THE CRITICAL TREATMENT OF THE CHURCH IN THE WORKS OF FRIEDRICH SCHILLER

by
Tim Jansa

A thesis submitted to the Department of Modern and Classical Languages
and The Graduate School of The University of Wyoming
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
GERMAN

Laramie, Wyoming
May, 1998

To The Graduate School:

The members of The Committee approve the thesis of Tim Jansa presented on April 8, 1998.

_____
Lowell A. Bangerter, Chairman

_____
Hannelore G. Mundt

_____
Eric D. Kohler

APPROVED:

_____
M. Ian Adams, Department of Modern and Classical Languages

_____
Donald S. Warder, Dean, The Graduate School

Contents

I. INTRODUCTION

Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805) was born in a time of great political, philosophical, and religious struggles, and during his relatively short life, he encountered a great number of people representing different views on related issues. One aspect of society in which Schiller soon showed particular interest was the importance of the Church for everyday life in late 18th century Germany. Under the influence of his early teachers, and later other authors and philosophers like Klopstock, Goethe, Herder, and Kant, Schiller soon began to develop and gradually refine a critical concept of religion and the Church that would be of great significance for a large number of his creative writings. The fact that he frequently and unambiguously expressed his criticism, and only in his later works began to restrain himself in the explicitness of his critique soon earned him both contempt from the ecclesiastical authorities and the admiration of a great majority of his audience, including many famous contemporaries.

When browsing through the enormous number of publications on Schiller, one is surprised that only a handful of authors and literary scholars have thus far studied the issue of religion and the Church in Schiller's works in a comprehensive manner. This becomes particularly obvious when one attempts to gather information on a work like Schiller's *Der Geisterseher*, a novel based altogether on the topic of the Catholic Church's struggle to increase its power. Without this in mind, an analyst will miss an extremely important aspect not only of this work, but also of the greater image of the Church that Schiller creates throughout his literary life.

In a time of gradual loss of moral guidance, humaneness in everyday contact with other people in an increasingly anonymous society, and true religious faith, today's reader may find reassurance and even help in examining how an author like Schiller dealt with such moral and religious issues; despite the great temporal gap of 200 years, the problems are astoundingly similar. Yet, one must not accept Schiller's ideas as the only answer for one's questions, since that–as will be shown–would contradict this author's ideal of a free, autonomous mind.

This thesis will attempt to demonstrate a) that religious issues and the role of the Church are a central theme in a large number of Schiller's creative writings and are of great significance for the overall understanding for these works–something that has often been neglected in literary discourse–, b) that Schiller's treatment of these topics reflects not only the changes in society and philosophy of that time, but also Schiller's own biography, as well as a broader historical context–for example in *Don*

Carlos and the *Wallenstein* trilogy–, and c) that Schiller's writings–in particular the later ones– make a strong distinction between religiousness and its individual expression, and its institutionalization in the form of the Church, something that might well have contributed to the loss of power of the Church in a society in transformation toward modernity and enlightenment. The effects of this loss of power can still be felt in these days.

To achieve this goal, I will have to confine myself to a relatively small number of his works due to the enormous amount of material provided by the author himself. Yet, I hope that the reader will be able to get a well-rounded impression of the treatment of religion and the Church which forms such an important topical field throughout Schiller's literary endeavors.

II. SCHILLER AND RELIGION

1. The Historical and Religious Environment in the 18th Century

When Friedrich Schiller was born in 1759, institutional Christianity had been in a severe crisis for much of the 18th century. Beginning with the Enlightenment and its emphasis of the human power of reason, the Christian churches in Germany had suffered a series of set-backs. After the struggles between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches in the wake of the Reformation, the Church's role as a mediator between the people and God as well as its authoritative power had been severely weakened. As a result of this, the time had come for movements that advocated a direct relationship between man and God without the clergy (c.f. Rieder, 11-12). The Thirty-Years'-War (1618-48) resulted in an overall unwillingness among the people to further discuss clerical issues and an ever increased undermining of the power of the Church. Counter-movements soon followed: on the Catholic side the Jesuits favored an extremely orthodox approach toward questions of religion and faith, and in the Protestant camp Pietism evolved, preaching a fatherly and mild God-figure as opposed to the God of Wrath whom the Catholic Church would conjure up. In its orthodoxy, however, the Catholic Church did not fully comprehend the severe inroads that the Enlightenment had already made regarding its absolutist claim to power: "[Sie] konnte nicht recht erkennen, daß der Stoß der in der letzten Konsequenz atheistischen Aufklärung in Form des Deismus den Unterbau des orthodoxen Offenbarungsglaubens traf, die natürliche Religion und die aus ihr abgeleitete, im Christentum gereinigte natürliche Moral" (Rieder, 13). Eventually, Pietism also contributed to a weakening of the orthodox movement. This struggle can be clearly observed in the fight between such figures as Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729-1781) and Johann Melchior Goeze (1717-1786) where Lessing demanded a "natürliche, dogmatisch unverbindliche Moraltheologie" (ibid.) and a religion based on humanness and love, whereas the latter supported the strict dogmatism of the Catholic Church (c.f. Rieder, 13).

In the struggle over religious power, Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) played an important role. He raised individual reasoning skills above all subjective outside influences–including religious dogma–and rooted all evil in people's nature and their self-centered love and ambitions. Since for him reason was the key to truth, the term 'religion' was narrowed accordingly: it no longer described the relationship of man to an almighty divinity, but rather the "Anerkennung all unserer Pflichten als

göttliche Gebote" (Rieder, 16). Therefore, the Church was reduced to a merely "ethisches Gemeinwesen, dessen Aufgabe die Darstellung und Erfüllung der moralischen Gebote ist" (ibid.). Man was proclaimed autonomous in the face of God, and the Church existed solely to demonstrate morally correct behavior.

As one can see, Catholic orthodoxy and Kant's belief in the power of reason formed two extremes between which the Protestant Church constantly vacillated. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) attempted to bring relief to the overall precariousness of the situation by finding a compromise to the rather one-sided view of Kant's followers: he emphasized a natural society and an unspoiled image of man, opposed to a political and cultural class system, and therefore religious dogma.

In the region where young Schiller grew up, the Protestant Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687-1752) was the most prominent religious leader at that time. Basically, he followed Pietism but accepted the strict word of the Bible as the sole authority. Since the Bible had to be followed and obeyed almost literally and with all its moral implications, Bengel defended a sort of religious–although Protestant–orthodoxy: "Bengels Theologie ist ganz auf die Erwartung des Weltgerichtes abgestimmt, sein Adventismus sieht in der Welt nur ein Provisorium, in dem sich der Mensch sittlich zu bewähren hat, seinem Gewissen zu folgen hat, standhaft und vertrauend seinem Gott gegenüber und fest in der Abwehr der Versuchungen des Fürsten der Welt" (Rieder, 14). In particular, the aspect of the coming of the *Weltgericht* later influenced Schiller when he conceived *Die Räuber* in 1781 and conjured up governing bodies based on tyranny and absolutism as the harbingers of the Last Judgment. Before Bengel died in 1752, seven years before Schiller was born, the Church had once again become what it had previously been: an institution of power, controlling virtually all aspects of people's lives with an almost absolutist touch, making any free practicing of religion impossible. "[The] epistolary etiquette of those days demanded extreme humility and hypocritical adulation on the part of the subject toward his sovereign" (Boyesen, 292), something against which Schiller and many others–including Johann Wolfgang Goethe–soon rebelled. Although Schiller never met Bengel, one of the latter's students was to have a tremendous impact on his life and early view of religion: Reverend Philipp Ulrich Moser (1720-1792). It was therefore due to Bengel's achievements that Schiller was raised in Württemberg in an environment in which "die Lehre Luthers in der Reinheit des Offenbarungsglaubens" (Rieder, 14) of Biblical Protestantism was preserved in a time of strong attempts to deconstruct Christianity (c.f. Rieder, 14-15).

