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INTRODUCTION

I should like, in this study, to deal with a special genre of drama, the genre of the history play. The history has not been ignored by critics over the past several decades, and so the question immediately arises: why yet another study? The answer lies in the types of studies already done. As we might suspect, Shakespeare has received the ampest treatment. Not only are his histories covered in the broad general works on Shakespeare, but they have inspired separate volumes. Most prominent among these are Lily Bess Campbell's Shakespeare's 'Histories: 'Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy, E. M. Tillyard's Shakespeare's History Plays, and, to a lesser extent, L. C. Knight's Shakespeare: the Histories, and Clifford Leech's Shakespeare: the Chronicles. This simple listing does not include, of course, the vast amount of periodical literature on separate history plays of Shakespeare. But this wealth of printed material reveals one weakness in our understanding of the history: Shakespeare alone is considered. The present writer knows of no full-length study of the history that deals with the genre in itself, rather than as an aspect of Shakespeare's writing. One other playwright besides Shakespeare has received book-length treatment of his history plays, and that is Strindberg. But Joan Bulman's Strindberg and Shakespeare and Walter Johnson's Strindberg and the Historical Drama are once again treating one facet of a great man's writing, rather than dealing with a specific dramatic form.
I have thus conceived of a study that would treat the history in itself, and not as merely one aspect of the work of a great dramatist. My immediate problem was to select few enough plays to allow for ample analysis within the dimensions of the present study, and yet to select the plays from a broad enough spectrum that they would be representative of the various phases in the development of the history. Shakespeare, as has been noted, has received a great deal of coverage elsewhere, and yet he was the father of the history play, and hence it was determined that he must be included in the study. He is here represented by the play Richard II.

But what other plays to include? The history play, as we know, was a development of the Elizabethan theatre during the 1590's. After that period, it lost its popularity in England, and went into literary exile. It was not until the late eighteenth century that the form was re-discovered by the German critic Herder. Under the influence of Herder, the young Goethe dramatized an old German chronicle of the Reformation period in his Goetz von Berlichingen, and largely due to the enormous success of Goetz, late eighteenth-century German dramatists turned once again to the pages of history when they sought a subject for dramatization. Although it was Goethe who popularized the form, Goethe was not essentially a dramatist, and it was left to his friend Friedrich Schiller to create the most perfect specimens of the form during the period of Weimar classicism. Hence, from this period in which the history was reborn, I have selected Schiller's Wallenstein for analysis.
Thirty years after the death of Schiller, lesser playwrights were still attempting to exploit the form he had perfected. But during the comfortable Biedermeier period of reaction in Germany, something new was gestating in Europe: an attitude that was not to come of age until the end of the nineteenth century, and was not to receive full recognition until the twentieth. This attitude was to be exploited in the drama by the young Georg Büchner, a man so far ahead of his time that his work was not discovered for fifty years. Hence, as representative of the modern temperament in the history play, I have selected Büchner's Dantons Tod.

When I initially selected these specific works of my three key authors, I thought I saw similarities among them which, upon further examination, I can no longer perceive. These three plays appealed to me because I imagined that their protagonists were all similar, all being men of dreams rather than men of action. Yet Wallenstein does not dream in exactly the same way as does Richard II. Nevertheless, I have stood by my original selection of plays because they are all typical of their periods and authors in one way or another. Richard II is logically, if not chronologically, the first play in Shakespeare's great cycle which terminates in the accession of the Tudors. Wallenstein is not only the product of Schiller's years of studying the Thirty Years' War period, but it is also the first of his histories to be written in the typical style of Weimar classicism. And Dantons Tod is the only history which that proto-modern, Georg Büchner, had time to write during his brief life.
The critical tools which I decided to apply to my three dramatic prototypes are those developed by Kenneth Burke in the running dialogue which he has been carrying with human behavior in general and literary behavior in particular since the appearance of his first book *Counterstatement*, in 1931. In the past, Burke has received much attention in university speech departments, but his ideas have been largely ignored by students of the drama. Yet it seems extremely fitting for several reasons that Burkean method be applied to the drama. First, Burke himself refers to his method as "dramatistic," for he sees all human behavior as "symbolic action," and, in discussing that behavior, he borrows much of his vocabulary from traditional dramatic criticism. Second, when Burke wishes to illustrate a point he is attempting to clarify, he almost invariably selects an example from dramatic literature, thus providing specific demonstrations for how his ideas may be applied to the drama. And third, almost all of Burke's essays in practical criticism are studies of dramatic literature. Thus, while it is not the purpose of this paper to deprive speech scholars of their Burke, since too many fine studies have been written for that, it is hoped that here some part of Burke can be retrieved for drama students, because his methods are eminently appropriate in the analysis of drama. This fact should become obvious after a brief discussion of Burke's ideas on critical method.
TWO CRITICAL FALLACIES

To discuss what Burkean criticism is, it might be well to start out by stating what it is not. In general, Burke attempts to steer a course between what he discerns as two extremes of modern criticism. The first tends to emphasize external criticism, and might be termed an "environmentalist" fallacy. The second carries internal criticism to an extreme, and ends up in a "nominalist" fallacy.

As an example of the environmentalist fallacy, Burke cites the "death of tragedy" school of writing, as exemplified in The Modern Temper by Joseph Wood Krutch. The "death of tragedy" school bases its notions on the fact that, in the distant past, certain things were believed, and, since poets used these beliefs to produce poetic effects, the beliefs themselves became "poetic." In the course of time, contrary things came to be believed, with the consequence that the earlier beliefs were now called "illusions." Noting that so much of the world's poetry had been built upon what were now called illusions, critics began to argue in a circle: the illusions, they said, were poetic, and in the loss of the illusions through science we face the death of poetry through science. The difficulty here, for Burke, "lay in the assumption that the illusions were inherently 'poetic'—wheras they had been made 'poetic' by the fact that poets had constructed poetry upon them."

---

But for ambitious writers, the "death of tragedy" served as an instance of science's destructive effect upon the highest poetry. Tragedy, they observed, was developed out of a sense of theological or metaphysical stability; man was dignified; he had some direct or personal relationship with the forces of the cosmos; his problems were of vast importance in the universal scheme. But the "illusions" of tragedy were slain by the scientific point of view, which leaves us too humiliated for the noble, god-like posturings of tragedy, wherein man shares that sense of the universe as being personally with him or against him. This "death of tragedy" (and thus, the death of the very essence of poetry) is manifested already as an inability to write great tragedies—and in time it will even be manifested as an inability to appreciate the great tragedies already written.

Krutch, according to Burke, combines under his concept of tragedy both the tragic drama and the tragic spirit. "Once a distinction is made between them," he says, "... the issue may look less discouraging." For, while "the death of the tragic drama we should attribute to the crumbling of an ideology," "in the matter of the tragic spirit ... there seems to be no essential abatement at all." And Burke goes on to explain that, if tragedy is a sense of man's intimate participation in processes beyond himself, we find that science has replaced the older metaphysical structure with an

\[2\text{Ibid.}, \text{p.} \ 200.\]

\[3\text{loc. cit.}\]
historical structure which gives the individual man ample grounds to feel such participation. It is to the great credit of Nietzsche that "he made this readjustment so thoroughly, turning from the 'tragic dignity' of theology to the 'tragic dignity' of history, and showing that if there was something 'poetic' in the sense of a stable metaphysical structure personally concerned with the fate of man, there can be something equally 'poetic' constructed out of the 'illusion' or belief now current, the sense of the individual's place in an historical process." Thus, according to Burke, by seeing certain types of poetry simply as products of their own time, the environmentalists have wished tragedy out of existence against their own wills.

But if Burke opposes those critics who concentrate so heavily upon external criticism that they see the drama as a mere by-product of its cultural milieu, he also opposes those who attempt to deny the passing of time and concentrate so heavily upon internal criticism that they commit a "nominalist" fallacy. "There is a rhetorical explanation," he says, "for doctrines proclaiming the eternity of art. We can say that, esthetic standards being transitory, men try to compensate for this changefulness by denying its existence." When you consider a thing just as it is, with the being of one part involved in the being of its other parts, and with all the parts derived from the being of the whole considered as a generating principle,

4 loc. cit.

there is nothing but a "present tense" involved here, or better, a "tenselessness," even though the thing thus dealt with arises in time and passes with time.

In Aristotle such a concept of substance or being was carried to its full metaphysical limits. For he abided by the logic of his terminology to the extent of concluding that the world itself was not created, but eternal. Though individual things came and went, Aristotle held that their genera (their family identities that contain the principle of their being) had existed and would exist forever.

The internal principle of motivation, the "entelechy" (or "that which contains its own aim") was the incentive of the thing to attain to the kind of perfection proper to the kind of thing it was. From such reasoning comes the rationale of the Chicago School of neo-Aristotelian critics.

At the opposite extreme from Aristotle was Spinoza. Like Aristotle, Spinoza took the notion that a being must be considered "in itself," but Spinoza went on to observe that nothing less than the totality of all that exists can meet this requirement. When dealing with such individual things as a tree, a man, a stone (which are merely parts of the universe), we should have to consider their nature as grounded in a wider context, rather than as simply individuals embodying principles of their own.

"Paradoxically," says Burke, "the Spinozistic advice to see things sub specie aeternitatis was really a splendid introduction
into philosophies that would see things in the terms of history." Spinoza, to be sure, considered the universe in terms of being; he proposed to treat the parts in terms of this eternal whole; and when considering historical sequence, he proposed to consider it in terms of logical sequence. But as soon as you begin treating things in terms of a surrounding context (and a naturalistic context at that) you have laid the way for their treatment temporally, in terms of history. At every important point in Spinoza's doctrines, he had a compensation for such a movement. His history was equated with a timeless logic; his nature was equated with God. But when you equate two terms, either can replace the other. Hence, Spinoza's equating of naturalistic history and pantheistic being could be developed into a doctrine of naturalistic history pure and simple, by merely dropping the theological side of the equation. This is what happens with the environmentalist school of critics.

In proportion as theological geneticism developed into a purely secular historicism, the notion of a thing's intrinsic substance dissolved into the out-and-out extrinsic. Aquinas had balanced intrinsic and extrinsic motivations by saying that, though God moved all beings, he moved each according to its nature. But modern science is par excellence the approach "from without."

It is against this philosophical background that Burke chooses to criticize statements by the Neo-Aristotelians R. S. Crane, Norman Maclean, and Elder Olson. First he notes the distinction Crane makes

---

6 Ibid., p. 468.
between the "Coleridgean" critic and the Neo-Aristotelean. In the
Coleridgean method, Crane says, one begins by expounding some general
philosophic or metaphysical or psychological frame. Next one treats
poetry in general as a representative aspect of this frame. And
finally one treats specific poems as individual instances of vessels
of poetry. The Coleridgean critic thus employs what we might call a
process of narrowing down. The poem, according to Crane, would thus
not be explained in itself, but as "a kind of emblem or exemplar of
principles broader in their relevances than poems or any given kind
of poems."

Maclean and Olson, on the other hand, "represent a radical
departure" from this tradition:

They are interested in lyrics not as exemplars but as
objects; they insist upon approaching them as poems of a
distinctive kind rather than as receptacles of poetry . . .
The appreciation they wish to make possible is one of which
the object is not a universal form or value reflected in the
poem but the poem itself in its wholeness and particularly
as a structure of mutually appropriate parts. 7

To attain this "theoretical grasp of the parts of lyrics and of the
principles of their unification," Crane says, we must confine ourselves
to "an inductive study of lyrics pursued apart from any a priori
assumptions about the nature of poetry in general." And after many
more such essays, on many more poems, we may begin to see "what an
inductive poetics of the lyric is likely to be."

Burke responds to Crane: "If you consider philosophic or
critical terminologies as languages, however (languages from which we

7Quoted in ibid., p. 471.
derive kinds of observation in accordance with the nature of the terms featured in the given philosophic idiom), you find reason to question his (Crane's) claims in advance." For the critic, to Burke, does not by any means begin his observations "from scratch," but has a more or less organized set of terms by which to distinguish and characterize the elements of the poem he would observe. This language, or set of terms Burke was later to call "terministic screens," and he says that, although the critic's observations derive modifications from the observing of the given poem, they will also in part be deduced from the nature of the language or terminology which the critic employs.

It is to be regretted, Burke continues, that the three Neo-Aristotelean, in stressing the importance of an analysis which considers the relations of parts to whole, fail to make any mention of the fact that in Aristotle's treatment of tragedy, there are two versions of this relationship. In chapter six, Aristotle writes:

There are six parts consequently of every tragedy, as a whole (that is) of such or such quality, viz. a Fable or Plot, Characters, Diction, Thought, Spectacle, and Melody.10

But in Chapter Twelve he writes:

The parts of tragedy to be treated as formative elements in the whole were mentioned in a previous chapter. From the point of view, however, of its quantity, i. e., the separate

---

8 loc cit.


sections into which it is divided, a tragedy has the follow­
ing parts: Prologue, Episode, Exode, and a choral portion, distinguished into Parode and Stasimon. Burke finds it notable that both these treatments of the part-whole relationship apply not only to single tragedies but to tragedies as a class. Yet, in an article on Wordsworth, Maclean says: "To explain the poem . . . in terms of its particular beginning is to explain as exactly as possible its uniqueness, and to distinguish it from other poems by Wordsworth that treat much the same theme." And likewise Elder Olson ends an article on Yeats with a similar remark: "great art . . . is always in the last analysis sui generis." There is, Burke agrees, a sense in which every work is unique, since its particular combination of details is never repeated. But, asks Burke, is the emphasis upon this fact feasible if one would develop an "Aristotelian" poetics of the lyric, treating lyrics as a class? And a mere concern with one lyric, then another lyric, then another would not yield the kind of observations needed to treat of lyrics as a class. For to treat lyrics as a class, one must examine individual lyrics from the standpoint of their generic attributes. And to do this, one must have terminological prepossessions, prior to the analysis, even before one can select a poem that he considers representative of the lyric. "Though the authors," says Burke, "would presumably get immunity from such objections by presenting their analyses as mere

\[\text{loc. cit.}\]

\[\text{Quoted in ibid., p. 478.}\]

\[\text{loc. cit.}\]
preparations for a poetics of the lyric, we would object that observa-
tions confined in their reference to the unique are not classificatory
at all."\textsuperscript{14}

Burke finds the point made still clearer by another citation
from Olson:

The scrutiny of particular poems would thus be the beginning
of the critical enterprise; but the principles eventually
reached, as disclosed by analysis, would not be rules
governing the operations involved in the construction of any
further poem, nor would the enumeration of poetic parts and
poetic devices suffer extension beyond those objects to
which analysis had been turned . . . Poetic questions
would be concerning the poetic structure of a particular work
. . . \[and\] would terminate in a discovery of the parts of a
work and of the interrelations through which the parts are
parts of a whole.\textsuperscript{15}

Now, says Burke, if the principles of a specific work were so defined
that the definition would not apply to "any further poem," would not
this also mean that the definition would not apply to any other poem?
Would not this conception of the relation between parts and whole be so
particularized as to make statements about the lyric as a genus
impossible? And would a critic, aiming at analyses that meet these
particularized requirements, go beyond the merely statistical to the
generic unless at the same time he happened to be taking some other
kind of step not expressly signalized? "Surely," concludes Burke,
"it is ironic to find Aristotle, who was so long admired and resented

\textsuperscript{14}\textit{loc. cit.}

\textsuperscript{15}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 479.
as the Prince of Deducers, now serving as Prince of Inducers." 16

As Burke had supposed, he finds many instances in Olson's essay where he profits by going beyond his principle of uniqueness. Olson launches into generalizations about the lyric generically that are not at all confined to the particular poem he is analyzing (Yeats's "Sailing to Byzantium," which Burke considers a "really superb" analysis). When Olson says, for instance, that tragedy, epic, and comedy are "dynamic," for they imitate change, whereas "the kind we have been scrutinizing is static," his concern here with stasis profits by dramatistic reference.

Burke finds Olson's discussion of the poem itself thoroughly dramatistic in its choice of vocabulary, being built about distinctions between "action" and "passion," explicitly recognizing the theme as a problem of "regeneration," and treating the whole series of transformations from stanza to stanza as "dialectic" wherein character is determined "not by its share in an action, but by its role in a drama, not of action, but of thought." Yet, surprisingly, Burke notes, this highly developed vocabulary is employed quite as though it had been forced upon the critic purely by inspection of the given poem.

What good has the Chicago School accomplished? For Burke, they have done criticism a great service by stressing the part-whole relationship of a work, a work's nature as "finished," particularly at a time when the state of the sciences has offered so many extrinsic approaches to poetry, which can be considered as the "exemplar" of

16 loc. cit.
political exigencies, neurosis, physique, diet, climate, cultural movements, or economic classifications. Nevertheless, Crane offers us a choice of the poem as "exemplar" and the poem as "object."

Burke believes there exists another alternative. For if we begin by explicitly recognizing the dramatistic nature of the vocabulary, then looking at the Burkean pentad (the terms Act, Scene, Agent, Agency, Purpose), we may ask ourselves: "What about the poem considered as an act?" Thus, when Crane says that the poem is to be considered "as a product of purposive activity on the part of its author," Burke would agree with him, "only more intensely than he would want us to."17

RHETORIC AND POETICS

Although he started out as a literary critic, Kenneth Burke has been fascinated with the idea of rhetoric since the writing of his first book, Counterstatement, in 1931. Certainly, he has since Counterstatement been interested in the ways in which rhetoric overlaps with other disciplines, and especially with poetics. Perhaps his most complete statement on the discipline of rhetoric and its overlap with poetics is to be found in his 1950 book, A Rhetoric of Motives. In this book, after discussing rhetoric for years, he finally comes to terms with the classical definition of rhetoric. He also reveals how modern behaviorists have contributed to the art, although, unlike the anthropologists he admires, he attempts a strict separation of rhetoric from "Magic" on the one hand, and from science on

17Ibid., p. 482.
the other. And, by broadening the definition of the classical concept of "persuasion," he shows how a writer's poetic output may be examined in rhetorical terms.

Burke defines the basic function of rhetoric as "the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in other human agents." This function, he says, is certainly not "magical." If you are in trouble, and call for help, you are no practitioner of primitive magic. You are, on the contrary, using the primary resource of human speech in a thoroughly realistic way.

Nor, on the other hand, is your utterance "science," in the strict meaning of science today, as a "descriptive" terminology for charting the conditions of nature from an "impersonal" point of view, regardless of one's wishes or prejudices. A call for help is quite "prejudiced"; it is the most arrant kind of "wishful thinking"; it is not merely descriptive, it is hortatory. It is not just trying to tell how things are, in strictly "scenic" terms; it is trying to move people. A call for help might, of course, include purely scientific statements, or preparations for action, as a person in need might give information about particular dangers to guard against or advantages to exploit in bringing help. But the call, in itself, as such, is not scientific; it is rhetorical.

If rhetoric is not science, neither is it a survival of primitive magic. In fact, one comes closer to the true state of affairs if one

---

treats the socializing aspect of magic as a "primitive rhetoric" than if one sees modern rhetoric simply as a survival of primitive magic.

"For rhetoric," says Burke, "... is not rooted in any past condition of human society. It is rooted in an essential function of language itself, a function that is wholly realistic, and is continually born anew; the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols." 19 Though rhetorical considerations may carry us far afield, leading us to violate the principle of autonomy separating the various disciplines, there is an intrinsically rhetorical motive, situated in the persuasive use of language. And this persuasive use of language is not derived from "bad science," or "magic." On the contrary, "magic" was a faulty derivation from it, "word magic" being an attempt to produce linguistic responses in kinds of beings not accessible to the linguistic motive. However, once we have introduced this emendation, we can see how much of value has been contributed to the New Rhetoric by scientific investigators, though their observations are made in terms that never explicitly confront the rhetorical ingredient in their field of study. We can place in terms of rhetoric all those statements by anthropologists, ethnologists, individual and social psychologists, and the like, that bear upon the persuasive aspects of language, the function of language as addressed, as direct or roundabout appeal to real or ideal audiences, without or within.

In broadening the scope of rhetoric to make it overlap with

19 Ibid., p. 43.
poetics, Burke begins by considering some of the classical definitions of the function of rhetoric. For Cicero, in his De Oratore, rhetoric, along with its synonym, "eloquence," was seen as "speech designed to persuade" (dicere ad persuadendum accommodare). Crassus, who is spokesman for Cicero himself in the work, cites it as something taken for granted, as the first thing the student of rhetoric is taught. Three hundred years before Cicero, Aristotle's Art of Rhetoric had similarly named "persuasion" as the essence and end of rhetoric, which he defined as "the faculty of discovering the persuasive means available in a given case." Likewise, in a lost treatise, Aristotle’s great competitor, Isocrates, called rhetoric "the craftsman of persuasion" (peithous demlourgos). Thus, at this level of generalization, even rivals could agree, though as DeQuincey has remarked, "persuasion" itself can be differently interpreted.

Somewhat more than a century after Cicero, Quintilian, in his Institutio Oratoria, changed the stress, choosing to define rhetoric as the "science of speaking well" (bene dicendi scientia). But his system is clearly directed towards one particular kind of persuasion: the education of the Roman gentleman. Thus, in a chapter where he cites about two dozen definitions (two-thirds of which refer to "persuasion" as the essence of rhetoric), though he finally chooses a definition of his own which omits reference to persuasion, he has kept the function of the term. For he equates the perfect orator with the good man, and says that the good man should be exceptional in both eloquence and moral attributes. Rhetoric, he says, is both
"useful" and a "virtue." Hence his notion of "speaking well" implies the moralistically hortatory, not just pragmatic skill at the service of any cause.

Add now, says Burke, the first great Christian rhetoric, the fourth book of Saint Augustine's De Doctrina Christiana (written near the beginning of the fifth century) and you have ample material, in these four great peaks stretched across 750 years, to observe the major principles derivable from the notion of rhetoric as persuasion, as inducement to action, ad Agendum, in the phrase of Augustine, who elsewhere in the same book, states that a man is persuaded if

he likes what you promise, fears what you say is imminent, hates what you censure, embraces what you commend, regrets whatever you build up as regrettable, rejoices at what you say is cause for rejoicing, sympathizes with those whose wretchedness your words bring before his very eyes, shuns those whom you admonish him to shun . . . and in whatever other ways your high eloquence can affect the minds of your hearers, bringing them not merely to know what should be done, but to do what they know should be done.²⁰

Despite this tradition, Burke maintains that often we could with more accuracy speak of persuasion to "attitude," rather than persuasion to out-and-out action. Persuasion involves choice, will; it is directed to a man only insofar as he is free. Only insofar as men are potentially free, must the spellbinder seek to persuade them. Insofar as they must do something, rhetoric is unnecessary, its work being done by the nature of things, though often these necessities are not of a natural origin, but come from necessities imposed by man-made conditions, as with the kind of peithananke (or "compulsion under the

²⁰Quoted in ibid., p. 50.
guise of persuasion") that sometimes flows from the nature of the "free market."

Insofar as a choice of action is restricted, Burke continues, rhetoric seeks rather to have a formative effect upon attitude (as a criminal condemned to death might by priestly rhetoric be brought to an attitude of repentance and resignation). Thus, in Cicero and Augustine there is a shift between the words "move" (movere) and "bend" (flectere) to name the ultimate function of rhetoric. This shift corresponds to a distinction between act and attitude (attitude being an incipient act, a leaning or inclination). Thus the notion of persuasion to attitude would permit the application of rhetorical terms to purely poetic structures; the study of lyrical devices might be classed under the head of rhetoric, when these devices are considered for their power to induce or communicate states of mind to readers, even though the kinds of assent evoked have no overt, practical outcome.

SITUATIONS AND STRATEGIES

Basic to Burke's "sociological" view of literature is his concept of the situation-strategy pair. Leroy Shaw has summed up Burke's attitude toward situations and strategies in the following manner:

Literature (and this is preeminently true of the drama) is intimately related to the business of living—not in the sense that it deals with events directly in order to influence our handling of them, but in the sense that it formulates experience symbolically, testifying to an encounter with reality and to one way of coming to terms with it. As a virtual pattern of experience, a work exists for pure contemplation—that is its nature as an aesthetic construct—
but it may also be said to speak both for the author, who has transmuted his profound concerns into this particular form, and to the reader, whose encounter with the form is the more meaningful the greater its affect upon the quality of his own attitudes and actions.  

But Burke himself begins his Philosophy of Literary Form with a distinction which sums up his position quite succinctly:

Critical and imaginative works are answers to questions posed by the situation in which they arose. They are not merely answers, they are strategic answers, stylized answers. For there is a difference in style or strategy, if one says "yes" in tonalities that imply "thank God" or in tonalities that imply "alas!" So I should propose an initial working distinction between "strategies" and "situation," whereby we think of poetry (I here use the term to include any work of critical or imaginative cast) as the adopting of various strategies for the encompassing of situations. These strategies size up the situations, name their structure and outstanding ingredients, and name them in a way that contains an attitude toward them.  

Summing up his position, Burke states that poetry, or any verbal act, is to be considered as "symbolic action," and the symbolic act represents "the dancing of an attitude." As an example of strategies at work in situations, Burke cites the proverb. Proverbs, he maintains, are strategies for dealing with situations. In so far as situations are typical and recurrent in a given social structure, people develop names for them and strategies for handling them.

