

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by L. Wade Sanford entitled "The Criticism of Friedrich Schiller's Major Dramas in the Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek (1770-1796) and the Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek (1793-1806)." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in German.

John C. Osborne

John C. Osborne, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Henry Katz
Robert H. Miller
Wurtler

Accepted for the Council:

L. Evans

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

THE CRITICISM OF FRIEDRICH SCHILLER'S MAJOR DRAMAS IN THE
ALLGEMEINE DEUTSCHE BIBLIOTHEK (1770-1796) AND THE
NEUE ALLGEMEINE DEUTSCHE BIBLIOTHEK (1793-1806)

A Thesis
Presented for the
Master of Arts
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

L. Wade Sanford

June 1982

3060944

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish especially to express my gratitude to Dr. John C. Osborne, without whose advice, patience and time it would have been impossible to have completed this thesis. I also want to thank Dr. Robert L. Hiller and Dr. David Lee for their helpful suggestions and encouragement.

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to determine the general attitude of the Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek (1770-1796) and the Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek (1793-1806) toward the major dramas of Friedrich Schiller. This subject merits attention because of the profound influence which this periodical had upon the opinions of the German-speaking people in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Because this periodical was founded by Friedrich Nicolai, an arch Rationalist, and since it continued to reflect the attitudes of the Rationalists, this study offers a view of their reactions to the Storm and Stress movement and German Classicism, as seen in the dramas of Schiller.

In order to study the development of the criticism of Schiller's major dramas, all the reviews of these in the Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek and the Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek were carefully examined. Only the reviews themselves were read for the purposes of this study.

The resulting overall view was much as expected. The early dramas, characterized by Storm and Stress, are harshly rejected, with the last of them, Kabale und Liebe, receiving less severe treatment than the first two. The criticism of Don Carlos, generally regarded as being Schiller's transitional drama from Storm and Stress to Classicism, marks an abrupt change from rejection to approval. This tone

generally prevails for most of the later dramas, with the sole exception of Die Braut von Messina. In all the reviews, even the most strident, Schiller's talent is acknowledged. This and the increasingly extensive treatment of his dramatic works undoubtedly contributed to the widespread influence of his works and ideas, and to his personal acclaim.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
I. SCHILLER'S EARLY DRAMAS	6
Die Räuber	6
Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua	8
Kabale und Liebe	11
II. SCHILLER'S TRANSITIONAL DRAMA	16
Don Carlos	16
III. SCHILLER'S LATER DRAMAS	30
Wallenstein	30
Maria Stuart	45
Die Jungfrau von Orleans	61
Die Braut von Messina	82
Wilhelm Tell	88
IV. CONCLUSION	105
BIBLIOGRAPHY	108
APPENDICES	110
Appendix A	111
Appendix B	112
VITA	113

INTRODUCTION

The Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek (henceforth abbreviated ADB) was a critical journal founded by Friedrich Nicolai in 1765. It was the first periodical to include reviews of books in all intellectual fields. It was also distinctly German in that it restricted itself to books published by German publishing houses.¹

Nicolai's main purpose in founding the ADB was to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas in all disciplines and from all German speaking areas. He was particularly interested in German language and literature, and he sought to provide in the ADB a centralizing force which might bring about a unifying, a strengthening, and a refining of German culture.²

The ADB was widely read in German-speaking areas and undoubtedly had an influence on the tastes of its readers. Friedrich Ost includes a list of the periodical's circulation for Volume 55, pt. 1, 1783.³ Approximately 1200 copies are listed according to the various geographical areas of

¹Kelly, Barbara Maureen. "The Development of Goethe Criticism in the Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek and the Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek" (diss., The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1970, p. 1). Ms. Kelly's source was Gunther Ost, "Friedrich Nicolai and the Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek" (diss., Berlin, 1928). This copy was not available to me.

²Ibid., p. 2.

³Ibid., p. 2.

distribution (figures for Berlin and the surrounding areas are not included). This level of circulation is particularly impressive for a period in which most journals were merely regional.

That Prussia did not have a free press in 1765 posed few censorship difficulties for Nicolai. His periodical was largely apolitical and was not financially dependent upon the state. His publishing firm had already received a general permit in 1713, and therefore no special permit was needed for the ADB. In addition, he was also successful in getting a permit from Saxony.⁴ Nicolai did have problems with Catholic Vienna because of his inclusion of some theological writings, but the ban imposed on the ADB in Vienna did not greatly affect circulation.⁵

When Friedrich Wilhelm II succeeded Friedrich II in 1786 as King of Prussia, the picture changed for the worse, for Friedrich Wilhelm II was much more tyrannical than his predecessor, and Nicolai was compelled to move his journal outside of Prussia to maintain its integrity.⁶ After great difficulty Nicolai found a new publisher, C. E. Bohn, who took over the publication in 1792.

The ever-growing number of books printed in Germany

⁴Ibid., p. 2.

⁵Ibid., p. 3.

⁶Ibid., p. 3.

soon made it impossible to review all the significant works as they were published. Nicolai therefore developed a system for reviewing them. For example, the books published between 1774 and 1777 were reviewed in the four year period between 1775 and 1778. Late reviews submitted were published in supplementary volumes (Anhangbände). It was during one of these four year periods when Bohn took over (1788-1791). The ADB was continued until 1797. In 1793 Bohn began to publish simultaneously the Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek (henceforth abbreviated NADB). The first four-year period of the NADB was 1792-1795.⁷

By 1800 the NADB was in serious financial difficulties. It lacked the influential name of Nicolai, and it also failed to keep up with the changing times. Readers were losing interest in the conservative, rationalistic views of the journal. Bohn, who was primarily a businessman and who relied largely on his editors, lost his chief editor, J. Samuel Ersch, to the Jena Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung. Bohn saw no alternative but to discontinue the NADB unless Nicolai could find a new publisher for the journal,⁸ and the aged and weary Nicolai reassumed responsibility for the NADB in 1802.

Declining revenues finally caused the NADB to be

⁷Ibid., p. 4.

⁸Ibid., p. 4.

discontinued. The number of volumes had grown so that the annual cost of a subscription was twice that of its leading rival, the Jena Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung.⁹ In addition, Nicolai was too old to carry the burden of editorship, and most of his former co-workers had died. The final issue of the NADB appeared November 18, 1805. It had been in continuous publication for forty years. The concluding three volumes, including the index for the past period, were published in 1806.¹⁰

The purpose of this study is to examine the attitudes of the ADB and the NADB toward Schiller's major dramas. Such a study will perhaps shed some light on the overall attitudes of the Berlin Enlightenment toward the two movements reflected in Schiller's dramas: Sturm und Drang, and Klassik (Classicism). Only the actual reviews of the major dramas in the ADB and the NADB were considered in this study. All reviews are listed chronologically in the Appendix. The division of chapters is based on the three periods generally recognized in Schiller's literary development: his early plays, i.e. those characterized as being Sturm und Drang; his transitional drama, Don Carlos; and his late works; which reflect the attitudes of the Klassik, or

⁹Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 5.

or Classicism. The form of reference is by volume, part, and page. Quotations are taken verbatim, and no changes or corrections have been made in older spellings or misspellings.

CHAPTER I

SCHILLER'S EARLY DRAMAS

Since Schiller's early dramas (Die Räuber, Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua, and Kabale und Liebe) are in the style of the Sturm und Drang movement, toward which the Berlin critics were generally hostile, it is no surprise to find that the ADB reviews of them were harsh and negative, although the treatment of Kabale und Liebe is somewhat less harsh than that of the earlier two plays.

Die Räuber

The critic's opening description of Die Räuber reveals his alarm at and his antipathy toward a presentation of material which he considers distasteful, shocking, and too controversial for the stage. This attitude is completely consonant with the politically conservative point of view which characterized the mainstream of the Enlightenment in Germany. The following remarks emphasize the critic's indignation:

Ein erschreckliches Gemälde des bejammernswürdigsten menschlichen Elendes, der tiefsten Verirrung, des schrecklichen Lasters-Menschen dargestellt, die voll Kraft zu bessern Dingen geboren, hinabgesunken, nicht mehr an Würde der Menschheit zu glauben, durch eine Reihe

von Verführungen, ach! und von unglücklichen
Schicksalen dahin gestossen werden, tollkühn
und verzweifelnd dem Abgrunde entgegen zu
eilen.¹¹

However, in spite of his aversion to the substance of the play, the reviewer seems compelled to laud Schiller for his talent and for his skill in depicting the action and the characters involved:

So erschütternd dies Gemälde ist, Schlag auf Schlag, Abscheulichkeit auf Abscheulichkeit; so wenig es zu wünschen seyn mag, dass man sein Herz an den Anblick dieser grässlichen Scenen gewöhne; so untauglich dies Stück vielleicht zu einer Vorstellung auf dem Theater ist; so wohl (wir müssen es gestehen) ist es gezeichnet, so stark ausgemalt; so lebhaft ist das Colorit, so äusserst fein; auch hin und wieder ausgearbeitet und nuanciert. Gewiss ist der Verfasser kein gemeiner Kopf. . .¹²

But the critic immediately adds that the introduction belies the author's talent and drags along boringly.

The reviewer turns next to the characters and states that the characterization of the robbers is masterfully executed; however, he does not elaborate here, but rather goes to some length to express his negative feelings about the character of Franz, whom he finds unbelievable and corrupt beyond logical explanation:

Franz. . . (das wollen wir zur Ehre der Menschheit hoffen) ist ein Geschöpf, wie es deren nie gegeben hat. So ganz von Grunde aus verderbt, vergiftet, ohne dass man weiss woher; in dem Schosse des besten Vaters erzogen, ohne je etwas gelitten, ohne je etwas erfahren zu

¹¹Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek, Vol. XLIX, pt. 1 (1782), p. 127.

¹²Ibid.

haben, welches das Feuer einer wilden Leidenschaft anzünden könnte; bloss aus dem einzigen Gefühle, dass er allein hier seyn will, ein so eingefleischter Teufel! - Nein! das ist nicht möglich.¹³

The ADB review of Schiller's Die Räuber, then, is quite negative. The first eleven lines clearly reflect the critic's repugnance for the action and the theme: he rejects it as too dreadful and distasteful for the stage, an affront to the decorum and dignity that the stage should reflect.

The next few comments are indeed in the author's favor, but they are prefaced with the qualifying words in parentheses: "Wir müssen es gestehen." The reviewer goes on to praise in generalities the detail and thoroughness of the work, the author's talent, and the depiction of the robbers, but the characterization of Franz is then attacked at length, covering the last part of the review.

Thus criticism comes as no surprise, however, for implicit in the criticism lies the conviction of the Rationalists that man is essentially rational and that man's character is dictated by education and family environment.

Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua

The ADB review begins with an expression of regret by the critic that Schiller does not have a better understanding of the importance of the effect which the performance of the play creates and that Schiller does not

¹³Ibid.

exercise more care and energy in refining the work. To illustrate this point, the reviewer makes reference to Fiesko's relationship with Julia. The critic maintains that in Act I, scene 4, Fiesko not only appears to be in love with Julia, but is, in fact, in love with her; the reviewer feels that this impression is later contradicted when Fiesko claims that his display of what seemed to be genuine affection for Julia was only feigned. This, says the critic, comes not only unexpectedly, but is something which the preceding action and characterization completely fail to anticipate.

The character of the Moor is found to be well depicted until toward the end of the play. The critic calls the cold-bloodedness which he finds on the Moor's part in the scene where the latter is about to be hanged (Act V, scene 10) a contradiction to human nature.

The reviewer finds Verrina's behavior toward his daughter (Act I, scene 12) revolting. In this scene, Verrina lays a curse upon Bertha, blaming her for bringing shame upon his name, even though she was taken advantage of. The critic also takes exception to the way the countess, Julia, treats Leonore (Act II, scene 2); Julia's manner is called coarse and unnatural: in the critic's opinion, a court coquette of such elevated position would not be capable of such behavior.

The critic claims that Fiesko is an appealing

character until the end of the second act, an esteemed man who is successful in maintaining control over his passions. If he had remained that way, it is contended, the play would have still been interesting and would have been relieved of many deficiencies and flaws. Scenes twelve and thirteen in Act IV are called interesting, but Fiesko's manner toward Julia is labeled vulgarly common and unbecoming of such a fine man. With this the reviewer makes a general statement and, in obvious reference to Schiller, asserts: "Die jungen Schriftsteller nach neuer Mode glauben immer, was plump ist, wäre stark."

Further complaints are expressed by the reviewer in reference to the following scenes: in Act V, scene 8, Bourgognino's not recognizing Bertha immediately is considered "unnatural;" Leonore's death at the hands of Fiesko due to mistaken identity (Act V, scene 11) is termed piteous and unnecessary; that Fiesko so easily overcomes this terrible loss is found to be unlikely in light of the actions of this character in the beginning of the play.

The reviewer is very succinct in his summary of the language in this play. Once again he attempts to temper his direct negative criticism of Schiller with a general statement: "Die Sprache im Ganzen ist zu bilderreich, zu voll von Wortspielen und Gleichnissen. Der Fehler aller neuern seynwollenden Shakespearschen Nachahmer." The review ends with an acknowledgement of Schiller's talent, which is

called good but in need of improvement. That the reviewer feels that Schiller has been presumptuous and somewhat reckless in this drama is evident in the last sentence of the review: "Der Verfasser hat gute Talente, aber sie bedürfen Ausbildung. Abentheuerliche Dinge sind nicht Zeichen von Genie."

Perhaps even more clear in the review of Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua than in that of Die Räuber is the critic's dislike for the Sturm und Drang dramatists and their attempts to imitate Shakespeare. Evident in the critic's reaction here is the neo-classical rejection of passion and the firm belief that even characters on the stage should behave with decorum.

Kabale und Liebe

The ADB review of Kabale und Liebe begins with the concession that Schiller shows considerable dramatic talents and the capability of the highest accomplishments in his two tragedies, Die Räuber, and Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua, but the critic adds that he could never bring himself to deliver the same unlimited approbation which these works received and were continuing to receive from the masses. At this point, he strongly decries what he considers an attempt by some of the younger authors, more specifically Schiller, to cater to the baser tastes of the public by attempting to imitate Shakespeare at the

expense of more established dramatic practices such as the three unities. The critic explains:

Vielmehr schien ihm dieser zufahrende Beifall ein trauriger Beweis von der flachen, ungebildeten Geschmackstheorie des grossen Haufens zu seyn, dem alles Starke, sey es auch noch so wild, noch so roh und unnatürlich, tragische Gewalt zu seyn dünkt; dem Nachahmungen Shakespeare's in seiner schlechtern Manier, mit Hintansetzung aller Rücksicht auf Personen, Ort, Zeit, und Publikum.¹⁴

The reviewer goes on to accuse Schiller of allowing himself to be deluded by his attempt to emulate Shakespeare into believing that he might be called a second Shakespeare, and of allowing himself to become blinded to all established rules, customs, and tastes by the desire to create works through a vain and unbridled imaginative genius, thereby lending validity to highly unnatural characterization and expression. The reviewer views this development with alarm and expresses the fear that this harmful perversion of literary rules and tastes may already be so generally accepted by the public that one might soon be unable to differentiate between obvious nonsense and genuine artistic expression, and that even the most detailed and thorough criticism of literary works might be wasted or ignored.

After this negative introduction, the critic begins to discuss the merits and shortcomings of Kabale und Liebe. He expresses his surprise in finding that this work has

¹⁴Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek, Volume LVIII, pt. 2 (1784), p. 478.

noticeable merits that were lacking in the previous tragedies. He praises the structure and elaboration of the plot, the characterization of the personae, the division and effective use of the situations, and the treatment of the dialog. No specific examples are given here, however. Instead, the reviewer turns to those aspects of the play of which he disapproves.

The reviewer reveals his dissatisfaction with what he considers to be an overly tragic ending for the two principals, Luise and Ferdinand, who, he feels, do not deserve such an unfortunate fate. With this, the opportunity is taken to criticize the excesses and lack of discipline of the younger dramatists and writers. The reviewer regards the tragic ending as indicative of a trend by the Sturm und Drang writers toward untempered severity in preparing the fates of their heroes and heroines, and he sees such tragic endings as ill-advised and illogical attempts to elicit a greater reaction from the audience. The critic feels that such tragic endings defeat the aim of tragedy, i.e. to arouse genuine compassion for the principals:

Eine von denen daraus entstehenden üblen Folgen in Ansehung, der tragischen Wirkung, scheint uns dann immer die zu seyn, dass solch ein Ausgang mehr Schauder, Missvergnügen und Unwillen, als sanftes, theilnehmendes Mitleid in den Seelen der Leser und Zuschauer rege macht; eine Wirkung, die durch sich selbst dem Schauspieler und Dichter nachtheilig ist, und nicht etwa deswegen, weil sie nicht kunstmässig, nicht aristotelisch ist.¹⁵

¹⁵Ibid., p. 197.