Slowly, however, a craving for religious guidance reappeared among the people and was reinforced by a tragic event that would probably not have had such a great impact on Christianity throughout Europe, had it not occurred in a time of such religious instability and hidden endeavors on the orthodox side: the Lisbon earthquake of November 1, 1755. To many it proved that God was not good and just, but rather vengeful, full of wrath, and eager to destroy all that violated the Bible's and the Catholic Church's dogma.

The Enlightenment ultimately became unable to establish a new order of religion and society in general; by 1770, Germany was left a "Trümmerfeld auf dem Gebiet der Religion und der Moral" (Rieder, 17). Most governmental structures, above all the hundreds of little isolated dukedoms and their despotic rulers still existed. Among these the court of Württemberg under Karl Eugen (1728-1793) was probably one of the most conservative, compared, for example to the one in Weimar, Schiller's later home (c.f. Rieder, 18).

2. Schiller's Religious Background

Into such a confusing and unstable environment Friedrich Schiller was born on November 10, 1759. For an analysis of the development of Schiller's view of the Church it is important to investigate his earliest exposure to this institution in contrast to his later experiences. Schiller's father "appears to have been a pious, conscientious, and hard-working man, determined although never needlessly severe to his inferiors, rather obsequious toward his superiors" (Boyesen, 292), a behavior that was anything but typical for a man of Johann Kaspar Schiller's standing as an officer and doctor. Both of young Friedrich's parents were very religious people, but reflected a type of natural religiousness that the orthodox church on both sides was so vigorously battling. It was a "mit Weisheit und Freiheit gepaarte ehrliche Ueberzeugung, die wohl geeignet war, die Herzen [des] Knaben für sich zu gewinnen" (Burggraf, 11). For Schiller's mother "war der Christensinn der verborgene Quell, aus dem all ihr Leben und Streben hervorging" (ibid.), so that from his earliest years her son was exposed to true belief and religious sincerity. The study of the Bible at home eventually led him to the Church. The ultimate effect on Schiller was a naïve love for religious devotion: "He was fond of going to church; and, climbing up on a chair in the nursery, would improvise sermons and deliver them with much emphasis to his elder sister, Christophine, and whoever else might happen to be present" (Boyesen, 292). For quite some time, the boy's greatest desire was to become a priest himself. This would soon change.

When Friedrich was 7 years old, the aforementioned Reverend Moser entered his life. Moser was to be his teacher in the years to come. This man, who called himself an "orthodoxus Lutheranus" (von Wiese, 68), soon began to confront the boy with his own orthodox interpretation of the Bible and the duty of the Church. Although he has been characterized as "ein Mann, der durch den Zauber einer reinen, Gotteskräfte in sich bergenden Persönlichkeit hohe Würde um sich breitete und trotz seinem herben Wesen die Geister zu bezwingen verstand" (Burggraf, 12), he nonetheless exerted a certain pressure on the boy and tried to force his own beliefs upon him. Until his death in 1805, Schiller would repeatedly have to defeat similar situations, dealing with outside influences on his personality and creeds, situations that would be a threat to his freedom. The term 'freedom' was to be of extreme importance for his later works. "Abgesehen davon, daß das Christentum […] sich nicht als die Religion der reinen Menschlichkeit, sondern als ein in Glaubensformeln ausgeprägtes Geheimnis darbot, stand es […] als harter Zuchtmeister vor der Gemeinde" (Burggraf, 24). Although he worked hard to push the young Friedrich into conformity with orthodox Protestantism, Moser's efforts had

anything but the desired effect; “ein Christentum mit der Geißel in der Hand erkältet ihren religiösen Sinn” (ibid.). This describes exactly what happened to Schiller. He found himself engulfed in a form of Christian belief and religious expression that was completely strange to him: a Christianity of asceticism and dark and dispirited renunciation (Burggraf, 26), which he later sharply criticized in *Die Götter Griechenlands* (1788). Moser represented this type of church. The fact that Schiller was unable to establish a profound and spiritual relationship with it, despite his reverence for everything that had to do with religion, ultimately provided a basis for a view that would influence most of his major writings in the many years to come: The young boy developed an early sense for the conflict between religiousness as an important part of human conduct and everyday family life and an all powerful institution that would attempt to control people’s lives–an institution he saw represented by Reverend Moser. Therefore, one cannot see in Schiller at any stage of his life an agnostic or even an atheist rebel against religion like Marx in the 19th century. Despite all estrangement that the Church itself had forced upon him in his early years, religion remained an important guiding factor throughout his life; some of his later writings on aesthetics would otherwise probably not have been conceived in the way they were. Schiller “[trug] sich vielmehr mit dem Gedanken an eine Geisteskirche der Zukunft, in der Glaube und Kunst, Religion und Humanität miteinander versöhnt sein würden” (Burggraf, 30); his studies of or acquaintances with Kant, Rousseau, Herder, Humboldt and–to a certain extent–Goethe would later confirm this.

3. Early Literary Influences on Schiller

A. Goethe

Johann Wolfgang Goethe was ten years older than Schiller. As Burggraf (1902) points out, the two authors' childhoods were–although a decade apart–strikingly similar; the ultimate effect of the childhood experience on Goethe, however, was a different one. Like Schiller's family in Lorch, Goethe's family exercised religion in a way that defied any orthodox and institutionalized aspects. Although religion might not have been as strong a factor in Goethe's home in Frankfurt, it can be assumed that it was nonetheless important (c.f. Burggraf, 11). As it was for Schiller, the Bible was Goethe's approach to the Church. But unlike Lorch, Frankfurt was a battleground in the struggle between the two Christian denominations. This enabled the boy not only to develop an early feeling for religious dogma – since it came from both sides –, but also to experience and examine any strictly orthodox endeavors first-hand, in particular after the Lisbon earthquake 1755[1]. Goethe, too, was influenced by a priest, Reverend Georg Schmidt. Under his guidance, the Bible, "dem Knaben ein Buch voll Leben und Poesie", changed into "eine Sammlung das Dogma belegender Sprüche. Und diese Bibelsprüche, einst ihm Himmelspforten gewesen, an denen er lauschend gestanden, fingen in dieser Behandlung ihn zu langweilen an" (Burggraf, 21). However, it was not only his experiences with religious dogma through his teacher that led to a critical view of the Church. Goethe differed from Schiller in his natural aptitude for rationally analyzing his environment, which, at a very early stage, had led to a critical attitude toward the literal interpretation of the Bible and issues pertaining to religion in general:

> Es war schon ein Zwiespalt in ihm. Und der rührte daher, daß sich unter der von seinem Gemüt und einer mystischen Neigung seiner Natur gehegtem orthodoxen Glaubensüberlieferungen bereits sehr früh der seinem Wesen ebenfalls eingeborene Trieb zu verstandesklarer und lebenswahrer Anschauung zu regen begonnen hatte. Während Schiller, in dessen Natur dieser rationale Erkenntnisdrang eigentlich doch viel stärker angelegt war, sich damals noch ganz unbefangen in dem naiven Vorstellungskreise seiner Umgebung bewegte, weil noch nichts ihn daraus aufgestört hatte, war Goethe schon in seinem sechsten Jahre durch einen ihn tief erschütternden Eindruck auf das prüfende Nachdenken in Glaubensfragen geleitet worden. […] Auch die heilige Schrift machte ihm nicht wenig Schwierigkeiten, weil er darin viel fand, was mit dem Wirklichen und Möglichen sich nicht vertrug. (Burggraf, 16-17)

This, in addition to his despising of an institutionalized dogmatic Church with its "finsteren Gesetzwesen" (Burggraf, 30), soon led to an open opposition from which Schiller at this age still shied away[2] .

