Translator's Introduction

An *Auftritt*—the central term of this book—is an entrance. It is also a performance and an appearance in public, a stepping up, out, and onto. The upward "stepping" of this "Tritt" (from "treten," to step) embodies a vertical physicality that is the main focus of *Making an Entrance*. Or to quote the nineteenth-century definition from the dictionary of the Brothers Grimm, which Juliane Vogel takes as the title for an earlier essay that can be read as a proleptic sketch of the concepts in this book, an *Auftritt* is a "sinnliches aufsteigen"—a physical or even sensual rising up, climbing, or mounting, and specifically, "a stepping up [Auftritt] to the pulpit, the stage, or a raised elevation."[1] The verb *aufsteigen* has its own entry in the Grimms' dictionary, where it is defined as "*ascendere*, elevating oneself," with three intransitive senses. First, it signifies a "climbing up by foot"—though the textual example provided, of Jacob's ladder, reaches far beyond the steps of human beings: "and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it."[2] Second, the word can be applied to physical objects "that are seen to be ascending": the sun rising "splendidly" into the sky, an air balloon, a mountain rising "before us," or "more gently," a "hill covered in the shadows of bushes and trees." And third, it denotes the upward movement of inner, abstract states: "my heart rose within me"; or anger, thoughts, spirit. As defined here, an *Auftritt* is thus a movement that can bridge heaven and earth, that begins in one's feet but semiotically cuts across a subject's inner and outer worlds. It is a splendid rising up that can be observed in both nature and human ingenuity or artifice, in things that naturally ascend and things that are made to do so. It not only claims a visible position in a high place but also posits a concrete position of spectatorship—and of this spectatorship as an "us," a shared experience of seeing.

Only after these senses of the word, concerned with physical bodies, does the Grimms' dictionary then point to a specific development in eighteenth-century German theater, in which "Auftritt" came to mean "scene" in the sense of the separate parts of a play, or even an event or happening outside the theater in the sense of a "single, variable picture or adventure." The relationship captured in this shift

---

1 See Juliane Vogel, "Sinnliches Aufsteigen: Zur Vertikalität des Auftritts auf dem Theater," in *Auftritte in Raum und Zeit*, ed. Annemarie Matzke and Jens Roselt, 105–119 (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2015); and "Auftritt," in Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1854), column 765, www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB?lemid=A07240, accessed November 10, 2021.
2 "Aufsteigen," *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm*, https://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB?lemid=A07118. The biblical passage quoted by the Grimms' dictionary, namely Genesis 28:12, is cited here from the King James Version.

constitutes the central question of Juliane Vogel's book: the ways in which an entrance, as a rising or stepping up and out onto the stage, functions as the crucial act for establishing a space of theatrical representation. Making an entrance in this sense means establishing presence and visibility before an audience of spectators, crossing a threshold, and emerging from what this book calls the *Grund*. The *Grund* in this sense is concretely the background of the stage, often furnished with painted back cloths, or the ground in the visual sense of a field from which a figure can detach and become visible as an individual in coming forward into a setting or scene. It is, Juliane Vogel writes in chapter one, a "medium of figuration." In stepping forth from such a ground, the entrances examined in this book strive to constitute a "successful theatrical articulation" that would endow a character with "recognizability, sovereignty, and the stability of a form."[3] They function as the foundation for a persona's dignity and control over a space, performed through a purposeful placing of their step. In the triumphal splendid entrances of the sovereign that developed in the court theater of seventeenth-century France, where *Making an Entrance* begins, such an entrance figures as the rising of a "guiding star" that radiates light.[4] A celestial body of this kind makes the scene visible in the first place and gives it a point of orientation.

Understood in this way, a successful *Auftritt* articulates the beginning of theatricality itself, as an appearance made in a space it claims and opens up, before spectators it intentionally addresses and thus presupposes. That is to say: *Making an Entrance* argues that theatricality as a form of representation is predicated on an act of entering—and thus positing—the theatrical space and its spectators. Entrances pose questions about what makes this appearance visible, what holds a site together as scene, how different actions hold together as a plot, and what constitutes the theater as shared semiotic space of performance and spectatorship. And writing a history of entrances means studying the history of forms in which they are made. Shifted into the sphere of dramatic discourse, the topic of this book is thus the beginnings, coherence, and history of drama as a genre and form of representation. One of the main claims of the book, however, is that an *Auftritt* never entirely escapes the *Grund* out of which it originates, and that this *Grund*, too, remains as a structuring force within the theater. The perspective scenery developed during the Renaissance, for instance, not only establishes a space that appears to be structured in three dimensions: as a *Grund*, it also creates an illusion of depth toward the back that can open into an abyss. Here, the horizontal becomes vertical and depth becomes a chasm or the deeps of the sea.

---

3 Vogel, "Sinnliches Aufsteigen," 107.
4 Vogel, "Sinnliches Aufsteigen," 109.

The *Grund* of the dramas examined in this book can also be a diffuse field such as haze, smoke, waves, or foliage. Or it can be a source of violent, rending force—as the *Kriegsgrund* or "ground of war" that destroys the very figures it surrounds. In its most compact (though not always solid) sense, found in some of the stage directions and settings of these dramas, the *Grund* can mean a chasm, cliff, or ravine. When used less literally, however, it can mean "at root" or "essentially," or it can denote a metaphysical ground or grounds as reasons. Making *an Entrance* also asks what kind of a foundation this *Grund* concretely provides for the theater as space of performance. And in dramatic theater, the ground always encompasses the text with which characters inexorably remain entangled.

