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German Roots and Mangel-wurzels

Fairy-tales and fantasy literature were not invented by the German Romantics, but they are indelibly associated with them. While there are other collections of what came to be called fairy-tales – *contes de fées* was originally, and significantly, a French term – it is the Grimm Brothers’ collection of folktales, *Children’s and Household Tales* [*Kinder- und Hausmärchen*] (1812–14), that has become the classic and probably most influential collection of ‘fairy-tales’. The Grimms did a fair bit of rewriting of the oral ‘folk-tales’ that they collected; indeed some of these were not originally oral at all, but were originally French literary fairy-tales that had passed into oral tradition. However, it was German Romantic writers such as Tieck, Novalis, Eichendorff, Brentano, Fouqué and E.T.A. Hoffmann, who developed the so-called *Kunstmärchen* or invented literary fairy-tale in this period (1796–1830). Again, the idea of inventing fairy-tales was not itself new – the French, for example, had been inventing fairy-tales in the century before the Grimms and the Italians in the preceding centuries. What was new was the set of ideas and values – the ideology – that inspired German Romantic writers to take up folk material and motifs and refashion them into a literary creation that was *fairy-tale-like* [*märchenhaft*], though not itself originally belonging to folk tradition.

German Romanticism is a notoriously complex phenomenon. It had a more complicated development than other Romanticisms and there are up to three distinct stages of Romanticism in Germany. Its complexity is partly due to the fact that it could be said – with some measure of agreement – that German writers and intellectuals invented the concept of ‘Romanticism’ as a theorized literary movement. As Raymond Immerwahr puts it:

> Although the adjective [*romantisch*] itself was of English origin and the steadily increasing prestige of ‘romantic’ values and attitudes was a general European phenomenon, the attempt to make them the basis of a programmatic literary and cultural movement originated in Germany.
As was suggested in the Prelude above, the philosophical roots of Romanticism go back a long way, but certainly late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century German Idealist philosophy played a crucial role in shaping the Romantic world-view. Wordsworth may have claimed to be innocent of German metaphysics, but Coleridge was certainly not. Passages of his *Biographia Literaria* are notoriously plagiarized from German sources. What characterizes German Romanticism perhaps above all is an emphasis on the imagination and on creativity. This emphasis derives in large measure from the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, who argued in his *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) that, to put it very crudely, the human mind is not merely the passive recipient of information coming into it from the outside. On the contrary, argued Kant, the human mind actively shapes what it perceives. Every perception is already interpreted within the structures of consciousness. Kant is probably the most influential philosopher in modern western thought in the sense that wherever there is talk of the constructedness of human knowledge and experience, there is present some residual influence of Kant’s concept of philosophical Idealism: that is, the idea that the mind (or language itself, as later ‘linguistic idealists’ such as Wittgenstein and perhaps Derrida would say) plays a crucial role in creating our experience of ‘reality’.

This restriction of human knowledge to the capacity of our receiving equipment – that is, to the structures of human consciousness – may be seen negatively, as some kind of loss of the real, whether material or spiritual. However, from early on, followers of Kant saw his project in more positive terms as an affirmation of the human mind in its creative role in shaping and even constructing experience. The particular part or faculty of the mind that controls this shaping, constructing process is the Imagination [*Einbildungskraft*]. The idea of the ‘primary’ or transcendental imagination is central to Romantic thought. Coleridge famously contrasts it in his *Biographia Literaria* with ‘fancy’, which is merely imitative, whilst the creative imagination is literally divine in origin, scope and power. Followers of Kant took up this implication of his thought and developed it in ways that went far beyond Kant himself. They saw the presence of the divine shaping Imagination in the human spirit (Coleridge’s ‘repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM’) as suggesting that humanity too was in some sense divine. While Kant himself had modestly wanted to limit religion to the bounds of reason alone, his more adventurous followers such as Fichte, Schelling and Hegel developed forms of pantheism that affirmed the ultimate identity of the human spirit with the divine Spirit.

