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Introduction

Gerhard Fischer and Florian Yassen

Collective Creativity: Traditional Patterns and New Paradigms

Seldom has a cultural construct held such popular currency in the contemporary global marketplace of ideas as the ubiquitous notion of creativity. It is a subject taught and researched by teachers and scholars in a range of disciplines, from the aesthetics of art and literature to developmental psychology, from business management to behavioural studies and, indeed, ‘creativity studies’. Countless educators promise to awaken or stimulate your child’s creative potential from the earliest days of daycare and kindergarten. ‘Creative art directors’ have all but convinced us that their ‘creations’ are at the cutting edge of modernist and avantgarde cultural expression and design, rather than just about selling ‘things’ (of sometimes rather dubious if not spurious use value).¹ Media advisers and ‘spin doctors’ are tirelessly ‘creating images’ of politicians and other so-called celebrities that allegedly sway our opinions of such persons along with our views of the policies and values they supposedly represent. Whole industries claim to be involved in the business of creativity, with real estate agents – not wanting to be left behind – spruiking ‘creative office spaces’: where the members of the ‘creative classes’ can presumably go about pursuing their goal of ‘creative excellence’. In universities around the world, courses and degrees in ‘creative writing’ have sprung up in departments of literature and cultural studies in order to ‘teach the unteachable’.² In the UK, as no doubt in other countries, there is a ‘National Centre for Excellence in Creative Industries’, while US academics can join a professional body called the ‘American Creativity Association’ which presents an annual ‘Champion of Creativity Award’: the list could go on. Not

¹ These days, information technology, communications, and advertising are taking over the words “concept” and “creative”, and these “conceptualists” constitute an arrogant breed that reveals the activity of selling to be capitalism’s supreme thought’. Gilles Deleuze, Negotiations, 1972-1990, trans. by M. Joughin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), p. 137.

² Kevin Brophy, Patterns of Creativity: Investigations into the Sources and Methods of Creativity (Amsterdam and New York, NY: Rodopi, 2009), pp. 60-65.
surprisingly, there is also a wealth of literature on creativity, most of it of fairly recent provenance.3

The hyperinflated use of creativity as a cultural and social catch-all term and panacea is all the more astonishing if one considers that the word - albeit not its cognates to create and creation - was not recorded in print in the English language before 1875.4 Creativity is a 'cool' and distinctly new arrival in the contemporary cultural vocabulary. Indeed, art historians and theorists have easily done without it during much of the course of Western art history since classical antiquity. The powerful and long-lasting model of Aristotle's mimēsis held that artistic endeavour was about the imitation of nature, while the equally potent doctrine of a sole god as creator ex nihilo during the Christian Middle Ages meant that human beings were in the business of 'making' things: whether paintings, sculptures or poems. Artists were craftspeople, working collectively as a rule, and to think of them as 'creators' would have been close to blasphemy. It was only during the late Renaissance that a focus on individual artists as outstandingly talented, productive and celebrated led to a new concept that became firmly established by the end of the eighteenth century: the artist as individual creative genius, as Originalgenie, who creates from within himself or herself as an expression of his or her own, unique personality. The socio-historical development that underpinned this paradigm change was a clearly related phenomenon: the challenge to the absolute feudal structure of society with its rigid demarcations of social status and role, of class and gender, gave way to an emerging libertarian, capitalist society with its emphasis on a free, autonomous and secular subject, the bourgeois individual.

It was a process that meant loss as well as gain. The disappearance of the "old order" gave way to a new one in which a radically new experience of the Self became possible. But while the disappearance of the communal bonds of old and of the coercive tradition of a divine absolute led to a liberating experience of the Self, the caesura of 1800 also brought about new forms of social division, isolation, dissociation and individualism along with the desire for new forms of collective experiences, solidarity, class consciousness, communal and social collectivism. New forms of a secular absolute (nation, class, race) and their respective moral and political legitimacy emerged alongside attempts to formulate radical positions of an aesthetic opposition in which moral concepts and argument are replaced in favour of an absolute of individual artistic creation. The distinction between individual and collective creativity, which dates back to the historical juncture of the period around 1800, is thus a characteristic feature of modernity.

Why is it that the idea of creativity holds such universal appeal, given that today the idea of the artist as individual creative genius has become commonplace, if not cliché? We are convinced that an observation by Siegfried Schmidt holds the key to this question: creativity makes 'alterity, discontinuity and difference attractive'. The 'strange' and the 'other', the disruption of the usual, the new, being different, and the differentiation from the universally known are central aspects of a critically productive theory and practice. To be engaged in making this position desirable and tempting is the main characteristic of creativity, in clear opposition to the mundane, the routine, the habitual and non-creative positions whereby nothing undergoes change and everything, repeating itself uniformly, goes its usual way.

But what about collective creativity - the key term with which the present volume is concerned? There is still today a widely held popular opinion, even though it can be found within some academic circles in the Humanities as well, that artists are outsiders, loners, self-absorbed geniuses who create the highest works of art from within themselves. For a long time, collective creativity and collaborative artistic endeavour have been regarded as less valuable if not impossible. Apart from certain phases of artistic production in the context of the working class movement and the more recent historical development of revolutionary states claiming to be in a transition towards socialist or communist social structures, and apart from a few avant-garde experiments in radical aesthetics, an alternative perspective on creative collaboration has emerged only in the last few decades. We are currently in the middle of a transitional period - from an industrial to a post-industrial 'knowledge society', from modern to postmodern aesthetics - during which we have seen the gradual erosion of the idea of the autonomous subject. New theories regarding the position of the individual in society, of individual versus group identity, have come about as a response to the extreme individualisation in the neo-liberal societies of Europe and North America. The dissolution of the concept of the artist's 'work' and the claim of the 'death of the author' - now commonplace in contemporary discourse - along with a number of concepts central to current cultural theories such as 'intertextuality' (a key notion of deconstruction discourse) or 'hybridity' (a favourite of postcolonial studies), all seem to suggest a new openness towards an understanding of human cre-

activity strongly anchored in collective processes. Similarly, a tendency towards the theatrical, towards performativity and staged self-realisation that can be observed just about everywhere, in the media as well as in public and private, everyday life, equally seems to point to a new relevance regarding a practice of collective creativity.

Traditionally, the very notion of collectivity was often seen as a political/ideological issue, with collectivity assigned to the Left as a concept that privileged a subversive notion of collective artistic endeavour as resistance against dominant capitalist art forms and as performative critique of social institutions and political structures. Conversely, the primacy of the individual was claimed as a domain by the liberal/conservative Right. But are there distinctions still meaningful, particularly in view of the disappearing relevance of traditional systems of political fractionalism in a postmodern cultural environment? The implosion of the ‘communist bloc’ over the last two decades in particular offers a challenge to re-assess conventional concepts of collectivism that are politically motivated. On the other hand, contemporary work practices that are characteristic of the ‘new capitalist’ economy and that tend to downplay the role of the individual while emphasizing the virtues of teamwork, networking and of group projects, are similarly in need of a new ideological understanding.

Thus, scholars in the Humanities have begun to focus on a concept of creative collectivity as an overarching principle of organisation beyond the limiting socio-political boundaries of twentieth century discourses. Taking as a cue the ‘explosive expansion of computer networks’ made possible by digital technologies and the internet, the editors of a new Yearbook of Cultural Studies note the increasing interest in networking systems on the basis of which ‘individuals’, ‘groups’, ‘projects’, ‘enterprises’, ‘masses’ and ‘societies’ organise their thinking and learning as well as their aesthetic practice.

The process of individualisation in modernity has taken very different forms in the various arts, and a variety of individual and collective forms of production have thus emerged. We can observe that the more public forms of art, e.g., architecture, theatre, film or internet, tend to be based more obviously on collective forms of work, whereas a more private or intimate art form, such as literature, is being produced as well as received in a more individual mode. There is also great historical variety in the various expressions of collective work, from the builders’ hut of the medieval construction site to the Bauhaus model of the 1920s. In terms of quantity, it ranges from large collectives to small groups of like-minded artists to the collaboration of a single couple; in terms of quality from the radical collectivity in socialist communes to the co-operation of partners on equal terms or the model of a group work based on the principle of a primus inter pares. In collective creative work we can find the greatest spatial proximity next to clear local separation, synchronicity next to temporal sequentiality.