It is telling that in a final sense of *Auftritt* the Grimms' dictionary points to a sixteenth-century meaning that predates the term's specifically German application to the theater and is wholly independent from this context: namely, as "a fraud, deceit." At the root of this word, then, even before it generates a theatrical scene, we find that the movement it denotes and the claims it makes to presence are marked by the threat that comes with all forms of representation: that a sign is not what it appears to be, perhaps even intentionally so; that it might be motivated by secret powers and purposes; that it holds dangers unseen and untold. When the "magic" or "illusion" of a splendid entrance is aimed against nature, as Juliane Vogel writes, it also risks a hubris that can mean its own downfall.[5] It is this reversal in the movement of drama and its entrances that the book traces in the history of tragedy from Racine to Nietzsche. At stake is the integrity of a form that undoes its own foundations in the act of positing itself.

This single word, too, exemplifies the challenge of translating Juliane Vogel's text and its way of thinking—the shape of its arguments and the language it employs. This is language that often operates, as one sees in *Auf-tritt*, through roots and suffixes that cannot always be rendered in English, or that are not always immediately apparent as such because their parts have no independent meaning. Or, as with the word *Grund*, the book's vocabulary unfolds across a range of meanings that cannot be captured within a single term or even family of terms in English. Tracing shifts and tensions across these terminological relationships, *Making an Entrance* fashions a conceptual framework constituting a theory of drama, performance, subjectivity, and political representation. This can be followed, for instance, in the book's pithy discussion of *Don Carlos*, the heir to the Spanish throne, as a crisis of entering caught between court forms of ceremonial and familiar forms of intimacy shared by father and son. Here the book captures the play of these tensions in its own play with *Auftritt*, *Vortritt*,

---

5 Vogel, "Sinnliches Aufsteigen," 111.

and *Rücktritt*—of a stepping up and out as an entrance; a stepping forward as a right or privilege to take precedence over others; and a stepping back as a resignation.[6] These analyses develop a conceptual precision that never veers into jargon, but remains concretely attuned to the language in which these dramas themselves articulate the dazzling, weakened, wavering, or diffuse entrances made by the figures who appear on stage.

To put it another way: the language of the book amplifies and makes explicit valences implicit within the language of the works the book examines and the critical discourse about theater and art that these works spurred. It consequently reflects a constant tension between moving, seeing, and speaking. Operating within a single semiotic space encompassing the physical movements of the figures on stage, the visibility of their actions, and the performative power of their words, the book aims to develop theoretical insight into how all three interact. Thinking this way, writing this way, about dramatic texts also means taking seriously the performativity at the root of what the comparatist and literary critic Peter Szondi called "absolute drama," as a discourse that generates a (dialogic) space of representation within dramatic speech.[7] *Making an Entrance* aims its critical attention precisely at the tensions between drama as a literary genre, its performance on stage, and the visual setting in which it takes place.

In addition to *Auftritt* and *Grund*, other key terms include *Evidenz*, *Protokoll*, and *Plastik* or *plastisch*. Rather than denoting the foundations or conditions of figuration, they derive from rhetorical, aesthetic, and political vocabularies used to articulate a figure's significance. It is worth noting that they come from Latin and Greek, and that their cognates in English diverge semantically from their usage in German. *Evidenz* is not evidence, a *Protokoll* is not exactly a protocol, and it is only in an obsolete sense that "plastic" in English is related to the art of sculpture. *Evidenz* in German stems from the rhetorical tradition of *evidentia*, a physical and convincing representation in language that makes something appear to be present before the eyes.[8] But the word has come to mean both the

---

6 See the section of "Impotent Impulses" in chapter 2, "Tragedy in the Court Space of Appearance."

7 Peter Szondi, *Theory of the Modern Drama*, trans. Michael Hayes (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 7–10.

8 For a broad overview of the term's origins and the issues its poses in the study of culture, see *Auf die Wirklichkeit zeigen: Zum Problem der Evidenz in den Kulturwissenschaften*, ed. Helmut Lethen, Ludwig Jäger, and Albrecht Koschorke (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2015). For an earlier examination of "evidence" in the English sense of the term as a proof, sign, or indication, see *Questions of Evidence: Proof, Practice, and Persuasion across the Disciplines*, ed. James Chandler, Arnold I. Davidson, and Harry Harootunian (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994).

quality of being evident, in the meanings of "immediate and completely comprehensible [*Einsichtigkeit*] clear, and certain" and as an "incontrovertible fact or factual givenness."[9] The German word *Einsichtigkeit* is nevertheless more visual than my translation here of "comprehensible"—more about "seeing into" something or having insight. The English "evidence" reflects this visual quality but is narrower than the German *Evidenz* in denoting an "outward sign" or "token" in the sense of "furnishing proof" or "bearing witness."[10] Moreover, the meaning of the English word "evidence" as the "state of being evident" is now archaic, while its legal sense is conversely absent from the German. And to my ears at least, a "protocol" is more official than its German cousin: to call the minutes of a meaning or a set of instructions for a situation a "protocol" in English is to elevate this discourse to the formalized language of diplomacy or administration, often comically so, whereas the German usage is free of these qualities. In some cases, the "entrance protocols" described in this book are certainly those of court ceremony. But they are also just textual directions or instructions for steps to be taken, and expectations to be fulfilled for an entrance to be received and apprehended by spectators—rules, routines, or scripts that "formalize the moment of joining the scene and [that] generate presence under conditions regulated by convention," as Juliane Vogel writes in the first chapter of this book.