In a letter to A. v. Hennings, dated from November 18, 1772, Johann Georg Kestner characterizes the 23-year-old Goethe as follows:

> Er geht nicht in die Kirche, auch nicht zum Abendmahl, betet auch selten. Denn, sagt er, ich bin dazu nicht genug Lügner. […] Vor der christlichen Religion hat er Hochachtung, nicht aber in der Gestalt, wie sie unsere Theologen vorstellten. […] Er strebt nach Wahrheit; hält jedoch mehr vom Gefühl derselben, als von ihrer Demonstration.[3]

As can be seen, Goethe did not express his religious beliefs openly and in conformity with the Church and its rituals, but rather focused on himself as an individual who was able to cope with such issues without the Church as a mediator. This attitude is also reflected in his writings of the time.

In 1773, at the age of 24, Goethe worked on the early drama *Prometheus*. Although never published, it will nonetheless help us to understand his attitude toward religion. Prometheus–as in the Greek legend–despises the Gods. To Minerva–a figure representing nature like the later *Erdgeist* in Faust I–he speaks

> Und du bist meinem Geist,
> was er sich selbst ist.
> Sind von Anbeginn
> Mir deine Worte Himmelslicht gewesen!
> […]
> Und eine Gottheit sprach,
> Wenn ich zu reden wähnte,
> Und wähnt' ich, eine Gottheit spreche,
> Sprach ich selbst. (ll. 100-103, 110-113)

and shows an utterly indestructible self-confidence as an individual towards his superior deities. He does, however, accept a God-like authority, even though he won't recognize it in an outside power, but rather in nature itself. Therefore one can say: "Der junge Goethe ist erst auf dem Wege zum christlichen Theismus. Seine Gottesanschauung bleibt noch im Pantheismus stecken" (Burggraf, 181). The term 'Pantheism' will later be of some significance for the treatment of some of Schiller's works. Burggraf continues with a definition: "Der Pantheismus ist ein philosophisch, religiös und ethisch noch nicht ausgereifter Theismus. Er ist der Gottesbegriff, zu dem immer die gebildete Jugend zunächst gelangen wird, wenn sie, wie Goethe hier, mit zu dem deistisch weltfernen, als menschenartiger Persönlichkeit und in himmlischer Sondergestalt vorgestellten Gott des naiven Glaubens mit Recht zerfallen ist" (184).

A slightly different aspect of Goethe's view of religion can be found in another fragmentary drama, *Mahomet* (1774). The protagonist's endeavors cue in well with those of a literary character like the title figure of Lessing's *Nathan der Weise*. Both promote the idealistic view that the divine can be found in every individual, who therefore can do without the "Fesseln des ererbten Glaubens und der

religiösen Beschränktheit" (Burggraf, 157). Furthermore, religious tolerance as opposed to damnation of all 'non-believers' is presented as a moral guideline[4]. A strikingly similar constellation and attitude toward denominational issues can be found much later in Schiller's epigram *Mein Glaube* (1796). It must, however, be added at this point that Schiller did not adapt Goethe's early view of religion but rather came to the same conclusion through independent studies and after developing his ideas of aesthetics more than two decades after Goethe's *Mahomet* was written.

Neither of these fragments were ever published during Schiller's lifetime, unlike another of Goethe's works, one that influenced not only Schiller to a great extent, but an entire generation of young people: *Die Leiden des Jungen Werther* (1774). In addition to Klopstock's writings (c.f. II.3.B.), *Werther* was read and adored by a great majority of the young men at the *Karlsschule*, the military academy that Schiller attended against his and his parents' will from 1773 to 1780.

Not only does Werther represent the individual who is unable to cope with the conventional orthodox conservatism of society, of which Schiller found himself a victim, but also one who seeks fulfillment in retreat, isolation, and the idea that the human heart can fully grasp God's creation through nature[5] and most of all through art. For the first time, religion and aesthetics merged in Goethe's literature; religion is completely defined in terms of its aesthetic value. Werther sees himself as an artist who can rise to a level equal with God, but ultimately fails. He even goes so far as to identify with the figure of Christ who sacrifices himself for the good of mankind; because of his pathological narcissism, however, his attempt is doomed. But unlike Faust, Werther does not find forgiveness for his sins when he calls on God near the end of the novel, and after his suicide, the local priest refuses to conduct the funeral. Although Goethe temporarily raises his pantheistic views above those of conventional religion, the fact that the protagonist cannot do without the latter in the end leads to the conclusion that Goethe was not oblivious to his religious heritage, but rather modified it to fit his evolving aesthetic concepts. Still, in the end God does not appear as a forgiving father figure, but lets Werther die alone and in sin. A possible interpretation of this fact is that Goethe wanted to condemn any form of institutionalized religion as he had experienced it as a boy in Frankfurt: not even the last honor of having a representative of the Church present is granted to Werther when being put to rest; he is condemned as someone who did not abide by the word of the Bible, and will therefore never find peace in the hereafter. This outcome, though admittedly ambivalent, must have contradicted Goethe's own Christian beliefs of tolerance and forgiveness and could thus be seen as a hidden but sharp

criticism against the Church, particularly since the reader would most likely have felt sympathy with Werther.

This constellation must not have escaped the young Schiller. In *Die Räuber* (1781), his first important dramatic work, Karl's situation can–in some respects–be compared to Werther's[6]: He, too, flees society and violates laws dictated by traditional views of morality and humaneness. Yet, many of his evil deeds are justified through his endeavor to avenge the tyranny of the ruling class and the Church. In the end, Karl succumbs to the load of his sins and willingly sacrifices himself; this sacrifice, however, is often interpreted as a true act of human kindness, and therefore, Karl can face his death with a pure heart. As a contrast to Karl's fate, Schiller further elaborates on the religious aspect of life in the figure of the villain Franz Moor, who ultimately despairs when facing his demise and God's wrath. But unlike Karl, who finds peace in performing a final act of goodness, instead of calling upon God for forgiveness, Franz dies a sinner. As in *Werther*, God is an avenger, in keeping with the Christian dogma, but, as Karl demonstrates, the gloomy fate of standing trial before him can be avoided by a natural religiousness, which he represents. Although Schiller takes Goethe's views one step further, the similarities cannot be ignored. This fact supports the initial argument that Goethe, a man whom Schiller adored and idolized during much of his life, must have had at least some influence on the young author.