What is relevant to the present study is the fact that these post-Kantian Idealist philosophers moved in the same circles as – and often actually were – creative writers in the early German Romantic school. Flourishing in the late 1790s and early 1800s, what is technically called Early German Romanticism (*Frühromantik*) not only included theoreticians such as
Friedrich Schlegel, but also creative writers such as Tieck and Novalis. The latter was also in his very distinctive way a philosopher, just as Friedrich Schlegel wrote novels. German Romantics were trying to overcome the dichotomy between literature and philosophy, and develop a ‘progressive universal poetry [Universalpoesie]’ produced by a communal process of ‘Symphilosophy’ [Symphilosophie], of which the short-lived journal the Athenaeum (1798–1800) was the principal organ. The next stage of German Romanticism, called High Romanticism (Hochromantik), spanned the first two decades of the nineteenth century and includes Friedrich de la Motte Fouqué and E.T.A. Hoffmann. There is a famous essay by Heine that compares the different styles of Romanticism evident in Novalis and Hoffmann. For Heine, Novalis represents, in summary, the kind of early German Romanticism that is otherworldly and ‘yearning for the blue yonder’, symbolized by Heinrich von Ofterdingen’s ‘Blue Flower’. This kind of utopian Romanticism is characterised by longing [Sehnsucht] for the Ideal contained in some quasi-Platonic ideal realm that is our true home; what Novalis had in mind when he said: ‘All fairy-tales are only dreams of that familiar world of home which is everywhere and nowhere’, and to which we are always going home (‘Where are we going?’ ‘Home, always home [immer nach Hause]’ (HvO 159). Although Hoffmann belongs to the High Romantic period, he was aware of ‘the unspeakable bliss of infinite yearning’ (GPOT 82) that characterizes the Early Romantic movement. This idea is also evident in MacDonald’s GK where Mossy and Tangle spend their whole lives trying reach the ‘country whence the shadows come’. The present world is only a ‘vale of Soul-making’, in Keats’s phrase, from which we seek liberation through finding our true home in the other world. However, as Heine pointed out, there is in the later Romanticism of Hoffmann much more of an awareness of the pull of this world, and of a real struggle between the competing demands of this world and some other world.

This second stage of German Romanticism is also the period in which Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm produced their famous collection of ‘fairy-tales’. Originally the Grimms were collecting folk material for a collection of folk-tales planned by another leading German Romantic, Clemens Brentano, as a sequel to his collection of folk songs and ballads, co-edited with Achim von Arnim, entitled The Boy’s Magic Horn [Des Knaben Wunderhorn] (1805–8). However, when Brentano’s folk-tale project went off the boil, the Grimms decided to publish their material themselves as Children’s and Household Tales. Like other Romanticisms, German Romanticism had a strong interest in folk material such as ballads and folk-tales. This connects with an emphasis on the supposedly natural as opposed to what were perceived as the pernicious constraints of civilization. Romanticism began after all in the century of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the cult of the noble savage, though it immediately has to be said that for German Romanticism – that most dialectical of literary movements – there was strong sense of the centrality of art. Novalis
famously said that ‘to become a human being is an art’; what epitomizes German Romanticism is precisely the Kunstmärchen [Kunst = art]. The idea of self-creation is also reflected in the emphasis on the distinctiveness both of the individual and of the nation or people [Volk]. This contrasts with the Enlightenment’s emphasis on Universal Reason as the guardian of moderation and civilized values. During the Enlightenment the claim to be special, whether made of a religious revelation or a privileged caste of priests or aristocrats, was liable to be thought of as superstitious, reactionary and extreme. By contrast, the Romantics prized what was strange, individual, different and even excessive. They also flirted with religion and mysticism (there is much emphasis on Eastern ideas, which were beginning to become more widely known in the West at this time).

Romanticism was drawn to what was dark and ambiguous, as opposed to the Enlightenment ideals of rational clarity and universality; to the Gothic, as opposed to the Neo-Classical, in literary as well as architectural terms. In contrast to the Enlightenment’s preference for what was clear as day, Novalis composed a set of ‘Hymns to the Night’ [Hymnen an die Nacht], translated by George MacDonald (his translation of their companion piece, the unorthodox Spiritual Canticles [Geistliche Lieder], was partly responsible for his ejection from his pastorate at Arundel). Again, in contrast to the great advances made in the natural sciences by the eighteenth century, one Romantic thinker and scientist, G.H. Schubert, wrote a book on aspects of the ‘dark side’ (Nachseite) of science, Ansichten von der Nachtseite der Naturwissenschaft (1808), and explored the unconscious in a way that remarkably anticipates Freud. Schubert’s work on the Nachseite of science is one of the main sources for the mythology in Hoffmann’s The Golden Pot (=GP) and Princess Brambilla. The Romantics in general were very interested in the unconscious and dreams; for Schubert, especially in his book The Symbolism of Dreams [Die Symbolik des Traumes] (1814), dreams were the royal road to the unconscious, which in turn led, he believed, to an awareness of the presence of God in nature.