My intention in pointing out these etymological layers is not to follow any sort of linguistic fetishism, which might privilege the Germanic roots as primary or more semantically flexible. I highlight them, first, because they reflect a practical difficulty in translation, and moreover because they mark the particular, historical linguistic texture between French, German, and English in which the works this book examines were written, performed, and discussed. Etymological tensions that exist in the German often become more structurally pronounced in translation to English. For English, with a vocabulary suspended between a dominant Germanic base and layers adopted from French and Latin, augmented by Renaissance coinages modeled on Greek, this hybridity is a constitutive feature of the language. I have thus accepted that certain displacements occur in English from the German that nevertheless reflect the cultural and linguistic context with which the book is concerned. *Fortschreiten* generally becomes *progress*, and *vorschreiten* usually becomes *advance*, rather than go, move, or step forward. Yet in the dramatic tradition being discussed here, *vorschreiten* is itself a "translation" of the French *avancer*. Such terms themselves

---

9 "Evidenz" in *Duden*, https://www.duden.de/node/43286/revision/484155, accessed December 20, 2021.

10 "Evidence," *Merriam-Webster's Unabridged Dictionary*, Merriam-Webster, https://unabridged. merriam-webster.com/unabridged/evidence, accessed December 20, 2021.

travel back and forth between languages, countries, and traditions, as do plots, motifs, and other dramatic forms. Synonyms coexist in my translation when called for by context. *Evidenz* is often translated simply as *presence* or *manifest presence*, or even as *evidence* when employed as an attribute ("Entrances and Their Evidence"). Other renderings include *vivid clarity*, *visual evidence*, or the rhetorical term *evidentia*. The tugging and stretching of these terms in slightly different directions is representative of the discourse from which they come. For similar reasons, I have only very rarely opted to reproduce the original German words or phrases in square brackets. The aim has been a text that is primarily readable in English, for an English-speaking readership. Rather than a commentary, it is a translation in the sense of a transposition from one linguistic and cultural context into another. One boon of translating this book has been a sharper awareness of how the shared, shifting etymologies of this dramatic language remain inherent within the changing contexts in which it was employed—that is to say, how each linguistic tradition has its own productivity that is situated in different historical moments, and how these different traditions mutually constitute each other.

This can be seen, for instance, in another term—*Verkehrseinheit*—that Juliane Vogel borrows from the seminal book, *Renaissance and Baroque*, by the Swiss art historian Heinrich Wölfflin. On its face, this term could mean the *unity as a totality*, and/or *a discrete unit* of, traffic, intercourse, or interaction. In *Making an Entrance*, it denotes perspective as a new principle for structuring the stage—a standard for measuring and ordering a theatrical space and for defining its overall coherence, spatial composition, and visibility. In Wölfflin's book, it appears in a discussion of baroque villas:

> The baroque element of the complex [*Anlage*] is expressed not so much in the buildings as in the fact that the area surrounding it [or: its grounds, *Areal*] has been significantly enlarged in comparison with architecturally structured gardens, and that it is conceived as a *Verkehrseinheit* and thus as a dynamic composition [*bewegte Komposition*].[11]

This passage—and the meaning of *Verkehrseinheit*—turns on another term that is central to both Wölfflin's book and *Making an Entrance*: *bewegt*, or *moved*. In describing something as *moved*, the German word *bewegt* often carries the idea that something is, or appears to be, *moved from within*, and I have most often

---

11 Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock: Eine Untersuchung über Wesen und Entstehung des Barockstils in Italien*, 4th ed. (Munich: Bruckmann, 1926), 158: "Das barocke Element der Anlage äußert sich nicht so sehr in den Gebäuden als darin, daß das Areal, im Vergleich mit den architektonischen Gärten bedeutend vergrößert, als Verkehrseinheit und somit als eine bewegte Komposition aufgefaßt ist."

translated term as *dynamic* or sometimes even *restless* or *agitated*.[12] When applied to a composition or work of art, *bewegt* points to a representational conceit: the idea that a work fashioned by human hands could itself appear to come to life, could be animated or vivified and appear to be truly present and alive before spectators. In this passage from Wölfflin's book, this conceit becomes literally physical: the *Verkehrseinheit* of this baroque complex is the unity allowing the movement of everything that travels along its paths to be apprehended as part of a larger, intentionally composed whole.

The word is historically out of place, though, with a rub of anachronism that can be felt in *Making an Entrance,* too. For this reason, a brief detour along the word's history may illuminate how *Making an Entrance* often appropriates terminology—and how this poses difficulties for translation. *Verkehrseinheit* was in fact a later addition to Wölfflin's book, introduced to the expanded fourth edition published with his "permission, but not under his supervision" in 1926, nearly forty years after the first edition of 1888.[13] The advent of the automobile and airplane in the time in between as technologies that accelerated revolutions in global transportation and traffic makes the friction of applying this word to early modern villas especially jarring. But the seeds for this anachronism are older than the 1920s, or even the first edition of Wölfflin's book: the term itself comes from the technical yet grandiose language of nineteenth-century railway logistics and public administration—and as far I can tell, it is a translation from the French.[14] Alphonse Belpaire's 1847 *Traité des dépenses*

---

12 This a tension illustrated strikingly in the German phrase *bewegte Bilder*, i.e., *images that have been made to move*, to denote film and earlier techniques of combining still images into an animated stream. Here, images set into motion generate the illusion of inner movement, and *bewegte Bilder* become what in English are called *moving images* or *moving pictures*. Or as Duden defines, "bewegt" can mean both "characterized by movement" and "evidence/testimony of movement"—or, more literally: "generative" of movement ("von Bewegung zeugend"). Duden, "Bewegt," meaning 2.

13 Heinrich Wölfflin, *Renaissance and Baroque*, trans. Kathrin Simon (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, [1964] 1966), "Translator's Preface." Wölfflin's book was originally published as *Renaissance und Barock: Eine Untersuchung über Wesen und Entstehung des Barockstils in Italien*, 1st ed. (Munich: T. Ackermann, 1888). For a publication history of the book into this fourth edition, see Andrew Hopkins, "Reprinting and Republishing Wölfflin in the 1920s," *Journal of Art Historiography* 14 (June 2016): 1–7.

