

A COMPARISON OF GOETHE'S "GÖTZ VON BERLICHINGEN  
UND SCHILLER'S "DIE RÄUBER".



By

ELLEN M. BRUNNER.

Submitted to the Department of German  
and the faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Approved: E. F. Engel

Date

Department of

B I B L I O G R A P H Y.

-:-

Bellermann, Ludwig.

"Schiller's Dramen", Erster Teil, Weidmannische  
Buchhandlung, Berlin, 1898.

Bielschowsky, Albert.

"Goethe- Sein Leben und Seine Werke", Erster Band,  
C. H. Veck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, München, 1914.

Bulthaupt, Heinrich.

"Dramaturgie des Schauspiels", Erster Band, Schulz-  
esche Hof-Buchdruckerei, Oldenburg und Leipzig,  
1898.

Carlyle, Thomas.

"Life of Friederich Schiller" (1825), "Life of John  
Sterling" (1851), London: Chapman and Hall, Ld.,  
1893.

Düntzer, Heinrich.

"Goethe's- Götz von Berlichingen", Ed. Wartig's Verlag  
(Ernst Hoppe), Leipzig, 1888.

Düntzer, Heinrich.

"Schiller's- Räuber", Verlag von Ed. Wartig, Leipzig,  
1876.

Engel, Eduard.

"Goethe- Der Mann und das Werk", Verlag von George  
Westermann, Braunschweig und Berlin.

Freytag, Gustav.

"Technique of the Drama", Translated by Elias J.  
Mac Ewan, S. C. Griggs & Company, Chicago, 1895.

## II

Goodrich, Frank.

"Goethe's- Götz von Berlichingen", Henry Holt and Company.

Goedeke, Karl.

"Goethe und Schiller", Verlag von Louis Ehlermann, Hanover, 1859.

Gözens von Berlichingen.

"Lebens- Beschreibung", Abdruck der Original- Ausgabe von Steigerwald, Nurnberg, 1731; Halle, Max Niemeyer, 1886.

Klinger, F. M.

"Seine Werke", Erster Band- "Die Zwillinge", Bei Friederich Nicolovius, Königsberg, 1815.

Kürschner, Joseph.

"Deutsche National Litteratur", Band 120, Schiller's Räuber, Verlag von W. Spemann, Berlin und Stuttgart.

Kürschner, Josphe.

"Deutsche National Litteratur", Goethe's Götz von Berlichingen, Verlag von W. Spemann, Berlin und Stuttgart.

Leisewitz, Johann Anton.

"Julius von Tarent und die Dramatischen Fragmente", G. J. Goschen'sche Verlagshandlung, Stuttgart, 1889.

Meyer, Richard M.

"Goethe", Erster Band, Ernst Hoffmann and Co., Berlin, 1905.

Minor, J.

"Schiller- Sein Leben und Seine Werke", Erster Band, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, Berlin, 1890.

III

Sime, James.

"Life of Johann Wolfgang Goethe", Walter Scott,  
24 Warwick Lane, London, 1888.

Schlag, Dr. Hermann.

"Das Drama", Verlag von Fredebeul and Koenen, Essen  
(Ruhr).

"Schiller's Samtliche Werke".

Mit Einleitungen von Karl Goedeke, Zweiter Band, J.C.  
Cotta'sche Buchhandlung, Stuttgart und Berlin.

# C O N T E N T S.

-:-

Introduction.

Discussion: A Comparison of Goethe's "Götz von Berlichingen" und Schiller's "Die Räuber".

Materials.

Sources.

Place and period.

Nature: Outline of stories.

Use.

As to characters and character delineation.

As to predominant motive.

Dramatic form.

Plot.

Main incidents.

Truth and Magnitude.

General method of treatment.

Characters.

Classification.

Comparison.

Storm and Stress Elements.

Adaptation to the Stage.

Conclusion.

## I N T R O D U C T I O N .

-:-

When considering the foremost representatives of German literature, it is but natural that our thoughts turn at once to the three most popular German writers, Lessing, Schiller and Goethe. Lessing was the producer of the first German drama of importance and is regarded as the father of dramatic literature in Germany. Goethe and Schiller were his great successors. These two men stand to each other in a relation both of contrast and harmony, similar to that which has been said to exist between Herder and Kant. Goethe's chosen field of study was nature and the human affection, Schiller's was history and human aspirations; Goethe's prevailing attitude was one of sympathetic contemplation, Schiller's, one of energetic activity. Goethe like Herder looked at life as an organic whole of natural causes and effects, while Schiller, like Kant, regarded it as a continuous struggle for perfection; Goethe too strove for aesthetic universality, while Schiller strove for moral freedom. But in spite of these differences of temperament and genius existing between these two great contributors to German literature, the mission performed by both for modern

humanity was practically the same.

Both Goethe and Schiller began in the tumultuous fashion of the Storm and Stress enthusiasts. In literature the Storm and Stress movement was an insurrection of youthful impulse and passion against the restraint of rules. Poets thought they were on the road to the expression of true humanity and true poetry if they abandoned tradition and rule, and surrendered themselves completely to imagination and feeling. The movement's chief form of expression was the drama. The first literary embodiment of its spirit was Goethe's "Götz von Berlichingen", and the last literary creation which arose entirely under its influence was Schiller's "Die Räuber". These early works, although they fully reveal the extraordinary genius of both, are not so much creations of pure art as they are outcries of souls overflowing with compassionate zeal for struggling and suffering humanity. The germ of their after poetry may be traced in these early prose works, and as examples of impassioned and vigorous diction these two works are unsurpassed.

In view of all this, and because of the distinguished and peculiar position of their respective authors in the literary history of Germany and the high excellence of

## VII

Their dramatic productions and their representative German spirit and art, a comparative study of these two dramas is interesting not only for the insight thereby obtained into the methods employed by these great artists and their relation one to the other, but for the idea which such a study will furnish us of the literature, especially of the technique, significance and use of the drama as interpreted by the Teutonic people.

