



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

THE NEW ION AND THE DIMINISHED KREUSA:
FAMILY RECONSTRUCTED IN AUGUST WILHELM
SCHLEGEL'S DRAMA ION

presented by

Amy J. Eisen

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

M. A. degree in German

Major professor

Date 6/22/97

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

THE NEW ION AND THE DIMINISHED KREUSA:
FAMILY RECONSTRUCTED IN AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL'S
DRAMA ION.

By

Amy J. Eisen

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Linguistics and Germanic, Slavic,
Asian and African Languages

1997

ABSTRACT

THE NEW ION AND THE DIMINISHED KREUSA: FAMILY RECONSTRUCTED IN AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL'S DRAMA ION.

By

Amy J. Eisen

August Wilhelm Schlegel is renowned as a translator and theorist of drama. His only drama, Ion, has sustained his reputation as a translator, because few have recognized that the drama was an adaptation, rather than a translation, of Euripides' Ion. The parents assume new roles in Schlegel's version of Ion. Xuthus, who was a secondary character in Euripides' drama becomes a protagonist along with Kreusa. The transformation of Xuthus and Kreusa suggests that Schlegel was influenced by his contemporary notion of masculinity and femininity and attempted to conform the characters in accordance with the values of his time. Previous interpretations ignore the transformation of the Kreusa character and the connection between Schlegel's theory of drama and Ion. Recent feminist criticism of Euripides' work as well as new socio-historical studies on gender in Germany support my conclusion that the parents in Ion are redefined by the ideal roles of men and women in Schlegel's time. In addition, an analysis of his poetic theory suggests that he chose to adapt Euripides' Ion, rather than translate it, to create *Poesie*: a synthesis of nature and art.

August Wilhelm Schlegel is renowned for his work as a translator and theorist of drama. His Shakespeare translations and his lectures on drama are an integral part of German literary history. As a dramatist, however, he has gained far less attention. His only drama Ion, which is based on Euripides' drama of the same name, demonstrates his attempt to create a drama suitable to the sensibilities of his late Eighteenth/early Nineteenth-Century German audience.

In the following, I will show how Schlegel adapted Euripides' Ion. While several dialogues are direct translations, he revises the constructs of masculinity and femininity from Euripides' text, suggesting that his drama is neither entirely original, nor a translation. For this reason, I wish to show how Schlegel adapted the drama in accordance with his own theory of literature, as it stood at the time he worked on Ion and how he was influenced by the new gender roles in society to rewrite the role of the original female protagonist, Kreusa.

Before examining how Schlegel transformed Kreusa's and Xuthus' roles, I will explore Ion's turbulent reception history to suggest why the drama has been overlooked and frequently mistaken for a translation. Secondly, I will compare the revisions in the three parents (Kreusa, Apollo and Xuthus) to Euripides' version in order to focus on the aspects that Schlegel altered in his drama. Lastly, I will examine Schlegel's critical writing in an attempt to understand why he chose to write a new Ion rather than translate Euripides'. My analysis will follow a socio-historical approach coupled with an analysis of Schlegel's critical writing. In my analysis, I understand masculinity and femininity as social constructs, defined by the culture in which they exist, therefore I will focus on how late eighteenth century

German society defined masculine and feminine identity and how Schlegel incorporates these concepts in Ion.

Scholarship concerning Schlegel's Ion

In this century, Schlegel's drama attracted the most scholarly interest around 1930. Two dissertations were published on the topic: Viktor Lipka's dissertation "Schlegels Ion und seine Nachfolge" (1931), focuses on the structure of Ion and Helene Griesch's dissertation (1925) also explores the structure of the drama. In addition, two books that directly mention Ion were published during this time. Olga Franke's book, Euripides bei den deutschen Dramatikern des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts was published in 1929. August Emmerleben compared the work of August Wilhelm Schlegel and Friedrich Schlegel concluding with a short chapter on Ion in 1937.

Later analysis of the drama began to appear nearly thirty years after World War II. More recent interpretations of Ion evaluate it as it pertains to Goethe's staging of the work and some note that it demonstrates a model of the transition from Enlightenment to Classicism in German drama. Still others have compared it to Wieland's translation of Euripides' work. Bernd Maurach, for example, focused on the theatrical aspect of the drama when he wrote of the scandal that arose in the late fall of 1801 when Goethe began rehearsing Ion in Weimar and the name of the author, August Wilhelm Schlegel, was not revealed. Critics were dumbfounded that Goethe would be so protective of the dramatist that he would mask the author's identity. Maurach's work centers on the theatrical production and Goethe's choice to direct the work.

The familial structure in Ion has not been the subject of recent scholarship, but it was mentioned in one of the earlier studies by Olga Franke, in Euripides bei den deutschen Dramatikern des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts (1929). Her analysis was published long before modern day Feminist criticism emerged and therefore does not go into detail about the social constructs of gender that contemporary scholars employ. In her brief analysis of Schlegel's work, she contends that he rewrote Euripides' work so that it placed greater emphasis on the family. Schlegel's Ion is not discussed in detail, rather it is alluded to when she compares it to Goethe's Iphigenie auf Tauris. Franke's work is significant, however, because she draws attention to the revision of the familial structure. Her work did not gain much attention until Gehard Schultz, in a 1984 article, agreed with her interpretation that the family was emphasized. In addition, he maintained that Schlegel's goal was similar to that of Goethe's for Iphigenie auf Tauris, that is, to humanize the ancient mythology (Schultz 197). Schultz's study was not specifically about Schlegel's work Ion, rather he explored the state of German theater and the collaboration between Goethe and the Schlegels. Comparisons to Goethe's Iphigenie auf Tauris reveal both authors use of a Greek model to present an image of humanity¹, that is, the audience must leap a cultural gap when they experience emotions toward Greek characters. In doing so, they experience their pure humanity.

Although the experience of humanity is similar, where the female protagonists are concerned, the comparisons fall short. Goethe's female protagonist maintained the prominent role she had in Euripides' version. Goethe's Iphigenie demonstrates how Greek

theater could be adapted by Germans, a culture without a theater of its own. The portrayal of Iphigenie, argues Benjamin Bennett, demonstrates how she must learn to speak in a new and deeper way when she comes in contact with the barbarians. She learns to speak as an individual (Bennett, 101). Bennett additionally points out that "...the allegory in Iphigenie implies that some sort of fruitful interchange will be required with the culture of ancient Greece, where drama for European purposes, is born" (Bennett, 101). He furthermore suggests that like Iphigenie, who had to learn to communicate with a culture less advanced than her own, the Greek drama will learn something from the interchange with the Germans (101). He interprets Iphigenie's role as a symbol of the German theater. The presentation of Greek drama in Germany stood to be improved by German interpretation and the new language necessary for the German stage. Kreusa in Ion is, in contrast to the importance of the female protagonist in Goethe's work, relegated to an inferior role in Schlegel's version. Speaking as an individual does not figure in to the adaptation, but the idea that Iphigenie symbolized, that the Greek drama could learn something from the Germans, may contribute to Schlegel's choice of Euripides' drama.

While scholars agree that Schlegel's version places greater emphasis on the family, they tend to equate family with Xuthus. For this reason, I wish to suggest that Schlegel's version places greater emphasis on the male and that the importance of family is consistent in both Euripides' and Schlegel's dramas. The primary difference is the definition of family and the voice and importance of the mother within that structure.

The analyses that suggest that Schlegel's Ion places greater emphasis on the family define family in relationship to the father. That is, family is understood as a patriarchal family in which the father assumes the dominant role as a parent and the mother's involvement is lessened². With such a concept of family, Franke and Schultz focus on the family as a whole, not on the individual members and their roles within the construct. In comparison to Euripides' Ion they aim to demonstrate how the focus emphasized the importance of family. Since Franke's analysis, the notion of family in German Eighteenth-Century literature has gained considerable attention and new research concerning the historical role of the mother at that time has surfaced.

Even in the most recent analysis of Schlegel's Ion, the presentation of the female is not explored. Georg Reichard's book, August Wilhelm Schlegel's "Ion" (1987), is the most comprehensive study of Schlegel's Ion to date, but like many of his predecessors, he chooses to focus on the performative aspect, the stagings by Goethe and Iffland. He includes background information on the drama, including an overview of Schlegel's theory of art and a chapter on Ion adaptations written prior to Schlegel's drama. While he does offer some textual interpretation, his focus is primarily on the theatrical aspect of the drama, namely the directors' involvement, scenic design, costuming and the audience's response. Several of the above mentioned studies address staging and the implications and place of the drama within the historical development of drama, but to date no analysis examines how Schlegel redefines the characters, although Schlegel emphasized the importance of character and the interactions between characters in his twenty-seventh lecture on drama³. Georg

Reichard did note that, "Schlegels Äußerungen lassen vermuten, daß er in seinem Ion versucht, die Darstellungsweise der griechischen Tragödien nachzuahmen und die Handlung gleichzeitig dem zeitgenössischen Geschmack anzunähern" (28). While he does acknowledge that Schlegel attempted to rewrite the drama so that it would appeal to his contemporaries' interests, he does not explore what changes specifically should have achieved such a goal.

Schlegel's Contemporaries and Ion.

The debut performance of Ion under Goethe's direction in the Weimar theater on January 2, 1802 invited controversy: Critics questioned Goethe's interest in the work, they were concerned that it was offensive, and some mistakenly referred to it as a translation. Georg Reichard's chapter on the reception of the drama outlines the controversy surrounding Ion. In addition to the collected letters and reviews contained in the critical editions of the Schlegels' writing, Reichard's museum research provides us with examples from newspapers not found in critical editions, including Oscar Fambach's collection on theater. Reichard's compilation of statements on Ion is useful because it allows glimpses of the public response to Schlegel's drama. Two newspapers insisted that the drama was a direct translation. Reichard found the following in die Oberdeutsche allgemeine Litteraturzeitung: "In Weimar wurde ein griechisches Stück, in deutschen Jamben, Io[n] genannt, einstudiert⁴". This blatant suggestion that the drama was merely a translation echoes suggestions of the same nature in personal letters and public articles, that Reichard succinctly summarizes in his last chapter.

Among the public letters concerning Ion, one by Goethe, the original director, states that the mythological background should be obvious to the well educated audience member and for those who do not have such a background the drama should have a pedagogical purpose:

Uebringens ist das Stück, für gebildeten Teil, denen
 mythologische Verhältnisse nicht fremd sind, völlig klar
 und gegen den übrigen, weniger gebildeten Theil,
 erwirbt es sich das pädagogische Verdienst, daß es ihn
 veranlaßt, zu Hause wieder einmal ein mythologisches
 Lexikon zur Hand zu nehmen und sich über den
 Erichthonius und Erectheus aufzuklären⁵.

Goethe's comments indicate the two classes of citizens that would attend the production. The published letters about the drama most likely were written by that portion of the audience familiar with the mythological figures. Though they do possess a certain degree of familiarity with the myth, the similarity of the plots as well as the parallel sequence of events in Schlegel's and Euripides' Ions may explain why even contemporary scholars' attention is drawn to the performative aspect. Essentially, the redistribution of roles within the family unit distinguishes Schlegel's drama from Euripides'. Because, as Karoline Schlegel writes, it was staged in classical Greek style costume⁶, the audience could easily be persuaded to believe that they were watching an authentic Greek drama in German (sans Choir). Schlegel's notoriety as a translator would also persuade audience members to assume that his goal was to translate the drama, just as he

had previously translated several Shakespearean plays. The confusion about Schlegel's intentions is evident in the letters and reviews.

Karl Spazier in his review of Ion in die Zeitung für die elegante Welt is one of the first to attribute the drama solely to Schlegel. One month later, and after many other newspapers published articles that proclaimed Schlegel's Ion a translation of Euripides, a report of the publications was published in which A.W. Schlegel (anonymously) insisted that it must be understood as a new drama⁷.

Letters concerning the content or specifics about the drama other than performance are few in number. In a letter from Karoline Schlegel to her husband, she expresses her concern for the way in which Kreusa was presented⁸:

Einige zarte Veränderungen haben wir entdeckt mit
Bleistift gezeichnet, jene die ich Dir schon anfangs sagte:
Neigung zu der Braut-und wo Jon fragt im letzten Act I.
Sz. (ich schreibe aus dem Gedächtniß):

J. Doch hört ich, euer Bett blieb unfruchtbar.

Xuthus. Das ihre-
steht ungefähr:

Daß ihr bisher noch ohne Kinder bliebet.

X. Kreusa-

Dann zwischen Jon und Kreusa:

Du weiß wohl, Scham bedrängt die Frauen oft.
ist Scham in etwas von Schickung verwandelt worden,
welche die Frauen bedrängt [sic]. Es ist genug Dich auf
diese Stellen aufmerksam zu machen, so wie Du es
überhaupt noch in der Rücksicht durchgehn solltest, denn

ich kann Dir nicht bergen, über Anstößigkeit haben sie hintennach doch sehr lamentiert, und das mag auch in der Herzoglichen Loge geschehn seyn⁹.

Karoline Schlegel's knew the mythology well and critically read the drama. Her concerns appear to be directed at the audience's response and in the severe criticism she believes Schlegel expressed toward Kreusa. In Euripides' drama, Xuthus does not blame his wife for their lack of children. Karoline fears that the last line may be offensive to the audience members, perhaps because of the double entendre in the word *Scham*. The explicit reference to sex, an open remark concerning something that was not discussed in the public arena, would have offended an audience. The implication that Kreusa was responsible for the childlessness was not unusual for the time period. Although it was frequently assumed that the woman acted only as a vessel for the child, it was not uncommon to blame women for childless marriages¹⁰. Schlegel likewise posits the blame on Kreusa for the couple's inability to conceive.

Karoline Schlegel's concerns were justified, as demonstrated by Reichard's research, in that many of Schlegel's contemporaries considered his drama unfit for the stage. Friedrich Schiller was one such audience member. On July 5, 1802, he wrote from Weimar to Christian Gottfried Körner in Dresden about one of Goethe's later stagings of Ion. The letter, unlike many earlier complimentary letters written directly to A.W. Schlegel, demonstrates Schiller's distaste for Ion. Schiller compares the drama to the ill received drama Alarcos by A.W. Schlegel's brother, Friedrich, and bases his assessment of Ion on its relation to Euripides work of the same name:

Mit dem Alarcos hat sich Goethe allerdings compromittiert; es ist seine Krankheit, sich der Schlegels anzunehmen, über die er doch selbst bitterlich schimpft und schmäht. Das Stück ist aber hier nur Einmal und völlig ohne allen Beifall gegeben worden. Die Intention des Stücks wäre wirklich zu loben, wenn die Manier in der Ausführung nicht so widerwärtig wäre. Der Jon von Wilhelm Schlegel ist schon deßwegen genießbarer weil er auf das Stück des Euripides gebaut ist, dem er im ganzen und oft auch wörtlich im einzelnen folgt. Dieses Stück enthält wirklich manches geistreiche und schön gesagte, aber die Schlegelsche Natur schimmert dann wieder sehr zum Nachtheil hindurch. Der Jon selbst hat an Interesse verloren, die Mutter hingegen hat hie und da gewonnen¹¹.

Schiller's note about the mother becoming a more interesting character in Schlegel's version is one of the few comments regarding the change in the presentation of Kreusa among Schlegel's contemporaries. Schiller seems to have appreciated the presentation of Kreusa, which was more in accordance with his contemporary notion of womanhood, although he disliked the Schlegels. As we shall see, the negative reception of Kreusa comes primarily from female audience members.