The Romantic awareness of a supernatural power in nature was ambivalent, however. If nature could be positively overwhelming and might occasion a sense of rapture, it could also be terrifying and might reduce an individual to madness. This daemonic and disruptive side of nature can been seen in Fouqué’s Undine (1811), while Tieck’s Eckbert the Fair [Der blonde Eckbert] (1797) is a deeply unsettling study of madness, as is his The Rune Mountain [Der Runenberg] (1802), written just before Tieck himself suffered some kind of mental breakdown. The fickleness of nature and its domination by supernatural powers is also a theme of Tieck’s later The Elves [Die Elfen] (1811), translated by Thomas Carlyle. The literary work of Hoffmann also explores madness, not only in the essentially light-hearted manner of GP, but also in a very disturbing way in The Sandman (1816). The latter was of course the subject of Freud’s famous (and famously flawed) reading in his essay ‘The Uncanny’.
Undine is, according to Carol Tully, ‘in many ways the ultimate Kunstmärchen’. Certainly MacDonald claimed in his essay ‘The Fantastic Imagination’ that: ‘of all the fairy tales I know, I think Undine the most beautiful’ (CFT 5) and offered it as an epitome of the genre. As a Kunstmärchen or literary fairy tale it is certainly much longer and more complex than the average folk tale. It contains typical Romantic elements such as an element of the daemonic Nachtseite or uncanny dark side of Nature, especially in the many forms of Undine’s shape-shifting uncle Kühleborn. Kühleborn would be the archetypal wicked uncle (like Uncle Andrew in Lewis’s The Magician’s Nephew) if he were human, though of course he isn’t. There is also a strong flavour of the medievalism that was an essential ingredient of Romanticism in general, though it is perhaps particularly characteristic of German Romanticism. In this, as in most respects, HvO epitomizes German Romanticism, though well-known works by Tieck, Novalis, Eichendorff, Brentano, Fouqué and Hoffmann are set in a quasi-medieval world, or in an idealized sixteenth-century Germany based on the revival of interest in Dürer’s art in the Romantic period – a trend culminating in Wagner’s Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg. The medievalism which characterizes the fantasy tradition explored in this book (knights, dragons, castles, damsels in distress, witches and wizards) comes not only from indigenous British traditions such as Malory’s Le Morte d’Arthur and Spenser’s The Faerie Queene, but also from the German fairy-tales that so impressed the Victorian writers of fantasy and fairy-tale.

Like a Grimms’ fairy-tale or Tieck’s Eckbert the Fair, Undine is contained within its own quasi-medieval fairy-tale world – as would also be the case with many later fairy-tale fantasies, from works by Ruskin and MacDonald through to (with reservations discussed below) Tolkien. In contrast to this ‘one world’ fairy-tale, there is in Hoffmann’s GP a dramatic tension between two (or more) worlds, which is perhaps more characteristic of the fantasy tradition explored in this book, for example in The Chronicles of Narnia (=CN), HDM and to some extent the Harry Potter series. Indeed with GP we can perhaps see the beginnings of the idea of ‘Muggles’ with the typical Romantic contempt for the bourgeois ‘Philistines’, a term actually coined by German students in the Romantic period. The idea of a tension, and indeed a kind of negotiation, between the pull of two worlds is a typical theme of German Romanticism, particularly of the second phase. Earlier German Romanticism often seemed only hostile to the everyday world, seeking either magically to transform it or merely to escape from it.

Typical of early German Romanticism is Novalis, who claimed, in MacDonald’s favourite quotation, that ‘[o]ur life is no dream; but it ought to become one, and perhaps will’. Novalis called his revolutionary project of transforming the world through poetry ‘Magic Idealism’, and sought, like other German Romantics, to create a new mythology that would express, and perhaps initiate, a social and even a cosmic revolution: a Golden Age. In the Prelude above, I suggested that whatever direct knowledge of Novalis’s writing...
Pullman may or may not have, there seem to be parallels between the two writers, if only in the sense that Pullman seems bent on the creation of a new, essentially Romantic, mythology of the kind that Novalis sought to achieve in his writings. Perhaps the point at which the writings of Novalis and Pullman most resemble each other is in the (veiled) expression of the sexual charge that is generated by the coming of the Golden Age, or at least by the reversal of a process of catastrophic decline. At the end of *AS* the halting and subsequent reversal of the loss of Dust coincides with the beginnings of Will and Lyra's carnal knowledge of each other. There is evidently an erotic aspect to the moment when they mutually (and presumably metonymically) stroke their daemons’ fur. In the fairy-tale ‘Hyacinth and Rosebud’ ['Hyazinth und Rosenblütchen'], recounted in Novalis’s philosophical novel *The Novices of Sais* [*Die Lehrlinge zu Sais*] (1802), the protagonist Hyacinth embarks on a long quest for the goddess Isis, who in the end, at the moment of unveiling, turns out to be Rosebud, his childhood sweetheart:

[O]nly a dream could lead him into the holiest of regions. The strange dream led him through endless chambers full of curious things floating on harmonious sounds and with changing chords. Everything seemed to [Hyacinth] so familiar and yet in such splendour as he had never seen. Then the last trace of earth disappeared, as if dissolved in air, and he stood before the heavenly maiden; he lifted the light shimmering veil, and Rosebud sank into his arms. A distant music surrounded the mystery of the lovers’ reunion, the outpourings of yearning, and excluded all that was foreign from this rapturous place.25

The final words of ‘Hyacinth and Rosebud’ speak of ‘those days’ and evidently refer to a kind of Golden Age. Similarly, the conclusion to the so-called Atlantis Märchen in *HvO* presents the resolution of a love problem as the inauguration of a Golden Age: ‘... that evening became a holy eve for the whole country whose life thereafter was only one long beautiful festival’ (though the Golden Age of Atlantis is not destined to last, at least not ‘in the sight of men’) (*HvO* 52). The conclusion of ‘Klingsor’s Märchen’ in *HvO* is Novalis’s boldest expression of the arrival of the Golden Age as an (orientalized) erotic event:

In the meantime the throne [of Arcturus and Sophie] had imperceptibly changed into a magnificent bridal bed, over whose canopy the Phoenix hovered with little Fable. The back of the bed was supported by three caryatids of dark porphyry, and the front rested on a sphinx of basalt. The king embraced his blushing beloved, and the people followed the example of the king and caressed one another. One heard nothing but words of endearment and a whisper of kisses.

