The Influence of Calderón and Goethe on Shelley in the Context of A. W. Schlegel's Conception of Romantic Drama

DUMKE, STEPHANIE,JULIA

The Influence of Calderón and Goethe on Shelley in the Context of A. W. Schlegel's Conception of Romantic Drama

Stephanie J. Dumke

A dissertation submitted to the

Department of English Studies

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Durham University

2013

Abstract

This thesis investigates the impact of German ideas of 'romantic drama' on Shelley's dramatic conceptions. Taking his reading of August Wilhelm Schlegel's *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature* in March 1818 as its starting point and fundamental basis, it begins by outlining the concept of 'romantic drama' that Shelley encountered in Schlegel and traces its subsequent influence on Shelley's dramas and theoretical prose. In contrast to previous studies of Shelley's readings of Goethe and Calderón, which focused on common themes such as the nature of evil, I argue that his interest in these writers can first and foremost be understood in the context of his attempts at forming a new drama. Together with Shakespeare, Calderón was the main representative of 'romantic drama' for Schlegel, and Goethe's reaction to the Spaniard paralleled Shelley's.

A chapter on Shelley's reading of Calderón will demonstrate the scope of his engagment with the Golden Age dramatist, while chapters on his Spanish excerpts and his translations from *El mágico prodigioso* and *Faust* will elucidate the English poet's understanding of Calderón's and Goethe's dramatic art and intentions. After analyzing *The Cenci*, *Prometheus Unbound*, and *Charles the First*, the thesis will close with a chapter on *Hellas* which demonstrates how Shelley draws together the dramatic elements and ideas he had encountered in Schlegel, Calderón, and Goethe. This second lyrical drama represents the epitome of his engagement with these European writers.

Table of Contents

Copyright Statement		i
Note on Editions		iii
List of Abbreviations		iv
Introduction		1
Chapter 1:	Shelley and August Wilhelm Schlegel's *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*	21
Chapter 2:	'Voyaging [...] from island to island': Shelley's Reading of Calderón	62
Chapter 3:	Shelley's Engagement with 'Romantic Drama': Excerpts from Calderón	102
Chapter 4:	Shelley's Translations from Calderón and Goethe	138
Chapter 5:	Traces of Calderón, Goethe, and Schlegel's 'Romantic Drama' in *The Cenci*, *Prometheus Unbound*, and *Charles the First*	164
Chapter 6:	*Hellas*	200
Epilogue		241
Bibliography		245

Copyright Statement

To Nicho

La voz a ti debida.

(Garcilaso de la Vega / Pedro Salinas)

Note on Editions

Works that Shelley knew are cited from those translations and editions that he read. Thus, for instance, I am quoting from John Black's 1815 translation of the *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature* without recourse to the German. Where no definite proof exists, I have resorted to editions that are based on texts which he is likely to have consulted.

In the case of Calderón's *comedias*, I am quoting from various modern editions, because the seventeenth- or eighteenth-century editions Shelley could have had do not contain line numbers and use an inconsistent, pre-standardized seventeenth-century spelling, which at times differs considerably from the modern practice. However, as twentieth- and twenty-first century editions often take manuscript sources into consideration, I shall only quote from them when the text coincides with that of the *Partes* edition.

Since the text of Goethe's *Faust: The First Part of the Tragedy* hardly varies in modern editions and those editions that Shelley could have owned, I am using the most widespread one, Erich Trunz's, which employs modernized German spelling.

Abbreviations

Aguilar	Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *Obras Completas*, ed. Angel Valbuena Briones and Angel Valbuena Prat, 3 vols.: Vol. I, *Dramas*, ed. Angel Valbuena Briones, 5th ed., 1st reprint (1966; Madrid: Aguilar, 1969). Vol. II, *Comedias*; ed. Angel Valbuena Briones (Madrid: Aguilar, 1956). Vol. III, *Autos Sacramentales*, ed. Angel Valbuena Prat, 2nd ed. (Madrid: Aguilar, 1967).
BCPW	Lord Byron, *The Complete Poetical Works*, ed. Jerome J. McGann, 7 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980-93).
Bixby	*Note Books of Percy Bysshe Shelley, from the Originals in the Library of W. K. Bixby*, ed. H. Buxton Forman, 3 vols. (Boston: The Bibliophile Society, 1911).
BLJ	*Byron's Letters and Journals*, ed. Leslie A. Marchand, 13 vols. (London: John Murray, 1973-94).
BSM	*The Bodleian Shelley Manuscripts: A Facsimile Edition, with Full Transcriptions and Scholarly Apparatus*, gen. ed. Donald H. Reiman, 23 vols. (New York: Garland, 1986-2002).
BSM, v	*The Witch of Atlas Notebook: A Facsimile of Bodleian MS. Shelley adds. e. 6*, ed. Carlene A. Adamson, Vol. V of *The Bodleian Shelley Manuscripts* (New York: Garland, 1997).
BSM, vi	*Shelley's Pisan Winter Notebook (1820-1821): A Facsimile of Bodleian MS. Shelley adds. e. 8*, ed. Carlene A. Adamson, Vol. VI of *The Bodleian Shelley Manuscripts* (New York: Garland, 1992).
BSM, ix	*Bodleian MS. Shelley e. 1, e. 2, and e. 3: Intermediate Fair Copies of* Prometheus Unbound, ed. Neil Fraistat, Vol. IX of *The Bodleian Shelley Manuscripts* (New York: Garland, 1991).
BSM, xii	*The 'Charles the First' Draft Notebook: A Facsimile of Bodleian MS. Shelley adds. e.17*, ed. Nora Crook, Vol. XII of *The Bodleian Shelley Manuscripts* (New York: Garland, 1991).
BSM, xvi	*The* Hellas *Notebook: A Facsimile of Bodleian MS. Shelley adds. e.7*, ed. Donald H. Reiman and Michael J. Neth, Vol. XVI of *The Bodleian Shelley Manuscripts* (New York: Garland, 1994).
BSM, xviii	*The Homeric Hymns and* Prometheus *Drafts Notebook: Bodleian MS. Shelley adds. e. 12*, ed. Nancy Moore Goslee, Vol. XVIII of *The Bodleian Shelley Manuscripts* (New York: Garland, 1996).
BSM, xix	*The* Faust *Draft Notebook: A Facsimile of Bodleian MS. Shelley adds. e. 18*, ed. Nora Crook and Timothy Webb, Vol. XIX of *The Bodleian Shelley Manuscripts* (New York: Garland, 1997).
BSM, xxi	*Miscellaneous Poetry, Prose and Translations from Bodleian MS. Shelley adds. c. 4, etc.*, ed. E. B. Murray, Vol. XXI of *The Bodleian Shelley Manuscripts* (New York: Garland, 1995).
CCJ	*The Journals of Claire Clairmont, 1814-1827*, ed. Marion Kingston Stocking, with the assistance of David MacKenzie Stocking (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968).

CPPBS	*The Complete Poetry of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, 3 vols. to date, ed. Donald H. Reiman, Neil Fraistat, and Nora Crook (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000).
El mágico	Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *El mágico prodigioso*, ed. Bruce W. Wardropper, Letras Hispánicas, 217, 5th ed. (Madrid: Cátedra, 2011).
El mágico/trans	Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *The Prodigious Magician*, ed. and trans. Bruce W. Wardropper (Madrid: Porrúa Turanzaz, 1982).
El purgatorio	Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *El purgatorio de San Patricio*, ed. J. M. Ruano de la Haza, Publications of the Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, Textual Research and Criticism Series (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1988).
Faust	Johann Wolfgang Goethe, *Faust: Der Tragödie erster und zweiter Teil; Urfaust*, ed. Erich Trunz (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1996), based on *Dramatische Dichtungen I*, ed. Erich Trunz, 16th ed. (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1996) = Vol. III of *Goethes Werke*, 'Hamburger Ausgabe', gen. ed. Erich Trunz, 14 vols. (1948-64).
Gedenkausgabe	Johann Wolfgang Goethe, *Gedenkausgabe der Werke* [Artemis-Gedenkausgabe], gen. ed. Ernst Beutler, 27 vols. (Zürich: Artemis, 1948-71).
Gisborne/Williams	*Maria Gisborne and Edward E. Williams - Shelley's Friends: Their Journals and Letters*, ed. Frederick L. Jones ([Norman]: University of Oklahoma Press, 1951).
Lectures	Augustus William [August Wilhelm] Schlegel, *A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, trans. John Black, 2 vols. (London: Baldwin, Cradock, Joy, et. al, 1815).
Life	Thomas Medwin, *The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. H. Buxton Forman, revised ed. (1847; London: Humphrey Milford / Oxford University Press, 1913).
Life/1847	Thomas Medwin, *The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, 2 vols. (London: Thomas Cautley Newby, 1847).
Literary Lives, ii	Mary Shelley, *Spanish and Portuguese Lives, French Lives*, ed. Lisa Vargo and Clarissa Campbell Orr, Pickering Masters (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2002), Vol. II of *Mary Shelley's 'Literary Lives' and Other Writings*, gen. ed. Nora Crook (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2002).
MWSJ	*The Journals of Mary Shelley, 1814-1844*, vol. 1, 1814-1822, ed. Paula R. Feldman and Diana Scott-Kilvert (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).
MWSL	*The Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley*, ed. Betty T. Bennett, 3 vols. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980–88).
MYR:S	*Manuscripts of the Younger Romantics: Shelley*, gen. ed. Donald H. Reiman, 7 vols. (New York: Garland, 1985-97).
MYR:S, iii	*Hellas: A Lyrical Drama: A Facsimile of the Press-Copy Transcript and Fair-Copy Transcripts*, ed. Donald H. Reiman, Vol. III of *Manuscripts of the Younger Romantics: Shelley* (New York: Garland, 1985).
MYR:S, iv	*The Mask of Anarchy Draft Notebook: A Facsimile of Huntington MS. HM 2177*, ed. Mary A. Quinn, Vol. IV of *Manuscripts of the*

	Younger Romantics: Shelley (New York: Garland, 1990).
MYR:S, vi	*Shelley's 1819-1821 Huntington Notebook: A Facsimile of Huntington MS. HM 2176*, ed. Mary A. Quinn, Vol. VI of *Manuscripts of the Younger Romantics: Shelley* (New York: Garland, 1994).
MYR:S, vii	*Shelley's 1821-1822 Huntington Notebook: A Facsimile of Huntington MS. HM 2111*, ed. Mary A. Quinn, Vol. VII of *Manuscripts of the Younger Romantics: Shelley* (New York: Garland, 1996).
Notopoulos	James A. Notopoulos, *The Platonism of Shelley: A Study of Platonism and the Poetic Mind* (New York: Octagon, 1949).
OSA	Percy Bysshe Shelley, *Poetical Works*, ed. Thomas Hutchinson, corrected by G. M. Matthews (London: Oxford University Press, 1970).
OWC	Percy Bysshe Shelley, *The Major Works*, ed. Zachary Leader and Michael O'Neill, Oxford World's Classics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
PBSL	*The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. Frederick L. Jones, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964).
PS	*The Poems of Shelley*, ed. Kelvin Everest, Geoffrey Matthews, Michael Rossington, et al., 3 vols. (Harlow: Longman, 1989–).
SC	*Shelley and his Circle, 1773–1822*, ed. Kenneth Neill Cameron, Donald H. Reiman, Doucet Devin Fischer, et al. 10 vols. to date (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961–).
SPP	*Shelley's Poetry and Prose: Authoritative Texts, Criticism*, ed. Donald H. Reiman and Neil Fraistat, A Norton Critical Edition, 2nd ed. (New York: Norton, 2002).
Violet	Timothy Webb, *The Violet in the Crucible: Shelley and Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

Introduction

This thesis examines Shelley's relation to Pedro Calderón de la Barca (1600-1681), Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832), and August Wilhelm Schlegel (1767-1845) under one particular aspect: the conception of 'romantic drama', as found in Schlegel's *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*. In intricate ways, this 'context', as the word's Latin origin *contexĕre* suggests, 'weaves together' all of these authors: Schlegel, an acquaintance of Goethe, saw in Calderón one of the two representatives of 'romantic drama' and translated him; Goethe read translations of Calderón's works including those by Schlegel, was familiar with the German critic's conception of 'romantic drama', and represented a type of 'romantic drama' in his *Faust*, which furthermore contains some traces of Calderón; Shelley, finally, read Schlegel, Goethe, and Calderón, the latter after he learnt about his significance in the *Lectures*, and translated both from the Spaniard and *Faust*. This triangular German-Spanish context for Shelley's thought and works has hitherto been almost completely neglected, although individual connections to the English poet, often with a limiting focus on specific intersections, have been pointed out.[1]

---

[1] The two exceptions, which come close to my approach of combining Shelley, Calderón, Schlegel, and Goethe, are articles by Susana Hernández-Araico and Michael Rossington, which, however, are necessarily restricted in scope. The latter also considers Shelley's drama more generally and is therefore prevented from developing the relations in detail, and the former, whilst providing valuable groundwork, is vitiated by its ignorance that Shelley in fact perused the *Lectures* in the spring of 1819 as well as by its claim that he was familiar with Friedrich Schlegel's comments on Calderón. Susana Hernández-Araico, 'German and English Romanticism: The Schlegels, Shelley and Calderón', *Neophilologus*, 71.4 (1987), 481-8; Michael Rossington, 'Beyond Nation: Shelley's European Dramas', in Lilla Maria Crisafulli and Cecilia Pietropoli (eds.), *The Languages of Performance in British Romanticism* (Oxford / New York: Peter Lang, 2008), 83-95.

En route to Italy in March 1818, when travelling through France with Mary and Claire Clairmont, Shelley read aloud John Black's 1815 translation of August Wilhelm Schlegel's *Über Dramatische Kunst und Literatur: Vorlesungen*, entitled *A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature* (*MWSJ*, i. 198; entries 16-21 March 1818). The lectures, delivered in Vienna 1808-1809 and published in German in three volumes from 1809 to 1810,[2] provided one of the earliest histories of European theatre, and, with their promotion of a 'romantic drama', sparked significant theoretical debates about the direction of drama not only in the German lands but also beyond.[3] They are regarded to be 'the major statement on the drama in the Romantic period' and 'arguably the most influential work of drama criticism of the nineteenth century' by scholars such as Frederick Burwick and Roger Paulin, respectively.[4] Werner Brüggemann even argues that the *Lectures* more generally constitute 'a representative document of the romantic conception of literature and history', and as such they were 'virtually the only intermediary' between German Romanticism and the rest of Europe.[5] Therefore, Shelley's engagement with

---

[2] The date-range is sometimes given as 1809-1811, which is explained by the fact that the first two volumes appeared in 1809, and volume 2, part 2, was published 'late in 1810, with the date 1811 on the title-page' (Coleridge, *Lectures 1808-1819: On Literature*, ed. R. A. Foakes, 2 vols. [1987], i. 345, = Vol. V of *The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, gen. ed. Kathleen Coburn [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969-2002]).

[3] In Spain, Schlegel's elevation of the theatre of the demoted Calderón, which Nikolaus Böhl von Faber, an émigré, drew attention to, caused fierce reactions, particularly by the neoclassicist José Joaquín de Mora (for more on the impact of Schlegel's position see Evangelina Rodríguez Cuadros, 'Pedro Calderón de la Barca', in David T. Gies [ed.], *The Cambridge History of Spanish Literature* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005], 265-82, here 269-70).

[4] Burwick, *Illusion and the Drama: Critical Theory of the Enlightenment and Romantic Era* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), 127; and Paulin, 'The Romantic Drama', in Nicholas Saul (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to German Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 85.

[5] '[...] als repräsentatives Dokument romantischer Kunst- und Geschichtsauffassung nahezu den einzigen Vermittler zwischen der deutschen Romantik und dem

Schlegel's work also places the English poet into a wider European context and makes him part of a transnational Romantic movement. Several of the traces of Schlegel's *Vorlesungen* in Shelley's writings as well as similarities between them have been noticed by critics such as Stuart Curran,[6] Nancy Moore Goslee,[7] Susana Hernández-Araico,[8] Hugh Roberts,[9] and, more recently, Jacqueline Mulhallen.[10] However, these critics have only picked out individual points of the *Lectures*,[11] and there is no discussion taking a comprehensive look at Schlegel's work and relating it to Shelley's reception of Calderón and Goethe.

Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca, a seventeenth-century Spanish Baroque playwright, was the last great writer of the so-called 'Golden Age' (*Siglo de Oro*, literally the 'Golden Century'), which includes famous authors such as the novelist Miguel de Cervantes, the dramatists Lope de Vega and Tirso de Molina, and the poets

---

literarischen Ausland darstellt' (Brüggemann, *Spanisches Theater und Deutsche Romantik*, Vol. I, Spanische Forschungen der Görresgesellschaft, 2nd ser. 8 [Münster: Aschendorff, 1964], 242).

[6] *Shelley's Annus Mirabilis: The Maturing of an Epic Vision* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1975), 33-5.

[7] Chapter 5, 'Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*' (especially the subchapter 'Dramatic Structure: The Unbinding of Sculptural Form'), in *Uriel's Eye: Miltonic Stationing and Statuary in Blake, Keats, and Shelley* (University: University of Alabama Press, 1985), 134-89, and *Shelley's Visual Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 216. Goslee's 'Shelley's Cosmopolitan "Discourse": Ancient Greek Manners and Modern Liberty' is not concerned with drama but illumines another influence the *Lectures* had: 'Shelley's reading of Schlegel will help him discover a way to emulate a lost Greek culture and to activate that "principle" of a central spirit of liberty in modern culture' (*The Wordsworth Circle*, 36.1 [2005], 2-5, here 3); this article also parallels my analysis of Shelley's understanding of history with reference to Schlegel.

[8] 'German and English Romanticism: The Schlegels, Shelley and Calderón', see footnote 1 above.

[9] 'Mere Poetry and Strange Flesh: Shelley's *The Cenci* and Calderón's *El Purgatorio de San Patricio*', *European Romantic Review*, 20.3 (2009), 345-66.

[10] *The Theatre of Shelley* (Cambridge: OpenBook, 2010), 71-8.

[11] Hugh Roberts is somewhat more comprehensive; however, as will become clear in Chapter 5, his broad view and rough sketch of the *Lectures* are too generalizing and intermixed with writings of other German Romantics.

Luis de Góngora and Francisco de Quevedo. He wrote extensively, and almost exclusively dramas, which, apart from a few minor works in short comic subgenres,[12] fall into two categories: *comedias* and *autos sacramentales*. The term *comedia* denoted any drama written in three acts, or *jornadas*, of which Calderón composed over a hundred. *Autos sacramentales*, or simply *autos*, are allegorical plays, religious and dogmatic.[13] Staged for the Feast of Corpus Christi, they 'dealt directly or indirectly with the redemption of Man through the Body and Blood of Christ',[14] and the Eucharist usually appeared in some form. The characters are predominantly abstractions or personifications, as in the *auto* of *La vida es sueño*, which Shelley is very likely to have read.

Even though Shelley could certainly not compete with Don Juan's mother, who, according to Byron, 'knew by heart / All Calderon',[15] he was well-read in the Spaniard's works and likely to have known significantly more than just the fourteen plays for which there is definite proof. In Chapters 2-4, I shall discuss his engagement with Calderón's dramas in detail and shall thus postpone an introductory presentation of Shelley's relation to the Spanish writer until Chapter 2. Stuart Curran already suggested that Calderón 'would later become perhaps the crucial influence on his notions of drama',[16] and this thesis sets out to prove just that.

---

[12] For these, which Shelley would not have known, see Rodríguez Cuadros, 'Pedro Calderón de la Barca', 281-2.
[13] For more on the *autos* see, for example, Melveena McKendrick, 'Theatre in the street: the *auto sacramental*', in *Theatre in Spain 1490-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989), 238-60.
[14] McKendrick, *Theatre in Spain 1490-1700*, 239.
[15] *BCPW*, v. Canto I, 11, 1-2.
[16] 'Shelleyan Drama', in Richard Allen Cave (ed.), *The Romantic Theatre: An International Symposium* (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1986), 61-77, here 64.

Whilst Calderón served as pre-Romantic model for the conception of 'romantic drama', Goethe embodies this type of play in his *Faust* (*The First Part of the Tragedy*, 1808), even though Schlegel, not on best terms with the poet, fails to acknowledge as much. In fact, Goethe was as fascinated with Calderón as Shelley was, although, lacking a knowledge of Spanish, he depended on German translations. Shelley had, with long interruptions, a lifelong interest in Goethe, beginning with his reading of *Die Leiden des Jungen Werther* in a French translation during his time in Oxford.[17] In 1816, he witnessed an impromptu translation from *Faust* by Matthew Gregory 'Monk' Lewis in Switzerland, and some time between 1815 and 1816, Shelley started a literal translation of *Faust* (known as the 'crib'), omitting the 'Vorspiel auf dem Theater' and breaking off at line 1213, shortly after the beginning of the 'Studierzimmer' scene (*BSM*, xix. p. lvii). The crib, however, betrays a poor understanding of the foreign language and therefore *Faust*, and did not trigger a profound response to Goethe, although traces of the tragedy, including a quotation from Shelley's crib, can be found in *Alastor*.[18]

In Italy, Shelley read *Faust* only from April or May 1821 onwards, and consequently its influence on his dramatic works is restricted, for only *Hellas*, *Charles the First*, and the *Unfinished Drama* were written thereafter. The case is of course different with Shelley's poetry, in particular *Adonais* and the late poems to Jane Williams. The author himself implied a Goethean influence on his elegy when he

---

[17] On *Werther*'s influence on Shelley see Hugh Roberts, *Shelley and the Chaos of History: A New Politics of Poetry*, Literature and Philosophy (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 152-3.

[18] See Neil Fraistat's commentary and notes on *Alastor*, *CPPBS*, iii. 366 and 428 for the verbal echo in line 720 ('Birth and the grave').

asked the Gisbornes, sending them the first printed copy of *Adonais* on 13 July 1821, if they observed 'any traces of him in the Poem', referring to Faust (*PBSL*, ii. 308).[19] However, Goethe's dramatic conceptions parallel Shelley's in various ways, so that the latter must have been struck when he encountered *Faust* again after his acquaintance with Schlegel's conception of 'romantic drama' in 1818. For example, Goethe shows himself to be equally interested in the recuperation of pre-neoclassical dramatic forms in *Faust* and engages to an extraordinary degree in genre-mixing. This play is 'the most extensive composite order of European Romanticism', 'the supreme example of *genera mixta* in all of literature, the consummate *Gesammtkunstwerk* [sic]', in Curran's words.[20] Nevertheless, scholars have been almost exclusively concerned with Shelley's thematic interest in Goethe's play, as a short overview of the previous scholarship will exemplifiy, whereas this thesis foregrounds the authors' common concerns with genre and style.

Several articles and chapters have been published on Calderón and Goethe in relation to Shelley. Salvador de Madariaga's essay 'Shelley and Calderón' (1920) constitutes the earliest general study; the most comprehensive and most valuable work is still Timothy Webb's *The Violet in the Crucible* (1976), although it contains generalizations and misreadings of the Spanish.[21] Often, Shelley's translations of

---

[19] With his use of the personal pronoun, Shelley seems to allude to Faust as a character but the reference is ambiguous for the preceding sentence is concerned with the play.

[20] Although the panoply of forms and genres is even more pronounced in Part II (1832), Stuart Curran's appraisal referring to both parts is equally valid for the first alone (*Poetic Form and British Romanticism* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1986], 219).

[21] Salvador de Madariaga, 'Shelley and Calderón', in *Shelley & Calderón, and Other Essays on English and Spanish Poetry* (London: Constable, 1920), 3-48; Timothy Webb, chapters 'Scenes from Goethe's *Faust*: the Shelley Version' and 'A Spanish Faust: *El mágico prodigioso*', in *The Violet in the Crucible: Shelley and Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 174-203 and 237-75.

Faust and *El mágico prodigioso*,[22] and the notion of evil in all three authors are the focus of investigations into their relationships,[23] though Shelley's and Goethe's world-views and interests in natural philosophy have also been compared.[24] Two Hispanists made valuable contributions: Eunice Joiner Gates, in an article that draws attention to verbal parallels and suggests instances of indebtedness to Calderón in Shelley; and Ann L. Mackenzie, who examined the Shelley-Medwin translations from *La cisma de Ingalaterra*.[25] Whilst Neville Rogers weaves his examination of Calderón's and Goethe's influence into his larger arguments in *Shelley at Work* (1956), he deserves to be singled out from similar studies with smaller references to these foreign authors because of his perceptiveness.[26]

Influence

'Poets, the best of them – are a very camæleonic [sic] race: they take the colour not only of what they feed on, but of the very leaves under which they pass', Shelley wrote to the Gisbornes, having just asked whether they detected any traces of *Faust*

---

[22] Robert C. Casto, 'Shelley as Translator of *Faust*: The "Prologue"', *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 26.104 (1975), 407-24.
[23] For a focus on evil, see especially Frederick Burwick, 'Origins of Evil: Shelley, Goethe, Calderón, and Rousseau', in Michael O'Neill and Anthony Howe (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Percy Bysshe Shelley* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 460-77.
[24] See my own 'A Chameleon under Goethe's Leaves: Shelley and the *Farbenlehre*', in Michael Meyer (ed.), *Romantic Explorations: Selected Papers from the Koblenz Conference of the German Society for English Romanticism*, Studien zur Englischen Romantik, n.s. 8 (Trier: WVT, 2011), 219-28, and Frederick Burwick's chapter 'Shelley: The "Traces" of *Faust*', in *The Damnation of Newton: Goethe's Color Theory and Romantic Perception*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, n.s. 86 (210) (Berlin / New York: de Gruyter, 1986), 255-74.
[25] Eunice Joiner Gates, 'Shelley and Calderón', *Philological Quarterly*, 16 (1937), 49-58; Ann L. Mackenzie, '*La cisma de Inglaterra*: dos versiones inglesas del monólogo de Carlos sobre Ana Bolena', *Cuadernos de Teatro Clásico*, 4 (1989), 53-77.
[26] Neville Rogers, *Shelley at Work: A Critical Inquiry* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956).

in his *Adonais* (*PBSL*, ii. 308). These lines display no concern about works or authors betraying their influences; on the contrary, the poets' chameleonic quality is not only as natural to them as the spots to the leopard, but also a mark of distinction. Moreover, the relationship between writers and their precursors appears depersonalized. As this statement suggests, Shelley was never as preoccupied with influence or even debilitated by it as other Romantics such as Keats and or even Wordsworth were. Thus, and for a variety of other reasons to be elaborated below, this thesis does not conceive of itself as an 'influence study' in a more restricted sense, despite the word 'influence' in its title.

First of all, Calderón's, Goethe's, and Schlegel's influence will not be analyzed in its entirety but explicitly in its relation to Shelley's conception of drama. A Bloomian investigation into the 'anxiety of influence', into psychological aspects, such as Shelley's conceptualization of his own status with regards to his predecessors, can make little if any contribution to a study focusing on aesthetic questions, the awareness of traditions, and the use of form and genre; particularly since not one single form and tradition is represented in Calderón and Goethe or activated by Shelley. Besides, a playwright as little known in England as Calderón would not have exerted a stifling power over an English author, and even Goethe's status at the time is not at all comparable with that of Milton or Shakespeare. In the case of Schlegel, it needs to be pointed out that his notion of 'romantic drama' is too open and flexible to be confining; it consists of concepts, abstract ideals (such as 'organic unity'), and not of definite tools for criticism or composition. The influence I am concerned with is less personal and is embedded in a web of 'influences' in the form of generic and formal traditions and contemporary European literary criticism. The latter is in this thesis mostly represented in the form of one person, August

Wilhelm Schlegel, but Shelley is very likely to have known that this critic reflected much of German contemporary thought, which is another cause for a less 'personal' relationship between the two writers. The idea of a 'spirit of the age' certainly has its limitations and faults, but it was evoked by Shelley himself and may thus help us grasp his understanding of influences and the relationships between authors of the same period. At any rate, the historicization of literature, which we find in both Schlegel and Shelley, precludes imitation and inevitably distances writers of distinct periods from each other, as I shall elaborate in Chapter 1.

Schlegel's, Calderón's, and Goethe's influence is mostly not traceable directly, apart from verbal echoes such as the ones we encounter in *Prometheus Unbound*, for instance. This, however, does not present a problem because I understand 'influence' as encompassing a wide range of modes and elements of impact. Through his readings, Shelley was directly compelled to consider or incorporate new ideas, conceptions, or images into his work, but he was also reinforced in his ideas, and persuaded to turn speculative thoughts into stronger beliefs or develop more nuanced views. Therefore I disagree with Ronald Tetreault's attempt to deny Schlegel's importance:

> Schlegel's influence on Shelley might be regarded as crucial to his search for literary form were it not for the persistent impression that Shelley read theoretical works only to confirm what he had already come to suspect out of his own practice. Certainly, though, it can be said that Schlegel provides us with a useful theoretical explanation for what Shelley tried to accomplish in dramatic poetry.[27]

---

[27] Ronald Tetreault, *The Poetry of Life: Shelley and Literary Form* (Toronto / London: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 124.

This claim – by an otherwise brilliantly perceptive critic – that 'Shelley read theoretical works *only* to confirm what he had already come to suspect' (emphasis added) is unwarranted; I need only point out that the searching and erudite Shelley was open-minded enough to revise completely his earlier views on materialism and idealism, and constantly experimented with form, abandoning the romance-epic after *Laon and Cythna*. That aside, it was certainly also an act of influence when Schlegel 'confirm[ed] what he [Shelley] had already come to suspect' and provided him with a well-argued framework for his thoughts. Not only can we as critics find in Schlegel 'a useful theoretical explanation for what Shelley tried to accomplish in dramatic poetry', as Tetreault claims, but Shelley found one as well. Nonetheless, as I have stated in the beginning, this thesis argues that Shelley *developed* his conceptions in response to the *Lectures*, for ideas similar to Schlegel's do not appear in his writing until after March 1818, and neither did he begin composing dramatic works prior to that (the childhood plays excepted).

One final issue remains in relation to the question of influence. Much of Schlegel's conception of 'romantic drama' derives from his study and translation of Shakespeare, and the Bard is always held up by him as representative of this kind of drama alongside Calderón. Similarly, Shakespeare represents an undeniable influence in Shelley's works. However, as this influence, in contrast to Calderón's significance, has received much critical attention and must not automatically be assumed where the same parallels exist between Shelley and Calderón, I shall generally refrain from referring to the English playwright. Besides, large parts of the *Lectures* consist of a critical analysis of Shakespeare's works, so that Shelley's reception of his fellow countryman may to some extent have been shaped by the German critic. After all, even Wordsworth acknowledged in his 'Essay,

Supplementary to the Preface' (1815) that 'The Germans only, of foreign nations, are approaching towards a knowledge and feeling of what he [Shakespeare] is. In some respects they have acquired a superiority over the fellow-countrymen of the Poet'.[28] And equally, Hazlitt praised Schlegel's study of Shakespeare in his review of the *Lectures*: 'It is indeed by far the best account which has been given of the plays of that great genius by any writer, either among ourselves, or abroad.'[29]

Shelley's Relationship with the Theatre and Dramatic Traditions

In little more than four years, between his arrival in Italy in April 1818 and his death in July 1822, Shelley planned and began three dramas (a tragedy on Tasso, *Charles the First*, and *An Unfinished Drama*), completed four (*The Cenci*, *Prometheus Unbound*, *Oedipus Tyrannus, or Swellfoot the Tyrant*, and *Hellas*), contributed lyrics to his wife's mythological plays *Proserpine* and *Midas*, jotted down ideas for a drama on Napoleon, contemplated writing a tragedy on Timon of Athens, a work entitled 'Troilus & Cressida', and a lyrical drama on the *Book of Job*, and he translated Euripides's satyr play *The Cyclops* as well as scenes from Goethe's *Faust* and Calderón de la Barca's *El mágico prodigioso*.[30] Moreover, many of his poems display

---

[28] William Wordsworth, *Poems*, 2 vols. (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1815), i. 352.

[29] 'Lectures on Dramatic Literature. By W. A. [sic] Schlegel. Translated from the German, by John Black Esq. 2 vol. Baldwin & Co. 1815', *The Edinburgh Review*, 26.51 (February 1816), 67-107, here 68.

[30] We may add the two stanzas from Calderón's *La cisma de Ingalaterra* translated by Medwin and corrected by Shelley (*OSA*, 748), and, possibly, the partial translation of a speech from Calderón's *La vida es sueño*, which is found in *The* Faust *Draft Notebook* in Thomas Medwin's or Edward Ellerker Williams's hand (*BSM*, xix. 124-5; page 60rev.). For the tragedy on Tasso, see e.g. *PBSL*, ii. 8, and for the 'Scene for Tasso', 'Song for Tasso', and the outline, see *PS*, ii. 365-9, 445-7; the memorandum 'on Bonaparte: A Drama' is contained in HM 2176 (*MYR:S*, vi. 346-9; ff. *9r-*8v); for Shelley's thoughts about a tragedy on Timon of Athens ('Modern Timon') see his notes for the first act (*MYR:S*, vii. 310-11; f. *8r), and *Gisborne/Williams Jnls*, 121;

dramatic elements, such as dialogue, or are to some extent performative. Curran has stressed that 'once the poet arrived in Italy, he became almost obsessed with dialogic works'.[31] However, not only the sheer amount of dramatic works is astonishing: each of Shelley's plays has its own distinctive form and characteristics.