People have often commented on the fact that there are contrary

---


23 Ibid., p. 9.
proverbs. Burke believes that the "situation-strategy" approach to proverbs suggests a necessary modification of that comment. The apparent contradictions depend upon differences in attitude, involving a correspondingly different choice of strategy. One might consider, for example, the apparently opposite pair: "Repentance comes to late" and "Never too late to mend." The first is admonitory. It says in effect: "You'd better look out, or you'll get yourself too far into this business." The second is consolatory, saying in effect: "Buck up, old man, you can still pull out of this."

The reason why past verbal acts, from proverbs to sophisticated poetry, still appeal to us is because situations tend to overlap. They overlap, says Burke, if only because men now have the same neural and muscular structure as men who have left their records from past ages. We and they are in much the same biological situation. Furthermore, even the concrete details of social texture have a great measure of overlap. And the nature of the human mind itself, with the function of abstraction rooted in the nature of language, also provides us with "levels of generalization" by which situations greatly different in their particularities may be felt to belong in the same class (to have a common substance or essence). As an example of "timeless" literature, Burke mentions Aesop's Fables. The situations and strategies framed in Aesop's Fables apply to human relations now just as fully as they applied in ancient Greece. They are, like philosophy, sufficiently "generalized" to extend far beyond the particular combination of events named by them in any one instance. They have an "essence." Or we
could say that they are on a "high level of abstraction." One doesn't usually think of them as "abstract," since they are usually so concrete in their stylistic expression. But they invariably aim to discern the "general behind the particular."

Defending his "strategy" concept against detractors, Burke cites several martial definitions of the word, and states that surely the most highly alembicated and sophisticated work of art, arising in complex civilizations, could be considered as designed to organize and command the army of one's thoughts and images, and to so organize them that one "imposes upon the enemy the time and place and conditions for fighting preferred by oneself." One seeks to "direct the larger movements and operations" in one's campaign of living. One "maneuvers," and the maneuvering is an "art."

THE PENTAD

In _A Grammar of Motives_, Burke develops his situation-strategy pair into a pentad. But whereas in _The Philosophy of Literary Form_ the key image was Man as Warrior, in _A Grammar of Motives_ the key image is Man as Actor. Thus, in the Grammar, Burke gives full development to a concept which had been with him at least since _Permanence and Change_ in 1935. Appropriately, the key term for Burke's theory of human motives is dramatism, since Burke here views man as an actor, acting out his purpose on a life stage. As has already been explained above, because man is a symbol-using animal, man's acts are mostly verbal.
Burke asks what is involved, when we say what people are doing and why they are doing it? The answer involves five terms, borrowed from the drama. They are Act, Scene, Agent, Agency, Purpose. In a rounded statement about motives, we must have some word that names the act (names what took place, in thought or deed), and another that names the scene (the background of the act, the situation in which it occurred); also, we must indicate what person or kind of person (agent) performed the act, what mean or instruments he used (agency), and the purpose. Men may violently disagree about the purposes behind a given act, or about the character of the person who did it, or how he did it, or in what kind of situation he acted; or they may even insist upon totally different words to name the act itself. But be that as it may, any complete statement about motives will offer some kind of answer to these five questions: what was done (act), when or where it was done (scene), who did it (agent), how he did it (agency), and why (purpose).

In displaying how the pentad functions, Burke argues that various philosophical schools feature different elements of the human situation. The materialist school, for example, features the scene as the central element in any situation. The agent, act, agency, and purpose are viewed as functions of the scene. On the other hand, the idealist school views the agent as central and subordinates the other elements to the agent. This works out all down the line: the realist features act, the pragmatist, agency, and the mystic, purpose.

Burke illustrates the different ways in which men may impute
motives with the example of a typical situation from the melodrama: the hero (agent) with the help of a friend (co-agent) outwits the villain (counter-agent) by using a file (agency) in order to escape (purpose) from the room where he has been confined (scene). In selecting a casuistry here, we might locate the motive in the agent, as were we to credit his escape to some trait integral to his personality, such as "love of freedom." Or we might stress the motivational force of the scene, since nothing is surer to awaken thoughts of escape in a man than a condition of imprisonment. Or we might note the essential part played by the co-agent, in assisting our hero to escape—and, with such thoughts as our point of departure, we might conclude that the motivations of this act should be reduced to social origins.

While the pentad may be implemented in the examination of actual human behavior, it is also applicable to the imaginary situations in the drama, as Burke reveals when he discusses the scene-act ratio. with regard to the closing moments of O'Neill's Mourning Becomes Electra. The relevant moment in the play is as follows:

**LAVINIA**
(turns to him sharply)

You go now and close the shutters and nail them tight.

**SETH**

Ayeh.

**LAVINIA**

And tell Hannah to throw out all the flowers.
SETH

Ayeh. (He goes past her up the steps and into the house. She ascends to the portico—and then turns and stands for a while, stiff and square-shouldered, staring into the sunlight with frozen eyes. SETH leans out of the window at the right of the door and pulls the shutters closed with a decisive bang. As if this were a word of command, IAVINIA pivots sharply on her heel and marches woodenly into the house, closing the door behind her.)

CURTAIN

We end here, says Burke, on the motif of the shut-in personality, quite literally objectified. And the closing, novelistic stage directions are beautifully suited to our purpose; for, once the shutters have been closed, placing before our eyes the scenic replica of Iavinia's mental state, this scene in turn becomes the motivation for her next act. For we are told that she walks like an automaton in response to the closing of the shutter, "as if this were a word of command."

Thus, when we speak of man acting out his purpose on a life stage, we are speaking primarily of symbolic action. All symbolic actions are composed of five elements: scene, agent, act, agency, and purpose. These five elements may be said to constitute a pentad, and the main bias of any particular man-in-action will be determined by what element of the pentad he chooses to emphasize.

CLUSTER ANALYSIS

Besides the pentad, another excellent tool for gauging the structure of a work is cluster analysis. For Burke, cluster analysis constitutes what images b, c, and d the poet introduces whenever he talks with engrossment of subject a. Were we to have, says Burke, a
survey of the hills and valleys of the mind, to match our government's
geological surveys, it would be done by the charting of clusters, which
have a momentous effect upon history. For instance, a certain man
may be a great popular idol. But this does not necessarily mean that
his popularity belongs in the cluster that could make him a good
candidate for president. It may be in a cluster that absolutely forbids
his election as president. The example Burke has in mind here, of
course, is Will Rogers.

An excellent example of what cluster analysis can do is
provided by Caroline Spurgeon, in her book Shakespeare's Imagery
(Burke rates Miss Spurgeon, along with Richards and Empson, as one
of the three greatest critics after T. S. Eliot.). To be sure,
Burke adds, Mr. M. D. Zabel has expressed reservations concerning
Spurgeon's book. He finds the analysis of imagery somewhat slovenly.
"We are inclined to be more charitable on this score, however," says
Burke, "because we doubt whether the analysis of imagery can ever
attain scientific precision. It serves better to point in the general
direction of something than for acute microscopic divisions."24

Before Miss Spurgeon's book was published, Burke had proposed
following the images in a given play through the use of concordats
to see what the image meant in a variety of contexts. But, he
concedes, even had he exploited his own proposal to the fullest, he
could not have gotten the astounding results that Miss Spurgeon got by
hers. Her method discloses statistically how Shakespeare frequently

24 Kenneth Burke, Attitudes toward History (Boston: Beacon
organized a play about a key or pivotal metaphor, which he repeated in variants. There is even some ground, Burke adds, to suspect that Shakespeare may have been partially conscious of such choices, but this possibility is one that Burke chooses not to press.

Burke chooses not to press the possibility because he seems to be of the opinion that, while the pentad reveals to us the conscious choices of the poet, cluster analysis reveals the unconscious ones. Though the poet be perfectly conscious of the act of writing, conscious of selecting a certain kind of imagery to reinforce a certain kind of mood, he cannot possibly be conscious of the interrelationships among all these equations. For, by the charting of clusters, we reveal, beneath an author's "official front," the level at which a lie is impossible. For example, if a man's virtuous characters are dull, and his wicked ones are done vigorously, his art has voted for the wicked ones, regardless of his "official front." If a man talks dully of glory, but brilliantly employs the imagery of desolation, his true subject is desolation.

Despite his admiration for Spurgeon, however, Burke tends to broaden her method. For Spurgeon remained strictly involved in Shakespeare's "imagery," which for Spurgeon meant metaphors and similes. In examining "what goes with what," however, Burke suggests the scrutinizing of "acts and images and personalities and situations" in finding what goes with the writer's notions of heroism, villainy, consolation, despair, etc.25 For example, in his analysis of Shakespeare's

25 Kenneth Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, p. 18.
Julius Caesar, Burke identifies the character of Antony as a kind of image, a "Caesar-Adjunct" who sees to it that the "Caesar-Principle" will triumph in the play. In his analysis of Odet's Golden Boy, Burke seems to take dramatic situations as "images." The total dramatic agon of Golden Boy, he says, is broken down into "violin" as the symbol of the protagonist, and "prizefight" as the symbol of the antagonist, with the two symbols competing in an over-all co-operative act, as teams competitively work together to make a game. The equations here are especially easy to observe, he says, as you find, by statistically charting the course of the plot, that prizefight equals competition, cult of money, leaving home, getting the girl, while violin equals cooperative social unity, disdain of money, staying home, not needing the girl.

In addition to this examination of dramatic alignment, of "what is vs. what," Burke states that there are qualitative considerations involved in cluster analysis. Thus, in Shakespeare's Imagery, Caroline Spurgeon has shown, by quantitative tests, that a certain image predominates in a given work. But, says Burke, might there not also be the qualitative importance of beginning, middle, and end? That is: should we not attach particular significance to the situations on which the work opens and closes, and the events by which the peripatry, or reversal, is contrived? Hence, along with the distinction between opposing principles we should note the development from what through what to what.

Applying this observation to Coleridge's "The Ancient Mariner,"
Burke states that he should tentatively lay emphasis upon the fact that the narrative takes place on the occasion of a marriage-feast, that the narrator throughout is deflecting the wedding-guests from attending this ceremony, and that, at the very end, the Mariner explicitly states his values:

O sweeter than the marriage-feast,  
'Tis sweeter far to me,  
To walk together to the kirk  
with a goodly company: -

I should expect, Burke continues, to see this strand, latently if not patently, maintained at any intermediary points crucial to the development, as with the killing of the Albatross and the blessing of the snakes. The Albatross, we are told, came through the fog "as if it had been a Christian soul," and the sun that avenges the murder is said to have been "like God's own head." In "The Eolian Harp" we are told that Sarah, the poet's wife, who biddeth the poet walk humbly with his God, is a "Meek Daughter in the family of Christ." Sarah and the Albatross are thus seen to be in the same equational cluster. The drug, however, is in a different cluster.

As Coleridge tells us in his letters, it is responsible for "barbarous neglect of my family." As with its affinity with pure or metaphysical evil, we have that explicitly in his letters: "I used to think St. James' text 'He who offendeth in one part of the law, offendeth in all,' very harsh; but my own sad experience has taught me its awful dreadful Truth. What crime is there scarcely which has not been included in or followed from the one guilt of taking opium?" And when he suffered from its malign effects, we are told in the same letter,
"An indefinite indescribable Terror as with a scourge of ever restless, ever coiling and uncoiling serpents, drove me on from behind (as the Mariner's ship was driven)." Its benign effects, on the other hand, are manic and integrative. When under its influence, Coleridge would pour forth vast encyclopaedic projects that encompassed the whole of experience. It had the unifying attribute of imagination, which (he tells us in Table Talk) would have as its excessive form "mania."

While it benignly lasted, the drug gave the unitary effect that Coleridge celebrates in his communion with the universe ("The Eolian Harp"), a vision followed by his surprising apologies to Sarah. Taking all these points together, Burke asks if we may not line up, as one strand in the symbolic action of the poem, the marriage problem and the murder of the Albatross as synecdochic representatives of Sarah. In another strand is the "blessing" of the snakes that represent the drug and the impulsive premarital ethic. If we do this, we conclude that, in "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner," Coleridge makes an explicit statement of preference for church, prayer, and companionship over marriage.

Having offered a tentative interpretation, Burke notes that he has brought in a certain amount of material external to the poem. This, he notes, violates the principles of the Chicago School, which, as we have seen above, he both admires and disagrees with. Granting the Chicagoans that the critic's first task is to focus in upon the structure of the work itself, he adds: "It is my contention, however,
that the proposed method of analysis is equally relevant, whether you would introduce correlations from outside the given poetic integer or confine yourself to the charting of correlations within the integer.  

What does all this add up to? We have seen that the Burkean cluster analysis reveals to us something of the unconscious workings of the poet's mind, even as the pentad reveals his conscious choices. But Burke admits that many of the things a poet's work does for him are not things that the same work does for us (i.e., there is a difference in act between the poem as being-written and the poem as being-read). Nevertheless, Burke explains, "my position is this: if we try to discover what the poem is doing for the poet, we may discover a set of generalizations as to what poems do for everybody. With these in mind, we have cues for analyzing the sort of eventfulness that the poem contains. And in analyzing this eventfulness, we shall make basic discoveries about the structure of the work itself."  

PROGRESSIVE FORM

If pentadic analysis shows us the dramatist's conscious choices, and cluster analysis reveals his unconscious ones, Burkean formal analysis describes how the work affects an audience. For, in Counter-statement, Burke defines form as "the psychology of the audience." "Or, seen from another angle," he says, "form is the creation of an appetite in the mind of the auditor, and the adequate satisfying of

26 Ibid., p. 62.
27 loc. cit.
that appetite."²⁸

Warring against the psychology of form in the work is the psychology of information. Burke notes that one of the most striking derangements of taste which science has temporarily thrown upon us involves the understanding of psychology in art. Psychology has become a body of information (which is precisely what psychology in science should be, or must be). And similarly in art, we tend to look for psychology as the purveying of information. Thus, a contemporary writer has objected to Joyce's Ulysses on the ground that there are much more psychoanalytic data available in Freud. To his objection, Burke answers that one might, similarly, denounce Cézanne's trees in favor of state forestry bulletins. Yet are not Cézanne's landscapes themselves tainted with the psychology of information? Has he not, by perception, pointed out how one object lies against another, indicated what takes place between two colors (which is the psychology of science, and is less successful in the medium of art than in that of science, since in art such processes are at best implicit, whereas in science, they are so readily made explicit)? Is Cézanne not, to that extent, a state forestry bulletin, except that he tells what goes on in the eye instead of on the tree? And do not the true values of his work lie elsewhere—and precisely in what Burke distinguishes as the psychology of form?

In information, Burke continues, the matter is intrinsically

²⁸Kenneth Burke, Counterstatement, p. 31.
interesting. This does not mean intrinsically valuable, as witness the intrinsic interest of backyard gossip or the most casual newspaper items. In art, at least the art of the great ages (Aeschylus, Shakespeare, Racine) the matter is interesting by means of an extrinsic use, a function. Burke gives the instance of Mark Antony's speech in *Julius Caesar*, the "Brutus is an honourable man." Imagine, he says, in the same place a very competently developed thesis on human conduct, with statistics, intelligence tests, definitions; imagine it as the finest thing of the sort ever written, and as really being at the roots of an understanding of Brutus. Obviously, Burke concludes, the play would simply stop until Antony had finished. For in the case of Antony's speech, the value lies in the fact that his words are shaping the future of the audience's desires, not the desires of the Roman populace, but the desires of the pit. This is the psychology of form as distinguished from the psychology of information.

Having defined form, and having made the important distinction between the psychology of form and the psychology of information, Burke goes on to say that a discussion of form will be "diagnostic rather than hortatory: it will be more concerned with how effects are produced than with what effects should be produced". He then proceeds to discuss what he calls "five aspects of form": progressive form (which is divided into syllogistic progression and qualitative

---

29 For a fuller Burkean analysis of *Julius Caesar*, see "Antony in Behalf of the Play," in *The Philosophy of Literary Form*, pp. 279-290.

30 Kenneth Burke, *Counterstatement*, p. 123.
Syllogistic progression is the form of a perfectly conducted argument, advancing step by step. It is the form of a mystery story, where everything falls together, as in a story of ratiocination by Poe. It is the form of a demonstration in Euclid. To go from A to E through stages B, C, and D is to obtain such form. We call it syllogistic because, given certain things, certain things must follow, the premises forcing the conclusion. In so far as the audience, from its acquaintance with the premises, feels the rightness of the conclusion, the work is formal. The arrows of our desires are turned in a certain direction, and the plot follows the direction of the arrows. The peripatry, or reversal of the situation, discussed by Aristotle, is obviously one of the keenest manifestations of syllogistic progression. In the course of a single scene, the poet reverses the audience's expectations— as in the third act of Julius Caesar, where Brutus' speech before the mob prepares us for his exoneration, but the speech of Antony immediately after prepares us for his downfall.

Qualitative progression, the other aspect of progressive form, is subtler. Instead of one incident in the plot preparing us for some other possible incident of plot (as MacBeth's murder of Duncan prepares us for the dying of MacBeth), the presence of one quality prepares us for the introduction of another (the grotesque seriousness of the murder scene preparing us for the grotesque buffoonery of the porter scene). . . . Such progressions are qualitative rather than syllogistic as they lack the pronounced anticipatory nature of the
syllogistic progression. We are prepared less to demand a certain qualitative progression than to recognize its rightness after the event. We are put into a state of mind which another state of mind can appropriately follow.

**Repetitive form** is the consistent maintaining of a principle under new guises. It is restatement of the same thing in different ways. Thus, in so far as each detail of Gulliver's life among the Lilliputians is a new exemplification of the discrepancy in size between Gulliver and the Lilliputians, Swift is using repetitive form. . . . Repetitive form, the restatement of a theme by new details, is basic to any work of art, or to any other kind of orientation, for that matter. It is our only method of "talking on the subject."

**Conventional form** involves to some degree the appeal of form as form. Progressive, repetitive, and minor forms, may be effective even though the reader has no awareness of their formality. But when a form appeals as form, we designate it as conventional form. Any form can become conventional, and be sought for itself—whether it be as complex as the Greek tragedy or as compact as the sonnet. We might note, in conventional form, the element of "categorical expectancy." That is, whereas the anticipations and gratifications of progressive and repetitive form arise during the process of reading, the expectations of conventional form may be anterior to the reading. If one sets out to read a sonnet, regardless of what the sonnet is to say, he makes certain formal demands to which the poem must acquiesce.

**Minor or incidental forms.** When analyzing a work of any length,
we may find it bristling with minor or incidental forms—such as metaphor, paradox, disclosure, reversal, contraction, expansion, bathos, apostrophe, series, chiasmus—which can be discussed as formal events in themselves. Their effect partially depends upon their function in the whole, yet they manifest sufficient evidences of episodic distinctness to bear consideration apart from their context. Thus a paradox, by carrying an argument one step forward, may have its use as progressive form; and by its continuation of a certain theme may have its use as repetitive form—yet it may be so formally complete in itself that the reader will memorize it as an event valid apart from its setting. A monologue by Shakespeare can be detached from its context and recited with enjoyment because, however integrally it contributes to the whole of which it is a part, it is also an independent curve of plot enclosed by its own beginning and end.

Burke points out that progressive, repetitive, and conventional and minor forms necessarily overlap. A specific event in the plot will not be exclusively classifiable under one head—as it should not, since in so organic a thing as a work of art we could not expect to find any principle functioning in isolation from the others. Should we call the aphoristic couplet of the age of Pope repetitive form or conventional form? A closing scene may be syllogistic in that its particular events mark the dramatic conclusion of the dramatic premises; qualitative in that it exemplifies some mood made desirable by the preceding matter; repetitive in that the characters once again proclaim their identity; conventional in that it has about it something categor-
ically terminal, as a farewell or death; and minor or incidental in that it contains a speech displaying a structural rise, development, and fall independently of its context.

In summary, one may say that, when speaking of form in Burkean terms, one is speaking of form as that element of a work by which an audience is affected. The psychology of form is distinguished from the psychology of information in that information has an intrinsic interest, whereas form bears an extrinsic function, the affecting of the audience. Form has four aspects, which may be referred to as progressive form (syllogistic and qualitative progression), conventional form, repetitive form, and minor form. For the most part, these aspects are not mutually exclusive, but tend to overlap in a given literary work.

CONCLUSION

In their Theory of Literature, Rene Wellek and Austin Warren say, "Genre should be conceived, we think, as a grouping of literary works based, theoretically, upon both outer form (specific meter or structure) and also upon inner form (attitude, tone, purpose—more crudely, subject and audience)."\footnote{Rene Wellek and Austin Warren, Theory of Literature (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1956), p. 231.} The Burkean approach to drama would seem to satisfy this rule, for it allows means for examining outer form (pentad, clusters, progressive form) and inner form (the "naming of strategies").

The present study does not, however, claim to be a thorough
genre study of the history play, for it takes too small a sampling for that. Nevertheless, such a study should be of some assistance in evaluating definitions of the history play already in existence. I think specifically of Brigitta Steene's four-point definition:

1. It (the history play) must have a definite politico-historical background and deal with a specified period in the past; (2) it must have epic scope both in plot and structure, which means for one thing that it needs a panoramic stage; (3) its conception of character should be horizontal rather than vertical—the protagonist should have width rather than depth, be a public figure rather than a private man; (4) it must embody the author's coherent historical purpose to give form and unity to a drama that would otherwise be mere confusion.

Definitions as thorough as this obviously have their value. But if rigidly applied, they have their limitations as well. For Miss Steene has considered the Shakespearean history alone in formulating her definition. And we think that in applying her rules to non-Shakespearean histories she was perhaps too rigid, despite the excellence of her article.

The problem with the post-Shakespearean history play is somewhat analogous to the post-classical tragedy. Did Shakespeare really write tragedies? And did Schiller and Büchner and their followers really write histories? We should answer in the affirmative in both instances, even though the Shakespearean tragedy might be somewhat non-Aristotelian, and even though the Schilleresque history might be somewhat non-Shakespearean.

I have already quoted once from Wellek and Warren, and I should

like to do so again, because their brief commentary on the genre study seems so succinct. "Another question," they say, "has to do with the continuity of genres . . . We ought, surely, to be able to produce some strict formal continuity in order to claim generic succession and unity." It is here that I hope this small study may be of some value. By observing first the Shakespearean history play, and then examining two other specimens, one from the late eighteenth century, when the Germans were enthusiastically reviving the form, and one from thirty years later, when the first signs of "modernism" were creeping into the drama, we may find that existing definitions of the history play are too limited, and, hopefully, point in the direction of a more comprehensive definition of the genre.

---

33 Wellek and Warren, p. 236.
CHAPTER I

THE REALIST'S STRATEGY: SHAKESPEARE'S RICHARD II

Shakespeare's King Richard II was entered in the Stationer's Register by Andrew Wyse on August 29, 1597. It would appear, however, to be several years older than this. Irving Ribner mentions a letter dated December 7, 1595, in which Sir Edward Hoby invites Sir Robert Cecil to a private showing of what appears to have been Shakespeare's play, although it is impossible to be entirely certain of this. Nevertheless, a date of 1595 seems to be the most reasonable for the writing of the play.¹

King Richard II was not Shakespeare's first history play. At the time of its composition, he had already completed the Wars of the Roses tetralogy, consisting of the three parts of King Henry VI and King Richard III, and King John. King John indicates that after Shakespeare had written his first tetralogy dealing with the Wars of the Roses, he had apparently decided to backtrack and deal with the causes leading up to the wars. Thus, although Richard II is not chronologically Shakespeare's first history, it is logically the opening portion of Shakespeare's story of England, with King John serving as a prologue.

THE SITUATION

The period in which Shakespeare wrote his histories was one of great turmoil and rapid transition.² The Middle Ages in England came to an end with the Reformation of Henry VIII (1529-39). Following a period of contention in the reigns of Mary Tudor and Edward IV, Elizabeth I made certain that the Church of England was to remain a national, Protestant institution, with the monarch for supreme governor. Roman Catholic Englishmen of course opposed this settlement, while from the opposite camp there came pressure upon the Church of England from the Puritans, who wanted a Presbyterian reform of Church government, a church purified of bishops and ceremonies and free from state control.

But even as the Puritans attacked the Church of England from one side and the Catholics from another, the influence of the theories of Machiavelli seemed to cut away the ground from religious theories altogether. Although publicly excoriated as a cynical atheist, Machiavelli was studied in private for his effectual truth. His realism influenced both Bacon and Ralegh, the two ablest political writers after Hooker. Though neither formulated a coherent theory of politics, they were both students of the naked element of power.

If Machiavelli secretly influenced public morality, private morality was also changing. Against the old contemplative virtues

of the Middle Ages, the new morality summoned men to fame, to public glory, to the ideal of the courtier devoted alike to statecraft and poetry, to love and war. Two of the most formative books of Shakespeare's generation were Ascham's *Schoolmaster* and North's translation of Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans* (1579). Ascham (1515-68) was a younger member of the group of Sir Thomas Elyot, at one time Elizabeth's tutor. In his work he urged that Englishmen should gain "praise unto themselves, and . . . profit to others" by joining action with learning, like Caesar; he composed his program of classical studies in *The Schoolmaster* to show how to educate "a learned preacher or a Civil Gentleman." North introduces his work in the same spirit, stating that all learning other than Plutarch is private and fitter for universities than cities, but that Plutarch had chosen the special acts of the best persons of the most famous nations in the world.