(*HvO* 148)
Like all true Romantic heroes, Novalis died young. The second wave of German Romantics were more aware of the need to decide between this dull, unsatisfactory world and some other, more utopian dream world. The narrator at the end of *GP* laments: ‘Happy Anselmus, who has cast off the burden of daily life! ... now you are living in joy and bliss on your estate in Atlantis! But as for poor me ... I shall ... return to my garret; the petty cares of poverty-stricken life will absorb my thoughts ... ’ (*GPOT* 83). However, the narrator is admonished by Archivist Lindhorst, who is also, or ‘really’ (that is the question26), a salamander or elemental spirit; he is reminded by Lindhorst that Atlantis is ‘the poetic property of the mind’. Indeed, he asks, ‘is Anselmus’s happiness anything other than life in poetry, where the holy harmony of all things is revealed as the deepest secret of nature?’ (*GPOT* 83).

The suggestion of a resolution of the tension between two worlds into a this-worldly experience, transfigured but not abolished by the poetic imagination, is typical of second wave German Romanticism, and gestures ultimately towards the culture of *Biedermeier*, or middle-class conventionality, typical of nineteenth century Germany and comparable in some respects with Victorian ‘respectability’. The latter is mocked by Rowling in its modern incarnation in the Dursleys, whose obsession with respectability occludes the family history of magic, though the final scene of *Deathly Hallows* shows Harry Potter himself, now a family man, looking very *Biedermeier* (his magical scar hasn’t troubled him for 19 years). *Biedermeier* is a compromise-formation that distances itself from the utopian dreams of early Romanticism as leading only to madness or revolution. An unkind interpretation would call this ‘selling out’. Similar tendencies have been seen in Wordsworth and Coleridge.

However, Hoffmann was far from offering in his writings any comfortable resolution of the tensions between the two worlds – that of Philistine ordinariness and that of utopian fantasy. On the contrary, he repeatedly dramatized precisely this tension, a tension that characterized his own life and that of many other middle-class artists and intellectuals in this period in Germany.27 It is significant that at the end of *GP* the narrator explicitly appears as a writer living in a garret; Hoffmann’s framing devices are often sophisticated and readers neglect them at their peril – as in the case of Freud’s notoriously reductive reading of *The Sandman*.28 Anselmus’s problem is to decide between – on the one hand – a safe career in the bourgeois world of minor officials such as Sub-Rector Paulmann and Registrar (later Counsellor) Heerbrand, and marriage to the former’s daughter Veronica; or – on the other hand – living in bliss in Atlantis with Serpentina, the daughter of Archivist (Salamander) Lindhorst. But Anselmus’s problem is transferred (or does the transference actually work the other way?) to the narrator, who, feeling ‘pierced and lacerated by ... anguish’, complains that ‘the petty cares of my poverty-stricken life will absorb my thoughts, and my gaze is obscured by a thousand ills as though by a black mist, so that I doubt if I shall ever behold
the lily’ (which, symbolizing ‘the knowledge of the holy harmony of all living things’, grants ‘utmost happiness for evermore’) (GPOT 83). As Zipes has pointed out, Hoffmann himself was ‘experiencing personal difficulties regarding what professional career he should pursue (musician, writer or lawyer?) and at a time when early capitalist market conditions in publishing and the absence of copyright made the process of writing for unknown audiences all the more alienating.’29 If Anselmus goes out of his mind in the most blissful of ways (that is, into Atlantis), then the narrator of GP, who is ‘pierced and lacerated by . . . anguish’, fears going out of his mind in a considerably less happy way, (‘my tormenting dissatisfaction made me ill’) (GPOT 79). In The Sandman ‘the tormented, self-divided Nathanael’ goes out of his mind in the most terrifying way imaginable.

