



1934

The Evolution of Schiller's Thought on Freedom and Patriotism, with Special Reference to "Die Rauber", "Don Carlos", and "Wilhelm Tell"

Charles B. Seal

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/grtheses>



Part of the [German Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Seal, Charles B., "The Evolution of Schiller's Thought on Freedom and Patriotism, with Special Reference to "Die Rauber", "Don Carlos", and "Wilhelm Tell"" (1934). *Graduate Thesis Collection*. 149.
<https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/grtheses/149>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Scholarship at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

THE EVOLUTION OF SCHILLER'S THOUGHT ON FREEDOM AND PATRIOTISM,
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO "DIE RÄUBER", "DON CARLOS", AND
"WILHELM TELL" 17

by

Charles Bernard Seal ①

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
German Department
Butler University

Indianapolis
1934

LD
701
B82h
5459

10 0 34

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE BACKGROUND OF "DIE RÄUBER".....	5
II. AN ACCOUNT OF "DIE RAUBER", WITH ANALYSIS AND INTER- PRETATION OF THE ELEMENTS OF FREEDOM AND PATRIOTISM.....	13
III. OUTLINE OF SCHILLER'S PROGRESS UP TO THE WRITING OF "DON CARLOS".....	27
IV. AN ACCOUNT OF "DON CARLOS", FOLLOWED BY DISCUSSION OF SCHILLER'S MODIFIED OPINIONS ON FREEDOM AND PATRIOTISM.....	31
V. EVENTS, AND MOST IMPORTANT INFLUENCES ON SCHILLER, MED- IATING BETWEEN "DON CARLOS" AND "WILHELM TELL".....	46
VI. ACCOUNT OF "WILHELM TELL".....	57
VII. INTERPRETATION OF THE ELEMENTS OF FREEDOM AND PATRIO- TISM IN "WILHELM TELL".....	68
VIII. THE EVOLUTION OF SCHILLER'S THOUGHT ON FREEDOM AND PATRIOTISM AS SHOWN IN "DIE RÄUBER", "DON CARLOS", AND "WILHELM TELL", --SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....	77

INTRODUCTION

I have chosen the topic, "The Evolution of Schiller's thought on Freedom and Patriotism, with special reference to "Die Räuber", "Don Carlos", and "Wilhelm Tell", because it seems to me to represent one of the most significant and basic phases of the general philosophy of Germany's greatest dramatist. According to consensus of critical opinion, it was Schiller's ardent love of freedom which motivated practically all of his plays. In the actual world about him, in the society of his time, he found little that seemed to him to make for his ideal of inner harmony. Indeed, he felt that this ideal could be attained only in direct opposition to the spirit of his age. The despotic state of the eighteenth century, with its bureaucratic narrowness, its lack of popular energy, seemed to him the sworn enemy of all higher strivings, and fatal to the development of a harmonious, well rounded inner life. In his "Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man", he says:

"When the state makes the office the measure of the man: when it honors in one of its subjects memory alone, in another clerical sagacity, in a third mechanical cleverness: when in one case, indifferent towards character, it insists only on knowledge, in another condones the most flagrant intellectual obtuseness if accompanied by outward discipline and loyalty,--is it a wonder that in order to cultivate the one talent which brings honor and reward all other gifts of the mind are neglected? To be sure, a genius will rise above the barriers of his profession; but the mass of mediocre talents must of necessity consume their whole strength in their official existence. And thus individual, concrete life is gradually being annihilated in order that the abstract shadow of the whole may drag out its barren existence."¹

In such an age, then, this is Schiller's reasoning: the man who wants to be himself, who strives for inner harmony, must live as a stranger to his surroundings; a stranger to his time, he must remove himself from the distracting and belittling influence of the ambitions of the multitude; he must scorn participation in

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man. Tr. by Charles W. Eliot. Pp. 235-6.

sordid quest for outward success; he must fill himself with the spirit of that which the best and the finest of all ages have dreamed and accomplished: he must dwell in the idea of the Beautiful.

Though freedom remained throughout Schiller's life the most characteristic theme of his plays, his conception of its intrinsic meaning underwent drastic modifications, as his mind ripened. So far as I have been able to discover in the literature available, no systematic attempt has ever been made to discover exactly the nature and bases of these modifications of Schiller's ideas of freedom and patriotism. The purpose of this paper is specifically to investigate these changes in the thought of Germany's great patriotic writer.

I shall first endeavor to show the immediate background of "Die Räuber" Schiller's school life and general reading, his relation to the Duke of Württemberg, which profoundly influenced his writings, the Storm-and-Stress movement, the influence of Shakespeare, and a brief discussion of the political situation behind the play. Or, paraphrasing this statement somewhat, I shall pursue an inquiry as to Schiller's relation to his Storm-and-Stress predecessors and his own contributions to the movement, with its essential meaning. Destruction of every barrier to individual growth; war against authority of whatever kind; the glorification of primitive, uncorrupted nature, of instinct, of passion, of genius; the vilification of the existing social order, of regularity, of learning, of conscious effort--these were the watchwords which inspired the generation succeeding that of Klopstock and Lessing.

The political situation in Germany at the time warrants some attention, as it serves to explain Schiller's general attitude of rebellion against authority. It must be remembered that he lived at a time when the very foundations of German political greatness appeared to be crumbling away. Of the ancient glory of the Holy Roman Empire--the pride of former generations--hardly a vestige was left. The civic independence and political power of the German city-republics of the Renaissance had come to be nothing but a shadowy tradition. Public life was

hemmed in by a thousand and one varieties of princely despotism, and bureaucratic misgovernment, by class monopoly, by territorial jealousies, by local obstructions to trade and industry, by serfdom, by complete political apathy of the ruled as well as the rulers. No wonder that a nation which lacked the most fundamental prerequisites of national consciousness was powerless to withstand foreign aggression, and found itself dismembered, limb by limb, in the furious onslaught of Napoleonic imperialism.

Having then recounted the most significant aspects of Schiller's background for the writing of "Die Räuber" at the age of twenty-one, I shall review the play itself, with interpretation of the elements of freedom and patriotism, as then conceived by Schiller. In this connection, I propose to show that the theory, or rather idea or feeling, on which this play was written, was essentially that of an anarchist who saw nothing in government in general and in the political system then obtaining in particular which commended itself to his judgment. It is interesting to note that his conception of liberty at this stage of his development was purely negative; complete absence of restraint was the desideratum. Hence, with an egregious breach of logic, he concludes that all modern governments are inherently and per se wrong. The optimum condition of life, according to this vague conception, was that of primitive man. The return to nature extolled by Rousseau had found an eloquent mouthpiece in the young dramatist.

"Die Räuber" had been exclusively destructive in import. But "Don Carlos", which appeared in 1787, reveals that the poet has moderated his revolutionary fervor, and has expressed a wish to build up rather than to destroy. I shall attempt to show that Schiller's youthful and vague enthusiasm for liberty had been moderated by his historical studies, of which the results were soon to appear in "History of the Revolt in the Netherlands (1788) and in a "History of the Thirty Years' War(1791-3). The happiness of friendship had made the world look bright to him. General love of humanity, tolerance, and reconciliation, a kind Father above the stars--these thoughts came to him like a grand revelation.

Having given an account of "Don Carlos", with amplification of the interpretation suggested above, I shall proceed to a discussion of the events and most important influences on Schiller mediating between the writing of "Don Carlos" and "Wilhelm Tell". Among these are to be named the French Revolution, and Schiller's feeling of repugnance for its outrages, with attendant modification of his political ideas. An exposition of the influence of his study of history and philosophy, the latter exemplified in the Kantian transcendentalism, follows. Kant's concepts of moral and political freedom were particularly carefully studied by Schiller, and their influence is unmistakably discernible in "William Tell". Another most significant influence was his inspiring friendship with Goethe, whose poems he sought to master critically, and to learn from them. It was Goethe, e. g., who introduced him to the culture and poetry of the Greeks. Rousseau's republicanism and individualism, and Herder's ideal of culture are other constituent elements of the play, "William Tell", of which, after this attempt at furnishing a background, I shall then give an account, followed by detailed interpretation of our specific concepts.

In conclusion, I shall draw the inferences as to Schiller's development in treatment of the elements of freedom and patriotism which the foregoing study has not only warranted but necessitated.

THE EVOLUTION OF SCHILLER'S THOUGHT ON FREEDOM AND PATRIOTISM, WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO "DIE RÄUBER", "DON CARLOS", AND "WILHELM TELL"

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND OF "DIE RÄUBER"

This introductory part of my inquiry would wax to a disproportionate size were I to attempt exhaustively to recount all the facts of Schiller's early life which have bearing on his first play, "Die Räuber". I shall, then, only attempt to point out those influences which were most pregnant with significance for his youthful development, and these I call the background of his first drama.

Johann Christoph Friedrich Schiller was born on November 10, 1759, in Marbach, Germany. His childhood unfolded among conditions that must have given to life a rather somber aspect. After the close of the Seven Years' War, his father, Captain Schiller, moved his family to Lorch, a village some thirty miles east of Stuttgart, where he was employed by the Duke of Württemberg in recruiting soldiers for mercenary service abroad. At home, being of a pious turn and setting great store by the formal exercise of religion, he presided over his household in the manner of an ancient patriarch. Between him and his son no very tender relation ever existed, though the poet of later years always revered his father's character. The child's affections clung rather to his mother, whom he grew up to resemble in form and feature and in traits of character. At Lorch her trials were great, for Captain Schiller received no pay and the family felt the pinch of poverty. Here was little room for that merry comradeship, with its "Lust zum Fabulieren", which existed between the boy Goethe and his playmate mother at Frankfurt-on-the-Main.

As a boy, Schiller seems to have been very susceptible to religious impressions. His sister Christophine carried with her through life a vivid memory of his appearance at family worship, when the captain would solemnly intone the rimed prayers that he himself had composed for a private ritual. Another reminiscence

tells how he one day ran away from school and, having unexpectedly fallen under the paternal eye in his truancy, rushed home to his mother in tearful excitement, got the rod of correction, and besought her to give him his punishment before his sterner parent should arrive on the scene. Still another, from a somewhat later period, relates how the mother was once walking with her children and told them a Bible story so touchingly that they all knelt down and prayed. This is about all that has come down concerning Schiller's early childhood.

Toward the end of the year 1766, having exhausted his private resources at Lorch, Captain Schiller applied for relief and was transferred to duty at Ludwigsburg, where the family remained under somewhat more tolerable conditions for about nine years. For the impressionable Fritz one could hardly imagine a more momentous change of environment than this which took him from a quiet, rural village to the garish residence of a licentious and extravagant prince. Karl Eugen, Duke of Württemberg, whom men have often called the curse of Schiller's youth, came to power in 1744 at the age of sixteen. Having come to the ducal throne prematurely, he began well, but after a few years shook off the restraints of good advice and entered upon a course of autocratic folly that made Württemberg a far-shining example of the evils of absolutism under the Old Regime. The following trenchant statement well illustrates the nature of his rule: "Während so der Fürst Millionen vergeudete, während er in einem einzigen Feuerwerk gelegentlich eine ganze Tonne Gold verpuffte und bei einem Feste einmal in fünf Minuten für 50,000 Taler Kleinodien als Geschenke an die Damen austeilte, während Günstlinge und Mätressen mit Gnaden überhäuft wurden, mussten treue Offiziere wie Kaspar Schiller mit ihren Familien darben".¹

The removal of the court to Ludwigsburg took place in 1764, three years before the Schiller family found a home there. From the first the little city had been backward, but it now leaped into short-lived glory as the residence of a prodigal prince who was bent on amusing himself magnificently. The existing ducal palace was enlarged to huge dimensions and lavishly decorated. Great parks and gardens

were laid out; the market-place was surrounded with arcades and an opera-house was built, with a stage that could be extended into the open air as to permit the spectacular evolutions of real troops. Everything about the place was new and pretentious. Here Karl Eugen gave himself up to his dreams of glory, which was to rival the splendors of Versailles. For all his barbaric ostentation the people of Württemberg were expected to foot the bills. 'Fatherland!' said his Highness, when a protest was raised on behalf of the country, 'Bah! I am the Fatherland!'

Here it was, then, that the young Friedrich Schiller got his first childish impressions of the great world: of sovereignty exercised that a few might strut in gay plumage while the many toiled to keep them in funds; of state politics determined by wretched court intrigues; of natural rights trampled at the caprice of a prince or a prince's favorite.

About the year 1770 Duke Karl began to undergo a change of heart. Wearying at last of life's vanities and frivolities, the middle-aged sinner took up virtue and philanthropy, as if to show mankind that he too could be a benevolent father to his people. An educational project, the founding of a school which later came to be known as the Karlschule, marks the beginning of the Duke's career in his new role. He began very modestly in the year 1770 by gathering a few boys, the sons of officers, at his castle called Solitude, and undertaking to provide for their instruction in gardening and forestry. Once started, the school became his special pet and pride. His immense energy had found a new fad--that of the schoolmaster. He was bent on having a model training-school for the public service. In his own house, under his own eye, he proposed to mould the future servants of the state like potter's clay. To provide the clay for his experiment he began to look around for promising boys, and thus his eye fell on Friedrich Schiller. Summoning the father and making some gracious inquiries, he offered to provide for the boy's education at the new school. Resistance to God's representative on earth was out of the question.

The scholars selected by the Duke were subjected to the severest discipline.

The school at Solitude had now come to be known as the Military Academy, and well it deserved its name. The duke himself was the supreme authority in large matters and in small. The nominal head, called the intendant, was a high military officer who had a sufficient detail of majors, captains, and lower officers to assist him in maintaining discipline. Under the eyes of these military potentates the "elses", as they were called, lived and moved in accordance with a rigid routine. They rose at six and marched to the breakfast-room where an overseer gave them their orders to pray, to eat, to pray again, and then to march back. Then there were lessons until one o'clock, when they prepared for the solemn function of dinner. Dressed in the prescribed uniform,--a blue coat with white breeches and waistcoat, a leather stock and a three-cornered hat, with pendent queue and at each temple four little puffs,--they marched to the dining-room and countermarched to their places. From two to four there were lessons again, then exercise, and study hours. At nine they were required to go to bed. There were no vacations and few holidays.

The boy, Schiller, grew rapidly into a lank, awkward youngster for whom the military discipline was a great hardship. Frequent illness led to a bad record on the books of the faculty. But it is time now to glance at the really important phase of his youthful development, namely, his reading. While his native Suabia was still chewing the cud of pious conventionality, a prodigious ferment had begun in the outside world. What is called the "Storm-and-Stress" movement was under way.

For a moment let us consider the meaning of this movement, of which Schiller's "Die Räuber" is the most eloquent expression. Kuno Francke's brief account ranks among the best authorities on the subject. We quote from him:

"In the seventh and eighth decades of the eighteenth century, when the 'Sturm-und-Drang' agitation was at its highest, it looked as though Germany was to be the scene of a violent social upheaval. Never had individualism been preached with greater vehemence and aggressiveness than it was preached by the leaders of this agitation.

It was the time when Hamann (1730-88), 'the Magus of the North', wrote in sibylline utterances of the lofty freedom of Oriental literature, contrasting with it the shallowness and meagreness of modern life. 'Nature works through senses and passions. He who mutilates these organs, how can he feel? Passion alone gives to abstraction

hands, feet, wings; passion alone gives to images and symbols, spirit, life, language. A heart without passions is a head without ideas.' It was the time when the youthful Herder, Hamann's pupil, revelled in panegyrics on untutored popular life and unstudied popular song. It was the time when Basedow (1723-90) filled the air with his boisterous call for a new education and based on individuality and the contact with real life; when Lavater (1741-1801) by his bold generalizations about a mysterious correspondence between spiritual force and physical form seemed to give a new and higher aspect to individual existence. It was the time when the German drama, novel, and lyrics, seemed to have become a vast battlefield, on which there were arrayed against each other social prejudice, class tyranny, moral corruption, on the one hand; and free humanity, self-asserting individuals, the apostles of a new morality, on the other. " 1

Although the movement would have been impossible had it not been preceded by Lessing's intrepid, though conservative, work of reform, its conservatism prevented him from having a large personal influence upon the younger and more radical minds of the age. Wieland was considered by most of the "Sturm-und-Drang" men as the very incarnation of artificiality and corruption; he and Voltaire were held up to scorn and contempt as the two great enemies and destroyers of morality. Klopstock, on the other hand, was probably the patron saint of the movement; not only at Göttingen, where Voss, Boie, Holty, Miller, the brothers Stolberg, and the rest of the so-called 'Hainbundler' went into hysterics over his name, but all over Germany he was at that time worshipped as the greatest man of the nation. Yet possibly even the effect of Klopstock's influence would have been less, but for the quiver of feverish emotion into which the intellectual world of Germany was thrown by the man who more powerfully and eloquently than any other had expressed that longing for nature, for freedom, for individuality, for humanity, which cropped out again and again in German literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: Jean Jacques Rousseau.

How much of this literature fell into the hands of Schiller at the academy cannot be told with perfect certainty, but it would seem that very little of it escaped him. He read and was deeply touched by Gerstenberg's 'Ugolino', with its picture of the agonies of starvation. He read the early writings of Goethe, of Leisewitz and of Klinger, and was touched by the woes of Miller's 'Siegwart'. In 'Emilia Galotti', with its drastic comment upon the infamies of princely lust, he saw the subject of court life from a slightly different point of view from that in which it habitually appeared to the carefully guarded pupils of the Stuttgart academy. Probably he read

Rousseau more or less, though direct evidence of the fact is lacking. At any rate the air was surcharged with Rousseauite feeling. Certainly he read Plutarch and Cervantes, and along with all these came Shakespeare to whom he was introduced--in the Wieland translation--by his favorite teacher, Abel.

Concerning his first acquaintance with Shakespeare, Berger makes the following interesting observations:

"In einer Vorlesung Abels, wohl schon zu Anfang des Jahres 1776, war er denn auch, wo Schiller zum ersten Male mit dem Dichter bekannt wurde, dessen Genius wie die allbelebende Sonne über dem aufkeimenden deutschen Geistesfrühling stand, mit Shakespeare. In einer Psychologiestunde hörte er seinen Lehrer Abel zur Veranschaulichung von Leidenschaftskonflikten einige Stellen aus Shakespeare's "Othello" nach Wielands Übersetzung vorlesen. 'Schiller war ganz Ohr', so erzählt Abel selbst, 'alle Züge seines Gesichts drückten die Gefühle aus, von denen er durchdrungen war, und kaum war die Vorlesung vollendet, so begehrte er das Buch von mir, und von nun an las und studierte er dasselbe mit ununterbrochenem Eifer.' Aber die gigantische Grösze des Briten ergab sich dem jugendlichen Liebeswerben nicht auf einmal. Der Jüngling, so hat Schiller weit später sein werdendes Verhältnis zu Shakespeare erklärt, wollte dem Herzen des Dichters begegnen, mit ihm gemeinschaftlich über seinen Gegenstand reflektieren, aber der Poet liesz sich gar nirgends fassen; seine Kälte, seine Unempfindlichkeit, die ihm erlaubte, im höchsten Pathos zu scherzen, stiesz den nach Empfindung Hungernden zurück. Und doch liesz dieser nicht ab, in die naturgewaltigen Abgründe der Shakespearischen Welt zu versenken. Dort spürte er in vollendeter Wirksamkeit eine Kraft, die auch in ihm gärte und nach Gestaltung rang."²

The effect of all this reading upon the mind of Schiller was prodigious. It changed the native docility of his temper, weaned him completely from his angelic proclivities, and carried him with a rush into the midcurrent of the literary revolution. There came a day when the young medical student, faithfully pursuing his routine, and on festal occasions spouting fervid panegyrics of the noble Karl and the divine Franziska (his wife), was not altogether what he seemed to be. There was another Schiller, burning with literary ambition and privately engaged in forging a thunderbolt.