Admittedly, Shelley had relatively early in his life developed an interest in the drama and the stage.[32] Apparently, at the age of eighteen he co-wrote a play with one of his sisters, and around the same time composed a tragedy; both he tried to get staged, and both are lost. Yet we hear of no further dramatic compositions for almost eight years, until Shelley had left England for good, and the most important statements regarding his dramatic conceptions appear in works written after he had settled on the continent, namely in *A Defence of Poetry* as well as the prefaces to *Prometheus Unbound* and *The Cenci*. Not without reason Shelley called himself 'one whose attention has *but newly* been awakened to the study of dramatic literature' in the Preface to *The Cenci* (*SPP*, 144; my emphasis). This thesis contends that the striking shift towards an enthusiasm for composing dramatic literature, which distinguishes Shelley's English period from his Italian, is owing in large parts to the

---

evidence for his ideas on a drama on *Job* is found in Mary Shelley's 'Note on *Prometheus Unbound*' (*OSA*, 271). In October 1821 he announces to Ollier 'Charles the 1st or Troilus & Cressida' (*PBSL*, ii. 357). The lyrics Shelley contributed to *Proserpine* are 'Arethusa' and 'Proserpine's Song'; those for *Midas* are the 'Hymn to Apollo' and 'Hymn to Pan'.

[31] Stuart Curran, 'Lyrical Drama: *Prometheus Unbound* and *Hellas*', in Michael O'Neill and Anthony Howe (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Percy Bysshe Shelley* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 289-98. Curran here also refers to his earlier publication 'Shelleyan Drama', 61.

[32] For a good summary of his early (and later) dramatic interests see, for example, Jeffrey N. Cox, 'The Dramatist', in Timothy Morton (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Shelley* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 65-84, and Lilla Maria Crisafulli, 'Shelley, Percy Bysshe, Drama', in Frederick Burwick (gen. ed.), Nancy Moore Goslee, and Diane Long Hoeveler (associate eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Romantic Literature*, Vol. III Re-Z, The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Literature (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 1222-32.

decisive impulse he received from his reading of Schlegel's *A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature* on the way to Italy.

To be sure, Shelley became an avid attendant of the theatre and opera in London during the latter part of 1817 and the early months of 1818. Curran, for example, has stressed that it was during his residence in the capital that Shelley became interested in the drama, and, according to Peacock, in acting in particular.[33] However, I argue that this presents an insufficient and comparably minor explanation of Shelley's use of the dramatic genre, not only because of Schlegel's significance. First, it is important to distinguish between the attraction that the attendance of theatre or opera performances held for Shelley and his interest in the dramatic genre. Second, Shelley's attitude towards contemporary theatre and drama was mixed and essentially critical.

After the Shelleys witnessed a performance of Shakespeare with Edmund Kean as Hamlet at the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, on 13 October 1814, Shelley jotted down a scathing criticism in Mary's journal: he was '*displeased with what he saw of Kean*' and points out '*The inefficacy of acting to encourage or maintain the delusion*' of all the actors (*MWSJ*, i. 35). His aversion to the current stage would change but despite his increased theatre attendances in 1817 and 1818, some of his scepticism lived on; for instance, Shelley clearly rated the musical stage far above theatre performances, if we believe Peacock's claims in his *Memoirs*.[34] Of course, Peacock's view needs to be toned down, as Shelley had no general aversion against acting, especially not after his last theatre season in London: he was impressed by Eliza

---

[33] 'Shelleyan Drama', 63.

[34] Thomas Love Peacock, *Peacock's Memoirs of Shelley, with Shelley's Letters to Peacock*, ed. H. F. B. Brett-Smith (London: Henry Frowde, 1909), 39-41. 'With the exception of Fazio, I do not remember his having been pleased with any performance at an English theatre' (49).

O'Neill, intended her for the role of Beatrice Cenci, and even imagined the previously despised Edmund Kean as an excellent choice for the Count when he composed the *Cenci* with the stage in mind. Moreover, Jacqueline Mulhallen has rightly argued that Shelley may have seen more performances than were recorded,[35] and she certainly proved Peacock wrong, who only remembered his friend's presence at two plays: Mulhallen presents evidence that, all in all, he attended twenty-five theatre performances before moving to Italy in 1818.[36] Nevertheless, it is hard to deny Shelley's scepticism of the traditional theatre, for even in Italy he almost exclusively attended operas, ballets, and *improvvisatore* performances.[37] Moreover, Shelley witnessed very little *serious* drama: according to Mulhallen, he only attended four tragedies for certain (*Richard III*, *Hamlet*, Milman's *Fazio*, and Maturin's *Manuel*) and three more serious plays conjecturally (John Home's *Douglas*, Arthur Murphy's *The Grecian Daughter*, and *Henry IV, Part 1*) – and these latter ones he would have seen early in his life with Harriet, if at all.[38]

Despite recent scholarly attempts to revaluate and even promote more popular plays from the Romantic period, Jeffrey Cox's 1998 assertion is still unassailable: 'No one has doubted then or now that the theater of the early nineteenth century was in crisis'; for instance, the playhouses had grown too large to convey the 'power of the word' or act effectively, and popular dramatic types were displacing 'legitimate' dramatic forms.[39] Even though we find some traces of

---

[35] Mulhallen, 62.
[36] Peacock, *Peacock's Memoirs of Shelley*, 40; Mulhallen, 66 and 'Appendix I – List of Performances Seen by Shelley', 250-5.
[37] See Mulhallen, 'Appendix I', 250-5.
[38] Mulhallen, 66-7.
[39] Jeffrey N. Cox, *Poetry and Politics in the Cockney School: Keats, Shelley, Hunt, and their Circle*, Cambridge Studies in Romanticism, 31 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 124.

popular types in Shelley's dramas, besides a general interest in stage effect, he cannot but have felt this crisis, in theatrical performances as well as in the form and quality of contemporary plays. Thus I argue for the importance of Shelley's *reading* in raising his interest in the drama as genre to be employed in future compositions. His reading was, furthermore, a discriminating one, focusing on older traditions instead of popular, contemporary plays. Therefore, Shelley's turn to Schlegel's *Lectures* and his subsequent creative and critical response did not occur in a vacuum because we can already detect a more serious, historical and formal interest in the drama before the spring of 1818.

Shelley's criticism of the *Hamlet* performance he attended, referred to above, especially his remark '*The loathsome sight of men of* [sic] *personating characters which do not & cannot belong to them*' (*MWSJ*, i. 35), may be seen as echoing or paralleling important aspects of the Romantic reception of Shakespeare, in particular the general scepticism or even hostility towards stagings of his plays. This aversion to performances, which Shelley must have been aware of, resulted from efforts to restore the texts of the First Folio or early quartos after their mutilations and revisions according to neoclassical principles.[40] For Romantics such as Coleridge, William Hazlitt, or Charles Lamb, Shakespeare was 'too ingenious for the stage', as Frederick Burwick has laconically put it.[41] Hazlitt, for one, referring to the very play Shelley witnessed, proclaimed that 'We do not like to see our author's

---

[40] For a succinct account of the Romantics' reception of Shakespeare, see Frederick Burwick, 'Shakespeare and the Romantics', in Duncan Wu (ed.), *A Companion to Romanticism*, Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture, 1 (Malden, MA / Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), 512-19; for textual aspects see 512-13.
[41] 'Shakespeare and the Romantics', 513.

plays acted, and least of all, HAMLET.'[42] Indeed, Shelley was an avid *reader* of the Bard: in the same year that he criticized the *Hamlet* performance, Claire noted that he 'carries [...] about everywhere with him' 'three small volumes of Shakespeare'.[43] But Shakespeare's works constituted only part of the dramatic tradition that he perused.

In 1817, he and Mary read Charles Lamb's *Specimens of English Dramatic Poets who Lived About the Time of Shakespeare* (1808), containing extracts from playwrights such as Christopher Marlowe, John Marston, John Webster, or Beaumont and Fletcher, with explanatory headnotes as well as footnotes.[44] Furthermore, in February 1818, Mary Shelley, possibly also with her husband, read plays from *Ancient English Drama* (1810), a three-volume edition generally attributed to Walter Scott. Shelley moreover studied several works by Ben Jonson, Shakespeare, and Beaumont and Fletcher, in addition to ancient Greek plays before leaving for the continent.[45] His interest was uncommon for the period and associates him with a select number of authors and critics, above all Charles Lamb, William Hazlitt, and Leigh Hunt, who not only turned to Shakespeare but also the 'Old Dramatists' in order to rescue neglected historical forms and to gain inspiration for shaping the current and future English drama. Greg Kucich has argued that '[t]he Romantics' engagement with Renaissance dramatic tradition was an integral component of their overall effort to create what they often thought of as "a second

---

[42] William Hazlitt, *Characters of Shakespear's Plays* (London: Hunter, C. and J. Ollier, 1817), 113.
[43] Entry in Claire Clairmont's journal for 17 August 1814 (*SC*, iii. 346).
[44] The work appears in Mary's 1817 reading list and is marked as read by Shelley as well (*MWSJ*, i. 101).
[45] See Appendix viii, 'Shelley's Reading', in *PBSL*, ii. 467-88.

poetic Renaissance'".[46] However, this 'movement' was not monolithic. Had Charles Lamb chosen plays 'which treat of human life and manners' over 'masques and Arcadian pastorals', it was exactly those that Leigh Hunt and his circle promoted and employed shortly after.[47] In 1815, the editor of the *Examiner* published *The Descent of Liberty, A Mask*, with the prefatory essay 'Some Account of the Origin & Nature of Masks' (xix-lv). Of the new edition, appearing under a different publisher the following year, Hunt gave an inscribed copy 'to his dear friend / Percy B. Shelley',[48] and whilst no record of the date survived, he is likely to have made this present around the time they saw each other regularly or lived together in 1817. Apart from Hunt's treatise on the history of the masque, Shelley acquired through his reading a knowledge of the tradition, which was, if not extensive, 'at least basic and sound', according to Curran.[49]

A few years after Hunt had resurrected and reworked the masque, he promoted another form, the pastoral drama, when publishing *Amyntas: A Tale of the Woods* (1820), a translation of Torquato Tasso's play *Aminta* (1573), again with a long preface. It was not until 26 August 1821 that Shelley sent Hunt his thoughts on the volume (*PBSL*, ii. 345), and he only learned of his friend's translation activity on 20 September 1819 (*PBSL*, ii. 152n6). Yet not only the masque but also the pastoral

---

[46] Greg Kucich, '"A Haunted Ruin": Romantic Drama, Renaissance Tradition, and the Critical Establishment', in Terence Allan Hoagwood and Daniel P. Watkins (eds.), *British Romantic Drama: Historical and Critical Essays* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press / London: Associated University Presses, 1998), 56-83, here 66.
[47] Charles Lamb, *Specimens of English Dramatic Poets who Lived About the Time of Shakespeare, with Notes* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1808), vi.
[48] Leigh Hunt, *The Descent of Liberty, A Mask; A New Edition* (London: Gale and Fenner, 1816). I am grateful to the Houghton Library, Harvard University, for allowing me to consult this dedication copy from the bequest of Amy Lowell (shelfmark *EC8.H9135.815db.).
[49] *Annus Mirabilis*, 189.

drama was a constant concern of the Hunt circle, as Jeffrey Cox has shown,[50] and Shelley had read key pastoral plays by the time he began his own dramatic compositions: Tasso's *Aminta* in 1815 and April 1818 (*MWSJ*, i. 92 and 203), Giovanni Battista Guarini's *Il pastor fido: tragicomedia pastorale* in 1815 (*MWSJ*, i. 92), as well as Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Faithful Shepherdess* in June and July 1817 (*MWSJ*, i. 175-6).

Thus it is not surprising that Curran has found influences of both genres, the masque and the pastoral drama, on *Prometheus Unbound*,[51] and suggested in particular parallels between the form and structure of Hunt's *The Descent of Liberty* and Shelley's play.[52] Cox has made similar observations on Shelley's use of the masque as well as the pastoral drama in his *Prometheus Unbound*,[53] and demonstrated a link to plays by members of the Hunt circle, who

> work[ed] to acquire cultural influence for a countercultural message by seeking beyond established and ideologically stabilized forms for a generic site within which one can negotiate between tradition and innovation, authority and revolutionary gesture, necessary formal containment and desired ideological criticism.[54]

Cox draws our attention already to the purposes of dramatic form, but this short prospect shall suffice for the moment as this thesis will return to questions of social

---

[50] See *Poetry and Politics in the Cockney School*, 125-30 for the masque, and 130-5 for the pastoral drama.
[51] Curran, *Poetic Form and British Romanticism*, 202. For Shelley's use of the masque in *The Mask of Anarchy* and *Charles the First*, see Richard Cronin, *Shelley's Poetic Thoughts* (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1981), 51-5.
[52] Curran, 'Lyrical Drama: *Prometheus Unbound* and *Hellas*', 295-7.
[53] Jeffrey N. Cox, *Poetry and Politics in the Cockney School*, 142-4. Cox convincingly establishes parallels between *Prometheus Unbound* and Horace Smith's *Amarynthus, the Nympholept: A Pastoral Drama* but we must bear in mind that the latter appeared in 1821 and thus could not have been an influence.
[54] *Poetry and Politics in the Cockney School*, 124.

and political motivations in Shelley's interest in 'romantic drama'. Having shown how Shelley can be related to other writers that investigated, resurrected, and appropriated historical forms and neglected traditions, I also want to point out the limitations of such a linkage and its use as sole explanation for his dramatic engagements. For instance, the extent to which Shelley recuperates and reworks genres and forms in *Prometheus Unbound* is unprecedented, and, as will become clear, his knowledge and use of Schlegel, Calderón, and Goethe set him distinctly apart from contemporary English efforts at reanimating the drama.

Shelley's reading, his interest in the pre-neoclassical dramatic tradition and important historical stages, as well as his attention to various traditional forms and genres, which I have analyzed and outlined above, constitute both the backdrop against which his turn to Schlegel and Calderón must be seen and his springboard for an involvement with and creation of a 'romantic drama'.

Overview of the Chapters

The first chapter analyzes Shelley's readings of August Wilhelm Schlegel's *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature* and outlines the conception of 'romantic drama', as propounded in this work. Throughout, the principles set forth by the German critic will be related to Shelley's ideas, mainly as expressed in *A Defence of Poetry*. In order to establish which works Shelley is likely to have known besides those mentioned in letters or quoted from, Chapter 2 traces his reading and possible knowledge of Calderón's dramas and investigates which edition of the *comedias* the English poet may have used. In Chapter 3, I shall scrutinize his excerpts from Calderón and argue that his choice reveals his interest in and understanding of the Spaniard's style of drama – predominantly as it relates to Schlegel's notion of romantic drama. The

following chapter discusses his translations from *El mágico prodigioso* and *Faust*, employing the same methodology with identical aims. With Chapter 5, I move on to Shelley's own dramas. Focusing on two works partly finished before his first encounter with the Spanish playwright and his rereading of *Faust* – *The Cenci* and *Prometheus Unbound* – as well as on an abandoned tragedy – *Charles the First* – this section will necessarily be of a more speculative nature but will nevertheless reveal both suggestive and convincing parallels with Calderón and Schlegel, and, to a lesser extent, with Goethe. Chapter 6 constitutes a detailed study of *Hellas*. Given that it is usually related to the *Persians*, I shall first examine the parallels between Shelley's lyrical drama and Aeschylus's tragedy, before focusing on their differences and Calderón's, Schlegel's, and, Goethe's influence, which, I argue, move *Hellas* into the realm of the romantic drama. A short epilogue will briefly provide suggestions of how our reading of Shelley's poetry may be affected by the findings of this thesis.

Chapter 1: Shelley and August Wilhelm Schlegel's *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*

Before examining August Wilhelm Schlegel's *Lectures* in detail, drawing out parallels with and influences on Shelley, I shall begin by investigating the evidence for the English poet's initial interest in and subsequent engagement with the *Lectures*. An overview of the status of Schlegel's work in England, with particular consideration of its reception by Romantic critics and Shelley's friends, will illustrate the background against which the importance of the *Lectures* for Shelley can be understood.

Shelley's Reading of Schlegel's *Lectures* and the Work's Status in England at the Time

As mentioned in the Introduction, Shelley read aloud Black's 1815 translation of August Wilhelm Schlegel's *Über Dramatische Kunst und Literatur: Vorlesungen* when travelling to Italy in March 1818 (*MWSJ*, i. 198). He never commented on the *Lectures*, but he referred to their author as 'the learned critic Schlegel' in a prose draft of July or August 1818, which relates to 'A Discourse on the Manners of the Antient Greeks' or the prefatory 'On the Symposium' (*BSM*, v. 140-1).[1] Moreover, Shelley undoubtedly had A. W. Schlegel in mind when, composing *A Philosophical*

[1] The whole sentence reads: 'One of the chief objections to Euripides, & the reason why Sophocles was considered so holy & chaste a person – a circumstance which the learned critic Schlegel cd hardly have been ignorant of when he abuses Euripides for his licentiousness was, as Athenæus tells us [...]' (*BSM*, v. 141). The Greek sentence which Shelley subsequently quotes translates as follows: 'Sophocles was fond of young lads, as Euripides was fond of women' (*BSM*, v. 391).

View of Reform in late 1819 and 1820, he enlisted 'their severe bold & liberal spirit of critisism [sic]' as proof that the Germans 'are a great People' (*SC*, vi. 982).[2]

At the end of 1820 or in early 1821, Shelley encountered Schlegel once again as he found a translation of his essay on Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, accompanied by an anonymous introduction with general critical remarks, in *Ollier's Literary Miscellany, in Prose and Verse* (1820).[3] Julius Charles Hare, the author-translator of the piece, furthermore contributed the anonymous 'On the German Drama, No. 1: Oehlenschlaeger' (pp. 90-153), which displays traces of his own and Oehlenschläger's Schlegelian influences, and praises *The Cenci*. On 20 January 1821, Shelley reported to Ollier that he was 'enchanted' with the journal and wanted to know the identity of the 'commentator on the German Drama', whom he thought 'a powerful thinker' (*PBSL*, ii. 258).[4]

Due to Shelley's silence on Schlegel's *Lectures*, which stands in contrast to its significance for him, I shall give further evidence for his appreciation of the *Lectures*

---

[2] Shelley's incomplete draft with gaps and problematic insertions is the only manuscript evidence in his hand. Composition began in November 1819 and continued into 1820.

[3] Anonymous [Julius Charles Hare], 'A. W. Schlegel on Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*: with Remarks upon the Character of German Criticism', *Ollier's Literary Miscellany, in Prose and Verse*, 1 (1820), 1-39. Only a few copies of *Ollier's Literary Miscellany* are extant but a summary of Schlegel's essay in English can be found, for example, in Ernst Behler, *German Romantic Literary Theory*, Cambridge Studies in German (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 93. For Shelley's interest in Hare's contributions to the *Miscellany*, see also G. F. McFarland, 'Shelley and Julius Hare: A Review and a Response', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 57.2 (1975), 406-29.

[4] I should point out that the 'Schlegel' Shelley mentions in his letter is August Wilhelm's brother Friedrich. Still referring to Hare's article on the German drama, he tells Ollier: 'I was immeasurably amused by the quotation from Schlegel about the way in which the popular faith is destroyed – first the Devil, then the Holy Ghost, then God the Father. I had written a Lucianic essay to prove the same thing' (*PBSL*, ii. 258). However, this reference to an extended footnote in small print on pages 120-1 is valuable evidence for Shelley's thorough perusal of the article, or even the *Miscellany* as a whole.

by considering his circle's engagement with it. Shortly after having become acquainted with the Gisbornes, with whom the Shelleys would regularly and intensively discuss literature, they lent their copy of Schlegel to their new friends.[5] Mary's comment to Maria Gisborne on 26 July 1818 – 'how much finer a view does he take of the tragic poets than that Frenchman Barthelemy'[6] – already indicates a basic endorsement of Schlegel's opinions, and her remark that Jean-Jacques Barthélemy would undoubtedly 'have preferred Racine to Sophocles', 'if he could without an anachronism in his work' (*MWSL*, i. 76), points to the Shelleys' and Schlegel's shared basis: a rejection of the dominance of French neoclassicism, combined with an admiration of ancient Greek tragedy. Mary later noted in her chapter on Calderón for the *Literary Lives* (written 1835-1837), that Schlegel's 'observations on his [i.e. Calderón's] works are replete with truth' (*Literary Lives*, ii. 249), and her opinion certainly followed her late husband's view.

Claire Clairmont, having first heard the *Lectures* read out loud on the coach, noted perusing them in her journal on 19 and 27 March 1819, and finishing Schlegel on the 30th (*CCJ*, 101-104). On 28 January 1820 in Pisa she again records reading two chapters (*CCJ*, 119). Given that she was part of the Shelleyan household at these times and often echoed Shelley's readings and interests, her engagement with the German critic suggests his continued importance to the English poet. Moreover, Thomas Medwin, a member of Shelley's Italian circle from October 1820 to February 1821 and November 1821 to March 1822, reported that Shelley referred to 'that

---

[5] They first met on 9 May 1818, the day the Shelleys arrived at Leghorn (*MWSJ*, i. 209), and the letter accompanying the loaned book ('We send you Schlegel') was written before June 1818 (*PBSL*, ii. 17); Jones, who transcribed it from John Gisborne's MS. copy, dates it 11-31 May.

[6] Mary refers to Abbé Jean-Jacques Barthélemy (1716-95) and his *Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis en Grèce vers le milieu du quatrième siècle avant l'ère vulgaire* (1788), which the Shelleys had finished reading that day (*MWSL*, i. 76n6).

most excellent critic Schlegel' in his analysis of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* for Byron, which confirms that Shelley considered Schlegel an authority on Shakespeare and thus also more generally on the drama.[7]

The *Lectures* generally received attention in England and were also, to varying degrees, known to some of Shelley's acquaintances and friends.[8] In command of the German language, Samuel Taylor Coleridge already borrowed heavily from Schlegel's first edition in his later lectures on Shakespeare in 1811 and 1812.[9] The ninth lecture on 16 December 1811, the first after Coleridge received a copy of Schlegel, and one in which he borrowed particularly much, including the distinction between mechanic and organic form, was 'almost certainly' attended by Byron.[10] Yet, whilst Schlegel's ideas thus spread, no real reception could follow as Coleridge did not acknowledge his borrowings, although he at times displayed the volumes during his lectures. Thus, ironically, Leigh Hunt suggested in *Foliage* in

---

[7] Anonymous [Thomas Medwin], 'Byron and Shelley on the Character of Hamlet', *New Monthly Magazine and Literary Journal*, n.s. 29, Part II (1830), 327-36, here 334. On the question of the authorship and authenticity of this article see Nora Crook's assessment: 'This contains an unquantifiable amount of Shelley's authentic table-talk of 1821-22. Medwin's authorship is still officially classed as uncertain, but circumstantial and stylistic evidence [...] build a compelling case for it' ('Shelley's Late Fragmentary Plays: "Charles the First" and the "Unfinished Drama"', in Alan M. Weinberg and Timothy Webb (eds.), *The Unfamiliar Shelley*, The Nineteenth Century Series [Farnham / Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009], 297-311, here 311n77).

[8] For an account of the *Lectures*' impact in England see Josef Körner, *Die Botschaft der Deutschen Romantik an Europa*, Schriften zur deutschen Literatur für die Görresgesellschaft, 9 (Augsburg: Benno Filser, 1929), 70 and notes 101.

[9] 'A Course of Lectures on Shakespeare and Milton in Illustration of the Principles of Poetry', consisting of 17 lectures held at the London Philosophical Society in London between November 1811 and January 1812. See Coleridge, *Lectures 1808-1819: On Literature*, ed. Reginald A. Foakes, 2 vols. Bollingen Series, LXXV (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Princeton University Press, 1987), Vol. V of *The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, gen. ed. Kathleen Coburn (Princeton, 1969-2002). The lectures, however, remained unpublished until 1853. For details of Schlegel's influence on Coleridge, see Anna Augusta Helmholtz, *The Indebtedness of Samuel Taylor Coleridge to August Wilhelm von Schlegel*, Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, 163 / Philology and Literature Series, 2.4 (1907).

[10] Coleridge, *Lectures 1808-1819*, 344.

1818 that 'M. Schlegel' was 'not uninstructed perhaps by an eminent German scholar of our own'.[11]

However, the French translation of the *Lectures* of 1814 received notice as a review of over thirty pages in the *Quarterly Review* of the same year attests; it begins by praising the work as being 'of extraordinary merit' and concludes that it is 'worthy of that individual [...] whom Europe has classed among the most illustrious of her literary characters'.[12] Therefore it is not surprising that its publication in English in 1815 met with much interest. Indeed, the reception of the *Lectures* was such that the translator John Black could already report to August Wilhelm Schlegel in September 1819 that the first edition had almost sold out. The fact that a second one did not appear until 1840 is mainly to be blamed on the four North American pirate editions of Black's translation as well as on Schlegel's unwillingness to fulfil the English publisher's demand for original additions.[13]

John Black was a former colleague of William Hazlitt on the *Morning Chronicle* and provided Hazlitt with an advance copy for his anonymous review in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1816. This spanned no less than forty pages, and, though critical in its attitude, quoted large passages from it.[14] Schlegel would also appear in Hazlitt's subsequent publications. His *Characters of Shakespear's Plays*, for example, published in July 1817, was strongly influenced by the *Lectures*, and Hazlitt referred

---

[11] Leigh Hunt, *Foliage; or, Poems Original and Translated* (London: C. and J. Ollier, 1818), 35.
[12] [Hare-Naylor F.], 'ART. VI.—*Cours de Littérature Dramatique*. Par A. W. Schlegel. *Traduit d'Allemand*. 8vo. 3 vols. pp. 1900. London. 1814', *Quarterly Review*, 12.23 (October 1814), 112-46, here 112 and 146.
[13] Körner, *Die Botschaft der Deutschen Romantik*, 70.
[14] 'Lectures on Dramatic Literature. By W. A. [sic] Schlegel. Translated from the German, by John Black Esq. 2 vol. Baldwin & Co. 1815', *The Edinburgh Review*, 26.51 (February 1816), 67-107; reprinted in *The Selected Writings of William Hazlitt*, ed. Duncan Wu, Pickering Masters (London: Pickering & Chatto, 1998), Vol. I, 271-306 (Appendix). For Black's relation to Hazlitt see Wu's annotations.

to Schlegel several times by name.[15] Whilst there is no evidence that Shelley read this work, his friend Leigh Hunt did.[16] Moreover, after they had become friends in late 1816, Hunt introduced Shelley to his circle of friends and acquaintances, including Hazlitt and other theatre critics and Shakespeare enthusiasts such as Charles Lamb.[17]

Indeed, it may have been Leigh Hunt who induced Shelley to pick up Schlegel's *Lectures*, recommending the work due to his friend's growing interest in the drama. They lived together at Albion House in Marlow from 10 April to 25 June 1817, and would afterwards regularly visit each other.[18] When Shelley moved to London several weeks before his departure for the continent, the two writers constantly spent time together and certainly discussed Hunt's forthcoming *Foliage*, for Shelley was, in his own words, 'already familiar' 'with most of the poems' before receiving a printed copy (*PBSL*, ii. 2). Hunt wrote about August Wilhelm Schlegel in his Preface to *Foliage*, published in early 1818,[19] of which he presented an inscribed copy to Shelley as a 'gift for the journey'.[20] On the way from London to Lyon, the English poet read this presentation copy and the *Lectures* almost simultaneously: Mary notes her husband's reading of Schlegel from 16-21 March 1818 (*MWSJ*, i.

---

[15] William Hazlitt, *Characters of Shakespear's Plays* (London: Hunter, C. and J. Ollier, 1817). See also Wu's judgement on this issue in *The Selected Writings of William Hazlitt*, i. 271n1. Furthermore, Hazlitt later included long excerpts of his review in a part of the final, eighth lecture in *Lectures Chiefly on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth, Delivered at the Surry Institution* (London: Stodart and Steuart / Edinburgh: Bell and Bradfute, 1820), 321-35. There is, however, no evidence that Shelley saw a copy of this publication.

[16] For evidence, see Hunt's review, referred to below.

[17] Mary Shelley notes meetings with Hazlitt and Lamb in February 1817 (*MWSJ*, i. 163-4).

[18] See Nicholas Roe, *Fiery Heart: The First Life of Leigh Hunt* (London: Pimlico–Random House, 2005), 299-310.

[19] *Foliage*, 35-8.

[20] Roe, *Fiery Heart*, 310. Before, Shelley had twice ordered Hunt's *Foliage* from Charles Ollier (*PBSL*, ii. 591 and 595).

198), and a day later Shelley reported to Hunt that he had finished *Foliage* (*PBSL*, ii. 2). To be sure, the Preface mostly disagrees with Schlegel, who possesses 'a great deal of talent' but 'owes a sort of grudge to cheerfulness'.[21] Hunt vehemently rejects the idea that his contemporaries should imitate the spirit of Greek tragic drama and, in particular, make 'the same use of the idea of destiny'. [22] Yet, as the editors of *Leigh Hunt's Literary Criticism* have rightly pointed out, 'Hunt's remarks about Schlegel [...] are hasty and ill-considered' and his criticism of Schlegel's interpretation of *Macbeth* is subject to a 'hasty generalization'.[23] *Foliage*, however, does not reflect Hunt's true judgement of the German critic, for in an article on Hazlitt's *Characters of Shakespear's Plays* in the *Examiner* of 20 July 1817, he claimed that Schlegel, 'with the exception of a few scattered criticisms from Mr. Lamb, had hitherto been the only writer who seemed truly to *understand* as well as feel him [i.e. Shakespeare]'.[24]

Considering this context, it becomes clear that Shelley would have approached Schlegel's *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature* with serious studiousness and expectations, for he would have been aware of its status and most likely even some of its main arguments. However, as the work's most immediate impact in England was on criticism in general and that on Shakespeare in particular, Shelley may not have fully realized beforehand how relevant and stimulating it could be to authors striving for progress not only in criticism but also in the age's dramatic productions. Thus, before paying close attention to Schlegel's *Lectures*,

---

[21] *Foliage*, 35 and 36.
[22] *Foliage*, 37.
[23] *Leigh Hunt's Literary Criticism*, eds. Lawrence Huston Houtchens and Carolyn Washburn Houtchens (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956), 637.
[24] 'Theatrical Examiner, No. 289', *Examiner*, 499 (20 July 1817), 457-8. Reprinted in *Leigh Hunt's Dramatic Criticism 1808-1831*, eds. Lawrence Huston Houtchens and Carolyn Washburn Houtchens (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), 289-91, here 291 (Appendix).

above all to his conception of 'romantic drama', I shall outline his objectives concerning contemporary German drama as expressed in the *Lectures*, his rejection of dramatic forms dominant at the time, and points of contact between him and Shelley.

Shelley's and Schlegel's Shared Basis For Criticism

Apart from a general ambition to produce an historical-critical account, one reason for Schlegel's dramatic investigations was his conviction that the German-speaking lands were in the process and need of developing their own national theatre: 'The German stage is the last of all, and has been influenced in the greatest variety of ways by all those which preceded it' (*Lectures*, i. 19). The *Lectures* conclude with a chapter on German drama, the final section of which is concerned with its future and exposes Schlegel's urge to provide guidance: 'What path shall we now enter?', he asks rhetorically; 'Shall we endeavour to re-accustom ourselves to the form of the French tragedy?' Expectedly, he negates; 'it appears to me that our [German] taste inclines altogether to the romantic' (*Lectures*, ii. 387).[25] His compatriots should therefore use the description of 'romantic drama' – elaborated at the beginning of the *Lectures* and a reference point throughout – as a model for future dramatic compositions. To be sure, this recommendation at the end of the work does not come as a surprise after Schlegel had savagely torn apart French and neoclassical

[25] Admittedly, for rejecting French neoclassicism, Schlegel also had nationalistic reasons, resulting in particular from Napoleonic despotism and occupations (cf., e.g., his appeal: 'let them feel their indestructible unity as Germans!' [*Lectures*, ii. 389]). Giovanni Vittorio Amoretti furthermore points out his sense of homesickness during his time abroad (Introduction to August Wilhelm von Schlegel, *Vorlesungen über Dramatische Kunst und Literatur* [Bonn / Leipzig: Kurt Schroeder, 1923], ix-cxii, here xi-xii). On Schlegel's political motivations in his devotion to Calderón, see Ernst Behler, 'The Reception of Calderón among the German Romantics', *Studies in Romanticism*, 20 (1981), 437-60, here 441.

theatre, exalted certain authors and periods of the Spanish and English dramatic tradition, and established Calderón and Shakespeare as the representatives of 'romantic drama'.

