
This thesis considers the reception of Schiller's Wilhelm Tell in England and America from its first publication in 1804 to the present. The main sections of the thesis treat the reception of the play as a literary work, as a textbook for schools and colleges, and as a drama appearing on the stage. Appendices are included which indicate the circulation of the play in textbooks and English translations.

In two particular areas, this thesis contradicts previous research: First, the Schiller celebrations, especially the celebration of 1859, have been portrayed as popular demonstrations of affection by non-Germans for Germany's poet of freedom. No evidence could be found to indicate any such popularity either before or after 1859. The greatest support for Tell and Schiller in either country came from the German Forty-eighters and the Turnvereine, but there is no evidence that any considerable percentage of the German immigrants shared their views. The great success of the celebrations among the immigrants lay in the fact that they were literally "celebrations."

Second, in determining the reception of Tell, the thesis investigates the assumption that James Sheridan Knowles' William Tell; or, The Hero of Switzerland (1825)
is "an English adaptation of the German play." This assumption is rejected. Knowles' play cannot in any sense be considered an "adaptation of Schiller's play."
The similarities can be explained by the fact that they both use the same historical sources. It is doubtful that Knowles' Tell would have been confused as an adaptation if it had been written prior to 1804. Since it is so frequently cited as "the" English version of Schiller's Tell for the stage, an interesting and significant question arises: has a direct translation of Schiller's Tell ever been performed on the English or American stage? So far as this investigation has been able to determine, no such English performance has ever been undertaken.

A definitive history of Schiller's plays would have to continue this investigation. The absence of Tell on the English-language stage considerably alters the picture of the popular reception which works dealing with this subject have created. In considering the reception of the play, the influence of the German immigrants, especially the Forty-eighters, has long been neglected as a major factor in the popularity the play enjoyed.
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INTRODUCTION:

This thesis undertakes to study the reception of Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* in England and America. In the face of numerous books and articles already written which pertain to or include this subject, it would appear at first glance, as some writers have indicated, that many aspects of this study have already been thoroughly explored. Further examination of these materials does not confirm this conclusion. Many have the tendency to over-simplify, by implication at least, the complexities of the English and American cultural traditions, ascribing influences to Schiller's *Tell* that are often ambiguous. The effects of such early works as Mme. de Staël's *Germany* and Thomas Carlyle's *Life of Schiller* in introducing *Wilhelm Tell* to the English-speaking world are often considered only in the light of favorable criticisms from well-known personalities without any attempt being made to determine the actual reception of the play among the general reading public. In attempting to determine the popularity of the play, mention of it by great literary figures has often been cited as being of great importance while other factors, such as the German immigration, have been greatly neglected.

Admittedly the general outlines of Schiller's reception in England and America have been fairly well established. The purpose of this thesis is to build upon
these outlines, adding to them where they appear to be substantiated and offering new materials where basic assumptions have proved to be inadequate. Many of the books and articles consulted in this study have dealt with but one particular phase of this subject or with one particular period of time. The broader study encompassed by this thesis, tracing the reception of Wilhelm Tell from its introduction in England and America to the present time, allows comparisons to be made and factors to be weighed which would otherwise be overlooked in a more restricted treatment of the subject. In this manner, it is felt, the way can be prepared for a more objective study of the reception, evaluation, and influence of Schiller's Wilhelm Tell in England and America.
I. MMÉ. DE STAËL AS AN INTERMEDIARY FOR TELL IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

Schiller was writing his *Wilhelm Tell* when MMé. de Staël crossed the Rhine for her first visit to Germany in 1803. Schiller's reaction to her impending visit is reflected in a letter written to Goethe on November 30, 1803:

Fray v. Stael ist wirklich in Frankfurt, und wir dürfen sie bald hier erwarten. Wenn sie nur Deutsch versteht, so zweifle ich nicht, dass wir über sie Meister werden, aber unsere Religion in französischen Phrasen ihr vorzutragen und gegen ihre französische Volubilität anzukommen ist eine zu harte Aufgabe.

Much to Schiller's distress his conversations with her were held in French.

MMé. de Staël's role as an intermediary of German literature has been portrayed in numerous books and articles. It is necessary to review her relation to Schiller at this time, however, because of the influence it had on the introduction of *Tell* to England and America. Of her first meeting with Schiller in Weimar, she wrote: "I found him so modest and so indifferent as to what concerned his own success, so proud and so animated in the


defence of what appeared to him to be the truth, that I vowed to him from that moment a friendship replete with admiration."³ Available documents show that Mme. de Staël became familiar with Tell during her stay in Weimar. Schiller's letters tell of various occasions on which he and Mme. de Staël were together socially. Since Tell was the subject of much conversation during that particular period, there is little doubt that it was discussed by them. Jean de Pange records two items that bear upon her acquaintance with Tell: Schiller "consentit à venir dîner chez Goethe le 25 février et à y lire deux scènes de Guillaume Tell. Il est possible que Mme de Staël ait pris part à cette réunion."⁴ A footnote in the 1958 edition of De l'Allemagne quotes the following letter:

Mme de Staël écrit à Hochet, de Weimar, le 28 février (surcharge en 29) 1804: "J'ai entendu hier la lecture interprétée un peu par Benjamin de Guillaume Tell de Schiller. Il y a vraiment des beautés remarquables et une énergie d'amour de la liberté qui ferait un terrible bruit chez nous ...⁵

Schiller's letters make it apparent that Mme. de Staël made it difficult for him to concentrate on Tell.

³ Germany; by the Baroness Staël Holstein, 3 vols. (London, 1813), I, 278. Translated from the French.

⁴ Comtesse Jean de Pange, Mme de Staël et la découverte de l'Allemagne (Paris, 1939), p. 47.

He admits to Goethe that she is "in der That ein Phänomen in ihrem Geschlecht, an Geist und Beredsamkeit mögen ihr wenige Männer gleich kommen," but her frequent visits strained him: "Es ist das alte mit ihr, man würde sich an das Fass der Danaiden erinnern, wenn einem nicht der Oknos mit seinem Esel dabei einfiele." Shortly before the completion of *Tell*, he complains in a letter to Goethe: "Ich bin nun dem Ziel meiner Arbeit nahe und muss mich vor allem, was mir die nöthige letzte Stimmung rauben oder verkümmern kann, sorgfältigst hüten, besonders aber vor allen französischen Freunden."

Mme. de Staël's *Germany* records many admiring phrases regarding Schiller and devotes an entire chapter to the discussion of *Wilhelm Tell*. This chapter intersperses a narration of the play with translated extracts and personal opinions of the play. Her evaluation of the play is generally favorable. Two of her opinions are very interesting because they are in regard to two controversial scenes in the play: Tell's monologue in Act IV Scene 3 and the fifth act. Tell's soliloquy is considered to be "extremely fine," but the belief is expressed that the play should end with the fourth act: "It seems that

7 Graf and Leitzmann, II, 474, dated January 13, 1804.
8 Graf and Leitzmann, II, 485, dated February 16, 1804.
9 She was aware of the success of the play on the
the piece should naturally end here . . . but . . .
Schiller has added a sort of appendix or explanation, which can be no more listened to after the principal catastrophe is terminated.\(^\text{10}\)

It is noteworthy that she rejects the confrontation of Tell and John the Parricide in the fifth act for its use on the stage only: "The putting these two characters in opposition to each other is a just and ingenious idea, yet this contrast, so pleasing in the closet, does not answer on the stage."\(^\text{11}\)

She then continues: "On the stage, the additional act of John the Parricide is suppressed, and the curtain falls at the moment when Gessler's heart is pierced by the arrow."\(^\text{12}\)

German stage. Wieland wrote her of the first performance in Weimar, describing it as "l'événement littéraire de la saison," in a letter recorded by Jean de Pange, *Mme de Staël*, p. 49.

\(^{10}\) *Germany*, II, 135.

\(^{11}\) *Germany*, II, 136.

\(^{12}\) *Germany*, II, 136. She is possibly referring to performances at Weimar in which the fifth act was omitted. There is another reason given for this omission. Günther Skopnik, "Die Dramen Schillers auf den Bühnen der Deutschen Bundesrepublik seit 1945," *Maske und Kothurn*, V, 3 (1959), p. 200, states "dass im Dezember 1804 und im März 1805 auf dem Theater Goethes der 'Wilhelm Tell' ohne den fünften Akt gespielt wurde, weil auf die neue Grossherzogin und die Ermordung ihres Vaters, des Zaren Paul im Jahre 1801 Rücksicht genommen werden musste."
The fifth act was given in the performances at Berlin in 1804.
The appearance of *Germany* (London, 1813) marks the occasion of the first known English translation of extracts from *Wilhelm Tell*, but the effect of this translation remained without immediate success in England and America. Schirmer speaks of a wave of translations that were the result of this work, yet no complete translation of *Wilhelm Tell* was among them, the first appearing in English in 1825.\(^\text{13}\) The Catalogue of the British Museum lists F. Hodgson and William Lamb as the translators of *Germany*. In December, 1812, Thomas Campbell wrote to Mme. de Staël proposing that he be allowed to supervise the translation of that work.\(^\text{14}\) Though Staël accepted Campbell's offer, the memoirs of the publisher of *Germany* nevertheless list the translators as Hodgson and Lamb.\(^\text{15}\) There would still appear to be some controversy concerning this. B. Q. Morgan, in his bibliography of English translations, lists the translator as "anonymous."\(^\text{16}\)


\(^{15}\) Cf. *A Publisher and his Friends. Memoirs and Correspondence of the Late John Murray* (London, 1891), I, 313.

In a discussion of the effect of this book in England and America, the reputation of the author must be separated from the work. Mme. de Staël was very popular socially. The popularity of her book is another matter. Published early in November, 1813, it reached a sale of 3500 copies in six weeks, a sizeable sale in that period.\(^{17}\) A reprint of this edition appeared in New York in 1814, with new printings appearing in New York in 1859, 1860, 1871, and 1887.\(^{18}\) But in spite of the almost instant success of the first English edition, R. C. Whitford comments: "Madame de Staël's friends among reviewers and poets and people of fashion, and her enemy, Napoleon, gave her a large part of the tremendous prestige which she came to have in England as the author of Germany. The treatise itself found comparatively few careful readers."\(^{19}\) Whitford says that after her death her work lived chiefly in the work of Lord Byron, James Mackintosh, William Taylor, Thomas Carlyle, and Lord Francis Jeffrey.\(^{20}\) Herein lies the great importance of Germany as an

\(^{17}\) As reported by Mackintosh in Memoirs of the Life of the Right Honourable Sir James Mackintosh, ed. R. J. Mackintosh, 2 vols. (London, 1835), II, 266, in a letter dated December 24, 1813.


\(^{19}\) Robert C. Whitford, Madame de Staël's Literary Reputation in England (Urbana, 1918), p. 53.

\(^{20}\) Whitford, p. 53f.
intermediary for *Tell* in England and America: "Durch Frau von Staël finden Kant, Goethe und Schiller nicht nur den Weg in die Romania; auch der angelsächsische Bereich der Germania wird ihnen auf dem Weg über Paris, die grosse Vermittlungszentrale internationalen Geistes- austausches, jetzt erschlossen." Several important American scholars were led to the study of German literature through Mme. de Staël's *Germany*, among them George Ticknor of Harvard; yet for the introduction of *Tell* to America her work is not as important as that of an Englishman who was influenced by her to study Schiller's works, Thomas Carlyle.

II. THE RECEPTION OF TELL IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA TO
WORLD WAR I.

A. FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF TELL TO 1859.

1. ENGLAND.

One reason given for the relatively late discovery
of Wilhelm Tell by the British is that it was published
in Germany at a time (1804) when Schiller's general
reputation had suffered a decline: "When at last it did
reach British attention, it became popular almost
immediately, and was translated five times from 1825 to
1831 . . ."¹ Nicoll says it is not strange that Schiller
and other dramatists from Germany were recognized by only
a few literary enthusiasts in the early part of the nine¬
teenth century. The English moral mood was growing in
intensity and resulted in the assumption that fresh and
novel ideas originating abroad must of necessity be
subversive of morality. ² In the reception of Tell in
England, the name of Thomas Carlyle appears as a major
factor in Schiller's revived popularity. It was in
September, 1817, that Carlyle read Mme. de Staël's
Germany and was drawn to the study of German literature.

¹ Bayard Quincy Morgan and A. R. Hohlfeld (editors),
German Literature in British Magazines 1750-1860

² Allardyce Nicoll, A History of English Drama,
Six months later he was studying the German language, and by 1821 he was reading Schiller and Kant, Schelling and Fichte.  

It is likely that Carlyle would have been responsible for the first complete translation of *Tell* in English had he been able to find a publisher. By the beginning of 1821, he was "corresponding . . . with London booksellers, offering a complete translation of Schiller for one thing, to which the answer had been an abrupt No." Carlyle did not discourage that easily. In a letter dated July 25, 1822, he wrote the following to his brother, John:

". . . If you can find Schiller's tragedy of *Wilhelm Tell*, I wish you would send it up, in the next bundle of clothes, perhaps it will surprise you to learn that Oliver and Boyd have agreed to go half with me in printing a poetical translation of this work! I have sometimes tried a little jingle last winter, and found it do me go hurt at all. *Tell*, however, is still in dubio."

If this translation was ever completed, it is no longer extant. Possibly the extracts from *Wilhelm Tell* which


appeared in his biography of Schiller date from this period. Carlyle's continued interest in *Tell* is seen in a letter of December 22, 1822, to Jane Welsh in which he expresses disappointment in the play, but nevertheless sends it to her for her opinion:

> I have sent you *Tell*, which Schiller's critics have praised greatly... I was disappointed in *Tell*; it struck me as too disjointed and heterogenous, though there are excellent views of Swiss life in it and *Tell* himself is a fine patriot-peasant. I want your criticism of it.