14 Alphonse Belpaire, *Traité des dépense d'exploration aux chemin de fer* (Brussels: Départment des Travaux Publics de Belgique, 1847); translated by Leopold Kastner as *Handbuch über die Leistungen und Fahrbetriebskosten der Eisenbahnen* (Vienna: Bei Mörschner's Witwe & J. Gress, 1849). I found no earlier instances of the term in a search of hits in Google books: the search engine does suggest several earlier publications, but on closer examination I only found versions of "Verkehr" or "Einheit," and not the compound term. An n-gram search

d'exploitation aux chemins de fer, translated into German in 1849 as *Handbuch über die Leistungen und Fahrbetriebskosten der Eisenbahnen*, begins by presenting the "development of the railways on the European continent" as one of the "epoch-making . . . facts . . . in our age's history of Enlightenment," and as a "precursor and first cause of a great social transformation."[15] Situating the railways in a single line of development with gunpowder and book printing, the book grandly announces the frame for its arguments: "Whoever studies history from its most sublime point of view cannot help but recognize something providential in the logical sequence of events, in the continuous tendency of humanity toward a greater community of ideas, interests, and relationships, toward social unity." The German translation is tendentious in exaggerating impulses from the French, rendering "son point de vue le plus élevé" as "its most sublime point of view" ("von ihrem erhabensten Gesichtspunkte"). This sublime perspective of a social unity taken to be embodied in an increasingly networked human community resembles something like the perspective of Hegelian spirit that sees human endeavors as the realization of a "providential" and "logical" tendency—forged here, though, by a technological fantasy of communication and control.

The measure of this new network and its mode of traffic, intercourse, and interaction is what the term *Verkehrseinheit* is meant to capture: it denotes both the "unity" of this network and/or the "units" of the "work" that makes it move. Like all instances of the sublime since Kant, it is faced with the difficulty of finding a measure for something that exceeds measured comprehension, and of grasping a point of view that perceives the whole from a finite series of representations. Regarded from the unity of this sublime perspective, observed and measured with this new unit, the doings and workings of human beings become manifest as part of a grand social enterprise beyond any individual intentions or activities. This is yet another sense of the word *auftreten*, articulated when the term is used as a verb: to appear as a manifestation; to become manifest or occur. History functions here as the stage—one is tempted to say the *Grund*—for the entrance of a more profound movement. At the same time, it is hardly surprising that *Verkehrseinheit* quickly took on a more political, nationalist cast, as a word denoting the unity of transportation systems among the German states. And long before Wölfflin's book employed the term, its semantic slipperiness—or

---

indicates the first appearance and then an explosion of the term's frequency in 1844 to 1850, so Kastner's use of the word perhaps reflects its emergence in a wider context rather than a coinage, though this could also be an artifact of the algorithm or the OCR and it's not possible to be sure.

15 Belpaire, *Traité des dépense d'exploration,* 1; Belpaire, trans. Kastner, *Handbuch über die Leistungen und Fahrbetriebskosten*, 1.

overdetermination—had motivated at least one author to complain that that it was "one of those buzzwords that creates more confusion than enlightenment."[16]

The appropriation of *Verkehrseinheit* in *Renaissance and Baroque* projects this unit(y) of traffic back onto baroque architecture as a threshold historical moment poised between organic and technological structure. Indeed, an *Anlage*—the word used to describe the unity of the baroque villa with its grounds—is also a machine or technological device; a work, a draft or outline of a work yet to be completed; and a naturally inherent aptitude or tendency. All three senses can be read into the word in Wölfflin's book: as a rational tendency, conception, and technology for organizing a space that anticipates industrialization. It is only when "significantly enlarged" from a "natural garden," the book writes, that this "Anlage" can function as measure and frame of unity for its "Verkehr." Belpaire's treatise used the term *Verkehrseinheit* to imagine the construction of the railways as part of a grand historical development encompassing the power of guns and the printing press. The use of the word in the 1926 edition of Wölfflin's book not only echoes this fantasy in a new historical moment in which these developments had been raised to new heights. It also retrospectively plants an aesthetic seed for this history in the structural composition of sixteenth-century architecture and garden design.

Juliane Vogel's application of the term to the space of the perspectival stage further amplifies this tension in a "unit/unity" of traffic conceived as organic, rational, or technological, and between a unity that claims to capture a point of view that is the highest or most sublime and a unit that could pervade and measure all parts of a space or network. In *Making an Entrance*, the term locates the comings and goings of figures on the stage within a mathematically measured and rationalized space whose unity is grounded in the sovereign's gaze. As a form of unity and unit of measure, it thus expresses both coherence and power. On the stage, as perspective, it produces an illusion of depth and life—but it does so through utterly artificial means, i.e., through painted backdrops and other dramatic techniques that align a space to match the measure of the monarch's rule. In harking ahead to the industrialized and technological shape that this rationalization will take, the *Verkehrseinheit* of this dramatic space similarly foreshadows the new infrastructures that will weld streams of traffic into an imagined or desired single space of interaction and political unity.

