

**The Inner Tragic of the Sturm und Drang and its Dramatic Trilogy:
Lenz's *Die Soldaten*, Schiller's *Die Räuber*, and Goethe's *Faust I***

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Charles Joseph Brown
May 2021

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express sincere gratitude to my dissertation advisor Dr. Adrian Del Caro and to my committee members Dr. Sarah Eldridge, Dr. Maria Stehle, and Dr. Allen Dunn for accepting this mission and for supporting me at every stage of the process. I would also like to thank Dr. Ohnesorg, Dr. Huth, Dr. Hodges, and Dr. Magilow for their unwavering support throughout my tenure at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK). The German program and the intellectual atmosphere at UTK is amazing and the professors acknowledged here embody the majesty that underlies the university's commitment to fairness, integrity, and academic excellence.

And to my family – thank you lil b, girl, and boy.

ABSTRACT

My research examines three German dramas – J. M. R. Lenz's *Die Soldaten* (1776), Friedrich Schiller's *Die Räuber* (1781), and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *Faust: eine Tragödie* (1808). The three plays exhibit with remarkable parallel a three-phase dramatic structure that serves as the inner framework for a tragic process. This shared inner tragic process is suggestive evidence of an enlightening intertextuality within the purview of the Sturm und Drang. Featuring prominently in this tragic trilogy of the Sturm und Drang is Lenz, the tragic innovator whose template for inner tragic not only influences works of literature in this sequence of plays, but also serves as the transition and point of departure from classical tragedy to the modern notion of the tragic within the philosophical framework of German Idealism.

The inner arrangement of tragic elements, the Lenzian inner tragic structure, is composed of 1) a psychological exposition, 2) physical climax, and 3) emotional dénouement. The inner tragic structure captures the tragic process, a series of experiences and events that the protagonists suffer as they prepare for tragic action. The tragic phases of this process are captured respectively by each element of the inner structure as follows: 1) self-shattering, 2) tragic selfhood, and 3) death wish. The individuals experiencing the inner tragic are the literary protagonists who represent three profiles of *Menschen* in a continuum of ascendancy, *Mensch* (*Die Soldaten*), *Kraftmensch* (*Die Räuber*), and *Übermensch* (*Faust I*), respectively.

The literary figures who experience this tragic process embody several cultural threads within the greater context of the Enlightenment, Sturm und Drang and early Romanticism in the German-speaking world. My research uncovers an inner structure and an intertextual unity along tragic lines between the three plays in an era known for formlessness and divergence. Moreover, my findings reveal an exceptional Sturm und Drang manifestation of tragic that fills a void between a poetics of tragedy and a philosophy of modern tragic. Foreshadowing several other

developments in the nineteenth century such as existentialism and depth psychology, the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process delivers timeless wisdom about self-transformation and the efficacy of reason.

Keywords: tragic, German drama, Sturm und Drang, self

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
Preamble: Lenz's Sturm und Drang Tragic Project.....	1
The Lenzian Inner Tragic Structure.....	3
The Three Phases of the Sturm und Drang Inner Tragic Process.....	9
Lenz and Aristotle: Liberties and Lineages.....	14
The <i>Menschheit</i> Continuum: <i>Mensch</i> , <i>Kraftmensch</i> , and <i>Übermensch</i>	22
CHAPTER ONE: THE UNDERPININGS OF THE LENZIAN TRAGIC PROJECT, 1700-1773..	32
The Enlightenment and the Evaluation from Rousseau and Kant	32
The Sturm und Drang and its Founding Figures, 1759-1772.....	37
The German Theory of Drama in the Eighteenth Century.....	46
<i>Galotti</i> and <i>Götz</i> : Models for Sturm und Drang Drama.....	60
Freytag and the Significance of Structure.....	63
CHAPTER TWO: PHASE I OF THE INNER TRAGIC– THE SHATTERED SELF.....	69
A Psychological Exposition.....	69
<i>Die Soldaten</i> : Tearing.....	70
<i>Die Räuber</i> : Trembling.....	78
<i>Faust I</i> : Temptation and Tears.....	90
Chapter Commentary for Phase I: Language, and Theory of Drama.....	97
CHAPTER THREE: PHASE II OF THE INNER TRAGIC – TRAGIC SELFHOOD	104
A Physical Climax with Moral Implications.....	104
<i>Die Soldaten</i> : Batman and Beggar.....	107
<i>Die Räuber</i> : Power, Freedom, And Worldly Woes.....	114
<i>Faust I</i> : Tragic Selfhood and the Supernatural.....	121
Chapter Commentary for Phase II: Margarete's Transformation.....	127
CHAPTER FOUR: PHASE III OF THE INNER TRAGIC – DEATH WISH	130
Combining Dénouement and Catastrophe for an Emotional Resolution.....	130
<i>Die Soldaten</i> : Foregrounding the Tragic Resolution.....	132
<i>Die Räuber</i> : Tragic Voices.....	136
<i>Faust I</i> : The Fallen Veil.....	144
Inconsistencies: Tragic and <i>Menschen</i>	145
CHAPTER FIVE: LENZ AS TRANSITION TO THE TRAGIC AND BEYOND.....	149
Interlude.....	149

Peter Szondi and The German <i>Philosophie des Tragischen</i>	152
August Wilhelm Bohtz' <i>Schattenseite</i>	156
German Idealism and Existentialism.....	157
<i>Tiefenpsychologie</i>	160
Traces of an Inner Tragic Process in Later Drama: <i>Faust II</i> , <i>Woyzeck</i> , and <i>episches Theater</i>	162
EPILOGUE: THE MORAL OF THE INNER TRAGIC STORY	166
The Transition: Shifting from Fiction to Non-Fiction.....	166
Implications for Sturm und Drang Scholarship	166
The Origins of the Inner Tragic Process.....	169
Concluding Statement: The Tragic Moral of the Sturm und Drang for Today.....	170
WORKS CITED	174
VITA	182

INTRODUCTION

“Lassen Sie mich für die Ausführung dieses Projekts sorgen.”
–J. M. R. Lenz, “Über *Götz von Berlichingen*”

Preamble: Lenz’s Sturm und Drang Tragic Project

In his speech¹ “Über *Götz von Berlichingen*” (1776), J. M. R. Lenz answers the call made by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe with *Götz von Berlichingen* (1773), a German drama that serves as a prototypical play of the early Sturm und Drang. Lenz refers to the Sturm und Drang (1759–1786)² as a project and considers Goethe’s *Götz von Berlichingen* as a “schönere Vorübung” (“Über *Götz von Berlichingen*”) and the standard bearer for achieving great drama for the movement known in English as the Storm and Stress. *Götz von Berlichingen*, Goethe’s “first major drama, [is] a historical play written in emulation of Shakespeare with demonstrative disregard of the classical rules, [that] took Germany by storm in 1773” (Chamberlain 196). Like many Germans taken by storm, Lenz appeared ready to carry Goethe’s momentum forward. A few years later, however, Lenz wrote *Die Soldaten* (1776), a play quite unlike Goethe’s *Götz von Berlichingen* and indicative of a turn from the Sturm und Drang drama that Goethe tendered. Instead, Lenz had a project of his own in mind for the era of Sturm und Drang with *Die Soldaten*. This Lenzian project of the Sturm und Drang, albeit experimental and critical, turned out to be more of a *Vorübung* for the tragic.

In its own right, Lenz’s tragic project within the Sturm und Drang is a worthy research topic as exemplified in *Die Soldaten*, but his use of an inner dramatic structure to chart a specific tragic process goes beyond the play he was shaping. Understanding the full extent of Lenz’s

¹ According to Chamberlain, “Lenz’s speech was probably delivered at a club in Strasbourg in 1774” (196).

² There are various beginning and ending dates for the Sturm und Drang depending on the source, but the German literary phenomenon is considered a movement that traditionally begins with the publication of Johann Georg Hamann’s *Sokratische Denkwürdigkeiten* in 1759 and ends with Goethe’s trip to Italy in 1786.

tragic project is, thus, the ultimate aim of this dissertation, and accordingly, I provide a multifaceted examination but with a literary focus. My literary analysis has primacy because a semblance of Lenz's tragic structure appears in at least two other dramas of the period, namely, in Friedrich Schiller's *Die Räuber* (1781) and in Goethe's *Faust: die Tragödie erster Teil*, or simply, *Faust I* (1808). This makes Lenz's tragic, first and foremost, an intertextual literary phenomenon, and second, it makes *Die Soldaten* a trendsetting drama with respect to its tragic traits, and not necessarily for its renowned experimental and critical properties. It is through the three dramas, the tragic trilogy of the Sturm und Drang that I establish an intertextual inner tragic before describing how this dramatic strain relates to the bigger misconception that the Germans took a tragic turn from classical tragedy to the philosophy of the tragic without any link to Lenz's exemplary inner tragic. Since the objects of my investigation, *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* share a distinctive inner tragic literary pedigree, the intertextuality serves as a principle of selection for these texts being the core of my dissertation.

By most accounts, all three dramas are usually regarded, and rightly so, as literary works of the Sturm und Drang. Goethe's *Faust I*, in its final version, was published twenty-two years after his trip to Italy in 1786,³ but his original conception of Faust, the *Urfaust*, occurs in the early 1770s, and as such, the final version is generally considered a product whose foundation was formed during the *Geniezeit*.⁴ Much scholarship has been devoted to these three works, especially to their affiliation with the era in which they were either conceived or published. Despite a vast Sturm und Drang scholarship about these three dramas, however, scholars have

³ Goethe's travelogue *Italienische Reise* (1786) is considered his "rediscovery of classical learning, and it is through this lens that Goethe frames his own Italian experience" (Ter Horst 401) and also as the end of the Sturm und Drang.

⁴ *Geniezeit* is used here as a synonym for the Sturm und Drang, as is often the case in the research. At certain points of my analysis, the importance of *Genie*, especially as it relates to Lenz's tragic genius, explains my reasons for stressing this aspect of the Sturm und Drang.

written little about their intertextual inner tragic legacy – the three-phase structure that serves as the inner framework for a tragic process. Therefore, my objective is to enhance the scholarship with my examination of this inner tragic structure of Sturm und Drang drama.

The Lenzian Inner Tragic Structure

Going forward, the inner dramatic framework that captures the intertextual tragic process of the three dramas will be called the Lenzian inner tragic structure in honor of Lenz, the *Genie* (genius) who developed it for *Die Soldaten* as a part of his Sturm und Drang project. I make the argument that Lenz's inner structure is the work of a "tragisches Genie" ("Genie" *DWB*)⁵ in that his creation became an *Exemplar* that others emulated for its tragic depth. The terms *Genie* and *Exemplar* are considered here primarily in a Kantian sense and are connected to inspiration. Eldridge describes that the "importance of inspiration is increasingly shared from the early seventeenth onwards, the most well worked out and influential conceptions of artistic genius is put forward by Kant in sections 46-50 of *The Critique of the Power of Judgement*" (117). The term *Genie* in late eighteenth-century Germany defined an era, the *Geniezeit*, and it was even conferred upon those German writers in that era who demonstrated the kind of innate creative brilliance that Shakespeare supposedly possessed. In *Kritik der Urteilkraft* (1790), Kant famously claims that "*Genie ist die angeborene Gemütsanlage (Ingenium), durch welche die Natur der Kunst die Regel gibt*" (§46).⁶ Kant also describes different kinds of imitation with words such as *Exemplar*, *Nachahmung*, and *Nachäffung*. Cherry states that "Immanuel Kant argues that exemplars are useful for moral education, inspiration, and emulation" (56). In *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics* (1998), Kelly points out that Kant's "primary property [for genius] is originality...and it must be able to serve as a model for those who come after" (289). I use

⁵ *Deutsches Wörterbuch* is abbreviated *DWB* for in-text citations.

⁶ The "§" represents a specific section of Kant's *Kritik der Urteilkraft*.

Exemplar for Lenz because this term, in the Kantian sense, signifies that a genius has created something exceptional or original for others to emulate. More importantly, I use *Genie* in a tragic and wicked sense because, assuming my argument is correct, Lenz's *Exemplar* extends into *Faust I*, a work with the mark of a "böser Genius, Teufel" ("Genie" *DWB*). This evil genius designation is not necessarily indicative of the authors' characters, it simply acknowledges their panache for the tragic as dramatists. The inner tragic strain of the *Die Räuber* and *Faust I* shows a lineage traceable to the Lenzian inner tragic structure of *Die Soldaten*, and Lenz's genius should be acknowledged, but the three works as a whole represent a tragic trilogy of the Sturm und Drang.

As the centerpiece of this dissertation, the Lenzian inner tragic structure represents a point of origin. Keckeis offers the definitive⁷ examination of Sturm und Drang drama in his *Dramaturgische Probleme im Sturm und Drang* (1907), and in a commentary on the three unities⁸ of drama, he describes an "innere Form"⁹ (61) and an "äußere Form" (64) of Sturm und Drang plays. Although form is usually associated with genre in the English-speaking world, meaning, a play can take the form of a tragedy or comedy, in this particular case, the German word *Form* refers more to structure. Moreover, Keckeis likens this inner source to a will of a play much like Aristotle refers to plot as the "soul of tragedy" (21). According to Keckeis, the "innere Form"¹⁰ strebt nach der adäquaten äußern; im Problem der inneren Form liegt der Wille

⁷ Leidner's more recent work (1994) on Sturm und Drang drama relies heavily on Keckeis, and other works on the subject fail to address inner structure and unity as clearly as Keckeis.

⁸ I address Aristotle's three unities of drama (time, place, and plot) later in this Introduction and again in Chapter I with the review of the German theory of drama in the eighteenth century.

⁹ Keckeis also mentions "innere Einheit" (26) and "innere Gewalt" (3) in relation to the inner structure of drama.

¹⁰ Keckeis describes Goethe's preference for inner form as follows: "Im Anschluss an Wagners Mercierübersetzung schrieb Goethe: man soll nicht so sehr an der Technik der äußeren Form, an den Einheiten des Dramas, haften bleiben und von ihnen ein Urteil über ein dramatisches Kunstwerk abhängig machen wollen, sondern bedenken, dass es eine innere Form gibt, 'die sich von jener unterscheidet wie der innere Sinn vom äußern, die nicht mit den Händen gegriffen, die gefühlt sein will'" (65).

nach klarster, deutlichster Gestaltung, der Wille zum anschmiegendsten, alle Feinheiten verratenden Stil” (68). At the basic level of interpretation for this description by Keckeis, the inner structure, as will, contributes to the overall refinement of the outer structure, that which is presented in acts and scenes and corresponds to the play’s form, a tragedy or comedy.

There are a few points to make here with regard to the Keckeis commentary on inner and outer form and how this relates to the Lenzian inner tragic structure. First, the inner structure that Lenz presents in *Die Soldaten* is the will of his play because he takes the Aristotelian soul out by supplanting the primacy of plot for primacy of character. I elaborate on this act of soul-removing later in this Introduction and discuss the will in Rousseauian and Kantian terms in Chapter I. For now, my notion of will as it relates to the Lenzian inner tragic structure connotes a core driving force that is intertextual and equates to a general will, a force that connects the three drams as a whole. Second, Lenz’s *Die Soldaten* is officially a comedy (outer form) that has a clear tragic strain within. This dissonance between inner and outer structure/form is not an uncommon topic for debate in the scholarship on Lenz. As such, the Lenzian inner tragic structure explains the dramatic discord of *Die Soldaten* and possibly other works of this tragicomic nature.

Continuing with the topic of structure and form, the Sturm und Drang is considered an era of formless drama. Keckeis describes the tendency to view the Sturm und Drang drama as unformed: “Formlos nannten die Gegner das Drama des Sturm und Drangs, formlos nannten es später auch die Klassiker. Viel treffender wäre allerdings der Ausdruck ‘noch nicht geformt’ gewesen” (62). If we consider the sentiment of Keckeis and others as accurate, then, actually uncovering an inner tragic structure in an era of formlessness is in itself significant but not novel in the scholarship on the Sturm und Drang. The Lenzian inner tragic structure, as a whole, represents an internal arrangement, a structure within a structure, so to speak. A typical example

of this kind of multilayering that is often cited in the scholarship of the period is the Gretchen tragedy¹¹ of *Faust I*, a “sequence of seventeen clear-cut scenes (of the twenty-one scenes of the *Urfaust*), charged with grandeur and misery...the story of the girl abandoned by her lover” (Heffner 33). The Gretchen tragedy was introduced by Goethe during the early stages (1772-1773) of the Sturm und Drang movement “leading one commentator¹² to see in *Urfaust* ‘in the first order the tragedy of a woman’” (Smith, “The Confinement of Tragedy” 743). Although I argue in Chapter II that the Gretchen tragedy is more of a religious episode with an even deeper Lenzian inner tragic structure embedded in the episode, I do not dispute that Margarete’s (Gretchen’s) religious experience is an internal structure within the overall *Faust I* tragedy. Unlike the Gretchen tragedy’s rather clear-cut sequence of scenes, however, the Lenzian inner tragic structure presented by Lenz is more of a free flowing, three-phase arrangement within the overarching structure of the play that often cuts across the scenes of the plays. In the bigger frame, however, both the Gretchen tragedy and the Lenzian inner tragic structure demonstrate the kind of dramaturgical innovation displayed during the Sturm und Drang.

The final component of the Lenzian inner tragic structure requiring elucidation in this section is the tragic. At this stage, it would suffice to say that the intertextual inner structure of the three plays is tragic because it captures a tragic process that the protagonists experience. Although Szondi’s philosophy of the tragic features in Chapter V, it is necessary here to explain that much of the tragic that he traces in his *Versuch über das Tragische* (1961), especially in the ideas of the tragic from Schelling and Hölderlin, Szondi describes a tragic in terms of a

¹¹ The Gretchen tragedy refers to the circumstances surrounding Margarete in *Faust I*, and in most scholarly works the diminutive form of Margarete (“Gretchen”) is used to signify this inner tragedy. In keeping with the scholarship, I will use Gretchen tragedy when referring to the accepted notion that her experience is an inner tragedy of *Faust I* and Margarete when referring to the protagonist of *Faust I*.

¹² The commentator Smith refers to is Gerhard Sauder.

“Vorgang” (141) and stages that make up that tragic process. The Lenzian inner tragic structure has phases that convey a tragic process reminiscent of the process in the German theoretical tragic tradition that Szondi presents, only Lenz’s tragic predates the tradition by twenty years. Furthermore, the Lenzian inner tragic structure demonstrates features of its own, making it a unique manifestation of the tragic.

The Lenzian inner tragic also represents a turning from tragedy. Lenz’s tragic project was not only a turn from the kind of Sturm und Drang drama that *Götz von Berlichingen* represented in emulation of Shakespeare, but he also deviated from ancient form of high tragedy that began in ancient Greece and was used in more or less the same manner in Neoclassical France (1700s) and even in early eighteenth-century Germany. As Sir Philip Sidney eloquently wrote in *An Apology for Poetry* (1595), it is “high and excellent Tragedy, that openeth the greatest wounds...and teacheth the uncertainty of this world, and upon how weak foundations gilden roofs are builded...” (117-18). As Heitner points out in *German Tragedy in the Age of the Enlightenment: A Study of in the Original Development of Tragedies 1724-1768* (1963), however, the German high and excellent “tragedies of the 1720s, 30s, 40s, 50s, and 60s are, with rare exceptions, the shallowest, most amateurish works imaginable...” (xi).

This disparaging sentiment about German tragedy is largely attributable to the German’s meticulous imitation of French Neoclassical tragedy, a perceived perversion of Aristotelian tragedy, especially the three unities. This German scorn for French drama in the late eighteenth-century is highlighted in the section on the German theory of drama in the next chapter, but Lenz’s tragic, albeit relevant to the bigger French–German discord on drama and theater, is something different. Like most things concerning Lenz, his inner tragic structure is arguably more relatable to a thought or discourse of the distant future. Leidner and Wurst make the point

that Lenz was writing for new age (xii), and if this accurate, then the theoretical discourse a century later between Friedrich Nietzsche and Walter Benjamin on the tragedy is noteworthy. Dowden explains that unlike “Nietzsche, who views tragedy as renewable source for the modern world, Benjamin thinks it to be wholly unavailable and unrenovable” (Dowden 11). Lenz’s tragic project signifies that tragedy is indeed renewable, but only in the form of a new inner tragic, the kind of tragic that intellectuals like Schelling, Hölderlin, Nietzsche, Benjamin and others would later ponder.

On the whole, the Lenzian tragic project was his experiment with the tragic art in order to transform the inner workings of drama, but this literary endeavor serves as a bridge to the theoretical tragic that Szondi terms the philosophy of the tragic in *Versuch über das Tragische*. Szondi asserts that “seit Aristoteles gibt es eine Poetik der Tragödie, seit Schelling erst eine Philosophie des Tragischen [und] sie bleibt der deutschen Philosophie eigen...” (7). Indeed, according to Szondi, a German tragic philosophical tradition, as opposed to the Greek tradition of tragedy as a form of drama, emerges in the German-speaking intellectual world around 1795 (with Schelling). According to Lambropoulos, the “tragic is abstracted from the drama and its circumstances for the first time at a fascinating moment in history when moral, political, and artistic demands converge in the German confrontation with modernity” (8). This modern German tragic tradition begins, I argue, not in 1795 with Schelling, but with the Lenzian inner tragic structure. In other words, it is Lenz’s *Exemplar* and its continuance in *Die Räuber* and in *Faust I* that sets the proverbial stage for the moment when tragic is eventually abstracted from tragedy. Also noteworthy is the tragic of everyday life which truly guides Lenz’s project and presages another work that will feature in Chapter V, Maurice Maeterlinck’s “The Tragical in Daily Life” (1896). Maeterlinck begins his essay with a statement about a tragic that Lenz would

properly capture a century earlier with his inner tragic structure: “There is a tragic element in the life of every day that is far more real, far more penetrating, far more akin to the true self that is in us than the tragedy that lies in great adventure” (115).

The actual inner arrangement of the Lenzian inner tragic structure, is composed of 1) a psychological exposition, 2) physical climax, and 3) emotional dénouement. My research has uncovered Lenz’s efforts to capture a certain process that is not tragedy but something deeper. In order to properly capture this deeper mystery of tragic drama, Lenz reads Aristotle and uses the Greek philosopher’s principles in a different way in order to accurately depict what I refer to as the inner tragic of *Die Soldaten*, an internal development that became more of a Sturm und Drang intertextual tragic process in *Die Räuber* and *Faust I*. Considering the comedy as an essential outer form for this inner tragic, Lenz develops his inner tragic structure in consultation with Aristotle. Unlike the French and Gottsched, who remained nearer to neoclassical spin-offs, and unlike Lessing and Herder, who searched for a truer Aristotelian model, Lenz takes the more obvious rules of the *Poetics* and bends them slightly to create the inner tragic structure. At the same time, the Lenzian inner tragic structure captures the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process, a series of experiences and events that the protagonists suffer as they prepare for tragic action. A major argument of mine postulates that the Sturm und Drang tragic process, as captured by the Lenzian tragic structure, is what would later be the basis for the abstraction of tragedy for the philosophy of the tragic in the German tradition, and not directly from Aristotelian tragedy of the *Poetics*.

The Three Phases of the Sturm und Drang Inner Tragic Process

Serving as a preview and a frame of reference for the analyses of the dramas in Chapters II, III, and IV, this overview presents the phases of the Sturm und Drang Inner Tragic Process.

The phases correspond to the Lenzian inner tragic structure, and in this section, the major characteristics of each phase are provided. The first tragic phase is captured by the Lenz's psychological exposition and takes the form of an exposé of the mind instead of a traditional exposition that provides the basic information about characters, setting, and time at the start of the play. In this expository phase, the psychological distresses or mental anguish of the protagonists is on full display. In most cases, a neurotic episode highlights the first phase and is akin to what Aristotle describes as a "scene of suffering [that is] the destructive or painful action, such as death on the stage, bodily agony, wounds and the like" (33). In the *Poetics*, Aristotle provides a famous example of a scene of suffering from Sophocles' tragedy *King Oedipus* – the moment when Oedipus learns of his tragic fate (he had killed his father and married his mother). Unlike Aristotle's scene of suffering that usually occurs towards the end of ancient Greek tragedies, Lenz's scene of psychological suffering is a moment of self-shattering that occurs near the beginning of the plays. The self refers to the psychological dimension of personality more than the external physical form of the person.

The source of this self-shattering scene of psychological suffering is a realization or an acute awareness of one's tragic situation in which a loss of hope and a plunge into despair occur and bring about the fragmentation of one's self. Similar to the Lenzian realization, the scene of suffering in the ancient Greek tradition is caused by *anagnorisis* (recognition), the "change from ignorance to knowledge, producing love or hate between the persons destined by the poet for good or bad fortune" (Aristotle, 31). According to Aristotle, the "best form of recognition is coincident with a Reversal (*peripeteia*) of the Situation, as in the *Oedipus*." (31). Drawing again a comparison with Aristotle, the recognition and reversal combination of ancient Greek tragedy occur ideally near the end and prior to the scene of suffering. In the Lenzian inner tragic

structure, however, everything occurs near the beginning of the play in the psychological exposition, first the tragic realization, then the scene of self-shattering, and eventually the reconstitution of self in the second phase which equates to Aristotle's reversal. Although similar to the Aristotelian reversal, the reconstitution of self in Phase II does not represent a change in fortune, but rather a change in appearance. All six protagonists under analysis from *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* experience this first phase with varying levels of despondency, irrational thinking, and thoughts of suicide.

The first phase of self-shattering can also be considered a kind of fragmentation, a word that has special meaning in late eighteenth-century German politics and literature. Fragmentation best describes the political state of affairs in German-speaking Europe known as *Kleinstaaterei*. Fragmentation is also a word that is often associated with the fragmentary nature of some Sturm und Drang texts such as Herder's *Fragmente über die neuere deutsche Literatur*, Riga (1766/67), Goethe's *Faust: ein Fragment* (1790) and an even earlier *Dramenfragment* of Faust from Lessing in 1759 that technically falls within the Sturm und Drang purview. Leidner aptly points out that "fragmented works are said to be typical of Sturm und Drang" (10) with the example of the "tradition's most fractured text: the first draft of Goethe's *Faust I* (1808), called the *Urfaust*" (10). Both shattering and fragmentation will be used to describe the crumbled self of the protagonists of the first phase, but when applicable, fragmentation will also relate the sufferings of the first phase with a broader significance of textual and political fragmentation of the period.

The second phase of the Sturm und Drang Inner Tragic Process corresponds to the physical climax; its major feature is self-reconstitution that equates to a tragic selfhood, a state that conceals and projects and a condition that involves some degree of physical transformation. In this phase, the original self, shattered and hidden, is replaced with a tragic self that makes the

person basically unrecognizable even technically as themselves. This tragic selfhood is a voluntary acceptance of a condition that will knowingly lead to some extreme form of violent “destructive or painful action” (Aristotle 33), such as murder. The assumption of tragic selfhood and the physical transformation equates to kind of *Bildung* (formation), either a *Selbstbildung* (self-formation) or a *Umbildung* (transformation) of oneself. Much like fragmentation, the German word *Bildung*, especially in the era of the Sturm und Drang, has a special significance that will be explained in detail later with a discourse between Rousseau and Kant from the 1760s about human malleability and notions of human perfectibility. In contemporary Germany, *Bildung* is often associated with the modern education system, but in the late eighteenth century the “Bildung der Menschen” (“Bildung” *DWB*) was less systematic and more aligned with the Enlightenment’s aspiration of achieving the highest good or noblest form of *Menschheit*, another important concept that features at the end of this Introduction with the *Menschheit* continuum. For now, it is important to understand that Lenz incorporates *Bildung* into his inner tragic scheme for the second phase, and as the analyses show, this voluntary tragic *Umbildung* of the self has consequences that are irreversible. This second phase also serves as the transition from the first psychological phase to the third emotional phase but does not necessarily represent the middle (or *Höhepunkt*) of the plays. As mentioned, the inner tragic structure flows through the acts and scenes and is the middle of the inner tragic structure but does not demarcate a halfway point of the story. This phase of reconstitution represents a moment when the shattered protagonist figuratively picks up the pieces and reassembles the self in a form that is distorted. This new unrecognizable form is needed for the characters to complete a number of actions, some secondary measures during the second phase, but most significantly the final violent action in the third phase that completes the inner tragic cycle with an emotional finale. In *Goethe's*

Allegories of Identity (2014), Brown discusses “Goethe’s use of dramatic allegory” (96) and considers an “invisible self that drives the action” (96) in *Faust I* as an intricate and elusive energy that resembles the tragic self of the inner tragic process.

The third phase of the Sturm und Drang Inner tragic process is depicted by Lenz in an emotional dénouement and features a death wish, “the conscious or unconscious desire for the death of oneself or of another” (“death wish” *Merriam-Webster*). After experiencing psychological distress (self-shattering) and undergoing a physical transformation (in essence or appearance), the emotions boil over in the third phase and lead to violence in the form of murder. In the classical sense, most tragedies are designed to excite certain emotions in the audience, usually either pity or fear. As Aristotle describes in the *Poetics*, during a tragedy’s finale, or catastrophe (dénouement), the audience is expected to commiserate with the figures experiencing the tragedy and thereby undergo a *catharsis* or purging of such emotions. The third phase of the Lenzian inner tragic structure is strictly a resolution in the sense that a murderous action has been completed while under the guise of tragic selfhood. The protagonists experiencing the intertextual inner tragic do make the deepest emotional impression with their emotional resolution just as the “Greek drama makes its strongest impact through generally subtle representation of emotional stress.” (Lind ix). In contrast, the emotional impact from the Lenzian inner tragic structure is less subtle but certainly just as distressing. Moreover, in classical tragedy recognition and reversal are “the most powerful elements of emotional interest in tragedy” (Garver xxviii), and both occur generally near the end. The Lenzian equivalent for Aristotelian recognition and reversal, realization, and reconstitution, occur instead with psychological and physical interest in the beginning and in the middle of the inner tragic structure. Nevertheless, there are aspects in the Lenzian inner tragic that can be quite comparable to the “psychological

transformation, an outward expression of an inner conflict that...rise to that level of human suffering which is the essence of Greek tragedy” (Lind ix).

Lenz and Aristotle: Liberties and Lineage

The comparisons made thus far between the Lenzian inner tragic structure and the tenets of Aristotelian drama as outlined in his *Poetics* have only presaged the critical discourse that Lenz had with Aristotle in his theoretical work “Anmerkungen übers Theater” (1774). Most of the German theory of drama for this dissertation will be covered in Chapter I, but Lenz’s engagement with the *Poetics* in “Anmerkungen übers Theater” provides us with the finer points and a solid understanding of his Sturm und Drang tragic project and the inner tragic structure of the plays that underpin the project. As was the fashion on the late eighteenth-century German literary scene, Lenz directly engaged the classical primary source, the *Poetics*, instead of relying on French interpretations of Aristotle, and like Lessing before him, Lenz applied his interpretations of the ancient drama for his modern drama. Unlike Lessing’s more conservative approach to Aristotle in *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* (1767), Lenz took unusual liberties with the rules that Aristotle outlined in his study of Greek tragedy to punctuate his project and to set a course for inner tragic. Many of Lenz’s unorthodox methods concerning the elements of Aristotelian drama are evident in the previous sections on the Lenzian inner tragic structure and in the overview of the phases, but the exchange goes deeper. A closer look at the *Poetics* in conjunction with the “Anmerkungen übers Theater” provides the clues as to why Lenz crafted *Die Soldaten* in a way that represented his turn away from a Götz-inspired Sturm und Drang drama to a tragic project all his own.¹³

¹³ In general, Lenz is considered different, a trend setter of the Sturm und Drang whose “writings are unlike any other texts of the tradition – Lenz’s creations refuse to press their author’s rhetorical advantage into service” (Leidner 11). In this respect, Lenz’s works are considered prototypes for others to emulate, and *Die Soldaten* is often viewed as the prototypical formless drama, a mixture of tragedy and comedy.

According to most accounts about the “Anmerkungen übers Theater,” Lenz’s essay was an attempt “die Grundzüge eines nationalen bürgerlichen Dramas zu formulieren” (Hammer 532). In reality, Lenz’s commentaries on the theater were mostly interpretations of Aristotle’s *Poetics* in a quasi-response to French neo-classical interpretations of ancient Greek theater. At the outset of “Anmerkungen übers Theater,” Lenz expresses his “große Hochachtung für den Aristoteles” (298) and the *Poetics*, a work Lenz quotes numerous times in this critical work about the theater. The main topics of Lenz’s “Anmerkungen übers Theater” are the top two elements of Aristotle’s six-point hierarchy for tragedy, the plot (in conjunction with *mimesis*) and character. Lenz’s commentary is of particular interest because he essentially agrees to disagree with Aristotle on tragedy, and it is within this subtle conflict that we uncover the basis for the inner tragic structure he developed for *Die Soldaten*.

In the *Poetics*, Aristotle outlines the major aspects of Greek drama, especially for tragedy. Aristotle defines tragedy as “an imitation [*mimesis*] of an action that is complete, and whole, and of a certain magnitude...a whole is that which has a beginning, middle, and end” (23). According to Aristotle, imitation of the action is plot (the combination of actions), and a plot –what Aristotle calls the soul of tragedy – can be either simple or complex; the former containing a reversal or “the change of fortune [*peripeteia*]” (31) and the latter containing both reversal and “recognition [*anagnorisis*]” (31) In most cases, the combination of reversal and recognition at the end of the plot represents the best tragedy, with *King Oedipus* being the supreme example in Aristotle’s opinion. In his six-point hierarchy of drama, Aristotle gives primacy to plot while placing character as the second most important aspect. Although Aristotle’s description of plot and character serve as initial targets in Lenz’s “Anmerkungen übers Theater,” there are some other important aspects of tragedy along Aristotelian lines that

require elucidation because they are also evident in Lenz's inner tragic structure. In reading Athenian tragedies "we cannot escape the constant repetition of such words as necessity, fate, chance, destiny, and God's purpose" (Agard 117). Above all, the Greek tragic heroes, whose tragic flaw [*hamartia*] compels them to struggle against fate, experience the full brunt of tragedy when they essentially defy the will of the gods. In tragedy, the defiance of fate leads to some catastrophe in which the tragic hero suffers much anguish, and as result, the audience also suffers frightfully and experiences in its empathy *catharsis*, the purging of the pity and fear they share with the tragic hero. Probability, and not historical accuracy, is also a hallmark of Aristotelian theory of drama in that the tragic poet should not write history but instead craft an ideal of the human drama with a succinct arrangement of elements and events (i.e., complex plot) that guides characters despite their reluctance to follow the path to their tragic fate (a word akin to fatal). Aristotle highlights all of these components of Greek tragedy and sets the classical rules for drama that have influenced dramatists for centuries, including Lenz during his search for a structure to frame the inner tragic of Sturm und Dang drama.

In relation to classical tragedy, one aspect in particular, *hamartia*, is an example of how Lenz, Schiller, and Goethe adapted classical ideas in novel ways. *Hamartia*, which means missing the mark, or in many sources tragic flaw, is a kind of miscalculation on behalf of the tragic hero. In most cases, however, *hamartia* is best considered as missing the mark. For example, in Sophocles' *King Oedipus*, Oedipus misses the mark when attempting to save his city from the plague by finding the murderer of the Theban king. As we see in the plays of this dissertation, the Lenzian inner tragic structure has no missing of the mark in the sense of Greek *hamartia* which is a hallmark of Athenian tragedy. The tragic protagonists in *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* are all determined to and will hit the intended mark while accepting their

tragic fate with eagerness. Greek tragedy is more of the human conflict with fate and the missing of the mark, both of which are less prevalent in this German inner tragic of drama.

Instead of criticizing Aristotle's stance on tragedy outright, Lenz simply shuffles the Greek philosopher's ideas and makes use of them in different ways. First and foremost, Lenz makes character the most important consideration in his drama and, in effect, relegates plot, the Aristotelian soul of tragedy. By giving primacy to character, Lenz alters the fundamental nature of tragedy and, by extension, adapts the themes of tragedy to suit his tragic project and chart the inner tragic process of Sturm und Drang drama. Agard claims that a "deterministic motif does run steadily through Greek plays" (121) and leaves us to wonder if freedom is even possible in writing tragedy. Much like the Rousseauian and Kantian vision of eighteenth-century human nature, the nature of tragedy was malleable. Lenz downgrades the plot in an attempt to upgrade the tragedy to that of a higher form, the tragic, and he does so by restoring the soul of drama to the characters, the people (Ger. *Menschen*). Instead of the plot guiding characters to their fate as in ancient Greek tragedy, the Lenzian inner structure captures a tragic in process, characters deciding their fate. Although the idea of characters deciding their own fate does not seem wicked on the surface, underneath Lenz seeks to show an underlying tragic of self-determination or human agency. In this respect, Lenz's restoration of the soul of drama to the character equates to his desire to promote the idea that an infusion of agency could also be possible in real people but with a word to the wise on tragic. As my theory of the *Menschheit* continuum shows in the final section of this Introduction, Lenz was writing for the common people (*Menschen*) through his common characters to highlight the prospects of human agency while presenting the darker side of agents who look to go beyond balanced levels of agency.

Lenz's striving for a people centric plot (*Menschenhandlung*)¹⁴ was the impetus for his overall approach to drama and outer structure, but the inner tragic process made it necessary to also formulate an inner structure. Still needing to sequence actions, Lenz developed an Aristotelian-based beginning-middle-end *Exemplar* with a few tragic twists. Although Lenz sequenced the outer structure of *Die Soldaten* around comic human experiences and actions, it is clear that he sequenced the inner structure around the tragic experiences of the protagonists, Stolzius and Marie. Unlike Aristotle, Lenz gives primacy to the *Mensch* over *Handlung*, and this is truly an act of restoring the soul of drama to its characters, the *Menschen*. Nevertheless, Lenz sequences his *Menschenhandlung* in a three-phased Aristotelian fashion with a clear beginning, middle, and end in which the hallmark attributes of Aristotle's plots, the reversal and recognition, are incorporated, but in a different way. Whereas Aristotle's supreme examples of tragedy have reversal and recognition nearer to the end in the final build-up just before the resolution, Lenz begins his inner tragic structure with a recognition in a psychological exposition. In addition, Lenz uses a form of reversal, or a reconstitution of self, to indicate a physical *Umbildung* in the middle phase. Lenz's finale involves a violent action and signifies the emotional or even perhaps the metaphysical. In true classical tragic fashion, Lenz makes allowances for *catharsis* in the end as the emotional stage presents the final outcome for the tragic *Menschen* in all three dramas. Thus, the three phases of the Lenzian inner tragic structure represent three aspects of the *Mensch* in his or her social milieu, for the "modern tragic character, says Lenz, has society to deal with" (Leidner and Wurst, 14).

¹⁴ Lenz does not use the term *Menschenhandlung*, but it is evident that a people-driven plot was his intent. Therefore, I will use *Menschenhandlung* to refer to Lenz's overall approach to plot in drama, that is, a plot driven by people and not by fate (tragedy would be more of a *Schicksalhandlung*).

In his evaluation of character, Lenz addresses his second preference, realism instead of ancient tragedy's probable and ideal. Lenz values "den Charakteristischen, selbst den Carrikaturmahler zehnmal höher als den Idealischen, hyperbolisch gesprochen, denn es gehört zehnmal mehr dazu, eine Figur mit eben der Genauigkeit und Wahrheit darzustellen" ("Anmerkungen übers Theater" 295). Lenz's desire to develop plots around the common *Mensch*¹⁵ provides the exactness and realism for the magnitude of tragic he was trying to achieve. In the Lenzian mode, true tragic depends on realism and brings us closer to the essence of even Maeterlinck's tragic in daily life. While Lenz rejects Aristotle's notion of probability, he does acknowledge his view on imitation (or *mimesis*) when he considers "das Wesen der Poesie sei Nachahmung der Natur" ("Anmerkungen übers Theater" 295). Lenz's *modus operandi* as dramatist, however, became the imitation of human nature. Lenz even describes that imitation is "für die menschliche Natur" ("Anmerkungen übers Theater" 295) at the lowest level and in the realest terms, and this is the *Wesen* of his tragic experiment. Based on the portrayals of characters in *Die Soldaten*, Lenz was interested in presenting an impartial look at human nature and suffering because "die objektive Realität war für Lenz also Ausgangspunkt und Gegenstand der Kunst." (Hammer 533). For Lenz, Aristotle's idea that "the poet first constructs the plot on the lines of probability" (25) would be an act of distorting the very reality needed to achieve the real tragic, not the ideal of tragedy. Lenz preferred strict lines of realism with no imitation of action per se, but rather imitations of human nature, especially the darker aspects of human nature that serve as the essence of the tragic.

¹⁵ The discussion on *Mensch* and 'man' features in the next section, but from this point forward, I will use the German word *Mensch* for human being, mankind, or man when referring to characters in the plays (when not referring to them as protagonists) because the term best represents the intent of Lenz to elevate *Menschen* and diminish notions of destiny, fate, and chance.

Circling back to Lenz's oration about *Götz von Berlichingen* and the importance of character, Lenz elaborates: "Wählen Sie sich die Rollen nach Ihrem Lieblingscharakter, oder erlauben Sie mir sie auszugeben... durchs Agieren drückt sich der Charakter tiefer ein" ("Über *Götz von Berlichingen*"). Again, Lenz offers his services, this time, to distribute the kinds of characters that form deep impressions through action. As Lenz demonstrates in *Die Soldaten*, he was no longer interested in ideal characters, but instead in the real *Menschen* that could deliver the deeper impressions required for producing the inner tragic of the plays. I cannot overstate the importance of the term *Mensch* as opposed to character. Lenz's quote about character from "Über *Götz von Berlichingen*" is about character, but a year later in "Anmerkungen übers Theater" it is more about "einen Menschen zu sehen" (258) and especially "einen Menschen zu zeigen" (258).