In such processes of collective creativity, we can also find that the different arts join together in intertextual and intermedial relationships, as for example painting and architecture, image and text, or text and sound. In terms of personal artistic relationships, we can identify composer and librettist writer, actor, conductor, musician and singer, to give only a few examples. Moreover, a very special role in the artistic process is played by the recipient, whether they are readers, listeners, viewers or spectators, either individually or as groups. Many creative activities are not possible without the interaction between actor and spectator, especially in the theatre with its transitory, live communication between actors and audience who physically share the same moment and space; but the same is true, to a different degree, also for film, TV, video or hypertext and other medial forms of internet communication. We can observe that collective creativity has reached such a high level of technical development that it has become the dominant aesthetic reality in many areas of artistic human endeavour without, however, negating the creativity of the individual, whether as actor or as spectator. Individual creativity is necessarily embedded in collective creativity, and both are thus given a distinct quality.

2

In the Call for Papers, in which we announced the 2009 Sydney German Studies Symposium on ‘Collective Creativity’, the abstract dichotomy between individual and collaborative creation was formulated as the opening question: ‘Is there such a thing as collective creativity? Two starkly alternative answers were suggested:

YES. All creativity is collective. No creative person exists in isolation; all human beings, artists and scientists in particular, depend on their work and in their creative self-expression on the contribution of others. The original Western philosophical model of creative inquiry is the Socratic Dialogue: without question no answer (which in turn provides a new question). For philosophers like Martin Buber, the creative dimension arises from what lies between I and Thou. In Mikhail Bakhtin’s literary theory, too, the creation of meaning can only proceed in dialogic interaction. Furthermore, all artistic creation aims at outside presentation and recognition in a process of collective reception.

NO. Creativity is always individual. While the social dimension of the Artist’s and the scientist’s work is undeniable, it must nevertheless be stated that the original creative impulse, the intellectual spark that leads to innovation, can only ever be found in the individual mind. The original aesthetic model of this concept is the Romantic Poet: alone and at one with nature. While artists may be surrounded by collaborators and while the technology of some artistic or scientific production requires a highly complex team effort, the final work is always recognizable by the expression that an individual personality has stamped upon it.

---

The following essays — selected from the papers presented at the Sydney Symposium in July 2009 — can all be located within the parameter of this radical binary codification. But rather than focussing on seemingly irreconcilable concepts phrased in terms of traditional binary opposites, the essays show that a contemporary discourse on creativity might be more productive if it searches out and questions the borders, intersections or interfaces of artistic, scientific and cultural practice where the individual and the collective merge, come together or confront each other. This precisely is the criterion on which we have based the selection of the following essays. They are divided into five sections, each one with their own specific subject area, focus and emphasis: ‘Historical and Theoretical Reflections on Creative Collaboration’, ‘The Caesura around 1800: Collectivity and Individuality’, ‘Visual Arts, New Media and Internet’, ‘Collective Writing’, and ‘Collectivity and Theatre Arts’.

3 Historical and Theoretical Reflections on Creative Collaboration

The First Section offers an overview of the topic of collective creativity from a number of scholarly perspectives, based both on historical and theoretical lines of enquiry. ROLF G. RENNER’s essay ‘Subversion of Creativity and the Dialectics of the Collective’ — presented as the keynote address at the Symposium — shows that, from its very beginnings, the ideal of the individual creative genius was under critical scrutiny in aesthetic theory. The deconstruction of the work of the legendary authors Homer and Ossian, both featured as model original geniuses in Goethe’s Werther, by contemporary philological analysis is the first step in a line of argument that traces the inseparable dialectic of creativity between the individual and the collective authorship. Renner’s conclusion, based on his reading of Marxist literary theory on the one hand and twentieth century aesthetic discourses on the other, is that in the ‘Medial Turn’ in literary analysis the traditional opposition of individual and collective creativity has become ‘irrevocably neutralized’ while being ‘kept alive as an epistemological figure of contrast’.

DAVID ROBERTS’ essay ‘From the Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism to the Creative Economy: Reflections on the New Spirit of Art and Capitalism’ takes up the thesis of the rise of a ‘creative class’ as a new bohème developed by American sociologist Richard Florida, along with the discussion of the crisis of anti-capitalist critique in view of the ‘new spirit’ of capitalism, as presented by French political scientists Éve Chiappello and Luc Boltanski. The apparent absorption of the critical potential of the traditional bohemian subculture — the ‘libertarian other’ of nineteenth century bourgeois society — into the mainstream of contemporary capitalist society under the label of the ‘creative economy’ gives rise to the question whether this change ‘from an antagonistic to an affirmative relationship’ foreshadows a new ‘spirit of art’ that reflects the ‘new spirit of capitalism’.

The following essay, ANNETTE WÖWINKEL’s ‘Is Simulation a Collective Creative Practice?’, focuses on simulation as a term used by cultural critics (Bauman, Lyotard) as well as an instrument used both in the entertainment industry (animated movies, computer games, etc.) and in ‘serious’ science applications (physics, meteorology, population studies, etc.). Scientific simulation, made possible by digital computer operations, was established as a third instrument of science — along with theory and experiment — only late in the twentieth century. Wöwinkel argues that the creative potential of computer simulation as a collaborative cultural process has been underestimated as a result of the pre-postmodern dichotomy between ‘popular’ and ‘high’ culture: ‘the lack of recognition mirrors the fact that scientific simulations have hardly been reflected upon by the creative community, while the products of the entertainment industry are generally regarded as lacking creative potential’.

The last two chapters in the first section deal with empirical studies on collective creativity. In their essay ‘Collective Creative Processes in Behavioural Studies: Community Theatre as an Agency of Political Research and Action’, sociologists and political scientists Gerd Koenig and Sinah Marx discuss a project of ‘neighbourhood theatre as a collective theatre action’ that aims at engaging citizens in political activity. With reference to Hannah Arendt’s concept of vita activa and John Dewey’s ‘experiential democracy’, the authors explore possibilities of groups of local citizens becoming involved in collective action and research to widen their participation in political processes on different levels. Concepts such as ‘forum theatre’ or ‘legislative theatre’ are shown as exemplary models that can lead to an aesthetic as well as social practice in everyday life, ‘empowering’ their participants in the context of the ideal of a civil society. The authors voice the ‘cautious hope’ that such creativity ‘might represent the last hope for a blocked society’.

The research project described by anthropologists Peter F.N. Horz and Marcus Richter in their essay ‘Old Know-how for New Challenges: East Germans and Collective Creativity? Two Anthropological Case Studies’ investigates the question of how collective strategies of self-organization developed in the GDR under the conditions of economic scarcity and ideological-cultural repression are now being used by people in the former communist regime to help them adjust to life in a free market economy. While the literature cited by Horz/Richter is divided on the subject, the two authors maintain that, on the basis of their ethnographic observations, they have found evidence of ‘a growing momentum of collective socio-cultural creativity among East Germans’ that draws on ‘the old competences of negotiating a difficult daily life’ under communist rule, enabling them to successfully negotiate the transition to a capitalist system despite severe economic problems and high unemployment.
4 The Caesura around 1800: Collectivity and Individuality
On the basis of the ‘historical and theoretical reflections’ presented in the First Section, the essays of Section Two, ‘The Caesura around 1800: Collectivity and Individuality’, investigate concrete forms of collective creativity at the turn from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century. The chapters make it not only very clear that quite different forms of creative collaboration are being realised in the different arts, as the examples from theatre, literature, translation, dance and painting show, but also that the formation of what has come to be known as the ‘bürgerliche Subjekt’ brings about clearly visible conflicts between individual and collective forms of artistic work and expression. It is of particular interest in this context that the theatre, one of the oldest and most strongly collective art forms, displays very strong anti-collective tendencies during this period, while in the realm of aesthetics and ‘Bildung’ generally, in literature (the salon), choreography and dance as well as painting (the new form of the panorama), collective tendencies hold their own against the emerging model of the artist as individual genius.