On another level, however, the main protagonist of GP, that ‘Modern Fairy-Tale’, is not so much Anselmus (or even the narrator) as the salamander living in early nineteenth century Dresden under the name of Archivist Lindhorst. The salamander is one of the elemental spirits about whom, in Fouqué’s Undine, the eponymous nymph tells her new husband, the knight Huldrbrand:

>You should know, my love, that there are living creatures among the elements that look quite like mortals but are seldom seen by them. Wondrous salamanders glitter and play in the flames, withered bad-tempered gnomes live deep in the earth; treefolk who belong to the air inhabit the forests; a multitude of water spirits reside in the lakes and rivers and streams.30

Hoffmann knew Undine, published in 1811, not least because he later created an opera based on it, which was successfully produced in 1816. There is even an echo of the plot of Undine in GP, insofar as the story in Undine hinges on the fact that elemental spirits such as Undine have no immortal soul and can only acquire one by marrying a mortal; similarly, the salamander in GP can only be restored to his original glory by marrying off his three serpent daughters to mortal men, of whom Anselmus is the first. All of this material is also found in Le Comte de Gabalis (1670) by the Abbé de Montfaucon de Villars, which is referred to in passing by ‘Salamander Lindhorst’ in his letter to the narrator of Anselmus’s adventures; Lindhorst claims that according to Gabalis ‘elemental spirits are by no means to be trusted’ (GPOT 80). Lindhorst’s claim is actually a simplification of Le Comte de Gabalis where there is much discussion of the advantages and disadvantages to both sides in unions between humans and elemental spirits. For example, some gnomes reckon that having an immortal soul is too big a risk given that it can be condemned to eternal punishment in Hell, of which they have some knowledge due to its underground proximity; non-existence is better than Hell, they argue, a viewpoint that is of course roundly condemned in Le Comte de Gabalis.
Hoffmann's main source for the myth in *GP* is, according to Ritchie Robertson, G.H. Schubert's book on the ‘dark side’ of science, *Ansichten von der Nachtseite der Naturwissenschaft* (1808) (*GPOT* xiiin11). Whatever its precise origins, the myth as it appears in Hoffmann's fairy-tale it is very much in the same genre as the other great fairy-tale myths of the Romantic period in Germany – Goethe’s *Märchen* and Novalis’s ‘Klingsor’s Märchen’ in *HvO*. Though he never mentions Abrams’s *NS*, Robertson’s comment in his Introduction very much aligns Hoffmann’s myth with Abrams’s summation of the ‘recurrent pattern’ in Romantic thought: ‘Thus the myth is dialectical. Instead of moving in a circle from original unity to its restoration, it moves in a spiral from original unity to the recreation of that unity on a higher plane, enhanced by consciousness’ (*GPOT* xiv). The myth first appears in the third chapter (or ‘Vigil’, as Hoffmann calls them), under the ironic subtitle ‘News of Archivist Lindhorst’s family’. It begins with the primeval waters, and the first appearance of life and particularly of ‘a black hill which rose and sank as does a man’s breast when it heaves with ardent yearning’. When touched by the pure ray of the sun, the black hill in ‘an excess of delight gave birth to a splendid fiery lily’ (*GPOT* 15). Enter the youth Phosphorus, for whom the lily is overcome by ‘passionate yearning love’. Phosphorus warns the lily that, should their love be consummated, ‘the yearning that now suffuses you will be split into countless rays and will torture you, for the mind will give birth to the senses, and the supreme joy kindled by the spark that I now cast into you is the agonizing despair in which you will perish, to grow anew in an alien guise. This spark is thought!’ (*GPOT* 15–16). This passage not only harks back to ancient Gnostic myths of the alienation of consciousness, but also perhaps points forward to Pullman’s myth of ‘Dust’ as matter becoming self-conscious. At the kiss of Phosphorus the lily suffers a kind of *Liebestod*, or ‘love-death’, bursting into flames from which emerges ‘an alien being which swiftly escaped . . . and roamed through infinite space’ (*GPOT* 16). A black dragon appears and manages to capture the being that had sprung from the lily; this being becomes the lily once more, but ‘thought remained to lacerate her, and her love for the youth Phosphorus was an agony which breathed poisonous vapours upon [her fellow] flowers . . . and made them wither and die.’ Phosphorus then dons shining armour, fights and defeats the dragon with the help of the flowers who flutter round it like brightly coloured birds. The lily is freed and united with Phosphorus in ‘the ardent passion of heavenly love’ to general rejoicing in which the flowers, birds and ‘even the lofty granite rocks’ join in (*GPOT* 16). The myth that Lindhorst recounts is accused by the other characters of being ‘a lot of Oriental bombast’, to which Lindhorst replies that ‘it is very far from absurd or even allegorical, but literally true’; the fiery lily is his ‘great-great-great-great-grandmother’ (prefiguring Princess Irene’s ‘great-great-grandmother’ in MacDonald’s *Curdie* books) (*GPOT* 17). Lindhorst continues with some further news about
his brother who ‘went to the bad and joined the dragons’ and now lives in
grove of cypresses near Tunis, guarding a mystical carbuncle from the atten-
tions of an evil necromancer. The company greets this latest news about
Lindhorst’s family with laughter, but Anselmus has an uncanny feeling
about it and the ‘mysterious penetrating quality’ of Lindhorst’s ‘strangely
metallic-sounding voice’ shakes him to the core (GPOT 17–18).

