

Shakespeare among the German Classics

On Sunday morning, 23 April 1995, towards ten o'clock in the morning, church bells ringing in the distance, a procession of people, among them the editors of the Arden 3 and the Cambridge editions and George Steiner, many of them carrying a rose, was slowly moving through the Park an der Ilm in Weimar, towards the Shakespeare monument, as always at this time of the year, when the German Shakespeareans meet at Weimar. Having arrived at the secluded spot, among huge trees, below an artificial ruin visible through the mist, the procession halted, there was some music, there was a short speech, and then, as always, flowers were laid down. However, one thing was different on this occasion: The statue of Shakespeare had been removed, and the congregation met in front of its empty pedestal.

The monument had been removed to protect it against further damage by vandalism, by pollution and by the damp rising from the river nearby, and it was to be restored (if only the money could be found) in view of Weimar being nominated the European City of Culture for 1999. The monument, erected to immortalize a great but mortal human being had itself become a victim of time. But the ritual of remembrance did not need the monument; the awareness of a tradition to be renewed was sufficient to make it effective.

There was a strange sense of playful seriousness, of serious playfulness about the occasion: people were glad to have a chance of ironizing a time-honoured ritual without entirely denying its importance, the ritual of doing homage to an author who has played a powerful role in German culture, beside the indigenous classics Goethe and Schiller.

The Shakespeare statue in the park, made of Carrara marble, has meant a great deal for Weimar and for the German nation, and its history tells us something about what Shakespeare has meant to the Germans. In discussing the monument, I should like to turn to four contexts that are important, and for reasons which will become clear in a moment I should like to introduce them by turning to the monument to Goethe and Schiller which stands in front of the National Theatre.¹

First context: the relation between the monument and the object represented. Goethe and Schiller have been put on a pedestal, which is 259 cm (8½ ft) high; and their figures are

¹ Two studies have proved particularly useful in studying these contexts: Selbmann and Appelbaum. Neither of them mentions the Shakespeare monument in Weimar.

of monumental size: almost 334 cm (11 ft) (Appelbaum 116). Both gaze into the distance, both are standing but about to step forward. On the other hand, their heroic pose in accordance with traditional monuments is somewhat diminished by the fact that they do not wear the classical toga, but the everyday clothing of their time. The relationship between the figure and Shakespeare in the case of the Shakespeare monument will have to be discussed later. It was controversial from the beginning.

Second context: The relationship between the monument and the public, in particular the founders and donors and the object of the monument. The inscription on the pedestal makes clear what this was in the case of the Goethe/Schiller monument:

Dem Dichterpaar
Goethe und Schiller
das Vaterland²

This indicates the role the two poets played in the formation of the German nation state, where their work helped to focus awareness on what the many dukedoms and kingdoms had in common: their language and literature—it is no coincidence that the first German republic was founded in Weimar. On the Shakespeare monument, by contrast, it simply says "Shakespeare"—perhaps in case somebody would not recognize him.

Third context: the relationship between the monument and the figure, or specifically the figure and other sculptural elements, often symbolic ones, on the pedestal. In this respect the Goethe-Schiller monument is a special case, as it creates a relationship between two equals who have been made a pair in the service of their national mission. Goethe and Schiller are even shown as being of equal height, although Schiller in real life was considerably taller than Goethe. The pedestal is unadorned; the stump of a German oak putting forth leaves behind the two figures does not only support them structurally, but also symbolizes national regeneration. The symbolic objects at Shakespeare's feet are a skull with a fool's cap, a fool's bauble, a dagger, and a laurel wreath. All of them relate to his works, none of them to his influence, as with Goethe and Schiller.

Fourth context: The relationship between the monument and its location. The Goethe-Schiller monument was erected in the centre of the city, in front of the theatre, which was to become the "Nationaltheater" in 1919. A monument to Goethe and Schiller may be considered superfluous in Weimar, a city full of their memories. But it is here that the interdependence of the various contexts becomes visible.