In addition to the Lenzian liberties with Aristotle's Poetics, there is also the Lenzian lineage to trace in this section. The inner tragic structure referred to as 'Lenzian' is considered Lenz's project for German drama of the Sturm und Drang. Moreover, the Lenzian inner tragic structure is his *Exemplar*, a kind of template that he offers for others to follow or imitate. Obviously, Lenz was determined to offer his services, to take the lead in the Sturm und Drang project, and to provide something to the German drama, and when he did, it was *Die Soldaten*. In several accounts there is a strong consensus that regards Lenz's *Die Soldaten* as a key work in German theatre, and the influence it has had on Büchner, Grabbe, Wedekind, Brecht, and Horvath validates the Lenzian effect. My argument simply states that the Lenzian effect took root much earlier in the works of Goethe and Schiller at the level of tragic. Although Goethe was writing his *Urfaust* in the early 1770s before the publication of Lenz's *Die Soldaten*, the scene *Hexenküche* in *Faust I*, the proposed second stage of the Lenzian inner tragic structure, was

actually added later in *Faust: Ein Fragment* in 1790. Furthermore, two scenes in *Faust I*, namely *Nacht. Straße vor Gretchens Tür* and *Kerker*, are potentially components of the third phase that were written well after the Sturm und Drang period and for the final version of *Faust I* in 1808. Therefore, it is appropriate to view *Die Soldaten* as the *Exemplar* and Lenz as not only the initiator, but also as a bone fide *Genie* of the Sturm und Drang in terms of inspiration, originality, and talent.

It is well known that Goethe revised his *Faust I* throughout the late eighteenth century after the publication of *Die Soldaten* and *Die Räuber*, despite starting it before both. In “*Die Gretchenfrage: Goethe and Philosophies of Religion around 1800*” (2011), Smith indicates that Goethe’s *Fauststoff* underwent several “major revolutions—a Kantian and a post-Kantian” (184) in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and there was a “rethinking that occurred during this period on themes of mankind, nature, God, and religion” (184). It is plausible to consider that Kant was not the only influence on Goethe during this time especially since Goethe was in close contact with Lenz in Strasbourg and both Lenz and Schiller in Weimar; Goethe even expelled Lenz from Weimar in 1776, the year of *Die Soldaten*. According to Leidner, Goethe had “a talent for dispatching from his life things he found unsettling, whether feelings or people” (92). In any event, Goethe mentions Lenz and *Die Soldaten* a few times in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* (1811–14, 1833) and admits in Chapter III:14 that he admired Lenz’s talent (Goethe writes: “ich seine Gaben wirklich sehr hoch schätzte”) and had even received a copy of *Die Soldaten* (Goethe writes: “er [Lenz] sendete mir...seine Manuskripte, den *Hofmeister*, den *Neuen Menoza*, *Die Soldaten*...”). This does not prove that Goethe was influenced by Lenz, it just offers potential evidence that he may have added Faust’s second and third phases of the inner tragic process post-*Die Soldaten*.

The *Menschheit* Continuum: *Mensch*, *Kraftmensch*, *Übermensch*

The tragic process that the Lenzian inner structure of drama captures is experienced by *Menschen*, the male and female literary protagonists whose modern condition at the psychological, physical, and emotional levels presents a realism that captures a real-life tragic instead of an ancient profile of tragedy. Like *Bildung*, *Genie*, and *Exemplar*, *Mensch* has a special significance in late eighteenth-century Germany and will be used in that context in its original German to make a specific point or substantiate a certain claim of mine. The *Menschheit* continuum encapsulates the lineage discussed in the previous section that serves as a special tragic connection between *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*. Understanding the *menschliche* connection between these three dramas, I argue, is essential to recognizing the tragic they share as the mode of *Menschheit* evolves each level.

At the basic level, the *Menschheit* continuum is a three-tiered spectrum of tragic that charts a *Mensch* ascend from the common *Menschen* of *Die Soldaten*, through the *Kraftmenschen* of *Die Räuber* to the *Übermenschen* of *Faust I*. They are all *tragische Menschen* who experience the same tragic process charted by the Lenzian inner structure. For clearness and reassurance, there are numerous references made in the scholarship that allude to the commonness of Lenz's *Menschen* in *Die Soldaten* while other sources specifically refer to the characters of Schiller's *Die Räuber* as *Kraftmenschen* and point out the use of *Übermensch* in Goethe's *Faust I*. Based on the references in the scholarly works to these types of *Menschen* for each work, the *Menschheit* continuum technically exists, it is just suggestive that the very three dramas that share the Lenzian inner tragic structure show evidence of elevation in *Menschheit* on that continuum. My task is to explain this *Mensch* ascendancy in relation to the inner tragic process that connects them. There are other significant reasons (to be discussed in this section)

for using *Mensch* and positing the idea of a *Menschheit* continuum to augment my analysis of the three plays, but above all the *Mensch* designation captures the essence of Lenz's protagonists and serves as the point of departure for a detailed explanation of the *Menschheit* continuum.

Lenz's protagonists of *Die Soldaten*, Stolzius and Marie, represent the *Menschen*, the lowest level on the continuum. Each level of *Menschen* in this section receives a general definition from the Grimm *Deutsches Wörterbuch* and a specific textual reference from the plays about *Mensch* that serves as a preview for the analyses. This double-source approach will help explain my logic for identifying the continuum and using it to accentuate the Lenzian inner tragic structure. The renowned *Deutsches Wörterbuch* of the Brothers Grimm is the primary source for German words prior to the dictionary's publication in 1854 and it is in this work that *Mensch* (and its derivatives) receives its first comprehensive definition in a German language publication. According to the Grimm dictionary, the word "Mensch bezeichnet, wie in der älteren Sprache das neutr. Mensch...allgemein ein menschliches Wesen, somit in jedem von beiden Geschlechtern, sowie jedem Lebensalter." ("Mensch" *DWB*) This definition states the obvious, a *Mensch* is a human being (*menschliches Wesen*) that encompasses both genders (*beiden Geschlechtern*). The adjective *menschlich* is also defined in the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* using the Latin '*humanus*' (which is 'humane') and to be humane means "zum Menschengeschlechte gehören" ("Mensch" *DWB*).

The *Deutsches Wörterbuch* even provides examples of *Mensch* that appear in Schiller's *Die Räuber* and Goethe's *Faust I*. As the literary analyses show, the three plays are replete with the term *Mensch* and, in most examples, there is something philosophical imbedded in the *Menschen* passages, usually an anecdote about what it means to be a *Mensch* according to the minds of eighteenth-century Germans. A quote from *Die Räuber* under the entry of *Mensch* in

the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* offers a rough example of the *Mensch*–*Kraftmensch* distinction. The quote from *Die Räuber* is a scene in which the father Moor (*Alter Moor*) pleads with his son¹⁶ Karl Moor to have a “*menschliches Herz*” (4:V),¹⁷ in other words, to be a *Mensch*, but *Alter Moor* is unaware that Karl cannot be *menschlich*. As I demonstrate in the analysis of *Die Räuber*, Karl cannot be a *Mensch* because he is a *Kraftmensch*, and his elevated *Menschheit* in accordance with the continuum makes it impossible to do something *menschlich*, that is, a deed with truly honorable intent. In contrast, the *Mensch* Stolzius (male protagonist) in *Die Soldaten* commits murder in the name of honor, he avenges the indignity committed against Marie, the female protagonist.

The *Mensch* entry in the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* also describes “*Mensch [als] der Mikrokosmos, die Welt im kleinen*” (“*Mensch*” *DWB*) and includes a quote from Goethe’s *Faust I* in which Mephistopheles speaks to Faust about the folly in thinking that one is complete: “*wenn sich der Mensch, die kleine Narrenwelt, gewöhnlich für ein Ganzes hält*” (1347-1350).¹⁸ As with much of the *Übermensch* dialogue in *Faust I*, there is an uncanny interaction between earthly and supernatural beings that seem to take place at times in a mythical dimension. The interaction between human and supernatural figure is a key element of the *Übermensch* designation for both Faust and Margarete. As the following textual examples from *Die Soldaten* show, there are subtle differences in inner tragic with each level of *Menschen*, but the phases, characteristics, and results are all very similar.

As stated earlier, at the lowest level on the *Menschheit* continuum are the protagonists of *Die Soldaten*, the *Menschen* Stolzius and Marie. The designation of *Menschen* is an analytical

¹⁶ In this scene *Alter Moor* thinks he is speaking to a stranger; he does not recognize his son Karl.

¹⁷ All in-text citations for dramas will have the name of the play (if not mentioned in the preceding text), act (Arabic numeral) and scene (Roman numeral).

¹⁸ Since *Faust I* does not have acts and scenes, the line number will be used.

category extrapolated from the scholarship but also refined for usage in my examination of the *Die Soldaten*. In consideration of the scholarship and the way Lenz depicts Stolzius and Marie, it is safe to declare that they are common *Menschen*, the little folk of society. Strictly speaking, Stolzius and Marie are member of the middle-class, the German *Bürgertum*. Leidner and Wurst explain that Lenz was going through a phase in 1775–76 when he bid “farewell, great men, geniuses, ideals!” (xii), preferring instead “to walk among the poor, broken, weak mortals” (xii). The broken (shattered or fragmented) souls at the lower rung of society best represent Lenz’s *Menschen* because these were the kind of human beings that “could lend his drama tragic authority” (Leidner and Wurst xiii).

The protagonists of *Die Räuber* are the next level up on the continuum, the *Kraftmenschen*. In the *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, *Kraftmensch* is defined as an “urkräftiger Mensch, Kraftnatur” (“Kraftmensch” *DWB*), basically a human force of nature. Moreover, *Kraftmenschen* possess “eigenartige Begabung, naturell” (“Kraftmensch” *DWB*) with links to “das griech. Dämon, δαίμων” (“Kraftmensch” *DWB*). Butler includes a section called “The Daimon” in her discussion of Goethe and considers the “daimonic element as described in *Poetry and Truth* is a genuine mythological creation, which owed something undoubtedly to the daimon of Socrates as interpreted by Hamann...to Goethe himself and his intimate personal experiences” (*The Tyranny of Greece Over Germany* 151). Although the daimon applies more to an *Übermensch* according to Butler’s commentary, the *Kraftmensch*, as something more than a mere *Mensch*, is a category of human that brings us closer to the *Übermensch*. Relating this back to *Die Räuber*, Leidner has a chapter called “A Titan in Extenuating Circumstances: Sturm und Drang and the *Kraftmensch*” and in it he explains how “Schiller’s transformation of the *Kraftmensch*, in *Die Räuber*” (58) takes the *Kraftmensch* “from a destructive to a unifying force” (58).

In this elucidation of *Kraftmensch* and *Die Räuber*, the term *Kraftkerl* is worth mentioning because most male literary figures of the Sturm und Drang are critically classified, and often rightly so, as excessively misogynistic *Kraftkerls*. In the article “The Mirror and The Tower: Masculinity and Specularity in Klinger's *Die Zwillinge* and Gerstenberg's *Ugolino*” (2009) Schuman explains that German dramatists of the Sturm und Drang created primarily *Kraftkerl* characters who demonstrated “hypersexualized male subjectivity...all of whom are in one way or another ‘reflections’ of each other” (127) and all “express violence toward women and desperation with male impotence” (127). Seeing the Sturm und Drang male literary figures as *Kraftkerls* and the female characters solely as the victims of a desperate male struggle with impotence (among other things) is certainly one way of viewing the situation. The *Menschen* designation does not discount the fact that issues of gender existed in the era of the Sturm und Drang or on the pages of its dramas. Strictly speaking, *Menschen* are “zum Menschengeschlechte gehörend” (“Mensch” *DWB*), meaning, the term *Menschen*, when used, covers all genders. Certainly, there are differences, but with Karl and Amalia as *Kraftmenschen*, for example, if forceful speech, quick temper, and propensity for physical violence typify a *Kraftmensch*, and both Karl and Amalia speak forcefully, react with swift indignation, and commit physical violence on another (which they do), then, both exhibit *Kraftmensch* qualities. At the same time, the respective *Mensch* designations on this continuum, especially *Kraftmensch* for Amalia and *Übermensch* for Margarete, do not diminish the fact that women in the eighteenth century were viewed more as objects and foils for the male characters. In this respect, the *Menschheit* continuum shows some intriguing insights about the possibilities that a non-gendered *Menschheit* could hold.

In keeping with the spirit of the *Menschheit* continuum, Schiller's protagonists in *Die Räuber* are considered *Kraftmenschen*, the human beings who represent an elevation on the *Menschheit* scale in several ways. The Sturm und Drang is an era known for *Kraftmenschen* whose "undisciplined *Schwärmerei*" (Leidner 52), energetic behavior, and strong language mark their impulsive temperaments. Karl Moor, the male protagonist of *Die Räuber*, fumes over a "schlappe Kastraten-Jahrhundert" (1:II) and yearns for the "Lichtfunke Prometheus" (1:II) to spark an age of chinless wonders. Despite his antecedent *Kraftkerl* Götz, *Kraftmensch* Karl must reinvent himself to fulfill his destiny. Amalia, the female protagonist of *Die Räuber*, speaks with such fierceness when addressing a man that it totally shakes his apparent supremacy: "Ungeheuer! Schamloser Lästere! Siehst du, wie gottlos, wie abscheulich du bist – geh aus meinen Augen!" (1:III). Amalia even reacts with such violence that her male adversary helplessly beats his chest and stamps his feet like a childish rage. Mortensen claims that "the freedom that Schiller grants his feisty and independent-minded heroine Amalia" (48) was difficult material for eighteenth-century audiences considering that "overt disobedience in men was outrageous enough, but violent predilections in women" (48) was nearly intolerable. The behaviors of Karl and Amalia are certainly more forceful and ambitious than the timid actions of *Menschen* Stolzius and Marie, and as *Kraftmenschen* who shake their earthly surroundings, they anticipate the rise to the supernatural and Goethe's *Übermenschen* of *Faust I*.

In *Faust I*, the term *Übermensch* appears in the conversation between Faust and the *Erdegeist*, the spirit that mocks Faust's horror by sarcastically referring to him as superhuman: "Welch erbärmlich Grauen faßt Übermenschen dich" (489-490). Goethe's use of the term *Übermensch* for Faust establishes a tradition that Del Caro claims eventually developed into a duel with Nietzsche's Zarathustra in "a rivalry among Superhumans" (144). Del Caro also states

that the interaction with the *Erdgeist* left “Faust shattered” (145). My analysis will show that Faust’s self-shattering in the first phase of the tragic process occurs even before his disappointing meeting with the *Erdgeist*. In any case, the protagonists of Goethe’s *Faust I* are *Übermenschen* according to the *Menschheit* continuum, that means the transcendent designation of human in this series of *Menschen* and the culmination of the cycle for inner tragic structure. As alluded to previously, the *Übermensch* designation is perhaps the most controversial in terms of the history¹⁹ involved with the use of the concept as it relates to Nazism in the twentieth century. Nevertheless, the initial comment on the term *Übermensch* was an effort to describe the idea behind the continuum and explain the problems with masculinizing *Mensch* in translation. As the Grimm *Deutsches Wörterbuch* explains, the “ältesten Belege für Übermensch wurden aus der theologischen Prosa (16. u. 17. Jahrhundert) nachgewiesen: sie (die Anhänger Luthers)” (“Übermensch” *DWB*). Interestingly, the early use of *Übermensch* involves “moralischen Fähigkeiten über den menschlichen Durchschnitt” (“Übermensch” *DWB*). This above-average moral ability has its roots in Lutheran theology and retained this moral emphasis until the eighteenth century when Herder further developed the concept:

Herder übernahm das Wort nicht einfach, sondern bildete es gleichsam neu wie das schwanken zwischen un-, über- und auszermensch bei ihm zeigt, die theologische Beschränkung auf moralisch hochwertige und dadurch den durchschnitt überragende Menschen fehlt allen anderen Belegstellen bei ihm, die Bedeutung nähert sich der von Heros, Halbgott, Genie. (“Übermensch” *DWB*)

The Grimm *Deutsches Wörterbuch* provides a critical point in that “von Herder übernimmt Goethe das Wort im Sinne von Originalgenie, Vollmensch, Kraftmensch” (“Übermensch” *DWB*). In this elucidation from the *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Goethe ‘overtook’ (inherited) Herder’s *Übermensch* and used it in the sense of *Kraftmensch*, but the protagonists in *Faust I* are

¹⁹ The entry in the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* outlines a history of the term *Übermensch* that begins with Luther.

more in the Herder sense, the demigod (*Halbgott*), and thus, demonstrates an advancement from *Kraftmensch*.

A final commentary on the *Mensch* designation involves issues of translation and also the role of translation with respect to my analysis. In a “wonderfully readable translation”²⁰ of *Faust I* by Salm, the passage between Faust and the *Erdegeist* reads: “What pitiable terror seizes you, you superman?” There are two aspects that need to be addressed here concerning *Mensch*. First, there is a tendency to translate *Mensch* as human being, but *Übermensch* as superman (masculine) in many texts. *Übermensch* is usually associated with Friedrich Nietzsche and his use of the term in his book *Also sprach Zarathustra* (1883) as a designation for a certain kind of human aspiration to be a superhuman. In “Finding the *Übermensch* in Nietzsche's Genealogy of Morality” (2005), Loeb provides a detailed account of Nietzsche’s superman in more human terms by which humankind of Nietzsche’s age transcend the decadence of late nineteenth-century Germany. Moreover, Loeb describes “Nietzsche's famous sovereign individual [the *Übermensch*], the ripest fruit of humankind’s entire prehistoric labor” (77). As for relevance with respect to the translation of *Mensch*, Del Caro explains the nuances concerning Nietzsche and his use of the term *Übermensch*:

Just as *Mensch* means human, human being, *Übermensch* means superhuman... I use human being, mankind, people, and humanity to avoid the gendered and outmoded use of “man.” Two things are achieved by using this combination. First, using “human being” and other species-indicating expressions makes it clear that Nietzsche is concerned ecumenically with humans as a species, not merely with males.²¹

²⁰ This is a quote from the back of Bantam Classic’s *Faust, First Part* (1985) and used somewhat sarcastically. There is “A Note on the Translation” (xvii–xviii) from Salm about his desire to “steer an intermediate course” but he also explains that his style of “translation [in *Faust*] easily suffers from a jingling quality that may vitiate or even falsify the mood of the original.” This is not a revelation, but some English translations (such as Salm’s translation of *Mensch*) will be used, and sometimes critiqued, to substantiate an argument that I am trying to make.

²¹ This is a footnote from Del Caro in Nietzsche’s *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (5).

Translating *Mensch* as man (male) represents an inclination to exclude women from the discussion. My analysis of the female protagonists as *tragische Menschen* in accordance with the continuum places their tragic-ness on the same level as the male *tragische Menschen*. My approach addresses a serious issue in the scholarship, in particular for Marie and Amalia, because the research done on the Stolzius and Karl far outweighs the analysis done on their female counterparts. In “Amalia: The Third Extraordinary Person in Schillers *Die Räuber*” (1994), Stern draws attention to the fact that “few have given Amalia much consideration” (321). Stern adds that “Gerhard Kluge believes that the widespread scholarly and critical neglect of Amalia is unjust” (321), and it is in this spirit that the *Menschheit* continuum gives the female protagonists equal weight with the male with regards to their enlightening properties for the inner tragic. In terms of their tragic-ness, there are differences in which the male and female protagonists experience the inner tragic process. The differences do not make any protagonist less interesting or more insightful over the other. On the contrary, the differences in tragic-ness provide a holistic picture of the inner tragic process and the structure that provides the frame.

Suffice to say, there are a number of other relevant aspects of context and theory of the late eighteenth century that figure into a multifaceted analysis of the intertextual inner tragic structure of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*. There are the intellectual and literary currents (and countercurrents), in particular a scholarly debate about the relationship between the Enlightenment and Sturm und Drang is pertinent to any discussion of German literature of that time. The social, political, economic, and religious tensions, many of which are linked to the currents, are pertinent and will highlight aspects of late eighteenth-century German society that appear in the texts of Lenz, Schiller, and Goethe. Of great importance is the influence of France and the German rejection of French cultural and literary models. Philosophy is an essential

component considering that most works of the period, especially *Faust I*, are profoundly philosophical in content and many of the dramatists, like Schiller in particular, wrestled with Kantian idealism. Considering that all three works under investigation are dramas, the theory of drama will provide some critical underpinnings for genre, structure, and formal ties. Finally, there are other dramas of the late eighteenth century, like *Götz von Berlichingen* and Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's *Emilia Galotti* (1772), that help put the tragic intertextuality of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Fast I* into the appropriate perspective because *Götz von Berlichingen* and *Emilia Galotti* do not share this specific inner tragic despite being referred to in the scholarship as models of Sturm und Drang drama. That said, all of these topics will be covered in Chapter I: The Foundations of the Lenzian Inner Tragic. Chapters II, III, and IV constitute the analysis of the inner tragic structure of the three literary works and represent the bulk of this dissertation. Chapter V details the links between the inner tragic structure and the classical tragedy, the philosophy of the tragic, *Faust II*, and modern psychology. The Conclusion provides a final commentary on the significance of the findings in this dissertation. The remainder of this introduction will explain the Lenzian inner tragic structure and the notion that the protagonists are all experiencing the same tragic as different forms of *tragische Menschen*.

**CHAPTER I:
THE UNDERPINNINGS OF THE LENZIAN TRAGIC PROJECT
1700–1773**

“Das, was edle Philosophen von der Welt gesagt haben,
gilt auch von Shakespearen: das, was wir böse nennen, ist
nur die andre Seite von Guten...”

Johann Wolfgang Goethe, “Zum Shakespeares-Tag”

The Enlightenment and the Evaluation from Rousseau and Kant

There are various contexts, literary works, and theoretical essays of the eighteenth century that potentially provided the impetus for Lenz to develop his tragic project for Sturm und Drang drama. Most of the information in this chapter contributed in some way to my interpretation of the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*. Naturally, the Enlightenment, as the dominant intellectual current of the eighteenth century, would feature prominently in any discussion of the Sturm und Drang because of the much-debated relationship between the two movements in the scholarship. The claim that the Sturm und Drang is a one of the “first shots” (Garrard 16) as a countercurrent within the Enlightenment helps accentuate Lenz’s tragic project as an undercurrent of the Sturm und Drang, a movement with its own undertones. Before I address the actual debate about the relationship between the Enlightenment and the Sturm und Drang and explain its significance to the Lenzian inner tragic structure, an outline of the Enlightenment and then the Sturm und Drang will serve as a buildup to some of my statements about Lenz’s project and the inner tragic of the plays.

By most accounts, the Enlightenment was an “intellectual movement that knew no national boundaries” (Kramnick ix). Peter Gay’s *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation, The Rise of Modern Paganism* (1966) explains the Enlightenment as “united on a vastly ambitious program, a program of secularism, humanity, cosmopolitanism, and freedom above all, freedom in its many forms – ” (3). Indeed, the Enlightenment as a transnational movement is referred to

as the “modern emancipatory project” (Velkley 45) in which the main agents of liberation, the philosophers, empower the individual and facilitate his or her release from the shackles of the restraining order (social or religious) by encouraging the use of one’s own reason. Reason was also meant to be a rational guide that would free the human mind from its slavery to passion and its instrumental use of reason. The tenets of the Enlightenment were many, but the primary watchwords were reason, tolerance, individualism, liberalism, progress, and secularism. Most of these Enlightenment themes appear in the texts of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*, but freedom and individualism are most prominent, and understandably so considering that the tragic traced by Szondi congregates around freedom and necessity.

Philosophy was a major source of Enlightenment thought with philosophers from across Europe offering various perspectives that contributed to a more or less integrated multinational intellectual movement. Although the French *philosophes* such as Voltaire, d’Alembert, Diderot and Rousseau feature prominently in most accounts of the Enlightenment, the “*philosophes* themselves saw three Englishmen as the prophets of Enlightenment, and they dedicated their *Encyclopédie* to Bacon, Locke, and Newton” (Kramnick ix). The German intellectuals usually associated with Enlightenment thought are Leibniz, Wolff, Kant, and Lessing. There are also a number of Enlightenment thinkers who are known more for their skepticism or uncertainty about the Enlightenment, such as the Scottish philosopher David Hume, Italian Giambattista Vico and the Germans Hamann and Herder. Moreover, even some of the more devoted Enlightenment philosophers such as Rousseau and Kant highlight some of the imperfections of the Enlightenment, but on the whole remained fervent defenders of the movement’s essence and sought to develop a more systematic and thorough grounding of Enlightenment rational projects. Kant was especially keen on presenting a critical philosophy that would serve as a completely

new foundation for the faculty of human reason. For the purposes of this dissertation, the commentary from Rousseau and Kant about human malleability within the context of the Enlightenment is relevant to the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process because human malleability in the physical sense and the notion of self-transformation (*Selbstumbildung*)²² is key to the second phase of the inner tragic process.

In the decade prior to the peak of the Sturm und Drang in the 1770s, Swiss philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau was laying the foundations for what would be considered, in effect, the “undertaking [of] a new kind of Enlightenment.” (Velkley 52). For the most part, Rousseau’s Enlightenment undertaking centered on the notion that reason was considered instrumental to human passion, and as such, the human was essentially a slave to passion. Operating under passion’s dominion, the human was expected to use its reason to control its surroundings and fuel the human drive for progression. This early modern instrumental account of reason stems from the Hobbesian theory of humankind as fixed in wickedness, slaves to self-serving passions that reject notions of classical and medieval teleology. On the whole, the early Enlightenment enterprise was considered the modern emancipatory project (freeing man from nature’s mastery) and its rationalism served as the basis of the Enlightenment (freeing man from religion’s superstition). Rousseau’s consideration of the instrumental account of reason was not necessarily critical, he essentially contemplated the possibility of opting out of this fixed view of human nature. In other words, Rousseau focused on the individual’s ability to change oneself or even perfect oneself. Comparable in certain respects, Rousseau’s new kind of Enlightenment enterprise could be comparable to Lenz’s subsequent undertaking of a new kind of Sturm und Drang the tragic lines that accompany the individual’s desire to change oneself.

²² There are no examples of the term *Selbstumbildung* in the German texts covered in my research despite the fact that this is what occurs during tragic selfhood.

In *Freedom and the End of Reason: On the Moral Foundations of Kant's Critical Philosophy* (1989), Velkley points out that Rousseau makes some significant discoveries about the flexibility of human nature in his critique of the Hobbesian view of human nature as bad and fixed. Specifically, Velkley describes how “the natural desires and the human faculties as a whole are not fixed in their character, but have a certain malleability, or as Rousseau puts it rather ironically, they have a certain quality of ‘perfectibility’” (54). Rousseau’s deliberation on human malleability and its potential for perfectibility triggered his subsequent reflection on the proper way of forming and possibly perfecting the *Mensch* of the eighteenth century. According to the writings of Rousseau, he believed that the practices of forming (or educating) *Menschen* in his time had been twisted in the guardianship of the Enlightenment. One of Rousseau’s masterworks is *Emile, or On Education* (1762), and as the title conveys, it is a treatise on education and also on the nature of the proper way of carrying out education. Therefore, the theme of *Menschenbildung* was a hot topic in the decade before Lenz’s *Die Soldaten* and suggests that the core of phase two of the Lenzian inner tragic structure has its roots in the 1760s with Rousseau’s critique of the Enlightenment’s modal of human formation. Furthermore, Rousseau’s confrontational stance is relatable to another prototype of early Sturm und Drang literature, Goethe’s “Prometheus” (early 1770s), the anti-hymn about the titan who forms *Menschen* in his image, or in a manner in opposition to God’s method. Much like Lenz’s Sturm und Drang tragic project represents a turn from Goethe’s modal for drama, *Götz von Berlichingen*, the second phase of Lenz’s inner tragic structure represents a new deliberation on *Menschenbildung* along tragic lines and a second turn to address matters of *Bildung* in the tradition of Rousseau and Goethe.

In his readings of Rousseau, Kant outlines some interesting discoveries of his own in *Remarks* (1764-65)²³ about the autonomy of human reason. Velkley points out that “Rousseau’s complex attack on modernity...[is] taken over by Kant ...[and] under the influence of Rousseau, he discovers it...the existence of a ‘third faculty’ one of freedom, understood as self-legislative reason” (45). Kant’s idea of a self-regulating reason as an autonomous faculty (free from passion’s dominion) that has its own hidden logic is the precursor to his transcendental logic, a foundational component of the *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781). Central to Kant’s self-legislative reason (freedom) is also the notion of the will, the power of the human soul to acquire autonomy over passion. This Kantian will seeks to maximize freedom and strives to achieve unity of the self. Moreover, the Kantian will is destined to rule itself, and “at the same time, capable of transforming itself” (Velkley 54). In Kantian terms, the will fuels a self-legislative reason and provides it “the power to redeem itself, to have salvation without recourse to the superhuman as the agent of salvation. Providence can be justified, for the human species’ effort to emancipate itself need not be tragic” (Velkley 65). This quote from Velkley about the Kantian will is overflowing with terms and ideas that relate well to other scholarly contributions, namely Keckeis’ notion of the inner will of the Sturm und Drang drama and Agard’s pessimism about the possibility of freedom in tragedy. Not to mention, the constellation of superhuman salvation, tragic emancipation, and self-transformation in Velkley’s quote, all themes of the Lenzian inner tragic structure, show the roots of Lenz’s tragic project. Although Kant believes that emancipation itself does not have to be a tragic process, evidently Lenz felt differently because the freedom and agency that the protagonists demonstrate to transform themselves for action has

²³ Velkley explains that Kant’s *Remarks* are “marginalia made by Kant in his copy his aesthetic and moral treatise *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime* (1764), They normally go by the title of *Remarks* to that work, although Kant gave them no title” (49).

a dark side that requires a tragic conclusion. At the same time, it seems that not only Goethe was experiencing a Kantian revolution, but also Lenz was evidently moved by Kant's philosophy.

Although Kant was not anti-Enlightenment, he understood that there was room for improvement concerning the Enlightenment's modern emancipation project and would later outline the problems and prospects of the Enlightenment in his essay "Was ist Aufklärung" (1784). Kant critiques the Enlightenment for not going far enough or being fully complete, as his summing up question illustrates: "Wenn denn nun gefragt wird: Leben wir jetzt in einem aufgeklärten Zeitalter? so ist die Antwort: Nein, aber wohl in einem Zeitalter der Aufklärung" ("Was ist Aufklärung"). As for the implications for the Sturm und Drang and the Lenzian tragic project, the critique from Rousseau and Kant of the Enlightenment serves as a precursor to the Sturm und Drang as a countercurrent within the age of reason and as an antecedent of Lenz's critique of Sturm und Drang drama in the form of a tragic turn.

The Sturm und Drang and its Founding Figures, 1759-1772

The Sturm und Drang, unlike the Enlightenment, was strictly a German affair with a focus on cultural renewal. Leidner describes the Sturm und Drang as a "cultural phenomenon unique to German-speaking Europe" (18). In the English-speaking world, the Sturm und Drang is known as the Storm and Stress, a title that conveys the turbulent nature associated with the movement. But what was so turbulent about the Sturm und Drang? For the most part, the unrest of the Stürmer und Dränger concerned a yearning or plea for emotion in an age of reason. This turbulence also created a general desire for release or need to express. Taylor refers to an *expressivism* that arose "with the diffuse movement we know as the *Sturm und Drang*, although it continues well beyond its demise" (1). According to Taylor, the term expressivism emerges from Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803) whose work represented a protest against the

Enlightenment view of the human and its relation to nature. Furthermore, Taylor describes the desire for a more radical freedom in the Kantian sense and quest for unity (i.e., of self, with nature, within Germany). As Taylor describes, it was the hope of Herder to “unite the two ideals, radical freedom and the expressive fullness” (6) in order to relieve the storms and stresses of the age. As a literary movement, the Sturm und Drang was not necessarily a cohesive enterprise organized by German writers but was instead a nexus of certain tendencies, trends, and characteristics that made its relationship to the Enlightenment ambiguous because they both shared some basic premises but occasionally arrived at different conclusions.

In any event, whereas the Enlightenment was predominantly driven by philosophy, the Sturm und Drang is generally considered a literary movement or a literary period in which the drama, the theory of drama, and the national theater served as the main sources and forums of thought. It is in the German drama of the 1770s and 1780s that the Sturm und Drang is exemplified in the strongest terms with radical depictions of rebelliousness, titanism, Teutonism, and idealistic visions of *Volk*, nature, and pessimism. Much of what exemplified the Sturm und Drang was linked to the notion of *Genie* and literary works of such genius. The Sturm und Drang is also known as the *Geniezeit*, a moniker that accentuates originality of thought that was sought in German intellectual and literary circles. Schneider explains that the *Geniezeit* is seen as the “gleichfalls übliche und noch häufiger gebrauchte Betitelung Sturm und Drang...” (1) and as a *Geistesströmung* much like the Enlightenment had a “Interesse am Menschen” (2) with “volkpsychologische Gründe” (4). As the first phase of the Lenzian inner tragic structure demonstrates, there is an interest in the psychology of *Menschen* in the form of an exposition of their mental anguish. As the tragic genius of the Sturm und Drang, Lenz understands to

importance of a deep psychological probing to start the tragic process, and it is this deep-rooted psychology that I connect to *Tiefenpsychologie* in Chapter V of this dissertation.

There are three figures that feature as founders of the Sturm und Drang in contemporary scholarly literature about the movement, namely Georg Hamann (1730–1788), Johann Caspar Lavater (1741–1801), and Herder. Beiser refers to Hamann as the “father of the Sturm und Drang” (16) and considers his *Sokratische Denkwürdigkeiten* (1759) as “the first manifesto of the *Sturm und Drang*, the first influential attack upon the *Aufklärung*’s principle of the sovereignty²⁴ of reason” (*The Fate of Reason* 24). According to Beiser’s account of Hamann, the Sturm und Drang, as an extension of Hamann’s manifesto, would be adversarial to the Enlightenment.

The core of Beiser’s account of Hamann as father of the Sturm und Drang hinges on Hamann’s rejection of reason’s authority in human affairs and how this denial of reason’s sovereignty brought Hamann into conflict with the supposed defender of the age of reason, Kant. Fundamentally, Hamann defended the “authority of the Bible” (Beiser, *The Fate of Reason* 17) and championed a kind of *sola scriptura* (scripture as sole authority) theology that Martin Luther advanced in conjunction with his principle of *sola fide* (by faith alone). Apparently, Hamann’s preference for biblical authority caused a clash with Kant, but around that same time, in the 1760s to be precise, Kant was writing under the influence of Rousseau, and Kant’s “critique of modern instrumental accounts of reason brings about, on a modern basis, a renewal of certain aspects of the classical autonomy of reason” (Velkley 44). Technically, Kant’s critique, then, was directed against the same reason that Hamann was rejecting. Fundamentally, both Hamann and Kant were assessing some aspect of Enlightenment accounts of reason, and despite Beiser’s

²⁴ In essence, the sovereignty of reason means reason’s freedom from human passion. Subjugated by human passion, reason is simply viewed as instrumental, a means of achieving the ends of passionate desires.

claim that they were at odds philosophically, they were essentially two sides of the same coin. Beiser's emphasis on the conflict between Hamann and Kant, which sounded more personal than intellectual, overshadows the idea of Hamann as the father of the Sturm und Drang because his rejection of Kant's autonomy of reason is considered the beginning of the Sturm und Drang and its departure from Enlightenment ideals. If the Sturm und Drang is indeed an extension of Hamann and it was his goal "to defend the spirit of Luther when the *Aufklärung* threaten to destroy it" (Beiser, *The Fate of Reason* 17), then, this would be in opposition to Enlightenment secularism and efforts to diminish the Catholic's church authority. Ironically, the Catholic church was the nemesis of both Luther and the Enlightenment.

Unfortunately, this account of Hamann's defense of Luther and his conflict with Kant does not add much to Lenz as the tragic genius of the Sturm und Drang or the intertextual tragic of the three dramas. Lenz, a former student of "his favorite professor, Immanuel Kant" (Leidner and Wurst 4) at the University of Königsburg, published his first poem "Die Landplagen, ein Gedicht in sechs Büchern, nebst einem Anhang einiger Fragmente" (1769) while in Kant's hometown. Leidner and Wurst explain that critics viewed Lenz's poem as a "boring sermon in the spirit of Pietist austerity: God, the poems says, has a reason for letting loose plagues on us; we should try to be better Christians" (4). If anything, Lenz's first work, a poem published before "he became part of the literary movement of Sturm und Drang (Leidner and Wurst, 4), shows traces of the conflict between Kant and Hamann and the pre-Sturm und Drang Lenz that appears to return after his experiences with the literary circle at Strasbourg from 1771 to 1774.

The second founding figure of the Sturm und Drang is Johann Kaspar Lavater, a theoretician who inspired Herder, Goethe, and even Lenz. The source of Lavater's inspiration for the Stürmer und Dränger was the optimism and hope that he described in *Aussichten in die*

Ewigkeit (1768–73). Despite the pessimistic tendencies of the Sturm und Drang, there was clarity in the hope of Lavater, especially his desire to make “das ganze Menschengeschlecht zu Einer Familie” (3:92 – 93). Regarding Lenz’s inner tragic structure, I would argue that Lenz rejects Lavater’s hopeful outlook because the first phase of the inner tragic structure is when hope turns into despair with the realization of the tragic situation. Nevertheless, Lavater, like Hamann before him, also offers the viewpoint as a theologian whose “positive, confidence-building Christianity taught his followers to give themselves a great deal of credit for their faith” (Leidner 18) and whose argument for Christian homiletics seems to have influenced both Lenz and Goethe. For example, in *Die Soldaten* there is a statement by the character Haudy about the power of the sermon or a theater performance:

Ich behaupte Ihnen hier, daß eine einzige Komödie und wenn's die ärgste Farce wäre, zehnmal mehr Nutzen ich sage nicht unter den Offizier allein, sondern im ganzen Staat angerichtet hat als alle Predigten zusammengenommen, die Sie und Ihresgleichen in Ihrem ganzen Leben gehalten haben und halten werden. (1:IV)

Similarly, in Goethe’s *Faust I*, when the *famulus* Wagner claims that an actor could give lessons to a preacher, Faust responds with “Ja, wenn der Pfarrer ein Komödiant ist; Wie das denn wohl zu Zeiten kommen mag” (528-29). This similarity not only shows the influence of Lavater but is also a fine example of the many connections that *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* share. Continuing with Lavater, his relevance to the Sturm und Drang and its relationship with the Enlightenment is not conclusive for the relationship being either complementary or oppositional. Lavater’s main idea of a timeless human steadfastness grounded in Christianity resembles Hamann’s preference for biblical authority, both of which are grounded in Pietism, the religious sect within the greater Protestant fold that would find more of a friend in the Enlightenment as the common enemy of the Catholic church. Much like the conclusion about Hamann, if the Sturm und Drang is an extension of Lavater, then, the debate (featured at the end of this section)

about its relationship with the Enlightenment is neither exactly complementary nor totally confrontational.

The third major intellectual figure of the Sturm und Drang is Herder. Already mentioned in relation to expressivism, Herder is perhaps the most important of the Sturm und Drang prime movers because his effect on Goethe in Strasbourg in 1770 led to works of literature such as “Prometheus” and *Götz von Berlichingen*, the texts that are considered prototypical of the Sturm und Drang. Herder’s influence on Goethe and the Sturm und Drang drama will feature more in the theory of drama section, but for now it would suffice to mention that his literary criticism and appreciation for medieval German lyric poetry and folk songs made a serious impact on Stürmer und Dränger yearning for self-expression.

Concerning the Enlightenment, Herder’s “rejection of all things French” (Ogg 224) was not necessarily a rejection of all things Enlightenment despite the fact that “Herder certainly attacks Enlightenment abstraction [and] the arrogance of its Eurocentric historical teleology” (Denby 55). Unlike Hamann and Lavater, Herder’s views on the German language, folklore, national consciousness, and Germanic mythology follow a stream of thought that is akin to the kind of paganism that Gay seems to suggest in *The Enlightenment: The Rise of Modern Paganism*. Moreover, the “relation of Herder to Hamann turns out to be far more equivocal, since ‘in the end it was the influence of Kant that proved victorious’” (Zammito et al. 670). According to Zammito, Menges and Menze, Herder was certainly influenced by Hamann, but under the influence of Kant, Herder secularized Hamann’s thought by explaining it in a naturalistic and rational way. At the same time, Herder’s turn to natural science, and in particular anthropology, contributed to the Sturm und Drang reaching its zenith in the early 1770s with the release of literature that captured the spirit of his thought.

In Herder's writings we see the first real animosity toward the French from a founding figure of the Sturm und Drang. Although the Sturm und Drang was a German movement, much like the Enlightenment, it was also emancipatory. There was a general longing among the Stürmer und Dränger to free themselves from the constraints of their age, usually Enlightenment reason is credited as the source of the constraint. Compounding the restricting nature of reason was the influence the French exuded through Enlightenment culture. In one form or another, the Sturm und Drang represents a German reaction to the Enlightenment that usually focused on the French and their influence over the Enlightenment in Germany. The debate about the nature of the relationship between the Enlightenment and the Sturm und Drang sheds some light on Lenz's relationship with the Sturm und Drang and his desire to follow a tragic thread within the movement proper.