The reviewer lists several scenes from the play which he deems discordant or unlikely. It is explained that it would be superfluous even to mention them, had not visible progress on Schiller's part already been acknowledged. Referring to Act I, scene 5, he points out that the president is overly candid with Wurm concerning his plan and deception; and that the president's revelation to Ferdinand (Act I, scene 5) of the bloody means by which he rose to power lies in direct contradiction to the character of the president, who is otherwise careful and effective in his highly calculated intrigues and schemes.

Nor does the reviewer find Luise's actions credible in Act III, scene 11, where she is readily persuaded to write a letter which, so thinks the critic, she knows will have, in view of Ferdinand's extreme gullibility, the most fatal consequences. And the critic finds it highly unlikely that even the gullible Ferdinand would not entertain the slightest doubts concerning the authenticity of the letter; furthermore, it is unlikely that Ferdinand, who should know his father's motives quite well, submits so quickly and completely to his father's will, while his father now feigns remorse at having been so hard, and pretends that he is suddenly willing to accept Luise as his daughter-in-law.

The critic finds another inconsistency, that in the character of Luise's father, Miller, in Act V, scene 5. The reviewer says that while he concedes that Miller's

behavior is technically necessary for Schiller to allow Ferdinand to be alone to carry out the poisoning of Luise, the father's sudden outburst of frolicsome behavior upon receiving the pouch of gold from Ferdinand is inconsistent with the hot-headedness, pride, and inflexibility of principle which he showed up to this point.

Although, as noted above, the reviewer does afford the dialog some general, mild praise, he does point out a few examples which he considers proof that this drama is not completely free of the excesses and the offensiveness which he finds so abundant in Die Räuber.

CHAPTER II

SCHILLER'S TRANSITIONAL DRAMA

Don Carlos

In a clear departure from the censure given the earlier dramas, the NADB critic seems genuinely pleased with Don Carlos and generously praises it. The first paragraph of the review shows the critic's emphatic approval:

Don Karlos gehört unstreitig zu den vorzüglichsten Erzeugnissen unserer dramatischen Literatur. Obwohl er bey seinem ersten Ausfluge in die Welt mit dem Götheschen Meisterwerke, Iphigenia in Tauris, fast zu gleicher Zeit erschien, war dennoch der Eindruck, den er hervorbrachte, allgemein eben so ehrenvoll für den Verfasser.¹⁶

The reviewer then refers to Schiller's earlier dramas, noting, that while Schiller had shown talent in them, he had unfortunately been guided by an all too unbridled imagination, that he understood Shakespearean drama and was unsuccessful in his attempt to emulate it. The critic says that the characters in the three earlier dramas were more the products of the poet's imagination, more like caricatures than true copies of nature or characters from the real world. The reviewer finds these earlier works lacking in unity of plot and calls Schiller's

¹⁶Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Biliothek, Vol. LXXXIII, pt. 1 (1803), p. 86.

plan a colorful but confused mass of crossing events and occurrences. Although the reviewer concedes that Schiller had shown talent, and even excellence, in depicting individual scenes in the first three dramas, he feels that Schiller was unsuccessful in the treatment of the material as a whole. Finally, he complains that, instead of natural, expressive language, he found in the earlier plays language filled with bombast, ostentation, and grotesqueness.

With this the critic turns to Don Carlos itself. Nearly all the faults that the critic found in the earlier works mentioned above seem to have been corrected in Don Carlos, including the main complaints about Schiller's extravagance and uncontrolled imagination, about his misguided Shakespearean tendencies, and about the lack of genuineness of his characters. He writes:

So zeigte sich im Don Karlos die Phantasie des Dichters auf einmal mässig und gezügelt; so enhüllte sich, statt des falschen Shakspeareanismus, ächtes Studium des unsterblichen Britten; so erschienen in ihm Wesen aus der wirklichen Welt, Charaktere, geschaffen nach Menschenbilde; so entsprach das Ganze einem durchdachten, gereiften Plane; so glänzte das dramatische Talent des Dichters nicht bloss in einzelnen Situationen, sondern auch in der ganzen Anordnung des Stoffs; so sprachen die vorgeführten Personen grösstentheils im Geist und Sinn ihrer Charaktere, der Leidenschaft, und der Natur.¹⁷

The reviewer goes on to say that he was as greatly pleased as he was surprised at the sudden, progressive

¹⁷Ibid., p. 86-87.

surge in Schiller's talents which he finds in Don Carlos. He praises Schiller's fastidiousness in giving his complete attention to answering all the demands of literary criticism in writing this drama.

The reviewer next discusses the individual characters, and devotes particular attention to Philipp, the Marquis von Posa, Elizabeth, the queen, and Don Carlos himself. Philipp is termed the most completely developed of all the characters, historically accurate but also modified to serve the purposes of theatrical art. The critic points out that Schiller effectively depicts Philipp as a king who has become a kind of monster in history because of the compelling circumstances of his upbringing, which inculcated in him certain principles which were then nurtured and reinforced during his imprudent, inhumane, and unjust reign by those about him in court. The reviewer says that Schiller is skillful in the manner in which he allows Philipp to be stripped of his monstrosity through the positive effects of the powerfully moving, enlightened spirit of humanity and justice, a spirit that works effectively upon Philipp's hitherto suppressed humane qualities and potential for true greatness and brings him closer to humanity. The critic praises Schiller's characterization of Philipp as thorough and successful in achieving the high level of dramatic effect that such a powerful personality and historical figure compels. Schiller's Philipp,

says the author, gives the most instructive lesson on the problems and pitfalls that punctuate the wielding of such sovereign might and authority as that held by Philipp. The reviewer believes that Schiller adroitly and clearly presents the various insidious influences which surround Philipp and confuse, divide, and corrupt someone who is otherwise a potentially magnanimous, just and humane leader. The reviewer finds that Schiller naturally and realistically shows how Philipp is conditioned and driven by the erroneous traditional concepts of religion and orthodoxy upon which the sovereignty is based, concepts which fail to take into account the worth of man and his self-determination; and how the members closest to the throne, Alba, Domingo, and the Grand Inquisitor, are successful in shaping the thinking of the king for the preservation of their own rank and privilege by maintaining and even furthering established despotic ideas and doctrines. The critic further expresses his approval of Schiller's realistic depiction of Philipp and his relationship to the above-mentioned characters:

. . .wie natürlich und menschlich machen sie ihn, diesen Philipp, zu dem eisernen, durch keinen Laut der Menschheit in und um sich zu erschütternden Despoten, so lang er die Menschen um sich her wirklich nur als Zahlen sieht. . .¹⁸

If the critic does not often indicate his approbation

¹⁸Ibid., p. 90.

directly with words like "wie natürlich" in the remainder of his comments on Philipp's characterization, his tone of genuine interest and even enthusiasm is evident in his lengthy account of how Philipp becomes increasingly imbued with the mistrust, the superstition, and the harshness which overshadow his humaneness and true greatness. In the critic's description of the king's encounter with Posa, the following passage more clearly indicates the reviewer's positive reaction to the character and the scenes involved. Here he refers to Posa's effect upon Philipp:

Wie erwärmt fühlt er sich auf einmal von diesem tugendhaften Schwärmer, in dem er, allen seinen Zweifel zum Trotz, in dem langen Laufe seiner Regierung dem ersten wahren Menschen begegnet, und das Bedürfnis seines sehnenden Herzens befriedigt sieht!¹⁹

Later, the reviewer recounts Posa's betrayal of the king's trust and friendship. He expresses personal sympathy over the betrayal. The critic closes his account with a favorable view of the final turn which Schiller brings about in Philipp, who understandably yet coldly and gruesomely allows his own son to be sentenced to death as a heretic:

Wieder klein und unterwürfig der Glaubensdespotie, entfremdet er sich auch wieder von seinem bessern Geiste; . . . und sanktioniert den schrecklichen Mord des Sohnes; aber ohne uns als ein entmenschartes unserer Natur völlig fremdes Ungeheuer, zu erscheinen; sondern trotz seiner Ausartung, menschlich

¹⁹Ibid., p. 90.

gedrängt, statt Abscheu, und sogar Mitleiden
 einflössend, uns psychologisch unterrichtend,
 und, nach Aristoteles Forderung, die Sitten
 reinigend.²⁰

The above quote indeed marks a departure from the negative criticism which Schiller had received in the ADB for such shocking scenes in his three Sturm und Drang dramas; heretofore, scenes such as those presenting the deaths of Luise and Ferdinand in Kabale und Liebe were called not only overly shocking, but also distasteful, unlikely, and, often, pointless. In Don Carlos, however, Schiller appears to have effectively incorporated a controversial action into the drama in a manner that pleases the critic.

The reviewer turns next to the Marquis von Posa, whom he describes as the character who stands opposite Philipp in the drama, and Schiller's "Lieblingsheld" in the drama. The reviewer, however, indicates that he does not see Posa on as lofty a plane as does the author:

Rec. hat diesen Charakter nie für ein
 idealisches, über die menschliche Natur zu
 sehr erhabenes Wesen halten können. Mehr als
 eine Menschlichkeit, zeigt ihn der menschlichen
 Natur verwandt, und selbst seine Grösse ist
 eine menschliche, nicht zum Erstenmale auf
 Erden erscheinende.²¹

On the other hand, the ADB critic disagrees with those who maintain that the character of Posa is strange and not

²⁰Ibid., p. 91.

²¹Ibid., p. 92.

genuine. He maintains that Posa's nature, his thoughts, and his feelings are clearly developed, his actions clear and convincing. In response to the complaint voiced by other critics that Posa is odd and unbelievable, the reviewer writes that Posa's unusually free spirit of thought and of action, and his irrepressible drive to turn the ideals of freedom into reality would indeed be inconsistent with the era and the setting of the drama, if such a spirit and striving were as completely developed in several other characters as it is in Posa; however, that one man could be so imbued with such ideas and such enthusiasm is not to be construed as being unlikely or unnatural. The critic explains:

Aber, dass ein einzelner Mensch, und ein so ausserordentlicher sie (die Ideen von Freiheit) hat, und in Thätigkeit setzt, ist nicht nur nicht unnatürlich, sondern sogar sehr natürlich. Regte sich dieser Geist des Aufstandes gegen weltliche und geistliche Unterdrückung nicht dunkel, dem Gefühle nach, in Tausenden; und trieb sie sogar zur thätigen Auflehnung dagegen?²²

Thus the reviewer believes that it is not so strange that one such as Posa could manifest the will to gain freedom for a suppressed people, that a Posa might emerge too zealously, yet sensibly hasten the rescue of the subjugated. The critic thinks that Schiller's Posa is not just a likelihood, but an inevitability:

²²Ibid., p. 92.

Ein solcher aber ist Posa. In der Lage in die ihn der Dichter setzt, konnte er nicht nur werden, was er wird, er musste es sogar. . . Gerade das finstere Zeitalter also musste in einem Menschen dieser Lage, mit diesen Gaben, solche Kräfte vorzüglich wecken und entwickeln.²³

Although the critic does find Posa's cause to be a noble one and the young champion's ultimate loyalty to man rather than to his friend, Don Carlos, to be understandable, he does not think Posa's duplicitous methods are noble or consistent with his otherwise open character. He cites as examples Posa's failure to give Carlos even the slightest hint of the nature of his plan with the king, Posa's denial that a confidentiality even exists between the kind and himself, and his deceptive procurement of papers from Carlos which are dangerous to the latter's very existence. The critic suggests that Posa's almost complete abandonment of Don Carlos was unnecessary in achieving his ends and asks:

Warum spielt Posa diese so zweideutige Rolle? Würde eine offenerzige Darstellung des Vorgangs mit dem Könige, und des daraus entstandenen Verhältnisses mit ihm, seinem edlen Charakter nicht weit geziemender, und seiner ehemaligen Freundschaft für Karlos würdiger gewesen seyn, ohne dass er dadurch der ihn begeisternden Sache der Menschheit untreu geworden wäre?²⁴

The critic calls Elizabeth a feminine Posa: for her the happiness and welfare of mankind is foremost in

²³Ibid., p. 93.

²⁴Ibid., p. 94.

importance, even if she must sacrifice to these ideals her love for Don Carlos; she controls this love and, in the end, even manages to direct Don Carlos' audacious love for her to a higher love for mankind, one which lies within the boundaries of responsibility and heroic resolution. The reviewer thus is of the opinion that Elizabeth is like Posa in spirit, but different from him in her gentle feminine nature. Elizabeth, writes the author, is no less sincere or resolute in these lofty goals. She is quiet and firmly staunch to lofty ideals and presses thoughtfully onward. Unlike the zealous Posa, she is not given to impetuosity and to the inclination to avail herself of the most convenient or most expedient means in a moment that compels immediate action. The reviewer finds Elizabeth more noble than Posa in this respect: she would not use anyone as an unwitting instrument in her plans, nor would she sacrifice trust in order to achieve them.

The reviewer seeks to debunk what he calls an unjust criticism of Elizabeth's behavior in the last scene with Don Carlos. The reviewer defends her candor when she displays sadness in acknowledging Don Carlos' sacrifice of his love for her for that of a higher one of mankind, a cause for which his friend, Posa, has just died. Even though Elizabeth does bare her true feelings for Don Carlos here, the critic thinks that the brevity of this declaration and the manner in which, and the dignity with which,

she conveys these feelings, in conjunction with the joy she expresses in having won Don Carlos to a greater cause-- albeit through the forfeit of her mortal love for him-- dispel any likelihood that her behavior is improper or censurable.

According to the critic, Don Carlos is the hero only in title, not in deed. The reviewer infers from the action in the early acts that Schiller indeed planned to make Don Carlos the hero of the drama. Here the critic sees Schiller introducing Don Carlos in a masculine role in which he seems destined to become the hero of his fatherland and people, even in spite of the paralyzing effect of his love for Elizabeth; however, the critic maintains that the author abandons Don Carlos after these first acts in favor of Posa, and that Don Carlos becomes a mere pawn of blind passion who forgets the outside world and lives only in his love for Elizabeth. The reviewer gives a rather unflattering view of Don Carlos in the following characterization of him:

Ein liebesiches Wesen erschlaft jede andere Thätigkeit in ihm; er winselt wo er handeln soll, wird, statt eines wirkenden, bloss ein leidender Held. Ihm bleibt von der Grösse seines Charakters, die er uns in den ersten Akten, selbst in den Verirrungen seiner Leidenschaft entwickelt, nichts als der hohe Glaube an die Treue und Tugend seines Freundes, so zweideutig ihm auch beide erscheinen.²⁵

²⁵Ibid., pp. 98-99.

The reviewer says that where Don Carlos should show manly action, he only displays tears. To the critic, only the death of Posa reawakens heroic strength in Don Carlos and makes him realize that he had become lost in a ruinous passion; only then does a higher love, that for his oppressed people, awaken in him, but this, writes the critic, is gained only through the sacrificial death of Posa and is thus the work of Posa, not of Don Carlos. The reviewer thinks that Posa alone remains the true hero of the drama.

The reviewer does give the characterization of Don Carlos limited praise for the scenes with the page, the one with the queen, and the one with Princess Eboli (Act II, scenes 4, 6, 8). On the one hand, the reviewer thinks that these scenes are among the most outstanding of the entire work: he finds the charm of love's expectation and fulfillment, the bitter feeling of deceived hope, and the torment of embarrassment all uncommonly real and well depicted. On the other hand, he claims the scenes lose their credibility if one considers the causes by which these scenes are produced. For example, the critic finds it hard to believe that Don Carlos, in spite of the overwhelming evidence of Elizabeth's virtue and dignity, fatuously concludes that she indeed could write a letter which unabashedly begs for his affections and implies reward and fulfillment. The reviewer maintains that Carlos should realize that even if

the queen could bring herself to openly declare her love for him, she would not be foolish enough to entrust such a message to a mere page amidst the everpresent informers and eavesdroppers of the court.

