions are concerned]. See Antonio Conti, *Il Cesare* (Faenza: G.A. Archi, 1726), 54-55. Voltaire, in his eighteenth "Lettre philosophique": "Shakespeare, qui passoit pour le Corneille des Anglais, fleurissoit à peu près dans le temps de Lope de Vega: it créa le théâtre" [Shakespeare, who may be considered as the Corneille of the English, flourished at the time of Lope de Vega: he created the theater]. Quoted by Gaby Petrone Fresco, *Shakespeare's Reception in 18th Century Italy: The Case of Hamlet,* Europäische Hochschulschriften, Series XVIII:70 (Bern: Peter Lang, 1993), 52.

[19] Robertson, "Shakespeare on the Continent," 1923.

relied on existent translations as their source. It was not, then, Shakespeare the poet who attracted them." [20] Although the answer fails to persuade me (can an interest in historical fiction have had such wide-ranging effects?), the observation is useful because it suggests that various European national **<30>>** cultures may have been ready to welcome Shakespeare at the same time and for the same reasons.

What can we learn from this brief survey? Obviously the task has proved too large for those who have tried to tackle it; the only hope is a network of the kind we are establishing here.

I shall therefore try to sketch a framework for what remains to be done. It offers for discussion three types of re-production and three phases of history. In his book *What Was Shakespeare: Renaissance Plays and Changing Critical Practice,* Edward Pechter distinguishes "various social practices by which we produce Shakespeare."[21] He names three institutions:

> Unlike Homer, Dante, Wordsworth, and other classics whose works thrive almost exclusively in university classrooms and in the writing of university professors, Shakespeare is still vital beyond the institutions of academic criticism and pedagogy. The major difference is the existence of a healthy theatrical tradition ... To make matters more complicated, there are versions of Shakespeare outside both the academy and the theater—in the streets, so to speak ... Shakespeare still has a substantial authority in the popular culture of the English-speaking world.[22]

Pechter's analysis clearly shows the perspective of the American professor.

Boldly claiming homogeneity for Europe, I should probably define the three institutions slightly differently. In particular I should assign a less prominent role to the university, and acknowledge the problems with simply calling *popular* all culture not associated with high-cultural institutions. I should want to reckon with a common culture existing beside and complementing education and the theater, associated with quality newspapers, radio programs, galleries, literature and its lonely readers, but also with media like cartoons and the cinema.

In these three areas, scholarship, the theater, and common culture—areas for which I would claim equal importance—we have been served in different ways.

As I have indicated, we do have histories of Shakespeare criti-

---

[20] Frank Peeters, "Round Table," in *European Shakespeares,* edited by Delabastita and D'hulst, 238.

[21] Edward Pechter, *What Was Shakespeare? Renaissance Plays and Changing Critical Practice* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), 2.

[22] Ibid., 2.

cism. We do not have, however, studies of how Shakespeare has been taught—of how he has been re-produced—in schools and universities. Even in individual nations little work has been done in this field. I am aware of Ruth Freifrau von Ledebur's work on Germany after 1945, and Patricia Shaw' s "Estudio y docencia de Shakespeare en la universidad española" [The study and the teaching of Shakespeare in Spanish universities]. [23] This lack is, of **<31>>** course, due to a widespread lack of interest in the history of pedagogy. This may, however, be changing.[24]

The study of Shakespeare production in the theater is a well-established field, and there are impressive accounts of national histories, most recently Wilhelm Hortmann's *Shakespeare on the German Stage: The Twentieth Century.* [25] There are few accounts, however, that do not limit themselves to a single country. Among them, I am thinking of David Daniell's *"Coriolanus" in Europe,* but especially of Dennis Kennedy's *Foreign Shakespeare* and *Looking at Shakespeare.* They remind us of how much remains to be done.[26]

What we do not have is a history of Shakespeare re-production as part of what I have called common culture. There are single studies that are of considerable interest, particularly Brown and Fearon' s classic on England *Amazing Monument: A Short History of the Shakespeare Industry* (which finds it difficult to take its topic seriously), Gary Taylor's notorious *Reinventing Shakespeare,* and, more recently, Barbara Hodgdon's *The Shakespeare Trade: Performances and Appropriations.*[27] The beginnings of Shakespeare re-production

---

[23] Ruth Freifrau von Ledebur, *Deutsche Shakespeare-Rezeption seit 1945* (Frankfurt am Main: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, 1974); and Patricia Shaw, "Estudio y docencia de Shakespeare en la universidad española" [The study and teaching of Shakespeare in Spanish Universities] in *Shakespeare en España: Critica, traducciones y representaciones,* edited by Jose Manuel González (Alicante/Zaragoza: Universidad de Alicante/Libros Portico, 1993), 95-117.