B. Klopstock

Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock (1724-1803) undoubtedly had a tremendous influence on both Schiller and Goethe in their early years; he was their "Sänger, und mehr als das, ihr Prophet" (Burggraf, 16). Goethe–and through him eventually Schiller–must have felt a certain affirmation of his own beliefs through Klopstock's works and their powerful religious imagery. In many of the poet's odes, nature takes the place of the mediator between man and his God. Schiller depicts such a relationship between man, God, and nature in his earliest philosophical work, his dissertation *Philosophie der Physiologie* (1779). In the first chapter he writes: "[D]er Mensch ist da, daß er nachringe der Größe seines Schöpfers, mit ebendem Blick umfasse die Welt, wie der Schöpfer sie umfaßt – […] zur Überschauung, Forschung, Bewundrung des großen Plans der Natur"[7]. This immediate connection to God, however, implies a possible reduction and almost an elimination of the Church as a body needed to bring man closer to divinity. Here *Die Frühlingsfeyer* (1759/71) must be mentioned as a good example. Not only is this poem mentioned in Goethe's *Die Leiden des jungen*

Werther[8], but Schiller also adopts some of Klopstock's motifs in his early poetry. Such an immediate relationship between man and God was already discussed in reference to Goethe's *Prometheus* or *Werther*. Klopstock's religious understanding, however, is not as great as that of Goethe as reflected in his pantheistic views. What both authors–and eventually Schiller–have in common is the image of God as an all-powerful being, who in every act of nature, shows man how insignificant he is compared to God's grandeur. And here Schiller and Goethe differ greatly from Klopstock. The latter is awed and inspired by God's expression of greatness and power, whereas both young authors find in this manifestation a reflection of the God of the orthodox Church dogma that they both had encountered during their early years of religious instruction. In Schiller's poem *Hymne an den Unendlichen* of 1781 (c.f. III.4.), for example, all this is expressed: Man is reduced to a 'worm' who is forced to acknowledge his power and "schauernden Pomp", and can do nothing but appeal to God for mercy. This image bears a striking resemblance to Klopstock's *Frühlingswürmchen* in *Die Frühlingsfeyer*. Schiller's 'worm', however, differs from the parallel image in Klopstock's poem, insofar as the latter uses this animal's mortality to emphasize the immortality of the human soul. Schiller even reverses this step and paints an image in which the animal merely depicts human vainness and transitoriness in comparison to God's eternal existence.

Although both Schiller and Goethe modify Klopstock's imagery and religious philosophy for their own purposes, they clearly apply many of the characteristics of the latter's poetry to their works. In the light of the young Schiller's religious background and his image of the Church in these early years, *Hymne an den Unendlichen*, for example, reflects a great array of influencing factors. The combination of these factors will be the starting point for the following detailed analysis of Schiller's works until his death in 1805.

III. THE CHURCH IN SCHILLER'S WORKS

1. General Overview

While the previous chapter provided general information on the historical situation of Schiller's time, we will now turn to the actual analyses of his works. Throughout his life, Schiller frequently dealt with aspects of religion and the Church. Stimulated by Goethe's example, he wrote his first published drama, *Die Räuber*, in 1781. After *Kabale und Liebe* (1783) and *Fiesko* (1784)–two dramas that will not be discussed in this thesis–, *Don Carlos* followed in 1787. Between 1786 and 1789 Schiller published *Der Geisterseher*, his only major work of prose. This novel complements the overall image given by his early dramas: *Die Räuber*, *Don Carlos*, and *Der Geisterseher* all deal with a number of religious issues, and depict the struggle of the individual for freedom against an tyrannical power. Apart from secular tyrants, this power is often the institutionalized Catholic Church as the representative of a vengeful fearsome God. The same situation can be observed in his poetry. For the Protestant Schiller, Catholicism–and connected with it the Inquisition–represented this religious tyranny. With respect to Schiller's experiences in the *Karlsschule*, all these works before 1790 must be regarded as the author's attempt to cope with the traumatic restrictions of his own free will as a student.

After his intensive research for *Don Carlos* and *Fiesko*, and his appointment as a professor for history at the university in Jena 1788, Schiller began his historical studies that produced–among others–the *Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande von der spanischen Regierung* (1788), *Geschichte des Dreißigjährigen Krieges* (1790), and prepared the ground for his great late historical writings, the *Wallenstein* trilogy (1796-99), *Maria Stuart* (1800), *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* (1801), and *Wilhelm Tell* (1804).

For the development of the treatment of the Church in Schiller's creative writings, the poem *Die Götter Griechenlands* ([1]1787, [2]1793) is of great significance, as are the period between 1791 and 1793 and his friendship with Johann Wolfgang Goethe from 1794 to Schiller's death in 1805. In the early 1790s Schiller began his studies of Kant's philosophy and under its influence developed his concept of aesthetics, which was based on the idea of the individual's natural freedom of thought. This new philosophy changed Schiller's perception of the Church from–in his earlier works–an organization that restricts a person's physical freedom to one that hinders man from following his natural craving for

free religious expression. By broadening these religious issues and rooting his critique of the Church in his aesthetic ideas, denominational issues gradually lost the significance they had in works like *Don Carlos*. In the works after 1800, open criticism against the despotic rule of the Church has clearly been replaced by a depiction of humanness and spiritual freedom, often hiding and merely alluding to Schiller's contempt of the institutional Church.

This development will be examined in this chapter, focusing both on the author's lyrical and dramatic works, and paying special attention to *Der Geisterseher* because of its neglect in literary discourse to this day.

2. Early Dramatic Works

A. *Die Räuber* (1781)

Die Räuber was Schiller's first major literary work and can be seen as a starting point for the author's intense treatment of the topic of the Church and religion in his creative writings. In order to fully grasp Schiller's intentions regarding religious implications in this work, one must consider that he began conceiving the play while a student at the *Karlsschule*. During this time, Schiller had been forced to attend this institution by order of duke Karl Eugen, who assumed the role of a 'benevolent despot' to the teenager. Yet, for Schiller Eugen was still a tyrant who represented all that was restricting his and other people's freedom and thus the forces that needed to be fought. Another victim of one of Eugen's despotic acts was a friend of Schiller's, the poet Christian Friedrich Daniel Schubart (1739-1791). After being lured into Eugen's domain by a faked letter, Schubart was incarcerated for over ten years without ever learning what he was being accused of (c.f. Burschell, 45). Schiller used the motif of imprisonment in his play as a symbol for the kind of tyrannical arbitrariness he saw in Eugen, and its manifestation in the *Karlsschule*, which Schubart once called a "Sklavenplantage" (Burschell, 47).

Although a rebellion against such acts of caprice and the tyrant who performed them was undoubtedly one of Schiller's initial goals when he began to conceive *Die Räuber*, he soon modified and greatly broadened his intentions. In the foreword to the play, he expresses his desire to fight 'vice'. Although he does not provide a clear definition of this term, he still focuses on moral and religious aspects:

> Wer sich den Zwek vorgezeichnet hat, das Laster zu stürzen und Religion, Moral und bürgerliche Gesetze an ihren Feinden zu rächen, ein solcher muß das Laster in seiner nakten Abscheulichkeit enthüllen und in seiner kolossalischen Grösse vor das Auge der Menschheit stellen […]. (III, 6-7)

Schiller's intention was therefore to portray vice in all its horrible grandeur, shocking the reader and making a lasting impression on him. Yet, he cannot deny his religious heritage. Later in the foreword he writes:

> Die edle Einfalt der *Schrift* muß sich in alltäglichen Assembleen von den sogenannten wizigen Köpfen mißhandeln und ins Lächerliche verzerren lassen; […] Ich kann hoffen, daß ich der *Religion* und der wahren Moral keine gemeine Rache verschaft habe […]. Jedem, auch dem Lasterhaftesten, ist gewissermassen ein Stempel des göttlichen Ebenbilds aufgedrückt, und vielleicht hat der grosse Bösewicht keinen so weiten Weg zum grossen Rechtschaffenen, als der kleine; denn die Moralität hält gleichen Gang mit den Kräften […]. (ibid.)