By comparing Schlegel's Ion to Euripides' we will see that Schlegel was, in this case, not only a translator. It is also informative to note how contemporary scholars approach Euripides' drama; who they believe to be the protagonist and what issues are commonly associated with Euripides' drama. By exploring these issues we can contrast it to

Schlegel's reconstruction of the family. After the published letters concerning the originality of Schlegel's Ion and the above mentioned letter from Schiller, Schlegel's drama did not capture the attention of scholars again until over one hundred years later.

Feminism and Classical Scholarship on Euripides' Ion

If we examine the scholarship on Euripides' Ion, it becomes apparent that scholars continue to debate who the protagonist is, and where the plot emphasis in Euripides Ion lies. They agree, however, that the difficulty of pinpointing a central theme in his work may explain why for centuries scholars continue to explore the work. New interest in Euripides' Ion surfaced in the 1950's. D.J. Conacher's article, "The Paradox of Euripides' Ion," for example, explores the continuing debate about the central issue of the drama. Among those in this study are H. Grégor, who believed that the work was primarily political, and U. von Wilamowitz, who argues that it was propaganda for the creation of an Athenian nation¹². The scholars mentioned do not agree on Apollo's role. The debate of whether or not the drama was propaganda, a tragedy or a tragic-comedy continues. Not only has the work evaded classification, but scholars continue to debate who the protagonist is: E.M. Blaiklock argued that the drama revolves around Ion and praised Euripides for being one of the few early dramatists to portray childhood accurately¹³. Max Imhof agreed with Grégor that the drama was about a national hero, but points out that Kreusa is the main character,

Das Stück heißt *Ion*, es stellt die Rückführung eines nationalen Heros und Stammvaters in seine Mutterstadt dar; so verkündet es Hermes am Schluß des Prologs. Das

spannungs- und hindernisreiche Suchen und Finden von Mutter und Sohn bestimmt die äußere Handlung; aber Kreusa, die Frau und Mutter, ist , wie häufig bei Euripides, innerlich die Hauptgestalt des Stückes. Sie ist nicht zufällig in der Prologrede sechsmal erwähnt¹⁴.

Imof's study was published in 1966. In 1977 Barbara Gauger published her dissertation entitled, Gott und Mensch im Ion des Euripides. She contends that the drama's main concern is the antagonism between the god Apollo and the female main character, Kreusa. Since the publication of her dissertation, the drama has attracted a re-evaluation by feminist scholars.

While feminist criticism has changed German scholarship for the past several decades, feminist scholars in Classical Greek scholarship recently began debating the issue of the literary canon and the role of feminist interpretation in their field . In 1993 Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz and Amy Richlin edited a collection of articles concerning feminism and the study of Greek Classics (Feminist Theory and the Classics). Their book outlines the progress of feminist studies and suggests that "gender studies" may be the best approach when examining texts by men because one must also take into account the notion of masculinity¹⁵. Their book explores the problems that classical Greek scholars contend with as they attempt to incorporate feminist criticism in the study of Greek and Roman literature. While the book is written primarily for Classical scholars, it suggests that feminism can and should be applied to traditional male texts.

In the same year, Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz's feminist criticism, Anxiety Veiled, explored the role of wife and mother in several of

Euripides' works. She contends that, "the female presence has been reduced to a voice speaking Apollo's words and acting as his surrogate" (195)¹⁶. She suggests that Kreusa is not the prominent character in the drama. Patrica Watsons' Ancient Stepmothers (1995) explores the stereotype of stepmothers and the role of women in the family in the ancient world. Watson uses Euripides' Ion to explain the negative reputation of stepmothers in general and her work will be helpful in exploring the transformation of the woman in Schlegel's new Ion.
Schlegel's Ion and the Mythological Origins of the Drama

The origins of the Kreusa character could be found in Greek mythology before Euripides dramatized the Ion story. However, because the transmission of the myth is based largely on Euripides' dramatization, differentiation between his version and the oral tradition are difficult to evaluate. The mythological Kreusa is known for her marriage to Xuthus, a foreigner who won her in battle. She is the mother of Ion and the daughter of Erechtheus. She was said to have secretly met with Apollo in a cave. There, they conceived a son, Ion. When Ion was born Kreusa assumed that Apollo abandoned her. She feared telling her father that she had a child, so she left her son in a cave. The child was rescued by Apollo and became a servant at the temple in Delphi. The temple priests named him Ion. Kreusa assumed that he was dead and never told anyone that she had Apollo's child.

The drama begins when Xuthus and Kreusa approach the oracle at Delphi to ask Apollo for children. Xuthus is told that the first person he saw would be his son. When he returns to find his wife, the first person he sees is Ion, and he immediately accepts him as his son.

Kreusa becomes angry that she must have a stepson in her home and attempts to poison Ion, but is unsuccessful. The plot is essentially the same in Euripides' and Schlegel's versions. In fact, the sequence of events remains unchanged. Because the changes are subtle, this may indicate why previous interpretations, including the reception by Schlegel's contemporaries, are directed at the performative aspect.

From Motherhood to Fatherhood: Schlegel's New Emphasis on Men

The changes Schlegel made to individual characters demonstrates the heightened importance of the patriarchal family in his Ion. The most obvious change, and one that disturbed Schlegel's contemporaries, is Apollo's physical presence in the drama. In no previous version does Apollo appear on stage. In Barbara Gauger's analysis of Euripides' Ion, she suggests that Apollo's distance from the characters (his concerns presented only by an intermediary) define not only the nature of the Apollo character, but the other characters as well. Because Apollo does not appear in Euripides' version his positive and negative attributes can only be suggested by characters and, Gauger cautions, must be carefully interpreted with regards to the source (78), that is with regards to the speaker. She additionally suggests that the traditional representation of Apollo (all-powerful) engages him with every aspect of the drama, especially the outcome of other characters' fates. Schlegel's physically present Apollo could have addressed some unanswered questions from Euripides' drama. His monologue could have been addressed to Kreusa and he could finally have the opportunity to express his version of the story: why he abandoned Kreusa and if he indeed raped her. Schlegel, however, chose not to address such issues. Instead, Apollo briefly addresses Kreusa:

"Empfang' ihn du, Kreusa, wohl bewahrt zurück, Der schönen Luft
Andenken, die mich noch entzückt, Denn unvergänglich ist der Dank
der himmlischen" (153). Apollo thanks Kreusa but demonstrates no
regret for his actions. Not only is Apollo the all-powerful god, as in
Euripides' drama, he is unsympathetic to Kreusa's hardships. It is not
surprising that his appearance offended some of Schlegel's
contemporaries like Karoline Herder, who wrote of her dislike for
Apollo in a letter to Johann Wilhelm Ludwig Gleim in March 1802:

Schlegel hat des Euripides Ion übersetzt-aber so
ungriechisch, so beleidigend die Schamhaftigkeit u.
Sittlichkeit! - Statt der Pallas erscheint Apollo selbst u.
erzählt [sic] mit einer Frechheit, die Scene in der Höle mit
der Kreusa, daß einem Hören u. sehen vergeht. Auf
solche Weise will man uns die Griechen kennen lernen
u. geben!¹⁷

Karoline Herder's observations are important not only because they
give us an idea of how the original audience may have responded, but
also because she also gives insight not found in the published reviews.
Her letter gives us a glimpse into a contemporary female interpretation
of Schlegel's drama¹⁸, when she suggests Apollo's disrespect of Kreusa
was offensive. Herder suggests that Schlegel is presenting a poor
example from which to learn about classical Greek drama when he
chooses a drama in which a god appears on stage and callously
discusses how he raped an innocent woman. In the printed version of
the drama, that we have today, Apollo makes no such statement, but it
is implied in his last monologue. Herder is opposed to the way

Schlegel chooses to introduce them to the classical Greek dramas because of Apollo's crude description of his past with Kreusa.

As Herder noted, Schlegel excludes Pallas Athena, Apollo's messenger from his drama. Her removal alters Apollo's role by making him physically present and suggests that Schlegel wanted to eliminate Apollo's female intermediary. Like Kreusa's less verbal role, Athena becomes completely silenced in Schlegel's drama and the loss of a female intermediary suggests that Apollo's actions are undoubtedly male, untainted by a female voice.

In Euripides' version, Apollo admits guilt through his intermediary, when Athena says, "I have come here in haste, sent by Apollo. Who did not think it right to come himself before you, lest he be blamed for what has happened in the past; he has sent me to give his message..." (252). Euripides' Apollo is more humble than Schlegel's, as evident in his need to send an intermediary, which suggests an admission that he may be blamed. Schlegel's revision also suggests that the masculine authority figure should not only have an entirely masculine voice (without a female intermediary), he must also be physically present. Whereas Euripides' Apollo had an implied dominance in the drama created by other characters' reference to him, Schlegel's Apollo is not dependent on the other characters for representation when he appears at the conclusion. His presence and his new voice overshadow his past with Kreusa. Apollo's physical presence suggests that his role as an authority figure is of greater value than rectifying the situation with Kreusa.

Apollo maintains a position of unrelenting power in Schlegel's version and expresses no regret. In addition, Schlegel's Apollo places

greater emphasis on his role as a father, rather than as Kreusa's seducer, although his role as a father is less clearly defined. His ill-defined role as a father in Schlegel's version occurs for two reasons. First, because Schlegel's Ion lacks a prologue in which all the background information is shared with the audience; the audience or reader must rely on their knowledge of Greek mythology to know that Apollo seduced Kreusa. Apollo's role as a father gains less attention, because it is not mentioned directly in the text. Instead, and secondly, he is initially introduced by Ion as a deity, "Apollo, heiterer Gott! Der Du von droben das milde Licht herab zur Erde sendest..." (59). Thus, the initial presentation emphasizes the common understanding of Apollo from mythology, as a powerful god, rather than as Kreusa's seducer. In addition, Apollo is referred to as a father in the Ion's opening monologue, "Du, den Gebieter ich und Vater nenne, weil du im Heiligtum mich auferzogst..." (59).

While Ion is not aware that Apollo is his natural father in the beginning, one could easily interpret his mode of addressing Apollo in Schlegel's version as nothing more than reverence towards a god, who provided him with a secure life, but the irony that Apollo fathered him is less apparent, because Schlegel chose to omit a prologue. Apollo is therefore presented in a distanced, more powerful position and the audience, like Ion, does not know of his paternal relationship to Ion at the beginning of the drama.

Even when Ion refers to Apollo directly as father he implies that he is a spiritual parent, "Man heißt mich Ion; keinen Vater weiß ich zu nennen, als den Gott, der rings hier waltet" (74). When Ion consequently refers to him as father he confirms the distanced nature

of the Apollo character, "Apollo, du vor allen, habe Dank! Mein unsichtbarer und olymp'scher Vater, das bleibst du dennoch, ob du schon mir sichtbar den sterblichen Erzeuger zugewiesen" (92). Apollo's claim to fatherhood in Schlegel's version is as controversial as that of Kreusa and Pythia in Euripides' version because of its multiple meanings. He is presented both as a nurturing spiritual parent and as a biological parent. The opening scene accentuates Ion's spiritual dependence on Apollo. Ion says, for example:

Ein jeder Tag erneut mir Leib' und Luft,
Wie täglich frisch gepflückte Zweig' und Kränz,
Von deinem ewig grünen Lorbeerbaum
hier diese Säulen, dieses Tor umwinden (I,1).

Ion expresses his gratitude towards Apollo through a comparison of the natural wonders, which Apollo provides to enhance his life. He appears content to have only a spiritual father, who secures a peaceful environment for him. Schlegel's choice of the adjective "ewig" emphasizes the infinite powers of Apollo and suggests Ion's insignificance in the realm of Apollo's authority.

Other characters also refer to Apollo's authority and his role in granting parenthood. Pythia, for example, a priestess of Apollo, praises his intuitive nature for allowing her to experience maternal love in caring for Ion, "Wehmut befiel mich, und sie gab mir ein, vielleicht vergöne mir für meine Treue Apoll die süße Zärtlichkeit zu fühlen, die eine Mutter an den Säugling knüpft" (I,1). Even Pythia is unaware that the child she was chosen to care for is Apollo's. Her gratitude toward him for allowing her to experience motherhood, like Ion's

gratitude for the beauty of nature, maintain Apollo's distanced stature and furthermore present him in a positive light.

His presence as an omniscient deity with no personal involvement in Ion's life, is reconfirmed when Ion expresses his desire to ask him the identity of his natural parents. Ion assumes Apollo's unending knowledge when he asks Pythia, "Warum befragen wir Apollen nicht?" (I, 2). Her response is the first indication that would indicate to the audience that Ion's background may be intentionally masked. Pythia dissuades him from approaching Apollo, perhaps for her own benefit, and convinces Ion that he may be disappointed if Apollo revealed that he was the son of a slave, "Du könntest hören, was dir nicht gefiele" (I, 2). Pythia prohibits Ion from further inquiring about his parent's identity and diverts his attention by reassuring him of Apollo's power, "Apollon's Lieb' und seines Tempels Dienst. Erwart' in Ruh bis die bestimmte Zeit Die Knoten deines Schicksals lösen wird, denn Vorwitz könnte sie noch fester schürzen"(I, 2). Schlegel emphasizes her outwardly obedient nature through her reverence for Apollo, but suggests that she may have her own motivations for silencing Ion, namely that she does not want to relinquish her role as a mother to him. She realizes that if a natural parent could claim him, that she would lose the role that Apollo assigned her.

Kreusa, like Pythia, emphasizes Apollo's stature in her first line, "Ja, ich sehe die hochberühmte Wohnung des Apoll." (I, 5). Schlegel reinforces the breadth of Apollo's notoriety with the adjective "hochberühmte". The first reference to Apollo's less redeeming qualities is foregrounded in Kreusa's conversation with Ion. She recounts the story of her friend who was raped by Apollo:

Ein Weib, das ich als schuldlos kenn' und edel,
 Doch deren Namen ich nicht nennen darf,
 Beteuert, daß Apoll ihr einst genaht,
 Und ihr der Jugend jungfräuliche Blüte,

Ein Gott der schwachen Sterblichen, entwandt. (I, 5)

By prefacing the young woman as innocent and of noble birth, Apollo's actions, in comparison, appear more cruel. In Euripides' version, Kreusa simply refers to a friend without any further discussion of her status: "I have a friend-who says-she lay with Phoebus" (199). Because Schlegel chose to include additional information about the supposed friend, who is in actuality a projection of Kreusa's own experience, the audience or reader is allowed to judge the stance of both involved parties. The included reference to Kreusa's innocence works in two ways. First, it allows Kreusa to voice her opinion of how she perceived of herself, namely as a victim. Secondly, it implies that Apollo's actions were justified and virtuous, whereas in Euripides' version Apollo was honored as a god, but he expressed a degree of guilt that he impregnated and abandoned Kreusa.

Through Kreusa's story, Apollo assumes mortal qualities, in that he was able to interact with a mortal on a physical level. In mythology it was not uncommon for a god to briefly interact with a human. Mary Lefkowitz, in Women in Greek Myth, argues that the idea of rape in mythology revolves around the idea that the unmarried woman is sexually vulnerable and her vulnerability determines the degree of freedom or mobility a mortal woman can have. It is for this reason, she claims, that when a god wishes to rape a mortal woman, he has to devise a way to remove her from her home or from a group of girls

with whom she would normally travel (45). She demonstrates this with the example of Persephone who was raped by Zeus when he came to earth disguised as a bull. The mythological Apollo would not be considered closer to mortals because he interacted with them, because such an occurrence was common in the stories of the gods. In both Euripides' and Schlegel's Ion no indication is given that Apollo disguised himself in any way to pursue Kreusa. Schlegel, nevertheless, hints at Apollo's mortal qualities when he allows other characters to be judgemental of his actions. His transition from a classical Greek model of a god, who can transcend into the mortal sphere and avoid judgement, redefines Apollo. Schlegel allows the characters to judge gods by human criteria, thus momentarily putting Apollo's authority in question:

KREUSA. Die Wahrheit ist zu sagen stets erlaubt.