In spite of the genuine depiction of the resulting confusion and embarrassment that the reviewer finds in the scene between Don Carlos and Princess Eboli, the critic thinks it is unlikely and unnatural that Don Carlos stays so long in such a tense situation and even more unlikely that Don Carlos should bare his true feelings for the person he thought he was to meet, the queen. The reviewer maintains that Carlos should feel increasingly exposed and endangered, yet he remains and exchanges pleasantries with the princess instead of fleeing. All this the critic finds highly unnatural.

Of the remaining characters, the Grand Inquisitor is termed a horrible, cold figure who has been gradually dehumanized through the years of blood maxims in his court of murder; however, as much as the reviewer is repelled by this character, he finds him true to life and the result of what his office made him to become. The reviewer also finds Alba a true-to-life figure, with many characteristics of the historical figures.

The reviewer criticizes the character of Princess Eboli as lacking validity; he thinks that her bold overture to Don Carlos and the coldness and ruthlessness with which she resolves to avenge the insult and injury she

suffers, together with the sacrifice of her maidenhood to exact this revenge, are actions which might be expected not of a young maiden in the prime of her youth, but rather of an older, experienced court coquette.

The NADB critic finds this drama to be a clear departure from Schiller's basically undesirable Sturm und Drang dramas and sees in it a transition to what is hoped to be an even greater realization of Schiller's talents in pursuing the dramatic ideals of the Rationalists. It should be mentioned that many modern critics agree that Don Carlos clearly marks a transition from the Sturm und Drang to Schiller's later dramas belonging to the realm of Klassik. Also noteworthy is the parallel between the view of the NADB critic and those of many modern literary authorities concerning the character of the Marquis von Posa: he is recognized by both as the true hero of the drama. Another, and more specific parallel is found between the opinion expressed directly by the NADB here about the character Philipp, the king, and that opinion expressed indirectly through the hero, Tonio Kroger, in Thomas Mann's modern novelle, Tonio Kröger; the NADB critic praises Schiller's success in conveying the potential greatness and humaneness of the beleagured, isolated, and otherwise insensitive, tyrannical king who is entrapped by the inertia of traditional religion and politics. In Tonio Kröger, Tonio is greatly moved when he reads the scene in which the king astounds the court as he weeps

after learning of his betrayal at the hands of Posa. Tonio identifies with this lonely character and tries unsuccessfully to convey the beauty of the scene to his admired friend, Hans Hansen.

CHAPTER III

SCHILLER'S LATER DRAMAS

Wallenstein

The NADB critic gives qualified approval to Wallenstein in the opening paragraph of his review. He maintains that a work can be praised for achieving a high degree of excellence and can thereby in its long-awaited appearance satisfy one's expectations and provide great enjoyment in response to all the hopes that grow in anticipation of a new work by a famous and honored author. The reviewer refers indeed to Schiller as just such a famous and deservedly honored author and finds his latest work to be a success in fulfilling the above-mentioned requirements. However, he adds, if one expects a non plus ultra of the dramatic act, a work of the highest perfection, one will be somewhat less satisfied with Wallenstein. But then he admonishes those who are unable to enjoy the merits of a work because they maintain inflexible, unrealistically high standards. The critic declares that he did not follow this tendency and that his foremost hope, that an exceptional writer's latest work be his best, was by no means disappointed. He expresses his admiration for Schiller as follows:

Rec. hat von dieser Schmälerung seiner
Erwartungen nichts erfahren. Bey aller seiner
Verehrung der Schillerschen Muse und trotz des

schönen Genusses, den er sich von einem so lange gehegten und gepflegten Zöglinge dieses Geistes versprach, verhiess sich seine Hoffnung, doch nur immer, was sie sich von jedem vortrefflichen Kopfe verheisst: dass sein letztes Werk auch sein bestes seyn werde; und in dieser Hoffnung hat ihn Wallenstein auf keine Weise getäuscht.²⁶

The critic justifies his lengthy, detailed discussion and praise of Wallenstein with a reference to the countless pages of literary criticism being written which erroneously praise so many inferior works as examples of fine literature. The critic does, however, go on to state that he also feels justified in revealing the faults he finds with Wallenstein, inasmuch as they are often as instructive as the merits within a work.

The review begins with a discussion of Wallensteins Lager, which the critic says functions like the prologue in the Greek tragedy, except that Wallensteins Lager, although it cannot be considered true drama but rather "drama-like" in its series of scenes within the military camp, more effectively informs the reader or spectator of the realm in which the seeds of insubordination grow within the hero, and more efficiently engages the attention and sympathy of the reader or spectator than does the narrative prologue in the Greek tragedy. The critic further reveals in the description of this prologue of scenes in Wallensteins Lager his solid

²⁶Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek, Vol. 60, pt. 1 (1801), pp. 113-114.

approval of Schiller's revealing picture of Wallenstein's military camp:

Dieses bewegliche Feld- und Lagergemälde. . . gibt uns einen sehr anschauenden Begriff von der Stimmung, dem Geiste und den Sitten der Krieger, deren Köpfe und Herzen der furchtbare Mann in seinen Händen hat, dessen tragische Lebenskatastrophe unsern Augen vorgeführt werden soll; und lässt uns die Möglichkeit der Thaten einsehen, die er durch sie vollbrachte. . . Das lebendige Gewühl und die bunte Bilderabwechslung in diesen Szenen reissen uns unaufhörlich mit sich fort. Wir befinden uns selbst in dem Lager, treiben uns mit darin herum, und fühlen uns ganz in die Zeit und auf den Schauplatz der Begebenheiten versetzt. . .²⁷

The critic has special praise for the cavalry scene at the end, which he calls outstanding, highly characteristic, and extremely effective in transforming the past into a very believable illusion of the present. Despite this lavish praise, the reviewer hesitates here and voices a complaint that the Berlin school has had against Schiller's other works: improper or excessive use of verse and rhyme. Here the critic states that the illusion could have been even more effective if Schiller had not set the colorful scenes to verse or, at least, if he had not used rhyme. His opinion is that the rhymed dialogue coming from the mouths of common soldiers, trumpeters, and peasants, may not be decisively distracting to the reader, but it is obstructive to the spectator, who is immediately affected by the illusion presented on the stage and who is, unlike the reader, not given

²⁷Ibid., pp. 114-115.

over to such a great extent to his imagination. The rhyme, the critic contends, brings about a sharp contrast to these characters' visual presentation: rhyme coming from these personages of low birth detracts from the authenticity, vividness, and color of the soldiers' camp. The reviewer explains:

So sehr auch Worte und Gesinnungen, in denen und mit denen sie sich ausdrücken, der Natur ihres Standes gemäss sind: der Reim ist und bleibt unsrer Täuschung entgegen. . . und so verliert auch unsere Illusion den Grad von Lebendigkeit, den sie haben müsste und würde, wenn der Dichter nicht die--Grille gehabt hätte, sich des Reimes zu bedienen, wo der Reim nicht an seinem Ort war.²⁸

After a brief description of the action in the three-part work: Wallensteins Lager; Die Piccolomini, and Wallensteins Tod, the critic sets forth three questions he will attempt to answer satisfactorily in his criticism: How does Schiller depict the hero and the other characters? How does the author direct the course of action? Of what nature is the color and tone of his dramatic picture?

Turning to the characterizations, the critic begins with the acknowledgement that the historical Wallenstein was himself a truly dramatic character, whose great and powerful spirit, stormy passions, insatiable ambition for power and greatness, and belief in the power of the stars make him an attractive figure for the stage. And the critic praises Schiller's treatment of the character, calling it ingenious

²⁸Ibid., pp. 115-116.

and adding that it markedly enhances the dramatic effect of Wallenstein, the character. It is pointed out that Schiller has refined the character and made him even more interesting by giving Wallenstein assorted characteristics of a loftier nature, and by allowing his decision to rebel to be the unavoidable means of survival:

Aber der Dichter hat ihn durch seine genievollte Behandlung noch um vieles dramatischer gemacht. Ohne der historischen Wahrheit allzu nahe zu treten, hat er ihn durch verschiedene Züge einer höhern Menschlichkeit, und dadurch, dass er den Entschluss zur Empörung nur als Nothhelf, als Nothwehr, in ihm entstehen lässt, noch veredelt, und für unser Interesse anziehender gebildet.²⁹

The critic states that the traits which Max Piccolomini ascribes to his commander in announcing Wallenstein in Act I, scene 4 of Die Piccolomini are in accord with the picture of Wallenstein which history provides, and that they effectively increase the audience's participation and personal interest in Wallenstein's plight considerably beyond that which the historical Wallenstein elicits. Wallenstein's characteristics are described here as being clearly and forcefully indicated in Max Piccolomini's speech. No less praise is accorded the direct characterization of Wallenstein, presented when he enters to meet the challenge of Questenberg (Die Piccolomini, Act II, scene 7). Schiller's hero is described as cold, proud, and conscious of his greatness, but without

²⁹ Ibid., pp. 116-117.

ostentation and self-approbation; and he is seen to be clever, and skillfully guarded and incisive against the charges and insinuations of Questenberg, but not disrespectful, inconsiderate or giving even the slightest sign of disloyalty to the emperor.

Indeed, the reviewer's tone in the above description is enthusiastic and expresses even higher approval of the manner in which Schiller depicts the human characteristics which Wallenstein slowly and naturally reveals as he is led to the reluctant decision to commit treason:

Noch wirksamer zeigt sich der Genius des Dichters in der Darstellung seines Helden durch die vermenschlichenden Züge, mit denen er es bey ihm zum Verbrechen kommen lässt. Wir sehen es nur nach und nach in ihm entstehen, mit Kampf und Sträuben vorwärts rücken, und fast nur gesungen zur That werden. Wahr und lebendig sind die Vorfälle herbeigeführt, die den Schwankenden immer mehr entscheiden.³⁰

The reviewer offers numerous additional scenes to illustrate his unqualified satisfaction with Schiller's characterization of Wallenstein. A monologue is pointed out, which, according to the critic, excellently expresses Wallenstein's disinclination to recognize the irrefutable facts compelling him to take the step which was up until then only a loathsome possibility, compelling him to violate his sacred honor and duty. The reviewer offers the following excerpt of Wallenstein's speech from the play: "Wär's

³⁰Ibid., p. 118.

möglich, könnte ich nicht mehr, wie ich wollte?" Also referred to is the scene immediately following the one mentioned above; the reviewer is of the opinion that this scene with Illo and Terzky clearly and forcefully shows how Wallenstein is horrified and disgusted at the thought of the imminent results of his actually accepting the Swedish general's offer.

The critic also expresses a high degree of satisfaction with Schiller's hero after the fateful step is taken; he finds that the manner in which Wallenstein, now a traitor, is forced to complete his hated plan is most effective in arousing sympathy and enlisting the audience's sincere concern and participation in the fate of the beleaguered commander. The critic finds Wallenstein to be a most pitiable figure after he is so heartlessly and viciously betrayed by Octavio Piccolomini, whom Wallenstein had implicitly given his entire trust and friendship, and to whom Wallenstein had even more firmly tied his belief in the stars. The following words from the reviewer convey the interest and sympathy which the character elicits from the critic. The way that Schiller has his hero maintain his genuine belief in the stars, despite this betrayal by Octavio, is applauded here:

Vortrefflich ist der Zug, dass ihn der Dichter
bey dieser bittersten aller Täuschungen doch
seinen Glauben an die Sterne nicht verlieren
lässt.³¹

³¹Ibid., p. 119.

The reviewer refers to the effect which Wallenstein's loss of faith in all his fellow men and followers has upon the audience as uncommonly tragic. Finally, the reviewer, even if less explicitly, indicates his approval of, and perhaps even admiration for, the stolid, heroic, noble Wallenstein, whom he calls a solid tower of strength and resistance, even when he sees his hopes completely vanish.

In the opinion of the NADB reviewer, the character Max Piccolomini ranks second to Wallenstein in importance and in the completeness of character development. The reviewer thinks that Max Piccolomini holds the most universal interest for the reader and for the spectator:

Gewiss hat dieser für Leser und Zuschauer das allgemeine Interesse. Die Reinheit des Geistes und Herzens, die ihn bezeichnet; die Sittenunschuld bey so vieler leidenschaftlicher Kraft; die Weichheit seines Gefühles bey so lebendigem Krieger, und Heldensinne, halten uns, wie mit einem Zauber, an ihm fest, und machen ihn für unsere Mitempfindung, wie für unser Kunstgefühl, gleich anziehend.³²

Thus the critic thinks that this character is just as appealing to the emotions as he is to the aesthetic instincts of the audience. The reviewer adds that, as a work of art, Max Piccolomini could be placed beside Goethe's Iphigenia, who the reviewer thinks is a complete portrait of lofty, beautiful, and pure, yet human femininity. He sees in Max Piccolomini the male counterpart of Iphigenia: Max is a human ideal of noble, pure, and great masculinity. The

³²Ibid., p. 121.

reviewer praises Max for his honesty and resolution, for his steadfastness, for his loyalty to his heroic ideals and fellow man, and for his perception and keen understanding of human emotions and relationships. The critic gives specific praise to the scene (Die Piccolomini, Act I, scene 4) in which Max describes the touching reunion at the homecoming of the soldier. His description is called sincere, inspired, intense, and moving:

Wenn er die Heimkehr des Soldaten, . . . , die mit grünen Mayen geschmückten Helme und Hüte, . . . , das jauchsende Volk, . . . , wenn er diess alles mit einer Trunkenheit, mit einem Überströmen des Gefühles beschreibt, die jede Mitempfindung in uns rege machen: wer erräth nicht, welche neue Stimme jetzt in diesem Heldenherzen wach geworden? und mit seiner Stärke und Kraft, Sanft- und Weichheit sich vermählt hat?³³

The critic refers to another scene in Die Piccolomini (Act II, scene 4) with even more enthusiasm; in this scene Max expresses his gratitude and devotion to Wallenstein after having received Wallenstein's expression of gratitude for Max's respectful and professional concern and consideration in protecting his wife and his daughter, Thekla. However, the critic adds, this warm and fulfilling passion which moved him so does not diminish his pure spirit and his irreproachable morality, but rather it even more firmly anchors and enobles these qualities in Max Piccolomini. Max is praised also for his refusal to be implicated in an all-too impetuous

³³Ibid., p. 122.

and biased indictment of Wallenstein by Octavio and the others, others, and for his abhorrence of the crafty, insidious deceit that is rationalized through expedience and is so characteristic of the Empire's military undertakings and diplomacy. The critic's greatest enthusiasm is found in his discussion of the scenes where Max must decide between love, his life's hopes, and friendship on the one hand, and honor, duty, and loyalty to the emperor on the other. The reviewer counts the scenes where Max takes final leave of Wallenstein and Thekla among the finest of the entire play. The overwhelmingly enthusiastic endorsement of the characterization of both Wallenstein and Max Piccolomini does not carry over to the characterization of Octavio Piccolomini. The reviewer finds the contrast between father and son to be too sharply drawn. Octavio is described by the critic as a self-serving, cunning, and deceitful master in the art of court intrigue, and his every word and action are viewed as consistent with this image. The reviewer points out that Octavio sounds convincingly loyal and devoted to the welfare of the state when he attempts to explain his betrayal of Wallenstein: he flows forth with glittering speech about civic happiness, the blessings of peace, and the benefits of the law. So convincing, so thinks the critic, is Octavio's rhetoric, that one is easily deluded into believing that the above are indeed the motivation for Octavio's duplicity toward Wallenstein. The critic believes that the complete lack of honesty in Octavio's actions, however, clearly reveals that

he is actually motivated by envy, self-interest, and ambition. The critic cites as supporting examples the craftiness with which Octavio deliberately directs the intrigue in whichever direction he chooses; his calculating behavior in the scene where the statement of allegiance to Wallenstein is signed, and the manner he employs to explain the nature of the document to Max in order to win him over to his scheme. These, together with the ease with which Octavio cunningly plays upon the weaknesses of Isolani and Buttler to successfully lure them to betray their oath of allegiance, provide a clear picture, according to the critic, of the dexterity which Octavio has in the role he has assumed here. The critic thinks that this not only makes Octavio an irretrievably unattractive character, but that it also causes the reader's interest in him to be even more forcefully repelled when he is compared with his son, a paragon of virtue and humaneness. The critic believes that Schiller went too far in painting a negative picture of Octavio and made the contrast between father and son too great:

Wirklich hat der Dichter durch diesen grellen Kontrast seinen Octavio in ein allzuwiderwärtiges Licht gestellt, und ihn dadurch, seine empörende Falschheit gegen Wallenstein mit eingerechnet, mehr entmenscht, als er für unser theatralisches Interesse gesollt hätte. Kontraste dieser Art sind undramatisch, und solche empörende Charaktere widerstehen unsrer Illusion: wir wenden uns mit Abscheu davon weg, und alle Kunst des Dichters vermag nicht, uns damit zu versöhnen.³⁴

³⁴Ibid., p. 125.