The continuation of the myth is taken up in the eighth Vigil by Lindhorst’s
daughter Serpentina, who mysteriously appears to Anselmus (evidently, like
Harry Potter, a ‘Parseltongue’), while he is copying a manuscript whose unfa-
familiar characters tell – as he realizes ‘in an inner intuition’ – ‘Of the Marriage
of the Salamander and the Green Snake’ (GPOT 52). The land ruled by
Phosphorus, we now learn, was Atlantis. Phosphorus was ‘the mighty prince
of spirits’ and the elemental spirits (sylphs, nymphs, gnomes and salaman-
ders) were his servants. Serpentina’s father, the salamander we know as
Lindhorst, was Phosphorus’s favourite. He fell in love with a green snake, the
daughter of a lily, and carried her off to Phosphorus’s castle, imploring the lat-
ter to marry them. But Phosphorus refuses, telling the salamander that the lily
was his former beloved, and only the victory of Phosphorus over the black
dragon now bound in chains by the earth-spirits, has kept the spark that
Phosphorus deposited in the lily from destroying her. If the salamander were
to embrace the green snake, Phosphorus warns him, his heat will burn her up
and a new being will appear which will immediately escape (this is clearly a
repetition of the earlier part of the myth). However, like Phosphorus before
him, the salamander cannot resist kissing the green snake; as prophesied, it
crumbles to ashes, and out of them a winged creature flies away. At this the
salamander goes mad with grief and lays waste the garden in his wild fury. As
a punishment, the prince of the spirits banishes the salamander – his light
now extinguished – to the realm of the earth-spirits. But after the intercession
of the gardener (an earth-spirit), the prince of spirits declares:

In the unhappy time when the degenerate race of men will no longer
understand the language of nature, when the elemental spirits, each con-
fined in his own region, will speak to men only in faint and distant
sounds, when man will be estranged from the harmonious circle and
only an infinite yearning will bring him obscure tidings of the wondrous
realm that he once inhabited, while faith and love dwelt in his heart – in
that unhappy time the salamander’s fiery substance will catch light anew,
but he will rise only to their wretched life and endure its privations. But
not only will he retain the memory of his primal state; he will again live
in holy harmony with all of nature, he will understand its marvels, and
the power of his brothers will once more be at his command. In a lily
bush he will again find the green snake, and his marriage to her will bring
forth three daughters.

(GPOT 55)
If, however, each of the green snakes can attract the love of youth with "child-like poetic spirit" who can shake off "the burden of common cares" and develop, along with his love for the snake, "a living and ardent faith in the wonders of nature, and in his own existence amid these wonders", then finally the salamander may "cast off his weary burden and join his brothers" (GPOT 56).

Anselmus is of course precisely such a youth with "child-like poetic spirit", who is indeed "mocked by the rabble because of the lofty simplicity of [his] behaviour and because [he] lack[s] what people call worldly manners" (GPOT 56). He is the archetypal Romantic "outsider" and bears a family resemblance to other specially chosen, but rather geek-ish heroes down to Bastian in Michael Ende’s Neverending Story and even perhaps Harry Potter (or the youthful Severus Snape). The fact that Anselmus has been chosen finally to attain Serpentina (and Atlantis) does not mean, however, that he will be spared a long and testing struggle to achieve this lofty destiny. The testing of Anselmus is partly based on that of Tamino in The Magic Flute by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, whose middle name Hoffmann appropriated as a mark of his admiration for the composer. GP has many similarities to Mozart’s fairy-tale opera that Hoffmann knew well from his work as an orchestra conductor. Lindhorst resembles the wise old man Sarastro, while the main antagonist in both works is an evil female figure, the Queen of the Night in The Magic Flute. In GP the evil female is the old apple-woman with whom Ansemus collides in the first sentence of the story and who pursues him for the rest of the narrative.

The old woman owes her malign existence to the fact that the black dragon, defeated by Phosphorus in the first part of the myth, managed to escape after a hideous battle with the salamanders and earth-spirits. Although the dragon was recaptured and is once more heaving and groaning in chains, black feathers from his wings fell to earth during the struggle and brought about the birth of malign spirits. The union between one particular feather and a mangel-wurzel gave birth to the evil old woman. She derives much of her power from the captive black dragon (in a sense her grandfather); she works her black magic ceaselessly to oppose the salamander, and in particular, to capture the eponymous golden pot. Anselmus is warned by Serpentina to beware of the old apple-woman who is his foe, because his "innocent child-like spirit has already foiled many of her evil spells" (GPOT 57). The old woman finally succeeds in grabbing the magic pot, but Lindhorst foils her escape – she and her cat are brutally destroyed by the salamander and his screech owl:

Thick smoke was rising from the spot where the old woman had been lying under [Lindhorst’s] dressing gown. Her howling, her terrible piercing yells of lamentation, were dying away in the distance. The clouds of smoke evaporated, along with their penetrating stench. The Archivist raised the dressing gown, and beneath it lay a nasty mangel-wurzel.