Similarly, as I have already emphasized, some of Shelley's contemporaries regarded the drama in England as being in a state of crisis and sought possibilities for change and renewal by turning to its historical manifestations and the English tradition. English critics such as Hunt shared Schlegel's rejection of French neoclassicism, its imitators, and its proponents, for in his treatise on the masque, the editor of the *Examiner* complained that 'some critics [...] see in it nothing but the violation of rules and probabilities; and turn aside from the most charming fancy, when it comes to them in a dress which the French have not authorized.'[26] Shelley's reading up to March 1818 shows a similar concern with playwrights employing pre-neoclassical forms, namely Shakespeare and the 'Old Dramatists', but the fact that he only envisions dramatic productions himself *after* his acquaintance with the *Lectures* suggests that he was more sceptical about the ways of regeneration suggested in England. If we consider the authors and dramatic forms absent from his reading, he appears to have already had a common basis with Schlegel through sharing his aversions. Nevertheless, Shelley's harsh statements on neoclassical drama and melodrama post-date his familiarity with the *Lectures* so that the German critic appears to have helped the poet in intensifying and fully shaping his views. Due to this causal connection, I shall now turn to a detailed discussion of Schlegel's work and demonstrate parallels with Shelley's later views. Afterwards, I shall concretize and illustrate Shelley's position regarding neoclassicism and melodrama.

---

[26] 'Some Account of the Origin and Nature of Masks', in *The Descent of Liberty*, xix-lv, here xxiv-xxv.

Schlegel's Distinction between 'Classical' and 'Romantic'

Schlegel divides his history of the drama into three main parts, using a structure that combines a chronological treatment of the material with a typological interpretation. He first discusses the period of classical drama comprising the Greeks and Romans, although the latter, following the decline of the drama allegedly manifest in Euripides, are already seen as mostly imitating their predecessors (Lectures 3-8). The second section comprises Italian (Lecture 8) and French drama (Lectures 9-11), both of which he overall dismisses as imitators of the ancients, whilst the third part examines the theatre that developed independently, namely the English and Spanish stage (Lectures 12-14). Schlegel concludes with a lecture on the German drama, still in the process of developing itself. This structure reflects his view of a 'grand division' in dramatic literature (*Lectures*, i. 11), derived from and justified by the observation 'that there is no fundamental power throughout the whole range of nature so simple, but that it is capable of dividing and diverging into opposite directions. The whole play of living motion hinges on harmony and contrast' (*Lectures*, i. 8).

In his opening lectures, Schlegel expounds the main distinction around which his subsequent historical and critical analysis revolves: the contrast between the 'classical' or 'antique' and the 'romantic' or 'modern' spirit and literature (*Lectures*, i. 8). For Schlegel, the origin of the latter coincided with the establishment and dominance of Christianity, so that 'romantic' essentially acquires the meaning of 'post-classical' and does not narrowly connote his own age.[27] However, the term had both a chronological and typological meaning for Schlegel, and even though the

[27] Consequently, we are required to differentiate clearly between 'romantic' in Schlegel's usage (which will be indicated throughout the thesis by lower-case *r*) and the adjective referring to the 'Romantic Period' in England (designated by capital *R*).

romantic spirit forms a contrast to the classical typologically, it cannot so neatly be separated from it chronologically. The appellation 'romantic' is

> derived from *romance*, the name of the language of the people which was formed from the mixture of Latin and Teutonic, in the same manner as modern cultivation is the fruit of the union of the peculiarities of the northern nations and the fragments of antiquity. (*Lectures*, i. 8)[28]

Whilst Schlegel's meaning of 'romantic' – a word that could have a variety of nuances – began to establish itself in Germany towards the end of the eighteenth century,[29] the classic-romantic distinction was only introduced into England in 1811 through Coleridge, and it was not until Madame de Staël's visit to London in 1813 and John Black's 1815 translation of the *Lectures* that the terms became more familiar.[30] Shelley never uses the word 'romantic' in the Schlegelian sense, although he expressed ideas relating to the term, especially in the *Defence*, and employs 'modern' in a way similar to the *Lectures*.[31] For instance, he equally stresses the historical intermixture between the ancients and Northern moderns: 'The incorporation of the Celtic nations with the exhausted population of the South, impressed upon it the figure of the poetry existing in their mythology and

---

[28] Shelley would already have seen a very similar account in chapter 9 of Madame de Staël's *De l'Allemagne*, Volume I ('De la poésie classique et de la poésie romantique'). However, by explaining that 'romantic' designates the poetry whose origin lay in the songs of the troubadours and which was born from Chivalry and Christianity, de Staël implies that the term derived from the appellation of the literature, i.e. the *romances*, and not from romance language. She draws the same distinction as Schlegel between the era preceding the establishment of Christianity and that following it ([Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1968], i. 211).

[29] Behler, *German Romantic Literary Theory*, 26.

[30] Paul H. Fry, 'Classical Standards in the Period', in Marshall Brown (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, Vol. V: *Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 7-28, here 16.

[31] In the *Defence*, the term 'modern' includes writers as early as Dante (*OWC*, 679) and contrasts with 'ancient' (*OWC*, 691).

institutions' (*OWC*, 690). The characterization of the Southern population as 'exhausted' even echoes Schlegel's argument that Christianity 'has regenerated the ancient world from its state of exhaustion' (*Lectures*, i. 13).[32]

For Schlegel, the cultivation of the moderns was consequently not as much 'of a piece' as that of the ancients (*Lectures*, i. 8), whose formation 'was a natural education in its utmost perfection' (*Lectures*, i. 11): 'under a singular coincidence of favourable circumstances, [they] performed all of which our circumscribed nature is capable. The whole of their art and their poetry is expressive of the consciousness of this harmony of all their faculties' (*Lectures*, i. 11-12). After a visit to the allegedly Greek Pompeii on 22 December 1818 (*MWSJ*, i. 245), Shelley expressed very similar, idealized views on the Greeks: 'They lived in harmony with nature'; 'I now understand why the Greeks were such great Poets, & above all I can account, it seems to me, for the harmony the unity the perfection the uniform excellence of all their works of art' (*PBSL*, ii. 73, 74). Certainly, as Timothy Webb has pointed out, '[t]his recreation of the life of classical Greece is not classical in character so much as romantic.'[33] Yet it is precisely the way in which the German and the English Romantic similarly theorized about the ancients (or subsequent ages and peoples) that is of interest here, regardless of the factual truth of their assumptions.

Schlegel succinctly concludes from his characterization of the ancient Greeks that they 'invented the poetry of gladness' (*Lectures*, i. 12). Again, the two writers' views correspond, for Timothy Webb has demonstrated in an analysis of Shelley's prose texts, the translations of the *Homeric Hymns*, and various poems such as 'The

---

[32] Schlegel adds 'and debasement', which Shelley, unsurprisingly, does not list as a feature of the ancients.

[33] 'Shelley and the Religion of Joy', *Studies in Romanticism*, 15.3 (1976), 357-82; here 360.

Cloud', that 'what he discovered in Greece was a celebration of the spirit of joy'.[34] Webb may mistakenly give the line, which I have cited at the beginning of this paragraph, from the revised 1846 edition of the *Lectures* ('They invented the poetry of joy'), but he is perfectly accurate as regards the parallel to Schlegel.[35] It should also be pointed out that Webb's following qualification of this correspondence – 'unlike Schelegel [sic] who regretted that Greek religion had clouded the mind with superstition, he specifically associated the poetry of joy with the Greek conception of divinity' – is based on a misreading, and thus unjustifiably sets our authors apart.[36]

Schlegel establishes a sharp contrast between the ancient and the romantic spirit, and locates the main cause for this difference in Christianity.

> Among the Greeks human nature was in itself all-sufficient; they were conscious of no wants, and aspired to no higher perfection than that which they could actually attain by the exercise of their own faculties. We, however, are taught by superior wisdom that man, through a high offence, forfeited the place for which he was originally destined; and that the whole object of his earthly existence is to strive to regain that situation, which, if left to his own strength, he could never accomplish. (*Lectures*, i. 15)

The Greek 'religion of the senses', as the German critic calls it, 'had only in view the possession of outward and perishable blessings; and immortality, in so far as it was

---

[34] 'Shelley and the Religion of Joy', 376.
[35] In 1846, Bohn republished Black's translation with revisions by the Reverend A. J. W. Morrison.
[36] 'Shelley and the Religion of Joy', 377. The passage Webb refers to actually reads: 'Their religion was the deification of the powers of nature and of the earthly life: but this worship, which, among other nations, clouded the imagination with images of horror, and filled the heart with unrelenting cruelty, assumed, among the Greeks, a mild, a grand, and a dignified form' (*Lectures*, i. 12).

believed, appeared in an obscure distance like a shadow, a faint dream of this bright and vivid futurity' (*Lectures*, i. 15). In the *Defence*, Shelley equally stresses the sensual side of the ancient Greeks and their literature, for instance when he admires Homer and Sophocles for their 'sensibility to the influence of the senses and the affections' and praises the former in particular for having 'clothed sensual and pathetic images with irresistible attractions' (*OWC*, 686).

> For Schlegel, '[t]he very reverse of all this' applies to the Christian: every thing finite and mortal is lost in the contemplation of infinity; life has become shadow and darkness, and the first dawning of our real existence opens in the world beyond the grave. Such a religion must waken the foreboding, which slumbers in every feeling heart, to the most thorough consciousness, that the happiness after which we strive we can never here attain; that no external object can ever entirely fill our souls; and that every mortal enjoyment is but a fleeting and momentary deception. (*Lectures*, i. 15)

Opposing most of Christianity's dogmas, Shelley certainly saw himself in disagreement with the absolute tone of many statements in this passage. However, to use Michael O'Neill's cautiously worded conclusion, 'his poetry never wholly disallows the possibility that "the realm without a name" ([*OWC*] 396) is itself a potentially numinous space.'[37] More generally, therefore, he would have felt an affinity with some of Schlegel's ideas, in particular with the notion 'that no external object can ever entirely fill our souls'. As I shall elaborate in my chapter on *Hellas*, from 1821 onwards Shelley strongly identified with Faust's perpetual yearning or

---

[37] Michael O'Neill, 'A Double Face of False and True': Poetry and Religion in Shelley', *Literature and Theology*, 25.1 (2011), 32-46, here 44. The quotation is taken from *The Triumph of Life*.

strife (*Streben*) as well as the feeling of polar drives, which manifest themselves predominantly in a longing to transcend earthly existence and a simultaneous enchantment with the sensual and mutable. Thus Wordsworth's supposition that in this world '*We find our happiness or not at all*' appeared 'absurd' and 'demoniacal' to Shelley (*PBSL*, ii. 406), who could at least poetically imagine 'some world far from ours'.[38]

Moreover, Shelley considered religion conceptually and aesthetically important in drama, lamenting in the *Defence* that tragedy '[o]n the modern stage' is 'without religion and solemnity' (*OWC*, 683). Yet 'Calderon in his religious Autos has attempted to fulfil some of the high conditions of dramatic representation neglected by Shakspeare; such as the establishing a relation between the drama and religion' (*OWC*, 684). Having praised the Spaniard's attempt, Shelley goes on to criticize his execution: 'he omits the observation of conditions still more important, and more is lost than gained by a substitution of the rigidly defined and ever-repeated idealisms of a distorted superstition for the living impersonations of the truth of human passions' (*OWC*, 684). This criticism, however, specifically concerns the *autos sacramentales*, religious allegories. The fact that most of the *comedias* Shelley engages with are in one way or another 'religious' suggests that in his view Calderón succeeded better in combining 'a relation between the drama and religion' with 'the truth of human passions' elsewhere. The *comedia* focused on in the chapter on *Hellas*, *El príncipe constante*, presents such an example, I argue. To be sure, Shelley's interest in religion was also a reaction to the petty bourgeois concerns and realism of the domestic drama, a form he attacks in the *Defence*, and 'religion' must be understood in the widest sense of the word: what he ultimately intended was

[38] *To Jane ('The keen stars were twinkling')*, *OWC*, line 22.

certainly closer to an epic and cosmic extension of the dramatic subject than to the presentation of any more closely defined faith.

Religion, of course, can furthermore figure in a different sense, and indeed does so in some of Shelley's plays, namely in its relation to the socio-political conditions and the mental framework of the society in which the action is set. As Michael Rossington has pointed out, *The Cenci*, *Charles the First*, and the translations from *El mágico prodigioso* and *Faust* 'may be broadly characterized as historically-minded investigations into the nature of Christian belief in early modern Europe'.[39] For instance, in *The Cenci*, when portraying 'Catholics deeply tinged with religion' and representing how religion 'is interwoven with the whole fabric of life', as the Preface puts it (*SPP*, 142, 143), Shelley throws light primarily on the patriarchal, socio-political function of religion. Yet the different dramatic uses of religion can also intermingle, as the representation of a deeply religious society may form the basis and backdrop for a foregrounding of the spiritual, transcendental aspects of religion. This is frequently the case in Calderón's religious and historical *comedias*, and Shelley's *Hellas* constitutes such an example, as I will illustrate in more detail in Chapter 6.

The historical impact of Christianity, distancing the moderns from the ancients in feeling and thought, is touched on in the *Defence*. When 'the ancient system of religion and manners had fulfilled the circle of its revolutions', Shelley writes,

> the world would have fallen into utter anarchy and darkness, but that there were found poets among the authors of the Christian and Chivalric systems of manners and religion, who created forms of opinion and action never before conceived. (*OWC*, 688)

---

[39] 'Beyond Nation: Shelley's European Dramas', 83.

Whilst praising ancient Greek literature, he grants Christianity certain positive effects, acknowledging that 'the scheme of Athenian society was deformed by many imperfections which the poetry existing in Chivalry and Christianity have [sic] erased from the habits and institutions of modern Europe' (*OWC*, 682). To be sure, Shelley repeatedly railed against its negative consequences, such as its stifling effect on the mind.[40] More interestingly, in contrast to Schlegel, he also tries to establish points of contact and continuity with the ancients: 'Jesus Christ divulged the sacred and eternal truths contained in these views [of Plato] to mankind, and Christianity, in its abstract purity, became the exoteric expression of the esoteric doctrines of the poetry and wisdom of antiquity' (*OWC*, 690). Yet Shelley's qualification – 'in its abstract purity' – concedes that there are no historical manifestations of a direct, open continuity, which indicates that he is merely making an ideal statement, perhaps resulting from a generally synthesizing desire.

At any rate, Shelley would have agreed with the following distinction between the ancients and the moderns, in which the German critic refrains from Christian vocabulary. Having argued that the Grecian idea[41] of human nature 'consisted in a perfect concord and proportion between all the powers,—a natural harmony', Schlegel explains that, in contrast, the moderns have become conscious of 'the internal discord' (*Lectures*, i. 16);

> hence the endeavour of their poetry is to reconcile these two worlds between which we find ourselves divided, and to melt them indissolubly into one

---

[40] Cf. for instance the Preface to *Prometheus Unbound*: 'We owe the great writers of the golden age of our literature to that fervid awakening of the public mind which shook to dust the oldest and most oppressive form of the Christian Religion' (*SPP*, p. 208).

[41] John Black intensified Schlegel's difference between the ancients and moderns by translating 'Ideal' as 'idea'.

> another. The impressions of the senses are consecrated, as it were, from their mysterious connexion with higher feelings; and the soul, on the other hand, embodies its forebodings, or nameless visions of infinity, in the phenomena of the senses. (*Lectures*, i. 16-17)

Referring to this portrayal of romantic feeling and literature, Stuart Curran declared in *Shelley's Annus Mirabilis*, that '[s]uch a passage could stand as an epigraph for Shelley's life work: it must have struck him with peculiar force. Up to this time he had published scarcely a poem that did not stretch the normal boundaries of reality with the vague compulsions of eternity.'[42] Needless to say, he also scarcely composed works that did not do so thereafter, with the feeling in fact steadily intensifying, as I shall demonstrate particularly in *Hellas* and Shelley's connections with Goethe. In Curran's words, Schlegel 'comprehended a sensibility that, more than any other English Romantic, Shelley possessed'.[43]

The Characteristics of 'Romantic Drama'

The general dissimilarity in spirit between the ancients and moderns manifested itself in opposite characteristics of their literary productions:

> The antique art and poetry separate, in a strict manner, things which are dissimilar; the romantic delights in indissoluble mixtures; all contrarieties: nature and art, poetry and prose, seriousness and mirth, recollection and anticipation, spirituality and sensuality, terrestrial and celestial, life and death, are blended together by them in the most intimate manner. (*Lectures*, ii. 98-9)

---

[42] *Shelley's Annus Mirabilis: The Maturing of an Epic Vision* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1975), 33-4.
[43] *Shelley's Annus Mirabilis*, 34.

More concretely, this means for Schlegel above all '[t]he alternation of times and of places', 'the contrast of mirth and seriousness', and 'the mixture of dialogical and lyrical ingredients' (*Lectures*, ii. 101). One consequence of its mixed character is that romantic drama, 'strictly speaking, can neither be called tragedy nor comedy in the sense of the ancients' (*Lectures*, i. 18). More generally, Schlegel presents here a theoretical basis for the practice of mixed style, which has been identified as a fundamental characteristic of Romantic literature both by contemporary German theorists and current scholarship.[44] The most famous English example may be Wordsworth and Coleridge's *Lyrical Ballads*, and, according to David Duff, 'signs of that combinatorial impulse' were 'everywhere' in England;[45] but, one poet can still be singled out, as Duff does: 'Of the British Romantics, none goes further in the art of genre-mixing, and in the theorization of that art, than Percy Bysshe Shelley.'[46] Whilst a combinatorial impulse was in the air, one can still assign an influence to Schlegel, I argue, for it is not until after Shelley read the *Lectures* that he theorizes on mixed form, as in the *Defence*, and composes his masterpiece in this respect, *Prometheus Unbound: A Lyrical Drama*, 'the most formally complex of all mixed-genre works of the period'.[47]

In its relation to Shelley, each of Schlegel's instances of romantic intermixtures will be illustrated and discussed in more detail in subsequent chapters, but the most important examples shall be adumbrated here for the sake of a more direct comparison with Schlegel. Variations of places and leaps in time occur in all of Shelley's dramatic works apart from *Hellas*. The action in *The Cenci*, for

---

[44] See, for instance, David Duff's chapter 'The Combinatorial Method', in *Romanticism and the Uses of Genre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 160-200.
[45] Duff, *Romanticism and the Uses of Genre*, 160.
[46] Duff, *Romanticism and the Uses of Genre*, 191.
[47] Duff, *Romanticism and the Uses of Genre*, 191.

instance, takes place over approximately six days and is situated in various locations in Rome and the Castle of Petrella. *Charles the First*, if fully executed, is likely to have comprised at least fifteen years and the setting moves around freely.[48] Even *Hellas* only theoretically observes the neoclassical unities because it can be understood as repeatedly stepping out of the limits of time and space altogether due to its concern with the cosmic level and its long historical accounts.

As Schlegel promotes the mixture of seriousness and 'mirth', or tragedy and comedy,[49] so does Shelley, arguing in the *Defence* that 'The modern practice of blending comedy with tragedy [...] is undoubtedly an extension of the dramatic circle [...]. It is perhaps the intervention of this principle which determines the balance in favour of *King Lear* against the *Oedipus Tyrannus* or the *Agamemnon*' (*OWC*, 683).[50] In fact, Shelley considered not only Shakespeare but also Calderón as prime example of this intermixture, for in a letter to Peacock, he observed that Calderón 'resembles' Shakespeare 'in the rare power of interweaving delicate & powerful comic traits with the most tragical situations without diminishing their interest' (*PBSL*, ii. 120). This aspect will be further explored in Chapter 5, because, according to Medwin, 'Shelley meant to have made the last of king's fools, Archy, a more than subordinate among his dramatis personæ, as Calderon has done in his

---

[48] My estimate is based on Nora Crook's calculations that the first two acts covered seven years and that the drama would have continued 'to the King's execution eight years later, possibly even beyond' ('Shelley's Late Fragmentary Plays: "Charles the First" and the "Unfinished Drama"', in Alan M. Weinberg and Timothy Webb [eds.], *The Unfamiliar Shelley*, 305).

[49] '[T]he *tragic* and *comic* bear the same relation to one another as *earnestness* and *mirth*' (*Lectures*, i. 40).

[50] To be sure, Samuel Johnson had already pointed out before Schlegel that 'Shakespeare's plays are not in the rigorous and critical sense either tragedies or comedies' (*Johnson on Shakespeare*, ed. Arthur Sherbo, Vols. VII-VIII of Allen T. Hazen [ed.], *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968], vii. 66). However, Johnson stresses less the blend of the two than the generally 'mingled' character of Shakespeare's dramas.

Cisma d'Ingalaterra' (*Life*, 343). Finally, 'the mixture of dialogical and lyrical ingredients' will be examined particularly in *Prometheus Unbound* and *Hellas*, which both indicate this aspect already in their shared subtitle, 'A Lyrical Drama' – the denomination of 'drama' resulting from 'its being composed in dialogue', as Shelley explains in his Preface to *Hellas* (*SPP*, 430).

Directly related to these mixed and expansive characteristics is an important, more general contrast between ancient and modern drama, which Schlegel presents at the beginning of his work and elaborates in the second volume: 'the spirit of ancient art and poetry is *plastic*, and that of the moderns *picturesque*' (*Lectures*, i. 9). Consequently, ancient tragedy compares to a group in sculpture, as the 'figures correspond to the characters, their grouping to the action' (*Lectures*, ii. 99), whilst romantic drama

> must be viewed as a large picture, where not merely figure and motion are exhibited in richer groups, but where even what surrounds the persons is also portrayed; where we see not merely the nearest objects, but are allowed the prospect of a considerable distance, and all this under a magical light. (*Lectures*, ii. 99-100)

Thus romantic drama 'does not, like the old tragedy, separate seriousness and the action in a rigid manner from among the ingredients of life; it embraces at once the whole of the checkered drama with all its circumstances' (*Lectures*, ii. 100-101). Nancy Goslee has ingeniously analyzed *Prometheus Unbound* in relation to Schlegel's terms and has shown how Shelley moved from a sculpturesque first act to a 'picturesque' drama, thereby suggesting that he was well aware of the German

critic's concepts.[51] Even if Schlegel compares romantic drama to 'a fragment cut out of the optic scene of the world' (*Lectures*, ii. 100), this should not deceive us about its scope: it often involves a plethora of characters, an ambitious time-scale, wide shifts in space, and vast perspectives. Out of Shelley's dramatic works, *Charles the First*, to be discussed in Chapter 5, is the play that best illustrates this aspect.

Anticipating a neoclassicist critique of portraying 'circumstances' and surroundings, Schlegel attacks 'the prosaical species of criticism' which fails to recognize that the picturesque nature of the romantic drama 'requires richer accompaniments and contrasts for its main groupes' (*Lectures*, ii. 127). This type of critic 'never looks for more than the logical connexion of causes and effects' 'instead of penetrating to the central point and viewing all the parts as so many irradiations from it' (*Lectures*, ii. 126). Lines such as these, or his forceful assertion that mixtures in romantic drama 'are not mere licenses but true beauties' (*Lectures*, ii. 101), reveal Schlegel's perceived need to constantly defend what was seen as formlessness and lack of unity. He did so mainly in two ways: first, by arguing that the spirit of poetry naturally assumes a new form in a new age, and second, by promoting a different understanding of form altogether, which leads to his famous distinction between mechanical and organic form.

Romantic Form and Organic Unity

Schlegel was far from endorsing a neglect of form: 'The poetic spirit requires to be limited', he explained, for 'otherwise its strength will be evaporated in boundless vacuity' (*Lectures*, ii. 94). 'The works of genius cannot therefore be allowed to be

---

[51] Nancy M. Goslee, *Uriel's Eye: Miltonic Stationing and Statuary in Blake, Keats, and Shelley* (University: University of Alabama Press, 1985), 134-89.

without form' (*Lectures*, ii. 94). However, given the interrelationship between literature and the historical socio-political conditions, illustrated at length in the differences between the 'classical' and the 'romantic', the 'spirit of poetry' will always fashion for itself a new 'body' throughout the ages (*Lectures*, ii. 95). In fact, poetry '*must* assume a new and peculiar form in different ages' (*Lectures*, i. 49; emphasis added). As much as Schlegel entertained 'an enthusiastic adoration for the Greeks' (*Lectures*, i. 49), due to his sense of historical determination, he asserts that there are no transhistorical aesthetic principles, particularly no universally and eternally valid forms. He illustrates his assertions by tracing the origin of specific structural and stylistic elements of ancient Greek tragedy to historical circumstances. For instance, the presence of the chorus can be related to the fact that 'publicity, according to the republican notion of the Greeks, was essential to a grave and important transaction' (*Lectures*, i. 55). Moreover, Schlegel argues that the difference between the ancients and the moderns in the treatment of time and space is due to the state of the Greek stage (*Lectures*, i. 348), the constant presence of the chorus, the mythological subjects, and, above all, to the difference between 'the plastic spirit of the antique, and the picturesque spirit of the romantic poetry' (*Lectures*, i. 348-9).[52] Consequently, no literature of a certain nation or period must be judged by rules of another (*Lectures*, ii. 95), and, more importantly, imitation in general, including that of the Greeks, must strictly be avoided.

Schlegel emphasizes that '[t]he Greeks neither inherited nor borrowed their dramatic art from any other people; it was original and native, and for that very reason it could produce a living and powerful effect' (*Lectures*, ii. 93). Likewise, the

---

[52] Schlegel explains that 'the tragic art of the ancients annihilates in some measure the external circumstances of space and time; while the romantic drama adorns by their changes its more diversified pictures' (*Lectures*, i. 349).

Spanish and English, in contrast to other modern European nations, 'possess a theatre entirely original and national' (*Lectures*, ii. 93).[53] The stage of the fifteenth century originated from the allegorical and spiritual Moralities and Mysteries, and, unacquainted with ancient dramatists, was free from any classical influences. 'In those rude beginnings lay the germ of the romantic drama as a peculiar invention' (*Lectures*, i. 26). Thus, with autonomous literary traditions, the Spanish and the English drama stand on the same level as ancient Greek theatre; had they prior to the Romantics been depreciated because of their neglect of neoclassical rules, they were now appreciated for this very reason by Schlegel and his circle.

At the same time as Shelley maintained that artistic works had a transhistorical *value* (which could, however, only ever be partially understood due to the limitations of one's own historical horizons), he embraced Schlegel's historicism and its consequences with regards to *form*, for his critical writing not only demonstrates an awareness of historical relativism, but he also opposed transhistorical aesthetic norms and imitation. His remarks on the latter in the fifth and sixth paragraphs of the Preface to *Prometheus Unbound* were mainly written in refutation of the accusation that he had imitated Wordsworth in *The Revolt of Islam* (*OWC*, 744), but in these paragraphs, Shelley displays the same historicist attitude as Schlegel when he stresses that human thought and literature are dependent on the respective historical conditions. For example, he argues that, '[i]f England were divided into forty republics' comparable to Athens, 'each would produce philosophers and poets equal to those' of ancient Greece (*SPP*, 208), and, because poets, artists, and philosophers are 'the creations of their age' (*SPP*, 208), those of

[53] Schlegel here excludes German national theatre from any judgement, as it 'is but forming' (*Lectures*, ii. 93).

the same period, such as Shakespeare and Fletcher, will necessarily share similarities. This idea, expressed in terms of a 'spirit of the age' at the close of the *Defence* (*OWC*, 701), is a corollary of the historicist perception, as is Shelley's rejection of universally valid forms. Regarding 'traditional forms of harmony and language', he argues in the *Defence* that 'every great poet must *inevitably* innovate upon the example of his predecessors in the exact structure of his peculiar versification' (*OWC*, 679; emphasis added). Shelley's works in themselves are sufficient proof that he embraced constant formal innovation, but he also articulates his principles of composition: '"Prometheus Unbound" is [...] not, as the name would indicate, a mere imitation of the Greek drama, or indeed if I have been successful, is it an imitation of anything' (*PBSL*, ii. 219). Imitation is even linked to 'the decay of social life', as in such periods, '[t]ragedy becomes a *cold imitation* of the form of the great masterpieces of antiquity' (*Defence*, *OWC*, 685; emphasis added). Thus, despite his admiration and enthusiasm for the ancients, Shelley, as Schlegel before him, recognized the impossibility and undesirability of copying them in spirit and form. At the same time as historical determinism or relativism distances authors from past periods, it allowed Shelley to truly appreciate religious authors such as Milton, Dante, or Calderón, for any questionable notions expressed in their writing 'are merely the mask and the mantle' of these poets, attributable to their age (*Defence*, *OWC*, 691).

August Wilhelm Schlegel was not unique in his historicism. The historicity of classical literature and art had already begun to be examined critically in the late eighteenth century and 'classical (for the most part Roman) works ceased to be

regarded as aesthetically normative', as Nicholas Halmi points out.[54] Shelley, however, would not have found the historical relativism of literature expressed to the same extent elsewhere, since it was still a predominantly German thought. In France, Madame de Staël, influenced by German Romanticism, was the first to spread the idea of a relationship between literature and 'religion, manners, and laws' in *De la littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales* (*On Literature Considered in Its Relationship to Social Institutions*, 1800), a work Shelley read in 1815, according to Mary's journal (*MWSJ*, i. 69).[55] Yet de Staël's investigation is cruder and, in the tradition of French eighteenth-century philosophers, emphasizes the progress of the human faculties and art,[56] whereas Schlegel, with his appreciation of the ancients, strikes an almost neutral tone that would have appealed to Shelley. Another aspect of the historical attitude has come out in this paragraph: the interdependence and interaction between literature and the current social and political circumstances. This central issue in both Schlegel and Shelley I shall turn to after the current discussion of form.

To further counter accusations of formlessness and establish a concept of form, Schlegel argued that most critics have understood the meaning of the term 'merely in a mechanical, and not in an organical sense. Form is mechanical when, through external influence, it is communicated to any material merely as an accidental addition without reference to its quality' (*Lectures*, ii. 94-5). Organical

---

[54] Nicholas Halmi, 'The Greco-Roman Revival', in David Duff (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of British Romanticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).
[55] Madame de Staël-Holstein, *De la littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales* ([s.l.]: [s.a.], 1800), iii, my translation. On the significance and consequences of Madame de Staël's conceptions see Alfredo de Paz, 'Innovation and Modernity', trans. Albert Sbragia, in Marshall Brown (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, Vol. V: *Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 29-48, here 32-3.
[56] See, for instance, pp. iii-iv of her 'Introduction'.

form, however, 'is innate; it unfolds itself from within, and acquires its determination along with the complete development of the germ.' As 'significant exterior' or 'speaking physiognomy', form gives true evidence of the 'hidden essence' (*Lectures*, ii. 95). Organic form thus fulfils Schlegel's requirement of 'a unity which lies much deeper, is much more fervent, and more mysterious' than the neoclassical unities, which are arbitrarily superimposed onto the material (*Lectures*, i. 337).

In the context of organic unity in the *Lectures*, Schlegel refers back to his essay on *Romeo and Juliet* (1797) – the very one published in *Ollier's Literary Miscellany* (1820) – in which he 'demonstrated the inward necessity of each [scene] with reference to the whole' (*Lectures*, ii. 127).[57] The essay ascertained, as Schlegel summarizes in the *Lectures*, that 'with the exception of a few plays of wit now become unintelligible or foreign to the present taste, [...] nothing could be taken away, nothing added, nothing otherwise arranged, without mutilating and disfiguring the perfect work' (*Lectures*, ii. 127). In addition to perfectly illustrating the inner unity he demanded for a romantic drama, Schlegel exemplified the necessary correspondence of content and form by relating the antithetical structure of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* to the antitheses inherent in the play's subject, love.[58]

With this understanding of organic wholeness and structure, Schlegel is free to argue that 'unity may be narrowed or enlarged at pleasure'. Having given a wider understanding of Aristotle's 'unity of action', he even suggests that romantic drama

---

[57] For this essay, Schlegel refers the reader to the first volume of *Charakteristiken und Kritiken* (1801) published by his brother and himself ('Ueber Shakspeare's [sic] Romeo und Julia', pp. 282-317), which however had derived from an article that first appeared in Friedrich Schiller's journal *Die Horen* in 1797 ('Ueber Shakespeare's Romeo und Julia', in *Die Horen: eine Monatsschrift*, 10.6 [1797], 18-48).
[58] *Ollier's Literary Miscellany*, 36-8.

can instantiate this unity, '[f]or every series of events or actions [...] may always be comprehended under a single point of view, and denoted by a single name' (*Lectures*, i. 334). To illustrate his claim, Schlegel chooses not a play by Shakespeare but one of Calderón's *comedias históricas*, *La aurora en Copacabana*.