[24] See Balz Engler and Renate Haas, eds., *European English Studies: Towards the History of a Discipline* (Leicester: The English Association for ESSE, 2000).

[25] Wilhelm Hortmann, *Shakespeare on the German Stage: The Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

[26] David Daniell, *"Coriolanus" in Europe* (London: Athlone Press, 1980); Dennis Kennedy, ed., *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); and Dennis Kennedy, *Looking at Shakespeare: A Visual History of Twentieth-Century Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

[27] Ivor Brown and George Fearon, Amazing Monument: A Short History of the Shakespeare Industry (London: Heinemann, 1939); Gary Taylor, Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present (London: Hogarth Press, 1990); and Barbara Hodgdon, *The Shakespeare Trade: Performances and Appropriations* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998).

in this area are best served by Michele Willems's *La genèse du mythe shakepearien* [The making of the Shakespeare myth].[28]

This takes me to the three phases I would like to distinguish. They are as schematic as the three types of re-production. In particular, they need not be contemporaneous in different parts of the world; in Europe, however—I have already referred to Michael Windross's comments—they seem to be relatively synchronous. I should provisionally like to label these phases: *beyond the rules, beyond criticism,* and *beyond the text.* I have deliberately chosen these tags so as not to suggest that one of them must be over for the other to begin; the moments of co-existence and conflict between them may often be the most interesting. I should like to comment on each of these in turn.

Shakespeare beyond the rules. The early history of European Shakespeare re-production in the eighteenth century, as we all know, was closely associated with the attempt to adapt or displace rule poetics. As-this was an aristocratic poetics based on hierarchies, using Shakespeare to do so was also a political move.[29] Shakespeare, the son of the Stratford glover, appeared as a bourgeois hero, a great autonomous individual. Rule poetics was gradually replaced by a poetics of genius.

It is important to note here that it was not primarily the texts of **<32>>** Shakespeare's works that were crucial, but rather what their author stood for. The definitive shape of the texts was still being established, and in any case they were often unknown yet. As Péter Dávidházi has reminded us, in many cases Shakespeare began to be revered as a cultural hero *before* his works were even available.[30]

There is an important European complication to this, which I have to introduce here as an aside. The version of the early history of Shakespeare reception I learned is the following: In the eighteenth century, the dead hand of all-powerful French classicist rule poetics lay on European writing and stilled all poetic innovation. Writers and critics were looking for a way to free themselves from its grip, and it was Shakespeare who

---

[28] Michèle Willems, *La genèse du mythe shakespearien, 1660-1780* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1979).

[29] This point is explicitly made by Voltaire: Corneille "was uneven like Shakespeare and full of genius like him; but Corneille's genius compared with Shakespeare's is as a lord with respect to a man of the people born with the same intelligence" [était inégale comme Shakespeare, et plein de génie comme lui; mais le génie de Corneille était a celui de Shakespeare ce qu'un seigneur est à l'égard d'un homme du peuple né avec le même esprit que lui]. See Voltaire, "Observation sur le *Jules César* de Shakespeare," in *Voltaire, La mort de César,* ed. by A. M. Rousseau (Paris: Societé d'Edition d'Enseignement Supérieur, 1964), 192.

[30] Péter Dávidházi, *The Romantic Cult of Shakespeare: Literary Reception in an Anthropological Perspective* (London: Macmillan, 1998).

helped them to loosen it. In this version, Voltaire is the villain—as he also appears in Steiger's *Geschichte der Shakespeare-Rezeption—especially* in his "Appel a toutes les nations de l'Europe" [Appeal to all nations of Europe] of 1761.

Not surprisingly, I learned this version in a German-speaking school and as a student of German—and it clearly shows an anti-French tendency.[31] Also unsurprisingly, such accounts are not appreciated in France. In a slightly intemperate manner, Jose Lambert has observed:

> Paradoxically, as Germany was quick to claim for itself a key role in promoting the genius of Shakespeare, moreover exploiting it in its anti-French policies, France continued to serve as an agent in establishing a new theatrical paradigm, which often seemed to be incompatible with French traditions. In fact, throughout Europe French commentaries were used as an introduction to Shakespeare, and the French translations often served as a model.[32]

Indeed, it can be shown that an educated German public (as people elsewhere) first got to know Shakespeare via the French translations of English periodicals like *The Spectator,* and that Voltaire's early promotion of Shakespeare (especially his translation of Hamlet's "To be or not to be" soliloquy) was crucial in this. That he later came to think that things had gone too far and needed to be stopped is a different matter.[33]

The national, even nationalist, dimension of Shakespeare re-production is certainly characteristic of Europe, having to do with the association of language and nation and the need to translate his works. But Shakespeare himself invited such national perspectives by writing plays on the history of his own nation at the beginning of a European age of nation states. In Germany this went as far, of **<33>>** course, as some extremists wanting a complete appropriation of him; the best account is