ION. Daß Götter Zucht und Sitte so zertreten?

KREUSA. Es muß der Mensch die Übermacht wohl dulden (79).

The characters nevertheless concede that they are inferior, while judging the god by human criteria. Although Schlegel's Apollo appears to be judged by mortals, their judgment is of no consequence. Humans must endure unyielding and amoral decisions of the gods. As indicated in the above passage, Kreusa suggests that she, as a mortal, must endure the wrath of the gods.

Schlegel does not include information about the circumstances of Apollo and Kreusa's meeting. Since the audience or reader must make inferences about Apollo's motivation for pursuing Kreusa, the audience is left with a negative impression of Apollo as a father. Kreusa's story reveals a negligent father image: one who abandons

both mother and child. Ion, however, reassures Kreusa (and the audience) that Apollo is a good father:

Beruh'ge deine Freundin mit dem Trost,
 Wenn sie nicht eitler Täuschung sich ergeben,
 Daß Götter ihre Kinder nicht verlassen,
 und daß Apoll gewiß den Säugling schirmte,
 Ihn nicht verschlingen oder rauben ließ,
 Und irgendwo zu seiner Lust ihn pflegt (80).

The male character supports the idea that interaction with the father is not necessary, provided that the father protect the child. Ion, like Apollo, does not respond to the woman's feeling of abandonment, instead he suggests that the mother should be comforted knowing that the child was not entirely neglected. Apollo, in Ion's opinion, remains virtuous because he, as a moral god, probably would provide for the child. Apollo's treatment of the mother merits no response, suggesting that Kreusa's concern is unjustified. Ion, unlike Kreusa, refuses to consider Apollo's flaws and exalts him in a song:

Dein lichtstrahlendes Götteranlitz
 O du, der im reinsten Taue badet
 Die goldlockige Scheitel
 Am Felsborne Kastalias,
 Apoll! Dürft ich es schaun nur einmal;
 Anredens gewürdigt
 Mich hinwerfen zu deinen Füßen
 Inbrünstiger Liebe voll!

Ion remains loyal to Apollo, regardless of Kreusa's story. His devotion, as demonstrated in the above passage, highlights his servile nature

characterized by his wish to throw himself at Apollo's feet. His desire to visually confront Apollo and his extreme reverence for him contradicts Kreusa's relationship with the god. After Apollo gives Ion to Xuthus, Kreusa expresses her hatred of Apollo and her desire to seek revenge by harming Ion: "Ihn liebt Apoll, der mich verschmäht, vergißt. Ja, Ion, ja! Das büße mir dein Tod!" (111) Through Kreusa, Schlegel projects the negative qualities of Apollo. In her eyes, he is ruthless and uncaring. His role as a father is strictly biological in Kreusa's opinion. The male characters focus on his nurturing qualities and disregard Pythia's efforts.

At the conclusion of the drama, Apollo's wrongdoings are overlooked and he is praised for taking care of Ion and giving him a good stepfather. He admits that he fathered Ion, but expresses no regrets. The concluding monologue, in which Apollo speaks, is new to Schlegel's Ion. While Kreusa receives thanks for her actions (bearing the child), Xuthus is elevated in stature to a god: "Sei Ions Vater, wie dein Ahn Deukalion, Mit Zeus gemeinsam Vater deines Vaters hieß." (153) The comparison to Zeus exonerates Xuthus for accepting Ion as a son, thus suggesting that Xuthus' actions are more honorable than Kreusa's suffering. Apollo suggests that the mother is unimportant first by ignoring Kreusa when she gave birth in the cave and later when he revealed that Ion was his son and gave him to Xuthus. Even though Xuthus had no idea that he was acting as a stepparent until the conclusion of the drama, Apollo praises him for his quiet acceptance of the child. Whereas Xuthus' distress was momentary (finding out that he is not the real father), Kreusa lived for sixteen years in shame. Apollo's appearance and his lack of remorse imply that his role as the

biological father and later Xuthus' role as a stepfather are more important than Kreusa's role as a mother in either situation.

Xuthus

Xuthus demonstrates a differing notion of parenthood from the idea presented through the Apollo character. At times he alludes to the possibility that he might be the biological father Ion, but must also confront his mixed emotions about being a stepfather as Ion's true identity is revealed. By placing greater emphasis on the Xuthus character, Schlegel allows for a similar contemplation of Xuthus' claim to fatherhood as Euripides facilitated with his presentation of motherhood. That is, the dilemma of understanding one's role as a natural parent versus the assumed role, which is an issue of motherhood in Euripides' text, becomes an issue for the father in Schlegel's drama. Georg Reichard, however, claimed that the focus on the Xuthus character was an attempt to focus on the lie told to Xuthus that he was Ion's father¹⁹. While Reichard recognized that the focus of Schlegel's drama shifted from the mother-child theme of Euripides text, he did not expound upon the reevaluation of fatherhood in the new Ion.

Perhaps Schlegel's idea of writing an Ion better suited to the German stage, involved redistributing the familial roles so that the male character could reclaim agency. In Euripides Ion, Xuthus makes two entrances, but in Schlegel's Ion he becomes a protagonist, detracting from Kreusa's importance. Xuthus' new role marks a distinct transition from the original. In scholarship on Euripides' Ion, Xuthus is understood as a supporting character and usually gains little

attention in criticism of the work, as the following excerpt from Max Imhof's analysis of Euripides' drama demonstrates:

Xuthus hat eine platte Scheinlösung für die Bedenken bereit, er will den Ion vorerst als Besucher in Athen einführen. Mit etymologisierender Namensnennung, Anordnung zum Opfermahl und Schweigegebot an die Mädchen schließt er ab. Dieser handfeste Optimismus des Xuthus, welcher damit seine Rolle in dem Stück ausgespielt hat, überzeugt den Ion nicht, zieht ihn aber einfach mit. In seinen Schlußworten (668-675) wird das Ganze noch einmal deutlich auf das Hauptthema Mutter ausgerichtet. "Wäre doch die Mutter in Athen"-so wird in euripideischer Weise am Schluß eines Epeisodions das folgende vorbereitet (32).

As we compare Euripides' Xuthus to Schlegel's it will become apparent that Xuthus is no longer the optimistic character he was, nor does his last line, or any of his dialogue, direct attention back to the main theme of motherhood. Xuthus' entrance is markedly different from Euripides' version. In Euripides' Ion he enters and says, "My greetings first is to god, and then to you my wife..." (p.202), whereas in Schlegel's drama he says, "Ich komme, teure Gattin, eilig nach, Damit dich mein Verweilen nicht bekümmre" (82). Euripides' Xuthus, who greets god and his wife respectively, presents a devout and respectful Xuthus. Schlegel's, by contrast, has no reference to god and only expresses concern that his wife may worry. In Euripides' Ion, Xuthus enters and explains that he heard good news from the oracle: that they will not return home childless (202), but in Schlegel's version Xuthus urges

Kreusa to go home with him. Schlegel's Xuthus is pessimistic and god-fearing, whereas he was optimistic and reverent in Euripides version. Xuthus' pessimism in Schlegel's version is further revealed in Xuthus' vision. He describes the "dunklen Eingang" to the Oracle (83) and images of discord among women and children: "Kinder winselnd, dann flieh'nde Weiber mit zerstreuten Haaren, Ein Jungling, wild nach ihrem Busen zielend..." (83). Xuthus describes his dream as a nightmare, in which he is haunted by the image of a child chasing after his mother's breast. His dream reveals his fear of a natural mother-child bond, one that he, as a father, cannot be a part of. Exclusion as well as uneasiness with female nature are revealed in the image. In Euripides Ion, Xuthus says nothing about a dream and rejoices in the good news Trophonius gave him when he visited the oracle (202). By contrast, in Schlegel's version Trophonius appears to Xuthus in the dream and warns him of danger. Schlegel's Troponius says the following to Xuthus:

Nicht vorgreif' ich dem delphischen Sitz und dem Seher
Apollo;
Aber hüte dich, Xuthus, daß deinem Geschlecht
nachstrebend,
Nicht du den Fall des Geschlechtes erwirbt und des
Hauses Zerrüttung (84).

Because Troponius appears to Xuthus in a dream, he represents Xuthus' own concerns, revealing a further aspect of his personality and adding a psychological insight to the Xuthus character. In the above passage Troponius represents the critical, rational side of Xuthus, unwilling to embrace the idea that he is guided by a higher power.

Xuthus' dream clearly reveals the shift in focus in Schlegel's drama. Instead of hoping for a child to share with his wife, Xuthus appears to have the insight of a god, forewarning him that his family could be destroyed by a new child. Xuthus' concerns are not necessarily for the well-being of his wife, but instead his dream implies that he fears protecting his existing family, or in other words, his fortune. The dream functions to give the Xuthus' character greater depth and a more significant presence in the drama. It shows how the turn of events directly affects him, whereas this aspect was missing from Euripides' version.

Xuthus' entrance marks a sharp contrast to Euripides' version. Not only is Xuthus transformed into a pessimistic expectant father, but he is given a larger speaking role. Euripides' Xuthus had four optimistic lines in his entrance and revealed his hopes for going home with a child. Schlegel's Xuthus speaks seven different times in his entrance including a long monologue about his dream.

Xuthus' second entrance, in which he meets Ion, provides more detail concerning the Xuthus character and his entrance elicits less antagonism in Schlegel's version. In Euripides' version, Ion is so enraged at the stranger's (Xuthus') embrace that he threatens to kill him, whereas in Schlegel's version Ion simply asks Xuthus who he is. The scene proceeds when Xuthus reveals that Ion is his son and reveals why he believes that he must be the biological parent of the child Apollo granted him. When he meets Ion he hugs him without introduction and then exclaims, "Du bist mein Sohn, steh' deinen Vater hier" (88). He assumes that Apollo gave him a son because he already had one that he did not know about. His understanding of

fatherhood is first biological and secondly he defines his new position in terms of ownership. He immediately asks Ion what he knows of his family and when Ion replies that he knows only that he was abandoned (90), Xuthus replies, "So bist du sicher mein Leibes Sohn" (91). Xuthus' insistence on his claim to fatherhood echoes the character's response in Euripides version, although Schlegel allows Xuthus to respond to Ion directly. Without doubting his biological relationship to Ion, Xuthus distances his wife Kreusa from possible involvement in the child's life. Xuthus appears to have forgotten his motivations for approaching Apollo: To ask to become a parent with Kreusa. When Ion informs Xuthus that he already talked to Kreusa and learned that they were without children, Xuthus promptly asserts that he was not childless:

ION. Ich hörte doch Kreusen erst beteuern,

Daß ihr bisher noch ohne Kinder bleibt.

XUTHUS. Kreusa freilich. Welches ist dein Alter?

In assuming Ion to be his own, Xuthus disclaims previous concerns that he may have been responsible for the long childless state, thus justifying his masculinity. As he asserts his claim to fatherhood, his association with Kreusa is gradually diminished, so much so that Xuthus eventually refers only to his own relationship to Ion: "Kinderlos war ich, und habe jetzt dich zum Sohn..." (90) Schlegel highlights Xuthus' belief that he is the father when the character justifies his right to fatherhood by explaining that the last time he visited the town was approximately seventeen years ago, the right time to have fathered Ion. In addition, he details his encounter and explains how he left the supposed mother:

Beim Schmaus, der festlich meinen Sieg beging,
 (Jetzt lebt es wieder im Gedächtnis mir)
 hat mich der Freude Taumel und des Weins
 Mit einer der Bacchanten hier verbunden,
 Die des Parnassus Klüfte wild durchstreifen,
 Und hochgeschwungen, weinumrankt, ein Thyrsus,
 Statt Hochzeitfackel uns vorangewinkt.
 Aus diesem Rausch mußt du entsprungen sein.
 Mich kümmerte, nach rascher Jugend Art,
 Das Weib nicht ferner, noch der Tat Erfolg,
 Und bald verließ ich diese Fluren (II, 2).

His monologue supplies the Xuthus character with an individual past, allowing the audience to sympathize more with him than for the Xuthus in Euripides Ion, who says nothing about his past. Schlegel demonstrates the character's feelings and concerns to such an extent that his concerns often overshadow Kreusa's. Schlegel's Xuthus is similar to Apollo's role in Euripides' version. Like Apollo, he abandoned the mother and defines his role as merely biological, but explains that leaving the mother was immature. He does not give any indication of regret. Since Schlegel claimed that Euripides' characters were too similar to each other²⁰, his choice to create similar histories for both Apollo and Xuthus contradicts his criticism. Like Apollo, he appears to provide care only for the child and not for Kreusa. Although Xuthus condemns his past disrespectful act, unlike Apollo, he similarly abandons Kreusa by disregarding her concerns and assuming that she will accept Ion as her son. Like Apollo, his primary interest is the child-not the mother.

The dialogue between Ion and Xuthus emphasizes the importance of fatherhood. In Euripides' version, Ion is hesitant to embrace Xuthus as a parent and continues to ask about the identity of his mother. While Ion does, near the end of the scene, question the identity of his natural mother and suggest that her absence is significant, "Daß meine Mutter uns nicht mit umarmt; so schlängen dreifach sich der Liebe ketten" (93), Xuthus emphasizes his own interests. Xuthus understands his role as a father in terms of ownership and as opportunity to expand and maintain his power. He reveals his understanding when he explains Ion's new role to him: "Mein königliches Zepter erbt auf dich, Du mußt dich zeitig, es zu führen, üben" (95). As evident in this quote, Xuthus equates parenthood with fatherhood, a system which enables him to protect his wealth and sovereignty²¹.

In addition to the discussion of parenthood, several references to fatherhood strengthen its importance in the drama. Such references do not occur in Euripides' version, in which the scene of Xuthus' and Ion's meeting is less than half the length of Schlegel's. When Xuthus explains how Apollo granted him a son he talks about first seeing Ion, playing his lyre and he experienced "...die erste Vaterfreude" (89). No such reference occurs in Euripides' version, instead Xuthus says, "I am your father. You are my son" (207) and the scene continues as Ion doubts Xuthus' claim to parenthood and repeatedly asks, "Well- Who is my mother?" (208). In Euripides' Ion, the boy's repeated questioning directs attention back to the main theme of motherhood. Schlegel's Ion does not have the opportunity to ask questions about his mother because Xuthus explains his hypothesis of Ion's conception before the

boy asks. With references such as "Vaterfreude", Schlegel steers the reader's attention to the notion of fatherhood. Ion, too, places greater emphasis on fatherhood. For example he exclaims, "...Zu väterlicher Sorge mir heraus. Wie bin ich unbemerkter Knab' es wert?" (90). Later, Ion remarks that Xuthus looks at him with fatherly love, "Du siehst mich schon mit Vateraugen an" (90). Ion also praises Xuthus, "O teurer Vater, ich gelobe dir, Ich will durch all mein Streben und mein Tun dem Geber und Empfänger Ehre bringen" (92). Euripides' Ion is less willing to accept Xuthus as his father and continues to question his mother's identity at the end of the scene. Xuthus concedes in Euripides' drama that he too does not want to harm his wife and therefore plans to introduce Ion as a visitor in his home, "I do not want to hurt my childless wife with my own happiness" (213), Xuthus remarks. Xuthus' only response to possible antagonism from his wife in Schlegel's version is the hope that he will still have a child with her. He tells Ion that he is only one son and he will soon have another with Kreusa, "Du bist der eine, den andern Sohn erwart' ich bald von ihr" (95). His lack of compassion for his wife, who will have to accept a stepson, suggests that Kreusa should be content to someday bear his child. Xuthus assumes a position of authority somewhat like Apollo with his suggestion that she will have to accept whatever he decides. No such assertion of superiority arises in Euripides' drama, in fact Xuthus exits after he says that he does not want to harm his wife by presenting Ion as a step-son. He does not appear again in Euripides' drama.