This view of *Tell* was to be modified in Carlyle's *Life of Schiller*. Regardless of the disappointment he expresses to Jane, the spirit of liberty he found in *Tell* appears to have exerted some influence on a poem he wrote. A letter written to his mother, dated December 4, 1822, speaks of a "screed of verses which I made some time ago. I fear you will not care a doit for them, though the subject is good — the deliverance of Switzerland from tyranny by the hardy mountaineers at the battle of Morgarten about five hundred years ago." The poem is in six stanzas, the first two as follows:

> Proud Hapsburgh came forth in the gloom of his wrath,  
> With his banners of pomp and his Ritters in mail,  
> For the herdsmen of Uri have fronted his path,  
> And the standard of freedom is raised in the vale.

6 Norton, II, 156.

7 Froude, I, 174.
All scornful advancing, he thought as he came
How the peasants would shrink at the glance of
of his eye;
How their heath-covered chalets in ruin must flame,
And the hope of the nation must wither and die. 8

Tell is not the theme of the poem, yet the possibility of
influence from Schiller's play remains when it is
considered that Carlyle contemplated a Tell translation
in early 1821, and began early in 1823 to write his "Life
of Schiller" series for the London Magazine at the request
of William Taylor of Norwich.

In October, 1823, Carlyle began to publish articles
on his "Life of Schiller" serially in the London Magazine.
The second part was published in the same magazine in
November of that year, and the final part appeared in
January, 1824. This series was published in book form in
1825. Carlyle's Life of Schiller has been called the
"first major contribution to a better understanding and
appreciation of Schiller..." 9 Part of the difficulty
Carlyle experienced while writing this biography came from
his own desire for perfection. His journal shows he was
not satisfied with the quality of his work. Of his article
he writes in November, 1823: "Schiller is in the wrong
vein -- laborious, partly affected, meagre, bombastic.

8 Froude, I, 175
9 Morgan and Hohlfeld, p. 101.
Too often it strives by lofty words to hide littleness of thought. Would I were done with it." But his dyspepsia was also a large part of the difficulty: "These drugs leave me scarcely the consciousness of existence. I am scribbling not writing Schiller . . Alas! there is mercurial powder in me, and a gnawing pain all over the organs of digestion . . ."

In his Life of Schiller, Carlyle comments on the apparent lack of connection between Tell and the men of Rütli; he calls it a 'deficiency inseparable from the faithful display of the historical event, and far more than compensated by the deeper interest and the wider range of action and delineation, which a strict adherence to the facts allows.' Carlyle speaks of the beauty of Schiller's descriptions and the fine delineation of Tell, in whom all the attributes of a great man are combined. A translation of Act IV, Scene 3 is given. He concludes by ranking Tell with the very best of Schiller's plays:

Less comprehensive and ambitious than Wallenstein, less ethereal than the Jungfrau, it has a look of nature and a substantial truth, which neither of its rivals can boast of. The feelings it inculcates and appeals to are those of universal human nature, and presented in their purest, most unpretending form. There is no high-wrought sentiment, no poetic love.

10 Froude, I, 203.
11 Froude, I, 206.
13 Life of Schiller, p. 187.
By 1838 Carlyle had come to the conclusion that Schiller's ""Wilhelm Tell" was the best thing he ever wrote...""14

Carlyle's work received widespread attention and helped to bring attention to Tell. The Cambridge History of English Literature says of Carlyle's influence: "We have already claimed Carlyle as the greatest moral force in the England of his day, and it is difficult to say more. His influence penetrated deep into English intellectual life, at no time overprone to impracticable idealisms."15 Carlyle's interpretation of Schiller on a moral level was instrumental in introducing Tell to the British public. He was more interested in the moral influence of Tell than the artistic side. To him the hope of improvement lay in morality, not in aesthetics, and the constant references to aesthetics by Schiller and Goethe left him dissatisfied: "One is tired to death of his and Goethe's palabra about the nature of fine arts."16 "They pretend that Nature gives people true intimations of true beauty and just principles in Art... Stuff and nonsense I fear it is."17

14 Thomas Carlyle, Lectures on Literature (London, 1892), lectures delivered April to July 1838, 11th lecture, pp. 209-211.
16 Froude, The First Forty Years, I, 201.
17 Froude, I, 202.
The moralistic interpretations of *Tell* overshadow the artistic considerations for many decades.

Much is made of the fact that Carlyle's initial enthusiasm for Schiller soon cooled and that he then turned to Goethe. Nevertheless, Carlyle always retained great respect for Schiller the man. Concerning this, Carlyle wrote:

> We once heard a German remark that readers till their twenty-fifth year usually prefer Schiller; after their twenty-fifth year, Goethe. This probably was no unfair illustration of the question. Schiller can seem higher than Goethe only because he is narrower. . . . Without asserting for Schiller any claim that enemies can dispute, enough will remain for him. We may say that, as a Poet and Thinker, he attained to a perennial Truth, and ranks among the noblest productions of his nation and century. Goethe may continue the German Poet, but neither through long generations can Schiller be forgotten. 18

During Carlyle's visit to Germany in 1852, he visited Goethe's home for two hours and then spent an hour in Schiller's. A letter from Weimar to his wife shows his feelings: "Schiller's house was still more affecting; the room where he wrote, his old table, exactly like the model, the bed where he died, and a portrait of his dead face on it. A poor man's house, and a brave, who had fallen at his post there." 19


Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* reveals how some of the thoughts expressed in *Tell* influenced him. Though Carlyle took chiefly ornamental phrases and illustrations from Schiller for this work, it nevertheless represents the epitome of all that Carlyle had thought and contains the essence of all that he had felt.\(^{20}\) On at least two occasions, Carlyle borrows directly from *Tell*. In *Tell*'s monologue we read:

> Hier geht
> Der sorgenvolle Kaufmann und der leicht
> Geschürzte Pilger — der andächt'ge Mönch,
> Der düstre Räuber und der heitre Spielmann,
> Der Säumer mit dem schwerbeladenen Ross,
> Der ferne herkommt von der Menschen Ländern,
> Denn jede Strasse führt ans End' der Welt.\(^{21}\)

This thought is expressed as Herr Teufelsdröckh ponders his youth:

> With amazement I began to discover that Entepfuhl stood in the middle of a Country, of a World; that there was such a thing as History, as Biography; to which I also one day, by hand and tongue, might contribute.\(^{22}\)

It was then that, independently of Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell*, I made this not quite insignificant


\(^{22}\) *Sartor Resartus*, p. 85.
reflection (so true also in spiritual things): Any road, this simple Entepfuhl road, will lead you to the end of the world!  

The other borrowing from Tell comes from the scene in which Melchthal vows to destroy the tyranny in his land:

Und wohnt' er droben auf dem Eispalast
Des Schreckhorns oder höher, wo die Jungfrau
Seit Ewigkeit verschleiert sitzt -- ich mache
Mir Bahn zu ihm . . .

This "Schreckhorn," the peak of terror, appears as Teufelsdröckh observes the mountains:

Often also I could see the black Tempest marching in anger through the distance: round some Schreckhorn, as yet grim-blue, would the eddying vapour gather, and there tumultuously eddy, and flow like a mad witch's hair; till, after a space it vanished, and, in the clear sunbeam, your Schreckhorn stood smiling grim-white for the vapour had held snow.

Guaging the influence of the Life of Schiller on the British public can perhaps be done on a superficial level by pointing to the numerous reprintings until the beginning of the twentieth century (see Appendix II). Though admittedly not the most desirable measure of popularity, it does show how much the British view toward German

23  Sartor Resartus, p. 86.
24  Act I, Scene 4, 626-629.
25  Sartor Resartus, p. 170. That this impression was received from Schiller's Tell can be seen in Life of Schiller, p. 187, where Carlyle discusses the depiction of nature in Tell: "It is delightful and salutary to the heart to wander among the scenes of Tell: all is lovely, yet all is real. Physical and moral grandeur are united; yet both are unadorned grandeur of Nature. There are the lakes and green valleys beside us, the Schreckhorn, the Jungfrau, and their sister peaks, with their avalanches and their palaces of ice, all glowing in the southern sun . . ."
literature had changed in a relatively short time, or perhaps how Carlyle's stature had increased. Only five years after he had published Life of Schiller, Carlyle still had great difficulty finding a publisher who would accept works dealing with German literature. In fact, Sartor Resartus was first published as a complete work in America because the German coloring made it difficult to find an English publisher. Froude records:

Boyd . . . wrote that he would be proude to publish for Carlyle upon almost any other subject except German literature. He knew that in this department Carlyle was superior to any other author of the day . . . Everyone of the books about German literature had been failures, most of them ruinous failures. The feeling in the public mind was that everything German was especially to be avoided.  

Carlyle was one of the men instrumental in changing this feeling. The numerous reprints of his Life of Schiller between 1845 and 1904 reflect the new acceptance of German literature in England. Goethe praised Carlyle for this work and was instrumental in having it translated into German. The numerous translations and editions of Tell, beginning in 1825, were made possible by the groundbreaking efforts of Carlyle and other English literary critics.

26 Froude, The First Forty Years, II, 102.

27 See Goethe's letter to Carlyle, dated July 20, 1827, in Froude, The First Forty Years, I, 414-421. Goethe wrote the introduction to the first German edition (Fankfurt, 1830).
William Taylor of Norwich acknowledged Tell to be Schiller's best dramatic effort. Taylor was for a short period the recognized arbiter on all things German in England. Other critics reviewed Tell in the various English periodicals and their readers must have obtained some knowledge of Tell from these sources. A frequency count of Schiller's works in British magazines during the period 1825 to 1859 shows Wilhelm Tell received 21 references. One of the more influential critics, Robert Pearse Gillies, writing in the "Horae Germanicae" section of Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine (March, 1825), refers to Tell as the one play of Schiller's deemed "the best calculated to be introduced to the knowledge of our readers, as one of the best, as most consonant with British taste and feeling." He notes that it is a favorite on the German stage, and that it does not create any political difficulty there because in this play it is sought only to maintain old established rights and privileges. However, Gillies finds several faults with the play. Major among


these are the love affair between persons not connected with the main business of the play, and the insinuation that Gessler did not intend to enforce his command to make Tell shoot at the apple. He concludes that Tell is a work "with . . . great and numerous beauties, and . . . strange faults."

The articles are by no means all favorable to Tell, but they are still a means of making the readers aware of the play. Many of the criticisms show a glaring lack of knowledge of factual detail and insight into the work. An anonymous review in the Monthly Review for September/November, 1825, is entitled: "Wilhelm Tell; a Drama. Transl. from the German of Frederic Schiller. London. 1825." This is a review of Samuel Robinson's translation which appeared that year. The writer knows of no subject "less fitted for dramatic representation." Further: "But although every attempt to represent this subject on the stage has failed, and must always fail, it is a theme, nevertheless, susceptible of considerable effect

31 Gillies, cont. in XVII, 99 (April, 1825), p. 423. Gillies is apparently referring to Tell's shot and Gessler's statement: "How? Has he shot? The madman!" (Act III, Scene 3) which would mean to Gillies that Tell had not shot of necessity.

32 Gillies, p. 436.

33 Anon., CVIII, 344-352.
in a dramatic poem." This statement completely overlooks the success of Schiller's *Tell* in Germany, even though Gillies had made mention of this several months earlier. If the writer is referring to productions of the Tell theme in London, he is dealing, apparently unknown to him, with plays which are not translations of Schiller's *Tell* and do not follow his play in plan or execution.

An article written as late as 1848, entitled "The German Mind," claims that Schiller's "very last play, *Wilhelm Tell*, not only studiously advocates coldblooded assassination, but throws a sentimental colouring over it, which is most pernicious in its effects, and tends to confuse the first principles of right and wrong." A more scholarly source for the acceptance of the Tell theme in England is a long article entitled "Wilhelm Tell" by a Professor de Vericour. This article concerns itself with

---

34 Anon., pp. 344, 345.


37 *Dublin University Magazine*, LIII (1859), pp. 60-77.
The history of Wilhelm Tell which is prefaced by the statement: "It would be difficult to find in history an episode more popular than that relating to Wilhelm Tell." The history of the legend is then traced through its various stages. Only at the close of the article is Schiller's Tell considered, indeed in glowing terms:

Such a spirit (that animates a whole people) has never ceased to breathe in the mountains and valleys of Switzerland; it has inspired other Swiss heroes... it kindled the genius of Schiller, whose masterpiece, Wilhelm Tell, was the song of the Germanic Swan, expressing the purest aspirations and the sentiments which ennobled his soul... And it is impossible to contemplate, without emotion, the nobler vibrations of the human soul... whenever Schiller's Wilhelm Tell is performed in that blessed land... Though Tell is mentioned in literary works of this period, it appears to have had no far-reaching influence. Traces of Tell's influence can be found in Manfred by Lord Byron (1788-1824). Tell's name is mentioned in the play, though not in connection with Schiller's work. It is in Byron's description of nature that the influence appears. Act I, Scene 2 in Manfred and Act I, Scene 1 in Wilhelm Tell show various points of contact. Manfred is alone upon the "Mountain of the Jungfrau." The shepherd's pipe is heard in the distance, following which a "chamois hunter" enters the scene (in Tell the order is

38 Prof. de Vericour, p. 60.
39 Prof. de Vericour, p. 77.
the same). Schiller describes a pastoral scene; Byron refers to a place in which "the patriarchal days are not
A pastoral fable . . .". Two examples of these borrowings will be given. In the first, Schiller's Alpenjäger and Byron's Manfred are atop a mountain and express their thoughts as they view the world below:

Alpenjäger: "Und unter den Füssen ein nebliches Meer,
Erkennt er die Städte der Menschen nicht mehr . . ."

Manfred: "The mists boil up around the glaciers;
Rise curling fast beneath me, white and sulphury . . ."

Alpenjäger: "Durch den Riss nur der Wolken
Erblickt er die Welt . . ."

Manfred: "Mountains have fallen,
Leaving a gap in the clouds . . ."