By this time political interests had struck deep in Swabia. The worthy John Jacob Moser, counsel to the Württemberg Parliament boldly opposed princely despotism, and his son, Friedrich Carl von Moser, exerted his influence as a minister and writer in favor of enlightened systems of government, upholding the interests of the state as against the selfishness of kings. The works of Wieland dealt with political subjects,

and among journalists, Wilhelm Ludwig Weckherlin ridiculed the constitution of the Imperial towns. The journalist, poet, and musician, Christian Schubart, (who had been shut up in the Duke of Württemberg's fortress at Asperg for ten years, unjustly and without trial) a true Bohemian in disposition, but also an ardent worshipper of Frederick the Great and of Klopstock, was at once a German and Swabian patriot; he greeted with enthusiasm all the productions of the "Storm-and-Stress" party, and sang their praises in newspaper articles. His best work is to be found in his popular songs. His poem entitled "Fürstengruft" was an attack on tyrants, reproaching them with their crimes against humanity.

Only one more phase of Schiller's early life important for our study remains-- his relation to the last-named poet, Schubart. For an account of this significant influence, I quote from Berger:

"Aus Schubarts gewaltigen Zornesausbrüchen gegen Fürstenwillkür und Despotenmacht schlug ihm ein flammender Hauch des Geistes entgegen, der in ihm selber gärte. Da war kein abstraktes Freiheitsverlangen, kein unbestimmter Tyrannenhasz, wie etwa bei den im Leben so sanften Dichtern des "Hains": aus der Wirklichkeit der heimischen Zustände, aus den Schicksalen des eigenen Lebens wuchs diese Empörung und loderte hell auf in den rächenden Liedern des allzeit kampfbereiten Zeitungsschreibers und Stegreifdichters. Seit seiner Vertreibung aus Württemberg hatte ein unstetes Wanderleben Schubart zuerst nach Augsburg, dann nach Ulm geführt: sein eigener Leichtsinn und die Rachsucht seiner Feinde lieszen ihn nirgends zur Ruhe kommen; sein scharfer Mutterwitz und seine kecke Feder wurde ihm überall gefährlich. Ein klar blickender Politiker in einer höchst unpolitischen Zeit; ein Mann rücksichtslosen Freimuts in der Blütezeit der Knechteligkeit; eine kraftvolle Natur, masslos im Guten wie im Schlimmen, zog er (seit 1774) die heimtückische Rache desjenigen, dem er oft genug seinen beizenden Spott, seinen heißen Hasz zu kosten gegeben hatte: Herzog Karl liesz den vorlauten Schreiber auf Württembergisches Gebiet locken und als Gefangenen auf den Hohenasperg bringen, um ihn durch die Zuchtrute des inzwischen wieder zu Gnaden aufgenommenen Generals Rieger zur Tugend und zum rechten Christentum bekehren zu lassen. Sicherlich hat auch Schiller von diesem Gewaltstreich des Herzogs und der grausamen Behandlung des Eingesperrten, den jahrelang nicht einmal seine Gattin besuchen durfte, gehört. Und bezeugt ist uns der starke Eindruck, den "einige kräftige Gedichte Schubarts, vorzüglich die Fürstengruft", sofort auf Schiller machten. Möglicherweise hat er diese flammenden Verse noch vor ihrem Erscheinen (1780) in irgend einer Abschrift kennen gelernt. Jedenfalls sind bald die verwandten Seiten politisch-satirischer Lyrik in Schiller erklingen: in einem Gedichte "Die Gruft der Könige", von dem nur ein paar grollende Verse erhalten sind, um in einer "Regellosen" Ode, "Triumphgesang der Hölle", worin wie überliefert wird, der Satan alle seine verderblichen Erfindungen "von Beginn der Welt bis auf heut" aufzählt, während die übrigen Teufel mit blasphemischen Chören ihrem Herrn und sekundieren." ¹

But for the most important stimulus of these youthful years, Schiller was indebted to his unfortunate countryman: a tale of Schubart's in the year 1777 gave the

1. Berger, Karl. Schiller, Sein Leben und Seine Werke. Pp. 92-93.

first impulse to "Die R#uber". At this time, however, his medical studies, which required all his energies, interfered with the writing of his play; but the plan silently ripened with the growth of his mind.

In the Schubart story we hear of a nobleman with two sons, of whom the elder, Karl, is high-minded but dissolute, while the younger, Wilhelm, is a hypocritical zealot. Karl plays the role of the prodigal son and his excesses are duly reported at home by his brother. After a while the sinner repents and writes his father a remorseful letter, which is intercepted by Wilhelm. Then the older brother returns to the vicinity of his home and takes service with a poor farmer. Here it falls to his lot to rescue his father from the hands of assassins. It turns out that the instigator of the murder was no other than Wilhelm. When the plot is discovered, the magnanimous Karl entreats pardon for his vile brother. His prayer is granted; Wilhelm receives a share of the estate and all ends in happy tears.--In publishing the sketch Schubart recommended it to the geniuses of the day as an excellent foundation for a novel or a comedy. Here was a chance, he thought, to prove that the Germans, notwithstanding the servility of their pens, were not the spiritless race that foreigners saw in them.

We see here the thought that struck fire in the mind of young Schiller, whose bent was all for tragedy. If there was to be a proof that strong passion and bold action were still possible, notwithstanding the degeneracy of the age, what better object could there be for the passion to wreak itself upon than the age itself? If life had become vapid, here was the field for a modern Ajax who should make havoc among the cowards and the pigmies. In Schubart's tragi-comedy there are no heroic passions whatever. Nothing is conceived in a large and bold way. The characters live and move throughout in the little world of their own selfish interests. Such a piece, in which the penitent hero bends his back to the plow and weakly pardons an abominable crime, did not comport with Schiller's mood of fierce indignation, engendered in the manner we have above suggested. So he converted the story into a tragedy and turned Schubart's meek and forgiving prodigal into a terrible avenger of mankind.

CHAPTER II

ACCOUNT OF "DIE RAUBER", WITH INTERPRETATION

PART I--THE PLOT

The reader is first introduced to the old Count Moor and his son, Francis, in their castle in Franconia, Germany. Quickly and with a sure hand, the poet presents the situation, and when the first scene is over the Moor family is well known to us. Francis announces the arrival of a letter which, however, he has himself manufactured to poison his father's mind against his brother, Charles, who is leading a gay, student's life in Leipzig. Because Charles is the elder son and by the right of primogeniture is entitled to advantages not accruing to the younger, Francis is jealous. He envies his brother also because the latter, by reason of his personal attractiveness and noble qualities, has succeeded in winning the love of Amelia, the Count's beautiful niece, whom he desires for himself.

All of the Count's high hopes had centred about Charles, who had repaid him with a love greater than his own. With fiendish cunning, however, Francis so arranges matters that there is not the least reason to doubt the reliability of the news. The accusation was, in part, that Charles had contracted debts to the amount of forty thousand ducats, dishonored the daughter of a rich banker, fatally wounded her fiance, and then escaped from justice with seven companions.

The decrepit and gentle old count is barely able to survive the shock of the report. Francis, taking advantage of his father's condition, endeavors to persuade him to disown the wayward son. Trusting him implicitly, the old man asks him to write to Charles and reprove him for his misconduct, but at the same time urges him to couch the letter in such terms that the favored son will not despair of his father's forgiveness. Instead, Francis posts a letter which says in substance that Charles is disowned, and that if he returns to his father's castle, he will be confined in the dungeon for the rest of his days.

Karl and his friends are now introduced to us; a wild, inglorious life

lies behind him. Apparently he had not concerned himself about his home and his father for several years. But, nevertheless, he has never lost his youthful idealism and better self; in an earnest letter he has again turned to his father, and humbly supplicated his pardon. In trepidation, he awaits the paternal answer; it comes from Francis' pen. He is disowned; he cannot comprehend it:

"So eine rührende Bitte, so eine lebendige Schilderung des Elends und der Zerfließenden Reue, die wilde Bestie wäre in Mitleid zerschmolzen, Steine hätten Tränen vergossen, und doch!--Reue und keine Gnade, Vertrauen, unüberwindliche Zuversicht, und kein Erbarmen!"¹

In this mood, when he would like to thrust from him all his love of humanity, and indeed annihilate this "Hyänengezücht der Menschen", then it is that his companions suggest this thought to him:

"Komm mit uns in die böhmischen Wälder, wir wollen eine Räuberbande sammeln, und du sollst unser Hauptmann sein!"²

The scales fall from his eyes; he thinks:

"Mörder, Räuber! Mit diesen Worten ist das Gesetz unter meine Füße gerollt."³

Thus, in the first act, we find that each of the brothers has taken that crucial step which from now on determines his fate. The act has given us the deepest insight into the minds of both brothers, and everything points to the next development: Francis must perpetrate other crimes to attain his goal, which is to be master, absolute master in his father's principality. The old Moor is called "regierender Graf von Moor"; we are to conceive of his dominion as one of those small sovereignties, of which there were hundreds at the time, and the powers of whose rulers were absolute. Francis aspires to be ruler, and his overweening ambition motivates his actions; then he will have Amelia, whose beauty has inflamed him. Charles, on the other hand, wishes to revenge himself on the whole social order, from which he has been so summarily ostracized. He will revenge himself for the inhuman injustice of which he is the victim. Not for himself will he seek this revenge, still less to accumulate wealth by these ignoble means; no, he imagines himself with his bandits, to exercise the avenging office of heaven, and to fulfill the justice

1. Schiller, Friedrich. "Die Räuber" Erster Akt, Zweite Scene. Z. 38-42. (S. 32)

2. Ibid. Erster Akt, Zweite Scene. Z. 15. (S. 33)

3. Ibid. Erster Akt, Zweite Scene. Z. 31. (S. 33)

of God.

In the second act we find both brothers quickly acting upon their resolutions. Francis must take a further step in order to be master and in order to win Amelia: a false announcement of the death of Charles is expected to kill the weak old man, and at the same time drive Amelia into his arms. He puts his plan into execution with the help of Hermann, the natural son of a nobleman, who enacts the role of a messenger. The diabolical scheme is effective. Count Moor is almost prostrated by the thought, insidiously instilled by Francis, that it is he, who is responsible for Charles' death. He collapses, apparently dead. Francis has attained part of his goal; he is master.

In the second half of the act the machinations of the above-described tyrant are contrasted with those of the fiery young anarchist, Charles. The supposedly dead brother has entered upon his career of crime. But while he exercises force in the service of his ideals, he cannot prevent the others from robbing from greed and "Freude am Schlechten". Indeed, in order to liberate his favorite, Roller, he himself must perforce perpetrate the most fearful crimes:

"Roller, du bist teuer bezahlt!" 1

A premonition of his mistake dawns on him for the first time. For his shameful excesses, he expels Schusterle from the band, but he admits to himself that he is not the man "das Racheschwert des oberen Tribunals zu regieren", that he has conquered pigmies, where he intended to smite titans. But this is no time for reflection. For the counter-attack of the ravaged city is already in progress, and forces the captain further on his course. If he is not to be an "Elender", he must fight with his band for life. The turn of developments has again led him to the heights of his proud and unselfish resolve. Again he inveighs against society, and justifies himself, but he must also, now more than ever, identify his lot with that of his band, for they reward his nobility with fidelity and risk life and death for him.

The third act introduces, to our no great surprise, the conversion. Francis is to be sure master, but he discovers in his glory that he has incarcerated his father in the "Hungerturm" in vain: he cannot win Amelia's heart. She repels his advances

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Die Ruber. Zweiter Akt, Dritte Scene. Z. 22. (S. 61)

although when she finds out from the repentant Hermann that her lover still lives, she does nothing, notwithstanding her protestations that she feels herself "stark wie das funkensprühende Ross" and "grimming wie die Tigerin beim Raub ihrer Jungen." The fact that he cannot win Amelia remains a thorn in the side of the lascivious Francis.

And Charles, the victor in a glorious battle, can no longer suppress the emotions engendered early in the fight. On the banks of the Danube, at the sight of the setting sun, moved by pictures of a silent, great, pure nature, he feels with heartrending keenness how distasteful, infamous, and defiled his own existence is. The thought of the contrast provokes a longing for innocence and peace of soul and the dreams of his boyhood. Yet the life to which he has dedicated himself will not permit of his emancipating himself from it. While his thoughts plaintively linger on the idyllic existence of his youth, the stoutest of his confederates, Schweizer, comes with the drink of water for which he has risked his life: "der Geliebten schmachsender Blick", "des Busenfreundes Umarmung", can never fall to his share, the exiled, disinherited robber and murderer, but here before him embodied he sees fidelity and self-sacrifice. The heroic death of his Roller, the fresh wounds and old scars of Schweizer remind the captain of his debt and duty to the band, and so he renews in the confusion of contending emotions his pledge of fidelity. This is the psychologically significant point in the drama, and is most powerfully depicted. At the same moment when the hero is seized by regret, and in his own mind repents of his errors, he must own the inevitable consequence, and cannot turn back. This conflict between his tortured conscience and his duty to his comrades must be decided. At this point a new turn is given to the course of action; this is the appearance of Kosinsky. In the rejection of the young nobleman, whose fate strikingly resembles Moor's, only it is still more terrible, we find Karl in veiled language expressing his bitter recognition of the fact that it was despair which he had mistaken for "Stärke des Geistes." Meanwhile the tale of Kosinsky strengthens in Moor the longing which we already saw awakened in the lyrical episode on the banks of the Danube, the inexpugn-

ably powerful longing for home, and engenders the torturing reflection that his Amelia also is "in den Klauen des Tigers", in the midst of an almost unbearable situation. The call "nach Franken" is sounded; probably there too there is work for the self-appointed judge and avenger. There, we feel, the conflict between the brothers, and that in Charles' mind must be decided.

In the fourth act we find him actually in the neighborhood of his home. The double stream of the action now for the first time fuses. In magnificent, melancholy words, Charles greets his fatherland, and his consciousness of guilt almost drives him again into despair, away from the "Vaterlandstälern", the scenes of his boyhood dalliance and hopes. But his longing finally leads him into the castle. He meets Amelia, but "mirabile dictu" she does not recognize her lover in the foreign prince, to whom she is mysteriously attracted. Her tears reveal her unshaken love for him. A wave of happiness carries him to Olympian heights; but a moment later this very joy has plunged him the deeper into an abyss of despair. And when she finally recognizes him in the garden under the disguise by his quoting the familiar words of parting of Hector to Andromache, he has already fled. Shortly before, in conversation with Daniel he revealed himself under the influence of fond remembrance, and received from the faithful servant an indication of his brother's treachery; but he will not shed his brother's blood, although that would be an outlet for his bitterness. Therefore, he decides to leave immediately.

On Francis the appearance of the foreign prince has exercised a peculiar influence. With dramatic verisimilitude, Schiller shows how his feelings of something mysterious about the stranger develop into terrible premonitions, and are from premonitions crystallized into certainty that he is none other than Charles. Already Francis feels as if the sword of Damocles' is suspended over his head. Yet he seeks to maintain his equanimity, to still his conscience, and to rescue himself from his precarious position by murder.

Charles, who has been deeply moved by his interview with Amelia, on his return to his band feels that he has received a warning: Spiegelberg, who once "das

Sirenlid trillerte", has been killed by the hand of the vigilant Schweizer. Moor says:

"Die Blätter fallen von den Bäumen, und mein Herbst ist kommen." ¹

In vain does he endeavor to quiet his disrupted soul by singing the great Roman song eulogizing Brutus and Cassius. He decides to kill himself, but his manlier nature asserts itself before it is too late. He will not surrender to despair, but will finish as a man what he has begun. Again Charles has reached his Olympian heights, and feels himself strong as Colossus. In the dungeon his father's unhappy fate and his brother's perfidiousness are finally clearly disclosed to him. Furiously, he renews his terrible oath of revenge; Schweizer is to deliver the rascal to him alive and un-
hurt.

The fifth act presents Francis to us, now bereft of his powers by reason of his inner conflict. Tortured by the voice of conscience, he paces about the castle feverishly, and tries to deceive himself into thinking that all will yet be well; one moment he curses God, and the next asks for his mercy. Schweizer and his men find him when they force their way into the castle. He feels that these are his brother's men, and has actually found the courage to choke himself with his hatband. The faithful Schweizer shoots himself because he has not been able to keep his promise to bring Francis back alive.

But also for Charles the fateful hour has arrived. His suffering has been increased by his conversation with his father, who did not recognize him. When he hears the news, he feels grateful that his brother is dead, and that he had not executed his avenging power on him. "Nun wär' auch das Überstanden--alles Überstanden!", he cries out. And yet the hardest blow of all is still to be borne. For now Amelia, pursued by the robbers, throws herself before him; his father dies from horror when he again finds his long-lost son in this captain of incendiaries. But Amelia refuses to leave him. Life once more nods to him in friendly wise--a blissful existence with her as wife. But his destiny cannot be gainsayed: the sacrifice of his dead and living confederates and his own oaths and deeds preclude forever all hope and happiness. In order to save Amelia from death at the hands of the robbers, he has to kill her him-

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Die Räuber. Vierter Akt, Fünfte Scene. Z. 21-22. (S. 98)

self, and with this last, highest sacrifice the "Narben, die böhmischen Wälder" are paid for. Charles Moor is finished--finished with the world and finished with himself:

"O über mich Narren, der ich wähnte, die Welt durch Greuel zu verschönern und die Gesetze durch Gesetzlosigkeit aufrecht zu halten! Ich nannte es Rache und Recht, ich maszte mich an, o Vorsicht, die Scharten deines Schwertes auszuwetzen!-- Da steh'ich am Rand eines entsetzlichen Lebens und erfahre nun mit Zähnkloppern und Heulen, dasz zwei Menschen wie ich den ganzen Bau der sittlichen Welt zu Grund richten würden." ¹

The only service which he can render now is voluntarily to deliver himself to the law which he has so long contemned, and this he unhesitatingly does.

PART TWO--INTERPRETATION OF THE THEMES OF FREEDOM AND PATRIOTISM IN "DIE RÄUBER"

The idea of freedom was implicit in the story of "The Robbers" long before Schiller thought about writing his version of it. To understand the furor created by Schiller's play, one should read two other Storm-and-Stress plays which present the same fundamental situation,--'The Twins', by Klingler, and 'Julius of Tarentum', by Leisewitz. Both these plays came out in the year 1776 and were evidently studied with care by Schiller. In both these plays we have, as in 'The Robbers', an aged father whose dynastic hopes center in an excellent son: this son the object of mad jealousy on the part of a younger brother, and both brothers in love with the same girl. In both the outlook is limited to the fortunes of a single house. Yet in each case the tale of private woe is not intertwined with the larger tangle of human destiny.

The latter is what Schiller did with masterly insight. He converted the dynastic tragedy of his predecessors into a tragedy of the social revolution, and his work has lived because we can hear in it the preliminary roar of the storm which was soon to burst in the streets of Paris. The logic of Rousseau finds in Karl Moor a practical interpreter. What the Frenchman had preached concerning the infamies of civilization, the reign of injustice and unreason, the petty squabbles of the learned, the necessity of a return to nature,--all this seethes in the blood of Moor, but he does not content

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Die Räuber. Fünfter Akt, Zweite Scene. Z. 55-43. (S. 123)

himself with sentimental repining. He takes arms against the sea of troubles. Instead of an excellent youth pitifully done to death by a jealous brother, we get a towering idealist who is the moulder of his own fate. With sublime arrogance he takes it upon himself to wield the avenging bolts of Jove, but finds that Jove rejects his assistance.

In order really to interpret Schiller's drama, we must again revert to a consideration of those influences, cursorily sketched above, which brought about the writing of the play, and which one finds sublimated in it. Possibly the misguided paternalism of Karl Eugen in rousing the tiger proved a blessing in disguise. However, and be this as it may, we have the authority of Goethe for the statement of the importance of Schiller's "jugendliche Ungeduld und der Unwille über einem schweren Erziehungsdruck" for any significant explanation of the play. The straining of a powerful individuality against a pedantic, cloistral, military rule, the rebellion of a great, free nature against oppression and the negation of all rights, are as incontrovertibly present in the play as in Schiller's life. The longer and more deeply the young poet looked about him in the actual world, the more keenly he appreciated, that his personal fate was only a part, a special form of the suffering of others, a necessary consequence of this same absolute power obtaining in monarchies. Therefore, he was well able in the light of his own experience to give universal meaning to the "Privatverbitterung" of his hero.