Scholarly analyses of Euripides' Ion often refer to Xuthus' role as an unwelcome stranger. His role is usually understood as that of an

intermediary. Erechtheus, Kreusa's father, had no other children in Euripides' version and once he married his only daughter to Xuthus, in exchange for military service, he risked losing his property to a foreigner. Because it is revealed that Ion is the son of Kreusa and Apollo, Erechtheus' belongings can remain in the hands of a descendent of his city; thereby resisting the transference of ownership to a foreign land²². In Euripides' text it is important that the audience understand that Apollo is the father of Ion to emphasize Ion's right to his grandfather's property. Because Apollo is a god, there remains no question that the property will remain in the hands of the original household²³. The only reference to Xuthus' foreign identity is when he tries to assure Ion that he need not fear stepmotherly hatred from Kreusa: "Bedenke, daß dein Vater als ein Fremdling, von seiner Heimat ein Verbannter, auch sich auf den Thron der Erechthiden schwang durch kühne Tat" (97). Schlegel maintains the notion of property transference in his version, but it assumes secondary importance to Xuthus' new identity as a father. Because in Euripides' time, property transference was equated with the notion of family, Xuthus' identity was largely defined by his ability to maintain wealth. Kreusa would inherit her father's wealth, until she passed it on to a son, because she was the only child in her family. Xuthus needed to have a son not only to pass on his property, but also to combine his wealth with his father-in-laws. Parenthood, therefore, would have been understood by Euripides' contemporaries in terms of property transference. Because Schlegel's contemporary notion of family was less dependent on inheritance for self definition, it makes sense that he would downplay Xuthus' role in property transference to appeal to his

contemporary audience's sensibilities. In so doing, the familial structure would represent a more contemporary German understanding of the concept. The drama would likewise be more similar to Eighteenth-Century German sensibilities than a direct translation from the Greek with classical Greek customs and beliefs.

In Schlegel's time marriage was redefined. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, love became a legitimate basis for marriage, whereas until this time, marriages were arranged to protect family wealth and power. In addition to the new definition of marriage, as a union of love, the familial structure changed. Childhood was considered a unique stage of life, whereas there was no distinction made previously between childhood and adulthood. The upbringing of children became the work of women, when husbands began to work outside of, and away from the home. The changing economic structure forced the site of labor away from the home. In this process, the family became the private sphere, a distinct and separate entity from the public sphere, in which men labored²⁴. Jürgen Habermas explored the development of the public sphere in Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. He was primarily discussing the gender division in participation in politics, but the division of spheres is still pertinent:

Der Status eines Privatmannes kombiniert die Rolle des Warenbesitzers mit der des Familienvaters, die des Eigentümers mit der des "Menschen" schlechthin. Die Verdoppelung der Privatsphäre auf der höheren Ebene der Intimsphäre bietet die Grundlage für eine Identifikation jener beiden Rollen unter dem gemeinsamen Titel des "Privaten"; auf sie geht in letzter

Instanz auch das politische Selbstverständnis der bürgerlichen Öffentlichkeit zurück (88).

Within the private sphere, that is within the construct of family, new concepts of male and female subjectivity began to arise. For this reason, Habermas suggests that the classical Greek portrayals of the family no longer suited the German public of the eighteenth century, because the notions of family, as well as the concept of the private sphere, were so markedly different²⁵. In Euripides' time the family was defined by its involvement in the public policies and politics and there was little definition of public and private space²⁶.

Xuthus' character changes incorporate Schlegel's contemporary understanding of the male's role in society. Xuthus' role in the family in Euripides' version was primarily to act as an intermediary. His involvement heightened the dilemma of property transference from Kreusa's family. Because the new construct of family was no longer primarily a link between powerholds (that is a system of securing wealth) Xuthus' new role reflects a contemporary eighteenth-century notion of the father's place in the public and private sphere. The family in Schlegel's Ion is strongly dependent on Xuthus for definition. Only Xuthus speaks to Apollo, thus suggesting his involvement in the public arena. Apollo represents the public sphere, the political power center of society, from which women were excluded. All laws and rules stem from Apollo and Xuthus' dialogue with him suggest that the father's role is to communicate in the public sphere. The mother, by contrast, is confined to the private sphere, namely the family (the dialogues with Ion and Xuthus). Xuthus' expanded role in Schlegel's

version, draws attention toward the father and suggests the mother's involvement is primarily biological.

The Mother's Role in the Family

In Euripides' version, motherhood is of primary concern and is an issue of controversy. It begs contemplation and definition as the reader or audience member is confronted with two concepts of motherhood: the biological and the social. It focuses on Kreusa's dilemma of understanding her role as a biological mother to Ion and also as his stepmother. In Schlegel's version, Kreusa's role is more limited to her confined role within the family. The changes Schlegel implemented in reconstructing the Kreusa character, reflect the changing attitude toward the notion of femininity in his time.

Gender was discussed by Euripides' contemporary Plato, who believed that men and women had the same nature, that it was only in the act of procreation that they differed. He suggested that both genders could achieve the same knowledge and believed that both were capable of being involved in politics. His vision of an ideal city was one in which women assumed roles generally associated with men, like overseeing the military. The woman in this role should instigate peace, supposedly through her nature²⁷.

In terms of marriage, Plato was opposed to the suggestion that the rulers should make a list of the best men and women, so that they should marry and produce optimal offspring (Föllinger, 109-110). The goal of such a union was to strengthen the city, so that it was composed of only the best possible people. Producing offspring for the city was extremely important as evident in the laws concerning marriage. Several stipulations were in place, so that if a marriage produced no

children the couple should remarry, or if a woman were widowed and still young enough to have children, she too should remarry (Föllinger, 113).

As mentioned earlier, the new definition of marriage as a construct based on love rather than an arrangement to protect family wealth, indicates that women's role in marriage became less like a pawn (i.e. an object transferred to signify wealth) in Schlegel's time. Besides the new ideas concerning marriage, which strongly influenced the understanding of male and female identity, the study of the female body also spurred a new understanding of the self. In 1796, while Schlegel was working on *Ion*, German anatomist Samuel Thomas completed one of the earliest drawings of the female skeleton. Although male anatomy was studied at least three hundred years earlier, it was not until the end of the eighteenth-century that the woman's body was included in the study of anatomy²⁸. "The discovery, description and definition of the gender differences in every bone and muscle, every nerve and vein of the human body took precedence in the study of human anatomy" (Schiebinger, 42). Along with new discoveries in science came cultural changes, namely a binary understanding of the concept of male and female²⁹. Whereas the previous understanding of the female body suggested that her anatomy was merely a more limited, or inverted version of male anatomy, at the end of the eighteenth-century male and female anatomy were divided into two categories³⁰. Linda Nicholson, in an article about Gender studies, cites the binary opposition established by the study of anatomy as one of the factors influencing the sharp division between public and private: the division of home and work, industrialization

and urbanization (Nicholson, 197). Whereas Habermas suggests that only one public sphere and one private sphere divide the eighteenth-century understanding of society, I wish to recognize Joan Landes critique of Habermas in which she points out that he overlooked areas that could be considered separate spheres, such as salons and reading circles, although the division in *Ion* does not extend into such spheres. Landes disagrees with Habermas' assumption that within the region of social discourse a public body is created wherein the differential rights of private individuals did not matter (Landes, 97). She contends that one was forced to master the discourse of the private society to be included within that group and, while ownership was not a prerequisite to be included, one must be capable of discussing such topics to remain within the public sphere. Of particular interest in this analysis, is Landes observation that in Habermas' model of the public and private sphere, concerns of the market and family came to be labeled as private and treated as improper subjects for public debate (Landes, 98). Because the theater was considered an area in which the bourgeois private sphere collected as a public, Schlegel's drama demonstrates the inclusion of intimate concerns (the family) in the public sphere. It furthermore suggests where women's place was within that construct in the revisions he made to the Kreusa character.

Previous interpretations of Schlegel's work suggest that Kreusa still maintained a prominent role. Georg Reichard claimed that although Schlegel attempted to give precedence to Xuthus in his drama, the character did not attain the same stature as Kreusa. Evidence of Kreusa's dominance, according to Reichard, is the number of entrances she makes and the number of monologues she has. *Ion*,

he concludes, is the most important because he makes the most entrances, Kreusa follows Ion in importance because she has the second most entrances³¹. Following Reichard's method of counting entrances and exits, Apollo should be considered the least important character in Schlegel's drama, since he only appears once. Because Apollo *does* play a pivotal role in the outcome of events: as the father of Ion and the powerful deity who controls the mortal characters' fates, I would argue, contrary to Reichard, that the number of entrances and exits does not necessarily reflect the importance of a particular character. In addition, evaluating the interaction between Kreusa and Xuthus as well as Xuthus' monologues concerning his stature as a Ion's father indicate that he does overshadow Kreusa in Schlegel's Ion.

Comparisons to recent interpretations of Kreusa's role in Euripides' drama also suggest that Schlegel's Kreusa, by comparison, presents a new image of motherhood and therein a new understanding of femininity. Patricia Watson, for example, points out that Euripides' Ion illustrates the transformation of Kreusa as she becomes a stepmother,

At first, Creusa's character is depicted as unobjectionable: at her initial meeting with Ion, she feels a natural bond with him, since she is in fact his mother. Once convinced that Ion is her stepson, however, she is transformed into a potential murderess (Watson 24).

A similar transformation occurs in Schlegel's Ion, but the initial portrayal of Kreusa loses some of the qualities that Watson points out later in her study. Kreusa's entrance in Schlegel's Ion differs significantly from Euripides' version and alters the image of the

Kreusa character. She is not introduced through a prologue³², so already the audience perception of her is based solely on her monologues, dialogues, actions and what other characters reveal about her within the text. Because this is the case, her entrance in Euripides' version, in which she enters and is questioned by Ion, would allow the audience more insight into her character. Schlegel, who maintained that he did not intend to follow Euripides' model exactly, changes the scene in which Kreusa enters. As a result, Kreusa's character is redefined. In Euripides' version, she enters lamenting her powerless state as a woman, but asks Ion not to question her about her despair further, "Unhappy women! Where shall we appeal for justice when the injustice of power is our destruction?" (194). Ion, in response, inquires as to her origins and what brought her to Delphi. In this scene, much of what has already explained in the prologue is retold.

In Schlegel's Ion, when Kreusa and Ion meet, she interrogates him. The roles are entirely reversed from the Euripides' version, in which Kreusa enters powerless and obediently answers Ion's questions. In Schlegel's version she does not enter in despair, nor lament her powerless state, instead she begins by rejoicing in her arrival at Apollo's temple, "Wir sind am Ziel der Reise. Ja ich sehe die hochberühmte Wohnung des Apoll". She continues by inquiring of Ion's identity, "Wer bist du, Jüngling, der so freundlich fragt?" (74) He identifies himself first by name and then through his fatherless state, "Man heißt mich Ion; keinen Vater weiß ich zu nennen, als den Gott der rings hier waltet" (74). This is one of the earliest scenes in which the emphasis of Schlegel's Ion is directed toward the idea of fatherhood, rather than the mother as in Euripides' version. Kreusa

is, at this point, inquisitive, as revealed by her discussion with Ion, and bold and confident, as demonstrated by her ability to confront Ion. Schlegel's portrayal of Kreusa in the first two acts functions to posit Kreusa in an authoritative role. He does this by gradually revealing her motivations for visiting the oracle and by implying that she knows more about Apollo than she is willing to reveal to Ion:

KREUSA So heißest du mich auf Apollen hoffen?

ION Und Kamst du nicht mit dieser Hoffnung her?

KREUSA Es hegt sie mein Gemahl mehr, als ich selbst.

ION Du nahst dich hier dem freundlichsten der Götter.

KREUSA Du rühmst ihn billig: dir erwies er Gutes.

ION Du hast nur seine Liebe nicht erprobt.

KREUSA So war's mein Glück; ein Mensch erprobt die Liebe
Der himmlischen doch niemals ungestraft.

ION Erklär mir dies rätselhafte Wort.

KREUSA Vernahmst du nie, wie in des Donners Armen
Einst Semele zu Asche niedersankt.

Wohltaten kommen uns von höhern Wesen,
Doch Liebe kann das gleiche nur gefallen.

Hör' an, was mich auf den Gedanken leitet;
Dein offner Blick flößt Zuversicht mir ein.

Ich bringe außer meinem und des Gatten
Anliegen, einer Freundin Auftrag mit
Zu des Orakels vielbesuchtem Sitz:

Ist kein geheimer Ausspruch zu erlangen?

Du, der du stets beim Heiligtum verkehrst,
Kannst etwa mir mit Rat behilflich sein.

Kreusa clearly reveals her mistrust of Apollo and when she says that the gods are never punished she hints that she knows more about Apollo than she is willing to reveal. Kreusa's abrupt and often short responses leave the impression that she is in control of the situation and calculatedly coying with Ion. Her brief climb to dominance marks a distinct transition from Euripides' Kreusa, who reverently approached the servant to Apollo, Ion. Her motivations for approaching the oracle, however, are not her own. In Schlegel's version she follows her husband, who wanted to consult the oracle. Schlegel uses her disinterest in consulting the oracle to draw attention to Xuthus when she says, "Es hegt sie mein Gemahl mehr, als ich selbst". Her response to Ion's question concerning contacting Apollo, suggests passivity by indicating that she blindly followed her husband to the oracle.

The shift in emphasis towards fatherhood occurs simultaneously with the redefinition of the Kreusa character, namely at a point in the text where it would appear that Kreusa has gained agency. Her dominant speech act, her role as the interrogator in her opening scene, overshadows the underlying assertion of the importance of fatherhood. As the above mentioned quote demonstrates, Ion defines himself through his lack of a father, whereas he defined himself as motherless in Euripides' version.

Kreusa's discussion brings to the forefront the dominance of the father image in Schlegel's Ion. In Euripides' text, in a similar passage, a long discussion ensues concerning the difficulty of growing up motherless. In addition, the interview with Kreusa in Euripides' drama gives her an individual history and adds a dimension to her

character aside from her identity as Xuthus' wife. In Schlegel's version Xuthus gains an individual history that he did not have in Euripides' drama. Schlegel removes reference to Kreusa's individual past and writes an individual history for Xuthus. The removal of Kreusa's individual history signifies a silencing of the female protagonist, in that her character is revealed only in the present, at the time she visits the oracle with her husband. Because this is the case, Schlegel's Kreusa is defined by her role in the family unit of Xuthus and Ion and not by her role outside the private sphere.