The Alpenjäger speaks of his treacherous foothold "auf schwindlichem Weg," while Manfred, aware that a "stir, a motion, even a breath" would bring death, refers to the "dizziness of distance." Schiller's "Melodie des Kuhr-reihens" has also left a noticeable parallel in Byron's work:

Fischerknabe: "Da hört er ein Klingen,
Wie Flöten so süß,
Wie Stimmen der Engel
Im Paradies."

Manfred: "... pipes in the liberal air,
Mix'd with the sweet bells of the sauntering herd;
My soul would drink those echoes . . ."

40 The quotations from Byron's work have been taken from Manfred, a dramatic poem, 2nd ed. (London, 1817), Act I, Scene 2.
Of the international influence of Tell, Kurt Wais notes in regard to Byron: "Wie Schillers neue Bildschöpfungen zu internationalen Topoi wurden, müsste als Gegenstand einer Untersuchung eine überreife Ernte ergeben. Zu solchen Funden von Schillers Phantasie gehört, um ein Beispiel zu nennen, das Bild aus dem Schweizer Zusammenhang des Tell-Dramas 'Auf den Bergen ist Freiheit.' Von diesem Vers aus wurde das Alpenerlebnis Byrons zu einem Leitmotiv seiner Dichtung ..." 41 Oliver Elton says that during the early nineteenth century the German influence in poetry and fiction, though widespread in England, was often superficial, transitory, or of little service. 42

2. AMERICA.

The early American acceptance of Schiller's Tell was greatly influenced by literary criticism of it in England. Germany had been published in New York in 1814, yet in America as in England the article on Tell and the selected translations in English appear to have had no direct effect on the play's popularity. But along with the English influence was also the German. The two men who were to a great extent responsible for introducing Tell to


the American public were Thomas Carlyle and Charles Follen. The lateness of this introduction can be seen from a statement by Stanley Vogel: "In 1829 Americans knew Schiller only by Coleridge's matchless translation of Wallenstein and by his play Die Räuber, which, written at the age of seventeen, should have been considered merely as a juvenile effort when compared with the productions of his manhood." 43

Carlyle and Follen influenced the study of Schiller and Wilhelm Tell in America during the same period, and their influences cannot always be separated and classified. Emerson had not become aware of Carlyle's name until 1832, although numerous essays by Carlyle published anonymously in the British quarterlies had for years been highly regarded by Emerson and by other American scholars. 44 During that same year, 1832, an entry in Emerson's journal shows that he had been reading Carlyle's Life of Schiller. 45 Whether Emerson had read that work prior to this time is uncertain, even though it was easily obtainable and fairly well-known. It is certain, however, that Emerson visited Carlyle in Craigentinns in 1833, after which he began a

43 Stanley Vogel, German Literary Influences on the American Transcendentalists (New Haven, 1955), p. 44.
45 Slater, pp. 4, 5.
personal campaign to introduce Carlyle's name to America. After 1833 Carlyle was no stranger to the New England transcendentalists: "All of the zealous New England Transcendentalists in that time were close readers of Carlyle; many of them owed to him their principal knowledge of German literature; most of them were profoundly affected by him." In spite of some adverse criticisms of Schiller as a writer, Emerson called Schiller the man pure gold. His opinion of Schiller was probably colored by Carlyle's Life of Schiller, which gained popularity in America and materially aided the spread of German literature among American scholars.

The first American edition of Carlyle's Life of Schiller was edited by Follen, who apparently was ignorant of the author's identity at the time. Follen, a German immigrant, was appointed to the first instructorship in German at Harvard. He was an ardent admirer of Schiller. Vogel says this suited Americans who preferred the moral and political qualities rather than the artistic in the literature they read. There is evidence to show that


47 Frank Luther Mott, "Carlyle's American Public," Philological Quarterly, IV (1925), p. 245, says that Carlyle's influence upon American thought and letters was probably greater than that of any other writer of his century.

48 This edition appeared in Boston, 1833.

49 Cf. Vogel, p. 54f.
Follen had a great influence in changing the American attitude toward Schiller.\(^50\) In addition to the influence he exerted though his classes at Harvard, Follen gave lectures in New York and Boston in which he is said to have highlighted Schiller's writings, often including whole scenes of the plays in original translations. William Henry Channing reported in the *Christian Examiner* for September, 1842, that these lectures were delivered before the best audiences in those cities and that the translations were as poetical as they were accurate.\(^51\) Many of the New England Transcendentalists attended these lectures. It is no coincidence that the first American translator of Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell*, Charles Timothy Brooks (1813-83), had studied German under Follen at Harvard. Brooks, for many years Unitarian pastor at Newport, Rhode Island, was one of a wide circle of Unitarians in New England who took an active part in making the literature of Germany known to the literary public.

The reviews and evaluations written by members of this group indicate the early reception of *Wilhelm Tell* in America. Frederic Hedge (1805-90) was a noted Unitarian clergyman from a prominent New England family. As did many other young men from his circle, he went to

\(^{50}\) Cf. Vogel, p. 13.

\(^{51}\) Cf. *Christian Examiner*, XXXIII, 33-56, for his article.
Germany to study, remaining there from 1818 to 1822. Thereafter much of his life was spent in the interpretation of German literature and philosophy. His review of Carlyle's *Life of Schiller* is less an appraisal of Carlyle's work than an independent analysis of Schiller and his works. As part of his evaluation of Schiller, Hedge asserts:

> There never was a poet in whose works unity and wholeness, harmony of form and concentration of interest were more conspicuous than in his own. In his own style he seems less intimately related to his country than most of his contemporaries. We cannot subscribe to the sentence which has pronounced him a peculiarly national poet.

Hedge considers "The Maid of Orleans" to be the most popular of Schiller's dramas. Issue is taken with the American editor of *Life of Schiller*: "On what grounds the American editor of this biography pronounces our author a 'moral poet,' we are at loss to divine. That he has written nothing very wicked, certainly affords no grounds for such an appellation." For Schiller's descriptions of nature in his dramas there is strong criticism: "His descriptions of nature are accurate and strongly colored, but stiff and formal."

---

52 A good introduction to Hedge can be found in Orie William Long, *Frederic Henry Hedge, A Cosmopolitan Scholar* (Portland, Maine, 1940).


54 Hedge, p. 389.

55 Hedge, p. 388.
In this point, Hedge is in strong opposition to the author of the book he is reviewing. *Tell* is treated with one sentence: "Wilhelm Tell has no faults and great beauties, but it wants the glow and life necessary to produce a strong impression."\(^{56}\)

A review of C. T. Brooks' *Tell* translation shows more enthusiasm for *Tell* than did Hedge:

The play is full of stirring incident. Without confusion a wonderful deal is compressed into it. The whole history of the period is here shortly told. The vision is complete; it takes entire possession of us, as we read. It is a living work or art, not a mechanical copy. It has the integrity of nature; it shows us much and convinces us of more.\(^{57}\)

A comparison of the above reviews by two well-known authors shows how difficult it is to obtain an accurate indication of Schiller's popularity from literary critics.

A valuable work for the early history of *Tell* in America was written by Mrs. Elizabeth Fries Lummis Ellet (1818-77), who "perhaps did more than any one of her sex to make Schiller known and appreciated in America."\(^{58}\) In her *Characters of Schiller* (1839), Schiller is highly praised: "Among the few, the very few modern poets who

\(^{56}\) Hedge, p. 374f.


\(^{58}\) Scott Holland Goodnight, *German Literature in American Magazines Prior to 1846*, Bulletin of the Univ. of Wisconsin, No. 188 (Diss., Univ. of Wisc., 1905), p. 100.
have attained to excellence in the delineation of character, Schiller stands first.\textsuperscript{59} The discussion of \textit{TeI I} is interspersed with original translations from the play, and it is ranked high among Schiller's works:

\textit{Wilhelm Tell} is the last of Schiller's tragedies, and unquestionably one of his very best. Bearing more clearly than any of its predecessors, the stamp of his matured intellect, it exhibits the complete triumph of art over a subject which though stirring and exciting, seems at the first glance scarcely adapted for dramatic effort.\textsuperscript{60}

Mrs. Ellet agrees with Carlyle's evaluation of Schiller's nature scenes:

The vivid and picturesque coloring shed over the play transports the imagination at once into the midst of those celebrated scenes. The very first impression is one of wild sublimity; we breathe the air of the alps... The whole of the first scene is inimitable; and complete, inasmuch as it furnishes us with the first glimpse into the character of Tell himself.\textsuperscript{61}

The narration of the play shows that she is familiar with the historical background of the Tell theme:

Tell takes no part in the meeting of the patriots, and the conspiracy, that occupies the first two acts of the piece; he is not a tragic hero, but a bold and honest mountaineer, who meddles not in political affairs, and is roused to resist the pressure of tyranny only when it disturbs the course of his peaceful domestic life. He sets forth no political opinions... This is a new and worthy conception of the character of the peasant hero. Tell does not brave the power of Gessler; his disobedience to the

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{59} (Boston, 1839), p. 11.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Ellet, p. 273.
\item \textsuperscript{61} Ellet, p. 277.
\end{footnotes}
order of the Austrian Vogt arises merely from inadvertence and ignorance, and on this he grounds his defence.\textsuperscript{62}

Even the controversial scenes of Tell's monologue and his confrontation with the Parricide are found to be praiseworthy. In the monologue the "gentleness and affectionateness of his nature is touchingly painted . . . in the pass among the rocks of Küssnacht."\textsuperscript{63} Her defence of the fifth act is noteworthy for her insight into Schiller's plans:

In this tragedy, as in Mary Stuart, the author has subjoined one or more scenes after the great catastrophe of the piece, and dealt in person the poetical justice which might safely have been left to the imagination of the spectators. The fifth act of Wilhelm Tell, containing the episode of Jean-le Parricide, has frequently been omitted in the presentation; the curtain falling at the moment when the arrow pierces the heart of Gessler. But the effect of the whole is completely set forth only in the last scenes.\textsuperscript{64}

Mrs. Ellet's discussion of Tell shows that she was strongly influenced by Carlyle. Especially in her closing review of the strong points of Wallenstein, The Maid of Orleans, and Tell can this be seen as it is a paraphrase of Carlyle's words in Life of Schiller.\textsuperscript{65}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{62} Ellet, p. 281.
  \item \textsuperscript{63} Ellet, p. 292.
  \item \textsuperscript{64} Ellet, p. 294.
  \item \textsuperscript{65} Compare Ellet, p. 296, and Life of Schiller, p. 187.
\end{itemize}
The criticisms of Schiller's *Tell* from 1822 to 1846 are practically all laudatory. Though the lofty idealism and patriotism found in his dramas were beyond reproach, in America Schiller became especially known for his poems. However, Goodnight's review of the German literature in American magazines indicates that after the *Dial* period (1840-44) a reaction set in against Schiller. This was expressed not so much by adverse criticism as by a lack of American interest in his works shown by American magazines and periodicals. Appendix III shows that from 1842 until after the Schiller celebrations of 1859 only a reprint of Peter's *Tell* translation appeared in the United States. During the same period in England, English extracts and new translations or new editions of older translations were appearing at the rate of approximately one per year. Haertel, who covers German literature in American magazines from 1846 to 1880 lists only five articles for that period which deal with *Tell* as a work or as a theme. One is a reprint from *Blackwood's Magazine* in England, another is a twelve-line review of a textbook edition, and still

66 Cf. Goodnight, p. 96.


68 Martin Henry Haertel, *German Literature in American Magazines 1846 to 1880*, *Bulletin of the Univ. Wisconsin*, No. 263 (Diss., Univ. of Wis., 1908), entries 896 (1863), 1331 (1872), 1442 (1874), 1459 (1875), and 1663 (1877).
another is a poem called "The myth of William Tell." It becomes obvious at this point, that Tell enjoyed only a short-lived popularity among the general American public, if the lack of periodical interest is any indication. The interest shown in Schiller by the New Englanders did, however, leave its mark on the new departments of Germanic studies being established in the schools and universities of that area. Another, perhaps more important, factor must be considered, the tremendous German immigration of the nineteenth century.

Largely because of the influence of the German Forty-eighters Tell became a symbol of freedom from oppression in America. An investigation of numerous Midwestern census records showed that nine out of ten German immigrants to America between 1848 and 1854 came from west of the Elbe River, "that is from the very regions which were the scenes of memorable revolutionary events." The Forty-eighters among these immigrants arrived in America at a time when the Germans were on the defensive: "Acting as a 'spiritual yeast' to leaven the mass of their countrymen, they resolved to stir them up to a better appreciation of their potentialities for spiritual and cultural progress." The Forty-eighters were not the first

69 Haertel, entries 1331, 1663, 1442.


political refugees from Germany. The Follen brothers had fled Germany earlier because of their activities with the "Giessen Blacks," whose political agitation had in 1819 led to the plan of establishing a utopian German state in North America. Charles Follen, a pupil of Friedrich Ludwig Jahn, had organized and taught the first school of gymnastics in America based on Juvenal's plea *mens sana in corpore sano*. These early "Turner," well-known for their ardent patriotism and devotion to liberty, were ardent admirers of Schiller's *Tell*. Yet not until the arrival of the Forty-eighters did the quality of the German-language newspapers improve, the German-language theaters begin their renaissance, or the German-Americans begin to actively insist on the instruction of German and German culture in American schools.