² "To the pair of poets/Goethe and Schiller/The fatherland"—All translations from German in this essay are by BE. From here onwards only the English text is reproduced; the German originals may be found in Engler

By erecting the most important monument for the two poets in this place, those who promoted the idea and collected money for it all over Germany also emphasized the symbolic role of Weimar for the German *Kulturnation*.

The relation between the monument and its surroundings is of particular interest with the monuments to poets. Literature, with the book as its medium, is, to a striking degree, independent of place and time, unlike battlefields for generals or the government district for politicians.³ If poets are given monuments, this does not only suggest that their work can be apprehended in their statues; it also appropriates them for a particular place which gains significance in the process. As we shall see, the location became a bone of contention with the Weimar Shakespeare monument.

All four contexts of a monument in combination—those of the person represented, of the donors, of the symbolic adornments, and of the surroundings—serve to shape and to strengthen memory. But monuments cannot do this on their own; Robert Musil has reminded us how many of them just stand around holding up traffic or not being noticed at best (see Musil). But they may offer occasions, serve as invitations to interpret, to ascribe meanings to them. They can only serve their purpose if they are part of a culture of remembrance, which usually has a cultic dimension. They are then supported by institutions of reverence, whose activities are characterized by ritual regularity—associations, for example, that have made it their task to edit and discuss the work of a poet, that publish their annual *Jahrbücher*, that meet every year, possibly around the poet's birthday, and on that occasion do homage at the poet's monument.⁴

Monuments should therefore be studied in the context of such institutions. The processes that lead to their erection—how often do they lead to quarrelling!—the ceremonies at their unveiling, and the way they are dealt with afterwards, are of particular interest. They make it possible to register the way the object of the monument acquires and changes its meaning.

Weimar is full of monuments. To mention only some of those to writers, there is one to Johann Gottfried von Herder in front of the Stadtkirche, there is the double monument to Goethe and Schiller in front of the National Theatre, there is a statue to Christoph Martin Wieland on Wieland-Platz,

³ This may be one reason why editions are sometimes stylized as monuments—quite explicitly in the case of Shakespeare's First Folio edition (see essay 7).

⁴ The Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft was founded in 1864, the Goethe-Gesellschaft in 1885. The situation is more complex with Schiller.

and in the park, where the Shakespeare monument has been placed, there are also monuments to Adam Mickiewicz, Sándor Petőfi, Aleksander Pushkin, and Hafiz.

The location of these monuments, and the moment when they were erected, is not coincidental. Again and again, these were determined by the kind of contexts that were to be created, contexts of the kind indicated above. The first was the Herder monument in 1850. 1857 the Goethe-Schiller monument followed; on the same day the Wieland monument was dedicated too. We have already noted the link between the erection of the Goethe-Schiller monument and the emergence of a unified German state. The monuments to the national poets of Russia, Poland and Hungary, Pushkin, erected in the late 1940's, Mickiewicz (1956) and Petőfi (1976) were erected after the Second World War, when Weimar became part of the German Democratic Republic; they were meant to create a context supporting political conditions. And the Hafiz monument, which commemorates Goethe's special relationship to this Persian poet, was dedicated in 2000 on the occasion of the UNESCO year of the dialogue between cultures.

The monument to Shakespeare, unveiled in 1904, is more difficult to place. Its history, of which only some crucial moments can be sketched here, is typically characterized by acts of consecration and desecration.

On 13 May 1901 the *Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* informed its members that the erection of a Shakespeare monument had been proposed at its annual meeting. A further meeting on 30 May was to draft the essential features for the organization of a committee working towards the erection of a Shakespeare monument in Weimar. The procedure proposed indicates that, as with the Goethe-Schiller monument, the project was to be based on public subscription. The committee was to look for a substantial number of influential and well-known personalities from various professional and social groups, who would sign a public appeal.

This committee formulated the appeal, which was also sent to the *Kaiser*, the arch-dukes and princes. This appeal tells us something about the intentions of the proposers, but also about the objections they anticipated.