Schiller did not fully assimilate his observations and experiences of tyranny until he left school. Then the young, regimental doctor saw with painful clearness, what he as a boy in Ludwigsburg had vaguely felt, namely that mankind bled from the same wounds which also harassed his own life. And no ducal sophistry, no consolatory theory of happiness, could longer conceal from him the outer splendor and the inner rottenness of the world about him, or dissuade him from his conviction that might and not right prevailed. In servitude, cruelly bound--what an unendurable feeling for a creative, ambitious, young genius! How could he change the situation? Melancholy and longing for death might occasionally assail him, but to sink apathetically into hypochondria did not by any means comport with the nature of the young Swabian. Schiller's

impulse to action, his demand for personal freedom, and his revolutionary proclivities united with his hate for a degraded world, filled, and widened the outlines of the play which he had begun long ago; thus, it became at the same time the expression of personally experienced tragedy and suffering, a philippic against the time, a passionate cry for drastic changes, and flaming declaration of war against the evils rampant in society.

The characters of the hostile brothers are now developed to their full, tragic greatness; the contrasts in their significance far transcend the interests and bounds of the family in which they are found: they are now representatives of the conflicting feelings and strivings of the time. Culture and nature, enlightenment and sentimentality, understanding and feeling, despotism and freedom, materialism and idealism--all these we see embodied in Francis and Charles Moor.

Francis desires nothing but the brutal satisfaction "seines Ichs", and nothing but sensuous pleasure and the exercise of power can satisfy this desire. His motto is:

"Das Recht wohnet beim Überwältiger, und die Schranken unserer Kraft sind unsere Gesetze." ¹

Nature has denied him almost everything he needs for the attainment of his goal; it has disinherited him, the younger son, and rendered him ill-favored and jealous; he has even been denied the love of his father. Therefore, he has "grosze Rechte, mit der Natur zu grollen", his villainy a just cause. He shall be master in spite of nature. He has not been denied ingenuity, but virtue and duty have no meaning for him. To a point of view which conceives of all events as having emanated from blind, natural goals, to whom love is nothing more than the satisfaction of bodily passion, there can only be material obstacles. And so for the cynic, Francis, it is an easy conclusion that the dignity of God, the world, and family relations, is a mere chimera to which fools cling.

Charles stands in the sharpest contrast to his brother. In his mode of thought is reflected the other soul in the poet's breast, his heroic thirst for activity, his exalted ideals, his manly power, and his tender sentimentality. As his hero, so also the poet was enthusiastic for the concepts of Rousseau and Plutarch's great

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Die Räuber. Erster Akt, Zweite Scene. Z. 7-9. (S. 20.)

men, for nature and the past, for mighty deeds in freedom, and for blissful dreams in idyllic solitude. Charles thirsts for deeds, for freedom. His fiery heart glows in response to every beauty and everything great. But where is there room for his unlimited, ideal longings in this empty, pusillanimous, shallow world, in this "tintenflecksenden Säkulum", this "schlappen Kastratenjahrhundert"? "Die gesamte Natur" he finds obstructed "mit abgeschmackten Konventionen", the free development of the personality precluded by "Gesetze". Where shall his power, his unbridled will, find a goal in a time which does not permit the "Adlerflug"? In the old days this youngster would have grown into a great man, a Brutus, but the wretched state of affairs in the world forces his spirit on a career of crime; he becomes a Catalina. At the time when we first meet him, his morals have suffered because of a gay life with dissolute companions, but the noble kernel of his being is unharmed. No matter how his mind, bent as it is on great actions, rebels against the "Schnürbrust" of law and the "Schneckengang" of life; no matter how the phantasms of his comrades flatter his imagination, his tender heart shows him the place where hope will again blossom, where he will find refuge and consolation: in the shades of his father's woods, in the arms of his Amelia "ein edler Vergnügen" than "auf Schandssäulen zum Gipfel des Ruhms" beckons to him. But the "Blutliebe" for which he is ready to sacrifice his active propensities practices treason to him through the malignancy of his brother.

With this, the last band which unites the disowned and disinherited hero to humanity, "die falsche, heuchlerische Krokodilbrut", is severed:

"Was für ein Tor ich war, dass ich ins Käfig zurück wollte!"¹

The mad proposal of his friends finds an echo in his frame of mind:

"Mörder! Räuber! mit diesem Wort war das Gesetz unter meine Füße gerollt!"²

The only thing for the victim of his father's condemnation and society's ostracism to do now is to satisfy his thirst for great deeds, to act as avenger and judge of humanity.

To be content with sighs and complaints concerning a degenerate world, that corresponded neither to the dramatic exigency, nor to the character of the hero. Charles

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Die Räuber. Erster Akt, Zweite Scene. Z. 29. (S. 33)

2. Ibid. Erster Akt, Zweite Scene. Z. 31-32. (S. 33)

Moor sees himself as a sacrifice to injustice and "Unnatur". Under existing conditions thousands suffer as he, in fact the greater half of mankind; if he helps himself, then he also helps others. Goethe also has made his "Götz" a defiant, self-helper in a wild, lawless age. But the stout, imperial knight feels himself as a representative of order against the misuse of power; he believes that he serves the emperor best by opposing princely acquisitiveness and selfishness. It is otherwise with Moor: his sword is raised against the whole existing order as against a single, great injustice. This is reminiscent of the famous dictum of the Roman emperor, Caligula, who wished that humanity had but one head, so that he could cut its head off with one stroke. However, Moor breaks with society, and all the bases of culture; he withdraws into the "böhmischen Wälder", in order from there to attempt to restore the dignity of humanity to its pristine purity:

"Das Gesetz hat noch keinen groszen Mann gebildet, aber die Freiheit brütet Kolosse und Extremitäten aus." ¹

In their own way, then, Schiller's outlaws stand for the state of nature. They represent natural man rising in brute strength against the oppressions of a depraved society. Such at least is Karl Moor's construction of the matter when he says to the Pater: 'Tell them my business is retribution, that my trade is vengeance!'

We are now approaching the crux of Schiller's treatment of the elements of freedom and patriotism in "Die Räuber". By way of introduction, I quote a significant line from Berger:

"Was R o u s s e a u s grandiose Irrlehre phantasievoll ausgemalt und als sicheres Rettungsmittel gepriesen hatte, das liess der deutsche Dichter zur Tat werden, indem er seinen Helden und dessen wilde Schar dem Sirenenlied" von Natur und Erlösung folgen und den Kampf gegen die faule Welt aufnehmen liess." ²

I understand this to imply that all things considered, the theory on which the play was written was a wrong one, and that we must not allow Schiller's eloquence to mislead us into unreserved acceptance of the revolutionary ideas here promulgated.

Let us see exactly what is objectionable in in his concept of freedom, if

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Die Räuber. Erster Akt, Zweite Scene. 2. 9-10. (S. 23)
2. Berger, Karl. Schiller, Sein Leben und Seine Werke. Zweiter Band, S. 155.

such a vague notion can correctly be called a concept. In the first place, freedom is interpreted negatively as the annulment of all personal restrictions. Schiller's protests and declamations are directed without qualification at all existing institutions, as inherently wrong. Anarchy is described as propitious to the development of 'genius' and strength of character:

"Das Gesetz hat zum Schneckengang verdorben, was Adlerflug geworden wäre. Das Gesetz hat noch keinen grossen Mann gebildet, aber die Freiheit brütet Kolosse und Extremitäten aus." ¹

Anarchy, lawlessness, chaos, mean salvation for mankind, for its ills are the direct and necessary result of civilization. This is another "non sequitur" in his reasoning. It is indubitably true that the civilization and culture against which he inveighed were unprincipled, unstable, and unnatural. It is equally true that the way out of the dilemma was not feasible by the return to nature advocated by Rousseau. He who wishes to cure the world of some of its ills cannot break from her, but must persevere in her, and wrestle with evil, as Jacob did with the devil.

Moreover, it is not to be forgotten that after all "Die Räuber" belongs to that period in literature of flagrant and in most cases passionate extremism which we have described above as "Storm-and-Stress". Destruction of every barrier to individual growth and war against authority of whatever kind were the watchwords of the period. On these premises, it is obvious that no co-operative society, significant government, or progressive culture would be possible. The vilification of the existing social order may have been perfectly justifiable, but when the school came to denounce with equal vehemence all order, learning, and conscious effort, it was small wonder that brilliant minds like Lessing no longer could accede to its theories, however speciously they were presented. The glorification of primitive, uncorrupted nature was an egregious anachronism. Rousseau and his ilk, who, as we have seen, gave impetus to the movement, had solved the mystery of the Gordian knot after the fashion of Alexander.

In evaluating "Die Räuber", then, which was the best expression of Storm-and-Stress," we must reflect that it was the work of a twenty-one year old boy.

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Die Räuber. Erster Akt, Zweite Scene. 2. 9-10. (S. 23)

To my mind, it bears a striking resemblance to Shakespeare's first drama, "Titus Andronicus", whose bloodiness and violence now repel us. Each is the work of a young giant who in learning the use of his hammer lays about him somewhat wildly and makes a tremendous hubbub.

The eminent Schiller scholar, Bellermann analyzes "Die Räuber" as follows:

"Er hatte das Losungswort der Zeit mit unerhörter Gewalt zum Ausdruck gebracht: der Drang nach Freiheit, der Hass gegen all Unwahrheit und Heuchelei, der so wuchtig als Grundzug des Ganzen heraustritt, fand stürmischen Widerhall in tausend Gemüthern. Der weltunerfahrene Blevé in der strengumschlossenen Karlschule hatte mit der Spürkraft des Genies den Pulschlag seiner Zeit gefühlt. Man sah in dem Stücke nichts geringeres als eine kühne Kriegserklärung gegen alle bestehenden Verhältnisse der staatlichen und gesellschaftlichen Welt, einen Fehdehandschuh, den ihnen der Dichter hinarwarf; und darum musste der Ingrim des Helden zünden, der "seinen Willen nicht in die Schnürbrust des Gesetzes pressen will, weil das Gesetz noch keinen grossen Mann gebildet, während die Freiheit Kolosse ausbrütet." Freilich stand der lauten Begeisterung der Jugend und a l l e n, die sich als die Unterdrückten und Enterbten der Gesellschaft fühlten oder ein Herz für das Elend und die Ungerechtigkeit der Welt hatten, begreiflicher Weise in anderen Schichten ein ebenso starker Abscheu entgegen." ¹

The above seems to imply that Schiller should be lauded because of his artistic expression of those feelings which at that time seethed in every soul. Only the wild, rhapsodic, monstrous, and formless could satisfy these people. Why should Schiller be praised for participating in this error, which he later recognized as such? A great dramatist forms public opinion, and does not accept it "prima facie", especially when its implications are so blatantly vicious as this state of public opinion was. The fact is that Schiller was infected by these popular feelings--they were uncritical emotions, and not intellectually digested beliefs--and it was years before he could emancipate himself from this influence.

Berger's analysis is much more profound:

"Ohne die Absicht für die Bühne zu schreiben, ohne das deutsche Theater zu kennen, erfüllt von einer falschen Theorie, hat Schiller gleich mit seinem dramatischen Erstling ein Stück auf die Bühne gebracht, das an Wucht und Grösze des Wurfs, an tragischem Gehalt und Geist, an dramatischer Energie und Sturmkraft in Handlung und Sprache, und damit auch an echter, nachhaltiger Bühnenerkennung alles in den Schatten stellte, was bis dahin die deutsche Literatur an Bühnenerkennung besaß, selbst Lessings durch strenge Geschlossenheit der Form ausgezeichnete Meistertragödie "Emilia Galotti" und Goethes an Lebensfülle und Stimmungszauber unvergleichlich viel reicheren "Götz." ²

Having thus in true critical fashion sifted the wheat from the chaff, he

1. Bellermann, Ludwig. Schillers Dramen: Beiträge zu ihrem Verständnis. Erster Band, S. 63.
2. Berger, Karl. Schiller, Sein Leben und Seine Werke. Erster Band, S. 157.

goes on to conclude:

"Kein Wunder, dass diese flammenden Anklagen zusammen mit dem unwiderstehlichen dramatischen Zug die Leser und Hörer zu jauchzendem Beifall hinrissen, dass neue, schönere Lebenshoffnungen in tausend Herzen durch diese Offenbarung höherer Menschenwürde geweckt wurden. Wie aufwühlend ihre Wirkung, wie zwingend ihre Gewalt war, das bezeugt, nicht minder als die Begeisterung auch das Entsetzen und der Abscheu, den die Dichtung bei Zierlichen und Zimperlichen in Perücke oder Zopf hervorrief. Zum Sprecher ihres Schreckens machte sich jener Fürst Futiattin, der nach Eckermanns Erzählung zu Goethe auszerte: "Wäre ich Gott gewesen, im Begriff die Welt zu erschaffen und ich hätte in dem Augenblick vorausgesehen, dass Schillers Räuber darin wurden geschrieben werden, ich hätte die Welt nicht erschaffen."

"Der Mann hatte recht vom Standpunkt eines um seine absolute Herrlichkeit besorgten Autokraten, wenn er auch der Vorsehung seinen beschränkten Despotenverstand unterzuschreiben allzu bereit war. Seine Befürchtung hat sich bewahrheitet: unter den deutschen Dichtungen ist wohl keine, die mehr zur Erhebung und Befreiung der Geister aus dem Joch unwürdiger Knechtschaft beigetragen hat als dieses Drama. Und bis zur Stunde findet der eherne Vollklang dieser Tragödie begeisterten Widerhall in allen Herzen, die für Jugendkraft und männlichen Ernst glühen. Denn ewig ist der Kampf, der in den Räubern ausgefochten wird zwischen Mensch und Welt, wenn auch seine Formen wechseln." ¹

Let us now recapitulate the most salient points in this interpretation of the elements of freedom and patriotism in "Die Räuber." At the time of the writing of this play, Schiller's concept of freedom was one based on Rousseau's popular and erroneous theory of return to nature as a panacea for all mankind's ills, the necessary implications of chaos, disorder, and strife of such a primitive condition being completely neglected. The excessive strictures in his own life and in life about him, his extreme youth, and his ignorance at the time of philosophy, co-operated to make Schiller tend to subscribe to these unreasoned attacks against all government. As to Karl Moor, all order was anathema to him, and the kind of freedom which is here wildly apostrophized is negative, vague, anarchistic, inconceivable in society of any kind. In his apotheosis of the individual to the exclusion of everything else, Schiller had sinned against the institutions of life, against civilization, culture, and progress. From "Die Räuber", with its retrogressive tendencies, it is a far cry to "William Tell."

1. Berger, Karl. Schiller, Sein Leben und Seine Werke. Erster Band, S. 157-158.

CHAPTER III

OUTLINE OF SCHILLER'S PROGRESS UP TO THE WRITING OF "DON CARLOS"

In the second act of "Die Räuber" Schiller had made Spiegelberg refer to the Swiss canton of the Grisons as the "Athens of modern scalawags." Tradition has it that the passage was a thrust at an unpopular Swiss overseer in the academy. In any case, the passage gave offence to a patriotic Swiss named Amstein, who aired his grievance in print and demanded a retraction. When Schiller paid no attention to this, Amstein appealed to one Walter, a fussy official living at Ludwigsburg. Walter took up the case of the traduced canton with great zeal, and brought it to the attention of the duke. The result was a summons to Schiller, a sharp reproof, and an order to write no more "comedies". He was to confine himself strictly to medicine.

Matters came swiftly to a head. On September 1, 1782, Schiller addressed to his sovereign a letter of remonstrance, setting forth that his authorship had added more than five hundred florins to his income, and that this money was absolutely necessary for the prosecution of his studies; that he was winning reputation and thus bringing honor to the academy and to its illustrious founder, and so forth. The duke's reply was to threaten him with arrest in case he should write any more letters upon this subject. Schiller now resolved to take his fate in his own hands. Resistance and submission to the autocrat were alike out of the question; the only recourse was flight from Württemberg to Mannheim, where his first play had been enthusiastically received.

When Schiller arrived at Mannheim, in the latter part of September, 1782, he was soon made aware that he had reckoned badly on the climate. The friends to whom he showed himself were shocked at the audacity of his conduct; they could only advise him to conciliate the Duke and meanwhile to keep out of sight. As it was, Mannheim gradually became odious to him. In his extremity the exile now remembered the kind-hearted lady who had offered him an asylum in case of need. Frau Henriette von Wolzogen was a widow of humble means who had several sons in the academy at Stuttgart. She had conceived a liking for Schiller, and although there was some danger that her role of protectress might offend the Duke of Württemberg, she did not hesitate to keep her

word. The necessary arrangements were soon made and late in November Schiller bade farewell to his friend, Streicher, and set out for Bauerbach, a little village near Meiningen, to occupy the vacant cottage that had been placed at his disposal. Here for the first time in his life he was the master of his own movements; he had a chance to collect himself, to browse among his books, to meditate, and to dream. And the long-cherished hopes of a connection with the Mannheim theater were destined soon to be fulfilled. In the course of a few weeks Schiller entered into a contract which assured him, for a year at least, a respectable status in society and opened a new chapter in his life.

"Fiesco" was written during the summer and fall of 1782. We need not tarry long with it. Biese trenchantly expresses its significance:

"Man merkt an manchen Mängeln des 'Fiesco', dass er in einer unruhvollen Zeit entstanden ist und doch nicht ein Ausdruck der innersten Empfindungen des Dichters werden konnte, da der Stoff der Vergangenheit und der Geschichte angehört, also ihm selbst und seiner Zeit gleich fern lag. Freilich war der Stoff mit Kunst und Geschmack behandelt, aber bei weitem nicht von solchem Feuer und solcher Leidenschaft belebt wie 'Die Räuber'. So offenbart denn das Drama nicht die unmittelbar zündende Kraft des Erstlingswerkes; immerhin ist es schon dadurch wichtig, dass der Dichter mit ihm zuerst den Boden der historischen Tragödie betrat, auf dem er später das Höchste geleistet hat." ¹

In "Kabale und Liebe" which followed shortly after, Schiller found a more congenial theme. It is the tragedy of two lovers, an honorable aristocrat and a girl of humble birth, whose deaths are brought about through a vile intrigue which is dictated by the exigencies of an infamous political regime. By means of a compromising letter, which is not forged but extorted, the lover is made to suspect his sweetheart's fidelity; and she, though innocent, is prevented by scruples of conscience from undeceiving him. In a jealous fury he gives her poison and then partakes of it himself. The mischief is wrought not so much by the wickedness of the great, although that comes in for a share of the responsibility, as by the obstinate class prejudice, amounting to a tragic superstition, of the heroine and her father. Schiller so vitalized the familiar conflicts and situations, and threw into his work such a power of genuine pathos, that "Kabale und Liebe" still stands out as a notable document of the revolutionary period.

1. Biese, Alfred. Deutsche Literaturgeschichte. Zweiter Band, S. 180.

For our purposes, the point to be noted carefully is that "Kabale und Liebe" unquestionably shows that Schiller has developed a much more intelligent and intelligible concept of freedom. "Die Räuber", as we have seen, was the result of his general "Bitterkeit gegen die unidealische Welt", of his antipathy to the whole state of the world and men in it, to all "Unnatur" and selfishness, of a vague longing for a better state and happiness. In "Kabale und Liebe", on the other hand, the protest is directed against very definite social defects and weaknesses, against a ruinous existing court, and the servitude of worthy citizens, against the prejudice and arrogance of the great.

Then came the influence of Schiller's friend, Körner, the effect of which was to give great prominence to the character of Posa in "Don Carlos", as a positive champion of the right, and to make him for a while the real hero of the play. At first sight there seems but little resemblance between the fanatical idealist of Schiller's imagination and the sensible Dresden lawyer, but the Körner strain in Posa is unmistakable. In his intercourse with Schiller he was evermore insisting on the importance of doing something for mankind. Enthusiasm, love, friendship, sentiment of any kind, were valuable in his estimation only as sources of inspiration for telling activity. As matters of mere private ecstasy, of froth and foam rising and falling to no effect, they were for him objects of mild derision. And the idea that lay nearest his heart as a student of Kant was the idea of freedom. And so, as Schiller worked upon his play (Don Carlos) Posa was made the exponent of the new point of view. He became the teacher of the unripe Carlos, even as Körner had been the teacher of the unripe Schiller, the subduer of unmanly emotionalism, the apostle of renunciation, the pointer of the way to great deeds, the prophet of a free humanity to come.