Among the Forty-eighters were intellectuals such as Reinhold Solger, Julius Fröbel, Carl Schurz, and Friedrich Hecker:

To men of such intellectual interests, the hundredth anniversaries of Schiller's birth in 1859 and that of Alexander von Humboldt ten years later provided an opportunity to honor two great Germans and impress their American countrymen with the distinguished achievements of German literature and scholarship . . . The anniversary of Friedrich Schiller, author of *Wilhelm Tell*, and a champion of freedom . . . aroused real enthusiasm among the

---

73 Wittke, p. 287.
Germans of the United States. Along with Freiligrath, Herwegh and Heine, Schiller was a favorite of the Forty-eighters, and the Schiller anniversary celebrations were largely their work.74

German Forty-eighters were also responsible for the great Schiller celebrations held 1859 in the Crystal Palace in London. Some of the most prominent Forty-eighters ended their days in England, among them Gottfried Kinkel and Arnold Ruge. Kinkel, whom Schurz had dramatically rescued from behind Prussian prison bars, was a leader of the London celebrations in 1859. He was head of the Revolutionsverein in London, and his speech at the Crystal Palace shows his revolutionary fervor:

Im Namen der Deutschen in England, die zu dieser Stunde mit Stolz ihres Stammes gedenken; im Namen aller Herzen, die für die Freiheit glühen, grüß' ich in Ehrfurcht Dich, der uns den Wallenstein schuf, der die Glocke goss, der den Bogen Tells spannte.75

Tell became identified with the German immigration. As Carlyle had viewed this play as a great moral force, so did the Forty-eighters and "Turner" in England and America consider it to be representative of their fight for liberty. Artistic considerations were overshadowed by the revolutionary tendencies these men felt they had found in the work. Popular interest in Tell was sustained by German-speaking persons, but it had little effect upon the non-German communities.

74 Wittke, p. 311

B. SCHILLER'S *WILHELM TELL* FROM 1859 TO WORLD WAR I.

Some Schiller critics and scholars consider the year 1859 to be a significant cut-off date in Schiller interest. In reviewing the popularity of Schiller in America, E. C. Parry concludes that the year 1859 may perhaps be regarded as the culmination of Schiller's popularity in the nineteenth century. Writing in 1905, he said: "Friedrich Schiller is studied to an extent to-day that was certainly not the case fifty years ago; he is everywhere loved and revered. Yet it is probably safe to say that his fame has not increased since the world-wide wave of enthusiasm of 1859."76 The importance of 1859 is stressed much more by John Frey, who, in his recent Schiller bibliography, states that in the century since the centenary celebrations of 1859 in America "the Schiller interest of more than fleeting consequence has been almost exclusively confined to the scholarly sphere."77 Since that year only the period from 1900 to 1914 has witnessed so much interest in Schiller: "The period from the turn of the century to 1914 easily stands out as the high point of American Schiller interest in our time. The popular interest


subsided after 1905 and has deteriorated progressively since. Scholarly attention, on the other hand, has been well sustained."

In an article written in 1878, F. H. O. Weddigen confirms that there is hardly a German author of note who is not in English translations: "doch ist die Zahl der Leser verhältnismässig noch eine geringe. Schiller ist im Ganzen der Lieblingsdichter der Engländer, Goethe wird mehr bewundert als verstanden." Works such as Tell were readily accepted for their moral and political messages; whether the writer's real meaning was understood is another matter.

In the face of these statements from Parry, Frey, and Weddigen, one could conclude that the peak of Tell's popularity occurred in 1859, and that thereafter Schiller (and Tell) received little more than scholarly interest. This would, however, be misleading. The statements assume that the celebrations of 1859 were native declarations of esteem for Schiller. In fact, they were celebrations mainly for Germans sponsored by Germans to which Americans and Englishmen were invited. Representatives from the literary world attended many of the festivities; for example,

78 Frey, p. v.

William Cullen Bryant represented the American literary world at the celebrations in New York City. Participation of non-Germans was restricted at the popular level because of the lack of esteem in which the German immigrants were held: "In General, the German element was not highly regarded before the Civil War, and its own lack of self-respect did not improve the situation." The American nativist agitations of the 1850's did not improve relations. Determination to preserve the German language against narrow-minded nativists led to a crisis of assimilation among the immigrants which retarded the normal Americanization process. This situation did not disappear until World War I: "To overcome any feeling of inferiority, Germans loudly proclaimed the superiority of their own culture and founded societies, schools, and newspapers to insure its surviving." To the Forty-eighters, Schiller was a pillar of German culture: "They venerated that poet of freedom, Schiller, and in several American cities erected a monument to his memory. They admonished their children to cherish the German language and German culture." Schiller interest did not subside

80 Wittke, p. 312.
81 Wittke, p. 15.
82 Wittke, p. 59.
83 Johnson, p. 77.
to nothing more than one of fleeting consequence after 1859. It was sustained until the end of the century by the groups which had been responsible for its significance in 1859.

The Schiller celebrations in 1859 were the occasion for various German-language productions of *Wilhelm Tell*. Schiller's continued popularity, at least shortly after 1859, is seen in the fact that in 1860 a German edition of Schiller's works appeared in Philadelphia, and that in 1861 the first English edition of Schiller's works to be published in America appeared in Philadelphia, the well-known Hempel edition, with a 2nd edition in 1870. By the late 1800's the various English translations and textbook editions became the main sources of influence for *Tell* in England and America. The influence of the German theater productions was limited because of the language barrier.

Especially after 1859, the number of *Tell* textbook editions increased rapidly. *Tell* was incorporated into various collections of "classic" works (see Appendix I). The use of *Tell* for purposes of instruction had already begun in 1826 in America when Charles Follen issued, anonymously, a *Deutsches Lesebuch für Anfänger*. A *Tell* textbook edition was prepared in 1851 by James C. Oehlschlager, a teacher of German in Philadelphia: "This

84 (Cambridge, 1826)
little volume evidently filled a demand, for there was a
second Philadelphia edition (1854), and even a third was
printed in 1865. In 1865, E. C. F. Krauss, an
instructor of German at Harvard, began to issue simple
school texts of Wilhelm Tell, Maria Stuart, and Wallenstein.

W. H. Carruth speaks of sixteen editions of Tell prepared
by thirteen different editors for schools and colleges in
America. This constitutes more editions than for any other
single work by Schiller. Frey discusses some of the
successful textbook editions of Tell that appeared after
1900 and before 1914 and the popularity of the Tell theme
during those years:

Sogar diese kleine Auswahl macht die besondere
Beliebtheit des Tell ersichtlich, und es ist in diesem
Zusammenhang ein kleines Zwischenspiel erwähnenswert,
da es ein ganz interessantes Licht auf die Lage und
Stimmung der Vorkriegszeit wirft. Ein kritischer
Geist hatte geäußert, nichts bezeichne so sehr den
Tiefstand der germanistischen Wissenschaft in Amerika
wie die grosse Zahl von Schulausgaben des Tell. Dazu
erhebt sich nun (1912) die nicht ungewichtige Stimme
E. C. Roedders, der selbst ein Herausgeber des Tell
und Verfasser einer Reihe von Schilleraufsätzen ist,
darunter eines recht guten über Tell, und meint
unbesorgt, die dauernde Beliebtheit des Tell sei kein
schlechtes Zeichen für den Geschmack der Zeit, allen
Neutöneren zum Trotz...

85 Parry, p. 329.
86 Parry, p. 367.
87 William H. Carruth, "Schiller and America," German
88 John R. Frey, "Schiller in Amerika, insbesondere
in der amerikanischen Forschung," Jahrbuch der deutschen
The boom in textbook editions in England and America is reflected in Appendix I, but it is difficult to correlate their number with the popularity of the play. The popularity may have extended no further than the instructors' enthusiasm, as Schiller's plays have long been valued as a means of instruction.

C. TRANSLATIONS OF SCHILLER'S WILHELM TELL.

Evaluation of the many English translations of *Tell* is not made easier by the common consensus among some scholars that the translation by Sir Theodore Martin (first published in 1846) is unsurpassed. Appendix III shows that Martin's translation is reprinted far more often than others. B. Q. Morgan says it is an excellent translation, the only really outstanding version available in English. It is considered to be the "standard" translation of *Tell* in the English-speaking world. The evaluation of translations nevertheless remains subjective to a large extent. Extracts from Martin's translation and that of Edward Massie's (appeared 1878), which was rated "thumbs down" by Morgan, will be given so that the "best" and the "worst" of translations may be compared. The first extract is from the song of the "Alpenjäger," Act I, Scene 1, lines 25-36:

Massie

The heights roar with thunder, and trembles the bridge,
The hunter is calm on the dizzy ridge;
Thus fearless he marches
O'er icefields and snows,
Where Spring never smileth,
Where grass never grows;
On an ocean of mist he looks from the height,
The dwellings of men are hid from his sight;
Through a rift in the welkin
The world is scarce seen,
Far beneath the loud waters
A bright patch of green.90

Martin

On the heights peals the thunder, and trembles the bridge,
The huntsman bounds on by the dizzying ridge.
Undaunted he hies him
O'er ice-covered wild
Where leaf never budded,
Nor Spring ever smiled;
And beneath him an ocean of mist, where his eye
No longer the dwellings of man can espy;
Through the parting clouds only
The earth can be seen;
Far down 'neath the vapor
The meadows of green.91

It is obvious that much is lost in both translations from the poetry of the original. A translation into verse is probably in part responsible for some loss in meaning in both extracts. The "Es donnern . . . es zittert" (line 25) of the original is not translatable. Line 26 loses in both translations:

Schiller: Nicht grauet dem Schützen auf schwindlichtem Weg;

90 Extracts from Massie are quoted from William Tell, A Drama by Schiller, translated into English verse by Edward Massie (Oxford, 1878).

91 Extracts from Martin are quoted from The German Classics of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, ed. Kuno Francke, 20 vols. (New York, 1913-15), III.
Massie: The hunter is calm on the dizzy ridge;
Martin: The huntsman bounds on by the dizzying ridge.

In both translations, the result is more interpretation than translation. In the first, the hunter becomes calm, in the second he bounds. That Martin is more accurate in this extract is seen from such examples as line 35, where Massie completely missed the point that the vapors are below the hunter and Schiller's "unter den Wassern" is translated as "the loud waters." Martin's translation is not faultless. Schiller's "Er schreitet verwegen" loses its boldness in Martin's "Undaunted he hies him." Martin's poetic rendering is considerably more trite than Massie's. Some of his worst diction can be seen in "peals the thunder," "he hies him," "O'er," and "'neath."

Various passages in Massie's translation show certain words to be dictionary translations. In Act III, Scene 3, the stage explanation lines 2059-2060 is translated to read:

(He draws the arrow from his belt and darts a fearful look at the governor.)

Martin renders it as:

(He draws the arrow from his belt, and fixes his eyes sternly upon the governor.)

Schiller's Tell transfixed Gessler "mit einem furchtbaren Blick." Massie's version, though allowable as a dictionary, though not accurate translation, makes it appear that Tell
is full of fear or awe. This is but one of numerous passages that shows an inadequate knowledge of the German language.

A final comparison, an extract from Act V, Scene 3, lines 3250-3262; Tell's description of the way to Italy:

Massie

Before each cross fall down and with hot tears Of contrite penitence confess your guilt. And, pass ye happily through the gorge of terror, Hurl not the mountains from their back wind-shaken A snowy deluge on you, ye will come Upon a bridge, which rising clouds of spray Scatters in liquid dust unceasing. If It break not in beneath your weight of guilt, If ye should leave it happily behind, A gateway, hell-black, bursting the hard rock, Gapes -- daylight never enter'd there -- go through, It leads you to a bright and happy vale. Yet must ye hasten on with quicken'd step: Ye may not stay where peace and innocence dwell.

Martin

At every cross, kneel down and expiate your crime with burning penitential tears -- And if you 'scape the perils of the pass, And are notwhelm'd beneath the drifted snows, That from the frozen peaks come sweeping down, You'll reach the bridge that's drench'd with drizzling spray. Then if it give not way beneath your guilt, When you have left it safely in your rear, Before you frowns the gloomy Gate of Rocks, Where never sun did shine. Proceed through this, And you will reach a bright and gladsome vale. Yet must you hurry on with hasty steps, You must not linger in the haunts of peace.

The literalness of Massie's translation is seen in two lines containing the word "glücklich," lines 3252 and 3257, which each time is used as "happily." In the original these lines are:
Und seid ihr glücklich durch die Schreckensstrasse,
Wenn ihr sie glücklich hinter euch gelassen,

Lines 3253-3254 in Massie's translation are difficult to understand without knowledge of the original:

Hurl not the mountains from their back wind-shaken
A snowy deluge on you,

The original German is as follows:

Sendet der Berg nicht seine Windeswehen
Auf euch herab von dem beeisten Joch,

Martin catches the proper meaning with:

And if you 'scape the perils of the pass,
And are not whelm'd beneath the drifted snows,
That from the frozen peaks come sweeping down,

But once again Martin uses an artificial "poetic" diction in his "'scape the perils" and "not whelm'd beneath."

Schiller's "Brücke, welche stäubet" (line 3255) becomes Massie's "rising clouds of spray / Scatters in liquid dust unceasing," and Martin's "bridge that's drench'd with drizzling spray."

Numerous passages could be cited to further compare these translations, yet these few suffice. Though Massie's version may not be accurate "Schiller," it is much less ostentatious and mannered in English than Martin's version. As the "standard" translation by which the English-speaking world knows Schiller's Tell, Martin's translation leaves much to be desired.
III. WILHELM TELL DURING TWO WORLD WARS.

Any attempt to discuss the reception of Schiller's *Tell* during the two world wars must to some extent analyze the public reception of *Tell* in England and America before that period. From the available materials it is not possible to compile any statistics of *Tell*’s circulation and acceptance. This would involve problems of literacy, size of published editions, etc., which would be beyond the scope of this study. It is at least possible, however, to gain some insight into these problems.