Weimar is rich enough in cultural heroes of its own breeding, whose memory has not only left its mark in bronze and marble but is also indelibly engraved in the thinking and feeling of the German people. Weimar does not run the risk of being suspected of having to run after the cult of foreign cultural heroes because she lacks her own. If, however, Weimar wants to add a statue to a son of British soil to the two of its own Goethe and Schiller, this only confirms an adoption that the German nation, to the extent

it thinks and feels, has taken place long ago. It is indeed a singular act in the cultural history of all peoples that the poetic hero of a foreign nation receives his spiritual citizenship from another, albeit related people, that his cult is linked permanently and without envy with that of its own cultural heroes, as this is evident in the veneration of the triumvirate Goethe-Schiller-Shakespeare by the German people.

The committee decided not to include the claim that Shakespeare had long ceased to be an English poet.

The political programme is evident: only the link to Goethe and Schiller is mentioned. Shakespeare is not only presented as an equal to them, but also closely associated with them. Considering the national role of Goethe and Schiller this could only work by insisting on the German adoption of Shakespeare.

Objections against the project did not take long to be raised (Fränkel). Basically, there were four of them: (1) If there was to be a triumvirate including Goethe and Schiller then the third person should be Herder rather than Shakespeare. (2) Each nation erects monuments to its own great persons. If Shakespeare was to become a precedent, who knows to whom statues should be erected too? (3) The weightiest criticism in the press was the following: what was needed was the promotion of Shakespeare's memory on the page and on the stage; "the money collected would be much more profitably invested in this than in a second-rate statue of a figure unknown to or viewed with indifference by the average person in a corner that had happened to be empty in a remote small town where a duke had his residence." (4) Finally, there was the problem that nobody knew what Shakespeare really looked like. "And an artificial or idealized imaginary physiognomy would be an offence against the one who faithfully embodied the truth of life and humanity in the universal language of the stage."

Two important factors are named here: the location and the design of the monument. In the spirit of the political programme, the first letter to the members of the Shakespeare-Gesellschaft had still said that the monument was going to be erected opposite the monument to Goethe and Schiller. But this idea could not be maintained. After lengthy debate on various locations,⁵ the view of Otto Lessing, the sculptor who had been entrusted with the

⁵ On 3 November 1901, at a meeting of the committee in Berlin, the location of the monument became topical. A place to the southwest of the court theatre was proposed where there was a monument to Hummel at the time. At the meeting of 22 April 1902 the issue of the location was postponed; a further possibility, the Karlsplatz had been mentioned.

design of the monument proved decisive.⁶ He declared that Shakespeare's monument should not be placed in the town, because there was no link between him and Weimar. The market—where he would have been perceived as standing somewhere between Duke Karl August and Goethe was out of the question; the square in front of the theatre was dominated by the Goethe-Schiller monument. The square behind the theatre was a blind spot. Large squares needed large monuments; "the monuments of princes and statesmen obviously fitted such squares; those of poets and artists a park." This means that Shakespeare is classified by him as a poet in the romantic tradition, unlike Goethe and Schiller, who apparently belonged among the princes and statesmen. The contrast between them and Shakespeare is made so stark as to contradict completely the original intentions of the project.

Even though the statue was ultimately erected in the park, the topic of the location continued to be debated. The wish to link Shakespeare and the German classics remained strong. This wish also shows clearly in the debate on the figure of Shakespeare. Otto Lessing was asked to make sketches; he was obviously expected to present a statue that was as monumental as the one to Goethe and Schiller. But since 1853, when that monument had been erected, sculpture had become a more realistic art. Lessing went as far in his realism as to research the actual looks of Shakespeare; among other things he had the Darmstadt death-mask sent to study his physiognomy. Instead of orienting himself towards the statues in England and France he designed a figure—essentially the one we still see today—that showed his own idea of the poet and his works rather than serving the purpose of commanding reverence. His model in this was Prince Hal in the first scene in Eastcheap as he had seen it in a production of *Henry IV, Part I*, at the Berlin *Schauspielhaus (Brandl)*.