The critic points out, however, that Schiller does offer a few scenes which show Octavio in a more positive light. The reviewer finds in places a few glimpses of paternal affection in Octavio, and he points out that Octavio, indeed, is moved immediately upon hearing of the news of Buttler's sordid murder of Wallenstein and expresses his indignation and regret that events have reached such deplorable extremes. This reaction, the critic points out, is not really inconsistent with the scheming, duplicitous Octavio who is seen throughout the rest of the play, for although the ambitious Octavio has a keen selfish interest in toppling Wallenstein, he does not entertain the idea of having him killed; however, the critic is of the opinion that even this non-complicity and those few signs of paternal love do not begin to rescue Octavio from being such an excessively negative figure.

The critic thinks that Colonel Buttler stands out the most among the remaining conspirators. Buttler is described, somewhat harshly, as a soldier of fortune who seeks only to further his career and increase his power and prestige, and to whom loyalty is only valuable as a means to fulfill his ambitions. The critic maintains that Buttler is so open in his behavior and so efficient in the execution of his duties that the reader or viewer is inclined to see only the ardent, dutiful soldier in him, and not the intriguer. The reviewer points out that Buttler's character is excellently maintained until he is induced by the plotting Octavio to desert

Wallenstein for the same reason that he once deserted the emperor: wounded pride. It is at this point that the critic thinks Schiller begins to allow Buttler to deviate from the peculiarities of his nature. The critic thinks that his hypocritically feigned loyalty is maintained with a stealthiness and control that are in direct conflict with Buttler's outspokenness and his crude and stormy nature, and that at the very best Buttler would have the will to maintain the strict silence necessary. He is judged here to be too lacking in the craftiness and polished manner to withstand the repeated tests he must encounter in interaction with Wallenstein. Thus, the critic maintains, Schiller should have left Buttler to his natural inclinations; Buttler's behavior, he contends, would have been more consistent and the reader or viewer would have been less repelled by his actions.

The critic thinks that Schiller portrays the female characters well. The Duchess is described as gentle, quiet and patient, Thekla as lovely and pensive, and Terzky as ambitious and intriguing. All are thought to be complete characters, but the critic unhesitatingly singles out Thekla as the most appealing and successfully portrayed. The reviewer admires the innocence, moral simplicity, and openness that she acquired through her life in the convent, the heroic spirit from her father, and the gentle nature from her mother. It was the remoteness and uniformity of her life in the convent, the critic adds, that sowed for her the seeds

for the dreamy enthusiasm of first love. The critic approvingly describes the love that an enamoured innocent Thekla expresses for Max: pure, unabashed, and totally sincere. But the reviewer expresses no less approbation as the sensitive, devoted Thekla gives herself over to honor and self-sacrifice by not only resigning herself to Max's decision to foreswear happiness in favor of his duty to the emperor, but also supporting it as the only possible virtuous choice that can be made. And, finally, Thekla is praised for her heroic behavior upon hearing the news of the death of her beloved Max at the hands of the Swedes in battle. She is last seen as she searches for the grave of the fallen young hero. The critic thinks that Schiller achieves a considerably dramatic effect in allowing the reader or viewer to guess what her ultimate fate will be:

Wir erfahren nicht weiter, was aus ihr wird?
 aber wir ahnen es, dass sie von diesem Grab nicht
 wieder in das Leben, ohne ihn zurückkehren wird;
 und diese Ahnung ist dramatischer, als alle
 Gewissheit, die uns der Dichter hierüber gegeben
 hätte.³⁵

Turning to the last question which he set forth to be discussed, the critic says that Schiller failed to follow his own genius in creating the tone and color of his play. It is contended that Goethe's ideal, Iphigenia, was what Schiller had in mind, and it is added that Schiller was often successful in approaching this ideal: his diction is rich

³⁵Ibid., pp. 127-128.

in fullness of thought, in harmony in versification, in florid coloration, in genuine, passionate expression, and in outstanding, brilliant reflection. However, the critic is of the opinion that Schiller falls short of his ideal in many places. He thinks that Schiller's attempt to copy Goethe is often all too evident and that many passages show a need of final polishing. Also obvious, the critic points out, is Schiller's mania for reflection, which is visible in each of his characters. The reviewer thinks that their declamations and superfluous imagery in moments of distress and passion reflect the poet more than the character. The reviewer also thinks that the rhyme which Schiller mixes into his scenes is often forced and deleterious to the body of the work. It is conceded that the rhyme does create a magical effect in a few passages, for example the soft, elegiac moods achieved seem natural, especially in several scenes with Thekla. But the critic finds many places where he considers the rhyme to be without effect. He turns with this to a recurring complaint: that of Schiller's unsuccessful attempt to imitate Shakespeare. The reviewer explains:

Was bey Shakespeare, der hier nachgeahmt wird, Werk des eigentümlichen Genius, bloss zufällig war, ist hier beabsichtigt, vorsätzlich, und wird eben dadurch blosse Spielerey.³⁶

Although there is a recurrence in this review of

³⁶Ibid., p. 128.

some of the complaints which were predominant in reviews of the Sturm und Drang dramas and which were considerably diminished in the review of Don Carlos, the incidence and effect of the NADB critic's negative findings in Wallenstein are greatly outweighed by his numerous positive reactions to this drama and by his unmistakable overall approval of it. This review of Wallenstein, the first of Schiller's later dramas which are generally regarded as Klassik dramas, is noticeably more positive than the basically positive review of Don Carlos, and overwhelmingly positive when compared with the negative reviews of the early dramas. In general, each successive drama seems to draw less negative criticism from this journal representing the neo-classical perspective.

Maria Stuart

The first three pages of the review are devoted to a discussion of the latest aesthetics and the latest philosophy found in contemporary drama and more specifically, of how these negative trends affect drama and dramatists. The reviewer laments the emergence of these trends or tendencies and their effect upon fine literature. He finds that these are so perverted and so capricious that it is impossible to determine which criteria to use in judging the works of gifted writers. He explains:

Auf dem Kopfe steht, was ehemals, auf den Füßen stand, und Verwirrung und schwankende Begriffe walten, wo man sich sonst bemühte, Ordnung und Bestimmtheit herrschen zu lassen.

Keine Regel, die aus den ewigen Gesetzen der Natur und anerkannter Meisterwerken abstrahirt, . . . , gilt mehr.³⁷

The critic sarcastically adds that one is now allowed to neglect illusion and effect in tragic drama, as long as this is a result of the product of the latest concept of genius, which either rejects all established rules or makes up rules to suit the given purpose. Poets and dramatists who take such liberties, he adds, are given to their own caprice, disorder, and their own wild inspirations, without regard for beauty and truth, without which no product of the imagination can be considered a true work of art. The critic concludes: "Das allerneueste Genie setzt: es müsse so seyn, schlechthin, unbedingt und ohne allen Beweis!"

The reviewer now turns to the elements of the tragic drama established by the playwrights of ancient Greece. He points out that from Greek dramas Aristotle deduced that if a work was to be considered a genuine tragedy the hero must be a controlling and autonomous character; that is, when deluged by misfortunes, he does not merely suffer and bear them, but rather struggles against them; he does not just complain and lament and allow himself to be controlled, but rather acts and struggles to overcome adversity.

Another element in the true tragedy, the critic contends, is economy of speech: the persona should not say

³⁷ Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek, Vol. 69, pt. 1 (1802), p. 129.

more than is necessary to the theme or for the development of his character; he should say nothing which does not fit the passion which drives him or the situation in which he finds himself.

A third point on the requirements of the tragedy concerns the nature of the material to be performed: the opinion here is that nothing should be brought onto the stage that appeals more to the viewer's desire to be entertained than to his intellect, least of all that which shocks or arouses the indignation of the spectator or which converts the theater into an arena for the display of unnatural passions and disgusting outbursts. Even during the most spontaneous effusions of emotion and passion, the dramatist should adhere to the laws of moral propriety, decorum, and beauty, if the viewer's interest is to be successfully enlisted.

With this, the critic turns to the more specific shortcomings that he finds in the newest trends in tragic art. In recent German dramas, he asserts, the hero languishes and does not actively attempt to overcome the adversary or to mitigate the prevailing problem; instead, he is given to feelings and long-winded speeches. The hero does not really try to work his way out of his misfortune, but allows himself instead to be driven along by necessity. His only assault upon the antagonist, the critic adds, is made with a barrage of ornate phrases and finely embellished

maxims, which brings the critic to another complaint: verbosity and style of speech.

The critic finds in the latest form of tragic art a lack of a dialogue that economically and effectively characterizes and informs. He sees only declamations, a confluence of images, and reflection, in which the poet, not the character, is perceived, venting his feelings and his imagination. The long tirades, full of imagery, and the well-planned arguments are found obstructive to the course of the action and too lengthy to be skillfully managed by the hero. These, it is added, are ill-suited for a dramatic performance and are a product of the excesses of the unbridled poetic genius.

Finally, the critic turns to Schiller's drama, clarifies the pertinence to the introduction, and sets the basic tone for his criticism:

Ungeachtet diese Einleitung nicht bloss von dem vorhabenden Trauerspiel veranlasst worden ist: so behauert doch her Rec. bey der ungeheuchelten Hochachtung, die er sonst für die ausgezeichneten Dichtertalente des Verf. hat, bekennen zu müssen; dass ein grosser Theil seiner Klagen über die verkehrten Tendenzen der allerneuesten Aesthetik leider auch diess neueste Product der Schillerschen Muse trifft.³⁸

The critic asserts that it is his duty not to allow those pernicious trends which he finds in Schiller's dramas to go uncontested, lest aspiring, talented young dramatists should

³⁸Ibid., p. 131.

adopt the bad qualities and erroneous ideas exhibited here by Schiller, while possibly ignoring his outstanding qualities. Such erroneous conceptions, it is added, cripple reason and nature, intellect and taste.

The critic promises, even after this harsh but candid introduction, that he will be even-handed in assessing the good points as well as the negative ones already implied; however, constant reference is made to Schiller's violation of the necessary elements of the Greek theater enumerated above: definitive action, economy of speech, and propriety in the use of stage material. The critic does mention some fine points of Schiller but does not elaborate on them as often as he does on the negative points.

The reviewer begins the body of his criticism with a reference to a violation of the first of the aforementioned elements. In his opening, specific complaint here, the critic finds a marked lack of action and self-determination by the heroine, Maria Stuart. The critic refers to Wallenstein in the drama Wallenstein as another example of lack of action by the hero. Wallenstein, he adds, struggled within himself, at least, between resolution and action, between wanting to act and not wanting to act, and, in the end, was at least driven to action by circumstance. Maria, he contends, does not even show a true will to struggle against her adversary, much less act. It should

be noted that the only scene in which the critic finds action on the part of Maria Stuart to be even close to heroic action is in the confrontation in the park between her and Elizabeth. During the remainder of the play, she is physically confined. The critic seems to overlook the possible internal or psychological action that must be considered within such a constructed setting as that seen here in this drama. Continuing with his argument, he maintains that Maria's actions are effected more through the wills and actions of others than through her own, more through persuasion than through a desire from within herself to act.

Apart from this complaint, Schiller's characterization of Maria is lauded as providing her with many great and beautiful qualities, which, the critic adds, do not make up for her inaction, but do render it less noticeable. Had Schiller made her more assertive, the critic contends, Maria would have been a much more tragic figure.

Turning to specific scenes, the reviewer finds the exchange between Hanna Kennedy, Maria's nurse, and Paulet, the guard assigned to Maria, very effective in characterizing Maria in a favorable way, and thereby gaining the sympathy of the audience by presenting the contrast between Maria's former comfortable, royal existence and the lamentable, restricted one of the present. However, the critic thinks that the useful revealing glimpses which Kennedy and Paulet offer early in the play are cut short when the

murder of Maria's husband is brought up. This is considered to be a mistake, in that it brings about a loss of esteem for Maria and hurts the initial favorable impression of her which had been established. Simply put, the critic feels it is without dramatic purpose and a breach of decorum. This error, he adds, was a result of Schiller's inclination to verbosity. Schiller's florid and lengthy speeches are viewed as an unsuccessful attempt to emulate Goethe's example in Iphigenie auf Tauris; Goethe, he adds, is far more economical and successful in the use of maxims and in adapting them to his characters. Such attempts by Schiller, he further adds, demonstrate a propensity to moralize and to reveal his own thoughts directly.

Turning to the positive aspects of the play, the critic praises Maria Stuart's appearance in her first scene; she is described as one who compels our sympathy and dignified, even in the fact of adversity:

Maria tritt nun selbst auf und gleich ihre erste Erscheinung hat etwas Wundervolles, das uns für sie einnimmt. Voll edler Ergebung und königlich ihrem Schicksal sich beugend, stellt sie sich uns dar. Sie prahlt nicht mit ihrem Unglück, sie trägt es, als Mass für Mass der gleichmessenden Gerechtigkeit.³⁹

By his approval of the manner in which Maria bears her misfortune, the reviewer seems to be indirectly pointing out the action, albeit psychological, which he claimed to find lacking in her character.

³⁹Ibid., p. 133.

The critic also shows approval of the indirect method which Schiller uses to convey the severe conditions under which Maria now lives. The reviewer explains how Hanna speaks of them to Maria, as if holding up a mirror of the past before the prisoner, and thereby projects a more favorable image of her. Hanna describes Maria's crime as circumstantial, but the reviewer finds that the description becomes too detailed and reveals pictures that are so harsh and repugnant that they weaken the interest and sympathy of the reader or viewer:

Wir sehen in her duldenden Königin, deren ersten Ausserung sie uns interessant machten; nun mit geheimer Abscheu, die Mörderin ihres Gemahls, dazu kommt, dass der Dichter sie uns vorstellt, als beinahe von allen weiblichen Schaamhaftigkeit entkleidet, mehr von Wohllust und Begier, als von Lieb ergriffen, und das macht sie gewiss nicht liebenswürdig.⁴⁰

The first scene in the third act, where Maria is allowed to go out into the garden to prepare for her encounter with Elizabeth, is called one of the most appealing in the play. Maria's exultation over her momentary release from confinement is found to be natural and moving. The critic even admits that the lyrical and rhymed speech, although unsuitable for dramatic performance, enhances her expression of freedom and fleeting joy; also praised is the natural transition of the mood with the sudden fading of this joy, which is followed by the inevitable anxiety that is brought

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 134.

about through Paulet's announcement of the impending arrival of Elizabeth. Concerning this encounter in the third scene of the same act, the reviewer states that Maria cannot overcome the cold, heartless Elizabeth by attempting to match her pride, but can only reach her through forbearance and resignation. This, too, might be viewed as a tacit approval by the critic of qualities that do not denote overt action or self-assertion, but rather passive resistance--an apparent contradiction to the points he emphasized earlier--or a failure to acknowledge the psychological power that Maria wields.

Maria is further praised for her behavior in the confrontation scene. She is seen as dignified and true to character, even as she foreswears all her royal rights and entreats Elizabeth for only her life and her freedom; when her request is denied with scorn and snide references to her past guilt, Maria's anger flares to the highest possible degree, but still remains within boundaries of propriety and dignity. The critic calls these scenes, in respect to the portrayal of Maria, Schiller's triumph. On another positive note, the critic finds it touching and realistic when Maria, with quiet resignation to her unavoidable fate, bids a melancholy farewell to her servants and reveals her testament; however, the critic adds, these scenes are too long and too contrived. Harsher criticism is heaped upon Schiller for the detailed last sacrament that Melvil

conducts for Maria; it is called an action that has no place on the stage and is labeled as offensive to both the enlightened and the unenlightened audience. Furthermore, it is seen as deleterious to the sympathy for the condemned Maria and, finally, boring. The critic finds the following scenes, Maria's final ones, much more appealing: here she achieves a highly tragic effect in her display of strength and dignity toward Burleigh and Leicester. The reviewer also credits Schiller with at least providing Maria with some appeal and some characteristics of heroic greatness which elicit not only admiration, but also genuine sympathy, even though she is labeled by the critic as a heroine who is passive, as one who fails to demonstrate heroic action.