Her history is masked so that the audience knows Kreusa only in her role as Xuthus' wife. Because her past with Apollo, the conception of Ion, is important to the outcome of events; Kreusa discusses the situation with Ion through the veil of a fabricated friend. She tells Ion that she seeks information, not for herself, but for a friend who had a child with Apollo (79). Kreusa's individual history further loses significance in Schlegel's version as her monologues revolve around others. The masking of Kreusa's life outside the family construct centered around Xuthus, restricts the audience's understanding of Kreusa to the intimate sphere, while allowing the story of her "friend", a woman who does not appear, to extend beyond the private sphere. Schlegel's Kreusa is a diminished version of Euripides'. Her past is reduced to minimal details about her inability to conceive. The only past revealed in the drama involves her time with Xuthus. She is defined by her relationship to her husband. Previous to her marriage, Schlegel's Kreusa appears to have had no identity. Euripides' Kreusa, by contrast, is identified in the prologue as the child who escaped death in her mother's arms when the gods told her father to kill his children.

Kreusa's siblings were sacrificed as she watched. Euripides' Kreusa, therefore, is a woman who has overcome many obstacles.

Schlegel's Kreusa is a silenced version of Euripides'. Patricia Watson points out, in her interpretation of Euripides' drama, that when the chorus informs Kreusa that Xuthus has been granted a son, Kreusa is allowed to give voice to her feelings in the matter (35). In addition, she suggests that Kreusa had a legitimate grievance against the god Apollo, when she learned that Xuthus had been granted a son:

The Chorus' revelation that Xuthus has been provided by Apollo with an heir looks like one further act of cruelty on the part of the god, who has already raped and then abandoned her and, as she believes, let her child die: now he is on the one hand denying her children, while at the same time presenting her husband with a son whom she must accept in the palace as their heir (35).

Watson's observations that the act of granting Xuthus a son abases Kreusa twice over, could also be said of Schlegel's presentation. It should be noted, however that Euripides' chorus prefaces its revelation to Kreusa by saying that the response from the gods was, "An evil fate!" (217). Even before Kreusa hears the news, the chorus has set the tone and precipitated Kreusa's response. Because the chorus indicated that the new son was a direct attack on her by the gods, it is no wonder that she responds with hostility. With this in mind, the transitions from mother to stepmother, from loving and nurturing mother to murderess is somewhat justified. Watson's interpretation of Euripides' drama suggests that the idea of stepmotherhood in general underlies Kreusa's actions:

In Euripides' *Ion*...where Creusa plans to murder her son Ion in the mistaken belief that he is her husband's offspring by another woman, her decision to make the attempt at Delphi..., rather than to wait till [sic] Ion's arrival at her home in Athens, is explained in terms of the sinister reputation of stepmothers in general: since step-mothers proverbially hate their stepchildren, it would be impossible for her to deny her guilt if the deed were to be performed in her own house (12).

She argues that it is not the character's nature that precipitates the evil acts, rather it is the idea of becoming a stepmother that transforms a woman of otherwise agreeable temperament. Watson's analysis suggests that the stereotypical negative perception of stepmothers causes a person to be transformed to fit that societal image, regardless of their previous nature.

Schlegel underplays the transformation to step-mother. The scene in which Kreusa learns her fate is not dramatized in his *Ion*. Kreusa, therefore, does not have the opportunity to respond verbally to the revelation. Instead, when she approaches Xuthus, he asks her if she is aware of their fate. She responds, "Den Anspruch hört', ich von den Priestern schon" (98). Kreusa's interaction with others outside her family is not dramatized. Xuthus, in Schlegel's drama, is the intermediary between the public sphere and the private sphere, in which Kreusa is situated. Schlegel's Kreusa does not participate in public life and therefore any news that would come from outside the intimate sphere must be mitigated by the male who can transcend both spheres. Kreusa's answer that she knows her fate gives no indication

of her feelings about becoming a step-mother. Her character seems willing to suffer, as if she should quietly accept her fate: "Es muß der Mensch die Übermacht wohl dulden" (79), Kreusa says in response to Ion when he questions the gods' actions in the story of Kreusa's friend. Schlegel's characterization of Kreusa reflects Sigrid Weigel's interpretation of female characters of eighteenth-century drama. In her essay, "Die geopfert Heldenin und das Opfer als Heldenin" Weigel states that: one finds only two types of female main characters in eighteenth-century drama the victims who suffer and the victims who die in the end: "Es gibt die Frauenfiguren, die Großes leisten oder verkörpern, aber dieses mit ihrem Tod bezahlen. Und es gibt Frauenfiguren, die als Gebende, als Opfernde überleben" (Weigel 140). In addition, she notes that most female characters are found in dramas of the eighteenth-century and questions why female characters are better suited for the dramatical form. She maintains the characterization of women in drama allows for a greater degree of fantastical sculpting. In other words, the male author could best create his ideal in the dramatical form, and she argues, the presentation is much further distanced from reality:

Eine Fülle von Einzelinterpretationen von Frauenbildern läßt die Verallgemeinerung zu, daß in den Entwürfen von Frauenfiguren weniger eine Bearbeitung realer Lebenserfahrungen und -probleme enthalten ist, daß sie viel als Projektionsobjekte für die Wünsche, Ängste und Ideen ihrer männlichen Verfasser fungieren (Weigel 141).

Kreusa too represents a type of subservient ideal both projected by the male author and the male characters in the text. She is silenced by the new characterization. Kreusa is a character who suffers quietly, but the extent to which she is merely a projection of Schlegel's personal ideals may be limited. She is rather a projection of the societal ideals of the time in which Schlegel lived. Certainly one could argue that the ideal of the masculine hegemony is intertwined with the ideals of the male author, but I wish explore the ideals depicted in the Kreusa character as Schlegel's wish to reach a contemporary audience. The new Kreusa, therefore is not only a projection of Schlegel's personal beliefs of what a woman's role should be, she is also an amalgamation of the ideals he believes his audience would understand and recognize as German.

In Schlegel's version, interaction between Kreusa and Xuthus, that is family communication, is dramatized. His revision draws attention to the intimate sphere and explores the family and individuals roles within it. Kreusa, for example, responds reverently to her husband, "Ich wünsche heil dir mit dem schönen Fund" (99). In Euripides' version Kreusa never confronts Xuthus directly and instead is intent on seeking retribution because she feels betrayed. In order to please his audience, Schlegel included more interaction between the husband and wife in an attempt heighten the significance of family life from the model in Euripides' drama. With the new focus on the married couple, Kreusa's individual concerns become less significant. Whereas Euripides' Kreusa wanted to avoid becoming a stepmother and lamented the child she lost, Schlegel's Kreusa distances herself as a parent and indicates that the new son only gratifies Xuthus' wishes.

She resigns to believe that her fate is justified for a woman who cannot conceive:

Das Weib, das seinem Gatten keine Kinder bringt,
Ist schon zufrieden, duldet man sie nur
Im Hause, dessen Hoffnung sie betrog;
Un neben ihr sich andre zu gefallen,
Aus deren Liebe bess'rer Segen blüht,
Ist Männerrecht, und mehr der Kön'ge noch (100).

Her statement indicates that she believes that it is her duty to suffer. Taking into account the interest in female anatomy and the fascination with the biological capabilities of the female body to conceive and bear children beginning in the 1750's³³, the new Kreusa character reflects the importance of the body as a signifier of identity in Schlegel's time. Because Kreusa feels that she has failed in her obligation to conceive, she believes that she is unworthy of hoping for a better life. The female body was defined by its difference in its ability to bear children. Incapable of fulfilling the attribute that defines her womanhood, Kreusa is unable of justifying her self-worth.

Also in the above passage, Schlegel's Kreusa speaks of "Männerrecht", a topic that gains no discussion in the original version, in which Kreusa responds angrily to her husbands infidelity. The mere mentioning of male rights signifies a shift in focus from Euripides' *Ion*. Schlegel's drama favors male characters, especially when the female protagonist admits that it is her duty as a woman to suffer. Not only is she relegated to an inferior role simply by the inclusion of a stronger father in Schlegel's version, the new Kreusa admits that the female body, namely its ability to reproduce, defines her significance.

Schlegel's Kreusa is not as much a motherly character as Euripides'. As Patricia Watson noted, Euripides' Kreusa felt a motherly bond to Ion in their first meeting she asked who cared for him when he came to Delphi alone:

KREUSA. What Delphian woman suckled you?

ION. No breast fed me. But she who reared me.-

KREUSA. Yes, who, poor child? (aside) A sorrow like my own
(198).

Schlegel's Kreusa never states that she is a mother and feels sorrow for the loss of her son. In the opening scene Ion remarks that she should be a mother, "Du solltest Mutter edler Söhne sein" (76). Ion is the first to mention the motherhood in reference to Kreusa. Kreusa does not bring up the issue herself and instead begins interviewing Ion. As a result, the topic is quickly passed over.

Kreusa's mother image is undermined by her identity as Xuthus' wife. Georg Reichard in his work on Goethe's staging of Ion, alludes to the difference in the new Kreusa character. He suggests that Schlegel portrayed her in a more defenseless light than did Euripides, but justifies the new helpless Kreusa as a method of eliciting more pity from the audience:

Im Gegensatz zu Euripides zeichnet Schlegel Kreusa als eine wehrlos leidende Figur, die Mitleid erregen soll. Um das Mitgefühl für Kreusa zu erhöhen, fügt Schlegel ihre Unfreiheit in der Wahl des Gatten ein (Reichard, 45).

He further suggests that the emphasis on her confined role in the marriage should entice the audience to pity her. It would appear, however, that the audience would experience a more distanced

relationship to Kreusa in Schlegel's version, because her background is not revealed in the prologue, as is the case in Euripides' version and she has less opportunity to express herself due to her reduced speaking role. In Euripides' version, Kreusa's hardships are known to the audience from the beginning of the drama. It is explained how she was seduced and abandoned by Apollo, had a child and abandoned him and finally how she was married to Xuthus as a war prize. Pity, it seems, is surely one of the foremost issues in the prologue of Euripides text. In Schlegel's drama, details of Kreusa's past experience with Apollo are revealed gradually throughout the text. The initial presentation of Kreusa, is neither entirely focused on her identity as a mother, nor on her identity as a childless queen.

A.W. Schlegel and Femininity

Perhaps the discussions concerning classical mythology and the ancient Greeks that Schlegel participated in while working on Ion may help to explain his revision of the female characters. He was undoubtedly familiar with his brother's theories of femininity and ancient Greece when he recommended to Schiller that he read his brother's article:

Dürfte ich so fry seyn, Sie auf einen Aufsatz meines Bruders über die Bildung der Griechischen Frauen unter dem Titel Diotima aufmerksam zu machen, der im 7ten und 8ten Stück der Berliner Monathschrift gestanden hat? Zu meinem Gedünken ist es das reifste, was er bis jetzt hat drucken lassen³⁴.

In his 1795 essay "über Diotima"³⁵, Friedrich Schlegel explains the differences between the role of women in ancient Greek society and his present age. Specifically, he explores Socrates' lecture concerning

love and appears fascinated with Socrates' employment of a conversation with Diotima, a seer and courtesan, to explain his thoughts. F. Schlegel is enthralled with the idyllic nature of the women in the conversation and maintains that Diotima's high degree of understanding not only portrays the beauty of the feminine, but also that of all of humanity³⁶. The essay Diotima reflects a particularly Romantic notion of femininity, that is a belief that the feminine is closer to nature and can therefore understand art better due to the naive and simplistic standpoint. "Diotima" demonstrates the degree to which sexual fantasies and abstract projections of femininity sever its meaning from a biological understanding of the term. The Romantic discussion of femininity made a distinct separation between the idea that the female body defined femininity, rather it was a way of thinking that could be embraced by either sex³⁷. A.W. Schlegel did not engage in discussions of femininity in his own writing like his brother. However, F. Schlegel's earlier essay, "Über die weiblichen Charaktere in den griechischen Dichtern" [1794], which prefaced his ideas about femininity included in Diotima, includes a criticism of Euripides' and his drama, Ion:

Am meisten verführt ihn seine Neigung, so viel Leidenschaft als nur möglich, in sein Werk zu bringen, bis zu Unwahrscheinlichkeiten. So ist es widersprechend, dass Kreusa, deren zärtliche Betrübniß und Sehnsucht nach dem verlohrnen Sohn, so edel dargestellt ist, den Sohn, der ihr als Stiefsohn aufgedrungen wird, gleich ermorden will. Dieser grausame Entschluss ist nicht hinlänglich motiviert; auch geht der Dichter leicht und

flüchtig darüber hin, um den Widerspruch zu verhüllen.
 Das schöne Detail, die Verzweiflung der Kreusa über das
 Mislingen dieser Absicht, und die freudige Ueberraschung
 bei der Entdeckung das Jon ihr rechter Sohn sey,
 verführten den Dichter zu diesem Widerspruch.
 Sophokles verlieh seinen Charakteren so viel Schönheit,
 als das Gesetz des Ganzen und die Bedingung der Kunst
 erlaubten; Euripides legt in seine Personen so viel
 Leidenschaft als möglich, gleichviel ob diese edel oder
 unedel ist; oft ohne Rücksicht auf das Ganze und die
 Foderungen der Kunst³⁸

F. Schlegel cites an unjustified motivation for Kreusa to kill her stepson as Euripides' calculated toying with the audience's emotions, so that the conclusion will be more riveting. His criticism of Euripides' tendency to depict his characters with as much passion as possible, without paying attention to the affect of his choices on art, indicates F. Schlegel's dislike for Euripides and also demonstrates accordance with A.W. Schlegel's opinion of Euripides³⁹.

There are, however differences in the brothers' approaches to literature. F. Schlegel examined the literary works of the ancient Greeks as an expression of their societal beliefs. He narrows the boundary of art and historical fact in his essay Diotima, when he discusses the education of women in ancient Greek society. A.W. Schlegel does not necessarily discuss the Greek culture in his lecture series, rather he focuses on ancient Greek art. What makes F. Schlegel's essays on ancient Greece important to the study of A.W. Schlegel's works is their discussions of the role of women in ancient

Greece and in the works of Euripides. Since the most marked change in Schlegel's Ion from Euripides' is the emphasis on the male characters, the contemporary discussions of the importance of female characters may have influenced Schlegel while writing the work, although he did not embrace the notion of femininity as an abstract philosophical concept as his brother did. In addition, some scholars have suggested that A.W. Schlegel's lectures actually popularized ideas that were originally his brother's⁴⁰, therefore suggesting either a collaboration or exchange of ideas⁴¹.

If we examine Kreusa's role as a projection A.W. Schlegel's understanding of what constitutes womanhood, it appears that to him masculinity and femininity were forms of sex-appropriate behaviours based on the culturally shared fantasy of what the male and female biologies should be. His Kreusa is dependent on her reproductive capabilities for identity. She reveals this when she admits to her husband that it is her duty to suffer because she cannot conceive. She is relegated to the appropriate role of a wife in Schlegel's time, namely absent from communication in spheres outside the home, or in Kreusa's case, outside the family. Because Schlegel's drama is not situated specifically in a home setting, rather at the temple at Delphi, the markers between public and private are delineated by communication within the family versus communication with members outside of it. Kreusa's dialogues do not transcend the boundary of family, since Ion is actually her son. Xuthus, by contrast, communicates with Apollo and acts as an intermediary between the public and private spheres for Kreusa.