In the previous century of scholarship (prior to the 1980s), most schools of thought view the Sturm und Drang, for better or worse, as either an extension of or separate current within the Enlightenment. Edith Braemer's *Goethes Prometheus und die Grundpositionen des Sturm und Drang* (1959) echoes a Marxist view held originally by Georg Lukacs that perceives the Sturm und Drang as a continuation of the Enlightenment that provides deeper examinations, for example, of class conflict. On the other hand, there are scholars such as Herman August Korff whose work *Geist der Goethezeit* (1955–57) views the Sturm und Drang as a separate thread and as an ideological rival that serves as an irrational counterpart to the Enlightenment. Representing more recent scholarly accounts about the relationship between the Sturm und Drang and the Enlightenment, authors John H. Zammito, Karl Menges and Ernest A. Menze present the following argument:

Recent scholarship insists that Sturm und Drang be seen as a development within the Enlightenment, and not its abandonment. Gerhard Sauder has formulated this continuity thesis elegantly, conceiving Sturm und Drang as the ‘dynamization and internal critique’ of Enlightenment. ‘Dynamization’ entailed enlightening the wider public, empowering its capacity to think for itself. In other words, Sturm und Drang was an element in the *Popularphilosophie* which dominated the German Aufklärung in the 1770s. But it was also ‘internal critique’: it challenged the ways in which Enlightenment—not only in France, but also and perhaps especially in Germany—was falling short of, or even betraying its own ideas and aspirations, especially from the social vantage of young men of talent. (669)

On the other hand, Leidner considers the Sturm und Drang as something fundamentally oppositional to the Enlightenment:

Can Lenz’s scrambled plots, the abject superbia of Klinger’s raging protagonists, or a play like Schiller’s *Die Räuber*, which seems designed to make an audience side with a murderer, really be traced to relatively homogenous currents of eighteenth-century European thought and sensibility? I do not think so. (2)

Leidner’s statement leads one to believe that the Sturm und Drang was homogenous in its opposition to Enlightenment thought. The Sturm und Drang, as previously mentioned, was not itself a unified program, there were fractures within, Lenz’s praise of *Götz von Berlichingen* and his subsequent turn from Goethe’s early drama being a prime example. In reaction to Leidner’s statement, it is difficult to imagine the Enlightenment or the Sturm und Drang as homogenous currents when considering what has been written during those periods and the scholarship about those movements. Both the Enlightenment and the Sturm und Drang seem to have contending factions and internal disputes, but most of the discord within follows a general flow of the movement. The continuity thesis presented by Zammito, Menges and Menze seems to strike a balance in the debate about the relationship between the Enlightenment and the Sturm und Drang, meaning, the Stürmer und Dränger simply dared to push the boundaries of the Enlightenment. In a similar fashion, Lenz’s tragic project tests the limits of the of the Sturm und Drang drama, in particular the bourgeois tragedy it was famous for.

This dissertation is not designed to set the record straight in the debate about the relationship between the Sturm und Drang and the Enlightenment, but simply to show the standard demarcation of the two movements and to show how it relates to the Lenzian inner tragic structure. *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and the genesis of *Faust I* are usually considered dramas of the Sturm und Drang in the sense that they represent in some form or fashion the German literary movement that is generally portrayed as anti-Enlightenment. In some cases, Schiller's *Die Räuber* being a great example, the roar of the Sturm und Drang challenges the entire civilized world, not just the Enlightenment. Although Zammito, Menges and Menze disagree with Leidner concerning the nature of the relationship, the idea of Sturm und Drang as internal critique of the Enlightenment in their article does find some accord in Beiser's *The Impatient Muse: Germany and the Sturm und Drang*. Leidner explains there was the "Sturm und Drang's well-known propensity for self-critique" (48) instead of what some may interpret as self-promotion. As I interpret Leidner's claim, the self-critique angle would be the Germans critiquing themselves as Stürmer und Dränger, primarily in the style of *Götz von Berlichingen*. Leidner and Wurst state that "Herder, Friedrich Maximilian Klinger and others saw the need to rein in some of their own attitudes" (13) and, as a result, the Stürmer und Dränger created a "microclimate of self-critique" (13). At the same time, the Lenzian inner tragic also appears to be a critique of a certain self within the Sturm und Drang, in this case, a self that is acquired through a tragic process, and not necessarily a self-critique that encapsulates an entire movement.

A brief look at the major characteristics of *Götz von Berlichingen* provides a clear profile of the drama that embodied the Sturm und Drang. First, Goethe portrays an actual German historical figure, Götz the *Freiherr* (En. baron, literally "free man") who fights in the name of liberty and justice. Second, as a vigorous German of principle, Götz inspires with energetic

action and powerful language such as the famous Götz-Zitat: “er kann mich am Arsch lecken” (Act 3). Third, Götz leads a (peasant) rebellion and defies a corrupt system administered by a disingenuous authority. Finally, the protagonist Götz personified the Shakespearean strains of individualism, defiance, and decency. *Götz von Berlichingen* seems to capture the main tenets of the Sturm und Drang drama, and as Lenz admits in his essay of *Götz von Berlichingen*, it was a watershed drama for the movement. As it turns out, *Götz von Berlichingen* became the Enlightenment of the Sturm und Drang, and according to Leidner, Schiller’s *Die Räuber* was more of a critique of “German dramatists [who] found themselves creating the *Kraftmensch*” (48). Of course, I argue that before Schiller, Lenz set a new course for the Stürmer und Dränger with *Die Soldaten* and its inner tragic strain which was his idea of challenging the kind of Sturm und Drang that *Götz von Berlichingen* established.

The German Theory of Drama in the Eighteenth Century

Lenz’s “Anmerkungen übers Theater” is one example of an array of German theorizing about the drama and theater in the eighteenth century that constitutes a veritable golden age of German theory of drama. Lenz’s contribution to this golden age of theorizing about the drama is a continuance of a discourse dominated by several prominent motifs. Among the many motifs, the discourse about Aristotle’s *Poetics* is *the* leitmotif. This is somewhat misleading, the primary object of analysis was indeed the *Poetics*, but the direct engagement with Aristotle’s text was the Sturm und Drang way of targeting its nemesis, French Neoclassicism. In general, the French influence on German life was stifling, but the French interpretation of Aristotle and their models of drama were even more oppressive. Therefore, the Germans theorized and experimented with the drama in order to circumvent French Neoclassicism and develop a drama and theater that suited their Germanic temperament and instructed their German audience. Lenz’s

“Anmerkungen übers Theater” is one example of a Sturm und Drang theoretical text that directly engages and reconsiders the classical Aristotelian rules of drama within the context of anti-French sentiment in Germany’s literary milieu during the later phases of the Enlightenment. In order to fully understand Lenz’s theory and subsequent innovation, a brief outline of the theoretical discourse the leads up to his “Anmerkungen übers Theater” is pertinent.

Many of the hostile attitudes taken by Germans toward the French in late eighteenth-century Germany were also directed at their own compatriots like Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700–1766), the author of *Versuch einer kritischen Dichtkunst* (1730). Considered a reform-minded work that espoused French Neoclassicism, Gottsched’s poetics²⁵ serves as the beginning of the German theoretical discourse on the drama and set a standard for German drama over the next thirty years known as the *Ständeklausel*. Gottsched made extensive commentary on both Greek and Latin theories of drama but prefers Horace over Aristotle and composes his poetics mostly within the purview of French Neoclassicists who provided the “examples to refine provincial (vulgar) German sensibilities” (Demetz 302). Gottsched’s poetics offers a thorough exploration of the two classical forms of drama – tragedy and comedy – and insists on maintaining a *Ständeklausel* for German dramas, that is, keeping the tragedy highbrow while preserving comedy’s lowbrow status. Concerning the leitmotif of Aristotle and his *Poetics* as it relates to Lenz, Gottsched explains that “bei den Griechen war also, selbst nach *Aristotels* Urteile, die Tragödie zu ihrer Vollkommenheit gebracht” (23). Unlike Lenz, however, Gottsched remains steadfast in maintaining Aristotle’s “Einheit der Handlung, der Zeit und des Ortes”

²⁵ Although the word *Poetik* exists in German, *Dichtkunst* is considered the purer German word for poetics. Gottsched’s poetics refers to his *Versuch einer kritischen Dichtkunst*.

(*Versuch einer kritischen Dichtkunst* 28) in a manner consistent with Pierre Corneille's "Of the Three Unities of Action, Time, and Place" (1660).²⁶

In the chapter "Von Tragödien oder Trauerspielen," Gottsched provides critical commentary on the basic elements of the tragedy and the *Trauerspiel*, the German mourning play that was common in the Baroque period (1600s) and the future object of examination in Benjamin's *Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels* (1928). It is noteworthy that Gottsched considers both tragedy and mourning play as one in the same. According to Gottsched, both tragedy and mourning plays are the same "weil sie zu ihrer Absicht hatte, durch die Unglücksfalle der Großen Traurigkeit, Schrecken, Mitleiden und Bewunderung bei den Zuschauern zu erwecken" (23). Steiner remarks that a "clear demarcation between these two terms was essential not only to a grasp of baroque drama and the baroque world-view, but also to that of certain aspects of German literature in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries" (14). The term *Trauerspiel* surfaces in the Sturm und Drang and several plays were named as such, often with *bürgerlich* (bourgeois) as attributive adjective. A deep discussion about the distinction between *Tragödie* and *Trauerspiel* is not my intent, but both classifications of drama are linked to the two plays, *Die Soldaten* (*Komödie*) and *Die Räuber* (*Schauspiel*), that are not officially tragedies or mourning plays in their standard forms.

Lenz and Schiller both struggled with the appropriate classification for their dramas and demonstrate another connection in their consideration of *Tragödie* and *Trauerspiel* in the Sturm und Drang tragic trilogy. Yiull states that Lenz referred to his comedy *Der Hofmeister* "in his correspondence occasionally as a tragedy" (xiv) and even asked his friend Zimmerman to remove the comedy designation from *Die Soldaten* and substitute it with the more neutral term

²⁶ This is from Corneille's *Trois Discours sur le poème dramatique* (Three Discourses on Dramatic Poetry).

Schauspiel. Schiller went in an opposite direction with *Die Räuber* when he reclassified his first edition *Schauspiel* of 1781 as a second edition “*Trauerspiel* of 1782” (Stransky-Stranka-Greifenfels 89). Stransky-Stranka-Greifenfels make a shrewd point that the “*Trauerspiel* has been performed, while the *Schauspiel* has been read and interpreted” (89). In these two examples, it is intriguing that Lenz was later moving towards Schiller’s *Schauspiel* while Schiller was moving in the direction of Goethe’s future *Tragödie*. Although I follow the tradition of reading and analyzing the *Die Räuber* as a *Schauspiel*, I am aware that the *Trauerspiel* could possibly yield better results for an exploration of the play’s inner tragic. Nevertheless, I chose the standard texts from both Schiller and Goethe because most of the scholarship deals with the *Schauspiel* (1781) and the *Tragödie* (1808) respectively, and it is my objective to contribute to the scholarly discourse on these standard texts.

If Gottsched’s poetics was an unconvincing *cause célèbre* about the tragedy, then his “Die Schauspiele und besonders die Tragödien sind aus einer wohlbestellten Republik nicht zu verbannen” (1736) is unequivocally his most vehement and explicit stance on the tragedy:

Ein Trauerspiel...ist ein lehrreiches moralisches Gedicht, darin eine wichtige Handlung vornehmer Personen auf der Schaubühne nachahmet und vorgestellt wird. Es ist eine allegorische Fabel, die eine Hauptlehre zur Absicht hat, die stärksten Leidenschaften ihrer Zuhörer als Verwunderung, Mitleiden und Schrecken zu dem Ende erregt, damit sie dieselben in ihre gehörigen Schranken bringen möge. (15)

Furthermore, during his discursive defense of the tragedy as a useful instrument for a *wohlbestellten Republik*, Gottsched reiterates a dislike for the comedy and states his preference for the tragic heroes of the stage: “Ich sehe niemals Komödianten; ich sehe Könige und Helden auf der Schaubühne” (15). Despite Gottsched’s negative view on comedy, Lessing would later defend the worth of comedic figures: “auch dem Freigebigen ist der Geizige lehrreich” (*HD*,

St29).²⁷ Lessing's attitude would represent a shift in thought amongst Germans in their running discourse on the theory of drama during the eighteenth century, but before then, Gottsched's critical poetics served as the basis for most German domestic dramas or *Haupt- und Standesaktionen*. Lessing and the *Stürmer und Dränger* would ultimately overturn the *Gottschedschen Literaturreform* and begin experimenting more with the drama in order to discover something more suitable for German national stages.

The most prominent critique of Gottsched's doctrine came from Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–1781) and his “17. Brief” from *Briefen, die neueste Literatur betreffend* (1759–65) in the first years of the Sturm und Drang. Lessing criticizes the French-based dramaturgical reforms of Gottsched and questions the adaptability of French drama in German-speaking theaters. “Und was für einen neuen?” (“17. Brief” 140), asks Lessing rhetorically about German theater, “eines französierenden; ohne zu untersuchen, ob dieses französierende Theater der deutschen Denkungsart angemessen sei oder nicht.” (140). In his discussion of foreign models that are suitable for the German character, Lessing explains that “der Engländer erreicht den Zweck der Tragödie fast immer...der Franzose [Corneille] erreicht ihn fast nie” (“17. Brief” 140–41). Lessing's praise of the English could be considered the introduction of another thread in the dramatic discourse, the infatuation with Shakespeare during the Sturm und Drang. Of course, the Shakespearean thread is prominent in my research because Shakespeare resonates in Goethe's early theory of drama and his play *Götz von Berlichingen*, which in turn, serve as the antithesis of Lenz's “Anmerkungen übers Theater” and *Die Soldaten*. In other words, Goethe's early Sturm und Drang work in the Shakespearean mold is somehow responsible for Lenz's tragic turn. In Lessing's quote, the English achieve the *Zweck* of tragedy is usually considered *catharsis*.

²⁷ For in-text citations, Lessing's *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* will have the abbreviation *HD* with the *Stück* number; Lessing divided his commentary on the theater into *Stücke* (pieces) instead of chapters or sections.

Catharsis is yet another motif within the discourse that is actually absent from Lenz's commentary on Aristotle, but prevalent in Lessing's next contribution to the discourse on drama, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*.

In his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, a critical commentary of theatrical performances in the Hamburg National Theater, Lessing sustains his critique of the French but dedicates more energy to Aristotle's *Poetics* and includes a discussion about the German national theater. A good example of Lessing's direct engagement with Aristotle and the critique of the French involves the concept of *catharsis*, the purging of pity and fear. Lessing zeros in on fear as he describes how "Bei den Franzosen führt Crébillon den Beinamen des Schrecklichen. Ich fürchte sehr, mehr von diesem Schrecken, welches in der Tragödie nicht sein sollte, als von dem echten, dass der Philosoph zu dem Wesen der Tragödie rechnet." (HD St74). In Lessing's direct engagement with *Poetics*, he is able to show that the "Wort, welches Aristoteles braucht, heißt Furcht: Mitleid und Furcht, sagt er, soll die Tragödie erregen; nicht Mitleid und Schrecken" (HD St74). This example demonstrates that Germans, such as Lessing and Lenz, were uneasy with French interpretations of Aristotle and genuinely eager to understand the true meaning of his *Poetics*. Lessing's *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* is generally considered the point of origin for the national theater movement of the Sturm und Drang. Lessing states with some compunction that the Germans did not possess a true national theater but instead regional theaters throughout German-speaking Europe that were under the control of local German governments. On the one hand, the absence of a central German national theater was frustrating, but on the other hand, the absence of a unified German theater and integrated German dramatic art nourished the effort to bring not only a proper German stage to fruition but also a German nation. Leidner points out that there was one constant in the literature of the Sturm und Drang – the "attempt to produce a

substitute for Germany on paper – a surrogate, yet also an inspiration, for readers and audiences unwilling to wait for political cohesion and what they imagine to be its emotional benefits” (7).

Despite vehemently criticizing Gottsched, Lessing’s stance on morality and education as crucial components of a drama reflect Gottsched’s vision of tragedy as a “lehrreiches moralisches Gedicht” (“Die Schauspiele und besonders die Tragödien” 15). In *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, Lessing boldly declares that “the theater is to be the school of the moral world,” (8). Lessing’s statement demonstrates clear resolve to use the dramatic art as a way to educate and improve the German people, a sentiment echoed later by Schiller in his “Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet” (1784). Lenz does not address the moral and educative properties of drama in “Anmerkungen übers Theater” but in “Letters on the Morality of *The Sorrows of Young Werther*” (1775) he describes his indifference to morality in *Die Soldaten* with the explanation that he “only wanted to give a specific picture of things as they are” (198). Lenz’s theoretical writings and letters indicate that he had a low interest in morality and education, but much affection for and fascination with the “niedrigste Pöbel...denn sie sind Menschen” (“Anmerkungen übers Theater”).

A few years after Lessing’s *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, Herder would ask his fellow Stürmer und Dränger in the title of his essay “Haben wir eine französische Bühne?” (from *Fragmente über die neuere deutsche Literatur*, 1766/67) and would reiterate Lessing’s lamentation about the status of the German theater: “wir [die Deutschen] werden nicht rühmen können, dass wir eine deutsche Schaubühne haben” (205). Similar to his stature as founding figure of the Sturm und Drang, Herder also had “für die Theorie des Dramas insgesamt weitreichende Folgen” (Langemeyer 168), and his importance on the drama cannot be understated. Herder transformed the debate about English and French models by suggesting that

both were inadequate for German drama when he makes an astute observation about the German character that his fellow dramatic theorists fail to consider: “der Deutsche ist nicht so launisch wie der Engländer und hat nicht die Dose komischen Esprit wie der Franzose: er schwenkt zwischen beiden...” (“Haben wir eine französische Bühne?” 217). Herder reserves a third space for Germans, somewhere between the French and the English. At the same time, Herder stresses on the uniqueness of German character, that is, a distinctive genius within that alone should be sufficient for inspiration. In his closing statement, Herder admits that some foreign artistic achievement is admirable and worth emulating, like French visual artistry, but encourages the Germans in a different way regarding the performing arts: “Lasset uns also ihre [Frankreich] Schüler sein in der Kunst, nicht aber in der *Natur* des Theaters” (“Haben wir eine französische Bühne?” 218).

Getting back the leitmotif of Aristotle and the Greeks, Herder’s *Adrastea* (1802) provides a thorough history of Greek theater with a focus on the origins and nature of drama. In the chapter “Das Drama,” Herder, in effect, sets a course for the origins and nature of Greek drama that culminates with Friedrich Nietzsche’s *Die Geburt der Tragödie* (1871). Herder’s *Adrastea* clears away both classical and modern versions of dramatic theory and innovation in an attempt to capture the true nature of the dramatic art for contemporary German use by applying a more critical approach towards Aristotle than Gottsched and Lessing. In a bold statement, Herder even claims that Aristotle “*hat uns kein Rezept zu geben*” (*Adrastea* 255). We find a similar attitude from Lenz in “Anmerkungen übers Theater” about the need for Germans to take up the *großes Unternehmen* and make their own recipes and classifications: “Hören Sie also die Definition des Aristoteles von der Tragödie, lassen Sie uns hernach die Dreistigkeit haben, unsere zu geben. Ein großes Unternehmen, aber wer kann uns zwingen, Brillen zu brauchen, die nicht nach unserm

Auge geschliffen sind” (“Anmerkungen übers Theater”). It is important to note here that *Adrastea* comes after “Anmerkungen übers Theater” and contains strong traces of Lenz. Therefore, *Adrastea* would be another example that the Lenzian effect was not “submerged almost at the outset” (Yiull xxiv) and occurred long before it “came into its own radical fashion with the Naturalist movement at the end of the nineteenth century” (Yiull xxiv).

A look at a few additional points of interest in *Adrastea* shows that Herder, perhaps the most important figure in a Sturm und Drang before Lenz (1760s), was now using language in the early Romantic period (early 1800s) that was similar to Lenz’s commentary in the 1770s. On Lenz’s preferred element of drama, character, Herder implores his fellow theorists make their own formulas for “die *reine* Darstellung menschlicher Charaktere” (258). Concerning Lenz’s preferred mode of presentation, realism, Herder t “die *reine* Entwicklung menschlicher Leidenschaften und Gesinnungen” that allows us a “natürliche Wahrheit [zu] sehen” (258). Clearly, Herder is describing the kind of drama that Lenz had written twenty-five years before when he was carrying out his Sturm und Drang tragic project. When describing the kind of drama that best captures the real characters of everyday life, Herder does mention “eine mittlere Gattung, die heißt: *bürgerliches Schauspiel*” (215). Robertson refers to the bourgeois tragedy in his book *Lessing’s Dramatic Theory* (1965) as the “tragedy of common life” (205) and a form of drama that convinced Lessing and others (i.e., Schiller, Lenz) that “there were other and better ways of [presenting] tragic excellence” (205). Although Lenz’s *Die Soldaten* carries the title comedy, it is generally considered a “mittlere Gattung” (Herder, *Adrastea* 255), something in between tragedy and comedy. The problem remains, however, that Lenz considered something inherently tragic about the comedy especially the everyday processes that run through the inner workings of the genre. At the same time, it was through the comedy that Lenz could trace what

Maeterlinck later calls the tragic in daily life and do it better than a bourgeois tragedy such as *Emilia Galotti*.

Following Herder's early Sturm und Drang theoretical contributions, Goethe's "Zum Shakespeares-Tag" (1771) describes the impact of Shakespeare on his psyche and his effect on Goethe's new outlook on drama. Goethe's reaction to Shakespeare is legendary, and as a result this young "Goethe, in his extreme sensitivity and restlessness, was the embodiment of a new, turbulent age..." (Ogg 224). For Goethe, the three unities espoused under French Neoclassicism made him "kerkermäßig ängstlich" (373) and served as the "lastige Fesseln unsrer [deutschen] Einbildungskraft" (373). Much like Lessing and Herder before him, Goethe denounced a French standard of drama that had corrupted German taste, clouded visions of Germanness, and held the German theater in a state of darkness. On the other hand, Shakespeare was a Germanic breath of fresh air who followed no rules (*keine Plane*) and presented the model of freedom for German creative genius in drama. In fact, Shakespeare was considered a diamond in the rough among Germanic geniuses. Theisen's article "The Drama in Rags: Shakespeare Reception in Eighteenth-Century Germany" (2006) describes the "Storm and Stress drama [and] the fact that theater was 'in rags,' that it was beginning to lose credibility in a functionally differentiated modern society" (512). Theisen claims that Germans (like Wieland, Lessing, Herder, and Goethe) considered Shakespeare a raw genius *because* he had weaknesses which were "the necessary by-product of a genius that, like the genius of nature itself, encompasses the great and minor alike" (507-08). This raw, unruly Shakespearean genius made a profound effect on many Germans, and upon reading Shakespeare, Goethe even states that "die erste Seite, die ich in ihm las, machte mich auf zeitlebens ihm eigen..." (371). Sidnell's translation of this passage offers a curious thought: "the first page I read made me a slave to Shakespeare for life" (135). Although

Goethe's reading of Shakespeare enabled him to "sprang in die freie Luft" (373), Sidnell makes it a point to show through translation that another form of captivity was emerging. The irony here is the evolution of captivity that Goethe experiences as he goes from a prisoner of French rules to a slave of English unruliness. Despite the feeling of an "Unendlichkeit erweitert" (372-73), Goethe and many of the early *Stürmer und Dränger*, were not truly free in the way that Lenz would finally demonstrate in his emancipatory play with the Aristotelean rules; in effect, it was a middle-ground solution between Classical rules and German innovation of the *Sturm und Drang*.

Contrary to Goethe's fancy for no plans (or rules) at all, the Lenzian inner tragic structure is a balancing act between rules and unruliness that places his approach to drama in a third space. In the Postcolonial tradition of the late twentieth century, Homi Bhabha's theory of hybridity is considered "a third space which enables other positions to emerge" (Huddart 124). Lenz's third space of the *Sturm und Drang* "displaces the histories that constitute it and sets up new structures of authority" (Huddart and Bhabha, 124). In this respect, Lenz's structure is a new authority for an inner tragic of drama that displaces the tragedy. A big part of Lenz's compromise with rules was direct engagement with Aristotelian rules and a truly German interpretation and application of those rules in an attempt to rectify the French corruption of those rules. According to a rather awkward statement from Löb:

Lenz, in his theoretical *Anmerkungen über das Theater...* which recalls Lessing, Herder, and the early Goethe, rejects Neo-Classicism, eulogizes Shakespeare, and calls for truth to life instead of beauty, but makes no social comments. In the plays, however, he underlies the determination of men by their social standings.
(70)

I take issue with several of Löb's points. One, Löb lumps "Anmerkungen übers Theater" in with earlier *Sturm und Drama* theory. When Lenz was writing his commentary on theater in 1774, he was in a transition period, but well on his way to the tragic project that defines his rejection of

the early movement. More than that, much of Lenz's commentary reflects the direction he wanted to go with Aristotle's guidance, a major point that Löb fails to mention. Two, Lenz was determined to present the tragic of his *Menschen*, both male and female, more so than just "men by their social standings" (Löb 70). As a result, Lenz's balancing act, which usually equated to his bending of Aristotle's rules, enabled him to capture the inner tragic of his social plays from the third space of Sturm und Drang drama.

Another look at "Zum Shakespeares-Tag" provides an interesting view of the *Menschenbildung* theme that also appears in Goethe's "Prometheus" hymn. According to Goethe, Shakespeare "wetteiferte mit dem Prometheus, bildete ihm Zug vor Zug seine Menschen nach, nur in kolossalischer Größe; darin liegt's, dass wir unsre Bruder verkennen; und dann belebte er sie alle mit dem Hauch seines Geistes, er redet aus allen, und man erkennt ihre Verwandtschaft" (374). Similarly, Lenz, Schiller, and Goethe form and re-form their *Menschen*, *Kraftmenschen*, and *Übermenschen*, respectively, and through them we see a tragic affinity that represents the notion of *menschliche Umbildung* as a Sturm und Drang response to the malleability of man in Rousseau and Kant. Lenz, Schiller, and Goethe each use *menschliche Umbildung* as the centerpiece (middle phase or *Höhepunkt*) of the dramas that represent a critique of *Menschen* who undergo physical transformation in an age of enlightenment, but not in a truly enlightened way. This philosophical context of Rousseau and Kant, both critiquing Enlightenment stewardship of humanity, brings about a similar self-critique in the Sturm und Drang dramas. As the middle of the tragic structure, the second phase is also the 'centerpiece' because it represents the most suggestive occurrence of the dramas, the transformation (or *Umbildung*) of self in the *Menschen*. As stated in the introduction, the primary aim of this dissertation is to decipher the meaning and significance of the tragic structure through the phases

and its *tragische Menschen*. Since all the protagonists undergo some kind of self-transformation (or reconstitution into a different self) as a result of their mental fragmentations which leads to tragic consequences, the second phase required supplementary consideration in this chapter.

Following in the footsteps of Gottsched and Lessing, Schiller's "Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet" (1784) leaves no doubt, at least as the title reveals, that the purpose of the dramatic art should include some form of moral instruction. Much like Lessing, Schiller describes the value of teaching morality on stage, explains how the influence of the dramatic art extends far beyond the theater house, and pronounces the theater a rallying point for the various German states in central Europe. In a more poignant observation, Schiller describes the theater as a mirror that reflects human folly: "Einen großen Theil dieser Wirkung können wir von der Schaubühne erwarten. Sie ist es, die der großen Klasse von Thoren den Spiegel vorhält und die tausendfachen Formen derselben mit heilsamem Spott beschämt" ("Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet"). And for those who fail to recognize their folly and continue to maintain a façade, Schiller reveals that the "Schaubühne allein kann unsre Schwächen belachen, weil sie unsrer Empfindlichkeit schont und den schuldigen Thoren nicht wissen will. Ohne rot zu werden, sehen wir unsre Larve aus ihrem Spiegel fallen und danken insgeheim für die sanfte Ermahnung" ("Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet"). In all three dramas of the Sturm und Drang tragic trilogy, the *Larve* is an important aspect of the tragic self in the second phase of the inner tragic process and Schiller uses this terms extensively in *Die Räuber*. We can see in "Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet" a few years after that Schiller was discussing an *Ermahnung* in the same breath, the word of warning that I interpret initially from Lenz in his original formulation of the inner tragic structure and the ultimate warning that I discuss later in my final commentary of this dissertation.

In terms of educating the German people, Schiller's experience with the dramatic art heightened his awareness of the fact that the "Schaubühne ist der gemeinschaftliche Kanal, in welchen von dem denkenden, bessern Theile des Volks das Licht der Weisheit herunterströmt und von da aus in milderen Strahlen durch den ganzen Staat sich verbreitet" ("Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet"). It was from the German stage that Schiller and other leading German intellectuals such as Lessing, Goethe, and Herder wanted to develop a national consciousness as well. Schiller's vision of a German national theater and its role in bringing about German unity is evident in his moving commentary:

Was kettete Griechenland so fest aneinander? Was zog das Volk so unwiderstehlich nach seiner Bühne? – Nichts anders als der vaterländische Inhalt der Stücke, der griechische Geist, das große überwältigende Interesse, des Staats, der besseren Menschheit, das in denselbigen atmete. ("Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet")

As is usually the case, *Menschheit* is included in the discussion, and the many references to the *Mensch* in the three plays and in the discourse on drama justifies the inclusion of a *Menschheit* continuum that addresses the palpable evolution from *Mensch* to *Übermensch* as it relates to the inner tragic process.

Continuing with the German national theater theme for a moment, this was another anti-French enterprise pre-Sturm und Drang that carried over as demonstrated with Schiller's essay on morality on stage during the final years of the movement. Already mentioned in the Lessing commentary, this theater enterprise includes several aspects, such as education and morality, that are interconnected with the overarching theme of German unity. This particular strand of the discourse on drama actually began with Gottsched when he first mentions a *deutsche Schaubühne* in his poetics and states a hope of producing drama "was unser Nation Ehre machen könnte" (642). Gottsched is often criticized for "having 'Frenchified' the German theater"

(Demetz 296) but “it was only because...[of] Gottsched’s many efforts to make German literature again part of the European constellation” (Demetz 296) that a belief in a German national theater could be taken seriously. Schiller’s consideration of the Greek theater as source of unity represents a move in the direction of the movement that follows the Sturm und Drang, the Weimar Classicism. At the same time, much of Schiller’s language in “Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet” reflects the inner tragic and represents a contribution to the transition to the tragic that Lenz began with his inner tragic structure.

***Galotti* and *Götz*: Models for Sturm und Drang Drama**

The Sturm und Drang was a literary movement that used the drama as its primary source of expression. There are several plays of the period that could be considered typical or ideal, Goethe’s *Götz von Berlichingen* is one of them. As described previously, *Götz von Berlichingen* embodies the moment of the early 1770s when the Shakespeare craze hit Germany and led to a series of dramas that glorified the *Kraftkerl* and detracted from the worth of the eighteenth-century woman. It is in that context that *Götz von Berlichingen* serves as the backdrop and the source of Lenz’s alternate drama *Die Soldaten* and the tragic within. Another drama worth considering in this equation is Lessing’s infamous domestic bourgeois tragedy *Emilia Galotti* (1772). Appearing a year before *Götz von Berlichingen*, *Emilia Galotti* was “hailed by the Sturm und Drang generation as a model attack on absolutism and class-distinctions” (Löb 68). In terms of its virtue as a Sturm und Drang model, *Emilia Galotti* is the second drama of the early Sturm und Drang that serves as a reference point for Lenz’s Sturm und Drang tragic project because *Die Soldaten*, albeit a bourgeois drama that addresses the troubles of absolutism and class-distinctions, has the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process, and *Emilia Galotti* does not. Stern points out that *Die Räuber* plays a role in a “process of bettering the social condition” (323), and

this contextual process is shared with dramas such as *Emilia Galotti*, but the inner tragic process is intertextual and it runs most distinctly through the trilogy of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*.

Generally, Lessing is not listed as a typical Stürmer und Dränger and his *Emilia Galotti* is not usually listed a Sturm und Drang drama despite being published during the “Morgenröte einer neuen Dramaturgie.”²⁸ Leidner barely mentions Lessing in *The Impatient Muse: Germany and the Sturm und Drang* and Keckeis considers the Sturm und Drang as something that came after Lessing in *Dramaturgische Probleme im Sturm und Drang*. In “Das Drama des Sturm und Drang” (1980), Zenke claims that “Lessing und Shakespeare bieten die Vorbilder für edle Handlung” (121) for the Sturm und Drang. Certainly, Lessing’s *Emilia Galotti* is a drama of the Sturm und Drang, but not necessarily a Sturm und Drang drama. On the surface, *Emilia Galotti* is actually rather classical considering the ancient Roman theme of Virginia, a setting in Italy, and a five-act Horatian-style tragedy that ends with recognition and reversal in the way Aristotle envisioned the perfect ending. The fact remains that *Emilia Galotti* (1772) and *Götz von Berlichingen* (1773) were written one year apart, and yet, they are a world apart on the Sturm und Drang scale of drama. If we include *Die Soldaten* (1776) in this mix a few years later, then, there is no consistent picture of Sturm und Drang drama in its earliest dramas. Nevertheless, there seems to be three basic models for the different forms of attack or lines of resistance within the Sturm und Drang: *Emilia Galotti*, the *bürgerliches Trauerspiel*, *Götz von Berlichingen*, the *Kraftkerl* drama, and *Die Soldaten*, the inner tragic drama. These three dramas set the tone for the movement on other levels also, but their value in these respective forms of drama appears to prevail most distinctly.

²⁸ This statement is attributed to Hamann in his reception to *Götz von Berlichingen* after reading it, but the actual quote is from Werner (90).

The historical, intellectual, and social stirrings of the eighteenth century in German-speaking Europe, especially French influence within the purview of the international Enlightenment program, are factors that led to German resistance in the form of the drama of the Sturm und Drang. Again, the Sturm und Drang was a German literary movement that represents a buttress that opposes the outward thrusts while supporting the Enlightenment edifice. The Sturm und Drang, as a movement, did not have a series of coordinated and organized activities working toward a common objective, but there were enough commonalities among the dramatists to establish a clear national strain within the international Enlightenment. There is a play (*Schauspiel*) by Friedrich Maximilian Klinger, *Sturm und Drang* (1777) – the original title was *Wirrwarr* (chaos) – set in the American Revolutionary War, but no manifestos, rallies, or anyone claiming to write in the name of Sturm und Drang. There were also products of the Sturm und Drang period that were lauded by Stürmer und Dränger such as Lessing's *Emilia Galotti* and Goethe's *Götz von Berlichingen*, but they were not exactly the multilayered and formless dramas that tended to capture the true tragic storm and stress of the movement. All of this provides an illuminating backdrop for the tragic structure that takes center stage in the next three chapters.

Another literary work of the Sturm und Drang that provides potential insight into the *Menschenbildung* is Goethe's "Prometheus" (written between 1772 and 1774) which is seemingly a "poetic antihymn that dismantles a religious order" (Wellbery 290). The intriguing aspect of "Prometheus" was Goethe's original intention for the poem as a drama. Leidner explains that "Goethe's unfinished drama *Prometheus* (1773)...suggests the tradition's uneasy relation to Promethean rebellion: although Goethe completed a short poem...he never brought the play to completion" (47). Aside from the mystery behind the unfinished play, "Prometheus" also warrants attention for its ending about *Mensch* and *Bildung*: "Hier sitz' ich, forme

Menschen, Nach meinem Bild.” There is an allure to interpreting this as a direct challenge to the Christian God, a stance that reflects the Enlightenment’s anti-religious attitude. The Lenzian inner tragic structure, however, provides further possibilities for interpretation of *Menschen* who play Prometheus and attempt to transform others and themselves. In this spirit, the idea of *Menschen* performing self-transformation should be linked to this crucial statement of Goethe’s “Prometheus.” In other words, there is a self-critique angle to consider if self-transformation in the Lenzian sense leads to tragic results. In other words, Lenz issues a word of warning in his inner tragic structure, especially in the second phase when the protagonists accept a tragic selfhood and its physically and morally corrupting side-effects.

Freytag and the Significance of Structure

An important theoretical source that is probably the most famous German text about the structure of the drama is Gustav Freytag’s *Die Technik des Dramas* (1863), a nineteenth century theoretical work that is extremely relevant here because the sources for Freytag’s *Technik* is based primarily on ancient Greek and eighteenth-century German drama. Freytag’s analysis of the structure of eighteenth-century German plays provides an interesting preview of aspects that underlie the Lenzian inner tragic structure. The second chapter of the book “Der Bau des Dramas,” Freytag describes how structure not only regulates action but also maximizes dramaturgical effects. Presenting his famous “fünf Teile und drei Stellen” (102) of his *pyramidalen Aufbau* (known as *Freytag’s Pyramid* in English), Freytag describes specific moments of the plot when the audience should be experiencing the high and lows of the action, or what Freytag describes as the “Spiel und Gegenspiel” (93). These two opposing forces especially bring about a “kräftige Steigerung der Effekte” (110) between the *Exposition* (beginning) and the *Höhepunkt* (middle) known as the *erregendes Moment*. Freytag even inserts

an ‘emotional pause’ known as a *retardierendes Moment* (moment of hesitation) just after the ‘high point’ and before the *Lösung/Katastrophe* (end) which allows the audience to briefly prepare for what Freytag considers the most difficult part of the drama – the sequence of events during the *Umkehr* (falling action) prior to the end:

Und doch fordert die Umkehr eine starke Hebung und Verstärkung der szenischen Effekte wegen der Sättigung des Hörers, der größeren Bedeutung des Kampfes [Spiel und Gegenspiel]. Deshalb ist das erste Gesetz für den Bau dieses Teiles, dass die Zahl der Personen sowie nur möglich beschränkt, die Wirkungen in großen Szenen zusammengeschlossen werden. (110)

In addition to the five main parts of Freytag’s *pyramidaler Aufbau*, he also includes the “drei Stellen” (102). Literally, the *drei Stellen* mean ‘three places,’ but a translation by Elias J. MacEwan in an 1895 English edition of Freytag’s work converts three places to “three crises” (114). In certain cases, like this one from MacEwan, I will use a translator’s version if it adds to the hermeneutical effect of my interpretation or analysis. Therefore, the three crises, as described by Freytag, stand “zwischen ihnen [die fünf Teile]” and are the “drei wichtige szenische Wirkungen...heißen hier: das erregende Moment, das tragische Moment, das Moment der letzten Spannung” (102). Obviously, Freytag’s three points are comparable to the three phases of the Lenzian inner tragic structure, with the second crisis “das tragische Moment” offering the most promise. Freytag’s three crises perform a supporting role conform to the five parts of the pyramid much like the Lenzian inner tragic structure does for the outer comedic form of *Die Soldaten*.

An intriguing facet of Freytag’s theory of drama is his selection of eighteenth-century German works – from the three works of my dissertation, only Goethe’s *Faust* is mentioned. This is not surprising considering that Freytag’s work is actually an attempt to catalogue classical structure in German drama of the eighteenth century. As such, Freytag discusses German works

that follow a classical five-act model, dramas such as Lessing's *Emilia Galotti*, Schiller's *Kabale und Liebe* (1784), and Goethe's *Iphigenia in Tauris* (1779, 1786). It should be noted that *Faust* is not a five-act play, and *Die Soldaten*, a five-act play, is not mentioned. The exclusion of Lenz probably means that Freytag was aware of Lenz's unorthodox dramatic structure, and therefore, did not consider him with the other more classical dramas.

A final informative piece from Freytag contradicts most accounts of the Germans' reception and emulation of Shakespeare during the Sturm und Drang. First of all, Freytag describes the typical heroes of Shakespeare as formidable figures with "entschlossenen Charaktere, Lebensfeuer und Mark, gedrungene Energie und hochgespannte männliche Kraft..." (97). As for the German dramatists imitating Shakespeare, Freytag states that "in scheidendem Gegensatz zu ihm [Shakespeare] steht die Neigung der großen deutschen Dichter des vorigen Jahrhunderts...in mehreren ihrer Dramen sieht es aus, als würden ihre Helden ruhig in gemäßigter Stimmung, in unsicheren Verhältnissen beharren, wenn man sie nur ließe" (97). Freytag's characterization of German dramatist leads one to believe that they clearly missed the mark on emulating Shakespeare. At the same time, Freytag does not truly include *Götz von Berlichingen* in his analysis, only the German dramas that adhere the ancient Greek and Roman rules for high drama.

Concluding this chapter is a final word on the Lenzian inner tragic structure as a transition to the next chapters. Naming this a Lenzian *Exemplar* carries with it several major points of importance that appear in the analyses of the dramas. Firstly, the Lenzian inner tragic structure was something different and unique from a writer (Lenz) who was writing "theater in a different mold not only from the German theater envisioned by Lessing, and even Herder, but also from the rest of the Sturm und Drang" (Leidner and Wurst 11). This makes Lenz a trend

setter within the movement that was already trendsetting with Lenz turning from the kinds of trends that Lessing and Goethe were setting earlier in the movement. Although it is not a revelation that Lenz was different, this dissertation does argue the kind of innovation that Lenz was presenting was more tragic than what is usually argued that he was addressing real social issues of small people. Instead, the Lenzian inner tragic structure is a deeper thrust into the psyche of Lenz to reveal something much bigger than the simple realities of the middle-class. Secondly, the neo-classical vein that runs through the Sturm und Drang does come into contact with the Lenzian inner tragic structure but only to show how it serves to end that tradition by serving as the transition from the tragedy of the *Poetics* to the philosophy of modern tragic in the German tradition.