> When Calderon [...] describes the conversion of Peru to Christianity, from the very beginning, that is, the discovery of the country, to the completion, and when nothing actually appears in his piece which had not an influence on that conversion; is not this as much an exemplification of unity in the above sense, as the most simple Grecian tragedy [...]? (*Lectures*, i. 334)

Shelley is unlikely to have known this play, but he perused a drama with an even larger time scale, *Origen, pérdida y restauración de la Virgen del Sagrario* (*The Origin, Loss, and Recovery of Virgin of the Sanctuary*), which is held together by a central 'figure', the image of the Virgin.[59] Its first act, or *jornada* in Spanish, is set in the seventh century, its second in the eighth, and its third in the eleventh, with a new set of characters appearing in each and the setting changing freely around the town and outskirts of Toledo. Because it is contained in the *Segunda Parte*, Shelley could also have been familiar with *Los tres mayores prodigios* (*The Three Great Miracles*), which is comparable in its construction, for its three acts are self-contained and have, with one exception, a new set of characters. Similar to the way in which the image of the Virgin holds together *La Virgen del Sagrario*, unity is bestowed by the figure of Hercules as he relates the first two 'miracles' (*prodigios*) to the third. Most of the

---

[59] *La aurora en Copacabana* was published in the *Cuarta parte de las comedias*, but, as this thesis establishes in Chapter 2, Shelley is likely to have had only copies of the *Primera*, *Segunda*, and *Octava parte de las comedias* before 1822, and of the *Verdadera Quinta* and *Sexta Parte* in 1822.

Calderón plays that Shelley refers to or quotes from include not only broad leaps in space but also gaps in time, as *El mágico prodigioso*, in which the year of Cipriano's apprenticeship with the devil is skipped between the second and third act. Since the English poet praised the 'satisfying completeness' of plays such as *La cisma de Ingalaterra* or *Los cabellos de Absalón* (*PBSL*, ii. 154), he appears to have been as convinced as Schlegel was of the unity achieved by Calderón.

It seems ironic that Schlegel, having negated the universality of any aesthetic rules, appears still keen to prove that romantic drama, such as Calderón's works, conforms to Aristotle's idea of a unity of action. However, whilst Schlegel's promotion of romantic drama took place in fierce opposition to neoclassicism, it also occurred together with a true appreciation and close study of classical literature, in which Shelley resembled him. The German critic emphasized that the neoclassicists 'derived their ideas more from Aristotle, and especially from Seneca, than from an intimate acquaintance with the Greek models themselves' (*Lectures*, i. 320). Moreover, he gleefully exposed their limited knowledge and misconception of the *Poetics*: 'It is amusing enough to see the name of Aristotle borrowed to sanction these three unities, while the only one of which he speaks with any degree of fulness [sic] is the first, the unity of action' (*Lectures*, i. 325-6). Indeed, Aristotle was silent on the subject of place and not prescriptive but descriptive in his comments on time – or, as Schlegel puts it, he 'merely makes historical mention of a peculiarity' (*Lectures*, i. 338): 'tragedy tends so far as possible to stay within a single revolution of the sun, or close to it'.[60] Even with regards to the unity of action, Schlegel points out, Aristotle had only loose ideas, as he understood action not 'as determination

[60] Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. and ed. Stephen Halliwell, Loeb Classical Library, 199; Aristotle 23 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 47.

and deed', but as 'merely something that takes place' (*Lectures*, i. 333). Shelley's admiration of the Greek dramatists needs hardly be recapitulated; the works of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides were his constant companions during his time in Italy.[61] His reading notes to Aeschylus's *Agamemnon*, which reveal how closely he was studying the form and content of Greek tragedy, demonstrate that he had the same desire as Schlegel to disprove the unities as classical: 'The unities cannot be observed in Agam.', he jots down before giving proof.[62] Schlegel sees in neoclassicism not only 'an endeavour to restore the ancient stage', but also an attempt, 'if possible, to perfect it' (*Lectures*, i. 18), so that Voltaire, for one, 'is often [...] most insupportable in his depreciation of the Greeks' (*Lectures*, i. 48). By showing neoclassicism to be in opposition to both romantic and classical drama, Schlegel, whilst pointing out their essential differences, intentionally and unintentionally drew the ancients and romantics closer together. When wondering rhetorically 'what path' German drama should 'now enter', he went so far as to first suggest that '[t]he genuine imitation of the Greek tragedy is more related to our way of thinking [than neoclassical drama]; but it is beyond the comprehension of the multitude, and must always remain a learned enjoyment of art for a few cultivated minds' (*Lectures*, ii. 387). Schlegel's contradiction and resistance to his own historical scheme was characteristic of German romanticism at large, and was for the most part motivated by his own appreciation of the ancients. Thus I want to point out that Shelley did not stand in opposition to August Wilhelm Schlegel when he was reading the ancient Greeks alongside the romantic Calderón and found

---

[61] For instance, in October 1821, he tells John Gisborne: 'I read the Greek dramatists & Plato forever' (*PBSL*, ii. 364), and Hogg: 'I read the tragedians, Homer, & Plato perpetually' (*PBSL*, ii. 360).

[62] HM 2177, *MYR:S*, iv. 334; folio *38r. As Shelley, Schlegel points out that time is skipped before Agamemnon's arrival in Mycenae (*Lectures*, i. 341).

inspiration in both. 'I have been reading nothing but Greek and Spanish', he wrote to Peacock in 1820, 'Plato and Calderon have been my gods' (*PBSL*, ii. 245). Consequently, one can even find a certain justification in the *Lectures* for Shelley's preservation of ancient elements in his dramatic works.[63]

As I have indicated in the context of form above, a historicist attitude such as Schlegel's not only impacts aesthetic questions. Yet, before we look at the wider implications, it is worth noting that the first expressions of what Shelley later termed the 'spirit of the age' – a corollary of historicism – are already to be found in his writing before the spring of 1818. In the Preface to the *Revolt of Islam* he states:

> I have avoided [...] the imitation of any contemporary style. But there must be a resemblance which does not depend upon their own will, between all the writers of any particular age. They cannot escape from subjection to a common influence which arises out of an infinite combination of circumstances belonging to the times in which they live, though each is in a degree the author of the very influence by which his being is thus pervaded. (*CPPBS*, iii. 117, lines 156-62)

As David Perkins has maintained, '[n]o one has put the concept of a literary period better'.[64] Nevertheless, Shelley's concerns here lie still mainly with style, form, and aesthetics overall, and the notion of a 'spirit of the age' carries a stronger sense of a

---

[63] See also Shelley's remark in the 'Preface' to *Prometheus Unbound*, referring to the Greek tragedians as well as to the 'romantic' Shakespeare: 'The imagery which I have employed will be found in many instances to have been drawn from the operations of the human mind, or from those external actions by which they are expressed. This is unusual in modern Poetry; although Dante and Shakespeare are full of instances of the same kind [...]. But the Greek poets [...] were in the habitual use of this power, and it is the study of their works [...] to which I am willing that my readers should impute this singularity' (*SPP*, 207).

[64] David Perkins, 'Literary History and Historicism', in Marshall Brown (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, Vol. V: *Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 338-61, here 340.

general intellectual climate or of a 'prevailing tone or tendency *of* a particular period of time', as the OED defines it, listing Shelley's use of the phrase in a letter of 1 May 1820 as the first occurrence.[65] Therefore I argue that Schlegel contributed something distinct to Shelley's pre-existing historicizing notions, since it is a significant step from the vaguer 'common influence' arising 'out of an infinite combination of circumstances' to Shelley's later perceptions on literature and the socio-political conditions, as detailed below.

Given that works of art are conditioned by historical circumstances, the literature of a certain age is closely interrelated with the respective social and political conditions, and the influence was reciprocal for Schlegel. For instance, he points out that the arts of the Romans also 'produce[d] corruption and degeneracy' (*Lectures*, i. 26). The drama being a public and social form, or 'the most worldly of all' genres, as Schlegel puts it (*Lectures*, i. 33), the connection is even more pronounced than in other modes of writing. It is of a 'powerful nature' and 'an engine for either good or bad purposes' (*Lectures*, i. 35).

Like Schlegel, Shelley affirms the reciprocal relationship between literature (in the widest sense) and the socio-political conditions. Indeed, this relation stands at the centre of the *Defence*,[66] and Shelley again and again returns to the idea: 'The

---

[65] The exact phrase or variations of it are, however, already found in the 1813 translation of Madame de Staël's *De l'Allemagne* (1813), a work Mary Shelley read in French in 1815 (*MWSJ*, i. 89). David Perkins argues that the expression 'the spirit of the age' was omnipresent in German discourse and became common in England after the publication of *De l'Allemagne* in English ('Literary History and Historicism', 339). For the first occurrence in Shelley's letter, see his remark on the ending of a play by Medwin, in which the main character 'should live on in [...] [a] dismal way' instead of killing himself: 'It is the spirit of the age & we are all infected with it' (*PBSL*, ii. 189).

[66] Hugh Roberts makes a similar argument, identifying 'the *Defence*'s principal subject' as '[t]he poet's and the poem's relationship to society' (*Shelley and the Chaos of History*, 294).

drama at Athens, or wheresoever else it may have approached to its perfection, ever co-existed with the moral and intellectual greatness of the age' (*OWC*, 684). The reverse equally applies, as he notes before his complaint about contemporary drama: 'in periods of the decay of social life, the drama sympathizes with that decay' (*OWC*, 685). And, finally, he formulates this notion comprehensively and in relation to the drama:

> The Drama being that form under which a greater number of modes of expression of poetry are susceptible of being combined than any other, the connection of beauty and social good is more observable in the drama than in whatever other form: and it is indisputable that the highest perfection of human society has ever corresponded with the highest dramatic excellence: and that the corruption or the extinction of the drama in a nation where it has once flourished is a mark of a corruption of manners, and an extinction of the energies which sustain the soul of social life. (*OWC*, 686)

Not only does Shelley single out the drama, but he portrays its combinatorial possibilities as decisive. Although he subsequently extends his claim to include 'poetry in its most extended sense', it is significant that he first presents the possible means of regeneration by reference to the drama: 'that [social] life may be preserved and renewed, if men should arise capable of bringing back the drama to its principles' (*OWC*, 686).

Shelley's concern is here – and even more strongly in 'A Philosophical View of Reform' (written a little more than a year before the *Defence*) – to establish a theory for effecting change. In 'A Philosophical View' he proclaims that poetry, meaning 'an intense and impassioned power of communicating intense and impassioned impressions respecting man and nature', is 'the most unfailing herald, or companion,

or follower, of an universal employment of the sentiments of a nation to the production of beneficial change' (*SC*, vi. 992). In this he goes one step beyond Schlegel, who did not have the same revolutionary drive, even though his emphasis on national aspects had political implications by counteracting the scattered regionalism in Germany.

Yet Schlegel's influence on Shelley's later thought is unquestionable and further evidenced by the fact that the historically attentive argument of the *Defence* is already anticipated in the 'Discourse on the Manners of the Antient Greeks Relative to the Subject of Love', composed in the summer of 1818. Having argued that the period 'between the birth of Pericles and the death of Aristotle, is undoubtedly [...] the most memorable in the history of the world', Shelley asks: 'What was the combination of moral and political circumstances which produced so unparalleled a progress during that short period in literature and the arts [...]'? (*Notopoulos*, 404).

If literature is so tightly bound up with the historical situation, what makes compositions from previous ages, especially from those with inferior social and political conditions, valuable and significant to later generations? Schlegel is quick to point out at the beginning of the *Lectures* that '[t]here is no monopoly of poetry for certain ages and nations' (*Lectures*, i. 3).

> Poetry, taken in its widest acceptation, as the power of creating what is beautiful [...], is a universal gift of Heaven, which is even shared to a certain extent by those whom we call barbarians and savages. (*Lectures*, i. 3)

Thus, there is something divine and eternal in a work of art, independent of historical determination. In the *Defence*, Shelley concurs with Schlegel in this as he asserts that 'Poetry is indeed something divine' (*OWC*, 696), and, whilst establishing

the reciprocity between literature and the historical conditions, he posits the idea of an ahistorical, 'eternal' portion in the work of art: 'A Poet participates in the eternal, the infinite and the one; as far as relates to his conceptions, time and place and number are not' (*OWC*, 677). Shelley's famous concept of the 'great poem' equally serves to affirm poetry's universal existence: even less perfect compositions such as the bucolic poets' can be recognized 'as episodes of that great poem, which all poets like the co-operating thoughts of one great mind have built up since the beginning of the world' (*OWC*, 687).

Despite arguing against universally valid rules throughout the *Lectures*, Schlegel supplements his historicist approach with a transhistorical, normative criterion: poetry must possess 'a living germ' (*Lectures*, i. 3):

> Internal excellence is alone decisive, and where this exists, we must not allow ourselves to be repelled by the external appearance. Every thing must be traced up to the root of our existence: if it has sprung from thence, it must possess an undoubted worth [...]. (*Lectures*, i. 3-4)

In the *Defence*, Shelley also uses the idea of the poem as a living plant that has to grow organically from a root, albeit in the context of translation.[67] Yet, more importantly, Schlegel's distinction between '[i]nternal excellence' and 'external appearance' conforms with some of the ideas behind Shelley's imagery of clothing. For instance, he argues that

> a poet considers the vices of his contemporaries as the temporary dress in which his creations must be arrayed, and which cover without concealing the eternal proportions of their beauty. [...] The beauty of the internal nature

[67] '[I]t were as wise to cast a violet into a crucible [...]. The plant must spring again from its seed or it will bear no flower' (*OWC*, 678).

> cannot be so far concealed by its accidental vesture, but that the spirit of its form shall communicate itself to the very disguise [...]. (*OWC*, 681)

This idea of the indispensable but ultimately transparent disguise is also found at the beginning of the *Lectures*, where Schlegel argues that a 'true critic' with a 'universality of mind' must 'recognize and respect whatever is beautiful and grand under those external modifications which are necessary to their existence, and which sometimes even seem to disguise them' (*Lectures*, i. 3). Schlegel's literary cosmopolitanism logically follows from his attitude and principles, and whilst Shelley, familiar with the language and major literary works of several cultures, would hardly have had to be converted, it is likely that the German strengthened his existing cosmopolitan inclination and demonstrated to him ways of approaching religious authors of a repellent 'vesture', such as the Catholic Calderón.

Signs of Schlegel's Influence and Shelley's Attitude Towards Byron's Dramatic Conceptions

There are many indications that Shelley was immediately and in the long term inspired by August Wilhelm Schlegel's *Lectures*, such as his enthusiasm for the drama, evidenced by his large number of completed or abandoned projects, his interest in Calderón, the use of form in *Prometheus Unbound*, or his fondness for generic and thematic mixtures. These parallels will comprehensively be drawn out in the following chapters. Here I shall consider a fundamental correspondence between Schlegel's and Shelley's conceptions of a new drama: their shared aversion to certain forms. To be sure, I do not intend to claim that the English poet simply copied Schlegel's conception of 'romantic drama', but I argue that it guided and influenced him decisively in his own search for a new drama. During his time in

Italy, Shelley made remarkably strong statements on dramatic forms and models, of which the most important ones are found in *A Defence of Poetry* as well as in his correspondence when reacting to Byron's plays and dramatic principles. I shall begin with the more famous assertions in the *Defence* before showing how he counters Byron's position by using arguments that closely resemble Schlegel's in the *Lectures*.

In the *Defence*, Shelley presents the two main strands of drama since the eighteenth century, neoclassical tragedy (mainly based on French models) and moralistic melodrama, as deeply inadequate. He complains that tragedy has become either 'a cold imitation of the form of the great masterpieces of antiquity, divested of all harmonious accompaniment of the kindred arts; and often the very form misunderstood' or

> a weak attempt to teach certain doctrines, which the writer considers as moral truths; [...]. Hence what has been called the classical and the domestic drama. Addison's *Cato* is a specimen of the one, and would it were not superfluous to cite examples of the other! (*OWC*, 685)[68]

Shelley obviously chimes with Schlegel's detestation of neoclassical plays (here called 'classical'), and his example, Joseph Addison's *Cato: A Tragedy*, popular on the English stage, was also selected for attack in the *Lectures* (ii. 318-20). If Shelley's outburst against the 'domestic drama' seems without precedent in the *Lectures*, it is only because Schlegel was loath to evoke it and did not even consider it worthy of an

---

[68] For more on the 'two main lines of development [...] that preceded romanticism's own experimentation with tragedy', pointed out by Shelley, see Jeffrey N. Cox, 'Romantic Tragic Drama and its Eighteenth-Century Precursors: Remaking British Tragedy', in Rebecca Bushnell (ed.), *A Companion to Tragedy*, Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture, 32 (Malden, MA / Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 411-34, here 411.

attack. His vague references to its prime representative in Germany from the late eighteenth century onwards, August von Kotzebue (1761-1819), were however helpfully explained by the translator John Black.[69] Ironically, Kotzebue's (domestic) dramas, written in a melodramatic mode and marked by 'ordinary morality',[70] gained popularity in England and came to present another kind of cosmopolitanism,[71] so that Shelley and Schlegel were indeed opposing a shared threat to dramatic quality.

Byron was equally opposed to popular melodrama; but, whereas Schlegel and Shelley countered it with a 'romantic' form, he promoted neoclassical drama as the antidote to be employed in reforming the genre. Or, to put it more succinctly, Shelley's problem was Byron's solution. Thus, whilst Paul H. Fry has argued that 'the strictly neoclassical in England is to a large extent a straw man' and a 'dead horse' in the Romantic period,[72] Shelley was in fact flogging a quadruped that was still very much alive in his immediate surroundings. Directly confronted with the problem of popular melodramatic productions on the London stage, the appalled Byron tried to restore the 'regular' drama as a member of the subcommittee for Drury Lane in the 1815-1816 season – without lasting success, as financial concerns eventually

---

[69] Cf. *Lectures*, i. 36n and ii. 280n.
[70] For more on Kotzebue's plays in England, see pages 45-9, and for his 'ordinary morality', a term borrowed from Hegel's analysis of melodrama, pages 48-9 in Jeffrey N. Cox, *In the Shadows of Romance: Romantic Tragic Drama in Germany, England, and France* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1987).
[71] Jeffrey N. Cox has called melodrama 'a trans-European theatrical form' ('British Romantic Drama in a European Context', in Christoph Bode and Sebastian Domsch (eds.), *British and European Romanticisms: Selected Papers from the Munich Conference of the German Society for English Romanticism* (Trier: WVT, 2007), 115-30, here 126.
[72] Fry, 'Classical Standards in the Period', 10 and 11.

brought back 'illegitimate' conventions,[73] but his personal battle against melodrama continued. In his own dramatic compositions, he turned to neoclassicism after *Manfred*, a 'metaphysical' drama (*BLJ*, v. 170), rejecting as models both Shakespeare ('the *worst* of models – though the most extraordinary of writers', *BLJ*, viii. 152) and the 'Old Dramatists'. 'My dramatic simplicity is *studiously* Greek, and must continue so: *no* reform ever succeeded at first. I admire the old English dramatists; but this is quite another field, and has nothing to do with theirs', he told John Murray in August 1821 (*BLJ*, viii. 187).

After Shelley's reunion with Byron in August 1821, he saw himself directly competing against his fellow expatriate, not simply because of outer circumstances – they began living close to each other in Pisa – but in particular because they found their dramatic conceptions diametrically opposed.[74] The year before, Byron had composed his first neoclassical tragedy, *Marino Faliero*, which was published in 1821, and he continued to adhere to the neoclassical rules as best as he could. Referring to *Sardanapalus* and *The Two Foscari*, respectively, he wrote in the Preface to the volume containing these works together with *Cain* (published in December 1821) that

> The Author has in one instance attempted to preserve, and in the other to approach the 'unities;' conceiving that with any very distant departure from them, there may be poetry, but can be no drama. (*BCPW*, vi. 16)

---

[73] Alan Richardson, 'Byron and the Theatre', in Drummond Bone (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Byron* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 133-50, here 134-5.

[74] The best account of Shelley's and Byron's competition is Charles E. Robinson's *Shelley and Byron: The Snake and Eagle Wreathed in Fight* (Baltimore / London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976). See, e.g., 144-60 for the differences between *The Cenci* and *Marino Faliero*.

Ironically, the Preface echoes Shelley's remark in a letter to Leigh Hunt on 26 August 1821, that 'if "Marino Faliero" is a drama, the "Cenci" is not' (*PBSL*, ii. 345). Shortly after, Shelley concisely elaborated their contrary positions in a letter to Horace Smith, informing him that Byron

> is occupied in forming a new drama, and [...] is determined to write a series of plays, in which he will follow the French tragedians and Alfieri, rather than those of England and Spain, and produce something new, at least, to England. This seems to me the wrong road [...]. (*PBSL*, ii. 349)

Opposing Byron's principles, Shelley directly resorts to Schlegel's suggestions for a new, 'romantic' drama by promoting English and Spanish playwrights, certainly having in mind above all, if not exclusively, Shakespeare and Calderón. The German critic had equally argued in the *Lectures* that the 'wrong road' led past the neoclassical French tragedians and the predominantly neoclassical Italians, such as Vittorio Alfieri; 'the principles of tragic art which Alfieri followed are altogether false', Schlegel maintained (*Lectures*, i. 313). Yet Shelley saw hope for Byron, envisaging that '[h]e will shake off his shackles as he finds they cramp him' and 'soften down the severe and unharmonising traits of his "Marino Faliero"' (*PBSL*, ii. 349). He must have felt confirmed on seeing *Cain* (cf. *PBSL*, ii. 388) and *The Deformed Transformed*, which displayed traces of Shelley's discussion of Calderón's *El purgatorio de San Patricio* (*The Purgatory of Saint Patrick*) with Byron as well as of his partial translations of Calderón's *El mágico prodigioso* and Goethe's *Faust*.[75]

---

[75] For the Calderonian influence on Byron's fragmentary play, see Charles E. Robinson, 'The Devil as Doppelganger in *The Deformed Transformed*: the Sources and Meaning of Byron's Unfinished Drama', in Robert F. Gleckner and Bernard Beatty (eds.), *The Plays of Lord Byron: Critical Essays* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997), 321-46, an abridged reprint of the article originally published in *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, 74 (1970), 177-202. I have

The following chapter will elaborate Shelley's engagement with Calderón in detail in order to demonstrate the importance the Spanish playwright held for him and to determine which works he either read for certain or was likely to have been familiar with and which preoccupied him most. This will enable us to identify or rule out specific points of influence as well as to establish the general manner of Shelley's reception. As we shall see, Schlegel not only inspired the English poet to learn Spanish and read Calderón's dramas but also influenced his approach to the Golden Age playwright.

---

made similar arguments, focusing on the influence of Calderón's devil and notions of evil in an unpublished conference paper, '*The Deformed Transformed* and Calderón de la Barca's Devil', given at the International Byron Society Conference in Valladolid, Spain (27 June to 1 July 2011).

Chapter 2: 'Voyaging [...] from island to island': Shelley's Reading of Calderón

> I have been lately voyaging in a sea without my pilot, & although my Sail has often been torn, my boat become leaky, & the log lost, I have yet sailed in a kind of way from island to island Some of craggy & mountainous magnificence, some clothed with moss & flowers & radiant with ~~flo~~ fountains, some barren desarts. __ I have been reading Calderon without you. (Shelley to Maria Gisborne, 16 November 1819)[1]

Whilst Shelley occasionally came across some 'barren desarts', the magnificence and beauty to be found in Calderón compelled him onwards from play to play, despite the difficulties he encountered in the reading process. After having acquired a working knowledge of Spanish, it only took him approximately a month to read about twelve of Calderón's plays, and he always faithfully returned to the Calderonian Ocean after each foray into other authors or 'journey across the great sandy desert of Politics' (*PBSL*, ii. 150). This chapter traces Shelley's reading of Calderón from July 1819 up to his death in 1822, gathering all available details and hints in order to present a comprehensive view, which contrasts with the limited picture we receive when only taking into account the few dramas the English poet refers to by title. The conclusion of this study will form the basis for the final part of this chapter, in which I shall try to identify the Calderón edition, or editions, Shelley used. As Shelley does not refer to all of the plays he read by title (telling his correspondents that he read 'about 12 of his Plays', 'three or four others', or 'several

---

[1] I am very grateful to Dr. Bruce Barker-Benfield for permission to consult the original letter, Bodleian, MS. Shelley c. 1, ff. 318-19. 4 pp. 8vo (d-s). All subsequent citations from this letter are taken from my own transcription unless stated otherwise (cf. *PBSL*, ii. 154-5).

more' [*PBSL*, ii. 120, 150, 436]), detecting which volumes he is likely to have used will enable a well-informed conjecture about which dramas he may have known and at what time. This is significant, for, in various instances, scholars have suggested particular influences that my findings have shown to be impossible.[2] Conversely, I shall suggest influences that have hitherto been neglected for lack of evidence; for instance, Chapter 5 will suggest that Calderón's mythological plays helped inspire Act IV of *Prometheus Unbound*.[3] Shelley's excerpts and translations from Calderón will here only be briefly put into context, as a more detailed discussion of these can be found in Chapter 3 and, in case they relate to specific works by Shelley, in the relevant sections of the remaining chapters.

As Shelley's interest in Calderón is unprecedented in England in its scholarliness and scope, I shall briefly sketch the Spaniard's reception by previous English writers in order to underline my argument that it was August Wilhelm Schlegel who drew the poet's attention to Calderón and guided him in his focus and choice of plays. All in all, we can assert that Calderón's name and works were virtually unknown by the public before the Romantic Period. Especially after the Restoration in 1660, some English dramatists used Spanish plays as models, including works by Calderón, and pillaged them for material. The most famous of

---

[2] For instance, Michael Rossington suggests that Shelley may have derived his 1819 images of the 'Monster of water and fire' (fragmentary lyric, 'Child of Despair and Desire', *PS*, iii. 217) and 'Monstruo di fuego e acqua' (*PBSL*, ii. 132) from a phrase in Calderón's *El mágico prodigioso* (*PS*, iii. 215), a play which, I argue, he did not possess until January 1822.

[3] Jessica K. Quillin has suggested that Shelley knew 'several semi-operatic plays' by Calderón but fails to give any evidence and to substantiate her claim; moreover, he could not have read the drama Quillin mentions, *La estatua de Prometeo* (*The Statue of Prometheus*), contained in the *Quinta Parte* of 1677 and the *Sexta Parte* (1683), before 1822, as my identification of Shelley's first Calderón edition will reveal (*Shelley and the Musico-Poetics of Romanticism* [Farnham: Ashgate, 2012], 105 and 105n20).

these, John Dryden, for instance lifted the story of *El astrólogo fingido* for *An Evening's Love, or the Mock Astrologer* (1671). However, the original plays were not acknowledged, and the very fact that such plagiarism went undetected attests to their unfamiliarity in England. In fact, one cannot even attribute a true knowledge of the source material to these English dramatists given that the Spanish *comedias* were merely known through French or Dutch adaptations and very loose translations. Moreover, almost all of the plays adapted in England were *comedias de capa y espada*, 'cloak and sword plays', or pieces of intrigue about love and honour, which represent only one dramatic form of Calderón's enormous oeuvre.[4] The situation did not improve for Calderón in the eighteenth century, which saw only three plays based either on *comedias* or on other works that had in turn been adapted from them.[5]

After the turn of the century, two of Shelley's countrymen made efforts to introduce the English public to Calderón: Lord Holland, who anonymously published two translations in 1807;[6] and Thomas Holcroft, who included two – rather loose –

---

[4] For Calderón's reception in England before 1700 I have consulted the following works: Jorge Braga Riera, *Classical Spanish Drama in Restoration English (1660-1700)* (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2009), and John Loftis, 'La comedia española en la Inglaterra del siglo XVII', in Henry W. Sullivan, Raúl A. Galoppe, and Mahlon L. Stoutz (eds.), *La comedia española y el teatro europeo del siglo XVII* (London: Tamesis, 1999), 101-19.

[5] See Appendix II in Luisa-Fernanda Rodríguez Palomero, 'Calderón, Shelley y Roy Campbell: Un apunte sobre la seducción', in M. D. de Asís and I. Pérez Cuenca (eds.), *Calderón de la Barca y su aportación a los valores de la cultura europea: Actas de las Jornadas Internacionales de Literatura Comparada celebradas en la Universidad San Pablo-CEU, 14 y 15 de noviembre de 2000*, Centro Virtual Cervantes, <http://cvc.cervantes.es/literatura/calderon_europa/palomero.htm>.

[6] *Three Comedies, Translated from the Spanish* (London: Hatchard, 1807), including *The Fairy Lady* and *Keep Your Own Secret*, translations of Calderón's *La dama duende* and *Nadie fíe su secreto*.

translations by his daughter Fanny in issues of his *Theatrical Recorder* in 1805.[7] Again, both Lord Holland and the Holcrofts only selected examples from one type of drama, the *comedias de capa y espada*. To be sure, the comedies were suitable for attracting the wider audiences, but Lord Holland also had other motivations for his exclusive interest in the 'cloak and sword plays', which he expounds in his anonymous Preface: these dramas were free from several faults usually found in Spanish theatre, namely a neglect of the unities, a violation of historical facts, and the introduction of 'sacred subjects on the stage and [the] profaning [of] those subjects with the invention of false and absurd miracles'.[8] His position represents a typical neoclassical stance, and, as I have shown in the previous chapter, it was precisely these supposed 'faults' that attracted August Wilhelm Schlegel and subsequently Shelley to Calderón.

'Specimens of the very highest dramatic power': Shelley's First Encounter with Calderón's Works in 1819

Shelley first mentioned Calderón on 25 July 1819, in a letter to Thomas Jefferson Hogg: 'I have been reading "La Devocion della Cruz" and the "Purgatorio di San Patricio", in both of which you will find specimens of the very highest dramatic power' (*PBSL*, ii. 105). His great admiration for the Spanish playwright almost instantly manifested itself in his work: in the 'Preface' to *The Cenci*, a work

---

[7] *From Bad to Worse* (*Peor está que estaba*), trans. Fanny Holcroft, in Thomas Holcroft (ed.), *The Theatrical Recorder*, 1.4 (April 1805), 223-64. *Fortune Mends* (*Mejor está que estaba*), trans. Fanny Holcroft, in Thomas Holcroft (ed.), *The Theatrical Recorder*, 2.8 (August 1805), 75-111. Both plays are lightly annotated and followed by a short section of 'Remarks' by Thomas Holcroft.

[8] 'Preface', in *Three Comedies*, iii-xv, here vii.

completed on 8 August (*MWSJ*, i. 294),[9] Shelley admits to an instance of 'plagiarism' from *El purgatorio de San Patricio (The Purgatory of Saint Patrick)*, which he 'intentionally committed' in 'Beatrice's description of the chasm appointed for her father's murder' ('Preface', *SPP*, 143).[10] That Shelley should have needed to resort to another author's description is surprising, as is the fact that he draws such attention to it when he keeps silent over his echoes of Shakespeare in this play. Given that Calderón was mostly unknown in England, the 'plagiarism' would certainly have gone unnoticed; moreover, it is not even plagiarism in the strictest sense, for he creatively extends and alters the original, as discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Therefore, the reference to *El purgatorio de San Patricio* in *The Cenci* may relate to Shelley's immediate desire to promote the playwright he had just discovered, a sentiment that also shows in his private correspondence. 'Let me recommend you who know Spanish to read some plays of their great dramatic genius Calderon' (*PBSL*, ii. 105), Shelley told Hogg in the letter of 25 July; and Peacock is informed of the Spaniard's high status on 24 August (*PBSL*, ii. 115) and 21 September (*PBSL*, ii. 120). The comparison he drew for Peacock – 'a kind of Shakespeare is this Calderon' (*PBSL*, ii. 115) – immediately echoes August Wilhelm Schlegel's association of the two playwrights in his presentation of them as prime examples of romantic drama. Shelley early considered rendering Calderón into English, probably not only to substitute a lack of inspiration for original

---

[9] Shelley made later revisions (*MWSJ*, i. 294).

[10] See *The Cenci*, *SPP*, III. i. 247-65. For the relevant Spanish passage see Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *El purgatorio de San Patricio*, ed. J. M. Ruano de la Haza, Publications of the Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, Textual Research and Criticism Series (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1988), 130, Act 2, lines 2019-34; the text is available online on the editor's website: http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~jmruano/purgatorio.1.pdf. An English translation can be found in *Dramas of Calderon: Tragic, Comic, and Legendary*, Vol. 2, trans. Denis Florence Mac-Carthy, 2 vols. (London: Charles Dolman, 1853).

composition, as he suggested, but also in order to make the Golden Age dramatist accessible to his friends and countrymen: on 24 August he told Peacock, who lacked a knowledge of the Spanish language, that he had 'some thoughts, if I find that I cannot do anything better, of translating some of his plays' (*PBSL*, ii. 115).