FRANZ-JOSEF DEITERS, in his essay ‘From Collective Creativity to Authorial Primacy: Gottsched’s Reformations of the German Theatre from a Mediologists’ Point of View’, investigates the turning point when literature started to dominate theatre and the importance of the author began to overshadow the collective practices in the theatre. In Germany, this paradigmatic shift in the evolution of theatre is attributed to Johann Christoph Gottsched whose ideas concerning the ‘reformation’ of theatre proved to be decisive in introducing a Literaturtheater that strongly privileged the author, as opposed to the primacy of the collective of actors and other theatre craftspeople. As Deiters points out, this paradigm change of a Literarisierung des Theaters resulted in a ‘self-legitimization process of the modern author’ that in turn established ‘a social distinction essential for the modern age’.

In contrast to Gottsched’s anti-collective re-orientation of the theatre towards a Literaturtheater, choreography and dance present an alternative paradigm of collective appropriation that became important during the late eighteenth century. It has remained an influential model of modern art beyond its own special form until today. In this context, the essay of GABRIELE FOIS-KASCHEL, ‘Synergetic Art production: Choreography in Classical and Neo-classical Discourse on Performative Arts’, deals with synergetic effects that exist in ‘any place where the mutuality between human beings, materials and forces promote the emergence of an unexpected order’. The primacy of the body – rather than the text – along with the confluence of different media practices within choreography offers a possible alternative to transcend the limitations of artists’ specialized individual endeavours.

In her essay ‘Kindred Spirits: Collective Explorations of Individuality in the Classical Period (Goethe, Schiller, Wilhelm von Humboldt)’, SUSANNE LEDANFF analyses the ambivalent tension between collectivity and individuality in the personal and working relationships of authors in the classical ‘Age of Goethe’. On the one hand, they are responsible for jointly developing the centrally important idea of the ‘Bildung’ of the individual subject in society as a key concept of their aesthetic theories, although this was not at all a unified construct. Ledanff shows that there are substantial differences between Schiller and Humboldt, with the latter supporting both Schiller and Goethe in their respective theoretical self-reflections while developing his own ‘surprisingly modern concept of the hermeneutics of individuality’. On the other hand, the philosophical explorations of individuality that led to the formulation of the ‘classical ideal’ of the human being comprise aspects of both individual as well as collective, social aspects deeply rooted in an understanding of the history of humankind.

In his essay ‘Keeping it in the Family? The Creative Collaborations of Sophie and Dorothea Tieck’, ALAN CORKHILL explores the collective aesthetic practices of the creative writer Sophie Tieck-Bernhardi-Knorr and the literary translator Dorothea Tieck, especially their collaboration with the ‘king of German Romanticism’, Ludwig Tieck. In the context of family relationships, of developing and changing friendships within groups and circles of writers, we discover individuals who developed literary collaborations along with shared literary projects and forms. The romantic notion of sociability was a crucial factor that shaped these working relationships, while conventional gender distinctions concerning editorial control and public recognition of the female writers’ contribution remained an important issue.

AXEL FLEITMANN’S essay ‘Vision around 1800: The Panorama as Collective Artwork’, finally, focuses on the new art form of the panorama that was developed in the last decade of the eighteenth century. Fleitmann notes the astonishing discrepancy between the popular success that the panorama enjoyed throughout the nineteenth century, both in terms of public support and media interest, and the complete disregard of the subject by academic aesthetic theorists. According to Fleitmann, it is the intimate linkage between art, technology and economics as well as the necessary collective nature of the panorama’s construction and its commercial display that explains its absence in the discourse on ‘high art’.

5 Visual Arts, New Media and Internet
The Third Section of our book is devoted to studies of collaborative projects in which the ‘new media’ (computer, digital technology, tv and internet) play an essential role in shaping current artistic expression. The first two essays deal specifically with the question of interdisciplinary creativity generated by collaborations between scientists and visual artists, while the following two focus on the work of media artists and their experiences exploring the creative potential of contemporary mass media in television and the internet, respectively. We also return here to the topic, already raised in the first sec-
tion, of problems associated with the transition from the communist society of the GDR to the neo-liberal system of post-communist Germany, in this case with special regard to the changing role and function of art as demonstrated by the metamorphosis of artists of the ‘Leipzig School’ to the ‘New Leipzig School’ (of representational painting).

In their essay ‘DEXA-Dan: Embedding the Corporeal Body’, artist DANNY MACDONALD, art writer KATHERINE MACDONALD, and neuroscientist GAVIN LAMBERT outline a collaborative project which fuses art with science. The title of the essay refers to a medical imaging technology (Dual Energy X-ray Absorption) which provided a digital photographic scan of the artist as the basis of a monumental self-portrait installation in the Baker International Diabetes [Research] Institute (Melbourne, Victoria). The innovative artwork aimed at providing new perspectives on medical research as well as redefining the practice of self-portraiture by exploring advanced technology that allows a view of interior parts of the subject’s body; it brought together the skills and creative energy of artists, scientists, designers, public relations and technical advisers in an unusual – yet public – space to which non-scientific personnel have normally no access. The essay addresses the question of how an individual artist can play within a specialized scientific environment as well as the ‘collective role scientists can play in an alternative aesthetic, cultural and educational expression of their research’.

The essay ‘Bridging the Two Cultures: The Fragility of Interdisciplinary Creative Collaboration’ by social anthropologists JANET CHAN, ROANNA GONSALVES and NOREEN METCALFE describes a research project designed to study the prospects and limitations of creative, interdisciplinary collaborations between new media artists and computer scientists in an internationally renowned university research centre. Based on ethnographic observation and interviews and adopting Bourdieu’s conceptual framework of a struggle for ‘symbolic capital’ in cultural production, the study suggests that the barriers between the ‘two cultures’ – as formulated by C.P. Snow in 1959 – have been overcome in this particular collaboration. However, the authors also note that ongoing conflicts over issues like authorship, recognition and control continue to act as obstacles to effective collective work, demonstrating the ‘fragility’ of such interdisciplinary enterprises.

ANNETTE HAMILTON’s essay ‘Neo Rauch: Post-socialist Vision, Collective Memories’ takes as its point of departure the remarkable international success of Neo Rauch and other artists of the ‘New Leipzig School’ who have continued, but at the same time further developed the tradition of realist painting – characteristic of the officially sanctioned art of the German Democratic Republic – by incorporating non-realist imagery into their work. According to Hamilton, the particular quality of Rauch’s art lies in the mobilization of collective images based on visual references to the old ‘socialist’ world and its detritus today. While ‘fashion’ is to a large extent responsible for Rauch’s spectacular commercial success in the Anglo-European art market, Hamilton suggests that his work represents a rare and attractive form of collective creativity, ‘both in the way he has grasped the elements of a shared imaginary of the past and in the way the viewer is forced to enter into complicity with his vision even when the experiences on which it is based are not shared’.

TARA FORREST’s essay ‘Creative Co-productions: Alexander Kluge’s Television Experiments’ also pursues the idea of the incorporation of the viewing audience into a collective cultural experience. Her focus is on Alexander Kluge’s work, both his theoretical analysis of the role of the electronic mass media in the contemporary public sphere and his experimental television practice on German commerical television that was made possible by a special access provision in the German broadcasting law. Kluge maintains that the media must engage the viewers not as passive recipients but as active ‘co-producers’ by challenging them to use their own power of imagination and to draw on their own life-experiences in order to engage critically and creatively with the media and ideas presented on screen. Forrest discusses some concrete examples of Kluge’s television work in order to ‘explore how, and with what effects, this process of creative co-production is enabled’.

ROMAN MAREK’s essay ‘Creativity Meets Circulation: Internet Videos, Amateurs and the Process of Evolution’ also focuses on the creative potential of consumers of contemporary mass media becoming partners in a collective process, in this case as ‘users’ of programs produced on the internet. User-generated content on web pages like YouTube, which operate on the basis of easily accessible video-sharing digital technology that allows unlimited data editing, adds a dimension to the principle of collective creativity in which the distinction between professional artist or designer and lay audience is becoming obsolete. The practice of ‘recycling’, ‘remixing’ or ‘mashing up’ different video versions based on the same original material is a new ‘phenomenon [...] in the field of visual media’. But rather than being active and becoming emancipated by creatively contributing to a collective experience, as Kluge’s theory would have it, Marek cautions that the users are likely to remain trapped in a bigger process which they cannot control.