As he explicitly states, his goal is not to denounce religion but those who violate its truly moral laws in the play. Christian world order and moral equilibrium must be destroyed in order to be reconstructed in the end. God functions through man and his moral consciousness. Here Schiller again tries to defend the strong sense of a natural religiousness that he learned to love as a child. Thus, when religion is criticized in the play, it must be the institutionalized aspect of organized religion rather than Christian faith itself.

Such criticism is mainly portrayed in the figure of Karl, who early in the play evolves as the avenger against this degenerated institution and sees his mission in reestablishing morality and religious sincerity:

> Karl ist ausgezogen, um die göttliche Gerechtigkeit in der Welt wiederherzustellen, auch wenn er darüber selbst zum Sünder würde, denn die apokalyptische Zeit bedrängt ihn furchtbar, die ungeheure Fülle ihrer Verbrechen, das grenzenlose Maß des Abfalls von Gott ist diesem Schiller-Karl, diesem Moralisten aus innerster Leidenschaft, diesem wahrhaft christlichen Empörer unerträglich. Es ist eine protestantische Empörung, es ist die Empörung eines Luther gegen das in der Sünde vergehende Papsttum, die hier weiterlebt. (Rieder, 33)

In the course of furthering his noble endeavors, however, he becomes a sinner himself. In this respect, two scenes are of extreme importance, since they deal with the issue of restoring a religious and moral order from the debris that all its violations have left: The dialogue between Karl and the *Pater* (II/3) and the scene between Franz and Moser (V/1), as mentioned in II.3.A. In the former, the priest is sent to Karl Moor by the "hohe Obrigkeit, die über Leben und Tod spricht" (III, 68). With this initial statement, he expresses the institutionalized Church's claim for power over all aspects of an individual's life, which is exactly what Karl wants to fight. The Pater then further elaborates on the Church's role in representing a dogma that–superficially–seems to promise forgiveness for all sins, but ultimately demands complete submission of the individual without living up to the promised absolution:

> Pater: […] Wirst du izt gleich zum Kreuz kriechen, und um Gnade und Schonung flehen, siehe, so wird dir die Strenge selbst Erbarmen, die Gerechtigkeit eine liebende Mutter seyn – sie drükt das Auge bey der Helfte [!] deiner Verbrechen zu, und läßt es – denk doch! – und läßt es *bey dem Rade bewenden*! (III, 69)

Karl, however, sees through this deception and even admits to being responsible for all the cruelties that were performed by his order. By emphasizing religious bigotry and greed among the clergy, however, he points out his role as an avenger in favor of true religiousness; "[s]ein Handwerk ist Wiedervergeltung – Rache ist [s]ein Gewerbe" (III, 71). Although the reader sees Karl from his worst side, he nonetheless cannot help but accept his justification of his questionable deeds:

> Wahr ists, ich habe den Reichs-Grafen erschlagen, die Dominikus-Kirche angezündet und geplündert, hab Feuerbrände in eure bigotte Stadt geworfen, und den Pulverturm über die Häupter guter Christen herabgestürzt – […] (III, 69-71)

Karl then tells the priest how he acquired the rings on his fingers, one of which was stolen from a priest. Schiller hereby stresses a) the striving of the Church for materialistic rather than spiritual wealth, and b) the abuse of their suggestive power over the people by the clergy. He also introduces the problem of the Inquisition into his works, which he later treats to a great extent in *Don Carlos* (1783-87) and *Der Geisterseher* (1786-89):

> Diesen Achat trag ich einem Pfaffen Ihres Gelichters zur Ehre, den ich mit eigener Hand erwürgte, als er auf offener Kanzel geweint hatte, daß die Inquisition so in Zerfall käme […] (III, 70)

Another aspect of the institutional Church that is stressed is the ever present hypocrisy, bigotry and greed among the clergy, and the questionable way of worshipping God; also, Schiller makes a clear reference to the Spanish *Conquista* in Central and South America after the rediscovery of the New World in the late 15th century:

> Da donnern sie Sanftmuth und Duldung aus ihren Wolken, und bringen dem Gott der Liebe Menschenopfer wie einem feuerarmigen Moloch – predigen Liebe des Nächsten, und fluchen den achtzigjährigen Blinden von ihren Thüren hinweg; –stürmen wider Geiz und haben Peru um goldner Spangen willen entvölkert und die Heyden wie Zugvieh vor ihre Wagen gespannt – Sie zerbrechen sich die Köpfe, wie es möglich gewesen wäre, daß die Natur hätte können einen Ischariot schaffen, und nicht der schlimmste unter ihnen würde den dreyeinigen Gott um zehen Silberlinge verrathen. […] Ihr scheut euch nicht, vor Kreuz und Altären zu knien, zerfleischt eure Rücken mit Riemen, und foltert euer Fleisch mit Fasten; ihr wähnt, mit diesen erbärmlichen Gaukeleyen demjenigen einen blauen Dunst vorzumachen, den ihr Thoren doch den allwissenden nennt, nicht anders, als wie man der Grossen am bittersten spottet, wenn man ihnen schmeichelt, daß sie die Schmeichler hassen; ihr pocht auf Ehrlichkeit und exemplarischen Wandel, und der Gott, der euer Herz durchschaut, würde wider den Schöpfer ergrimmen, wenn er nicht eben der wäre, der das Ungeheuer am Nilus erschaffen hat. (III, 70-71)

An interesting fact is that the reference to the role of the Spaniards in the Christianization of the Americas is a clear blow against the Catholic Church. The aspect of Protestantism versus Catholicism had thus far been left out or was only indirectly implied; now–for the first time–a direct criticism of the Catholic Church and its cruelties in the name of God is brought to the reader's attention.

In concluding his speech, Karl then turns to his followers and once more stresses the restrictions and lack of freedom the Church provides. Finally he tackles the problem of the original sin of man–an aspect that Goethe later treats in his play *Iphigenie auf Tauris* (1787; c.f. III.6.B.)–and denies its relevance for the free individual that he himself represents:

> [Die Kirche] bietet euch Freyheit, und ihr seyd wirklich schon ihre Gefangene. – Sie schenkt euch das Leben, und das ist keine Prahlerey, denn ihr seyd wahrhaftig gerichtet – Sie verheißt euch Ehren und Aemter und was kann euer Loos anders seyn, wenn ihr auch obsiegtet, als Schmach und Fluch und Verfolgung. – Sie kündigt euch Versöhnung vom Himmel an, und ihr seyd wirklich verdammt. Es ist kein Haar an keinem unter euch, das nicht in die Hölle fährt. (III, 71)

This scene then comes to a rather comical ending: The priest, being confronted with all this criticism–which, at least partially, he must admit is the truth–, realizes that his mission to bring the robbers to his side against Karl has failed; he flees the camp. Karl, though admitting to his sins, is ultimately the moral and spiritual victor. This again vindicates Karl's claim to being an avenger in the name of true religiousness. At the end of the play, he finds peace and forgiveness through one true act of goodness, and dies with a clear conscience.