Perhaps there is no dramatic work of Schillers that seems more truly in the spirit of Goethe than "Die Räuber". In many respects it suggests the play of "Götz von Berlichingen", and the similarity in the dramatic development of these two works make their comparison not only interesting but profitable as well.

## A COMPARISON OF "GÖTZ VON BERLICHINGEN" AND "DIE RÄUBER".

-:-

We have frequently observed that great writers need not necessarily be great inventors, but that many of them are often great simply because of their aptness to recognize the value of the material at hand. We know that some of our most famous English and French writers such as Shakespeare, Molière, Corneille and Racine originated very few of the plots for their plays and in some cases were even subjected to the accusation of plagiarism. Thus our two famous German writers likewise fashioned their works upon those of their predecessors.

The seed time of Goethe's "Götz von Berlichingen" was during his Strassburg period. Previous to this he had already been directed to national subjects by Lessing's works and had become acquainted with the works of Shakespeare. It was at Strassburg, too, that he made the acquaintance of Herder whose influence is shown in his productions. Under Herder's training his writings underwent a complete transformation. He learned to base his poetical creations upon reality, and he turned aside from French influences and French literature. He introduced him to many English writers, and above all taught him to under-

stand and appreciate more fully the magic power of Shakespeare's genius. Julius Caesar and other great historical characters soon afterward captivated his fancy, but none attracted Goethe nearly so much as the historical Götz von Berlichingen. He found traces of this knight in a law book, and felt that he, more easily than any of the other historical characters, could be made the center of a drama.

Fortunately for Goethe, this man who had played so great a part in the peasant wars of the sixteenth century had written an autobiography. He had written this autobiography in his last days in defence of his life and conduct. In it he represents himself as an honest and manly warrior, but often misunderstood and slandered, a man who in the age which formed the bridge between the mediaeval and the modern world had always followed right and justice, and had never fought but in defence of the weak. His autobiography is a frank and simple record of his adventures written with a view to correct the opinions of men as well as to prevent his descendants from misunderstanding him.

This record of himself was printed and Goethe obtaining access to it just at this time completely believed it. It is natural, however, that Goethe should have chosen such

a subject, because at that very time chivalry was being revived in literature especially in France. "His early acquaintance with Tasso and with popular romances such as the "Haimonskinder" had laid a good foundation in this direction, and the subject of Götz attracted his glance to the most important period of the Reformation, as well as to those old imperial relations and conditions which had from ancient times been filled with special interest for the imperial town of Frankfort".<sup>1</sup>

As Goethe read this autobiography, it seemed to him that notwithstanding external differences, there was much inward resemblance between the influences with which Götz had contended, and those which in his own day choked up the springs of thought and natural feeling. Götz had not permitted his spirit to be broken by the tyrannical forces of his period. He had asserted his individuality, and had been loyal to his own loftiest aims. In Götz he found embodied the virtues which were uppermost in his affections during the years of 1770 and 1771, and which were lacking in the world, namely, bravery, independence, honesty and kindness, a straightforward, spirited, free and noble life. He felt that he had found in the historical Götz a figure who could be made the medium for the expression of his own

1. History of German Literature. Vol. II, W. Scherer, p. 96.

aspirations, and he at once decided to make him the hero of his first drama. It seems strange that Goethe should have given us the biography of this brave man in dramatic form, but Herder had preached that history was the essence of the Shakespearian drama, and had placed great stress on the great event. Thus this longing for great men burned with great intensity in the hearts of the young men of Germany, and since the present seemed to be lacking in great men, they more zealously endeavored to rescue the memory of past heroes. It is in this way that we may explain Goethe's temperament to dramatize the biography of Gótz.

In a similar manner, Schiller found a starting point for his "Räuber". Early in life he was carried away by the tumultuous passion for literature, and during his school days at Stuttgart, although under strict discipline, he devoured the works of Rousseau, Gerstenberg, Goethe and other writers. Enthusiasm drove him to imitation. It seemed so easy to reproduce what he felt so keenly. Two dramatic attempts resulted, but both were destroyed by the disgusted author, however, he was not discouraged. Finally in the year 1777, one of his friends called his attention to one of Schubart's stories which he found in a

Suabian magazine. It was entitled, "Zur Geschichte des menschlichen Herzens". This was a story of a father, a nobleman and his two dissimilar sons, of whom the elder, Karl, was frank and noble-minded but wild, while the younger, Wilhelm, was a "plausible moralist but at heart a scoundrel". Karl plays the role of the prodigal son, and his excesses are reported at home by his younger brother. Later Karl writes a remorseful letter to his father, but Wilhelm manages to hide it from his father. Karl then returns to the vicinity of his home and enters the service of a farmer. It finally falls to his lot to save his father from the hands of assassins. The instigator of the murder was the younger brother, and when the plot is discovered Karl entreats pardon for him. The pardon is granted and Wilhelm receives a share of the estate and the story ends happily.

Schubart, in publishing this story, recommended it as an excellent foundation for a novel or comedy. Schiller took the hint and decided to write "Die Räuber", his interest probably being increased by Schubart's miserable fate. That theme of two hostile brothers and the tragedy of primogeniture was a favorite one with the Storm and Stress dramatists. Klinger had employed it in his early plays and it had been likewise introduced into the tragedy of

Leisewitz which made a deep impression upon the mind of Schiller. His immediate models for "Die Rauber" were no doubt Klinger's "Die Zwillinge", and Leisewitz's "Julius von Tarent", while the main incidents of the plot were taken from the Schubart story.

Klinger's "Zwillinge" presents a similar situation. There are two brothers, Guelfo and Fernando, and there is a question as to which of the two is the elder. Fernando has been treated as the elder, has enjoyed the favor of his father and has risen to power and distinction. Fernando displays a noble and forgiving temper while Guelfo like Karl Moor, has read Plutarch and is desirous of doing something great like Brutus or Cassius, but after all remains only a poor knight. The suspicion that he has been the victim of a conspiracy his entire life, that he and not Fernando is the elder brother, has paralyzed his heroic spirit; consequently he becomes extremely jealous of him. One morning, the two brothers go for a ride, and he kills him. He then reports the deed and he himself is slain by his father.