6 Collective Writing

While the essays of the preceding Third Section have shown the contemporary relevance of collective creativity in the arts and the new media in particular, the chapters of Section Four, devoted to collaborative creative and poetic writing, suggest that the literary arts are similarly characterized by a complex and productive tension between individual and collective endeavour, even though the long tradition in this area of cultural production seems to be predominantly one of individual writers. There is a wide range of topics and subject areas that are analysed in the chapters of this section, from the
work of the ‘travelling companions’ Captain James Cook, Johann Reinhold Forster and Georg Forster to the experimental collective writing of the Bitterfelder Weg in the GDR during the early 1960s, from a theoretical discussion of modern literature between subversion and submission to a discussion of the experimental postmodern literary technique of German novelist Klaus Hoffer, and, finally, the inter- and multicultural dialogic play of authors engaged in a continuum of translation of and poetic responses to poetry in each others’ work. The respective authors analyze their material according to a variety of interpretative approaches, focussing on sociological and psychoanalytical methods, on discourse analysis as well as on close hermeneutical reading.

In his chapter ‘From Avant-Garde to Capitalistic Teamwork: Collective Writing between Subversion and Submission’, THOMAS ERNST draws on some of the points made by Rolf Renner and David Roberts in their opening essays. Ernst emphasizes the link often made between collective writing and ‘alternative or subversive traditions’, while noting that the traditional literary avantgarde has lost much if not all of its originally oppositional aesthetic potential whereas newer forms of collective work have been absorbed by the ‘new spirit’ of capitalism. Ernst insists that it is necessary to employ a comprehensive roster of techniques of literary analysis (based on historical, economic and sociological criteria, as well as on discourse analysis) in order to establish in each case whether a given piece of writing that is produced collectively falls into a category of ‘subversive or submissive literature’, or whether it belongs to an ambiguous, in-between category of cultural production.

In her essay, ‘Travelling Companions: Cook’s Second Voyage in the Writing of Georg and Johann Reinhold Forster’, CHRISTIANE WELLER describes the difficult and at times conflict-ridden relationship between these three very different men, both during their journey to the South Seas and with regard to the subsequent publishing of their respective diaries and travelogues, notably the collaborative endeavor of the two Forsters in view of the limitations placed upon Reinhold’s work by the British Admiralty. Weller observes ‘a kind of transference’ with regard to the experiences of father and son that becomes apparent in Georg’s writing on the circumnavigation, and she analyses, on the basis of a psychoanalytical reading of the oedipal constellation, the special textual strategies chosen by the author to present an account of a scientific expedition fraught with personal conflict and psychological trauma.

The Bitterfelder Weg (Bitterfeld Way; 1959-64) refers to the short-lived attempt in the German Democratic Republic to initiate processes of cultural collaboration between intellectuals and workers by sending professional writers into the factories in the hope that their writing would reflect the life of the working classes, while the authors would act as mentors to workers who were encouraged to ‘take up the pen’. In her essay, entitled ‘The Romancing of Collective Creativity: The Bitterfelder Weg in Brigitte Reimann’s Letters and Diaries’, ALISON LEWIS investigates the case of Brigitte Reimann who was initially quite enthusiastic to share the life experiences of a ‘brigade’ of male workers in an industrial power plant and to subsequently use her ‘material’ in her novels and radio plays. Reimann’s diaries and correspondence provide the evidence for Lewis to conclude that the programme was a failure, not least due to unpredictable, non-political factors that proved impossible for the Party to control’, i.e. ‘romance and desire’.

In her close reading of an experimental, two-part postmodern novel, STEFANIE KREUZER discovers a complex web of intertextuality, authorial self-reflection and meta-narrativity. As she shows in her essay, entitled ‘Intertextuality as Mandatorive Collective Creativity? Textual Interconnections in Klaus Hoffer’s Novel Bei den Biersch’, the author has written a ‘novel of quotations’ that includes references to about fifty authors and eighty literary texts. Kreuzer argues that Hoffer’s work presents its intertextual practice on three distinct levels, as ‘eclecticist theft’, as ‘identity-corroding illness’ and as a ‘technique of artistic grafting’. Collective creativity is thus embedded in literary ‘displacements which give an individual shape to the novel’s text’.

While the previous chapters in the section on ‘Collective Writing’ dealt with forms of avantgarde literature, travel writing, diaries and other prose texts, CHRISTOPHER KELEN offers a theoretical reflection on collective authorship in order to formulate his concept of ‘collaborative poetics’. Kelen’s essay, ‘Community in the Translation/Response Continuum: Poetry as Dialogic Play’, emphasizes both the academic setting of teaching creative writing where translation and poetic dialogue are used ‘as a means of teaching the composition of poetry in the non-native context’, as well as the poetic interaction to existing poetic works – classical as well as contemporary – in a way that brings together a diverse group of writers in multilingual and multicultural Macro. Kelen describes the process of collaborative translation in dialogic form as a ‘poetry of response’, referring to theorists like Paolo Freire, Mikhail Bakhtin and Raymond Williams who provide models for a kind of collective and interactive creativity aimed at pedagogic and community empowerment.

7 Collectivity and Theatre Arts

Historically, theatre constitutes one of the oldest collective art forms. In the theatre, in contradistinction to literature or the visual arts for example, the production process has always been a collaborative one, and in addition to the work of author, director, actors and other theatre professionals the presence of an audience is usually required to complete the aesthetic experience of theatre art. Nevertheless, in the history of the theatre there have been distinct periods where the connection between individual and collective
processes has been quite differently accentuated. After a long period in which
Litteraturtheater - with the primacy of the individual author - was dominant,
as shown by Deiters in his chapter on Gottsched in Section Two, we are
witnessing at present a tendency in theatrical work in which collective creativity
is moving again to occupy centre stage. It is this development, which began
at the beginning of the twentieth century and was then prominently taken up
by Bertolt Brecht as well as by the practitioners of the subsequent 'post-
dramatic theatre', that provides the common theme linking the contributions
of Section Five.

FLORIAN VASSEN prefaces his essay 'From Author to Spectator: Collective
Creativity as a Theatrical Play for Theatre Artists and the Audience' with
some general reflections on historical and theoretical aspects of collective
creativity before turning his attention to the collective theatre practice of Ber-
tolt Brecht and his 'art of speculating'. Vassen shows that Brecht's successor
Heiner Müller and in his wake the 'postdramatic' theatre artists further de-
velop and strengthen the 'the experimental field in which the spectators can
coproduce'. As the barrier between stage and audience is being progressively
dismantled and the aesthetic synthesis of the artistic process is more and
more entrusted to the spectators, a specially productive tension is created:
the individual viewer is part of the collective of the audience and as such again
part of a collective artistic process. According to Vassen, 'individual crea-
tivity is thus embedded in collective creativity and both take on a new
quality'.

In her chapter, 'Spotlight on the Audience: Collective Creativity in Re-
cent Documentary and Reality Theatre from Australia and Germany', ULRIKE
GARDE provides a concrete answer to the question asked by Vassen con-
cerning the relevance of the audience with regard to theatre's collective creativity.
Garde's essay is a comparative case study of the work of two theatre com-
panies, the Australian group Version 1.0 and Germany's Rimini Protokoll. She
shows that while there are comparable features of a global transnational de-
velopment, for instance with regard to the expectation of authenticity in
theatrical work, it is the specific local and regional character of the two
group's productions and the differing 'horizons of expectation' of their
respective audiences that make their artistic profiles distinctive. Garde's analysis
of a tendency towards the documentary and an interest in 'reality theatre'
leads to the issue of 'collective memory' and the final question: 'What is real?
in reality theatre?'

In her essay 'Fluid Collectives of Friendly Strangers: The Creative Polit-
ics of Difference in the Reality Theatre of Rimini Protokoll and Urban Thea-
tre Projects', MEG MUMFORD takes a similar approach, discussing Rimini
Protokoll by comparing it to the Australian group Urban Theatre Projects.
The work of both companies is community-oriented and based on techniques
of documentary and reality theatre; both aim at staging a 'socially engaged
live performance'. Drawing on the postmodern feminist critique of Iris
Marion Young and her concept of a 'city of strangers', Mumford argues that
the performance strategies of the two companies offer an implicit critique of a
communitarian ideal of collective creativity which emphasizes 'fusion' and
'unity'. Instead, their work is characterized by a commitment to an aesthetics
of difference. It is a theatre that rejects the hierarchical structures of Litera-
tur- as well as Regietheater (director's theatre) in favour of an egalitarian,
participatory model of theatrical work to ensure an acknowledgement of col-
lective creativity as much as a practice of participatory democracy.