---

[31] Jonathan Bate has written on the political implications of romantic Shake-speare reception in "The Politics of Romantic Shakespeare Criticism: Germany, England, France," *European Romantic Review* 1, no. 1 (1990), 1-26:

[32] "Le paradoxe est que, si l'Allemagne se donne vite un rôle-clef dans la propagation du génie shakespearien, en l'exploitant d'ailleurs dans sa politique anti-française, la France elle-même va continuer a fonctionner comme médiatrice dans l'établissement d'un nouveau paradigme théâtral qui paraît souvent incompatible avec les traditions françaises. En effet, l'Europe entière utilisera certain commentaires français pour s'initier à Shakespeare, et les traductions françaises servent souvent de modèle." See Jose Lambert, "Shakespeare en France au tournant du XVIIIe siècle: Un dossier européen," in *European Shakespeares,* edited by Delabastita and D'hulst, 25-44,30.

[33] See Kenneth E. Larson, "Introduction: Traditions and New Directions in the Study of French and German Shakespeare Reception," *Michigan Germanic Studies* 15, no. 2 (1989), 103-13; and Arnold Miller, "Voltaire's Treason: The Translation of Hamlet's Soliloquy," *Michigan Germanic Review* 15, no. 2 (1989), 136-59.

that by Michelsen.[34]

But let me finish this aside. *Beyond the rules:* I note in conclusion that beginnings tend to have long-lasting effects: When cultural phenomena become visible as such, they acquire a definite shape that later re-productions will always imitate, vary, or react against, but which will not disappear.

The second phase, which I have labeled *beyond criticism,* begins with the triumph of the poetics of genius—with the romantic enthronement of Shakespeare as the creator per se. Once Shakespeare had acquired the status of a classic, it was no longer the critic who judged Shakespeare but Shakespeare who judged the critic. Shakespeare is celebrated as the creator of lifelike individuals, constructed like he himself as an author, which offer us patterns of identification. This produces a type of criticism that concentrates on the motives of Shakespearean figures. Some of the greatest Shakespeare criticism, notably Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy,* is part of this tradition. Critics who accept the premises of character criticism will view stage performance as irrelevant (like Bradley), or be hostile to it, because it distracts the critics from their task of reading the figures' minds.[35] The most striking example of such hostility is probably Charles Lamb on *King Lear* in his "On the Tragedies of Shakespeare" of 1811.[36] This is also the phase in which Shakespeare's text becomes sacred, and textual criticism tries to establish the one single, authentic, inspired text. Greg's *The Shakespeare First Folio* of 1955 is a monument to this.[37] In many respects this phase is still with us. Harold Bloom's strident apotheosis in *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human,* published in 1999, ascribes the shape of Western humanity, *tout court,* to Shakespeare: "Shakespeare will go on explaining us, in part because he invented us."[38]

Finally, Shakespeare *beyond the text.* In this phase there is a

---

[34] Peter Michelsen, "Review of Lawrence Marsden Price, *Die Aufnahme englischer Literatur in Deutschland, 1500-1800,* Bern: Francke, 1961," *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 220 (1968), 239-82.

[35] A. C. Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy* (London: Macmillan, 1904).

[36] Charles Lamb, "On the Tragedies of Shakespeare" (1811), in *Shakespeare Criticism: A Selection, 1623-1840,* edited by D. Nichol Smith (London: Oxford University Press, 1916), 190-212.

[37] W. W. Greg, *The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955). This urge to define a single text is not, by the way, restricted to the English-speaking world; a similar tendency may be observed with the Schlegel-Tieck version in the German-speaking world.

[38] Harold Bloom, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (London: Fourth Estate, 1999), xvii. We should note, perhaps, the constructivist twist here: It is not only Shakespeare's universal genius, but also the re-production of his works that has made us what we are.

new critical interest in theatrical production, as first impressively documented in Granville-Barker's *Prefaces to Shakespeare.*[39] It begins cautiously by unfolding the theatrical implications of the text, but also takes for granted that there is more than one possible version of doing a play. In this phase, the idea of the single text begins to dissolve. It begins to be accepted that there may be more than one Shakespearean text, for example, due to revision. And quite practically, various critical texts, all claiming authority for themselves, exist beside each other—not only for marketing reasons. The same trend leads to critics beginning to be interested in foreign Shakespeare and in translations, even to theaters doing productions in **<34>>** more than one language, like Karin Beyer's Düsseldorf production of A *Midsummer Night's Dream* (premiere 31 October 1995). The text, and with it language, is losing its central. role. As with the popular ballad, various versions exist beside each other, which recognizably share certain figures and their constellations, certain stories, and. certain motives. To put it provocatively, Shakespeare has acquired a position similar to the one poetry used to have in an oral society.[40]

By way of a conclusion, I should like to turn to what research is to be done in the area of European Shakespeare reception. Obviously, in all three types of re-production I have mentioned, much work remains to be done, especially if the European dimension is to be taken as seriously as it deserves. In particular, the history of Shakespeare in education should receive more attention than it has in the past. But I should like to concentrate on an area in which the last type and the last phase of re-production meet: common culture beyond the text. Here I see the following areas in particular where useful new work is to be done in and for Europe.