The second relevant scene in this context is the dialogue between Franz Moor and Pastor Moser (V/1). This confrontation between the two antagonists can be seen as a parallel to the scene between Karl and the priest. Here, however, Franz represents the atheist, completely denying the existence of an almighty God and an immortal soul. Moser, in contrast to the priest in the scene discussed before, is a much more humane representative of the Church. He does not represent an institution whose sole purpose it is to condemn and punish the sinners of this world. Also, he does not raise himself above the people he preaches to, but is very aware that it is not in his power to judge the unjust[9]. Instead, he appeals to Franz's heart and his moral consciousness, although stressing God's supreme power and superiority. When Franz challenges the existence of God–"Es ist kein Gott!" (III, 121)–and expresses his belief in the transitoriness of the human soul, Moser returns his challenge by questioning his ability to adhere to his beliefs in the moment of death.

It is an interesting fact that Moser clearly refers to Franz as a tyrant (III, 122) and thus gives a basic justification for his threat that Franz will eventually fall victim to an avenging God. With the words

> Der Gedanke *Gott* weckt einen fürchterlichen Nachbar auf, sein Name heißt *Richter*. […] Nun, glaubt Ihr wol, Gott werde es zugeben, daß ein einziger Mensch in seiner Welt wie ein Wütrich hause, und das oberste zu unterst kehre? […] Er wird jede Minute, die Ihr [euren Opfern] getödtet, jede Freude, die Ihr ihnen vergiftet, jede Vollkommenheit, die Ihr ihnen versperret habt, von Euch fodern dereinst, und wenn Ihr darauf antwortet, Moor, so sollt ihr gewonnen haben (III, 123)

Moser conjures up an image of a God of Wrath whose revenge Franz is destined to feel. This image does superficially resemble the one given by the priest to Karl, but here it is removed from an institution that sees its duty in executing this anger. The tyrant Franz would eventually have to stand trial directly before God and not one of his representatives, and be judged in the hereafter: "Aber was hier zeitliches Leiden war, wird dort ewiger Triumf, was hier endlicher Triumf war, wird dort ewige unendliche Verzweiflung" (ibid.).

Franz's ultimate challenge of God –"Ich will ihn zwingen, daß er mich zernichte, ich will ihn zur Wuth reizen, daß er mich in der Wuth zernichte" (III, 124)–results in Moser's naming the two greatest sins: "Vatermord" and "Brudermord", and Franz finds himself guilty of both. It is then that he finally begins to comprehend the gravity of his sins. Shortly after Moser leaves and the robbers approach to kill him, he tries to turn to God in utter despair, thus admitting his guilt and inability to face death without spiritual guidance. Moser has won, and Franz commits the disgraceful act of suicide. He never finds atonement.

Comparing these two scenes, both members of the clergy–the priest and Moser–represent extremely opposite sides of the religious spectrum: Where the priest portrays a corrupt and degenerate church that has formed an alliance with the egocentric despots of the time, Moser–and to a certain extent also Karl–supports true Christianity in accordance with the views of a figure like Martin Luther, in whose spirit the attacks against the institutionalized Church must be seen (c.f. Rieder, 32). Moser is an "aufrechter Seelsorger […], der auch vor der Obrigkeit nicht zurückweicht" (ibid.), and "zeigt den Beginn der Ecclesia triumphans, der Wiederherstellung der christlichen Weltordnung, die durch beide, Franz und Karl, gestört wurde" (Rieder, 27).

What becomes obvious, is that it is not Christianity itself that Schiller criticizes in *Die Räuber*, but rather its abuse by the Church as an institution that has become a tyrant figure of the kind that Schiller learned to despise during his years at the *Karlsschule*.

B. *Don Carlos* (1787)

In the preceding chapter it was mentioned that the motif of the Inquisition is of great importance for some of Schiller's later works. *Don Carlos* is one of these. It must be noted, however, that Schiller's original plan was to create a much more pointed accusation against the Inquisition than the end result[10] shows: "In Bauerbach, where the plot of *Don Carlos* first began to assume shape, he had conceived the intention of making it a satire against the Inquisition and all kinds of clerical oppressions" (Boyesen, 352), then, however, changed his plans in favor of a more mellow story of the royal family at the Spanish court (ibid.). That the Inquisition would nonetheless play a very important role in this drama is shown in a letter that Schiller wrote to his friend and later brother-in-law Wilhelm Friedrich Hermann Reinwald on April 14, 1783, when the author first began to make plans for the play:

> Außerdem will ich es mir in diesem Schauspiel zur Pflicht machen in Darstellung der Inquisition die prostituirte Menschheit zu rächen, und ihre Schandfleken fürchterlich an den Pranger zu stellen. Ich will – und solte mein Karlos dadurch auch für das Theater verloren gehen – einer Menschenart, welche der Dolch der Tragödie biß jetzt nur gestreift hat, auf die Seele stoßen. (XXIII, 81)

Even more pointed than in *Die Räuber*, Schiller wanted to portray evil and vice, in this case in the concrete image of the Inquisition and less through indirect hints and overall human actions. In *Don Carlos* the royal court in Madrid serves as a place where the Church spies on and tries to psychologically investigate everyone, including even the royal family (c.f. Kittler, 264). Again, parallels with Schiller's biography are obvious; the situation at the Spanish court bears great resemblance to Schiller's experience at the *Karlsschule*, as Kittler (1984) points out: "Eine listige Strategie flößt[e] [dort] Ängste vor Beichtvätern und Militärpersonal ein, damit die wahren Seelengeheimnisse an ein anderes und genaueres Ohr dringen" (Kittler, 265).

Before beginning an analysis of the image of the Church in *Don Carlos*, one must note that– because of its setting–it is the Catholic Church that plays the leading role in this drama. Only in allusions to the problem of the rebellion of the Netherlands against the Spanish supremacy does the reader come in contact with the Protestant Church, and the latter plays only a minor role[11].

Early in the drama, the reader is confronted with the fact that the Church is omnipresent and seems to rule virtually every–even very personal–aspect of the lives of people living at court. In the second scene of the first act the reader learns that Carlos' love for Elisabeth–now his stepmother–is doomed from the beginning since

> Weltgebräuche,
> die Ordnung der Natur und Roms Gesetze
> verdammen diese Leidenschaft. (VI, 21)

"Roms Gesetze", meaning the laws of the Roman Catholic Church, are immediately shown as being treated as equivalent to the laws of nature, hereby emphasizing their inviolability and power. Furthermore, the term 'naturalness' is modified insofar as it is defined solely through conformity with Catholic dogma and ritual. Those laws are now abused to suppress true feelings between the two lovers Carlos and Elisabeth.