For a time Rousseau's gospel of return to nature had led Schiller into error; but this point marks his accession to the clearer idea, taken from his historical and philosophical studies, that his ideal of human perfection could not possibly be attained by a reversion to a state of nature, and by dodging reality. Montesquieu's forward-looking cultural and political ideal began to force Rousseau's backward-looking

theory to give ground. Now it seemed a more significant goal, instead of attacking the world, to endeavor to transform it; instead of assailing tyranny, to give expression to ideals of true freedom and humanity; instead of ill-humoredly fleeing reality, to ameliorate it. He would sow for the future. He had seen that the writers of the Storm-and-Stress school had tried to remedy by fire that which was not amenable to such remedy.

We see that by the end of his first year in Mannheim Schiller had indeed undergone a change. The "saeva indignatio" of the dramatic pamphleteer had given way to the serener mood of the poetic artist. This change was hastened by the influence of Klein and Wieland, and by the example of Lessing's "Nathan". Anton von Klein, a Jesuit living at Mannheim, was a steadfast champion of the regular tragedy. At Mannheim a friendship sprang up between the two, and Schiller heard much talk about the superior merit of the noble poetic style,--a region of thought in which he had up to this time wandered but little. He had written thus far out of the fervor of his soul, and theory of any sort had touched him but little. And now he found that there was after all something to be said in favor of the classical French type. The "anglo-maniacs" were not in possession of the whole truth. Might there not be, perhaps, a German drama having a character of its own and combining the literary dignity and artistic finish of the French with the warmth and variety of the pseudo-English school? "Don Carlos" was his answer.

CHAPTER IV

AN ACCOUNT OF "DON CARLOS", FOLLOWED BY INTERPRETATION
OF THE ELEMENTS OF FREEDOM AND PATRIOTISM IN IT

PART I--THE PLOT

"Don Carlos" is the longest of Schiller's plays and is correspondingly complicated.

The beginning of the first act shows us Prince Karlos dominated by his passion for his stepmother, which he recognizes as alike hopeless and criminal, and which he nevertheless is unable to suppress. Because of this obsession, Karlos has lost all power of thought and activity. The introductory scene, in which Father Domingo is presented as the enemy of the Prince, hints that a dreadful secret burdens Karlos' soul which he must at all costs conceal from his father. "Beweinenswerter Philipp," he cries out when he is alone, "wie dein Sohn beweinentwert!"

"Dein unglücksel'ger Vorwitz übereilt
Die fürchterlichste der Entdeckungen,
Und rasen wirst du, wenn du sie gemacht." 1

In the following scene we meet the Marquis Posa. He comes with great political plans for the salvation of Flanders. He knows that the king is just on the point of sending the Duke of Alba, "des Fanatismus rauhen Henkersknecht", as viceroy to Brussels, and that "die letzte Hoffnung dieser edeln Lande" rests on the chance of Karlos soliciting this office for himself. But now he makes the painful discovery that Karlos' heart "vergessen hat für Menschlichkeit zu schlagen", that his ideals of freedom have been lost because of his unnatural passion. The prince discloses himself to his friend:

"Ich liebe meine Mutter--Weltgebrüuche,
Die Ordnung der Natur und Roms Gesetze
Verdammen diese Leidenschaft. Mein Anspruch
Stößt fürchterlich auf meines Vaters Rechte.
Ich fühl's und dennoch lieb' ich. Dieser Weg
Führt nur zum Wahnsinn oder Blutgerüste.
Ich liebe ohne Hoffnung--lasterhaft--
Mit Todesangst und mit Gefahr des Lebeng
Das seh'ich ja, und dennoch lieb' ich." 2

The Marquis listens to the outburst, and pledges to him a secret audience

1. Schiller, Friedrich, Don Carlos. Erster Akt, Erster Auftritt. 2. 125-27. (S. 109)
2. Ibid. Erster Akt, Zweiter Auftritt. 2. 276-280. S. 115.

with the queen, to whom he has access by reason of his delivery of letters to her from France. His purpose in doing this is to quiet the Prince's mind through the queen, whom he knows as noble and high-minded, and to render his mind hospitable to his own ideas of political reform. The following scene between Karlos and the young queen is the high point of the first act: in the beginning he gives violent expression to his passion, indeed, when he has convinced himself that she too cherishes a similar feeling for him, the wild idea that there is still hope for this love flames up, and he says:

"Dasz Karlos nicht gesonnen ist zu müssen,
So er zu wollen hat; dasz Karlos nicht
Gesonnen ist, der Unglückseligste
In diesem Reich zu bleiben, wenn es ihm
Nichts als den Umsturz der Gesetze kostet,
Der Glückliche zu sein." ¹

But Queen Elisabeth with a few words convinces him of the futility of this intense emotion, and he owns, "Ja, es ist aus, jetzt ist es aus." The queen is lost to him for ever; he cannot grasp it fully. But here the queen shows purity and the quality of her exalted mind, and fully justifies Posa's confidence in her. With mild but powerful words, she urges him to struggle against his passion; she teaches him that it is never too late to be a man, and closes with the reminder:

"Die Liebe ist Ihr groszes Amt. Bis jetzt
Verirrte sie zur Mutter. Bringen Sie,
O bringen Sie sie Ihren künft'gen Reichen,
Und fühlen Sie statt Dolchen des Gewissens
Die Nollust, Gott zu sein. Elisabeth
War Ihre erste Liebe; Ihre zweite
Sei Spanien. Wie gerne, guter Karl,
Will ich der besseren Geliebten weichen." ²

Then Karlos "von Empfindung überwältigt" throws himself at her feet and swears that never again will he reveal his wishes. The purpose of the interview is attained. Karlos has resolved to conquer his passion; the letters from the Netherlands which she gives him point to the same goal, as Posa earlier had done.

This is the most important event of the first act:

"Ich bin entschlossen, Flandern sei gerettet! Sie will es, das ist mir genug." ³

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Don Carlos. Erster Akt, Fünfter Auftritt. 2. 724-28. (S.134)
2. Ibid. Erster Akt. Fünfter Auftritt. 2. 787-794. (S. 137)
3. Ibid. Erster Akt. Siebenter Auftritt. 2. 901-2. (S. 142)

We see that if Karlos succeeds in securing the office of viceroy, for which he is to implore the king the next morning, the danger will be side-tracked: he will then without doubt find his erstwhile power in political activity, and be able to suppress his passion. But it is equally clear that if he must remain in Madrid, the danger will sweep over him with renewed power, and a conflict with Philipp will be inevitable. Everything depends on the issue of the interview; however, we look forward to it with some trepidation, for in the meantime the poet has introduced the king himself to us, and showed us enough of his personality to intimate that an understanding between him and his son can hardly be effected. The king is, so to speak, shut in and isolated by the wall of his impenetrable majesty; only Alba and Domingo are his confidants; in the very first words which he speaks we find suspicion of his queen, distrust of and hostility to, his son. Karlos himself has said that there could not be in all nature "zwei unverträglichere Gegenteile" than he and the king. The conclusion of the first act leaves us in anxious expectation.

The second act fulfills this expectation. The interview takes place; it is an incomparably important moment. On the decision of the king now depends, without his knowing it, his own fate and that of his wife and son. Karlos exercises all his ingenuity in trying to sway his father, for it is a case of "to be or not to be" for him. But it is all in vain. The king's suspicion proves an insuperable obstacle; Karlos leaves in despair, and Duke Alba is named vice-roy to the Netherlands.

What will Karlos do now? His heroic renunciation has served no purpose; it seems to him that he has little to live for. Then he finds a ray of hope in the source from which he least expected it. From the page he receives a letter which he believes is from the queen. He follows, and finds the Princess Eboli. The reader or spectator is in a position to conjecture the real author of the letter, for in the first act the Princess by an impulsive remark has rather clearly revealed her feeling for Karlos. He himself, however, is not aware of this, and mistakes her declaration of love for mere sympathy, so that he is just on the point of disclosing his secret love for Elisabeth to her, when a chance expression of hers suddenly enlightens him

as to the truth. He hurries away; she remains in desperation, all the more since he takes an important disclosure with him, which she imparted under the impression that he loved her--Philipp himself has made an indecent proposal to her.

When Karlos shows the letter to Posa, the Marquis tears it up; he has promised to be "ein schreckenloser Hüter seiner Tugend." And upon finding out that Karlos' wish to go to Flanders has been disappointed, he conceives of a new and similar plan for reclaiming him from his enervating passion. As we later discover, it is nothing less than that Karlos is to go to Flanders against Philipp's will, anticipate the arrival of Duke Alba, and "vi armis" establish himself as viceroy to the Netherlands. But first Karlos is to hear the plan from the queen's own mouth, as Posa wishes.

The friends separate, apparently without premonition of the approaching storm. For Karlos has mortally offended Princess Eboli: moreover, she knows now that he loves the queen, and assumes that the queen also is in love with him. Domingo and Alba have hit on the idea of feeding the flame of the king's jealousy of the prince. Both hate and fear him, because they know that as soon as he ascends the throne, their domination, fanaticism, and Inquisition will no longer exist; both are firmly convinced that there exists between Karl and the queen a secret understanding. But in the first place they lack proof, and in the second place the proper person to convey the suspicion to the king, for they are both "erklärte Feinde des Prinzen", and therefore cannot be unsuspected witnesses against him. The princess comes to them, and the intrigue is complete. She undertakes to procure letters from the queen's cabinet in order to have unmistakable, written proof, and promises to direct the ire of Philipp against his wife and son.

The machinery of the intrigue is in motion in the third act. The letters secured prove inadmissible evidence of an illicit relation, since Karlos had written them to Elizabeth when she was intended to be his bride, "mit Bewilligung von beiden Kronen." Nevertheless, they are most effective in arousing the king's torturing jealousy. If one adds the poisonous fabrications of Eboli, the fearful effect is wholly comprehensible: he is so beside himself that he can utter nothing but imbecilities to

Count Lerma. He wants to know the whole truth. Alba and Domingo, his constant advisers, instill more of the poison; Alba tells him that when he was in Aranjuez he found the prince and the queen together without attendants; Domingo goes farther, and dares to express a suspicion concerning the birth of his child. The king is not wholly deceived. He points out the uncertainty of their conjectures:

"Ihr fürchtet nur, ihr gebt mir schwankende
Vermutungen, am Absturz einer Hölle
Laszt ihr mich stehen und entflieht." 1

His trust in them is shattered and he believes that they traduce the prince and the queen because of their own personal motives. He dismisses both of them. And now suddenly the realization of his loneliness and unhappiness cuts him to the quick. He begs Providence to send him "den seltenen Mann mit reinem offnem Herzen, mit hellem Geist und unbefangnen Augen." Chance leads him to the Marquis Posa, who swiftly gains his confidence and esteem. Posa attempts to throw "eine Feuerflocke Wahrheit" into the king's mind, and permits himself to express those thoughts which obsess him. After Philipp has penetrated the minds of his courtiers, it is a most grateful change to turn to a strong, unservile, brilliant young idealist.

"Ich habe solch einen Menschen nie gesehen" 2

he admiringly admits. He feels an extraordinary and mysterious confidence in him. We see again that the king, in spite of his distrust of the queen, cannot credit the malign reports which he has heard:

"Hast nicht der Priester meinen Sohn und sie? Und weisz
ich nicht, dasz Alba Rache brütet?" 3

He gives a commission to the Marquis of investigating the relation of Karl and the queen, and as a token of his trust in him, gives him unprecedented power.

Now we come to the fourth act. What will the Marquis do in this radically changed situation? First we find him with the queen; he tells her about his plan of Karlos going to the Netherlands against the king's will. Elizabeth who appreciates that Karlos cannot remain in Madrid, promises to discuss the matter with the prince.

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Don Carlos. Dritter Akt, Vierter Auftritt. 2. 2783-85. (S. 223)
2. Ibid. Dritter Akt, Zehnter Auftritt. 2. 3271-2. (S. 243)
3. Ibid. Dritter Akt, Zehnter Auftritt. 2. 3329-30. (S. 246)

In the meantime, Posa defends them to the king against the hostile faction. To this end, he takes Karl's letter-box: he wishes to remove those missives which are of suspicious import, and show the others to the king, thereby discounting the importance of those which Princess Eboli secured. Karlos has received no letters from the queen. If Posa succeeds in rehabilitating his friends in the good graces of the king, then he can hope for his seeing Karlos' proposal of going to Brussels in a different light. He acts consistently with this purpose as his influence becomes greater. The queen reproves Philipp for the theft of her papers which he has had perpetrated, and he stands ashamed before her. But at the conclusion of the scene his distrust has again cropped out. He becomes violent, so that she falls to the ground and, half-unconscious, is carried to her rooms. He is deeply moved by the sight; Alba and Domingo are told that they are "die Teufel" who "mir genug gesagt zum Rasen mich zu bringen, zu meiner Überzeugung nichts!" Posa appears and produces indubitable proof of the innocence of the queen. Philipp is especially affected by the sight of Eboli's love letter to Karlos, since she is his mistress and since she ostensibly disliked the prince. The Marquis receives permission to take her into custody and is instructed to watch Karlos.

The bold and strategic coup of Posa proves a most happy one; his influence ever waxes greater. As all-powerful minister, he "führt des Königs Siegel, und seine Alba sind nicht mehr." But he has not considered one thing: he has neglected to disclose his relation to the king, and the purpose for which he pilfered the letters, to his friend and has not reflected that this violation of friendship would necessarily appear strange to him. Once before Karlos was warned by the noble Count Lerma, and now a second and worse report comes from the same source. Lerma had seen his letters in the king's hand, and had heard Philipp thank Posa for securing them for him. Karlos can doubt no longer; his friend has betrayed him, of course from the highest and purest motives, as he believes. He interprets the action in this wise: the king trusts Posa; in order to hold this trust and in order to contribute something to the great cause of freedom, he has sacrificed the queen and his prince. His only thought now is to save the queen, since he fears that Posa has not spared her. But nowhere does he see a

possibility of getting access to her, when suddenly it occurs to him that Princess Eboli will lead him to the queen. He finds her, and he has already expressed his desire to see the queen, when Posa hurries into the room. He sees that all is betrayed, his plan nullified. In order that Karlos will say nothing more, he has him taken away. His idea is that now that Eboli knows their secret, the suspicion of the king will be confirmed, and his revenge fearful. A means must quickly be found by which to devolve the fury of the king on someone else and to give Karlos time at least to flee. The only way out seems to him to be that he sacrifice himself. Since he knows that all letters to Flanders are delivered to the king, he writes a letter to the Duke of Orange, in which he confesses his guilt: he loves the queen, but has been able happily to divert suspicion on Karlos. He quickly makes preparations for the prince's departure from Madrid. All this he confides to the queen, since he is himself not certain of another interview with Karlos. Also, he arranges a private audience for Karlos with the queen.

In the ante-room of the king we learn the effect of Posa's letter. Philipp really loved the Marquis as a son, and it is clear that this deception, since he naturally literally accepts the letter as true, crushes him. Schiller does not present this scene to us, but from others we know what a tremendous shock he has sustained. "Der König hat geweint", reports the astonished Count Lerma. But his despotic nature soon reasserts itself, and he decides the death of the Marquis without trial. Justifiably, Alba triumphantly calls to Domingo:

"Lassen Sie in allen Kirchen ein Tedeum tönen, der Sieg ist unser!"¹

Matters quickly come to a crisis in the fifth act. When Posa enlightens Karlos as to his line of action, the latter is deeply moved and filled with boundless admiration for his friend. An arrow comes through the window; Posa is dead. The king, who finds his son on the corpse of his friend, at last learns the real springs of the latter's enigmatical behavior, that Karlos was taken captive to save him and that the letter to Orange was "die erste Lüge seines Lebens." Philipp is overcome and sinks

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Don Carlos. Vierter Akt, Vierundzwanzigster Auftritt.
Z. 4484-86. (S. 311)

impotently into Alba's and Lerma's arms. When he recovers, he says:

"Ein freier Mann stand auf in diesem ganzen Jahrhundert; er verachtet mich und stirbt." ¹

The "Undank" of the Marquis has shaken him in the very marrow of his being:

"Ich hab' ihn lieb gehabt, sehr lieb. Er war
Mir teuer, wie ein Sohn"---"Er
War meine erste Liebe. Ganz Europa
Verfluche mich, Europa mag mir fluchen,
Von diesem hab' ich Dank verdient." ²

Once more we have a manifestation of his tyrannical nature. He knows that it was Fosa's purpose to make in Karlos a representative of his theory of freedom, and to place him on the strongest throne. This hope must be destroyed at once. "Die Welt," he says:

"Ist noch auf einen Abend mein. Ich will
Ihn nutzen diesen Abend, dasz nach mir
Kein Pflanzler mehr in zehen Menschengaltern
Auf dieser Brandstatt ernten soll." ³

His next efforts are dedicated to plans for Karlos' death. He arranges with the Inquisitor-Cardinal for the delivery of his son to the Inquisition. Karlos, meantime, in the garb of a monk, has reached the queen's room.

In the last scene we find Karlos and the queen again united, and are involuntarily reminded of that scene in the first act, whose inevitable results were then intimated. What the queen asked for then, she now receives: Karlos is another person, and has become mature; now he has indeed conquered his love and can say:

"Endlich seh' ich ein, es gibt ein höher, wünschenswerter Gut, als dich besitzen." ⁴

This transformation has been effected by the death of the Marquis; through the sublime example of his friend he has "frühzeitig zum Mann gereift" and has "die grosse Meinung seines Todes" understood.

"Einen Leichenstein will ich ihm setzen, wie noch keinem Könige geworden--
Über seiner Asche blühe ein Paradies." ⁵

With admiration Elizabeth sees how the young man who such a short time ago in the garden

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Don Carlos. Fünfter Akt, Neunter Auftritt. Z. 5045-6. (S.337)
2. Ibid. Fünfter Akt, Neunter Auftritt. Z. 5051-57. (S. 338)
3. Ibid. Fünfter Akt, Neunter Auftritt. Z. 5083-87. (S. 339)
4. Ibid. Fünfter Akt, Letzter Auftritt. Z. 5321-23. (S. 350)
5. Ibid. Fünfter Akt, Letzter Auftritt. Z. 5296-9. (S. 350)

of Aranjuez was so weak and powerless, has suddenly attained to manhood, and admits:

"Ich darf mich nicht
Empor zu dieser Männergröße wagen,
Doch fassen und bewundern kann ich sie." 1

The ideal Karlos for which Posa had hoped is at last flesh and blood reality, but a short-lived reality. Accompanied by the Grossinquisitor and his grandees, King Philipp surprises them. Elizabeth faints, Philipp has done what he promised, nothing remains but for the Inquisition to fulfill its office.

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Don Carlos. Fünfter Auftritt, Letzer Akt. Z. 5350-52. (S.351)

CHAPTER IV

PART TWO--INTERPRETATION OF "DON CARLOS", WITH EMPHASIS ON
THE ELEMENTS OF FREEDOM AND PATRIOTISM

"Don Carlos" marks the transition in Schiller's development from the Storm-and-Stress of his youth to the heights of a manly poetry, from civil plays to historical tragedies, to "der Menschheit groezen Gegenständen"; it is a testimonial to a strong belief in the power of humanity, not an indictment of its institutions and culture. Like his hero, Schiller had felt the ignominy of force and servitude. He, too, had longed for a friend to whom he could disburden himself of his sorrows and inner struggles.

At the age of twenty-one, Schiller had conceived the play as one in which the love of the prince for the queen was to be the central plot. But at that time the theme of "Die Räuber" intrigued him more, and several years elapsed before he again took up the materials of "Don Carlos." His more matured point of view, together with the greater objectivity to which he had attained, led to his making drastic changes. The titular hero of the piece, and his passion for his stepmother lost favor in Schiller's eyes, and Marquis Posa, the representative of liberal ideas, who sacrifices himself for his friend, Karlos, was brought into the foreground of the play. This change affected the whole character of the tragedy. In the earlier version Philipp and his son Karlos are inimical to each other, and intriguers try to widen the breach between them and to hinder a reconciliation; but Schiller now gave the play a more refined and spiritual character; a friend with the best possible intention warns Karlos, who thus becomes suspicious of the Marquis, and this suspicion results in the destruction of both. In the earlier version the satirical element had predominated, but now Schiller sought to ennoble his subject, to raise individual and local elements to a universal level, and to give expression to his ideal of perfection. In "Don Carlos" he made the same transition to idealistic art which Goethe had made in his "Iphigenie." He struck out the wild and bombastic tirades against the priests, which he had at first put in the mouth of his Don Carlos; and replaced them by an indirect but all the more effective warfare. He abandoned the rhetorical style, and, following Lessing's example, made the

play generally more concise.