The article “*Die Räuber: Structure, Models, and an Emblem*” (2005) by Werner von Stransky-Stranka-Greifenfels offers a detailed analysis of the various structures and models that permeate Schiller’s play. Stransky-Stranka-Greifenfels claims that it “is essential that we read the text carefully on the surface” (89) and focus on the “external dramatic action” (92). At the same time, Stransky-Stranka-Greifenfels proposes that “the internal plot (*Binnengeschichte*) of act 2, scene 3, namely in the story of the burning of the city upon Roller’s release from the gallows...” (102) is an allegory of the Taborites during the Hussite Wars of 1434. Structurally speaking, Stransky-Stranka-Greifenfels does not consider Lenz’s *Die Soldaten* in his examination of structure in *Die Räuber*. Therefore, it is not surprising when Stransky-Stranka-Greifenfels states that in “the *Räubern*, we recognize numerous models” (91), and again, disregards Lenz’s *Vorübung* for the tragic while acknowledging Schiller’s “‘Übungsobjekt’ — *Die Räuber*” (91). My research shows that Lenz’s inner tragic extends structurally into *Die*

Räuber and *Faust I*, and the three together form an intertextual tragic that serves as a transition to the philosophy of the tragic.

The Lenzian inner tragic structure of the Sturm und Drang provides the kind of transition that makes the emergence of the tragic less abrupt and provides a side of the movement that was less a “revival of Teutonism, so distinct from and contrary to the ideals of the Enlightenment which was mainly French” (Ogg 221). Lenz avoided the classical tragedy as a play driven by plot (and fate) and instead favored the *Menschen* and their personalities that carried a modern version of ancient tragedy with a twist (but with similar cathartic effects). Leidner mentions that many contemporaries (such as Friedrich Nicolai and Schiller) admired “Lenz’s distinction between classical tragedy, which hinges on fate, and a modern tragedy, which has no such similar cultural force at its disposal, but instead only a personality” (Leidner and Wurst 15).

Finally, there are certain motifs associated with the Sturm und Drang that are somewhat unaccounted for in the Lenzian inner tragic structure, the most important being the reverence of all things Shakespeare. It has been stated that the Sturm und Drang’s revolt against the rules of French Neoclassicism, a reaction that began with Lessing in his “17. Brief” von *Briefen, die neueste Literatur betreffend* (1759-65)²⁹, was strongly underpinned by the Shakespearean style of tragedy. In addition to Lessing’s letter, there are several important essays in this period such as Goethe’s “Zum Shakespeares-Tag“ (1771) that could be equated to a Shakespeare craze. Although the drama of the Sturm und Drang is unimaginable without Shakespeare, the Lenzian inner tragic structure appears to bear little resemblance to all things Shakespeare. Interestingly, Lessing claimed that Shakespeare’s dramas were truer to the nature of Greek drama than the Frenchified theater, but Shakespeare was known for his disregard of the rules that Aristotle

²⁹ According to Lessing, “der Engländer [Shakespeare] erreicht den Zweck der Tragödie fast immer...der Franzose [Corneille] erreicht ihn fast nie” (“17. Brief” *Briefen, die neueste Literatur betreffend*, 140).

formulated in a study of Greek drama in *Poetics*. In “Zum Shakespeares-Tag,” Goethe raves about the lack of structure and rules in Shakespeare plays but his relatively quick disfavor of the Sturm und Drang in the mid-to-late 1770s and turn to classicism demonstrate that Shakespeare had run his course fairly quickly. Arguably, Goethe was no longer writing as a Stürmer und Dränger when he added parts to the *Faust: Ein Fragment* in 1790 and when he finalized *Faust I* in 1808, but if my hunch is correct, Goethe added the additional parts in emulation of Lenz’s inner tragic structure which basically serves as a Sturm und Drang model of tragedy in the modern sense. Leidner and Wurst argue that Lenz’s “characters were written not for the contemporary audiences, but ‘for a coming age’” (xii) but my argument shows that the Lenzian effect was already creating a universal tragic tale for his age.

CHAPTER TWO: PHASE I OF THE INNER TRAGIC– THE SHATTERED SELF

“...die Mannigfaltigkeit der Charaktere und Psychologien ist die Fundgrube der Natur, hier allein schlägt die Wünschelrute des Genies an.”
J. M. R. Lenz, “Anmerkungen übers Theater”

A Psychological Exposition

This chapter covers the first phase of the Lenzian inner tragic structure, the psychological exposition, and provides the first detailed look at the literary works that feature in this dissertation – *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber* and *Faust I*. Each exposé of a protagonist’s psychological state presents the markers that illuminate the intertextual aspects that link the works on the inner tragic plane. The shared markers also build the framework, the inner structure that charts a tragic process by which each protagonist follow a similar path from self-shattering to violent action. The first phase represents the psychological exposition, that is, the information that describes the mental anguish, the internal sufferings, stresses, and strains of the protagonists, the *Menschen*. In a section called “An Emerging Terminology of Psychological Representation” (104), Brown describes “how creatively Goethe reorganized our psychic landscape” (104) in his novel *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* (1794), but Lenz’s psychological exposition of his inner tragic structure suggests that he began a certain restructuring of the psyche or the way in which reading drama would be carried out.

As a demonstration of inner turmoil, the first phase of the Lenzian inner tragic structure does not necessarily constitute the beginning of the play which a traditional exposition (or *protasis*) would represent in that all the essential background information of every character is provided. Instead, the inner exposition creates psychological profiles for the protagonists that readers can easily slip into for an “empathetic reading” (Bledsoe 202) that developed during the early years of the Sturm und Drang. In “Empathetic Reading and Identity Formation” (2001),

Bledsoe explains the “shift from exemplary reading to empathetic reading has a parallel in the development of the aesthetic drama from Gottsched to Lessing” (Bledsoe 202). In essence, there is a sympathy sought for the psychologically trembling protagonists which, in connection with fear in the third phase, is a cathartic beginning and another adjustment to Aristotle whose pity and fear are the end effect of Greek tragedy. In all three cases, there is apparent psychological distress (or psychosis) that is described and highlighted by a scene of suffering that is caused by a form of *anagnorisis* (recognition). The Aristotelian recognition is converted here to a Lenzian realization in which the protagonists understand the reality of the situation and recognize the source of their despair. The stresses incurred from this realization lead to a shattering experience that is characterized by despondency, irrational thinking, and thoughts of suicide. In general, the shattering is of the self and the need to recover from this self-shattering triggers the beginning of the second stage, the reconstitution of self and physical transformation. Similar to Aristotelian recognition, Lenzian realization is “coincident with a reversal” (Aristotle 28), only the reversal represents not a change in fortune, but a change in appearance.

Die Soldaten: Tearing

On the surface, Lenz’s *Die Soldaten* has five acts which is a format that actually follows the Roman standard set by Horace in his *The Art of Poetry*. In the section on drama, Horace states that a “play that really seeks to be in demand and then, once seen, revived, is not to be shorter or more extended than five acts” (138). Many German dramas of the eighteenth century follow the five-act standard such as Johann Christoph Gottsched’s *Sterbender Cato* (1732), Lessing’s *Emilia Galotti*, Goethe’s *Götz von Berlichingen*, Friedrich Maximilian Klinger’s *Sturm und Drang* (1777), Schiller’s *Kabale und Liebe* (1784), Goethe’s *Iphigenia in Tauris* (1787), and many others. The Roman prescribed five-act surface structure was the most prominent formal

external consideration but within the dramas, as Lenz demonstrates with his three-phase inner tragic structure, there were other dramaturgical considerations that were mainly Greek inspired. Considering the external five-act structure along Roman lines, the three-phase inner structure, then, would probably be more of a Greek tragic model in that Aristotle describes tragedy as “a whole...that which has a beginning, middle, and an end” (23). Here we see Lenz’s desire to appease both Roman and Greek standards by combining an inner three-part tragic structure within a five-act outer frame. Lenz is a pioneer in this respect and his *Die Soldaten* demonstrates the full range of this combination of classical structures in conjunction with his adaptations of the supporting classical features which make his work “unusual, and ahead of its time...” (Leidner and Wurst xi).

The initial scenes of *Die Soldaten* provide the pertinent comings and goings of the play and the initial glimpses of the protagonists, Stolzius and Marie. In other words, there is a kind of traditional exposition that opens the play that more or less coincides with the first act. *Die Soldaten* does have the feel of a *bürgerliches Trauerspiel* because the middle-class *Menschen*, not only Stolzius and Marie, are bemoaning their bourgeois existences. The general mourning of the middle-class in *Die Soldaten* carries over somewhat into the psychological exposition, but the psychological sorrows of Stolzius and Marie are caused by deeper personal issues. Nevertheless, Stolzius is a middle-class cloth merchant and Marie, like most middle-class women of the eighteenth century, has no profession. Marie’s father Wesener is a “fancy-goods dealer from Lille” (Yiull 82) who is constantly fretting about his daughter and secretly hopeful that her pursuit of Desportes, a dashing aristocratic officer, will come to fruition and ultimately benefit the family. Oddly enough, but somehow typical for Lenz, the setting is France, the country that exuded so much negative influence over Germany and was so detrimental to the German national

renewal project of the Sturm und Drang. There is a lot of complimentary action that occurs throughout the play that contributes to the overall effect but very little to the inner tragic process that is raging within. Most of the characters perform on the periphery of the tragic supporting the outer comedic structure while Stolzius and Marie operate on the inner tragic plane.

On the *Menschheit* continuum, it is quite clear that Stolzius and Marie are *Menschen*. According to statements made by Lenz, his interest in people lies at the lowest level, not in social status, but in terms of the depths of real human suffering that is unselfish and in relation to distance or isolation. In this respect, Stolzius and Marie are considered *Menschen*. At the depths of suffering for Stolzius and Marie, when compared to their counterparts in *Die Räuber* and *Faust I*, there seems to be such loneliness, triviality, and vulnerability. Although there are references to Stolzius and Marie being romantically involved, the two are never really together in the same scene of the play; just once actually, and Marie could not recognize Stolzius anyway. In other words, they suffer mostly in isolation. This distance between Stolzius and Marie is shared initially by Karl and Amalia in *Die Räuber* and is an intertextual feature of the Lenzian tragic that is neither in tragedy nor modern philosophy of the tragic. There is a tendency to consider the designation of *Mensch* as something common “denn aus gemeinem ist der Mensch gemacht.”³⁰ Marie and Stolzius as *Menschen* in this continuum also means no thoughts of the grander stage or selfishness as in *Die Räuber* and no interaction with supernatural figures like in *Faust I*.

Stolzius’ initial appearance in the play is at home with his mother and it marks the beginning of his first phase, the psychological exposition. Stolzius declares (in his first words) that he is not well as he appears “*mit verbundenem Kopf*”³¹ (1:II). Immediately, it is evident that Stolzius is feeling sick and has suffered a head injury. As a psychological exposition, Lenz

³⁰ This is from Schiller’s *Wallensteins Tod*, (1:IV).

³¹ Quotes in italics represent the information provided in the play that is not dialogue.

draws attention to the head of Stolzius for the reason of expositing on his psychological state in the text. Stolzius' mother helps in the exposition of her son when she provides the reason for his head injury: "Nun, ich glaube, ihm steckt das verzweifelte Mädel im Kopf, darum tut er ihm so weh. Seit sie weggereist ist, hat er keine vergnügte Stunde mehr" (1:II). The word *verzweifelt* (despairing) is illuminating because it also describes the general state of mind for both Marie and Stolzius. In this way, Stolzius' mother contributes to the psychological exposition of her son and Marie. Furthermore, Stolzius' mother is referring to her son in the third person, as if he is not there. Another feature with Stolzius is the way those around him speak as if he is either not there or not himself; there is more of this in the second and third phases of the Lenzian inner tragic structure. In Stolzius' response to his mother, he states that "Aus Ernst, Mutter, mir ist nicht recht" (1:II). In German, when people say they are not *recht*, that usually refers to a psychological issue, as in a person is mentally unstable. In his initial statement, Stolzius uses *nicht wohl* which usually refers to nausea, a sickness that makes the head spin. Either way, there is something not right *in* Stolzius' head.

In Stolzius' psychological exposition, there is also the sign of a physical injury, the bandage around his head. Despite this being a physical head injury, this is a sign that Stolzius may have attempted to harm himself, as in a suicide attempt. As the story progresses, it is safe to assume that this was indeed a suicide attempt because suicidal tendencies manifest again in Stolzius and eventually turn into more than just tendencies in the end. Another example of Stolzius' suicidal tendencies in this first phase is when he verbalizes his suicidal thoughts during a scene of suffering: "Ich könnte mich den Augenblick ins Wasser stürzen, wenn ich dem Ding nachdenke" (1:II). The 'Ding' that Stolzius is referring to is the situation surrounding Marie (and Desportes), and the *Augenblick* is the moment of realization, Stolzius' change from ignorance to

knowledge losing Marie to Desportes. As described in the Introduction, suicidal tendencies are an intertextual aspect of the three dramas.

Marie, the female protagonist who is actually “the central figure in the play, Mariane Wesener” (Osborne 92) is also suffering but in a different way. In the opening of the play, Marie is introduced as a petty bourgeois young lady who aspires to escape the “constriction of the bourgeois household within which [she] suffers” (Osborne 92). There are also indications that Marie’s psychological state is off-balance when her own sister, Charlotte, claims that Marie “will honette Mädels in Blame bringen, weil sie so denkt” (1:V). Marie’s heart is also strained but full of courage as she concludes her first phase with thoughts of her own death:

Das Herz ist mir so schwer. Ich glaube, es wird gewittern die Nacht. Wenn es einschläge – (*sieht in die Höhe, die Hände über ihre offene Brust **schlagend**.*) Gott! Was habe ich denn Böses getan? –Stolzius – ich lieb dich ja noch – und Papa selbst mir den Rat gibt, (*zieht die Gardine vor.*) trifft michs, so trifft michs, ich sterb’ nicht anders als gerne. (*löscht ihr Licht aus*). (1:V)

Marie’s thoughts of dying *gerne* are represented symbolically with the closing of the curtains and the extinguishing of light. As Marie performs these symbolic acts of fading out, she signals the first phase of her tragic process and foregrounds her impending misfortune.

Stolzius’ and Marie’s scenes of suffering eventually culminate in a shattering of the self when Desportes eventually abandons Marie. The self refers to the psychological dimension of personality more than the external physical form of the person.

For many people, the term *self* refers to the subjective or inner side of [one’s] life. The self is a morally responsible agent, and the term may refer to the whole range of a person’s inner states of consciousness. Since the time of the Greeks, there has been a tendency on the part of philosophers to think of the *self* and *mind* as synonymous, and to “equate the self as subject with mind; and the self as object either with body or the mind-body unity.”³² (Titus 144)

³² The short quote within the long quote is from page six of Reinhold Niebuhr’s *The Self and the Dramas of History* (1955).

The first two phases represent separate aspects of self during the inner tragic process, a shattering of old self in the first phase and a reconstitution of new tragic self in the second phase. During Faust's tragic process, he exclaims, there are "zwei Seelen" (*Faust I*, 1112) in his chest, but there also seem to be two selves in everyone's (the protagonist) heads. It is quite possible that the dual nature of the self in the minds of all the protagonists originated with Lenz. The lines "606-1769 [were] added in the final version" (Heffner 146) of *Faust I*, and thus, the quote from Faust about two souls (line 1112) would have developed well after *Die Soldaten*. We can see some of the intricacies of the inner tragic of *Faust I*, such as certain tragic markers and certain phases, being added to the *Faust: ein Fragment* in 1790 or in the final version. It is very intriguing how the Lenzian inner tragic structure represents a potential internal *Exemplar* for certain aspects of Goethe's masterpiece. Although the second phase is accentuated by physical transformation, the change in appearance indicates the acceptance of a tragic selfhood during self-reconstitution, and Stolzius and Marie provide excellent examples of the transition to the second phase.

In the moment of transition, Stolzius' head issues continue as "*er sitzt mit verbundenem Kopf an einem Tisch, auf dem eine Lampe brennt, einen Brief in der Hand*" (3:II). Stolzius' clothed head represents his psychological issues since there is actually no mention of an external head injury or any discussion of his bandages. Stolzius and his mother avoid the topic, but as his mother explains, Stolzius' head issues are internal, not external. The light of the Stolzius' lamp connects the moment to Marie's extinguished light, both signals of the end of the first phase. The letter in Stolzius' hand represents bad news, and we relive a similar moment with Karl Moor in Schiller's *Die Räuber* during his first phase when he receives a letter from his brother containing the bad news. In this time of suffering, Stolzius' mother scolds him for his devotion to Marie and uses the most disparaging language while she tries to convince him that Marie not worth the

mental anguish. As Stolzius sits shattered before his mother, he remains loyal to Marie and defends her vehemently: “Liebe Mutter, schimpft nicht auf sie, sie ist unschuldig, der Offizier hat ihr den Kopf verrückt. Seht einmal, wie sie mir sonst geschrieben hat. Ich muß den Verstand verlieren darüber. Solch ein gutes Herz!” (1:V). Stolzius mentions the head of Marie just as his mother speaks of his head, that is, their mental states. Moreover, Stolzius states that he must lose his reason, a first indication that what is about to happen, the acceptance of tragic selfhood, is out of his control once the process begins. This scene also shows that there are remnants of Stolzius’ old self still intact because he defends Marie. The text shows that Stolzius wavers in his adoration of Marie, and in the moments that he expresses indignation for Marie, we see his new tragic voice and his state of tragic selfhood.

The moment that signifies that Stolzius is figuratively picking up the pieces of his shattered self for reassembly is when he decides that he will avenge Marie. In this decisive moment, there are several clues that represent the beginning of reconstitution of self. For example, Stolzius strikes his chest right, a gesture that symbolizes the breaking his old self. Stolzius immediately stands up, he is now on his own two feet and picking up the pieces, he thinks of Desportes and speaks to himself: “Ich will dem Teufel, der sie verkehrt hat...O du sollst mir's bezahlen, du sollst mir's bezahlen” (1:V). Stolzius refers to Desportes as the Teufel and is intent on making the devil pay. In accordance with the principles of the *Menschheit* continuum, Stolzius the *Mensch* wishes to make the devil pay for his actions, but Karl Moor the *Kraftmensch* assumes a devilish character and Faust the *Übermensch* actually makes a pact with the devil. While Stolzius transitions from old, shattered self he is now *kalt*³³ as the new tragic

³³ Lenz portrays Stolzius as “cold” more than once and Schiller describes Karl as “pale as death” on several occasions, especially in the final phase when the protagonists assume the image of the grim reaper.

self forms within him, and for the first time in the play, we see a bizarrely ‘healthy’ Stolzius who jumps up and sets off: “(Springt auf.) Laßt mich, Mutter, ich bin gesund” (*Die Soldaten*, 1:V).

Notice how Stolzius was sick in his shattered condition, but when reassembled in his new self, he is suddenly healthy. Mumbling parts of a song to his mother, Stolzius departs and reappears later fully transformed to start the next phase.

During Stolzius’ moment of self-reconstitution, Marie has reached her breaking point when she hears of the news about Desportes’ departure. Marie seeks counsel from her father, Wesener, and asks desperately about a resolution: Oddly, Wesener repeats the decisive breaking gesture of Stolzius when “*sich auf die Brust schlagend*” (1:V) he seemingly serves as a connection between Stolzius and Marie in this moment of shattering. Guthrie’s “Schiller’s Early Styles: Language and Gesture in *Die Räuber*” (1999) is an article that focuses on *Die Räuber* and will be referenced in the analysis of Karl and Amalia, but many of the gestures that Schiller uses in his text are preceded by Lenz in *Die Soldaten*. The shared gestures between all the protagonists of the three plays add to the markings of the inner structure that traces the tragic process. After Wesener demonstrates his gestures of frustration, Marie makes her own gestures later that reveal her scene of suffering and subsequent shattering. Charlotte, Marie’s sister, is taking dictation from Marie for a letter, the object that symbolizes bad news and the trigger for some form of suffering or shattering. Suddenly, Marie tears the paper away from Charlotte, and tears it into “tausend Stücken” (1:V). As the language shows, this moment for Marie represents either a ripping (*zerreißen*) into a thousand pieces or a tearing into fragments. Marie’s shredding of the letter, the object that figures important in this moment and in the first phase of Schiller’s *Die Räuber*, actually concludes the first phase for her and Stolzius collectively in a clearly meaningful and fitting gesture leaving no doubt that fragmentation has occurred, and at the very

least, a reconstitution of self or some action of resolution is required. Marie's transition from fragmentation to reconstitution, that is, her picking-up-the-pieces moment occurs in the final scene of Act III during a conversation with the Countess De La Roche who proposes to transform her into, for all intents and purposes, a nun. In actuality, Marie will be the Countess' companion, but must be prepared "in einem Jahr keine Mannsperson zu sehen" (1:V) which is apparently Marie's "einzige Weg, sie [die Ehre] wiederherzustellen" (1:V). For the *Menschen* Stolzius and Marie, honor is the key symbol of their *Menschheit* on the continuum from *Die Soldaten* through *Die Räuber* and to *Faust I*, three works united on the inner tragic plane.

Die Räuber: Trembling

The external structure of the *Die Räuber* begins with a three-scene exposition in the first act in which the essential characters and fundamental intentions are revealed for all the major characters. Within this first act, the first phase of the inner tragic process begins for Karl and Amalia, the protagonists of *Die Räuber*. The Lenzian inner tragic structure developed by Lenz enables us to track the phases of the process across acts and scenes of external structure. At the same time, the Lenzian inner tragic structure serves as a delineation between the inner tragic process and the action on the periphery from the supporting cast. At the very beginning of the play, the opening action is a scene of suffering for *Alter Moor*, the patriarch of the Moor family, father of Karl and Franz, and surrogate father of Amalia. *Alter Moor* displays deep anguish over a letter that contains information about the apparent misdeeds of his oldest and favorite son Karl who is a university student in Leipzig. More precisely, the letter states that Karl has acquired considerable debt, has defiled the daughter of a rich banker, and has wounded the daughter's upper-class lover in a duel. In the eyes of *Alter Moor*, Karl's conduct is so dishonorable and reprehensible that any chance of redemption is impossible, therefore, the father dispatches a

swift letter of disinheritance to his disgraced son. In reality, the letter containing the news about Karl is a contrived message written by Franz Moor, Karl's jealous and scheming younger brother. Although Karl has been exemplifying the kind of rebellious and restlessness that is typical of the *Stürmer und Dränger*, the intermediary Franz has taken liberties with the content of the letter to *Alter Moor* and does the same in the response from father to a soon-to-be disowned Karl.

In his exchange with *Alter Moor*, Franz's diabolical intentions are not entirely clear until he ends the first scene of *Die Räuber* with an ominous monologue. Although Franz is not a protagonist, his behavior and language in this first scene provides clues about the inner tragic process for the protagonists, much like Stolzius' mother who contributes to the psychological exposition of her son. First of all, Franz is Luciferian, and this is the first indication that we are now at a different level of *Mensch* in terms of the continuum. Operating at the level of *Kraftmensch*, Franz's wickedness goes beyond Lenz's lowly *Menschen* to a level where the human selfishness is devilish. The *Kraftmenschen* of *Die Räuber* has only traces of the Mephistophelian whereas Goethe's *Übermenschen* in *Faust I* actually interact with such figures and assume similar supernatural or mythological heights. Franz also provides the first hint of the Lenzian inner tragic process when he asks his father what he would do "wenn er [Karl] nun kommt mit der Larve des Heuchlers" (1:I). Franz seems obsessed with the term *Larve* (mask) in this play which suggests that his conscious is afflicting him because he is constantly projecting a false front and at the same time providing clues about the inner tragic process of Karl. Franz is also obsessed with inheriting both Karl's share of the father's estate and also Karl's love interest, Amalia. In his concluding statement, Franz explains his motive: "Herr muss ich sein, dass ich das mit Gewalt ertrotze, wozu mir die Liebenswürdigkeit gebricht" (1:I). The full effect of Franz's

treachery is felt when Karl receives the doctored letter containing his father's disownment; as a result, it shatters Karl's self and begins his tragic process. According to Bohm, in "Franz and Karl Moor, Schiller has represented two versions of the same character, psychologically deformed and emotionally scarred by exclusion from authentic selves and viable **self**-concepts" (34). The psychological exposition of Karl provides the clues to his acceptance of a tragic self that could potentially heal his emotional scar in the final stage of emotion of the inner tragic process.

Even before the arrival of Franz's letter, Karl is already in a state of nausea, a condition that Stolzius begins his first phase when he claims to be *nicht wohl*. In the company of friends at a local tavern, Karl uses the phrase *mir ekelt* (I am sickened) as he tirades and complains about the woes of his century and the lack of "großen Menschen" (1:II). This desire for big humans is another indicator that *Die Räuber* is also dealing with more powerful people, the *Kraftmenschen* of the continuum. Again, the *Menschheit* continuum is intended to show the significance of what is apparent in the texts: there are different levels of *Menschen* experiencing the same inner tragic process. This is evidence that solidifies my argument that *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* represent a tragic trilogy of the Sturm und Drang.

In his opening rant, Karl evokes images of Goethe's "Prometheus" and *Faust I* as he describes how "der lohe Lichtfunke Prometheus' ist ausgebrannt" (1:II) and laments that there is nothing in their midst that could spark the German theater or the nation of Germany. There are two points of interest in Karl's statement that add to the discussion about the Sturm und Drang as a movement. One, if the light of Prometheus has indeed burned out, then this would mean that the Sturm und Drang has also burned out because Goethe's poem "Prometheus," like *Götz von Berlichingen*, were works that apparently embodied the movement. If Schiller was in fact acknowledging that the Sturm und Drang had run its course by 1780, this could be his

affirmation of what Lenz recognized in 1776 when he wrote *Die Soldaten*, the play that discontinued his *Götz von Berlichingen* project and initiated his Sturm und Drang tragic project. Second, *Die Räuber* is a play that “abounds in Shakespearean characteristics...the deformed Franz Moor, a sophistic villain, has touches of Iago and obvious affinities with Richard III” (Waidson and Holmes 35). Moreover, the protagonist Karl “oscillates between impassioned revolt on the fearful scale of Shakespeare’s activists, and a brooding hesitancy that recalls Hamlet (Waidson and Holmes 35). Despite the affinities between Shakespeare and *Die Räuber*, Schiller’s statement about Prometheus, the titan embodied by Shakespeare, informs us of a dissonance in the Sturm und Drang that resembles the dissonance I mentioned earlier (p. 5) between inner and outer structures of Sturm und Drang drama. In other words, the “Shakespearean Strain” (Waidson and Holmes 27) that runs through *Die Räuber* cannot be, in principle, the same that runs through “Prometheus” and *Götz von Berlichingen* in terms of defining a movement. In Schiller’s *Die Räuber*, the probability, then, of self-criticism becomes more credible as opposed to Goethe’s emulation of Shakespeare.

Karl’s rant continues much like the beginning of Faust’s tirade about university education, in that “ein schwindsüchtiger Professor halt sich bei jedem Wort ein Flaschen Salmiakgeist vor der Nase und liest ein Kollegium über Kraft” (1:II). Curiously, the next sentence begins with “*Kerls*” and leaves the impression of some liaison between the two words to indicate a prominent feature of Sturm und Drang drama, the *Kraftkerl*. Lange describes that “traditional interpretations hold that Goethe became enamored of *Götz von Berlichingen*’s autobiography because he discovered in the historical figure of *Götz* the perfect embodiment of the ideal Sturm und Drang character, the *Kraftkerl*” (1). Possibly, Karl’s exaggerated use of the term *Mensch* instead of *Kerl* when addressing his friends (all males) indicates a shift from

Goethe's *Kraftkerl* Götz to a *Kraftmensch* that seems to call on all of humanity to take up a cause. At the same time, Karl often seems like a rebel *without* a cause or simply an *enfant terrible* trying to shock or disturb others. Leidner explains that "*Kraftmenschen* respond to frustration by bursting explosively into action, and underlying that action is a curious ambiguity" (49). Notice here that Leidner describes *Kraftmenschen* who are erupting into action while Waidson and Holmes describe a more subdued *Kraftmensch* with a "hesitancy that recalls Hamlet" (35). I tend to prefer the explosiveness of the *Kraftmensch* because Karl often bursts into action and even Amalia does not hesitate to lash out violently at Franz when he frustrates her with the story of Karl.

In the delightful essay "Zur Geschichte des menschlichen Herzens" (1775), Christian Friedrich Daniel Schubart enriches our understanding of the difference between *Mensch* and *Kraftmensch* with a story of local color that appears to be the model for Schiller's *Die Räuber*. Carl, the main figure in Schubart's story, has a storyline similar to that of Schiller's Karl Moor with the main differences being Carl's decision to become a simple farmer instead of a robber captain and his decision to grant his treacherous brother (Wilhelm) clemency "mit den sanftmütigsten Ausdrücken" ("Zur Geschichte des menschlichen Herzens") instead of seeking vengeance. It is evident that Schiller's murderous and unforgiving Karl is the antithesis of Schubart's dutiful and moral Carl. The comparison of Carl and Karl shows the features of a *Mensch* and *Kraftmensch* distinction. Carl has what his father calls the "Güte des Herzens" (Schubart, "Zur Geschichte des menschlichen Herzens") of a *Mensch* like Stolzius while Karl is not able to truly possess a "menschliches Herz" (*Die Räuber*, 4:V) as a *Kraftmensch*. For whatever reason, Schiller modifies Schubart's Carl the "sanftmütiges Lamm" (*Die Räuber*, 1:II) and makes him Karl by granting him the heart of a *Tier*, specifically, the heart of a wild tiger

(“verwilde zum Tiger” *Die Räuber*, 1:II). In *Faust I*, Mephistopheles describes how the *Menschen* plague themselves with their use of *Vernunft* to be only “tierischer als jedes Tier” (286). In this moment of reflection upon these words from Mephistopheles in the “Prolog im Himmel,” the image of Karl appears in my mind as the linkages in a Sturm und Drang tragic trilogy gradually come to light. Schubart’s essay not only enhances our sense of Karl as a *Kraftmensch*, but also demonstrates that the Germans of the Sturm und Drang are themselves “Menschen, die ihre Leidenschaften haben und handeln, so gut als ein Franzos‘ oder ein Brite” (“Zur Geschichte des menschlichen Herzens”).

The critical moment for Karl in the first phase of the inner tragic structure is the arrival of the doctored letter. The letter, an object that also features prominently in the first phase of *Die Soldaten*, contains a *Botschaft* that brings both Stolzius and Karl to the breaking point. Therefore, the letter symbolizes some aspect of the inner tragic. In the case of Marie, it was the tearing of the letter that symbolized her torn self the end of her first phase. In Karl’s case, he reads the letter, instantly recognizes his change in fortune, and springs not necessarily into action, but into despair. Karl’s comrade Grimm notices a sudden change in Karl, and Grimm asks: “Was hat er, was hat er? Er ist bleich wie die Leiche” (1:II). The deathly skin complexion of the protagonists features more prominently in phase three when the image of the grim reaper (no pun here intended with Grimm) seems to suit tragic selfhood and the violent conclusion of the inner tragic process. In the beginning of *Die Räuber*, the first words from Franz to *der alte Moor* was about his father’s *bläss* complexion. Like the letter, the paleness of skin symbolizes a significant aspect of the inner tragic process. Under normal circumstances, paleness is obviously indicative of death, as in natural death of the body, but paleness in the inner tragic process can

also signify the death of the original self if we consider that there really is no turning back once the second phase begins and tragic selfhood is accepted.

Karl returns to the tavern in forceful agitation, prowling back and forth talking to himself, and then suddenly yells in this moment of recognition: “Menschen – Menschen!” (1:II), an exclamation that would be equivalent to us today saying “Humans, humans!” (or more colloquially “People!”). Once again, Karl is addressing his men as humans, not as men (*Kerls*) which I would think would be more in line with a *Kraftkerl* tradition. Alas, Karl does mention a “männliche Gelassenheit” (1:II) that should be replaced with the wildness of a tiger, as if to say, that the equanimity of men in his age is not adequate for the task at hand. The actual task at hand is debatable because “underlying that action is a curious ambiguity” (Leidner 49), but the inner tragic process has only one task and one action, and they amount to murder.

Unlike the *Mensch Stolz*, the *Kraftmensch* Karl considers murder in the grandest terms and with no sense of real honor, Stolz wants to poison another person (Desportes) and Karl states a desire “den Ozean vergiften” (1:II). In the same speech about poisoning the ocean, Karl mentions two *Schwerter im Busen* (instead of *zwei Seele* in one’s *Brust*) that he would gladly use in his cause. This comparison between Karl and Faust is a bit facetious, but there are countless similarities between *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* that add up, and over the length of this dissertation, make a strong case for the intertextual tragic lineage in the three dramas. In any event, the *Schwert* that Karl is carrying is a weapon akin to the dagger if such a weapon is located in the chest region. The poison and dagger are important intertextual objects with gender connotations. In *Emilia Galotti*, Countess Orsina explains to Emilia’s father, Colonel Galotti, the difference between poison and dagger in terms of their gender affiliation: “Ich hab' einen mitgebracht. *Einen Dolch hervorziehend*. Da nehmen Sie! Nehmen Sie geschwind, eh uns

jemand sieht. – Auch hätte ich noch etwas, – Gift. Aber Gift ist nur für uns Weiber; nicht für Männer. – Nehmen Sie ihn! Ihm den Dolch aufdringend. Nehmen Sie! (4:VII). Applying the principles of Countess Orsina, Stolzius' poisoning of Desportes would symbolize a womanly or simply more honorable form of killing in the eighteenth century. Karl's desire to poison the ocean, and then subsequently his longing instead to use the dagger, is indicative of the subtle differences in killing between a *Mensch* and a *Kraftmensch* during the Sturm und Drang. And for the future robber Karl, as they say, there is no honor amongst thieves.

Karl's first phase of the inner tragic process displays the typical scene of suffering in which several indications of psychological distress relate the visibly shattered self. Although Karl is hopeful of returning home, he is clearly uncertain and anxious because his mate Roller notices Karl trembling and states: "Du zitterst" (1:II). Fear and trembling (*zittern*) are two prominent features of the inner tragic process for *Die Räuber*, and in a way, they replace Aristotelian fear and pity as the tragic combination. Although Lenz created the inner tragic structure and is emulated by Schiller and Goethe, there are subtle variances in the tragic process in each play. On constant in all the works is the way in which psychological and physical issues are connected, Lenz, Schiller, and Goethe all use the body and physical indicators to communicate certain aspects of the mind and its complexities. For example, Karl's trembling is a physical symptom of his fragile psychological state. Despite the outward optimism about potentially being reunited with his father and his love Amalia, Karl is inwardly troubled. It is clear that the realization, the change from hope to despair, is manifesting. Expecting a compassionate response from his father in answer to his letter, Karl's self-shattering occurs when he finally receives the letter (doctored by Franz) which conveys Karl's disownment.

Karl poignantly drops the letter and runs out; it is a moment reminiscent of Marie tearing the letter to shreds and letting them fall to the ground in her moment of fragmentation. The letter from *Alter Moor* leaves Karl pale as death, another physical indicator that Karl is enduring some form of serious trauma. Bohm states that “Karl too suffers from...a crisis of **self**, and also resorts to theft as the solution” (35), but the real solution to Karl’s crisis of self is assuming a new tragic self in order attain ultimate resolution with a death wish; Karl’s thief persona is more of a consequence of the tragic process.

Karl eventually reenters the tavern, and he is already in a transition stage from old self to new tragic self. In his old self, Karl was noticeably more sensible in his entreaties and his desire to know and mend humanity: “Menschen haben Menschheit vor mir verborgen, da ich an Menschheit appellierte” (1:II). After his moment of turning to a darker side, Karl no longer has sympathies when he issues a statement about his disdain for human compassion and desire for violence: “Weg dann von mir Sympathie und menschliche Schonung! – Ich habe keinen Vater mehr, ich habe keine Liebe mehr, und Blut und Tod soll mich vergessen lehren, dass mir jemals etwas teuer war!” (1:II). Mortensen explains that Karl “directs his titanic anger not just against the aristocratic tyrant directly responsible for his own disinheritance, but against all of respectable society” (45). In When Roller is speaking to Karl about becoming a robber and pleading with him to listen, Karl is not really listening, and like Stolzius, Karl is in his little world in this transition period and having imaginary dialogues in the presence of others. Although Roller is pleading with Karl to hear him, Karl is not addressing those around him, but rather something that has a “Menschengesicht” (1:II). Whatever Karl is addressing, it has the face of a human, a mask. In this situation, Karl sees what others do not, and this is tragic vision, a common capability for some of the protagonists experiencing the tragic process. Tragic vision

is an acquired capability, it comes with acceptance of tragic selfhood and enables the tragic self to see what others do not. In modern psychology, tragic vision would be considered schizophrenia. At the same time, Karl informs his comrades that “ein unbeugsames Fatum!” (1:II) reigns over them, and like Stolzius who must lose his reason, there is a sense that both are without choice once the move has been made to accept a tragic self. Moreover, Stolzius the *Menschen* must lose his mind while the *Kraftmensch* is dealing with an unalterable, but deeply desired fate. In the examples of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*, there is no conflict with fate in the traditional classical sense, there is acceptance of the fate that is attached to the tragic selfhood in the second phase of the inner tragic process.

Amalia, the female protagonist of *Die Räuber*, experiences her shattering of self after being informed by Franz about the situation with Karl. Amalia exudes the same kind of energy (*Kraft* is the German word for *energy*)³⁴ and powerful language that Karl possesses as a *Kraftmensch*. When Franz tells Amalia that she would be disgusted with her precious Karl if she could see him “unter der Gestalt” (1:III), she calls him *Ungeheuer* without even hearing the full report. Amalia’s extreme reaction could be likened to flying off the handle and is not typical behavior of the eighteenth-century female in literature. In this same exchange, Franz mentions Karl’s new Gestalt as robber, the form that represents Karl’s tragic selfhood, his physical transformation begins to take shape in the scene prior to Amalia’s interaction with Franz.

In terms of *Menschheit* on the continuum, Karl and Amalia share the qualities of the *Kraftmensch* profile, but their inner tragic process is slightly different. Amalia’s first phase

³⁴ The German *die Energie*, which is used frequently for energy, is a borrowing from the Greek, ἐνέργεια (*energeia*). Wilhelm von Humboldt even describes language as “kein Werk (*Ergon*), sondern eine Thätigkeit (*Energeia*)” (Busch & Stenschke, 8). In this respect, a *Kraftmensch* could be considered a person in action or under development. As my analysis of the plays in relation to the continuum reveals, the *Kraftmensch* is possibly an intermediate and necessary form between *Mensch* and *Übermensch*.

begins when she starts to realize that Karl has been the victim of some mischief. After Amalia experiences her realization, the change from hope to despair, she begins transitioning much like Karl when he rebukes of humanity. In her tirade, Amalia refers to those who have had any part of the mischief against Karl as *Unmenschen* and “Schande der Menschheit!” (1:III). When Franz questions Amalia’s loyalty to Karl she “*schlägt ihn*” (1:III).and calls him a shameless liar. Amalia’s conduct is not that kind of behavior that Marie the *Mensch* would display, nor does Margarete display this kind of *Menschheit*. On the contrary, Amalia is a *Kraftmensch* in her own right and is demonstrating her potency as a woman in the face of a man. Referencing Schiller’s philosophical letter “Theosophie des Julius” (1786), Kluge explains that in “Amalia tritt dem Verächter des Menschen ein Bürge der Menschlichkeit entgegen. Dies eben ist Amalias Funktion” (204). Although Amalie demonstrates *Kraftmensch* qualities, unlike Karl, she does demonstrate that her heart is *menshlich*, meaning, she has honorable intentions like Stolzius. I would even declare that Schiller took the heart of Schubart’s Carl and placed it in Amalie for her function. And yet Amalie also demonstrates violent, vehement, and “egoistic behavior” (Stern, 323) which is certainly justifiable under the circumstances, but these qualities make her a *Kraftmensch* on the continuum, and as such, allows for an analysis that put her on par with Karl as an “extraordinary person” (Stern, 321).

In his less-than-*Kraftmensch* reaction to Amalie, Franz claims that she will learn to *zittern* before him, but he is the one “*mit den Füßen stampfend*” (*Die Räuber*, 1:III) just like Stolzius’ mother who “*stampft mit dem Fuß*” (*Die Soldaten*, 3:II) in the scene with her son in a similar phase one involving recognition, fragmentation, and the beginning of reconstitution and physical transformation. These are two episodes, one from *Die Räuber* and *Die Soldaten*, in which characters who do not experiencing the inner tragic process witness the first phase of a

protagonist and react with stamping of the feet. Although a physical gesture, the stamping of feet reflects an internal frustration that is similar to an impotent rage, and in this case, Stolzius' mother and Franz demonstrate their powerlessness to deal with the first phase of tragic that Stolzius and Amalia are experiencing. There are several examples of the "figure of Franz continuing to be subjected to the formulaic sentimental depreciation of self" (Jonnes 148). Franz's stamping feet and hollow threats symbolize his self-depreciation, and he is either unable or unwillingly to assume the tragic selfhood that would provide the capacity to deal with the *Kraftmensch* Amalia.