Such advocation of public virtues in the new morality fitted the needs of the crown. In 1559, Elizabeth's leading minister, William Cecil (Lord Burleigh), had noted that "the wanton bringing up and ignorance of the nobility forces the Prince to advance new men that can serve." Cecil stated the condition exactly. Finding the old aristocracy inadequate, Queen Elizabeth promoted a new kind of aristocracy, men who had begun as merchants and lawyers, had acquired estates under the Tudors, and were wedded to their interests by the spoils of the monasteries. These were the men Sir Thomas Elyot had called for in 1531, in his *Book named the Governor*, men
who were wealthy enough to serve the Crown, and men who were fit to serve by their education, their liberal training in the new type of classical scholarship which men like Erasmus and More had transplanted from Italy to Northern Europe during the previous generation.

The new aristocracy was not the only class that rose during Elizabeth's reign. The new Capitalist also appeared. Although most of Elizabeth's subjects were country-dwellers, their prosperity depended upon foreign trade, and all of the main events of the reign were connected with the rise of merchant capital. Shakespeare's interest in the sea reflects the outlook of an increasingly mercantile society. Moreover, Shakespeare's lifetime was marked by the most rapid advance in mining and manufacture that England was to know until the late eighteenth century. Altogether, the period was marked by new industries and technical knowledge, a rising standard of living for many, and a thriving atmosphere in which the newly built theatres could prosper.

The sciences also advanced during the period. Two factors that emerge from the English Renaissance are a challenge to Aristotle's authority and a desire for a more productive form of scientific learning. The desire for scientific knowledge was stimulated from one side by the sublime confidence of Renaissance scholars in the capabilities of pure intellect. Christopher Marlowe celebrated these capabilities in many speeches from his plays, and, at the time Marlowe was writing, the Copernican hypothesis was already under discussion.
in England. Besides the mathematical theories of science, there were the numerous "empirics"—medical men, navigators, land-surveyors, mining engineers, and a variety of charlatans—whose learning mingled, as in Marlowe's Faustus, with belief in astrology and alchemy, in magic and witchcraft. It was the age of Hakluyt's Principal Navigations, of Gilbert's work on magnetism, and of William Harvey's on the circulation of the blood. And finally, it was the age of Francis Bacon's great work, The Advancement of Learning, published in 1605, which stood as a survey of the whole range of Renaissance scholarship, from divinity to natural history.

In such a period of transition, a certain amount of unrest was inevitable. Burleigh and his successors upheld the guilds and corporations, intending to protect the small producers and traders. But their policy could not be stretched over the whole of an expanding economy, and where it was enforced, it tended to favor the wealthy capitalists in the privileged groups more than anyone else. Journeymen lost their hopes of becoming masters, and in the handicrafts poorer men were slipping into the status of wage earners or toppling over the brink into unemployment and vagrancy. In the country, increased rents and manorial fines, and enclosures, which might depopulate a whole village, were two of the principal grievances of the age. In 1596, there were hunger riots in Oxfordshire against the enclosing gentry, and in 1607 came a rising of "Diggers" in the most enclosed region, the Midlands.

Taken as a whole, the age of Shakespeare was an age of rapid
transition, bringing advances and increased wealth in some cases, and in others displacement and poverty. During that tumultuous period one of the few factors in English society that gave that society its stability was the English Crown. Hence it is possible to understand Shakespeare's preoccupation with the crown in his plays.

A PENTADIC VIEW OF RICHARD II

Following the tradition of the First Folio, editors divide Richard II into five acts. Each act-division of the play very neatly contains an "act" in the Burkean sense, and so Richard II may be said to be a play containing five "acts" within five act-divisions. There are, to be sure, lesser deeds committed by lesser characters, but the idea that Richard II contains five major acts will hold up.

The first act-division of the play contains the first of these acts, the one leading to all the others. Richard's cousin, Henry Bolingbroke, is locked in a fierce controversy with Mowbray, the Duke of Norfolk. Richard is called upon to settle the difference, and at first he agrees that the outcome is to be determined through trial by combat. But then he changes his mind and banishes them. Viewing the action of this act-division according to the Burkean pentad, we might see it thus:

Scene: The quarrel between Bolingbroke and Mowbray
Agent: Richard
Act: The banishment of Bolingbroke and Mowbray
Agency: Royal authority
Purpose: To get rid of Mowbray, an embarrassing friend, and Bolingbroke, a potential enemy.
Part of this arrangement is obvious, but "purpose" lies on less obvious ground. Why does Richard change his mind and banish the antagonists? Scenes one and three, the scenes depicting the antagonism and the banishment at the lists, reveal nothing. Shakespeare here observes a great deal of formality, in keeping with the chivalrous action, and none of the players in this game gives himself away.

We do know, however, that Mowbray's banishment for life was "all unlook'd for" at Richard's hands. Why? We may see the reason in Act One, Scene Two, the scene inserted between the court and tournament scenes. Here Richard's uncle and Bolingbroke's father, John of Gaunt, receives his sister-in-law, the Duchess of Gloucester, wife of the murdered Woodstock, who had been Lord Protector during Richard's minority. The Duchess urges Gaunt to avenge Woodstock's murder, but Gaunt informs her that he cannot, because Richard was the cause, and Richard is God's appointed. The only comfort that the Duchess can derive is from the fact that Bolingbroke may kill Mowbray in the trial, and the Duchess identifies Mowbray as one of Woodstock's murderers, as having been in league with Richard. Here we see the reason why Mowbray's banishment was "all unlook'd for" at Richard's hands, and here too we get an idea of Richard's motive for wanting Mowbray banished. Mowbray is an embarrassing friend. To keep Mowbray from revealing their common crime, Richard rid himself of Mowbray by banishing him for life.
Bolingbroke gets off easier. He is banished for six years only. But in the scene immediately following the banishment, we see easily why Richard should banish Bolingbroke. Discussing Bolingbroke's departure with his favorites, Richard notes that little love is lost between himself and his cousin. Richard has seen Bolingbroke as a dangerous rival, and hopes that the six-year banishment will weaken Bolingbroke's power in England.

In the Second Act of the play, Bolingbroke's father, John of Gaunt, dies, and this sets off the next major action of the play:

Scene: The death of John of Gaunt at Ely House
Agent: Richard
Act: The confiscation of Bolingbroke's inheritance
Agency: Royal authority
Purpose: To raise funds to prosecute the Irish wars, which Richard's extravagance leaves him otherwise unable to afford.

For the character of Richard, this "act" is the most important in the play, and constitutes the climax of Richard's part in the play. For one thing, it is the last act which King Richard himself commits. After this, in the remaining three act-divisions, which constitute a second part of the play, others perform the actions, most notably Bolingbroke. Besides being the last action that Richard himself commits, this action is also important for two other reasons. First, it provides the ambitious Bolingbroke with a pretext for returning to England before his banishment is over. Second, by confiscating Bolingbroke's inheritance over the protest of his uncle York, Richard sets a dangerous precedent for doing an heir out of what is rightfully his. It is now only a matter of time before Richard
must pay for this deed.

Payment falls due in the third act-division of the play.
The action is now out of Richard's hands, and he can only go along
with what others decree. Pentadically, we might break down the
action thus:

Scene: Ravenspurgh
Agent: Bolingbroke
Act: Return to England despite banishment
Agency: Force of arms
Purpose: Ostensibly, to claim an inheritance. Actually,
to see what chance affords while the King is
absent in Ireland.

It might be of value to note the change in agency here.
No longer can royal authority rely upon divine right. A new type
of authority has developed, force of arms, or naked power, and
Bolingbroke is its master. With his authority questioned Richard
can do nothing but lament the situation.

Despite the fact that agency has been transferred to
Bolingbroke, it might be interesting to note that Richard still
occupies center stage. Shakespeare achieves this feat, first,
simply by giving Richard more to say than any of the other characters,
and second, by revealing the action through messengers and the
conversations of minor characters.

But if Richard occupies center stage, he is no longer
operating effectually. We see him only as acted upon. As with
the third act-division, so with the fourth, the famous deposition
scene that was omitted from all editions of the play during
Queen Elizabeth's lifetime. Here the action may be broken down as
follows:
Scene: Westminster
Agent: Bolingbroke
Co-agents: The English nobles, and finally, the English commons, i.e., the entire nation
Agency: Force of arms
Purpose: Ostensibly, because Richard has grown "tired of kingship." Actually, naked ambition

The co-agents are important here. Northumberland in a sense symbolizes the entire nobility, but other nobles join him against the King. Before Richard is led into the hall to abdicate, there is an argument among the nobles over who was responsible for Woodstock's death. The death of Woodstock is the pretext for the argument; actually, the line of demarcation is between those who support Bolingbroke and those who support the King, and Bolingbroke has more supporters. Later, after the King has been deposed, we learn that Bolingbroke, the new King, also enjoys more popularity among the commons, for in the second scene of Act Five, the Duke of York reports to his Duchess that the commons enthusiastically welcomed King Henry into the city of London, while they heaped dirt upon Richard's head. Thus, the entire English nation is implicated in the deposition of Richard.

But in what has the English nation been implicated? Richard misused his royal authority, but what will the new agency accomplish? In Act Five we see, for here the principle act is the murder of the former King:

Scene: Pomfret
Agent: Bolingbroke
Co-agent: Sir Piers of Exton
Act: The murder of King Richard
Agency: Force of arms
Purpose: To rid the kingdom of a dangerous rival.
Ironically, as we shall see, grief has ennobled Richard, and it is thus that he dies. But the new King Henry is left with the realm, and with blood on his hands that is already stirring his conscience.

To summarize: The last act in Richard II in which Richard is the agent is the confiscation of Bolingbroke's inheritance, over the protest of his uncle, York. This constitutes an early climax to Richard's share of the play, and divides the play into two parts, for as Richard sinks into oblivion, Shakespeare gradually takes up the story of King Henry IV. However, although Richard is no longer the agent in the second half of the play, Shakespeare keeps attention focused on Richard, who indulges in an extended pathopoeia while his foes remain tight-lipped. And, although Richard only appears in Act Five to be murdered, he is granted an anagnorisis before he passes out of the play and out of English history.

CLUSTERS IN RICHARD II

Blood imagery. -- Images of "blood," "bloody," and "bleeding" occur twenty-two times in the first three scenes of the play, and appear often enough thereafter to bring us to the conclusion that "blood" is the dominant image of the play. Why does Shakespeare do this? If we examine the first scene of the play, the quarrel between Bolingbroke and Mowbray, we may see that the word "blood" is used in several different contexts.

As the argument begins, Bolingbroke accuses Mowbray of treason. Mowbray answers thus:
MOWBRAY

Let not my cold words here accuse my zeal.
'Tis not the trial of a woman's war,
The bitter clamour of two eager tongues,
Can arbitrate this cause betwixt us twain;
The blood is hot that must be cool'd for this.

Mowbray uses the term "blood" in a context that suggests aggravated temper and violence. A few lines later, Bolingbroke answers Mowbray by accusing him of the death of Thomas of Woodstock, the Duke of Gloucester and Richard's uncle:

BOLINGBROKE

Further I say, and further will maintain
Upon his bad life to make all this good,
That he did plot the Duke of Gloucester's death,
Suggest his soon-believeing adversaries,
And consequently, like a traitor coward,
Sluic'd out his innocent soul through streams of blood;
Which blood, like sacrificing Abel's, cries,
Even from the tongueless caverns of the earth,
To me for justice and rough chastisement . . .

Once again, the word blood is associated with violence, and this is one of the chief contexts in which it is used in the play.

But the context of violence is not the only one in which the term is used. Responding to Bolingbroke's accusation, Mowbray has the following lines:

MOWBRAY

0, let my sovereign turn away his face
And bid his ears a little while be deaf,
Till I have told this slander of his blood
How God and good men hate so foul a liar!

The "slander of his blood" is, of course, Bolingbroke, and here Mowbray accuses him of being unworthy of his ancestors. King Richard replies:
KING

Mowbray, impartial are our eyes and ears.
Were he my brother, nay, my kingdom's heir,
As he is but my father's brother's son,
Now by my sceptre's awe I make a vow,
Such neighbor nearness to our sacred blood
Should nothing privilege him nor partialize
The unstooping firmness of my upright soul.

Thus, in the second context, the term "blood" refers to family relationship.

Closely related to the family motif, which the term "blood" suggests, is the use of the term to imply social condition, to imply royalty. Challenging Mowbray to trial by combat, Bolingbroke offers to forget that his social condition is higher than Mowbray's—that he, Bolingbroke, has royal blood, while Mowbray is merely a noble:

BOLINGBROKE

Pale trembling coward, there I throw my gage,
Disclaiming here the kindred of the King,
And lay aside my high blood's royalty,
Which fear, not reverence, makes thee to except.

This suggestion that Bolingbroke is of "royal blood" is, of course, a hint that Shakespeare drops in our way to foreshadow the coming events of the play.

Thus, to summarize, we note that the image of "blood" is used in three contexts. First, it signifies family relationship, indicating to us that Shakespeare's history cycle will constitute a kind of family tragedy similar to that of the Greeks. "Blood" also signifies social condition, and indicates the nearness of relationship between Bolingbroke and the King, foreshadowing
Bolingbroke’s decision to seize the crown as Richard’s “heir”. And last, "Blood" signifies violence. Early in the play the violence is distributed among many of the characters, but, as we shall see, later in the play the blood of violence becomes more and more closely identified with Bolingbroke, indicating that the simple royal authority of Richard will no longer do; rather it is Bolingbroke’s force of arms, or violence, that carries the day.

**Images of the English soil.** — The images of blood are by far the most frequently used in the play. But other images occur and recur in different contexts, lending the play a rich texture and, in some cases, a note of irony. Irony occurs in the imagery of the English soil.

The "England" speech which Shakespeare furnishes for the dying John of Gaunt is justly famous: a patriot’s paean to his native land. But after Gaunt has sung his song of praise to "this England," he notes with sadness that King Richard, who should respect the land most of all, has abused it:

**GAUNT**

This land of such dear souls, this dear dear land, Dear for her reputation through the world, Is now leas’d out (I die pronouncing it) Like to a tenement or pelting farm. England, bound in with the triumphant sea, Whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege Of wat’ry Neptune, is now bound in with shame, With inky blots and rotten parchment bonds.

Callously, Richard has rented out the English lands to pay for the extravagance of his court.

With this accusation of Richard’s callousness in our minds, we
cannot help but notice the note of irony that is struck in Act Three, Scene Two. Richard has returned to England from Ireland. Bolingbroke has broken his banishment and landed at Ravenspurgh, where crowds of English nobles and commons are rushing to greet him. Richard is now deeply in trouble, and his attitude toward the soil of his land undergoes a significant change. No longer is he callous toward the English soil:

KING

I weep for joy
To stand upon my kingdom once again.
Dear earth, I do salute thee with my hand,
Though rebels wound thee with their horses' hoofs.
As a long-parted mother with her child
Plays fondly with her tears and smiles in meeting,
So weeping, smiling, greet I thee, my earth,
And do thee favors with my royal hands.

And, then, forgetting that he had betrayed the earth by renting it out, Richard supplicates the land to stand by him in the struggle with Bolingbroke to come:

KING

Feed not thy sovereign's foe, my gentle earth,
Nor with thy sweets comfort his ravenous sense;
But let thy spiders that suck up thy venom,
And heavy-gaited toads, lie in their way,
Doing annoyance to the treacherous feet
Which with usurping steps do trample thee.

Having betrayed the land by renting it out, Richard now realizes, too late, the land's true value, as he "does it favors" with his royal hand, and begs it to "do annoyance" to the feet of the rebels.

Images of inheritance. - - Also employed for its ironic value is the image of inheritance. In Act Two, Scene One, in what
we have identified as the climax of the Richard-plot, Richard, upon Gaunt's death, announces his plan to confiscate Bolingbroke's inheritance to finance his Irish wars. He listens to a long plea by his uncle, the Duke of York, warning him against doing away with the rights of inheritance. Richard's response to York's argument is crisp and curt:

KING

Think what you will, we seize into our hands
His plate, his goods, his money, and his lands.

When, however, in Act Three, Scene Two, Richard returns from the Irish wars to learn that Bolingbroke is gathering men about him at Ravenspurgh, ostensibly to claim his inheritance, Richard guesses Bolingbroke's true purpose, and sings a different song from the one he had sung at Gaunt's death:

KING

Not all the water in the rough rude sea
Can wash the balm off from an anointed king.
The breath of worldly men cannot depose
The deputy elected by the Lord.

Having done Bolingbroke out of his birthright, and thus provided Bolingbroke with an excuse to violate his banishment, Richard fears he will lose his crown, and argues according to divine right, according to rights by birth. Thus he recognizes too late that his uncle York had given him good advice.

Climate images. — Climate imagery does not occur frequently in Richard II, but when it does, it is employed very carefully to underscore the action of the play, and thus it is worth viewing here. With regard to climate, Shakespeare subscribes to the
Renaissance theory of the planes of existence, with a disturbance in nature signifying a disturbance in the body politic. He was, of course, later to use weather imagery in this way in *Julius Caesar*, when the great storm occurs on the night before Caesar's assassination. He uses the image in the same way in *Richard II*. In Act Two, Scene Four, the news of Bolingbroke's arrival at Ravenspurgh has spread through England. The Earl of Salisbury is attempting to convince a Welsh Captain to keep his forces intact to support Richard when he returns from Ireland. But the Welsh Captain refuses on account of the weather:

WELSH CAPTAIN

'Tis thought the King is dead. We will not stay.  
The bay trees in our country are all wither'd,  
And meteors fright the fixed stars of heaven;  
The pale-fac'd moon looks bloody on the earth,  
And lean-look'd prophets whisper fearful change;  
Rich men look sad, and ruffians dance and leap -  
The one in fear to lose what they enjoy,  
The other to enjoy by rage and war.  
These signs forerun the death or fall of kings.

Later, in Act Three, Scene Two, Sir Richard Scroop joins Richard on the coast of Wales to report the estate of the kingdom. In his speech, he identifies Bolingbroke with the storm that will sweep Richard away:

SCROOP

Glad am I that your Highness is so arm'd,  
To bear the tidings of calamity.  
Like an unseasonable stormy day  
Which makes the silver rivers drown their shores  
As if the world were all dissolv'd to tears,  
So high above his limits swells the rage  
Of Bolingbroke, covering your fearful land  
With hard bright steel, and hearts harder than steel.
Thus, in the image of nature running rampant, Shakespeare employed an image that would be familiar to his audience as a presage of political change.³

Sun imagery. - - Sun imagery does not occur in Richard II until Act Three, but, like the image of weather, it plays an important part in the drama of the play. In Act Three, Scene Two, when Richard returns to England and learns of Bolingbroke's landing at Ravenspurg, he buoys up his confidence by likening himself to the sun, indicating that when he rises in the east, Bolingbroke will tremble at his sin:

KING

So when this thief, this traitor Bolingbroke, Who all this while hath revell'd in the night, Whilst we were wandering with the Antipodes, Shall see us rising in our throne, the East, His treasons will sit blushing in his face, Not able to endure the sight of day, But self-affrighted, tremble at his sin.

When the meeting between Bolingbroke and the King does occur, in Act Three, Scene Three, at Flint Castle, Bolingbroke does not blush, but he does apply to Richard the same sun imagery which Richard applied to himself:

BOLINGBROKE

See, see, King Richard doth himself appear; As doth the blushing discontented sun From out the fiery portal of the East When he perceives the envious clouds are bent To dim his glory and to stain his track Of his bright passage to the Occident.

Since the last of Richard's army has deserted him, and since Bolingbroke now holds all the cards in his hand, Bolingbroke is obviously applying irony to Richard's situation, and turning the earlier metaphor inside out.

A few moments later, Richard recognizes the irony of the sun image as applied to himself. Forced through Northumberland, Bolingbroke's man, to welcome Bolingbroke back to England despite the banishment, Richard then is invited to come off the castle walls and meet with Bolingbroke in the lower courtyard. He agrees to do so, but recognizes that his likening himself to the sun was a bad image.

KING

Down, down I come, like glist'ring Phaeton, Wanting the manage of unruly jades.

Phaeton was, of course, the son of Apollo, who borrowed his father's chariot of the sun, but was too weak to manage it, and came toppling to the earth. Thus Richard comes toppling to the earth.

This image of the sun, with its identification with the king, is used one more time in the play, and that quite significantly. In Act Four, Scene One, Richard is called to Westminster Hall to abdicate in favor of Bolingbroke. Realizing that there is now no way out of his predicament, he recognizes that another has become the sun, and that he is something weaker:

KING

O that I were a mockery king of snow, Standing before the sun of Bolingbroke To melt myself away in water drops.
Thus, the image of the sun-king is here transferred from Richard to Bolingbroke, and Richard can only wish that he did not exist.

**Images of name and identity.** — Another image used to denote how badly Richard has allowed himself to be backed into a corner is the image of name, here implying identity. In Act Three, Scene Two, learning of the loss of the Welsh army, Richard attempts to buoy up his own hopes and those of his few loyal followers by reminding himself that he bears the name (has the identity) of a king:

**KING**

I had forgot myself. Am I not King? 
Awake, thou coward majesty! thou sleepest. 
Is not the King's name twenty thousand names? 
Arm, arm, my name!

But in Act Four, at the enforced abdication, Richard is compelled to see this little bravura speech of his for what it is: empty. Northumberland addresses him as "my lord," and Richard responds:

**RICHARD**

No lord of thine, thou haught insulting man, 
Nor no man's lord. I have no name, no title - 
No, not that name was given me at the font - 
But 'tis usurp'd. Alack the heavy day, 
That I have worn so many winters out 
And know not now what name to call myself!

In the game with Bolingbroke, the once-arrogant king has lost his very identity.

**Images of time.** Time images occur several times in Richard II, but most significantly in Act Two, Scene One, which we have identified as the climax, where Richard confiscates Bolingbroke's inheri-
tance, and in Act Five, Scene Five, where Richard loses his life, but not without undergoing an anagnorisis.

The first use of time in the play is a personification used by York in urging Richard not to seize Bolingbroke's inheritance:

**YORK**

O, my liege,  
Pardon me, if you please; if not, I, pleas'd  
Not to be pardoned, am content withal.  
Seek you to seize and gripe into your hands  
The royalties and rights of banish'd Hereford?  
Is not Gaunt dead? and is not Harry true?  
Did not the one deserve to have an heir?  
Is not his heir a well-deserving son?  
Take Hereford's rights away, and take from Time  
His charters and his customary rights;  
Let not tomorrow then ensue today;  
Be not thyself - for how art thou a king  
But by fair sequence and succession?

In Act Three, Scene Two, Richard seems to remember this warning. As he is about to be deposed by Bolingbroke, he states: "Time hath set a blot upon my pride." And finally, in his cell in Pomfret Castle, when he is about to be set upon by murderers, he realizes that his lowly fate was brought upon him by his own misgovernment:

**RICHARD**

Music do I hear?  
Ha, ha! keep time. How sour sweet music is  
When time is broke and no proportion kept!  
So is it in the music of men's lives.  
And here have I the daintiness of ear  
To check time broke in a disordered string;  
But, for the concord of my state and time,  
Had not an ear to hear my true time broke.  
I wasted time, and now doth time waste me;  
For now hath time made me his numb'ring clock;  
My thoughts are minutes; and with sighs they jar
Their watches on unto mine eyes, the outward watch, 
Whereto my finger, like a dial's point, 
is pointing still, in cleansing them from tears.

The egocentric King is here permitted an insight into his condi-
tion, the condition which has brought about his ruin.

The image of the lion. —Having experienced an anagnorisis,
Richard goes out fighting. Sir Piers Exton and his men, at the 
new King Henry's instigation, enter his cell to kill him. Richard 
takes several of Sir Piers' men with him. That Shakespeare intended 
this to be a kingly act on the part of the purged Richard, and 
not the reflex action of a mere weakling, we know from the imagery 
employed by the Queen when she learns of Richard's abdication:

QUEEN

What, is my Richard both in shape and mind 
Transform'd and weak'ned? Hath Bolingbroke depos'd 
Thine intellect? Hath he been in thy heart? 
The lion dying thrusteth forth his paw 
And wounds the earth, if nothing else, with rage 
To be o'erpow'rd... 

As we shall see in the next section, the function of the Queen in 
this play is to lend atmosphere, and to foretell what is about 
to happen. Thus, we may assume that Richard, purged of his folly, 
thrusts forth his own paw "like a dying lion."

More blood imagery. — Although the images of blood are 
used less frequently in the remainder of the play than in the 
first three scenes, they still constitute the dominant image, for 
they are used more frequently than any other. It is both im-
possible and unnecessary to cite all the uses here, but a generous 
sampling would appear to be in order since, consciously or un-
consciously, Shakespeare must have considered them important.

Act Three, Scene One is set at Bolingbroke's camp at Bristol, after Bolingbroke has violated his banishment and returned to England. Bolingbroke has the first speech of the scene, and in this short speech, he utilizes the term "blood" four times. The occasion is the trial by Bolingbroke of the King's favorites, Bushy and Green. Bolingbroke speaks:

BOLINGBROKE

Bring forth these men.
Bushy and Green, I will not vex your souls
(Since presently your souls must part your bodies)
With too much urging your pernicious lives,
For 'twere no charity; yet, to wash your blood
From off my hands, here in the view of men
I will unfold some causes of your deaths.

Here the term "blood" is used in a slightly different context than any of those in Act One, for here blood has come to imply guilt. Bolingbroke seems to realize that, if he is to consolidate his position, he must involve England in a blood bath, and he is quite concerned with his reputation, lest he should incur any guilt in the eyes of men.

Bolingbroke also uses the term to imply station in life. Continuing his accusation against Bushy and Green, he says:

You have misled a prince, a royal king,
A happy gentleman in blood and lineaments. . .