Shelley began learning Spanish from Maria Gisborne presumably not long after 17 June 1819, when he arrived in Livorno,[11] a city to which he, Mary and Claire had moved from Rome (*MWSJ*, i. 291). Maria James Reveley Gisborne had been a friend of Mary Wollstonecraft and William Godwin, who unsuccessfully proposed to her in 1799, and she had nursed the infant Mary Shelley after her mother's death. With a letter of introduction from Godwin for his daughter,[12] the Shelleys first met the Gisbornes in Livorno on 9 May 1818 (*MWSJ*, i. 209). However, on 11 June they left to settle at the Bagni di Lucca. When in 1819 the Shelleys 'rented a Villa in our immediate vicinity near Leghorn,' as Maria Gisborne's son Henry Reveley later recalled, 'our friendship ripened into intimacy, so that we were continually at each others' houses and frequently all day long.'[13] The Spanish language and Calderón's plays were an important element of their meetings, as Shelley's letter to Peacock on [24] August 1819 underlines: 'at 1/2 past 5. pay a visit to Mrs. Gisborne who reads Spanish with me until near seven' (*PBSL*, ii. 114). Henry Reveley furthermore recollected that Shelley

> was attracted by our library of ancient and modern books, with almost every variety of dictionary and lexicon in a variety of languages, but more so by the deep literary studies of my mother and Mr Gisborne. It was the former who

---

[11] Rossington supports this assumption (*PS*, iii. 198).
[12] See *SC*, v. 512-13.
[13] Henry W. Reveley, 'Notes and Observations to the "Shelley Memorials"', written after October 1859 (item SC866), *SC*, x. 1141-2.

> introduced Shelley to the beauties of 'Calderon de la Barca', and other great Spanish Authors.[14]

However, there is no evidence that they looked at any other Spanish authors together in addition to Calderón,[15] who seems to have been Shelley's main or sole motivation for studying the language.[16] Not only did Shelley constantly read his works with Maria Gisborne in the beginning; his wording in the letter to Hogg of 25 July suggests that his language acquisition was propelled towards the one goal of making Calderón's works accessible: 'it is from Mrs. Gisborne that I learnt Spanish enough to read these plays' (*PBSL*, ii. 105).

Shelley later commemorated these joint readings and recorded his indebtedness in the *Letter to Maria Gisborne*, composed in late June or early July 1820:

> [...] how I, wisest lady! then indued
> The language of a land which now is free,
> [...] —that majestic tongue
> Which Calderon over the desert flung
> Of ages and of nations; and which found

---

[14] Reveley, 'Notes and Observations', *SC*, x. 1141.
[15] Shelley may, however, have picked up Miguel de Cervantes's *El cerco de Numancia* (*The Siege of Numantia*) on the Gisbornes' recommendation, for he asked Henry Reveley on 19 April 1821 to report to them that he has read 'the Numancia' and to convey his opinion of it (*PBSL*, ii. 286-7). Mary Shelley read Mateo Alemán's *Guzmán de Alfarache* (1599-1604) in October 1819 but certainly not in Spanish (*MWSJ*, i. 299), and she may have heard of the work through her father, who perused it in 1805 (see *The Diary of William Godwin*, ed. Victoria Myers, David O'Shaughnessy, and Mark Philp [Oxford: Oxford Digital Library, 2010]. http://godwindiary.bodleian.ox.ac.uk.)
[16] In this I contradict the Longman editors, who believe that Shelley's 'letter to Peacock of ?20-21 June suggests his motivation to study Calderón may initially have been, at least in part, to learn Spanish with a view to moving to Spain for his health' (*PS*, iii. 198; for the letter see *PBSL*, ii. 99).

An echo in our hearts, and with the sound

Startled Oblivion—thou wert then to me

As is a nurse, when inarticulately

A child would talk as its grown parents do. (*PS*, iii. lines 175-86)

At the same time as the English poet here stresses the transhistorical value of Calderón's works, which 'found / An echo in our hearts', he registers the historical differences that separate him and his contemporaries from this playwright of a different century and nationality. Suggesting a barrenness in the literary and cultural period that followed Calderón's time by using the word 'desert', Shelley further joins Schlegel in his assessment of the Spaniard as the epitome of romantic drama in Spain and as the terminus of any noteworthy drama in Europe. Moreover, these lines reveal Shelley interlacing his love for Calderón with his political hopes for freedom, having closely followed political events in Spain.[17] In *Hellas*, we shall find him again combining Calderonian echoes with the theme of liberty. Another play Shelley certainly studied with Maria Gisborne in addition to *La devoción de la cruz* and *El purgatorio de San Patricio* before leaving Leghorn on 30 September 1819 was *El príncipe constante* (*The Constant/Steadfast Prince*).[18] On 25 July, Shelley told

[17] Only about two months after his first perusal of Calderón, Shelley was provoked by Charles Clairmont's reports on Ferdinand VII's reactionary policy to write 'An Ode [Written, October, 1819, Before the Spaniards had recovered their Liberty]' (*PS*, iii. 162), which was followed by the 'Ode to Liberty' after the successful Spanish revolt in the spring 1820. For more on Shelley's political interest in Spain see Herman E. Hespelt, 'Shelley and Spain', *PMLA*, 38 (1923), 887-905.

[18] Although the earliest proof of his having read *El príncipe constante* does not appear until 6 November 1819, when, after using an excessive metaphor, he refers to his own writing as 'out-Calderonizing Muley' (*PBSL*, ii. 150), we can conclude from his letter to Maria Gisborne on 16 November 1819 that he read the play with her in Livorno: 'These pieces, [i.e. *La Cisma de Ingalaterra* and *Los cabellos de Absalón*,] inferior to those we read, at least to the "Principe Constante" [...]' (*PBSL*, ii. 154).

Hogg that 'The "Principe Constante" they say is also very fine' (*PBSL*, ii. 105),[19] which indicates that he was aware of its reputation but yet unable to form his own opinion, and his tone of anticipation suggests that he may have read the play shortly after.

Shelley soon profited from an additional Spanish teacher. Claire Clairmont's brother (and Mary Shelley's stepbrother) Charles arrived in Livorno on 4 September 1819, and, moving into the Palazzo Marini in Florence with the Shelleys on 2 October, stayed with them until he departed for Vienna on 10 November 1819 (*CCJ*, 114n). Charles had just returned from a fifteen-month stay in Spain (*CCJ*, 114n) and was fluent in the language so that Shelley made 'him read Spanish all day long', as he reported to Peacock on 21 September 1819 (*PBSL*, ii. 120). Unsurprisingly, Mary's journal records almost daily readings of Calderón for Shelley – either alone, with Charles Clairmont, Maria Gisborne, or both – from 12 to 22 September 1819 (*MWSJ*, i. 296-7), after which date Shelley leaves to arrange lodgings in Florence and feels unwell. By 21 September 1819, Shelley could already proclaim that he was reading Calderón with 'great ease' and had finished 'about 12 of his Plays' (*PBSL*, ii. 120). His initial enthusiasm had not waned but increased with his continued readings: some of his plays, he informed Peacock,

> deserve to be ranked among the grandest & most perfect productions of the human mind. He exceeds all modern dramatists with the exception of Shakespeare; whom he resembles however in the depth of thought & subtlety of imagination of his writings, & in the rare power of

[19] To whom Shelley's 'they' refers is indeterminable. Rossington points out that a detailed summary of *El príncipe constante* can be found in J. C. L. Simonde de Sismondi's *De la littérature du midi de l'Europe* (Paris: Treuttel and Würtz, 1813), iv. 144-58. Yet, there is no evidence that Shelley was familiar with this work (*PS*, iii. 67).

> interweaving delicate & powerful comic traits with the most tragical situations without diminishing their interest. (*PBSL*, ii. 120)

Shelley not only uses the Shakespeare comparison once more but also praises Calderón for a 'rare power' that constitutes one of Schlegel's characteristics of romantic drama: the mixture of comic and tragic elements.

On 30 September 1819, the Shelleys left Livorno for Florence, accompanied by the Clairmonts. Yet their friendship with the Gisbornes was sustained through regular correspondence, which would almost inevitably contain references to their shared passion, Calderón. In a letter to Henry Reveley on 28 October, Shelley calls the planned steam boat 'our "Monstruo di fuego e acqua"' [sic, for 'monstruo de fuego y agua'] (*PBSL*, ii. 132), which demonstrates that the fascination with Calderón was shared by the Gisbornes to such a degree that it even extended to Maria's son. Shelley's Spanish phrase could derive from the following line spoken by the *gracioso* Clarín in Act III of *La vida es sueño*: 'monstruo es de fuego, tierra, mar y viento' ('it is a monster of fire, earth, sea, and wind').[20] Shelley is likely to have read *La vida es sueño* by that date, as I demonstrate below, but he may also have adapted a phrase from *Los cabellos de Absalón*, a *comedia* he read between 30 September and 16 November. In the first act, Semey tells King David that he has come with his fleet and its boats, which are monsters of two elements: 'vengo / con tu armada y sus bajeles,

---

[20] Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *La vida es sueño*, ed. Ciriaco Morón, Letras Hispánicas, 57, 34th ed. (Madrid: Cátedra, 2012), line 2681. All subsequent references are to this edition. I am grateful to Michael Rossington for this suggestion. Nora Crook (email of 21 March 2013) proposes that it is 'a loose quotation' from the opening speech of the *Autor* in *El gran teatro del mundo*, an *auto sacramental*: 'monstruo de fuego y aire, de agua y tierra' ('monster of fire and air, of water and earth'; *Aguilar*, i. 203, line 20). However, there is unfortunately no evidence that Shelley was familiar with this work or any other contained in the respective volume of the only edition of *autos sacramentales* available in Shelley's lifetime.

/ monstrous de dos elementos' (705-7).[21] Yet no source can be established with certainty as many of Calderón's plays contain 'monsters' of elements,[22] or, more generally, animals or objects belonging to two or more elements, so that the mere repetition of such images may have fixed the idea in Shelley's head. Indeed, the 'monstruo de fuego y agua' also appears in draft lyrics amidst the intermediate draft of *The Mask of Anarchy*, as was first pointed out by Neville Rogers: 'Child of despaire [sic] & Desire / [Monster] of water & fire / Wingless sea-bird outspeeder' (*MYR:S*, iv. 110-11; 24r).[23] The final metaphor is inherently Calderonian, as the Spaniard frequently describes ships as birds and associate birds with fish, exchanging their bodily characteristics, wings and scales, as well as the elements into which they belong. For example, in *El mayor encanto amor*, Ulysses refers to his boat as 'pez que por las ondas buela, / aue que en los ayres nada', 'fish that flies on the waves, / bird that swims in the air'.[24] E. M. Wilson has illustrated and analyzed the almost excessive use of elements in Calderón, relating it to aspects of his world view, such as the belief that the stability of the world depended 'on the equilibrium of the

---

[21] The phrase appears again towards the end of *Los cabellos de Absalón*, but not to denote ships. Absalón addresses his horse as 'monstruo de dos elementos' (line 3113). This and all subsequent quotations from the play are taken from Calderón de la Barca, *Los cabellos de Absalón*, ed. Gwynne Edwards, The Commonwealth and International Library: Pergamon Oxford Spanish Division (Oxford: Pergamon, 1973).

[22] In seventeenth-century Spanish, *monstruo* differed in meaning, commonly denoting any being that is by birth 'against the natural rule or order' (Sebastián de Covarrubias y Orozco, *Tesoro de la Lengua Castellana, o Española* [Madrid: Luis Sanchez, 1611]).

[23] *Shelley at Work*, 95. For a different transcription of the fragmentary lyric and an extensive commentary, see *PS*, iii. 215-17. Rossington here convincingly argues that these lines cannot be dated with any certainty as they may well succeed the *Mask of Anarchy* draft of September 1819.

[24] *Parte segunda de* comedias, ed. Don Juan de Vera Tassis y Villarroel (Madrid: Francisco Sanz, 1686), 8.

constituent elements', which are forever in motion, interacting, and contrasting with each other.[25]

Having just finished a long letter to Leigh Hunt in his function as editor of *The Examiner*, Shelley wrote to the Gisbornes on 6 November:

> I have deserted the odorous gardens of literature to journey across the great sandy desert of Politics; not, you may imagine, without the hope of finding some enchanted paradise. In all probability, I shall be overwhelmed by one of the tempestuous columns which are forever traversing with the speed of storm & the confusion of a chaos that pathless wilderness. You meanwhile will be lamenting in some happy Oasis that I do not return. – This is out-Calderonizing Muley. (*PBSL*, ii. 150)

Even when not engaged with poetry, Shelley could not throw off Calderón's poetic style, a style which sparked his poetic imagination, and of which his grasp was now good enough for imitation.[26] In fact, even the word construction 'Calderonizing' is Calderonian since the conjugating of names – albeit with different meanings – appears in several *comedias*, mostly as a source of humour for the *graciosos*.[27] About

---

[25] E. M. Wilson, 'The Four Elements in the Imagery of Calderón', *The Modern Language Review*, 31.1 (1936), 34-47, here 35.

[26] Other critics also stress the significance of Shelley's 'Calderonizing'. Michael Rossington concludes that '[b]y the end of 1819 [...] "Calderonizing" had become a routine activity for the Shelleys' ('Beyond Nation: Shelley's European Dramas', 87), and Timothy Webb sees in the 'Calderonizing' a 'habit [...] which can be traced in his other letters of the period' (*Violet*, 206).

[27] For example, when the soldiers in *La vida es sueño* realize that they had mistaken Clarín for the Prince and therefore ask him why he pretended to be Segismundo, the *gracioso* counters that it was them who 'segismundized' him: 'Vosotros fuisteis los que / me segismundasteis' (Act 3, lines 2272-3). In *El galán fantasma*, Porcia accuses the *gracioso* Candil of pretending that his master kept him busy whilst it was in fact another love interest, Lucrecia; but Candil exclaims: 'El diablo me lucrecie' ('The devil lucrecize me'; *Parte Segunda*, ed. Vera Tassis [1686], 74a).

three weeks after this instance of 'Calderonizing', Mary gives further evidence of her husband's practice: in a letter written 27-30 November 1819, she tells Maria Gisborne that 'Shelley Calderonized on the late weather – he called it an epic of rain with an episode of frost & a few similes – concerning fine weather' (*MWSL*, i. 116).[28]

On 16 November 1819, Shelley reports to Maria Gisborne from Florence: 'I have been reading Calderon without you. I have read the "Cisma de Ingalaterra" the "Cabellos de Absalon" & three or four others.' Thus he certainly read all these plays after 30 September and some probably even later than 6 November, the date of his previous letter to the Gisbornes, in which he had declared himself to 'have deserted the odorous gardens of literature' (*PBSL*, ii. 150).[29] Shelley was truly immersed in Calderón at that point, commenting on *Los cabellos de Absalón*, elaborating on its incest scene, and (mis-)quoting two lines by Amón from the first act ('si sangre ~~con~~ sin fuego hiere / que fara sangre con fuego?' ['if blood boils without fire / what will blood do with fire?']).[30] As a postscript, he transcribed a passage from Carlos's speech in the first act of *La cisma de Ingalaterra*, asking Mrs Gisborne if 'there [is] any thing in Petrarch finer than the 2.[d] Stanza.'[31]

The same day, on 16 November, Shelley also told Leigh Hunt: 'With respect to translation – even I will not be ~~tempted~~ seduced by it although the greek plays &

---

[28] Webb dates this letter, which is postmarked 1 December at Livorno (*MWSL*, i. 117n1), 29 November (*Violet*, 229).

[29] According to Nora Crook, Shelley 'maybe' read these five or six plays after 14 October, 'when he had the opportunity to have mentioned this' in a letter to Maria Gisborne, but did not (email of 21 March 2013). Subsequent letters to the Gisbornes, prior to that of 6 November, dating from 21 and 28 October, are only business correspondence.

[30] The correct lines are: 'la sangre sin fuego hierve, / què harà la sangre con fuego?' (*Octava Parte de* comedias *verdaderas*, ed. Don Juan de Vera Tassis y Villarroel [Madrid: Viuda de Blas de Villanueva, 1726], 120a). Shelley transcribes 'hiere' ('harms') instead of 'hierve' ('boils').

[31] My own transcription from the original.

some of the ideal dramas of Calderon (with which I have lately, & with inexpressible wonder & delight become acquainted) are perpetually tempting me to throw over their perfect & glowing forms the grey veil of my own words' (*SC*, vi. 1081).[32] As his notebooks reveal, Shelley could not fully resist this temptation, for we find individual sentences and images translated or adapted in these.

Indeed, not only Shelley's letters but his notebooks also attest to his fascination with Calderón in the months following his first acquaintance with the Spaniard. Various excerpts in Spanish or in translation, made between October and November 1819 according to Nora Crook,[33] are found in Huntington MS. HM 2176 (*MYR:S*, vi),[34] and another quotation, hitherto unidentified and most likely noted down before late October 1819, is contained in *Bodleian MS Shelley adds. e. 12*, *The Homeric Hymns and* Prometheus *Drafts Notebook* (*BSM*, xviii).[35] The order of the excerpts in the Huntington Notebook – let alone their exact dates – cannot be determined with certainty, and Nora Crook has argued that, whilst some jottings come from recent readings, others were made when Shelley went through the plays for a second time. Thus, in the latter case, even if we could date the excerpts, we would still only have a *terminus ante quem* for Shelley's reading. Nevertheless, let us consider the sources of the transcriptions and evidence for datings in detail.

---

[32] For Jones's earlier transcription, without the precise date and with different orthography, see *PBSL*, ii. 153.
[33] Email of 21 March 2013. In my discussion of HM 2176 I follow mainly the argument of Nora Crook, who studied this notebook closely in 2012 and differs in her conclusions from Mary Quinn, the editor, in several instances.
[34] *Shelley's 1819-1821 Huntington Notebook: a Facsimile of Huntington MS. HM 2176 including Drafts of* Prometheus Unbound, *'Ode to the West Wind', 'The Sensitive Plant', 'Fragment of a Satire on Satire',* Una Favola, *together with Minor Poems and Fragments*, ed. Mary A. Quinn (New York / London: Garland, 1994), Vol. VI of *Manuscripts of the Younger Romantics: Shelley*.
[35] *The Homeric Hymns and* Prometheus *Drafts Notebook: Bodleian MS. Shelley adds. e. 12*, ed. Nancy Moore Goslee (New York / London: Garland, 1996), Vol. XVIII of *The Bodleian Shelley Manuscripts*.

The Homeric Hymns and Prometheus *Drafts Notebook*, in use from at least January 1818 to early 1821, contains a quotation from Calderón's *Judas Macabeo*, consisting of two lines from Judas's remark on seeing the sleeping Cloriquea in the second act: 'pues aunque duerma el sentido, / està en vela la hermosura' ('even though the senses may be asleep / her beauty is awake').[36] The transcription appears on the top of the notebook page and is followed by a free adaptation of these lines into English. Nancy Goslee, the facsimile editor, suggests that these jottings as well as a pencil drawing were already on the page when Shelley drafted lines underneath that would later appear, slightly altered, in the beginning of Act IV of *Prometheus Unbound* (*BSM*, xviii. 288-9). Consequently, Shelley must have read *Judas Macabeo* before late October 1819, the probable date of the *Prometheus Unbound* drafts on pages 52 and 59 (pages originally facing each other in the notebook) (*BSM*, xviii. 289). We do not have a definite *terminus ante quem* other than 25 July, but a date significantly after the end of July is more likely since Shelley seems to have read mostly plays from the *Primera Parte* when he first engaged with Calderón, whereas the drama on Judas Maccabeus is found in the *Segunda Parte*.

Even though Shelley possibly first took up the Huntington notebook HM 2176 in July and August 1819, he more likely used it from September to October 1819, according to Nora Crook.[37] The Calderón excerpts, all written in reverso except one,

---

[36] *adds. e. 12*, p. 52; *BSM*, xviii. 82. Goslee could not even make out the language of these badly smudged pencil lines, which she transcribes as '[?maes anque dome elesensir] / [?Esta di vela la femina mia]'; but, as an extended discussion of Shelley's Calderón edition at the end of this chapter will show, there can be little doubt about my identification. Due to the near illegibility of the Spanish lines, the quotation is taken from Vera Tassis's *Parte Segunda* (1686), 126b.

[37] I here follow Nora Crook (email of 21 March 2013), who argues that Garnett's identification of the lines on folio 3r as discards for *Julian and Maddalo* is false and that therefore Mary Quinn, accepting his identification, wrongly concluded that

come from four *comedias*, which are contained in three different volumes of the *editio princeps* and are spread across the notebook. I shall follow Crook's suggestion regarding their order, only reversing the excerpts from *Los cabellos de Absalón*. Shelley probably began with the fragments from *Origen, pérdida y restauración de la Virgen del Sagrario* (*The Origin, Loss and Restoration of the Virgin of the Sanctuary*), all in pencil and all taken from Selín's final speech close to the end of the play. On folio *10r he wrote 'And in that death like cave' and 'y voz humana' before turning the page over to continue with 'Her dress / Antique & strange & beautiful' on folio *11r.

In the next notetaking session, this time in ink, Shelley may have started with two quotations from *Los cabellos de Absalón* on folio *11r (underneath his excerpt from *La Virgen del Sagrario*): 'que de gozos' and 'Es tal que aun di mi silencio' . With the page filled, he could have then jotted down further lines from this play on the facing page on the left, 'I more esteem / Her whom I love' (*10v), before writing his final quotation from *Los cabellos de Absalón* onto folio *3v ('pero si dize un proverbio').[38] Not only do all these Calderón fragments stem from the same play, but, as Nora Crook has informed me, the ink is very similar throughout. Around the same time, Shelley probably copied lines from *El príncipe constante*, beginning 'A florecer las rosas madrugaron' (*11v) and followed by a translation, since they are in

---

Shelley used the notebook 'for the most part between spring or summer 1819 and late spring or early summer 1821' (*MYR:S*, vi. xix).

[38] I am reversing the order suggested by Crook for the excerpts from *Los cabellos* firstly, to keep with the order in which they appear in the play (cf. *Octava Parte de comedias verdaderas*, ed. Vera Tassis [1726], 110a and 110b; 112-13; and 120a), and secondly, because I cannot find a strong explanation for why Shelley would have written an excerpt on the top of folio 10v, then left the rest of the page blank, and continued underneath a quotation from a different play on the facing page on the right.

the same style and with the same colour of ink as 'I more esteem' from *Los cabellos de Absalón*.

Finally, we find two fragments from *El galán fantasma* (*The Gallant Phantom*). The one on folio *26r, beginning 'Viento in popa nuestro amor', is taken from the first act, and doubtlessly helped inspire Asia's lyric at the end of Act II, 'My soul is an enchanted boat', for Shelley drafted lines for it immediately underneath. It is in the same style of writing as 'A florecer' and 'I more esteem', but was not necessarily made at the same time.[39] The other is found on folio 12v ('diselo a mis ojos [...]') and taken from the beginning of the second act. Quinn wrongly argues for its date as 'July or August 1819', but she is certainly right that '[t]hese two excerpts were probably made on separate occasions, given their locations in HM 2176 and the significant differences in quill sharpness, tone of ink, and Shelley's hand' (*MYR:S*, vi. p. xxxiii).

Furthermore, Michael Rossington relates the following lines, written between July and October 1819 into the same notebook, HM 2176 (*MYR:S*, vi. 370-1), to a *comedia* by Calderón, *Guárdate del agua mansa* (*Beware of Still Waters*), which Claire Clairmont is known to have read the following year (*PS*, iii. 198-9):[40]

> Within the surface of the fleeting river
>
> The wrinkled image of the mountain lay
>
> Immoveably unquiet; it (*PS*, iii. 200)

[39] Nora Crook, email of 21 March 2013.

[40] Rossington considers this to be the passage on which Claire bases her 'explication' of Calderón's play of 12 December 1820 (see *CCJ*, 193). These draft lines, as they later appear slightly revised in the 'Ode to Liberty' (lines 76-9), are usually linked to lines from Wordsworth's 'Elegiac Stanzas, Suggested by a Picture of Peele Castle'. I am grateful to Michael O'Neill for this observation; see Michael O'Neill, 'Realms without a Name: Shelley and Italy's Intenser Day', in Frederick Burwick and Paul Douglass (eds.), *Dante and Italy in British Romanticism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 77-91, here 90.

The similarities between these lines and the passage Rossington cites from the play in support of his argument are not very strong (*PS*, iii. 198-9),[41] yet the parallel he observes between Calderón's 'inquietud tranquila' ('tranquil restlessness') from Act I and Shelley's 'Immoveably unquiet' (*PS*, iii. 200) is particularly convincing.[42] Generally, I want to note that many of Shelley's excerpts from Calderón in HM 2176 predate original works, and as they are interspersed throughout, his eyes would have fallen on them as he was leafing through the notebook, drafting his poetry around them or looking at earlier material. The Calderonian traces, whether direct echoes, stylistic parallels, and atmospheric similarities, which are found in compositions drafted here – *Prometheus Unbound*, 'Ode to the West Wind', and 'The Sensitive Plant' –, will be discussed in the later chapters.

Shelley also started reading Calderón's *autos sacramentales* in 1819 according to Mary's reading list for her husband, which includes 'Calderon – Several of the tragedies and Auto's' (*MWSJ*, i. 303). Claire Clairmont's reading of January 1820, which I will discuss presently, also suggests that Shelley was at least familiar with one of Calderón's religious allegories in 1819. However, since he did not express his enthusiasm for the *autos* until November 1820, a discussion of these will be postponed.

---

[41] Rossington considers this to be the passage on which Claire bases her 'explication' of Calderón's play of 12 December 1820 (see *CCJ*, 193). These draft lines, as they later appear slightly revised in the 'Ode to Liberty' (lines 76-9), are usually linked to lines from Wordsworth's 'Elegiac Stanzas, Suggested by a Picture of Peele Castle'. I am grateful to Michael O'Neill for this observation; see Michael O'Neill, 'Realms without a Name: Shelley and Italy's Intenser Day', in Frederick Burwick and Paul Douglass (eds.), *Dante and Italy in British Romanticism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 77-91, here 90.

[42] Rossington argues that Shelley had read the play by October 1819 because 'another speech from it (ll. 1118-29 [i.e. Don Juan's first extended speech at the beginning of Act II]) may possibly be a source of *Ode to the West Wind* [...] ll. 66-7' (*PS*, iii. 199). I would, however, argue that the parallels are too tenuous to draw conclusions.

Shelley's Continued Fascination and his Circle's Enthusiasm for Calderón in 1820

Mary includes 'Several of the plays of Calderon' in Shelley's reading list for 1820 (*MWSJ*, i. 345), but, unfortunately, no record of his engagement with the Spanish playwright as detailed as that of the previous year can be derived. In fact, Calderón only twice appears in Shelley's letters prior to November. On 9 February 1820, Shelley urges the Gisbornes to visit: 'The stage direction on the present occasion is (exit Moonshine) & enter Wall; or rather four walls, who surround & take prisoners the Galan & Dama' (*PBSL*, ii. 172). This is a clear allusion not only to Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* but also to Calderón's *comedias*, in which *galán* and *dama* are common roles. In late June or early July 1820, Shelley composed his *Letter to Maria Gisborne*, in which he wistfully remembered their readings of Calderón and acknowledged the Spaniard's importance, as detailed above. On or around 7 July, he asks the Gisbornes, who had left Italy in May, to send him Calderón's 'Opera Omnia', which they were supposed to purchase for him in Paris, on their way to England, but failed to do (*PBSL*, ii. 212). However, his relative silence should not deceive us into thinking that the Spaniard no longer held an importance for Shelley. In 1820, his circle became seriously occupied with the Spaniard, which suggests Shelley's own engagement with his works also at times when we have little or no record of his activities.

Claire Clairmont's journal entries for 1819 stop after 2 July, and so we are unable to reconstruct how she was involved in Shelley's preoccupation with Calderón; but that she was in some way is certain. She had been staying with the Shelleys, and the day she resumed her journal, 2 January 1820, she jotted down: 'Read a little Spanish' (*CCJ*, 114). Even though she perused plays slowly, her level of

proficiency suggests that she had already been learning the language for a while. From January to May 1820, she noted reading four works by Calderón: *Los cabellos de Absalón* (on 2 and 6 January 1820; *CCJ*, 114-15), the *auto* of *La vida es sueño* (7-9 January; *CCJ*, 116),[43] *La cisma de Ingalaterra* (between 11 and 25 February; *CCJ*, 123-9), and *La Virgen del Sagrario* (between 6 and 11 May 1820; *CCJ*, 146-7).[44] From the latter she also transcribed two very short passages, from Acts I and II (*CCJ*, 146-7). Given that Shelley read *Los cabellos*, *La cisma*, and *La Virgen del Sagrario* in 1819, and that Claire is likely to have based her readings on his recommendations, Shelley must also have been familiar with the *auto* of *La vida es sueño* by 7 January 1820. Whilst there are no entries on Calderón in Claire's journal for the summer, on 19 July 1820, Shelley, adding a few paragraphs to a letter by Mary, mentions to Maria Gisborne that 'Clare is yet with us, and is reading Latin and Spanish with great resolution' (*PBSL*, ii. 218). Even if Shelley was not reading Calderón himself, Claire would most certainly have discussed her perusal of the Spaniard's works with him, and, staying with the Shelleys until 31 August and again from 21 November to 23 December 1820, she had indeed ample opportunities to do so.[45]

In the autumn, Shelley gained another companion for reading, translating, and discussing Calderón: his second cousin Thomas Medwin. Shelley met him in Pisa and returned with him to Bagni San Giuliano on 22 October 1820 (*MWSJ*, i. 337, 337n2). Having taught himself some Spanish in India (*Life*, 243), Medwin frequently read Calderón with Percy during his stay with the Shelleys until 27 February 1821

---

[43] Since Claire always explicitly writes 'the Auto of La Vida es Sueño de Calderon' and never uses the term *auto* to refer to *comedias* (as Medwin did), she certainly read the *auto* and not the *comedia* of the same title.
[44] To be precise, *La cisma de Ingalaterra* is noted down on 11-12, 16, 19, 21, 23-25 February; and *La Virgen del Sagrario* on 6, 9, 10, and 11 May.
[45] All information on Claire's whereabouts is taken from *CCJ*.

(*MWSJ*, i. 354). From Medwin's recollections and own translations we can draw reasonable assumptions about their Calderonian activities. In the *Life of Shelley*, he informs us that they 'luxuriated in what Shelley calls "the golden and starry Autos," or Mysteries' and read his tragedy on Henry VIII, *La cisma de Ingalaterra* (*Life*, 243-4). Shelley so much admired 'the octave stanzas (a strange metre in a drama, to choose,) spoken by Carlos, Enamorado di Anna Bolena [...] that he copied them out into one of his letters to Mrs. Gisborne' (*Life*, 244).[46] Medwin then appended a translation of the two last stanzas of this transcription, 'marking in Italics the lines corrected by Shelley' (*Life*, 244).[47]

In his *Sketches in Hindoostan with Other Poems* (1821), Medwin also published an almost complete translation of Carlos's speech under the title 'From the Spanish of Calderon', omitting only the first two *octavas reales* and the final one.[48] As Henry Buxton Forman and Ann L. Mackenzie have argued, this is 'not unsuggestive of Shelley's coöperation'.[49] An exact date for Medwin's translation is hard to establish, but he cannot have made it long after his arrival since *Sketches in*

---

[46] Whilst writing about his stay in 1820, Medwin here of course alludes to the letter from November 1819, which he probably had on loan while working on his *Life* as there are several references to letters the Gisbornes had received.

[47] For Carlos's speech see lines 333-44 in Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *The Schism in England (La cisma de Inglaterra)*, trans. Kenneth Muir and Ann L. Mackenzie (Introduction, Commentary and Edition of the Spanish Text by Ann L. Mackenzie), Hispanic Classics: Golden-Age Drama (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1990). All subsequent quotations and line references will be to this edition unless otherwise stated.

[48] Thomas Medwin, *Sketches in Hindoostan with Other Poems* (London: C. and J. Ollier, 1821), 105-109. See also: Thomas Medwin, *Oswald and Edwin, Sketches in Hindoostan, Ahasuerus*, ed. and introd. Donald H. Reiman, A Garland Series, Romantic Context: Poetry, Significant Minor Poetry 1789-1830 (New York and London: Garland, 1978), a facsimile edition of works printed originally in 1820, 1821 and 1823, respectively.

[49] *The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. Harry Buxton Forman (London: Reeves and Turner, 1877), iv. 283n. See also Ann L. Mackenzie, '*La cisma de Inglaterra*: dos versiones inglesas del monólogo de Carlos sobre Ana Bolena', *Cuadernos de Teatro Clásico*, 4 (1989), 53-77, here 57-8.