In "Julius of Tarentum", Guido, the younger brother is again the active man. Jealousy again exists between the brothers. Julius, the elder, is of a gentle and rather

sentimental disposition. He has fallen in love with a girl named Blanca, whom the father does not deem a suitable bride for him. The girl is shut up in a convent and he tries to persuade her to leave the convent and marry him, but she reminds him of the danger which results from the breaking of vows. He is determined however to capture her and flee with her, In his attempt to carry out his purpose, he is killed by his brother, who then meets death by the hand of his father.

We see here that all these stories are woven about a similar thread, and since we have discovered the seed, so to speak, from which Schiller's "Räuber", and Goethe's "Götz" has risen, our next step is to trace its germination or development, differentiate between the material used in them as compared to their sources and the author's chief motive in producing these works.

Goethe's Götz had never been intended for the stage, his mother tells us, but it was written for the purpose of rescuing the memory of a noble and honest German warrior for the benefit of his contemporaries. He chose the dramatic form because he felt it would be the most effective way of endowing his hero with life. This purpose is expressed also in the title of the first version,

"History of Gottfried von Berlichingen with the Iron Hand Dramatized", which appeared in 1771. This first version was severely criticised by Herder, who said that Goethe had been spoiled by the slavish adherence to Shakespeare's style. Goethe had in the first version utterly disregarded all unity of time and place. Change of scenes occurred for a monologue of only a few lines or a short dialogue. The unity of action was spoiled by the introduction of Weislingen who was brought in as a second hero. Men of all ranks, citizens, soldiers, servants and peasants were introduced. Tragedy and comedy were intermingled. He even introduced a Shakespearian clown and jester, and set him down in the midst of a society of courtiers. Many short songs were introduced, strong language and coarseness, far-fetched similes and exaggerations and at the same time many Shakespeare reminiscences were to be found throughout the play.

Herder's criticism, however, did not completely discourage Goethe. He became conscious of the grave defects in his work, especially the lack of unity in the action and immediately set to work to recast his play. He had been misled by his fondness for subordinate characters like the fascinating Adelheid, so that the interest became

divided and the attention was drawn away from the hero. In his new version, he tried to remedy this matter. He omitted some of the most powerful scenes, changed others and added new ones. The motivation became clearer and more logical, the language and characters more real and natural. A comparison of the two versions reveals considerable progress made by Goethe in the conception of his art. He was no doubt influenced by Lessing's "Emilia Galotti", which made its appearance just at that time. This second version appeared in 1773 and was called "Götz von Berlichingen".

When we compare the latter with Götz's "Autobiography", we are at once impressed by the originality, the creative genius of the author. In the former, we have a series of adventures, loosely put together, and on the whole monotonous and dull. In Goethe's play we have, on the other hand, a wealth of variety and contrast. Each scene presents a picture full of life, truth, and local color. Scenes follow one another in quick succession. The action of the play has little in common with the story of the Autobiography. Single events are made use of, and in a few cases, such as the hostility of the Swabian League, or Götz's connection with the Peasants' War, they occupy an

important place in the action of the play, but their relation and significance are changed. Most of the prominent characters of the play, namely, Weislingen, Franz, Georg, Adelheid, Maria and Elizabeth have no part in the Autobiography, and others like the Bishop of Bamberg and Selbitz owe little more than their names to that source. Dramatic elements are entirely invented by Goethe.

Schiller's purpose differs somewhat from that of Goethe. His chief desire seems to have been to express that longing for liberty which he felt personally throughout his school-days, and which had been strengthened by his knowledge of the cruel imprisonment of Schubart. Many people think that had it not been for the perverted discipline of the Stuttgart school, we would never have seen this tragedy. The plays that he read during his school career no doubt helped also to arouse his enthusiasm and desire to try his hand at the drama, which was so popular at that time. That conception of the hostile brothers, he had gained from numerous works.

As I have previously stated, Schiller based his play upon incidents taken from the Schubart story making changes where necessary to suit his plan. In Schubart's story there were no heroic passions. Nothing was conceived in

a bold, large way. The characters lived and moved in the little world of their own selfish interests. His hero was a meek and forgiving character. Such a work did not suit Schiller's fierce mood of indignation, so he converted the Schubart story into a tragedy and turned the meek and forgiving hero into a terrible avenger of mankind. Schiller's play also differs from his sources in that he has not laid the scene of his play in far-off Italy and in the remote past, but in Germany and in the middle of the century which boasted of enlightened philosophy and its excellent police regulations. He converted the dynastic tragedies of his predecessors into a tragedy of social revolution. The earlier plays read tamely compared to Schiller's "Räuber". Very little actually happens and the conversation sometimes drags. In them we miss the great dramatist, who looks upon life with a broad scope and intertwines his tale of private woe with the larger tangles of human destiny.

Thus so much may be said of the material and purpose of the plays, but what of their dramatic value. We do find in them a certain general similarity of dramatic structure. But let us turn for a moment to a brief outline of their action.

Goethe's play opens just a few months before Emperor Maximilian's death, in 1519. We are at once introduced, in a scene full of life and spirit, to the conflict between Götz, the noble knight, whom everybody knows as brave and generous, and his most bitter enemy, the Bishop of Bamberg. Götz's generosity has not only been shamefully abused by the Bishop, but the latter has also captured one of his pages. Götz is going to wreak punishment upon him, and thus is lying in wait for Weislingen, the Bishop's right-hand man, who was Götz's former friend, but is now his enemy. In the next scene Götz himself appears. He and three of his men have been lying in wait for five days and nights in a forest inn not far from Bamberg, while here, they are informed of Weislingen's whereabouts, so they set out immediately and capture him and all but one of the men who are with him. In the meantime we are taken to the castle of Jaxthausen, Götz's abode, and are introduced to his wife, sister and son. They are anxiously awaiting his return. Soon Götz approaches the castle, accompanied by his captive, Weislingen. He hopes to win back his friendship. The two had grown up together in boyhood and had been fast friends, till Weislingen was carried away by the false tendency of the age and attract-

ed to the court by its artificial glamour, and, consequently, abandoned his free and independent life as a knight to become a courtier. This scene presents a remarkable contrast in the characters of Götz and Weislingen, the former a free, noble and upright man, opposed to a weak and impressionable nature.