We are considering rather closely the differences between Schiller's first conception and "Don Carlos", for such an analysis throws clearly into the limelight what our poet's ideals of freedom and patriotism had come to be. In the opposition of father and son we were to find the representatives of two different centuries: political despotism and ecclesiastical encroachments were to be contrasted with government in a milder, more humane period. This plot he intended to relate to the original love plot, and sharpen it. But the family tragedy, as it was intended to be, was already transcended; now we find in the play the seeds of popular freedom, as opposed to princely self-aggrandizement. Karlos' mission first had been to realize these ideals, Posa being merely his fiery friend and mentor. Now the Marquis appears as the "Abgeordneter der ganzen Menschheit", and in this way overshadows Karlos. We have seen how his friendship with Körner conduced to his development of the theme in this way.

We note in "Don Carlos" that Schiller no longer inveighs indiscriminately against princes. He had himself experienced through his relations with the Duke of Weimar that a potentate could exercise his power wisely and for the good of all. He had learned to admire the great friend of the people, Joseph II, and the free-thinking philosopher on the throne of Prussia, Friedrich II, who only wished to be the first servant to his state. In his ideal of human happiness, then, princes must be included, for mankind could only free itself from the chains of tyranny if magnanimity reigned on the kings' thrones. "Das kühne Traumbild eines neuen Staats" is glowingly presented to us by Posa, and along with it the picture of a prince, who as the father of his people, establishes and maintains freedom of thought and conscience, and recognizes the eternal, inalienable rights of man.

Now the love of the son for the mother and the friendship between Karlos and Posa became themes subordinate to the idea of the dignity of the human individual, and the ideal of popular freedom. As for Karlos, it is not merely the ecclesiastical, political, and domestic tyranny under which he languishes that stands in the way of happiness: the unfortunate prince carries his worst enemy in his own breast, an enervating

passion which renders him incapable of carrying on his work. He does not have the strength to rid himself of his incubus. To blow the sparks of his youthful and now dormant passion for freedom, is the self-appointed office of the Marquis. Passion is to be conquered by love. Posa bases his plan on the depth and purity and unselfishness of the prince; this plan, namely, is to awaken Karlos to his real heroic nature. In the high-minded queen he finds a worthy helper; from her hands Karlos receives the letters from Flanders; she recalls his departed genius, while she gives the right direction to his love, as we saw.

At the conclusion of the play, the powers of evil have apparently conquered. We find that the idea of political and religious freedom, that "Geistesfrühling", which Posa has striven for, has been trampled in the dust. Yet, the apparent victor, Philipp, is not so in reality. He must humble himself and bow to the Cardinal-Inquisitor, whose tool he is; the political despot and religious fanatic who will destroy all freedom is not himself permitted even to be a human being; he is the slave of the power dedicated to suppressing "Freiheitlicher Bewegungen".

The ideals so often expressed in the play are victorious: the godless and unnatural despotism cannot maintain itself. In the world's history, we feel, that the powers of darkness will be defeated. That which is right may sustain temporary setbacks; but only on a foundation of truth can any government really persist, and we are not disconsolate. As the herald of a new freedom of the people, as a banner-carrier in the battle for the rights of the individual, "Don Carlos" secures a tremendous effect; in Posa and Don Carlos the poet himself lives, with his sufferings and loves, his great hopes and his ideal plans.

Let us listen to Posa's noble appeal to the king in act three:

"Sehen Sie sich um
In seiner herrlichen Natur! Auf Freiheit
Ist sie gegründet--und wie reich ist sie
Durch Freiheit! Er, der grosse Schöpfer, wirft
In einen Tropfen Tau den Wurm und lässt
Noch in den toten Räumen der Verwesung
Die Willkür sich ergetzen--Ihre Schöpfung,
Wie eng und arm! Das Rauschen eines Blattes
Erschreckt den Herrn der Christenheit--Sie müssen
Vor jeder Tugend zittern. Er--der Freiheit

Scherer says:

"Two years before the outbreak of the French Revolution Schiller painted one of those enthusiasts who then appeared in real life, and in part determined the destinies of Europe. In Posa he created a political ideal which even in the nineteenth century, inspired many popular leaders, and which played its part in revolutions and constitutional struggles."¹

"Don Carlos", like "Die Räuber", was also a "Tendenzdrama", one written with a specific purpose "gegen die Tyrannen"--but no longer does the poet apostrophize and apotheosize that kind of freedom to which all law is inimical. No longer does he defend the "edlen Verbrecher", who wishes to better the world with fire and sword. He now sets himself to the task of placing before humanity great, attainable, noble goals, and leading the world to high ideals. He turns his back, so to speak, on Rousseau and repudiates his once accepted theory of throwing over all civilization and culture as the panacea for mankind's ills. The dream of Posa for a state in which the ruler is at the same time enlightened and interested in the public good, forms the high point of "Don Carlos"; the shattering of this ideal thought is the tragedy of the play.

"Die Räuber", with its rather puerile, indiscriminate invective against society had its seeds in Schiller's unhappy early life, and was a natural and even brilliant reaction to it. But in attacking the abuse, his youthful impetuosity had carried him to the opposite extreme of attacking order. Now, in "Don Carlos", his revolutionary zeal has been somewhat placated; his favorable reception by the Duke of Weimar, for one thing, led him to think that the princely station is not inherently wrong. He abandoned his vague, negative concept of freedom, and, as we have pointed out above, Posa is the exponent of a genuinely free people governed by a kindly, wise monarch, the father of his people. The callow, though gifted, author of "Die Räuber", had under the mellowing influence of his friendship with Körner and his inspiring ideals, and a less stringent pecuniary situation, awakened to a knowledge that not by force, by ranting and raving, could significant changes be effected. As we saw, he had outgrown "Storm-and-Stress" extravagances.

1. Scherer, Wilhelm. A History of German Literature. Tr. by F. C. Conybeare. P. 209.

It is not to be forgotten that "Die Räuber" was a dramatic rhapsody, written in favor of anarchy, which was described as propitious to the development of genius and strength of character. The vicious, though inescapable, corollaries of such a proposition were apparently overlooked. Not only in the greater restraint of his method in "Don Carlos", but also in the obvious clarification of his ideas of freedom and patriotism, is Schiller's development shown. He had learned from Kant through Körner that freedom must be founded on morality. He had whole-heartedly accepted the categorical imperative: "Always act so that you can will the maxim or determining principle of your action to become the universal law; act so that you can will that everybody shall follow your action." The categorical imperative implicitly commands a perfect society; the ideal of a rational realm of spirits is necessarily implicit in it. Therefore, every rational being ought to act as if he were by his maxims, his universal principles, a legislating member in a universal kingdom of ends. He is both sovereign and subject: he lays down the law and acknowledges the law. By virtue of his moral nature, he is a member of a spiritual kingdom; in recognizing the authority of the law over him, he recognizes the ideal world as the highest good.

A man who is governed by the moral law and not by his impulses, his selfish desires, his appetites, is free. The brute is the playball of its wants and instincts; through the knowledge of the moral law within him, man can reject his clamoring appetites, all of which aim at selfish pleasure. And because he can suppress his sense-nature, he is free: he ought, therefore, he can. The moral imperative is the expression of man's real self, of the very principle of his being. It is his innermost self that expresses itself in the moral law; the moral law is his command, the command of every rational being.

The great poet of freedom had at last discovered what freedom means.

CHAPTER V

EVENTS, AND MOST IMPORTANT INFLUENCES ON SCHILLER, MEDIATING
BETWEEN "DON CARLOS" AND "WILHELM TELL"

For nine years after the completion of "Don Carlos" Schiller wrote nothing of any moment in the dramatic form. He occupied himself mainly with historical and philosophical studies which he regarded as preparatory to some new and nobler flight of artistic creation. The period from 1787 to 1796 was for him similar to that which Goethe passed through after his Italian journey; it was a time of distaste for poetry, a time of preparation, research, and reflection, from which he returned with his mind enriched and ripened to the cultivation of the drama.

"Don Carlos" had been published while Schiller was in Weimar, and he decided to remain there and devote himself to historical writing for a time. This resolution formed, life at once began to open pleasantly before him. Herder was pleased with "Don Carlos" and came out in its favor before the aesthetic tribunal of Tiefurt. Wieland noticed it favorably in the Merkur, spoke flatteringly of it in conversation, and declared himself convinced that Schiller's forte was the drama.

"The Defection of the Netherlands" was begun in the summer of 1787 and was first intended as a mere sketch. He began to consult the authorities, and the intended sketch gradually expanded into a six-volume treatise which was to present the history of the Netherlands from the earliest times down to the establishment of their independence. The animating idea of the work is the same that we find running through all his writings--the idea of freedom. From the days of his youth, "freedom", however unphilosophically he might think about it, had connoted for his imagination the highest and holiest interest of mankind. He saw in the Dutch revolt a glorious battle for liberty; the struggle of a small trading population against the proudest, richest, and most powerful monarch of the century.

In 1790 Schiller took up the task of an "essay" on the Thirty Years War, to be published in the "Historical Calendar for Ladies." In this work, the burden

of his thought again is the idea of freedom. The Thirty Years' War is conceived by him as the successful struggle of German liberty against Hapsburg imperialism. He makes himself the champion of Protestantism, because Protestantism is identified in his mind with the august cause of liberty.

In this connection it is to be observed that Schiller's enthusiasm for liberty was unaffected by the "ideas of 1789." He manifested no strong sympathy with the revolutionary aims of the French democracy. Liberty for him was the perfection of benevolent despotism. It is something that concerns the prince in his relation to some other prince, rather than in relation to his own subjects. With all his devotion to liberty, and with all his poetic fondness for republicanism, he remained at heart a devoted monarchist. All his life, nearly, was lived with aristocrats, and he himself had the temper of an aristocrat. As for equality, there is no evidence that it entered as a factor or an ideal into his scheme of man's better time to come.

As Biese says:

"Aber Schiller erkannte bald, dass von den gewaltthätigen Pariser Revolutionären nicht die wahre Freiheit für die Menschheit zu erwarten sei. Nach der Verhaftung des Königs hatte er die Absicht, in einer besonderen Schrift öffentlich gegen die Revolution aufzutreten, die Ereignisse aber kamen ihm zuvor." ¹

As an historian, it appears that Schiller lacked the spirit of the investigator and had not a sufficient reverence for fact. History interested him for the sake of his theories and his pictures, and rhetoric was his element. Perhaps occasionally we get a distorted image from him. And yet, without professing erudite scholarship, he tells a complicated story in a lucid and interesting manner. But let us consider these works from a wholly different angle. What Schiller actually contributed to history, however important, is of less interest to us than that which he gained through his indefatigable researches. This study tended to orient him, the eloquent and sometimes vague idealist, in the realities of life. Pet theories capitulated to iron-clad fact; Schiller gained some of Goethe's ability to see truth as it was. Freed from his youthful proclivity of hovering between enthusiasm and despair, he calmly armed his soul against the evils of reality and was the better able to express his ideals.

1. Biese, Alfred. Deutsche Literaturgeschichte. Zweiter Band, S. 208.

Up to this time Schiller had remained virtually ignorant of the Greek poets; but his friendship with the Lengefeld sisters, Lotte and Charlotte, led to his filling in this hiatus in his education. The conversation of these amiable girls turned occasionally upon the Greeks. Schiller had absorbed indirectly something of the Hellenism that had been diffused through the air by Winckelmann, Lessing, Herder, and Goethe, but his knowledge of the Greek language was very rudimentary, and good translations had not been easily procurable. Thus the glory that was Greece now came to him with the charm of a new discovery. In the meantime, through the influence of Goethe, he was appointed professor of history at Jena, where he soon became the most popular instructor. It was not pleasant to drop his fascinating studies of the Greek poets and bury himself in historical learning, but it was not to be helped.

On the 22nd of February, 1790, Professor Schiller and his courageous, aristocratic sweetheart, Lotte von Lengefeld, were married. He was very, very happy. He had found what he needed--salvation from self through a woman's love. But the winter of 1791 brought with it a disastrous illness which shattered his health, doomed him for the rest of his days to an incessant battle with disease, and finally carried him away prematurely at the age of forty-five. Life for him was perennial "stürmisches Wetter."

Let us turn to Schiller's aesthetic theories. A course of lectures on tragedy given at Jena probably gave the impulse to a more exact consideration of its presuppositions in aesthetics, and ethics. It is significant that here too the argument hinges on the idea of freedom. The aesthete of the time was of course Kant, for whom the whole question of beauty is a subjective matter. He does not inquire what it is that makes objects beautiful, but how it is that we "judge" them to be beautiful. While his predecessors made the impression of the beautiful to depend upon objective attributes of form, proportion, harmony, completeness, and the like, he insisted that the essence of beauty was to please without reference to any such intellectual concept whatever. He expounds the doctrine that beauty cannot depend upon a mental concept. Even a generic concept was for him fatal to the idea of pure beauty. Thus, pure beauty could not

be affirmed of a horse, because one inevitably has in his mind an antecedent notion as to how a horse ought to look. Again, there could be no such thing as pure beauty in a moral action, since a moral action does not please in and of itself. At the same time Kant held that the highest use of beauty is to symbolize moral truth, and in illustrating the possibilities of this symbolism he indulged in many speculations.

Schiller was not satisfied with a philosophy which decreed that an arabesque is more beautiful than any woman, and that morality cannot be beautiful at all, except in some mystical poetic sense. Nor was he content with Kant's "sensus communis aestheticus", which seemed to leave the beautiful finally a matter of taste. He studied the theory and announced his solution: Beauty is nothing else than freedom-in-the-appearance (Freiheit in der Erscheinung). Freedom is the form which the practical reason instinctively applies upon presentation of an object. It is satisfied, when and only when, the object is free, autonomous, self-determined. He then propounds his theory that beauty is simply an analogon of moral freedom. On the presentation of an object the practical reason (the will) may banish for the time being all concepts of the pure reason, may assume complete control, and ask no other question than whether the object is free, self-determined, autonomous. If then the object appears to be free, to follow no law but its own, the practical reason is satisfied; the effect is pleasurable and we call it beauty. Schiller points out that it is all a question of appearance: the object is not wholly free,--since freedom abides only in the supersensual world--but the practical reason imputes or lends freedom to it. Hence freedom-in-the-appearance is the true meaning of beauty. Or, as Biese succinctly expresses Schiller's divergence from Kant:

"Durch Schönheit zur Freiheit, durch ästhetische Bildung zur moralischen: das war auch der Grundgedanke der "Künstler", und dies bleibt auch der mannigfach gewandelt, gedeutete und vertiefte letzte Gedanke fast aller übrigen Ideendichtungen Schillers." ¹

It is to be remarked, however, that "Letters on Aesthetic Education", the ripest expression of his aesthetic philosophy, is not valuable because of its illuminating and rigorous logic, in which Schiller himself admitted that it was woefully deficient, but

1. Biese, Alfred. Deutsche Literaturgeschichte. Zweiter Band, Seite 216.

because of its incidental flashes of suggestive comment.

But we must move on to an account of that sublime friendship between the Olympian Goethe and Schiller, fraught as it was with profound meaning for both. For six years the two men, though living as neighbors with many friends and many interests in common, had steadily held each other aloof. That they did so was Goethe's fault, at least in the beginning. A friendly advance from him would have melted Schiller's animosity. But he did not say the word. He looked upon Schiller as the spokesman of a new and perverse generation that knew not Joseph; and so he went his own way, serenely indifferent to the personality of the man whose talent he had recognized by helping him to a Jena professorship. He paid some attention to Schiller's philosophic writings, but what he read did not altogether please him. It seemed to him that Schiller, in his enthusiasm for freedom and self-determination, was inclined to lord it all too proudly over mother Nature. Goethe was no less interested than Schiller in "ideas", but he had not the same fondness for abstract reasoning from mental premises. His starting-point was always the external fact, and he regarded ideas as possessing a sort of objective reality. His homage was paid to nature and the five senses; Schiller's to the deductive reason.

Nevertheless, the whole trend of Schiller's aesthetic speculations brought him steadily nearer to Goethe's way of thinking. His intense Hellenism; his insistence upon the immense importance of art as an element of culture; his fervid championship of art for art's sake; his practical identification of the ideal with the typical; and above all his great earnestness, as of one striving with all his powers towards the better light,--this and much more could not fail of meeting Goethe's approval. And then came the great project of the "Horen", which was to unite the best writers in Germany in a common effort for the advancement of letters and the elevation of the public taste. Goethe accepted Schiller's invitation to contribute to the "Horen" and to serve on the editorial committee. Thomas describes their collaboration in this way:

"For Goethe, whose nature really craved friendship hardly less than Schiller's,

there was something grateful in his frank homage combined with rare perspicacity. He saw that Schiller understood him or at least was more concerned to understand him. With all their differences they were spiritual congeners, and much might be hoped for from this connection." ¹

As they worked together, the two men were drawn together in mutual sympathy and appreciation, and found in each more and more a bulwark against hostile criticism. It is to be remarked that their friendship was not a mere relation of master and pupil. It was rather a spiritual co-partnership of equals, each recognizing the other's strength, respecting the other's individuality, and eager to profit by discussion. If Schiller deferred to the superior wisdom of Goethe in dealing with the plastic arts and with natural science, there were other matters,--philosophy, poetic theory, and the dramatic art,--upon which he felt that he could speak as one having authority. And his authority was respected by Goethe, especially after the completion of "Wallenstein". Goethe saw that Schiller, along with his poetic gift, possessed a practical, dramatic talent,--an eye for effect and a powerful way of appealing to the general heart,--such as he could by no means claim for himself. He looked to him as the best hope of the German drama... A little later we shall investigate the meaning of this relationship in greater detail, so far as Schiller is concerned.

"Wallenstein", the great play which signaled the return of Schiller to dramatic poetry, is accounted upon the whole his master piece. Its chief figure is by far the most impressive of German tragic heroes. A space of almost twelve years lies between the appearance of "Don Carlos" and the completion of the Wallenstein trilogy. "Don Carlos" is related to "Wallenstein" as longing is to fulfillment; "Don Carlos" is the seed, "Wallenstein" the fruit of his development. About "Wallenstein", Goethe has said:

"Es ist so gross, dasz in seiner Art zum zweitemal nicht etwas Aehnliches vorhanden ist." ²

The purpose of the "Camp", the first part of the trilogy, is to show the nature of Wallenstein's soldiers and the grounds of their attachment to their commander.

1. Thomas, Calvin. The Life and Works of Friedrich Schiller. Pp. 290-91.

2. Berger, Karl. Schiller, Sein Leben und Seine Werke. S. 379. (Zweiter Band)

It is not an integral part of the whole. The loyalty of his men is of course the great factor in Wallenstein's position; it is because he relies upon their fidelity that he dares to dally with the thought of treason. As a prelude, the "Camp" transports us into the "milieu" of the tragedy.

The dramatic fable devised by Schiller for the tragedy proper carries us back to the winter of 1634. Events extending over several months are concentrated into the four days preceding the assassination of Wallenstein. The prominent characters fall into two groups,--the abettors of Wallenstein in his treason, and the imperialists who work his ruin. The first group consists of officers whom he has bound to him by one or another tie of selfish interest. Foremost among these are Illo, the Count and Countess Terzky, and General Butler, who turns against its chief and becomes the agent of his taking-off. The central figure of the other group is Octavio Piccolomini. Octavio, in reality the trusted agent of the emperor, is regarded by Wallenstein with a superstitious infatuation as his own most faithful friend. Between these two groups stand the lovers, Max and Thekla.

It is impossible to do justice to a long, complicated, profound play in a few words, and in this brief notice of "Wallenstein" we shall content ourselves with a few general remarks concerning it.

"Schillers Riesenwerk (Wallenstein) ist die monumentalste Tragödie, die Deutschland besitzt, ein Denkmal historischer Dramatik, wie es kein Volk in dieser Rundung und Abgeschlossenheit sein eigen nennt." ¹

In the imaginative power whereby history is made into drama; in the triumph of artistic genius over a vast and refractory mass of material, and in the skill with which the character of the hero is conceived and denoted, "Wallenstein" is unrivaled in German tragedy.