The German immigration of the nineteenth century has been seen to be directly connected with *Tell*’s popularity. An estimated 6,000,000 German immigrants came to the United States between 1820 and 1910.1 To the leadership of many of these immigrants, *Tell* was a beloved symbol of freedom. The German organizations in both countries were responsible for the large and successful Schiller celebrations in 1859 and 1905.2 The Forty-eighters were active in establishing *Turnvereine* in the United States, and these in turn vigorously supported German Instruction in American schools. The emergence of a unified Germany in 1871 inevitably fanned into flame a new spirit of

---


2 Cf. Wittke, pp. 311, 312-13, 345.
"Germanism" among America's German groups. Large parades were held by Germans in many American cities in the wake of this new national unity. In 1871 the American Turnerbund adopted resolutions favoring the teaching of German and physical education in the American schools. This organization was determined to increase the political influence of the German-American groups and preserve German culture and the German language in America. Politically this group was considered to be radical. The German-language theaters established under the influence of the Forty-eighters helped to sustain interest in Tell, but it is in the schools that the immigrants formed their greatest service for the play. As German instruction increased, Schiller's Tell found its real home in America in school through textbook editions. The close association of this work with German-American groups and the German instruction in schools proved disastrous during World War I. The figures available for the growth of German instruction in American public secondary schools are therefore important in discussing Tell's reception. In 1890, 10.5% of the total high school enrollment was receiving instruction in German courses. By 1915 this had risen to

3 Cf. Wittke, p. 156.
4 Wittke, p. 157.
5 The statistics do not separate the German-Americans from other ethnic groups.
24.4% (324,272 students). American involvement in World War I ended this spectacular growth. In 1922, .6% (13,358 students) of the students were taking German. A slow rise after 1922 was impeded by World War II, and even in 1960 we find that only 1.7% (151,261 students) of the high school students were enrolled in German.6 Ernst Voss summed up the effects of World War I on German influence in America in a speech given in 1926: "Die deutsche Schule, das deutsche Theater, die deutsche Sprache, die deutsche Presse, das deutsche Turnen . . . haben Verluste zu verzeichnen, dass es Jahrzehnte brauchen wird, sich davon zu erholen . . ."7

The sudden drop in German enrollment between 1915 and 1922 is reflected in Appendix I, showing the German textbook editions of Tell publishes in England and America. W. Witte speaks of the spread of German studies in Britain, virtually uncheckked by two major wars between England and Germany,8 yet the same appendix shows that in England also the textbook editions of Tell ceased to apper at the outbreak of hostilitees. The publication of English translations ceased in both countries.


From the above statistics, it becomes apparent that Tell could not have enjoyed much circulation during the two world conflicts. This is, however, no indication of any unpopularity of the work itself. J. Wesley Childers speaks of a wave of hysteria that swept over America upon entry into the First World War:

Stories of German atrocities were printed in most of the newspapers and repeated from pulpits and platforms; the German language was dropped from high schools and colleges; and the teaching of German was declared illegal by the legislatures of 22 separate states.9

The great distrust and dislike of all things German forced Tell into exile, though at least during World War II the colleges maintained a calmer attitude toward the teaching of German than did the secondary schools.10

The two world wars, as important as they are in any discussion of the decline of influence of Tell during duration, are not the only factors to consider. As Schiller's Tell became a "classic" work in England and America, its continued spread became dependent upon the schools and colleges. A survey of the educational level in the United States in 1935 shows how limited the educated group was, upon which a classic work depends for its acceptance:

9 Childers, p. 8.
10 Childers, p. 9.
Total adults in the United States, 1935:
75,215,000
Total adults completely illiterate:
3,675,000 (4.88%)
Total adults not completing 8th grade:
34,446,000 (48.4%)
Total adults not completing high school:
64,790,000 (86%)
Total adults who were college graduates:
2,204,000 (2.9%) 11

When these figures are considered in light of the German enrollment during the wars in the secondary schools, it can readily be seen that the term "popularity" as used regarding Schiller's Tell can only refer to its acceptance among small educated groups and persons of German descent who maintained an interest in the German culture. Though the figures given in this section are for the United States, the limitation of Tell's acceptance in England by educational factors alone among the non-Germans would be a major consideration. There is no evidence in either country to support any claim for the "mass popularity" of Wilhelm Tell before World War I. The enormous decline in German language interest following 1915 was detrimental to the continued interest in Tell by effectively reducing, and in many cases eliminating, German influence in education and culture.

It would appear, however, that Tell suffered more than did the works of other German authors. Whereas

German literature has once again begun to flourish in England and America, Schiller interest has not kept pace. Hermann Barnstorff considers the reception of Schiller in the United States from 1918 to 1939 and concludes:

... Schiller has suffered a similar fate in the United States as he suffered in Germany and in England. He has been pushed aside by Goethe. Schiller's writings became reading material in the schools and colleges as a means of learning the German language.

Before and especially during the world war our interest in Schiller waned and it took a number of years after the great armed conflict before the study of German and German literature began to flourish again. But Schiller remained neglected and in contrast to the development in Germany ... has been neglected up to the present day.12

IV. **WILHELM TELL** ON THE STAGE IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

A. PLAYS TREATING THE TELL THEME PRIOR TO 1804.

The Tell theme was a familiar part of the American stage productions before Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* appeared in 1804. The Revolutionary War created a demand for plays dealing with the theme of freedom unequalled during the same period in England. The following announcement appeared in the June 3, 1794, issue of the *New York Daily Advertiser*:

> On Wednesday will be presented a play interspersed with songs, in three Acts, never acted here, and for that night only, called *The Patriot, or Liberty Asserted*. This piece is founded on the well-known story of William Tell, the Swiss patriot, who shot an apple from his son's head at the command of the tyrant Grislor (sic!) which first gave liberty to the Cantons of Switzerland.1

It is interesting to note that the article speaks of the "well-known story of William Tell." The announcement gives only a short description of what the play will contain: "In Act Istd. The Hall and Statue of Liberty. In Act IIIRD. A display of Archery for the questionable prize of freedom."2 The play was presented by the Old American Company on June 5, and showed the following cast:


William Tell  Provost
Melchdale  Bowman
Edwald    Serena
Grisler   Lucella
Werner    Marina
Lieutenant.³

The Philadelphia Daily Advertiser of March, 1794, listed several requests for the New Theatre to perform an opera called Helvetic Liberty; or, the Lass of the Lakes, which was founded on the William Tell theme. May 16, 1796, the Gazette announced: "New Theatre, May 16, The Patriot: or Liberty Obtained, as altered from the play of Helvetic Liberty."⁴ Helvetic Liberty gave William Dunlap, manager of the New York Theatre from 1796-1805, the suggestion for his own Tell production. In his History of the American Theatre, he refers to Helvetic Liberty as a recent English play "which was utterly unfit and perhaps not intended for the stage."⁵ Dunlap says that "comic parts were introduced with some effect."⁶ With reference to Schiller, Dunlap says: "Schiller's play did not then exist. We have had of late years a popular English drama on the same subject, made more so by the talents of an American actor."⁷

³ Baker, p. 7.
⁵ (London, 1832), I, 285.
⁶ Dunlap, I, 285.
⁷ Dunlap, I, 285.
Dunlap, though aware of Schiller's *Tell*, makes no connection between it and the "popular English drama" which is none other than James Sheridan Knowles' *William Tell*.

Dunlap's own play, which he called an opera, was entitled *The Archers or Mountaineers of Switzerland*: "On the 18th of April, 1796, the opera *The Archers* was performed for the first time, and received great applause . . . The piece was repeatedly played, and was reprinted immediately."³ The title page shows it to contain three acts. A historical sketch is included, to which the preface says: "The historical sketch from pages 81 to 94 is based on Coxe's *Switzerland.*"⁹ Baker says a look at the cast of the play reveals an interestingly great number of characters found in Schiller's *Tell* nearly a decade later:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Tell</td>
<td>Pickmen of Schweitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Furst</td>
<td>Burghers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Melchthal</td>
<td>Austrian Soldiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner Staffach</td>
<td>Conrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesle</td>
<td>Portia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgomaster</td>
<td>Rhodolpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Female Archers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopold</td>
<td>Cicely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowmen of Uri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, a look at the "opera" quickly reveals that the similarity ends with the use of the historical names.

³ Dunlap, p. 299. Baker, p. 9, says the play was unsuccessful.


¹⁰ Cited by Baker, p. 10.
The play begins with humorous scenes involving two basket makers, Conrad and Cecily. Conrad's impressment into Gessler's army provides a comic relief for the more serious fight for liberty by the confederation. Conrad's difficulties as a soldier constitute a subplot that runs through the play. Tell is an active participant in the league. He is considered by Gessler to be the major cause of the unrest among the peasants. Tell's spirit is shown in a discussion he has with his wife, Portia, concerning the oppressions in the land:

Portia: But yet, my William, since we feel them not, Why should we risk our all to right oppressions?

Tell: What! Shall I sit content, my neighbour wrong'd? Because my property untouch'd remains, Shall I, by not opposing, aid the robber?  

Tell and the confederation are aided by Rhodolpha, Walter Fürst's daughter, and her "Maidens" who fight at their side.

Speaking of the Tell theme on the American stage to 1798, Brede says: "Plays dealing with liberty and patriotism, such as Gustavas Vasa and William Tell, were enthusiastically received in America and are found in numerous versions..."  

12 Brede, The German Drama, p. 70.
appearance of the Tell versions reflect at this time the aspirations for freedom and foreshadow the coming of the German plays. The Tell theme is included with subjects which German writers, especially Schiller, will later choose for their dramas.

B. PLAYS OTHER THAN SCHILLER'S TELL TREATING THE TELL THEME AFTER 1804.

After the presentation and publication of Schiller's Tell in Germany, audiences in England and America continued to enjoy Tell performances other than those of Schiller's work. During the season of 1805-06, a new play appeared at the Chestnut Street Theatre in Philadelphia. Entitled John Bull, the play itself did not treat the Tell theme, but it was followed by a new song called "William Tell," by a Mr. Woodham. During the season 1812-13 at the same theater, we find the following play:

Among other plays we note first William Tell, December 26, with the announcement 'Saturday evening, December 26, will be presented an historical play interspersed with music, called William Tell or The Patriots of Switzerland, founded on the most interesting events of the Helvetian Confederacy against the usurpation of the House of Austria.

14 Brede, p. 40.
15 Brede, p. 120.
Performe at New York and Boston with great applause. A new Patriotic Epilogue will be spoken by Mr. Mason.  

No cast is given. Once again the Tell story, as in earlier years, is here used to arouse the patriotism of the audience.

The Devil's Bridge appeared in New York during the season of 1814-15. It is uncertain if the play had a German subject, but it is noteworthy for the "Ballad of William Tell" that accompanied it. A play entitled simply William Tell appeared at the Chestnut Street Theatre March 12, 1819. Though the author and origin of the play cannot be found, the presentation of such a play indicates the degree of popularity enjoyed by William Tell in America. Another play, William Tell, or The Deliverer of His Country, was given at the Chestnut February 22, 1823, in honor of Washington's birthday. Again there is no cast or author given, and it is impossible to determine which William Tell this was.

In addition to these plays, there were others which dealt with Swiss themes of liberty. In February, 1819, an American authoress, Fanny (Frances) Wright, presented

16 Brede, The German Drama, p. 175.
17 Brede, p. 79.
18 Brede, pp. 208, 230.
her play Altorf in New York. This play appeared regularly as late as 1829, as did others of the foregoing plays. Other plays were Sigesmar, the Switzer, or The Helvetian Patriots, October, 1819, in Philadelphia, and the Sisters, or The Heroines of Switzerland, June, 1824, in New York. 19 The year 1825 saw Knowles' William Tell begin a long and successful run both on the English and American stages. Thus there was no dearth of William Tell plays or of Swiss motifs. Nor were the Tell plays confined to the American stage. English audiences were also well-acquainted with Tell. Allardyce Nicoll records William Tell; or The Hero of Switzerland by Henry William Grossett for the year 1812. 20 He also mentions a William Tell that appeared at the Royal Coburg in 1821. 21 John Genest records the Beacon of Liberty, which appeared at Covent Garden on October 8, 1823. 22 A glance at the Stage Cyclopedia for the English stage reveals the following list of plays dealing with William Tell:


21 Nicoll, IV, pp. 86-87.
22 Genest, Some Account of the English Stage, IX, 247.

William Tell; A Telling version of an Old Tell tale. Burlesque. Leicester Buckungham (sic.). Strand Theater, April 13, 1857.


William Tell with a Vengeance; or, the Poet, the Parrot, and the Pippin. Burlesque. Henry J. Byron. Liverpool, Alexandra Theatre. September 4, 1867; Strand, October 5, 1867. 23

This list makes no attempt at completeness. It does provide an insight into the familiarity of English and American audiences with this theme. Especially noticeable is the English inclination to parody the theme. This familiarity may have been a factor impeding the performance of an English translation of Schiller's Tell as simply "another" William Tell. Milburn speaks of the continuing superficiality of the English theater up to 1850: "The actors are still capable enough; the playwrights, ever subject to the whims of the audience, must still work in the limited realm of that which is momentarily pleasing." 24 In discussing the significance of the time-lag with regard to the English acceptance of Schiller's and Goethe's works, Milburn writes:


24 Milburn, German Drama in England, p. 121.
Their appeal, among the English, was more to the reader, lost in the subjective time of leisurely meditation. The immense complexity of the dramatic heritage of Goethe and Schiller, instead of arousing and widening the interest of the English in German drama, served rather to concentrate and limit that interest. The popular mind, having forgotten Kotzebue, thus came to comprehend German drama much as Gillies had as something remote, lofty, and noble, hardly suited for representation on the stage.

Of the William Tell plays, Knowles' work poses certain problems to the study of the influence of Schiller's Tell in England and America which justify a separate investigation of its origin and influences.

C. JAMES SHERIDAN KNOWLES' WILLIAM TELL: OR, THE HERO OF SWITZERLAND.

James Sheridan Knowles' William Tell was first performed May 11, 1825, at the Drury Lane Theater in London. Scholars of German literature often refer to it as an adaptation of Schiller's Tell. It is neither a translation nor an adaptation. Milburn, German Drama in England, p. 119. Cf. Genest, IX, 293.

Cf. this in the following works:

Milburn, p. 162.