The next scene which takes us to the Bishop's court marks also a striking contrast with the homely simplicity at Jaxthausen. Here we hear loud praises of a foreign institution, the Roman Law, introduced into Germany in the interest of the princes and hostile to the old German ideas of liberty and justice, but everywhere that tone of gross self-indulgence, ignorance, bigotry and narrowness of the ecclesiastics prevails. The scene ends with the startling news of Weislingen's capture which brings great sorrow to the Bishop. To conclude the first act we return to Jaxthausen where the reconciliation between Götz and Weislingen takes place. The latter's vow of friendship is sealed by the betrothal of Maria to Weislingen. Weislingen appears to be in high spirits and feels that he is going to make good his faithfulness to Götz. His page, Franz, however, comes with news from Bamberg, tells also of the new arrival at the court, the charming widow,

Adelheid, with whose beauty Franz is completely infatuated. We are made to feel that great danger is awaiting Weislingen.

In the next act this danger is revealed. Weislingen has been induced to visit the court where he is attracted by the seductive charms of Adelheid and finally brought to commit a double breach of faith against Götz and Maria. Götz charges the Nuremberg citizens with the betrayal of his page to the Bishop and assisted by Sebbitz and his page, Georg, prepares to make good the threat. Weislingen still under the influence of Adelheid is ready to take active measure against Götz, and urges the Emperor to do likewise. The Emperor is influenced to have Götz outlawed and has an imperial force sent against him to execute the ban. Franz of Sickingen, a powerful knight, comes just at this time to ask Götz for his sister's hand. He succeeds in winning Maria, and promises to send aid to Götz, who will not permit Franz himself to assist him. The following scenes depict the movements and character of the imperial troops and the successive encounters with Götz's small army, reporting numerous victories for him, but finally overpowered by the large numbers, he is forced to retire to his castle. There follows the siege which brings us to the

climax of the action, especially where Götz is surrounded by his brave followers, and shares with them his last bit of food and drink and gives a toast to the Emperor and freedom. These scenes display the admiration and faithfulness of Götz's men, especially that of Georg and Lerse who are ready to stand by Götz through thick and thin. In spite of all their efforts Götz and his men are taken captive .

Götz is then brought to trial before the imperial councilors, which is interrupted just at the opportune moment by the appearance of Sickingen and a small army of troops. He is released from imprisonment upon swearing the oath of Urrehe, which condemns him to a life of inactivity. Adelheid and Weislingen have been married, and are anxiously waiting for another chance to take action against Götz. Weislingen also is jealous of the future Emperor Charles V, who has been showing attention to his wife. Even his page has again become infatuated with Adelheid, who has shown him favor.

In conclusion, Götz is drawn into the Peasants' War, breaks his oath and thus gives his enemies the wished for opportunity to take action against him. Weislingen heads the Swabian League. Götz is captured and imprisoned.

His spirit is completely broken. Franz poisons his master and then drowns himself on account of despair. Adelheid, who planned her husband's death, is condemned to death by the Secret Tribunal. The play closes with the tragic end of Götz, who, although pardoned, has become so weakened and broken in spirit, that he dies in the prison garden surrounded by his wife and sister and the faithful Lerse.

When we read this play we are greatly impressed by the variety and wealth of situation and character, by the beauty, power and individuality of its language, and by the truth and reality which is manifest in every scene. A remote age seems to have been revived. We are introduced to various phases of sixteenth century life. Numerous classes of society are herein represented and portrayed in a vivid manner. All of them are made to talk in a manner which seems thoroughly true and characteristic, and all appear as real human beings of flesh and blood.

Before entering farther into our discussion however, I should like to outline in a similar manner the action of Schiller's "Räuber", and then compare and contrast the two wherever possible.

In the opening scene of "Die Räuber", the keynote is struck. We are introduced at once to Count Moor and his

younger son, Franz. The elder brother is attending school at Beipsic. Franz immediately takes advantage of his absence, and by forged letters and false reports attempts to poison his father's mind against the elder brother, the purpose of such a stratagem being to secure the succession to the inheritance. The father being old and feeble, becomes heart-broken, and instead of receiving consolation from his younger son is criticised for his laxity in the discipline of Karl. He convinces the father of the truthfulness of the forged letter and suggests a means whereby they themselves might be saved from the disgrace- that is the father should disinherit Karl. The old man overcome by the sudden shock of this false report, willingly accepts Franz's advice and even permits him to write the letter to Karl in which he asserts this fact. Franz rejoices over his plan by which the father was so easily entrapped. Now his thoughts turn to the invention of a new scheme whereby he may supplant his brother in the affections of Amalia, a niece of the old Moor who has been making her home with her uncle, Count Moor.

In the meantime, Karl has been discovered in the midst of wild, young comrades reading Plutarch from the contemplation of whose heroes he has learned to loathe his own

petty age of critics, professors and commentators. He longs for action; he chafes against the laws. "Das Gesetz hat noch keinen grossen Mann gebildet", sagt er, "aber die Freiheit brütet Kolosse und Extremitäten aus." xxxxxxxxxxxx "Ah! dass der Geist Hermanns noch in der Asche glimmte!- Stelle mich vor ein Heer Kerls wie ich, und aus Deutschland soll ein Republik werden, gegen die Rom und Sparta Nonnenklöster sein sollen".<sup>1</sup> These lines well portray his ambitious mood and just at this time he receives a letter from Franz announcing that his father has cast him off and ceased to regard him as a son. Wild with rage he curses the whole human race. "Ich möchte ein Bär sein und die Bären des Nordlands wider dies mörderische Geschlecht anhetzen- Reue und keine Gnade!- Oh ich möchte den<sup>2</sup> Ozean vergiften, dass sie den Tod aus allen Quellen saufen!"