We should extend the study of how Shakespeare has been constructed beyond the beginnings (where we are relatively well served) into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; and we should study how this has been done in various countries. The aims in doing so will be different from those of Samuel Schoenbaum, who has taught us so much about the history of Shakespeare in his classic *Shakespeare's Lives.* He describes his book "as a novel species of Shakespearian biography, with the protagonist gradually emerging from the mists of ignorance and misconception, to be seen through a succession of different eyes and from constantly shifting vantage points."[41] instead of *mists*

---

[39] Harley Granville-Barker, *Prefaces to Shakespeare* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1927; reprint, London: Batsford, 1927-1947).

[40] See Balz Engler, "Shakespeare's Passports," *International Shakespeare: The Tragedies,* edited by Patricia Kennan and Mariangela Tempera (Bologna: CLUEB, 1996), 11-16.

[41] Samuel Schoenbaum, *Shakespeare's Lives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), x.

we should speak of *myths,* and not consider them in terms of ignorance and misconception but of constituting what Shakespeare has meant at different times in different places.

We should then be interested in not only Shakespeare the man but also the figures of his plays as the protagonists in novels and plays, as the object of reverence in sacred places like Stratford and Verona., as the subjects of painting and sculpture, and the like. We should be interested in Shakespeare as the hero of cartoons and films. *Shakespeare in Love,* significantly, uses elements of *Romeo and Juliet* in constructing its hero. The film suggests that biography leads to art; we, as an audience, know that it is the other way round.

We may even show renewed interest in an area that has been **<35>>** much neglected, even despised, in authorship theories. But we would do so not because we are looking for truth and authenticity, but because we want to know why and how people came to form such strong opinions about this problem. From a European perspective, it may be good to know that there have been, as far as I can see, not only English, but also Irish, French, and Italian candidates, but no German ones.[42]

We can also take the relative stability produced by the second phase I have posited and use it for the comparison of cultures. Patricia Shaw has observed that in Spain the most popular Shakespeare plays were (in this order) *Hamlet* and *Macbeth, Romeo and Juliet, Othello, Julius Caesar* and *The Taming of the Shrew, The Merchant of Venice,* and *King Lear.*[43] It may be difficult to determine the respective places of plays in such a popularity contest, but the results would certainly look different in different countries. Why?

Translation is usually studied in terms of a comparison between the work in the source and in the target language. But this is not the only possibility. If we compare translations into various languages with each other, using Shakespeare's English text as a *tertium comparationis,* as it were, we can learn about how different cultures and languages cope with specific issues. One area that lends itself specifically to this kind of study is metaphor, which has interested us in the Basel *Shakespeare in.*

---

[42] See on these issues John Michell, *Who Wrote Shakespeare?* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1996); Schoenbaum, *Shakespeare's Lives,* 441; and Ina Schabert, ed., *Shakespeare-Handbuch* (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner, 1992), 199. The Italians John Florio and his father Michelangelo Florio were proposed as candidates for authorship, as was the Frenchman Jacques Pierre, and the Irishman Patrick O'Toole.

[43] The source of this claim is Eduardo Juliá, *Shakespeare en España* (Madrid: Tipografía de la Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, 1918), 96. Juliá refers to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and restricts himself to translations. The situation in the theater may well have been different.

Europe project. Preparing bilingual critical editions at Basel, we have also become aware of how different cultures need different kinds of explanation—an area that offers itself for more detailed study.

Finally, the presence of Shakespeare's works in the discourse of various. cultures casts light both on the history of Shakespeare reproduction and the respective cultures. Some figures, allusions, and quotations may be present in most European languages, often without people being aware of their origins. Hamlet's "To be or not to be" is a case in point. Ultimately, Voltaire is probably responsible for this; but how, for example, could it become one of Hitler's favorite phrases, albeit with quite a different meaning? Preliminary research on *Hamlet* in Basel has shown that not only have different quotations. become proverbial in different countries, but the same quotations may also be used in different ways.

Much work, then, remains to be done, work of different kinds, work illuminating widely different areas, but work also that will help us to understand what Shakespeare was at different times in different places—his various authenticities, as it were. This issue may be of **<36>>** special urgency in Europe at this particular moment, but it is vital to cultures in all parts of the world.