Hindoostan appeared relatively early in 1821,[50] and Shelley soon became weary of his company.[51] We even find a translation of a stanza from Carlos's speech by Shelley himself on the front paper paste-down of his *Pisan Winter Notebook* (1820-21).[52] Since Shelley's translation is likely to date from the same time as his correction of Medwin's, I agree with Michael Rossington that it was 'probably written soon after 22 October 1820' (*PS*, iii. 724).[53]

Medwin's *Sketches in Hindoostan* also contained another translation or adaptation from Calderón, entitled 'From the Spanish of Calderon: The Azure and the Green, a Dialogue', which was first identified by Nora Crook as taken from *La banda y la flor* (*The Sash and the Flower*).[54] The 'translated' passage, found at the end of the first act, is based on a verbal dispute between the sisters Clori and Lísida about whether blue or green is the more perfect colour. Both in love with Enrique, they had anonymously given him pledges: Clori a sash ('la banda') in blue and Lísida a flower ('la flor') representing green. Asked by their aunt Nise which pledge he preferred, Enrique had replied that the colour will tell his preference, thus sparking

---

[50] Michael Rossington points out that the work was listed as 'lately published' in *London Magazine*, 3 (May 1821), 580 (*PS*, iii. 724).

[51] On 15 January 1821, Mary wrote to Claire: 'You have no idea how earnestly we desire the transfer of Mxxxxn to Florence – in plain Italian he is a Seccatura [nuisance, bother]' (*MWSL*, i. 177-8).

[52] *Shelley's Pisan Winter Notebook (1820-1821): A Facsimile of Bodleian MS. Shelley adds. e. 8*, ed. Carlene A. Adamson, The Bodleian Shelley Manuscripts, vi (New York: Garland, 1992), 80, transcription on p. 81.

[53] Rossington continues that, if made at the same time as Medwin's translation, 'it must have been before 10 November 1820 since S[helley]'s letter to Ollier of that date notes that "The Lion Hunt", the first poem in *Sketches*, had already been sent to him for publication' (*PS*, iii. 724; cf. *PBSL*, ii. 246). However, I would not find it unlikely that, once Ollier accepted 'The Lion Hunt' for publication, Medwin sent additional material, i.e. his translations, to fill the *Sketches*.

[54] Email from Nora Crook, 14 October 2009. Medwin, *Sketches in Hindoostan*, 114-16.

the sisters' debate.[55] I would argue that it is doubtful whether Shelley had a hand in 'The Azure and the Green'. Unlike Medwin's translation of *La cisma de Ingalaterra*, which he corrected, this 'dialogue' is more of a 'transcreation' or composition inspired by Calderón, so that Medwin may not have needed assistance with the original language; moreover, the English lines are not immediately suggestive of Shelley's poetical advice. Nevertheless, Shelley was certainly familiar with 'The Azure and the Green' and *La banda y la flor*, as Mary complained of Medwin: 'He sits with us & be one reading or writing he insists upon interrupting one every moment to read all the fine things he either writes or reads' (*MWSL*, i. 178). If we want to cite evidence other than Medwin's character: Shelley helped to get the *Sketches* published with Charles Ollier,[56] 'it appears that almost every poem in' it 'had been criticized and corrected by Shelley', as Donald Reiman has shown,[57] and Medwin would have borrowed his Calderón edition for the translation. In fact, Shelley may have first drawn his cousin's attention to this passage, which is easily detachable from its context, to stand alone as poetry. Reiman has similarly argued that 'it is likely' that some pieces, including the translations from Calderón, 'were suggested by him [i.e. Shelley] as beautiful or powerful passages.'[58] If so, it is telling that Shelley only took interest in a social comedy with regard to the poetry it contained and not

---

[55] Medwin starts with Lísida's lines 'La verde es color primera / del mundo' (Aguilar, ii. 431b-2a) and ends with Clori's 'pues el infierno de celos / no espera favor jamás' (Aguilar, ii. 432b), without marking the speakers, however.

[56] On 10 November 1820, Shelley kindly asks Charles Ollier to help Medwin publish 'a poem on Indian Hunting' [i.e. 'The Lion Hunt'] (*PBSL*, ii. 246). In a letter of 16 April 1820, Shelley had already offered Medwin to send him a list of recommendations for 'The Pindarees', which became the other major composition in *Sketches* (*PBSL*, ii. 183-4).

[57] Reiman, 'Introduction', in Medwin, *Oswald and Edwin, Sketches in Hindoostan, Ahasuerus*, vii.

[58] Reiman, 'Introduction', in Medwin, *Oswald and Edwin, Sketches in Hindoostan, Ahasuerus*, vii.

the plot intricacies or its direct representation of contemporary society and manners.

In November 1820, some time after the 18th, Shelley writes to John Gisborne from Pisa: '*I* am bathing myself in the light & odour of the flowery & starry Autos. I have read them all more than once' (*PBSL*, ii. 251). This supports Medwin's claim that they were reading Calderón's *autos*, even though Medwin's phrase 'golden and starry Autos', quoted above, may be lifted from Gisborne's letter, which Medwin is likely to have had at his disposal when writing the *Life*.[59] At the time, the only edition of Calderón's *autos* was the one by Don Pedro de Pando y Mier in six volumes (1717).[60] We only know for certain that Shelley was familiar with the *auto* of *La vida es sueño*, found in the *Parte Sexta* of Pando y Mier's edition, but, given that Shelley claimed to have read the allegories available to him 'all more than once', he must have perused all of the twelve *autos* contained in this volume. In fact, Shelley may not have had any other copies of *autos* for he could never have read twenty-four or thirty-six dramas two or three times. *La vida es sueño* is also the only *auto* Mary ever refers to. Lines of it not only appear on a loose manuscript,[61] but she praises the

---

[59] I would like to point out that Medwin is likely to overstate his part in Shelley's Spanish occupations at the time, as he exaggerated his presence during his cousin's time at Oxford. Moreover, Medwin was incapacitated by 'a long and severe attack of illness' during his stay (*Life*, 235), and Mary became seriously involved with Spanish and Calderón as well, as I shall illustrate in the following paragraph.

[60] *Autos sacramentales, alegóricos, y historiales del insigne poeta español Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca. Obras posthumas, que del Archivo de la Villa de Madrid saca originales a luz Don Pedro de Pando y Mier* (Madrid: Manuel Ruiz de Murga, 1717). As Edward Wilson has pointed out, there were in fact different issues of the Pando edition, which would, however, not noticeably have affected Shelley's reading experience. See Edward M. Wilson, 'On the Pando Editions of Calderón's *Autos*', *Hispanic Review*, 27.3 (1959), 324-44, and 'Further Notes on the Pando Editions of Calderón's *Autos*', *Hispanic Review*, 30.4 (1962), 296-303.

[61] Mary transcribes on a piece of manuscript, now in the Abinger Collection: 'que passada[,] / què ventura no es soñada?' ('what happiness, once past, is not a dream?') (MS. Abinger c.65 fol. 10r;

work highly in her *Literary Lives*, claiming that more than any other *auto*, *La vida es sueño* 'is an instance of that peculiarity, which we imperfectly endeavour to describe, of clothing in sensible and potent imagery, the thoughts of the brain, the feelings of the heart' (*Literary Lives*, ii. 251). Such admiration suggests that her late husband equally valued this *auto*, and that he considered its allegorical mode, when conveying more than religious dogmas, to successfully fuse the sensuous and supra-sensuous.

The final two months of the year not only saw Shelley continue in his engagement with Calderón but also Mary getting involved. On 8 November 1820, Shelley reported to Peacock: 'I have been reading nothing but Greek and Spanish. Plato and Calderon have been my gods' (*PBSL*, ii. 245); and Mary wrote into her journal 'S. reads Calderon' on 14 November (*MWSJ*, i. 340). By then, she was learning Spanish herself: she records 'Spanish' on 14 and 23 November (*MWSJ*, i. 340), 'Spanish with M.xxxxx [Medwin]' on 24 November (i. 340), 'Spanish' on 9 and 11 December (i. 342), and includes 'A Little Spanish' in her own reading list (*MWSJ*, i. 347). On 1, 2, 3, and 11 December (*MWSJ*, i. 341-2), she notes down 'Calderon' alone or in combination with 'Don Quixote', which seems to refer solely to her own reading. Thus she was certainly not exaggerating when she told Maria Gisborne on 13 December that she was 'at present very busy with Greek & Calderon' (*MWSL*, i. 168). It is such evidence that induces one to believe that Mary frequently exchanged views on Calderón with her husband and that some of the opinions voiced in her *Literary Lives* directly reflect statements Shelley made to her in discussions. The increased Calderonian activities also extended to Claire Clairmont, who noted

---

http://www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/dept/scwmss/wmss/online/1500-1900/abinger/images/Dep.c.516.1-20-1.jpg).

reading *Guárdate del agua mansa* on 12 December 1820 (*CCJ*, 193), and recorded what Michael Rossington has termed a 'translation-cum-paraphrase' from this play.[62] It is very likely that, as with other plays before, Shelley had read it first, recommended it, and lent her the volume. Given this engagement with Calderón in the Shelley household at the end of 1820, it is surprising to see how rarely the Spaniard's name was mentioned the following year, which requires us to look for reasons behind this sudden change.

'I want a Calderon': Shelley's Lack of Access and Final Enthusiasm, 1821-22

We have no definite proof that Shelley – or anyone else of his circle – was reading Calderón in 1821. Certainly, it was not a lack of enthusiasm. Even though Shelley criticized some aspects of Calderón's *autos sacramentales* in the *Defence of Poetry*, written in February and March, he still praised others (*SPP*, 519), and subsequently mentioned the Spaniard's name twice in his essay: in his list of authors who 'have celebrated the dominion of love, planting as it were trophies in the human mind of that sublimest victory over sensuality and force' (*SPP*, 526), and when enumerating authors and artists important for 'the moral condition of the world' (*SPP*, 530). Since critics have often read Shelley's words on the religious *autos* as a criticism of Calderón's plays *per se*, I want to stress that he does not comment directly on the *comedias* in the *Defence*, which certainly would have elicited praise and must have been on his mind in his general observations on their author. Furthermore, the opening chorus of Greek captive women in *Hellas*, written in October 1821, was

---

[62] Rossington thinks this 'serve[s] as bitter commentary on her infatuation with Byron' (*PS*, iii. 199). A few months later, on 15 March 1821, Claire scribbled the leading idea behind the title in flawed German into her journal, presumably as reference to herself: 'Stille Wassers sind gerne Tief' ('still waters like to be deep'; *CCJ*, 216).

influenced by *El príncipe constante*, as Shelley apparently pointed out to Medwin (*Life*, 353).

However, Shelley's continued passion for Calderón is best demonstrated by his eager search for further works. On 2 April 1821, he wrote to Claire Clairmont with impatience: 'Pray order Calderon for me without delay and try if you can urge the bookseller to some sort of speed' (*PBSL*, ii. 279). On 14 September 1821, Shelley turned to Horace Smith in Paris for help, after it became clear that the Gisbornes had not bought him books in the French capital as promised; first on his list is '*A complete edition of the works of Calderon*' (*PBSL*, ii. 350). And on 31 December 1821, he again appealed to Claire: 'Should you take it into your head to call on Molini for me, let not Calderon having been sent for be an objection – I want a Calderon' (*PBSL*, ii. 371). The question whether Shelley was using a broken set belonging to the Gisbornes, who reclaimed it when moving to England for good at the end of July 1821 (*MWSJ*, i. 375, 375n5), or whether Shelley had simply exhausted his volumes will be discussed below. For the moment, only the fervour of his requests for a Calderón edition is of importance, as it substantiates my claim that it was not an absence of interest but a lack of access that prevented Shelley from perusing further works.

Should Shelley still have had at hand the old Calderón volumes he had begun using in mid-1819 before acquiring new ones in January 1822, he may have engaged with *La vida es sueño* towards the end of 1821. On 15 November 1821 (*MWSJ*, i. 383), Medwin arrived in Pisa for another stay until 9 March 1822 (*Gisborne/Williams*, 133), and the translation from *La vida es sueño* in *The* Faust *Draft Notebook* (*BSM*, xix. 124-5), which pre-dates 29 January 1822, or even 20 January 1822 (*BSM*, xix. pp.

lxv-lxvi), is almost certainly in his hand.[63] Shelley probably acted as a 'contributor-corrector' to the translation, for Crook and Webb argue that 'A close analysis uncovers cumulatively strong evidence of his contribution of wording and ideas to the translation' (*BSM*, xix. pp. lxv-lxvi).

Similarly, Shelley was once more studying *El purgatorio de San Patricio* either from November 1821 or January 1822 onwards. Byron had arrived in Pisa on 1 November 1821 (*MWSJ*, i. 381) and moved into the Palazzo Lanfranchi, close to the Shelleys' lodgings. Medwin recounts how Byron outlined a projected drama to him there, which was influenced by a play of Calderón's entitled *El Embozado* or *El Encapotado* (the cloaked or muffled one). This projected work was *The Deformed Transformed*, as Charles Robinson has shown,[64] and 'El Embozado' merely a part of the third act of *El purgatorio de San Patricio*, in which 'un hombre embozado', a muffled man, appears.[65] Thus, Shelley, possibly together with Medwin, must have outlined or partly translated Calderón's play to Byron before or in January 1822, the month he started to write *The Deformed Transformed*.[66] On or around 3 January, Shelley began working in earnest on a new composition himself, *Charles the First*, which he had long contemplated and in which he was influenced by his earlier

---

[63] The notebook's editors Timothy Webb and Nora Crook reason that the translation from *La vida es sueño* predates 29 January, because 'Shelley's "May-Day Night" attempt on p. 61 rev. (which can be dated pre-January 29, 1822) has blotted upon it' (*BSM*, xix. p. lxvi). Whilst they suggested in their introduction of 1997 that the hand could also be Edward Williams's, Crook has subsequently come to the conclusion that it is 'almost certainly' Medwin's (email of 20 February 2009).

[64] Charles E. Robinson, 'The Devil as Doppelganger in *The Deformed Transformed*: the Sources and Meaning of Byron's Unfinished Drama', 321-46.

[65] This was first discovered by Horace E. Thorner, 'Hawthorne, Poe, and a Literary Ghost', *The New England Quarterly*, 7.1 (1934), 146-54.

[66] The MS in the Lovelace Collection is headed 'Pisa J[anuar]y 1822' (*BCPW*, vi. 725).

readings of Calderón: Archy, Medwin writes, owes much to Pasquín, the fool of Henry VIII in *La cisma de Ingalaterra* (*Life*, 343).[67]

Early in 1822, and thus shortly after his final appeal to Claire for a Calderón on 31 December 1821 (*PBSL*, ii. 371), Shelley finally got hold of an edition. On 25 January 1822 he told Horace Smith: 'I have delayed this fortnight answering your kind letter because I was in treaty for a Calderon which at last I have succeeded in procuring at a tolerably moderate price' (*PBSL*, ii. 378). Unfortunately, we have no details about the exact day of purchase, the edition, or the amount of volumes Shelley acquired; but he resumed his reading of Calderón instantly. When Edward Trelawny, a friend of the Williamses, first met Shelley in Pisa on 14 January (*MWSJ*, i. 389), the poet had Calderón's *El mágico prodigioso* in his hands and, on Jane Williams's request, 'he analysed the genius of the author', gave 'his lucid interpretation of the story', and translated with 'marvellous' ease 'the most subtle and imaginative passages of the Spanish poet'.[68] Byron, by now Shelley's constant companion (*PBSL*, ii. 373) and partner in Faustian discussions, also learned about this play – and its similarities with *Faust* – from Shelley and Medwin,[69] and,

---

[67] I follow Crook's argument that Shelley worked on *Charles the First* between 3 and 25 January (*BSM*, xii. pp. xliv-xlv), in contrast to Reiman and Neth's: 'it seems quite possible that he started drafting a scene or two [...] by August or early September 1821' (*BSM*, xvi. p. xxxi). Shelley told Charles Ollier on 25 September 1821 that '*Charles the First* is conceived but not born. Unless I am sure of making something good the play will not be written' (*PBSL*, ii. 219-20; *BSM*, xvi. p. xxx).

[68] J. E. Morpurgo (ed.), *The Last Days of Shelley and Byron, Being the complete text of Trelawny's 'Recollections' edited, with additions from contemporary sources* (Westminster: The Folio Society, 1952), 12.

[69] In his *Journal of the Conversations of Lord Byron: Noted During a Residence with His Lordship at Pisa, in the Years 1821 and 1822* (London: Henry Colburn, 1824) the latter reports Byron as saying: 'You tell me the plot [of *Faust*] is almost entirely Calderon's. [...]. That *magico prodigioso* must be worth reading, and nobody seems to know any thing [sic] about it but you and Shelley' (141).

unsurprisingly, *The Deformed Transformed* reveals parallels with this *comedia* as well.[70]

Quinn has argued that Shelley 'must have begun translating *El mágico prodigioso* during the first or second week of January, 1822' (*MYR:S*, vii. p. xxxvi). However, judging from Trelawney's account, I would suggest that he may have merely been reading Calderón at that time, making oral instead of written translations. At any rate, around 20 March 1822, Shelley was certainly preparing translations in writing, as an entry in Edward Ellerker Williams's journal for that date attests: 'Walked with Shelley along the banks of the Arno. Took our writing materials and while S[helley] translated Calderon's "Ciprian" I wrote some revisions–' (*Gisborne/Williams*, 135). The translations comprised three scenes from *El mágico prodigioso*, which were at least in parts intended for publication in the first volume of Leigh Hunt's *The Liberal: Verse and Prose from the South* (1822), together with translations from Goethe's *Faust*.[71] On 10 April 1822, writing to John Gisborne from Pisa, Shelley still had *El mágico prodigioso* on his mind, although he had finished his task:

> I find a striking similarity between Faust & this drama, & if I were to acknowledge Coleridge's distinction I should say, Göthe was the greatest philosopher & Calderon the greatest poet. *Cypriano* evidently furnished the *germ* of Faust, as Faust may furnish the germ of other poems; although it is different from it in structure & plan, as the acorn from the oak. – I have, – (imagine my presumption) translated several scenes from

---

[70] See Robinson, 'The Devil as Doppelganger in *The Deformed Transformed*', 321-46.
[71] 'Scene I' and lines 62-190 of 'Scene II' are drafted in Huntington MS. HM 2111 (*MYR:S*, vii), and 'Scene III' as well as the beginning of 'Scene II' (lines 1-61) are found in *The* Faust *Draft Notebook* (*BSM*, xix).

> both, as the basis of a paper for our journal. I am well content with those from Calderon which in fact gave me very little trouble (*PBSL*, ii. 407).

The translations, and Shelley's claim to have completed those from Calderón with ease, will be examined in the following chapter. At least on one occasion, Shelley's preoccupation with Calderón was, however, of a very different nature. In his *Life of Shelley* Medwin recounts a nightmarish vision which Shelley had soon after his arrival at Casa Magni on 30 April 1822 (*Life*, 404-5; for the date see *MWSJ*, i. 410). This story – related to him by Byron and confirmed by the Williamses – can be associated with *El purgatorio de San Patricio*. Shelley followed 'a figure wrapped in a mantle' that beckoned him from his bedside; 'when in the drawing-room, the phantom lifted up the hood of his cloak, and said, "*Siete soddisfatto*," ["Are you satisfied?"] and vanished.' Medwin explains that the play 'worked strongly on Shelley's imagination, and accounts for the midnight scene' (*Life*, 405).

Throughout his final months he remained under Calderón's spell. Rousseau's first appearance in *The Triumph of Life* displays close parallels with Fénix's encounter with a decrepit African woman in *El príncipe constante*, which she reports at the beginning of Act II. On 18 June 1822, Shelley told John Gisborne: 'I have read several more of the plays of Calderon. "Los Dos Amantes del Cielo" is the finest, if I except one scene in the "Devocion de la Cruz"' (*PBSL*, ii. 436). Unfortunately, it is almost impossible to identify the unnamed plays. Shelley may have reread some works he had studied back in 1819, as is the case with *La devoción de la cruz*, but his second perusal of this play could merely have been sparked by the Gisbornes'

reports that Maria Gisborne had read it with Thomas Jefferson Hogg in February.[72] Shelley read further plays between this letter and his death, and would surely have read many more if not for his accident, for on 29 June 1822, he told Horace Smith: 'I still inhabit this divine bay, reading Spanish dramas' (ii. 442-3).

One way of deducing which plays Shelley may have been familiar with, in addition to those he named or transcribed from in notebooks, is to establish which edition of Calderón's *comedias* and which volumes he was using. This also reveals that the volumes the English poet is likely to have had access to all contain *comedias de capa y espada*, the so-called 'cloak-and-sword plays', which previously Englishmen were solely attracted to, and which were the most palatable dramas for neoclassicists. It is vitally significant that Shelley, similar to Schlegel and Goethe,[73] neglects them and omits quoting from them, with the exception of *El galán fantasma*. As my overview of his reading has shown, he focuses on historical, philosophical, and religious plays, which include miracles and references to a metaphysical plane. *El purgatorio de San Patricio*, *El mágico prodigioso*, *El príncipe constante*, and *Los dos amantes del cielo* are hagiographical, based on the legends of Saint Patrick, Saint Cyprian, the beatified Ferdinand (known as 'Ferdinand the Holy Prince'), and Saints

---

[72] On 9 and 19 February 1822, Maria and John Gisborne, respectively, told the Shelleys that Hogg visited them at their house once a week and had read *La devoción de la Cruz* with Mrs Gisborne (*Gisborne/Williams*, 79, and *PBSL*, ii. 378n).

[73] Schlegel translated *La banda y la flor* into German but seems to have done so mostly for the sake of covering all the different genres Calderón employed – having rendered a mythological-operatic play (*El mayor encanto amor*), a religious one (*La devoción de la Cruz*), and a hagiographical-historical one (*El príncipe constante*). Tellingly, Schlegel received little response to *Die Schärpe und die Blume* (*The Sash and the Flower*). Goethe was even more dismissive of the cloak-and-sword plays, remarking that they were 'geistreich und in gewisser Hinsicht vollendet, allein es fehlt ihnen ein spezifisches Gewicht, eine gewisse Schwere des Gehalts. Sie sind nicht derart, um im Gemüt des Lesers ein tiefes und nachwirkendes Interesse zu erregen'; 'witty, and in a sense perfect, they only lack a specific weight, a certain gravity of content. They are not the sort to awaken a deep and lasting interest in the mind of the reader' (*Gedenkausgabe*, xxiv. 107).

Chrysanthus and Daria. *La devoción de la Cruz* is deeply religious, a play of conversion, set in contemporary Spain. *Los cabellos de Absalón* draws on a biblical story, and *La cisma de Ingalaterra* on a moment in history that had significant consequences for religious life, dealing with the 'Schism in England'.

Shelley's Edition of Calderón *comedias*

Whilst Shelley's text of the *autos* can easily be identified, it has never been established which edition or issue of the *comedias* he read. Shelley himself did not leave any indication as to the Calderón edition he was using, and his copy is not known to have survived to this day. Before I discuss several pieces of evidence that allow us to draw limited conclusions, it needs to be pointed out that he had two different sets of books, which may or may not be volumes of the same edition: one set he was using from 1819 onwards, and another he acquired in January 1822 while living in Pisa. Only two editions were available during his lifetime, the seventeenth-century *editio princeps* or *Partes* edition, and Apontes's edition of 1760.[74] However, the textual situation is highly complex, if not indeterminable in the case of the *Partes* edition, for several issues, corrected versions, pirated versions, and fakes exist. The main distinction runs between the volumes published during Calderón's life (*Primera Parte* to *Quinta Parte*, 1636 to 1677, though only the first four had his approbation), and the volumes added and corrected after his death in 1681 by Don Juan de Vera Tassis y Villarroel (*Verdadera Quinta Parte* to *Novena Parte* [1682-1691], and *Primera Parte* to *Cuarta Parte*, [1685-1688], respectively). Yet for each of the first five volumes, as first published, one or two authorized or

[74] *Comedias del celebre poeta español Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca*, ed. Don Juan Fernández de Apontes, 11 vols. (Madrid: Fernández, 1760).

unauthorized reprints exist with at times significant textual variations, and the reprint of Vera Tassis's edition from 1698 to 1731 also contains slight differences in text. Moreover, fake copies (so-called 'pseudo Vera Tassis') exist, for which individually printed plays (*sueltas*) were bound together following the order of titles in the Vera Tassis edition. From this information, we can draw the conclusion that it is ultimately impossible to determine what Shelley's text of Calderón's *comedias* might have looked like. Fortunately, the texts of the passages which Shelley translates from *El mágico prodigioso* do not vary greatly between editions.[75]

The only direct statement we have on Shelley's Calderón edition is found in an interpolation made by Thomas Medwin on the margin of a copy of his *The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley* (1847), next to the following passage on his stay with the Shelleys in the winter of 1820-1821:

> and we luxuriated in what Shelley calls 'the golden and starry Autos,' or Mysteries, - except the Greek Choruses, perhaps among the most difficult poems to comprehend - and very rare; so much so, that they are scarcely to be obtained in Spain, though found by Shelley accidentally in an old book-stall at Leghorn. (*Life*/1847, ii. 13)

The interpolation was, like all of Medwin's revisions, published by Buxton Forman in the *Revised Life of Shelley* (1913):

> It was the quarto Edition, which formed one of the gems in Tieck's Catalogue, an edition of great rarity and value. It was not a perfect work but consisting of

[75] My information on editions is mainly taken from Kurt and Roswitha Reichenberger, *Bibliographisches Handbuch der Calderón-Forschung: Manual Bibliográfico Calderoniano*, 5 parts in 4 volumes (Kassel: Edition Reichenberger, 1979), i. 21-32.

> several odd Volumes, which it may be remarked was the case with Tieck's. (*Life*, 243)

What Medwin refers to as 'Tieck's Catalogue' is the *Catalogue de la bibliothèque célèbre de M. Ludwig Tieck qui sera vendue a* [sic] *Berlin le 10. décembre 1849 et jours suivants par MM. A. Asher & Comp.* (Berlin, 1849), published two years after his *Life of Shelley*.[76]

Yet Medwin's later addition is confusing, for it appears next to a remark on the *autos sacramentales*, even though it can only refer to Tieck's incomplete but extremely valuable seventeenth-century edition of the *comedias*, described in detail in the *Catalogue*:

> 4to. Madrid. Tous ces volumes sont de la plus grande rareté, même en Espagne; [...] Malheureusement, pour complêter cette collection précieuse des editiones principes, il nous manque le 1er vol. de 1635 et le 9me de l'édition de Vera Tasis [sic]. (99)

The auction catalogue's wording in this entry closely resembles Medwin's (for instance, 'great rarity' matches 'grande rareté') and, furthermore, Tieck's copy of the *autos* does not consist 'of several odd Volumes' but is complete. When Medwin discovered 'Tieck's Catalogue', he may have hastily chosen a passage on a Calderón edition in his *Life* for a memorandum for future purposes, and he was inconsistent in his use of generic terms anyway, as elsewhere he refers to *El purgatorio de San Patricio*, a *comedia*, as 'the Auto of El Purgatorio di [sic] San Patricio' (*Life*/1847, ii. 14). However unreliable in many respects, Medwin knew his cousin's Calderón edition well, having used it himself for translating passages from *La cisma de Ingalaterra* and *La banda y la flor*, and, presumably, also from *La vida es sueño* (*BSM*,

---

[76] 'Tieck's Catalogue' was first identified in *SC*, x. 1043.

xix. 124-5).[77] Therefore, we can conclude that Shelley is highly likely to have had access to the *Partes* edition of the *Comedias*, at least for some of his readings.[78]

Crook and Webb have raised the question whether the edition Medwin refers to actually belonged to Shelley:

> the odd volumes might have been on extended loan from the Gisbornes. If so, the Shelley and the Gisborne households between 1819 and 1821 had between them only this one broken set, and PBS had access to no Calderón at all between July 1821 (when the Gisbornes left for England) and January 1822. Neither Claire Clairmont nor MWS record reading Calderón in 1821, though they had done so in 1820. (*BSM*, xix. p. lxxvi.n36)

Thus the editors of *The* Faust *Draft Notebook* indirectly suggest that Medwin's account of Shelley's purchase – he found the volumes 'accidentally in an old book-stall at Leghorn' according to the *Life* (*Life*/1847, ii. 13) – was either invented or refers not to his first but his second, 1822 set of Calderón, even though Medwin's interpolation was made next to a passage regarding his stay with the Shelleys from 22 October 1820 to 27 February 1821. It is indeed likely that the Shelleys and Gisbornes shared some Calderón volumes between them from the summer of 1819 onwards, given that Percy transcribed several verses for Maria Gisborne in November 1819, but the books could also have belonged to him and not the

---

[77] A further, albeit minor piece of evidence is the fact that Shelley mentions to Peacock on 21 September 1819 that he has read about twelve plays, and the volumes of the *Partes* edition each contain twelve *comedias* (with the exception of the 'false' *Quinta Parte*). I am grateful to Nora Crook for this observation in personal communication.

[78] Angel Valbuena Briones maintained in 1965 that Harvard Library owned a copy of the eighth volume of Apontes's edition, which includes *El mágico prodigioso*, with Shelley's marginalia (*Perspectiva crítica de los dramas de Calderón*, Naturaleza e Historia [Madrid: Rialp, 1965], 247-8). This was, however, soon called into question by the Houghton Library, and I have seen scans of samples of the marginalia, which are clearly not in Shelley's hand.

Gisbornes – or the latter simply did not possess the volume containing *La cisma de Ingalaterra*. The first irrefutable evidence that the Gisbornes owned at least one volume of Calderón's *comedias* does not appear until February 1822, when Maria Gisborne read *La devoción de la Cruz* with Hogg at their place (*Gisborne/Williams*, 79; *PBSL*, ii. 378n). Furthermore, Shelley already began requesting Calderón's 'Opera Omnia' in July 1820 (*PBSL*, ii. 213), a year before the Gisbornes' final departure, which suggests that the reason for his great anxiety to receive Calderón's works in 1821 was that he had exhausted his books. Elsewhere in *The Life of Shelley*, Medwin explains that his second cousin was by Mr Gisborne 'initiated in the beauties of Calderon, from the purchase of some odd volumes of his plays, and Autos, which were ever after his constant companions' (*Life*, 198). Granted, Medwin confuses Mr and Mrs Gisborne, but he clearly identifies Shelley as the purchaser and owner of the set of books.[79]

Yet what is more important than determining the owner of the first set Shelley used is to establish the edition with more certainty. Further evidence can be gleaned from Shelley's partial transcription of Carlos's speech in *La cisma de Ingalaterra* in his letter to Maria Gisborne on 16 November 1819. Here, the spelling of the Apontes edition differs in numerous instances from that of Vera Tassis's *Octava Parte*. For example, Apontes uses the '–aba' spelling of the imperfect (*pretérito imperfecto*) throughout whereas Vera Tassis employs '–ava'; Vera Tassis's words 'lisongera', 'hojas', 'abexa', appear as 'lisonjera', 'ojas', and 'aveja' in Apontes. In each instance, Shelley follows Vera Tassis, which is compelling evidence that he was using the *Partes* edition. Shelley's excerpts in the notebooks do not allow for

[79] The place of purchase, Livorno, does not necessarily point to the summer of 1819 as time of purchase since Shelley, living in Pisa when acquiring Calderón volumes in January 1822, still went to Livorno for business.

definite conclusions but at least do not rule out my assumption. Provided that he owned the books and Mary took them back with her to England, which is quite likely as she must have felt a particular sentimental attachment to them, the quotations from *El príncipe constante* and *La vida es sueño* in *The Last Man* (1826) are revealing. The first of these, consisting of lines spoken by Don Fernando in the second act of *El príncipe constante*, allows us to establish Mary's source as the reprinted Vera Tassis edition of the *Primera Parte* (1726; p. 527), because it is the only one printing an 'y' ('and') in the final line, as it appears in *The Last Man*: 'Un dia llama à otro dia / y ass i llama, y encadena / llanto à llanto, y pena à pena.'[80]

The works Shelley is known to have read before 1822 further point to the *Partes* edition as they all come from merely three volumes: the *Primera Parte*, the *Segunda Parte*, and the *Octava Parte*. The first two *comedias* he mentioned in July 1819, *El purgatorio de San Patricio* and *La devoción de la Cruz*, are the third and fifth play in the *Primera Parte*, and *El príncipe constante*, which he is likely to have read shortly after, concludes the volume, so that Shelley may have progressed more or less in order, possibly staying within the first volume. Although we have no date for Shelley's reading of *La vida es sueño*, it is worth pointing out that this *comedia* opens the *Primera Parte*. Another volume Shelley must have used is the *Segunda Parte*, for some of the excerpts in Shelley's notebooks, made probably from August or September to November, are taken from three *comedias* published there: *El galán fantasma*, *Judas Macabeo*, and *Origen, pérdida y restauración de la Virgen del Sagrario*. Finally, on 16 November 1819 Shelley reported to Maria Gisborne that he had read *La cisma de Ingalaterra*, *Los cabellos de Absalón*, '& three or four others'

---

[80] 'One day calls another day, / and thus calls, and chains / crying to crying, and pain to pain.' *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, Vol. 4, ed. by Jane Blumberg with Nora Crook (London: Pickering, 1996), 39.