E. Heyse Dummer, "Schiller in English," Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht, XXXV, 6 (October, 1943), p. 35, states that Knowles' Tell differs from Schiller's in plan and execution, but he nevertheless lists it as the second Schiller play performed in Chicago in English, referring to it as "the James Sheridan Knowles' version" of Schiller's Tell. He finds that Knowles' "Adaptation" has little of the merit of Schiller's drama: "There would ... have been more textual perfection in William Tell if the S. Robinson or the H. Thompson translation had supplanted that of Knowles."
a translation or an adaptation of Schiller's *Tell*. The differences between the two works, as striking as the similarities which exist, lead Ludwig Hasberg to this conclusion:

Mit Sicherheit festzustellen, aus welcher Quelle unser Dichter seinen Stoff geschöpft hat, war uns bei den uns zu Gebote stehenden Hilfsmitteln nicht möglich. Jedenfalls hat unser Dichter seinen Stoff nicht dem Schiller'schen Drama entlehnt, denn Inhalt, Bau und Charakterzeichnung sind in beiden Stücken völlig verschieden. Selbst ob Knowles aber überhaupt mit Schiller's *Tell* bekannt war, muss dahingestellt bleiben.28

In comparing the plays, we soon find that Knowles' *Tell* is less complex than Schiller's. Knowles Tell is an uncomplicated figure whose every deed is in the cause of the confederation. His actions in this cause at times make him appear vain and boastful. As the leader of the conspiracy at the Field of Rütli, he declares to his fellow patriots:

Baker, p. 122, refers to Knowles' play as "an arrangement from the drama of Schiller" prepared for the British stage.

Brede, p. 64, in speaking of the first performance of Knowles' *Tell* in Philadelphia says: "On November 28, 1825, Sheridan Knowles' play... which, as we know is an adaptation of Schiller's *William Tell*, was given for the first time."


The next aggression of the tyrant is
The downfall of his power . . .

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Farewell! -- When next we meet upon this theme,
All Switzerland shall witness what we do!29

Knowles' Tell dares Gessler by trampling on the hat which
had been placed on the pole in the square at Altdorf, and
then chasing the soldiers who were there to guard it.
These actions are in contrast to those of Schiller's
Tell, who stands apart from the conspirators and tells
them:

Der Tell holt ein verlorenes Lamm vom Abgrund
Und sollte seinen Freunden sich entziehen?
Doch was ihr tut, lasst mich aus eurem Rat,
Ich kann nicht lange prüfen oder wählen,
Bedürft ihr meiner zu bestimmter Tat,
Dann ruft den Tell, es soll an mir nicht fehlen.30

Tell's actions, when accused by Gessler of having failed
to salute the hat, show his desire to remain a law-
abiding citizen:

Verzeiht mir, lieber Herr! Aus Unbedacht,
Nicht aus Verachtung Eurer ist's geschehn;31

In Knowles' Tell, the hero's wife and child
display his fervent fighting spirit against all attempts
to inhibit their individual freedom. Emma tells her
husband:

29 Act I, Scene 2. Quotes from Knowles' Tell are
from The Dramatic Works of James Sheridan Knowles, A
31 Act III, Scene 3, lines 1870-1871.
I would not live myself to be a slave --
I would not live to be the dam of one!32

Schiller's Hedwig thinks more as a mother and wife and less as a patriot. Knowles' Albert is encouraged by his father to think of the destruction of Gessler. As Tell gives him instruction in shooting his bow:

You said the other day,
Were you a man, you'd not let Gesler live --
'Twas easy to say that. Suppose you, now,
Your life or his depended on that shot!
Take care! That's Gesler! Now for liberty!
Right to the tyrant's heart! (Albert shoots.)
Well done, my boy.33

Gessler's death is shown in the closing scene of Knowles' work. After shooting the apple from Albert's head, an arrow hidden in Tell's breast is discovered. Gessler demands to know why Tell had the second arrow and is informed:

To kill thee, tyrant, had I slain my son!
And now beware! (Tell suddenly takes aim at Gesler.
Stir thou, or any stir!
The shaft is in thy heart!34

Tell shoots, Gessler falls dead, transfixed with the arrow. The Swiss patriots then advance, Emma among them, and secure the liberty of their country without further bloodshed. There is no necessity to justify Gessler's death; he died because he attempted to strip

32 Act II, Scene 1.
33 Act II, Scene 1.
34 Act V, Last Scene.
the Swiss of their liberty, "that precious ore, / that pearl, that gem, the tyrant covets most; / Yet can't enjoy himself --."35

The exposition is pale when compared to any similar scene in Schiller's play. The humorous first scene does not lend dignity to the seriousness of the play. Schiller's opening scene shows us at once the full meaning of Gessler's tyranny. Knowles' subplot, the love affairs of Michael and Agnes, Jagheli and Anneli, winds through the play and tends to distract from the main plot. Knowles no doubt drew from the use of the Elizabethan "double plot" in trying to make this humorous subplot an essential part of the whole composition of the play. The result, however, is at best a sequence to relieve the audience. The major difference between the plays is that Schiller gave his work deeper meaning and greater intellectual strength: "Knowles' debt (to Schiller) seems to lie only in the chief plot materials, even though the story was also open to him in other sources."36

Knowles' subplot softened the somber effect of the main story, but it hardly had any connection with the

35 Act II, Scene 1.
main plot: "Macready insisted on the omission of the irrelevant parts, and after 1830 the play appeared only in its three-act form, an advantageous change strongly supported in the introduction to the American edition."\(^{37}\) The distinct advantage of this work over Schiller's is that Knowles' ending avoids the complexity of thought that arises from Tell's monologue and the ensuing Parricide-scene.

It does not appear to G. Schirmer that William Tell is an adaptation of Schiller's work. He brings out some interesting comparisons between Knowles' Tell and the "Guillaume Tell ou la Suisse libre" of the Frenchman J. P. Claris de Florian from which he concludes that Knowles "der Erzählung Florian's in der Hauptsache bei der Ausarbeitung seines Dramas gefolgt ist."\(^{38}\) It is not necessary, however, to go to France or Germany to find the influence upon Knowles. Nor is it necessary to look for this influence in a play. Joseph Planta's The History of the Helvetic Confederacy was published in London in 1800.\(^{39}\) For the material of this work, Planta is indebted to Aegidius Tschudi and his Chronicon


\(^{39}\) 2 vols. Planta was the secretary of the Royal Academy in London and was in a supervisory position with the British Museum.
Helveticum, William Coxe's Travels in Switzerland (London, 1789), and especially to the historian Johannes von Müller, with whom he corresponded. Planta's outline of Swiss history for the years 1307 and 1308 shows definite similarities to Knowles' play and should be considered as an influence, especially since it was an English work published in England by a well-known scholar.

For the year 1307, Planta describes the events leading to the confederacy of Rütli. Fürst, Melchthal, and Stauffacher are the leaders and Tell is not present. But though not directly named with the confederacy, Tell is more in keeping with Knowles' characterization. He scorns to pay respect to the hat as commanded by Gessler. An unguarded declaration of his contempt for this badge of servitude induces the governor to seize him. Tell is then placed on a ship to be transported across the lake. Once at sea a storm arises. This, of course, is common to most Tell plays. The scornful attitude of Knowles' Tell is obviously not a Schiller influence. Planta's description of the events of January, 1308, shows a strong possible source for Knowles' subplot. One of the confederates, a youth of Unterwalden, was courting a maid-servant in the castle of Rossberg, and was frequently admitted on nightly visits by climbing a rope to her window. In the early hours of January 1, he

40 Planta, I, pp. 154-155.
and twenty friends climbed the rope to gain entrance into the castle, subdued the keeper and his attendants, and prepared the way for the overthrow of the castle in the morning. With some modifications, this is essentially Knowles' subplot: in Act I, Scene I, Michael has promised to help in the overthrow of the castle. In Act IV, Scene 2, Michael and his friends climb the rope into the castle. Knowles has doubled the lovers to two pairs instead of the single pair in the works of Tschudi and Müller, and he has introduced extensive scenes to strengthen their roles in the play.

In Schirmer's attempts to show the influences of Florian on Knowles' play, he refers to this subplot:

... so mag noch auf die Beziehungen der Personen hingewiesen werden, welche im englischen Schauspielen in den mehr komisch gehaltenen, mit der eigentlichen Haupthandlung in bedenklich losem Zusammenhang stehenden Liebesszenen von Bedeutung sind. Für diese Teile des Dramas bot Florian Knowles keinerlei Anhaltspunkte, die Teilsage ebenfalls nicht und die Vermutung liegt daher nicht allzufern, dass der geschickte Dramatiker und Schauspieler Knowles diese heiteren, auf der Bühne gewiss wirksamen Liebesabenteuer freil erfunden habe.

Schirmer's statement is obviously in error. Not only has he overlooked Planta's work, he has also missed it in the historical accounts given by Tschudi and Müller.

41 Planta, I, p. 156.
42 Schirmer, p. 2
Schiller's Tell also includes this episode, though it is only mentioned briefly. As the confederates discuss ways of gaining control of the castles, Melchthal offers them his plan:

Den Rossberg übernehm' ich zu erstehen,  
Denn eine Dirn' des Schlosses ist mir hold,  
Und leicht betör ich sie, zum nächtlichen  
Besuch die schwange Leiter mir zu reichen,  
Bin ich droben erst, zieh' ich die Freunde nach.  

It becomes obvious, on closer comparison, that not only the differences but also the similarities between Schiller's and Knowles' plays are striking. Yet Knowles' play cannot be considered an adaptation of Schiller's play. The similarities are only those which arise from the use of the same historical sources. It is doubtful that Knowles' Tell would have been confused as an adaptation of Schiller's if it had been written prior to 1804. Since it is so frequently cited as "the" English version of Schiller's Tell for the stage, the problem arises as to whether a direct translation of Schiller's Tell has ever been performed in English on the stages of England and America. 44

The history of Knowles' Tell is one of popular acclaim by the audiences and reserved reception by the critics. The appearance of an outstanding actor in the

43 Act II, Scene 2, lines 1411-1415.

44 No work consulted has made note of such a performance.
role of Tell was a necessity for the play. A sampling of the American reviews shows that beginning with the first performance in 1825, the artistic value of the play was considered to be limited. In the American Athenaeum for October 13, 1825:

Mr. Knowles evidently writes not for immortality nor for the next age, even, but merely for the reigning actor of the day. He models his characters to the level of the actors. He does not seek to elevate the actor to that of the tragic muse. His plays are well calculated for acting in the present day but beyond this little can be said of them.

From a review of the play in the New York Mirror for October 20, 1826:

This is, we think, the poorest of Knowles' tragedies and can scarcely be termed more than a sort of refined melodrama. It has no pretensions to original character, it exposes and unfolds no hidden recesses of the human heart, it is apparent on the surface; it is a tragedy of situation. The story is, however interesting and skilfully dramatized ... In (Macready's) hands it rises to something much above what its own merits entitle it to.

A similar review appeared in the Evening Post for October 23, 1826:

In Wm. Tell a greater effort of genius is required to render that character than in any other of this author's productions. It is decidedly but an outline which may be said to depend wholly for

45 Meeks, p. 110, says the play was strong in the hands of Edwin Forrest.


47 New York Mirror and Ladies' Literary Gazette, IV, 103, quoted by Baker, pp. 133-34, n. 213.
its effect upon the painting of the actor. To Mr. Macready's talents alone, it is indebted for any popularity it may have gained.  

This, then, is the William Tell that was known to the theater audiences during much of the nineteenth century in England and America. If the critics of that period knew of any relationship existing between it and Schiller's Tell, they failed to mention it. Its popularity with the audiences is attested to by its regular performance in England until about 1850 and in America until about 1870, since which time it has disappeared from the stage. One critic, however, attributed the long life of this play to the fact that it was a standard item in the repertories of the great stars, who exercised imperious command over their choice of roles.  

D. SCHILLER'S WILHELM TELL ON THE AMERICAN GERMAN-LANGUAGE STAGE.

Some thirty-five years passed after the completion of Schiller's Tell before a German-language theater opened

48 Quoted by Baker, p. 132. According to Meeks, p. 105, Macready was the actor who suggested the subject of William Tell to Knowles and for whom Knowles created the role of Tell in his play.

49 Meeks, pp. 110, 175.

in the United States. Increasing immigration soon brought with it the demand for German-language theaters in most of the major cities, the first of these theaters opening in New Orleans. Some of these theaters are listed, with the year of establishment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only rarely was Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* performed more often in a given period than his other works. In spite of the fact that *Die Räuber* was seldom performed on the English-language stages by the 1840's, it still remained more popular on the German-language stages than *Tell*. A breakdown of Schiller's plays in St. Louis for the period 1842 to 1914 is representative for other cities:


A look at the performances given on the New Orleans Stage to 1890\(^5\) shows how Schiller’s works fared against those of other German writers during a period of fifty years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total performances, 1840-1890:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kotzebue</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiller</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goethe</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grillparzer</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A breakdown of Schiller’s dramas performed shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Number of Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Die Räuber</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhelm Tell</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabale und Liebe</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Stuart</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungfrau von Orleans</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallensteins Lager</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallensteins Tod</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Carlos</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^5\) 1890 marks the closing date in New Orleans.

\(^5\) Moehlenbrock, pp. 395, 404.

\(^5\) Moehlenbrock, p. 381
Of Kotzebue's reception in New Orleans, Moehlenbrook says: "The record of Kotzebue indicated that second-rate drama held first place in that city's German theater repertoire."\(^57\) This statement is generally valid for the other German-language theaters in the United States. Not only did Schiller's dramas take second place to Kotzebue's in total performances, his *Wilhelm Tell* was unable to dislodge *Die Räuber* as his most popular single play. The fact that the Forty-eighters cherished *Tell* is a major factor that the play was performed as often as it was.\(^58\)

The popularity of *Tell* on the German stage is in many respects similar to the reception of the *Tell* theme on the American stage, where the sentiment expressed was more highly-prized than the manner of expression.