On 6 June 1902, the committee looked at the designs. The president of the *Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, Alois Brandl, thereupon threatened to resign from the committee. Brandl articulated his disappointed expectations as follows: The conception of the whole is too conventional for this giant in the realm of culture. This Shakespeare would be able to write a few of the early comedies, but not the great plays that so decisively influenced Goethe and Schiller. How would such a figure, lounging negligently on a stone that is too high, look beside the truly monumental double figures of our classics in sacred Weimar!⁷

⁶ Lessing also created other poets' monuments, among them one for G.E. Lessing in Berlin in 1890 Selbmann 123 and a Kleist bust for the Hoftheater Meiningen in 1911 Selbmann 173.

⁷ In a letter of 12 July to Bojanowski in the archive of the Shakespeare-Gesellschaft.

Indeed, even though they are so different from each other, the monuments invite comparison. On the one hand, the double monument, heroic in its size and its *gestus*, on the other Shakespeare, somewhat smaller in size according to the first designs (275 cm, 9 ft),⁸ also in the garb of his own period, but sitting, lost in thought, like Schiller holding a scroll in one hand, as the attribute of the poet, roses in the other, the right arm supported, almost defiantly, on his hip. It is indeed difficult to imagine this statue being part of a triumvirate with Goethe and Schiller: Shakespeare would just observe, surprised and with irony on his face, the heroic entry of the German classics.

Lessing did promise to give Shakespeare's head a more serious expression, and the minutes of the following meeting on 27 July record in a somewhat resigned tone: "The monument is to stand in the park and therefore preferably to show the poet as the one of *A Midsummernight's Dream*." The design was accepted as a whole but discussion continued for some time on whether the rose in Shakespeare's hand should remain.⁹ The impression of Shakespeare as a romantic author was strengthened by the location of his statue in the park, near an artificial ruin.

A note on the material of the statue may be in place here. Originally, bronze had been intended—like with the Goethe-Schiller monument. Why exactly it was marble that was selected in the end and when the decision was made we do not know (Linke 2).¹⁰ But it would not be surprising if Lessing's conception of Shakespeare had played a role in this: marble is more in accordance with the lightness of his figure.¹¹ As we shall see, the material contributed a great deal to the later history of the monument.

The monument was officially dedicated on 23 April 1904, Shakespeare's 340th birthday, in the presence of the Grand-Duke and the Grand-Duchess—a ritual event of the type that makes the contexts mentioned earlier explicit. There were speeches by the chair of the monument committee Wilhelm von Oechelhäuser and the president of the *Gesellschaft* Alois Brandl. The ceremony was given a musical framework with songs that had specially been written for the occasion by Max Vogrich. They both

⁸ Mentioned in the minutes of a meeting with Lessing on 22 April 1902.

⁹ Criticism of the Shakespeare figure never really fell silent. It was compared to an extra, at best an actor in costume. See *Berliner Tageblatt* No 96, 21 February 1905.

¹⁰ In the minutes of the meeting with Lessing on 22 April 1902 the material of the statue is still supposed to be bronze.

¹¹ The difference between stone and bronze with monuments has been well-known since Horace (the *aere perennius* motif). Bronze remains but can be melted down any time and therefore also reminds us of how times can change. Bronze is easier to repair—as those responsible for the Shakespeare monument were to find out.

dramatize the conflict between the status of Shakespeare and the actual figure revealed and try to resolve it.

The worlds and the heavens all tremble:
Written with flames in thundering storms
The elements indelibly record your name
In the sun's fiery frame.
Are you only a marble guest for us
Who lays his eyes on us, cold and dumb
Look, a miracle! The stone softly raises itself—
Brings us word from Olympus:
It stays with us, it lives!¹²

In religious language Shakespeare is celebrated as the herald of timeless, divine truths, because, as it says elsewhere in the text: "Your spirit has bathed in the original spring."¹³ Wreaths were laid down, on the part of the Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, the Goethe-Gesellschaft, the k.u.k. Hoftheater in Vienna, the Grossherzogliches Hoftheater at Weimar, etc.; decorations were given to deserving persons. In other words, this was an official occasion. After the ceremony those invited went to the best restaurant in town, the "Erbprinz", and had a formal meal. Each item on the menu, most of them carrying English associations,¹⁴ was garnered with a Shakespeare quotation—another opportunity to celebrate playfully the universal application of Shakespeare's works.