(*PBSL*, ii. 154). Both *La cisma* and *Los cabellos* are contained in the *Octava Parte*, appearing as first and third play. As shown above, Shelley was familiar with *Guárdate del agua mansa* and *La banda y la flor* as well, possibly a little later, and these are likewise found in this volume.

We could count as further evidence the fact that the plays Shelley read in 1822 for certain, *El mágico prodigioso* and *Los dos amantes del cielo (The Two Lovers of Heaven)*, are not contained in any of these volumes.[81] This leads us to the question of Shelley's Calderón edition of 1822. *El mágico prodigioso* and *Los dos amantes del cielo* are included in different volumes in both the Vera Tassis and the Apontes edition. The former is found in the *Verdadera Quinta Parte* and Volume IX of Apontes, and the latter in the *Sexta Parte* and Volume VIII of Apontes. Since Shelley did not make any transcriptions that year, and the translations from *El mágico prodigioso* take many liberties, it is impossible to arrive at definitive conclusions. A comparison of Shelley's translations with the first edition (i.e. Vera Tassis's *Sexta Parte* of 1683), with the 1715 reprint, and with volume eight of Apontes's edition suggests that he may have used Apontes, given that twice, positive sentences in Shelley's translation are questions in Vera Tassis but not in Apontes,[82] and that he omits two sentences with words considerably misprinted in Apontes.[83] However, where 'genios' are misspelled as 'nenios', Shelley does translate 'Genii' (Apontes, iii. 321b; *OSA*, line 167). Yet, for my present purposes, it is unproblematic if we cannot identify the 1822 edition with certainty, mostly because the dramas I shall consider

---

[81] In this edition they could be found in the *Sexta* and *Verdadera Quinta Parte* (ed. Vera Tassis), respectively.
[82] 'Scenes from the Magico Prodigioso', *OSA*, 731-48, here Scene 1, lines 37 and 133-4.
[83] 'obras' ('works') is printed as 'oàras', 'iras' (the plural of 'ire') as 'ir' ('to go') (Apontes, iii. 321b and 337b).

are, apart from *Charles the First*, not influenced by Shelley's reading of Calderón in 1822. Moreover, if one wanted to venture a guess at which dramas he read in 1822, one would find that the plays contained in the respective volumes are almost the same, with Apontes lacking only four plays included in the larger *Partes* volumes. As such speculations are more significant to editors of Shelley's last poems, I shall turn to analyzing the transcriptions and translations.

Chapter 3: Shelley's Engagement with 'Romantic Drama': Excerpts from Calderón

As outlined in the previous chapter, Shelley immediately started recording a number of excerpts and short translations from Calderón's *comedias* in his notebooks, and in 1822, he decided to translate three scenes from *El mágico prodigioso* for publication. This chapter will consider his motivations behind selecting certain lines and passages and, using these as a starting point, will show that Shelley not only read the Golden Age dramatist very closely and understood his dramatic style and techniques but also paid attention to specific elements which chime with Schlegel's conception of romantic drama. The conclusions drawn in this chapter will already indicate what kind of influence we may expect on Shelley's own compositions in the subsequent chapters of this thesis.

The excerpts can roughly be divided into two groups with different emphases: those foregrounding lyricism and poetic images that served specific functions, and those demonstrating Calderón's dramatic sensibility and theatrical effects. However, both aspects are closely intertwined in the Spaniard's overall conception of drama, which brings to mind August Wilhelm Schlegel's approach of considering a dramatic work 'in a double point of view': 'how far it is *poetical*, and how far it is *theatrical*' (*Lectures*, i. 30). A 'poetical' play, in Schlegel's understanding, is not merely written in verse but displays 'poetry in the spirit and plan'; it must form a 'connected whole' – a demand in line with his stress on inner unity – and be a mirror of ideas, thoughts, and feelings (*Lectures*, i. 30). It becomes 'theatrical' when it 'produce[s] an impression on an assembled crowd', awakening attention, sympathy, and participation. These ends are achieved by perspicuity, rapidity, and

energy (*Lectures*, i. 31). A drama must have a rhythm and make a strong impression, for instance by using the effect of contrasts, such as between calm contemplation and tumultuous emotions (*Lectures*, i. 32-3). Owing to the fact that Shelley makes only short extracts and from different plays, until we come to his translations from *El mágico prodigioso*, our study of the 'theatrical' side of Calderón's works will necessarily be limited in scope and focus on the impression that is produced, stimulating sympathy and attention, instead of considering the progress of the action.

As Schlegel points out, his methodology presupposes that 'a visible representation is essential to the dramatic form' (*Lectures*, i. 30). In the case of a writer who failed at getting a play staged that was explicitly written for performance, who abandoned tragedies begun with a view to the stage, and who wrote dramas that he did not expect to be performed, a parallel to Schlegel's approach may seem rather far-fetched. However, as Jacqueline Mulhallen has shown in detail in *The Theatre of Shelley*, all of Shelley's dramatic compositions contain theatrical elements. Whilst I do not consider Shelley to have written all of them with the intention of making them stageable, for instance with specificities of production in mind, I argue that he wrote them with a theatrical consciousness and paid significant attention to the theatricality or even staginess of his works. Consequently, I venture to claim that whether or not a work was written for performance or was produced is virtually insignificant. After all, the effect of Calderón's plays and of *Faust* on him was enormous, even though Shelley never saw any of them in the theatre. Moreover, stage directions are extremely rare in the Spaniard's works, which makes it almost impossible for an English author without any knowledge of the stage during the Spanish Golden Age to imagine how the

dramas would have appeared in performance. Similarly, Shelley is likely to have envisioned his own impact on others in the same way. As director of the theatre in Weimar, Goethe mounted full-scale productions of Calderón's work but he claimed:

> Confronted with any stage structure, I would like to say to the truly theatrical genius: Hic Rhodus, hic salta! I shall dare to produce Calderón's plays at every country fair, upon simple boards extended over barrels, and provide pleasure for both the educated and uneducated masses.[1]

In fact, simply by reading Calderón's plays out loud Goethe achieved an enormous emotional impact – in particular on himself, for when he was reading August Wilhelm Schlegel's translation of *El príncipe constante* in Johanna Schopenhauer's literary salon in 1807, he 'had to interrupt himself and even threw the manuscript on the floor because of his great emotional response.'[2] When I speak of Calderón's theatricality, it is this ability of exerting a strong dramatic effect on the audience or reader that I am primarily referring to, and not a histrionic or affected style, and it is this aspect, I argue, that plays an important part in Shelley's response to and reception of the Spaniard's work.

Having elaborated my understanding of the theatrical side of a dramatic work, I shall begin with an excerpt that broaches exactly that aspect. In HM 2176, Shelley jotted down the following lines from *El galán fantasma* (*The Phantom Gallant*), which appear shortly after the beginning of the second act:

> diselo a mis ojos

---

[1] Letter of 1 February, 1808; 'Vor jedem Brettergerüste möchte ich dem wahrhaft theatralischen Genie sagen: Hic Rhodus hic salta! Auf jedem Jahrmarkt getraue ich mir auf Bohlen über Fässer geschichtet, mit Calderóns Stücken, mutatis mutandis, der gebildeten und ungebildeten Masse das höchste Vergnügen zu machen.' My translation is based on Ernst Behler's in 'The Reception of Calderón among the German Romantics', 440.

[2] Behler, 'The Reception of Calderón among the German Romantics', 439.

aparte

Porque si son mudas lenguas

Del alma, no callaran

A Carlos nada que sepan. (*MYR:S*, vi. 59; f. 12v)

The fact that Shelley transcribes the stage direction – 'aparte' ('aside') – shows that he contemplated the dramatic character of the situation, instead of merely considering the image and idea expressed in this passage. Therefore, I shall quickly place the quotation in context. The play opens with Julia telling her suitor Astolfo that the Duke of Saxony, desiring her, is intending to kill him. Critically wounded in duel, Astolfo is successfully nursed by his father Enrique, who, in order to save him from the Duke's revenge and another duel, as required by the honour code, pretends that he died. Just as Enrique informs his daughter Laura that he has two horses prepared for his son to leave, Astolfo's friend and Laura's love interest Carlos enters, and Enrique urges her not to disclose to him what happened. Her response, 'Say this to my eyes' ('[Eso] díselo a mis ojos'), as well as her subsequent aside, 'because, if they are mute languages of the soul, they will not conceal anything they may know to Carlos', constitute the passage copied out by Shelley. Although he does not transcribe the scene further, Shelley must have also had in mind a remark by Carlos, only five lines below those quoted in the notebook: 'It is well that today my eyes save me from the trouble of having to affirm to you how much I lament Astolfo's unhappy tragedy' (Aguilar, ii. 648).[3] Such cases of dramatic irony are common in Calderón's work, and particularly numerous in the *comedias de capa y espada*. Not only a source of amusement, they draw attention to the dramatist's construction of

[3] 'Si bien de una circunstancia / hoy mis ojos me reservan, / que es encareceros cuánto / siento la infeliz tragedia / de Astolfo.'

his material, which makes them instances of dramatic self-consciousness. Moments that expose the process of fiction-making are frequent in Shelley's poetry, as Michael O'Neill has demonstrated in *Romanticism and the Self-Conscious Poem* (1997), and they can also be found in his dramatic works, taking on various forms, often with a metatheatrical character, as will be shown in the following chapters. Moreover, the scene questions the possibility of dissimulation, and thus, even though the characters themselves are not aware of being characters, becomes partly metadramatic by indirectly hinting at the process of acting.

Calderón's emphasis on the eyes reminds us of the prominence Shelley gives to looks and eyes in *The Cenci*, often as means of exerting power, but also in their revelatory function. For instance, wondering what her husband could have done to Beatrice, Lucretia notes: 'Thou art unlike thyself; thine eyes shoot forth / A wandering and strange spirit' (*PS*, iii. i. 81-2). The extract from *El galán fantasma* is likely to have been made after August 1819, but even if Shelley had not read Calderón's work prior to his note-taking session and the completion of his tragedy, it still reveals what the English poet was looking for in the *comedias*, and how he considered them to relate to his own work. References to eyes ('ojos') recur throughout *El galán fantasma*, serving roughly two different purposes in addition to giving a certain unity and structure to the play. Until the middle of the second act, eyes are seen predominantly as a vehicle of truthful feelings and emotions, in particular in combination with tears. They not only connect the lovers – Laura and Carlos, or Julia and Astolfo – but also father and son, as Astolfo recounts how the blood flowing from his wounds mingled with the tears from his father's eyes when

holding his wounded son in his arms.[4] Thus, owing to their revelatory nature, eyes are an obstacle when emotions must be concealed and actions feigned, as in Shelley's excerpt. However, the reverse is true in the final act of *The Cenci*, as Beatrice commands Marzio to lie by looking at him. When the 'phantom' Astolfo begins to appear in Act II, the emphasis shifts from a more personal illusion, in the form of dissimulation, to a theatrical illusion, and new importance is added to the eyes, which now become the means to establish truth or induce the characters to give in to the illusion. From a superior position of knowledge, the spectators can critically observe the delusions and deceits on stage – but will also find themselves entranced by a fiction.

Keeping the audience in suspense is vital to the 'theatrical side' of a work and to the creation of stage illusion. Calderón ironically achieves this – both in the transcribed passage as well as throughout the whole play – by having characters create their own fictions, which the spectator is eager to see succeed. With its emphasis on the engineering of illusion and creation of theatrical effects *within* the framework of the play, *El galán fantasma* shows parallels with *The Cenci*, in which several characters, like dramatists, stage scenes, such as the Count during the banquet, or try to engineer their own 'drama', as the thwarted Orsino, who 'thought to act a solemn comedy / Upon the painted scene of this new world' (*SPP*, V. i. 77-8). The difference between the two plays lies of course in the characters' motivations: in Calderón's *comedia*, it is a survival strategy and a means to find freedom and

[4] Nora Crook has suggested that this passage may relate to lines found in the same Huntington Notebook, which are usually thought to have been inspired by the image of the blinded Oedipus in Sophocles's *Oedipus Tyrannus*: 'Mine eyes [ ] like two ever-bleeding wounds / Watering my footsteps with their briny rain' (*PS*, iii. 20; HM 2176, f. *12r) (email of 21 March 2013). Yet these Sophoclean lines may also have been inspired by a scene in the third act of *La Virgen del Sagrario*, in which the Moor Selín cries blood at the feet of the King of Toledo.

happiness in an oppressive society, ruled by a ruthless aristocrat; in *The Cenci*, it is only so in Beatrice's case in the Hall of Justice, and in a negative manner. In terms of the characters' motivations, another play by Calderón relates more closely to *The Cenci*: *Los cabellos de Absalón* (*The Hair of Absalom*), a drama based on the biblical story in 2 Samuel 13. Shelley had not read this *comedia* when he composed his tragedy, but the fact that it struck him deeply – he transcribed from it four times, thought it was 'full of the deepest & the tenderest touches of nature', and gave Maria Gisborne a detailed opinion of it[5] – suggests that it displayed something which he was likewise aiming to achieve in his own work.

The extract I shall consider first is also contained in HM 2176 and thematically related to the one discussed above. It is transcribed from the first act of *Los cabellos de Absalón*. On his return from a successful military campaign, King David finds one of his sons, Amón, withdrawn and refusing to give the cause of his melancholy, namely his love for his half-sister Tamar. Having sent his father and four brothers away, Amón is asked by his servant Jonadab to reveal the reason for his suffering, but he replies that he would deny it to himself if only he could, and continues:

> Es tal que aun di [sic] mi silencio
> Vivo tal vez temeroso
> Porque mi [sic] han dicho, que saben
> Con silencio hablar los ojos (*MYR:S*, vi. 338-9; f.*11r)[6]

This is the passage Shelley transcribed, which translates as:

> It is such that even of my silence

[5] Letter to Maria Gisborne, 16 November 1819; my own transcription from Bodleian, MS. Shelley c. 1, ff. 318-19.
[6] This excerpt was first identified by Timothy Webb (*BSM*, xix p. lxxvi n.35).

I live in fear

For I have been told that eyes

Can speak in silence[7]

If imagined as spoken on stage, these lines become highly theatrical. The audience, already kept in suspense for two scenes, is as desirous as Jonadab to discover the reason for Amón's suffering and thus likely to start observing the behaviour of the actor playing David's son, with a particular focus on his eyes – at least in theory, given the usual distance of spectators from the stage.

We find further lines relating to Amón's conflict between passions and reason in the Huntington Notebook, this time already translated by Shelley. Having learned from Amón that he is in love with a woman who must never know about it, Tamar unsuspectingly asks him why. 'I more esteem / Her whom I love, than that which I desire', Amón explains, showing his reason to still dominate his incestuous feelings (*MYR:S*, vi. 340-1, f. *10v).[8] Whilst at first fearful that his eyes will disclose the secret, Amón later reveals himself to his servant and begins to secretly scheme his approach to Tamar. In a letter to Maria Gisborne, Shelley comments on his conflicting behaviour: 'Calderon, following the Jewish Historians, has represented Amón's action in the basest point of view – he is a prejudiced savage acting what he abhors, & abhorring that which is the unwilling party to his crime'.[9] Amón's self-encounter, self-loathing, and twisted attempt at repression in the scene Shelley transcribes from – 'If I myself could deny it [the incestuous passion] to myself, I

---

[7] Trans. Jonathan Thacker (*PS*, iii. 66); *Los cabellos de Absalón*, lines 255-8.
[8] 'estimo más / lo que amo que lo que espero' (419-20). A literal translation would be: 'I esteem more what I love than what I hope for'. Shelley's translation was first identified in *The* Faust *Draft Notebook*, *BSM*, xix.
[9] 16 November 1819, Bodleian, MS. Shelley c. 1, ff. 318-19. The final part of Shelley's sentence refers to the fact that Amón abhors Tamar immediately after the incest (cf. the first scene of Act II), as well as at a later encounter (1812-21).

would deny it when I notice that I myself feel ashamed of myself when I name it' (250-4) – may have reminded Shelley of Orsino's self-encounter at the beginning of Act V in *The Cenci* ('if I am mistaken, where shall I / Find the disguise to hide me from myself [...]?' [*SPP*, V. i. 102-3]), which Hugh Roberts has recently linked to another character of a Calderón drama, who, in contrast, undergoes a conversion after confronting his sins.[10]

In general, the characters in *Los cabellos de Absalón* recall several of *The Cenci* in their concealment of sinful motivations, their ambitions, and dissimulation, finally destroying themselves and those surrounding them. For instance, when we first encounter Amón in his melancholy, Absalón reveals to his sister Tamar that he would not mind his brother's death because 'for him who aspires to reign, / each brother is an obstacle' (217-8). Yet David is standing above the ruthless ambitions and murderous desires. Regarding the King and his sons, Shelley wrote that 'nothing can be more pathetically concieved [sic] than the character of the old David, & the tender & impartial love, overcoming all insults & all crimes, with which he regards his conflicting & disobedient sons.'[11] One extract from the play which we have not yet considered can be related to Shelley's appreciation of David's sympathy and tender feelings for Amón, whose suffering spoils his military victory: 'que de gozos / Que de gustos, que de dichas / Dessazona un pesar Solo!' (*MYR:S*, vi. 338-9; f. *11r).[12] However, whilst almost God-like in his forgiveness of sins, he is also responsible for

---

[10] Hugh Roberts, 'Mere Poetry and Strange Flesh: Shelley's *The Cenci* and Calderón's *El Purgatorio de San Patricio*', *European Romantic Review*, 20.3 (2009), 345-66, here 352-3.

[11] 16 November 1819, Bodleian, MS. Shelley c. 1, ff. 318-19.

[12] 'How many enjoyments, / How many pleasures, how much happiness / Does one sorrow alone spoil!' Correctly, with modern spelling, these lines read: 'qué de gozos, / qué de gustos, qué de dichas / desazona un pesar solo!' (204-6). I have amended Quinn's misspelling 'Dessa zona'.

the disaster, for his pardoning of the incestuous rape of Tamar provokes her to seek fatal revenge on her half-brother out of a feeling of injustice.[13] Given Shelley's central concern with forgiveness in both *Prometheus Unbound* and *The Cenci*, he must have responded to the dramatization of the problematic nature of forgiveness in a more complex way than his lines to Maria Gisborne would indicate. Moreover, his construction of *The Cenci* on the whole recalls Calderón's involvement of most, if not all characters in the tragic outcome, which reflects the Christian idea of the Fall and forms a contrast to the ancient tragedians' focus on one 'flawed' tragic hero.

Amongst Shelley's excerpts from *Los cabellos de Absalón* are also two transcriptions of the same passage which exemplify the 'poetical side' of Calderón's dramas, as understood in Schlegel's terms. One is contained in Shelley's letter to Maria Gisborne and embedded in his opinion on the play:

> sin
> si sangre ~~con~~ fuego hiere
>
> que fara [sic] sangre con fuego?

The lines are spoken by Amón close to the end of Act I, when he becomes explicit about his desire for his half-sister Tamar, who unsuccessfully tries to defend herself. Under the heading 'I-----t', denoting 'Incest', according to Michael Rossington (*PS*, iii. 66), Shelley copies these lines again, slightly extended, into HM 2176:

> pero si dize un proverbio
>
> La sangre sin fuego hierve

[13] For a reading that stresses David's joint responsibility for the tragic events, see Gwynne Edwards, '*Los cabellos de Absalón*: A Reappraisal', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 48.3 (1971), 218-38. Edwards, in contrast to Shelley, stresses David's partiality, that is, his clear preference for one of his sons, Amón.

Que hara la sangre con fuego[14] (*MYR:S*, vi. f. *3v)

The saying, as Shelley must have gathered from the context, refers to the strength of blood bonds, which, combined with passionate 'fire', come to constitute incest. Shelley's focus on these lines is significant for they encapsulate and illustrate the central issue of the play, from which the action evolves. Moreover, the saying appears again in a crucial passage towards the end of Act II, just before King David learns about Amón's death. Worrying that Absalón may have killed his half-brother, David tries to reassure himself that he could not have done so because of their blood ties: 'La sangre hierve sin fuego' (1879). Yet as soon as he has spoken these words, he remembers the incest and admits that Amón is 'culpado en efecto', is indeed guilty (1881). Not only do characters throughout the play have recourse to images of blood and fire,[15] but Absalón and Tamar both, on separate occasions, indirectly allude to the proverb in the final act, announcing that they will wage war against 'blood and fire' (lines 2353 and 2481).

With its appearance before two turning points in the drama and references to it before the concluding war in Act III, the proverb, together with various other uses of 'blood' and 'fire', unifies the entangled issues at the heart of the drama, thereby fulfilling not only Schlegel's demand that there be 'poetry in the spirit and plan' of a play but also that it form a 'connected whole' (*Lectures*, i. 30). This does, of course, not make the image less effective in isolation for Shelley. It expresses the tragic

---

[14] 'but if, as a proverb says, / Blood boils without fire, / Then what will blood do with fire [?]'. Correctly and with twentieth-century spelling, the passage reads: 'pero si dice un proverbio / la sangre sin fuego hierve, / ¿qué hará la sangre con fuego?' (960-2).

[15] Amón, for instance, immediately after the rape, addresses Tamar with 'Infierno, ya no de fuego, / pues helando me atormentas' ('Hell, no longer of fire, / you torment me by freezing me' [1044-5]).

passion in Calderón, and could serve as illustration of the English poet's principle that 'In a dramatic composition the imagery and the passion should interpenetrate one another' (Preface to *The Cenci*, *SPP*, p. 143). Thus, unsurprisingly, he made use of the extract in his own work. As Mary Quinn pointed out, the proverb 'pertain[s] to the condition of the youth in *Una Favola*' (lines 19-20 on f. *37r, and lines 1-2 on f. *37v echo the image in Italian), and for this reason she speculated that Shelley 'may have considered using it as an epigraph for the story' (*MYR:S*, vi. 198). When discussing Shelley's dramatic works, in particular *The Cenci* and *Hellas*, I shall demonstrate that he employs imagery in a way similar to Calderón, to convey passions and central ideas on the one hand, and to give coherence and inner unity to the composition on the other.

As indicated in the previous chapter, Shelley was particularly fascinated by a monologue from *La cisma de Ingalaterra* (*The Schism in England*; lines 333-444), from which he copied four out of the fourteen *octavas reales* in a letter to Maria Gisborne (16 November 1819), and translated the first seven lines of a stanza on the front paper paste-down of *The Pisan Winter Notebook* (*BSM*, vi. 80-1). Moreover, Thomas Medwin printed a translation of two *octava reales* in his *Life of Shelley*, italicizing lines that were corrected by Shelley (*Life*, 244), and published his own translation, probably also made with his cousin's assistance, in *Sketches in Hindoostan*.[16] Shelley considered the speech not merely as a fragment of a drama but as independent poetry of the highest quality, as his comparison with the Italian model for lyrical poetry affirms: 'Is there any thing in Petrarch finer than the 2.[d] Stanza', he wrote to Maria Gisborne, the absence of a question mark suggesting that

[16] For more details see my discussion in the previous chapter, and *PS*, iii. 724-5.

he expected her consent.[17] Medwin remarked in his biography that 'the octave stanzas' were 'a strange metre in a drama, to choose' (*Life*, 244), and we can assume that his remark, at least to some extent, also reflected Shelley's opinion. The latter may have transformed the lines he plagiarized in *The Cenci* from their original *octavas reales* into blank verse for the sake of a smooth integration, but even in his two lyrical dramas, he does not draw on this verse form. Nevertheless, it is important to note Shelley's knowledge of and engagement with Calderón's use of the *octava real*, not least for the fact that it may have drawn his attention to the description of the chasm in *El purgatorio de San Patricio* in the first place, as it is the only instance of *octavas reales* in this *comedia* (extending over eighty-eight lines). Furthermore, if *El purgatorio* was the play with which Shelley began his studies of Calderón, it may also have constituted his very first encounter with the use of *ottava rima* in the dramatic genre – unless he considered the 'Zueignung' ('Dedication') in Goethe's *Faust* as an integral part of the play.[18]

The *octava real*, derived from the Italian *ottava rima*, was common in Spanish Golden Age drama for smaller passages – Tirso de Molina, for instance, employed it in his drama on Don Juan, *El burlador de Sevilla*[19] – although Cervantes used it extensively in *El cerco de Numancia*, which Shelley read in 1821. However, to non-Spaniards it seemed astonishing in a dramatic work, as it was the dominant form of Italian narrative verse and adopted abroad chiefly for narrative purposes as well. Therefore, the use of *ottava rima* in drama represented an extension of the formal

---

[17] Letter to Maria Gisborne, 16 November 1819, Bodleian, MS. Shelley c. 1, ff. 318-19.
[18] If he read *La devoción de la cruz* before *La cisma*, he would have found *octavas reales* in the first act, lines 763-94. Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *La devoción de la cruz*, ed. Manuel Delgado, Letras Hispánicas, 489 (Madrid: Cátedra, 2000).
[19] To be precise, the authorship of *El burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra* (*The Trickster of Seville and the Stone Guest*) has not been fully determined, but the play is traditionally attributed to Tirso.

possibilities, and an instance of genre-mixing for English Romantics such as Shelley. In the case of Carlos's speech, this combination of forms even extends further given that, in Shelley's judgement, the *octavas reales* constituted poetry – poetry with a narrative form in a dramatic work. Unlike Luigi Pulci and John Hookham Frere, who used *ottava rima* for mock-heroic works, or Byron, who put the verse form to comic or, in the case of *The Vision of Judgement*, satirical purposes, the *octavas reales* had a lofty tone and represented an elevated, noble style in Spanish Golden Age drama. Thus the serious use of the form in Spain resembles Tasso's and Ariosto's, but was not unknown to English literature given that, for instance, John Keats employed *ottava rima* in 'Isabella, or the Pot of Basil'.[20] Nonetheless, Donald Reiman considered the tone of the Medwin-Shelley translation of Calderón's *ottava rima* in *La cisma de Ingalaterra* so distinct from other models that he suggested that 'Shelley's use of the stanza in "The Witch of Atlas" derives not as a variant from Pulci or Byron's other Italian models but directly from Calderon de la Barca's use of the stanza.'[21]

Another unusual form to employ in dramatic works is also frequently found in Calderón's plays, particularly in earlier ones: the sonnet. In HM 2176, Shelley transcribed the first tercet of the first of two sonnets in *El príncipe constante*, with the Petrarchan rhyme scheme abba, abba, cdc, dcd.

Ã florecer las rosas madrugaron

Y para envejecerse florecieron,

---

[20] For a recent study of the status of *ottava rima* in England, see Diego Saglia, 'Ottavas and Spenserians in 1820s Britain', *The Wordsworth Circle*, 44.1 (2013), 51-6.

[21] Donald H. Reiman, 'Introduction', in Thomas Medwin, *Oswald and Edwin, Sketches in Hindoostan, Ahasuerus*, ed. Donald H. Reiman, Romantic Context: Poetry; Significant Minor Poetry 1789-1830 (New York and London: Garland, 1978), viii.

Cuna e sepulcro in un boton hallaron (*PS*, iii. 67; cf. *MYR:S*, vi. 336-7)[22]

He provided his own literal translation directly underneath:

The roses arose early to blossom

& they [~~pr~~] blossomed to grow old; [~~a~~]

they found a cradle & a sepulchre

in a bud. (*MYR:S*, vi. 336-7)

The two sonnets, succinctly encapsulating the main ideas, images, and opposing positions in *El príncipe constante*, as I shall elaborate in Chapter 5, stand not only metaphorically but physically, in terms of line numbers, at the centre of Calderón's *comedia*. At the same time, the sonnets retain a certain independence due to their formal qualities and the fact that they are almost detachable as pure poetry.

In general, Calderón's persistent use of rhyme (whether full rhyme or *asonance*, i.e. assonance serving the function of rhyme), and his variety of verse forms, frequently changing, struck foreign readers and were hailed by the German Romantics, some of whom became directly inspired to use assonances or trochees, which had hitherto been disparaged as metre for serious drama.[23] Shelley rendered Carlos's speech in *octavas reales*, both in his joint translations with Medwin and in his own, consisting of several lines in the *Pisan Winter Notebook*.[24] The translation of Segismundo's speech ('It is a singular world') is in blank verse, as is a large part of the scenes from *El mágico* prodigioso, but in the latter, we do encounter passages in

---

[22] I follow Michael Rossington's transcription instead of Quinn's. The lines and Shelley's translation of them were identified by Eunice Joiner Gates in 'Shelley and Calderón', 44.

[23] For the German Romantics' reaction to Calderón's verse forms, see Swana Hardy, *Goethe, Calderón und die romantische Theorie des Dramas*, Heidelberger Forschungen, 10 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1965), 55-8.

[24] The translation in the *Pisan Winter Notebook* is partly illegible and unfinished, but the rhyme of lines 1 and 3 ('night' – 'bright') suggests that Shelley intended to keep the original rhyme scheme.

rhymed verse in 'Scene 2' and 'Scene 3'. Nevertheless, Shelley was hesitant to introduce foreign metres and rhyme into his dramatic works, probably because the English blank verse tradition loomed large for him: both *The Cenci* and *Charles the First* are written in blank verse, apart from Beatrice's song (*SPP*, V. iii. 130-45) and Archy's ditty (*OSA*, Scene V, lines 5-16), a practice reminiscent of Shakespeare.

The constant use of verse with frequent variations in metre and rhyme was common practice in Spanish Golden Age drama. Scene changes or changes in the situation, variations in a speaker's objectives, and shifts in the mood of the dialogue or of a character are often accompanied by a new verse form.[25] Lope de Vega briefly sketched out the functions of individual verse forms in his *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo* (1609), but, whilst there were certain traditions, their use was never strictly limited to a certain content or specific dramatic situations. Concerned with Calderón's reception, Richard Chenevix Trench identified the variety of the Spanish metres and 'the curious intricacy of their rhythmical arrangement' as obstacles to the dramatist's introduction to England.[26] He considered the assonant rhyme of the *romance* 'altogether strange to our ears' and, having exasperatedly given several examples, concluded that it was 'impalpable'.[27] Given the supposed flexibility of the rules for syllable count and rhyming vowels or diphthongs, it was certainly difficult, if not impossible for English writers such as Shelley to detect the norms and the consistency of the *asonances*. Since the *romance* was the basic form for Calderón – for instance, it accounts for 56% of the verse in *El*

---

[25] For an introduction into Spanish verse forms and their use, see Jonathan Thacker, 'Appendix 1: Verse Forms', in *A Companion to Golden Age Theatre*, Colección Tamesis, Serie A: Monografías, 235 (Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2007), 179-85.
[26] Richard Chenevix Trench, *An Essay on the Life and Genius of Calderon*, rev. 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1880), 141-2, quote from 142.
[27] *An Essay on the Life and Genius of Calderon*, 142 and 143.

mágico prodigioso,[28] and 46% of that of *La devoción de la cruz*[29] – the translators' problems with the Spanish assonant rhyme was significant. The *romance* is octosyllabic and without a set rhythmical pattern, like all verse forms native to Spain, which according to Ciriaco Morón causes further difficulties in the process of translation. Emphasizing the sonority of the Spanish octosyllabic verses and arguing that they make the poetic element manifest, Morón regrets that, as a result, a translation will draw our attention away from the form and towards the theme.[30] In his analysis of Shelley's 'Scenes' from *El mágico prodigioso*, Timothy Webb pointed out that the English poet, by inserting and altering words and lines, 'dignified and elevated' passages in Calderón (*Violet*, 249; see also 250-1). Yet, with his Spanish teachers and sensitivity for prosody, Shelley would have been able to detect the poetry and grandeur already inherent in the original verse so that he felt the need to change the diction in order to convey what was lost in translation.[31]

Despairing at the incompatibility of Spanish and English verse, Richard Chenevix Trench wondered: 'what could be more unlike one another than the slow and somewhat stately movement of our dramatic verse, and the quick lyric dance of the Spanish assonants, short trochaics of seven or eight syllables in length?'[32]

---

[28] Wardropper, 'Introducción', in Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *El mágico prodigioso*, ed. Bruce W. Wardropper, Letras Hispánicas, 217, 5th ed. (Madrid: Cátedra, 2011), 11-59, here 53.

[29] I have calculated the percentage from Delgado's verse count in 'Introducción', *La devoción de la cruz*, 80.