Being in a rebellious mood, he, at the suggestion of one of his comrades, at once proceeds to organize his friends into a band of brigands under his own leadership. With murder and theft he will trample law under his feet and avenge the lacerated feelings of humanity at large. He exchanges a kind of coronation oath with his followers, then filled with the lust of slaughter and joyful expectation, they march off to the Bohemian forest. Here Karl

1. Die Räuber- Act I, Sc. II, pages 28-29

2. Die Räuber- Act I, Sc. II, p. 39.

becomes a king among men. He showers plundered gold and bathes his horse in wine. He, together with his eighty men, rob, murder, storm cities, violate nunneries, till finally they are surrounded by troops and a prize is offered by the police for his capture. His followers however remain faithful to him and with Karl at their head fight their way out.

In the meantime, Franz tries to win the affections of Amalia who spurns him. Her only request is that he should hate her. Franz tries to convince her of Karl's dishonour to her, by depicting to her his reckless life and comparing it to his own life. Franz leaves the raving Amalia however, enters his own chamber and there meditates upon a plan whereby he may get rid of his father, and at the same time win the affections of Amalia. To this end he suborns Hermann, the son of a nobleman, to bring false news of Karl's death at the Battle of Prague. This scheme, however, only proves partially successful. The old father faints at the news and is borne off for dead, Franz enters upon the estates with shameless threats against his new tenants, but Amalia resists his violent approaches and remains overwhelmed in unbroken woe, only longing for death that she may dream of her Karl till the resurrection

arouses her to the heaven of his embrace. In a later scene Franz meets Amalia in the castle garden, and tells her that he is lord and master. He voluntarily declares himself her slave and tries to force her to consent to become his wife. Upon her refusal he threatens to make her his mistress. She falls on his neck purposely, snatches his sword from his girdle and derides him. Hermann then enters and notifies her that both her uncle and Karl live.

Karl engaged in scenes of plunder and bloodshed has no care for booty; he despoils the rich mainly for their own good. He feeds the orphan and relieves the oppressed; His bloodiest and most daring enterprise is the rescue of a condemned comrade, for which he is ever praised by his followers. As he dwells in this forest, soft memories and sweet impulses of a fading innocence fill his heart with yearning and regret. He recalls the days when he could not sleep if he had forgotten his evening prayer. The beauty of the world fills him with woe. Eternity fills his thoughts and he meditates upon the problem of suicide. In the midst of such melancholy thoughts, Kosinsky enters and asks to serve Karl, and after certain tests is admitted. He then relates the

story of his life and incidentally tells of a love affair which reminds Karl of a beloved one whom he has not seen for a long time, yet cannot forget. This drives him on to a scheme, whereby he in the disguise of a Northern Count ventures to visit the castle where his brother is supreme and Amalia sits imprisoned like a captive bird. When he enters the castle, Amalia fails to recognize him. She finds herself rapidly becoming unfaithful to the memory of the exiled Karl. Franz sees through his disguise clearly enough to arrange for his murder, and the danger is only averted by the fidelity of an old servant. This scene furnishes touching reminiscences of childhood, and interviews between the lovers which brings out more and more the feebleness and stupidity of the heroine.

The next scene opens with a song by the Robbers, after which they quarrel, resulting in murder among themselves, till interrupted by Karl's return. Gradually, all fall asleep but Karl who is left meditating on time, fate and death. At midnight some one comes through the woods and approaches the ruined castle near which the Robbers are encamped. It is Hermann whom Franz has used as a messenger and for other purposes of his own. Unconscious of the presence of Karl and the Robbers, he speaks to the Old Moor

who is imprisoned in an old tower. Karl watches him and as he is about to leave seizes him. He then breaks into the tower, from whose depths emerges an old man, emaciated to a skeleton. The story is soon unfolded. His younger son, Franz, is responsible for his wretched condition and imprisonment, which he hoped would result in quick death from starvation. Upon hearing the old man's heart-rendering tale, Karl becomes wild with fury, summons his men and commands them to seize his old home and bring to him alive his brother, Franz.

A few hours later, the same night, Franz is discovered wandering about the corridors, haunted by terrible dreams of the Judgment Day and his own damnation. He sends for the parson in order that social disputation may relieve his feelings. The parson by his taunts and threats shatters his disbelief in God and immortality. He hears the shouts of the robbers as they pour in upon the castle. He entreats his servants to pray for him and he himself pours forth a rather ambiguous prayer. The castle is on fire. His followers desert him, and he seeing no chance for escape, strangles himself with the golden band off his hat. The Robber who had vowed to take him alive, shoots himself. Karl is conversing with his father who does not yet recog-

nize him, when Franz's death is reported. Amalia is then brought in by some of the Robber band. There is a general recognition, and at the thought of Karl as a captain of brigands and cut-throats, the old man dies without a word. Karl's dream of a happy future is cut short by the Robbers who claim Karl as their own and remind him of his oath never to leave them. In despair, Amalia entreats for death, and Karl kills her himself. He then resigns his position as leader, and goes to surrender himself to justice. He calls to mind a poor laborer who has eleven children, and who can now be enriched for life by the reward offered for his capture.

Of the two plays in question, Goethe's seems to me rather more incoherent than Schiller's in the construction of the plot. Goethe has interwoven what we might call two separate stories- the Götz story and the Weislingen story. The former he has treated in the manner of an epical biography, which deprives it of a centralized operating cause. Its unity is based solely upon the personality of its hero. The drama proceeds with a chain of adventures until it finds its necessary end in the death of Götz. In several places long before the last act, the drama might have come to an end, had the author not decided

to prolong his story by introducing a new incident which gives his hero a place in the action. The plot could have been made more coherent by making Weislingen's treachery the chief motive in the second act, and having Götz declare a new feud against the Bishop for the punishment of both the traitor and his protector. But Goethe thought little of the drama as a stage production and aimed merely to depict the life of his great hero.