(GPOT 72)
The myth is continued when Lindhorst the salamander contacts the narrator, who is in despair at his inability to complete the story of Anselmus. Anselmus has now of course been drawn into the salamander’s story and is himself part of the myth. Lindhorst invites the narrator to the very scene of writing, the purple desk where Anselmus had worked. Here the salamander produces a goblet of fire, or at least of flaming arrack, into which he jumps, to the narrator’s astonishment. The latter, however, is undeterred; he writes: ‘I blew the flames gently aside and took a sip of the drink. It was delicious!’ (GPOT 81). Without more ado, the final part of the myth suddenly appears on our page. There is nothing said in the text about whether the narrator copied a manuscript, wrote to the salamander’s dictation, or indeed found the text magically appearing as he wrote (as had once happened to Anselmus). The act of writing is in this case simply invisible. This is intriguing not least because in other cases, Hoffmann’s (or at least the narrator’s) act of writing has been made invisible – that is, it has been occluded – by readers, most notably by Freud in his essay on ‘The Uncanny’ which simply ignores the frame of The Sandman. The myth produced by this invisible act of writing depicts Anselmus as leading an idyllic life in Atlantis. Emerging from a magnificent temple, Serpentina appears, bearing the golden pot: the gift of the earth-spirit who was Phosphorus’s gardener. The golden pot now contains, as prophesied, a magnificent lily. At this point, we are told:

Anselmus raises his head, as though transfigured by radiant light. Is it his gaze, his words, his song? It rings out clearly: ‘Serpentina! Faith in you, love for you has disclosed to me the innermost being of nature! You brought me the lily which sprang from the gold, from the primal force of the earth, even before Phosphorus awakened thought. The lily is the knowledge of the holy harmony of all living things, and in this knowledge I shall live in the utmost happiness for evermore. Yes, I am a supremely happy man who has been granted supreme knowledge.’

(GPOT 82–3)

If Anselmus has reached the pinnacle of knowledge and happiness for which philosophers (Gnostic, Hermetic and Romantic) had all been searching, it is little wonder that when the narrator comes down from his trip to Atlantis, he feels ‘pierced and lacerated by sudden anguish’. As was noted above, this split between a yearned-for supreme happiness and an actual wretched reality, seems to have been particularly acute in Germany in the years following the French Revolution, though there is also something universal in this particular expression of what used to be called ‘the human condition’. The consolation offered to the narrator by the Salamander Lindhorst – ‘Weren’t you in Atlantis yourself a moment ago, and haven’t you at least got a pretty farm there, as the poetic property of your mind?’ (GPOT 83) – seems at best ambiguous. It looks very like a case of Romantic Irony.
Hoffmann also embodied myths in others of his works than GP, for example in *Princess Brambilla* (1820) and *Master Flea* (1822). *Princess Brambilla* is styled by Hoffmann as ‘A Capriccio after Jacques Callot’. He elsewhere defined ‘the manner of Callot’ as that of: ‘a poet or writer [i.e. Hoffmann] to whom the figures of ordinary life appear in his inward romantic spiritual realm, and who portrays them in the light that there plays around them as though strange and curious finery’ (*GPOT* xxii–xxiii). This capacity to see and represent simultaneously the ordinary external world and a vividly imagined magical inner world is also called the Serapiontic principle by Hoffmann. This was named after St. Serapion on whose feast-day the so-called ‘Serapion Brethren’ was founded: an informal circle of writers in Berlin to which Hoffmann belonged. In Hoffmann’s collection of stories *The Serapion Brethren* there is an account of a hermit in a wood near Bamberg, who believed he was Serapion, was living in the Egyptian desert and that the towers of Bamberg were actually those of Alexandria. The hermit’s failure, according to the Brethren, was not so much his powerfully vivid imagination, as the fact that he did not recognize that there is also a real external world in tension with the imagined (*GPOT* ix–x).

An inextricable mixture of dream and reality pervades *Princess Brambilla* to such an extent that it is never entirely clear whether the protagonist is actually Giglio Fava – a struggling actor in eighteenth-century Rome – or Prince Cornelio Chiapperi, or indeed King Ophioch of Urdar (Giglio’s lover similarly fluctuates between being the dressmaker Giacinta Soardi, Princess Brambilla and Queen Liris of Urdar). Just as the plot of *GP* alternates between contemporary Dresden and the myth of the salamander, so the plot of *Princess Brambilla* weaves in a complex series of arabesques between theatrical intrigues in eighteenth-century Rome and the myth of King Ophioch and Queen Liris of Urdar (the names are predictably derived from G.H. Schubert).