Schlegel's choice of a drama based on a family was not out of the ordinary in Germany at the time. Lessing established a tradition of patriarchal family drama, and many authors considered part of the Storm and Stress movement also included patriarchal family situations in their dramas. The success of such dramas in Germany certainly could have influenced Schlegel to choose a similar theme in hopes of attracting an audience and gain their approval. Schlegel's predecessors generally produced family dramas in a German home setting⁴². The home setting and the family represented the individual, in the private sphere, in conflict with the public sphere. The public sphere was in some way damaging to the individual and the family represented a shield against the imposing nobility. Writers of the Enlightenment aimed to create a uniquely German drama reflective of their own identity, rather than copy or translate French and English drama. Schlegel was critical of Enlightened thinking and chose a Greek drama based on mythology in an attempt to reunite poetry and myth. His interest in Greek myth, and specifically in Euripides' drama, may have stemmed from English influence, however.

As we know, Schlegel was fond of Shakespeare and translated many of his works and his appreciation of him led to his interest in Euripides. Schlegel was a student of Herder, who compared Shakespeare to classical Greek dramatists in his 1771 essay "Shakespear". In the essay, Herder suggests that the classical Greek tragedy was not art, rather nature,

...das Künstliche ihrer Regeln war-keine Kunst! war Natur!, -Einheit der Fabel-war Einheit der Handlung, die vor ihnen lag; die nach ihren Zeit-Vaterlands-

Religions- Sittenumständen, nicht anders als solch ein
Eins syn konnte⁴³.

In the essay, Herder compares the classical Greek writers to Shakespeare. He suggests that Shakespeare, like the classical Greeks' works, was nature, rather than just art. Shakespeare was the only modern poet, in Herder's opinion, who possessed such greatness. Shakespeare's astute perception of nature and the way in which he weaved nature in his works was akin to Sophocles, according to Herder. He went so far as to name Shakespeare Sophocles brother (Herder, 84). Schlegel shared Herder's fondness for Shakespeare, and although he did not necessarily equate Shakespeare's work with nature, he recognized in him perfection, as he wrote in 1798,

In dem edleren und ursprünglichen Sinne des Wortes
'korrekt', da es absichtliche Durchbildung und
Nebenausbildung des Innersten und kleinsten im Werke
nach dem Geist des Ganzen, praktische Reflexion [sic] des
Künstlers, bedeutet, ist wohl kein moderner Dichter
korrekter als Shakespeare⁴⁴.

From his fascination with Shakespeare and his education under Herder, sprung Schlegel's theory of *Poesie*. He developed Herder's idea of nature and poetics further in his theory and presented his ideas in an 1801-1802 lecture series. Herder's influence on Schlegel becomes apparent in his assumption that language is the mirror of man's thoughts. Language is the medium of *Poesie*, but *Poesie* is more encompassing than only language, it includes all of the arts⁴⁵. In the lecture series, he began his explanation of *Poesie* by stating that unlike other arts, *Poesie* was able to use language, the medium that best

expresses man's thought's and feelings⁴⁶. In reference to antiquity, namely the classical Greeks, Schlegel discussed the difference in their use of language. He maintained that they lived in an age in which a greater degree of fantasy ruled thought:

...in den früheren Epochen der Bildung gebiert sich in und aus der Sprache, aber eben so notwendig und unabsichtlich als sie, eine dichterische Weltansicht, d.h. eine solche worin die Fantasie herrscht. Das ist die Mythologie (Schöne Litteratur, 262).

He believed that the Greeks expressed the highest philosophical and religious insights by means of physical images in their mythology ⁴⁷. He maintains that the Greeks were unable to appreciate the depth of their *Poesie* because the world was too peaceful to precipitate such contemplation (Schöne Litteratur, 263). His belief that the ancient Greeks lived in a simpler, less complicated time, suggests that he may have regarded the ancient Greek civilization as utopic. The nature of the ancient Greeks precipitated the all-encompassing stories that evolved into a mythology. Schlegel held their mythology in high esteem and understood it as a basis for all knowledge: "Die Mythologie erstreckt sich eigentlich über alles, was Objekt des menschlichen Geistes werden kann: Sie gibt eine vollständige Weltansicht, und deswegen ist sie Grundlage der Philosophie⁴⁸".

His 1801 lecture series deals with Greek mythology as he explains his own theory of what *Poesie* is. He suggests that the less advanced civilization was more attuned to nature. In the Greek mythology, therefore, he saw *Naturpoesie*. He makes a distinction between *Naturpoesie* and *Kunstpoesie*, however, most Schlegel scholars agree

that the distinction between the two is difficult to pinpoint and may not have been clearly defined for Schlegel either. In his first lecture series, he indicates that Kunstpoesie differs from Naturpoesie, in that it is created by someone, who no longer lives in the simple fantasy or dreamlike state as he believed the ancient Greeks did. Kunstpoesie, therefore suggests that the creator is somehow more detached from the nature of humanity⁴⁹. Contemporary artists, in Schlegel's opinion were unable to create Naturpoesie. With this in mind, one may question if his transformation of Ion had anything to do with his theory of *Poesie*, perhaps an attempt to create a Kunstpoesie by improving on a work considered exemplary of Greek nature. His choice of Euripides' drama may have been precipitated by his belief that the dramatists of the time attempted to present an ideal humanity in their dramas (*Schöne Litteratur*, 340) and by exploring their ideal Germans could better understand their own.

His adaptation concurs with his earliest theory of drama and reflects ideas explored in his idea of *Poesie*. The notion that the artist has to appeal to human nature plays a prominent role in his discussion of drama at the time he was working on Ion. In a fragment included in, "Urtheile, Gedanken und Einfälle", Schlegel writes,

Ein Gedicht oder ein Drama, welches der Menge gefallen soll, muß ein wenig von Allem haben, eine Art Mikrokosmos sein. Ein wenig Unglück und ein wenig Glück, etwas Kunst und etwas Natur, die gehörige Quantität Tugend und eine gewisse Dosis Laster. Auch Geist muß drin sein nebst Witz, ja sogar Philosophie, und vorzüglich Moral, auch Politik mitunter. Hilft ein

Ingrediens nicht, so kann vielleicht das andre helfen.

Und gesetzt auch, das Ganze könnte nicht helfen, so

könnte es doch auch, wie manche darum immer zu

lobende Medicin, wenigstens nichts schaden⁵⁰.

In pleasing the audience, one must present a microcosm of the world in which they lived. His revisions to the Xuthus and Kreusa characters reflect his idea of what is necessary to please an audience. He modernized their roles, so that they presented a version of his contemporary world. As Euripides' drama already expressed a little bit of honor mixed with vice, Schlegel could revise this ideal element and still reach a modern audience. To capture the attention of a modern day audience he chose to a drama centered around the family⁵¹. But to appeal to his audience's perception of family life, it was necessary for him to redistribute the familial roles, thereby allowing the audience to see its own life on the stage.

His decision to maintain the Greek setting may be attributed to his interest in mythology. In his lectures on drama, after he completed Ion, he stressed that mythology played an important role in literature, serving as a source of inspiration and poetic material for later artists. Like his brother, he frequently made note of the fact that Germans did not have a mythology of their own. Greek mythology, he maintained, was created by the ancient Greeks to show ideal characters⁵². The characters therefore embodied values still important to later civilizations and perhaps Schlegel saw in the work of the classical Greeks the opportunity to create a German mythology, or at least improve upon the legend of Kreusa and Ion, by interpreting it from a German perspective.

Long after he completed Ion, he continued to explore the influence of Greek mythology on the development of drama in his 1809-1811 lectures. Some of his statements in the later lectures contradict his earlier suggestions concerning mythology, but he sustains an interest in Greek drama. He voices his concerns for the way dramatists attempt to recreate the type of ideal characters found in Greek tragedy. Too often, he remarks, portrayals of an ideal turn out to be mere shadows of a character, too one-dimensional to be believable⁵³. This results, he says, because the characters are too far removed from nature. Schlegel may have hoped to rectify the situation he believed his peers had created, that is in using the material of classical Greek authors to create ideal characters, rather than attempt to create new ideals that would be too far removed from nature. He maintained, therefore, his esteem for the classical Greek civilization and their uncomplicated art. The Greek artists were attuned to nature in a way that his contemporary culture could not emulate.

Because of Euripides' closeness to nature he may have seen in him promise. In reflecting on Euripides' role in the evolution of drama, he saw in him the beginning of a new age of tragedy-without a chorus ⁵⁴. Euripides was one of the founding fathers of drama and, in Schlegel's opinion, his technique ushered in modern drama. In addition to Euripides' understanding of nature, Schlegel's choice of Euripides' drama may have stemmed from his belief that Euripides' was a revolutionary, and at the time he was writing, following the French revolution, it was popular to research revolutionary figures. As evident in his lectures, he recognized that Euripides was on the brink of delving into the new phase of tragedy, but did not quite attain it.

Euripides and Greek Tragedy in Schlegel's Lectures

A.W. Schlegel's opinion of Euripides fluctuates between admiration and abomination. Although he devotes an entire lecture to Euripides, he concludes neither with praise nor condemnation of Euripides' contributions, rather he presents successes and failures leaving the dramatist's role in the history of tragedy open to discussion. In his introduction, Schlegel explains that few authors rightly deserve so much praise and criticism as does Euripides, whose aim was primarily to please and, argues Schlegel, would employ any means to achieve his goal⁵⁵, echoing his brother Friedrich's sentiments published fifteen years prior to the beginning of his lecture series. A.W. Schlegel further states that as a result of Euripides' obsession with appeasing the audience, his works often demonstrate moments of overpowering beauty, but at other times they are simply mediocre⁵⁶. Euripides, even in his own time, was criticized for his unconventional dramas. He often introduced subjects considered unsuited to the stage and his dramas questioned traditional values. Medea's murder of her children, for example, was denounced for its abnormality. In addition, his exploration of psychological motivations differed from other dramatists of the time, coupled with his suggestion that chance, rather than the gods rule the world, may have offended audiences. The structure of his plays has also been criticized by scholars other than Schlegel, who noted that the episodes were not always causally related and at times appear superfluous. Euripides' choral interludes were also criticized because they frequently disrupt the action of the drama⁵⁷. While Schlegel's observations concerning Euripides may not have been entirely his own, his public lectures,

given in German, facilitated understanding of classical Greek drama for a larger audience than had previously had access to such discussions.

In discussing Euripides, he compared his dramatic characters to Sophocles'. Sophocles, in his opinion, tended to develop his characters in Aristotelian style by portraying them as they should be and not as they are. Euripides, on the other hand, characterized them as they were. According to Schlegel, Euripides did not write idyllic portrayals because he wanted the audience to identify with the characters on stage and be able to imagine themselves in the same predicament⁵⁸.

Euripides therefore was closer to nature. Euripides faults, Schlegel pointed out, were mostly in the more technical aspect of dramatic writing. In terms of the characters Euripides presented, he specifically points out that Euripides hated women and showed their faults only to appeal to male audience members⁵⁹. Although Schlegel, like his brother Friedrich, made a point of stating that Euripides was a misogynist, he did not attempt to reconcile the unjust treatment of women in his version of Ion. In addition, he admits that what draws him to the drama is the portrayal of the male characters, Ion and Xuthus:

...Ion ist eines von den lieblichsten Stücken wegen der Schilderung von Unschuld und priesterlicher Heiligkeit an dem Knaben, wovon es den Namen führt. Zwar fehlt es im Lauf der Verwicklung nicht an Unwahrscheinlichkeiten, Notbehelfen und Wiederholungen; und die Auflösung vermitteltst einer Lüge, wozu sich Götter und Menschen gegen den Xuthus verbünden, kann unser Gefühl schwerlich befriedigen⁶⁰.

Schlegel notes the problems with Euripides' Xuthus character and appears to have attempted to reconcile the situation by creating an altogether new character. Although Schlegel cites several faults in Euripides' work, he must have at least recognized potential in his drama Ion. Euripides' closeness to nature allowed Schlegel to evaluate Greek nature through his modern eyes. In altering the drama, he was creating a *Kunstpoesie*. His drama could have allowed audience members to understand their own humanity, or identity, in his adaptation.

Several factors weighed in to his choice of the drama Ion. Representation of masculine strength in Greek models was not uncommon in Germany at the end of the eighteenth-century. Winckelman's Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums [1774] provided descriptions of the lithe and supple masculine figures in Greek sculpture and ushered in a new model of masculinity which became the ideals for the new German nation⁶¹. Perhaps the combination of Winckelman's work, his brother F. Schlegel's scholarly exploration of classical Greek writing, his own interest in Euripides, and previous attempts by his peers to create modern works based on classical models; influenced A. W. Schlegel to present a drama that would appeal to both the contemporary understanding the family and gain attention because of its connection to antiquity.

If he wanted to allow his audience a glimpse of nature and their own identity, he failed when the audience focused on what a poor translation Ion was. His break from antiquity and what should have indicated that his drama was not a direct translation, was his choice to avoid a prologue that would spell out all the forthcoming events and

give insight into the characters' pasts. Instead, all that is known about the characters is revealed during the action of the play by the characters themselves, rather than from a choir or through a narrator. The absent prologue also marks a distinct break from the ancient Greek tragedy and demonstrates that Schlegel aimed to correct the structural problems he listed in his lecture. He maintains the five act structure used by Euripides, but redistributes the characters' roles. Xuthus, for example, is given a larger role in Schlegel's text. He is no longer a secondary figure, who makes one entrance to learn that Ion has become his son and exit, instead he is one of the main characters⁶², with concerns and fears of his own. A further addition to Xuthus role in the outcome of events is his acceptance of Kreusa's admission to him that she indeed is the mother of Ion. Franke claims that his elevated role as well as the attention to the marital relationship of Xuthus and Kreusa demonstrates Schlegel's desire to emphasize the family (138). She also claims that the initial meeting between Kreusa and Ion reveals a greater affection between the two in Schlegel's version, again emphasizing the strength of familial bonding (Franke, 136). Although the familial relationship is strengthened with the introduction of the father, it seems oversimplified to understand Schlegel's inclusion and also elevated importance of Xuthus only in the context of a heightened presentation of the family. His inclusion detracts from Kreusa's strong and independent nature as dramatized by Euripides and consequently redefines the woman's role from a late Eighteenth-Century German perspective.

While several dialogues indicate a direct translation of Euripides' text into German, parenthood as a central issue is portrayed

with a new emphasis on the male in Schlegel's version. The fathers gain greater speaking roles and their involvement in the plot is resolved at the conclusion thereby suggesting that the female characters, who simply fade out of the drama, are less important.

The new male protagonist, Xuthus, is enhanced with a new dimension revealing his dreams and individual history. Through his dream, his desire to protect his own family surfaces when he recounts what Trophonius warned, "Nicht vorgreif' ich dem Delphischen Sitz und dem Seher Apollo; Aber hüte dich, Xuthus, daß deinem Geschlecht nachstrebend, Nicht du den Fall des Geschlechtes erwirbst und des Hauses zerrüttung" (I, 7). He sees himself has a protector and attempts to sway Kreusa from her desire to visit the oracle. Whereas, in Euripides' version, she made decisions on her own, Schlegel's greater emphasis on the male character leads to a more guarded presentation of Kreusa. Her voice and motivations are double checked, emphasizing that the good woman should not act alone.

While previous analyses insisted on the strengthened importance of the family in A.W. Schlegel's Ion, I wish to suggest that his version of Ion also demonstrates a reevaluation of the importance of the mother in that construct. Based on the title of Ion one would assume that the work revolves around Ion, which both Schlegel and Euripides' Ions do. Kreusa was, however, the original protagonist along with Ion; but this is not the case in Schlegel's text. Because we know that Schlegel's text is based in part on Euripides' we are able to compare the work to the original and notice how Kreusa's role was intentionally diminished⁶³.