The Weislingen story was invented for more than one reason. Life and literature seemed dull to Goethe without the ingredient of love. What was life or literature without a touch of feminine beauty! It meant nothing to Goethe, therefore he invented this part of the drama to overcome that dullness and emptiness and added it to his Götz story, where it well serves its purpose and moreover gives dramatic life to his dialogued biography. Every man who comes within the sphere of Adelheid's radiant beauty and seductive charms succumbs. Her uncanny charm drives men and boys to treachery and murder, as if they had no wills of their own. Maria, the sister of Götz, who is another of Goethe's inventions, marks a splendid contrast to Adelheid. Adelheid is a domineering and coquettish widow, with a longing for love and power; Maria on the other hand, is a pure and unselfish maiden, almost

angelic, who extends her hand to the man who has deserted her, and asks God to forgive him in order to lighten the burdens of his guilty soul.

The prototypes for Maria and Weislingen are very evident, and this incident brings us to the motive which no doubt gave Goethe the impulse to write his drama. It was just at the time when he deserted Friederike Brion and his soul was burning with the consciousness of a great wrong. This drama has no doubt been an attempt to partially atone for it, for Goethe said in a letter to one of his friends when he sent him a copy of "Götz"- "Die arme Friederike wird einiger massen sich getrostet finden, wenn der Untreue vergiftet wird".<sup>1</sup>

The motive of the Reformation is also introduced, with its representative, Brother Martin. The author does not emphasize its religious and ecclesiastical side, but the humanistic, the free, full humanity. Brother Martin says in one place, in his complaint against the monastic vows, - "Mir kommt nichts beschwerlicher vor, als nicht Mensch sein dürfen".<sup>2</sup> This was an essential point in common between the Storm and Stress period.

Goethe's drama marks the beginning of a new era and embodies the form of the new theories of art. In the plot,

1. "Goethe"., p.176; Bielschowsky.
2. "Götz von Berlichingen", Act I, Sc.1, p.10.

he has paid no attention to the observance of the traditional against limitations and inferiority. In "Götz von Berlichingen", Goethe has championed the cause of freedom against the tyrants of Germany and contrasted the honest, chivalrous and patriotic life of her hero with the corrupt life of the courts. This contrast between the different individuals, institutions, and modes of life is an important feature of the drama. It is the contrast of the natural simplicity, truth, loyalty and freedom of the past, with the artificial luxury, falseness, treachery and servility of the present age.

In Schiller's "Räuber", we again have revolt but this time the heroic revolt against the limitations of everyday morality. It is an appeal for grandeur of action, even though such action should over-ride the very laws that form the bulwarks of society. The plot as in Goethe's drama is very slight and abounds in obvious absurdities. In "Die Räuber", however, we do not have that changing back and forth of scenes so much as in "Götz von Berlichingen", nor do we have as many scenes as in the latter drama. Schiller introduces more soliloquies than Goethe and on the whole, the scenes are much longer and centered upon a particular phase of the plot. It is true that in the "Räuber" we find that some of the soliloquies are too long, for instance

some of Franz Moor's soliloquies, and in some of the robber-scenes, where Spiegelberg's tongue is frequently allowed to wag too freely.

What Rousseau preached concerning the infamies of civilization, the evil of society and politics, the reign of injustice and unreason, the necessity of a return to nature,- all this seethes in the blood of Karl Moor who takes arms against the sea of troubles. In him we meet a towering idealist who moulds his own fate. He errs disastrously in his own judgment and his work seems to have been in vain, but when the end comes it is not depressing. "We see no longer a revolting fratricide and the painful sacrifice of virtue to the meanest passions, but the verdict of the Gods upon human presumption".<sup>1</sup> The interest in the two brothers, however, does not lie in the greater or less success with which Schiller has portrayed them, but in the fact, that in these two men- the one all heart, the other a crafty, designing intellect, are personified the great forces which clashed during the French Revolution. Franz represents the tyrant, the despot of the old regime, Karl the man of feeling. It is this significance that makes "Die Räuber" not merely a German work but likewise a European work.

1. Life of Friederich Schiller-Carlyle.

Schiller makes Karl Moor a defiant self-helper and sends him against the minions of established order. To this extent he was no doubt influenced by Goethe's Götz von Berlichingen, for like him Karl Moor regards himself as the champion of freedom against the law, which is its enemy. Again both of them are friends of the oppressed but haters of pedantry. Likewise they both fight wildly against tremendous odds. They assume the leadership of a band of outlaws and thus become responsible for revolting crimes not foreseen or intended. But on the other hand Götz repudiates the name in which Karl Moor glories. It offends him to be pointed out as a leader of a band of brigands, or outlaws. He proclaims that his is an honorable feud. Götz is at heart a loyalist who recognizes the Emperor's claim to his allegiance, but as a free imperial knight feels that he is doing the right thing. In resisting his enemies, his aim is not to oppose the governmental authority for itself, but only to the abuse of authority by subordinates who disgrace their master and his. Thus he assumes the leadership of this insurgent rabble for the purpose of restraining them and expects in return to receive thanks from the Supreme Authority.

Karl Moor is of another class. He fights at the head

of his outlaw band, which in a way represents natural man rising in brute strength against the oppressions of a depraved society. Outlawry was by no means unknown. Literature had already fully familiarized us with such types as Robin Hood, the marauding bands of The Thirty Years War, the capture of lawless bands in South Germany, and the execution of their leaders. Thus Schiller's main fiction was in a way warranted by facts as the idealized bandit had already been a familiar type in literature. Karl Moor is a character such as young poets took delight in portraying. He is animated into action by feelings very similar to those under which Schiller himself was then suffering and longing for action. I could not agree, however, with Goedeke, who says that the author felt himself one with the hero. Schiller had during his school-days, longed for freedom and action, and everything seemed to him dull and oppressive. He was also familiar with similar acts of official villainy, as those against which Karl Moor draws his sword. Thus in certain phases of thought and feeling, Schiller was no doubt in sympathy with his hero, but not wholly as Goedeke would presuppose. Karl is a man, whom I believe, we can both despise and admire. He is gifted with every noble quality

of manhood but he lacks the power of management. Thus in his eagerness to attain the goal, he rushes on, entangles himself in a "labyrinthic maze" and instead of being patient and acting with skill, to find his way out, he uses force. Thus he is deceived and becomes more deeply involved. Injury and disappointment tend to exasperate him rather than instruct him. He had expected to find heroes and friends but instead he finds traitors who lead him onward to destruction. He is too fiery by nature and is incapable of calm reflection.