After their dedication monuments are left to the world. The programme articulated during the opening ceremony now must stand the test of time, in many cases without the support of a reverential institution. In the case of the Shakespeare monument in Weimar this history was characterized by two related problems, the uncertainty of its location and vandalism.

In his book on vandalism Alexander Demandt distinguishes three types (Demandt 19–27): playing the musclemans in youthful gaiety or exuberance, which is often directed against monuments; the misdeeds of the misguided loner, and vandalism as violence against culture. We know the damage that the monument suffered at different times, often by vandals: it lost both legs, its left foot, its chin, the

¹² I have not tried to reproduce the rhymes. As this is poetry, here is the original German: "Die Welten und der Himmel all erzittern:/Mit Flammenschrift in donnernden Gewittern,/Die Elemente halten deinen Namen/Unlöslich fest im Sonnenfeuerrahmen./Bist du uns nur ein Marmor-Gast,/Der kalt und stumm ins Aug' uns fasst?/Seht ein Wunder! Der Stein sich leise hebt—/Bringt ein Wort vom Olymp:/Es bleibt uns, lebt!"

¹³ German: "Du hast im Urquell deinen Geist gebadet."

¹⁴ Windsor soup, leg of mutton *à l'anglaise*, sole on a tomato sauce, Wildkrusteln nach Perigord, young turkey, salad—compot, mocca, ice cream, cheese. Cigars were offered with a quotation from *Henry IV, Part 1*, 3.2.62: "Soon kindled and soon burnt."

scroll, the bells of the fool's cap, the pommel of his dagger, and suffered many other kinds of smaller damage, probably due to stones thrown at it (Linke 7). We know little about the true motives of those who perpetrated these acts of vandalism (nobody was ever caught, it seems). But it is of interest to us to whom these acts were attributed.

Already in February 1905 the monument was "disfigured in a dreadful manner by a black acid fluid [...], which so far has resisted all attempts to remove it." (Berliner Tageblatt No 96, 21 February 1905) After more than two years' restoration work the monument could be saved. At the beginning of the First World War the monument was damaged again, in 1948 a third time.¹⁵ In the last case it no longer seemed sufficient to explain the matter as a thoughtless prank. The legend was spread that the monument had been "damaged by Anglo-American bombers in 1945." (*Abendpost*, 6 February 1950). The damage was to be ascribed to Demandt's third type; barbaric violence against culture was to be blamed on one's political enemies.

The isolated location of the monument in the park certainly made vandalism easy. Practical considerations may therefore also have played a role in making sure that the ideological question of Shakespeare's place in the symbolic geography of Weimar did not come to rest. In spring 1914 the local government of Weimar expressed the wish "that the Shakespeare monument should be relocated from the park to some other suitable location in the town." (Letter to the Shakespeare-Gesellschaft of 2 April 1914) This led to a correspondence that is of interest to us because of the reasoning used in it. The Shakespeare-Gesellschaft supported the matter, "because the monument, located in a remote corner of the park, is difficult to find for strangers, because the loneliness of its place makes its guarding against vandalism almost impossible, and finally because the fog rising from the river Ilm close by and general humidity had a damaging influence on the marble." (Letter of the Shakespeare-Gesellschaft to the Duke of 15 April 1914) But the Gesellschaft insisted that the monument must continue to be public property. It did not want the monument to be seen as a private affair of its own (besides shying away from the cost). It even used growing international tensions to support its case:

Even political moments would perhaps be adduced, because the celebration of the Gesellschaft's fiftieth anniversary does not only attract the participation of wide sections of the German population, but also the attention of England and America. There, where there is a tendency to present everything in a tendentious light to stir public opinion

¹⁵ A leg was knocked off. Letter by Mueller to Saladin Schmidt of 3 March 1948.

against Germany, the removal of the Shakespeare monument from public property would be considered an anti-English gesture.