The critic finds almost nothing good to say about Elizabeth. She is regarded as far too negatively depicted, as a queen in her legal rights, but totally lacking in regal behavior. The reviewer finds her vain, ostentatious, hypocritical, inhumane, cold-blooded and vindictive, and he charges her with feigning humaneness and selfishness in her first scene. He calls her long-winded and highly affected as she ostensibly expresses her disdain for the luxury and pomp enjoyed by her rivals and states her resolve to serve her people and land. He views her behavior as highly undramatic and artificial. Her true nature, it is maintained, is clearly revealed in the scene with

Talbot, when the guard suggests that Maria is fragile. A quotation is given from Act II, scene 3. Elizabeth quickly replies:

Das Weib ist nich schwach, Es gibt starke
Seelen in dem Geschlecht--Ich will in meinem
Beisein Nichts von der Schwäche des Geschlechtes
hören.⁴¹

The critic chooses to interpret this as a sure sign of Elizabeth's narcissism and jealousy. And later, when Talbot extols Maria's beauty, Elizabeth is seen as behaving even more indignantly. Apart from these moments when she reacts out of jealousy or vanity, her behavior is interpreted as the height of hypocrisy. The words from the reviewer are harsh:

Aber ekelhaft zurückstossend hat der Dichter
Elizabeths Character durch den Geist der
Heuchelei gemacht, der in allen ihrem Thun sich
versichtbart.⁴²

The reviewer even sees Elizabeth's weeping as spurious when she receives the letter from Maria sealing the latter's fate. Cited here as evidence is Elizabeth's haste in attempting to induce Mortimer to murder Maria. The critic notes that this comes too soon after the emotional scene not to cast aspersions upon the sincerity of Elizabeth's feelings. Her words to Mortimer reduce her even further in the eyes of the reviewer:

⁴¹Ibid., p. 139.

⁴²Ibid., p. 139.

. . . lasst es euch nicht leid thun, Dass
 meine Dankbarkeit den Flor der Macht Entleihen
 muss. Das Schweigen ist der Gott Der
 Glücklichen--die engsten Bande sind's, Die
 zärttesten, die das Geheimnis stiftet.⁴³

He interprets this speech as an unqualified compromise of feminine modesty, morality and dignity, a conveyance of the basest wantonness, in exchange for his services. Perhaps there is a better argument for the reviewer when he questions the likelihood that Mortimer, who heretofore was not privy to the more vital royal concerns, should immediately gain the confidence of the queen. The critic refers to the scene immediately preceding the incident above: that Mortimer should wander unchallenged into the queen's chamber seems unlikely to the critic; that Elizabeth should, upon first sight of Mortimer, and knowing that he had become a Catholic, reveal to him her plan and enlist his assistance, seems even less credible to the reviewer. He calls this carelessness on Schiller's part, a carelessness which he would not have expected of an author of Schiller's ability. Further negative criticism of Elizabeth includes what the critic terms an ever-increasing self-adulation or vaingloriousness, with special reference to the encounter scene with Maria, whom Elizabeth seeks to offend. The reviewer views Elizabeth's behavior in this scene as more proof of Schiller's misbegotten, overly negative portrayal of Elizabeth, whose boastful pride, inhumaneness, and

⁴³Ibid., p. 139.

commonness render her contemptible in the eyes of the critic. There is too stark a contrast, he says, between Maria's bowed dignity and pleading forbearance, and Elizabeth, who, he feels, mars an otherwise fine scene. The reference to Elizabeth's character, he comments:

Wahrlich, der Charakter der Elizabeth in dieser Scene ist noch etwas mehr als prosaisch, er ist gemein, und eines Dichters, wie Schiller, gar nicht würdig.⁴⁴

In Act IV, scene 5, the critic finds Elizabeth's behavior unauthentic and contradictory to the maiden-like, prim image which the critic says she is supposed to have in this drama. In this scene, without reserve, she declares her love for Leicester in Burleigh's presence. Also, in this scene and the following one, the critic maintains that several exchanges occur between Leicester and the queen which are naturally and authentically created, but the reviewer does not elaborate here; the remainder he calls devoid of all authenticity of character and humaneness. In the scenes where she is supposed to be agonizing over a choice between humaneness and fear, between sympathy and her own security (so states the critic), her speech, instead of gaining support and sympathy for her dilemma, only further repels the audience and conveys an artificiality and coldness which characterize her entire performance; furthermore, it is added, one who is truly agonizing does

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 141.

not speak in such phrases and tirades as Schiller has provided her with here.

In one of the last scenes, the reviewer very unflatteringly finds that Elizabeth reveals her true feelings, expressing her motive of revenge, as she signs Maria's death sentence, but later her reluctance to verbalize to Davison Maria's death sentence is viewed as an attempt to hide this same motive. Consistent to the end, the reviewer also finds Elizabeth's expression of grief upon learning of the execution another attempt at deceit. He concludes:

Kurz, Elizabeths Charakter ist und bleibt, vom Anfange bis zum Ende, höchst undramatisch. .
 . Sie ist nur von ihrer verächtlichen Seite historisch wahr, von ihrem grösseren, edlern, Geschichtscharakter, erblicken wir auch nicht den geringsten Zug.⁴⁵

Of all the characters, Mortimer is regarded as the most consistently portrayed. He is described as being expressively and vividly depicted, a firebrand of a young man with a glowing imagination and lively sensuality. These latter characteristics make him ripe for conversion to the Roman Catholic faith, and, thereby, into an instrument for its political designs. The speech which he makes describing the celebration of the great church festival in Italy, although more poetic than dramatic, is believed by the critic to give a highly characteristic picture of Mortimer. The critic thinks it quite plausible that such

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 143.

an enthusiast could develop almost immediately into a fanatical believer of such a religion and become enamoured of its prospective martyr Maria Stuart; to the critic, Mortimer reflects a genuineness of character in everything he says and does; he is a character dominated by his fanaticism and voluptuousness. For evidence the critic refers to the scene where Mortimer stands enchanted, first before Maria's picture, and then before Maria herself. The critic views this characterization as masterfully done and sees a special beauty in the scene where Mortimer, in spite of Maria's laudable protestations, reaffirms his dedication to her and to her faith, even if it means death for him.

The critic does not find Mortimer's character flawless, however: to Act IV, scene 6, he has an overwhelmingly negative reaction:

Schade ist es, dass Hr. Schiller in diesem sonst so vortrefflichen gehaltenen Charakter einen Zug gemischt hat, der diesen interessanten Schwärmer eben zu einem Gegenstande unseres Ekels, als unserer Verachtung macht. In der That gehört der sechste Auftritt des vierten Aktes zu den empörendsten, die je auf der Bühne erlebt worden sind.⁴⁶

No longer does the reviewer find Mortimer to be the religious enthusiast or the young man enchanted by his love for Maria; now he is described as being a madman who is crazed with wantonness. Scenes like the one referred to above, according to the critic, cannot be performed without

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 145.

offending all sense of decorum and moral propriety.

Of the remaining characters, Leicester and Paulet are the two most highly approved of in their portrayal. Burleigh is called a typical theater villain.

In closing, the critic chides Schiller for his penchant for the overuse of poetic language and maxims, which are called incongruous in the situation and the personae; but, finally, he gives the poet credit for providing everyone with more than one fine scene, such as the one in the park. Here, the critic generously adds, one finds an exquisite lyrical affluence of joy in Maria's expression of freedom, one of those which still convey the truth and spirit of Schiller's poetic genius.

The review of Maria Stuart marks an abrupt negative change from the positive turn taken by the NADB reviews of Don Carlos and Wallenstein. The introduction clearly sets the focus and the tone of this review. The critic states unequivocally that in Maria Stuart he finds many of the dramatic practices and tendencies which he considers anathema to the true dramatic art, that is to the form of drama that reflects a close adherence to strictly defined concepts of truth and beauty, and to the elements established by the playwrights of ancient Greece. More succinctly put, the critic reiterates complaints which were voiced in the ADB reviews of Schiller's Sturm und Drang dramas presented in the first Chapter. These negative reactions reflect the philosophy of drama in the final

phase of the Berlin Enlightenment. His complaint that Maria does not even display the will to struggle against Elizabeth reveals clearly the preference for dramatic heroes who are not content to find fulfillment in life through some inner sphere. His reaction to the glorification of the Eucharist is consonant with the strongly anti-Catholic stance of the Berlin intellectuals. Finally, the reviewer's overwhelmingly negative reaction to what he calls a much too negative characterization of Elizabeth seems unjustified. It is apparent that he is overly simplistic in his assessment and perhaps the victim of a too rigid concept of what "a woman" should be and feel. He fails to take note of the complexity of Elizabeth's character and of the intricacy of the problem which lies before her.

Die Jungfrau von Orleans

In the introduction to the review of Die Jungfrau von Orleans the critic proclaims himself an admirer of Schiller and relates his great enthusiasm upon hearing the announcement of this Schiller tragedy, a degree of enthusiasm, he indicates, that perhaps none of Schiller's previous dramas evoked. The reviewer states that he saw in this historical material and in the character of such a dazzling heroine the potential for Schiller to demonstrate his talent. The critic claims that his initial high hopes rested on the belief that such a dramatist and poet as Schiller could only have been attracted by one possible

dramatic treatment of the material, the only possible truly dramatic choice; this, the reviewer explains would entail the following: the historical basis of the tragedy would have to be free of all Catholic miracles; and the heroine would have to be devoid of all genuine inspiration and of all supernatural influences. The first would be achieved by replying upon the sources of completely natural, historical events, that is, upon the miracles that arise from an extraordinarily excited heroic strength; the second, her inspiration, would be a result of the force of her imagination, one fueled by a fervent patriotism and an almost fanatical piety. Through this powerful imagination, Johanna would be moved to a strong belief in the assistance of the supernatural and in her divine mission and thereby become the miracle-performing heroine of the legend. Furthermore, it is added, this powerful belief would exalt Johanna above her sex, her class, and her education, so that her condition would be tantamount to that of one who is truly inspired. Finally, through the power of her speeches, the strength of her convictions, her undauntedness in conflict, and her heroic strength, she would move all her fellow countrymen to amazement and then to belief in her and in her divine mission. The critic believes that through no other approach can Schiller's drama be more genuinely romantic than by means of the presentation of a highly extraordinary, great but mortal character who performs strange, miracle-like but nonetheless natural feats

with human powers. Such a figure, believing herself to be truly inspired, would, according to the reviewer, appeal to us as a psychological figure, capturing our imagination without offending our reason. The critic feels that the audience would only be mildly interested in Johanna were she portrayed as divinely inspired and effecting her mission with the help of supernatural powers, and he believes that an independently acting heroine would be far livelier and more dramatic than an inspired, manipulated character mechanically following her calling. The critic closes his argument with almost arrogant certitude:

Ausgemacht bleibt also diese Ansicht der Wundergeschichte von Johanna von Orleans, nur die dramatischste, für des Dichters Talente würdigste und rechthaltigste, und nur sie kann seinen sinnreichen Kopf zur Wahl dieses Stoffs für die Darstellung auf der Bühne bewogen haben.⁴⁷

The tone and length of the above argument imply that Schiller did not adhere to the plan which the critic had in mind. Indeed, the critic continues his review with a reproach that hints of sarcasm cloaked in feigned surprise. He reports that he was absolutely certain that a poet of Schiller's stature and talent could not possibly be of any other opinion than that of the reviewer. With this implication the critic turns to point out that his exclusively feasible viewpoint finds obvious, strong support in the historical account of the life of Johanna, and that only

⁴⁷ Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek, Vol. 82, pt. 2 (1803), p. 88.

according to legend is she reputed to have possessed miraculous powers and to have been aided by supernatural forces. To support his contention the critic refers to the account given by the historian, Hume, according to whom, the reviewer explains, Johanna's desire to rid her country of the English yoke grew into a will that was fired by her dutiful passion, a passion which culminated in the necessary belief that she was divinely inspired and in the concomitant certitude that she had been chosen to carry out a divine mission. Her extraordinary belief led her to await the inevitable revelations that could guide her on her mission, and the strength of her character and the ever-growing strength of her enthusiasm and imagination allowed her to accomplish deeds which border on, and are easily mistaken for, true miracles. Hume's view of Joan of Arc, the critic thinks, offers solid support for his own point of view. For further substantiation, he refers to the French accounts of the events in question. Even here, where the events in question are likewise called miracles, the critic claims to find evidence that belief in inspiration rather than true inspiration is undeniably accountable for the apparently miraculous. He cites as one example the reported miracle of the sword found in the chapel, a sword engraved with four crosses whose existence and location were a mystery to everyone except to Johanna, who was apparently guided to it through a revelation. The reviewer points out that no one mentions that at some

time previous to the incident several swords had been donated to the chapel of St. Catherine of Vierbois, and he suggests that Johanna could have easily heard of the location and the description of this sword. This and numerous other examples are cited by the critic as evidence supporting his contention. He states that he finds it unlikely that Schiller might have overlooked this evidence and then takes the opportunity to offer his outline of a possible dramatic treatment of these historic events, one which he thinks Schiller might have used had he adhered to the point of view espoused by the critic. Following this three page outline of an example of what Schiller might have written, the reviewer rounds out his lengthy argument with high praise for Schiller's rich imagination and talent for realistic depiction. However, this praise is couched in more somewhat bombastic speculations on Schiller's opportunity here to maximize his own potential and the dramatic potential of this intriguing historic figure by restricting his characterizations and dramatization to actions and events attributable to natural phenomena. The critic concludes with a reference to Schiller's successful characterization of Elizabeth in Don Carlos and of Thekla in Wallenstein; here he thinks Schiller had the chance to surpass those and to create a superior work built around the rich character of Johanna:

Welch ein fruchtbar tragischer Character für eine Schillerische Tragödie. Die Darstellung desselben durch den Schöpfer der Charaktere der

Elizabeth (im Don Carlos), der Thekla (im Wallenstein) musste zu einem Meisterwerk werden, musste alles übertreffen, was er jemals in dieser Gattung gedichtet hatte. Wie einer seligen Erscheinung harnte Rec. ihm entgegen.⁴⁸

At last, after a ten-page introduction, the reviewer begins the actual review. The first scenes of the Prologue surpass even the highest expectations of the reviewer: in its description of the quiet, peaceful village of Don Remy, where the people have been thus far spared the immediate horror of the raging battles, where only the dull echos of warfare and rumors and reports of armed conflicts have yet to be heard. The reviewer likens this scene to Pathmos and calls it an ideal setting in which to give the audience its first glimpse of Johanna, who, he contends, is already predisposed to seek revelation. Equal praise is expressed for the next scene, where Johanna's father, Thibaut, aware that the war is coming ever closer, seeks husbands for the protection of his daughters. Then, Johanna demurs, choosing to devote herself to her calling, incurs the scorn and reproach of her father, and hears it stoically, awaiting the moment to reveal what she believes to be her inevitable mission. This too, draws great enthusiasm from the reviewer, who finds it to be completely true to her nature and true to his own expectations of the logically explicable origins of Johanna's inspiration:

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 97.

Herrlich ganz in dem Geiste einer sich
glaubenden Gotteserwählten, die ihr heiliges
Amt nicht eher verkünden darf, als bis sie⁴⁹
ein sichtbarer Zeichen erhalten hat, . . .

He continued with similar praise for the following scene,
in which young Raimond, Johann's suitor, casts aside his
love for her and rallies to her support:

Wieder nur das Bild einer in sich gekehrten,
grosse Dinge Sinnenden, über ihre niedere
Sphäre sich erhebenden Seele, also ganz der
Erwartung gemäss, dass Johanna's Inspiration
bey dem Dichter nichts, als die Wirkung eines
lebhaft gezeigten grossen Entschlusses und
einer durch die nächtliche Einsamkeit, die
Wundersagen der Oerter, wo sie ihm nachhängt,
der segensreichen, hochentzündeten Phantasie
seyn werde.⁵⁰

But the very next scene elicits a negative reaction from
the reviewer. He refers to Thibaut's dream, in which the
father sees Johanna sitting on the throne at Rheims holding
a scepter from which emerge three lilies and Johanna is
surrounded by family, friends, and royalty, all of whom
pay homage to her. This shatters the expectations of the
reviewer. He finds the dream an unnatural event and main-
tains that not even all the hints from Johanna's behavior
could have led him to anticipate it. Only, he adds, if
she had by chance spoken about her mission and if Thibaut
had overheard her words, would his imagination have been
moved to produce such a dream. The reviewer points out,
however, that nowhere in the Prologue is there an

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 97.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 98.

indication that Thibaut overheard anything. Thus, the critic surmises that it might be a prophetic sign, a genuine revelation, but he finds no logical reason for it. He dismisses the possibility that it might be intended to infuse belief in Thibaut that Johanna indeed was truly inspired, contending that the opposite affect is actually the result: he claims that the dream fosters instead disbelief in her divine mission, serves to portend a ruinous end, and thereby works against the revelations which she experiences. Why then, the critic asks, should the Almighty want to perform a miracle which does not serve the ends desired?