Finally, GÜNTHER HEEG returns to the example of Bertolt Brecht and
Heiner Müller to complete the essays of Section Five. On the basis of
Müller's 'theory of separation', he analyses the 'adaptation of transnational
gestures' concerning the 'knowledge of life' as an example of collective the-
eartrical processes. In his essay 'Transcultural Gestures: Collective Engagement
in Theatre, Practice of Separation and Intermediary Crystallizations',
Heeg analyses the work of three different ensembles who all work with non-
professional actors and crew: Rimini Protokoll's production of Wallestein
with the by now customary 'experts of everyday life', the group 'theaterkombi-
binat' in Vienna with MassakerMykene, and Brecht/Müller's Der Auftrag:
Falter performed by students in Leipzig. Focussing on different aspects of
the central concept of separation, namely the 'separation of from communi-
ty', 'of text and body', and of Brecht's 'separation of elements' (words,
music and action), Heeg shows how forms of 'rigid political-cultural attitudes
and behaviour' can be deconstructed in a process of 'cultural transition'.

8 The essays collected in this volume present a broad spectrum of studies on
the topic of collective creativity in and between various forms of art, com-
prising individual as well as interdisciplinary focuses on areas in the humani-
ties, in social science and cultural studies. Our aim was to show the
remarkable heterogeneity of the subject, of its specific methods and, above
all, of the potential present in the forms of and approaches to creative col-
aboration. Our collection does not aim at a comprehensive presentation and
discussion of its topic - if indeed this was possible. However, the 24 chap-
ters are designed to point out intersections and interfaces of artistic, scientific
and cultural practice, and to provide signposts to points of departure in order
to stimulate further enquiry and research. The ambiguity and complexity in-
herent in the question of individual versus collective creativity is realised in
its dialectical relationship, whether one says with Rimbaud 'I is another' ('Je
est un autre'), or whether one says with Goethe 'my life's work is that of a
multiplicity of beings from the whole of Nature; it bears the name of Goethe'.
I.

Historical and Theoretical Reflections on Creative Collaboration
Alan Corkhill

Keeping it in the Family? The Creative Collaborations of Sophie and Dorothea Tieck

This essay explores the nature and extent of the collective aesthetic practices of the creative writer Sophie Tieck-Bernhild-Knorrings (1775-1833) and the literary translator Dorothea Tieck (1799-1841), primarily in relation to their collaborative ventures with the 'king of German Romanticism' Ludwig Tieck (1773-1853). The study addresses the politics of family and sibling creative partnerships, as well as the group dynamics of late eighteenth and early to mid-nineteenth century writers' circles and literary salons, inasmuch as they comprised individuals who shared and pooled ideas, values and visions and committed to similar poetic processes.

Art is a collaboration between God and the artist, and the less the artist does the better. (André Gide)

Romanticism is an appropriate movement in which to interrogate the symbiotic relationships between individual(istic) and collective aesthetic production. On the one hand, Romantic creativity is predicated on the conception of the artist as a solitary, divinely inspired genius and visionary, e.g., the exalted Fichtean definition of the artist as a 'Second Creator'. On the other hand, we find numerous instances of collaboration derived from co-operative aesthetics, such as Friedrich Schlegel's Symposium. This notion of philosophising in common (symphilosophieren) had its roots in democratic and republican thinking. It entailed a free and multiple transfer of ideas, a shared intellectual process of creation, which rejects traditional, monologous thought and invites unending, dialogical explanation.1 Accordingly, this dialogic exchange within Early German Romanticism is strongly characterised by a fruitful confluence of philosophy and poetics. We are reminded here of Friedrich Schlegel's frequently quoted axiomatic observation:

Vielleicht würde eine ganz neue Epoche der Wissenschaften und Künste beginnen, wenn die Symphilosophie und Symposium so allgemein und so innig würde, daß es nichts sequens mehr

---

wire, when more of the gentlest in general and nature of the community to create communal works.

(Perhaps a whole new era of the sciences and the arts would begin if sympathy and sympathy became so widespread and intense that it would no longer be strange for several people with complements of nature to create communal works.)

And for his part, the young nobleman Friedrich von Hardenberg (Novalis) envisioned not only a symbiosis of cognate and disparate intellectual disciplines, but equally a dialogic relation between text producer and text recipient. He comments: ‘Der wahre Leser muß der erweiterte Autor seyn’ (‘The true reader must be the author expanded’).

A useful methodological framework for assessing the range and broader significance of the collaborative ventures of those German Romanticists who shared and pooled their ideas, values and visions and networked with spouses, siblings and close friends is provided by English Romantic scholarship. It has focused critical attention on such avenues as the nature and impact of these literary interactions, the sociocultural forces informing texts of multiple authorship, the extent to which these determinants are cross-cultural or culture-specific, and, last but not least, the problematic role of gender. Of special relevance to German literary Romanticism, too, is the degree to which joint ventures in belles-lettres were inspired and driven by a greater (political) sensitivity to regional or national identity prior to, during and in the immediate wake of the German Wars of Liberation (1808-1815). While the pre-Romantic cultural anthropologist Herder held that poetry (in the widest sense) originated, like language, in collective consciousness, Romantic nationalists would often speak of a ‘mystical, collective creativity, in which the identity of the individual artist was lost in communal anonymity.’

2 Writers’ Circles and Sociability

The most cohesive literary collective of the German Romantic movement by virtue of the similarity of aesthetic tenets was a group of writers referred to as the Jena Romantics. Their main activities covered the years 1795 to 1800. They were ‘clustered around the brothers Friedrich and August Wilhelm Schlegel and included their wives Dorothea and Caroline, Novalis and the philosopher Friedrich Schelling. The writer, critic, and editor Ludwig Tieck and the philosopher and theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher, both of whom lived in Berlin, also associated with the Jena Romantics and formed part of their circle.’

Writers’ collectives were not unique to the various Romantics that flourished in Germany around the turn of the nineteenth century and in the few decades thereafter. Within English Romanticism, for example, ‘the mechanisms for collaborative writing took explicit form in the creation of coteries groups of authors that acted as forums for idea interchange, discussion, manuscript circulation, critique and small-scaling publishing.’

In terms of the symbiosis of individual and collective creative processes, ‘Keats was one such poet who espoused a Romantic conception of authorship while employing collaborative practices in the creation of his poems. [He] explicitly placed his poetry within a larger social context of its creation, revision, reception and influence.’ Similarly, we could point to the exemplary ‘culture of cooperation’ epitomised by the Lyric Ballads (1798) of the so-called Lake Poets: Samuel Taylor Coleridge and William Wordsworth. The ballads are undoubtedly the ‘most famous co-authored book in the English language.’

According to Schleiermacher, the early Romantic pursuit of autonomous genius in lifestyle and aesthetic praxis was not incongruent with engagement in the principles of Geselligkeit (sociability). Indeed, in his anonymously published treatise Versuch einer Theorie des geselligen Betrachtens (Towards a Theory of Sociable Conduct, 1799), Schleiermacher developed the concept of a free productive sociability in which the individual establishes an ideal network of Querebeziehungen (cross-currents) with the Other and through interfacing with these unfamiliar spheres thereby widens his/her horizons and perspectives. Or in Schleiermacher’s own words: ‘Alles soll Wechselfuhring seyn […] Alle sollten zu einem freien Gedankenspiel angezogen werden’ (‘Everything should entail interaction. […] Everyone should be
encouraged to engage in free thought play). Thus periodicals, as Novalis noted prophetically in 1798, were ideally suited as collective ventures, not principally because of any commercial benefit, but simply because...}

The Creative Collaborations of Sophie and Dorothea Tieck 


(writing in society is an interesting symptom, one that points to a major development of writing itself. One day people may write, think and act on mass. Whole communities, even nations will undertake a work.)