There is, if anything, an even more complicated series of permutations of identity in *Master Flea: A fairy-tale in seven adventures of two friends*. The eccentric hero Peregrinus Tyss is also identified with King Sekakis of Famagusta whose daughter Gamaheh is murdered by the Leech Prince and reincarnated in the beautiful Dörtje Elwerdink and later as a tulip. The reader is, moreover, given to believe that she is also somehow identified with Peregrinus’s old servant Aline. All of this is held together in a bizarrely complicated plot that includes the exploits of the eponymous Master Flea. There is a great deal going on in this tale, including a politically subversive satirical interlude (the Knarrpanti episode) that was still the subject of legal proceedings when Hoffmann died in 1822. The myth running through the tale is also heavily influenced by Novalis’s *Novices of Sais* and echoes the polemic in that tale about the dangers of a reductive and mechanistic approach to scientific research. The myth concludes with a paradisical vision similar to the vision of Atlantis at the conclusion of *GP*.

Typically, then, the protagonists in Hoffmann’s fairy stories are, or are fantasized to be, participants in a much grander narrative or myth. Freud’s
work on ‘Family Romance’ is arguably relevant here, as well as perhaps his work on the hysterical fantasies of Schreber. Myths in Hoffmann have a highly ambiguous and problematic relation to ‘reality’; it is quite arguable that Anselmus or Giglio Fava or Peregrinus Tyss (in GP, *Princess Brambilla* and *Master Flea* respectively) are simply mad. Certainly this seems a strong likelihood in the case of Nathanael in *The Sandman*. Maria Tatar has argued convincingly that Hoffmann was familiar with, and used, the contemporary discourse of madness. Analogously, it could be argued that Harry Potter’s adventures are the fantasies of a marginalized and clinically depressed teenage misfit (and/or single parent?). Psychoanalytical readings of the fantasy tradition really began with Freud’s analysis of works by Hoffmann, especially *The Sandman*, though as Calhoon has suggested, the traffic between Freud and Romanticism is by no means one way: Freud’s work only makes sense, he suggests, within the discourse that Romanticism helped to constitute. The fantasy writings of MacDonald, Lewis Carroll, C.S. Lewis and J.R.R Tolkien are eminently susceptible to psychoanalytical readings, as arguably are those of J.K. Rowling and Pullman.

The fantasy tradition stretching back to Romanticism seems to invite not only psychoanalytical, but also political readings. In NS, Abrams argues that Marx, like Freud, is a product of German Romanticism; he rests his case largely on Marx’s early *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* (1844) (NS 313–16). In Nietzsche’s case, Abrams argues for a Romantic genealogy as well, though here his argument is tenuous and based entirely on *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872) (NS 316–18). A much stronger case could be made for exploring Nietzsche in terms of the horizon of German Romanticism, not least with reference to Richard Wagner, about whom Abrams remains strangely (and noticeably) silent. Certainly the fantasy tradition from German Romanticism onwards has been from the beginning a matter of political debate. Heine was aware of such issues in his *The Romantic School [Die Romantische Schule]* in the 1830s. The question has always been whether German Romanticism in general – and in particular the myths which it created (especially those by Novalis and Hoffmann) – are, on the one hand, the expression of a radical Utopian subversiveness or, on the other, the products of a political apathy or conservatism finding solace in escapist fantasy. Some critics, such as Rosemary Jackson, are scathing of the particular tradition of fantasy that is the focus of the present book, seeing it as fundamentally reactionary. She calls it ‘transcendentalist’ and expressive of a ‘nostalgic, humanistic vision’ that looks back to a ‘lost moral and social hierarchy’, and seeks to ‘expel’ and displace desire into ‘religious longing and nostalgia’, thereby defusing ‘potentially disturbing, anti-social drives’ and retreating from confrontation. Jack Zipes, on the other hand, makes considerable claims for the subversiveness of the fairy-tale and fantasy tradition. Zipes and others are, however, scathing about ‘the Harry Potter phenomenon’ as implicitly reactionary and certainly an expression of rampant capitalism. The issue of the politics of Pullman’s *HDM* is more complex.
These are issues to which I shall return. The use, especially by Novalis and Hoffmann, of myths to embody spiritual as well as political aspirations has been discussed with an eye to the related use of myth by later writers such as Tolkien, Lewis and Pullman. In contrast to the Utopian other-worldliness of the early German Romantics, and their tendency to create a single self-contained, fairy-tale-like world (or ‘chronotope’) of the marvelous (in Todorov’s definition),\textsuperscript{37} there is in the fantasy works of later German Romantics, such as Hoffmann, a greater sense of ambiguity and tension between the competing demands of this world and other possible worlds. Particular attention has been given to Hoffmann’s \textit{GP} as a paradigm of fantasy literature ‘for children of all ages’, from MacDonald’s work through to the Harry Potter series. The characteristic theme of German Romantic literature, that is, the discrepancy (and complex relationship) between the fantastic world of the (possibly Utopian) imagination, and the ‘real’ world of the bourgeois ‘Philistines’ (the Dursleys, if not ‘Muggles’ as such) will inform the remainder of this study.
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