Several lines later we see why Bolingbroke has urged the nobility of Richard's blood, for Bolingbroke is the near relative of the King:
Myself - a prince by fortune of my birth,
Near to the King in blood, and near in love
Till you did make him misinterpret me -
Have stoop'd my neck under your injuries . . .

And once more, before closing his speech, Bolingbroke indicates the royalty of his blood by stating that, his estates confiscated, his royal blood was all he had left:

... From my own windows torn my household coat,
Ras'd out my imprese, leaving me no sign,
Save men's opinions and my living blood,
To show the world I am a gentleman.

Later, in Act Three, Scene Three, Bolingbroke's ally, the Duke of Northumberland, is to urge the royalty of Bolingbroke's blood when he guarantees Richard that Bolingbroke's intentions are honorable:

NORTHUMBERLAND

... And by the royalties of both your bloods
... His coming hither hath no further scope
Than for his lineal royalties . . .

We might note here that, although Northumberland is ostensibly referring to the Dukedom of Lancaster by "lineal royalties," Richard recognizes that "lineal royalties" means more than a mere dukedom to Bolingbroke.

Shortly before Northumberland has spoken this ambivalent line, Richard shows that he recognizes Bolingbroke's true intent by referring to the blood of violence:

KING

... He (Bolingbroke) is come to open
The purple testament of bleeding war.
But ere the crown he looks for live in peace,
Ten thousand bloody crowns of mothers' sons
Shall ill become the flower of England's face,
Change the complexion of her maid-pale peace
To scarlet indignation, and bedew
Her pastures' grass with faithful English blood.

Here Richard is issuing a threat to Bolingbroke, although he knows that he cannot keep it, because he lacks armies. Nevertheless, this speech serves as a forecast of what is to come in Henry's reign, from the bloodbath immediately after the usurpation, which occurs in Act Five of this play, to the endless rebellions which Henry must put down in the later plays that bear his name.

The prophesy which Richard unwittingly makes is made explicit in Act Four, Scene One. Here Bolingbroke determines to drag Richard into the Parliament to abdicate in Bolingbroke's favor. The Bishop of Carlisle warns that this must not be done:

CARLISLE

My Lord of Hereford here, whom you call king,
Is a foul traitor to proud Hereford's king;
And if you crown him, let me prophesy,
The blood of English shall manure the ground
And future ages groan for this foul act . . .

Thus, once again, the blood of violence is identified with Bolingbroke. The nobles, of course, reject the argument of Carlisle, and Richard is uncrowned.

But Henry cannot rest content with merely seizing Richard's crown. He must have assurances that he will keep it. When Carlisle and a band of nobles determine to put Richard back on the throne, Henry decides to rid himself of danger once for all by hinting to Sir Piers of Exton that he would like Richard killed.
Sir Piers complies, and murders Richard in his cell at Pomfret Castle. After the murder, Sir Piers experiences remorse, and in his use of the term "blood" we see Carlisle's prophesy beginning to come true:

**SIR PIERS**

As full of valour as of royal blood.  
Both have I spill'd. O, would the deed were good!  
For now the devil, that told me I did well,  
Says that this deed is chronicled in hell.

Here the word "blood" is used in two contexts at once. Since the Richard-plot has come to an end with Richard's death, the "royal blood" serves as an epitaph for Richard, indicating that in his last moments, he was truly noble and kingly. His death has proven that his blood was "royal." But insofar as Richard's death leads us full force into the Henry-plot, we emphasize the fact that Richard's blood has been "spill'd," that Henry can maintain his throne only by blood and violence, and that the deed is "chronicled in hell." Thus the image of blood, used in a number of contexts throughout the early part of the play, when the plot centered on Richard, is now used to imply violence and guilt, as the Richard-plot fades into the background and the Henry-plot comes to the forefront. The image of blood, in other words, serves to carry us over from one plot consideration to the next.

In the last scene of the play (V,6), the new King Henry is receiving his henchmen and learning of the demise of his enemies. He remains calm enough about the purge until Sir Piers enters and announces the murder of Richard. Then, finally, he recognizes that
he has gained his crown at the cost of incurring guilt, and in
his last speech, which ends the play, the blood image again figures
prominently:

KING HENRY

They love not poison that do poison need,
Nor do I thee. Though I did wish him dead,
I hate the murderer, love him murdered.
The guilt of conscience take thou for thy labour,
But neither my good word nor princely favour.
With Cain go wander through the shades of night,
And never show thy head by day or light.
Lords, I protest my soul is full of woe
That blood should sprinkle me to make me grow.
Come, mourn with me for what I do lament,
And put on sullen black incontinent.
I'll make a voyage to the Holy Land
To wash this blood off from my guilty hand.
March sadly after. Grace my mournings here
In weeping after this untimely bier.

Here, at last, the blood image has come home to rest, for blood
has "sprinkl'd" Henry to make him grow, and he has blood on his
"guilty hand." At last he has what he wanted, but his peace of
mind has been destroyed, and he feels the need to do a penance.
Power has passed from one hand to another in the realm of England,
but as Shakespeare's other histories were to reveal, no good could
come of it.

FORM IN RICHARD II

Examples of syllogistic form. - - As we have seen in the
preceding chapter, Kenneth Burke considers form to be, not merely
the structure of a work, but a functioning structure; it is the
excitation of certain expectations in an audience; and the satisfying
of those expectations. All good dramatists tend to see form in this way; Shakespeare was one of the greatest, and so we may expect to find him exciting and satisfying audience expectation.

As many historical critics have pointed out, the deposition of a king was a cardinal sin to the Elizabethans, for the stability of their society rested so heavily upon due process of succession. According to the official Tudor interpretation of English history, the deposition of King Richard II was a sin, a sin for which the English nation had to pay by several generations of bloody civil wars. By examining the last act of Richard II, which we intend to do shortly, we may see that Shakespeare generally accepted the official Tudor line. But Shakespeare was not a propagandist; rather, he was one of the most humane playwrights who ever lived. He could have made the affair of King Richard a simple case of black and white, and, if he had, the enforced abdication scene of his play might not have been cut from all published editions during Queen Elizabeth's lifetime. But, as a dramatist, Shakespeare was not interested exclusively in politics; he was also interested in the human motivations behind the political actions. Thus, in Shakespeare's play, the Richard affair becomes a complex human situation.

Hence, we find Shakespeare instinctively utilizing what Burke calls syllogistic form in King Richard II. We recall that syllogistic form, according to Burke, means that, given condition A and condition B, condition C must follow. To put it simply, Shakespeare's King Richard is by no means an innocent lamb led to the
sacrifice. In the first two acts of the play, the acts in which, as we have seen, Richard is the agent of the action, he does everything wrong. It may be a sin to depose him, but Richard practically asks for deposition.

That Bolingbroke should usurp Richard's crown follows, to use Burke's term, syllogistically from Richard's action in the first scene of Act Two of the play. This is the scene which we have identified as the climax of the Richard-plot, the scene in which Richard, over the protests of the Duke of York, confiscates the absent Bolingbroke's inheritance. Let us review the significance of this scene: (1) it is the last scene in the play in which Richard is the agent of an act; (2) by confiscating Bolingbroke's inheritance, Richard provides his cousin with an immediate pretext for violating his banishment and returning to England; and (3) most importantly, by seizing Bolingbroke's inherited goods, Richard sets a dangerous precedent whereby any man may be cheated out of the rights of due succession. Part of the irony of the play rests in the fact that Richard himself shows Bolingbroke and the nobility the way to commit treason.

But Bolingbroke, banished and deprived of his seat of power, could not act effectually without support. He receives this support from the Duke of Northumberland and a large number of other disaffected English nobles. And, as Richard has provided Bolingbroke with a motive for opposing him, so has he caused ample discontent among the nobility to cause a household revolu-
tion. Witness this scene among three of Bolingbroke's ultimate supporters, the dukes of Northumberland, Ross, and Willoughby, which occurs immediately after the confiscation scene:

NORTHUMBERLAND

Now, afore God, 'tis shame such wrongs are borne In him (Bolingbroke) a royal prince and many moe Of noble blood in this declining land. The King is not himself, but basely led By flatterers; and what they will inform, Merely in hate, 'gainst any of us all, That will the King severely prosecute 'Gainst us, our lives, our children, and our heirs.

ROSS

The commons hath he pill'd with grievous taxes And quite lost their hearts; the nobles hath he fin'd For ancient quarrels and quite lost their hearts.

WILLOUGHBY

And daily new exactions are devis'd, As blanks, benevolences, and I wot not what; But what, a God's name, doth become of this?

NORTHUMBERLAND

Wars have not wasted it, for warr'd he hath not, But basely yielded upon compromise That which his noble ancestors achiev'd with blows. More hath he spent in peace than they in wars.

Thus, out of both national concern and a sense of self-preservation, Richard's nobles are driven by Richard into the waiting arms of Bolingbroke.

Even before the nobility has had all that it can take, Richard has alienated the commoners. After Bolingbroke's banishment, but before John of Gaunt's death, there is a scene (I,4) between Richard and his favorites in which Richard reveals his
cavalier attitude toward the people he rules. Speaking of the banished Bolingbroke's courtesy to the common people, Richard says:

    Ourself and Bushy, Bagot here, and Green
    Observ'd his courtship to the common people;
    How he did seem to dive into their hearts
    With humble and familiar courtesy;
    What reverence he did throw away on slaves,
    Wooing poor craftsmen with the craft of smiles
    And patient underbearing of his fortune,
    As 'twere to banish their affects with him.
    Off goes his bonnet to an oyster-wench;
    A brace of draymen bid God speed him well
    And had the tribute of his supple knee,
    With 'Thanks, my countrymen, my loving friends';
    As were our England in reversion his,
    And he our subjects' next degree in hope.

Blinded by vanity and scorn, Richard fails to play the politician as the skillful Bolingbroke does. But not only is his attitude toward the commons scornful, he betrays a disastrous ignorance of their psychology. Several lines later in the same scene, he explains to his friends how he plans to finance his Irish wars:

    And, for our coffers, with too great a court
    And liberal largess, are grown somewhat light,
    We are enforc'd to farm our royal realm,
    The revenue whereof shall furnish us
    For our affairs in hand . . .

Farming out the realm meant, of course, renting the land for a fixed sum to landlords, who then were free to grind whatever they could out of the peasantry. Since Shakespeare was writing his play during the age of enclosures and their resultant hunger-riots, any member of Shakespeare's audience would have recognized that Richard was making a drastic strategic error if he meant to maintain his rule.

This bad strategy has its results in the play. After
Richard has been deposed and Bolingbroke crowned as Henry IV, there is a scene (V, 2) in which the Duke of York tells his Duchess of Henry's triumphal entry into London. Following Henry in the entry was Richard, who did not fare as well as his opponent:

YORK

As in a theatre the eyes of men,
After a well-grac'd actor leaves the stage,
Are idly bent on him that enters next,
Thinking his prattle to be tedious,
Even so, or with much more contempt, men's eyes
Did scowl on gentle Richard. No man cried "God save him!"
No joyful tongue gave him his welcome home,
But dust was thrown upon his sacred head;
Which with such gentle sorrow he shook off,
His face still combating with tears and smiles
(The badges of his grief and patience),
That, had not God for some strong purpose steel'd
The hearts of men, they must perforce have melted
And barbarism itself have pitied him.

The commons have paid Richard back, in kind and with a vengeance.

Examples of qualitative progression. According to Burke, syllogistic progression is that progression where one incident in the plot prepares us for some other possible incident of plot, while qualitative progression is that in which the presence of one quality prepares us for the introduction of another. The example given was the grotesque seriousness of the murder scene in MacBeth preparing us for the grotesque buffoonery of the porter scene.

Shakespeare sensed that this sort of progression was a valuable creator of appropriate moods in his audience, and used it in most of his plays. In King Richard II, two characters could be cut from the play and, as far as syllogistic progression is concerned, not be missed.

These characters are the Queen and the Gardener. But, as elements
of qualitative progression, they contribute immeasurably to the
tone of the play.

We first meet the Queen in Act Two, Scene Two, while Richard
is still at the height of his power and bound for Ireland with
high hopes. But the Queen is gloomy. Bushy and Bagot attempt to
comfort her by stating that her foreboding is an imaginary ill.
But the Queen cannot be comforted:

QUEEN

Some unborn sorrow, ripe in fortune's womb,
Is coming towards me, and my inward soul
With nothing trembles. At something it grieves
More than with parting from my lord the King.

A few moments later Green enters, and the Queen's foreboding proves
to be an accurate mood for the events that are to come. For Green
brings news that Bolingbroke has violated his banishment and has
landed in arms at Ravenspurgh. With a cry of grief, and using the
same "birth" imagery, the Queen recognizes how true her mood was:

QUEEN

So, Green, thou art the midwife to my woe,
And Bolingbroke my sorrow's dismal heir.
Now hath my soul brought forth her prodigy;
And I, a gasping, new-deliver'd mother,
Have woe to woe, sorrow to sorrow join'd.

We meet the Queen again in Act Three, Scene Four, in the
Duke of York's garden. This scene occurs after Richard's agony
on the walls of Flint Castle, when he realizes that he has lost
his power, and right before the deposition scene. The Queen's
foreboding has given way to grief, and her ladies cannot comfort her.
The melancholy of this scene is prepared for by Richard's sorrow in
the previous one and, in turn, prepares us for the pain of the abdication.

Finally, the Queen appears in Act Five, Scene One, to take her final leave of the deposed Richard. There her sorrow is mixed with indignation when she fears that Richard has been deposed in mind as well as body, and she uses the image of the dying lion cited in the previous section. That quality of defiance in a hopeless situation prepares us for Richard's death scene, where he finally emulates the kingly lion.

If the Queen seems always to foretell the mood of future scenes, the Gardener is a reminder of past ones, the past of Richard's misrule. He appears with the Queen in Act Three, Scene Four, and while the Queen watches him from the bushes, he gives instructions to his men, likening the garden to a state that must be well governed:

GARDENER

... 0, what pity is it
That he (Richard) had not so trimm'd and dress'd his land
As we this garden! We at time of year
Do wound the bark, the skin of our fruit trees,
Lest, being ever-proud in sap and blood,
With too much riches it confound itself.
Had he done so to great and growing men,
They might have liv'd to bear, and he to taste
Their fruits of duty. Superflous branches
We lop away, that bearing boughs may live.
Had he done so, himself had borne the crown,
Which waste of idle hours hath quite thrown down.

Not only does this speech remind us of Richard's entertaining favorites, but in its garden imagery it recalls to our minds Richard's odious rents, of his binding England in "with inky blots
and rotten parchment bonds." Thus, while the Queen foretells the mood of future scenes, the Gardener brings back to our minds the mood of the past ones.

Repetitive form and minor forms. -- Sophocles' Oedipus gains spiritual sight only after he has lost the use of his physical eyes. One of the dramatic ironies of *King Richard II* is that Richard gains kingly vision and valor only after he has lost his crown. This transformation in the protagonist of the play is what separates him from the other characters. As Dorothy C. Hockey has pointed out, Richard alone in the play visualizes. No one else in his "party" does so; none of the opposition do so.\(^1\) By observing this quality of vision in Richard, the other characters in the play may be seen to stand out as specimens of repetitive form. For repetitive form, according to Burke, is the consistent maintaining of a principle under new guises, a restatement of the same thing in different ways. The consistent politic activity of Bolingbroke in different situations may be seen as repetitive form, as may the consistent melancholy of the Queen.

As for minor forms, we might note that the play contains a number of aphorisms, such as King Henry's "they love not poison that do poison need," spoken when he learns that Richard has been murdered. The best-known longer minor form of the play is, of course, the dying John of Gaunt's paean to England. This speech

serves dramatically in the play to point up the crassness of Richard in renting out the land, but when properly cut, it can also be separated from the play and used as a panegyric on patriotic occasions.

**Syllogistic form in the Henry-plot.** As we have already indicated, after the Richard-plot comes to a close in Richard's abdication, Shakespeare takes up the fortunes of the new reign and initiates a Henry-plot that will continue into the two sequels to the play. Just where the Henry-plot begins is difficult to say, for the two plots overlap, one streaming from the other. Bolingbroke is in complete control of affairs by Act Three, but this act essentially belongs to Richard with his extended pathopoeia. In Act Four, the abdication again focusses attention upon Richard, but Henry has a significant scene before Richard is brought into Westminster, and so here we may say that his story begins. After a great deal of bickering among the nobles over who was responsible for Woodstock's death, Henry sets aside the quarrels for a later day, and York enters to announce that Richard is willing to renounce the throne. Henry states his intention to ascend it, and the Bishop of Carlisle, in a lengthy speech, warns Henry against usurpation, predicting decades of bloodshed if Henry should make himself king. Of course, Henry rejects this warning, but it serves to point the way for the unquiet reign of Henry as depicted in Act Five.

The central "act" of Act Five is the murder of Richard. This murder is prepared for syllogistically by the fact that
the Abbot of Westminster, the Bishop of Carlisle, and the Duke of Aumerle, together with a number of discontented nobles, plan to murder Henry at his celebration at Oxford and replace Richard upon the throne. Thus Henry is compelled to initiate his reign by murdering his rival and securing his throne through a bloodbath. The unnaturalness of Henry's reign is indicated qualitatively by Act Five, Scene Three, in which the Duke of York, learning of his son Aumerle's part in the assassination plot, pleads with King Henry to put Aumerle to death. This unnatural scene prepares us qualitatively for the "unnatural" act of murdering a king.

Not only does Shakespeare portray Henry's reign as troubulous in Act Five of King Richard II, he also prepares us for all of Henry's woes in the later plays of the tetralogy. Richard, being led to Pomfret Castle, and having been granted new vision through his griefs, predicts the falling-out between King Henry and Northumberland, preparing us syllogistically for the great northern uprising as depicted in I Henry IV. And already in Act Five of King Richard II King Henry is troubled over the profligate behavior of Prince Hal, thus preparing us for the Hal-Falstaff plot in the coming play. Thus, Act Five of King Richard II both sums up the story of Richard's life and lets us know that no good can come of Henry's reign, for he is steeped in sin.

CONCLUSION

A pentadic analysis of Richard II reveals that the "acts" of the play are almost equally divided between the two kings, Richard II
and Henry IV. In the early portion of the play, Richard is clearly
given the opportunity to be a presentable king, but he entertains
flatterers and he fails to take York's good advice. Ironically,
he deprives Bolingbroke of the rights of inheritance, and then he
himself loses the crown which is his right of inheritance. After
that, the major decisions of the play are made by Bolingbroke, or
King Henry IV, who proves himself to be a more astute politician
than Richard, but who is little better morally. For Henry deposes
a lawful king, seizes the crown, and then, through an indirect course,
has the king killed. And thus, through the "acts" of these two
imperfect kings, England is set upon a course of self-destruction.

Some critics have argued that Richard II is not a true history,
but approaches tragedy as it focuses upon the ill fate of the
hapless Richard. But if, as a pentadic analysis would seem to
indicate, Shakespeare was not truly concerned with the element of
"agent" in his plays, but in the "acts" of kings and the repercussions
of those "acts" upon England, the "tragedy theory" does not hold up.
Reading Richard II in the study, one can be overwhelmed by the sheer
bulk of Richard's lines. And, even in performance, given an actor
of heroic stature in the role of Richard, the character of Richard
can dominate the play. But if Bolingbroke is carefully cast in
production, his taciturnity serves as a perfect foil for the loquacious-
ness of Richard. For Henry, the "silent king," is everything that
Richard is not. Richard is passionate; Henry is cool. Richard easily
assumes his right to rule; Henry is calculating. Richard steps on toes;
Henry is politic. To be sure, they are two imperfect men, but both would be king. And out of their competition, their "acts" and "counter-acts", emerges the story of England's woes.

A cluster analysis of the play substantiates the theory that the play is not the drama of one man, but that of a competition between two kings. For the chief image of the play is that of "blood," and it is "blood" that both places Richard and Henry in the same royal family and sets them against one another in a deadly contest that is ultimately to divide the entire nation. And it is the English land, the "soil" of the native country, that is to suffer the most in this clash, as we learn from John of Gaunt's death-bed speech. When he is king, Richard bounds England in with "inky blots and rotten parchment bonds." But worse is to come, for, when Bolingbroke returns from exile, he bedews England's "grass with faithful English blood." The lesser imagery of the play all tends to support this main theme. The "storm" indicates a violent political upheaval. The "sun" images suggest a transfer of power. And the images of "time" indicate that the wheel is constantly turning and that every man has only a minute to work out his fate.

In terms of form, four of the five aspects of form mentioned by Kenneth Burke may be found in Richard II. The one aspect that Shakespeare did not utilize was conventional form, for no convention existed for the history play, and Shakespeare was creating as he went along. The structure that the play ultimately assumes is that of a diptych. In the first half of the play, Richard has his turn at
power. We are prepared for his downfall qualitatively by the Queen's misgivings, and syllogistically by his seizure of Bolingbroke's inheritance. Then Bolingbroke returns from exile and acquires followers. But, although he understands the uses of power better than Richard, he is no better a king, and we are prepared for his future miseries qualitatively by the Bishop of Carlisle's speech and syllogistically by the plot on his life, which leads to the blood-bath and the murder of Richard. At the end of the play, Richard is dead and Henry rules. But Henry knows no peace, for he has played foully for his power, and the land is in a state of turmoil, divided between the followers of Henry and those that oppose him.

At the beginning of this chapter, it was seen that the situation in which Shakespeare wrote his play was one in which the crown gave society a sense of stability although mind-shattering transitions were taking place in the religious, social, and economic spheres. And even the crown was not secure. Hence, Shakespeare chose to take his audience back to the bad old times when any baron with an army might choose to seize the crown or be a king-maker. But the facet of history which he chose to emphasize was "act."

For Shakespeare was a realist, in the Burkean sense and, as a realist, he presented his audience with at least one sense of comfort: that, despite the upheavals and vicissitudes of history, man's capacity to act, often for ill, but occasionally for good, would endure.
CHAPTER II

SCHILLER'S WALLENSTEIN: THE IDEALIST'S STRATEGY

Schiller's Wallensteins Lager (Wallenstein's Camp) was selected to open the winter season of 1798 in the newly renovated Weimar Court Theatre. Goethe directed the play, for Schiller was writing until the last minute. Goethe paid great attention to the speaking of the verse, and, for the grouping of the numerous figures on the stage, he consulted his Swiss artist-friend Meyer. A measure of historical accuracy was sought in the costumes and setting by consulting seventeenth-century woodcuts. The production was a huge success, and, so eager was the audience for the play's continuation, that Goethe was able to charge higher admission prices for the whole series. Die Piccolomini (The Piccolomini) was presented on 30th January, 1799, on the gala occasion of the birthday of the Duchess of Weimar. Its success assured the reception of Wallensteins Tod (The Death of Wallenstein) on April 20th of the same year. Despite its awkward length, the trilogy remained popular throughout the nineteenth century.

THE SITUATION

In the second half of the eighteenth century, there was no entity on the map that would correspond to a modern concept of "Germany." The savage Thirty Years' War, which ended with the Peace
of Westphalia in 1648, had totally undermined the central government of the Empire in Vienna, and had left Central Europe in a condition of Kleinstaaterei, or particularism. The old Empire of the Germans was left divided into three hundred or more individual states, each governed by a petty prince, who held absolute control over the local government.

The prince and his privy council in each state were responsible for foreign policy, for defense, for the administration of the prince's private estates and property, and, mainly from this source, for the financing of his expenditure, whether this financing was for the court or for what we would now call public services (for there was no distinction made between the prince's private and public expenditure). The government also attempted to control many aspects of citizens' private lives which we would now consider to be private affairs. The Reformation brought the church under the control of the government in Protestant lands, and even in Catholic states the princes attempted to exercise a similar, but less far-reaching, control over church affairs.

Princely edicts were strictly enforced. What was then called "police" covered every kind of regulation considered necessary for the health, prosperity, and moral good of the subject. The police controlled sanitary regulations, the qualifications of apothecaries and midwives, the regulation of prices, of hours and conditions of labor for apprentices, measures to prevent competition, the prohibition of begging, and many similar matters. Police also enforced sumptuary
edicts, still considered necessary to prevent the spread of luxurious habits, lest the time-honored external distinctions between the classes of society be obliterated. These edicts were designed to secure for everyone the status due to his rank. An example of such laws is the one of 1758 in Brunswick, forbidding servant-girls from using silk dress-materials, wearing gold or silver ornaments, or owning shoes made of anything but plain black leather. An edict in Posen instructed the wives of burghers not to wear capes or to wear their hair down their backs.

Such far-reaching despotism naturally rubbed the young Schiller the wrong way, for while it was occurring, Shiller was becoming familiar with the writings of Rousseau and other French Enlightenment advocates of human freedom. Schiller's early Sturm-und-Drang plays reveal how deeply the budding dramatist opposed the existing social order. In his inaugural lecture at the University of Jena, delivered in May, 1789, Schiller indicated his belief that man had grown satisfactorily through the centuries and was now ready for political freedom. Three months later, on July 14, 1789, a Parisian mob stormed the ancient prison of the Bastille and set its prisoners free.

The first news of the French Revolution was an occasion for some hope on Schiller's part. In a letter of October 30th to his prospective bride and sister-in-law, he wrote about the experiences of his friend Schulz during the riots of Paris. Schiller, at that time, hoped that "all he says is true," and greatly enjoyed the incident where the French King, forced by the crowd to clap his hands, put the
revolutionary cockade in his mouth. Schiller also retold in
lengthy terms the account of the King, who, not having been able
to have breakfast, had to content himself with a piece of black
bread, which he dunked in sour wine and ate with relish.