In the following scene (I/3), the Inquisition appears for the first time in all its cruelty in the form of the *auto-de-fé*, the burning of heretics at the stake. This expression of the Church's absolutist claim to power, as an appropriate practice within religious customs (c.f. Miller, 61), is openly defended by Mondekar and Eboli. This fact, at this early stage, presents these figures as the play's antagonists. They are later joined by Domingo and Alba, two other strong advocates of life in accordance with the

Church's dogma. It is interesting that all these are rather repulsive characters, whereas the great souls and protagonists bear the characteristics of philosophers (Burggraf, 125). According to Eboli, these victims of the Inquisition are not victims at all–at least not according to current beliefs. It is rather Eboli herself who plays the role of a 'victim' when she pleads with the queen: "Um Gottes Willen, lassen Sie mich nicht – / nicht aufgeopfert werden" (VI, 30), referring to the arrangement that she be married to Olivarez. Through this contrast and the treatment of the term 'victim', the Inquisition is presented as an institution of injustice and arbitrariness. This constellation becomes programmatic for the rest of the drama and is later supported when king Philipp's II and the Grand Inquisitor's despotic rule, under which "the emotions of the human heart are as unimportant as freedom of conscience" (Miller, 61), are compared to the Marquis von Posa's endeavors. The latter holds such strong ideals as political, intellectual and religious freedom[12] which form a clear contrast to the utterly restrictive policies of Philipp and the Church. The direct effect of this is that the reader immediately sympathizes with Posa and supports him when–in his great dialogue with the king (III/10), one of the core scenes of the drama–he demands: "Geben Sie / Gedankenfreiheit" (VI, 191) and "stellen Sie der Menschheit / verlornen Adel wieder her" (VI, 193). This wish, however, remains unfulfilled. The king himself soon emerges as being fully controlled by the Church which is ruled by the Grand Inquisitor and his followers Alba and Domingo. Although Philipp, in his friendship with Posa and his prayer for a confidante ("Jetzt gieb mir einen Menschen, […] / ich bitte dich um einen Freund", VI, 167), is presented as having some humane character traits, he ultimately cannot resist the pressure the Church exerts on him.

This clash between Philipp's character and the Church's expectations becomes an important factor when the sovereign's role in this society is discussed by Domingo and Alba in Act II, Scene 12. Here, Domingo not only describes the ruler's manipulation by the Church but also the potential threat that Carlos, through his friendship with Posa and his exposure to the latter's ideals, poses to the throne; if Carlos should one day become king, the Church's dominating role would be in jeopardy:

> Andre Sorgen nagen
> an meiner Ruhe, Sorgen für den Thron,
> für Gott und die Kirche – Der Infant
> (ich kenn' ihn – ich durchdringe seine Seele)
> hegt einen schrecklichen Entwurf – […]
> Regent zu sein
> und unsern heil'gen Glauben zu entbehren[…]
> Er *denkt* –
> […] er verehrt den Menschen – Herzog,
> ob er zu unserm König taugt?
> […]

Er ist stolz auf seine Freiheit […]
Der kühne Riesengeist
wird unsrer Staatskunst Linien durchreißen.
[…] Schrecklich ist
in diesem Körper dieser Geist – und Philipp
wird sechzig Jahre. (VI, 124-125)

The fact that Carlos 'thinks' and strives to follow humanistic ideals once more stresses the incompatibility of such guidelines with those of organized religion. A 'good' sovereign must be conform with the will if the Church, and this, as both Domingo and Alba recognize, makes Carlos anything but a suitable future ruler. A similar constellation can be found in Schiller's *Geisterseher* and will be discussed later (III.4.).

In this game of power, Posa is without doubt the leading figure. He is the designated humanist[13] and attempts to draw the king to his side by persuading him to abandon his path of denying his duty to protect the people in need. Like Goethe's Werther, Philipp–under the influence of the Grand Inquisitor–has assumed the position of a God-like figure who is completely removed from the people, merely exercises his power over them and eventually even over his own son. In Posa's great dialogue with the king (III/10), he explicitly states that such demeanor is a severe violation of the laws of nature and can only result in death and destruction:

Sie brauchen Mitgefühl – und einem Gott [Philipp]
kann man nur opfern – zittern – zu ihm beten;
mit ihm zu fühlen wagt man nicht. So laut,
so drängend auch die leidende Natur
hervor aus diesem Busen ruft – umsonst […] (VI, 187)
[…] Geben Sie
die unnatürliche Vergött'rung auf,
die uns vernichtet. (VI, 191)

Again, parallels can be drawn to the character of Werther, as well as to the type of Church the priest represents in his dialogue with Karl in *Die Räuber* (c.f. III.2.A). Werther, too, lifts himself to the same level as God and denies his power. In the end he perishes and dies a miserable death, although he is in any position but that of being able to decide over another person's life or death. This is what the Church has a right to do, according to the priest in Schiller's first play. Schiller presents all these acts–if performed by a human being–as despicable crimes, which are, however, frequently committed by the clergy. What is left after revealing and condemning these acts of evil is again an image of religiousness free of dogma and duty, and solely focused on the individual. This is what Schiller wants to support, and here the Church can only be seen as a major obstacle that must be overcome.

To further consolidate this point, the scene between Philipp and the Grand Inquisitor (V/10) must not be left out. Here, Schiller's critique reaches an unprecedented clarity and intensity. The Grand Inquisitor represents the epitome of the (religious) tyrant–although he works in secret–, and portrays the Church as an incarnation of an overly rational society in the wake of the Enlightenment (Rieder, 54). Under his rule, the Bible has lost all of its moral function and serves merely to justify the abuse of power and eventually the murder of Carlos in the name of the Church:

KÖNIG: Können
Sie einen Glauben mir erdenken,
der Kindermord des Gräßlichen entkleidet?

GROSSINQUISITOR: Die ewige Gerechtigkeit zu sühnen
starb an dem Holze Gottes Sohn. (VI, 333)

Through his argument he manipulates the symbolic meaning of Christ's sacrifice for mankind toward an alibi to execute the heir to the throne: "[Es] soll hier der klerikale-absolutistische Anspruch erinnert werden, 'ewige' und nicht bloß geschichtlich-evolutionäre 'Gerechtigkeit' zu üben" (Ehrig, 233-234).

But not only Carlos and his fate are the subject of the discussion between the two rulers. At the beginning of the scene, the Grand Inquisitor explains Posa's death as the unavoidable terminal point of a plan devised long before. The individual–here represented by Posa–is shown in all his lack of freedom under the rule of the Church, which decides upon the person's life or death: "Sein Leben / liegt angefangen und beschlossen in / der Santa Casa heiligen Registern" (VI, 327). But Philipp, too, is being severely reprimanded for his violation of his role within the greater order of the Church, which was induced by his acquaintance with Posa:

[…] uns wollten Sie entfliehen.
Des Ordens schwere Ketten drücken Sie;
Sie wollten frei und einzig sein.
[…]
Danken Sie der Kirche,
die sich begnügt, als Mutter Sie zu strafen.
Die Wahl, die man Sie blindlings treffen lassen,
war Ihre Züchtigung. Sie sind belehrt.
Jetzt kehren Sie zu uns zurücke […] (VI, 331)

The Grand Inquisitor's claim to be exercising great mildness in respect to Philipp's punishment seems almost ironic, considering the fact that Philipp will now probably forever remain a prisoner of the Church; his chance to free himself of the dogmatic shackles vanished with Posa's death.