The English term *traffic* would reproduce some of this anachronism, but it has a number of connotations that prevent me from translating *Verkehrseinheit*

---

16 H. B. v. Anruh [?], "Die Erwebung der deutschen Eisenbahnen durch das Reich," in *Die Gegenwart: Wochenschrift für Literatur, Kunst und öffentliches Leben*, February 5, 1876, 82.

as unity or *unity of traffic*. According to *Oxford English Dictionary*, *traffic* enters English from French (the first instance listed is from 1339) in the sense of "commerce, trade, especially long-distance trade," with usage becoming more widespread in the sixteenth century "with reference to dealing or bargaining in something which should not be made the subject of trade, e.g. (in Calvin) the sale of indulgences, intrigue, scheming."[17] And even in all of its current meanings—ranging from the commercial transportation of goods or commodities to "dealings, communication, social interaction" and the circulation of vehicles or information—*traffic* almost never entirely loses this taint of illicit exchange. When used as a verb, the neutral sense of the word as commercial trade or exchange has largely become historical in English, replaced only by illegal trade or dealings.[18] One *traffics* only in illicit or disreputable goods, in slaves, or with an enemy; conversely, the injunction is often to *have no traffic* with a person or thing. And, of course, there is the particularly modern misery of getting stuck in traffic. One could even argue that the "traffic of the stage" found in one example given by Merriam-Webster's dictionary precisely reflects an antitheatrical prejudice aimed against, or at least acknowledging, the artifice, i.e., the feigned or contrived quality, of theatrical "communication or dealings between individuals or groups: intercourse, business."[19] And certainly, the "two hours traffic of our stage" announced in the opening monologue of *Romeo and Juliet* draws from these negative senses in casting its shadow.

I have thus translated "Verkehrseinheit" in *Making an Entrance* as "unity of interaction." This is the most straightforward rendering of its sense, even if the physicality of *Verkehr* and its specific historical anachronism more or less disappear. As a demonstration of the historical layers in the vocabulary of this book, however, this consideration of the word *Verkehrseinheit* can also serve as a hinge for thinking about the movements of the study's terms. In its various senses, the word itself operates as a site of traffic exchange, illustrating how the movement of vocabulary across languages, traditions, and times is not always a matter of linear transmission. The genealogies of these forms of representation are sometimes productive in ahistorical or counterhistorical directions; in breaks and leaps; in imagining new futures or reimagining the future of the past. These are genealogies in Nietzsche's or Foucault's untimely understanding of the word, necessarily motivated by current concerns and seen from a contemporary point of view.

---

17 "Traffic, n.," *OED Online*, December 2021, Oxford University Press.

18 "Traffic, v.," *OED Online*, December 2021, Oxford University Press.

19 "Traffic," *Merriam-Webster's Unabridged Dictionary*, Merriam-Webster, https://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/unabridged/traffic, accessed December 20, 2021.

It is in this sense, too, that we can understand the term I have used in English for *Auftritt*, namely *entrance*. No other word, really, even comes into question as a translation for what the *Auftritt* means here in German—though at times this equivalence starts to reach its limits and show cracks, as when the word comes to denote the scenes of eighteenth-century German theater. Its use in this context itself marks a shift from earlier terms: from *Abhandlung* or *Aufzug* ("treatise" or "procession") in the baroque works of Andreas Gryphius and Daniel Casper von Lohenstein, to the *Handlung* and *Auftritt* ("action" and "entrance") of Johann Christoph Gottsched and the *Auftritt* of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's first dramas. Other words that then appear in German works of theater, such as *Bild* or *Szene*, reflect English and French influence. Conversely, the English word *entrance* opens a different, yet complementary field of meanings and movements. And although it shifts the focus, it is no less fitting as a catchword for the book's analyses. *Entrance* enters English in the late fourteenth-century with the meaning of both "admission, right of access" and an "opening that allows access to a place." Its verb root *enter* comes from "classical Latin *intrāre* to go into, to penetrate, to take possession of, to become a member of, to look into, to begin," with the suffix "ance" denoting a quality, state, or condition.[20] Like *Auftritt*, then, *entrance* also captures an act that expresses a state or condition—though here the meaning is more political, concerned with power and control. But *Making an Entrance* traces the splendid entrances of French neoclassical theater directly to the triumphal entry staged by Roman emperors after a victory to manifest their power. The original title of the book, *Aus dem Grund: Auftrittsprotokolle von Racine bis Nietzsche*, points to the emergence of figures as they step up and out of a ground. *Making an Entrance* points, from the opposite perspective, to the complementary act of *stepping in* that comes with this emergence. Both perspectives are concerned with the fashioning of this act, the setting and place in which happens, and the characteristics or qualities of its performance.

Similar dislocations apply to the translations of primary texts discussed in *Making an Entrance*, which are mainly works by Pierre Corneille, Jean Racine, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Friedrich von Schiller, Heinrich von Kleist, and Friedrich Nietzsche. Wherever possible, I have cited versions published in English, with my own translations in cases where none exist. However, the decision was also made to keep the original passages of this primary literature in the footnotes. This seemed appropriate, even nonnegotiable, for a book that is as much a work of literary criticism as it is a history of performance practice. The English texts are meant to make the book readable for an audience who

---

20 Entries on "entrance" and "-ance, *suffix*," *Oxford English Dictionary*.

may not understand French or German, whereas the original text is the basis for any close reading. In the latter case, when necessary, the original language is introduced directly into the argument. This occasionally produced new points that go beyond the original text of *Making an Entrance* but are necessary to explain the German or French being cited. Rather than mark these sentences with a translator's note, I have integrated them into the text. Often enough, they further underscore the translinguistic scope of the dramatic discourse being analyzed. The brief gloss in chapter three on the word *Getreibe*, for instance, takes recourse to the definition provided in Grimms' dictionary, which itself points back to a definition given in English by an eighteenth-century German-English dictionary as an "urging or pressing." Like the vocabulary employed by *Making an Entrance*, the translations of the literary sources thus also amplify the tension and exchange that exists between the French, German, and English traditions.

Not surprisingly, the decision of *which* translations to cite posed some difficulty. There are no less than eight translations of *Faust I* from the last fifty years, for instance, that could serve the purposes of this book—and a recent bibliography of translations of Goethe's texts into English from just the twentieth century runs to almost 350 pages![21] Like the wavering shapes that continually emerge and metamorphose amid Goethe's hazy grounds of mist and smoke, their variability allows us to recognize translation as hermeneutically and poetically productive in its own right.