In Amalia's moment of fragmentation, she begins to collect her self tragically and she can actually see clearer than Franz now that tragic vision is helping her see through Franz's lies and recognize Karl's situation: "Ha! Karl! nun erkenn ich dich wieder! du bist noch ganz! ganz!" (*Die Räuber*, 1:III). Moreover, Amalia recognizes Franz for what he really is and unleashes a verbal assault worthy of a *Kraftmensch*: "Verräter, wie ich dich ertappe! In eben dieser Laube beschwur er mich, keiner andern Liebe – wenn er sterben sollte – siehst du, wie gottlos, wie abscheulich du – geh aus meinen Augen" (*Die Räuber*, 1:III). And like Marie from *Die Soldaten*, Amalia, in her final gesture signifying her fragmentation "*sie reißt sich die Perlen vom Hals*" (*Die Räuber*, 1:III) and lets them fall before the swine Franz. My reference to the *New Testament* passage "pearls before swine" (Matthew 7:6) is not the first hint at a possible allegory between the inner tragic process and the Bible but the tearing here is more of a tragic marker that signifies a juncture of the first phase. In *Die Soldaten* and *Die Räuber*, the first phase of the inner tragic process exhibits several intertextual markers, such as trembling (Stolzius, Karl), pale skin (Stolzius, Karl), and the tearing of an object (Marie, Amalia). Just after Amalia tears her pearls, she also ponders Franz's threat to make her a beggar: "Bettler, sagt er?" (1:III). In *Die Soldaten*,

Marie transforms into a *Bettelmensch* in phase three of inner tragic process, but this is one of the examples to come that also show intertextual tragic markers that cut across phases.

Faust I: Temptation and Tears

Goethe's work on his Faust character developed over three stages, the *Urfaust* in the early 1770s, *Faust: Ein Fragment* in 1790, and *Faust I* in 1808. It is important to understand the three stages of Goethe's work on his Faust character in relation to the three phases of the inner tragic structure to show that Goethe may have been influenced by the Lenzian tragic project despite writing the Faust's first phase presumably before *Die Soldaten*. When Goethe arrived in Weimar in 1775, a year before *Die Soldaten*, "*Faust* was probably not much more than a bundle of dramatic sketches" (Heffner 27) that read as a "satire on university life" (Heffner 27). The first time the public actually sees Goethe's *Faust I* is in 1790 with the publication of *Faust: Ein Fragment*. By 1790, some fourteen years has passed since Lenz wrote *Die Soldaten*, and in that time period, the nature of Goethe's *Faust I* had changed from a satire on university life to its truer form, that of a *Gelehrtentragödie*. The third iteration of Goethe's work on his Faust character comes in the final version of 1808, *Faust I*. Technically, *Faust I* is the official final product and the primary version for most research concerning Goethe's Faust character in its entirety. *Faust I* is also my source for the analysis of the inner tragic process for Faust and Margarete. Nevertheless, the fact that certain phases of the inner tragic process of *Faust I* were undoubtedly written after *Die Soldaten* reinforces my theory of lineage (or continuity) between these works and *Die Räuber*. Although my focus is *Faust I* of 1808, there will be instances in which the development of Goethe's *Fauststoff* that show that the inner tragic structure in the final product possible developed after *Die Soldaten*. Moreover, Smith points out in "*Die Gretchenfrage : Goethe and Philosophies of Religion around 1800*" (2011), the religious and

philosophical contexts of the time affected the storyline of Goethe's Faust and "the intersection of Goethe and idealism needs to be considered in light of theological and *religions-philosophische* motivations. Once we take them into account, it makes more sense that Goethe would have been in the thick of this philosophical transition..." (184).

The main storyline of *Faust I* follows Faust, a university scholar who is suffering what today we would consider a mid-life crisis or an *Existenzkrise*. At the core of Faust's crisis is "the root of many a human enterprise: the drive for love and the drive for knowledge" (Heffner 12). In the case of Faust, his years of immersion in books and his inundation with knowledge has left him yearning for new spheres of excitement, but somehow, he feels uncertain about how to actually fulfill his yearning. Faust's uncompromising and maddening drive for knowledge opens dimensions from whence supernatural spirits emerge, initially an *Erdgeist* and later the devil himself, Mephistopheles. Faust's interactions with such supernatural figures is a crucial marker for the *Übermensch* in terms of the continuum. In fact, it is the *Erdgeist* that refers to Faust as an *Übermensch* and, in my opinion, this is the textual evidence – interaction with a supernatural spirit – that distinguishes the *Übermensch* for the *Menschheit* continuum. Faust and Margarete both interact with *Geister*, Faust with the *Erdgeist* and Margarete with the *Böser Geist*, not to mention their experiences with Mephistopheles. There is also an aspect of *Übermensch* that involves preparation for something beyond earthly life, the specter of higher powers at work in *Faust I* who prepare the *Übermenschen* in the "kleine [Welt]" (2052) of *Faust I* for the "große Welt" (2052) of *Faust II*.

Faust appears shattered from the very start and his opening serves as his scene of suffering within his psychological exposition. The cracks in Faust's shattered Self open wider with each line as he outlines the cause of his despair – years of erudition have actually achieved

little. Faust, the renowned scholar, has achieved great knowledge but feels unfulfilled: “Und bin so klug als wie zuvor!” (*Faust I*, 359). Much like the tearing action that signifies of important aspects of Marie’s and Amalia’s shattering, Faust’s years of learning has ‘ripped’ the joy of life from him: “Dafür ist mir auch alle Freud‘ entrissen” (*Faust I*, 370). Much like Stolzius and Marie, this psychological torment is accompanied by thoughts of suicide and a real intention to end life with a “letzte Trunk“ (*Faust I*, 735) which is presumably poison in a chalice. Suddenly, a ‘choir of angels’ singing a “tröstlichen Gesang” (*Faust I*, 746) prevent Faust from drinking the potion and evokes feelings of childhood and rebirth. Faust feels a “brünstige Genuss” (*Faust I*, 774) that offers him a brief moment of hope. Unfortunately, hope returns to despair when Faust recalls his prophecy from the *Erdgeist* and admits tearfully that the earth has brought him back to reality: “Die Träne quilt, die Erde hat mich wieder!” (*Faust I*, 784). In that consultation with the *Erdgeist* Faust discovers that he comprehends the spirit that he resembles which turns out to be the devil. This notion of comprehension essentially equates to understanding the appropriate supernatural source for fulfillment. The major cause of Faust’s suffering is the realization that he cannot achieve the kind of fulfillment that he demands. Therefore, Faust resorts to magic and manages to gain access to the supernatural source that can help him, Mephistopheles. The interaction with the *Erdgeist* and the eventual meeting with Mephistopheles in this first phase of Faust’s tragic process confirms fairly quickly that we are dealing with *Übermenschen*, the third type of *Mensch* that has access to and special consideration from supernatural beings.

Eventually, Faust makes the infamous pact with Mephistopheles in return for a heightened life of an array of emotions that results in the “demonically achieved, divinely sanctioned resurrection of Faust’s youth” (Dowden 1). The restoration of Faust’s youth is the tragic selfhood in the second phase of the inner tragic process and will feature more in the next

chapter. For now, the psychological exposition is of prime importance, and as a phase, runs more or less from “Nacht” to “Hexenküche.” Some of the tragic symbols for the psychological exposition have been covered, like the scene of suffering, but there are some additional tragic markers that will emerge with some critical background information in the form of a traditional exposition in the following paragraphs. My traditional exposition here, and there really is no exposition in *Faust I*, will serve as an outer element of structure to show the embedded inner tragic structure of the play.

The “Prolog im Himmel” is really the beginning of the play and serves in part as an exposition for the spectacle of Faust and Mephistopheles. During the prologue, a conversation between God and Mephistopheles takes place, and in this exchange, Mephistopheles makes wager with God that he can tempt God’s *Knecht* (servant) Faust. At this point, the psychological exposition begins with “Nacht” and continues through the next scenes “Vor der Tor,” “Studierzimmer I & II,” “Auerbachs Keller,” and into “Hexenküche.” Mephistopheles appears in human form in the first “Studierzimmer” scene as the comprehensible “Geist, der stets verneint” (*Faust I*, 1338) when Faust is picking up the pieces of his shattered self. Mephistopheles does not say it specifically, but he is there to help Faust reassemble his self because his statements about wholes and parts suggest that Faust is in pieces. Seeing Faust suffer in his shattered state, Mephistopheles teases about how people like to think of themselves as whole: “Wenn sich der Mensch...gewöhnlich für ein Ganzes hält” (*Faust I*, 1348). This notion of wholeness is also seen in the first phase of *Die Räuber* when Amalia considers that Karl is “noch ganz! ganz!” (*Die Räuber*, 1:III). Mephistopheles even riddles about being a “ein Teil des Teils, der anfangs alles war” (*Faust I*, 1349) and must be content now to just be “ein Teil der Finsternis” (*Faust I*, 1350). The entire discussion of parts and wholes reveals the shattered aura of Faust and the first phase

of the inner tragic process. In their next meeting in the second “Studierzimmer,” Faust’s fragmented state is still evident as he describes to Mephistopheles his distaste for worldly things (“Was kann mir die Welt wohl gewähren?” *Faust I*, 1548) and still has signs of suicidal tendencies when he expresses his longing for death. There is also a *Geisterchor* that sing in this scene and mention the carrying of fragments (“Wir tragen die Trümmern ins Nichts hinüber” *Faust I*, 1613-14) and bring Faust to the moment of no return: the diabolical reassembling of his new self. At the same time, this process of reconstitution and eventual acceptance of tragic selfhood means that “*Faust* allowed its hero to escape from his narrow gothic chamber, the prison house of the self” (Brown 100). Faust accepts Mephistopheles’ offer of things no human has ever seen before (“Ich gebe dir, was noch kein Mensch gesehen” *Faust I*, 1674), and further solidifies Faust’s status as an *Übermensch* with the vision of a tragic self. Although the agreement between Faust and Mephistopheles is referred to as a “*Pakt*” (*Faust I*, 1414) and a “*Bündnis*” (*Faust I*, 1741) it takes of the form of a wager in this fashion:

Faust: Werd ich beruhigt je mich auf ein Faulbett legen,
So sei es gleich um mich getan!
Kannst du mich schmeichelnd je belügen,
Daß ich mir selbst gefallen mag,
Kannst du mich mit Genuß betrügen –
Das sei für mich der letzte Tag!
Die Wette biet ich!
(*Faust*, I, 1692-1698)

Faust continues to describe what he wants to experience in relation to a new tragic self:

Faust: Will ich in meinem innern Selbst genießen,
Mit meinem Geist das Höchst' und Tiefste greifen,
Ihr Wohl und Weh auf meinen Busen häufen,
Und so mein eigen Selbst zu ihrem Selbst erweitern,
Und, wie sie selbst, am End auch ich zerscheitern.
(*Faust*, I, 1771-1775)

Concluding the wager in blood, Faust is now finishing his reassembling of self and will finalize a tragic selfhood in the next phase during the scene “Hexenküche.”

Transitioning to Margarete’s first phase of the inner tragic process, a brief summary of her episode in *Faust I* provides a segue to her psychological exposition. There is a tendency to consider Margarete’s story in *Faust I* as the Gretchen tragedy, a sub-plot of the greater Faust tragedy. This inner tragedy of Margarete complicates the Lenzian inner tragic structure somewhat, but a closer look at Margarete’s story and her deliverance in *Faust I* opens up the deeper inner tragic that aligns with the intertextual process. The source of the Gretchen tragedy is the theme of abandonment, specifically Faust’s abandonment of Margarete at the end of *Faust I*. As a concept, abandonment goes beyond mere act of deserting someone, and its usage within Existential philosophy reveals a deeper meaning for Margarete:

A rhetorical term used by existentialist philosophers such as Heidegger and Sartre to describe absence of any sources of ethical authority external to oneself. It suggests that one might have expected to find such an authority, either in religion or from an understanding of the natural world, and that the discovery that there is none leads one to feel ‘abandoned.’” (Baldwin 1)

Regarding Existentialist version of abandonment, there are three points that I would like to make about Margarete in *Faust I*. Firstly, I argue that the Gretchen Tragedy is more of a religious episode that actually ends in her salvation by a higher power and not in the abandonment by Faust. Butler maintains “the voice calling out that Gretchen is saved is the first voice proclaiming salvation in Faustian poetry to which one lends a willing and grateful ear” (*The Fortunes of Faust* 199). If we consider Baldwin’s definition of abandonment, then Margarete probably either felt abandoned in her conversation with the *böser Geist* or simply abandoned her faith in that moment, and eventually she would choose a tragic selfhood and turn her back on her religious beliefs. In reference to Margarete, Becker-Cantarino makes a

fascinating point about how women were believed to have “less faith (because *femina*, ‘woman,’ was supposedly derived from *fe minus* ‘less faith’) and thus fell prey to the devil” (2), and yet, in *Faust I* it is Faust who is the faithless and the devil’s prey. Secondly, Margarete’s story is not a tragedy in the classical sense and not tragic in the Lenzian sense. Embedded in her religious episode is an inner tragic process that leads to the death of her child, but her “sequence of seventeen clear-cut scenes” (Heffner 33) is not a tragedy in any sense of the word. Third, the deliverance of Margarete from above signifies her status as *Übermensch* in that a divine power has intervened to not only save her but elevate her to a sacred position from which she can later play a part in Faust’s entrance “zu höheren Sphären” (*Faust II*, 12094).

In a way, the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process also contributes to the conditions set in *Faust I* for *Faust II*. The truly tragic portion of Margarete’s episode, as it relates to the inner tragic process, is infanticide, the incident when Margarete drowns her newborn child in her anguish. As an element of the Lenzian inner tragic structure, the infanticide would represent the third phase of the inner tragic process, and thus, the emotional dénouement. When we consider the severity of infanticide, then, the “tragic parting in the dungeon” (Heffner 33) is not so tragic after all, especially considering that Margarete is “gerettet” (*Faust I*, 4612) from a “Stimme (von oben): Ist gerettet!” (*Faust I*, 4612). A reconsideration of Margarete using the Lenzian inner tragic structure shows that buried underneath both the *Gelehrtentragödie* and the traditional Gretchen Tragedy is the inner tragic process that illuminates Margarete’s tragic circumstances: abandonment of faith, tragic selfhood, and the death wish for her child.

If the infanticide is the final phase of the inner Margarete tragic structure, then her first two phases would precede this violent moment. Therefore, the first phase for Margarete, that is, her fragmentation, occurs in the scene “Am Brunnen” in which she begins to realize (or

recognize) her sin with Faust (“Und bin nun selbst der Sünde bloß!” *Faust I*, 3884). This realization shatters Margarete’s self which she equates with sin itself and begins her inner tragic will to reconstitute in a different form to prepare for violent action. In the next scene “Zwinger,” Margarete continues her fragmentation with tears and broken heart (“Ich wein’, ich wein’, ich weine, Das Herz zerbricht in mir.” *Faust I*, 3606-07) as she speaks to the father above praying for salvation (“Hilf! rette mich von Schmach und Tod!” *Faust I*, 3616). Of course, Margarete’s scene of suffering and self-shattering happens well into *Faust I* and represents an anomaly in this series of first phases. Nevertheless, Margarete displays the psychological torment, the spiritual and self-shattering, and the beginning of a reassembling that has some interesting potentialities as an anomaly. In fact, there are several possible transformations that could apply to Margarete. Margarete’s transformation along mythological lines and possibly into “an Ariadne figure” (Del Caro, “Margarete-Ariadne” 224) in the second phase of the Lenzian inner tragic structure is an alluring idea which would match Stolzius who looks different but has essentially the same physical appearance. Barbara Becker-Cantarino in her “Witch and Infanticide: Imaging the Female in Faust I” (2011) explains how “the female protagonist Margarete, who is transformed from virgin into child-murderess, has roots in early modern German cultural history, as do Faust and Mephisto” (1). Becker-Cantarino’s transformation of Margarete in terms of pureness into vileness is also a plausible change that relates well with the Lenzian tragic.

Chapter Commentary for Phase I: Language and Theory of Drama

In addition to inner tragic process there are aspects of the three plays that make their presence felt, namely language (style) and theory of drama. Duncan makes a noteworthy statement about Lenz’s language in that “Lenz presents the familiar eighteenth-century concepts of *Witz* and *Herz*. The distinction between arbitrary and natural signs in language, which actually

extends as far back as Plato's *Cratylus*, occupies a central position in eighteenth-century linguistics" (516). It has been well noted that Lenz's use of language reflects his sense of realism and desire to portray the *Mensch* at the lowest level. Schiller follows suit by also presenting "an element of realism in the very style of the play (Guthrie 443) Much like *Die Soldaten*, Schiller's *Die Räuber* is "written in prose, set in contemporary Germany, using contemporary German..." (Guthrie, 443). Schiller takes Lenz's brand of realism, however, to greater heights, and it is this elevated style that signifies the level of *Kraftmensch*. Guthrie explains that Schiller's *Die Räuber* achieves "shocking effects through its subject-matter a sense of cut and thrust, of dialectical, interlocking dialogue, of argument and counter-argument appropriate to the social, philosophical, and psychological themes it raises" (443). Although not written in prose, Schiller's plays serves as a transition from the simpler *Mensch* language of *Die Soldaten* to the elevated *Übermensch* language in *Faust I* because "in *Die Räuber* every word is meaningful" (Stransky-Stranka-Greifensfeld, 90). Unlike Lenz and Schiller, Goethe writes mostly in verse, a style that seems to best represent an even higher level of *Mensch*, the *Übermensch*. Goethe uses an array of rhythmic patterns in his verse, ranging from the five-beat iambic line to trochaic tetrameter, but he does also employ free rhythms. The lack of uniformity in Goethe's language is indicative of the different stages of *Faust I* and perhaps the nature of an era that was fractured, formless, and lacking coherence. As far as language is concerned, the one consistency of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* as tragic trilogy is found in word selection at certain points of the inner tragic process such as trembling and tearing. There is not only unity among the three plays on the tragic plane and at the inner structural level, but also in the tragic diction they use to accentuate a moment .

The final portion of this chapter presents the three commentaries on theater in *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*. The theoretical sections about the theater embedded in these dramas are not linked to the storylines, but since they are in the text, I include them here as a part of the textual analysis of the first phase. The appearance of the commentaries on theater suggest an even stronger intertextual relationship and lineage on the theoretical plane for the three literary works. Unlike the *Urfaust* being a product of the early 1770s and before *Die Soldaten*, Goethe's metadiscourse on theater "Vorspiel auf dem Theater" was added much later³⁵ in the 1808 final version. Furthermore, all of the commentaries appear at the beginning or near the beginning as if that were standard procedure to front load them. At the same time, all three commentaries are presented differently and reflect the three different genres: *Die Soldaten*, a *Komödie*, has an early scene of dialogue about the dangers of theater; *Die Räuber*, a *Schauspiel*, has a *Vorwort* with to references to the theory of drama; and *Faust I*, a *Tragödie*, has a "Vorspiel auf dem Theater" that is a dialogue between a stage manager, a poet (dramatist), and a comedian (actor) about the kind of theater the German people deserve most. The review of the German theory of drama discourse in the eighteenth century in the previous chapter provides the motifs that also appear in the three commentaries of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*.

In *Die Soldaten*, there is a discussion about the theater between several secondary characters of the play, namely Colonel von Spannheim, his cousin the 'young count,' the young count's tutor, Major Haudy, Eisenhardt the chaplain, and Mary. The main point of the discussion is the benefit of the theater for the officer corps and also "im ganzen Staat" (*Die Soldaten* 1:IV). The distaste for the French theater is also present when the officers describe "die Schaubühne [als] eine fast unentbehrliche Sache...wo Geschmack herrscht, wie zum Exempel auf der

³⁵ According to Trunz, "Das *Vorspiel* entstand vermutlich Ende der neunziger Jahre." (496)

französischen.” (*Die Soldaten* 1:IV). The discussion provides several interesting thoughts on the detrimental effects of “das furchtsame französische Trauerspiel” (*Die Soldaten* 1:IV) on the German audience. A classical reference to Horace’s *Art of Poetry* in which the Roman theorist describes the purpose of poetry is to teach and delight. When Eisenhardt asks “was lernen die Herren [Soldaten] dort?” (*Die Soldaten* 1:IV). Mary responds with the Horatian epitaph: “Ei was, muss man denn immer lernen, wir amüsieren uns, ist das nicht genug” (*Die Soldaten* 1:IV). The biggest issue is taken up by Eisenhardt who laments the way in which plays portray soldiers seducing and dishonoring respectable young middle-class woman, and thus, undermining the fathers who are the upholders of middle-class morality. Eisenhardt concludes his tirade with the following description of current stage plays:

Aber werden ihm nicht in den neuesten Komödien die größten Verbrechen gegen die heiligsten Rechte der Väter und Familien unter so reizenden Farben vorgestellt, den giftigsten Handlungen so der Stachel genommen, dass ein Bösewicht dasteht, als ob er ganz neulich vom Himmel gefallen wäre. Sollte das nicht aufmuntern, sollte das nicht alles ersticken, was das Gewissen aus der Eltern Hause mitgebracht haben kann. Einen wachsamem Vater zu betrügen, oder ein unschuldiges Mädchen in Lastern zu unterrichten, das sind die Preisaufgaben, die dort aufgelöst werden. (*Die Soldaten*, I:IV)

Notably, the real form of drama discussed in this scene is the comedy, not the tragedy. The word *Komödie* is used throughout and is considered by some as a disorderly form of drama (“was für Unordnungen werden nicht vorgebeugt oder abgehalten durch die Komödie” *Die Soldaten* 1:IV). As we will see with Goethe’s “Vorspiel”, the actor is a comedian and represents the comedic aspect of tragedy in accordance with Lenz’s vision of the genre in his theoretical essay *Anmerkungen übers Theater*.

Schiller’s famous “Vorrede” to *Die Räuber* is often included in anthologies about the theory of drama because Schiller expresses his “worries about the reception of his play, a sign that even at this early stage of his career he was concerned with the effect of theatre on society”

(Sidnell 153). Schiller designates his play a *Schauspiel* and that it should be taken “für nichts anders, als eine dramatische Geschichte, die die Vorteile der dramatischen Methode, die Seele gleichsam bei ihren geheimsten Operationen” (*Die Räuber* “Vorrede”). In *Die Räuber*, Schiller’s commentary on drama and theater provides some interesting justifications for detailing the grim truths of life of in his dramatic story. Just as Lenz begins with Horace, Schiller begins with Aristotle and explains the impossibility of adhering to “die allzu engen Palisaden des Aristoteles” (*Die Räuber* “Vorrede”) and his rules of drama such as the unity of time (twenty-four-hour period). As Schiller elucidates, the restrictions of the unities are not suitable for the kind of realism he is presenting in *Die Räuber*. In fact, there is not enough time to show the cruel realities of human nature in drama according to Schiller, but his attempt to highlight the “unmoralische Charaktere” (*Die Räuber* “Vorrede”) in life is a worthy endeavor. At the same time, Schiller states that his play is not suitable for the stage because of its darkness, but the reading public is encouraged as long as they do not misinterpret this gruesome depiction of humanity:

Wer sich den Zweck vorgezeichnet hat, das Laster zu stürzen und Religion, Moral und bürgerliche Gesetze an ihren Feinden zu rächen, ein solcher muss das Laster in seiner nackten Abscheulichkeit enthüllen und in seiner kolossalischen Größe vor das Auge der Menschheit stellen – er selbst muss augenblicklich seine nächtlichen Labyrinth durchwandern, – er muss sich in Empfindungen hineinzuzwingen wissen, unter deren Widernatürlichkeit sich seine Seele sträubt. (*Die Räuber*, “Vorrede”)

In a foreshadowing of Faust’s labyrinthine course (“Des Lebens labyrinthisch irren Lauf” *Faust I*, 13) as the “Ebenbild der Gottheit” (*Faust I*, 516), Schiller mentions the ‘nächtlichen Labyrinth’ and also the “der Stempel des göttlichen Ebenbilds” (*Die Räuber*, “Vorrede”) while concluding with an artist’s frustration reminiscent of the *Dichter* of Goethe’s “Vorspiel auf dem Theater” who wants “das höchste Recht” (*Faust I*, 135) for his poetic license:

Zu kurzsichtig, mein Ganzes auszureichen, zu kleingeistisch, mein Großes zu begreifen, zu boshaft, mein Gutes wissen zu wollen, wird er, fürchte ich, fast meine Absicht vereiteln, wird vielleicht eine Apologie des Lasters, das ich stürze, darin zu finden meinen und seine eigene Einfalt den armen Dichter entgelten lassen, dem man gemeiniglich alles, nur nicht Gerechtigkeit widerfahren lässt. (*Die Räuber*, “Vorrede”)

In the “Vorspiel auf dem Theater” in Goethe’s *Faust I*. The “Vorspiel” has three persons – the theater manager, the poet, and the comedian – who provide their perspective on theater. The theater manager emphasizes the need to put theatergoers in seats with ‘satisfying’ plays, the poet insists on quality plays that require time and creative genius, and the comedian promotes a mixture of fun, emotion, and sensibility. In his “Anmerkungen” to *Faust*, Erich Trunz claims that “die Idee, diese Gestalten auftreten zu lassen, kam Goethe durch ein ähnliches Vorspiel in dem von ihm sehr geliebten Drama ‘Sakuntala’ des altindischen Dichters Kalidasa, das er 1791 zum ersten Male las” (496). Trunz’ point regarding the possible Indian inspiration for Goethe’s prelude notwithstanding, the discussion on theater in *Faust I* resembles Lenz’s theater dialogue in *Die Soldaten* in comedic mood with tragic spirit. First, Goethe’s use of dialogue and especially a comedian (“*lustige Person*”) instead of a tragedian is linked to the discussion of comedy in *Die Soldaten*, itself a comedy with a tragic nature, and the idea of comedy representing drama as a whole. The comedy and the comedian speak for tragedy in the *Die Soldaten* and the Vorspiel. Second, a sentiment shared by the Vorspiel and *Die Soldaten* is the need for a drama suitable for the German nation and the importance of presenting something of quality which the poet and the preacher (*Dichter* and Eisenhardt) both express. A third relevant aspect is the idea of transcendence in these commentaries on drama, reflecting the *Menschen*-progression in that there seems to be a kind of *Mensch* discussion in *Die Soldaten* that focuses on family, a *Kraftmensch* “Vorrede” in *Die Räuber* on the unpleasantness of human reality as violent action, and an *Übermensch* “Vorspiel auf dem Theater” that considers the wonders of

poetry, the hand of God, and the circle of creation that takes us “vom Himmel durch die Welt zur Hölle” (*Faust I*, 242). As the next two phases of the Lenzian inner tragic structure will show, there is a tragic cycle started by Lenz in *Die Soldaten* and completed with Goethe in *Faust I*. In this era of national awakening, the stage played an important role and the national theater movement in Germany during the second half of the eighteenth century arguably become the focal point of German literature.

This metadiscourse about theater in *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* will conclude the next chapter since it is technically a part of the textual analyses. The discourse about a German national theater in the section about the theory of drama outlined the basic points of contention. There is also a significant debate in Sturm und Drang scholarship about the role of theater during the Sturm und Drang with *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* often at the center of this debate; especially, Schiller’s *Die Räuber*. As Leidner points out, there was a tendency in German drama after Lessing that was prominent with the Stürmer und Dränger to “write a national culture into existence” (3).

CHAPTER THREE

PHASE II OF THE INNER TRAGIC – TRAGIC SELFHOOD

A Physical Climax with Moral Implications

F.J.W. Schelling in his *Briefe über Dogmatismus und Kritizismus* (1794-96) describes a “Streben nach unveränderlicher Selbstheit, unbedingter Freiheit, [und] uneingeschränkter Tätigkeit” (141). According to Szondi, the origins of tragic theory in the German tradition resides in Schelling’s critical letters and his discussion about the tragic as a goal-oriented (teleology) process that involves selfhood, freedom, and action. Twenty years before Schelling, Lenz was developing a structure to capture a process of changing *Selbstheit*, the achievement of a new, but tragic selfhood to be precise. As this chapter will show, malleable selfhood, freedom, and tragic action all play a major part in the second phase of the inner tragic structure process. The second phase is the point of physical culmination following the psychological exposition (Phase I) in this tragic process. Schelling also describes a “tragische Vorgang” (141) in his *Briefe* as a form of dialectic in which a tragic hero like King Oedipus “does not merely succumb to the superior power of the objective, but is also additionally punished for succumbing, for taking up the struggle at all” (Szondi, 8). The inner tragic process described in this dissertation as a progression of psychological, physical, and emotional features within a continuum of *Menschen* resembles Schelling’s commentary on the tragic but precedes it, and as Chapter V demonstrates, much of the German philosophy of the tragic actually begins in the Sturm und Drang with Lenz.

The argument that Lenz’s inner tragic serves as the transition from Aristotle’s *Poetics* to Schelling’s philosophy of tragic is a major part of this dissertation and will highlight the final sections. For now, this transition phase serves as a reminder of the contextual links between German philosophy of the tragic and the inner tragic process of the three plays and continues to demonstrate the intertextuality between the *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber* and *Faust I* on the inner

tragic plane of the plays. Whereas the initial psychological phase involves an internal shattering of self with no significant external variance, the physical phase involves an internal reconstitution of self that projects itself outward with an external transformation that signifies the achievement of tragic selfhood (*tragische Selbstheit*), a term I use to describe the overall tragic state of the protagonists in the second phase. Unlike the unchanging *Selbstheit* in Schelling's commentary on the tragic, physical change is an essential component of tragic selfhood in the second phase of the Lenzian inner tragic structure because it conceals a reconstituted tragic self while suppressing the old, shattered self.

The confirmation that tragic selfhood has occurred in the dramas comes mostly in the way of a physical transformation but a change in status, attitude, or even aura can either accompany or serve as the actual acceptance of tragic selfhood. As a somewhat straightforward example of physical transformation, Stolzius suddenly appears as a batman (military officer's assistant) in *Die Soldaten*, and at the same time, exhibits all the signs of tragic selfhood. A more nuanced approach to transformation is Marie's change in position from merchant daughter to countess companion but could be interpreted as nun because she accepts celibacy and the austere, nun-like conditions set by the countess. Interpreting Marie as nun can also be substantiated by Mary whose comment about Marie living "wie in einem Kloster da" (4:III) provides textual testimony. The term *Umbildung* was used previously in this dissertation to represent the transformation of self, but the idea of tragic selfhood best represents the overall feel of the second phase. Specifically, tragic selfhood is a new, darker kind of self that overcomes the old through repression. There are several examples of relapses, moments when the old self manages to remerge. In moments of relapse, we sense two voices speak, one for each self, and in each case, the old self is forced back into a deep area of the character's psyche. Tragic selfhood

includes the obvious physical transformations that help readers visualize the change but also show that physical change is necessary for the protagonists to achieve the goal (or telos) – tragic action (violence, murder). In other words, tragic selfhood is required to complete phase two of the inner tragic process. More importantly, the protagonists who transform tragically do so willingly and cognizant of their turn to a darker side of themselves, and once transformed, they demonstrate an inability or unwillingness to control their actions or deny themselves any possibility of returning to normal self before the deadly action is complete. In truth, the protagonists have reached a point of no return with tragic selfhood. Paradoxically, freedom seems to creep into tragic selfhood as several protagonists cry for freedom in this phase but must acknowledge that their tragic confinement makes emancipation in the Enlightenment sense improbable.

In addition to the exterior changes that are occurring in this phase, tragic selfhood also illustrates a deep psychological rift in the minds of the protagonists between old moral self and new tragic immoral self. Tragic selfhood, as a projecting exterior power that hides itself and suppresses the old self, is ultimately connected to a deep psychological struggle. Meaning, the primacy of the physical change in the second phase does not discount the importance of psychology moving forward. In fact, the psychological strings of the first phase and the physical transformation of the second combine to create a different ontology, a tragic ontology, one obligated more to mood than to morals or *Sittlichkeit*. As the third phase will demonstrate, the protagonists eventually surrender totally to emotion, feeling, and violence. Nevertheless, the third phase and the final violent action is not possible without the *Larve* that Franz describes in *Die Räuber*, the new exterior that is required for tragic selfhood and the carrying out of immoral

deeds. In other words, the physical change is more than a symptom of the denial of *Sittlichkeit*, it makes *Unsittlichkeit* possible.

Die Soldaten: Batman and Beggar

In *Die Soldaten*, the second phase for Stolzius begins when he suddenly appears dressed as a soldier in the presence of the officer Mary. Prior to appearing in a military *Rock* (tunic), Stolzius' previous scene ended with him speaking in riddles to his mother as he seemed determined to take a course of action that would punish Desportes, thereby avenging Marie. Lenz does not provide the details about Stolzius actually planning and transforming, instead his sudden appearance in a different form signifies that he has achieved tragic selfhood. And the tragic indicators are apparent as Mary's astonishment and comment shows: "Wie verändert, wie abgefallen, wie blaß? Ihr könntet mir's hundertmal sagen, Ihr wäret Stolzius, ich glaubt es Euch nicht." (3:V). It is evident that Stolzius has changed drastically and is practically unrecognizable even as himself. The uniform probably contributes to Stolzius' change in appearance, but it is his gaunt look and pale complexion that really show the effects of the deathly tragic that Lenz is after. Karl Moor (and his father) were also *bläss* when experiencing their moment of self-shattering, and as a few other protagonists will show, pale complexion is an intertextual indicator of an inner tragic that flows through these plays. Stolzius offers to be Mary's *Bedienten* (usually translated as batman, an officer's assistant), and although Stolzius does not verbalize his intent with the charade, one has the sense that his new form is somehow a component of his overall plan to avenge Marie. Speaking of Marie, she later notices Mary's batman (Stolzius) and claims that his assistant resembles someone she used to know: "Hören Sie, Ihr Soldat gleicht sehr viel einem gewissen Menschen den ich ehemals gekannt habe und der auch um mich angehalten hat" (3:VI). Marie's inability to recognize Stolzius is such a significant event because she is the one

who was romantically linked to Stolzius and still by her own admission has feelings for him. This shows that despite being the same person, Stolzius has changed to such a degree tragically that even his former fiancé cannot recognize him.

A few scenes later, Stolzius' plan concerning Desportes becomes clearer when he discusses Marie with Mary. Actually, it is more like Mary talking to Stolzius about Marie as if Stolzius was never her fiancé, as if he was a disinterested third party. Again, this shows that Stolzius had transformed so drastically that Mary could talk to him about Marie as if he were not Stolzius. In reality, Stolzius is not the same, his old self is gone, this is his new tragic selfhood on display. Strangely, Mary confides in Stolzius that he has feelings for Marie and intends on marrying her if possible, and even describes a conversation he had with Marie in which she continued to have suicidal thoughts. "Und wenn ich noch so denke, wie sie [Marie] neulich im Mondschein mit mir spazieren ging und mir ihre Not klagte, wie sie manchmal mitten in der Nacht aufspränge, wenn ihr die schwermütigen Gedanken einkämen, und nach einem Messer suchte" (4:I). It is uncertain in what phase Marie was in during this conversation with Mary, but the thought of suicide is a feature of phase one. Structurally, either Marie is still in her psychological exposition or the effects of her psychological phase are still lingering and have carried over to her second phase as the companion of the countess. When hearing about Marie's thoughts of suicide, Stolzius, much like Karl in the first phase of *Die Räuber*, is trembling ("STOLZIUS zittert"). Trembling is an example of an intertextual inner tragic indicator that is prevalent in one phase of a play (first phase of *Die Räuber*) that has prominence in a different phase of another play (phase two of *Die Soldaten*) in the tragic trilogy of the Sturm und Drang.

As the action progresses, Stolzius is still *bleich und verwildert* as his plan for Desportes begins to take shape. While serving Mary, Stolzius explains to his officer-in-charge that rats have

damaged some of the officer's clothing making them no longer wearable. Mary orders Stolzius to lay out some poison for the rats, but Stolzius explains that Mary's official seal is required to obtain the poison. Mary gives the official seal to Stolzius who then walks into the corner of the room and begins talking to himself. In a short but revealing monologue, Stolzius speaks of Marie differently than before. In other words, this is Stolzius' new voice, and it is the voice of his tragic self: "Ihr Bild steht unaufhörlich vor mir – Pfui Teufel! fort mit den Gedanken. Kann ich dafür daß sie so eine wird. Sie hat's ja nicht besser haben wollen" (4:IX). I stress here in this moment monologue for Stolzius because later he has more moments of speaking to himself in which two voices, one of his old self and one of his tragic self, form more of a dialogue within the same person. Obviously, the Stolzius of old defended Marie, now with his new tragic selfhood and transformed appearance, Stolzius condemns Marie with a voice that reveals his new tragic self.

Despite telling his mother at the end of the first phase that he was feeling better, Stolzius "*tritt wieder zur andern Gesellschaft und hustet erbärmlich*" (4:IX) after his short monologue in the corner. Stolzius is indeed not well after all and his physical condition is deteriorating as his cough suggests. Moreover, Stolzius' trembling and anxiety only intensifies while later pacing back and forth outside the apothecary. In the next monologue, Stolzius asks himself: "Was zitterst du? Und müssen denn die zittern, die Unrecht leiden und die allein fröhlich sein, die Unrecht tun!" (4:XI). Clearly, this voice of Stolzius is deeply troubled and it appears to be his old self momentarily reemerging as voice of reason or morality. The brief return of the old self makes Stolzlius tremble, and the trembling, in this respect, appears to be the result of the struggle (or conflict) between old and new self. The case of Stolzius also shows that the old self is not entirely gone, just repressed by the tragic self. In tragic selfhood, the old self is hidden within in what later resembles a deep cavern (*Kluft*) in the mind while the tragic self (much like a *persona*)

projects the new external image that is required for concealment during the final tragic resolution. At the same time, there are even moments when the tragic self antagonizes the old self creating an especially wicked aura for the *Menschen* in the plays. The final statements of the scene with Stolzius obtaining the poison also demonstrates how the tragic self has command the old: “Herein Stolzius! wenn's nicht für ihn ist, so ist's doch für dich. Und das ist ja alles was du wünschest” (4:XI). Although the need for rat poison was not initially remarkable, the ultimate purpose for the poison is becoming evident as Stolzius enters the apothecary to obtain something *für ihn* (Desportes) or *für dich* (actually, for Stolzius’ old self). In a way, suicide has a different feel when we consider it is the new tragic self actually killing the old. The thought of suicide (“so ist's doch für dich”) that appears again in this second phase for Stolzius, and possibly for Marie, shows that suicide never truly leaves the thought process of the protagonist experiencing the inner tragic process.

Prior to her assuming tragic selfhood, Marie was abandoned by Desportes, and the humiliation of this incident contributes to her and Stolzius’ shattering in phase one of the inner tragic process. The act of abandonment comes up again in Goethe’s *Faust I* at the conclusion of that story, also signifying the conclusion of the Gretchen episode. As a component of the inner tragic process, abandonment involves more than just leaving a person stranded, it also signifies renunciation of certain beliefs, standards, and of one’s original self. Following the flight of Desportes, a countess offers to take Marie as a *Gesellschafterin* and help her redeem herself in that capacity. In the position as companion, Marie must live at least one year without any male company while she helps the countess raise her daughter. Marie agrees with the arrangement and then assumes her new way of life. For all intents and purposes, in Marie’s new life of celibacy she accepts the aura of a nun. In one of his meetings with Marie in her new position, the officer

Mary describes her current condition: “Sie sind ja aber wie in einem Kloster da, wollen Sie denn gar nicht mehr in die Welt?” (4:III). Living the life of a nun in a virtual convent is Marie’s first transformation in *Die Soldaten* and it materializes as a result of the first phase, but it does not affect her appearance like Stolzius, just her aura. At the same time, Marie as nun still entertains thoughts of death and still invites attention from the officer Mary. According to the countess, Marie does everything *zerstreut* in her current form, and therefore, the countess fears for her well-being. There are signs that Marie is languishing in a tragic condition, and given her shattering experience, this next phase as *Gesellschafterin* is her tragic selfhood. Strengthening this viewpoint of tragic selfhood is Marie’s behavior in this phase, particularly her self-sabotaging actions that eventually leads to her dismissal. When the countess catches Marie speaking to Mary in the garden, the countess dismisses her from service and describes the young girl’s thoughtless behavior as “nur ein gefristeter Tod” (4:III). One clear intertextual tragic indicator on the inner tragic process is the embodiment of death or the look (or aura) of death. The countess equates Marie’s actions with an untimely demise giving the impression that there is something deathly about Marie. According to Duncan, Marie’s woes stem from her “reaching for a social position obviously beyond her grasp” (516) and her acting “mechanically to the expectations of the outside world” (516). Duncan also states that Marie’s “ridiculousness has its dark side” (516), and I would agree there is the *Schattenseite* of Marie, but not because of ridiculousness. Rather, Marie and Stolzius are *Menschen* whose sufferings may seem ridiculous when in fact they make very deep impressions.

When dismissing Marie from service as *Gesellschafterin*, the countess concludes with the following statement about reason: “Wenn ich etwas ausföndig machen könnte, ihre Phantasei mit meiner Klugheit zu vereinigen, ihr Herz, nicht ihren Verstand zu zwingen mir zu folgen” (4:III).

The topic of reason does play a role in my analytical approach in both the Kantian sense and in its importance to the Enlightenment and the Sturm und Drang. Naturally, I attempt to explain the importance of reason as it relates to the inner tragic process. In this particular example, the countess wishes that she could persuade Marie to infuse her imagination with the cleverness of the countess, then, Marie would essentially abandon her fantasies perform her duties as *Gesellschafterin* with honor. In this equation is also the abandonment of reason and reliance on the heart (feeling) for direction which is a major tenet of the Sturm und Drang and later of the Romantic movement. For the inner tragic process, abandonment of reason is certainly occurring on several levels as intertextual indicator, and as such, is considered at the very least as a result of accepting tragic selfhood. In the grander scheme, we see the embodiment of Enlightenment and Sturm und Drang in the countess and Marie, respectively, with reason seeming sensible while feeling seems destructive. Reason was the watchword of the Enlightenment and was considered either as a subservient faculty to passion (mechanical Newtonian view) or as an autonomous faculty (Kant) that counterbalances passion. A usual claim for root cause of counter-Enlightenment in Germany involves this interplay between reason and feeling. In fact, the “‘faith and feeling’ philosophers of the Counter-Enlightenment, epitomized by Hamann” (Garrard 2–3) brought about “the epochal shift of consciousness of this revolt in Europe at the time, leading eventually to Romanticism” (Garrard 3).