It did not take long, however, for Schiller's early elation
to wear off. In a letter to Körner dated December 21, 1792, he
condemned Georg Forster, a German revolutionary, who had stirred up
the population of Mainz to join the French. In the same letter,
Schiller indicated his growing discontent with the French for their
handling of the trial of Louis XVI. He wanted to go to Paris to
join the debate, and write a "Memoir" in order to teach the "hot­
heads" a lesson. He believed that his stature as a celebrated writer
would make an impression on the French, and that his siding with the
King would help the "good cause."

After the execution of Louis XVI, Schiller became thoroughly
disillusioned with the Revolution. He believed that the French people
has defeated their own purposes and were unable to create a state of
freedom for themselves. In a letter to the Duke of Augustenberg, he
wrote: "The attempt of the French people to acquire their just human
rights, and to conquer political freedom, has only brought to light the
impotence and lack of dignity, not only of this unfortunate people,
but along with them, of a sizable part of Europe, and has thrown an
entire century back into barbarism and slavery. The moment was most
favorable, but it found a corrupt generation that was not worthy of
it and ignorant of how to honor or to use it.\textsuperscript{1}

From now on, Schiller, like Plato two thousand years earlier, tried to divert his interest in practical politics to theories of a more harmonious society. And, like Plato, he started to think about ways to educate mankind to a state of maturity which would make it worthy of moral freedom. The key to this educational problem lay in the importance of character, and, to regain this ethical harmony for man, an esthetic training of the mind was required. Schiller intensified his studies of the ancient Greek tragedian, Sophocles, and of the modern philosopher, Kant. Sophoclean tragedy he admired for its high tension between the forces of Fate and the demands of human free will. From Kant, he obtained the idea of the existence of an "ideal" freedom. Starting with Wallenstein, the first play he wrote after five years of prolonged study, both Sophoclean and Kantian elements worked their way into Schiller's drama.

\textbf{A PENTADIC VIEW OF WALLENSTEIN}

In his study of the classical German stage, W. H. Bruford has noted that the problem with Wallenstein is that Schiller could not decide whether he was writing a tragedy of Fate or a tragedy of Character, and the result is an uneven play.\textsuperscript{2} But Bruford's notion rests upon the concept that Wallenstein is a kind of German MacBeth, in which the protagonist's struggle with his conscience provides the chief drama.


Yet there is no evidence in the play that Wallenstein's famous delay in committing treason is motivated by a struggle with conscience. Rather, it seems patently obvious, as he himself says, that his playing of both ends against the middle in the first two plays is motivated by a desire to realize his power, to be courted both by the Emperor and by the Swedes. He delays because by delaying he maintains his power. Making a choice, either for the Emperor or for the Swedes, would mean a reduction in his power, his capacity to exercise his will in any way he chooses.

Fate does play a part in the play. This is Schiller's inheritance from Sophocles. But in each of Wallenstein's scenes in the plays, the great general is confronted with choices in which he may exercise his will freely. As a matter of fact, he makes erroneous judgments, and that brings about his downfall. But he has chosen his own downfall, and Fate would not have had an opportunity to work unless Wallenstein were the kind of character that he is. Thus, it is correct to assume that Schiller was concerned about the antagonism between necessity and free will, but, by stressing Wallenstein's choices, by stressing the agent of the action, Schiller creates a much more organic play than Bruford credits him with. That idealistic stressing of agent is, of course, Schiller's inheritance from Kant.

Although Wallenstein appears in only one act of the first two plays in the trilogy, he commits acts which prepare the way for the multiplicity of choices which he must make in Wallensteins Tod. The first two plays constitute a kind of exposition for the latter play,
and there Wallenstein's power, and hence his freedom, is absolute. We may see this in his first act of the trilogy, the situation which begins the play in *Wallenstein's Lager*:

**Scene:** Wallenstein's camp in Pilsen, Bohemia  
**Agent:** Wallenstein  
**Act:** The gathering of all the regiments in Bohemia, Wallenstein's seat of power and an Imperial crown land  
**Agency:** Wallenstein's power  
**Purpose:** To consolidate all of Wallenstein's forces into one strategic location where he can dictate to both the Emperor and the Swedes.

By doing what he does, Wallenstein goes expressly against the wishes of the Emperor on two counts. First, he is feeding his army off the fat of imperial land, rather than quartering on Lutheran territory as the Emperor would wish. Second, he has set up his winter camp in Bohemia, rather than marching to Bavaria, and directly facing the Swedes at Regensburg as he has been ordered. Here, the agent, Wallenstein, is clearly in control of all the other factors in the pentadic situation.

The same is true of Wallenstein's second act in the play, which occurs in the second play of the series, *Die Piccolomini*. Here, Wallenstein is confronted with the imperial war minister, Questenburg, and ordered to march on Regensburg, and, at the same time to detach eight regiments from his army to escort the Cardinal Infante of Spain to Flanders. Wallenstein's response to this situation is to seek to bind the army, his source of power and freedom, still
closer to himself by securing the unconditional pledges of loyalty from the generals:

Scene: Wallenstein's camp
Agent: Wallenstein
Act: The securing of the generals' pledges
Agency: Trickery
Purpose: To blackmail the general into following Wallenstein regardless of his acts.

Once again, Wallenstein, as agent, dominates. Neither the Emperor nor the Swedes, who serve as scenic elements to his act, can force his choice, and his power remains absolute.

Having displayed his protagonist's absolute power and freedom in the first two plays, Schiller begins the final play by backing Wallenstein into a corner where he is compelled to make a choice and thus limit his freedom. This process continues throughout Wallenstein's Tod, in which the title character is forced to surrender his external freedom little by little and finally bring about his own death. The first choice occurs in Act One, in which Wallenstein receives the news that his mediator with the Swedes, Sesina, has been captured and interrogated by Vienna. Wallenstein's response is to negotiate with Colonel Wrangel, the Swede who offers him the crown of Bohemia in return for service to Sweden:

Scene: The news of Sesina's capture by the imperials
Agent: Wallenstein
Act: The promise to turn Prague and Eger over to the Swedes
Agency: Wallenstein's will
Purpose: To retain his power when the Emperor will no longer have him.

Here it would appear that the scenic element of Fate has taken over, and that this element dominates all other aspects of the pentad. But this is not so. Wallenstein is not compelled to will his own destruction: his choice is not between treason and death, but between treason and a quite comfortable retirement. The ambitious Countess Terzky, Wallenstein's sister-in-law, sees to it that the General will choose treason, however, by the picture she paints of that comfortable retirement:

"Man wird den Herzog ruhig lassen ziehn.
Ich seh, wie alles kommen wird. Der König
Von Ungarn wird erscheinen, und es wird sich
Von selbst verstehen, dass der Herzog geht,
Nicht der Erklärung wird dar erst bedürfen.
Der König wird die Truppen lassen schwören,
Und alles wird in seiner Ordnung bleiben.
An einem Morgen ist der Herzog fort.
Auf seinen Schlössern wird es nun lebendig,
Dort wird er jagen, baun, Gestüte halten,
Sich ein Hofstatt gründen, goldene Schlüssel
Austeilen, gastfrei grosse Tafel geben,
Und kurz ein grosser König sein -im Kleinen!"

They'll quietly allow the Duke to leave.
I see how everything will come about:
The King of Hungary will come, and it will be self-understood the Duke should go;
No explanations will be necessary.
The King will have the troops sworn in, and all will be right where it was, in proper order.
And one fine day the Duke will have departed.
On his estates things will wax lively then:
There he will hunt, construct, maintain his studs,
Create himself a court, award gold keys,
Show hospitality at splendid tables,
In short, be a great king - in miniature!

But Wallenstein cannot endure to be a king im Kleinen. He has tasted absolute power, and he would rather risk his life than go into retirement:

Wenn ich nicht wirke mehr, bin ich vernichtet;  
Nicht Opfer, nicht Gefahren will ich scheuen,  
Den letzten Schritt, den äussersten, zu meiden;  
Doch eh ich sinke in die Nichtigkeit,  
So klein sufhöre, der so gross begonnen,  
Eh mich die Welt mit jenen Elenden  
Verwechselt, die der Tag erschafft und stürzt,  
Eh spreche Welt und Nachwelt meinen Namen  
Mit Abscheu aus, und Friedland sei die Losung  
Für jede fluchenswerte Tat.

If I can act no more I am undone.  
I shall not shy from sacrifice or perils  
To hold back from the final, extreme step.  
But yet before I sink to nothingness  
And end so small, who once began so great,  
Before the world confuses me with those  
Low creatures which one day creates and crushes,  
Let world and future times pronounce my name  
With loathing and let Friedland be the by-word  
For every damnable vile deed.

Wallenstein can no longer equivocate as he was wont to do, but it is still the willful agent who dominates the pentad.

Again, in Act Two, Wallenstein is once more given the choice between retirement and treason. This time it is Wallenstein's young friend and colonel, the idealistic Max Piccolomini, who offers the choice:

Und wär's zu spät - und wär's auch so weit,  
Dass ein Verbrechen nur vom Fall dich rettet,  
So falle! Falle würdig, wie du standst.  
Verliere das Kommando. Geh vom Schauplatz.

\(^3\)I have used the Charles E. Passage translation throughout this chapter.
Du kannst mit Glanze, tus mit Unschuld auch.
- Du hast für andre viel gelebt, leb endlich einmal dir selber, ich begleite dich,
Mein Schicksal trenn ich nimmer von dem deinen -

And even if too late - if so far gone
That only crime will save you from a fall,
Then fall! Fall worthily, as you have stood.
Lose your command. And leave the stage. This you
Can do with glory; do it also guiltless.
- You have lived much for others; live then once
Just for yourself! I will accompany you,
I will never divide my fate from yours.

Wallenstein dismisses this second opportunity to save himself with a curt reply:

Es ist zu spät. Indem du deine Worte
Verlierst, ist schon ein Meilenzeiger nach dem andern
Zurückgelegt von meinen Eilenden,
Die mein Gebot nach Prag und Eger tragen.
- Ergib dich drein. Wir handeln, wie wir müssen.

It is too late. While you are wasting words
My messengers are putting milestone after milestone far behind them as they hasten
To carry my commands to Prague and Eger.
- Resign yourself. We act as we must act.

Set up according to the pentad, this situation would look something like this:

Scene: Max offers Wallenstein a choice between treason and retirement
Agent: Wallenstein
Act: Wallenstein chooses to go ahead with his treason
Agency: The will to regain power
Purpose: To maintain his power once he has lost imperial support.

But the only reason Wallenstein must act in this particular way is the particular personality of Wallenstein: he cannot accept losing his power, and hence his absolute freedom, even for the sake of an honorable and comfortable retirement.
In Act Three, all of Wallenstein's plans have gone awry. Except for the Terzky regiments, the army has deserted him. Prague has declared for the Emperor. And his daughter Thekla, whom he would marry to one of the princes of Europe, wants nothing more than to be Max's wife. Still he has the Terzky regiments, and no one in Eger yet knows of his falling-out with the Emperor. He determines to move his family and few loyal followers to Eger, and to turn that fortress over to the Swedes:

**Scene:** The abandonment of Wallenstein by the regiments at Pilsen  
**Agent:** Wallenstein  
**Act:** The decision to move his family and few faithful regiments to Eger, where he will turn the fortress over to the Swedes.  
**Agency:** The will to power  
**Purpose:** To regain under the Swedes what he has lost under the Emperor.

The crown of Bohemia still lures him on, even though his position is becoming hopeless.

Finally, just before he is assassinated, Wallenstein is offered one last opportunity to save himself. His astrologer, Seni, warns him that death is in the stars. The commandant of Eger, his old boyhood friend Gordon, urges him to return to the Emperor, to hold the fortress of Eger against the Swedes until imperial troops come to his relief. But for this one last time, Wallenstein chooses the wrong way, and so goes to his death:

**Scene:** The fortress at Eger, which Wallenstein is to turn over to the Swedes in the morning. Seni begs him to flee. Gordon warns him to return to the Emperor.  
**Agent:** Wallenstein
Act: The decision to seek the Bohemian crown through the Swedes, which costs him his life
Agency: Willfullness
Purpose: To try to regain his once absolute power.

Again, it is the personality of Wallenstein which brings about his destruction, for he tells Gordon:

\[\ldots\ Nimmer\ kann\]
\[\text{Der Kaiser mir vergeben. Könnt ers, ich, Ich könnte nimmer mir vergeben lassen.}\]

\[
[\ldots\ The\ Emperor\ never\ Can\ pardon\ me.\ And\ even\ if\ he\ could,\ I\ could\ not\ tolerate\ to\ be\ forgiven.\]
\]

Having spent a lifetime seeking power, Wallenstein can only go down to death seeking power.

It should be noted here that other characters in the play commit acts: Octavio turns the army against Wallenstein, while Butler plans Wallenstein's assassination. But these acts tend to become the scenes for the protagonist's acts, and while Shakespeare's Richard loses control of the action fairly early in his play, Schiller's Wallenstein does not lose the power to save himself from destruction until the actual moment of his murder arrives. That he does submit to death springs from the fact that death is more palatable to him than the surrender of his will. All of Schiller's late protagonists (Mary Stuart, Joan of Arc) are strong-willed creatures, but Wallenstein is a monster of will. And yet this excess, this very devotion to the ideal of inner freedom, gives Wallenstein a heroic quality, in the same way that the strong-willed heroes of Corneille and Dryden are heroic.
In analyzing the clusters in Shakespeare's drama we turn naturally to imagery, with which Shakespeare's dramatic dialogue is so rich. But in approaching the German classics, a problem occurs. The eighteenth-century Germans did not much like imagery in plays. We recall that Wieland, in translating Shakespeare into German, dropped most of the images from the dialogue. And Schiller utilizes very few in his drama.

Besides dropping imagery from dramatic blank verse, the Germans also tended to be more abstract. Schiller's language is more concerned with generalities of thought rather than with the emotions of an individual under stress. Here it is helpful to recall that, besides plays, Shakespeare wrote lyrical sonnets, while Schiller's extra-dramatic writings include philosophical essays and narrative ballads. Consequently, we find a Shakespearean character expressing his emotion, whereas Schiller's character tends to talk about his.

It may be seen from this brief discussion that, when we approach Schiller's play with the object of analyzing its clusters, we are not going to find much imagery, but we are going to find a wealth of abstract terms. These abstract terms appear frequently in Wallenstein, and they seem to fit into two different camps, each warring on the other and thus supporting the general theme of the play. On the one hand, we have terms like "Schicksal" ("Fate"), "Notwendigkeit" ("Necessity"), and "müssen" ("To have to do"), and on the other hand, there are terms like "Wille" (The Will"), "Freiheit" ("Freedom"),
"Macht" ("Power"), and "willen" ("To will to do something"). Since it is these terms that tend to gather into clusters in Schiller's Wallenstein, it is these terms that we must examine in context to observe what they do for the play.

The soldiers' song in Wallenstein's Lager. -- In the "Prologue" to Wallenstein's Lager, Schiller states of his protagonist: "Sein Lager nur erklärt sein Verbrechen" ("His camp alone will make his crime quite clear"). Schiller then proceeds to give us a picture of that camp, with its polyglot population and its free-and-easy ways. After discussing the Emperor's order that eight regiments be sent to the Rhineland, the troopers determine to remain in camp by Wallenstein, defying the imperial edict. The play closes with the song in which the soldiers celebrate their carefree and daring existence:

Wohl auf, Kameraden, aufs Pferd, aufs Pferd!  
Ins Feld, in die Freiheit gezogen.  
Im Felde, da ist der Mann noch was wert,  
Da wird das Herz noch gewogen.  
Da tritt kein anderer für ihn ein,  
Auf sich selber steht er da ganz allein.

[Then up with you, comrades, to horse, to horse,  
To battle, to freedom ride forth.  
Out there a man's worth is still in force,  
And the heart is weighed for its worth.  
None other out there can take his place,  
He must stand alone for himself in space.]

One can imagine how stirring this song was for that original audience in the Weimar Court Theatre, set as it was to the ringing music of Christian Jakob Zahn. Here the soldiers explain why they enjoy their "freedom": because they are willing to risk freedom and life and all on the chaotic field of battle. One is reminded of the remark by
that twentieth-century dramatist of the heroic, Henry de Montherlant, that one is only entitled to those things which one is willing to risk losing.

The soldiers' song continues:

Aus der Welt die Freiheit verschwunden ist,
Man sieht nur Herren und Knechte;
Die Falschheit herrschet, die Hinterlist
Bei dem feigen Menschengeschlechte.
Der dem Tod ins Angesicht schauen kann,
Der Soldat allein ist der freie Mann.

[Freedom has vanished out of the land,
Only masters and slaves will you find;
Deceit and treachery now command
Among craven human kind.
Looking death in the face, as only he can,
There's none but the soldier who is a free man.]

Again the heroic view of freedom is presented, but something has been added. Throughout the world, one sees only "masters and serfs."

This is the soldiers' viewpoint, but the fact is, as Schiller frequently observed, that social order rests upon hierarchies. Thus, the soldiers' "freedom" is purchased only by their assuming the right to stand outside the social order.

This motif is substantiated in a following stanza. Here the soldiers sing:

Von dem Himmel fällt ihm sein lustiges Los,
Brauchts nicht mit Müh ze erstreben,
Der Fröner, der sucht in der Erde Schoss,
Da meint er den Schatz zu erheben.
Er gräbt und Schaufelt, solang er lebt,
Und gräbt, bis er endlich sein Grab sich gräbt.

[His lot falls to him from Heaven on high,
It takes him no effort to win it;
The serf, he searches the soil to try
For the treasure he fancies is in it.]
He digs and grubs and lives like a slave,
And grubs till finally he grubs his grave.

Here the soldiers sing of the effortlessness of their lives when they are not actually in battle, and contrast their ease with the odious drudgery of the serf. But is the soldiers' life a life to be admired? One thinks of the high praise which Schiller had for the well-regulated society of hard-working craftsmen and peasants in Das Lied von der Glocke (The Song of the Bell), written in the same year as Wallenstein's Lager. And one could also think of the rigorous work-schedule which Schiller set for himself in his own life. Then, too, there is the judgment of Max Piccolomini, one of Schiller's most sympathetic characters, about life in the camp:

... es führte mich
Der Weg durch Länder, wo der Krieg nicht hin
Gekommen - o! das Leben, Vater,
Hat Reize, die wir nie gekannt. - Wir haben
Des schönen Lebens öde Küste nur
Wie ein umirrend Räubervolk befahren,
Das in sein dumpfig-anges Schiff gepresst,
Im wüsten Meer mit wüsten Sitten hauet,
Vom grossen Land nichts als die Buchten kennt,
Wo es die Diebeslandung wagen darf.
Was in den innern Tälern Köstliches
Das Land verbirgt, o! davon - davon ist
Auf unserer wilden Fahrt uns nichts erschienen.

[. . . My way took me
Through countries where the war has never been. -
0 life has lovely aspects, father,
That we have never known. - We have but edged
Around the dreary coasts of lovely life
Like vagrant predatory pirate folk
Cramped in their close and evil-smelling ships
And dwelling with rude manners on rude seas,
And of the mainland knowing but the bays
Where they dare risk a landing for a raid.
What glorious things the land contains within
Its hidden valley - Oh, of those, of those
Our barbarous voyage has disclosed no view.]
Thus, the soldier has his "freedom," but this very freedom makes the fruitful labor of the peasant seem like drudgery to him. And so the soldier insists upon his prerogative to stand outside the established social order, and, as Questenberg says in Die Piccolomini, ". . . Wo dann ein zweites Heer gleich finden,/ Um dieses zu bewachen!" ("Where to find a second army/ To keep a watch on this one!"). The "freedom" of Wallenstein's camp is something sinister, because anarchic, and it is that excessive freedom that the great general demands for himself.

Freedom and power. - - Not having its basis in established society, Wallenstein's freedom is based on naked power. And freedom based on power is a heady experience for Wallenstein, one that he appreciates savoring. In Act Two of Die Piccolomini, Count Terzky, Wallenstein's brother-in-law, who has been negotiating with the Swedes on Wallenstein's behalf, urges the general to take some positive action with regard to the Swedes. Wallenstein responds: "Es macht mir Freude, meine Macht zu kennen . . ." ("It pleases me to realize my power."). Whether he will use the power or not, nobody knows, says Wallenstein, as he enjoys the fact that he is being courted from all sides. It is the possession of power, and the freedom it offers, that please the general. He even has the power to do his master, the Emperor, harm:

. . . Der Kaiser, es ist wahr,
Hat übel mich behandelt! - Wenn ich wollte,
Ich könnt ihm recht viel Böses dafür tun.

[. . . The Emperor, it is true,
Has shamefully misused me! - If I wished,
I could return him no small bit of mischief.]
His power has made him mightier than his master, and, since his master has not always done Wallenstein's will, that fact is no small consolation to Wallenstein.

Later in the same act, Wallenstein gives voice to the reason for his resenting the Emperor. Years earlier, at the Diet of Regensburg, the Emperor relieved him of his command to satisfy the jealousies of the German princes. So he tells Questenberg, the imperial war minister, and the following dialogue takes place:

**QUESTENBERG**

Eure Gnaden Weiss,
Wie sehr auf jenem unglücksvollen Reichstag
Die Freiheit ihm gemangelt.

**WALLENSTEIN**

Tod und Teufel!
Ich _hatte_, was ihm Freiheit schaffen konnte.

**QUESTENBERG**

Your Grace
Well knows his freedom was encumbered badly
At that ill-fortuned meeting.

Wallenstein

Death and devils!
I _had_ that which would have procured his freedom.

Wallenstein had at that time the "power" of the army behind him, and if the Emperor had remained by him, power would have forced the consent of the German princes.

Still later, in Act One of *Wallenstein's Tod*, when the General learns that Sesina has been captured by the Emperor's forces, he remains unperturbed:
Das Heer ist meine Sicherheit. Das Heer
Verlässt mich nicht. Was sie auch wissen mögen,
Die Macht ist mein, sie müssen nnderschlucken,
- Und steil ich Kautlon für meine Treu,
So müssen sie sich ganz zufriedengeben.

The army is my guarantee. The army
Will not desert me. Whatever they may know,
The power is mine. They've got to swallow that.
- And if I give my pledge of loyalty,
They'll have to be quite satisfied with that.

Again Wallenstein gives utterance to his faith in the freedom that power buys. Though it knows he is lying in his teeth, the Court must accept his pledge of loyalty, because it lacks his power, and hence his freedom, and can be dictated to.

Later, after he has promised Wrangel to turn Prague and Eger over to the Swedes, Wallenstein wavers in his faith in his own freedom. He has, he recalls, received his commission from the hands of the Emperor. But Countess Terzyk, his sister-in-law urges him on in his course, reminding him that it was not the Emperor, but Necessity, that commissioned him:

Vertrauen? Neigung? - Man bedurfte deiner!
Die ungestümte Presserin, die Not,
Der nicht mit hohlen Namen, Figuranten
Gedient ist, die die Tat will, nicht das Zeichen,
Den Größten immer aufsucht und den Besten,
Ihn an das Ruder stellt, und müsste sie ihm
Aufgreifen aus dem Pöbel selbst - die setzte dich
In dieses Amt, und schrieb dir die Bestallung.

His trust? His favor? - He had need of you!
Necessity, that vehement compeller,
Whose service is not done with hollow names
And figureheads, who asks for deeds, not tokens,
Who always seeks the highest and the best
And puts him at the helm though she must snatch
Him from among the human dregs, - she gave you
This post and wrote out your commission for it.
Thus, says the Countess, Necessity gave Wallenstein his commission through the hands of the Emperor. But since he lacked power, the Emperor was not acting of his own volition. He was not free, and his choice of Wallenstein in no way compels the general to be loyal.

Continuing, the Countess urges that there be no more talk of duty between Wallenstein and the Emperor:

Gestehe denn, dass zwischen dir und ihm
Die Rede nicht kann sein von Pflicht und Recht,
Nur von der Macht und der Gelegenheit!

Confess then that between the two of you
There can be no concern with right and duty,
Only with power and opportunity!

Since Wallenstein, argues the Countess, came by his power on his own, he owes nothing to the Emperor, and is free to act in the manner of his choice. Judging by Wallenstein's own statements, and by his choices, it would seem apparent that the Countess is merely mouthing what Wallenstein has already told himself.

But if Wallenstein's power confers upon him a freedom independent of his superiors, his subordinates lack all freedom, for their power derives from him. In Act Three of Wallensteins Tod, Max Piccolomini, the general's young friend, urges him not to betray the Emperor's trust. If he does, says Max, then Max cannot follow him. But Wallenstein cannot endure the thought of giving up his own subordinates:

Pflicht, gegen wen? Wer bist du?
Wenn ich am Kaiser unrecht handle, ists
Mein Unrecht, nicht das deinige. Gehörst
Du dir? Bist du dein eigener Gebieter,
Stehst frei da in der Welt wie ich, dass du
Der Täter deiner Taten könntest sein.
Who are you? If I do the Emperor wrong, 
The sin is mine, not yours. Do you control 
Yourself? Are you the master of yourself? 
Do you stand free amid the world as I do 
So you may be the author of your actions?

Max does not "stand free in the world" as Wallenstein does, he is not 
the "author of his actions," for it is Wallenstein who possesses 
power and hence stands free. And so, while Wallenstein owes 
allegiance to no master but only to his inner self, his subordinates 
owe him absolute loyalty.