This can be exemplified by the opening line of *Faust I*, which is also the opening line of a poem, "Zueignung" or "Dedication," that Goethe wrote long before the drama was completed. As the most important contemporary editor of the texts, Albrecht Schöne, writes, "Dedication" begins the Faust tragedy by breaking the theatrical illusion in marking what follows as a "poetic creation . . . a play of poetic imagination."[22] What's more, this poem is but the first of three "creative instances" that precede the tragedy, framing it in a staggered series of distancing gestures—not to count the two further layers of plays within a play that inwardly continue these framings, almost as a vanishing point that is explicitly not within the theater, but within the structure of the drama's parts. The effect, Schöne concludes, quoting Goethe, is to remind the spectator that the "whole theatrical business" is "nothing but a play, above which a spectator must remain in an elevated

---

21 Derek Glass, *Goethe in English: A Bibliography of the Translations in the Twentieth Century*, Modern Humanities Research Association, Bibliographies, vol. 2 (Leeds: Maney Publishing, 2005).

22 Albrecht Schöne, *Johann Wolfgang Goethe: Faust, Kommentare* (Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 2003), 151.

position, if it is to be of aesthetic or moral use to them."[23] This poem can be read, then, not as the first *Auftritt* of the work, but as a beginning that specifically aims to counter the theatrical movement of entering which would rise above and subjugate the spectators.[24]

This is, in other words, as Juliane Vogel analyzes in chapter three, an "entrance from a middle ground" that she identifies as characteristic of Goethe's dramatic works. Goethe's theater, she explains, rests upon a "paradoxical conception of theatricality that operates without emphasizing the entrance." And here, too, the poem's opening lines explicitly name an entrance that is not an entrance but rather an approaching, a coming closer that never becomes an arriving:

> Ihr naht euch wieder, schwankende Gestalten!
> Die früh sich einst dem trüben Blick gezeigt.

Here are eight translations, in chronological order of publication:[25]

> Walter Kaufmann (1963)
> You come back, wavering shapes, out of the past
> In which you first appeared to clouded eyes.

---

23 Schöne, *Kommentare*, 152.

24 The three frames that follow likewise resist any kind of entrance. The "Vorspiel auf dem Theater"—or "Prelude in Theater" (from Latin "*praeludere* to play beforehand," entry on "prelude," *Merriam-Webster's*), begins without any entrance whatsoever, at a strangely unlocalizable site (the "auf" in "auf dem Theater" literally means "on" but in fact cannot be located in anywhere in space; it is an idiom that generally designates "theater" as a place of activity). The subsequent "Prologue in Heaven" then opens with three archangels "stepping forward," but not necessarily up, or "auf." And when the curtain finally opens on Faust for his famous opening monologue, as the "First Part of the Tragedy," he is simply seated in a chair before a desk in a Gothic room.

25 *Goethe's Faust: Part One and Sections from Part Two*, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Anchor Books, 1963); Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Faust: A Tragedy*, trans. Walter Arndt, ed. Cyrus Hamlin, Norton Critical Edition (New York: Norton, 1976), 3; *Faust I & II,* with a new foreword by David E. Wellbery, trans. Stuart Atkins (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014 [1984]); *Faust: Part One*, trans. David Luke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987); *Faust: Part I*, trans. Randall Jarrell (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, [1976] 2000), 3; *Faust: The First Part of the Tragedy*, trans. David Constantine (New York: Penguin Books, 2005), *Faust: A Tragedy. Parts One & Two Fully Revised*, trans. Martin Greenberg (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014); *Faust: A Tragedy*. In *The Essential Goethe*, ed. Matthew Bell, trans. John R. Williams, 249–370 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016 [version first published in 1999]). All translations of the primary sources that were consulted are listed separately in the bibliography.

Walter Arndt (1976)
Once more you near me, wavering apparitions
That early showed before the turbid gaze.

Randall Jarrell (1976)
Again you come to me, faltering shapes
Who once at morning met my somber gaze—

Stuart Atkins (1984)
Once more you hover close, elusive shapes
my eyes but dimly glimpsed when I was young.

David Luke (1987)
Uncertain shapes, visitors from the past
At whom I darkly gazed so long ago.

John R. Williams (1999)
Once more I sense uncertain shapes appearing
Dimly perceived in days of youth long past.

David Constantine (2005)
Unsteady shapes, who early in the past
Showed in my clouded sight, you approach again.

Martin Greenberg (2014)
Come back, have you, you figures shifting, spectral,
Who first appeared to me when I was young?

A kind of vertigo sets in if you try to read all these versions together. It seems almost a fool's errand to compare this word here to that one there, while keeping in mind the differing textures of syntax across all eight translations. It gets exponentially worse if you try to do this across multiple passages. This is perhaps the wrong kind of elevation above the text! Alternatively, it would be possible to engage more directly with the different contexts, audiences, and purposes of each translation, developing a historical landscape for each to inform a selection. But my decision to use Walter Kaufmann's venerable translation is motivated above all by his choice of two words in these opening lines—"wavering shapes"—to render "schwankende Gestalten." This phrase has special significance. In Goethe's natural-scientific, morphological terminology, as Albrecht Schöne comments, it specifically denotes "organic shapes constantly transforming through metamorphosis."[26]

---

26 Schöne, *Kommentare*, 152.

And in *Making an Entrance*, where the phrase appears in the title of chapter three, the terms are crucial both as a pair and individually.

What matters to me is both the physicality of "wanken"—"wavering"—and the consistency of "shapes" as a distinct synonym to "form." The words "uncertain" and "elusive," by contrast, both move away from this embodiment; they are synonyms that operate with different roots and registers. "Unsteady" could have worked here, too, for the same reasons, as could have "faltering"—though this last choice is too strong an interpretation to suit the range of senses that "wanken" has in Juliane Vogel's analyses. Martin Greenberg's translations stands out as a freer rendering that has a powerful impact of its own, but his version is often too far from the original to be of use for the present book.