[30] Ciriaco Morón, 'Introducción', in *La vida es sueño*, 46-7.

[31] In the description of the shipwreck, however, as Webb has pointed out, Shelley exaggerates with his intensifying and over-indulgent additions, bringing a 'kind of melodramatic vulgarity' to the original lines (*Violet*, 260).

[32] *An Essay on the Life and Genius of Calderon*, 145. As regards speed, I do not agree with Timothy Webb that Shelley increases the tempo in the Daemon's account of his wanderings in 'Scene 2'. Not only would such a change be necessary simply to counteract the slowness introduced by the English metre, but the 'use of run-on lines' and 'the rapid accumulation of phrases' Webb notices in the translation are

Translators, he noted in 1880, 'have generally fallen back on blank verse' to render the *romance*.[33] It was indeed a reasonable choice, as even the German Schlegel noted that '[t]he blank verse has th[e] advantage, that its tone may be elevated or lowered; it admits of approximation to the familiar style of conversation, and never forms such an abrupt contrast as that, for example, between plain prose and rhymed Alexandrines' (*Lectures*, ii. 149). This flexibility accounts for the fact that Calderón was and still is commonly translated into blank verse, even though it levels the variety produced by the Spanish alterations of verse forms.[34] Through a consideration of the 'Scenes' from *El mágico prodigioso*, I shall illustrate Shelley's method of rendering Calderón's versification into his native tongue, which discloses his sensitivity to the foreign metre despite the impossibility of adequate representation. According to Medwin, Shelley 'held it an essential justice to an author, to render him in the same form' (*Life*, 244), yet he also reports in his *Life* that '[a]nother of the canons of Shelley, was, that translations are intended for those who do not understand the originals, and that they should be purely English' (246). Overall, the English poet at least tried to retain the rhyme in those instances in

---

already there in the original (*Violet*, 246). Shelley thus rather retains the speed. For instance, the first two lines of the passage Webb refers to (*OSA*, 141-3), a main clause in Calderón (*El mágico*, 1337-8), are connected by an enjambment, and the syntax hastens the reader to the predicate placed at the very end of the phrase, which would appear at the beginning in normal speech. Similarly, in the following sentence, the predicate does not appear until the sixth line (*El mágico*, 1341-6). Webb later uses the same example again to claim once more that Shelley sped up the verse (*Violet*, 271-2).

[33] *An Essay on the Life and Genius of Calderon*, 145.

[34] Cf. Mackenzie and Muir, in the Preface to their translation of *La cisma de Ingalaterra*: 'In our opinion, the naturalness and flexibility of speech in performance achieved through "the uses of polymetry" in the Spanish national theatre of the Golden Age can most nearly be emulated in English through the medium of blank verse, which was the form, after all, through which dramatists and actors ensured that their poetry was spoken believably and realistically, but yet artistically during the similarly national, comparably "Golden" and nearly contemporary Age of Elizabethan Drama in England' (*La cisma de Ingalaterra*, p. vii).

which verse forms other than the *romance*, in particular Italianate ones, were employed.

'Scene 1', written in *romance* throughout in the original (with the assonant rhyme á-a), is rendered in blank verse, but in 'Scene 2', in which Calderón used *redondillas* (abba) before and the Italianate *silvas* after the Daemon's acceptance of Cyprian's offer of his soul, most of the protagonist's opening monologue appears in rhyming couplets (*OSA*, ii. 1-70). In the original Spanish, the subsequent dialogue between Cyprian and the Daemon is in the native *redondillas*, and as the latter begins to recount the story of 'his' life, the metre switches to *romance* (ó-o). In both instances, Shelley chooses blank verse. In 'Scene 3', however, he tries to echo the original verse form of the Daemon's opening speech. These *silvas*, consisting of rhyming couplets of hendecasyllables alternating with heptasyllables, are also rendered in rhyming couplets, albeit at times irregular ones, and the line lengths vary between six and eleven syllables, although rather erratically. Shelley may well have felt the appropriateness of the *silvas*, generally found in more lyrical and passionate passages due to the motion introduced by the varying, conflicting nature of the metre. Similarly, the Voice in octosyllables rhyming aa-bbaacc-aa in Calderón is rendered in lines ranging between seven and nine syllables with a similar rhyme scheme, also including a refrain (*estribillo*): aa-bcbcddd-aa. And Justina's soliloquy in the temptation scene, held in octosyllabic *quintillas* (stanzas of five lines rhyming ababa, aabba, or abaab), equally appears in rhymed lines of mostly seven to nine syllables (*OSA*, iii. 1-78). The irregularity of Shelley's line length conforms with that of the original, which suggests that he either understood the complicated rules of counting Spanish syllables, depending on stress, or, more likely, that he assumed it

was standard practise to take liberties.[35] Yet the *quintillas* of Justina's monologue following the enchantment as well as her conversations with the Daemon and Lisandro are given in blank verse. We must note, however, that Shelley's blank verse at times departs from the iambic pentameter, particularly in 'Scene 1', employing trochees and introducing lines with spondees, thus avoiding the ponderousness of the English verse and the 'stately movement', as Trench called it.

In his two 'Lyrical Dramas', *Prometheus Unbound* and *Hellas*, Shelley shows an affinity with Calderón's use of verse forms, as I shall discuss in Chapter 5 and 6. In romantic drama, as conceived by Schlegel and practised by his circle and contemporaries, including not only Romantics such as Ludwig Tieck but also Goethe, versification holds an unprecedented importance.[36] It allowed for an inclusion of various generic and formal traditions, thus heightening the self-consciousness of the work and its constructedness. Not only enabling a mixture of forms and genres, a more varied metre also allowed for a greater combination of all kinds of opposites, so characteristic of modern consciousness and modern art. Versification carries not only a variety of passions but also meaning, for, as Schlegel demanded in the *Lectures*, content and form must correspond: as 'significant exterior' or 'speaking physiognomy', the latter represents the subject matter in a work of 'organical' unity (*Lectures*, ii. 95). That Shelley followed such a principle of a correspondence between verse form and theme or content becomes already evident in his most fundamental distinction: blank verse for tragedy, as exemplified by *The Cenci* and

---

[35] An outline of Spanish syllable count can be found in Jonathan Thacker, *A Companion to Golden Age Theatre*, 180-1.

[36] Swana Hardy emphasizes the importance of rhyme and metre throughout her study, arguing that the new form of the romantic drama is most evident in these (*Goethe, Calderon und die romantische Theorie des Dramas*, 55).

Charles the First, and a variety of verse forms with intricate rhyme schemes for lyrical dramas. Yet, as we shall see, his practice is much subtler and more elaborate.

In several of the octaves from Carlos's speech, Calderón matches the restrictive, inflexible form of the rhyme scheme with a highly structured arrangement of the imagery. In the octave stanza Shelley attempted to translate in the *Pisan Winter Notebook*, which also forms part of his transcription in the postscript for Mrs Gisborne, we find an example of the Spaniard's fondness for illustrating an idea, feeling, or theme with consecutive images or metaphors, standing in parallel to each other. At the end, they are drawn together in a single sentence, or, when Calderón elaborates his imagery in longer passages, are recapitulated in a stanza and related to a conclusion. Because Shelley's pencil lines, beginning 'The dewy silence of the breathing night', are badly smudged, I shall resort to Kenneth Muir and Ann L. Mackenzie's translation of the octave in question:

> Therein [i.e. in the garden] the silence of the chilling night,
> The jessamine twining round the trellises,
> The crystal water flowing from the fountain,
> The brooklet murmuring in self-complaint,
> The wind among the leaves, and the breeze sighing
> Among the flowers, all signifying love –
> Is it surprising then, in such a stillness,
> That birds and streams and flowers have a soul? (*La cisma*, 397-404)

Beginning in the silence of the night, the idea that all was 'signifying love' ('todo era amor', 403) runs through the images of flowers, of flowing water, and of soft wind, and, after re-emphasizing the 'stillness', these images are gathered together in reverse order in the concluding line. One could demur that Calderón's 'wind' or

'breeze' turns into 'birds' yet not only are birds always associated with the element of air in his works, but Ann L. Mackenzie has suggested that 'aves' ('birds') – often spelled 'aues' in the seventeenth century – was a misprint of 'auras' ('breezes').[37] In this instance, as so often in the *comedias* and *autos*, the images refer to the different elements: earth (flower), water (stream), and air (wind). With fire missing, a sense of imbalance is already underlying the supposed harmony of the scene, and when we arrive at the two successive octaves, which draw on the absent element, our feeling is confirmed.

These are the two stanzas Medwin translated with Shelley's co-operation (*La cisma*, lines 405-20), also transcribed in the letter to Maria Gisborne, in which Carlos illustrates his courtship of Anne Boleyn and the subsequent consummation of his love first by means of the image of the bee hesitantly drawing closer to the rose, and, afterwards, the moth circling a taper. Whilst Shelley and Medwin took much liberty, they still rendered the basic idea of the metaphors correctly:

> Hast thou not seen, officious with delight,
> Move through the illuminated air about the flower,
> The Bee, that fears to drink its purple light,
> Lest danger lurk within that Rose's bower?
> Hast thou not marked the moth's enamoured flight,
> About the Taper's flame at evening hour,
> *Till kindle in that monumental fire*
> *His sunflower wings their own funeral pyre?*[38] (*Life*, 244)

[37] 'Commentary', in *La cisma de Ingalaterra*, 203.
[38] The lines Medwin prints in italics were those corrected by Shelley, as he claims.

In the succeeding octave, Carlos relates the metaphor to himself, first by comparing his movements and naming the attracting objects – 'My heart its wishes trembling to unfold, / Thus round the Rose and Taper hovering came' – and, finally, after describing the change he underwent (which the translation does not render correctly), by restating the images of 'bee' and 'moth', and, crossing the metaphors, applying them to himself: '*I burnt my wings, and settled on the Rose*' (*Life*, 244).

The images do not necessarily have to relate to the different elements, and Calderón also extended this parallelistic structure into a more episodic one, devoting not merely one or two lines to some of the images but a whole stanza to each. The scene of Justina's temptation, which Shelley translated from Act III of *El mágico prodigioso*, provides another example. Given the frequency with which the Spaniard resorted to this principle of construction, it is impossible to list all the instances of episodic form Shelley would have encountered. We may only mention that another example, which he is likely to have read early in his Calderón studies, is contained in *La vida es sueño*, lines 1595-1617, an image of which – 'inquieta república de estrellas', 'unquiet republic of stars' (1605) – presumably gave rise to 'The unquiet Republic of the maze / Of Planets' in Act IV of *Prometheus Unbound* (*SPP*, 398-9). Salvador de Madariaga already argued almost a hundred years ago that this design was Shelley's model for the structural arrangement of the first four stanzas of 'Ode to the West Wind', consisting of five sonnets in *terza rima*: 'the first stanza might be called "The Leaf"; the second "The Cloud"; the third "The Wave"; the fourth sums up'.[39] In fact, the fourth stanza gathers the previous images twice. First, Shelley recollects them in individual, consecutive lines, emphasizing the parallel order: 'If I were a dead leaf [...] / If I were a swift cloud [...] / A wave [...]' (*SPP*, 43-5); then he

[39] *Shelley and Calderón*, 16.

summarizes the images in the most compressed manner through parataxis: 'Oh! lift me as a wave, a leaf, a cloud!' (*SPP*, 53). It is conspicuous that Shelley, like Calderón, chooses images belonging to different elements. Where we had earth (flowers), water (streams), and air (breeze) in the example from *La cisma*, we have earth (leaf), air (cloud), and water (wave) in the 'Ode to the West Wind'. What de Madariaga failed to notice was that, as in the passage from Carlos's monologue, another section is added that elaborates the missing element, fire, and forms a conclusion. The fact that stanzas one to three are drafted in the 'Calderonian' Huntington Notebook HM 2176 further underlines the connection between the Ode and the Spaniard. Neville Rogers also found Shelley to have imitated Calderón's 'episodic' form in 'To a Skylark' and 'The keen stars were twinkling'.[40] This illustrates how, in the words of Salvador de Madariaga, 'Calderón's influence seems to have contributed towards rendering Shelley's style a little more architectural than his natural bent would have warranted.'[41]

Whilst not all of Shelley's dramas are – as a whole and in their individual parts – to the same degree 'architectural' in form and content, the structuredness of the lyrical dramas is striking, as I shall elaborate in my discussion of *Hellas*. As exemplified in Calderón's plays, the strict formality of the verse forms employed,[42] the parallel and symmetric arrangement of images, and even the repetition of certain imagery all contribute to making the works ostentatiously artificial, and, consequently, unrealistic, non-mimetic. The metadramatic and self-reflexive

---

[40] *Shelley at Work*, 329.
[41] *Shelley and Calderón*, 16.
[42] To be sure, *ottava rima*, or verse forms similarly constraining, whilst visibly artificial, could be made ostentatiously formless, as Byron's *Don Juan* and *Beppo* demonstrate, for instance by employing conversational syntax with enjambments. In general, however, we can conclude that the more elaborate the rhyme scheme, the more obvious the artifice.

elements pointed out at the beginning work to the same effect, as do his depiction of character and his development of the dramatic action, to be explored in the translated scenes from *El mágico prodigioso*, analyzed below. The Spaniard's dramatic conceptions, representative of Baroque literature in general, thereby stand in sharp contrast to neoclassical demands for verisimilitude, the French *vraisemblance*, but also to certain Romantic notions, such as the emphasis on nature and an advancement of 'the real language of men' by William Wordsworth.[43] Although August Wilhelm Schlegel does not stress 'artificiality' as a characteristic of romantic drama, he lauds the fact that in Calderón's works 'all is finished, agreeably to the most secure and well founded principles, and with the most profound views of art' (*Lectures*, ii. 336). 'Artificiality' is in some respects an inevitable consequence of Schlegel's demand for an inner unity, in which all parts refer to one idea or feeling, as it requires a work to be highly structured. By demonstrating how Shakespeare skilfully crafted even the smallest parts of his works to form a whole, Schlegel disproved English eighteenth-century notions, such as Samuel Johnson's famous assessment of the Bard as a 'poet of nature'.[44] Goethe also emphasized this particular aspect of Calderón's works, praising the Spaniard for his 'unfathomable reason in the construction', as Schelling reported to August Wilhelm Schlegel in 1802.[45] Similarly,

---

[43] 'Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*' (1800), in William Wordsworth, *Wordsworth's Poetry and Prose*, ed. Nicholas Halmi, A Norton Critical Edition (New York: Norton, 2013), 76.

[44] *Johnson on Shakespeare*, ed. Arthur Sherbo, vii. 62.

[45] 'Unbegreiflicher Verstand in der Construction', letter of 13 October 1802, in Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling, *Historisch-kritische Ausgabe*, Reihe III: *Briefe*, Vol. 2 of 3 vols. (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 2010), 496.

Eckermann reports him as saying that 'Calderón is infinitely great in technicality and theatricality'.[46]

Craftsmanship, however, must not be misunderstood as a 'mechanical' organization of compositions. Salvador de Madariaga has, falsely in my view, claimed that there is an 'almost mechanical rigidity which frames and somewhat binds the work of both Shelley and Calderón.'[47] First of all, in terms of imagery, Calderón's style, while appearing to have a separative neatness and an unnecessary, even random effusiveness, in fact displays a love for correspondences and harmony as he weaves the characters into the cosmos, whose different elements, in turn, are all interrelated and, balancing each other, are essential for the order and harmony of the world. Moreover, the unity that Calderón creates through his structuredness is exactly that which Schlegel has termed 'organical', as all parts, all images, are not thrown together at random but are subordinated to one overarching idea and essential to the overall effect. It is not the degree of organization that makes a work 'mechanical' but the principles of organization, as is evident in Schlegel's riposte to the neoclassical 'unities'.

Chapter 1 illustrated the Schlegelian idea of organic unity with a play of a large time scale, Calderón's *Origen, pérdida y restauración de la Virgen del Sagrario*, which is given coherence not just simply by the title's comprehension of its tripartite arrangement (origin, loss, and recovery), alluding to the dogma of the Trinity, but by a structure placing an individual image, namely the physical image of the Virgin, at

---

[46] 'Calderon ist unendlich groß im Technischen und Theatralischen.' Johann Peter Eckermann, *Gespräche mit Goethe in den letzten Jahren seines Lebens: Erster und Zweiter Teil* (Berlin / Weimar: Aufbau, 1982), 137 (12 May 1825).
[47] *Shelley and Calderón*, 17.

its centre.[48] The Huntington notebook HM 2176 contains two lines from *La Virgen del Sagrario*, which, out of context, may appear insignificant: 'her dress / Antique and strange and beautiful' (*MYR:S*, vi. f. *11r). However, they are taken from Selín's description of the very image of the Virgin, which the Moor beheld in a deep well under the cathedral, where Christians had gathered to hear his report. Shelley also transcribed and translated a passage from the beginning of Selín's long speech, describing the cavern leading to the Virgin's niche: 'And in that death like [ ] ca[ve] / A thousand fading ruins lie / ~~Of~~ men & of the works of men' (*MYR:S*, vi. 342; f. *10r).[49] The scene forms the conclusion of the play, thus pulling it together with its focus on the image, next to which the Moor furthermore found an inscribed tablet recapitulating the moment of its concealment in Act 2.

In addition to their relation to the central, unifying image of the play, Shelley's lines are of interest because they form part of an ekphrasis. Selín's encounter with the physical image has visionary qualities as he sees light emanating from its eyes, and his impression changes continuously, so that he questions his ability to describe it. Shelley also transcribed the Moor's anxiety about the limits of

---

[48] For an interpretation supporting my argument of the unifying quality of the Virgin's image see Lorinser's introduction and notes in Calderón de la Barca, *Calderons Größte Dramen religiösen Inhalts, Volume 3: Die Jungfrau des Heiligtums, Die Morgenröte in Copacabana* (1901). The tripartite division of course also imitates the visual construction of altarpieces, and Javier Aparicio Maydeu has argued that elements of the play's construction and dramaturgy echo quasi-dramatic forms of religious Baroque festivals; but Shelley would not have learned enough about conventions of staging from Schlegel to detect the parallels ('Del parateatro litúrgico al teatro religioso: sobre la práctica escénica de *Origen, pérdida y restauración de la Virgen del Sagrario* de Calderón', in Javier Aparicio Maydeu (ed.), *Estudios sobre Calderón 1*, Serie Clásicos y Críticos, Colección Fundamentos, 162 [Madrid: Istmo, 2000], 744-62).

[49] This is an almost exact rendering of the lines which Shelley trancribed in Spanish underneath: 'en este lobrego sitio / Mil caducas ruinas yazen / de edificios y de hombres' (*MYR:S*, vi. 342; f. *10r). For an edition of the lines with commentary, see *PS*, iii. 64. The passage was first identified by Webb (*BSM*, xix. p. lxxvi n35).

representation in the Huntington Notebook and drew on these lines when composing Act IV of *Prometheus Unbound*:[50]

> y voz humana
>
> Quando a tanto se levante
>
> Se[ra] carbon que la bo[rr]e
>
> No matiz que la retrate[51] (*MYR:S*, vi. 342; *10r)

It should be noted that Calderón's character does not primarily question the capacity of language to register earthly reality but specifically its ability to record metaphysical phenomena and truths in mortal expressions. In the end, however, Selín perceived a fixed, representable image, which he sets out to describe: the Virgin's face, hair, eyes, mouth, the child next to her heart, her seat, and finally her clothes. Shelley's short translation forms the beginning of this passage:

> and her dress is
>
> strange and ancient, I
>
> never saw it until now on anybody;
>
> a white tunic
>
> and shawl and all the exterior clothing
>
> on a silver piece of cloth
>
> very bright and brilliant
>
> with some decorations
>
> of pearls and diamonds[52]

---

[50] I shall discuss the lines inspired by this quotation from Calderón (*SPP*, iv. 534-5) in Chapter 5.

[51] 'and a human voice / Which were bold enough to try / Would be charcoal that erases her / Not colour to paint her portrait', trans. Jonathan Thacker (*PS*, iii. 64). I have used Quinn's transcription but corrected her 'mati[x]'. This excerpt was also first identified by Webb in *BSM*, xix.

Despite the physical description, the previous metaphysical qualities loom large in the image as it is first described and later appears on stage. It is intended for the religious audience as an emblem that exists Eucharist-like between the celestial and terrestrial sphere in this hagiographical miracle play. Yet, being situated within a drama and thus merely the representation of a representational relation, the Virgin's status is complicated, theoretically desecrated, involving a potentially sacrilegious act. In such moments, Calderón's drama became unacceptable to neoclassicists, who rejected any non-mimetic and metaphysical associations on stage. However, Calderón's engagement with a non-mimetic style, and, in particular, the problems and limits of representation, certainly played an important part in his attraction for Shelley. Whilst divided from Calderón by his lack of faith in metaphysical certainties, he shared a similar concern with the possibilities of conveying 'beautiful idealisms', deeply aware that more often than not, 'a voice / Is wanting' (*Prometheus Unbound*, 'Preface', p. 209; II. iv. 115-6).

Although ekphrasis is common in Calderón's works, and in Golden Age *comedias* overall, it is unusual for the dramatic genre. Associated mostly with epic but also found in prose generally as well as in poetry (*Ozymandias* being a good example in Shelley), it is itself performance-like and thus virtually dramatic. Included in long monologues, however, it becomes more narrative within plays, and due to its common link with the narrative form, its use in dramas constitutes an extension of the genre, which could even be associated with genre-mixing. In the following chapter, I shall consider Shelley's use of ekphrasis in his dramatic works, begun in *Prometheus Unbound* independent of Calderón, with the short description of 'A temple, gazed upon by Phidian forms' (*SPP*, III. iv. 112-18), but, as I shall argue,

---

[52] Trans. Jonathan Thacker in *PS*, iii. 65.

developed further under the Spaniard's influence. Ekphrasis serves various functions in Calderón, for instance that of sparking the spectators' imagination for the reception of religious truths, or 'extending' the stage, but most interestingly, it constitutes a self-reflexive moment. Engaging with the organization and appearance of another work of art, it shows its own self-consciousness or produces an awareness of its own created status in the reader or spectator.

Ekphrasis' concern with representation and, thus, reality also links with a dominant theme in Calderón: the relation between this world and the world beyond, or, to phrase it differently, a (religious) understanding of 'reality', which is predominantly expressed in the motifs of the world as stage and the life as a dream. The former shall be discussed in more detail in the following chapter; the latter relates to another fragment from Calderón in a Shelley notebook: a partial translation of Segismundo's famous monologue at the end of the second act of *La vida es sueño*.

> It is a singular world we live in — and
> Experience has but taught me one thing alone that life
> Is made up of strange unconnected dreams.
> Man thinks he is — and dreams of that he is
> And never wakes to know he does but dream.
> [...] What is this life – that we should covet it?
> What is this life that we should cling to it?
> A phantom haunted frenzy — a false nature
> A vain and empty shadow, all the good
> We prize or aim at only turns to evil —
> All life and being are but dreams and dreams

> Themselves are but the dreams of other dreams. (*BSM*, xix. 124-5 [p. 60rev.], lines 1-5, 16-22)[53]

Regarding the final line of the translation, the editors of *The* Faust *Draft Notebook* argue that 'Calderón is less complex' with 'los sueños sueños son' (2187), whereas Shelley 'achieves a more confusing mirror-effect' as 'dreams / Themselves are but the dreams of other dreams' (*BSM*, xix. p. lxvii). However, Shelley's sense is already inherent in the original, whose simple wording is ambiguous. English translators have rendered the original 'dreams are dreams' differently, for instance as 'dreams are only dreams',[54] retaining an ambiguity, or 'even dreams are dreams'.[55] In fact, the context of the play and Calderón's religious belief direct us to the sense made explicit by Shelley. What is different in the translation, however, is a subtle shift from Calderón's emphasis that man dreams *what* he is ('sueña / lo que es', 2156-7), to a view that man dreams 'that he is', as Shelley puts it (line 4).[56] Similarly, Shelley produces a doublet in the penultimate line – 'All life and being are but dreams' whereas the original merely states 'toda la vida es sueño' (2186; 'all life is a dream') – again making the issue more existential through this extension.[57]

---

[53] I have removed the full-stop in the manuscript transcription at the end of line 21 for better comprehension.

[54] Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *Life Is a Dream*, trans. Roy Campbell, in Eric Bentley (ed.), *Life is a Dream and Other Spanish Classics*, Eric Bentley's Dramatic Repertoire, 2 (New York: Applause, 1985), 219-92, here 268.

[55] Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *Life Is a Dream / La vida es sueño: A Dual-Language Book*, ed. and trans. Stanley Appelbaum (Mineola, NY: Dover, 2002), 123.

[56] Daniel L. Heiple stresses that life is not a dream for Segismundo 'in the Cartesian sense that he doubts or affirms his existence, but in the sense that the goods of the world, riches and power, are illusory because they can be taken from him against his will' ('Life as Dream and the Philosophy of Disillusionment', in Frederick A. de Armas [ed.], *The Prince in the Tower: Perceptions of* La vida es sueño [Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press / London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1993], 118-31, here 125).

[57] The editors of *The* Faust *Draft Notebook* call the doublet Shelley produced in contrast to the original a characteristic change, as he showed tendencies to elaborate

Christianity is central to Calderón's conception of 'life as dream' and his world-view in general, which is representative of the modern or romantic spirit as defined by Schlegel in his *Lectures*: 'life has become shadow and darkness, and the first dawning of our real existence opens in the world beyond the grave.' We become conscious 'that the happiness after which we strive we can never here attain [...] and that every mortal enjoyment is but a fleeting and momentary deception' (*Lectures*, i. 15). In the age of Calderón, this feeling was captured by the term *desengaño* (disillusionment), the realization that everything worldly is transitory and will come to ruin.[58] The world is thus illusory, a deception. Shelley certainly felt this mood pervading most of Calderón's serious works to some extent, and he may even have learnt about the concept from Maria Gisborne, who instructed Mary about it ten years after Shelley's death, describing to her 'the dull period of what the Spaniards aptly call el desengaño – when the veil of enchantment is rent, and we see things as they really are – the hideous truth, in its own, no longer vivid colours, but in all its nakedness'.[59] Shelley, also influenced by Platonic ideas, expressed similar notions in his later works, most pointedly perhaps – albeit in variation – in the sonnet 'Lift not the painted veil', and his awareness of mutability is all-pervasive. More specifically, Segismundo's monologue, or Calderón's idea of life as dream, has often been directly

---

throughout (*BSM*, xix. p. lxvii). However, it should be noted that he was forced to find a way of extending the octosyllabic lines and, moreover, adopted a stylistic device that is in fact typical of Calderón – in his works in general, and in *La vida es sueño* in particular. Paul Lewis-Smith has pointed out that the Spaniard frequently 'reinforces an idea embodied in a single word by repeating the idea in a synonym [...] or amplifying it in a word of similar significance' (*Calderón de la Barca:* La vida es sueño, Critical Guides to Spanish Texts, 63 [London: Grant and Cutler, 1998], 117).

[58] For a basic description of *desengaño* and its historical context see Daniel L. Heiple, 'Life as Dream and the Philosophy of Disillusionment', 118-9.

[59] Maria Gisborne to Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley, Plymouth, 20 August 1832 (MS. Abinger c. 48, folios 109-10, here 110r; my own transcription).

linked to the 'Conclusion' of 'The Sensitive-Plant': 'in this life / [...] / Where nothing is – but all things seem, / And we, the shadows of the dream' (*SPP*, 9-12).[60]

The Spanish *comedia*, already self-conscious and metadramatic for various reasons,[61] was particularly suitable for expressions of *desengaño*, but drama in general, already concerned with illusion, constitutes an appropriate genre for thematizing dis-illusion. Thus Segismundo's monologue gains when put into the context of the play's overall concern with reality and illusion. Born under frightful portents, Segismundo is immediately after his birth imprisoned in a tower by his father, the King Basilio. As Basilio is confronted with the question of royal succession by his niece and nephew's impending wedding, he feels remorse and intends to test his son, and thus the verity of the prophecy that he would be the cruellest prince of all and divide the kingdom. He arranges to have Segismundo drugged and transplanted to the palace while sleeping. Should the experiment fail, the prince would be put to sleep once more and, on awakening, be told that his royal experience was but a dream, 'porque en el mundo [...] / todos los que viven sueñan' (1148-9).[62] Being thus 'staged', the trial has in itself a certain metadramatic character. Segismundo indeed proves unworthy, is treated as planned, and, on finding himself imprisoned once more, comes to believe, with the subtle influence of his jailor Clotaldo, that he was merely dreaming. The passage from Shelley's notebook is part of his subsequent attempt to make sense of his situation and constitutes the beginning of the prince's spiritual and moral development. From a

---

[60] See, for instance, Neville Rogers, *Shelley at Work*, 172.
[61] Some of the reasons I shall not elaborate here or in the following chapters, particularly those relating to the socio-historical context and the state of art in Spain, unknown to Shelley, can be found in Jonathan Thacker, *Role-Play and the World as Stage in the* comedia (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2002), especially 1-18.
[62] 'because in this world [...] / All who live are dreaming'.

specific experience, namely the supposed dream of his stay in the palace, Segismundo moves on to the general conclusion that all life is a dream, that no worldly goods can last. Yet he was also instructed by Clotaldo of the endurance of virtues: even in dreams, 'a good deed is not lost' ('aún en sueños / no se pierde el hacer bien' [2146-7]). Having been freed by soldiers who put him at the head of a revolution, the prince finds his jailor Clotaldo at his feet but instead of taking revenge on him, pardons him, and with recourse to Clotaldo's own argument, explains: 'Que estoy soñando, y que quiero / obrar bien, pues no se pierde / obrar bien, aun entre sueños' (2399-2401).[63] Acting in the same way towards his defeated father, Segismundo closes the play pronouncing the lesson, which a dream taught him ('fue mi maestro un sueño' [3306]). As the prince is instructed by his supposed dream – the 'staged' interlude in the palace, so is the audience instructed by the play's fiction. In fact, Calderón subtly disrupts the illusion at the end of the play by keeping the addressees of his protagonist's final lines ambiguous, employing words normally used by comic figures addressing the audience at the end of comedies: 'pidiendo de nuestras faltas / perdón, pues de pechos nobles / es tan propio el perdonarlas' (3317-19).[64] As the monologue transcribed in Shelley's notebook is set in dramatic form, unreality and the act of disillusioning are doubled for the spectator, who shares in the learning process of the protagonist. However, the play also exemplifies the staging of supposed realities by those in power, as in the case of Basilio and Clotaldo's plot of drugging Segismundo. This issue, together with metadramatic elements relating more closely to the notion of the 'world as stage'

---

[63] 'I am dreaming, and I want / to do right, for one does not lose / a good deed, even in dreams.'
[64] 'asking to pardon our faults, since it is so characteristic of noble breasts to pardon them'.

and the 'stage as world' shall be discussed in the following chapter, in relation to *The Cenci* and *Charles the First*.

Returning to the point of the constructedness of Calderón's dramas, which also relates to the dramatic self-consciousness discussed above, it remains for us to consider two further elements in his plays that manifest his 'artificiality', in addition to the use of imagery, the variations in metre, the self-consciousness, and metatheatrical instances already examined. As they are better demonstrated in longer passages, these aspects – his development of the dramatic action and his depiction of character – will be discussed below, in the context of Shelley's translations of scenes from *El mágico prodigioso*. To be sure, Shelley did not compose any dramatic works after rendering the three 'Scenes' from the *comedia*. Yet, despite changes in his style and predilection for certain sub-genres, Calderón's principles of construction and his craftsmanship as regards the creation of unity can, with only the very early plays excepted, be gleaned from all of his plays in various degrees so that the following conclusions must be understood as exemplary and transferrable.[65]

---

[65] William Blue has found Calderón to refine his use of imagery after 1630, making it more organic, concise, and complex, but images would already reoccur in critical passages before his middle period (William R. Blue, *The Development of Imagery in Calderón's* Comedias [York, SC: Spanish Literature Publications, 1983], 59). Shelley's quotations and remarks do not focus on early plays anyway; only once does he quote a single image and idea from *Judas Macabeo* (1623), a work particularly associated with a less mature style. *La devoción de la Cruz*, licensed in 1628, was probably written several years before, and, whilst not presenting the most intricate use of imagery on the whole, Alexander A. Parker has, by way of example, shown how a seemingly irrelevant episode, suggesting the image of a 'quagmire of honour', contributes to the unity of the play (Alexander A. Parker, *The Mind and Art of Calderón: Essays on the* Comedias, ed. Deborah Kong [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988], 19-21). Written in 1629, *El príncipe constante* already stands at the very end of Calderón's early period. Parker also draws attention to a shift from metaphor to symbol, which, however, takes place within a general move

towards mythological plays (see his chapter 'From metaphor to symbol', in *The Mind and Art of Calderón*, 25-41).