But in spite of further vandalism the monument remained in its place. Only after renewed damage in 1948, there were serious considerations to move the monument "to a place more central to the town and related to the sites of the classics, which must, however, be adapted to the essentially romantic character of the monument."¹⁶ The following solution was adopted:

The corner between the corner tower and the gate of the castle (with a view towards the Platz der Demokratie). Advantages: a background well harmonising with the conception of the monument's creator; remoteness from traffic; closeness of various sites reminiscent of Shakespeare's name (Goethe's first Weimar apartment, Goethe's workplace—the County Library—with the library holdings of the Shakespeare-Gesellschaft); symmetry with the Pushkin monument on the other side of the Library.

These considerations were clearly shaped by the ideological notions of art that had now become prevalent in the East of Germany. Now it was the relation to the monument to the city rather than that to the other classics that was considered crucial; on the other hand, the relation to the only other monument to a foreign poet, the Russian Pushkin, was emphasized.

On 24 August 1950 the Shakespeare monument was re-dedicated in a new place in a new Germany, as a "national monument" (Stroedel 14). Speeches were delivered, Shakespeare sonnets recited, wreaths laid down. Strikingly, the fact that Weimar had a monument to Shakespeare was no longer noted as a sign of Germany's adoption of him, but as an admonition

that there should be a return to that openness towards things foreign that had once been characteristic of the Germans. In spite of the embarrassing appeal to the basest instincts the statue is erected again, in the confident hope that in our time there may no longer be any room for blind chauvinism and frivolous destructiveness.¹⁷

Here there is a belief that the conditions of socialism would lead to an improvement of human nature.

In his address, a representative of the *Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, Dr. Fritz Behr, indicated the symbolic reasons for the relocation of the monument:

We have recovered the image of the poet from the noble retirement of the ducal park and placed it among the historically and culturally significant buildings of Weimar, we have placed it in the immediate neighbourhood of the

¹⁶ Letter by Fritz Behr, chair of the Gesellschaft's administrative committee, of 1 November 1949, to the Weimar city council.

¹⁷ *Thüringische Landeszeitung*, 26 August 1950.

agora, the market square of our town, the centre of our social and political life. With a bit of fantasy, we can imagine how the poet listens to the voices that seem to sound from there. With this symbolic change of place, we want to underline the intention of the *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* to place Shakespeare, much more than this has been done in the past, in the living present.¹⁸

Thus, it is no longer the closeness of Shakespeare to the cultural heroes, Goethe and Schiller, that counts, but that to the people of the present. Shakespeare is praised, because he never flattered the high and mighty, but, on the contrary, showed, with unsparing openness, the bloody chronicle of her dynasty to the threshold of the present his English people and his arrogant, condescending, irritable queen.

The later history of the monument was one of decline. It was damaged by soot and acid rain. But it did retain its political significance. When in the early 1960's the *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, after having coped with the strain of partition for so long, began to fall apart,¹⁹ the Weimar part of it rightly insisted against those in the West that it represented the original society. At a press conference on 4 November 1963 its president, Martin Lehnert, mentioned the location of the monument in Weimar first among the evidence for its claim (Lehnert 46).

In November 1963, in time for Shakespeare's 400th birthday in the following year, the monument was put back to its old place in the park. The anniversary was celebrated in grand style in view of the important role that Shakespeare played in the cultural policies of the GDR, as a force strengthening friendship between peoples; the "scope and depth of his artist's insight into the dynamics and the variety of human life" had not, as the president of the *Gesellschaft* pointed out, been reached by any other writer; "by his miraculous understanding for the human nature of all periods and peoples he had grown beyond his own time." (Lehnert 54) In spite of heavy rain more prominent guests than ever met at the Shakespeare monument. The Chairman of the Council of State of the GDR, Walter Ulbricht and his wife were there, along with the diplomatic representatives of various countries, and the guests of the *Gesellschaft*. Again wreaths were laid down, in the names of the GDR government, the *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, the political parties and a great number of social organisations,

¹⁸ Manuscript of Behr's address in the archive of the Shakespeare-Gesellschaft.