Schlegel's new Ion emphasizes fatherhood in the repetition of father and fatherhood in dialogue. The new father image is praised for simply protecting his child and elevated to the stature of a god when he accepts him in his home. The new Xuthus has the power of a deity when he has a vision of what his future may hold. His skepticism, pessimism and in the end honor embellish the character with an individuality and presence not apparent in Euripides' Ion. Attention is further directed to Xuthus by his individual history not involving Kreusa, whereas she loses individuality by losing her history. The diminished Kreusa is reduced to a servant of both her husband and Apollo, treated by both similarly. She receives no recognition when she attempts to point out the negative attributes of Apollo, nor does she elicit sympathy for her secret struggle to overcome giving up Ion. Her past with Apollo and her claim to motherhood is also somewhat diminished due to the loss of a prologue. She assumes the blame for the childless marriage. Her act of retribution, a point in which one could argue that she assumes responsibility to protect herself, is initiated by Phorbus' suggestion. She represents an ideal that strengthens the presentation of the male through her silence. Xuthus becomes the main character as the idea of fatherhood echoes through the drama. In Euripides' Ion the boy says, "...Unless I find my mother, my life is worthless (214)". Motherhood played an important role in Euripides' Ion and shaped the identity of the main character, whereas Schlegel's Ion defines himself through his father. Schlegel's diminished Kreusa demonstrates the heightened importance of male protagonists in the drama of Schlegel's time and demonstrates a calculated transformation of a previously strong and independent

mother character to a wife confined to the private sphere of the family and defined by her relationship to a husband who overshadows her concerns.

My analysis aims to demonstrate how Schlegel was a part of the history of drama in Germany, not only as a theorist and translator, but also as a dramatist in his own right. He embraced the theme of family like many of his predecessors and presents, in comparison to Euripides', a family reconstructed in accordance with the notions of femininity and masculinity popular at the time. His ill received drama and his often misunderstood intent in writing it, still leaves many unanswered questions. His later lecture series includes many statements that would condemn his own work. At one point, for example, he criticized family portrait dramas (*Familiengemälde*), while at the same time he created a drama centered on the family. Although his second lecture series tends to contradict and at times even condemn the approach in his own drama *Ion*, his drama clearly reveals a strong emphasis on masculinity and a calculated redistribution of the roles within Ion's family.

His choice to adapt Euripides' drama rather than translate it, is revealed in the lecture series on art and literature that he gave during his work on *Ion*. His ideal, *Poesie*, he believed was best achieved by the ancient Greek civilization. He said that their uncomplicated lives allowed them to best express nature in their art. Euripides' *Ion*, a product of this utopic time period, to Schlegel's thinking, allowed him to explore *Poesie*. His admiration for Shakespeare, as the only modern dramatist who was able to write a perfect work, led him to attempt the same feat (with the aide of an accomplished Greek master: Euripides).

With his chosen drama, he too could present an ideal, something that encompassed all philosophy and art, as he believed that myths could. Schlegel's drama suggests that he wanted to maintain the core of the Greek myth and keep it as close to nature as possible. The revisions to Xuthus and Kreusa reveal his intention to silence the female character, perhaps suggesting that it is her "nature" to mind her husband. She is defined by her body and its ability to reproduce. The feminine to Schlegel, was therefore strongly defined by anatomy, a definition that was widely discussed in his time. His Kreusa is a mere shell of the strong character of Euripides' Ion and Xuthus a magnification of Euripides' character of the same name. With the new protagonists, Schlegel reveals his interest in extending his fame beyond translator and theorist. Unfortunately, the subjugation of Kreusa, as well as his transformation of an already successful drama, disappointed audiences, who believed that his translation skills were at fault.

Notes

¹ "Humanity" has been defined as the struggle between barbarism and a cultivated society. For a further discussion of the notion of Humanity in Goethe's work please see: Benjamin Bennett, "Iphigenie auf Tauris and Goethe's Idea of Drama" Modern Drama and German Classicism (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1979) 97-121.

² The type of family situation I am referring to here is similar to what Gail Hart noted in her recent analysis of the portrayal of women in German drama of the Enlightenment to 1850. Hart studies the interrelatedness of the absence of mothers and daughters in German domestic drama. She defines such family situations where it is a male-based domestic situations as a "patriarchal family", the family in Schlegel's *Ion*, "Xuthus, Kreusa and Ion" constitutes the same kind of family situation.

³ August Wilhelm Schlegel, Dramatische Vorlesungen August Wilhelm von Schlegel's Sämmtliche Werke VI, ed. Eduard Böcking (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1847) 197.

⁴Quoted in Georg Reichard, August Wilhelm Schlegels Ion (Bonn: Bouvier, 1987) 264.

⁵Weimarisches Hoftheater from Journal des Luxus und der Moden reprinted in: Ein Jahrhundert deutscher Literaturkritik (1750-1850) Bd. 4 ed. Oscar Fambach (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1958) 566.

⁶See Karoline Schlegel's Bericht über die Aufführung des "Ion" auf dem Hoftheater in Weimar Published January 16 in Zeitung für die

elegante Welt. Reprinted in Ein Jahrhundert deutscher Literaturkritik (1750-1850) Bd. 4, 575.

⁷ Karl Spazier, "Berichtigung, das Schauspiel Ion betreffend" Ein Jahrhundert deutscher Literaturkritik (1750-1850) (Berlin: Akademie, 1958) 593.

⁸ The letter is written to A.W. Schlegel, who was out of town when Goethe visited and read the copy of Ion which he intended to sell to a friend and publisher on behalf of A.W. Schlegel.

⁹ Letter from Karoline Schlegel to August Wilhelm Schlegel February 22, 1802 in Ein Jahrhundert deutscher Literaturkritik (1750-1850) 592.

¹⁰ See: Merry E. Wiesner, Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 63-73.

¹¹ Friedrich Schiller, Schillers Briefe 1.1.1801-31.12.1802 Schillers Werke Nationalausgabe, ed. Stefan Ormanns. (Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus, 1985) 147.

¹² Conacher refers to H. Grégoire's Euripide texte et Tradition (Paris: Budé, 1950) and U. von Wilamowitz Euripides Ion (Berlin, 1926). It is worth noting that Wilamowitz's interpretation was published the same year as Olga Franke's interpretation of A.W. Schlegel's Ion. Both were published in German.

¹³ E.M. Blaiklock, The Male Characters of Euripides (Wellington: New Zealand University Press, 1952) 141-162.

¹⁴ Max Imhof, Euripides' Ion (Bern: Francke, 1966) 14.

¹⁵Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz, Introduction. Feminist Theory and the Classics. (New York: Routledge, 1993) 6-10. See also Elaine Showalter, Speaking of Gender (New York: Routledge, 1989).

¹⁶ She argues that Kreusa is not the dominant character and that she is merely a mouthpiece for Apollo because she keeps her rape a secret. Her analysis is problematic in that she bases her assessment of Kreusa's role primarily on the rape. Furthermore, her interpretation of the rape often conflates a contemporary notion of the concept with that of Euripides' times. She is conscious of this, and points out the difference, but nevertheless emphasizes Kreusa's passivity, while in the processes de-emphasizing the fact that Apollo was a god. Using psycho-analytic methods, she attributes Kreusa's silence to the replacement of the woman's body through symbols: the cave and the cradle - empty vessels signifying the womb. In conclusion she points out that male scholars suggest that Kreusa did in fact play the dominant role and feminist scholars need to reevaluate the text. Several pages earlier, she quotes Nicole Loraux (Les Enfants d'Athéna), who agrees that Kreusa was the protagonist and did play a dominant role in Euripides' version.

¹⁷ See Karoline Herder's Letter Johann Wilhelm Ludwig Gleim written from Weimar on 1. März 1802. The letter is number 284 in Johann Gottfried Herder Briefe 8te Band Januar 1799-1803 (page 283).

¹⁸ The letter was one of the few written forms available to women at that time. They were able to become engaged in literary discussion through the letter, therefore one could argue that Karoline Herder may have contributed the first feminist interpretation of

Schlegel's Ion. Such a statement would of course depend on one's definition of feminist criticism. For further information on women and letters of the eighteenth century see Barabara Becker-Cantarino's article "Leben als Text" in Frauen Literature Geschichte.

¹⁹ Georg Reichard, August Wilhelm Schlegels Ion: Das Schauspiel und die Aufführungen Unter der Leitung von Goethe und Iffland. (Bonn: Bouvier, 1987) 35.

²⁰ See Schlegel's eighth lecture in Vorlesungen über Dramatische Kunst und Litteratur ed. Eduard Böcking (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1846). In the same lecture, he criticized Euripides for not making a good enough distinction between his portrayal of gods and men.

²¹ Schlegel did not change the definition of fatherhood in this instance. Inheritance was an important issue in Euripides' time. The whole concept of family revolved around the idea of maintaining a family's wealth. As the sons traditionally inherited a father's wealth, it was important that a father make sure that he had a son to pass it on to. If he did not, he risked losing his family fortune. If a marriage, such as Kreusa and Xuthus' was childless, Athenian laws suggested that the wife attempt to conceive with the husband's brother or cousin to keep the wealth in the family. Another method of maintaining the right to transfer wealth within a family was to adopt a son (usually a cousin or nephew). The adoptive son could then inherit the father's wealth and keep it within the same family. See W.K. Lacey The Family in Classical Greece (London: Thames, 1968) 139-145.

²²Richard Seaford, "The Structural Problems of Marriage in Euripides" Euripides Women and Sexuality, ed. Anton Powell (London: Routledge, 1990)

²³ Robert Graves, The Greek Myths (New York: George Braziller, 1959) 163.

²⁴ See Heidi Rosenbaum, Formen der Familie (Frankfurt Am Main: Surkamp, 1982) 255-309 and for a discussion of the division of the public and private spheres see Jürgen Habermas, Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit (Frankfurt am Main: Surkamp, 1990).

²⁵ The section that I am referring to specifically can be found on page 116 and 117 of his book. The quote follows: Die Vertretung der Interessen einer privatisierten Sphäre der Verkehrswirtschaft mit Hilfe von Ideen interpretiert, die auf dem Boden kleinfamiliär Intimität gewachsen sind: Humanität hat hier ihren genuinen Ort, und nicht, wie es ihrem griechischen Vorbild entspräche, in der Öffentlichkeit selbst. Mit der Entstehung einer Sphäre des Sozialen, um deren Regelung die öffentliche Meinung mit der öffentlichen Gewalt streitet, hat sich das Thema der modernen Öffentlichkeit, im Vergleich zur antiken, von den eigentlich politischen Aufgaben der gemeinsam agierenden Bürgerschaft...zu den ehre zivilen Aufgaben einer öffentlich rasonierenden Gesellschaft...verschoben. Die politische Aufgabe bürgerlicher Öffentlichkeit is die Regelung der Zivilsozietät, mit den Erfahrungen einer intimisierten Privatsphäre gleichsam im Rücken, bietet sie der etablierten monarchischen Autorität die Stirn; in diesem Sinne hat sie von angeginn privaten und polemischen Charakter zugleich. Dem griechischen Modell der Öffentlichkeit

fehlen beide Züge: denn der private Status des Hausherrn, von dem sein politischer als Bürger abhängt, beruht auf Herrschaft ohne irgendeinen durch Innerlichkeit vermittelten Schein der Freiheit; und agonal ist das Verhalten der Bürger bloß im spielerischen Wettbewerb miteinander, der eine Scheinform des Kampfes gegen den äußeren Feind darstellt, und nicht etwa in der Auseinandersetzung mit der eignen Regierung.

²⁶ See W.K. Lacey, The Family in Classical Greece. I should note here that what is known today about the family in the 5th century B.C. is based primarily on archeological findings from Athens. Our understanding of their culture is based on large assumptions. We have little documented evidence and historians sometimes include artistic examples (like dramas) to justify their conclusions about what society and the family were like at that time.

²⁷ See: Sabine Föllinger, Differenz und Gleichheit. (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996) 107-117.

²⁸ See: Londa Schiebinger, "Skeletons in the Closet: The first Illustrations of the Female Skeleton in Eighteenth Century Anatomy" ed. Catherine Gallagher and Thomas Laqueur: The Making of the Modern Body: Sexuality and Society. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987) 42-82. I should also note here, in regards to the study of female anatomy, it was not until the 1990's that a textbook specifically on female anatomy and women's medicine was published by Harvard Medical School.

²⁹ See: Linda Nicholson "Wie heißt 'Gender'", 197.

³⁰ Laqueur, Thomas, Auf den Leib schreiben: Die Inszenierung der Geschlechter von Antike bis Freud. Frankfurt am Main: Surkamp, 1992. 171-172.

³¹ Georg Reichard, August Wilhelm Schlegel's Ion: Das Schauspiel und die Aufführungen unter der Leitung von Goethe und Iffland 79.

³² The prologue in Greek drama, is considered a late addition to Greek drama, which essentially led to the development of spoken drama. Thespis added a prologue of spoken lines by an actor impersonating the characters. Before the invention of the prologue, the story was sung and danced by a chorus. The purpose of the prologue was to provide information about the events that occurred prior to the beginning of the play. In some dramas it was also intended to set the mood of the drama. See: Oscar G. Brockett, History of the Theatre. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1995) 16-22. For information on Euripides' prologues see page 19.

³³ See: Londa Schiebinger, 51-53.

³⁴ Letter from October 13, 1795 in August Wilhelm Schlegel im Briefwechsel mit Schiller und Goethe, ed. Josef Körner (Leipzig: Insel, n.d.).

³⁵ For a further discussion of the German Romantics' notion of the ideal feminine see: Barbara Becker-Cantarino, "Priesterin und Lichtbringerin: Zur Ideologie des Weiblichen Charakters in der Frühromantik," Die Frau als Heldin und Autorin, ed. Wolfgang Paulsen (München: Francke, 1979) 112.

36 Friedrich Schlegel, "Über Diotima" Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe I, ed. Ernst Behler (München: Paderborn, 1979) 71.

37 For further discussion of the notion of femininity I am referring to here see: Sara Friedrichsmeyer, The Androgyne in Early German Romanticism (Bern: Peter Lang, 1983).

38 Friedrich Schlegel, "Über die weiblichen Charaktere in den Griechischen Dichtern" Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe I, ed. Ernst Behler (München: F. Schöningh, 1979) 62.

39 Ernst Behler contends that F. Schlegel generated interest in Greek literature between 1794 and 1797 when he began publishing works on the history of Greek poetry (336-337). He maintains that the brothers had similar opinions of Euripides, but F. Schlegel saw in him a progressive philosophy suited to modern understanding (359); whereas A.W. Schlegel judged him by preexisting models of tragedy. See: Ernst Behler, "A.W. Schlegel and the Nineteenth-Century Damnatio of Euripides," Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 27 (1986): 335-367.

40 See Ernst Behler, "The Damnatio of Euripides," Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies 27 (1986): 335-367. and Glenn Most, "Schlegel Schlegel und die Geburt eines Tragödienparadigmas," Poetica 25 (1993): 157.

41 It should be made clear that A.W. Schlegel's discussion of mythology was in reference to Greek mythology in his early lectures, but in his last lectures he referred to northern European mythology.