After the completion of "Wallenstein" in the spring of 1799, Schiller was not long in selecting a new dramatic theme. He set to work on "Maria Stuart" and finished it in June, 1800. Schiller conceives Mary, Queen of Scots, a beautiful sinner who has

1. Berger, Karl. Schiller, Sein Leben und seine Werke. S. 379.

repented. Her sins are grievous and she does not deny or extenuate them. But they are in the distant past; so far as the present is concerned, she is in the right. She has come to England seeking an asylum, but instead of being treated as a queen she has been confined in one prison after another and finally brought to Fotheringgay, where she is subjected to petty indignities and denied the consolations of the Catholic religion. She has been charged with a crime of which she declares herself innocent, has been brought to trial before a commission of judges whose jurisdiction she indignantly repudiates, and has even been denied the common right to confront the witness testifying against her. At the opening of the play she does not yet know the verdict of the court...This is the substance of Schiller's masterly exposition. Madame de Staël characterized "Maria Stuart" as the most moving and methodical of all German tragedies.

Schiller worked indefatigably these days; on the 15th of April, 1801, "The Maid of Orleans" was complete. The French peasant girl becomes an ambassador of heaven, gifted with second sight and the power of working miracles. She not only leads the French troops in battle, but she herself fights with a magic sword and kills English soldiers with the ruthlessness of a veteran in slaughter. Through it all, however, she is supposed to remain a tender-hearted and lovable maiden, such as the highest officers of France may wish to marry. By the command of the Holy Virgin, from whom her mission and power derive, she is bound to refrain from all earthly love. A momentary tenderness for the English general, Lionel, which leads her to spare his life, presents itself to her conscience as an infraction of the divine command. She is overwhelmed with remorse and loses all her power. Arm and soul are paralyzed. Taxed by her superstitious father with witchcraft, she cannot find speech to defend herself and imagines that a thunder-clap is heaven's testimony against her. Then she wanders about as a helpless and disgraced fugitive and is captured by English soldiers. With fettered hands she is compelled to witness a new battle, in which her countrymen, deprived of her aid, are about to be worsted. But through adversity she has been purged of her sin. Her self-confidence returns,

and with it her miraculous power. By the efficacy of prayer she breaks her chains, and rushes into the fray. Her reappearance brings victory to the French arms, but she herself is mortally wounded and dies in glory on the battlefield.

"The Maid of Orleans" is a drama of patriotism. It is Johanna's love of country that gives her human interest, in spite of the supernaturalism that invests her. Her mystical attributes and her unthinkable love-affair would place her beyond the range of natural sympathy, if it were not that she wins favor by her patriotic devotion, and when the end comes, one thinks of her as a heroine dying for her country.

After the completion of "The Maid of Orleans", Schiller found himself the unhappy victim of leisure. Having a mind to trying his hand upon a tragedy in "the strictest Greek form", he set to work on "The Bride of Messina", which was completed in February, 1803.

For the groundwork of his tragedy he resorted to the fiction of the hostile brothers, giving it this form: Two princes grow up in mutual hatred, but are finally reconciled through the influence of their mother. Both fall in love, each without the other's knowledge, with a young woman of whose family they know nothing, and who is in reality their sister. One day the younger prince finds the object of his passion in the arms of his brother, who has just learned the secret of the girl's birth. Instantly the old hate blazes up anew, and in a paroxysm of blind rage Don Cesar kills his brother. Then, when he discovers the whole truth, he expiates his crime by a voluntary death. The salient point is the fratricide committed in a sudden frenzy of passion: everything else leads up to this or grows out of it.

The play may be described as an attempt to treat a medieval romantic theme in such a manner as to convey a suggestion of Greek tragedy. But the highly artificial plot does not reflect any past or present truths of human existence. There is a chorus, and there are dreams which take the place of oracles. There is also a further suggestion of the antique in the pervading fatalism of the piece. Scherer remarks that there is in this play "an echo of his old favorite theme, the struggle against tyranny". Schiller's hatred of despotism finds expression in every one of his plays. In the same vein

Berger says:

"Am Schlusse der Braut von Messina, beim Zusammenbruch des gesamten Fürstenhauses, da leuchtet die Wahrheit auf aus dem Dunkel des Wahns und der Leidenschaft: Demut vor den waltenden Gesetzen ziemt dem Erdgeborenen, sittliche Bändigung der Kraft allein verleiht ihm wahre Menschenwürde."¹

In concluding this chapter, let us revert to Schiller's relation to Goethe. The coupled names of Goethe and Schiller denote a literary epoch as well as a peculiarly inspiring personal friendship. Many a writer has compared them and undertaken to assign their respective merits. The world is now well agreed that Goethe's was the rarer genius. Yet, if we compare the actual production of the two men during the eleven years of their association, it is not at all clear that the palm should be given to Goethe. The five plays of Schiller, with the "Song of the Bell", and the best of his shorter poems, will bear comparison very well with "Wilhelm Meister", "Hermann und Dorothea", and "The Natural Daughter."

I am here not attempting to adjudicate the issue between Schiller and Goethe, which I leave to the authorities, but merely pointing out that each poet inspired the other, that their personal and literary friendship represents the greatest duumvirate in literature, and that this kind of amicable relation was a noble tribute to the greatness of both.

In the summer of 1797 Goethe had visited Switzerland and brought back with him the idea of an epic poem about William Tell. He discussed the matter with Schiller. Finding his supposed plan the subject of curious gossip, Schiller was led to look more closely into the subject. He read Tschudi's "Chronicon" and found it Homeric in its simple straightforwardness. The legend fascinated him and he began to see in it the material of a popular drama that should take the theatrical world by storm. He had experimented with unfamiliar art-forms in "The Bride of Messina" and had achieved only an equivocal success; now he set about supplying in his new play that which would interest average human nature. Schiller took infinite pains with his local color, noting down from the books all sorts of minutiae that might aid his imagination; the result was that "William Tell" has remarkably vivid and accurate

1. Berger, Karl. Schiller, Sein Leben und Seine Werke. Zweiter Band. S. 641.

local color.

The above account of the influences on Schiller and events intervening between "Don Carlos" and "William Tell", is in the nature of the case fragmentary, but it is not, I trust, an inadequately brief exposition of the salient phases of Schiller's development to which I have confined myself. But now let us betake ourselves to a consideration of that sublime expression of freedom and patriotism, "William Tell."

CHAPTER VI

AN ACCOUNT OF "WILHELM TELL"

The first scene of the first act, like an overture, suggests the principal theme of the drama. First, in a series of beautiful pictures, the peaceful life of the Swiss people is presented. The call of the Alpine cowherds harmoniously mingles with the soft music of the cowbells; simple songs, which in their native charm reveal changing moods, child-like contentment, the hope of spring, and undaunted courage, resound from the lake, the mountain, and its peak. In some magic way the country and its people in all their joys and sorrows are with a few sure strokes of the poet's pen well-known, living, impelling realities to us. Suddenly a storm appears. With similar precipitation, the trend of events is transformed. A powerful scene shows us the tyrannical powers which have converted this idyllic country into the stage of a fearful struggle. Baumgarten, who in defending his wife's honor has slain a nobleman, has been forced to flee. Followed by closely pursuing riders, he wildly runs on the scene. In vain he begs the help of the old boatman, and in desperation he stretches his hands toward the other, saving bank of the raging sea. When Tell appears, immediately everyone turns to him, as the best of friends in need. With little hesitation, he undertakes to transport Baumgarten to the other side. The boat has scarcely launched, when the Landenberg riders arrive; their incendiary zeal, for they burn the huts of these people from whom they can secure no information, heightens the contrast between this and the introductory scene, and strengthens the power of the theme already struck:

"Wann wird der Retter kommen diesem Lande?"¹

With the beginning of the second scene, we are hurried with the bold boatman to the other shore, to Schwyz, before Stauffacher's house. As above in Unterwalden and Uri, the people are terrorized by murder and atrocities of all kinds, so here they fear the acquisitiveness of the nobleman, who because he is a second son,

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Wilhelm Tell. Erster Aufzug, Zweite Szene. S. 184.

has nothing of himself. That which was once the free peasant's pride and joy, won by hard labor, has become now his main source of worry--namely, his home. Stauffacher says:

"Es wankt der Grund, auf dem wir bauten." 1

Through worry the active power of the man who once was "ein Vater der Bedrängten" is lamed; his courage appears to be on the point of complete dissipation in ineffectual brooding. Frau Gertrud awakens her troubled husband to new hope and activity. She boldly gives expression to that which "zu denken er sich still verbot", namely the possibility of the attainment of freedom from the yoke of mutual oppression through union with the other suffering Swiss people. And the thought of rebellion, born in the cozy silence of their home, is to be spread in ever-widening circles. Execution immediately follows the resolution.

At Altdorf in Uri we meet with the Schwyzer peasant again. There he finds tyranny rampant: those hands which were wont to use the shepherd's staff and the plow, the oar, and the bow, must now, ironically enough, be lent to the servile work of constructing a fortress which is to enslave them still more ignominiously. As an insult to the free, the castle is to be called "Zwing-Uri". With ingenuity the governor has devised still another and more subtle mode of humiliating these people; he sets up a hat before which all must prostrate themselves. The indignation of the men waxes as they work, and finds expression in their defiant attitude and bitter remarks. In the midst of this exciting scene, in the face of this new outrage, Stauffacher seeks confederates for the contemplated union, but Tell does not wish to hear of the meeting he proposes. To the honest leader, this apparent defection of Tell from the common cause, comes as a blow; but our confidence in him remains unshaken, even if he is resolved to go his own peculiar way. We have been prepared for this by the Baumgarten interlude.

Then, a most powerful scene is enacted in the home of Walther Fürst, his

father-in-law. In the dialogue between Fürst and the fugitive, Arnold von Melchtal, we learn of new crimes of the governor of Unterwalden, then of the unconsidered revenge of the hot-blooded young man, and his rash flight. And again we find that the deed done because of personal longing for revenge has only more strongly forged the chains of servility, and has only invited still more horrible violence. Again the innocent is made to suffer for the guilty; for the fit of anger of the son, the father pays with the loss of his eyes. The effect of Stauffacher's news on the furious son is terrible. The sudden stroke of fate throws him to the ground. The perspicacity of the experienced men enables them to dam up the stream of his revenge, and to direct it to a higher, better goal than the satisfaction of selfish desires. To this purpose, Stauffacher entrusts to him the mission of bringing the men of Unterwalden into their pact; he himself promises to enlist the loyalty of the Schwyz people, while Walther Fürst promises to do the same with those of Uri. With solemn oath, each pledges his undying fidelity to the cause.

The second act fulfills what has begun in act one. The introductory scenes with Attinghausen justify Melchtal's proposal that he sound out the nobles, as well as add the last strokes to the picture of the situation. Attinghausen is a magnificent representative of the old patriarchal relation of the baron to his servants; the opposition of the simple mountain people to Austria appears in a new light. But the progressive disregard of tradition and the old spirit by the young nobles means a new danger for the cause of the people, discord between the people and its born leaders. The old man despairs of his time and the younger generation and does not imagine that the "Volk der Hirten" so dear to him has already girded itself for the new struggle. These preparations come to a provisional conclusion at Rütli. The representatives of the three sections are introduced; the impetuous Melchtal and his Unterwald supporters are the first on the scene; the restrained Stauffacher with his Schwyz adherents appear at exactly the

appointed time; the Uri faction under Hälther Fürst are delayed because of detours. From the exchange of remarks all the circumstances and events become clear to us. Over the whole assembly there rules a solemn mood, based on conviction of the right of their purposes. All personal animosities and all class differences are suspended in the interest of the general welfare. Stauffacher introduces his plans by an eloquent reminiscence of their glorious past, the common origin of the inhabitants of the three sections, and contrasts the freedom of their heroic ancestors with the present ignoble situation. His gripping, simple plea reaches its peak in his demand for united action, and his words,

"Wir stehn vor unsre Weiber, unsre Kinder,"¹

find an echo in all the confederates. But it is Rösselmann, the minister, that brings about the first "Landgesetz" of the union: in order to test the resoluteness of the men, he advises separation from the empire and annexation to Austria. A storm of protest arises:

"Wer von Ergebung spricht an Östreich,
Soll rechtlos sein und aller Ehren bar,
Kein Landmann nehm' ihm auf an seinem Feuer."²

Then, after hope of a just judgment from the emperor has been discarded, means are devised, plans considered, and a time of uprising agreed upon. Trivial differences of opinion are unable long to disturb the prevailing unanimity; they rather add to the vividness of the action. While the early morning breezes blow and the sun rises over the snowcapped mountains, the men seal their great work with solemn vows. Stauffacher reminds the confederates of one last significant thing: none must strike before the appointed day.

"Was noch bis dahin musz erduldet werden,
Erduldet's! Laszt die Rechnung der Tyrannen
Anwachsen, bis e i n Tag die allgemeine
Und die besondere Schuld auf einmal zahlt.
Bezdähme jeder die gerechte Wüt
Und spare für das Ganze seine Rache:

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Wilhelm Tell. Zweiter Aufzug, Zweite Szene. Z. 1289. (S. 65)
2. Ibid. Zweiter Aufzug, Zweite Szene. Z. 1307-9. (S. 66)

Denn Raub begeht an allgemeinen Gut,
Wer selbst sich hilft in seiner eignen Sache." ¹

In solemn quietude the men leave the silent mountain slope. Night still lies in the valley, but on the heights the sunlight has conquered the darkness: thus nature gives a symbol of "freiheitlicher Morgenröte."

Until Christmas no attack is to be made. But in the meantime the tyranny becomes even more unsupportable. Geszler, the principal representative of Austrian power, whom up to this time we have known only through the results of his despotism and vicariously through his men, appears on the scene with a new, almost inconceivable crime. The honest Tell, the man of action, is carried away by the current of events, and is forced into a train of circumstances which in their last results are to crown the work of the confederates.

The first scene of the third act prepares us for the fearful meeting of Tell with Geszler. The happy songs of his son, the security of the powerful man, the tranquillity of the idyllic family picture, stand in significant contrast to the anxious premonitions of the worrying Hedwig, Tell's wife. Tell is unmoved by the fears of his spouse and heightens her anxiety. In order to calm her worries over his intended journey to Altdorf, he tells her of his meeting with the unarmed Geszler on a narrow mountain path, where the latter, betrayed his mortal fear by losing all composure and sinking on his knees in a faint. She realizes that the coward can never forgive the strong man for seeing him in his weakness. But Tell, with his elder son and his loved bow, blithely sets out for Altdorf.

After the conversion of the blinded Rudenz by Bertha von Bruneck to the cause of the people in the second scene, we find Tell approaching in conversation with his son. Father and son are one in their love of their home in spite of lavines and other dangers, for it is better "die Gletscherberge im Rücken haben als die bösen Menschen." The two guards of the hat have been waiting

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Wilhelm Tell. Zweiter Aufzug, Zv
(S. 73)

in vain for a sacrifice, in the face of derisive remarks from the crowd. Unsuspectingly, Tell appears opposite the trap. The soldiers seize him; he has contemned the dignity of the governor in neglecting to make his reverence to the hat. Tell's friends maintain the innocence of his action, but while the dispute is still in progress, Geszler himself, with all his brilliant company, appears. Instantly, he grasps the situation; here is his long-sought opportunity. Besides, he is resolved to bow this stiff-necked people; to this purpose every means seems to him to be right, which will be serviceable in the accomplishment. We are all familiar with his mandate that Tell shall shoot an apple from the head of his son at one hundred paces with his cross-bow; if he fails to do this, both he and his son shall die.

"Du schieszest oder stirbst m i t Deinem Knaben." 1

A fearful struggle takes place within Tell. Only gradually does the harmless "Träumer" awaken to the exigency; no recourse, no delay is possible. While all the bystanders in growing excitement try to avert the danger, only the boy, full of childish trust in his father's skill, urges Tell to shoot; the latter runs the whole gamut of suffering, but gradually steadies his nerves. Although Tell remains the middle point in the action, at a crucial moment our attention is directed to the discord which now arises between Rudenz and Geszler. In the fearless words of the young nobleman, evoked by his love of Bertha and the sight of Tell's unspeakable pain, we find the promise of the support of the Swiss nobles against Austria. The argument reaches a dangerous point for Rudenz. Suddenly, Stauffacher cries out:

"Der Apfel ist gefallen!" 2

The tyrant has hoped in vain to humble the archer before all the people.

His out-cry:

"Er hat geschossen? Wie? der Rasende!" 3

1. Schiller, Friedrich. William Tell. Dritter Aufzug, Dritte Szene. Z. 1899. (S.96)
2. Ibid. Dritter Aufzug, Dritte Szene. Z. 2033. (S. 103)
3. Ibid. Dritter Aufzug, Dritte Szene. Z. 2036. (S. 103)

betrays his fury at the failure of his insidious scheme. The general joy, the fear of revenge from the tortured man, cause him to devise a new means for getting him out of the way. Tell is given a severe test by the question of Geszler concerning the second arrow which he has kept ready. At first he tries to evade it. But when the governor assures him of his life, he admits that had he missed with the first arrow, the second was to have ended his persecutor's life. They lead him away, bound in a boat, to captivity and death. "Der beste Mann im Land, der bravste Arm, wenn's einmal gelten sollte für die Freiheit" is lost to the cause. His friends remain disconsolate behind, and can scarcely credit what their eyes have seen. A forest of lances precludes the possibility of their rescuing Tell. But even more than this consideration, the vows taken at Rütli deter the confederates from attempting violence. One thing they have discovered: further delay can only lead to hopeless ruin.

In the first scene of the fourth act we find ourselves on the Austrian bank of the storm-tossed sea. The conversation of Ruodi, the fisherman, with Kunz von Gersau, clarifies the situation and prepares us for the appearance of Tell. They cannot reconcile themselves to such an unnatural crime as that which they have just seen committed; they repudiate their allegiance to Austria:

"O, mich soll's nicht wundern,
Wenn sich die Felsen bücken in den See,
Wenn jene Zacken, jene Eisestürme,
Die nie auftauten seit dem Schöpfungstag,
Von ihren hohen Kulmen niederschmelzen,
Wenn die Berge brechen, wenn die alten Klüfte
Einstürzen, eine zweite Sündflut alle
Wohnstätten der Lebendigen verschlingt!"¹

Nature helps its favorite son, who has learned to act decisively in decisive moments. Tell is wondrously saved from the storm and from the hands of the

1. Schiller, Friedrich. William Tell. Vierter Aufzug, Erste Szene. Z. 2142-49. (S.110)

governor, but his simple tale makes the event easily understood. We feel that God himself has intervened; with God's help, Tell will also complete the work in case the tyrant escapes the waves. Now at last the "Gemeingefühl" of the maltreated man is awakened; not only to his wife but also to the Rütli confederates does he significantly address his greetings:

"Sie sollen wacker sein und gutes Muts:
Der Tell seif r e i und seines Armes mächtig,
Bald werden sie ein weitres von mir hören."¹

But as always the strong man feels strongest alone; unaccompanied he sets out for Rüsznacht, where the action must come to a crisis.

In the meantime, the insurrectionists are not idle. The scene at Attinghausen's is not merely intended to mediate between Tell's escape and his second shot. The news of Tell's escape fires them to greater expedition in their plans for attaining freedom. Hedwig's bitter reproof of their feeble resistance at Altdorf strikes deep in their hearts.

"Wir alle wollen handeln, um seinen Kerker aufzutun",² says Stauffacher, who of them all is least inclined to rash action. The prophecy of the dying baron of freedom to come strengthens their resolution, and the powerful Rudenz pledges his utmost aid. Bertha has been abducted from Bruneck. Delay is out of the question. The pressing need has decreed an "anderes Gesetz" than that decided upon at Rütli.

Tell now removes the chief obstacle to the success of the confederacy, Geszler. His long monologue in the "hohlen Gasse" explains and justifies the action which he contemplates. The Alpine hunter lies in wait "auf ein edles Wild"; this "Wild" is to be sure a man, but one who has violated all laws of nature and

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Wilhelm Tell. Vierter Aufzug, Erste Szene. Z. 2296-8. (S.117)
2. Ibid. Vierter Aufzug, Zweite Szene. Z. 2363-4. (S. 121)

man. Not only his own self-preservation requires this action, but his love of his threatened family, the feeling for all the others, impels him to it. Not for a violated political right, not because of violated "Freiheitsbriefe", does he remove Geszler; his removal is unavoidable if significant changes, if life itself, as conceived by the Swiss people, are to be possible. In this situation, Tell has no inner struggles as to the justice of his action; by no mode of casuistry does he attempt to vindicate its justice, for he feels that it requires no justification. It is only because his mind is filled by his resolution, because he feels the earnestness of his intentions, that he examines and reviews all these things. Thus, we become witness of his feelings and thoughts. We understand that the man who succeeded in attaining composure enough to shoot an apple from the head of his son will not fail now. The deed is repugnant to the peace-loving Tell, but since it is a necessity, he can and will do it with a clear conscience, without doubt, as a sacred duty.