To further see why I have cited Kaufmann's translation, we can look at the passage where Mephisto transforms into a hippopotamus, or "Nilpferd" (literally: a "Nile horse") after having entered the scene "circuitously" as a poodle (in a movement that Juliane Vogel analyzes in chapter 3):

> Aber was muß ich sehen?
> Kann das natürlich geschehen?
> Ist's Schatten? ist's Wirklichkeit?
> Wie wird mein Pudel lang und breit?
> Er hebt sich mit Gewalt,
> Das ist nicht eines Hundes Gestalt.
> Welch ein Gespenst bracht' ich ins Haus!
> Schon sieht er wie ein Nilpferd aus . . . (lines 1247–1254)

I think Greenberg best captures the direct cadence and crispness of Goethe's lines:

> But what's that I'm seeing,
> A shadow or real thing?
> It beggars belief—
> My poodle's swelled up huger than life!
> He heaves up his hulk—
> No dog has such bulk!
> What a spook I have brought
> In my house without thought.
> He looks, with his fierce eyes and jaws,
> Just like a hippopotamus— (45, lines 1277–1286)

But what matters to me most in this passage is etymology. All of the translators I consulted differ from Kaufmann in rendering Goethe's verses here with range of terms that derive from Latin or Greek: "real" in Greenberg's text; or in the other versions: "metamorphosis," "apparition," "occurrence," "illusion," "reality," or

"fantasy." These registers are missing in the German—though of course they belong to the fabric of English in a way they do not in German. So it might seem like fetishizing Germanic roots or hair splitting to say that I don't like these choices here, were not the etymological texture of Goethe's text so striking.

Among these eight lines of Goethe's text, but a single word appears that is not of Germanic origin: *natürlich*. This Latin cognate is very old in both German and English, as a derivation from the root verb *nasci*, to be born.[27] It denotes, to quote Grimms' dictionary, "the creating, forming, changing, preserving, and structuring [or: ordering] force and the resulting constitution [Beschaffenheit] of nature as a whole, its parts, or creatures."[28] In Faust's description here of what he is seeing, it points to a level of reality that is ostensibly separate from or beyond the language in which it is being spoken—a "natural" world born of becoming that might "happen" outside the scene being conjured up by these lines and the generation of fantastical figures embodied by Mephisto. This "natural" world functions as a point of reference that might allow one to see through the illusion of this magical appearance and its creation here in dramatic language. Such an intention to generate figures through dramatic language is especially crucial to these lines. Strictly speaking, they paint a picture that is impossible to represent on stage except as a vision of what the characters are seeing, or rather doubting to see. Both Juliane Vogel and Albrecht Schöne note Goethe's interest in the special effects produced at the time by the *laterna magica*, which was an early kind of image projector. Goethe used this device to project "shadow images" or "haze images" onto clouds of smoke, in order to represent the dynamic, oversized "phantasmagoria" of his dramatic texts.[29] With this single word, "natürlich," Faust thus voices doubt that the "happening" unfolding on stage is a coming into being of life that is anchored in birth, in the natural generation of a body, in a way that differs from both the creative power of poetic language and the technical production of images.

There is thus something ironic about the function of this particular word here. All human language is arbitrary; no word or root is more "natural" than any other. And yet in a historical sense, "natürlich"—like its English cognate—is a borrowing that has been "naturalized" into the language to such an extent that

---

27 "Natürlich," in Wolfgang Pfeifer et al., *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen* (1993), in *Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, https://www.dwds.de/wb/etymwb/nat%C3% BCrlich, accessed November 24, 2021. "Nature, n.," *OED Online*, December 2021, Oxford University Press.

28 "Natürlich, adj.," Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, vol. 13, column 455, www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB/natürlich, accessed December 20, 2021.

29 Schöne, *Kommentare*, 247.

there is no other term for what it denotes.[30] Reaching for such a word would in fact take us into the realm of the supernatural, into a world of deities and magic forces,[31] or to other senses of "nature" as "kind" or "birth." Linguistically, then, the word reflects the relative *invisibility* of Latin roots that have become so naturalized as to disappear as such. It refers to a common heritage of Latin that predates and transcends all European vernaculars, and that has come to structure a shared understanding of reality in a way that also seems to transcend language itself.

I like that Kaufmann largely keeps this etymological texture in his translation, because it reflects a crucial aspect of what the German is doing—what it is saying—about the creative power of language and theater. And here again, my preference is guided not by any blind adherence to the German original, but by a critical take on the German combined with my sense of English. In the context of Mephisto's appearance, certainly, this Latinate vocabulary in English ("fantasy," "illusion," "apparition") has a specific valence: terms of this kind mark both the realm of (learned) magic and theories of representation and imagination. They belong equally to the language of philosophical aesthetics and to the made-up world of hocus pocus and Harry Potter's spells. Kaufmann avoids making such a shift until the very end of this transformation, with the word "specter":

> But what must I see!
> Can that happen naturally?
> Is it a shadow? Am I open-eyed?
> How grows my poodle long and wide!
> He reaches up like a rising fog—
> This is no longer the shape of a dog!
> Oh, what a specter I brought home!
> A hippopotamus of foam . . . (153 and 155, lines 1248–1254)

For me, it's simply hard to beat Kaufmann here. It's the little things: the slightly off-kilter cadence and rhyme of "sehen / geschehen," echoed in "I see / naturally." Or the way the passage flies off the tongue with its series of rhymes and rhythms, climaxing in the riotously ridiculous creature of the final line. Mephisto goes up here not in smoke but in bubbles. And, of course, the German word for hippopotamus more plainly names the strange hybrid that this shapeshifter has

---

30 The translation of the Greek *phusis* into the Latin *natura* was first problematized by Heidegger, who renders the Greek as "Aufgang" in the sense of "emergence." See David Pascal, "Nature," in *Dictionary of Untranslatables*, ed. Barbara Cassin (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 703–705.