After Marie is dismissed, she takes flight and, in effect, ends her short-lived life as *Gesellschafterin* and her first experience with tragic selfhood as nun. The loss of Marie’s previous condition results in another transformation, to that of a roaming beggar. Marie speaks to herself as she roams the countryside and states that she has become nothing more than a *Bettelmensch*. Despite her miserly condition, Marie hangs onto her *Mensch* status by adding

Mensch to *Bettler* instead of just calling herself a *Bettlerin*. Marie also expresses yet again a desire to end her life by just allowing herself to starve. Explicitly, Marie explains her goal: “Besser verhungern. Ich will kriechen, soweit ich komme, und fall ich um, desto besser” (4:III). Marie undergoes a second transformation to beggar, but as we discover later, this second change is her true acceptance of tragic selfhood because she appears before her father in the third phase as an unrecognizable *Bettelmann*.

Marie’s second transformation could also be considered an extension of the first, making the two changes actually one, a saintly figure. The images of the nun and the beggar have religious significance, the former as a servant of God and the latter as the inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. There are numerous references to beggars in the Bible such as Jesus’ parable of the rich man and the beggar, and Marie’s change from nun to beggar could technically be lumped under one acceptance of tragic selfhood, that of a religious conversion. In a way, Marie’s desolate and completely exposed condition as a wretched beggar³⁶ actually serves as her eventual salvation, meaning, she is foreshadowing of Margarete’s predicament in *Faust I* in which she is reduced to a miserable and destitute state before ultimately being saved from a voice above. Duncan notes a correlation between Marie and Margarete in that “the former girl tragically suffers from the conflict between her individual feelings and the dictates of society, the latter never really deviates from her group's actual values” (519). I would not disagree with Duncan’s statement, but I would consider this at the external level since he is dealing with “The Comic Structure of Lenz's *Soldaten*” (the title of his article).

³⁶ In addition to the parable of the beggar, the biblical passage about “the poor [who] will inherit the earth...” (*The Bible*, “Psalm 37:11-13”) creeps into this equation as Marie’s status goes from middle-class maiden to pauper but her character in biblical terms is technically improving.

Die Räuber: Power, Freedom, and Worldly Woes

In *Die Räuber*, the second phase for Karl Moor begins in earnest when he assumes command of a robber outfit as *Hauptmann* (captain). There is no particular reason given as to why Karl is thrust into the leadership position. When Schweitzer, one of Karl's companions, claims that Karl must be the captain ("Du musst unser Hauptmann sein!" 1:II), there is something not clearly defined in the story to explain why almost everyone (except for Spiegelberg) suddenly shouts: "Es lebe der Hauptmann!" (1:II). An explanation could be the new look of tragic selfhood that Karl has assumed, as Kosinsky would later comment, that Karl now has the tragic demeanor of one who destroys ("in dieser Miene...mit dem vernichtenden Blick..." 2:III). At the same time, there is the *Kraftmensch* aspect to consider in that Karl's gesture, language, and actions are markedly embellished when compared to that of Stolzius and Marie in the *Die Soldaten*. Furthermore, Karl's position as robber captain makes him a leader of others and responsible for their lives, a position that goes beyond the *Mensch* confines of Stolzius poisoning one person and Marie's lonely path to self-destruction. In addition, Stolzius as *Mensch* makes Desportes pay for his transgression for the sake of honor, Karl the *Kraftmensch*, on the other hand, is making humanity pay with impunity. Throughout *Die Räuber*, both Karl and Amalia seem to be performing on a grander stage when compared to Stolzius and Marie of *Die Soldaten* despite progressing through the same inner tragic process. The *Menschheit* continuum simply provides an explanation for the subtle differences between the three forms of *Menschen* in each phase.

Before we actually experience Karl's exploits in the second phase, there are some secondhand impressions of Karl's old self and his tragic selfhood provided in a conversation between *Alter Moor* (Karl's father) and Amalia at the Moor estate. Although the *Alte Moor* has

not actually seen Karl recently and is not fully informed of his actions as robber captain, he feels that “itzt ist er [Karl] anders” (2:II). Amalia acquiesces to *Alter Moor* but tries to remember Karl when he was “so menschlich” (2:II) and so endearing. Both *Alter Moor* and Amalia give the impression that they love Karl but were aware of something suspect in Karl’s character before the news of his transgressions. Intuitively, both *Alter Moor* and Amalia sense a certain gloom in Karl’s future based on previous experience or their knowledge of his propensity to act like a *Kraftmensch*. At the same time, *Alter Moor* demonstrates on a few occasions that he does not fit the *Kraftmensch* mold. Jonnes states that *Alter Moor* “is weak not because Schiller’s purported patriarchal premises are in question, but because the character fails to act in accord with the demands placed upon him by his position as father” (139). In my opinion, *Alter Moor* is more of a *Mensch* who cannot act in accordance with the demands of the *Kraftmensch*. Jonnes also states that Karl is “seen to act out of a nihilistic principle of self and of ‘Sich-auf-sich-selbst-Stellen’” (139). The tragic selfhood that Karl and the other protagonists assume does reflect an abandonment of religious and moral principles but not a belief that life is without meaning. Unlike nihilism, the varying degrees of *Menschen* of the three plays find meaning in the tragic process and are committed to its energy and outcome.

A revealing moment occurs when *Alter Moor* speaks to Amalia about the story of Joseph, the biblical figure of the Old Testament who was betrayed by his jealous brothers who sold him to slave traders. Much like Franz’s game of deception, Joseph’s brothers fabricate a story about Joseph, and in their jealousy, inform their father that Joseph had been torn to pieces by a savage beast. As *Alter Moor* describes the biblical scene, he stresses the tearing of Joseph, the very tragic indicator of the first phase of the inner tragic process. *Alter Moor* relates with vigor that “ein reißend Tier hat Joseph zerrissen!” (2:II). In the biblical story, Joseph manages to survive

his captivity, and he eventually succeeds in becoming the Pharaoh's advisor, but he changes so much physically that that he becomes unrecognizable even to his brethren. A compelling argument could be made that this aspect of Joseph's story, the fact that he was the same person but unrecognizable, is the paradigm for the intertextual tragic indicator of non-recognition in the inner tragic process. Considering that Lenz developed the aspect of non-recognition for the inner tragic of *Die Soldaten*, but makes no mention of Joseph's story, and then considering that Schiller mentions the story of Joseph suggests that Schiller identified Lenz's indicator of the tragic self in the context of Joseph. Despite being betrayed by his brothers, Joseph forgives them, and in the end, shows compassion when he helps them overcome their difficult situation. Karl, whose old self is *zerrissen*, also undergoes a physical change and becomes unrecognizable to his loved ones later in *Die Räuber*. Unlike Joseph, however, Karl's transformation is a willing change of self for a more tragic result.

In *Die Räuber*, Karl becomes a robber captain and leads his band of brigands near the Bohemian forest and his initial activities are reportedly gruesome and heinous. During a certain operation, one of Karl's robbers, Roller, was captured and sent to the gallows and Karl even dresses up as a monk and makes his way to Roller in a daring attempt to free him. Arriving at the scaffolds incognito, Karl is dressed in a *Kapuzinerkutte* and offers to exchange his *Person* (his costume) with Roller, but Roller "schlug's hartnäckig ab" (2:III). It is not clear why Roller would reject a chance of changing his attire and obtaining his freedom in this instance, however, Schiller uses the word *Person* instead of clothing which suggests that Roller had an aversion to Karl's actual persona, his tragic self. Clearly, the thought of death was preferable to Roller than assuming the *Person* of Karl, therefore, my interpretation of Roller's irrational reaction involves his recognition of something more of Karl than the text provides with the German word *Person*

being a key indicator. It is also noteworthy that Karl assumes the identity temporarily of a monk just as Marie assumes the role of nun provisionally before fleeing and becoming a *Bettelmensch*. Just as a comparison between nun and beggar can be drawn, the correlation between monk and robber is also notable in this Lenzian inner tragic as the person assuming tragic selfhood straddles the line between religious figure and undesirable. The religious or divine aspect of the inner tragic structure will be more relevant and revealing in the analysis of Goethe's *Faust I* of this dissertation because the *Übermenschen* Faust and Margarete are dealing with supernatural forces such as the *Erdegeist*, Mephistopheles, and the *Böser Geist*.

The first true glimpse of Karl in the second phase occurs after his return from freeing Roller to the robber hideout in the Bohemian forest where upon arrival he shouts "Freiheit! – Freiheit!" (2:III). Instead of relating to either the Enlightenment or the Sturm und Drang, both of which were emancipation projects of the eighteenth century, the desire for freedom displayed by Karl here is actually his old self crying out to his new tragic selfhood. In a monologue that resembles Stolzius' two-voice corner talk, there also appears to be two voices (the self of old and the new tragic self) in Karl's speech that are reminiscent of the two souls of Faust ("Zwei Seelen wohnen, ach! in meiner Brust," *Faust I*, 1112). The voice of Karl's old self speaks desperately but in vain as it must recoil and crawl (*verkriechen*) into the "Kluft der Erde" (2:III), the space of the mind that now holds and suppresses his old self. While hiding in the Bohemian forest with his band of robbers, Karl receives a visitor from the city, a Catholic priest (*Pater*). Karl's tragic selfhood takes center stage in his dialogue with the priest and serves as an instructive moment that helps us discern the nature of Karl's new self. The priest informs Karl that a small army has gathered and has surrounded the forest making any form of resistance futile. In addition, the priest attempts to make Karl acknowledge and repent his evil conduct and actions. Despite the

dire situation, Karl is not interested in surrendering or repenting. On the contrary, Karl baffles the priest with a resounding message of defiance and informs everyone in attendance that he is bloodthirsty, he seeks revenge, and he has no control over himself. Like Stolzius, Karl is thirsty for vengeance in his new form: "...mein Handwerk ist Wiedervergeltung – Rache ist mein Gewerbe" (2:III). Karl describes his misery but seems unable to let go of his tragic selfhood because it has consumed him, taken control over him: "Ich bin so elend, dass ich auch die Herrschaft über mein Leben verloren habe" (2:III). Although dealing with the priest, Karl continues his discourse with humanity with whom he is obviously dismayed ("Kann der Mensch denn so blind sein" 2:III), and it is the humankind of his time that is object of his retaliation. Of course, the kind of humans Karl is lashing out at are the weaklings ("schlappe Kastraten-Jahrhundert" 1:II) of his century which was the Age of Enlightenment. Karl is a *Kraftmensch* and expects his fellow human beings to follow his example. Karl ends his tirade with "itzt sind wir frei – Tod oder Freiheit" (2:III). Initially, the freedom seemed to resemble Karl's inner voice for his old self because it was an exclamation of freedom back-to-back. Now, speaking while in full tragic selfhood, it is freedom or death. In this case, freedom being juxtaposed with death could be interpreted contextually because Enlightenment "freedom in its many forms" (Gay 3) allows us to consider the concept again (initially covered in Chapter I) with the Kantian "freedom, understood as self-legislative reason" (Velkley 45). There are strong signals in the texts that show tragic selfhood as a legislating self in the tragic sense in that it must consume the person and create an appetite for a death wish.

After a confrontation with opposing forces around the Bohemian forest, Karl and the robbers manage to escape and later find themselves near the Danube river. In a second tirade in tragic selfhood during the second phase, Karl continues his castigation of humanity and the

world by describing in a mocking tone how he is “so hässlich auf dieser schönen Welt” (3:II) and asks why he must “allein die Hölle saugen aus den Freuden des Himmels?” (3:II). Karl claims to see through humans and their so-called divine plans (“Ich habe die Menschen gesehen...ihre Götterplane,” 3:II). During his speech, the robber Schwarz notices how Karl’s colors change when he remarks: “Wie er seine Farbe verändert!” (3:II). During this scene, Karl is also lamenting his acceptance of tragic selfhood as robber and even desires a return to childhood so that he could be the *Bettelmensch* that Marie in *Die Soldaten* desires during her tragic selfhood (Karl: “Dass ich ein Bettler geboren werden dürfte!” 3:II). Later in the scene, a certain young man named Kosinsky appears and announces his wish to join Karl’s band of robbers. Not knowing Kosinsky’s background, Karl provides a full description of tragic selfhood as a *Kraftmensch* to the young admirer:

Mord, Knabe – verstehst du das Wort auch? ...aber ein Mord auf der Seele zu tragen...ich rate es dir als ein Vater – lern erst die Tiefe des Abgrunds kennen, eh du hineinspringst! ...aus der Kreise der Menschheit – entweder musst du ein höherer Mensch sein, oder du bist ein Teufel. (3:II)

Kosinsky then describes his reason for coming to Karl, explaining that he too suffered a moment of self-shattering, a recent instance in his life that resembles Karl’s shattering. Like Karl, Kosinsky, Unlike Karl, Kosinsky was unable to achieve tragic selfhood after shattering because when he tried to avenge himself, his attempt failed. Kosinsky knows of Karl’s transformation and seeks the *Hauptmann* with “den vernichtenden Blick...” (3:II) to help him reconstitute and achieve a *kraftmenschliche tragische Selbstheit*. Kosinsky also joins “Karl’s retinue because he values ‘freedom’ (‘Freyheit’) more than ‘honor and life’ (‘Ehre und Leben’)” (Mortensen 48). Karl takes Kosinsky in and speaks to his robbers with a raised dagger and pledges allegiance to them: “Hier heb ich meinen Dolch auf. So wahr meine Seele lebt. Ich will euch niemals

verlassen” (3:II). Now prepared for the third and final phase of the Lenzian inner tragic structure, Karl is ready for tragic action because “so stirbt ein Held!” (3:II).

The second phase for Amalia begins with her acceptance of tragic selfhood as she acknowledges the deaths of Karl and the *Alter Moor*, and then, revels in the thought of living in a convent instead of submitting to Franz: “Bravo! Herrlich! ...Willkommen mit deinem [Franz’s] Kloster! Auf, auf mit deinen Mauern!” (3:I). Evidently, the reconstitution of a tragic self for Amalia will take the form of a nun. Faced with walls and the solitary life of a nun, Amalia declares that she “allein will hingehen und leiden” (2:II). Once again, the image of nun as of form of tragic selfhood appears for Amalia just as for Marie in *Die Soldaten*. In this tragic selfhood, Amalia has a *Totenfarbe* in her face much like Stolzius after he accepts his tragic selfhood in that she is now calm “mit sanfterem Ton” (2:II). At the same time, Amalia is assuming the exterior of an old woman, and in an opposite twist of Faust (who becomes young), Amalia yearns to be an old woman: “Wehe über die Kräfte der Jugend! Willkommen, du markloses Alter, naher gelegen dem Himmel...” (2:II). As with the rest of the tragic figures in the Lenzian inner tragic structure, the acceptance of tragic selfhood is a preparatory stage for violent tragic action of the third phase and the death of oneself, of another, or both. Although the ultimate tragic violent action occurs in the third phase, as with Karl, the second phase also has violence, especially at the *Kraftmensch* level. Amalia will demonstrate her own kind of amplified agency as a *Kraftmensch* in her reaction to Franz’s advances as she accepts tragic selfhood to deal with Karl’s treacherous brother.

There are various indications of the *Kraftmensch* in Amalia and each example shows that her strength flows through her language, action, and demeanor much like Karl. In fact, Amalia’s language is on par with Karl, and in many examples, rivals or exceeds Karl’s boisterous

outbursts. When commanded by Franz to assume her new role as his mistress, Amalia addresses him as a worm and considers his command a joke: “Wurm, du, befehlen? Mir befehlen? – Und wenn man den Befehl mit Höhlachen zurückschickt?” (3:I). When Franz insists on Amalia being his woman, she gives him a *Maulschelle* (slap) as a sign of her disdain and “reißt sie ihm den Degen von der Seite und tritt hastig zurück.” (3:I). Although Amalia is a woman, she is indeed a *Kraftmensch* and even explains the kind of woman she has become now that she is *kraftmenschlich* and accepting a tragic selfhood: “Ich bin ein Weib, aber ein rasendes Weib – wag es einmal, mit unzüchtigen Griff meinen Leib zu betasten – dieser Stahl soll deine geile Brust mitten durchrennen...” (3:I). In her new tragic form, Amalia resists Franz in the strongest possible terms and is ready to live life as a nun in a convent that Franz has promised her. Amalia is also pursuing her own form of freedom by way of this tragic selfhood in that “das Kloster – [und] das Kreuz des Erlösers ist die Freistatt” (3:I). There is something calming in this tragic settlement and this is why Amalia is *sanft* after exuding such strength and force in the face of Franz whose treachery is fully revealed when Hermann secretly visits her and divulges the truth about Karl and *Alter Moor* – they are actually still alive. When Amalia hears that both Moors are alive, she is at first “versteinert” (3:I), but then “fährt sie wild auf, eilt nach ihm [Hermann]” (3:I). Instead of going into a virtual nunnery, Amalia, as a *Kraftmensch* and in tragic selfhood, wildly pursues a plan of action that will lead her to a fate that is befitting resolution in the third phase – painful destructive action.

Faust I: Tragic Selfhood and the Supernatural

In *Faust I*, the second phase begins in *Hexenküche* with Faust’s recovery (“ich soll genesen” *Faust I*, 2338), or as I refer to it, a reconstitution that results in a transformation of self (tragic selfhood). Faust’s reconstitution involves removing thirty years from his life, it is a

process that will help him assume a tragic selfhood worthy of his fiendish ambitions. On the surface, Faust's restored youth enables him to seduce Margarete, but this is tragic selfhood, and as a reconstructed self under this condition, the propensity for violence is primary.

Mephistopheles actually advises Faust about a kind of manual labor as a purer means for restoring youth (*Sich verjüngen*) that probably would have sufficed for a *Mensch* or *Kraftmensch*, but the pure approach seems to be insufficient for Faust's ultimate aspirations as *Übermensch*. Unfortunately, Faust does not consider the side-effect (painful destructive action) of tragic selfhood which is interpreted here as the more rapid approach to restoring youthful appearance and virility. At the same time, Faust, as an *Übermensch*, is collaborating with otherworldly forces (devil, witches, etc.) and is ultimately (however unwittingly) seeking to transcend his earthly condition and limitations. Eventually, Faust receives the *Trank* full of *Saft* (juice, potion) from the witches and drinks it, signifying the completion of his reconstitution and acceptance of tragic selfhood. Faust has not only a new self that projects his youthful persona, but also the vision to see Helen, the ideal of womanly beauty, in every woman. As Mephistopheles explains, Faust will see with the "Trank im Leibe, bald Helenen in jedem Weibe" (*Faust I*, 2603-04).

When Faust appears on the street in his new form as a youthful tragic figure, he sees Margarete, the heroine of *Faust I* and the object of his desire. As I have consistently argued in my analyses of the female protagonists, the women of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* are all essentially objects of the male protagonists, but there are indications that the females are remarkably resilient, and in many ways, actually superior in character to the male counterparts. For example, when Margarete immediately rejects Faust's advance, this gesture represents a certain power and decency that many of the male characters lack. In any event, Faust is rejected,

but not despairing. In the early stages of tragic selfhood, Faust is acting quite undignified, impatient, and very demanding with the devil himself. Faust is giving orders to Mephistopheles and threatening him: “Wenn nicht das süße Junge Blut/Heut Nacht in meinen Armen ruht,/So sind wir um Mitternacht geschieden.” (*Faust I*, 2636-38). In making his demands, Faust is using the imperative form (“Sorg du mir...! *Faust I*, 2674) indicating that his “Liebeslust” (*Faust I*, 2662) is the devil’s command. In the next instance, however, Faust has a relapse in the scene *Abend* in Margarete’s chamber, and like Stolzius and Karl Moor before him, there are two voices within him speaking from the old and the new selves. In this dialogue, Faust’s old self describes that he no longer recognizes Faust in his tragic selfhood: “Armsel’ger Faust!/ich kenne dich nicht mehr.” (*Faust I*, 2720) In most cases, the second phase of the Lenzian inner tragic structure has this dialogue between old self and new self which appears to be a momentary relapse or a moment of hesitation just before committing fully to the task at hand. As Faust’s old voice states, he would not have the strength to obtain Margarete and would be so small and fall at her feet. Obviously, the old, small, and weak self is not what Faust needs to achieve his tragic fate. Therefore, the new tragic self of Faust yells “Fort! Fort! Ich kehre nimmermehr!” and reconfirms his commitment to the new tragic selfhood. In a translation by Salm, Faust’s proverbial statement “Wer überwindet, der gewinnt” (*Faust I*, 2835) reads as “Who conquers self will be rewarded in the end.” Although my use of translations generally concerns issues associated with those translations, Salm’s addition of the self corresponds well with the inner tragic process and captures the essence of tragic selfhood – victory over one’s original self. One can overcome an obstacle or difficulties but given the nature of the self in my analyses of the protagonists, an overcoming of (old) self is the key to achieving the kind of winning Faust and the others are desiring. Confirming this tragic commitment, Faust again begins to command the devil (“Schaff

du ihr...!“ *Faust I*, 2854), and it is in this commanding persona that Faust’s tragic selfhood is most visible.

In the second phase, Faust’s tragic selfhood seems to resemble at times an emotional rollercoaster ride, a series of ups and downs, or perhaps better stated, a string of lapses and recommitments. When Faust is discouraged and hesitant, Mephistopheles is there to remind him of his tragic mission and often presents compelling arguments like showing that Faust’s old self was not as innocent as Faust tends to think in his lapses:

Habt ihr von Gott, der Welt und was sich drin bewegt,
Vom Menschen, was sich ihm in Kopf und Herzen regt,
Definition nicht mit großer Kraft gegeben? (*Faust I*, 3043-45)

In moments of helplessness, Faust expresses a resignation to tragic selfhood in terms of necessity, meaning, he is no longer in control and must see it through: “vorzüglich weil ich muss” (3072). Karl Moor also expresses this lack of control in his second phase and this aspect is another marking for tragic selfhood. The scene of *Wald und Höhle* (forest and cave) seems to represent the old self (nature) and the new self (a dark place) with the latter resembling Karl’s “Kluft der Erde” into which he recoils. There are numerous indicators of tragic selfhood, for example, when Faust echoes Margarete’s “Er liebt dich” (instead of “Er liebt dich nicht” *Faust I*, 3187), the ‘he’ refers to Faust’s old self, not his new self. Faust even asks Margarete: “Verstehst du, was das heißt? Er liebt dich!” (*Faust I*, 3186). Upon hearing this, Margarete trembles, actually understanding somehow that Faust is referring not to his current tragic self. When Faust notices Margarete trembling, he tells her “O schaudre nicht!” (*Faust I*, 3188) before she turns and runs from him. Alone again and listening to two voices, Faust’s old self describes to the tragic self how it has been led to a cave deep within: “Dann führst du mich zur sicheren Höhle, zeigst/Mich dann mir selbst, und meiner eignen Brust” (*Faust I*, 3232-33). In that same moment,

the *Übermensch* in Faust emerges as the third phase of the Lenzian inner tragic structure (the tragic violent action) draws near. Faust feels closer and closer to transcendence when he acknowledges that nothing can become complete as mere *Mensch* (“O dass dem Menschen nichts Vollkommnes wird” *Faust I*, 3240). When Faust asks Mephistopheles about the kind of life power that Faust possesses in his tragic form (“Verstehst du, was für neue Lebenskraft/Mir dieser Wandel in die Öde schafft?” *Faust I*, 3278-79), Mephistopheles deems it as “überirdisches Vergnügen” (*Faust I*, 3281) and considers Faust as a *Gottheit*. In other words, Faust is no longer the *Erdensohn* but something that Mephistopheles considers “hohe Intuition,” an *Übermensch*. After Faust seduces Margarete, he continues his up and down tragic journey of lapse and relapse by reflecting on himself as “Der Unmensch ohne Zweck und Ruh’...Begierig wütend nach dem Abgrund zu?” (*Faust I*, 3359, 3251). In *Die Räuber*, Karl also mentions “die Tiefe des Abgrunds” (3:II) and “Hölle” (3:II), two cavernous locations that seem to represent the dark area of the mind. At the end of the second phase, Faust realizes that tragic selfhood is now closing in on him in an unexpected way and that his fate is dragging him into desolation: “Mag ihr Geschick auf mich zusammenstürzen/Und sie mit mir zugrunde gehn!” (*Faust I*, 3364-65)

Prior to Margarete’s acceptance of tragic selfhood at the well (*Am Brunnen*), there are several scenes that provide a picture of Margarete as the young girl who is, as Faust says, “sitt- und tugendreich” (*Faust I*, 2611). There is a hint of *Kraftmensch* in Margarete when she rejects Faust’s initial offer to escort her, but Mephistopheles, a supernatural figure, claims to have no power over her (“Über die hab’ ich keine Gewalt” *Faust I*, 2626), and this would hint at her more proper status as *Übermensch*. Aside from being an *Übermensch*, Margarete describes herself as a “ein töricht furchtsam Weib!” (*Faust I*, 2758) with “armes junges Blut” (*Faust I*, 2907), a statement that shows her own awareness of her inner tragic self. When Mephistopheles is in her

presence, he notices both her tragic self and *Übermensch* in that Margarete has “ein Wesen, einen Blick so scharf!” (2910) and that she possesses “eine der größten Himmelsgaben” (*Faust I*, 2947). In *Die Räuber*, Kosinsky says the same about Karl’s stare when he first sees the robber captain (“...den vernichtenden Blick,” 2:III). And like Karl, Margarete is also saddened with humanity and remarks that “die Menschen so unglücklich sind!” (*Faust I*, 2938) when she hears Mephistopheles’ fabricated story about the death of Martha’s husband in Italy. Although Mephistopheles may be aware of Margarete’s extraordinary qualities, Faust may be unaware of Margarete’s true propensity for the tragic because she even fears that he may have observed her dark side: “Ach, dacht’ ich, hat er in deinem Betragen/Was Freches, Unanständiges gesehen?” (*Faust I*, 3171-72). Margarete’s remark certainly tells us that she is capable of something bold and indecent, and later, her actions confirm this side of her especially with her acceptance of tragic selfhood.

In *Marthens Garten*, Margarete’s conversation with Faust about faith also helps us understand her eventual acceptance of tragic selfhood. In the scene “Am Brunnen/Zwinger.” Margarete insists that one must keep the faith even when tempted. As Der Herr (God) states in the *Prolog im Himmel*, “Ein guter Mensch ist seinem dunklen Drange/Ist sich des rechten Weges wohl bewusst.” (*Faust I*, 328-29). Although the discussion between Der Herr and Mephistopheles concerns Faust, I argue that Margarete is also included in this conversation. Unfortunately, Salm translates “Ein guter Mensch...” as “a good man...” but the original German *Mensch* designation covers any human being in their darkest hours. Therefore, Der Herr may already have one eye on Margarete in the statement since he is aware that she will also be in her *dunklen Drange*. Like Faust having superpower vision, Margarete is also able to see things in people that Faust sees, and in fact, she can see Mephistopheles for who he really is, and this

affects her feelings (“wo er nur mag zu uns treten/Mein’ ich sogar, ich liebte dich nicht mehr” *Faust I*, 3447-48) for Faust. Despite having tragic vision, Margarete’s new eyes are unable to pierce the tragic selfhood of Faust as she accepts from him the flask with a sleeping potion that turns out to be poison. In *Dom* of all places, Margarete accepts her tragic selfhood although she was gradually developing it while interacting with Faust considering that she is complicit in the death of her mother and brother Valentin. Nevertheless, Margarete’s true tragic action is to come, for her inadvertent parricide and fratricide serve as only a pretense for her infanticide. Beforehand, Valentin describes Margarete’s loss of old self when she forsake her honor: “Da du dich sprachst der Ehre los,/Gabst mir den schwersten Herzenstoss” (*Faust I*, 3772-73). In effect, Margarete symbolically kills Valentin with a dagger to the heart when she accepts a tragic self. In the cathedral with the *Böser Geist*, the manifestation of Margarete’s tragic selfhood is perhaps the most explicit of all the protagonists. First, the *Böser Geist* asks Margarete about her psychological state: “Wo steht dein Kopf?” (*Faust I*, 3784) Then, the *Böser Geist* proceeds to detail the emergence of the tragic selfhood, how the “Grimm faßt” (*Faust I*, 3800) Margarete, where it is “aufgeschaffen” (*Faust I*, 3806) in her heart, and why it “Bebt auf!” (*Faust I*, 3807). Margarete’s tragic self emerges from the depths and she can feel it taking over her (“Befangen mich” *Faust I*, 3818). Margarete also expresses how she will hide herself in her tragic selfhood while others will turn their faces at her new appearance. It is an overwhelming experience, and as a result of the tragic transformation, Margarete faints.

Chapter Commentary for Phase II: Margarete’s Transformation

The most ambiguous feature at this juncture, the mystery around Margarete’s actual transformation, remains unclear despite the fact that she experiences the second phase. The transformation of the other protagonists – Stolzius becomes a batman, Marie carries herself as a

nun (and beggar), Karl is a robber (and incognito as a monk), Amalia is ready for life as a nun, and Faust is a young man – are more clear-cut. The possible transformations for Margarete were highlighted in the previous chapter with a review of Becker-Cantarino's "Witch and Infanticide: Imaging the Female in Faust I" but a determination on my part was pending a review of the second phase. After covering the second phase, the actual stage of transformation, Margarete's acceptance of tragic selfhood, a course that requires some form of self-transformation, remains inconclusive. Becker-Cantarino points to Margarete's change from virgin to mother as a possible transformation and the other articles from Del Caro and Smith portray Margarete in more mythological terms. Admittedly, the mythological approach to Margarete is strong. During the scene *Walpurgisnacht*, Faust sees Gretchen in her tragic selfhood because she is *bläss*, has the *Augen einer Toten*, and is walking in a very unorthodox fashion. According to Mephistopheles, Margarete appears to have a mythological persona because what Faust see is her *Zauberbild*. In the same breath, Mephistopheles includes a reference to Medusa whose famous deadly stare could resemble the stare that Mephistopheles noted earlier in Margarete as a "Blick so scharf!" (*Faust I*, 2910). Faust also notices Margarete's *Wonne* and *Leiden* as she trudges through the street. In this description, Margarete is clearly in her tragic selfhood and resembles a wandering apparition, a phantom. Even Salm, in a rather poor translation of Mephistopheles words, presents the notion that Faust "must always hanker phantoms" (*Faust I*, 4209; "Nur immer diese Lust zum Wahn!"). Becker-Cantarino tends to associate Margarete with "woman's connection to the realm of the witch, the link being her body, the site of her sexual power, a locus for male confusion and disempowerment" (4). In any case, the banshee-like qualities of Margarete provide an alluring vision of her as a female spirit from Celtic folklore which adds to my interpretive framework for deciphering the true nature of her tragic selfhood. Of course,

Margarete is not gliding around the countryside shrieking and wailing, but her tragic selfhood does resemble a supernatural or mythological figure. A consideration of Margarete's tragic violent action in phase three will provide an additional angle that will require a look at the history of infanticide in late eighteenth-century Germany and an additional review of Becker-Cantarino's commentary of witch-hunting during the same century.

CHAPTER FOUR: PHASE III OF THE INNER TRAGIC – DEATH WISH

“For our time is as the passing of a shadow, and there is no going back of our end.”
Wisdom 2:5, *Douay-Rheims Bible*

Combining Dénouement and Catastrophe for an Emotional Resolution

Structurally, the final element of the Lenzian inner tragic is designed as a hybrid of traditional closures of dramas, namely the dénouement and catastrophe. As the final structural consideration, this hybrid element represents the emotional resolution and captures the final phase of the inner tragic process, committing violence that stems from a death wish.

Dénouement, the French word for *unknotting*, implies a “clearing up or 'untying' of the complications of the plot in a play or story; usually a final scene or chapter in which mysteries, confusions, and doubtful destinies are clarified” (Baldick 63). In this sense, the final part of the play provides literary closure, and in many cases, there is poetic justice, an outcome in which virtue is rewarded and evil is punished. The term catastrophe is often associated with classical tragedy and is the fifth and final element of Freytag’s structure, the Freytag Pyramid. According to Freytag’s rubrics, the catastrophe is the culmination of a play’s falling action and is usually highlighted with the death of the hero; other outcomes do appear in Freytag’s analysis of five-act tragedies in his book. The emotional resolution of the Lenzian inner tragic structure also accounts for a semblance of the traditional effect of tragedy, *catharsis*. Purging of the emotions is itself an emotional process that leads to a certain tranquility. The famous final line of John Milton’s *Samson Agonistes* (1671) describes the nature of *catharsis*: “Calm of mind, all passions spent.” If we briefly consider the case of Stolzius, he achieves a state of calm at the end of the third phase when he brings about poetic justice by killing Desportes. In this regard, the final phase of the inner tragic process is cathartic for the protagonist but achieving calm of mind requires the harboring a death wish and committing some violent action. The combination of

traditional elements in the Lenzian manner should not diminish the innovation that came out of Lenz's experimentation with the inner tragic and how this reoccurs in Schiller and Goethe. Moreover, Lenz's combinations of classical tragedy and modern tragic tendencies in German philosophy is an indication of the tragic transition he was forging in the drama.

The emotional resolution of the Lenzian inner tragic structure has some undeniable features of traditional endings, but in contrast, there are some distinguishing features that make it remarkably new for its time. First and foremost, the acceptance of tragic selfhood in the second phase leads to a distinct foreshadowing of death at the beginning of the third phase. Each protagonist exhibits an aura of death, an eerie cold-bloodedness (*kaltblütig*), and resoluteness for committing violence against others or self stemming from a death wish. In most cases, there are hints of death through the texts such pale skin and deathly stares. In many ways, the protagonists in the third phase are the personification of death, like a grim reaper. Secondly, voices carry tragically in this phase and voice recognition is an uncanny skill. In the first two phases, sight was more prevalent, but for some reason, tragic selfhood has altered the primary sense of detection. Thirdly, the protagonists seem fully aware of the requirements for a proper resolution of tragic selfhood, a violent action with extreme emotion. Despite several examples of lapsing to old (morally decent) self, each case is almost immediately followed by an uncontrollable relapse to tragic selfhood. Finally, the third phase contains the darkest moments of the dramas and provide a true glimpse of the kind of tragic that Lenz envisioned as a foray into one's psychological *Schattenseite*³⁷ to discover the unrecognizable tragic self that covets the death wish and possess violent intention.

³⁷ Taken from Bohtz's *Die Idee des Tragischen: eine philosophische Abhandlung* (53-54).

Putting this phase briefly in perspective, King Oedipus, the ideal hero of traditional Greek tragedy according to Aristotle, was completely unaware of his dark fate and he fulfilled it unwittingly. Unlike this classical model, the protagonists of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* are aware of the dark fate they have chosen and seek resolution of it knowing the fatal consequences. Furthermore, there is little surprise when the protagonists commit their crimes, and in most cases, there is little regard for self and others as murder is a defining and required action. In this phase of emotional certainty, the protagonists are easily excitable, and they display emotional stress openly. The emotions run high because the protagonists understand they require their tragic self and its amplification of agency and propensity for violence. At the same time, there is an understanding that the old self is insufficient for the tragic task at hand, but once the mission is accomplished, the protagonists, in the most poignant way, shed their tragic self and return to their old self after the crossing the point of no return. The result of reconstructing the self for tragic purposes is not in the traditional sense of tragedy a “gradually loosened repression, the kind of human suffering that epitomizes Greek tragedy” (Lind ix). On the contrary, much of the repression is released swiftly and deadly.

***Die Soldaten*: Foregrounding the Tragic Resolution**

In a more detailed analysis of Stolzius, his third phase of the Lenzian inner tragic structure begins like many of the scenes of the *Die Soldaten*, there is a kind of *in medias res* approach that thrusts the reader into the middle of the conflict. In general, Lenz does not provide a great deal of foreshadowing in the dialogue itself, but he does tend to employ foregrounding. Just to clarify, foreshadowing, as a literary convention, entails providing textual tones (i.e., creating a certain mood or describing a certain atmosphere) to help the reader or spectator prepare for an upcoming significant event. Usually, foreshadowing strengthens the unity of plot

and makes the action logical but at times too predictable. On the other hand, foregrounding is a literary convention that disrupts the unity of plot with discontinuities (i.e., disconnected discourse). Foregrounding is a term associated with Russian formalism of the early twentieth century and includes the concept of literariness, a focus on features that make a work literary. Prominent Russian formalists Jan Mukarovsky and Viktor Shklovsky also describe a certain linguistic foregrounding in which language is used to blur the background and create an estrangement effect that disallows for anticipation of events. An example of foregrounding from eighteenth century literature is Lawrence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* (1760-67), a novel that contains various digressions and discontinuities, and remarkably enough, a work published during the Sturm und Drang. Given the influence of Shakespeare (and English literature in general) on the Germans of the Sturm und Drang, it is likely that Sterne's style also influenced the Germans in much the same way. Much like Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*, Lenz's *Die Soldaten* is often a disjointed text with abrupt beginnings and endings of scenes with much of the lead-up (foreshadowing) omitted. According to Leidner, it was "Lenz's scrambled plots" (2) and the "interruptions in Lenz's texts" (93) that made him quite unique as a dramatic writer for his time. Circling back to Stolzius, his third phase begins in the middle of the final action, he has passed through the first two phases and is now about to complete the violent destructive action that concludes the tragic process, and thus, signifies the natural inevitability of tragic selfhood – a deathly outcome.

In Mary's quarters, Desportes and Mary are having a meal and discussing Marie while Stolzius looms ominously in the background. Stolzius is calculated, he is seemingly attending to items at the dinner table but is listening to the conversation. Desportes is speaking excessively disparaging of Marie calling her a *Hure* and laughing at her possibly being a leftover for his

Jäger (gamekeeper) who was compelled to escort her away from Desportes and accompany her to another location. Apparently, Marie did try to reunite with Desportes after leaving the countess but was unsuccessful in her attempt. Mary is quite upset with Desportes because he fancies Marie and considers her a worthy woman for any decent man. Again, Mary, who knows that Stolzius was Marie's fiancé, does not consider including his batman in a conversation about the very girl that Stolzius was going to marry. Stolzius leaves the room, but he is called back by Mary who orders him to fetch a bottle of wine for Desportes. Stolzius returns with wine and a plate; he is *totenbleich* and then stations himself behind Desportes like the shadow of death. When Desportes claims that thoughts of Marie bore him, Stolzius, restlessly standing *mit verzerrtem Gesicht* behind Desportes, makes a chilling comment: "Wirklich?" (5:III). Desportes suddenly grabs his chest in pain and cries out to Mary, but Stolzius inserts himself between the two and grabs Desportes by the ears yelling "(mit fürchterlicher Stimme.) Mariane! – Mariane! – Mariane!" (5:III). When Mary draws his sword in an apparent attempt to strike his shrieking batman, Stolzius "kehrt sich kaltblütig um und faßt ihm in den Degen: Geben Sie sich keine Mühe, es ist schon geschehen. Ich sterbe vergnügt da ich den mitnehmen kann" (5:III). Here is Stolzius' calm of mind that represents completion of task and the shedding of tragic selfhood which equates to death in the examples of Stolzius. Now with the mission complete, in his final words, Stolzius reveals his old self to Desportes:

Ja, Verräter das bist du – und ich bin Stolzius, dessen Braut du zur Hure machtest. Sie war meine Braut. Wenn ihr nicht leben könnt, ohne Frauenzimmer unglücklich zu machen, warum wendt ihr euch an die, die euch nicht widerstehen können, die euch aufs erste Wort glauben. – Du bist gerochen meine Mariane! Gott kann mich nicht verdammen. (5:III)

In *Die Soldaten*, the third phase for Marie begins with her escape to the countryside where she can wander around as a poor vagabond. Marie's father Wesener is also cruising the

countryside searching for his daughter when he comes across a *verhüllte Weibsperson*. This cloaked woman is Marie in her transformed self, which is actually an extended tragic selfhood, one from nun to beggar. As is usual for tragic selfhood, Marie is still technically herself, but her tragic transformation has made her unrecognizable to her father despite being away for only a short while. Like Stolzius, tragic selfhood has changed the essence of Marie to such extent that it seemingly blinds the beholder who has held onto their original moral self. At the same time, Marie, as a *Menschen* of the common type, has fallen even further in tragic selfhood, not in worth, but just in social standing. As the shabby beggar woman, Marie asks Wesener for some money and receives his indignation. Wesener calls the woman a *lüderliche Seele* and berates her for lowering herself to such a condition. After Wesener chases the shabby woman off, he feels remorseful for being so indignant, and in a change of heart, gives her some money and asks her to mend her ways. Despite asking Wesener for the money, the woman exclaims that money can do very little for her and almost collapses in an extreme state of fatigue. Seeing the woman's dilapidated state touches Wesener even more, and he takes an interest in her by inquiring into her life. The woman mentions that she was once the daughter of a respectable man but had fallen on hard times. Intrigued, Wesener continues to question the woman about her father's profession and receives no response. Although the text does not describe the effect of Wesener's questions, it seems that his line of questioning is stripping Marie of her tragic selfhood because there is an impression that he is starting to recognize this woman. In fact, Wesener even states that he will bring the woman to his home before truly understanding who she really is. At the last second, Wesener then asks her a very specific question: "Wohnt Ihr Vater nicht etwa in Lille?" (5:IV). This question appears to have broken the Marie's tragic selfhood because when she hears this question, she throws her arms around Wesener, and in this moment, he discovers that he has

found his daughter. After embracing, “beide wälzen sich halb tot auf der Erde. Eine Menge Leute versammeln sich um sie und tragen sie fort.” (5:IV).