Most impressive is the death scene. The happy, wedding-procession introduces a melancholy contrast to the earnest of the lonely, waiting man. When it is past, a sociable "Flurschütz" appears, only to ask multitudinous questions; his loquacity serves to increase our excitement in anticipation of Geszler's fateful arrival. Suddenly, Geszler is announced. Tell quickly prepares to shoot, as Geszler himself appears on horseback. In order in the last moment to show the inhumanity of his nature, the poet has Armgard, a poor woman with children in tatters, throws herself in his way: she begs for release, or at least trial for her unjustly imprisoned husband and bread-winner. Even this right is denied her with terrible threats. Geszler is on the point of riding over her when Tell's arrow pierces him. All circumstances have united to justify the fatal shot. Geszler's dying words are interrupted by the curses of Armgard, the jubilant cries of the freed people, and the merry sounds of the returning wedding party.

In the fifth act the deliverance from tyranny is at last gloriously accomplished. The fortresses are taken, the governors captured, and fires on the tops of the mountains gleam over a freed people. Only the symbol of servitude, Zwing-Uri, actually falls before our eyes. The new union of the peasants with the nobility has withstood the acid test. Even the last danger, the revenge of the Habsburg emperor, is obviated by a stroke of fate. King Albrecht lies murdered by his own nephew, a piece of news by which we have been prepared by the Rütli interlude. This royal murderer is now personally introduced to us. Just before Tell's joyous return home, Parricida knocks at his door and begs for help. His wild appearance frightens Hedwig, but ere long Tell arrives. In spite of her pride in her husband, the savior of the country, she hesitates to grasp the hand which has murdered. But Tell's courageous words convince her of her error. The contrast to the motives of the regicide we see before us and those of Tell provide a conclusive vindication of his action. Concerning it, Schiller himself has said:

"Tells Mordtat wird durch ihn allein moralisch und poetisch aufgelöst. Neben dem ruchlosen Mord aus Impietät und Ehrsucht steht nunmehr Tells notgedrungene Tat, sie erscheint schuldlos in der Zusammenstellung mit einem ihr so ganz unähnlichen Gegenstück, und die Hauptidee des ganzen Stückes wird eben dadurch ausgesprochen, nämlich: das Notwendige und Rechtliche der Selbsthilfe in einem streng bestimmten Fall." ²

Tell sympathizes with the criminal Parracida, and advises him to seek the salvation of his soul in "Sankt Peters Stadt", evincing once more his simple trust in God.

A jubilant testimonial of gratitude to Tell is given him by the people. The assembled confederates pay tribute to him as their inspiring leader. In their joy and freedom, a whole people, who "im Glücke, im Siege sich bescheidet", stands magnificently before us. The union of the lovers, Rudenz and Bertha, contributes

2. Berger, Karl. Schiller, Sein Leben und Seine Werke. Zweiter Band, S. 692.

to the prevailing happiness and suggests a blissful future. The drama is complete with the words of the young nobleman:

"Und frei erklär' ich alle meine Knechte." 1

And thus the play concludes in the same tone which pervades the whole: only self-sacrificing surrender and moral control can free the individual and the people, and establish and maintain the state.

and are distinguished. The country is represented by an
in place of life, and a youth; Nathan, Eliza, Hermann, Stauf-
... ..

CHAPTER VII

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE ELEMENTS OF FREEDOM

AND PATRIOTISM IN "WILHELM TELL"

"William Tell" represents a conspiracy like "Fiesco", and like the "Maid of Orleans", gives the history of a successful struggle against foreign tyranny. In the latter play, Schiller had represented a peasant-girl leaving the world of idyll to enter the political world, so as to restore independence to her fatherland. In "William Tell", he shows us a whole nation living in the world of idyll until the oppression of tyranny breaks in upon them; in the end they throw off the hated yoke, and violated nature reasserts her sway.

In "William Tell" the Swiss people form the centre of interest of the drama. The Swiss nation itself is the hero of the play, only split up into individuals, and represented in typical characters. In the first place aristocracy and peasantry are distinguished. The peasantry is represented by an old man, a man in the prime of life, and a youth: Walther Fürst, Werner Stauffacher, and Arnold Melchthal. These three men are at the same time representatives of the three Swiss cantons concerned in the struggle, and are all united in their resistance to tyranny and arbitrary force. The old man, Walther Fürst, is friendly towards the nobility, while the youth is opposed to them. Among the representatives of the aristocracy, too, there is a split between age and youth, the old times and the new; the old Baron of Attinghausen holds with the peasantry and with liberty; his nephew Rudenz has joined the foreigners. But it is only love of the noble Bertha von Bruneck that has thus led him astray, and she points out to him his duty to stand by his countrymen. Rudenz and Melchthal, the aristocratic and the peasant youth, are at first hostile to each other, but in the course of the drama they draw nearer and nearer together, and their final reconciliation, their mutual co-operation, their bond of friendship, signify the reconciliation

of classes.

William Tell stands apart in the midst of all these people. He is not represented as an idealist in contrast with realists, for here all live in the state of harmonious, ideal nature. Tell is the combative sportsman in contrast with the peaceful shepherd; he represents the self-reliant, strong man, in contrast with more ordinary men who believe themselves stronger when allied with others. And Tell acts where others only talk, deliberate, or hesitate. He knows no fear, and does not reflect long where it is a question of immediate action; at the same time he is humane and benevolent, and trusts God's help in time of need. He is strong and active in body and expert in all manly exercise, a sure shot, a bold sailor, a skillful carpenter, and always ready to help on occasion. He is scanty of words, but on his solitary paths he thinks all kinds of thoughts and is looked upon as a dreamer. Simple-hearted and unpretending, respectful to those set over him, and less inflamed than the rest against the tyranny of the imperial governors, he is willing to suffer and be silent, to wait and hope, though he will not stand aloof from his friends in case they really need his aid. Then suddenly, tyranny brutally intervenes in his own life. The governor, Geszler, totally destitute of humane feelings, and resolved to subdue the Swiss people by force, compels Tell, on pain of death, to shoot an apple from the head of his own child. Afterwards, he treacherously draws a dangerous confession from him, and then causes him to be bound, meaning to imprison him. Tell is almost miraculously delivered from the hands of his oppressor, and at once forms the firm resolve to kill this terrible tyrant. Geszler has sinned against nature in arming the father's hand against his son, and from that moment the tyrant is a lawful prey in the natural world, and the outraged father avenges nature by killing him, as he would have killed a wild animal which threatened danger to his house. Not the slightest moral

doubt rises in his mind. He is firmly convinced of the justice of his deed, and though his gentle wife is horrified, and though John Parricida dares to put himself on a level with him, still his clear conviction remains unshaken.

It is interesting to note that Schiller endeavored to free his hero from all connection with the regicides of the French Republic. There is but little comfort, and that adventitious, in "William Tell" for those who in the revolutionary epoch were clamoring against princes as such. The play is in no sense anti-monarchical. Schiller endowed his hero with that naive conviction of right which is to be found in a primitive age, and thus by implication established the principle that in less primitive times a similar mode of action must be judged differently. All the Swiss conspirators only wish to defend their wives and children. They all approve Tell's conduct, especially as he killed the tyrant at the very moment when he was cruelly maltreating a poor woman whose husband he had unjustly imprisoned, and threatening to employ new measures of violence against the unhappy land.

Schiller's first play was a wild rhapsody against law and order; civilization and government were described as inherently wrong and incorrigible. "Wilhelm Tell" was a true prophecy of freedom. Here nothing is said in favor of that negative and destructive liberty of which Charles Moor declaimed so wildly. For this freedom Schiller spoke out boldly in 1804, while his native land was in a disgraceful state of bondage. It was of Germany, divided against itself and trodden down, that he was thinking, more than of Switzerland, when he wrote the last words of the Swiss patriarch, Attinghausen:

"Drum haltet fest zusammen, fest und ewig;
Kein Ort der Freiheit sei dem andern fremd.
Hochwachten stellet aus auf euren Bergen,
Dasz sich der Bund zum Bunde rasch versammle.
Seid einig--einig--einig--" 1

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Wilhelm Tell. Vierter Aufzug, Zweite Szene. Z. 2447-51. (S.125)

When Schiller wrote "Die Räuber", he was in love with a shadow. In this play we see that he has fixed his affections on the true liberty--the companion of national honor and of intellectual and moral culture--and it was this among other things that endeared him to the hearts of the German people.

The scenes in which Tell is the hero are most interesting, but they are not the best part of the play. They are hardly worthy to be compared with the scene (Act ii, scene 2) in which the gathering of the Swiss people at Rütli is represented. There Schiller makes the manly and sober orator, Stauffacher, assert the rights of the people on grounds that are truly religious. He preaches no new dreams about the "rights of man", but asserts the ancient, lawful, and constitutional freedom of the Swiss people, in harmony with the welfare of the whole empire of which they form a part. The moral strength of the drama has its centre and heart in the oration delivered by Stauffacher at Rütli.

In the scene from which we quote a few paragraphs, the leaders of the Swiss people are assembled at night, on a plot of meadowland at Rütli, surrounded on all sides but one by rocks and trees. By steps cut among the crevices of the rocks and by ladders suspended from the cliffs, the confederate leaders of the people are hastening down to join the national gathering. A lake shines in the background and in the distance white Alpine mountains and glaciers are glistening in the moonlight. Stauffacher, one of the older members of the "Bund", stands in the centre of the confederate patriots, and delivers a speech which may be fitly called a German declaration of "the rights of man". It is as sober as it is enthusiastic, and gives us the poet's last ideas of liberty, which are strongly contrasted with the crude notions found in "Die Räuber";--

Stauffacher: Wir stiften keinen neuen Bund; es ist
Ein uralt Bündnis nur von Väter Zeit,
Das wir erneuern. Wisset, Eidgenossen,
Ob uns der See, ob uns die Berge scheiden
Und jedes Volk sich für sich selbst regiert,

So sind wir eines Stammes doch und Bluts,
Und e i n e Heimat ist's, aus der wir zogen. ¹

.....

Auf der Mauer: Ja, wir sind e i n e s Herzens, e i n e s Bluts.

Alle: Wir sind e i n Volk, und einig wollen wir handeln.

Stauffacher: Die andern Völker tragen fremdes Joch;
Sie haben sich dem Sieger unterworfen.
Es leben selbst in unsern Landesmarken
Der Sassen viel, die fremde Pflichten tragen,
Und ihre Knechtschaft erbt auf ihre Kinder.
Doch wir, der alten Schweizer echter Stamm
Wir haben stets die Freiheit uns bewahrt.
Nicht unter Fürsten bogen wir das Knie,
Freiwillig wählten wir den Schirm der Kaiser.

Rosselmann: Frei wählten wir des Reiches Schutz und Schirm;
So steht's bemerkt in Kaiser Friedrichs Brief.

Stauffacher: Denn herrenlos ist auch der Freieste nicht.
Ein Oberhaupt muß sein, ein höchster Richter,
Wo man das Recht mag schöpfen in dem Streit.
Drum haben unsre Väter für den Boden,
Den sie der alten Wildnis abgewonnen,
Die Ehr' gegönnt dem Kaiser, der den Herrn
Sich nennt der deutschen und welschen Erde,
Und, wie die andern Freien seines Reichs,
Sich ihm zu edelm Waffendienst gelobt;
Denn dieses ist der Freien einz'ge Pflicht:
Das Reich zu schirmen, das sie selbst beschirmt.

Melchthal: Was drüber ist, ist Merkmal eines Knechts. ²

Stauffacher: Wir haben diesen Boden uns e r s c h a f f e n
Durch unsrer Hände Fleisz, den alten Wald,
Der sonst der Bären wilde Wohnung war,
Zu einem Sitz für Menschen umgewandelt;
Die Brut des Drachen haben wir getötet,
Der aus dem Sümpfen giftgeschwollen stieg;
Die Nebeldecke haben wir zerrissen,
Die ewig grau um diese Wilnis hing;
Den harten Fels gesprengt, über den Abgrund
Dem Wandersmann den sichern Steg geleitet;
Unser ist durch tausendjährigen Besitz
Der Boden, und der fremde Herrenknecht
Soll kommen dürfen und uns Ketten schmieden
Und Schmach anthun auf unsrer eignen Erde,
Ist keine Hilfe gegen solch'en Drang?
Nein, eine Grenze hat Tyrannenmacht:

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Wilhelm Tell. Zweiter Aufzug, Zweite Szene. Z. 1155-61.

2. Ibid. Zweiter Aufzug, Zweite Szene. Z. 1203-27. (S. 62-63)

Wenn der Gedrückte nirgends Recht kann finden,
Wenn unerträglich wird die Last, greift er
Hinauf getrostes Mutes in den Himmel
Und holt herunter seine ew'gen Rechte,
Die droben hangen unverduszerlich
Und unzerbrechlich, wie die Sterne selbst;
Der alte Urstand der Natur kehrt wieder,
Wo Mensch dem Menschen gegenüber steht;
Zum letzten Mittel, wenn kein andres mehr
Verfangen will, ist ihm das Schwert gegeben.
Der Guter höchstes dürfen wir verteid'gen
Gegen Gewalt. Wir stehn vor unser Land,
Wir stehn vor unsre Weiber, unsre Kinder." 1

It seems as though in this last great work of Schiller's, this immortal apotheosis of lawful freedom, the full glory not only of his own life, but of the whole era of intellectual revolution and reconstruction was bursting forth once more with concentrated radiance. Rousseau's republicanism and individualism; the moral law of Kant; Herder's, Goethe's, and Schiller's ideal of culture--they all have entered into this poem as constituent elements. The republicanism which is preached here is not the anarchic republicanism of the French Revolution; it is the public-spirited devotion to the common weal practised by men rooted in common tradition and belief. The individualism held out here is not the selfish individualism of the Storm-and-Stress period; it is the self-mastery of individuals conscious of being representatives of a whole people. The moral culture exhibited here is not the result of a conscious struggle with lower passions; it is the instinctive culture of aristocratic characters, for every one of these Swiss farmers acts like a born aristocrat.

Here it seems there speaks no single individual. Here we hear the outcry of a whole century battling for the restitution of popular freedom and lawful government. With it mingle the voices of other ages and

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Wilhelm Tell. Zweiter Aufzug, Zweite Szene. Z. 1260-88.
(S. 64-65)

other countries, of Luther, of Hampden, and of the minute-men of Lexington, and of all crusaders in the campaign for freedom.

Biese has the following interesting exposition of Schiller's concept of true patriotism at this culminating point of his development:

"Schiller ahnte die kommende Größe seines Volkes, freilich nicht die politische; das verboten ihm die ganzen Zeitverhältnisse. Gemäß seiner weltbürgerlichen Gesinnung sah er in politischer Macht nicht einmal das erstrebenswerte Ziel, sondern er sucht die "deutsche Größe", wie das Bruchstück des gleichnamigen Hymnus (1801) zeigt, in dem regen Verkehr deutschen Geistes mit dem "Geist der Welten"; in dessen Führerschaft unter den Völkern auf dem Gebiete der Kultur, in der Verwirklichung des Ideals eines freien, edlen Menschentums. Mag der Brite die Polypenarme seiner Flotte ausstrecken, mag der Franke seinen 'ehernen Degen in die Wege der Gerechtigkeit werfen":

'Das ist nicht des Deutschen Größe,
obzusiegen mit dem Schwert.
In das Geisterreich zu dringen,
Vorurteile zu bezwingen,
männlich mit dem Wahn zu ringen,
Das ist seines Eifers wert!'

The uppermost thought of Schiller in this play was to win sympathy for freedom and the rights of man; yet in "Wilhelm Tell" we have nothing to do with any species of cloud-born idealism. The bearers of the message are not fantastic dreamers, like Posa; they do not call themselves ambassadors of all mankind, or citizens of the centuries to come. They are a plain, practical folk, whose wishes do not fly far afield and who attempt nothing that they cannot carry through. They are not in the least given to fighting for the sake of fighting; on the contrary, the thought of bloodshed is abhorrent to them. All they wish is to be allowed to pursue their peaceful, patriarchal industries, as they had done, and as their fathers did before them, under laws of their own devising. But things have come to such a pass that their lives, their property, and the honor of their women are not safe from the malice, cupidity, and lust of their rulers. And even

under such conditions the thought of a radical revolution does not occur to them: they do not rise against the overlordship of the emperor, but only against the brutal tyranny of the governors who disgrace him. Their final triumph opens no other vista of change than that, in the future, another emperor will send them better governors. Thus, the whole upshot of the revolution is simply a demonstration of Stauffacher's proposition that "tyrannical power has a limit".

In order fully to grasp the message of "Wilhelm Tell", we must briefly consider it from an historical point of view. What did the poet say for national freedom? Nothing more than that which had been said before. But the question should be rather--When did he say it?--In 1804--near the midnight-hour of national degradation (1806). To say nothing of the petty states--the want of union between Prussia and Austria had destroyed all hopes of liberty. In Austria the liberal measures of Joseph II had been repealed, and ignorance and bigotry were made the bases of a restored despotism. There were men who called themselves patriots; but their plans had no practical value. Schiller's countrymen understood the tendency of his best works, to cherish a love of unitive freedom and national honor. The idea of liberty and freedom pronounced at first so crudely in "Die Räuber" was more and more purified and ennobled as it passed through other forms of expression,--in "Fiesco", "Kabale und Liebe", "Don Carlos", "Wallenstein", and "The Maid of Orleans"--until it shone forth splendidly in "Wilhelm Tell" as a prophecy of coming liberation. So much so that Pallaske says concerning the latter play:

"Mit diesem Drama hatte Schiller sein Volk gegen Napoleon gewaffnet,

soweit ein Dichter es waffnen konnte. Wenige Jahre nachher stand es auf, Stein entfesselte die Volkskraft und entflamte die Fürsten, und Schill und York handelten ohne Rütlibeschlüsse." ¹

1. Pallaske, Emil. Schillers Leben und Werke. Vierzehnte Auflage, Erster Band.

CHAPTER VIII

THE EVOLUTION OF SCHILLER'S THOUGHT ON FREEDOM AND PATRIOTISM AS SHOWN IN
"DIE RÄUBER", "DON CARLOS", AND "WILHELM TELL", --SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

From the following brilliant summary by Germany's great lyric poet, Heinrich Heine, we may paraphrase the evolution of Schiller's attitude to freedom and patriotism:

"Ihn, den Friedrich Schiller, erfaszte lebendig der Geist seiner Zeit, er rang mit ihm, er ward von ihm bezwungen, er folgte ihm zum Kampfe, er trug sein Banner, und es war dasselbe Banner, worunter man auch jenseits des Rheines so enthusiastisch stritt, und wofür wir noch immer bereit sind, unser bestes Blut zu vergießen. Schiller schrieb für die grossen Ideen der Revolution, er zerstörte die geistigen Bastillen, er baute an dem Tempel der Freiheit, und zwar an jenem ganz grossen Tempel, der alle Nationen gleich einer einzigen Brüdergemeinde umschliessen soll; er war Kosmopolit. Er begann mit jenem Hass gegen die Vergangenheit, welchen wir in den "Räubern" sehen, wo er einem kleinen Titanen gleicht, der aus der Schule gelaufen ist und Schnaps getrunken hat und dem Jupiter die Fenster einwirft; er endigte mit jener Liebe für die Zukunft, die schon im Don Carlos wie ein Blumenwald hervorblüht, und er selber ist jener Marquis Posa, der zugleich Prophet und Soldat ist, der auch für das kämpft, was er prophezeit, und unter dem spanischen Mantel das schönste Herz trägt, das jemals in Deutschland geliebt und gelitten hat." ¹

known as "Storm-and-Drang", and like the entire period
First we saw the youthful Schiller as the most illustrious representative of the Storm-and-Stress school. He had preached destruction of every barrier to individual growth; war against authority of whatever kind; the glorification of primitive, uncorrupted nature, of instinct, of passion of genius; the vilification of the existing social order, of regularity, of learning, of conscious efforts. The theory, or rather the idea or feeling, for it was not clearly enough formulated to be a theory, on which "Die Räuber" was written, was essentially that of an anarchist who not only saw nothing in the political systems then obtaining in the world, but even in government itself which could commend itself to his judgment. His concept of freedom was negative, implying the corollary of absence of restraint. Because government does restrain, it is inherently evil. The life of primitive man is the optimum condition of life.