⁴² See: Bengt Sørensen, Herrschaft und Zärtlichkeit: Der Patriarchalismus und das Drama im 18. Jahrhundert. (München: C.H. Beck, 1984).

⁴³ Herder, Johann Gottfried, "Shakespear". Von deutscher Art und Kunst. (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1988) 68 .

⁴⁴ August Wilhelm Schlegel, "Urtheile, Gedanken und Einfälle über Litteratur und Kunst 1798. August Wilhelm Schlegel Sämmtliche Werke VIII. Ed. Eduard Böcking (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1971) 29.

⁴⁵ See Ralph W. Ewton Jr., The Literary Theories of August Wilhelm Schlegel (The Hague: Mouton, 1972) 40.

⁴⁶ August Wilhelm Schlegel, Vorlesungen über Schöne Litteratur und Kunst. Ed. Bernard Seuffert. vol 1. (Heilbronn, Henniger, 1884) 261.

⁴⁷ Ewton 44.

⁴⁸ August Wilhelm Schlegel, Schöne Litteratur 344.

⁴⁹ See: Silke Agnes Reavis, August Wilhelm Schlegels Auffassung der Tragödie im Zusammenhang mit seiner Poetik und ästhetischen Theorien seiner Zeit. (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1978) 34.

⁵⁰ August Wilhelm Schlegel, "Urtheile, Gedanken und Einfälle über Litteratur und Kunst 1798. August Wilhelm Schlegel Sämmtliche Werke VIII. Ed. Eduard Böcking (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1971) 28-29.

⁵¹ See: Georg Reicharg, August Wilhelm Schlegels Ion. 72-74.

⁵² August Wilhelm Schlegel, Schöne Litteratur 340-341.

⁵³ August Wilhelm Schlegel, Dramatische Vorlesungen 71-72.

⁵⁴ August Wilhelm Schlegel, Dramatische Vorlesungen 78.

55 Schlegel, Dramatische Vorlesungen 131.

56 Schlegel, Dramatische Vorlesungen 132.

57 Oscar Brockett, The History of the Theatre (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1995) 19.

58 Schlegel, Dramatische Vorlesungen 136.

59 Schlegel, Dramatische Vorlesungen 141.

60 Schlegel, Dramatische Vorlesungen 164.

61 George L. Mosse, Nationalism and Sexuality (New York: Howard Fertig, 1985) 13-14. In addition, he writes that Women were represented through medieval symbols rather than by the lofty and harmonious spirit of Greece (15).

62 See: Franke, 138.

63 Schlegel's new emphasis on Xuthus may be a reflection of his own questions about his identity as Caroline Schlegel's husband. Caroline Schlegel was married to Johann Franz Wilhelm Böhmer before she married A.W. Schlegel. During her first marriage she bore three children. The last child died soon after birth and shortly thereafter, in 1788, Caroline's husband passed away. She attempted to raise the children on her own. From 1792 to 1793 she lived in Mainz with Georg and Therese Forster. As the Prussian troops were advancing in 1793, she left Mainz and was imprisoned in Königstein. While there, she discovered she was pregnant. The father was a young French officer, who was stationed in Mainz (Jean Baptiste Dubois-Crancé). A.W. Schlegel, along with her brother, secured her release from prison. In November 1793 her son Julius was born in Lucka near Leipzig. She left him with foster parents in the country. In 1795 she

met Friedrich Schlegel and on July 1, 1796 she married A.W. Schlegel. They moved to Jena in 1800, the same year her fifteen-year-old daughter passed away. Caroline Schlegel's background parallels Kreusa's in several ways. She became impregnated out of wedlock, like Kreusa's child with Apollo. She similarly left her infant son. While she did not leave him to die as retribution, like Kreusa, she did lose contact with her illegitimate child. She did not have children with August Wilhelm Schlegel as Kreusa did not have children with Xuthus. Finally, like Xuthus, A.W. Schlegel was a stepfather to her children from a previous marriage. The stepdaughter passed away at the age of fifteen, approximately the same age as Ion in the drama. Shortly after she passed away A.W. Schlegel completed his work on Ion (See: Bitter Healing, 282-283).

Taking into account Schlegel's relationship to Caroline Schlegel, it would appear that he could clearly identify with Xuthus. He felt a need to justify his own importance as a stepfather and embraced Euripides' text for its biographical similarities. The negative image of Kreusa could also be justified when comparing it with his own family situation. Between 1798 and 1803, during the final stages of work on Ion and its opening in Weimar, A.W. Schlegel was experiencing turbulence in his marriage. It became increasingly apparent that his wife was in love with Friedrich Schelling. The marriage between A.W. and Caroline Schlegel was dissolved in 1803 and she married Schelling the same year.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Beutler, Ernst, ed. Johann Wolfgang Goethe: Gedankenausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche Briefe der Jahre 1786-1814. Zürich: Artemis, 1949.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. "Shakespear". Von deutscher Art und Kunst. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1988. 65-91.

Körner, Josef, ed. August Wilhelm and Friedrich Schlegel im Briefwechsel mit Schiller und Goethe. Leipzig: Insel, n.d.

Schlegel, August Wilhelm. Ion. August Wilhelm von Schlegel Ausgewählte Werke. Ed. Eberhard Sauer. Berlin: Dom, 1922.

--Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Litteratur. August Wilhelm von Schlegel Sämtliche Werke VI. Ed. Eduard Böcking. Hildesheim: Georg Olm, 1971.

--Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Litteratur V. Ed. Edgar Lohner. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1966.

--Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Litteratur VI. Ed. Edgar Lohner. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1967.

--Vorlesungen über Schöne Litteratur und Kunst. Ed. Bernard Seuffert. 2 vols. Heilbronn: Henniger, 1884.

Secondary Sources

Behler, Ernst. "A.W. Schlegel and the Nineteenth-Century *Damnatio* of Euripides." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 27 (1986): 335-367.

Brentano, Bernhard von. August Wilhelm Schlegel: Geschichte eines Romantischen Geistes. Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 1986.

- Buchholz, Helmut. Perspektiven der neuen Mythologie. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1990.
- Butler, E.M. The Tyranny of Greece over Germany. Boston: Beacon, 1958.
- Emmersleben, August. Die Antike in der romantischen Theorie: Die Gebrüder Schlegel und die Antike. Germanische Studien 191. 1937. Berlin: Kraus, 1967.
- Ewton, Ralph W. Jr. The Literary Theories of August Wilhelm Schlegel. The Hague: Mouton, 1972.
- Franke, Olga. Euripides bei den Deutschen Dramatikern des Achtzehnten Jahrhunderts. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1929.
- Maurach, Bernd. "Die Affäre um Goethes Inszenierung des Schlegelschen Ion." Neophilologus 60 (1976): 542-550.
- Most, Glenn. Schlegel und die Geburt eines Tragodienparadigmas. Poetica. 25. 1-2 (1993) 155-175.
- Reavis, Silke Agnes. August Wilhelm Schlegels Auffassung der Tragödie im Zusammenhang mit seiner Poetik und ästhetischen Theorien seiner Zeit. Europäische Hochschulschriften: Deutsche Literatur und Germanistik. 105. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1978.
- Reichard, Georg. August Wilhelm Schlegel's Ion: Das Schauspiel und die Aufführungen Unter der Leitung von Goethe und Iffland. (Mitteilungen zur Theatergeschichte der Goethezeit IX) Bonn: Bouvier, 1987.
- Schulz, Gehard. "Theater um Goethe und die Brüder Schlegel. Bemerkungen zu Demarkationslinien der Literaturgeschichte."

Goethe im Kontext. Ed. Wolfgang Wittkowski. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1984. 194-205.

Thalmann, Marianne. August Wilhelm von Schlegel. Bad Godesberg: Rudolf Müller, 1967.

Euripides Ion, Mythology and Ancient Greece

Conacher, D.J. "The Paradox of Euripides' Ion" Transactions of the American Philological Association 90 (1959): 20-39.

Föllinger, Sabine. Differenz und Gleichheit: Das Geschlechterverhältnis in der Sicht griechischer Philosophen des 4. bis 1. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996.

Gauger, Barbara. Gott und Mensch im Ion des Euripides. Bonn: Bouvier, 1977.

Graves, Robert. The Greek Myths. New York: George Braziller, 1959.

Imhof, Max. Euripides' Ion. Bern: Francke, 1966.

Micheline, Ann Norris. Euripides and the Tragic Tradition. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.

Rabinowitz, Nancy Sorkin. Anxiety Veiled: Euripides and the Traffic in Women. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Seaford, Richard. "The Structural Problems of Marriage in Euripides." Euripides, Women, and Sexuality. Ed. Anton Powell. London: Routledge, 1990. 151-176.

Watson, Patricia A. Ancient Stepmothers: Myth, Misogyny and Reality. New York: E.J. Brill, 1995.

History / Feminist Criticism

- Arthur, Marilyn. "From Medusa to Cleopatra: Women in the ancient world" Becoming Visible. Women in European History. Ed. Renate Bridenthal. Boston: Houghton Muffin, 1987, 74-103.
- Becker-Cantarino, Barbara. "Priesterin und Lichtbringerin: Zur Ideologie des weiblichen Charakters in der Frühromantik." Die Frau als Heldin und Autorin. Ed. Wolfgang Paulsen. München: Francke, 1979. 111-124.
- . Der Lange Weg zur Mündigkeit: Frau und Literatur (1500-1800). Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1987.
- Blackwell, Jeannine and Zantop, Susanne. Bitter Healing: German Women Writers 1700-1830. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1990.
- Bovenschen, Silvia. Die imaginierte Weiblichkeit. Exemplarische Untersuchung zu kulturgeschichtlichen und literarischen Präsentationsformen des Weiblichen. Frankfurt am Main: Surkamp, 1979.
- Cocalis, Susan L. "Der Vormund will Vormund sein: Zur Problematik der Weiblichen Unmündigkeit im 18. Jahrhundert." Amsterdamer Beiträge zur neueren Germanistik 10 (1980): 33-55.
- Domoradzki, Eva. Und alle Fremdheit ist verschwunden: Status und Funktion des Weiblichen im Werk Friedrich Schlegels: Zur Geschlechtlichkeit einer Denkform. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1992.
- Duden, Barbara. "Das schöne Eigentum zur Herausbildung des Bürgerlichen Frauenbildes an der Wende vom 18 zum 19 Jahrhundert." Kursbuch 47 (1977): 274-296.

- Friedrichsmeyer, Sara. The Androgyne in Early German Romaniticism: Friedrich Schlegel, Novalis and the Metaphysics of Love. Bern: Peter Lang, 1983.
- Frevert, Ute. Frauen-Geschichte. Zwischen Bürgerlicher Verbesserung und Neuer Weiblichkeit. Frankfurt am Main: Surkamp, 1986.
- . Ehrenmänner: das Duell in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft. München: C.H. Beck, 1991.
- . Women in German history: from bourgeois emancipation to sexual liberation. Oxford: New York: Berg, 1989.
- Gatens, Moira. "A Critique of the Sex/Gender Distinction" A Reader in Feminist Knowledge. ed. Sneja Gunew. London: Routledge, 1991. 139-157.
- Abrams, Lynn and Harvey, Elizabeth ed. Gender Relations in German History: Power, Agency and Experience from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century. London: UCL Press, 1996.
- Haberman, Jürgen. Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Frankfurt am Main: Surkamp, 1990.
- Hart, Gail. Tragedy in Paradise. Columbia: Camden House, 1996.
- Inge, Stephan. "Bilder und immer wieder Bilder..." Die verborgene Frau. Berlin: Argument, 1983. 35-66
- Laqueur, Thomas. "Orgasm, Generation, and the Politics of Reproductive Biology" The Making of the Modern Body. ed. Thomas Laqueur and Catherine Gallagher. Berkley: University of California Press, 1987. 1-41
- Lacy, Walter K. The Family in Classical Greece. London: Thames and Hudson, , 1968.

- Lefkowitz, Mary R. Women in Greek Myth. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1986.
- Maihofer, Andrea. "Geschlecht als Existenzweise"
Geschlechterverhältnisse und Politik. Ed. Institut für Sozialforschung. Frankfurt am Main: Surkamp, 1994. 168-187.
- Meehan, Johanna Ed. Feminist Read Habermas: Gendering the Subject of Discourse. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Menninghaus, Winfried, ed. . Friedrich Schlegel Theorie der Weiblichkeit. Frankfurt am. Main: Insel, 1983.
- Mosse, George L. Nationalism and Sexuality. New York: Howard Fertig, 1985.
- Nicholson, Linda. "Wie heißt 'Gender'" trans. Irmgard Hölscher.
Geschlechterverhältnisse und Politik. Ed. Institut für Sozialforschung. Frankfurt am Main: Surkamp, 1994. 188-220
- Prandi, Julie. Spirited Women Heroes. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1983.
- Rabinowitz, Nancy Sorkin and Amy Richlin, eds. Feminist Theory and the Classics. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Rosenbaum, Heidi. Formen der Familie. Frankfurt am Main: Surkamp, 1982.
- Schiebinger, Londa. "Skeletons in the Closet: The First Illustrations of the Female Skeleton in Eighteenth-Century Anatomy," The Making of the Modern Body. ed. Thomas Laqueur and Catherine Gallagher. Berkley: University of California Press, 1987. 42-82
- Seyhan, Azade. Representation and its Discontents. The Critical Legacy of German Romanticism. Berkeley: Univesity of California Press, 1992.

Sørensen, Bengt Algot. Herrschaft und Zärtlichkeit. München: C. H. Beck, 1984.

Weigel, Sigrid. "Die geopferte Heldin und das Opfer als Heldin zum Entwurf weiblicher Helden in der Literatur von Männer und Frauen." Die verborgene Frau. Berlin: Argument, 1983. 138-153.

Wiesner, Merry. Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Eighteenth-Century Drama

Behler, Ernst. German Romantic Literary Theory. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

---, ed. Friedrich Schlegel. Bis zur Begründung der Romantischen Schule 15. September 1788-15. Juli 1797. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1987.

Benjamin, Walter. Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels, 3rd ed. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1963. p. 203

Bennet, Benjamin. Beyond Theory: Eighteenth Century German Literature and the Poetics of Irony. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

---Modern Drama and Classicism: Renaissance from Lessing to Brecht. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1979.

Currie, Pamela. Literature as social action: modernist and traditionalist narratives in Germany in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Columbia: Camden House, 1995.

Grosse-Brockhoff, Annalen. Das Konzept des Klassischen bei Friedrich und August Wilhelm Schlegel. Köln: Böhlau, 1981.

Hoffmann-Axtheim, Inge. Geister-familie. Studien zur Geselligkeit der Fruhromantik. Frankfurt am Main, 1973.

Hoffmeister, Gerhart ed. European Romanticism. Literary Cross-Currents, Modes and Models. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990.

Lamport, F. J. German Classical Drama: Theatre, Humanity and Nation 1750-1870. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Mattenklott, Gert. "Der Sehnsucht eine Form. Zum Ursprung des Modernen Romans bei Friedrich Schlegel, erläutert an 'Lucinde'." Zur Modernität der Romantik. Ed. Dieter Bänsch. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1977.

Schaer, Wolfgang. Die Gesellschaft im Deutschen Drama des 18. Jahrhunderts. Bonn: Bouvier, 1963.

Schneider, Ulf-Michael. Propheten der Goethezeit: Sprache, Literatur und Wirkung der Inspirierten. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1995.

Szondi, Peter. Die Theorie des bürgerlichen Trauerspiels im 18. Jahrhundert. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1973.