Speaking of Schiller in the United States, Karl Guthke says of the average theater patron of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: "Man nahm ihn gewissermassen erster Lesung, und so wurde Schiller Werk in Amerika schneller und nachhaltiger heimisch als das irgendeines anderen deutschen Klassikers, und namentlich auf der Bühne war das der Fall."\(^59\)

\(^{57}\) Moehlenbrook, p. 404.


The poor quality of many of the Tell performances in the German-language theaters gave rise to humorous incidents. Ralph Wood tells of an early performance in Cincinnati. During the monologue "Durch diese hohle Gasse muss er kommen," the actor, Schneider, forgot his part for a moment, then continued: "Doch nur Geduld. Wir werden ihn schon fixen." It was often difficult to obtain enough actors for a performance of Tell, which is one of the reasons it appears so infrequently up to the present day. Many times the actors acquired more than one role in this play. The Volksblatt in Cincinnati reviewed a performance of Tell given in 1878 with the comment that if the viewers had decided before arriving that they would watch a "hochklassisches Schillersches Stück" performed "von einer weniger klassisch kombinierten Gesellschaft" then they should have been "einigermaßen befriedigt." Another performance of Tell, this one in 1889, wins the acclaim of an "abschreckendes Beispiel einer verfehlten Vorstellung." This unhappy amateur performance received a sharp review:

60 Ralph Wood, Geschichte des deutschen Theaters von Cincinnati, Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter, XXXII (1932), p. 423
61 Quoted by Wood, p. 456.
62 Wood, p. 482.
Die Vorstellung sei höchst realistisch gewesen, berichtete das Volksblatt satirisch, denn die Mitwirkenden sprachen teilweise Schweizer Mundart, da die Direktion den patriotischen Eifer des Schweizer Männerchors ausnutzte, um sich der nötigen Statisten zu versichern. Die Rütliszene sei ein Possenspiel gewesen und beim Anblick der Leiche des Langvogts sei das Publikum in ein helles Gelächter ausgebrochen.

A performance given February 22, 1863, in San Francisco, prompted the following versification by Leo Eloesser, the regular critic on the staff of the San Francisco Abend Post:

Das Spiel war nicht wie Schiller es erfasste,
Doch so, wie's eben unsern Künstlern passte.
D'rob zürne nicht, du grosser hehrer Geist —
Wenn Schweizer-Käse uns statt Ambrosia speist;
Wir murren nicht — wir tadeln nicht aus Lust;
Denn Käse, Milch und Brod ist Hausmannskost!

The inability of many German-language theaters, both professional and amateur, to perform serious dramas led to the widespread use of the "Posse, Rührstück und Lustspiel zweiten Ranges." The comparatively few performances of Tell are therefore not necessarily a reflection on the theatergoers' taste.

The performance of Tell in connection with the Schiller celebrations of 1905 was probably the high

Wood, pp. 482-483.


point of *Tell* performances in America. It was directed by Otto Ernst Schmid of the Cincinnati German-language theater:

Am 30. April 1905 veranstaltete Schmid zur Schillerfeier die in jeder Beziehung grösste deutsche Vorstellung die Cincinnati je erlebt hat. Die Aufführung von 'Wilhelm Tell' wurde zu einer machtvollen Feier nicht nur für die deutsche Bevölkerung, sondern für die ganze Stadt. Die *Music Hall*, ... Cincinnatis grösstes Auditorium, war gedrängt besetzt ... Zum Schluss des Spieljahres bereiste die Truppe die Grosstädte des Mittelwestens. Ueberall wurde die Tell-aufführung mit rückhaltloser Anerkennung angenommen.66

The response to an excellent performance indicates that the selection of plays was not always a matter of the public's taste.

The decline of German-language performances at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries ends any extensive basis of comparison to determine the continued and relative popularity of Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell*:

Many factors, among them the gradual Americanization of German groups, the first World War, the reduction of immigration, and the decline of the American legitimate stage as a whole, brought about the virtual disappearance of these theatres, so today only the Players from Abroad in New York, German departments in colleges and high schools, and an occasional amateur group present German performances.67


Limiting German-language performances to this extent and to the above groups has, of course, done much to eliminate the selection of Tell for presentation because of the difficulties connection with such a performance. In many cases, performances of Tell have had to be restricted to anniversaries of Schiller's birth and death. The role of this play on the German-language stage in America has thereby been changed. Instead of being presented as a play with broad popular base, it is now presented to more highly educated, select groups as the great work of Germany's greatest dramatist.

Paetel paints a gloomy picture for the future prospects of German-language theater in America. He describes the successful theaters on Broadway as those using the "trial and error" method, whereas "das deutsche Theater in Amerika ist stets ein Repertoire-Theater gewesen." This type of theater, says Paetel, has generally had poor luck in America. A further problem is seen because "die alten 'kulturbeflissenen' Schichten im Deutschamerikaner-tum" have died out and the new German immigration, comparatively unimportant in number, "meist bestrebt ist, sich so schnell wie möglich zu 'amerikanisieren' und keinen 'Blick zurück' mehr zuzulassen." 69

68 Paetel, p. 271.

69 Paetel, p. 275. And yet, as Wood, p. 515, observes, the Deutscher Stadtverband in Cincinnati had over 10,000 in 1915, at the very time the German theater there was rapidly failing.
As a result of these many factors, and they have been covered only very briefly, the present fate of Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* as a stage production in America is linked to an almost non-existent German-language theater. The regeneration of *Tell* on the stage is not alone a problem in America. Günther Skopnik, in an article concerning Schiller's plays in the Federal Republic of Germany from 1945-1959, expresses the thought that if a regeneration of *Tell* has taken place there, it was "mehr der Arbeit der Bühne als der Tätigkeit der Germanisten zu verdanken," since it has been shown "dass die Literaturhistoriker vom Beruf nur langsam und zögernd daran gingen, Schillers Werk kritisch in Frage zu stellen, um es auf diese Weise neu zu gewinnen."\(^7^0\)

But Skopnik's discussion of "ein neues und zeitnäheres Schiller-Bild" is in part deceptive, since this regeneration of which he speaks is by no means a new wave of popularity for *Tell*: "Der 'Tell' ist längst wieder, wie im bürgerlichen 19. Jahrhundert zum Weihespiel der Deutschen geworden, dessen man sich vorzüglich bei feierlichen Anlässen erinnert."\(^7^1\) The performance of *Tell* "bei feierlichen Anlässen" is comparable to its present


\(^7^1\) Skopnik, p. 202.
standing in America. In Germany *Wilhelm Tell* was
presented more than any other single Schiller play in
the seasons 1950-1951, and 1951-1951, but since that
time it has yielded its number one position to
*Maria Stuart*, *Kabale und Liebe*, and *Don Carlos*. 72

The beginning of World War I made college German
departments in America aware of the need for German
performances to replace those of disappearing German
amateur and professional theaters. However, the results
have not been particularly gratifying for Schiller's *Tell*.
In one survey of German plays in American colleges to
1933 inclusive, the total of Schiller's plays performed
placed him in the number seven position in popularity.
Hans Sachs, who was number one, Goethe, and Lessing all
ranked above Schiller in total performances. Schiller's
plays were performed 28 times, with *Tell* receiving four
performances. An additional four occasions at which
scenes from *Tell* were given make this play the most
popular of Schiller's works during that period. But
by contrast, the most popular single work was Lessing's
*Minna von Barnhelm* with 26 performances, followed by
Hans Sachs' *Der fahrende Schüler* with 21. 73

In surveys


73 Cf. Stephan Schlossmacher, *Das deutsche Drama in
amerikanischen College- u. Universitäts-Theater*, Die
Schaubühne, XV (Emsdetten, 1938), pp. 170, 171, 172.
of college performances during the period 1947-1954, 
Tell fared even worse. Only two performances of 
Schiller's works were given during that period. Wilhelm 
Tell was not included. The survey led to the 
conclusion: "Even a perfunctory glance at the table 
will show that serious dramatic activity was somewhat 
neglected." Observing the obvious neglect of Schiller, 
Rothfuss comments that it "remains to be seen whether 
1955, with its 150th anniversary of Schiller's death 
provides a stimulus." The German-language theaters 
of the nineteenth century were faced with the staging 
and casting difficulties in connection with Tell, and 
as a result the play was often avoided. College amateurs 
are no doubt aware of these difficulties in selecting 
less serious dramatic plays for presentation. It would 
appear that no change in this situation will be 
forthcoming in the foreseeable future.

74 Cf. Hermann E. Rothfuss, "German Plays in 
American Colleges, 1947-1950," Monatshefte, XLIII 
(1951), pp. 237-239, and "German Plays In American 
400-403.


These surveys have included American colleges and 
universities only. Information for England was not 
available. The surveys were primarily concerned with 
plays presented in German.
V. SCHILrer'S TELL IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA SINCE 1945.

Frey has pictured American interest in Schiller since 1905 as one of progressive deterioration except in the field of scholarly study. It is perhaps too early to gain a clear outline of Tell's position in England and America since 1945; however, certain tendencies can be noted.

World wars and quickly changing times have often forced Schiller's critics into the role of apologists. The key theme is the adaptation of Schiller's dramas to modern times. Articles written in England as well as in America reflect this tendency to re-evaluate and to adapt. Ilse Appelbaum-Graham writes in a recent article:

For there is no doubt; the relative neglect into which Schiller has fallen is not accidental. With every year that passes, Goethe means more to more of us; and other poets are having their day. But Schiller, to the large majority of us, is no more than a venerable historical phenomenon. As a living force he is all but obsolete.

She sees the most important single reason for this in the prevailing conception of Schiller as a philosophical poet, "of Schiller the poet we have heard next to nothing. . . . But ideas do not make the poet." This conception is one which Schiller himself started, but

1 John R. Frey, Schiller 1759-1959, p. v.


3 Appelbaum-Graham, p. 4.
Schiller is not alone a philosophical poet. Appelbaum-Graham's thesis is that the reflective nature of Schiller's characters is part of their personality and not an outcrop of the poet's philosophical temper. As applied to Tell and his long monologue, she sees this moment as Schiller's artistic device to overcome the grave shortcomings of tragedy caused by the spectator's loss of aesthetic distance from the hero. The artistic problem is solved by allowing the hero and the spectator to enjoy an aesthetic distance from the problem.

H. S. Reiss also uses the aesthetic approach in an attempt to revitalize Schiller for the modern world. His goal is to show that Schiller's works are not as didactic as some would make us believe. Referring to Wilhelm Tell he finds that the use and abuse of freedom in this play is understood only within the context of the play's aesthetic organization, "and appeals for freedom must never be isolated from their context as if they were extrinsic matter." Plays such as Tell speak out ostensibly against tyranny, "but these attacks against tyranny would no longer interest us if they were not an organic product of the dramatic intention of the play as


5 Reiss, p. 31.
a whole, and if they were not firmly grounded on a psychological basis. 6 Tell is interpreted as the work most closely expressing the aspirations of the Aesthetic Letters. 7 It was not Schiller's intention to elaborate a political constitution, rather to suggest what the ideal community might look like and how the individual might play his part in it. The value of the play is therefore in its suggestive and not in any one-sided explicit value: "To expect details of an ideal political organization is fundamentally mistaken." 8

William Witte's view of Tell in England corresponds to what Frey has said of the American outlook: "Nowadays Schiller's works occupy a safe and prominent place in the German curricula of British schools and universities." 9 There is a growing volume of new editions and translations of Schiller's works, but they represent the efforts of specialists, not affecting the general reading public. Witte quotes Philip Toynbee's review of Thomas Mann's Last Essays (which include the Schiller Essay of 1955) in which Toynbee says: "The English have never, I

6 Reiss, p. 31.
7 Reiss, p. 39.
8 Reiss, p. 40.
think, been very much interested in Schiller . . .

We know that he must be a great writer, but we find it hard to respond to his fervent sublimities."\(^{10}\) Witte then tries to show that the attitude of British indifference toward Schiller has been encouraged to a great extent by critics and literary historians who were hasty in writing Schiller off as outmoded, a period piece. The theme of *Tell* is presented as one of major importance in the world today, the rule of law to protect mankind from the extremes of anarchy and tyranny.\(^{11}\) The evaluation Witte gives for the modern-day reception of *Tell* and Schiller's works in general is of some objective significance. In both England and America the bulk of Schiller interest is generated by specialists. Toynbee's statement, however, is a generality that tends to be too one-sided. The large number of *Tell* translations and editions (issued separately or as part of Schiller's complete works) which we find up to 1914 in England hardly justifies the categorical statement that the "English have never . . . been very much interested" in Schiller, nor can all these editions be passed over as the result

\(^{10}\) Witte, p. 3, quoting from *The Observer*, April 26, 1959.

\(^{11}\) Witte, pp. 11-12.
of specialized, scholarly interest alone. Robert Pick, the authoritative Schiller bibliographer in England, has stated that reprints of the standard edition of Schiller's works (the H. G. Bohn edition, 4 volumes) became so numerous that it was impossible to trace them all.\(^{12}\)

In his Schiller bibliography, Frey notes: "Von den einzelnen Dramen hat der Tell die größte bzw. die häufigste Beachtung gefunden, auch in Hinsicht auf den Unterricht."\(^{13}\) Much of the American literature dealing with dramas by Schiller concerns itself with the reading of the works in schools and colleges. A common theme is breaking down the barriers associated in students' minds with the term "classic" works by attempting to make the work more "meaningful" to students. A method of doing this is to "plunge into the play by making every element meaningful to each student in the light of present times. That is, to arouse positive or negative feelings."\(^{14}\)

What this often amounts to amounts to in articles dealing with Tell is its use as a moral tool in politics. The


\(^{13}\) Frey, "Schiller in Amerika," p. 361.

play is used to show behavior under a totalitarian government and how freedom is obtained.15

One writer assigns the study of Tell to the fourth year of German in high school. He considers the work to be "well-suited to an understanding of man's political freedom from outside tyranny."16 Tell can be used to teach students about "political insurrection and its consequences, guilt and retribution, the opposing forces of God and the devil..."17 In another article, entitled "Individualism and Collectivism in Schiller's Wilhelm Tell," Hermann Barnstorff speaks of the value of teaching the work to college students. He propounds the theory that instructors should make it clear that the problem of the play is essentially political and should be discussed in light of contemporary American ideas. Attinghausen is represented as a conservative individual, an isolationist. William Tell is the real individualist. He does not tip his hat because it is not important. Barnstorff describes an "individual" as one who "makes his own laws as to what is important and what is not."18 Barnstorff justifies this type of individualism on two

15 Jetter, p. 47.
17 Rosenbaum, p. 314.
counts. The first is that members of groups rarely risk their lives for a cause except as elements of undisciplined mobs. For the second point, he contends that there "are outstanding individuals who demand for themselves more freedom of action than other people need." To give Tell the final "contemporary" touch, the lesson of the play is applied to the present American situation:

In our century the victory of individualism is being threatened by a new collectivism which has its roots in our present economic system, but in order to succeed in their endeavors, our economic reformers and agitators are anxious to uncover political abuses and social prejudices.