These two heroes are excellent examples of the Storm and Stress. They are the types which the young enthusiasts longed to depict. Franz Moor and Weislingen represent the villain in the dramas. Both are continually inventing schemes whereby they may entrap some particular persons, but which are not always well executed. Weislingen seems to me a weaker man than Franz Moor. He lacks strength of character to resist the evil tendencies of the age and thus falls to ruin. Both of them by their cruel acts, lose the respect of their servants, who finally turn against them in the midst of a tragic situation. Weislingen marks a splendid contrast to Götz, while Franz is diligently contrasted with his brother, Karl. Götz represents the

ideal knight in the drama, while Weislingen represents the degenerate knight. Karl Moor is open-hearted, attractive and chivalrous, while Franz is hypocritical, ill-favored and cruel. Franz Moor reminds us of Shakespeare's Richard and Edmund. Like the latter he covets the wealth and station of a preferred brother, and makes use of the forged letters.

In spite of his artfulness, Franz is at times a rather dull villain. He makes some terrible blunders, for example, in his attempt to win Amalia, where he depicts Karl, at great length and in awful language, as the victim of the most loathsome diseases. Another example is where he tries to hasten the death of his father, whom he already has in his power, and thereby endangers his own life. He and Karl both lack foresight. They rush madly on to things without careful consideration as to the outcome. The manner in which Franz meets death is decidedly unheroic.

The women do not play important roles in either of the plays, however, we have a splendid contrast of female characters in Goethe's "Götz von Berlichingen". Adelheid, a character of physical beauty and selfish ambition, who shrinks from no crime in attaining its ends stands in sharp contrast to Maria who represents the excess of tender,

womanly love. Beside Elizabeth, the sister of Götz, Maria seems weak and sentimental. Elizabeth represents the ideal German housewife, completely devoted to her husband and interested in his success. She stands by him in the hours of trial and in every way proves herself a worthy companion. We feel that she lacks many of the good qualities of Friederike Brion after whom Goethe no doubt has fashioned her. Schiller's Amalia is not so well portrayed as Goethe's women. She lacks initiative power, and is easily duped. Still and exalted in her enthusiasm, devoted in her love for Karl, she moves before us more as a shadow than a real person. The whole love affair between Amalia and Karl seems somewhat un-natural. We cannot conceive of faithful lovers, to whom it has never occurred to write to each other. Only once does she seem to be made of the heroic stuff of Schiller's women characters, that is where she defies Franz. Her conduct here might be considered somewhat unladylike, however, it brings out the Storm and Stress realism.

Similar defects are visible in other characters.

Moor, the father, is a weak and fond old man, greatly devoted to his sons, but again too weak to be really human. The author however chose to portray him thus in order to

make the way as easy as possible for the villainy of Franz, and not divert our attention from the main issue of the contrasted brothers.

Of all the characters, Georg is a most charming and favorite character. His relation to Götz, whom he worships, is the closest. He seems the very embodiment of that spirit of freedom which animates the whole work. He is always bright and cheerful and is ever ready for action. We see him pass from the stage of a mere boy into that of a brave soldier, one who fights desperately in the thick of battle and finally meets a heroic death upon the battlefield. To Götz he seems like a son and is shown the greatest affection.

Goethe's characters all live and breathe, and their language is fresh and vigorous. Götz is an admirable type of a just and fearless warrior. Schiller's characters as a whole are not so vividly portrayed. Some of them seem to me mere shadows, more like characters about whom we read than characters in actual life. Karl Moor is more vividly portrayed than any of the others and seems more real, regardless of his vicious deeds resulting from his fiery disposition. Of the outlaws, there are several whose portraits are very well drawn, namely Spiegelberg, Roller,

Kosinsky and Schweizer. The others less distinctly characterized represent the mass.

Goethe's characters are receptive rather than initiative, emotional rather than strong and heroic. They are types of inner life rather than of outer activity. Even the manliest of all, Götz von Berlichingen, does not so much determine circumstances as he is determined by them. He does not become a rebel because he wishes to revolutionize the present, but because he wants to uphold the past.

The inner life of Schiller's characters is less rich; their impress upon the world is stronger. They shape circumstances, battle with fate and are the leaders of great popular movements and destroyers of usurped and oppressive power. Goethe's characters stand out round and fully, while over them all he spreads a soft lustre of poetry. Schiller strives for brilliant effects. Instead of rounding out his figures he flashes a strong light on one side of them, and in this way gives them a brilliancy which often makes them appear larger than they really are. But in spite of these obvious contrasts of natural bent and artistic manner, there is not less apparent a sameness of ultimate moral aims. Götz von Berlichingen and Karl Moor, however widely they differ in range of thought and activity,

after all stand for one and the same thing, that is, a great and free personality, raised above the barriers of petty conventions and breathing in the pure air of the universally human.

"Götz von Berlichingen", and "Die Räuber" are, without a doubt, distinctly Storm and Stress dramas. Their disregard of all traditional laws of art, and the free expression of emotions and feeling are to be sure fundamentals of the Storm and Stress. It is through this disregard of all traditional laws that Goethe and Schiller are brought nearer to truth and nature. The emotional element in human nature and the individualistic are especially emphasized. The dramatis personae are made to speak their true and genuine dialect, and not an artificial literary German. The most varied classes of society are represented by Goethe, and are portrayed with the greatest realistic power. These varied types are made to talk in a manner thoroughly true and characteristic to their rank and station. Schiller divides his men into two classes; the noble spirits on the one side, the fiends on the other.

Lessing had already begun the attack on French classicism and had established the influence of Shakespeare in Germany. He had also produced his "Minna von Barnhelm",

the first truly national drama, but as we have seen in the case of his successors, Goethe and Schiller, the movement had become far more radical. Nature was exalted as the supreme law, Shakespeare was nature. The loud cries of the Storm and Stress youths were against all rules and conventions, and against all French influences. They all tried to write in imitation of Shakespeare, and likewise in these two dramas can his influence be traced in the powerful expression, character-drawing, spirit and animation, and in the approach to truth and nature. Thus we find therein that combination of the chief elements of the literary revolution known as the Storm and Stress, namely, the worship of Shakespeare, the return to nature, and hostility to the French.