Fate and the Will. — The power that gives Wallenstein his 
freedom makes him an extremely willful creature. But Wallenstein 
likes to believe that he is more than merely willful; his will is 
attuned to Fate. The Man of Destiny in France was on the rise at 
the time of the play's composition, and men of destiny made popular 
literary protagonists. Wallenstein is such a man.

The Emperor, who represents social order in the play, 
is no tyrant; he allows his subjects a certain amount of will, so 
long as they do not exceed lawful limits. Octavio Piccolomini says as 
much when he warns his son Max that Wallenstein is near to committing 
treason. Max is afraid that Octavio will act in the Emperor's name 
against Wallenstein on mere hearsay. Octavio assures him that the 
Emperor is prepared to be reasonable:

Fern sei vom Kaiser die Tyrannenweise! 
Den Willen nicht, die Tat nur will er strafen.

[Far be the tyrant's methods from the Emperor! 
He punishes the deed, not the intention.]
Wallenstein is free to entertain his intention (Wille) as much as he wishes; it is only when he attempts to transfer his will to the external world in the form of a treacherous act that he must beware.

But Wallenstein is made of the stuff that wants to transfer inner will to external deeds. In Act Two of Die Piccolomini, Illo attempts to persuade Wallenstein into open dealings with the Swedes. Wallenstein orders Illo to wait until he gives the word. But, argues Illo, Wallenstein is waiting for the hour marked in the stars while the earthly hour has come. Act now, he warns the general, for

In deiner Brust sind deines Schicksals Sterne.

[Your stars of destiny are in your bosom.]

Destiny, in other words, serves the man of bold action; he who forces his will upon others creates destiny. But, argues Wallenstein, the stars do exert a force in the world of men, and he must wait. But, asserting his will and his faith in the power of his Fate, he asserts that he will never surrender to the Emperor's will nor will he be deposed. He prefers to maintain a stasis in the situation, for it is here that he is powerful and free, not having to make a choice. And Fate, he obviously believes, has brought him to this pass.

The very language of the dialogue indicates the supreme willfullness of Wallenstein. For instance, in Act Two of Die Piccolomini, Illo guarantees Wallenstein that he will secure the unconditional oaths of loyalty of all the generals, and what he wants to know is whether, with this assurance, Wallenstein will finally act:
Willst du dann
Ernst machen endlich, mit beherzter Tat
Das Glück versuchen?

[ ... will you then
Play seriously at last and try your luck
with hearty action?]

It may be noted that here, in expressing futurity for Wallenstein,
Ilo uses the word wollen plus the infinitive. Simple futurity for
all other characters in the play is expressed by the more common
(and less forceful) werden with the infinitive. The future for
Wallenstein is thus not merely simple futurity but an act of will.

Similarly, when speaking of "intentions," a special case is
made of Wallenstein's intentions. For all other characters in the
play an "intention" is expressed with the term "Meinung," as when
Questenberg speaks of Buttler's loyalty to Wallenstein early in the
play:

... Auch dieser Buttler
Kann seine böse Meinung nicht verbergen.

[Nor can this Buttler hide his bad intentions.]

On the other hand, Wallenstein's intentions are expressed with the
word Wille, as in the close of Act Two of Die Piccolomini, when
Wallenstein dismisses his generals:

Hier der Feldmarschall weiss um meinen Willen.

[Here the Field Marshal knows of my intentions.]

Now the first meaning of Meinung is an "opinion," with the personal
element and the possibility of error stressed in the conclusion
reached about a matter. Wille, on the other hand, implies volition,
an act of will. Thus, we may say that when Wallenstein has an
"intention," it is much stronger than the "intentions" of the other characters.

Another indication of the special nature of Wallenstein's character stems from the fact that there is more than one word for "Fate" in German. "Schicksal" denotes both the power which predetermines events and these events themselves. "Geschick" refers only to the latter. It is noteworthy, then, that when Wallenstein speaks of his own fate, he always uses the term "Schicksal", but when he speaks of Max's fate, the term he uses is "Geschick", as in the second act of Wallenstein's Tod, where he attempts to persuade Max to choose him over the Emperor:

Sanft wiegte dich bis heute dein Geschick.

[Fate gently cradled you until today.]

By his choice of terms, Wallenstein sees himself as the special child of unseen powers, whereas Max, his colonel, is a mere creature of events.

For one brief moment in the trilogy, Wallenstein's faith in his own fate is shaken. This occurs in Act One of Wallenstein's Tod, when he learns of Sesina's capture and realizes that he is no longer free to go either with or against the Emperor. Sending Illo and Terzy to bring in the Swedish colonel, Wrangel, he has a long soliloquy in which he now recognizes that a choice has been forced upon him:

Die Wege bloss mir offen hab gehalten?
Beim grossen Gott des Himmels! Es war nicht
Mein Ernst, beschlossne Sache war es nie.
In dem Gedanken bloss gefiel ich mir;
Die Freiheit reizte mich und das Vermögen.

Can it be possible? Can I no longer
Act as I wish? No more retreat, if I
So choose? Must I act out the deed because
I thought of it and did not shun temptation -
Fed my heart on this dream, saved up the means
On the uncertain chance of realization,
And only kept approaches to it open? -
By Heaven's mighty God! I never meant it
In earnest, never fixed it as decided.
I did no more than to enjoy the thought;
The freedom and the capability
Engrossed my fancy.

Here Wallenstein realizes that he is no longer "able" to do as he
"wills." He is "compelled" to commit the deed because he thought it.
And he thought it because the "freedom" to think it engrossed his
fancy. Now, however, his will is no longer free in one sense: he
must make some kind of choice.

Continuing, Wallenstein compares his recent position with the one
he is now in:

Wars unrecht, an dem Gaukelbilde mich
Der königlichen Hoffnung zu ergötzen?
Blieb in der Brust mir nicht der Wille frei,
Und sah ich nicht den guten Weg zur Seite,
Der mir die Rückkehr offen stets bewahrte?
Wohin denn seh ich plötzlich mich gefürt?
Bahnlos liegts hinter mir, und eine Mauer
Aus meinen eigenen Werken baut sich auf,
Die mir die Umkehr türmend hemmt! -

... Was it wrong to take
Delight in visions of the royal hope?
Was not my will still free within my bosom,
Did I not still behold the good path at
The side that kept return still open to me?
Where do I see myself led suddenly?
Pathless the space behind me, and a wall
Of my own building towers up ahead
To block reversal of my course.

As long as Wallenstein merely took delight in visions of royal hope, his "will" was still "free" in his bosom. But now Sesina has been captured by the imperials bearing the fateful packet of letters to the Swedes, and now Wallenstein believes a wall blocks the reversal of his course. His deed is no longer his own:

In meiner Brust war meine Tat noch mein:
Einmal entlassen aus dem sichern Winkel
Des Herzens, ihrem mutterlichen Boden,
Hinausgegeben in des Lebens Fremde,
Gehört sie jenen tuckschen Mächten an,
Die keines Menschen Kunst vertraulich macht.

Now that his deed has been perpetrated, Wallenstein is not certain that he trusts the extraterrestrial powers.

But by Act Two, Wallenstein's confidence is restored. Having promised to turn Prague and Eger over to the Swedes, he dispatches Octavio Piccolomini to take command of General Gallas's regiments and to keep them stationary. Terzyk and llo are aghast that Wallenstein has entrusted Octavio with a vital mission, but Wallenstein is certain that his decision is the right one, for, as he says

Es gibt im Menschenleben Augenblicke,
Wo er dem Weltgeist näher ist, als sonst,
Und eine Frage frei hat an das Schicksal.
Moments come in life when one
Is closer to the world-soul than is usual,
And then one has a chance to question Fate.

And then he tells his fellow-plotters that before the battle of Lützen he had requested Fate to reveal to him who his best friend was by bringing that one man forward from all the army to offer Wallenstein tokens of affection. The man was Octavio. Before the battle, Octavio had brought him a faster horse to replace his own, and, by riding that horse, Wallenstein saved his life when the battle was thickest. Now Wallenstein believes that Fate itself has bound Octavio to him.

In the next act, Wallenstein learns that Octavio has betrayed him to the Emperor. But by now, Wallenstein is so convinced that the stars favor him that he cannot believe that Fate lied to him in his test:

Die Sterne lügen nicht, das aber ist Geschehen wider Sternenlauf und Schicksal.

The stars do not deceive, but this has happened Against the courses of the stars and Fate.

Once again, Wallenstein considers himself to be the privileged child of Fate, and Octavio's treachery cannot be explained in the stars. To betray Wallenstein runs against the entire "courses of the stars and Fate" itself. But, although weakened by Octavio's betrayal, the general continues on his fatal course, for, once again, he believes that he cannot fail.

But Wallenstein's fortune is no longer a benevolent one. In Act Four of Wallenstein's Tod, set in the fortress of Eger, Buttler
confides in Gordon that he plans to take Wallenstein captive: "Ich führte sein Verhängnis." (His Fate conducted him). Several scenes later, when it seems that the Swedish army is marching on Eger, Buttler changes his plans and decides to kill Wallenstein. Gordon, filled with pity for Wallenstein, asks rhetorically why he opened the fortress to the General. Buttler responds: "Der Ort nicht, sein Verhängnis tötet ihn" ("It is his Fate, and not this place, that kills him.") We notice that, in speaking of Wallenstein's fate, Buttler no longer uses the term "Schicksal," but rather "Verhängnis." We have already seen the meaning of "Schicksal," but "Verhängnis," another word for that which is decreed on high, is always used in an unfavorable sense: it refers to an untoward fate. Thus we learn, not only from the course of the play's action, but also from the shift in terminology, that Wallenstein is doomed.

**FORM IN WALLENSTEIN**

As we have noticed, Shakespeare blended four of the five aspects of form cited by Kenneth Burke in his *Richard II*. The one aspect he neglected was conventional form, and that was because he was working during a period of great experimentation with dramatic form. In fact, he was himself developing the form of the history, which had no precedent before his time.

With Schiller, the situation is different. Before writing the plays of his final period, Schiller made a detailed study of classical tragedy, and particularly admired the structure of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Consequently, we see Schiller adapting the structure of
classical tragedy to the genre of the history. Schiller was attempting to have the best of both worlds. He sought a play that would combine the sweep of the Shakespearean history with the concise inevitability of classical tragedy.

The play that resulted from Schiller's labors thus stresses the very aspect of form that Shakespeare neglected: conventional form. And since the conventional form developed by Sophocles involves a great deal of syllogistic progression, we also find this aspect as a dominant trait of Schiller's play. To be sure, Schiller also employed qualitative progression, repetitive form, and minor forms in his plays, but whereas Shakespeare blended the aspects of form into the total entity, conventional and syllogistic progression dominate the structure in Wallenstein.

Syllogistic form in Wallenstein. -- This is one of the dominant aspects of form used in the play. Despite the length of the trilogy, and the great number of characters it contains, almost every incident is carefully interlocked with those surrounding it by causal connections. The main strand of incidents, which connects the trilogy from the opening of the Lager to the conclusion of Wallensteins Tod, might be set up as follows:

1. The Emperor's distrust of Wallenstein results from Wallenstein's gathering his entire force on imperial lands in Bohemia.

2. Wallenstein seeks the oath of loyalty from his generals after he has learned of the Emperor's plan to divide his army.

3. Octavio Piccolomini prepares to muster forces for the Emperor after Wallenstein employs a trick to bring the generals to sign an oath of unconditional loyalty to him.
4. Wallenstein negotiates with the Swedes when he learns that Sesina has been captured by imperial forces and sent to Vienna for interrogation.

5. Octavio turns the army away from Wallenstein when he learns that Wallenstein has promised Wrangel the fortresses of Prague and Eger.

6. Wallenstein determines to turn the fortress of Eger over to the Swedes when he learns that the army has deserted him.

7. Owing to the advance of the Swedes, Buttler feels compelled to kill Wallenstein rather than merely taking him captive.

Other incidents, of course, occur in the play, but they are all at one point or another subsumed into this central action of the give-and-take between Wallenstein and the established social order represented by Vienna.

**Examples of conventional form.** — Schiller's Wallenstein adheres quite closely to the three unities of the neo-classical critics. Although Schiller was familiar with neo-classical French drama, his conformity with the unities follows less from a French influence than from a Greek. Of all the extant Greek classical drama, Oedipus Tyrannus follows most closely the unities which the Renaissance neo-classicists assumed they saw in Aristotelian theory. As has been previously mentioned, this play particularly attracted Schiller for its structure: given a pregnant initial situation, the action of the drama unfolds like an opening bud. Thus, it was from Oedipus that Schiller derived his notions of dramatic structure, more or less independently of the French.

As may be seen from the section above on syllogistic progression, Wallenstein has a singular unity of action. The Max-Thekla subplot
is worked into the play, for Schiller was also, so he hoped, a good Shakespearean, but this subplot tends, as it grows, to contribute to the main one. The action of the play occurs almost entirely at Wallenstein's camp in Pilsen, with the exception of the last two acts of Wallensteins Tod, where Schiller was compelled to move his protagonist to the fortress of Eger. And if the play does not take place in the neo-classically prescribed twenty-four hours, it does occur in a very short period of time. By the time that we meet Wallenstein, his chief military exploits are in the past; they are a part of his reputation, and we only observe the crucial four days in which the great general gradually declines and goes to his death.

Classical decorum also appears in Wallenstein, for this was a concept dear to the hearts of all Weimar classicists. We recall that when Schiller translated MacBeth he replaced the drunken porter scene with a stately dawn-song recited by a quite sober speaker. When we observe Goethe's "Rules for the Actors" (Actors must not spit on the stage or blow their noses during a performance), we recognize some of the pre-Weimar crudity of the German stage, and the preoccupation with decorum becomes understandable. At any rate, when Schiller portrays the hurly-burly of the camp in the first play of the trilogy, we may notice that he utilizes the Knüttelvers, the rimmed doggerel, of the German folk stage to depict lowly troopers and camp-followers. However, in the latter plays, when he portrays Wallenstein and his generals, a stately blank verse is employed. Although much violence occurs in the action, it all happens offstage,
and is merely reported by the characters. When Wallenstein is murdered, this too occurs offstage, and then the body is brought out wrapped in a scarlet rug. Charles E. Passage, one of Schiller's most recent translators, believes that this approach makes the tension of the play lag when it should be at its highest pitch. Perhaps Passage would prefer for Wallenstein to go down fighting onstage like a Shakespearean hero, but here as elsewhere Schiller is true to the classical preconceptions which he and Goethe worked out together.

In a later play, Die Braut von Messina (The Bride of Messina), Schiller was to employ a full-fledged Chorus, which he borrowed outright from Sophoclean drama. But in all of his later plays he was interested in the possibilities of reviving the classical chorus. The scene in Wilhelm Tell in which the League of the Forest Cantons meets on the mountains involved a great deal of choral speaking. In Wallensteins Lager, the entire scene serves as a chorus to the action of the later plays, giving exposition, commenting on the dramatic incidents, and in general lending mood to the entire trilogy.

Examples of qualitative progression. -- The Max-Thekla subplot is the most obvious example of this sort of progression in the play. Schiller could at times be a hopeless sentimentalist, and no doubt he enjoyed writing the parts of the play dealing with this Romeo-and-Juliet couple. But he was also shrewd enough to know that his eighteenth-century German audience was even more sentimental than he was, and that the lachrymose plight of this pair of
"beautiful souls" would go far in relieving the relentless intrigues of the main plot.

Besides their sentimental value, Max and Thekla do other things for the play. Max's admiration for Wallenstein serves to raise Wallenstein in the eyes of an audience. Max's defeat at the hands of the Swedes has a direct syllogistic bearing upon the progress of the main action, for it gives Wallenstein false hope and blinds him to his impending assassination. And finally, Max and Thekla serve to lend irony to all the strivings and intrigues of Wallenstein and Octavio, for the destruction of the young lovers means that the old men have no heirs to whom they may leave the fruits of their labors.

The characters of Seni the astrologer and Gordon, the keeper of the fortress at Eger, also function qualitatively. Seni lends the play the little comic relief it has, with his preoccupation with magic numbers during the table-scene. But Seni also bequeaths irony upon the play, for he serves to point up the fickleness of Fate and man's incapacity to harness extraterrestrial powers. When Seni informs Wallenstein that the stars are favorable, Wallenstein betrays the Emperor and loses his army. Then, when Seni warns Wallenstein that death is in the stars, Wallenstein ignores the warning and goes on to his doom.

Gordon is revealed to have been a boyhood friend of Wallenstein, but we learn that, whereas the young Wallenstein was a lonely dreamer, Gordon was a companionable boy. Gordon remains satisfied with the golden mean in his age, and thus points up the excessiveness of
Wallenstein's ambitions and the depths to which the great general must fall.

Repetitive form and minor forms. All of the characters in the play constitute repetitive forms, for each is true to his initially established personality. None of the characters, not even Wallenstein, experiences self-discovery, and none acquires a deeper vision into the course of events as the play progresses.

Minor forms abound in the play in the form of bons mots, at which Schiller was a capable creator. Many of these proverbs managed in the course of the nineteenth century to be extracted from the plays and to work themselves into the German language. Thus, we have such sayings as "nicht hoffe, wer des Drachen Zähne sät, erfreuliches zu ernten" ("whoever sows the dragon's teeth, let him not hope for cheerful harvest") and "es gibt kein andres unrecht, als den Widerspruch" ("there is no sin but inconsistency"). One saying that must have had particular significance for the weak and sickly Schiller was "es gibt der Geist, der sich den Körper baut" (it is the mind that builds itself the body"). One critic has marvelled at the lack of morbidity in Schiller's plays, despite his chronic ill health. But it was through the poet's strength of mind and will that he was able to compensate for his decaying body and to produce more work than the average healthy man does.

CONCLUSION

Although we may discover in Wallenstein all five of the aspects of form discussed by Burke, conventional form and syllogistic progression,
inherited from Sophocles, tend to dominate. Clusters support the main theme of the play, but these come most frequently in the form of abstract terms rather than as concrete images, as in Shakespeare. And finally, while Shakespeare gives prominence to act in his histories, Schiller, as a disciple of Kant, gives prominence to agent. Although during Schiller's period there occurred the first great outbreak of German nationalism, Schiller is curiously unconcerned with the fate of Germany in his play, and Wallenstein is the only play Schiller wrote on a German theme. Thus, in response to the revolutionary situation in which Schiller found himself, we may say that the dramatist employed a strategy of idealism, being concerned not with external acts, but with the willful choices of the inner man.
CHAPTER III

THE MATERIALIST'S STRATEGY: BÜCHNER'S DANTON'S DEATH

Many recent observers of European dramatic literature would say that modern drama was born in the period between 1835 and 1837. These are the dates that run from Georg Büchner's first play, Dantons Tod, and the dramatist's death. During this brief but intense time-span, Büchner produced three plays, Danton, Woyzek, and Leonce und Lena, which went largely unnoticed for the succeeding two generations, but which were suddenly discovered and praised by the celebrated dramatist Gerhardt Hauptmann in the 1880's. From that time to the present, Büchner has served as a source of inspiration for such diverse playwrights as Frank Wedekind, the German Expressionists, Bert Brecht, Eugene Ionesco, and the German documentarist school of dramatists during the 1960's.

Dantons Tod received its first performance at the Neue Freie Volksbühne in Berlin on 5 January, 1902. It received its American premiere at the Mercury Theatre in 1938, staged by Orson Welles. Recent productions have included Herbert Blau's at Lincoln Center in 1965, and Jonathan Miller's at the National Theatre, London, in 1971. Although it remains a difficult play, it will no doubt continue to find a place in the repertories of enterprising companies.
THE SITUATION

After the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo, Europe settled into a period of royalist reaction. The first minister of the period was Metternich of Austria, and Metternich was firmly committed to a balance of power on the international level, and a strong monarchy on the domestic. In Paris, the Bourbon prince Louis XVIII was placed upon the throne, and he was succeeded by his cousin, Charles IX, who was even more absolutist than Louis and, moreover, lacked Louis's diplomatic skill. Germany was permanently divided into a great number of petty principalities, each with an absolutist prince who aped the courts of Paris and Vienna.

But the effort of princes to turn the clock back and to forget the French Revolution was ultimately short-sighted. The French Revolution had established the principles of political Liberalism, and, although the princes could quell those principles in the short run, they would ultimately be turned out of office by them.

The royal policies were short-sighted for another reason. For while the French Revolution had provided a complete change in the European political outlook, an economic revolution was rapidly creating new social classes. The "old money" of the urban mercantile class was gaining ever increasing importance, but it could largely be assimilated into the system of classes prevalent under the old feudalism. But the "new money" of the factory owners was less pliable. These men drove themselves and their workers, and they were more concerned with free markets than with the reception of titles that
indicated that they had "arrived" socially. The workers in their plants created another new class, the urban proletariat, which was to grow and grow throughout the nineteenth century. Mass production also reached the farms, and involved the enclosure system, which destroyed the old European peasantry and created a new class of agricultural day-laborers. The new masses of workers, both in the city and on the farm, were poor, exploited, and miserable, and could easily be led to rebel against a system that seemed to have forgotten them.

Given these ingredients, the pot of European social life was bound to boil over, and it did in July, 1830. This was the date of the "July Revolution," which swept Charles IX off the throne of France and crowned the "bourgeois king," Louis Phillipe. Louis Phillipe adapted a more liberal economic policy which was designed to ingratiate him to the middle classes, but for this class it was too little too late, and Louis Phillipe totally ignored the great and growing masses of urban and rural poor. What the July Revolution accomplished was the creation of unrest elsewhere in Europe.

Events from 1830 to 1832 thoroughly frightened the rulers of Germany. Bavaria inflicted severe penalties on the orators of Hambach. Austria and Prussia took the lead in influencing the Diet at Frankfort to pass the six acts of June, 1832. That legislation assured the rulers of such states as had parliaments the right to override their assemblies and denied the right of any assembly to refuse the prince his income or to pass legislation prejudicial to the objects of the
Confederation of German States as interpreted by the statesmen of Austria and Prussia. The Diet annulled the press laws of Baden and forced the government at Karlsruhe to dismiss Rotteck and Welcker from their teaching positions. This legislation so irritated a group of students from Heidelberg and Göttingen that they tried a putsch in April, 1833. Planning to overawe the Diet, they seized the guardhouse at Frankfort and attempted in vain to hold it. Not long afterward the Diet re-established the Mainz Commission to ferret out all liberal agitators; in 1835 it condemned the doctrines of the Young German movement. Being well-off or contented, the mass of the German bourgeoisie looked on with indifference while the governments drove a handful of journalists and intellectuals into prison or exile.

Büchner's part in the disturbances of the '30's. Büchner's involvement in the politics of his period developed gradually. During his years as a student at the University of Strasbourg (which at that time was in French territory), he took note of the Liberal demonstrations without becoming personally involved. Nevertheless, he was watching, although with some cynicism. In December of 1831, he mentioned in a letter to his family in Darmstadt the great revolutionary demonstration in Strasbourg occasioned by the arrival there of the Polish-Italian rebel leader Romarino, who fled from Poland to France after the fall

---

of Warsaw in 1831. On that occasion a large crowd, in which students and national guard were conspicuous, demonstrated their hatred for Louis Phillipe's middle-class monarchy. For Büchner, that demonstration was a comedy. During that period, he was largely contemptuous toward governments and malcontents alike.

According to a law of the Duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt, all students of the Duchy were required to spend four semesters in the ducal university at Giessen. Hence, Büchner, in 1833, moved from Strasbourg to Giessen for his required four semesters. Deeply discontent with the provinciality in his native university-town, Büchner now turned both dramatist and political agitator. He is known to have been a friend of the unsuccessful but active revolutionary August Becker. It was evidently through Becker that he met the Butzbach pastor and agitator Friedrich Ludwig Weidig. With Pastor Weidig, Büchner wrote his political tract, The Hessian Courier, denouncing the government of Grand Duke Ludwig II.

The occasion for The Hessian Courier was the general governmental repression of liberal movements after the July Revolution in Paris. Hesse-Darmstadt, under Grand Duke Ludwig I up until 1830, and Ludwig II from 1830 onwards, was an average south German state, not especially ill--and certainly not especially well-governed. It was a backward little state, and for some time before 1830 parts of it were in dire financial and economic straits. The last straw was added by Ludwig II, who, upon his accession, demanded that the state should pay his private debts of 2,000,000 Gulden. This act resulted in a peasant revolt
In September 1830, which was brutally crushed by Büchner's 

toes noire, the minister Du Thil. By June, 1832, most of the personal rights 
granted by the Hesse-Darmstadt constitution of 1820 were annulled. 

It was after that that a so-called "democratic" movement was called into existence by Pastor Weidig. The farcical putsch in Frankfort seems to have been undertaken by students who were associated with that movement. Weidig saved himself by drawing back when he noticed that the coup d'état was attracting no popular support, and, try though they might, the authorities could not implicate him. Then came The Hessian Courier.