Needless to say, in Romantic circles, sociability in abstracto translated on the domestic level into intense forms of communal living such as that enjoyed by Friedrich Schlegel and Schleiermacher who used extended mealtimes to discuss common projects, read from their new artistic creations and engage in symphatisieren, the practice of mutual critiquing. This is essentially how Schlegel’s unfinished novel Lucinde (1799) came into being. Collaboration did not necessarily guarantee a finished project. But in any case, fragmentation and incompleteness were the fashion statements of Romantic poetry. A more elaborate co-operative venture similarly destined for incompleteness was the opening volume of a collective novel Die Versuche und Hindernisse Karls (Charles, His Endeavours and Frustrations; 1808) in which a quartet of male authors associated with the Berlin salon of Rahel von Varnhagen penned lighthearted parodies of contemporary literary figures and aesthetic conventions. A further exemplar of the dynamics of shared writing was the unfinished experimental project Der Roman der Freiherren von Vien (The Novel of the Baron of Four) to which E.T.A. Hoffmann, Karl Wilhelm Connessa, Adalbert von Chamisso and Friedrich de la Motte Fouqué each initially contributed a single chapter, but finally published them as individual narratives.

Literary co-production in the salons was often conducted in a competitive spirit to stimulate creativity. The Viennese author Karoline Pichler, for instance, set the tone for this practice within her Samstagsverein (Saturday Club) by challenging a member, Karl Streckfuss, to join her in the composition of her second novel Ruth (1805) and by delivering interim reports to the group on the production outcomes. The salons even prescribed rules for co-authored ventures, which often had the negative effect of limiting solo authorial creativity.

3 Male-female Collective Writing

Within the space constraints of this essay I propose to focus on what might be termed the sexual politics of co-authorship. Whereas the intentional or involuntary anonymity or pseudo-anonymity of the female author in the Romantic period has been the subject of much feminist research, most notably by Susanne Kord. I should like, instead, to consider the problematic of female literary co-authorship. I have selected as case studies the works of Sophie and Dorothea Tieck whose place in literary history has been revaled in a number of recent monographs devoted to their respective work and influence (or confluence).

It would be logical at this juncture to theorise the range of factors reinforcing or deconstructing the notion of male-female literary partnership. The first set of factors is anthropological. Technically speaking, the Romantic concept of androgyne undermined the gendered notion of the divine spark genius as female Muse, working instead in favour of a co-authorship poised on a potpourri of female and male intellectual and emotional outlooks and language registers. Whether the literary practitioners of both genders consciously thought along these utopian lines of genderlessness warrants further research based on poietological and confessional pronouncements in diary entries and correspondence outside the scope of this study.

A second consideration is aesthetically founded: the fact that a juxtaposition or marriage of traditionally perceived female genres such as lyric poetry and letter-writing and time-honoured male modes of literary expression was attuned to the heterogeneous aesthetics of Romantic Universalpoesie.

A third factor to take into account is ideological: namely, the entrenched and culturally mediated patriarchal qualms about empowering intellectual...

13 Novalis, Schriften, II, 645.
14 Schlegel's closest friends pooled their creative resources to suggest cuts and changes, as well as plans for a sequel to Lucinde. See on this point http://www.bildung.de/8888 /NetzkunstWoerterbuch/12 [accessed 13 July 2009].
15 See on the topic of multiple authors Richard Littlejohns, 'Collaboration as Ideology: The Theory and Practice of "Sociability" in German Romanticism', in Collaboration in the Arts from the Middle Ages to the Present, ed. by Silvia Biglazi and Sharon Wood (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 51-60 (p. 57-58).
17 Ibid.
19 In a similar fashion, feminist literary scholarship has now demonstrated the much more active role Dorothy Wordsworth played in the conceptualisation, revision, and indeed writing of William's poetry. See in this regard Bette London, Writing Double: Women's Literary Partnerships (Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 1999).
women to identify themselves by name as the originators or fomenters of political and philosophical issues outside the conventional female purvey, that is to say, above and beyond the comfort zone of domestic topics such as child-raising and philanthropy.

Fourthly, male-female co-authorship ventures could result from or lead to "unholy alliances" based solely on commercial or pecuniary expediency and designed more often than not to propel the writing female from the margins into the mainstream cultural arena. It is with this general theoretical framework in mind that I now intend to consider the factors working in favour of or militating against the various collaborations in which Sophie and Dorothea engaged both within and outside their immediate family milieux.

4 Family Literary Partnerships: Sophie Tieck-Bernhardi-Knorrning

Born in Berlin in 1775, Sophie was the younger sister of Ludwig Tieck (1773-1853). At the age of twenty-four she married the schoolmaster August F. Bernhardi, from whom she was divorced in 1804. She settled permanently in Estonia in 1812 following her marriage to the landowner Baron Karl Gregor von Knorrning. She died in 1833, Knorrning four years later. Although raised within the artisan class, upward social mobility secured Sophie qualified entry into intellectual circles, such as the Berlin salons, where she participated actively in debates on women's rights and social equality in general. She co-edited almanacs and penned short narratives, novels, fairytale, dramas, poetry, theatre reviews and a discursive essay. Prior to her second marriage, she published under the transparent pseudonym ‘Sophie B.’. Her last novel, Ewerk (1836) appeared posthumously. Kord's contention that women such as Bettina von Arnim lost the ability or the incentive to write once married11 is not valid for Sophie Tieck who, despite all kinds of domestic constraints, engaged consistently in individual and collective literary practice while married to her respective spouses.

Sophie's writings are now freely acknowledged as important contributions to the Romantic movement and as equally important milestones in the historiography of female belles-lettres. Until the late 1960s, when her correspondence became more accessible to scholars,22 her reputation was essentially confined to that of a dilettante whose relationship with Ludwig was surmised to be far too intimate for comfort.23 Literary criticism identified her as the real persona behind the figure of Bertha in the tale Der blonde Ecke (The Fair Ecket, 1797), whom a shock twist reveals to be the half-sister of her derring-do knightly spouse.24

With regard to shared creativity, the phase of Sophie's literary career in question constitutes the fledgling years under Ludwig's mentorship. Sophie's father, a rope-maker, had little understanding of his daughter's artistic spleen, which is likely to have been one of the reasons for her seeking Ludwig's company so ardently. As children they would act out the roles of the improvised playlets Ludwig was fond of composing. Between 1795 and 1796 when the sibling bond appears to have been strongest, the two translated Shakespeare and read the works of the Enlightenment in each other's company. Communal reading was a popular pastime for the European Romantics, whether in the intimacy of the home or within the more formalised reading circles established by saloniers/salonières, such as Duchess Anna Amalia's in Weimar.

When a career-advancing opportunity presented itself to Ludwig to write for a public readership by submitting translated French moral tales and anecdotes, as well as original stories, to Friedrich Nicolai's multi-volume Strassfeldern (Ostrich Feathers, 1787-1798), it is noteworthy that of the sixteen stories he contributed, eight, possibly nine, were by Sophie's hand.25 Ewa Eschler suggests that in this instance the collaboration between siblings was not commercially motivated, but simply constituted "co-operation in the spirit of early Romantic sociability", as well as 'experimentation with new writing modes'.26 As the stories are largely distinguishable by their subject matter - Ludwig indulged his preference for acerbic social criticism, while Sophie explored issues of existential and gendered identity - the creative coupling did not elicit what one might call androgynous 'heterotexts', free of the

---

21 Kord, p. 176.
22 See in particular Letters to and from Ludwig Tieck and his Circle. Unpublished Letters from the Period of German Romanticism including the Unpublished Correspondence of Sophie and Ludwig Tieck, ed. by Peretz Matriko, E.H. Zeydel, and Bertha M. Masche (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1907).
24 According to Valerie Sanders, "In Gothic novels of the period, the sibling-incest theme was a popular device". Valerie Sanders, The Brother-Sister Culture in Nineteenth Century Literature: From Austen to Woolf (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), p. 7. For insights into the later Sophie Tieck see "Bei aler brudlerlichen Lüche...", The Letters of Sophie Tieck to her Brother Friedrich, ed. by J. Trauner (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991).
25 Sophie Tieck-Bernhardi, Wunderbilder und Träume in elf Akten, ed. by Hannalore Scholz (Berlin: Trafo, 2000), p. 304. Ludwig was himself no stranger to joint artistic practice, as exemplified by "Herschreifungen eines kunstfleidenden Klosterbruders" (Confessions of an Art-Loving Monk; 1779), a collection of essays and stories written together with his bosom friend Heinrich Wackenroder.
bias of gender binaries. Sophie also worked in tandem with Tieck’s close friend Heinrich Wackenroder and the musical director Joseph Wessely on the German translations of the basketful of anthologised French narrative texts for Nicolai’s Osterich Feathers. Eschler concludes that Tieck relegated these tasks to Sophie as ghostwriter, not with her career prospects in mind, but simply in order to divest himself of the onus of such relentless hack work.