We find also in these dramas distinct individual types such as the young men of the Storm and Stress admired and longed to depict in their writings. They differ in many respects from other individuals in the plays and from one another since each possesses certain peculiar traits of character which are found to be wanting in the other.

Götz von Berlichingen has the strength of character which few individuals can equal. We are attracted by his

energy, frankness and simplicity, by his bravery and generosity. He is loved by the oppressed and hated by the oppressor. He is just as active in serving his neighbor as himself, in contrast to Weislingen who is eager for his own honor and distinction. His struggle is for individual liberty for the common people against the tyranny of the privileged classes; to right out his own and other people's quarrels according to his ideas of honor and justice. The free knights he believed should have a voice in the imperial diet, and like the princes owe their allegiance only to the emperor. We feel that through the efforts of Götz might come the establishment of a new order of things and the betterment of governmental affairs and society in general. Weislingen, on the contrary, nowhere even suggests his willingness or desire to improve society, but subjects himself to the flattery of dominating princes, becomes their counsellor and hopes to find in his lucrative and honored position at court sufficient compensation for the life of independent sovereignty which he had abandoned. Thus we feel that Weislingen is satisfied with the principles of the old regime and is interested mostly in working out his own welfare.

The language and subject-matter of these dramas shows characteristic marks of the Storm and Stress, intermingled with the crudities of expression, bombast and exaggerations. We do however find remarkable eloquence of speech. This can be more truly said of Goethe's "Götz von Berlichingen" than of Schiller's "Räuber", in which we have a happy combination of power and beauty of expression. The number of biblical expressions in the two dramas is likewise remarkably large, which indicates that both Goethe and Schiller had read the Bible diligently and were well-versed therein.

Both "Götz" and the "Räuber" portray truly national heroes, who arouse the interest of the German speaking people and thus have gained great popularity upon the German stage.

As a stage drama Schiller's "Räuber" proves to be better adapted to the stage than Goethe's "Götz". It is not pieced together according to theoretic rules and calculations like Lessing's "Emilia Galotti", nor is it restless and unwieldy like "Götz von Berlichingen" or many of the other Storm and Stress plays. We find in it innumerable flaws and improbabilities. Its characters lack the variety and the fine humanity which we find in Goethe's

"Götz von Berlichingen". The language is often bombastic and without dramatic significance, but in spite of these faults, the action, the movement of the play is extraordinarily well presented. We find in it also the true tragic pathos, the instinctive grasp of those elements which go towards making a genuine tragic conflict.

Bulthaupt says that the real German tragedy arose with "Die Räuber", and that the tragic style created here has, in a remodelled form remained the dominant one in Germany. Schiller's "Räuber" as a stage production is his most epoch-making achievement as a dramatist. In spite of its crudities, its exaggerations, this work has a greater power of gripping an audience in the theatre than any other tragedy of Schiller's.

"Götz von Berlichingen" is not so well adapted for the stage, on account of the frequent shifting of scenes. Many of the events could not be presented in a very successful manner. We find that Goethe's plays do not as a rule make the best stage productions, because of a certain inner action, which we can only obtain or feel by a careful study of the work itself. In spite of its manifest defects, it was received upon the stage with great applause. Although it has never met with such suc-

cess upon the stage as Schiller's "Räuber", its appearance however marks an epoch upon the German stage. It had previously been customary, in all plays representing modern life, for the actors to wear the dress of the French court. Goethe's play put an end to this conventionality and character costumes and decorations were introduced.

The enthusiasm that "Götz" awakened far surpassed Goethe's anticipations. To a few critics of the older generation, the play seemed extravagant, but the younger men hailed it as a "glorious symptom of the uprising of a new and adventurous spirit of liberty". Nature was exalted as the supreme law. Down with all rules and convention, with all French influence was the cry of the younger generation. A school of writers was formed and all looked to Goethe as their chief. On the other hand "Götz" gave offence to all admirers of the French theater, including King Frederick, who spoke of the new national drama as a "detestable imitation of bad English plays and full of disgusting platitudes". Goethe acquired confidence in his own genius and no longer doubted that he would be able to justify the highest expectations formed as to his future work. "Götz" was the signal for a perfect Shakespeare-mania

in Germany, but it marked the end of this same mania in Goethe himself. By writing this play, he learned original and independent art. This drama likewise produced its effect upon literature, which was made manifest by the large number of imitations which soon appeared, not only in Germany, but even in France and England.

Schiller's "Rauber" likewise produced an extraordinary feeling in the literary world. Translations of the Robbers soon appeared in almost every European language, and were read with a deep interest, "compounded of admiration and aversion, according to the relative proportions of sensibility and judgment in the various minds which contemplated the subject". In Germany the drama was received with wild enthusiasm especially by the younger generation. In the neighborhood of university towns, it has continued to hold the stage more successfully perhaps than any other German drama. The heart of the nation was profoundly moved in spite of the opposition of critics and the coldness of the upper classes. A French observer noticed that, as a rule, the nobility were not present at the representations, and that it was the common people that filled the theatre with applause. The brooding spirit of dissatisfaction and revolt had found a voice.

There was in this drama an appeal to the deeper nature of man, to the grander impulses of youth. The popularity of the "Räuber", brought Schiller into correspondence with friends of literature who gave him advice and assistance and encouraged him in his work. It did after a time complete his deliverance from school tyranny and military training, and finally decided his destiny for life.

Both "Die Räuber" and "Götz von Berlichingen" are as far as possible from being faultless plays. Both tried to conceive their works in the spirit of Shakespeare, but at this early period had not sufficient mastery of intellectual resources to be able to give, as Shakespeare does, unity of design to the representation of a complicated series of incidents. The forces in some instances are not combined so as to produce that impression of a complete and harmonious process of development, but taking all things into consideration, these dramas in spite of their defects. are undoubtedly the creations of genius.

FINIS.