Unfortunately, we do not know Marie’s and Wesener’s outcome because Lenz has not provided anything further in *Die Soldaten* about the two who were carried off – there is no true resolution in the text. Nevertheless, a few conclusions can be drawn, and an interpretation can be made based on the nature of the Lenzian inner tragic structure. Taken as a fact from the text, Marie’s tragic selfhood was broken because she was able to reassume her old self as daughter, and in turn, Wesener was able to recognize his daughter. In her tragic selfhood, Marie was not recognizable even at a close distance by her own father, and this fact is very informative about the power of tragic camouflage. An interpretation would stem from the need for violence and death in the Lenzian tragic equation. It may be stretching a point, but there would have to be something more to the fact that Marie and Wesener fell *halb tot* on the ground and were carried off. According to the rule of tragic selfhood, two dead bodies were carried away as *völlig tot* because there was no explanation why Wesener especially would have to be carried away. Moreover, it is not exactly strange, given Lenz’s unorthodox approach to plot of a tragic nature, to suggest that a crowd of people out of nowhere gathered around Marie and Wesener to carry them off because there was a reason why they could not walk off of their own accord. In any event, the final sentence about the people gathering around and carrying Marie and Wesener away, in my opinion, has the feel of a murder-suicide.

Die Räuber: Tragic Voices

Moving on to *Die Räuber*, in this emotional phase, Karl Moor is truly exuding deep emotion because he is, for example, feeling either “sehr gerührt” (4:I) or acting “in der heftigsten Bewegung” (5:II), both of which could be translatable as emotional. Karl’s path to final tragic

action begins when he arrives at his ancestral estate hoping to enter his former home and see Amalia. Karl's plan is to change character once again, this time to pose as a count and a distant acquaintance of the family. As noted in the second phase, Kosinsky was unable to achieve tragic selfhood, but with the assistance of Karl, he has now transformed himself and is serving as Karl's *Reitknecht*. In this particular case, the links between the three plays is quite illuminating, with Karl assisting Kosinsky much like Mephistopheles helps Faust in *Faust I* and Kosinsky playing a role similar to Stolzius' *Bedienten* in *Die Soldaten*. In this third phase, Karl continues to delve into the intricacies of humanity, freedom, and captivity in several soliloquies and in a few scenes, he is observed as having a *Todesblick* that gives the observer a *Todesschauer* (4:I). Characteristic of this phase, Karl has the aura of death and his monologues are chilling reminders of his grim appearance. Of course, Karl's appearance is not familiar to Amalia when she receives him in the castle. Like Marie in *Die Soldaten*, Karl, despite being away a relatively short while,³⁸ is unrecognizable even to Amalia, the love of his life.

In the Moor castle, Karl and Amalia get to know each other a little and Franz, Karl's brother, also makes the mysterious count's acquaintance. There are a number of portraits in the halls of the castle that Karl and Amalia study with interest, especially the portrait of a younger Karl. Naturally, the portrait of Karl stirs the emotions of both Karl and Amalia, the latter is especially emotional because she is crying as she is reminded of the man she dearly loves and misses. Although the mysterious count (Karl) reminds Amalia of Karl, she does not truly think in these moments that he is her dearest Karl. On the other hand, Francis has a strong feeling that the count is Karl and claims that he can see through his brother's *Larve*. As the case of Margarete in Phase II showed, in order to be able to see through tragic selfhood, a person would also have to

³⁸ At the beginning of the *Die Räuber*, Schiller provides a timeframe for the play in a very brief exposition: "Die Zeit des Schauspiels [ist] ungefähr zwei Jahre."

undergo the same process. Therefore, Franz, in some fashion, has accepted a tragic selfhood and even describes “dass man oft Maske nehmen müsse, um seinen Feinden zuzukönnen” (4:II). This comment by Franz is a confirmation of my assertion earlier (Margarete in the second phase) that tragic selfhood provides a tragic vision that enables tragic selves to view each other. Schiller’s use of *Larve* (for mask) is also telling in that the term represents an intermediate stage or a temporary form in a process of transformation that occurs in fauna and is similar to a metamorphoses. In any event, as the text has shown, tragic selfhood is only detectable by another tragic self, or there is a possibility that tragic selfhood can be broken by someone without tragic selfhood, as Wesener accomplished with Marie. In another example of breaking through tragic selfhood, Daniel, Karl’s boyhood servant in *Die Räuber*, was informed by Franz that the mysterious young count was in fact Karl, but Daniel could not verify this until he grabs the count’s hand and sees a familiar scar from Karl’s childhood. Evidently, Karl received the cut on his hand as a boy while in the care of Daniel, therefore, Daniel is really the only one who would know about this scar and its origins. In a scene similar to Marie and Wesener, the probing of someone (like Daniel) who cares deeply for the person (Karl) suffering in tragic selfhood creates a temporary breakthrough with the appropriate tactic, for Wesener the questioning and Daniel identifying the scar. Although Karl lapses momentarily to his old self when he rejoices with Daniel, he does regain his tragic composure swiftly. It is this example of Karl (and later from Faust) that compels me to think that Marie regains her tragic composure in *Die Soldaten*, and as a result, two people are carried away from the scene.

In the eyes of Amalie, Karl, as the young count, is the *Fremdling* who reminds her of Karl, her lost love who she hopes to meet one day in heaven “wo die Schleier hinwegfallen” (4:III). According to the young count (Karl), the veil for star-crossed lovers does indeed fall

away in heaven, but yet, a certain horror will be discovered when this happens. The thought of this horror angers Karl and he eventually retreats into the woods with a sense of purpose. Now in the forest, Karl sheds his secondary tragic self as a young count and recovers his primary tragic selfhood of robber captain. In another riveting soliloquy, Karl describes his condition as dark, his life as a maze, and again, he recognizes the point of no return: “Es ist alles so finster – verworrene Labyrinth – kein Ausgang” (4:V). As is usually the case, tragic selfhood causes a person to tremble, and even though Karl promises to not tremble, he is “heftig zitternd” (4:V). There are a number of key words in the passages of Karl in this phase of the Lenzian inner tragic structure, for example, Karl demands of his current self to remain “mir nur dieses mein Selbst getreu” (4:V). Karl boasts that nothing can take his *Freiheit* in accomplishing his mission (he is loading his pistol when saying this) and screams “Rache, Rache, Rache” (4:V) as he looks to the heavens; Karl yelling revenge three times is reminiscent of Stolzius yelling Mariane three times after completing his third phase of the inner tragic process. In the same moment, Karl says that “eine unsichtbare Macht unser Handwerk geädelt! (4:V), a reference to the power he possesses as *Kraftmensch*. Driven by his tragic self, Karl is determined to fulfill (vollenden) his mission, his tragic self *drängt ihn*, and things become darker and darker (immer finsterer) as the external plot advances.

In the final scenes of Karl’s third phase, he discovers that his father, *Alter Moor*, is still alive when he discovers that he was placed in the dungeon of the castle by Franz. Karl is furious with his brother and vows to shred him to pieces but *Alter Moor*, unaware that the robber captain is actually his son Karl, asks him to spare Franz if he is a *Mensch* and if he has “ein menschliches Herz” (4:VI). As mentioned in the introduction, according to the *Menschheit* continuum, Karl is not a *Mensch*, but a *Kraftmensch* that has undergone a tragic transformation

of self. As proof, Karl is unmoved by *Alter Moor's* plea despite admitting that the appeal would move the heart of a beast. Speciously, Condray claims that Amalia ultimately maintains her “love of the man [Karl] who is noble of heart” (71), but this would be the heart of the Karl before experiencing the tragic process. As a *Kraftmensch*, Karl’s heart is like that of a wild tiger, and he has “less noble aims...[as he] proceeds to murder with impunity, committing grave crimes against women, children, and the elderly for which he is ultimately responsible as its leader” (Condray 70). Karl, in a strangely calm manner, states that his darkened and ferocious soul will not allow him a humane action: “Nein, bei meiner grimmigen Seele” (5:II). Just as the “Grimm” (*Faust I*, 3800) seizes Margarete’s heart during her acceptance of a tragic self, so too does Karl experience an inner *Grimm* of the soul, and thus, this *Grimm* is an intertextual tragic marker. According to the Grimm *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Grimm means “wut, wütender, heftiger zorn” (“Grimm” *DWB*). In a fashion that is typical with the Lenzian inner tragic, Karl speaks of his old self in the third person when he wonders if he can break his tragic self and actually return to his father: “Ich kann ihm seinen Sohn doch nicht mehr schenken” (5:II). As Karl later describes to *Alter Moor*, his “Sohn [Karl] – ist – ewig verloren” (5:II), and therefore, destined not to return.

When Amalia arrives on the scene, she realizes that the robber captain (who was the young count) is Karl, and she pleads with him to return to her without knowing that Karl is beyond the point of no return. In an action reminiscent of the tearing of the first phase, Karl has to tear himself away (*losreißend*) from Amalia and even commands his troop to “reißt sie von meinem Hals! Tötet sie...alles...” (5:II). In this particular example (and others), there is clearly some misogyny evident and may even be a symptom of tragic selfhood in the male protagonists. For example, Stolzius speaks in a derogatory tone of Marie in his tragic state (different from old self), and the same for Karl who claims that “ein Weib erschüttert meine Mannheit nicht...Blut

muss ich saufen” (5:II). Despite wanting to tear away from Amalia, Karl does not fully pursue this course of action because Amalia is clinging desperately to his neck. This show of affection and commitment actually moves Karl and eventually breaks his tragic selfhood momentarily. Now lapsing into his old self, Karl feels his old self *aufblühend* and exclaims that “der Friede meiner Seele ist wiedergekommen” (5:II). Stern also addresses the shifts in behavior for both Karl and Amalie referring to them as “swings” (323) and “lapses” (323), respectively, back and forth from altruism to *Egoismus*. For Amalia, Stern explains how she has a “relapse into another phase of *Egoismus*” (323) when she begs Karl to kill her. In the case of Karl, Stern states that his decision to surrender himself to the authorities was “his shift from egoist to altruist” (323). Although relatable to tragic selfhood, Egoism is more of a general teleology of self, whereas the tragic selfhood has a distinct telos of the death wish. I find it telling that Stern does not mention the tragic in her article because it is a tendency among scholars who examine *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* to overlook the inner tragic process that unites the three plays.

When the robbers remind Karl of his oath, he is also reminded of his tragic selfhood and the knowledge that there is no return even when the old self is momentarily restored. In a very chilling moment that informs us of the exact darkness of tragic selfhood, Karl coldly releases Amalia’s hand, and in an instance, one can almost see the tragic self in control of Karl as he utters: “Es ist aus” (5:II). Moreover, Karl, in his tragic voice, calls the old self a blind fool who seeks to restore itself but cannot until tragic resolution has been finalized. Fully aware of the need for a tragic outcome, Karl kills Amalia (at her bequest) and finalizes his tragic selfhood. Condray claims that “Karl kills his love Amalia, at her behest, since he cannot resume his formerly happy life with her” (70), and this makes perfect sense on the surface. Underneath the surface, however, Karl can resume his former self after the tragic action, but the damage done

while in tragic selfhood makes a return to original self virtually pointless; this is a possible explanation for Stolzius killing himself and Margarete rejecting Faust's deliverance.

Now that Karl has fulfilled his tragic vow, his old moral self is restored, and as result, he wants to turn himself in to the authorities. In the final scenes, the robbers claim that Karl seems different as he contemplates a "Großmannssucht" (5:II), a quest that is related to the *Kraftmensch* in Karl.

During the final episodes of Karl's tragic selfhood, Amalia is also in the third phase of her tragic selfhood as nun, a sanctified persona that she manages to hold until Karl strikes her down in the end. Unlike others, namely Franz and Margarete from *Faust I*, Amalia in tragic selfhood does not have the vision to see through Karl's tragic state. Although Amalia, like Daniel previously, is able to temporarily break Karl's tragic selfhood, her actual tragic state, like the mystery surrounding Margarete's physical transformation, is a mysterious case among tragic individuals of the three plays. Before interpreting Amalia's anomaly, a review of her final phase of the Lenzian inner tragic structure shows that she is on a crash course for a tragic end and that she may have in fact been able to actually recognize Karl without the usual tragic vision. As a matter of fact, while sitting in the castle garden, Amalia states "das sprach er mit einer Stimme! Mit einer Stimme!" (4:IV), referring to the young count but thinking of Karl's voice. In this example, it is not tragic vision that Amalia possesses, but rather tragic hearing. Instead of seeing Karl's old self, Amalia is able to hear the voice of his old self. Hearing Karl's old voice breaks her own tragic self momentarily, and her old self reaffirms the commitment to Karl and castigates her "falsches, treuloses Herz" (4:IV) of her tragic selfhood. In addition, in Amalia's soliloquy there is also the sign of two voices speaking, at one instance in her tragic voice

penetrating Karl's *Larve* from his speech, and the next moment, in her old voice berating herself for having the tender thoughts of the young count.

Typical for the second phase, Amalia shows signs of momentary lapsing to her old self which robs her of her tragic abilities. In fact, Amalia's lapse makes it difficult for her to fully comprehend that the young count and Karl are one in the same. The confusing aspect of this involves Amalia's inability as a tragic self to see Karl despite being able to hear his old voice during the exchanges with him as the young count. In the final moments of Amalia's tragic selfhood in the third phase, she is again in Karl's presence after he has reverted back to robber captain and we can now see her old Karl clearly. It is also possible that Karl's double tragic disguise as robber captain and young count could have disrupted Amalia's tragic vision. In any event, as before, it is "seine [Karls] Stimme" (5:II) that Amalia claims is seemingly raising the dead (*Alter Moor*). Amalia is practically raving when she throws herself on Karl while praising the heavens, but in the next minute calls him *Teufel* and *Engel* in the same breath. Amalia seems to sense that Karl is two in one, and eventually appeals to the angel, the old self, but unfortunately, Karl is unable to overcome the constraints of tragic selfhood. Jonnes describes that "*Die Räuber* also begins to identify a new set of restrictions upon the 'self'" (152). Although Jonnes does not mention the tragic, the restricting power emanates from the tragic selfhood, the condition in which the new tragic self suppresses (or restricts) the old self. Many of the Schiller scholars in my research such as Jonnes, Stransky-Stranka-Greifenfels, and Stern all provide fascinating views on the self (or the *Ich*, or *ego*) with respect to *Die Räuber*, but none mention the tragic. Therefore, my tragic angle does contribute something fresh to the scholarly discourse on the notions of self in *Die Räuber*.

Faust I: The Fallen Veil

For all intents and purposes, Faust's third phase of the inner tragic structure ends when he kills Valentin. In that episode, Faust fulfills the requisite of tragic selfhood, to kill or be killed. This fact becomes clear when Faust arrives in the dungeon where Margarete is being held and she does not really recognize this older version of Faust. Technically, Faust is now free of the inner tragic of *Faust I* and proceeds to try and save Margarete as his old self. As is evident in the lead-up to tragic selfhood, Faust (and the other protagonists) are unable to have the kind of agency necessary to accomplish deeds of a tragic, and thus, heroic nature. There are several indications in the scene *Kerker* that show Faust has completed the inner tragic process and has been restored to his old self. Margarete says that she hears the "Freundes Stimme" (*Kerker*, 4461), that is, the voice of the youthful Faust prior to the tragic self. Margarete wonders where he is because she hears him calling but she does not truly see the young Faust. Actually, Faust is next to Margarete, but she does not recognize the person he is in that moment because he does not know how to kiss and his "Lippen sind kalt" (*Faust I*, 4493) like that of a dead person. Margarete wonders what has happened to the Faust she knew, now realizing that this is not the man she loved, and because of this realization, she turns from him. A key passage from this scene involves Margarete's questioning and uncertainty about the man in her presence: "Und bist du's denn? Und bist du's auch gewiss?" (4501). In an additional statement, Margarete reinforces the reality that it is actually Faust, but he has obviously changed because she is in disbelief: "Du bist's! Ich glaub' es kaum." (4510). Strangely enough, Margarete is not necessarily disappointed, she sees that the older Faust has a look "so gut, so fromm" (4535), however, she understands that his younger self was a deception, and as Faust states earlier in the play, Margarete's only "Verbrechen war ein guter Wahn!" (4408).

In essence, Margarete has also completed her tragic selfhood with the death of her child. At the very least, Margarete believes that she has killed her child (“Mein Kind hab’ ich ertränkt” 4508), and as a result, she is a “guter Mensch in seinem dunklen Drange.” (*Faust I*, 328) On the other hand, Margarete is an *Übermensch* when she grants Faust his freedom to live and charges him with the task of burying her and her relatives. Unlike Marie in *Die Soldaten* who becomes a *Bettelweib* as a *Mensch*, Margarete as an *Übermensch* says that it “ist so elend, betteln zu müssen” (*Faust I*, 4545) and understands the level of her *Menschheit*. Furthermore, as an *Übermensch*, Margarete will not allow Faust to force her against her will and commands him to leave her: “Lass mich! Nein, ich leide keine Gewalt!” (*Faust I*, 4576). Having shed her tragic self, Margarete is clearly coming out of her dark days and now on her way to the path of righteousness. At the same time, the *Übermensch* Margarete, in this moment of recovery, recognizes the destiny of a fellow *Übermensch* and can “liberate Faust for bigger deeds.” (Del Caro, “Margarete-Ariadne” 223). In a statement similar to Amalia’s question to Karl about star-crossed lovers in heaven and the falling of the veil, the majestic Margarete tells Faust that that they will meet again (*Faust I*, 4585). When Margarete sees Mephistopheles, she sees through him immediately and is disgusted that he should arrive to spoil a moment in which two *Übermenschen* must part ways for their transcendence to be complete.

Inconsistencies: Tragic and *Menschen*

Despite the many similarities, there are some inconsistencies that are actually just as enlightening as the consistencies in the Lenzian inner tragic structure and the *Menschheit* continuum because they required several readings and a deeper level of interpretation. Going by phase, a review of the major inconsistencies will show that there is a richer degree of tragic for the female protagonists. In first phase of the inner tragic process (the shattering of self), the least

convincing cases are probably Amalia and Margarete, and this raises questions of gender but not to the detriment of the women. Unlike the male protagonists whose demonstrated mental fragility leads to quicker shattering, Amalia and Margarete manage to maintain their original self longer by demonstrating a little more mental and spiritual endurance. Amalia was certainly devastated by the news of Karl, but it resulted in a violent reaction to the messenger (Franz) instead of the typical self-shattering moment with deep psychological insights and signs of suicidal tendencies. Although Amalia's physical and verbal assault on Franz was typical of a *Kraftmensch*, her psychological exposition was limited despite performing the tearing act (her necklace), an action that normally punctuates the end of Phase I; as a reminder, tearing was a significant attribute of the first phase. Amalia also had a form of tragic vision in this phase when she sees through Franz's concocted story, but she does not have any such vision in the third phase when she is in a tragic selfhood and when tragic vision (seeing through someone's disguise) was usually prevalent. In my estimation, Amalia's commitment to Karl is a factor concerning her lack of tragic vision because when she waivers somewhat from this commitment and experiences feelings for the *Fremdling* (young count/Karl), she is not able to see through the young count's disguise. As for Margarete, her psychological exposition seems more spiritual than psychological, and she suffers more from a broken heart rather than a shattered self. As Margarete tries to reconcile her behavior (in the company of Faust) with her faith, she suffers and is a broken soul but has no obvious early signs of tragic reconstruction in this phase. Instead of a psychological exposition, I would classify Margarete's first phase as more of a spiritual exposition in which her faith is shattered more so than her self. In a certain sense, Margarete's faith shattering was actually the more disturbing than the other cases in which the shattering of self was more prominent, especially if we consider the moment when Margarete actually

experiences Phase I with the evil spirit, and then, with what appears to be one of her possible transformations, from mother to child killer.

In Phase II, the physical transformation, the least convincing again is probably Margarete. On the whole, there are many uncertain aspects of Margarete which complicate an interpretation of her within the Lenzian inner tragic framework, and it is her absence of obvious change in this phase, in comparison to the other protagonists of Phase II, that requires the closest reading of her actions in *Faust I* and the keenest interpretation. For my initial estimation about Margarete's transformation, I considered Becker-Cantarino's idea that Margarete "transformed from virgin into child-murderess" (1), but this was too earthly for my tastes, too common for an *Übermensch*. In another portrayal of Margarete, Del Caro suggests that Margarete transforms into an Ariadne-figure (mythological) in the end to help Faust transcend his earthly existence. According to Del Caro "Faust is helped out of the earthly labyrinth in the end by the transformed Margarete (Ariadne)" (242).³⁹ In my view, the actual tragic transformation of Margarete occurs in the scene *Dom* and is most likely connected to the *Böser Geist*, who like Mephistopheles, helps her achieve her new form as an unrecognizable figure. In fact, the *Böser Geist* describes her physical change as something that make the others turn away in dread. If we consider the next scene, *Walpurgisnacht*, and the way Faust reacts to the young witch, then, it is possible that Margarete's tragic selfhood is her change into a wicked figure, such as a witch, perhaps the *Junge (Hexe)* that leads to the vision that Faust has of Margarete in that scene. Becker-Cantarino gives the scene considerable attention and mentions that Faust turns from the witch "Lilith, Adam's first wife (4119) and archetype of the demonic witch, who, according to Jewish lore,

³⁹ Del Caro also references Arnd Bohm who "speaks to the possibility of a transformed Helen already in part 1" in his *Goethe's Faust and European Epic* (Del Caro 242). This reference to Helen suggests that "all women are incorporated into Margarete" (Del Caro 242) which makes her more of a shell for multiple selves (personalities).

killed infants and was the devil's love" (6). Naturally, Lilith would be a natural fit for Margarete, and Becker-Cantarino alludes to this connection, but in the following statement, Becker-Cantarino cites Faust's decision to dance with the younger witch without giving her any consideration for possibly being an alter ego for Margarete. Instead, Becker-Cantarino describes Faust's witch experience as an encounter with the "woman as the body, as sexuality: first in the demonic Lilith, then in the seductive Eve-like figure of the beautiful young witch, then as 'blasses, schönes Kind' (4184) resembling Gretchen" (7).

As for further inconsistencies, in the violent action of Phase III, the only protagonist that does not technically kill (or be killed) is Marie in *Die Soldaten*. At the same time, all of the protagonists do have the death wish, the inconsistency is just a matter of how that materializes. Although Marie has suicidal tendencies (Phase I) and puts herself through a stage of virtual self-flagellation, the biggest mystery is the lack of violence at the end of her tragic selfhood when she and Wesener meet, and yet, are carried away from the scene. There is also the epilogue of the final phase, the complete reversion to old self (a post-tragic selfhood) that we possibly see with Marie because her tragic selfhood was, at least momentarily, broken by her father's questioning. There are other examples of this happening, with Karl for example, when tragic selfhood is temporarily lifted but relatively quickly restored to complete the violent requisite of kill or be killed. In a few examples, especially Faust/Margarete in *Kerker*, the scene is a part of the external tragedy but provides key information that shows that the inner tragic process is complete and old moral self is restored.

CHAPTER FIVE: LENZ AS TRANSITION TO THE TRAGIC AND BEYOND

Interlude

Thus far, this dissertation has been designed primarily to highlight, ground, and interpret the Lenzian inner tragic structure, a dramaturgical framework initially designed to capture an inner tragic process of *Die Soldaten*. The analysis of the *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* establishes the intertextuality of this inner tragic process and the inner dramaturgical features that chart its course inside the larger plots. In highlighting the structure, I make the claim that a distinct manifestation of the tragic emerges in the drama of the Sturm und Drang in late-eighteenth century Germany. I consider this tragic the literary beginnings of what will develop into the modern notions of theoretical and real-life tragic because many of its components reemerge in the German philosophy of the tragic and in other areas that incorporate its modern tragic ideals. Featuring in this new literary tragic is Lenz, the dramatist who stands out as the creator of something exemplary, which according to Kant in his *Kritik der Urteilskraft*, is the mark of genius. Lenz's tragic *Exemplar* was the core of his Sturm und Drang project, his move from earlier versions of the movement and his experiment with an inner tragic as the soul of his drama. Although Lenz is often considered *begabt*⁴⁰ by more contemporary critical commentators, he is rarely afforded the distinction of *Genie* of the *Geniezeit* in his own time. Moreover, Lenz is frequently regarded as “fortschrittlich” (Schneider 205) in contemporary scholarship, but as stated previously, this is usually applied to him as a in retrospect when considering dramatists like Büchner and Brecht whose plays show clear traces of Lenz's realism, psychological depth, and dramaturgical style. The effect of the Lenzian inner tragic of drama,

⁴⁰ The terms *Talent* or *begabt* are frequently used in Ferdinand J. Schneider's *Die deutsche Dichtung der Geniezeit* (1952) to describe Lenz. An example from Schneider is: “Bei seinem [Lenz] starken Talent...” (205).

however, takes Lenz beyond the talented, misunderstood, and innovative social critic of the next century and brings him back to his more appropriate status of tragic genius of the Sturm und Drang. In effect, the effect of Lenz is much more immediate and connected to earlier developments, namely the German philosophy of the tragic.

In terms of scholarship, I argue that Lenz's inner tragic structure as the intertextual anchor of a tragic trilogy of the Sturm und Drang and as the transition from literary tragedy to theoretical tragic has yet to be rightfully acknowledged. My interpretation of the Lenzian inner tragic structure reveals a deep internal process that not only consumes the protagonists and drives the plot of Lenz's *Die Soldaten*, but also stretches into Schiller's *Die Räuber* and Goethe's *Faust I*. The lineage with the works by Schiller and Goethe go beyond the mere understanding that an inner tragic structure exists, there is a depth to this connection that takes us even further beyond the confines of the Sturm und Drang. Situating the Lenzian inner tragic structure has helped show that various texts (i.e., *Poetics*) and contexts (i.e., the Enlightenment) from the years preceding the *Die Soldaten* have exuded influence on Lenz's initiation of his Sturm und Drang project and the formulation of his inner tragic structure. All of this in mind, this chapter is designed to show the more immediate Lenzian inner tragic aftereffect as transition to the philosophy of tragic, and then, to show some other links to later texts and developments that are not always presented in scholarship of Lenz, the three dramas, and the Sturm und Drang.

There are several key intellectual developments in the late eighteenth century and throughout the nineteenth century that exhibit certain aspects of the inner tragic process that permeate *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*. A basic understanding of the developments and the aspects they share with the inner tragic of the Sturm und Drang drama informs my research and communicates the significance of these links. The first intellectual development is

the conceptualization of modern tragic, as opposed to the classical tragedy. This move from tragedy to tragic emerges in the late eighteenth century and evolves within a long nineteenth century⁴¹ in the German-speaking intellectual world. Szondi's *Versuch über das Tragische* (1961) establishes a modern tragic that is "der deutschen Philosophie eigen" (7), a veritable German philosophy of the tragic. In Szondi's essay about the German tragic tradition, he fails to include a pivotal work from that tradition, namely August Wilhelm Bohtz's *Die Idee des Tragischen: eine philosophische Abhandlung* (1836). These two works will feature in this chapter with Bohtz's essay being an integral work because of its relative obscurity, its richness as a tragic theoretical work, and its links to the tragic of Lenz and the Sturm und Drang. Since the German philosophy of the tragic occurs within the context of German Idealism, the second major intellectual development that is a part of this chapter's coverage of post-Sturm und Drang. Some other significant developments are Existentialism and *Tiefenpsychologie* the former a philosophical tradition and the latter an aspect of modern psychology. The field of *Tiefenpsychologie*, a term coined by Swiss psychiatrist Eugen Bleuler (1837–1939), is of special interest because it explores the hidden or darker parts of human experience and the human psyche by seeing things in depth. There are also a few developments within the German drama of the nineteenth and early twentieth century that offer insight into the Lenzian inner tragic structure, namely Goethe's *Faust II*, Büchner's *Woyzeck* and Brecht's epic theater innovations.

⁴¹ Taken from the title of Blackbourn's *The Long Nineteenth Century: A History of Germany, 1780–1918* (1997). Szondi presents a 'long nineteenth century' (1795–1922) of the German philosophy of the tragic in *Versuch über das Tragische* (1961).

Peter Szondi and the German *Philosophie des Tragischen*

In *Versuch über das Tragische*, Szondi claims that a “Philosophie des Tragischen” (7) exists, and this philosophy of the tragic is “fundamentally a German one” (2).⁴² Szondi follows a German tragic thread through the nineteenth century and shows the fundamental nature of the tragic in a review of theoretical works by prominent German-speaking intellectuals like Schelling, Hölderlin, Goethe, Hegel, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche. Extremely important for my research is Szondi’s argument that the concept of tragic in the German tradition begins with the philosophical writings of Schelling in 1795. One of my major objectives is connecting Lenz’s inner tragic structure to the modern conceptualization of the tragic to show that this Szondian tragic begins to take shape in the drama of the *Sturm und Drang*. Furthermore, I argue that the Lenzian inner tragic structure, as a dramaturgical feature, serves as a transitional feature of drama that enabled subsequent abstraction. Lambropoulos makes the claim that the “tragic [was] abstracted from the drama... in the German confrontation with modernity” (8) in the late eighteenth century. I would also argue that the inner tragic process of the *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*, is a feature of the *Sturm und Drang* and the point of origin for the tragic, not with Schelling as Szondi claims. My argument contradicts Szondi by placing the ultimate beginning of modern tragic in the German tradition with Lenz and his *Die Soldaten*, that is, a work of literature (not a theoretical text), in 1776. In other words, the Lenzian inner tragic structure serves as a transition from tragedy by laying the groundwork for the status of tragic as a future philosophical topic.

⁴² This is from Paul Fleming’s translation *An Essay on the Tragic* (2002) of Szondi’s *Versuch über das Tragische* (1961). Fleming’s translation best captures Szondi’s original German passage: “Bis heute ist der Begriff von Tragik und Tragischem im Grunde ein deutscher geblieben.” (Szondi, 7).

Szondi's *Versuch über das Tragische* establishes a modern philosophy of tragic based on the theoretical texts of notable German-speaking intellectuals who weigh in on the topic of tragic. In Chapter IV of this dissertation, there were a few examples provided from Schelling, Szondi's progenitor of the tragic, that applied directly to Phase II of the Lenzian inner tragic structure. A look at another contribution to the tragic literature that Szondi reviews will show that there are additional traces of the Lenzian in the notions of tragic that reinforce my idea that Lenz's inner tragic of the drama was the basis of the eventual abstraction. In a fragment from Friedrich Hölderlin, Szondi shows that Hölderlin's tragic involves the human's desire to unite (*vereinigen*) inner "gewaltige Entgegensetzungen" (18) that compel a figure to seek reconciliation between the two forces by appealing to a tragic rule. Moreover, Szondi asserts that Hölderlin's vision of a tragic figures is tragic because such an individuals, must perish for the very reconciliation they embody, for the reconciliation he "sinnlich darstellt"⁴³ (18); Szondi provides the example of Hölderlin's Empedocles.⁴⁴ In the text *Sämtliche Werke*, Hölderlin also describes the tragic as such: "Im Tragischen nun ist das Zeichen an sich selbst unbedeutend, wirkungslos, aber das Ursprüngliche ist gerade heraus. Eigentlich nämlich kann das Ursprüngliche nur in seiner Schwäche erscheinen..." (*Sämtliche Werke*, 274). In Szondi's interpretation of Hölderlin, the physical (*sinnlich*) presentation and embodiment of the tragic is reminiscent of the Lenzian inner tragic process and Hölderlin's original self only appearing in its weakness would explain why a tragic self is needed for strength in the inner tragic process. The German philosophy of the tragic in Szondian terms is perhaps best described by Foti who considers it a tragic turning within German Idealism:

⁴³ Fleming translates this as a "...physically presents it." (7).

⁴⁴ Hölderlin's drama fragment *Der Tod des Empedokles: Ein Trauerspiel in fünf Akten* (1799).

Toward the close of the eighteenth century, tragedy, which had been of scant interest to philosophers since Plato and Aristotle, began to move to the forefront of German thought. Not only was this tragic turning of philosophy sustained well into the nineteenth century, it also surfaced anew in the first half of the twentieth century in the work of Martin Heidegger. Whereas Plato and Aristotle were concerned with the question of the educational and political impact of tragedy, or with its poetics, the German thinkers focused not so much on tragedy as a dramatic form (although Hölderlin took pains to study it as such, and Hegel does explore it in his lectures on Aesthetics), but on the very essence and philosophical thought-structure of the tragic, and ultimately on the role of the tragic paradigm in philosophy. (7)

Like Szondi, Foti also attempts to situate the tragic in a German philosophical tradition, but she considers “tragic thought of Hölderlin” (8) around 1800 as a more admirable starting point.

There are other works that follow the model of Szondi such as Lambropoulos’ *The Tragic Idea* (2006), a work that “owes much to Peter Szondi’s landmark *An Essay on the Tragic* (2002 [originally 1961]), and it gladly acknowledges its debt by adopting that book’s ingenious structure” (9). Unlike Szondi, Lambropoulos begins his historization of the German tragic with Lessing’s *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* (1767-69) and runs through Kant and Schiller before picking up with Schelling and Hölderlin. Both Szondi and Lambropoulos review a text from Georg Wilhelm Hegel, a German philosopher whose commentary on the tragic sets a standard framework for evaluating all texts in the German tragic tradition. According to Szondi, Hegel provides “für die übrigen Interpretationen die Grundlage” (Szondi 9). Lambropoulos’ commentary on Hegelian tragic⁴⁵ points away from the standard tragic view that the “outside forces (objective necessity) threatening man (subjective freedom) with annihilation were represented by fate [*Schicksal*]” (48). Instead, Lambropoulos describes Hegel’s theory in terms of a destiny (*Bestimmung*) that would drive the modern individual to self-realization. As for the nature of tragic, Hegel views a “contradiction between consciousness of one’s self and the

⁴⁵ Lambropoulos provides a fragment from G.W.F. Hegel, *Early Theological Writings* (1807), T.M. Knox (trans.), Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1948.

hoped-for difference in another's idea of one's self" (232). The Hegelian discussion of self and the contradictions of a self and a desired self all point to the Lenzian shattering of self, reconstitution under a tragic self, and the conflict between old and new selves while fulfilling a violent *Bestimmung*. A few other noteworthy works in this Szondian tradition are Joshua Billings' *Genealogy of the Tragic: Greek Tragedy and German Philosophy* (2014) and a collection of essays from *Tragedy and the Tragic in German Literature, Art, and Thought* (2014) by Stephen D. Dowden and Thomas P. Quinn (eds.). Billings also pays a special homage to Szondi as the one who "diagnoses a symptom of a larger change in the attitudes towards tragedy" (8) but also, much like my assessment, Billings feels that Szondi "misrepresents the causes of this shift" (8). In fact, Billings argues that the question of tragic still remains largely Aristotelian and fundamentally tragedy-based, and Billings draws even more on German idealist thought as evidence for his argument.

Despite all the wonderful work done on the German tragic tradition by Szondi and the others, none of those works mention Lenz despite incorporating literature into their essays; even Szondi concludes his work with a review of several tragedies. More relevant for this chapter is the fact that none of the works on the German tragic tradition mention possibly the most important treatise on the tragic in that tradition, Bohtz's *Die Idee des Tragischen: eine philosophische Abhandlung*. As chance would have it, in the German tragic tradition, Bohtz is the only one to mention Lenz, and it is with Bohtz that we find some of the most important links between Lenz and the tradition of tragic in Germany. Bohtz's omission from the discourse on the tragic is dubious considering that Lambropoulos' title *The Tragic Idea* is basically the same as Bohtz's *Die Idee des Tragischen*. For my dissertation, Bohtz's essay on the tragic idea is not only a special feature because of its obscurity and potential for original research, but also as the

best testimony of Lenz's tragic genius within the German philosophy of the tragic. Furthermore, Bohtz is an excellent source for placing the origins of the tragic tradition, or at least the transition stage from a classical poetics of tragedy to a philosophy of tragedy, in the the Sturm und Drang tragic and in the dramas *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*.

August Wilhelm Bohtz's *Schattenseite*

Bohtz's *Die Idee des Tragischen: eine philosophische Abhandlung* (1836) is both a special feature of this dissertation as a comparatively neglected essay in the German tragic tradition and a vital piece of commentary that best illustrates the inner tragic process of Sturm und Drang drama. The first part of Bohtz's first chapter from *Die Idee des Tragischen* is titled "Wesen des Tragischen überhaupt" and outlines Bohtz's notion of the tragic. On the whole, Bohtz's definition of the tragic as the "Widerspruch individueller Freiheit mit höherer Notwendigkeit" (52) does not differ very much from Schelling and others who theorized about the tragic before him. Bohtz differs remarkably, however, in his deeper discussion on the dark side of human psychology and the process that an individual undergoes when dealing with one's inner darker forces. According to Bohtz, the conflict between freedom and necessity brings about a shattering moment that tears one's existence,⁴⁶ and as a result, requires an encounter with the "Schattenseite des Lebens" (53-54) and a reconstitution within a tragic framework. This shadow side of life, or the "Nachtseite" (53), represents the dark side opposite "das fromme Bewusstsein" (32), and therefore, causes a "Disharmonie im sittlichen Bewusstsein" (36) and a host of tragic possibilities in the mind. An exploration of the *Schattenseite* results in a process that produces a tragic individual (or selfhood), one that seeks resolution "durch äußere, fremde Gewalt" (54).

⁴⁶ Bohtz's exact words are "Dasein zerreißen" (52).

Lenz's shadow is cast over Bohtz's work and even over the others who write on the tragic in the German tradition but omit Lenz from the discourse. Unlike the other tragic theorists, Bohtz does mention Lenz⁴⁷ in his *Die Idee des Tragischen* and mentions his effect on how "die romantische Tragödie geht in die innern Verhältnisse der Wirklichkeit selbst" (241). At the same time, Bohtz does discuss drama and the "jene psychologische Wahrheit, welche das bürgerliche Trauerspiel einseitig geltend macht, immer der Grund (die Basis) sein wird, auf dem die Begeisterung tragischer Kunst die ideale, übersinnliche Welt sich erheben läßt" (54), Bohtz also addresses one of the defining issues of the Lenzian tragic, the need to be unrecognizable and yet the same. Much of Bohtz's commentary on the tragic is littered with references to certain conditions for recognizing "das Individuum" (25) and the "tieferen Wesen" (35) of objects. Moreover, Bohtz discovers disparities between "im Innern wirkliches Dasein" (13) and a superficial "zerstörende Unwesen" (11) or a "trügerischen Schein" (31). At the same time, Bohtz mentions that "man würde das Tragische verkennen, wollte man meinen, es beruhe lediglich darin, daß die Nachtseite des Lebens als solche entschleiert wird" (53). In this respect, basing the tragic solely on the unveiling of life's dark side is not necessarily the answer for true recognition. For Bohtz, recognizing the tragic is the ability to see both the dark and the light simultaneously.

German Idealism and Existentialism

German Idealism is a philosophical current that runs relatively concurrently with the period (1776–1808) of the works covered in this dissertation and a brief investigation of another fundamentally German philosophy can be considered a corollary to the research presented here on the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process. In *German Idealism: The Struggle against Subjectivism, 1781–1801* (2002), Frederick Beiser states that German Idealism "designates the

⁴⁷ Bohtz references Lenz in a footnote "Vorrede zu Lenz's Schriften S. XXII" (Bohtz, 241).

philosophical doctrines initiated by Kant and then continued by Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel... and the young romantics (Hölderlin, Novalis, and Friedrich Schlegel” (vii). Karl Ameriks, the editor of *The Cambridge Companion to German Idealism* (2000), briefly discusses German Idealism in relation to the tragic in his contribution, the chapter titled “The Legacy of Idealism in the Philosophy of Feuerbach, Marx, and Kierkegaard.” Referencing Søren Kierkegaard’s *Fear and Trembling* (1843), Ameriks sketches Kierkegaard’s notion of the ideal “pathway of consciousness [and]...stages...in the development of individual freedom” (274). In the second stage of Kierkegaard’s pathway, the ethical, accounts for Hegel’s notion of *Sittlichkeit* and the moral possibilities of developing freedom which “can also take the extreme form of tragic sacrifice in giving one’s own life, or that of an individual very close to oneself (as in the example of Brutus...)” (Ameriks 275). As this dissertation demonstrates, Ameriks, for example, uses Brutus⁴⁸ to illuminate a tragic that was technically “der deutschen Philosophie eigen...” (Szondi 7) and a tragic that bears a strong resemblance to Lenz’s inner tragic. In my opinion, scholars who neglect Lenz in a discussion of the tragic in the German tradition miss a critical link in the evolution from tragedy to tragic as it relates to Szondi’s tragic scheme. Moreover, a comparison of Brutus and the *Menschen* of the Sturm und Drang tragic trilogy show a different kind of process with the latter protagonists following a more modern, Kierkegaardian tragic pathway.