The regular issues of the short-lived periodical Bamboccianen (1797-1800) were edited by Sophie’s first spouse, who, like her later husband, enjoyed a literary career. Yet as August Schlegel noted in a letter to Ludwig, Bernhardi displayed scant interest in or regard for his wife’s budding talents. Instead, Bernhardi claimed sole authorship of the short fiction from her pen that occupied almost the entire third volume of the Bamboccianen.

More beneficial for the collaborative phase of Sophie’s literary trajectory was her editorial input into the equally short-lived periodical Athenäum (1798-1800), conceived by her co-founder Friedrich Schlegel as a ‘Gemeinschaftswerk’ (‘collective venture’) that was not to be delimited by any particular ‘Form noch Stoff’ (‘form or content’). Needless to say, editorial work is creatively independent in itself, given that it entails reshaping or polishing of the original manuscript without formal attribution. More importantly, Sophie’s advisory voice on the editorial committee vocalised her security of operating within the collective intellectual and social parameters of an early Romantic writers’ circle, while at the same time empowering her to stake out a literary territory of her own. To the latter end she was invited to contribute a poem and a prose sketch to the Museenjahrbuch für das Jahr 1802 (Museum of Art for 1802), jointly edited by Ludwig and Friedrich Schlegel. In the following year Sophie entered a competition with Ludwig and August W. Schlegel to write imaginative ‘variations’ on the theme of love for inclusion in the 1803 volume of Friedrich Schlegel’s journal Europa (1803-1805). Sophie composed two variations, but Ludwig’s contribution was judged to be the most accomplished of the three contenders. Ironically, Tieck’s own attitude to collaborative authorship appears ambivalent in the light of his own tale Der Roman in Briefen (The Epistolary Novel; 1797), a parody of the collective novel predating the conception of the aforementioned Der Roman des Freiherren von Vienen (The Novel of the Baron of Four) by some eighteen years.

Such were the delicate politics of artistic collaboration with Ludwig by the dawn of the new century that Sophie kept secret her own input into the early published Shakespeare translations out of consideration for his rising fame as an homme de lettres. If brother-sisterly relations subsequently soured into a mutual love-hate complex, especially after 1810, driving her increasingly into the company of her younger brother Christian Friedrich (1776-1821), who was struggling to establish his metier as a sculptor, this was not simply due to competitive rivalries; nor did it emanate from a desire on Sophie’s part to move out of Ludwig’s shadow. Leaving aside the sorrid squabbles over pecuniary affairs that impacted adversely on relations between Ludwig, Sophie and Friedrich (whom Ludwig would refer to in his correspondence impersonally as ‘the artist’), there was equally a pathological subtext to sibling friction inasmuch as Ludwig and Sophie were temperamentally too similar, like poles that repelled each other. Both encountered periods of intense melancholy, morbidity, introspection and self-doubt throughout their lifetime and articulated these darker emotions in their writings, that is to say, in their thematisation of the quest for happiness, the longing for love and the banishment of loneliness. As a counterweight to isolationism both siblings cultivated sociability in different and mutual ways.

33 See on this point Moses Breuer, ‘Sophie Bernhardi geb. Tieck als romantische Dichterin: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Romantik.’ Dr. phil. diss., University of Tübingen, 1914, p. 66.
34 Hoberstok, p. 309. Equally ironic in Tieck’s case is the vexed question of appropriated authorship, given that he was accused during his lifetime and in subsequent Tieck scholarship of plagiaristic practice, itself a travesty of collective creativity.
37 Hoberstok, p. 363.
While the brother-sister duo was, from a broader cultural perspective, clearly indebted to the reservoir of shared ideas gleaned from their close affiliation with the Romantic coterie of writers and thinkers, compared to the passionate intensity of the intellectual and spiritual bond that united other pairs of Romantic siblings such as William and Dorothy Wordsworth, or Mary and Charles Lamb, there is little evidence to suggest that the collaboration was evenly matched and mutually dependent. Yet notwithstanding considerable differences in their style and register, Ludwig and Sophie expressed mutual respect and admiration for each other’s work, even during the years in which the relationship reached a low ebb. Ludwig was consistently open and responsive to his sister’s supportive criticism of his drafts and never hesitated to return the favour, especially when Sophie’s own literary career began to take shape in the first decade of the new millennium. We need only cite the epistolary extracts in which Ludwig encouraged his de facto protégé to dispatch him samples of her latest poetry and in which he declared his unequivocal approval of her debut volume of fairytales, Wunderbilder und Traume in elf Märchen (Miraculous Pictures and Dreams in Eleven Fairytales; 1802), as well as his conviction that she could learn much from the book.

Sophie’s individual and collaborative writings remained largely forgotten throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. It probably did not help matters that her eldest son Wilhelm Bernhardi (1800-1878), the editor of the posthumously published Reliquien, Erzählungen und Dichtungen von A. F. Bernhardi und dessen Gattin Sophie Bernhardi, geb. Tieck, (Relics, Tales and Poetic Writings of A. F. Bernhardi and his Wife Sophie Bernhardi, née Tieck; 1838) included a foreword by the salonier Karl Varnhagen von Ense that makes no mention of Sophie’s specific input into the three volumes, but instead sings the praises of August Bernhardi as one whose philosophical and literary accomplishments had been overlooked—so it is alleged—by the Romantic movement.

5 Family Literary Partnerships: Dorothea Tieck
Born in 1799, Tieck’s eldest daughter Dorothea demonstrated at a tender age a prodigious aptitude for languages. Having learnt French, English, Italian, Spanish, Greek and Latin, she found herself well equipped to read Shakespeare, Calderon, Homer, Livy, Virgil, Dante and Homer in the original. Following the family’s move to Dresden in 1819 she became her father’s personal assistant. She is best known for her translations of the plays of the Stratford bard, in which she collaborated with her father and the German diplomat Count Wolf Heinrich von Baudissin. Dorothea’s name did not appear on any of the title pages, and sometimes Ludwig would substitute his own name. She lived a very pious existence, having converted to Catholicism in 1805 under the assertive influence of her mother Amalie Alberti. She died of illnesses in 1841, an unmarried woman.

Although Dorothea never turned her hand to belles-lettres as such, her translation work into German, which included the entire collection of Shakespearean sonnets, proved to be of a high literary standard. Her most polished artistic attempt is thought to have been the translation of Macbeth, begun by Ludwig in 1819 and completed by her in 1833. Dorothea Tieck tells us very little about herself as a practising translator, except perhaps in her correspondence with Friedrich von Uechtritz, in which she identifies translation as a characteristically feminine forte rather than a male preserve. This observation is, of course, historically indisputable, given the tradition of female accomplishments in foreign languages and letters. (Sophie, too, had demonstrated an early flair for languages.) What is remarkably self-effacing, if not oddly old-fashioned by the third decade of the nineteenth century, is Dorothea’s subsequent comment that it was not the destined role of the fairer sex ‘etwas eigenes hervorzubringen’ (‘to produce something of its own’). Arguably, in privileging imitation (imiticism) over originality as the female default position, Dorothea must have believed or had been socialised into


50 Sophie was well disposed towards her aunt, with whom she had much in common intellectually and temperamentally. In an undated letter to Ludwig she writes: ‘Dorothea wird gewiß [...] wenn wir mehr mit einander umgehen [...] die Geistesverwandtschaft fühlen’ (‘Dorothea will certainly feel a spiritual affinity if we have more to do with her’). James Trainer, ‘Sophie an Ludwig Tieck: Neu identifizierte Briefe,’ Jahrbuch der deutschen Schillerge- sellschaft, 24, 1980, 162-181 (p. 180).