The Courier was composed early in 1834, a joint effort of Weidig and Büchner. This "treasonable" business was revealed to the authorities by an informer, one Konrad Kuhl, and Büchner's friend Minnigerode was arrested on August 1 in the act of smuggling 150 copies of the pamphlet into Giessen. Büchner gave it out that he was taking a walking-tour and hurried to Butzbach to warn Weidig, and then to Frankfort and Offenbach to warn other associates. Upon his return to Giessen he discovered that his room had been searched and his papers investigated. Finding nothing immediately incriminating, the authorities left Büchner alone, but Weidig was arrested, as was August Becker. Büchner left Giessen and returned to Darmstadt, where he lived under the watchful eye of his father. Georg's brother Wilhelm reminisced that during this period Büchner kept a ladder in the garden, so that he could escape out the back door and over the wall if the police arrived for him. To obtain money for the escape which had to
come sooner or later, Büchner wrote his first play, Dantons Tod (Danton's Death), and sent it to the Young German author Gutzkow for approval. But he was unable to wait for a reply. The authorities were hot on his heels. He borrowed a little money from his sympathetic mother and fled in haste and secrecy to Strasbourg. A circular letter requesting the help of all authorities inside and outside Germany in procuring his arrest was issued in Darmstadt, on June 13, 1835. Thus, Dantons Tod was a play written after Büchner's original disappointment in revolutionary politics and during his period of desperation as the authorities closed in on him.

A PENTADIC VIEW OF DANTON'S DEATH

The last play in Schiller's Wallenstein trilogy is entitled Wallenstein Tod, but Schiller gives his play that title simply because the death of the protagonist is the logical conclusion to the events recorded. What interests Schiller is the free decisions of a very lively Wallenstein. Büchner is known to have disliked Schiller, and perhaps his title is a parody of the Schiller title. At any rate, when Büchner calls his play Dantons Tod, he means what he says, for the entire play concerns one long act of dying. The play is divided into four acts, and each act represents a station, or a stage along the way, in that act.

In the first act, we meet Danton idling in the gaming-room, and already his thoughts have turned to annihilation. His friends bring

2For the historical backgrounds of the persons mentioned in Dantons Tod, Margaret Jacobs has compiled a very useful "Index of
up the problem of the guillotining of political prisoners, and urge Danton to create a Committee for Clemency, but Danton is indifferent. Then we see the commoners, and we learn of their discontent with revolutionary leaders who live like the decadent aristocracy of the ancien régime. Robespierre appears and quiets the mob, and then the first phase of Danton's death is set into motion:

Scene: Revolutionary France
Agent: Robespierre
Co-agent: Saint-Just
Act: The plot to do away with Danton and his followers
Agency: Political intrigue
Purpose: To win the support of the people by feeding them a victim.

In the second act, Danton strolls along the promenade with Camille. Later, he learns that the Committee for Public Safety has issued a warrant for his arrest. His response is to go for another walk, this time in the woods. When he returns to his home, the second phase of his death is carried out:

Scene: Revolutionary France
Agent: Robespierre
Co-agent: Saint-Just
Act: The arrest of Danton
Agency: Political intrigue
Purpose: To win the support of the people by feeding them a victim.

The third act is crowded with prison scenes, with the mob howling for revenge for its grievances, and with the machinations of the Revolutionary Tribunal to make certain that Danton will be condemned. Danton appears at his most active in the play here, but

he is defending primarily his name, and not his life. Thus, the "act" of Act Three breaks down as follows:

Scene: Revolutionary France
Agent: The Revolutionary Tribunal
Act: The trial of Danton
Agency: Political intrigue (packing the jury)
Purpose: To win the support of the people by feeding them a victim.

As the fourth act begins, Danton and his friends have been condemned to death. The carters prepare to haul their charges to the place of execution. The whores gather around to observe how their former customers will behave on the guillotine. Julie, Danton's wife, determines to kill herself rather than live without her husband. Thus, Act Four brings the action to its inevitable conclusion:

Scene: Revolutionary France
Agent: The Revolutionary Tribunal
Act: The execution of Danton
Agency: Political intrigue
Purpose: To win the support of the people by feeding them a victim.

Thus the action of the play progresses simply and starkly from the initial plot against Danton through his arrest and trial to his execution. Within this order of the play's progression, several elements are worth noting:

1. Danton is the completely passive hero—he initiates no external act in the play. At his most active, he is defending his name and not necessarily his life. Yet Danton is bristling with meditation, with internal action. Most of this internal action consists of boredom and a longing for the void, and thus Danton's
enemies, who perform the external acts of the play, are actually performing Danton's will, and there does exist a relationship between the external and internal action of the play. That relationship is largely qualitative rather than syllogistic.

2. Robespierre initiates the chain of external action, but then passes out of the picture after Act Two. That is true to history, for the historical Robespierre initiated the Reign of Terror but could not control it. More importantly, it is also true to Büchner's dramatic purposes, for one of Büchner's chief themes is the inability of men to control events, even those events which they have consciously initiated.

3. In all cases, the purpose of the acts is to win the support of the people, but the people, despite all their allusions to the classical Roman Republic, are depicted as an ignorant lot driven by their emotions, mostly those of envy. Here we should note their reasons for wanting to hang the well-to-do Young Man whom they meet in the street in Act One. The Young Man has a handkerchief; he does not blow his nose through his fingers. The same mob has similar reasons for turning against Danton after Danton has been condemned: Danton has nice clothes, Danton has a nice house, Danton has a nice wife. That class envy on the part of the common citizens blinds them to the fact that the Jacobins are manipulating them for the purposes of the party, and not really satisfying the actual needs of the people. Here we should note the irony of the scene in Act Four in which the Mother holds up her hungry child to view Danton's
execution in the hope that this will quiet its aching stomach.

4. In initiating the action against Danton and his luxurious followers, Robespierre likes to believe that he is protecting the morals of the new French Republic, and thus preventing it from sliding back into the decadence of the ancien régime. Yet Robespierre cannot even control the morals in his own party, as witness this cynical remark by one of the Jacobins during the trial of Danton:

COLLOT

(nimmt ein Papier.)

Eine Bittschrift, ein Weibename!

BARRERE

Wohl eine von denen, die gezwungen seyn möchten zwischen einem Guillotinenbrett und dem Bett eines Jacobiners zu wählen.

COLLOT

(takes a piece of paper and reads).

A petition! And signed by a woman!

BARRERE

Probably one of those who would like to be forced to choose between a crouch under the guillotine and the couch of a Jacobin.

Furthermore, Robespierre cannot even be certain of his own motives, for as Danton tells him, we are all epicureans. Thus, it may be that Robespierre's morality is a form of licentious pleasure.

5. Out of the pentad, Shakespeare tended to stress act,
while Schiller stressed agent. Büchner tends to stress scene, for it is out of the chaos and unrest of the revolutionary period that all the characters act out their lives. And beyond the revolution, there are the unseen Powers of which Danton speaks, blind, dumb, and brutal, and men are their puppets. The difference between Danton and Robespierre is that Danton faces this fact, while Robespierre attempts to deny it.

CLUSTERS IN DANTON'S DEATH

In performing a cluster analysis on Dantons Tod, a special problem emerges. Shakespeare and Schiller, in composing their histories, borrowed characters and incidents from the recognized historical sources of their times, but they largely created their own dramatic dialogue. Büchner, on the other hand, borrowed not only character and incident, but also short sayings and even lengthy speeches, with minor alterations, from documentary sources. Hence, although Dantons Tod contains some of the richest imagery on this side of Shakespeare's histories, not all of this imagery originated in the mind of the dramatist.

Nevertheless, although Büchner made large borrowings from sources, scholars of the drama have marvelled at how organically the documentary material has been woven into the fabric of the play. An obvious example of this organicism is the character of Robespierre. Taking his lead from two brief documented speeches dealing with the favorite preoccupation of the historical Robespierre, i.e., that the free state is the virtuous state, Büchner has created one of the most
Impressive shorter characterizations in European dramatic literature, that of a basically honorable but high-strung man who becomes self-deluded through an obsession with virtue. Hence, although Büchner did not originate all of the dialogue in his play, we may rightly speak of the imagery of the play as singularly his own, for in every case he transformed recorded rhetorical images into viable dramatic images. Thus, in analyzing several of the chief images of the play, I have chosen to treat them as Büchner's own.

Mechanistic imagery. -- In keeping with Büchner's concept that man's will is not free and that his behavior is governed by blind, brutal powers from without, we find in Dantons Tod a number of images and allusions that suggest the mere mechanical nature of much of man's day-by-day activity. As might be expected, given such an outlook, sexual images and allusions play a very strong part in the play, for the sex drive is an instinct that most of Büchner's characters find hard to deny.

The sexual motif in Dantons Tod appears within the first hundred lines of the play. The opening scene of Act One is set in a glittering and fashionable gaming-room reserved for more affluent revolutionaries. In one corner, Danton is musing with his wife. In the background we hear the brittle, cynical patter of Héralt-Séchelles and a Lady playing at cards:

DAME

Verloren!
HERAULT-SECHELLES

Das war ein verliebtes Abenteuer, es kostet Geld wie alle andern.

DAME

Dann haben Sie Ihre Liebeserklärungen, wie ein Taubstummer, mit den Fingern gemacht.

HERAULT-SECHELLES

Ey warum nicht? Man will sogar behaupten gerade die würden am Leichtesten verstanden. Ich zettelte eine Liebschaft mit einer Kartenkönigin an, meine Finger waren in Spinnen verwandelte Prinzen, Sie Madame waren die Fee; aber es gieng schlecht, die Dame lag immer in den Wochen, jeden Augenblick bekam sie einen Buben. Ich würde meine Tochter dergleichen nicht spielen lassen, kie Herren und Damen fallen so unanständig übereinander und die Buben kommen gleich hinten nach.

THE LADY

You have lost!

HERAULT

It was a romantic adventure that cost money, as they always do.

THE LADY

You must have declared your love with your fingers, like a deaf mute.

HERAULT

And why not? Some people even insist that deaf mutes are easier to understand than anyone else. I was arranging a love affair with a card queen. My fingers were bewitched princes in the shape of spiders, and you, Madam, were the Good Fairy. But it didn't work out; the queen was constantly pregnant and gave birth to one knave after the other. I wouldn't allow my daughter to play games like this, with gentlemen and ladies most indecently tumbling over each other, and little knaves turning up shortly after.

According to Hérault-Scénelles' conceit, the card-game is an allegory.
for a universal human condition. The queen of cards in his hand is a "queen" caressed by the "princes" who are his fingers, but all that comes of ladies and gentlemen "tumbling indecently over one another" is the mechanical production of "knaves," something the ladies and gentlemen hadn't taken into account. In other words, people are driven to actions the outcomes of which they cannot control.

The sexual motif continues into the second scene. Here the drunken comic figure, Simon, is excoriating and beating his Wife. Some citizens part them and ask why Simon is so upset. In Schilleresque tones, Simon replies that his Wife has brought dishonor upon their house: she is selling their daughter to all comers. Defending herself, the Wife argues with good working-class common sense:

**WEIB**

Du Judas, hättest du nur ein Paar Hosen hinaufzuziehen, wenn die jungen Herren die Hosen nicht bey ihr hinunterliessen? Du Brantweinfass, willst du verdursten, wenn das Brühnlein zu laufen aufhört, he? Wir arbeiten mit allen Gliedern warum denn nicht auch damit; ihre Mutter hat damit geschafft wie sie zur Welt kam und es hat ihr weh Gethan, kann sie für ihre Mutter nicht auch damit schaffen, he? und thut's ihr auch weh dabey, he? Du Dummkopf!

**WIFE**

Judas! Would you have a single pair of pants to put on if the young gentlemen didn't take off theirs when they're with her? You brandy barrel, wouldn't you die of thirst if the fountain stopped flowing, eh? We work with all our limbs, why not with that one? Her mother worked with it when she brought her into the world, and it hurt. So why shouldn't she work with it for her mother? And does it hurt? You blockhead!

For the Wife here, the sex drive makes her daughter a commodity, and if the commodity is in such demand, why not earn a living out of it?
Dignity is for beings without human needs.

The elemental nature of the appetite is expressed again in Act One Scene Five, as Marion the prostitute explains to Danton her reasons for joining the profession:

MARION

No, let me sit like this - just this once! My mother was a wise woman. She used to tell me that chastity was a great virtue. When people came to the house and started to talk about all sorts of things, she always sent me out of the room. When I asked her later what the people had wanted, she used to reply that I ought to be ashamed of myself. When she gave me a book to read, I always had to skip some pages. But she let me read the
Bible as much as I wanted; there everything was sacred. Still, there were some things in it that I did not understand, but I didn't like to ask anybody about it; I just brooded about it. Then spring came, and things were going on all around me in which I had no part. I became enveloped in a peculiar atmosphere, and it almost suffocated me. I looked at my limbs and sometimes I seemed to be two, and then again I melted into one. At that time, a young man used to come to the house. He was handsome and often said crazy things. I didn't quite know what he wanted, but he made me laugh. My mother asked him to come more often, and that suited both of us. Finally, we didn't see why we couldn't just as well lie next to each other between two bed sheets as sit next to each other on two chairs. I liked that better than his conversation and couldn't understand why I should be deprived of the greater and be allowed only the smaller pleasure. We did it secretly. And thus it went. But I became like the sea, devouring everything, and churning deeper and deeper. Only one difference existed for me - all men blended into one body. That's how I was, and who can jump out of his skin?"

With her mixture of vice and virtue, Marion is, of course, a specimen of the literary type that fascinated nineteenth-century Europe from Prévost's _Manon Lescaut_ forward. It seems fitting to quote her at length because her speech is one of the best examples in the play of one of Büchner's chief themes— that "we are all Epicureans."

In this, Marion is one with Danton, Camille, Hérault-Séchelles, Payne, and Laflotte. She is also an excellent example of Büchner's contention that we are not free—her sensuality is a form of fate, an elemental force. Her situation is filled with pathos, but this pathos serves to make her unbounded appetite all the more gruesome.

In case the point of Marion's speech is missed, Büchner adds another touch just to drive it home. When Marion finishes speaking, she and Danton begin to make love, but they are rudely interrupted by Lacroix, and this little bit of dialogue follows:
LACROIX, bleibt in der Thür stehn.

Ich muss lachen, ich muss lachen.

DANTON, unwillig.

Nun?

LACROIX

Die Gasse fällt mir ein.

DANTON

Und?

LACROIX

Auf der Gasse waren Hunde, eine Dogge und ein Bologneser Schoosshündlein, die quälten sich.

DANTON

Was soll das?

LACROIX

Das fiel mir nun grade so ein und da musst' ich lachen. Es sah erbaulich aus! Die Mädel guckten aus den Fenstern, man sollte vorsichtig seyn und sie nicht einmal in der Sonne sitzen lassen, die Mücken treiben's ihnen sonst auf den Händen, das macht Gedanken.

LACROIX

(remains standing in the doorway).

This really makes me laugh! It is too funny!

DANTON

(cross).

Well?

LACROIX

I was just thinking of the street.

DANTON

So?
LACROIX

There were two dogs on the street, a great Dane and a tiny, long-haired lapdog. They had a hard time.

DANTON

What about it?

LACROIX

The thought just occurred to me and I had to laugh. It really was an edifying sight! The girls were watching from the windows. One shouldn't even let them sit in the sunshine; the mosquitoes might carry on right on their hands, and that makes them think.

Here Büchner displays the same flair for mingling the sexual with the grotesque that marks the writings of one of his disciples several generations later, Frank Wedekind. Büchner also gives the lie to the florid sentiments that Danton is expressing to Marion. Try as man may to make it poetry, the sexual drive unites man with the lower creatures of the universe.

But the entire brothel scene is loaded with the sexual grotesque. Arriving at Marion's door with Lacroix are two of the "little sisters," Rosalie and Adelaide. Seeing Marion, Adelaide comments that it is pleasant to have the chance to visit, for she "never has a minute free anymore," which is Büchner's way of revealing that this blind drive is universal. Then Paris enters and informs Danton and Lacroix of Robespierre's dangerous speech to the Jacobin Club. Danton's response is to shrug it off and send Paris and Lacroix on their way so that he can continue his business with Marion. Lacroix bids him a good night in the final line of the scene: "Gute Nacht Danton, die Schenkel der Demoiselle guilletineren dich, der mons Veneris..."
wird dein tarpeijischer Fels." ("Good night, Danton! The thighs of Mademoiselle will be your guillotine, her Mound of Venus your Tarpeian Rock.") The Tarpeian rock, was, of course, the rock outside Rome from which the old republicans flung themselves when they were ruined. Danton should take measures to save his own life and those of his friends, but, once again, appetite is destiny, and all he can do is give in to the drive while his fate is sealed.

These scenes in Act One set the manner for the sex-patter throughout the remainder of the play, and it becomes especially prominent again in the promenade scene of Act Two, in which Danton and Camille go for a walk while Robespierre and Saint-Just are drawing up the warrants for their arrests. But if sex is the opium of the wealthy and the beautiful, drink is the opium of everyone else, and Büchner also includes several drunken scenes in the play. The first, and most illustrative, is that of the citizen Simon indignantly beating his wife for selling their daughter as a whore. The citizens part them, and then Robespierre gives his speech on virtuous republicanism. Already drunk with alcohol, the words make Simon even drunker and he grows maudlin over his wife, referring to her as his Portia. Human character is so fragile a thing that it can be altered by almost anything, a concept which Brecht, who admitted his indebtedness to Büchner, was to take up nearly a century later.

Sex and alcoholism provide Büchner with comic illustrations of the mechanical nature of the human personality, but the illustrations are comic precisely because the activities are engaged upon
unreflectively. Büchner's two chief characters, Danton and Robespierre, are granted deeper insights into the plight of man, and the insights are excruciating and tragic. One might consider Robespierre's image of the sleepwalker after a conversation with Danton has made Robespierre doubt the reality of his own pure intentions:

**ROBESPIERRE**


**ROBESPIERRE**

The night snores across the face of the earth and tosses in a wild dream. Thoughts and desires, barely suggested, confused and shapeless, which timidly hid from the light of day, now take on form, dress up and creep into the quiet house of dreams. They open doors, look out of windows and almost become flesh. The sleeping limbs stretch in their sleep and lips begin to murmur words. - And is not waking just a clearer dream? Are we not sleepwalkers? Do we not act awake just as we do in dreams, if more distinctly, more decisively and more effectively? Who can blame us? The mind performs more acts of thought in sixty minutes than our bodies' leaden organism is able to enact in years. The sin is in our thoughts. Whether the thought becomes an act, whether the body imitates the mind - is merely accident.

Thus, in the dark of night, Robespierre is compelled to "examine his conscience," and what he sees causes him agony: his purposively
virtuous activity is simply the activity of a "sleepwalker," and, although he has attempted to hold himself pure above the throng, he, too, is capable of sin. Whether he does it or not is not a matter of his much-vaunted will, but only "chance."

The dark of night brings Danton to a rueful awareness, too. On the night before his arrest, he recalls the active part he played in the notorious September Massacre, and, cringing before the memory of his own savagery, he asks one of the crucial questions of the play: "Was ist das, was in uns hurt, lügt, stiehlt, und mordet?" ("Was it that part of ourselves which lies, whores, steals, and murders?") But he can only come to the rueful answer that men are mere implements in the hands of dark powers: "Puppen sind wir von unbekannten Gewalten am Draht gezogen; nichts, nichts wir selbst! Die Schwerter, mit denen Geister kämpfen, man sieht nur die Hände nicht, wie im Märchen." ("We're puppets, and unknown powers manipulate our wires. Ourselves we're nothing, nothing! We are the swords wielded by ghosts who fight each other, their hands remain unseen as in a fairy tale.")

By the end of Büchner's century, Henri Bergson was to view the comic as "something mechanical encrusted upon the living."
Büchner anticipated this idea in 1835 in the comic scenes of Dantons Tod, but Büchner recognized that more than comedy was involved, for, given this particular "comic" viewpoint, the human condition was dark indeed.

Images of decay. - - Driven by unseen forces, man has indeed
reason to doubt his own worth. But this is not the end of it.
For the flesh in which his tormented spirit is encased is rotting away even as he goes through the motions of the living. Without constant attention, his body will deteriorate, and even with constant attention, the inevitable decay is only postponed.

In the preceding section, we noted that Büchner employed sexual imagery to illustrate the dictum that sensuality is destiny. But if man is driven to satisfy his sexual urges, the very satisfaction brings its ultimate retaliation in the form of flesh-rotting disease. Hence, we find among Büchner's characters a great deal of banter about syphilis. The banter is light but always cynical, for, in an age when cures were uncertain, the ever-present awareness of the disease that follows from satisfying one's drives makes a mockery of one of the revolutionary's favorite concepts: that human behavior is reasonable.

In the brothel scene cited above, Danton and Lacroix tease the prostitutes Adelaide and Rosalie, calling them "mines of Mercury," in reference to the notoriously unreliable treatment for syphilis:

**LACROIX**

So höre doch, ein moderner Adonis wird nicht von einem Eber, sondern von Säuen zerrissen, er bekommt seine Wunde nicht am Schenkel sondern in den Leisten und aus seinem Blut spriessen nicht Rosen hervor sondern schiessen Quecksilberblüthen an.

**DANTON**

Fräulein Rosalie ist en restaurirter Torso, woran nur die Hüften und Füsse antik sind. Sie ist eine Magnetnadel, was der Pol Kopf abstösst, zieht der Pol Fuss an, die Mitte ist ein Aequator, wo jeder eine Sublimattaufe bekommt, der die Linie passirt.
LACROIX
Zwei barmherzige Schwestern, jede dient in einem Spital d. h. in ihrem eigenen Körper.

ROSALIE
Schämen Sie sich, unsere Ohren roth zu machen!

ADELAIDE
Sie sollten mehr Lebensart haben.

ADELAIDE und ROSALIE ab.

DANTON
Gute Nacht, ihr hübschen Kinder!

LACROIX
Gute Nacht, ihr Quecksilbergruben!

LACROIX
Now listen to me! A modern Adonis is not torn apart by a wild boar but by sows. He is wounded, not in the thigh, but in his groin. And not roses grow from his blood, but blossoms of quicksilver.

DANTON
Mademoiselle Rosalie is a restored torso: only the hips and feet date back to antiquity. She is a magnetic needle: what the pole "head" repels, the pole "foot" attracts. In the middle is the equator, and everyone who passes the line is baptized with quicksilver sublimate.

LACROIX
They are two Sisters of Charity. They serve in a hospital, that is, each in her own body.

ROSALIE
You ought to be ashamed to make us blush!

ADELAIDE
You really ought to have better manners!
(ADELAIDE and ROSALIE leave.)

DANTON

Good night, my pretty children!

LACROIX

Good night, you quicksilver mines!

The syphilitic note in the dialogue is struck once again in Act Three, Scene One. Here Paine proves to Chaumette, who is called Anaxagoras, the non-existence of God. Chaumette is delighted.

Hérault-Séchelles, by now also a prisoner, rejoices with Chaumette:

HÉRAULT-SÉCHELLES

Freue dich, du kommst glücklich durch, du kannst ganz ruhig in Madame Momoro das Meisterstück der Natur anbeten, wenigstens hat sie dir die Rosenkränze dazu in den Leisten gelassen.

CHAUMETTE

Ich danke Ihnen verbindlichst, meine Herren.

HÉRAULT

Be happy, for you are gaining your ends. You may keep right on worshipping Madame Momoro as Nature's masterpiece. At least she's left the rosaries you need for your devotions in your groin.

CHAUMETTE

My most sincere thanks to you, gentlemen!

The Madam Momoro mentioned here was the wife of a leader of the defeated Hebertist faction. She had represented the Goddess of Reason in Chaumette's Fete of Reason staged in Notre Dame cathedral. That the Goddess of Reason should present Chaumette with a "Rosenkränze" is an irony, of course, for this was a medical term denoting the
effects of venereal disease. Since it was a bead-like formation, there is some allusion intended to the rosary.

Not even the followers of the virtuous Robespierre are safe from the effects of the disease, as witness this dialogue among members of the Jacobin Committee for Public Safety:

COLLOT, zu BARRERE

Wann kommst du wieder nach Clichy?

BARRERE

Wenn der Arzt nicht mehr zu mir kommt.

COLLOT

Nicht wahr, über dem Ort steht ein Haarster, unter dessen versengenden Strahlen dein Rückenmark ganz ausgedörrt wird.

[colloquial]

(to BARRERE).

When will you come to Clichy again?

BARRERE

When the doctor stops coming to see me.

COLLOT

It’s true, isn’t it, that above that place hangs a comet whose burning rays are shriveling your marrow?

Clichy was one of the fine country houses reserved by members of the Committee to indulge themselves when off duty. Since the spinal cord suffers in the later stages of syphilis, the nature of the entertainment is obvious.

But one doesn’t particularly have to engage in any activity, sexual or otherwise, in order to have the body deteriorate. One
can simply leave it alone and it will go to seed, as Danton and his friends discover in prison:

LACROIX

Hair and nails are growing in such a way one really has to be ashamed of oneself.

HERAULT

Be a little careful. You are sneezing sand all over my face.

LACROIX

And don't you step on my toes, my friend. I have corns.

HERAULT

You also seem to be suffering from vermin.

LACROIX

Oh, if only I could get completely rid of the worms.

A few moments later in the same scene, Danton is left the
only prisoner awake, and he, too has reason to muse about the ephemeral nature of the body's health:

**DANTON**

Bloss Arbeit für den Todengräber! Es ist mir, als roch' ich schon. Mein lieber Leib, ich will mir die Nase zuhalten und mir einbilden du seyst ein Frauenzimmer, was vom Tanzen schwitzt und stinkt und dir Artigkeiten sagen. Wir haben uns sonst schon mehr miteinander die Zeit vertrieben.