The reviewer indicates his disapproval of the miraculous manner in which Johanna's helmet appears on the stage but shows overwhelming approval of its use thereafter, pointing out that, from this point on, Schiller uses the helmet in a manner completely free of the influence of miracles. The critic relates the scene in which Johanna sees the helmet and interprets it as the long-awaited sign that spurs her on to her divine mission, and he attempts to point out that her aroused imagination and the influence of the pressing urgency of aiding her besieged, subjugated countrymen clearly culminate in her bold resolution to act, a resolution that is spawned by her zealous belief in her divine mission and in her genuine inspiration. He uses the highest superlative to describe

Johanna's speech in scene three of the Prologue: "Unvergleichlich! Laut und Sprache einer höchst lebendig ergriffenen, einer bis zum Wunder= und Offenbarungsglauben ergriffenen Seele." Thus, the reviewer is well satisfied with Schiller's depiction of this scene: it is consistent with his own point of view, for he thinks that Johanna's powerful, awe-inspiring behavior in proclaiming her mission, as miraculous and as moving as it seems, is logically grounded in her religious fervor and powerful imagination, which were enhanced by her many reflective moments alone in the mountains and in the shadows of her wonder tree; hence, he maintains that her powerful assertion of her destiny, upon closer inspection, is actually not as fantastic or as miraculous as the reactions of those about her would seem to indicate. He adds that she had long been looking for a sign, that she had almost willed it through her zeal, and that the helmet fulfilled her long-awaited expectation and sparked the spirit of prophecy within her, since she genuinely believes the helmet to be a sign from Heaven confirming her holy mission. The critic maintains that she says nothing that she could not have already known without the benefit of a true revelation.

At this point the reviewer, extremely satisfied, says that his high expectations may yet be fulfilled. The next scene mentioned does not reduce these hopes in the least. This is the scene at the royal court in Chinon, where Johanna's appearance awakens the belief in her ability to

perform the miraculous. The critic calls it an outstanding scene, one which he considers to be even more impressive since, given the utter despair of the king and the inhabitants of a besieged Orleans, Johanna's military success must have seemed to the French nothing less than supernatural intervention. He feels that indeed, her sudden, totally surprising arrival and the sensational victory to which she leads them give all the appearances of a true miracle. The critic points confidently, however, to what he feels is evidence which proves her waxing enthusiasm and unshakable belief are the source of the power which enables her to perform such an unbelievable task, and he adds that her startling success seems even more fantastic when one considers the almost impossible odds facing the king, his few remaining soldiers, and the unpromising state of the townspeople of Orleans. The reviewer refers to Johanna's helmet as being Johanna's god, and attributes the amazing, instantaneous transformation of the dwindling numbers of the French patriots into an invincible fighting force to her sudden appearance and to the strange figure she must have cast, with her beauty and glowing zeal, juxtaposed with her armor and weapons. The critic contends that it comes as no real surprise that her followers believe that she is inspired, nor, he adds, does the defeat of the English seem so miraculous considering the dramatic shock they must have felt when they first saw this undaunted, beautiful maiden

in battledress charging furiously toward them with her aroused believers.

Content with these scenes, in that they are verifiably consistent with his point of view, the critic now attempts to show that the so-called miracles which she performs before the kind are logically explicable. He reminds the reader that she could have been familiar with the king's likeness from the national coins that bore his portrait. This, the critic repeats, accounts for her not being fooled into mistaking Dunois for the King; however, he admits with great disappointment that Schiller introduces an event in a way that defies logical explanation: that is, it is a true miracle. Schiller is chided for wanting to embellish his talents through this fairy tale-like addition, and the reviewer grudgingly grants that he must try to deal with this undesired deviation from his own point of view in order to effectively continue the criticism, but adds that he foresees nothing less now than a world of wonders. He asserts that with the introduction of this miracle (Johanna divines the three prayers of the King) the reader and the viewer will hereafter be prisoners of the imagination and be compelled to believe in all the miracles that Schiller will undoubtedly use to arrive at his goal, but the critic concedes that he cannot reconcile himself to what he calls "the subjugation of reason" and to the consequent belief in miracles. He adds that he actually felt compelled to assume the Schiller standpoint, that he tried to believe in the other genuine

miracles that followed the one mentioned above. He states that he nonetheless remained unconvinced, that he could not be persuaded otherwise, even by the greatest efforts of Schiller's talented imagination. He explains that he had already seen prior to the scene in question occurrences that were miracle-like, but attributable to rational explanation; and that he found many of the true miracles to be pointless and unworthy of a divine mission. At this point the reviewer indicates that his patience and hopes have worn thin, and he discloses that he is dissatisfied with Die Jungfrau von Orleans as a whole:

So angezogen er sich von jedem einzelnen Schönen und Grossen dieses Dichterwerkes fühlte: so liess doch das Ganze, selbst aus dem vom Dichter gegebenen Gesichtspunkte unbefriedigt; es fehlte ihm Harmonie und Uebereinanderstimmung mit sich selbst.⁵¹

After this broad statement, the critic returns to the development of the remainder of the drama. He resumes by lauding Schiller for the diction in the speech in which Johanna recounts the revelations which she has experienced. The reviewer returns to what has been the main focus of his criticism: the question of whether Johanna is truly inspired and guided by the supernatural. As expected, the critic endeavors to point out that these revelations can be traced to earlier events, to her religious beliefs. He maintains that Johanna conjured up within her imagination

⁵¹Ibid., p. 104.

an image of the Virgin Mary as a shepherdess which would be consistent with her own likeness, thus facilitating her being selected as the one to execute the divine mission. It is pointed out that the angels who accompany Mary when she appears to Johanna are the ones that she has either seen in church paintings or has visualized from related legends. A similar case is suggested with regard to the lilies in the hands of the angels: these symbolize the restoration of the French monarchy; that Johanna had this drama of revelation three times is attributed to the prophetic custom: three is a sacred number. More examples are given to show that all these visions were merely the products of her imagination.

The next topic of discussion is the battle scene in Orleans in which Johanna succeeds in defeating the English and driving them out. Here the critic becomes strident in expressing his disgust at Johanna's obsession with the need to extirpate the enemy. He says that she doesn't merely want victory, but rather a bloody victory, which he finds shocking in one who is supposed to have been sent by God. The specific scene (Act II, scene 7) is referred to where Montgomery pleads for his life in vain:

Mit eherner, der Stimme der Natur verschlossener Brust, treibt sie das grausame Mordspiel, und lässt ihrem würgenden Schwerdte keine Rast. So hören wir sie nicht bloss beschreiben, so erscheint sie vor unsern Augen in der Scene mit Montgomery, ein eben so empörender, als unweiblicher Auftritt! Umsonst fleht der zagende Jungling mit allen Tönen der Menschlichkeit um

sein Leben, umsonst beschwört er sie bey den
heiligsten Trieben der Natur; sie will Blut.⁵²

The critic then reproduces an excerpt from the speech in which Johanna declares that she has no heart beneath her armor and that she only obediently executes the wrath of the god of battle. The critic asserts that here she ceases to be a woman and maintains that the supernatural power which is dictating her murderous fury obviously cannot logically be the spirit of a divine revelation, cannot be easily associated with the Mother of God, the source of grace and peace. The critic calls unbelievable the prayer scene in which Johanna addresses the Holy Virgin as the benefactor of the power in her unfailing lethal sword. He finds it incredible that this blood-letting power is ascribed to Her, and that She would pervert Johanna's better, more humane nature to such horrible deeds, only to reward the maiden's service and consequent estrangement of her noble nature by allowing her to suffer a horrible death. He says that this is a false portrayal of the Virgin Mary and would offend even the most ardent Catholic. He contends thus that the Mother of God would never require such atrocities, adding that Johanna must be under some feverish spell or the mentally confounding influence of some diabolical spirit. He thinks that Schiller erred here in introducing such heartlessness and bloodshed, that it contravenes what one would expect of

⁵²Ibid., p. 106.

such a prophet, even in the compelling expedience of furious battle. He believes that Johanna could have led the French patriots to victory without bloodshed through her mere imposing presence, her contagious enthusiasm, her consecrated flag, and her heroic spirit. The reviewer implies that Schiller must have been aware that such scenes of murder would repel the audience and dispel the belief in Johanna as a prophet and divine emissary, for Schiller presents abruptly in the next few scenes the gentler, more human sides of her nature, scenes which the critic thinks reflect the Schiller whom he esteems. For example, the reviewer refers to Johanna's efforts to bring about a renewal of loyalty from Burgund to the king and a conciliation with Dunois, his adversary. He finds her actions and speech here most moving, and highly dramatic:

Johanna führt einen Verirrten zu seiner Pflicht zurück, unterwirft Burgund seinem rechtmässigen Herrn wieder, und bewegt sogar sein Herz zur Versicherung mit du Chatel; Scenen in denen Schiller wieder ganz Schiller ist. Wahrheit und Schönheit sprechen hiermit siegender Gewalt an unser Herz.⁵³

Bearing an olive branch instead of a sword, casting glances conveying feminine tenderness instead of impersonal wrath, Johanna seems, the critic asserts here, again worthy of her belief in her divine mission. With the exception of the miracle of prophecy concerning the fates of France and Burgundy respectively, Johanna's actions are viewed by the

⁵³Ibid., p. 108.

critic as reflecting the lofty virtues which are consonant with her divine mission. He says that she compels the audience's active attention because all that she does borders so closely on the miraculous, but can be logically, naturally explained. Once again the critic states his case for the exclusive adherence to this point of view and expresses his vexation at and disapproval of the mysterious and, to him, confusing scene with the appearance of the black knight (Act III, scene 2). He thinks that this is a misplaced and confusing miracle which serves no apparent constructive purpose, that it is nothing but a pointless, intrusive, inconsequential fairy-tale scene that is repugnant to reason.

The reviewer expresses high approval of the scene where Johanna suddenly falls prey to mortal weakness and for the first time experiences feelings toward a man, the English officer Lionel (Act III, scene 9). The critic endeavors to point out that this sudden, seemingly miraculous attraction to Lionel does not loom so wondrous upon closer inspection. It is not extraordinary, he asserts, that one might be unexpectedly attracted at first glance to great, noble, expressive physiognomies, especially someone as highly impressionable and imaginative as Johanna. He finds the awakening in Johanna of her feminine nature in response to Lionel to be quite likely and natural. He notes that the unflinching, ruthless executioner's spirit, which drove her previously in battle, is purged, and sympathy

is aroused within her for a memuer of the opposite sex, for an enemy officer. The reviewer implies that the scene clearly reveals that this pristine awakening is only a beginning and not yet that for which she mistakes it; he maintains that this mistaken belief leads Johanna to believe that she has flagrantly broken her vow of chastity, forsaken her cause, and failed in completing her divine mission. It is the overwhelming guilt and self-reproach, the critic contends, not her subjugation to love for Lionel, which devastates her and leaves her trembling and submissive. The critic calls this scene, together with the situations which arise from it in the Act IV, some of Schiller's finest and most successful. The first scene is considered to offer a highly interesting situation of contrast: all about her there is joy and jubilation at her successfully completed mission, yet she is rife with self-reproach and filled with the feeling that she is unworthy of such praise and veneration. This scene further gains the approval of the critic because it effectively conveys the conflicts and complexity of emotion felt by Johanna, some of which are enthusiastically described by the reviewer:

Ihr Abscheu vor den bundbrüchigen Neugefühlen
ihres Herzens und dann wieder ihr unwillkür-
liches Sichhinneigen zu der schönen Sünde; ihre
Selbstanklage und ihre Selbstvertheidigung; das
ihr aufgelegte unnatürliche Gelübde ihre vom
Bilde des Geliebten entzündete und dann wieder
von den Schauern der Entheiligung ihre Gottsendung

ergriffene Phantasie, gewähren uns einen ungemein lebendigen Herz und Geist bewegenden Anblick.⁵⁴

The critic lauds Johanna's monologue for its psychological authenticity and completeness but goes on to complain about the form used: Schiller employs a form which the reviewer regards as too lyrical for dramatic purposes. A drama, the critic contends, is not an operetta, and monologues are not supposed to be vehicles for "the musical." He complains that change of meter, experiments with octaves, recitation, and arias disturb the imagination of the viewer, and that this lyrical form pushes the poet into the foreground along with the heroine and constitutes not a realistic event but only a lovely poem.

Effusive praise is given to the scenes which follow the monologue (Act IV, scenes 3-13). The critic considers highly dramatic and realistic the scene between Agnes Sorel and Johanna, where Agnes ignites Johanna's unintentional enthusiasm with her infectious romantic revelry. Equally dramatic and true to life, in the opinion of the reviewer, is the disgust which Johanna expresses upon suddenly seeing the consecrated flag she is to carry in the march of celebration. The powerful fear which she conveys after glimpsing the image of the Madonna; her visible, though momentary relief from it when the familiar voices of her sisters and friends seek to console her; the horror of

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 112.

suddenly awakening from an ensuing moment of reflection upon her earliest, most innocent childhood days to the threatening, awful presence of her accusing father, Thibaut; and, finally, her stoic acceptance of his accusation as a sign from the Madonna that she is indeed fully, and hopelessly corrupt. The critic summarizes his observations concerning the abovementioned scenes as follows: "Kurz, alles spricht in diesen Scenen herzlich und ergreifend an unsere Theilnahme." He adds that even Thibaut's dreadful accusation as much as it enrages one's sense of decency, contains truth: it is a product of the father's religious fanaticism, and, as much as one might seek to comfortably avoid this disturbing scene, it is, like everything else, true to the given character and situation. The only fault that the critic finds with the last scene mentioned above is the sudden crashing of thunder. Apart from this, he explains, there are no other supernatural events or miraculous revelations to disturb the theatrical illusion. The critic reproaches Schiller as harshly here in the following explanation for this intrusion as he did for that of the black knight. Were the thunder a confirmation of Thibaut's charges from God, it is contended, then this would be an affirmation of a lie; were it God's protest against the accusation, it would certainly have to be more effectual in hindering the impending execution. The possibility that the thunder might originate from evil forces is dismissed as equally unlikely. Once again the critic directs a

vitriolic attack against Schiller for introducing a "useless device" which weakens, rather than strengthens the potentially masterful achievement of pure dramatic effect.

So rächt sich die Grille des Dichters, aus Johanna's romantischer Geschichte einen dramatischen Wunderspuk zu machen, als seines Geistes unwürdig, an seinem grossen Darstellungstalent, in dem sie fast in jedem Akte durch ein inkonsequentes Mirakel selbst unsern bereitwilligsten Wunderglauben zurückstösst und vernichtet.⁵⁵

Directing his attention to the last act, the critic indicates his general approval of these scenes, which, he points out, reveal Johanna again justified in her eyes, absolved from her feelings of doubt. The scene in which Johanna confidently, courageously submits to all the tests imposed upon her by her accusers is finely and powerfully carried out, according to the reviewer. Other situations, such as those revealing her renewed awareness of the urgency of saving her country once again from the brink of defeat at the hands of the English, her sacrifice in achieving the victory, and her willingness to die in order to carry this out, likewise find the critic's approbation. Predictably, the one exception is the scene where Johanna miraculously throws off the chains confining her and almost instantaneously escapes from the tower and materializes in the middle of the raging battle, where she immediately turns the tide from imminent defeat to decisive, final

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 114.

victory. Apart from the supernaturally-aided removal of the chains, Johanna's every action is considered true to the character of one who has been absolved and redeemed as a prophet, true to her life and death in this act, to the nature of her spirit, to her character and belief, and is, therefore, genuinely dramatic.

In closing, the critic briefly sums up the argument which he set forth as the indication of the success of this drama. He maintains that everything which wins our warm support and attracts us, everything which affects and moves us dramatically, is either a human or natural event, or at least explicable in such terms; on the other hand, everything which is supernatural or attributable to absolute miracle precludes the lively concern of the spectator or reader and repels his interest. The critic adds that it is too bad that the poet did not base the character and material on human courage and natural forces: it reduced by one-half the likelihood that he might fulfill the glorious potential that this subject offered him.