Existentialism was mentioned earlier in this dissertation in reference to abandonment, a concept that was refined by philosophers such as Heidegger and Sartre to fit their overall existential enterprise. Both Existentialism and its version of abandonment are presented here to show how the philosophical movement and the concept are extensions of the Sturm und Drang inner tragic. Ameriks’ coverage of Kierkegaard sets the stage for this section on Existentialism

⁴⁸ The character Brutus from Shakespeare’s *The Tragedy of Julius Caesar* (1599).

because Kierkegaard is often referred to as the father of existentialism. As the first philosopher to explore the themes that would eventually define the existentialist movement in the twentieth century, Kierkegaard, as already demonstrated with his pathway of consciousness, is actually the only non-German considered in Szondi's strictly German philosophy of the tragic. In his essay on the tragic, Szondi "counts Kierkegaard among the Germans philosophers"⁴⁹ (Szondi 1) and makes the claim that Kierkegaard's "tragic is therefore restricted to one of these stages, the ethical [the second stage], which is essential to overcome" (35). The mode of overcoming tragic is basically ruled out "if one cannot force one's way out" (Szondi 35), and as the second phase of tragic selfhood demonstrates in the inner tragic process, forcing one's way out of the tragic proves to be difficult.

In his lecture "Existentialism Is a Humanism" (1946), Sartre states that all existentialists have at least one thing in common, they "believe that *existence* comes before *essence* – or, if you will, that we must begin from the subjective" ("Existentialism Is a Humanism"). Sartre declares that existentialism fosters the idea that every person is in possession of oneself and that responsibility for his existence rests with the individual ("Existentialism Is a Humanism"). Sartre also provides three foundational terms for Existentialism – anguish, abandonment, and despair. If we compare these three terms sequentially with the three phases of the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process, we can clearly see the similarities: anguish is a shattering emotion, abandonment of self is tragic selfhood, and despair is the death wish. Abandonment has particular relevance because it features in the *Die Soldaten* and *Faust I* in a conventional way, that is, someone gets left in the lurch. At the same time, the second phase of the inner tragic process allows us to see abandonment in the three plays in a more tragic sense which serves as the basis of a future

⁴⁹ The original German is not friendly, but provided here for clarity: "Sie bleibt der deutschen Philosophie eigen, sofern man Kierkegaard dieser zurechnen...darf" (Szondi, 7)

existential notion of the term. Sartre also offers a definition of abandonment that helps us understand the connection between tragic abandonment of self and Existentialism:

And when we speak of “abandonment” – a favorite word of Heidegger – we only mean to say that God does not exist, and that it is necessary to draw the consequences of his absence right to the end. The existentialist is strongly opposed to a certain type of secular moralism which seeks to suppress God at the least possible expense. (“Existentialism Is a Humanism”)

An example of the Strum und Drang inner tragic foreshadowing existentialist abandonment involves Margarete in *Faust I*, specifically, her acceptance of tragic selfhood (i.e., the second phase) after her interaction with *der böse Geist*. Margarete’s consultation with an evil force is the transition from a shattered religious belief, a conviction that essentially represented her original self, to the second phase and her abandonment of God, the inner tragic of her religious episode.

Tiefenpsychologie

Tiefenpsychologie, a German term coined by Eugen Bleuler, is known in the English-speaking world as depth psychology, a field of psychology that studies the relationship between the conscious and the unconscious. In the late nineteenth century, Bleuler and other psychologists such as C. G. Jung, Sigmund Freud, and Alfred Adler wrote theories, developed therapies, and employed methods such as psychoanalysis to explore the psyches of their patients. In the groundbreaking work of those German-speaking psychologists, *Tiefenpsychologie* emerged as a credible science for explain the nature of human consciousness and unconsciousness. In the term depth psychology, “*depth* is the crucial word. In psychoanalysis, it has more than a generic application. For some working analysts, it describes a point of arrival, a passing beyond perfectly useful but not yet sufficiently probing therapy sessions into deep analysis” (Ulanov 285). In my opinion, Lenz’s project for drama with the structure for capturing the inner tragic process is a *Vorübung* for the tragic, but also a deep probing and a representation

of the minds of his *Menschen*. In “Über Götz von Berlichingen,” Lenz does refer to characters that make deep impressions, but when conducting his Sturm und Drang project along tragic lines sometime later, he chose instead to analyze the depths of his *Menschen* in places where he discovered the *Schattenseite* (Bohtz) and the tragic that lurks in the *Kluft* (Schiller) of the human psyche.

Among more contemporary scholars, Leigh Selig states that if there is “one fundamental ontological assertion of depth psychology [it is] the assertion that we are partially unconscious human beings in the world” (287) Stewart adds to contemporary thought on depth psychology as field that is “concerned with our becoming human” (510) and in many instances “depth psychology affirms that we are more than we consciously know” (510) It could be argued that the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process of the *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*, especially the tragic transformation of self are experiences of the subconscious in which the protagonists explore the depths of their psyche’s darker side. In Leigh Selig’s explanation of depth psychology as research of “the logic of the psyche with our psyche” (287) there is also the sense that individuals (not professionals) explore their psyches when an event shatters them to the core. Instead of finding a logic in their shattered psyches, the *Menschen* of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* find that they are “endowed with the highest capacity for self-creation” (Golomb 11).

The Lenzian inner tragic process could be also considered when explaining modern psychological issues and even shed light on certain disorders as early examples of problems associated with the subconscious. Although not often considered a scientific formula, Sigmund Freud used literature extensively to shed light on his experiences using psychoanalysis such as his treatment of E.T.A. Hoffmann’s short story *Der Sandmann* (1816) to explain the topic of his

essay, “Das Unheimliche” (1919). In many ways, the Lenzian inner tragic is a foreshadowing of both the modern tragic and the modern science of the mind, psychology.

Traces of an Inner Tragic Process in Later Drama: *Faust II*, *Woyzeck*, and *episches Theater*

One of the main demonstrations of this dissertation describes the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process as the transition point between a tragedy that is generally a poetics standard and the German philosophy of the tragic. This transition point is found in literature, and the literary intertextual inner tragic process of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* provides literariness to the tragic before it eventually becomes abstracted. As to be expected, the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process continues its intertextuality after *Faust I* in bits and pieces, but the entire process as it appears in the Sturm und Drang tragic trilogy is difficult to replicate and similar cases do not seem to capture the spirit of the Sturm und Drang.

In keeping with the flow of the inner tragic process as a working hypothesis, Goethe’s *Faust II* would represent Faust’s second attempt at either original (moral) selfhood or another go-round with a tragic selfhood. Golomb describes “‘Übermenschen’ of optimal power” (11) in Nietzschean terms in his book *Nietzsche and Depth Psychology* (1999) and strikes a serious chord about Nietzsche’s psychology and other relatable ideas:

The transmitted ‘morality of tradition,’ which mechanically and arbitrarily conditions our ‘highest selves,’ is in fact anti-individualistic, obscuring and repressing the original personality. Hence this morality (generally conceived as altruistic), actually suppresses the ego and directs excessive violence against the "individuum," making us into a "dividuum." Nietzsche proposes morality that instead springs out of the ego's power and self-expression. The violence of the "highest self" against the ego explains the impoverishment, pessimism, and depression of the individual. Their vitality withers away, leaving a feeling of weakness, discontent, and "the profoundest misery. (7)

An extremely revealing point about such information – German philosophy of the tragic, *Tiefenpsychologie*, Existentialism and so on – is that fact that my discovery and sketch of the

inner tragic process came before knowing this information. Now, a quote such as this from Golomb about highest selves, repression of original personality, and an expression of violence all ring in tune with Lenz's efforts in the Sturm und Drang project many years before. Coming back to *Faust II*, Faust as an elevated *Übermensch* in the second part would presumably continue his foray into the depths of his own psyche to explore the tragic possibilities. Since the inner tragic of *Faust I* is conjectured here to be an extension of the Lenzian inner tragic structure, it would be logical to assume that *Faust II* would have similar tendencies for emulation along Lenzian lines. Even in the *Menschheit* continuum there are likelihoods, the *Übermensch* works with other-worldly forces and aspires to be other worldly, and now Faust, who is beyond *Übermensch*, would naturally not be on the *Menschen* spectrum. Therefore, the *Menschheit* continuum was officially closed out with *Faust II*. Meaning, the Lenzian inner tragic is used by all three to complete the ascendance and transcendence of *Menschen*, Lenz for common people, Schiller for more powerful but mundane people, and Goethe for godlike people who eventually become gods. Bohtz even describes this final stage of the *Menschheit* continuum: "Faust will nicht gottähnlich sein, nicht innerhalb der dem Menschen gesetzten Grenzen die Geisterwelt erkennen und über die Natur herrschen, sondern er will wie Gott selbst sein" (77).

Two other honorable mentions from literature and literary theory complete this chapter, Büchner's *Woyzeck* and Brecht's *episches Theater*. Much has been written about the effect of Lenz on Georg Büchner (1813–1837) and the similarities between *Woyzeck* and *Die Soldaten* especially. Büchner "felt temperamentally close to Lenz" (Price 247) the dramatist and the person, and even considered him a subject for psychological analysis. In Lenz, Büchner "could examine a human mind in a state of crisis, teetering on the verge of insanity" (Price 246) The result of Büchner's psychoanalysis of Lenz was the fragmented novella called *Lenz* (1836), and

Büchner's homage to Lenz in the drama was *Woyzeck*. In fact, the "first dramatist to take serious note of Lenz's work was Georg Büchner, who modelled characters and motifs in his *Woyzeck* on *The Soldiers*" (Yiull xxiii). In my concluding statement later, I briefly discuss the genesis of this dissertation, my seminar paper "Picking up the Fragments: Piecing Together the Tragic Individual from Lenz to Hofmannsthal." In that paper, I include *Woyzeck* in the discussion of the inner tragic process,⁵⁰ but state that he never truly reaches reconstitution. In actuality, *Woyzeck* does not experience a process, he is shattered from start to finish and keeps his original self to commit the tragic deed. Therefore, despite the similarities between *Die Soldaten* and *Woyzeck*, Büchner and his play is not a major feature of my research.

Bertolt Brecht (1898–1956) is another German dramatist that draws comparisons with Lenz and his style of drama. Brecht even staged an adaptation of Lenz's *Der Hofmeister* (1774) in 1950 in the former East Germany. In Brecht's adaptation of *Der Hofmeister*, he "objects to the state's idea of the proper role of education and literature in the new German state" (Leidner and Wurst, 77). On the whole, Brecht was deeply impressed with Lenz's sense of realism and social mindedness in his drama. According to Leidner and Wurst, Brecht even considered *Der Hofmeister* as "the most pointed literary expression of the eighteenth century" (76). There is no record of Brecht considering *Die Soldaten* for adaptation, but his work on *episches Theater* contains traces of Lenz's inner tragic structure. First, Brecht's details his dramaturgical innovations known as *episches Theater* in a commentary⁵¹ that immediately bring Lenz's "Anmerkungen übers Theater" to mind. Second, Brecht's *episches Theater* is a kind of stage craft that opposes a more traditional *dramatische Form des Theaters*. By most accounts, the

⁵⁰ In the seminar paper, the inner tragic process was initially diagnosed as tragic individuation.

⁵¹ Brecht provides a contrasting juxtaposition of dramatic theater and epic theater in his "Anmerkungen zur Oper Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny" (1930).

dramatic form of theater that Brecht is referring to is considered Aristotelian in nature, and therefore, Brecht's *episches Theater* is "nichtaristotelisch" (White 87), a rejection of Aristotle's dramatic theory of the *Poetics*. More relevant to the inner tragic structure are the components of Brecht's epic form of theater. Brecht provides a schema in his commentary that juxtaposes "Die dramatische Form des Theaters" and "Die epische Form des Theaters," and in the column under the latter there is a category for "der unveränderliche Mensch" ("Anmerkungen zur Oper Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny") in opposition to "der veränderliche Mensch" ("Anmerkungen zur Oper Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny") under the former. Surely, Brecht's "veränderliche Mensch" reflects human malleability and the protagonists of the *Sturm und Drang* tragic trilogy who demonstrate the ability to change themselves. Moreover, Brecht's chart shows that his non-Aristotelian dramaturgical tendencies resemble elements of Lenz's inner tragic structure, but in reality, Lenz was more of an eccentric Aristotelian instead of non-Aristotelean.

EPILOGUE: THE MORAL OF THE INNER TRAGIC STORY

The Transition: Shifting from Fiction to Non-Fiction

Outlined in this epilogue is my closing commentary on the significance of the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process in the grand scheme of scholarship and in terms of its value for contemporary minds. This final commentary shifts from a focus on the inner tragic process as intertextual literary phenomenon of the Sturm und Drang to contemporary real-life issues of mental health that mirror the indicators of eighteenth-century textual tragic. A concluding statement without some final word about the lessons to be learned from my investigation of Lenz, Schiller, and Goethe as Stürmer und Dränger would be remiss of me. Therefore, the final section expresses the timelessness that is found in the drama of the Sturm und Drang and the moral of its tragic story.

Implications for Sturm und Drang Scholarship

One of the purposes of this dissertation is to propose that *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* is a tragic trilogy of the Sturm und Drang. The three plays are well known for their usual Sturm und Drang panache, but the inner tragic process that they share takes us literally deeper to reveal a shared inner structure in a time of formlessness. Another purpose of this dissertation is to classify the trilogy of plays as a transition to the German philosophy of the tragic. In many accounts, the Sturm und Drang is considered the foundation for Romanticism. In the scholarly works about the German tragic tradition, very little is written about the Sturm und Drang as prelude or transition to the theory of tragic. A consideration of the three plays in relation to their shared inner tragic would add to their status and our understanding of their inner nature as works of the Sturm und Drang.

My research has shown that there are also cracks in the classification of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* as Sturm und Drang, with a tendency for oversimplification that merely suits periodization and the counter-Enlightenment narrative. There seems to be more than one version of the Sturm und Drang with respect to the drama, this is not exactly a revelation, but the Lenzian project in the Sturm und Drang and his inner tragic *Exemplar* present a fresh perspective on Lenz as tragic *Genie* and as the innovator that Schiller, Goethe, and others emulated in the years that followed his “Anmerkungen übers Theater” and *Die Soldaten*. Especially important for Sturm und Drang scholarship is the inner tragic bond between *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I*. The three inner tragic dramas of the Sturm und Drang even incorporate aspects of the Enlightenment either in the inner tragic process or on the periphery, specifically notions of freedom and reason. In particular, the abandonment of reason plays an important role in the inner tragic process and appears to be less of Sturm und Drang call for more feeling, but rather more of a call not to forsake the Enlightenment. In some respects, viewing Sturm und Drang as a fractured movement helps see the unity that exists beneath the cracked surface instead of viewing the movement as relatively united enterprise in its opposition to the Enlightenment. If anything, the inner tragic process of *Die Soldaten*, *Die Räuber*, and *Faust I* provides the kind of inner unity that often escapes those looking for rebelliousness, formlessness, and dissension.

The debate about Goethe publishing the final version of *Faust I* in 1808, a reality that technically makes it a work of the Romantic period, calls for a non-Sturm und Drang approach despite being conceived within the Sturm und Drang. Moreover, Faust supremely demonstrates the Lenzian inner tragic when compared with the other protagonists and appears to be the perfection of an earlier model of tragic figure, not just another version of the Faust series. If these three works are linked tragically, then, Goethe’s publishing date for *Faust I* is a statement

about timing and a desire to carry (perhaps the Lenzian inner tragic) into an era beyond the Sturm und Drang. As for the *Die Soldaten*, it is quite clear that Lenz's tragicomedy has so many qualities that make it unlike the Sturm und Drang despite being published during the climax of the Sturm und Drang. The comparison between *Die Soldaten* and *Götz von Berlichingen*, a work that embodies the tenets of the Sturm und Drang, demonstrates that it is sensible to place *Die Soldaten* in a different category, at the very least, within the greater Sturm und Drang framework; by extension, the works that share its inner tragic structure would also share this category.

Labelling this process as inner tragic, that is, a departure from tragedy and move toward the theoretical tragic (and daily life tragic), also warrants an additional consideration of the connection it has with Greek tragedy (the human necessity to surrender to fate) and the German tragic tradition (the conflict that emerges between human freedom and necessity). The common ground between tragedy and the tragic is freedom and fate, both feature in the inner tragic process but do not account for its key component, namely, the necessity for concealment, stealth, or nebulousness. It is a tragic concealment that makes it possible to have two selves at once, a moral self hidden deep in one's subconscious and another projecting a false front. In a sense, the acceptance of tragic selfhood makes one different while essentially being the same. This is the essence of the inner tragic and it is what makes it unique especially since this fact is accounted for by all the protagonists to some degree. As stressed in the analyses, the inner tragic structure is designed as internal arrangement that supports the external structure of the dramas. Restated, the series of developments have a structure that serves a dramatic purpose. Specifically, the structure does not correspond one-to-one with any external structural features such scenes, acts, and even secondary plots. *Die Soldaten* especially has subplots that relate very little to the inner tragic of

Stolzius and Marie. In this respect, the structure is more tragedy, and the process is more tragic, thus, reinforcing hybridity of the works and the idea that this is a transition point between the tragedy and tragic, or a third space so to speak.

The Origins of the Inner Tragic Process

This dissertation began as a seminar paper titled “Picking up the Fragments: Piecing Together the Tragic Individual from Lenz to Hofmannsthal.”⁵² The seminar paper soon became a prospectus, and shortly thereafter, my dissertation emerged after some revisions were made to my dissertation proposal. In both the seminar paper and the prospectus, Georg Büchner’s *Woyzeck* (1838) was a major part of my analysis because of the similarities between Lenz’s *Die Soldaten* and *Woyzeck*. There are many scholarly comparisons between Büchner’s “ekstatische Soldatendrama *Woyzeck*” (Selig 302) and Lenz’s *Die Soldaten*, especially between the protagonists Woyzeck/Marie and Stolzius/Marie, respectively. *Woyzeck* was replaced with *Die Räuber* for many reasons, mostly because Woyzeck does not experience the tragic as process, he suffers throughout the play in a continual state of fragmentation.

As with the foundational works for my dissertation, intertextuality is a defining aspect because it connects and unifies the works in a special way. By definition, intertextuality is considered both as the “Dialog der Stimmen innerhalb eines einzelnen Texts [Bakhtin]” (Broich and Pfister 16) and perhaps more importantly “der Bezug der einzelnen Stimmen im Text auf vorgegebene Texte [Kristeva]” (Broich and Pfister 16). In other words, the voices that are speaking, in some cases, several voices in the same person, represent the “Bezugsmöglichkeiten der Intertextualität” (Broich and Pfister, 16) and demonstrate best this dissertation’s intertextual approach as a form of methodology especially as the intertextual tragic that extends from *Die*

⁵² This seminar paper was written in the Spring of 2019 at UTK for GERM622.

Soldaten through *Die Räuber* to *Faust I*, and eventually, out of the literature into the philosophical essays.

Concluding Statement: The Tragic Moral of the Sturm und Drang for Today

For the most part, the message from the Sturm und Drang inner tragic is twofold: stay true to self and do not abandon reason. Upon reflection of the many aspects of this research, these two adages about trueness to self and use of reason make the most sense in terms of the second phase of the inner tragic process and the Lenzian Sturm und Drang project that set it on its intertextual course from *Die Soldaten* through *Die Räuber* and *Faust I*. The acceptance of tragic selfhood in phase two of the inner tragic process is not only the structural climax of the plays but also the principal lesson of the Sturm und Drang inner tragic. Prefaced by the Rousseauian and Kantian discourse on human malleability in the Enlightenment, the ability to transform oneself is real and full of promise. Whereas the Stürmer und Dränger were known for throwing caution to wind, the Sturm und Drang inner tragic process of Lenz, Schiller, and an older Goethe seems to err on the side of caution with a warning about the tragic possibilities of self-transformation. In my interpretation of tragic selfhood in the inner tragic process, I perceive a concern of the Stürmer und Dränger as it relates to real *Menschen* in their own time. Of course, if the *Menschen* of the late eighteenth were concerned with human malleability and self-transformation as a potentially tragic enterprise, then in our own time the word of warning from the Sturm und Drang is certainly relevant.

Similar to the first part of the message, the second part about the abandonment of reason also take the form of a notice. The Lenzian Sturm und Drang project was the preliminary to the tragic with the inner tragic structure of *Die Soldaten*, but Lenz's play represents a turn from the Götz-style of drama, and in this respect, serves as its critique. In turn, a critique of Götz equates a

critique of the kind of Sturm und Drang it represented. At the same time, a critique of Götz favors a return to the reason that preceded the most famous *Kraftkerl* of the early Sturm und Drang. In other words, the Lenzian Sturm und Drang project has three interconnected objectives – identifying a modern tragic, developing a structure of drama that captures the tragic as inner will, and using this formula as a critique or alert. Leidner and the three authors Zammito, Menges, and Menze describe the Sturm und Drang critique angle, there may be slight differences in the type of critique discussed by scholars, but the critique from the Sturm und Drang of Lenz and company has a hint of warning that few scholars seem to mention.

Considering the Lenzian inner tragic structure as self-critique requires a slightly different angle, and the second phase of the inner tragic process once again comes to the fore. The logic would suggest that if Sturm und Drang writers had a penchant for self-criticism, then the self-critique in the Lenzian inner tragic structure represents a hard look at the plays' German tragic *Menschen* whose suffering conveys the frustration associated with the Enlightenment's modern *Menschen* of reason. In some way, the Sturm und Drang appears to be an inner tragic of the Enlightenment and the Lenzian inner tragic structure may serve as a symbol of that internal critique. There is potentially a scenario of 'two sides of the same coin' in this debate and there is also a possible middle ground that the tragic structure of these three dramas represents and is played out by the ascending *Menschen* as self-critiquing 'enlightened' Germans. Just to reiterate, the essence of the tragic structure, as a manifestation within the Sturm und Drang, represents and accounts for the very essence of the German literary movement as something distinct either within or a specific counter to the Enlightenment as a foreign international current. All of this belongs to the debate in which scholars argue for the Sturm und Drang playing either a supporting role within or serving as the irrational complement to the Enlightenment. The latter

would probably reflect Kant's view of the self-regulating freedom (Sturm und Drang) as the counterpoise to the passion that uses reason as an instrument (Enlightenment).

Setting Lenz's genius as dramaturgical designer aside for a moment and approaching the inner tragic process in its own right as a real-life crisis, we could consider current issues of mental health in relation to the inner tragic process of the Sturm und Drang. Brown claims that the "most thematic motif is mental illness" (104) in *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, but also includes *Faust I* in this discussion. Much like the process of self-transformation of the Sturm und Drang inner tragic, Brown describes how "Wilhelm's healing proceeds through several steps" (105) and relates a similar transformation that includes projection and change:

Wilhelm's development and maturation, his change in attitudes and values, his discovery of who and what he really is, is represented not through the narrator's insight and interpretation, but through the same kind of projection onto other characters observed in the classical plays and in *Faust*. (102)

Song's article "Sturm und Drang and Mental Health During Adolescence" (2017) is a recent attempt to incorporate the Sturm und Drang into current psychological research:

Mental health is an important issue in adolescent development. Parents interviewed educators and researchers, often claiming that children who were good in early childhood became naughty and tough in puberty. This adverse emotionality and unstable behavioral tendency in adolescence has been called as *Sturm und Drang*. (Song 2)

There is even an editorial by Nemko in *Psychology Today* called "How Emotional Should You Be?" (2105) that mentions the Sturm und Drang, but the most eye-catching aspect is the style of the contribution: a dialogue between *Person* and *Alter Ego*. Nemko writes primarily about the importance of controlling one's emotions but in the final entry the *Person* states that "people want their personal lives to be a break from work's stresses not another source of *Sturm und Drang*" ("How Emotional Should You Be?"). This use of Sturm und Drang reflects a general perception of the movement in the undertone of something turbulent and stressful and offers little

for any serious consideration of the movement in relation to current mental health issues.

Nevertheless, the lessons of the Sturm und Drang taken in the proper context, especially with the links to modern psychology and matters of the self, provides us good reason for pause and even an eighteenth-century literary reference point for reflection on the current storms and stresses of our own times.

WORKS CITED

- Agard, Walter R. "Fate and Freedom in Greek Tragedy," *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 2, November 1933, pp. 117-126.
- Ameriks, Karl. "The Legacy of Idealism in the Philosophy of Feuerbach, Marx, and Kierkegaard." *The Cambridge Companion to German Idealism*, edited by Karl Ameriks, Cambridge UP, 2000, pp. 258–281.
- Aristotle, *Poetics and Rhetoric*, edited by Eugene Garver, Barnes & Noble, 2005.
- Baldwin, Thomas. "abandonment." *The Oxford Guide to Philosophy*, edited by Ted Honderich, Oxford UP, 2005.
- Baldick, Chris. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford UP, 2001.
- Becker-Cantarino, Barbara. "Witch and Infanticide: Imaging the Female in *Faust I*." *Goethe Yearbook*, Volume 7, Issue 1, 1994, pp. 1-22.
- Beiser, Frederick. *The Fate of Reason: German Philosophy from Kant to Fichte*. Harvard UP, 1994.
- . *German Idealism: The Struggle against Subjectivism, 1781-1801*. Harvard UP, 2011.
- The Bible*. Authorized King James Version, Oxford UP, 1998.
- Billings, Joshua. *Genealogy of the Tragic: Greek Tragedy and German Philosophy*. Princeton UP, 2014.
- Blackbourn, David. *The Long Nineteenth Century: A History of Germany, 1780–1918*. Oxford UP, 1997.
- Bledsoe, Robert. "Empathetic Reading and Identity Formation". *Lessing Yearbook*, Volume XXXIII, 2001.
- Bohm, Arnd. "Individualism in Schiller's *Die Räuber*." *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 1, 1987, pp. 31-42.
- Bohtz, August Wilhelm. *Die Idee des Tragischen: eine philosophische Abhandlung*. G. Rübler, 1836.
- Broich, Ulrich and Manfred Pfister. *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985.
- Brown, Jane K. *Goethe's Allegories of Identity*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.

- Busch, Albert and Oliver Stenschke. *Germanistische Linguistik: eine Einführung*, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, 2018.
- Butler, Eliza M. *The Tyranny of Greece Over Germany: A Study of the Influence Exercised by Greek Art and Poetry Over the Great German Writers of the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. 1935. Beacon Press, 1958.
- . *The Fortunes of Faust*. 1952. Cambridge UP, 1979.
- Chamberlain, Timothy. *Eighteenth Century German Criticism*. Edited by Chamberlain, Continuum, 1992.
- Cherry, Myisha. "Forgiveness, Exemplars, and the Oppressed." *The Moral Psychology of Forgiveness*, edited by Kathryn J. Norlock, Rowman and Littlefield, 2017, pp 55-72.
- Condray, Kathleen. "The 'Kerl' in the Wild West: Friedrich Gerstäcker's 'Die Regulatoren in Arkansas' and Friedrich Schiller's *Die Räuber*." *The Arkansas Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 73, No. 1, 2014, pp. 69-77.
- Del Caro, Adrian. "Margarete-Ariadne: Faust's Labyrinth," *Goethe Yearbook*, Volume 18, 2011, pp. 223-243.
- . "Zarathustra vs. Faust, or Anti-Romantic Rivalry among Superhumans." *Nietzsche on Art and Life*, edited by Daniel Came, Oxford UP, 2014, pp. 143-162.
- Demetz, Peter, editor. *An Anthology of German Literature 800-1750*. Prentice Hall, 1968.
- Denby, David. "Herder: Culture, Anthropology and the Enlightenment." *History of the Human Sciences*, Volume: 18(1), 2005, pp. 55-76.
- Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Online). Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm, 1854, <https://woerterbuchnetz.de/?sigle=DWB#0> Accessed December 2, 2020.
- Dowden, Stephen and Thomas P. Quinn, editors. *Tragedy and the Tragic in German Literature, Art, and Thought*, Camden House, 2014.
- Duncan, Bruce. "The Comic Structure of Lenz's *Soldaten*." *MLN*, Vol. 91, No. 3, 1976, pp. 515-523.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic*. Oxford UP, 2002.
- Eldridge, Richard. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Art*, Cambridge UP, 2014.
- Kelly, Michael. "Genius." *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, edited by Kelly. Oxford UP, 1998.
- Foti, Veronique. *Epochal Discordance: Hölderlin's Philosophy of Tragedy*. SUNY Press, 2006.

Freytag, Gustav. *Die Technik des Dramas*. 1863. Bearbeitete Neuausgabe. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965.

Garver, Eugene. Introduction. *Poetics and Rhetoric*, 2005, pp. xi–lv.

Garrard, Graeme. *Counter-Enlightenments: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, Routledge, 2006.

Gay, Peter. *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation, The Rise of Modern Paganism*. W.W. Norton and Company, 1966.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. “Zum Shakespeares-Tag.” 1771. *Dramaturgische Schriften des 18. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Klaus Hammer. Henschel Verlag, 1968, pp 372-375.

---. *Faust. Der Tragödie erster und zweiter Teil. Urfaust*. Edited by C.H. Beck, 1980.

---. *Faust: First Part*. Translated by Peter Salm. Bantam, 1985.

Golomb, Jacob, Weaver Santaniello and Ronald I. Lehrer. *Nietzsche and Depth Psychology*. SUNY Press, 1999.

Gottsched, Johann Christoph. *Versuch einer Critischen Dichtkunst* (1729). Nachdruck der 4. Auflage, Leipzig, 1751. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962.

---. “Die Schauspiele und besonders die Tragödien sind aus einer wohlbestellten Republik nicht zu verbannen” (1736). *Dramaturgische Schriften des 18. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Klaus Hammer. Henschel Verlag, 1968, pp. 14-20.

Guthrie, John. “Schiller's Early Styles: Language and Gesture in *Die Räuber*.” *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 94, No. 2, 1999, pp. 438-459.

Hamann, Johann Georg. *Sokratische Denkwürdigkeiten*. 1759. *Zeno.org*.
<http://www.zeno.org/Philosophie/M/Hamann,+Johann+Georg/Sokratische+Denkw%C3%BCrdigkeiten>.

Hammer, Klaus. Nachwort. *Dramaturgische Schriften des 18. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Hammer, Henschel Verlag, 1968, pp 483-550.

Heffner, R. M. Introduction. *Goethe's Faust, Part I*. edited by Heffner, Helmut Rehder, and W.F. Twaddell, D.C. Heath and Co., 1954, pp. 1–163.

Hegel, G.W.F. *Early Theological Writings* (1807). Translated by T.M. Knox, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1948.

- Heitner, Robert. *German Tragedy in the Age of Enlightenment: A Study in the Development of Original Tragedies, 1724-1768*. University of California Press, 1963.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried. "Haben wir eine französische Bühne?" (1766/67). *Dramaturgische Schriften des 18. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Klaus Hammer, Henschel Verlag, 1968, pp. 204-218.
- . *Adrastea* (1802). *Dramaturgische Schriften des 18. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Klaus Hammer, Henschel Verlag, 1968, pp. 249-291.
- Hölderlin, Friedrich. *Der Tod des Empedokles*. 1799. *Hölderlin: Selected Verse*, edited and translated by Michael Hamburger. Penguin, 1961.
- Hölderlin, *Sämtliche Werke: Große Stuttgarter Ausgabe*, edited by Friedrich Beißner. Vol. 4, Cotta'sche Buchhandlung, 1943-1985.
- Horace, *The Art of Poetry*. *Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, Third Edition, edited by Vincent B. Leitch, W.W. Norton & Company, 2018.
- Huddart, David, *Homi K. Bhabha*. Routledge, 2006.
- Jonnes, Denis. "Pattern of Power: Family and State in Schiller's Early Drama." *Colloquia Germanica*, Vol. 20, No. 2/3, 1987, pp. 138-162
- Kant, Immanuel. *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. 1781. *Zeno.org*.
<http://www.zeno.org/Philosophie/M/Kant,%20Immanuel/Kritik%20der%20reinen%20Vernunft>.
- Keckeis, Gustav. *Dramaturgische Probleme im Sturm und Drang*. Böhler & Co., 1907.
- Kluge, Gerhard. "Zwischen Seelenmechanik und Gefühlspathos: Umrisse zum Verständnis der Gestalt Amalias in 'Die Räuber' [von Friedrich von Schiller]." *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Schillergesellschaft*, 20, 1976, pp. 184-207.
- Kramnick, Isaac. Introduction. *The Portable Enlightenment Reader*, edited by Kramnick, Penguin, 1995, pp. ix–xxiii.
- Lambropoulos, Vassilis. *The Tragic Idea*. Duckworth, 2006.
- Lange, Horst. "Wolves, Sheep, and the Shepherd: Legality, Legitimacy, and Hobbesian Political Theory in Goethe's *Götz von Berlichingen*," *Goethe Yearbook*, Volume 10, 2001, pp. 1-30.
- Langemeyer, Peter, Editor. *Dramentheorie: Texte vom Barock bis zur Gegenwart*. Reclam, 2011.

- Lavater, Johann Caspar. *Aussichten in die Ewigkeit, in Briefen an Herrn Joh. Georg Zimmermann*. 2d ed., Vols. 1–2, Geßner, 1770.
- Leidner, Alan. *The Impatient Muse: Germany and the Sturm und Drang*. UNC Press, 1994.
- Leidner, Alan and Karin A. Wurst. *Unpopular Virtues: The Critical Reception of J.M.R. Lenz*. Camden, 1999.
- Leigh Selig, Jennifer. "Depth Psychology as 'Terrible Trouble' for Researchers." *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 7(3), 2013, pp. 287–288.
- Lenz, J.M.R. "Anmerkungen übers Theater." *Dramaturgische Schriften des 18. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Klaus Hammer, Henschel Verlag, 1968, pp. 295–317.
- . "Über Götz von Berlichingen." 1774. *Zeno.org*.
<http://www.zeno.org/Literatur/M/Lenz,+Jakob+Michael+Reinhold/Essays+und+Reden/%C3%9Cber+G%C3%B6tz+von+Berlichingen>. Accessed on December 1, 2020.
- . *Die Soldaten: Text, Materialien, Kommentar*. Edited by Edward McInnes, Carl Hanser Verlag, 1977.
- . *The Tutor–The Soldiers, J.M.R. Lenz*. Translated by William Yuill. University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- . "Letters on the Morality of *The Sorrows of Young Werther*." *Eighteenth Century German Criticism*, edited by Timothy J. Chamberlain, Continuum, 1992.
- Lessing, G. E. "17. Brief" von *Briefen, die neueste Literatur betreffend*. 1759-65. *Dramaturgische Schriften des 18. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Klaus Hammer, Henschel Verlag, 1968, pp. 139-141.
- . *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*. Reclam, 1995.
- Lind, L.R. Introduction. *Ten Greek Plays in Contemporary Translations*, edited by Lind, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957, pp ix–xxviii.
- Loeb Paul S. "Finding the Übermensch in Nietzsche's Genealogy of Morality." *Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, Volume 30(1), 2005, pp. 70-101.
- Löb, Ladislaus. "Domestic Tragedy – Realism and the Middle Class." *The German Theatre: A Symposium*, edited by Ronald Hayman, Barnes & Noble, 1975.
- Maeterlinck, Maurice. "The Tragical in Daily Life." *Modern Theories of Drama: A Selection of Writings on Drama and Theatre, 1840–1990*. Edited by George Brandt, Oxford UP, 1998.

- Merriam-Webster. "death wish." <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>. Accessed on March 30, 2021.
- Mortensen, Peter. "Robbing *The Robbers*: Schiller, Xenophobia and the Politics of British Romantic Translation." *Literature and History*, Vol.11 (1), 2002, p.41-61.
- Nemko, Marty. "How Emotional Should You Be?" *Psychology Today*. January 2015. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/how-do-life/201501/how-emotional-should-you-be>. Accessed March 12, 2021
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Edited by Adrian Del Caro and Robert Pippin. Translated by Del Caro, Cambridge UP, 2006
- Ogg, David. *Europe of the Ancien Régime: 1715-1783*. Harper and Row, 1965.
- Osborne, John. "Anti-Aristotelian Drama from Lenz to Wedekind", *The German Theatre: A Symposium*, edited by Ronald Hayman, Barnes & Noble, 1975
- Price, Victor (trans.). "Introduction", *Georg Büchner: Danton's Death, Leonce and Lena, Woyzeck*. Oxford World's Classics, 1998.
- Robertson, John G. *Lessing's Dramatic Theory*. Benjamin Blom, 1965.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. "Existentialism Is a Humanism." 1946. <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/sartre/works/exist/sartre.htm>. Accessed March 13, 2021
- Schelling, F.W.J. *Briefe über Dogmatismus und Kritizismus*. 1794-96. In *Hauptwerke der Philosophie in originalgetreuen Neudrucken*, Müller Verlag, 1914.
- Schiller, Friedrich. *Jugenddramen: Die Räuber–Kabale und Liebe–Don Carlos*. Wilhelm Goldmann Verlag, 1966.
- . "Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet." *Projekt Gutenberg-DE*. <https://www.projekt-gutenberg.org/schiller/anstalt/anstalt.html>. Accessed on April 2, 2021.
- Schneider, Ferdinand Josef. *Die Deutsche Dichtung der Geniezeit*, Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1952.
- Schuman, Rebecca, "The Mirror and The Tower: Masculinity and Specularity in Klinger's *Die Zwillinge* and Gerstenberg's *Ugolino*." *Symposium: A Quarterly Journal in Modern Literatures*, 63:2, 2009, pp. 127-144.
- Selig, Carl. "Georg Büchner: Lebensbild eines jungen Genies", *Georg Büchner: Gesammelte Werke*, Artemis Verlag, 1944.

- Sidnell, Michael. *Sources of Dramatic Theory. Diderot to Hugo*. Edited by Sidnell, Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Sidney, Philip. *An Apology for Poetry*. edited by Geoffrey Shepherd, Nelson Press, 1965.
- Smith, John H., “Die Gretchenfrage : Goethe and Philosophies of Religion around 1800”. *Goethe Yearbook*, Volume 18, 2011, pp. 183-203.
- Smith, Helmut Walker. “The Confinement of Tragedy: Between *Urfaust* and *Woyzeck*”. *Tragedy and the Tragic in German Literature, Art, and Thought*, edited by Stephen Dowden and Thomas P. Quinn, Camden House, 2014, pp 21–39.
- Smith, Matthew W. *The Nervous Stage: Nineteenth-century Neuroscience and the Birth of Modern Theatre*. Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Song, Hana. “Sturm und Drang and Mental Health During Adolescence.” *Korean Journal of Child Studies*, April, 38(2), 2017, pp. 1-3.
- Steiner, George. Introduction. *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*. Walter Benjamin. Translated by John Osborne, Verso, 1998, pp. 7-24.
- Stransky-Stranka-Greifenfels, Werner von. “Die Räuber: Structure, Models, and an Emblem.” *A Companion to the Works of Friedrich Schiller*, Edited by Steven D. Martinson Camden House, 2005, pp. 89-114.
- Stern, Dagmar. “The Third Extraordinary Person in Schiller's ‘Die Räuber.’” *Colloquia Germanica*, Vol. 27, No. 4, 1994, pp. 321-331.
- Stewart, David J. “Self, Spirituality, and Mysticism.” *Zygon*, vol. 49, no. 2, 2014, pp. 509–529.
- Stoner, Samuel A. “On the Primacy of the Spectator in Kant's Account of Genius.” *The Review of Metaphysics*, Vol. 70, No. 1, 2016, pp. 87-116.
- Szondi, Peter. *Versuch über das Tragische*. 1961. Insel, 1964.
- Szondi, Peter. *An Essay on the Tragic*. 1961. Translated by Paul Fleming, Meridian, 2002.
- Taylor, Charles. *Hegel and Modern Society*. Cambridge UP, 2015.
- Ter Horst, Eleanor. “Masks and Metamorphoses: The Transformation of Classical Tradition in Goethe's *Römische Elegien*,” *The German Quarterly*, Vol. 85, No. 4, 2012, pp. 401-419.
- Theisen, Bianca. “The Drama in Rags: Shakespeare Reception in Eighteenth-Century Germany.” *MLN*, Vol. 121, No. 3, German Issue, 2006, pp. 505-513.

- Titus, Harold H. *Living Issues in Philosophy*. Fifth edition. Litton, 1970.
- Trunz, Eric. Anmerkungen des Herausgebers. *Goethe-Faust: Der Tragödie erster und zweiter Teil, Urfaust*, edited by Trunz, C.H. Beck, 1980, pp. 461–661.
- Ulanov, Barry. “Depth Psychology, Depth Religion.” *Journal of Religion and Health*, Vol. 38, 1999, pp. 285-286.
- Velkley, Richard L. *Freedom and the End of Reason: On the Moral Foundations of Kant’s Critical Philosophy*, University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Wellbery, David. *Specular Moment: Goethe’s Early Lyric and the Beginnings of Romanticism*. Stanford UP, 1996.
- Yuill, William. Introduction. *The Tutor–The Soldiers*, J.M.R. Lenz. Edited by Yuill, University of Chicago Press, 1972, pp vi–xxvi.
- Young, Julian. *The Philosophy of Tragedy: From Plato to Žižek*. Cambridge UP, 2013.
- Werner, R. M. “Die erste Aufführung des Götz von Berlichingen.” *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, 2, 1881.
- White, John J. *Bertolt Brecht’s Dramatic Theory*. Camden House, 2004.
- Zammito, John H., Karl Menges and Ernest A. Menze. “Johann Gottfried Herder Revisited: The Revolution in Scholarship in the Last Quarter.” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, October, Vol. 71, No. 4, 2010, pp. 661-684.

VITA

Charles Joseph Brown is originally from Ohio. He earned a B.A. in German from the University of Maryland, University College, and a M.A. in Strategic Security Studies from the National Defense University. His research focuses on eighteenth-century German drama, the philosophy of the tragic, and German Classicism. He also has a special interest in second language acquisition (SLA) and pedagogy within the broader frame of applied linguistics. Charles is a graduate teaching associate (GTA) and teaches first and second-year German.