31 See the box on "Supernatural" in *Dictionary of Untranslatables*, 705.

become: a *Nile horse*, which could not only be a horse made of water (a "plastic" form hard to contain within itself), but also a river as a horse. For the first readers or audiences of *Faust*, such a current would have seemed both exotic and ancient, flowing through an entire cultural landscape of Egypt that had seized Europe's imagination and drawn Napoleon's armies. Its specific resonance cannot be kept in English, but the "hippopotamus of foam" does work of its own. The phrase is so hilarious precisely because it is etymologically mismatched: in the context of Faust's speech, and taken at face value without a learned knowledge of its Greek roots, or of the outlandish natural creature the word names, this sixteenth-century coinage looks and sounds like gibberish. Quite an entrance from a frothy ground!

Finally, to return to the opening line of the passage: only Kaufmann translates Goethe's "muß" as "must I see." The modal verb shifts the entire register of the scene: Faust is being compelled to see something that cannot be seen. But it can be said. And the "that" of the following line ("Can that happen naturally?" / "Kann das natürlich geschehen") could refer to the figure, to its emergence as an event, or to the action of seeing itself. Language here is capacious in a different way than images, both more precise and less figural in the sense of designating a shape with clear or even shifting contours. Another detail: Kaufmann changes Goethe's quotation mark to an exclamation point ("But what must I see!")—not only underscoring the character of the line as a command but also shifting it more toward amazement. This, too, I read as a productive interpretation, a slight change in perspective that also betrays or even acknowledges the work being done in translation.

And speaking of exclamation points: it is worth noting that none of Goethe's modern translators renders the punctuation to the first line of "Dedication" that is found in the *Ausgabe letzter Hand*, the final edition authorized by Goethe, from 1828: "Ihr naht euch wieder, schwankende Gestalten!"[32] No doubt this reflects the edition they were using, because the exclamation point is also missing in several modern critical editions of Goethe's works.[33] But here, too, contemporary

---

[32] Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Goethe's Werke: Vollständige Ausgabe letzter Hand*, vol. 12 (Stuttgart and Tübingen: J.G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, 1828), 5.

[33] Albrecht Schöne's edition includes the exclamation point, as does the Münchner edition; neither the Weimar nor Hamburg editions include it. See Johann Wolfgang Goethe, *Goethes Werke* (Weimarer Ausgabe), vol. 14, *Faust I* (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1887), 5; Johann Wolfgang Goethe, *Goethes* Werke (Hamburger Ausgabe), ed. Erich Trunz, vol. 3, *Dramatische Dichtungen I* (Hamburg: C.H. Beck, 1968), 9; and Johann Wolfgang Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke nach Epochen seines Schaffens* (Münchner Ausgabe), 21 vols., ed. Karl Richter et al. (Munich: Hanser Verlag, 1985–1999), vol. 6.1, 535.

translations of Goethe are productive in their own way, reflecting and even amplifying this discrepancy. Perhaps this calling out to the approaching shapes simply feels different now, after some two centuries of witnessing them emerge and re-emerge in so many ways—less excited, less like an act of invoking or hailing a spirit as muse, more like Greenberg's "come back, have you?"

Such little differences and choices are close-up details that disappear into the fabric of a reading. Like shapes in the fog, they make up a shifting texture of possibilities. Other translators might have different preferences, pursue different purposes, see or hear different things. My aim, always, has been to convey the arguments of this book by producing a readable text in English. In choosing translations, it has been to maintain a sense of consistency for each individual work, while recognizing that no one translation will be ideal for all citations. For each primary text, I have thus settled on one translator, but I have not forced myself to stick with this translator if they translated multiple works. For *Faust II*, then, of which Walter Kaufmann only translated certain scenes, I chose David Luke. But this did not necessarily entail citing David Luke for *Faust I*. And I did not decide to use Kaufmann's translation of Friedrich Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy*, which now sounds a bit dated with its verbal flourishes ("needs be") and other vocabulary choices. Nietzsche's style is sometimes shot through with biblical language—but more in his later works, such as *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Applying it here seemed to me like the wrong kind of historicization. For Kleist, the choice of Joel Agee was really beyond discussion.[34] In very select instances, I have pointed to multiple translations to unfold the meaning of a word or phrase, or choice of syntax, in the original German. These same principles applied to my selection of other translations. I will let the demonstrations offered above stand as illustrations, rather than address each work individually.

Finally, my special thanks go to Benjamin R. Trivers, who collaborated with me in producing this translation. His critical acumen and sense of language are reflected in every sentence of the book. I am also very grateful to Lara Dix and Carolin Eppinger, who were extremely helpful in finding versions in English for many of the secondary sources cited in the book, or for clarifying other questions about publications. Getting terminology "right" is also a real difficulty given the range of discourses mobilized by Juliane Vogel and the fact that some but not all of the main critical texts have been translated into English, with afterlives of

---

34 Agee's own *New York Times* review of the 1982 translation by Humphrey Trevelyan gives a good indication of why. "Kleist never wrote this badly," Agee suggests, pointing to "clumsy approximations" and "gratuitous . . . antiquated formulas." See Joel Agee, "An Unhappy Heaven Stormer," *New York Times*, July 24, 1983, section 7, page 3.

their own. I am indebted in particular to Sabine Kriebel and Kate Bredeson for advice with terminology in the visual arts and in theater. It goes without saying that mistakes or infelicitous choices are entirely mine.

Michael Thomas Taylor
Berlin, November 2021