Although Die Jungfrau von Orleans is given extensive praise by the NADB for its life-like characterizations and also, although to a lesser extent, for its language and action, the NADB critique of Die Jungfrau von Orleans is colored by a negative tone that reflects the reviewer's dissatisfaction and disappointment at Schiller's failure to create a drama in which all events performed by the

maiden, even the most wondrous and spectacular, could be attributable to natural phenomena. This critic's insistence upon psychological realism clearly reflects the Rationalists' rejection of anything which smacks of the supernatural or of superstition. This is not surprising in that Rationalism, a product of the Enlightenment, is the result of that movement against such non-worldly, non-empirical elements, i.e. against the miracles of religion, the supernatural, against anything whose existence could not be explained by means of the intellect. Perhaps even more evident in this review than in any of the previous ones is the tendency of the reviewer to adhere to the strictly rationalistic criteria in his observations.

Die Braut von Messina

The NADB critic begins his discussion of Die Braut von Messina by pointing out that Schiller's ideas and desire to bring the modern tragedy closer to the old tragedy were already known prior to his efforts in this work, which, however, more clearly than any of his previous dramas, corroborates the opinion that Schiller had classical antiquity in mind. To illustrate this, the reviewer says that the plot of the tragedy reminds him of Sophocles' Oedipus and Euripides' Phoenissae. This comparison does not imply approval of Schiller's play, however. On the contrary: the critic hastens to add that Schiller expended so little

artistic effort in the development of the action in Die Braut von Messina that he even resorted to the use of such devices as oracles and silence as a means of carrying out the plot. It is pointed out that Schiller fails to provide natural motivation for the action and instead allows an unknown something, fate, to act ubiquitously but with unclear objectives, so that the audience or readers do not know which wrongdoings will be avenged or which sacrileges committed by the fathers will be punished in their children. In a tone of disapproval, the critic calls attention to the fact that in addition to the characters who participate in the action itself, there are two choruses which exhort, warn, and avenge. Another similarity to the ancient Greek drama form is the metrical form of the dialogue: the play is written in iambs which flow into lyrical meter when the tone is raised. Moreover, Die Braut von Messina resembles classical Greek drama in its lack of division into acts. Schiller's decision not to follow the contemporary dramatic convention of division into acts evokes the emphatic disapproval of the reviewer, who says that Schiller ignored European dramatic convention merely to give the tragedy an authentic antique appearance.

The above comments are followed by praise for the talent and deserved renown of Schiller, and an acknowledgment that the manifestations of his genius which are present in his earlier works are also to be found in this one.

Cited are Schiller's great and lofty thoughts, his noble sentiments, and his comprehensive critical observations. The reviewer asserts that one anticipates these characteristics as soon as one hears the name Schiller, but he adds that these signs of the poet's genius are here far less in evidence than in his earlier dramatic works. The critic expresses his appreciation for what is referred to as the several isolated examples which he came across, but he goes on to declare his disappointment at not having found Schiller's genius in the work as a whole. Schiller is chided for having practiced here something which he himself had rejected more firmly than any other opponent of the French tragedy: the proliferation of endless tirades in a drama. Die Braut von Messina, the critic claims, is composed of nothing but tirades. As examples he points to the five-page oration by Isabella to the elderly Messina, and to the eighteen pages of reflections by the respective choruses; he adds that here the work resembles a drawn-out novel more than it does a drama, and complains that the further one reads, the more one becomes confused by Schiller's intentions. Also, the complaint is made that Schiller has with this work come closer than any other dramatist to mistaking the subject for the object. None of Schiller's previous plays are free of subjective influences, including the poet's opinions, his philosophy, and his mood. The critic feels that this should have been

all the more reason for Schiller to have consciously guarded against those predilections here. The critic thinks that Schiller ignored all precautions and created, not a plot, which would have necessitated his projecting himself out of his inward, subjective focus and into the characterizations of the various personages, but rather a succession of lifeless, tiresome scenes which Schiller fills with his own reflections, recitations, and poetry. The reviewer points to the poor reception of the play on the Berlin stage and to the negative response of even the most ardent Schiller admirers as an indication of the validity of his own negative view.

In further criticizing Schiller for what is called here an "obsession" with the idea of transplanting the old Greek tragedy onto the German stage, the critic suggests that Schiller, in his attempts to attain the simplicity of the Greek tragedy, seeks to link his own story to a remote antiquity of which the reader or viewer knows and learns nothing. The critic accuses Schiller of using this obscure connection to provide for himself a way out whenever the action of the play gets into trouble. He also reproaches Schiller for injecting fate into the action of the play. The critic maintains this is an absurdity for the modern stage and accuses Schiller of using fate merely as a device to inject fear into the viewers.

The next complaint has to do with Schiller's use of

the chorus. According to the inference made by the critic from Schiller's introduction, Schiller sought to employ the chorus as a means of separating action from reflection, by which separation reflection would be provided with poetic strength, the language itself would be enhanced by additional liveliness, and the action would be fused with a degree of tranquility. The critic contends that this separation is awkward and artificial, and that Schiller should have considered the much more natural alternative of leaving the reflection to the audience or to the reader; the reflection, he adds, should evolve from the action itself, and liveliness should not be borrowed from the chorus but should instead be written into the speeches of the active characters. On the other hand, the critic does admit that the chorus does at times have a particular effect or influence upon the vivacity of the speech, nonetheless, he adds that Schiller probably could have provided such lively expressions without the assistance of the chorus.

The reviewer turns next to what he calls the mixture of Christian religion, pagan mythology, and Moorish superstition which Schiller employs in the work. Listing an example of each to press home his point of view, the critic calls their respective appearances in the content of the play strange and inappropriate.

In conclusion, the critic expresses the hope that Schiller will take a lesson from what is called here his

"abortive attempt" to recall the ancient Greek tragic form, and that he will spare the theater any further such ambitious undertakings. The critic tempers his extended reproval of Schiller with an acknowledgement of the profundity of Schiller's literary endeavors:

Ein Dichter, der zugleich so ein trefflicher Kritiker ist, wie er, sollte doch den Unterschied zwischen Zeiten, Sitten und Völkern richtiger ins Auge fassen, als die excentrischen Künstjünger, die sich durch ihr loses Geschwätz über Griechen und Griechheit ein Ansehen zu geben meinen.⁵⁶

It is not surprising that the NADB critic rejects Die Braut von Messina. Even many modern critics regard this drama as an ambitious but unsuccessful dramatic experiment. However, this review is even more harshly negative than the ADB reviews of Schiller's Sturm und Drang dramas. Many of the NADB reviewer's complaints about these early works are also present in Die Braut von Messina: The NADB critic censures Schiller more harshly than ever before for the excessive use of tirades and reflection in order to project his own thoughts and moods into the drama. The critic claims that this unprecedented infusion of subjectivity resulted in a weak plot and, for the first time in the reviews of Schiller's major dramas, overall weak characterization. The reviewer adds to these complaints which reflect the Rationalists' viewpoint a new one: he takes exception to the

⁵⁶Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek, Vol. 88, pt. 2 (1803), p. 464.

introduction of fate into the action, calling it ineffectual and confusing. In short, he finds Schiller's attempt to transplant the old theater onto the modern one a failure.

Wilhelm Tell

After calling Schiller an excellent poet, the NADB critic begins his review of Wilhelm Tell by emphasizing that Schiller faced formidable difficulties when he set out to create a drama from the historical material concerning the legendary figure, Wilhelm Tell, and the Swiss struggle for freedom. It is pointed out that the deciding event involving Tell does not arise from any plan that was to be implemented, but it was rather an unanticipated act, done on the spur of the moment. Tell was not driven by duty or a will to lead a conspiracy to overthrow the oppressors of his people; he was simply driven to decisive action by chance. These conditions the critic considers to be problematic, in that neither the event nor its precipitator lends itself to a purely dramatic scheme. To further complicate the matter, Tell is not even the hero of the struggle for freedom. The critic points out that Melchtal, Stauffacher, and Walther Furst, as the founders and leaders of the confederation for freedom, share the audience's attention as well. Tell, he says, only hastened an inevitability. All this, the reviewer adds, works against the essence of drama,

which requires a focal point, a hero, and a plot which is created rather than one based upon chance.

After discussing these "difficulties," the reviewer lauds Schiller for possessing the necessary exceptional creativity and the literary brilliance to successfully transform this troublesome dramatic material into a literary work which satisfies all dramatic requirements; Schiller transforms Tell's fateful act into a self-initiated and thus dramatic action. The reviewer suggests that the manner in which Schiller interpreted and extensively developed Tell's character offers ample proof of the degree of success of the undertaking. Before he begins the treatment of Tell's characterization, the reviewer complements the above praise with more for Schiller and this work:

Es sey uns erlaubt, ihn zu führen; und überhaupt länger, als es sonst die uns vorgeschriebenen Grenzen verstatten; bey dieser schönen Dichtung zu verweilen. Es ist leider das letzte Wort, das uns diese von ihrem ehrwürdigen Herausgeber. . . bald geschlossene Bibliothek über diesen herrlichen Geist verstattet.⁵⁷

The critic extols Schiller's characterization of Tell, saying that Schiller brilliantly exploited his creative imagination in this treatment of the mythical hero. The reviewer points out that Tell does not really found the confederation, nor is he actually the uniting force for its conspirators; but it is clear from his very first appearance that he is profoundly moved by the spirit of freedom

⁵⁷ Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek, Vol. 103, pt. 1 (1805), p. 69.

to play a part in rescuing his homeland. The reviewer offers effusive praise for the other characters as well: Melchtal, Walther Furst, and Stauffacher, and the wives of Stauffacher and Tell, respectively. All these characters, it is stated, compel the viewer's attention and are highly attractive, but Tell is imbued with his own special, free, heroic spirit, which sets him apart from all the rest and makes him a special Swiss:

Dennoch hat er seinem Tell einen so eigenen, hervorstechenden, nur ihn bezeichnenden Schweizerund und Freiheitssinn eingehaucht, dass er sich nie unter unsrer jenen glänzenden Erscheinungen verliert; dass er unser Augenmerk auf ihn immer wacker und rüstig erhält, unsere Theilnahme für ihn immer lebendig beschäftigt; dass sein Bild sich vordrängend unser Phantasie und unsers Mitgefühls bemächtigt.⁵⁸

Tell, the critic continues, is the quintessential hero, who from the first scene on establishes himself as the person who will be paramount in determining the fate of his country. He selflessly, intrepidly sets himself the task, with unhesitating, yet prudent resolve. The critic cites the scene in which Tell helps Baumgarten escape by rowing across raging waters (Act I, scene 1) as one solid example that clearly establishes Tell's unfailing courage and willingness to intervene against injustice. But the critic points out that even though immediate action is Tell's element, his actions are always effective and beneficial. He adds that Tell exhibits these same characteristics at home,

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 69.

as husband and father; here, too, Tell shows the independence and spontaneity which he hopes to bequeath to his son. The critic presents excerpts from the scene at Tell's home (Act III, scene 1) and states that from these scenes it is clear that Tell finds value in life only when it is enjoyed in its fulness, when it is seized through powerful assertiveness. This, the critic argues, is the logical result of the two driving forces within Tell's soul: an unfailing faith in himself and in God. Therein lies his strength to attack any threat to freedom and to resist the yoke of tyranny. Tell is the first one, the critic explains, who instinctively disregards the symbolic authority of Gessler's hat, but when Tell suddenly hides his true contempt for this usurpation of royal authority and apologizes, he appears to be different from the independent, free-minded Tell in the previous scenes; but, according to the critic, this is merely a natural and temporary restraint that even Tell must place on himself: he faces superior forces, and Gessler's inhuman proposition for Tell to preserve his freedom jeopardizes the life of Tell's son, Walther. Thus, Tell, the free Swiss, must yield to Tell, the father, and show humility and beg for mercy. The critic thinks that this is not only natural but necessary, for Tell's character remains true to life.

Scene three in Act one receives the highest praise from the critic. He believes that this scene reveals most clearly Schiller's talent. In the scene, the emotional struggle within Tell the father is perceived in its extreme,

mounting intensity and reaches its peak when Tell successfully makes the shot at the apple on his son's head. This, the critic exclaims, is a magnificent success, the genius of it lying in the dramatic arrangement and execution of the shot: the horror of seeing the arrow fly toward the young boy's head is not actually witnessed due to a cleverly devised, diversionary argument between Gessler and Rudenz, who out of good conscience is impelled to decry the heartless and inhuman order of his superior. The critic is not only extremely pleased that Schiller saves the audience from viewing what is called the repugnance of the execution of this horrible order, he also extols the ease with which Schiller accomplishes it. All this, it is further added, is done in a most ingenious, natural, and simple manner so that the dramatic intensity of the scene is preserved:

Es ist einer der ergreifendsten und gelungensten Auftritte, den das Theater aufzuweisen hat. Meisterhaft ist, in Rücksicht auf die mimische Vorstellung, die dramatische Anordnung derselben.⁵⁹

The critic finds Tell even more moving and true to his fatherly nature immediately after the successful shot. The total abandonment with which he is given over to his parental instincts is clear when he joyously embraces his son and rejoins his wife amidst the joyous voices of his friends and supporters. Tell's obliviousness to the presence of the

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 73.

tyrant Gessler is considered to be quite natural, as is his initial reluctance to answer Gessler's query about the purpose of the second arrow: he does not want his son to become an orphan. The critic thinks that this is true to life and reflects Schiller's skillful preparation for the following conflict and dramatic intensity when Tell can no longer suppress his free spirit and defiantly explains that Gessler would have been the victim of his second arrow. The reviewer describes excitedly the ensuing escalating drama, as Tell, the champion of freedom and self-determination, pledges to free his land of tyranny. The critic reiterates here his great satisfaction over Schiller's skillful transformation of Tell's role in the struggle for freedom from that of a participant in a chance incident with only peripheral consequences to that of an initiator who feels that he is called by a higher duty to gain independence for his fellow countrymen. In supporting this, the critic introduces a quote from Act IV, scene 2, in which Tell speaks a message which is to be sent to the men of Uri, intimating his resolution to kill Gessler in the name of justice and freedom. The reviewer calls this an excellent scene and feels that it provides the final, clear statement of Tell's resolution:

Trefflich! So ist Tells entscheidender Streich nicht mehr ein Werk des Zufalls, sondern der Besonnenheit. Nicht mehr hineingestossen in des erfolgreiche Ereignis, sich dazu berufenfühlend, Held der Freiheit, handelt er.⁶⁰

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 75.

Exception is taken, however, to the psychological struggle within Tell revealed in his monologue in Act IV, scene 3. The critic believes that Tell agonizes over the moral implications of killing Gessler and seeks to justify it. The reviewer says that this deliberation is inconsistent with Tell's heretofore established character: Tell should act upon his better instinct just as before, quickly, for the sake of freedom. The long monologue is itself considered to be inconsistent with Tell's nature, for Tell, the critic insists, is not given to such long passages. Moreover, if Schiller felt that it was necessary to reveal Tell's motives to the audience, Tell should have communicated them in quick, brief gestures, not in a long speech inconsistent with his nature. Furthermore, the critic adds, the monologue contains passages which contradict the entire mood and situation: Tell's reflections on his past life; the step by step development of the justification for the deed he plans to do; forgiveness of this act; and his reflections on various ends of earthly endeavors. None of this, it is claimed, is something which Tell would think or say, for Tell is too occupied with the compelling necessity of the present to be able to stop and reflect on the past; he feels that he has been chosen to carry out this deed and therefore has no need to forgive himself for it. Besides, he is too preoccupied with his own endeavors to have time to think about the activities of others. The critic suggests that this scene would have either no effect or an extremely negative

one on the stage. In addition, he claims that these lines are not the words of Tell, but rather fine verses directly from Schiller, who, it is pointed out, here steps into Tell's role. Two quotations from Tell's lines after the monologue are offered in support of the contention that Schiller has again fallen prey to his desire to interject into his dramas ornate speeches and reflection where they do not belong. The critic also complains about Tell's excessively ornate and incongruous language. He refers with great disapproval to Tell's lengthy speech in Act V, scene 2, where Tell expresses his horror, disgust, and outrage at sympathy for Johannes Parricida's unpardonable assassination of the emperor. The reviewer maintains that here Schiller, once again, has provided Tell with a speech which is too long and ornate for Tell's heroic but simple character. The critic says that Schiller effectively intervenes here to discuss Tell's act and offer a contrast between the effect of this intervention and that of the interruption by the chorus in the old Greek tragedy.