Schiller's declamations are directed indiscriminately and without qualification at all existing institutions. Anarchy is propitious to the development of "genius" and strength of character:

"Das Gesetz hat zum Schneckengang verderben, was Adlerflug geworden ware. Das Gesetz hat noch keinen grossen Mann gebildet, aber die Freiheit brütet Kolosse und Extremitäten aus." ¹

Lawlessness, chaos, means salvation for mankind, for its ills are the direct and necessary results of civilization. This is another egregious "non sequitur" in Schiller's youthful reasoning after Rousseau. It is undeniably true that culture and civilization in his day could justly be arraigned of being unprincipled, unstable, and unnatural. It is equally true that the solution was not feasible by the return to nature advocated by Rousseau. The man who will better the world cannot break from her, but must persevere, and wrestle with evil, as Jacob did with the devil.

Despite its merits, "Die Räuber" belongs to that period of flagrant and passionate extremism known as "Sturm-und-Drang", and like the entire period it too can be indicted of grave defects. On the premises cited above, no co-operative society, significant government, or progressive culture would be possible. The glorification of primitive, uncorrupted nature was a grievous anachronism, however speciously presented. Rousseau and his ilk had solved the mystery of the Gordian knot after the rather bumptious manner of Alexander. The excessive strictures in his own life and in life about him, his extreme youth, and his ignorance at the time of philosophy, co-operated to make Schiller tend to subscribe to these unreasoned attacks against all government per se. A feeling of hate, not amenable to logic, surged in his heart against tyranny, and at the time he was so inaccessible to reason, that he identified all order and control with tyranny. As to Karl Moor, civilization was anathema to him, and the kind of freedom here wildly apostrophized is negative, vague, anarchistic, inconceivable in

1. Schiller, Friedrich. Die Räuber. Erster Akt, Zweite Szene. 3. 9-10. (S. 23)

society of any kind. In his apotheosis of the individual to the exclusion of everything else, Schiller had sinned against the institutions of life, against civilization, culture, and progress. As we saw, from "Die Räuber", with its retrogressive tendencies, it is indeed a far cry to "Wilhelm Tell."

For a time Rousseau's gospel of return to nature had led Schiller into error; but "Don Carlos" marks his accession to the clearer and more significant idea, taken from his historical and philosophical studies, that his ideal of human perfection could not possibly be attained by a reversion to a state of nature, and by thus dodging reality. Montesquieu's forward-looking cultural and political ideal began to force Rousseau's backward-looking theory to give ground. Now it seemed a more significant goal, instead of attacking the world to endeavor to transform it; instead of assailing tyranny, to give expression to ideals of true freedom and humanity; instead of ill-humoredly fleeing reality, to ameliorate it. He would sow for the future. He saw that the writers of the Storm-and-Stress school had tried to remedy by fire that which was not amenable to such remedy.

"Don Carlos" is a testimonial to a strong belief in the power of humanity, not a bootless indictment of its institutions and culture. We note that in this play Schiller no longer inveighs indiscriminately against princes. He had himself experienced that a potentate could exercise his power wisely and for the good of all. In his ideal of human happiness, then, princes must be included, for mankind could only free itself from the chains of tyranny, if magnanimity reigned on the thrones of kings. "Das kühne Traumbild eines neuen Staats" is glowingly presented to us by Fosa, and along with it the picture of a prince, who as the father of his people establishes and maintains freedom of thought

and conscience, and recognizes the eternal, inalienable rights of man. Positive in import, in contradistinction to "Die Räuber", "Don Carlos" was the herald of a new freedom of the people, a banner-carrier in the battle for the rights of the individual.

No longer does the poet apostrophize and apotheosize that kind of freedom to which all law is inimical. No longer does he defend the "edlen Verbrecher", who wishes to better the world with fire and the sword. He now sets himself to the task of placing before humanity great, attainable, noble goals, and leading the world to high ideals. He turns his back figuratively on Rousseau and repudiates the once avidly accepted theory of throwing over all civilization and culture as the panacea for mankind's ills. The dream of Posa for a state in which the ruler is at the same time enlightened and interested in the public good, forms the high point of "Don Carlos"; the shattering of this ideal thought is the tragedy of the play. Posa is the positive exponent of a genuinely free nation, governed by a kindly, wise monarch, the father of his people. The callow, though almost unprecedentedly (in view of his twenty-one years) brilliant author of "Die Räuber", had under the mellowing influence of his friendship with Körner and his inspiring ideals, and a less stringent general background, awakened to a knowledge that not by force, by ranting and raving, could significant changes be effected.

Not only in the obvious clarification of his ideas of freedom and patriotism, but also in the greater restraint of his method in "Don Carlos", is Schiller's development shown. He had learned from Kant through Körner that freedom must be founded on morality. Wholeheartedly, he had accepted Kant's categorical imperative (I quote from Thilly) of: "Always act so that you can will the maxim or determining principle of your action to become the universal law;

act so that you can will that everybody shall follow the principle of your action." ³

Let us look a little more closely at this concept of freedom, whose original was Kant's general theory:

"Freiheit ist eine Idee, ein Postulat im Sinne Kants, das heisst eine unumgänglich notwendige Voraussetzung des sittlichen Bewusstseins, durch die unser geistiges Leben erst sein endgültiges Verständnis und seinen Abschluss findet. Die eigenste innere Erfahrung des Menschen zeugt für Freiheit, für die Wirklichkeit und Wirksamkeit einer Natur, welche einem Willen unterworfen ist. Aber Freiheit ist uns nicht fertig gegeben: statt über sie theoretisch zu debattieren, sollen wir sie, der Natur zum Trotz, durch eigene, innere Tat beweisen und in immer höherem Grade erwerben. In diesem Sinn ist sie unser eigenes, ist sie Menschenwerk. Sie ist als solches die stärkste Macht: mit ihr wird er ihr Meister, und er meistert sie dort, wo sie am Widerstandsfähigsten ist: in sich, and wird dadurch Herr der Mittel, die ihm gegen jeden äusseren Feind sicher stellen. So ist Freiheit das höchste Vermögen, sittliche Selbständigkeit der grösste Vorzug der menschlichen Persönlichkeit. Sie gibt dem Leben Wert und dem Menschen Würde; sie macht diesen zum bewussten, planvollen Schöpfer seines Selbst und lässt ihn wachsen über das hinaus, was er bisher gewesen ist. Hier, im Innerlichen, ist sein Wirken unbegrenzt und schrankenlos; hier ist er dem eigenen, selbstgegebenen Gesetze unterworfen, hier ist er selber schaffende, gesetzgebende Natur. Denn Freiheit ist Autonomie, das heisst Bestimmtheit des Willens durch das in der "praktischen Vernunft", im sittlichen Bewusstsein, schon vorausliegende Gesetz. So bleiben Natur und Freiheit absolute Gegensätze, durch eine "unübersehbare Kluft" getrennt, und doch sind sie unlöslich verknüpft in der Persönlichkeit des Menschen: Natur ist nicht ohne Freiheit, Freiheit nicht ohne Natur, beide schliessen sich aus und setzen sich gegenseitig voraus. Je entschiedener aber der Mensch sein innerstes Wesen, seine Freiheit, behauptet in den Schranken und Leiden der Natur, desto reifer wird er als Persönlichkeit." ¹

The above account of Kant's conception of freedom is followed by the following significant statements:

"Die Idee der Freiheit war ihm (Schiller) der Lebensodem alles Guten und Groszen, das Leitmotiv seines Schaffens, der Leitstern seines Lebens, -- kein Wunder, dass er die Botschaft des Königsberger Weisen mit freudiger Bewunderung, wie einen klaren Widerhall seines eigenen Glaubensbekenntnisses vernahm." ²

A man who is governed by the moral law and not by his impulses, his selfish desires, his appetites, is free. The brute is the playball of its wants

1. Berger, Karl. Schiller, Sein Leben und Seine Werke. Zweiter Band, S. 169-70.
2. Ibid. S. 170.
3. Thilly, Frank. A History of Philosophy. P. 424.

and instincts; through the knowledge of the moral law within him, man can resist his sensuous appetites, all of which aim at selfish pleasure. And because he can suppress his sense-nature, he is free: he ought, therefore, he can. The moral imperative is the expression of man's real self, of the very principle of his being. It is his innermost self that expresses itself in the moral law; the moral law is his command, the command of every rational being.

The great poet of freedom had at last discovered what freedom meant.

In "William Tell" we have concrete, conclusive evidence of the above proposition. There is no comfort in it for those who in the revolutionary period were clamoring against princes as such. Schiller endeavored to free his hero from all connection with the regicides of the French Republic. The play is in no sense anti-monarchical. The poet endowed his hero with that naive conviction of right which is to be found in a primitive age, and thus by implication established the principle that in less primitive times a similar mode of action must be judged differently. The Swiss conspirators only wish to defend their wives and children. They all approve Tell's conduct.

Schiller's first play was a wild rhapsody against law and order; his last play, "Wilhelm Tell", was a true prophecy of freedom. Here nothing is said in favor of that negative and destructive liberty of which Charles Moor declaimed so wildly. When he wrote "Die Räuber", he was in love with a shadow. In this play we see that he has fixed his affections on true liberty--the companion of national honor and of intellectual and moral culture--and it was this among other things that endeared him to the hearts of the German people. Stauffacher, the manly and sober orator, asserts the rights of the people on grounds that are truly religious. He preaches no new dreams about "the rights of man", but asserts the ancient, lawful, and constitutional freedom of the Swiss people, in harmony

with the welfare of the whole empire of which they form a part.

It is no exaggeration to say that this last great work of Schiller's is an immortal apotheosis of lawful freedom, the quintessence of all utterances on patriotism. It seems that not only the full glory of his own life, but of the whole era of intellectual revolution and reconstruction was bursting forth here. Rousseau's republicanism and individualism had yielded, capitulated unconditionally, to the moral law of Kant, and Herder's and Goethe's ideals of culture; these entered into the poem as constituent elements, which we have already described more explicitly.

In "Wilhelm Tell" it seems there speaks no single individual. In it we hear the eloquent voices of the great pioneers in the cause of freedom, of Luther, of Hampden, and of the minute-men of Lexington. The Swiss people form the centre of interest of the drama, and the Swiss nation itself is the hero of the play, only split up into individuals and represented in typical characters. The bearers of the message of freedom are not fantastic dreamers, like Posa. They are plain people whose wishes do not fly far afield, and who attempt nothing that they cannot carry through. They are not in the least given to fighting for its own sake. All they wish is to be allowed to pursue their peaceful industries, as their fathers did before them, under laws of their own devising. But things have come to such a pass that their lives, their property, and the honor of their women are not safe from the malice, cupidity, and lust of their rulers. They must rise against their governors or be crushed.

Biese has the following interesting paragraph on Schiller's development of the themes of freedom and patriotism:

"Überblicken wir die Reihe der Dramen, die der Unermüdliche und Unererschöpfliche geschaffen, so stellen sie auch Selbstzeugnisse seines Lebens, eine Selbstentfaltung des Dichters, ein titanenhaftes Streben dar: von den "Räubern" bis zum "Wallenstein". Nicht nur im Stil, der aus dem Überschwang, aus dem Nebelhaften und aus dem Naturalismus sich zur höchsten und klarsten Kunstform emporrang, nicht nur in der Läuterung des Geschmacks und des Urteils, in der Vertiefung des Gedankeninhalts, in der Schärfe des Charakteristik, sondern vor allem in

der immer reineren Darstellung des Freiheitsideals. Freilich entbehrt selbst die nebelhafte Schwärmererei eines Karl Moor in allem Sturm-und-Drang nicht des sittlichen Grundgedankens, wie ihn der Wille, dem Guten zum Siege zu verhelfen, eingibt, und der soziale Untergrund von 'Kabale und Liebe' ist die Entrüstung über Unterdrückung der niederen Menschenklasse durch die höhere und dabei verderbte. Doch die volle Höhe erreicht der Freiheitsgedanke erst in der Reihe vom "Don Karlos" bis zum Demetrius". Um die höchsten 'Gegenstände der Menschheit' gilt der Kampf, ob der Einzelne für sein Vaterland, ob ein ganzes Volk oder ob ein Held für sich sein Recht, seine Freiheit fordert, und dieser Kampf wird bald gegen eine andere Herrschergewalt, bald gegen das Schicksal geführt--und selbst im Unterliegen sind die Helden noch gross wie Wallenstein oder läutern sich zur Reife des Menschentums wie Johanna, Maria, und Don Cesar." ¹

At a time when the continent was crouching under a theatrical revival of oriental despotism; when men and women were expected to submit to such discipline as would hardly be tolerated by boys in a respectable school; when the moral evil of tyranny was not more apparent than the contemptible nature of the means employed to uphold it; when it was expected that intelligent nations could be governed by an intellect which, though urged by a mighty will and skillful in strategy, belonged to the mechanical class:--at such a time, Schiller persevered in striving on towards his ideal of freedom for Germany, and for humanity.

In conclusion, let us listen to the eminent Schiller scholar, Beller-mann, analyze the nature of our poet's idealism:

"Auf dem Grunde seiner sittlichen Lebensanschauung erwächst ihm nun das Kostlichste, was er seinen Lesern und Hörern gibt: Die Begeisterung für die hohen sittlichen und geistigen Güter des Menschen. Darin liegt die eigentümliche verjüngende Kraft unseres Dichters, die Goethe an sich spürte, als er sein Zusammentreffen mit ihm einen neuen Frühling seines Lebens nannte. Schiller glaubt an die weltüberwindende Kraft des Guten und Wahren, und diese Überzeugung strömt aus seinen mächtigen Worten in die Seele des Hörers über und lässt sich weder durch den zeitweiligen Sieg des Schlechten noch durch 'die Angst des Irdischen' irre machen. Wenn seine schwerbedrängte, von der Welt verkannte Heldin, die untergehende Sonne anschauend, ihren felsenfesten Glauben ausspricht:

"So gewisz
Sie morgen wiederkehrt in ihrer Klarheit,
So unausbleiblich kommt der Tag der Wahrheit."

wenn Posa im Angesichte des Todes den Freund mahnen und beschwören lässt,

"Dass er für die Träume seiner Jugend
Soll Achtung tragen, wenn er Mann sein wird,
Nicht öffnen soll dem tötenden Insekt
Gerühmter besserer Vernunft das Herz
Der zarten Götterblume, dass er nicht,
Soll irrs werden, wenn des Staubes Weisheit
Begeisterung, die Himmelstoche, lüstert!"

das sind Siegesklänge des Idealismus, in eine Sprache gefasst, die nie veralten kann. Das sind die grossen Züge seiner Kunst und seines Geistes, die mächtigen Schwingen einer nach Wahrheit und Freiheit drstenden Seele, die auch den Hörer, wenn er nicht stumpfsinnig ist, im Sturme mit sich hinauftragen. Darin war und ist ihm kein anderer vergleichbar."²

In his last period of writing, Schiller had read enough of Kant's moral philosophy to know that freedom must be founded on morality. In his later years he was a true enthusiast in the service of freedom, and his works maintain the doctrine that virtue, patriotism, and true freedom are inseparable. As we have seen, the republicanism preached in "Wilhelm Tell" is not the anarchic republicanism of the French Revolution. It is the public-spirited devotion to the common weal practised by men rooted in common tradition and belief. The individualism held out here is not the selfish individualism of the Sturm-und-Drang period. It is the self-mastery of individuals conscious of being representatives of a whole people. Here it seems there does not speak an individual. Here we hear the outcry of a whole century battling for the restitution of popular freedom and lawful government.

Schiller's last play, like his first, was inspired by the Goddess of Freedom, but what a difference between the wild-eyed fury of the earlier day, and the decorous muse of "Wilhelm Tell"! There we had the frenzied revolt of a young idealist against chimerical wrongs of the social order; here we see a handful of farmers, rising sanely in the might of union, and appealing to the old order against

2. Bellermann, Ludwig. Schillers Dramen: Beiträge zu ihrem Verständnis. Dritter Band. S. 334.

intolerable oppression. There we had the tragedy of an individual madman-- here the triumph of a laudable patriotism. The vague concept of personal freedom of which "Die Räuber" was the exposition, had by the time of the writing of "Wilhelm Tell" developed to a point where political and moral freedom, in contradistinction to personal caprice, is recognized as the desideratum.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berger, Karl. Schiller: Sein Leben und seine Werke. In zwei Bänden. Dritte Auflage. München, 1906.
- Gostwick and Harrison. Outlines of German Literature. Edited by F. W. Christern. Holt & Williams. New York, 1873.
- Francke, Kuno. A History of German Literature, as determined by social forces. Twelfth Impression. New York, 1931.
- Francke, Kuno. German Ideals of Today. Cambridge, 1920.
- Thomas, Calvin. Life and Works of Friedrich Schiller. New York, 1901.
- Heine, Heinrich. Heine's Prose. Edited by Albert B. Faust. Revised Edition. New York, 1928.
- Thilly, Frank. A History of Philosophy. New York, 1931.
- Taylor, Bayard. Studies in German Literature. New York, 1879.
- Schiller, Friedrich. Die Räuber. Schillers Werke, Textrevision von Heinrich Kurz, Zweiter Band. Leipzig und Wien, 1901.
- " " Don Carlos. Schillers Werke, Vierter Teil. Herausgegeben von R. Boxberger. Berlin und Stuttgart, 1907.
- " " Wilhelm Tell. Edited by W. H. Carruth. New York, 1914.
- " " Wallenstein. Schillers Werke. Herausgegeben von Anton Birlinger. Fünfter Band. Berlin, 1907.
- " " Maria Stuart. Edited by Lewis A. Rhoades. Boston, 1894.
- " " Fiesco. Schillers Werke. Herausgegeben von R. Boxberger. Vierte Band. Berlin und Stuttgart, 1907.
- " " Die Jungfrau von Orleans. W. W. Florer, editor. New York, Cincinnati, 1908.

Schiller, Friedrich. Letters upon the Aesthetic Education of Man. Tr.'d. and edited by Charles W. Eliot. Harvard Classics, Vol. 32, Pp. 221-313. P. F. Collier & Son. New York City, 1909.

Carlyle, Thomas. Miscellaneous Essays. Vol. 1, Pt. 2, p. 143. London, 1885.

Düntzer, H. Schillers Räuber. Leipzig, 1876.

" " Don Carlos. Leipzig, 1886.

" " Maria Stuart. Leipzig, 1892.

" " Wilhelm Tell. Leipzig, 1892.

" " Die Jungfrau von Orleans. Leipzig, 1891.

" " Wallenstein. Leipzig, 1895.

Biese, Alfred. Deutsche Literaturgeschichte. In drei Bänden. Siebente Auflage. München, 1915.

Falleske, Emil. Schillers Leben und Werke. In zwei Bänden. Vierzehnte Auflage. Stuttgart, 1894.

Boyesen, Hjalmar Hjorth. Essays on German Literature. Pp. 175-210. New York, 1892.

Düntzer, Heinrich. Life of Schiller. Tr. by Percy E. Pinkerton. London, 1893.

Kühnemann, Eugen. Schiller. Tr. by Katharine Boyce. 3rd Edition. Boston and London, 1912.

Scherr, Johannes. Schiller und seine Zeit. Vierte Auflage. Leipzig, 1865.

Sime, James. Schiller. Philadelphia, 1882.

Scherr, Johannes. Schiller: Kulturgeschichte in sechs Büchern. Günther, 1873.

Scherer, Wilhelm. A History of German Literature. Tr. from the third German edition by Mrs. F. C. Conybeare. Edited by F. Max Müller, New York, 1887.

Bellermann, Ludwig. Schillers Dramen: Beiträge zu ihrem Verständnis. In drei Bänden. Fünfte, unveränderte Auflage. Berlin, 1919.