51 ibid.
believing that the art of translation (such as it was understood at the time) merely entailed the observance of a set of mechanical processes and thereby constituted an inferior intellectual praxis. Two years later we still find her failing to grasp the special creative resources with which gifted literary translators are endowed: “[W]enn man selbst nicht ersehen kann, ist es doch gewiß der größte Gemüth, sich in die Schöpfung eines großen Geistes so ganz zu vertieven, wie man es beim Übersetzen thun muß” (“If one cannot create, it is certainly the greatest pleasure to immerse oneself in the creation of a great mind, as one has to do when translating”).

Dorothea’s modest view of herself as little more than an ‘ancilla translationis’ within the competitive hierarchy of Shakespeare translators was not shared by von Baudissin, who, throughout the ambitious Shakespeare project, regarded himself vis-à-vis Dorothea as primus inter pares. The Count recalls in his memoirs the genesis of this stellar collaboration:

Da folgten Tiecks älteste Tochter Dorothea und ich uns ein Herz und taten ihm den Vor- schlag, viribus unitis die Arbeit zu übernehmen. [...] Das Unternehmen hatte raschen Fortgang: im Verlaufe von dreieinhalb Jahren wurden von meiner Mitarbeiterin Macbeth, Cymbeline, die Veronese, Coriolanus, Timon von Athen und das Wintermärchen, von mir die noch übrigen drei Stücke übersetzt. Tag für Tag war unser Schreibzimmer im Aufschwung, und das ungeschriebene Stück spielte eine Rolle in der Erfindung von Neuerungen und Änderungen, solange die Arbeit vollendet war. So ergab sich ein ständiger Wechsel der Arbeit, der von Tag zu Tag der Arbeit verliehen wurde. Der eine arbeitete, der andere schrieb, und so ging es weiter bis zu dem letzten Tag, an dem alles fertig war. Es war eine derartige Freude, die Arbeit gemeinsam zu vollenden, dass wir uns auf die Zukunft freuten, die noch bei uns war. [...] 

(“Then Tieck’s eldest daughter Dorothea and I pooled our strength and proposed to him that we would undertake the work viribus unitis (sic)! [...] The venture progressed rapidly. In the course of three and a half years my colleague translated Macbeth, Cymbeline, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, Coriolanus, Timon of Athens and The Winter’s Tale, while I translated the thirteen remaining plays. Every day from twelve to one we met in Tieck’s library. Whoever had a piece ready read it aloud. The other two members of our collegium compared the reading with the original, gave it the stamp of approval, or suggested changes, or rejected it.”).

There is much evidence to show that Tieck’s working relationship with his daughter, whom he once described in a letter to his brother Friedrich as his ‘pride and joy’ and similarly with Count Baudissin, bordered on the exploitative, despite the companionship it brought. Even though his two unnamed translators were publically acknowledged as willing helpers managed to rescue the Shakespeare project from failure and financial ruin, Tieck appeared to consider his editing of the translations (and he accomplished little else) sufficient justification to claim full authorship rights. The literary establishment would never have doubted the word of the König der Romanik, especially in view of his editorial renown in the translation of Calderon and other canonical authors of the seventeenth century. The real creative collaboration, however, was enacted by Dorothea and Baudissin, most notably in the translations of Much Ado about Nothing (Viel Lärm um Nichts) and The Taming of the Shrew (Der Widerspenstigen Zähmung), published in 1830 and 1831 respectively. In this pre-copyright era the collaborating translators did not embroil themselves in a legal dispute over intellectual property.

6 Reprise
The above snapshots of Sophie and Dorothea have focused on the specifics of a biographical approach to creative collectivity. They offer the possibility of contrastive insights into the nature and dynamics of cross-gender and cross-generational familial collaborations in eighteenth and nineteenth-century European literary history, such as the close working partnership between Goethe and his twin sister Cornelia, or between the siblings Christina and William Rossetti, or between William Godwin and his daughter Mary Shelley. Biographism, however, which can easily succumb to overspecialisation and the dramatisation of difference and conflict, is palpably not the only vehicle for evaluating the significance of the respective literary conjunctions. Postmodernism’s deconstruction of authorial uniqueness and the attendant paradigm shift towards the treatment of the shared textual spaces.

52 In his own preface to the translated plays Dorothea was simply referred to in a genderless manner as “eine jüngere Freundin” (“a younger friend”). W. Shakespeare: Dramatische Werke, trans. by A. W. Schlegel, complete and commented upon by Ludwig Tieck (Berlin: Reimer, 1830), p. 3. Tieck had also employed the same de-personalised appellation in 1819 to describe Dorothea’s proposed auxiliary role in the translation of Richard Cumberland’s Memoirs of Richard Cumberland (1807) and Walter Scott’s novels Waverley (1814) and Tales of My Landlord (1816–1818), a project that never materialised. See on this point Percy Mancen, Tieck and Goethe: The Complete Correspondence (New York and Berlin: B. Westermann, 1933), p. 119. Dorothea was never once given any acknowledgement in print, while Tieck only mentioned von Baudissin by name once — in a solitary footnote. Nor was public credit given to Dorothea’s competent translation of Vincenzo Spinelli’s autobiographical romance Relazione della vita del signor Marco di Oreggio (1618) (History of the Life of the Signor Marco of Oreggio; 1827), for which her father wrote a critical introduction.

53 By comparison, Samuel Coleridge treasured his daughter Sarah, who undertook a great deal of editorial work for her father, as an equal. See on the working relationship the article by Alison Hickey, “The Body of My Father’s Writings”, Sarah Coleridge’s Genial Labor”, in Literary Couplings, pp. 127–150.

54 In Much Ado about Nothing the division of labour was such that Dorothea translated the verse sections and von Baudissin the prose passages.
constructed by the respective collaborators as ‘cultural texts’ avoid the pitfalls of biographic subjectivism. Equally though, this broader definition of cultural ownership has the disadvantage of relativising women’s historical attempts to gain professional recognition because it essentially renders the patriarchal apppellations ‘willing helper’ or ‘unacknowledged collaborator’ in relation to the lower status of women of letters secondary to the Zeitgeist or Volksgeist in which the cultural artefacts were manufactured. Nevertheless, within the specific time frame of the outgoing eighteenth and early to mid-nineteenth centuries, the thought collectives, made up of literary salons and writers’ coteries, promoted and nurtured via dialogic exchange a universalistic, non-gendered ethos of collaborative endeavour anchored in the Romantic idea(1) of the fluidity of subject identity. This discourse was informed inter alia by the Schlegelian comprise politics of gender complementarity and the perception of both solo and collaborative authorship as an aesthetic praxis tantamount to a trans-gendered meeting of ‘androgynous minds’ (Coleridge).

Axel Fliethmann

Vision around 1800: The Panorama as Collective Artwork

The panorama has been widely ignored by aesthetic theory as well as within the canon of art and literature. It has, on the other hand, been extremely successful in attracting a mass audience during its periods of peak popularity. It first appeared in 1792 (Robert Barker’s Cities of London and Westminster) and maintained its popularity throughout the nineteenth century. In general, and when compared to other canonical forms of visual expression around 1800 (painting, sculpture etc.), it is clear that scholarly research has neglected the topic of the panorama, thus following the footsteps of aesthetic discourse itself. This essay will juxtapose the differences between aesthetic theory and general commentaries on the panorama. Both forms of commentary appeared, at the time, mutually exclusive while at the same time achieving overwhelming success in their respective circles of either academia or mass media. This is particularly due to the exclusion or inclusion of the concepts of ‘collectivity’, ‘technology’ and ‘economics’ around 1800.

1

The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy leaves us in no doubt as to the terminological and discursive confinements of art: artworks are either interpreted as ‘products of individual efforts’, or their meaning is produced by the conventions of ‘the artist’s own time’ or by the practices of the user. Further descriptions generally reside within the terminological limits defined by aesthetic theory from around 1800.

In the spirit of Freud, one might say that the three ‘insults’ to this aesthetic master discourse on art are, without much doubt, bound up in the questions of technology, economy and collectivity. All three seem to threaten what has commonly been accepted as the autonomy of art; that is, the inauguration of art as a cultural form that entirely relies on its own rulings. It is no coincidence that all ‘insults’ are core parameters of the visual art form of the panorama, the success of which finds its parallel in the merely uncontested establishment of modern aesthetic theory. But how did this duplicity of ‘events’ come about?
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