The critic now turns to the major male characters, notably Walther Furst, Werner Stauffacher, and Arnold von Melchtal, and points out that these characters, like Tell, are Swiss through and through, but of a different spirit and differently motivated. All three are highly praised. The critic is particularly impressed by the fiery young Melchtal, who, he feels, stands out as a very stirring and convincing patriot whose loyalty to his country's cause is surpassed

only by his devotion to his aged father. The scene in which young Melchtal learns that his father has been blinded is singled out for praise. Melchtal's expression of grief and sorrow is considered profoundly moving; equally convincing is his rage when he swears to exact revenge not only for the act against his father but also for all previous grievances borne by his people under the tyranny of the Empire. The critic points out that Melchtal's outburst and resolution are instrumental in effectively erasing all reservations and doubts by Walther Furst and Stauffacher about the need to act immediately and collectively. They are ignited by his enthusiasm and resolve to forge a brotherhood and to take immediate action. The critic lauds these characterizations by Schiller for their effectiveness and completeness. For example, he writes about Melchtal:

So hat auch in ihm der Dichter einen Charakter aufgestellt, der seines Genius Stempel trägt, und für alle Zeiten ihn bewährt und verherrlicht.⁶¹

This enthusiastic approval continues in the discussion of the characterizations of Werner von Attinghausen and his son, Ulrich von Rudenz. They are given extensive attention by the critic, who opens with the following opinion:

Und noch nicht erschöpft winkt sein Zauberstab auch Attinghausens und Rudenz Manen glänzend und glorreich aus der Vergangenheit Grabe hervor, lebendigen Odem ihnen einhauchend.⁶²

⁶¹Ibid., p. 79.

⁶²Ibid., p. 79.

The reviewer thinks that Schiller has masterfully painted Attinghausen with a fiery spirit and an ardent love for country and freedom, in short, a vitality that belies his aged, bent figure. The critic feels that his character traits, especially his passion for liberty, are appealingly conveyed in Act II, scene 1, where he remonstrates with Rudenz about the latter's blind complicity, as an officer of the Empire, in the continued subjugation of his native land and his fellow countrymen. But the approaching and ultimate death of Attinghausen in Act IV, scene 2, is regarded as even more effective in conveying the dignity and greatness of this venerable champion of freedom and independence. The reviewer is particularly pleased with the segment in which Rudenz returns to his dying uncle and receives the patriarch's blessing after avowing his repatriation and pledging to lead the fight against the crown. The reviewer calls this a powerful, moving, and highly dramatic scene. No less lauded is the solemn affirmation of loyalty and determination to the resistance made by Rudenz with Stauffacher and Melchtal over the now deceased Attinghausen. Here the critic says that Schiller's poetic genius is rivaled by his talent for painting a complete, captivating picture for the audience.

The critic also praises Schiller's characterization of Rudenz revealing, as he progresses with this critique, an increasing enthusiasm which culminates in his description of the scene between Rudenz and Bertha (Act III, scene 2), where Rudenz acknowledges his past delusion and reproaches

himself for his association with the Empire and its false grandeur. Also given special attention and highly praised is the scene with Tell and Gessler (Act III, scene 3). Here Rudenz openly defies Gessler and expresses his disgust and outrage at Gessler's inhuman behavior and usurpation of authority. The speech made by Rudenz is given almost in its entirety by the reviewer and is referred to here emphatically as effective in demonstrating conclusively that Rudenz is indeed a Swiss again with all his soul.

The critic lauds likewise the characterization of the female figures in the drama. Here, too, he says one finds rich and lively characters created by Schiller. Of these, Bertha Bruneck is mentioned first. The critic points out that Bertha's strong feminine virtue is instrumental in helping Rudenz resolve his inner conflict and renew his loyalty to his country. The critic finds Bertha a most compelling figure, who, in addition to being of noble birth, displays a genuinely noble nature and shows a keen understanding of, and sympathy for, the spirit of freedom and the cause of these simple but admirable Swiss.

In Stauffacher's wife, Gertrud, the critic sees a character whose actions and perceptions clearly reflect an education and upbringing based on the tenets of liberty; he finds in her a feminine heroic spirit which pervades her entire being, and calls her a "Swiss Portia" who loyally stands beside the Swiss Brutus, Stauffacher. The critic explains that, like Brutus, Stauffacher broods silently over

the prospect and need of overthrowing the tyrants and conceals his innermost thoughts. Gertrud, the critic adds, like Portia, senses the cause of her husband's worry, extracts his secret, and shares his burden, for she, too, is preoccupied with the plight of her country. Despite this heroic strength, she remains true in every way to the ideal of femininity. The critic asserts that she is the picture of a model housewife and of a devoted companion to her spouse. All this, together with her heroic spirit, gives her character a completeness and credibility which are so vital in capturing and maintaining the dramatic interest of the viewer.

Turning next to Tell's wife, Hedwig, the reviewer finds in her qualities which contrast directly with those of Tell and provide a balance that results in a union of man and wife which is as natural as it is attractive: her fearful love contrasts with his courage, her maternal worry with his boldness, and her feminine circumspection with his reckless daring. The reviewer feels that she is the feminine character necessary to provide the adventurer with the companionship he needs:

. . . und trefflich hat ihn der Schöpfer gehalten und ausgeführt. Mit rührender Theilnahme regt sie unser Herz, wenn der liebenden Gattin lebhaft geregte Phantasie den kecken Schützen auf seinen gefahrsvollen Wanderungen begleitet.⁶³

⁶³Ibid., p. 86.

The critic is especially impressed with Hedwig's reaction after Tell has successfully shot the apple from the head of their son. The reviewer says that her expressions of relief, horror, outrage and pain are realistic, powerful, and gripping.

After the characters, the reviewer proposes to discuss the structure and dramatic composition of the play, the illusory effects, and the dialogue. He praises the structure and dramatic composition up to the scene of Gessler's death. He finds scenes which flow smoothly into each other and a plot which moves forward quickly and naturally; however, he feels that the appearance of the monk, Johannes von Parricida (Act IV, scene 2), does not fit into the play at all. The appearance of Parricida severely disturbs the prevailing interest of the audience and draws its attention away from the great event: the achievement of freedom by the Swiss. The reviewer does approve, though, of the scene which immediately precedes the Parricida-scene, where the patriots and inhabitants of Uri are gathered in expectation and then learn of the emperor's death. The reviewer finds it appropriate, as the news of his death is deemed necessary in establishing the certainty of the freedom newly gained; also, this adds the finishing touches to Schiller's depiction. Also receiving approval is the use of the letter from the queen to the people of Uri; for the effect of the letter upon the recipients reveals that they are determined and

will take all measures to resist any further encroachment upon their recently acquired liberty. The critic believes, however, that the play should have ended with this scene. He thinks that Parricida's confession and description of the assassination tarnishes the freedom that has been won, and that it brings about a disgust in the viewer not unlike that displayed by Tell in the scene, and causes the viewer's interest to weaken and cool.

The critic bemoans the inclusion of this last scene and calls it an aberration of the pure dramatic art. He finds it even more so after such an abundance of very fine scenes, scenes which capture the imagination of the audience more completely than any of Schiller's previous works. The reviewer elaborates:

Mit einem wahrhaft magischen Zauber versetzt er uns, seine ganze Darstellung hindurch, in das Land, das der Schauplatz des vorgestellten Ereignisses ist. Ehe noch der Vorhang aufrollt, fesselt schon der Klang des Kuhreihens und der Herdenglocken harmonisches Geläut des Zuschauers Phantasie an die zu erwartenden Szenen. . . und so wechselt der Zauber von Scene zu Scene; immer neue Ansichten. . . Wir leben und weben in der Schweiz.⁶⁴

After this effusive praise of the rapidly changing panorama of landscape and characters, the reviewer suggests that, on the other hand, these rapid and colorful changes from scene to scene might disturb the theatrical illusion and the attention that should be focused on the plot itself.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 89.

He adds that it sometimes seems that one's vision is too occupied with the secondary movement to be able to focus on the main action.

Another complaint concerns the second scene in Act II. He says that while this scene is unquestionably one of the most outstanding of the play, he must object to its length, and he suggests that there is too much debate and detail among the conspirators. They are too slow in going into action. He remarks that this could almost be called undramatic if it were not enlivened by the continual stream of additional participants in the conspiracy and by the diversity in their characteristics.

The critic gives high approval to move of the language in the work. Throughout he finds the predominating stamp of truth and natural, realistic character differentiation, and he says that far fewer passages are encountered here than in Schiller's previous dramatic works where the poet noticeably speaks instead of the character himself. The reviewer thinks that the speech of the various characters reflects the individuality and spirit of each. He thinks that the characters reflect their rich heritage and lofty ideals, but he adds that he feels they are no more idealized than the degree dictated by art. Schiller, he says, has masterfully provided an idealism that is true to the spirit and sound of the people of this age.

Apart from the isolated complaints about Tell's monologue, the only other objection expressed concerning the

language deals with that of the fisherman (Act IV, scene 1) when he learns of Tell's imminent imprisonment and von Attinghausen's approaching death. In despair, the fisherman exhorts the elements to extirpate all human life in his land, which seems doomed to bear the yoke of tyranny forever. The reviewer likens this to the language of Shakespeare's Lear when he invokes the fury of the elements to exact revenge against his heartless daughters, who have turned him out into the cold, stormy night. The critic maintains that the fisherman's speech reflects the exalted imagination of a king; not the character of a fisherman. It is implied that Schiller might have again taken control of the character to express himself directly.

Wilhelm Tell, Schiller's last drama, receives the highest approval yet by the NADB critic. Only minor, basically recurrent complaints sparsely punctuate what is otherwise a perfectly positive review. Schiller is effusively lauded for his presentation of the historical material and for his masterful transformation of Tell's peripheral participation in the Swiss revolt into an effective, decisive, dramatic role. It is no coincidence that the material, the action, and the characterizations which are so fully accepted by the NADB critic are also consistent with the tenets of the rationalistic literary philosophy. The drama revolves around the historical, physical struggle of essentially simple but noble people for their freedom against a tyrannical representative of a tangible oppressor, the

Austrian Empire. The critic is pleased by the smooth flow of the action-filled scenes. He finds only traces of the excessive tirades and reflection about which he complained so in the earlier ADB and NADB reviews. Except for Parricida, he has praise for all of Schiller's characters. He has special praise for Tell, who contrast to Maria Stuart, exhibits the heroic action, self-affirmation and self-determination required by the neo-classicists of a true hero. All the complaints expressed in the review can again be explained as violations of the Rationalists' literary philosophy. Wilhelm Tell conforms more closely to their criteria than any other of Schiller's major dramas.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

There emerges from this study of the ADB and NABD a pattern that, not surprisingly reflects a distinct disapproval of Schiller's early or Sturm und Drang dramas, a highly positive reception of the transitional drama, Don Carlos, and a general approval of the later dramas. One might expect such an overall picture in light of the philosophical differences that grew out of the reaction of Sturm und Drang against Aufklärung. But a closer look at the various bases for praise or censure within the individual works reveals an extremely rigid, indeed almost inflexible pattern that, with few exceptions, parallels the neo-classical philosophy of drama. Early complaints about excesses of language and reflections, Schiller's attempt to imitate Shakespeare, the breach of propriety in regard to thematic material and stage decorum, and the implicit as well as the expressed rejection of displays of "unnatural" passion are recurrent sources of these complaints in the critiques of the later works. Failure to adhere to the established Aristotelean unities and established elements of the old Greek drama, implied in the earlier criticisms, provide the reviewer almost exclusively with the criteria supporting his negative argument in the general rejection of Maria Stuart. In the review of Die Jungfrau von Orleans, the critic's insistence upon "psychological" realism (i.e.,

the rejection of all supernatural and purely religious elements) as sole legitimate basis for the wondrous feats of the maiden again reflects the Rationalists's rejection of the supernatural and miracles associated with religion. While Die Braut von Messina is also considered by many modern literary critics as Schiller's least successful dramatic experiment, the majority of the harsh negative criticism found in the NADB review of this drama can again be traced to reactions reflecting the Rationalists' viewpoint. Works that were positively received or highly praised by the ADB and the NADB critic were those which approached more closely the dramatic ideals of the Rationalists. Schiller's dramatic genius is mentioned often in the reviews, and his talent for creating well-developed, true-to-life characters is acknowledged early in the NADB critiques of the Sturm und Drang and is most highly lauded in the critical reviews of Don Carlos, Wallenstein, and Wilhelm Tell, but the relative degree of praise for Schiller's powerful, accurate depictions is directly tied to the manner and extent of the passion or action exhibited by the character in question. A well-portrayed, true-to-life figure expressing improper or excessive passion and behavior was much less likely to receive positive recognition than those who were deemed proper in behavior and in control of their emotions. Max Piccolomini and Thekla are praised by the NADB critic for subordinating their love for one another to the higher causes of loyalty and duty. Certainly the virtue of

self-sacrifice itself is praised here by the critic, but one cannot mistake the reviewer's specific approval of the restraint of passion which the pair exercised in their decisions. In general, Schiller's characters were praised or rejected by the Rationalists according to their own strictly defined criteria; any other potential subjects of literary criticism which might have been praiseworthy or censurable but which lay outside the narrow focus of the Rationalists went either unnoticed or were ignored. As a result of this critical confinement, the ADB and NADB reviews yielded largely a predictable model of the Rationalists' literary philosophy, which, ironically, in view of their convictions and determination, was found greatly lacking in objectivity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLGEMEINE DEUTSCHE BIBLIOTHEK. XII-CXVIII and Anhangbände.
1770-1796.

Kelly, Barbara Maureen. "The Development of Goethe Criticism in the ALLGEMEINE DEUTSCHE BIBLIOTHEK (1770-1796) and the NEUE ALLGEMEINE DEUTSCHE BIBLIOTHEK (1793-1806)." diss., The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1970.

NEUE ALLGEMEINE DEUTSCHE BIBLIOTHEK. I-CVI and Anhangbände.
1793-1806.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

REVIEWS CONCERNING SCHILLER'S MAJOR DRAMAS IN THE

ALLGEMEINE DEUTSCHE BIBLIOTHEK (1770-1796)

Die Räuber, ein Schauspiel (1781), in ADB, XLIX, pt. 1
(1782), p. 127.

Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua (1783), in ADB, LVI,
pt. 1 (1783), p. 122.

Kabale und Liebe; ein bürgerliches Trauerspiel in fünf
Aufzügen von Friedrich Schiller (1784), in ADB,
LXVIII, pt. 2 (1784), p. 477.

APPENDIX B

REVIEWS CONCERNING SCHILLER'S MAJOR DRAMAS IN THE NEUE ALLGEMEINE DEUTSCHE BIBLIOTHEK (1793-1806)

Don Karlos, Infant von Spanien, von Friedrich Schiller
(1801), in NADB, LXXXIII, pt. 1 (1803), p. 86.

Wallenstein, ein dramatisches Gedicht (1800), in NADB, LX,
pt. 1 (1801), p. 113.

Maria Stuart, ein Trauerspiel von Schiller (1801), in NADB,
LXIX, pt. 1 (1802), p. 129.

Die Jungfrau von Orleans (1802), in NADB, LXXXII, pt. 1
(1803), p. 87.

Die Braut von Messina (1804), in NADB, LXXXVIII, pt. 2
(1803), p. 461.

Wilhelm Tell, Schauspiel von Schiller (1805), in NADB, CIII,
pt. 1 (1805), p. 67.

VITA

L. Wade Sanford was born on October 25, 1949 in Opelika, Alabama. He attended elementary school and secondary school in Smiths, Alabama, where he was graduated from Smiths Station High School in 1968. The following fall, Mr. Sanford entered Auburn University in Auburn, Alabama. He received the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1972 with a major in History and minors in Mathematics, Physics, and German. After working for two years and traveling briefly in Europe, Mr. Sanford accepted an appointment as graduate teaching assistant in German at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in 1975. From 1978 to 1980 he taught German in two high schools in Knoxville, Tennessee. After reassuming the position of graduate teaching assistant at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and completing his studies, he received his Master of Arts degree in June 1982.

Mr. Sanford plans to work briefly in Knoxville and to return to Europe the following year, where he hopes to work and travel before pursuing any further academic interests.