Many of these attempts to apply Tell to modern situations are by no definition "interpretations." Too often the play is but the identifiable object around which the particular writer winds his political philosophy. This is often done at the expense of the actual reading found in the text of the play. Barnstorff's description of Tell as an individual is an example of this. Tell's apologetic reply to Gessler for failing to tip his hat has already been mentioned:


19 Barnstorff, p. 167.
20 Barnstorff, p. 169.
21 Act III, Scene 3, lines 1870-1874.
This reply hardly seems to justify the statement that Tell did not consider tipping his hat important, or that he is an individualist who makes his own laws as to what is important. Possibly the traditional account of this incident has influenced the interpretations.

This type of interpretation is not new for Tell. Calvin Thomas voiced the danger of this narrow interpretation in 1905 when he warned against using Schiller as an apostle of freedom. Thomas believed that Schiller's chief validity and contemporary importance were his belief in reason, his intellectual seriousness, and his continuing fight for humanity. Reiss and Appelbaum-Graham also see what this narrow interpretation is doing to Tell, but see the solution in an aesthetic interpretation. An interpretation that concentrates almost exclusively on the political nature of the play allows for only a partial interpretation of the mature Schiller. Though many articles in the past twenty years are in this "narrow" category, some few do attempt to probe deeper into the meaning of the play. The level of American interpretations prompted John Frey to say it is "für die amerikanische Wirkungsgeschichte Schillers

---

geradezu kennzeichnend, dass sie wenig Nennenswertes aufzuweisen hat, wo es um die überraschend wichtige Frage künstlerischer Verwertungen von Schillerschen Anstössen geht. Frey believes this applies even to the period "In der die literarisch Schaffenden noch eines wahrhaft lebendigen Schillerinteresses fähig waren, d. h. der Epoche, die mit dem weithin und eindrucksvoll gefeierten Schillerjahr 1859 ihren Höhepunkt erreichte." It is encouraging that attempts are being made again to revive Tell as a great poetic work rather than to exploit it as an analogy for "current events." To gauge the reception of Tell in the near future by its reception of the past twenty years, it will continue to live in England and America only through the interest of scholars and its secure place in high school and college German programs. And to judge by many articles on how to teach Tell in these schools and colleges, many students will never gain a real appreciation for Schiller's Wilhelm Tell. Kurt Wais says: "Dass Schiller als Meister der Sprache am wenigsten im Ausland ausgekostet wurde, teilt er mit den Meistern aller Sprachen." Adding to this language

23 Frey, p. 338.
25 Wais, p. 97.
barrier is the lack of German productions of Tell. There is no substitute for the appreciation and direct knowledge that a good performance of the play would give.
VI. CONCLUSION.

Treating the reception of Schiller's *Tell* in England and America separately from Schiller's other works is not strictly possible. The reception of this play is too closely interwoven with Schiller's general reputation and with the reception of his other plays, poetry, and writings. It is nevertheless a fact that within this realm of general influence each work has received an evaluation which must be clearly distinguished from that of the other works. Attempts to determine the reception of *Tell* have often failed to separate the work from that general influence and reception, leading to assumptions, which though valid for other works, cannot be substantiated for this one. An example of this is the assumption considered in this thesis that Knowles' *Tell* is an adaptation of Schiller's work. The stage history of *Die Räuber* and other Schiller plays in English translations no doubt had an influence upon this assumption. Treating Schiller's *Tell* and the *Tell* theme separately from the other works has the merit of eliminating some of the pitfalls of generalities. Only in considering *Tell* so generally would it be possible to conclude, as was previously cited, that another "translation" of Schiller's *Tell* other than that by Knowles would have led to more textual perfection in the English stage presentations. This and other generalities indicate that
the history of Schiller's plays in England and America, both in the original and in translation, has yet to be written. It was not possible to verify any English performance of Schiller's *Tell* which could be shown to be a direct translation from the German. A definitive history of Schiller's plays in England and America would have to continue this investigation, as the absence of such performances on the English-language stage considerably alters the picture of the popular reception of Schiller's play which works dealing with this subject have created.

Especially in the reception of *Tell*, the political and moral implications of the play have far more often been a factor in the play's public popularity than its literary merits. In considering the popularity of the play based on its political and moral overtones, it would seem that the influence of the German immigrants, especially the Forty-eighers, has long been neglected as a major factor. Available materials would indicate, however, that the influence of the German element in America, beginning with Charles Follen, has done more for the acceptance of *Tell* than the highly-prized references to this work made by the great literary figures of the English-speaking world. It is interesting to note that, with the exception of the period when *Tell* was introduced to England and America, much of the
scholarly interest generated in these countries in behalf of this play has been the work of scholars of German origin. This is not to say that the work of literary critics has been without influence. Often, however, the ideas of the play simply coincided with the philosophies of movements in England and America and the laudatory statements concerning Tell are not so much an endorsement of the play as a recognition of this fact. In some instances these were in regard to the worship of simplicity and "the noble savage" which some critics saw as an echo of Rousseau's teachings. For many New Englanders, engaged as they were in the rebellion against England and then in the Abolition Movement, the popularity stemmed in part from the ideal of freedom from persecution symbolized by the play. Very few examples can be cited from the nineteenth century in which Tell is criticised on its literary merits alone. This has continued to the present day.

One of the most interesting aspects of Tell's reception which this thesis considered was the Schiller celebrations, especially those of 1859 and 1905. The use of these dates as turning points in Schiller's popularity is misleading. Especially concerning the Schiller celebrations of 1859, much has been written which cannot be substantiated. A picture is conjured of the mass demonstration of affection by non-Germans
for Germany's poet of freedom. Heartwarming though this scene may be to Schiller's admirers, it unfortunately has little basis in fact. No evidence could be found to indicate any general popularity in England and America among the non-Germans either before or after 1859. The greatest support for Tell in either country came from the German Forty-eighters and the Turnvereine, and there is no evidence to assume that even a large percentage of the some 6,000,000 German immigrants shared their views. The great success of many of the Schillerfeier among the German immigrants was that they were literally "celebrations." The German influence was in part responsible for the introduction of Tell into the classroom (beginning with Charles Follen), an important contribution to the preservation of Schiller's Tell in England and America for students of German and non-German parentage alike.
APPENDIX I

GERMAN TEXTBOOK EDITIONS OF WILHELM TELL IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.


1842. ANON. ED. 'Wilhelm Tell.' Merely German text; no notes or introd. London: D. Nutt. (BM. Pick 409)2

1847. BERNAYS, ADOLPHUS. ED. 'William Tell.' A play with an introd. and explanatory notes. London: Parker's German Classics. (BM. Pick 490)

1851. OEHLSCHLAGER, JAMES C. ED. 'Wilhelm Tell.' Philadelphia. 2nd Phila. ed. 1854; 3rd ed. Cinn. 1865. (Parry)


1868. OPPEN, E. A. ED. 'Wilhelm Tell.' Edited with introd. and English vocabulary and notes. London: Longmans, Green & Co. (BM. Pick 638)


3 LC = Library of Congress Catalogue.
1871. QUICK, R. H. ED. 'Wilhelm Tell,' with companion vol., containing a compl. vocab., with notes and an historical introd. by Hermann Müller-Strübing. Harrow: Crossley & Clarke; London: D. Nutt. (BM. Pick 653)

1874. QUICK, R. H. ED. 'Wilhelm Tell.' 2nd ed., as above. Harrow: S. Clarke. (BM)

1875. SCHÜNEMANN, H. ED. 'Wilhelm Tell.' London: Longmans, Green and Co. Grammar School series of German Classics, I. Merely German text, no notes or introd. (BM. Pick 688)

1877. WITNEY, W. D. ED. 'Wilhelm Tell.' With an introd. and notes by A. Sachtleben. New York: Holt. (LC)


1886. BEVIR, J. L. ED. 'Wilhelm Tell.' London: Rivingtons. (BM. Pick 764)


1890. BREUL, KARL. ED. 'Wilhelm Tell.' Cambridge Univ. Press; Pitt Press Series. (BM. Pick 802)

1890. BREUL, KARL. ED. 'Wilhelm Tell.' As above, but an abridged edition. (BM)

1894. ULRICH, A. J. ED. 'Wilhelm Tell.' London: Williams & Norgate, Ulrich's German Classics. (BM. Pick 847)

---

4 Pick states that this edition was reprinted 5 times until 1949, but I verified only the 1890 abridged edition and the 1897 revised edition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Publisher Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>BREUL, KARL.</td>
<td><em>Wilhelm Tell.</em> Rev. ed.</td>
<td>Vulpius 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>PALMER, ARTHUR H.</td>
<td><em>Wilhelm Tell.</em> With introd., notes and vocab.</td>
<td>New York: Holt (LC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>HEMPL, G.</td>
<td><em>Wilhelm Tell.</em> Act I.</td>
<td>New York: Hinds &amp; Noble, the ideophonic texts for acquiring languages, series I, v. I. (LC) 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>DEERING, ROBERT W.</td>
<td><em>Wilhelm Tell.</em> With an introd., notes and vocab.</td>
<td>Boston: Heath (LC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>CARRUTH, W. H.</td>
<td><em>Wilhelm Tell.</em> New York: Macmillan. (Hammer) 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>DEERING, ROBERT W.</td>
<td><em>Wilhelm Tell.</em></td>
<td>Boston: Heath. (Hammer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


6 A copy was not available in order to obtain an explanation of the "ideophonic" theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author/Editor</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>VOS, BERT JOHN. ED.</td>
<td><em>Wilhelm Tell.</em> With introd., notes and vocab.</td>
<td>Boston, New York: Ginn. (Vulpius 1285)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>VOS, BERT JOHN. ED.</td>
<td><em>Wilhelm Tell.</em> Same as above without vocab.</td>
<td>(BM, LC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>HEMPL, G. ED.</td>
<td><em>Wilhelm Tell.</em> Act I. Same as entry for 1900.</td>
<td>(Vulpius 1279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>SCHLENKER, CARL. ED.</td>
<td><em>Wilhelm Tell.</em> With introd., notes, German questions, excercises and vocab.</td>
<td>Boston: Allyn &amp; Bacon. (LC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>HEMPL, G. ED.</td>
<td><em>Wilhelm Tell.</em> Act I. New printing.</td>
<td>(Vulpius 1279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>GARLAND, H. B. ED.</td>
<td><em>Wilhelm Tell.</em> With introd., notes.</td>
<td>(BM. Pick 1089)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is the 'classical' school edition.*
1959. GARLAND, H. B. ED. 'Wilhelm Tell.' With an introd. and notes. London: Harrap (LC)


APPENDIX II

EDITIONS OF CARLYLE'S LIFE OF SCHILLER TO 1904.¹

1825. London: Taylor & Hessey. (BM. LC)
1837. New York: G. Dearborn & Co. (LC)
1845. London: Taylor & Hessey. (Pick 458)
1845. London: Chapman & Hall. 2nd ed. (BM. LC)
1857. London: Chapman & Hall. Two biographies; Life of Schiller, 1825. Life of John Sterling, 1851. (BM)
1872. New York: John W. Lovell Co. (LC)
1893. London: Chapman & Hall. Same as "Two Biographies" for 1857. (LC)

¹ I was unable to verify any reprints or new editions past 1904.


1901. New York: C. Scribner's Sons. (LC)


APPENDIX III

ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS AND EDITIONS OF WILHELM TELL IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.


1827. Schiller. William Tell. Translated by: Charles Des Voeux. (Nicoll)2


1830. Fraser's Magazine I, 161. R. L. Pearsall. First Song from Wilhelm Tell, original German and English Translation. (Pick 279)


2 Nicoll = Allardyce Nicoll, IV.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translated by</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Schiller</td>
<td>Wilhelm Tell</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>London: Burns. (BM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Schiller</td>
<td>Wilhelm Tell</td>
<td>Miss Molini.</td>
<td>Sharpe's London Magazine II, 52. Life and Writings of Schiller. (Pick 476)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Schiller</td>
<td>Wilhelm Tell</td>
<td>Ludwig Braunfels</td>
<td>London: Williams &amp; Norgate, German &amp; English. (Morgan 8209. Pick 492)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Schiller</td>
<td>William Tell</td>
<td>F. Lebahn</td>
<td>London. (Goedecke)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Schiller</td>
<td>William Tell</td>
<td>William Peter</td>
<td>Philadelphia. (Morgan 8229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Schiller</td>
<td>William Tell</td>
<td>William Peter</td>
<td>Lucerne: Kaiser. (Morgan 8230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Schiller</td>
<td>Wilhelm Tell</td>
<td>William Peter</td>
<td>Bilingual edition. (Morgan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


1874. Schiller. *William Tell*. Translated by: William Peter. (Morgan 8232)


4 The "S" before a number indicates that the entry is supplemental, cf. n. 1, Appendix III.
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