¹⁹ The reasons for this have remained an issue of debate, which continues in the Shakespeare-Gesellschaft of today, re-united since 1993.

cultural institutions, and factories (Lang and Petersen 312).²⁰

After that it became quiet again in the park. The fogs continued to rise from the river. The monument continued to weather. It suffered the occasional stone being thrown at it. It received its annual visitors during the *Shakespeare-Tage*.

But it was there again in 1990, that Maik Hamburger, member of the board of the *Gesellschaft*, clearly marked the political changes that were taking place, when in his speech at the monument he reminded his audience of the official pomp of 1964 and called to account the way Shakespeare was instrumentalised for political purposes during the GDR period. "William would have greeted the claim that his visions were being realised in this country with that sceptical glance the sculptor Otto Lessing gave him *in effigie*." (Hamburger in Klotz 217). And he addressed the presence of Shakespeare directly:

Pity that you rested far away in this lovely park, William, you should have been in Leipzig in front of Nikolaikirche or in Berlin on Alexanderplatz, to experience the events yourself. After all, it was your fellow actors who called the largest demonstration, dramatists wrote liberation pamphlets, it was from the stage that rebellious appeals came. You would not have to be ashamed of your profession [...]" (Hamburger in Klotz 218)

In a moving way Hamburger resorted to Shakespeare as an authority guaranteeing value, and he concluded:

Today, in a period, in which economic, political and geographical borders are disappearing, it may be in our interest, in promoting German cultural identity, of which Shakespeare paradoxically himself is part, to preserve his vision of the nation [...] Let us therefore commemorate Shakespeare, the one who lasts. (Hamburger in Klotz 218)

The monument was again removed to be thoroughly restored in view of Weimar becoming the European City of Culture in 1999. The great moment when the immaculately white marble monument was again unveiled, was of a strangely subdued and ironical nature. The high seriousness of those who had erected the monument at the beginning of the century, and of those who had made their morning walk to the monument every year during GDR times was replaced by a sense of ambivalence, a sense of the monument as a burden of history.

Appelbaum, Dirk. *Das Denkmal: Goethe und Schiller als Doppelstandbild in Weimar*. Tübingen: Wachsmuth, 1993. Print.

²⁰ It was common practice in the GDR for state-owned factories to send delegations to the meetings of the *Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*.

English version of Engler, Balz "Der Stein sich leise hebt: Das Shakespeare-Denkmal in Weimar," *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* 139, 2002, 146-60.

Brandl, Alois. "Jahresbericht für 1912/13." *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* 49 (1913): XIII–XIX. Print.

Demandt, Alexander. *Vandalismus: Gewalt gegen Kultur*. Berlin: Siedler, 1997. Print.

Engler, Balz. "Der Stein sich leise hebt: Das Shakespeare-Denkmal in Weimar." *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* 139 (2002): 146–60. Print.

Fränkel, Ludwig. "Ein deutsches Shakespeare-Denkmal?" *Der Tag* 23 Apr. 1902. Print.

Klotz, Günther. *Shakespeare-Tage im vereinigten Deutschland: 25. bis 28. April 1991 in Weimar*. Weimar, 1991]. Print.

Lang, Otto, and Leiva Petersen. "Die deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft im Geschäftsjahr 1964." *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* 100/101 (1964/65): 310–14. Print.

Lehnert, Martin. "Hundert Jahre Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft." *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* 100/101 (1964): 9–56. Print.

Linke, Jens. "Shakespeare-Denkmal im Park an der Ilm in Weimar: Sachstandbericht und Präzisierung des Maßnahmekonzeptes." 1998. Mellingen. Print.

Musil, Robert. "Denkmale." *Gesammelte Werke*. By Robert Musil. Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1978. 506. Print. 2.

Selbmann, Rolf. *Dichterdenkmäler in Deutschland: Literaturgeschichte in Erz und Stein*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1988. Print.

Stroedel, Wolfgang. "Aus dem Leben der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft 1948-49." *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* 84/86 (1948/50): 13–14. Print.