[DANTON]

It just made work for the gravedigger. I feel as if I smelled already. My dear body, I will hold my nose and try to think that you are a woman, sweaty and smelly from dancing, and I will pay you compliments. We used to entertain each other differently in the past. Tomorrow you'll be like a broken fiddle, and gone the melody you used to play. Tomorrow you will be an empty bottle, the wine drained, but I won't be drunk from it and go to bed sober. Lucky the people who can still get drunk! Tomorrow you will be a pair of seat-worn pants that is thrown into the wardrobe to be eaten by moths, no matter how much you stink.

Thus do Büchner's characters stand alone in the world in their fragile, rotting shells, trying desperately to make the time pass pleasantly, but realizing all too well the conclusion of Danton in prison: it isn't any use.

**Classical allusions.** - Most of the characters of Dantons Tod utilize classical allusions in their speech. Büchner made them do this, first of all, because it was of course historically accurate.
The citizens of Revolutionary France actually did make frequent reference to the great citizens of the ancient Roman Republic. But these classical allusions do other things besides lending the play authenticity.

For one thing, the only completely willed act in the play is the suicide of Danton's wife, Julie. The historical Madam Danton did not in fact kill herself when her husband was executed. She lived to marry again. Büchner ignored this rather uninspiring fact of history, and made his Julie sacrifice herself out of love and honor, like the virtuous Roman matrons of old. Hence, the frequent references throughout the play to these ladies must be seen as an effort to pre-figure Julie's sacrifice. Although the characters who refer to Portia, the wife of Marcus Brutus, Lucretia, and Arria, the wife of Paetus, do not recognize that they are serving this function in the play, all the women referred to have one thing in common: they died by their own hands out of a sense of honor. And when her time comes, Julie does the same, so that her husband will not "have to die alone."

Julie lives up to the standards of the virtuous Roman republicans. She is the only character in the play who actually does, and she does it unconsciously. Hence, the allusions to Rome serve another function in the play: they indicate how far both the drunken, envious commons and the glittering decadents who lead them are from the ideal. The most obvious example of this function is the second scene of the play, in which the drunken Simon berates his wife for whoring their daughter. First Simon refers to Virginius, the plebian centurion
who stabbed his daughter to save her from the lust of the decemvir Appius Claudius. Then Simon mentions Lucretia, who stabbed herself to death when outraged by Sextus Tarquinius, first exacting an oath of vengeance from her father and her husband. Finally, drink makes Simon maudlin, and he mellows toward his wife, calling her his Portia. With such high-flown language embellishing it, the situation of the scene only seems more sordid.

The love-death theme. — In this bleak universe that Büchner depicts there is not much hope for men. One possibility for salvation lies in the affection that people feel for one another, but even this affection is difficult to trust, for man is locked into his shell of bone and flesh, and it is practically impossible to really get to know the object of one's love; as Danton puts it in the opening scene to Julie, "Wir sind Dickhäuter, wir strecken die Hände nacheinander aus aber es ist vergebliche Mühe, wir reiben nur das grobe Leder aneinander ab, - wir sind sehr einsam." ("We are thick-skinned. We reach out for each other, but it is no good; we only manage to rub against each other and to irritate the coarse leather. We are very lonely.") Hence, the conditions of the material universe in which man finds himself trapped hinder any real expression of love. The only hope for lovers is in death, and here Büchner exploits the slightly morbid love-death theme which so fascinated the Romantic poets. After expressing his inability ever really to get to know Julie, Danton tells her that he loves her nonetheless like the grave. Julie is taken back, but Danton explains:
DANTON


[DANTON]

No, don't turn away! Listen to me! They say that there is peace in the grave, that being buried is the same as resting. If that is true, I'm buried when I lie in your lap. Sweet grave, your lips are funeral bells, your voice my deathknell, your breast the mound above my grave and your heart my coffin.

In a world in which each individual is trapped in his own flesh and subject to its drives, the only hope lovers have for complete union is in death.

Julie recalls this notion of Danton's as she is about to take the poison that will unite her with her executed husband. The phial of poison she addresses in the following tones: "Komm liebster Priester, dessen Amen uns zu Bette gehn macht." ("Come, you beloved priest, whose Amen sends us to bed."). Here Julie likens the phial of poison to the priest performing the nuptials, whose prayer sends the lovers to their wedding-bed. And this will be the most complete union that she and Danton will ever know.

If death releases lovers from the flesh and unites them, it does the same for friends. During the final execution-scene, Danton's friends are led one by one to the guillotine. Finally only Danton and Hérault-Séchelles are left. They move to bid each other farewell, but the executioner parts them. Danton is indignant:
DANTON

- Kannst du verhindern, dass unsere Köpfe sich auf dem Boden des Körbes küssen?

[DANTON

You can't prevent our heads from kissing at the bottom of the basket!]

Thus, the atheistic Danton, at his moment of death, finds one thing in the rotting earth worth preserving beyond death: his affection for his friends. That they go with him provides a dismal sort of comfort.

Life as an act of dying. - - As mentioned above, Schiller's play Wallensteins Tod is entitled after the death of its hero, but the play is about the act of living. Büchner's play, on the contrary, deals with the act of dying from its beginning. As early as the first act, Lacroix warns Danton that he is a dead saint, but that the Revolution doesn't recognize relics. Lacroix means to stir Danton up to action, but all that results is an agreement from Danton that he is indeed dead or dying. Then, in Act Two, Camille is attempting to hurry Danton up in dressing so that they may go to the promenade, and the following exchange takes place:

DANTON

Das ist sehr langweilig immer das Hemd zuerst und dann die Hosen drüber zu ziehen und des Abends in's Bett und Morgens wieder heraus zu kriechen und einen Fuss immer so vor den andern zu setzen, da ist gar kein Absehens wie es anders werden soll. Das ist sehr traurig und dass Millionen es schon so gemacht haben und dass Millionen es wieder so machen werden und, das wir noch obendrein aus zwei Halften bestehen, die beyde das Nämliche thun, so dass Alles doppelt geschiet. Das ist sehr traurig.
Du sprichst in einem ganz kindlichen Ton.

Sterbende werden oft kindisch.

How boring always to put on first the shirt and then on top of it the trousers, to creep to bed at night and out of it again next morning, and always to put one foot in front of the other. And there's no prospect that these things will ever change. How sad to think that millions before us did it just like we, that millions coming after us will keep on doing it, and that, to top it all, we consist of two parts doing both the same, so that all that is done is duplicated - how sad to contemplate all this.

You talk like a child.

The dying often become childish.}

Danton is inflicted with a malady that plagues the hero of many a modern literary work: boredom. And the sense-deadening sameness of the daily routine is for him part of the act of dying. Finally, in his prison cell on the eve of his execution, he gives vent to one of the more significant lines in the play: "Die Welt ist das Chaos. Das Nichts ist der zu gebärende Weltgott." ("The world is chaos. Nothingness is the World-God, still unborn."). Nailed to the earth by his own material nature, man's sole hope would appear to be a re-incorporation into the void.
FORM IN DANTON'S DEATH

Syllogistic form. — In so far as Dantine Tod had a narrative line, Büchner does employ some syllogistic form. The chief events that are thus causally linked together we have already encountered in our section on the pentad:

1. Saint-Just's indictment follows from the threats in Robespierre's speech.

2. The indictment results in Danton's arrest.

3. The arrest results in the trumped-up trial.

4. The trial results in the execution.

It should be noted that the syllogistic form of Dantine Tod is not the important formal aspect of the play. Schiller was greatly interested in intrigue, and hence he relied so greatly upon syllogistic form. Büchner thought that he was by-passing Schiller and returning to Shakespeare with a more panoramic form. But Büchner actually created something new, for in his play syllogistic form becomes a mere framework upon which to hang scenes out of both the high and the low life of the French Revolution.

Minor form. — Büchner quoted many epigrams from his sources, but he evidently saw something ironic in the practise of always having the right word for the occasion. Here we might notice the scene of the play in which Lacroix is executed. He addresses the mob, saying that it is killing the Dantonists while it has lost its senses, but that it will kill the Jacobins when it has regained them. The people shout up that they have heard that one before, and that
Lacroix should try again. His execution is boring them, because he can't think of something cleverer or more original to say at the hour of death. Why, Büchner seems to ask, should a man have to please anybody at the hour of his death with bons mots?

If epigrams form one type of minor form in the play, there are also the scenes themselves. Although the scenes in Dantons Tod are more closely connected syllogistically than the scenes in Büchner's later play Woyzeck, one can note the direction in which Büchner is moving: toward the play in which each scene may be considered a self-contained entity. This prefiguration of Brecht may be noted in most of Danton's early scenes: in the gaming-room, in the brothel, along the promenade, in the open field.

Conventional form. — Shakespeare did not use a conventional form in his histories; he created form as he went along. Schiller, on the other hand, borrowed the tightly-knit form of classical tragedy and adapted it to the history. As has already been noted, Büchner eschewed Schiller and attempted to return to Shakespeare, but simultaneously he created freely, and consequently what he developed was not a carbon of the Shakespearean history, but a form which contributed to the later Epic Theatre, in which many minor forms are combined to make a whole.

Repetitive form. — Repetitive form appears in a number of guises in Dantons Tod, and constitutes one of the chief formal aspects of the play. First, there is Danton's constantly reiterated statement that "they wouldn't dare" when he learns of the plotting of the
Jacobins. This becomes ironic when he is cast into prison with an "I didn't think they'd dare."

The characters are all repetitive: Danton bored and longing for nothingness, Robespierre obsessed at once with virtue and self-doubt, Camille a young man of conventional but humane values, Julie the noble "Roman" matron, Lucille the sentimental and distraught young wife.

Then there is the theme that is repeated throughout the play by all the characters who have any special insight - the theme of the blind, mechanical, inhuman nature of the universe. This theme is present in Danton's dressing-room speech, in his prison speeches, in Robespierre's "sleepwalker" speech, and in Camille's prison conclusion that mankind dumbly eats, sleeps and procreates without understanding a thing about its surroundings.

Qualitative form. - - Qualitative form constitutes the most significant aspect of Dantons Tod, for in so far as the various scenes that make up the whole are united, they are united qualitatively. We will note here only several of the uses of qualitative form.

1. The scenes of Robespierre delivering his "virtue" speech at the Jacobin Club and of Danton in the brothel are juxtaposed to point up the difference between the antagonists. Then the scene of confrontation between the antagonists occurs, and Danton delivers his famous line that we are all epicureans. Robespierre fears to admit it, but he is haunted by the conviction that Danton is right: that he derives as much pleasure from his ruthless virtue as Danton from his whores.
2. There are three husband-wife relationships in the play: the bawdy one between Simon and his Wife, the sentimental one between Camille and Lucille, and the noble one between Danton and Julie. The first two serve to point up the nobility of the latter.

3. Danton's night of private agony over the September Massacres is immediately preceded by the scene in the open field, a pastoral scene, and immediately followed by the comic scene between Simon and the Citizen-soldiers who have come to arrest Danton. Thus one of the most intense scenes of the play is led into calmly and is followed by rough humor.

4. The back-room machinations of Danton's judges on the Revolutionary Tribunal serve to point up Danton's moral superiority.

5. Immediately before the scene in which Julie makes the ultimate sacrifice of killing herself to be with her husband, Büchner places the scene in which Dumas is discussing his wife's fate with a fellow-citizen. The wife has been found a traitor to the Republic, Dumas says, and the Revolutionary Tribunal will divorce them and the guillotine will separate them. Dumas' callous attitude toward his condemned mate serves to make Julie's sacrifice seem all the more exceptional.

6. The ghoulish comic scene with the carters and the whores serves to foreshadow the serious ghoulishness of the mass executions at the guillotine.

7. The calmness with which everybody else takes the executions serves to lend point to the desparation of Lucille after she has
lost Camille to the guillotine. As night falls and the streets begin to clear, we note the contrast between the bawdy song of the executioners who are cleaning up after the show, and the pious funeral hymn which the desperate Lucille sings.

CONCLUSION

As we have seen, that element of the pentad which Shakespeare tended to emphasize was act. Schiller emphasized agent. Büchner is like neither, for he tends to emphasize scene. We have noted that the protagonist of Danton's Tod initiates no central act. Robespierre begins the process of the Reign of Terror, but cannot control it. What receives special attention in the play is the scene of revolutionary France. Early in the play, Hérault-Séchelles announces that the revolution must end and the republic begin. But several scenes later Robespierre counters this claim with the remark that one digs one's own grave if one leaves a revolution half-finished. Robespierre does not leave the revolution half-finished, but he digs his own grave nevertheless. The point is that the chaos of the period is what governs all of the characters and all of the acts of the play. In analyzing the clusters of Danton's Tod, we note the proliferation of mechanistic imagery: man is pinned to the earth by his sensual instincts, by those essential elements of his make-up that will not be denied. Behind the instinctual man, there are the unseen forces that drive man to his destiny no matter what he consciously wills. Further, we note in a formal analysis of the play that syllogistic progression counts for very little to Büchner. That is because the
Büchner hero does not initiate acts that result in other acts so much as he merely exists from minute to minute and from day to day. Life itself is not an arena for conscious action so much as an early stage of death; hence the play's title.

Kenneth Burke has remarked that the writer who stresses scene is basically a materialist. Many critics of Büchner have noted how his views appear to prefigure the views of Marxism. What caused Büchner to so emphasize scene? Doubtless, it was partly his training in early nineteenth-century science; but it must also have been his awareness after his disappointment in 1835 that the human race had a long way to go in order to establish the just and equitable society of which he dreamed. At any rate, Büchner, in responding to his political disappointments during the risings of the '30's, adapted the materialist outlook and that outlook permeated his view of man muddling through history.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The present study has, I hope, accomplished two things. One has to do with method, and the other with my subject proper. Insofar as method is concerned, this paper is yet another example of the effort to adapt the methods of Kenneth Burke to the study of the drama. Speech scholars have utilized Burke for years, but it is still somewhat rare to apply his concepts to the drama. To the best of my knowledge, only two such attempts have been published, Leroy Shaw's examination of four modern German plays, and Altmann and Machsoud's analysis of Shaw's Saint Joan. Shaw relied exclusively upon Burke's situation-strategy pair, while Altmann and Machsoud made a cluster analysis. But if this paper has accomplished anything at all in the way of method, it has been to establish the fact that there is not merely one Burkean approach. Implicit in Burke's writings are a variety of methods for the analysis of literary and dramatic works, and I believe that these methods are complementary and may be utilized in concert to come to a better understanding of the play. Besides the situation-strategy pair and the cluster analysis, I have also made use of Burke's pentad, which has received so much attention in university speech departments, and the five aspects of form which Burke enumerates in his earliest, and most literary book, Counterstatement.
Since this exact combination of methods has not been used before, I have had no model from which to work, and consequently this paper is something in the way of a probe. Thus it has the weaknesses of a first experiment, for I am certain that I have not recognized all of the implications of the methods which I have been attempting to demonstrate. If, however, I have managed to point the way for some future students of the drama, this effort will have been worthwhile. More importantly, I have restricted my examinations to plays-as-read in the study. Yet I believe that Burkean method, with its vision of artistic expression as a symbolic action, admirably suits the needs of scholars who concentrate upon plays-in-the-theatre, upon plays in performance. Thus it seems to me that the next logical step after scholars feel secure in applying Burke to written drama is the step of applying Burke to drama performed, and possibly to the purely theatrical arts as well. The analytical possibilities with which Burke confronts us are legion; it remains to us to learn to use them.

But apart from method, what have we learned concerning the history play? In my introduction, I mentioned Birgitta Steene's four-point definition of the history as being the most inclusive. Perhaps it would be well to review these points here: (1) The history must have a definite politico-historical setting. (2) It must have panoramic plot and structure. (3) The leading character must be a public rather than a private man. (4) The history must embody the author's coherent historical purpose to give form and unity to a
drama that would otherwise be mere confusion. I should like now to see how these points hold up in the light of an examination of the three prototypical plays which have just been observed.

First, there is the matter of the definite politico-historical setting. All three of the plays which I have examined here have it, from Shakespeare's conscious medievalism (trial by combat, knightly manners) through Schiller's bustling camp of the Thirty Years' War period to Büchner's use of exact documents to reproduce the customs and even the precise words of revolutionary France. Here we see a distinction between the author who attempts to duplicate the events of the past on the stage and the author who merely uses the period setting for exotic effect. Perhaps Mary Renault has stated this distinction most succinctly:

In the beginning came man's need to account for himself and his condition. No human society seems ever to have been without traditions of its past, and some sense of responsibility for transmitting them. One could claim even today that what distinguishes the historical novelist from the costume romancer is the persistence of this primitive urge.

According to this rule, we would say that Strindberg wrote history plays, whereas the early Ibsen wrote costume romances, which, for a time, Ibsen considered to be histories. But then he arrived at the conviction that the quintessential Norwegian was not a Viking but a bourgeois, he saw his early plays in a different light, and he never

---

1 See Chapter I, footnote 32.

wrote another play with a period setting. Strindberg, on the other hand, saw his Swedish contemporaries as the heirs of the Swedish past, and he continued throughout his life to explore the resemblances which he imagined he saw between the Swedes of the past and the Swedes of his own time. Those plays of Giraudoux and Anouilh that utilize Greek myths may not be considered histories, for the dramatists merely use the past as a vehicle for their purely contemporary concerns. On the other hand, Hofmannsthal's use of the same myths in his adaptations of Electra and Oedipus Rex may well be considered histories, for, despite their Freudian anachronisms which are obvious to us today, there was the attempt, in the Reinhardt stagings, to create anthropologically correct images of primitive times, and to reveal the persistence of these myths from primitive times to the present. Giraudoux and Anouilh simply present modern sophisticates in classical settings and costumes, while Hofmannsthal attempted to recreate the dim, distant period of the heroic age in the light of anthropological, archaeological, and psychological notions current in the Vienna of his time.

Miss Steene's second point is that the history must be panoramic in both plot and structure. By "plot" I take it that she means "story-line," since she makes the distinction between plot and structure. At any rate, what she seems to be saying is that the history must recreate an entire society from the highest to the lowest, and that the fate of the society as a whole hangs in the balance of the play's action. Given that definition of the panoramic, all of
the plays under discussion here fulfill the requirement, though each in its own way. Shakespeare and Büchner, with their free use of qualitative progression, are more obviously panoramic than Schiller, with his tight syllogistic progression. But despite the compactness of his plotting, Schiller works the commoners into his tale of generals and emperors by utilizing the prologue in the camp, and by reminding us throughout the play that the fate of the Empire and of Europe hangs in the balance of the intrigue between Wallenstein and Ferdinand. Shakespeare's Richard II takes us from court to tournament to the open field to parliament and, through York's speech, to the London streets. Büchner's form is completely kaleidoscopic, for he gives us scenes in gaming-room, Parisian street, Jacobin Club, promenade, tribunal, and prison. All in all, the idea that a society as a whole ought to be taken as the principal character of the history seems sound.

The dictum that the hero of the history must be horizontal rather than vertical, a public figure rather than a private man, is perhaps not so sound as Miss Steene's first two rules. For Miss Steene has occasion to mention Shakespeare's Richard II, and it gives her difficulty: Richard is allowed to perform public acts in only the first two acts of the play; after that he becomes a "private man." Miss Steene would no doubt also have difficulty with Wallenstein and Dantons Tod. Wallenstein acts throughout the play bearing his name, as we have seen, yet most of his acts are internal ones having personal motivations even though they have public implications. And Danton is portrayed more as a state of mind than as an effectual character.
Is Richard II a hybrid play, a cross between history and tragedy? Certainly it is if we take it to be the play which has been staged to fulfill the requirements of leading actors, for these requirements involve seeing Richard as the sole hero of the play. Yet our pentadic analysis has revealed that the acts of the play are shared between Richard and Henry, the "silent king." In King John, which a number of critics take to be the intended prologue for Shakespeare's entire history cycle, the Bastard closes the action by saying:

This England never did, nor never shall,  
Lie at the proud feet of a conqueror,  
But when it first did help to wound itself.  

Nought shall make us rue,  
If England to itself do rest but true.

Seen in the light of this speech, Richard II is the story of England wounding itself, of not resting true to itself. And Richard and Henry are the polestars of this internal division in the land; taken together, they are a symbol of Shakespeare's major theme.

Perhaps rather than saying that the protagonist must be a public man, it would be better to state that he must somehow serve as a symbol of his age; he must embody the spirit of his times. Thus Richard and Henry, taken together as the chief agents of Richard II, embody the great war of the barons that tore England asunder until the time of the Tudors. Thus, too, Wallenstein may be seen as the embodiment of his age--the fiercely independent and separatist prince who prolonged the great war in Germany for thirty years. And the character of Danton, although he never acts as an agent in the play that bears his name, does stand as a symbol of the chaos and moral anarchy that
prevailed in France in the wake of the Revolution.

Miss Steene's final point, that the history must embody the author's coherent historical purpose to give form and unity to a drama that would otherwise be mere confusion, seems valid, but Steene applies her own rule too strictly. For she tends to see Shakespeare's cycle as having a coherent historical purpose in that it presents a providential view of history, it sees history sub specie aeternitatis. But Strindberg, she says, does this with only his first history, The Saga of the Folkungs. His remaining "histories" are mere psychological studies of kings as private men. Consequently, they are not true histories, even though the providentialism of The Saga of the Folkungs is "obsolete." In other words, in her rule she seems to be trying to define something that will apply to all histories, but in her application she tends to see the history play as a phenomenon of one time, which can never be entirely duplicated because the conditions which produced it in the first place are outmoded. Northrop Frye also sees the history as strictly a phenomenon of Elizabethan times, but he is frank about it. For him, the central theme of the Elizabethan history is the unifying of the nation and the binding of the audience into the myth as the inheritors of that unity. 3

What Steene and Frye say about the Shakespearean history seems true enough. For our pentadic analysis revealed to us that in his cycle Shakespeare tends to emphasize act, the collective acts of the English nation under the eye of Providence. In this emphasis

Shakespeare is the heir of the middle ages, and is consequently a realist. His chief image in Richard II, that of "blood," reinforces this idea, for it is blood that both unites Richard and Henry into one family and divides them in acts of violence. And through the resolution of the cycle in an act of national unity, i. e., the uniting of the red and the white rose in the accession of the Tudors, Shakespeare makes his English audience realize that it, too, is of one blood in a unified nation.

But what of Wallenstein and Dantons Tod? Must we deny them the title of "histories" because their authors failed to hold a providential view of the universe, failed to be realists, and failed to emphasize the act? Schiller wrote Wallenstein at the beginning of the Romantic era, when Napoleon was on the rise. Some of his contemporaries saw the stage Wallenstein as a surrogate for Napoleon. It was an age when history was made by great individuals, and hence, in our cluster analysis of Wallenstein, we note Schiller's preoccupation with the Will. Thirty years later, Büchner cast a baleful eye upon a world weighed down with matter, and hence he viewed human history in the light of this scene and was one of the first nineteenth-century materialists. In the imagery of his plays, we see characters bowed down by their material beings, mechanistically performing the acts which their matter-based instincts force upon them. Schiller's confident faith in the individual is no longer with us; Büchner's mechanistic view of human fate still is, in some quarters. But what should be emphasized here is that, although Schiller and Büchner did not hold to Shakespeare's
view of history, they did have views of their own, which do give coherence to their plays. If Schiller does not seek to produce a collective communion, he does attempt to create a sense of awe and admiration for the hero in his audience, perhaps a different kind of communion. And Büchner was the first playwright of the modern era consciously to use shock techniques to heighten his audience's awareness of his dark view of human destiny. Although I do not wish to speak at length of Strindberg here, it must be observed that he frequently held views of matter similar to Büchner's, which would indicate that, although Miss Steene's fourth criterion for judging a play a "history" seems quite valid, one would have to apply it from a broader perspective than Steene's.

Thus it may be seen that, while Steene has provided a useful service in attempting a definition of the history, more work needs to be done. Not only will it be helpful if critics contribute articles concerning individual non-Shakespearean histories, but longer works of greater scope must be written. Besides the dramatists I have considered here, there are others of importance who need to receive more thorough critical treatment. Among these would be such classics as Pushkin of Russia and Grillparzer of Austria. Strindberg has received book-length treatment for his histories, but, rather than seeing his departures from Shakespeare as faults, critics should attempt to determine what positive contributions he has made to the form. Then there is the question of Brecht, who did write several plays which may validly be termed "histories." And in the last
decade, Robert Bolt of England has made a name for himself writing in the genre. A variety of approaches would appear to be appropriate in examining these plays. I have used Burke; other critics might choose to employ other methods with great success. For example, although some work has been done on the uses which dramatists have made of their sources, there is room for more exploration, dealing both with why the playwright chose the particular source he did, and what dramatic purposes he put his material to. Such studies would go a long way in giving us a clearer picture of the structure of the history play. The work is there to be accomplished; it is for future critics to act.

If we say that the history play is not merely a phenomenon of the Elizabethan age, and if, with Warren and Wellek, we believe that it is necessary to see the continuity of a genre despite the changing tastes of audiences and the changing preoccupations of playwrights, then we should be able to conclude that the history play still has a future. We know that it enjoyed wide popularity in Shakespeare's time, and again in the historical-minded nineteenth century. Today it seems to be more of a specialized interest, surviving perhaps in Germany in the dramatic works of the documentarist school, surviving more romantically in England in the works of playwrights like Robert Bolt, even though Bolt seems to be turning today from the history proper to the costume romance. Nevertheless, as long as men need, in Mary Renault's words, to account for themselves and their condition, it will no doubt survive and possibly even flourish again.
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