Another rather ironic aspect in the Inquisitor's views is his condemnation of Posa's death as murder: "Nein! / Er ist ermordet – Ruhmlos! Liederlich!" (VI, 328). This, however, is not based on the fact that a human life was violently ended, but rather that Posa was not put at the Holy Inquisition's

disposal as a “Gut”, which made it impossible for him to be publicly executed as an heretic in the name of God (c.f. Miller, 61):

Das Blut,
das unsrer Ehre glorreich fließen sollte,
hat eines Bravo Hand verspritzt – Der Mensch
war unser – Was berechtigt *Sie*
des Ordens heil'ge Güter anzutasten?
Durch uns zu sterben war er da. Ihn schenkte
Der Notdurft dieses Zeitenlaufes Gott,
in seines Geistes feierlicher Schändung
die prahlende Vernunft zur Schau zu führen. (VI, 328-329)

The fact that Posa was a mere figure in a game of power, planned and executed by the Grand Inquisitor, bears great resemblance to the situation in Schiller's *Geisterseher*. These situations can be seen as rather important illustrations of the author's view of the institutionalized Church at that time (c.f. III.4.C). As in the novel, the Church's absolute claim to power over the freedom of the individual and society in general form one main aspect of Schiller's criticism of this institution. The Grand Inquisitor's words "Vor dem Glauben / gilt keine Stimme der Natur" (VI, 333) and the following famous exchange about handing Carlos over to the Church, dramatically summarize the author's condemnations:

KÖNIG: Es ist mein einz'ger Sohn – Wem hab' ich
gesammelt?

GROSSINQUISITOR *mit Feuer*: Der Verwesung lieber, als
der Freiheit. (VI, 333-334)

To summarize Schiller's treatment of the Church in *Don Carlos*, one can say: "[Im] Don Carlos […] hatte sich [Schiller] eindeutig gegen die Kirche entschieden, die ihm, wie in der Gestalt des Pater der 'Räuber', ein Instrument der Tyrannis geworden war. Dennoch dürfen wir nicht dem Mißverständnis erliegen […], daß hier die Kirche an sich, die Religion, das Christentum an sich gemeint war. Schiller benutzte vielmehr eine historische Situation, eine bestimmte Ausformung kirchlichen Daseins, um die Tyrannis zu treffen, wie er sie […] in der Zergliederung ihrer Wesenszüge darbot" (Rieder, 115). This statement is of particular importance, since–as mentioned before–Schiller never abandoned or denied his religious heritage. What he criticizes is merely the danger of institutionalizing religion and the restrictions on a person's freedom that this would induce. Given Schiller's experiences at the *Karlsschule*, such fear can be well understood.

3. Early Poetry

As mentioned in II.3., Schiller's early works, including his poetry, were strongly influenced not only by his experiences during his time at the *Karlsschule*, but also by two particular authors: Johann Wolfgang Goethe and Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock. The latter's importance was already discussed in reference to Schiller's *Hymne an den Unendlichen* (1781); it will be necessary, however, to further elaborate on the overall image of religion and the Church that Schiller portrays in this and three other poems.

In Schiller's poems, as in many of Klopstock's lyrics, nature is used as a manifestation of the greatness and power of God. The lyrical I in *Hymne an den Unendlichen* finds itself standing amid a raging display of nature: storm clouds underneath him and a feeling of the vast expanse of heaven above. It is in this situation that he contemplates the eternal existence of God, who temporarily 'lends' this experience to mortal man:

> Zwischen Himmel und Erd', hoch in der Lüfte Meer,
> In der Wiege des Sturms trägt mich ein Zackenfels,
> Wolken türmen
> Unter mir sich zu Stürmen,
> Schwindelnd gaukelt der Blick umher,
> Und ich denke dich, Ewiger.
> Deinen schaudernden Pomp borge dem Endlichen,
> Ungeheure Natur! Du, der Unendlichkeit
> Riesentochter,
> Sei mir Spiegel Jehovas! (ll. 1-10)

It is this contrast of eternity–represented by nature and through it God–and mortality–the insignificant human being–that sets the tone for the understanding of the role of God and through him the Church in Schiller's early poetry. As discussed in II.3.B., man is reduced to a mere 'worm' in the face of his creator, who displays all his power in a thunderstorm. When God asks through the poet "*Kreaturen, erkennt ihr mich?*" (l. 17) and the humans can but acknowledge his horrible supremacy by crying out pleadingly "Schone, Herr! Wir erkennen dich." (l. 18), the former presents himself as a fearsome being, whose sole purpose seems to be to subdue any other existence in the universe. If one takes this image one step further and transfers it to an organization that has to represent this God, one quickly reaches something that bears a striking resemblance to the institutionalized Church presented by Schiller in *Die Räuber* or *Don Carlos*: an establishment that is full of cruelty, violent force, judgment, and condemnation against anyone not abiding by its laws.

A similar constellation can be found in Schiller's *Elegie auf den Tod eines Jünglings*, written during the same year. Although the young author primarily attempts to cope with the death of Johann Christian Weckherlin through this poem, it soon becomes obvious that he goes beyond mere mourning. In this death he recognizes man's inability to control his own life and the fact that he is at the mercy of an arbitrary *Fortuna*:

> Über dir mag auch Fortuna gaukeln,
> Blind herum nach ihren Buhlen spähn,
> Menschen bald auf schwankenden Thronen schaukeln,
> Bald herum in wüsten Pfützen drehn– (ll. 61-64)

But the Goddess of Fortune does not long remain the culprit. Very soon, the lyrical I begins to tackle religious questions and expresses doubt about the answers the Church has been giving:

> Daß es wahr sei, was den Pilger freute?
> Daß noch jenseits ein Gedanke sei?
> Daß die Tugend übers Grab geleite?
> Daß es mehr denn eitle Phantasei? (ll. 89-92)

The poem then climaxes in a direct accusation against the horrors and arbitrariness that God embodies:

> Zieht denn hin, ihr schwarzen stummen Träger!
> Tischt auch den dem großen Würger auf!
> Höret auf, geheulergoßne Kläger! (ll. 97-99)

Finally, the poet questions God's right to control human life and–by modifying the words of the Latin liturgy '*Sanctus! Sanctus! Sanctus! Dominus Deus Sabaoth. Pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua.*'[14]– rebukes God for being a divinity of death that must be feared, not honored:

> Wo der Mensch, der Gottes Ratschluß prüfte?
> Wo das Aug', den Abgrund durchzuschaun?
> Heilig! Heilig! Heilig! Bist du, Gott der Grüfte!
> Wir verehren dich mit Graun! (ll. 101-104)

In the end, the speaker defies God: even though the life of the deceased is over due to the Almighty's cruel will, his love will nonetheless prevail. This last statement must be seen not only as an attempt to see God's power in relative terms, but also in the light of Schiller's evolving metaphysics of love[15]. The latter is also of some significance for the following poem.

Freigeisterei der Leidenschaft (1784), later greatly abridged and renamed *Der Kampf*, deals with the author's inner conflict between his duty (*Pflicht*) and virtue (*Tugend*) on one hand, and passion (*Leidenschaft*) on the other[16]. This conflict can be found in many of Schiller's works.

One factor that further complicates this inner struggle is that virtue is defined in religious terms. The speaker finds himself bound by laws of religion and the Church that forbid him to follow his natural instinct to be with the one he loves:

> Sieh, Göttin, mich zu deines Thrones Stufen,
> Wo ich noch jüngst, ein frecher Beter, lag,
> Mein übereilter Eid sei widerrufen,
> Vernichtet sei der schreckliche Vertrag,
> […]
> Weil ein Gebrauch, den die Gesetze heilig prägen,
> Des Zufalls schwere Missetat geweiht?
> Nein–unerschrocken trotz ich einem Bund entgegen,
> Den die errötende Natur bereut. (ll. 9-12, 57-60)

And again we find the speaker questioning and defying these laws, through them the Church, and eventually God. Sufferings of the soul such as the ones the author describes cannot be the doing of a good and just God, but rather of an unsatisfied, negative divinity that desperately tries to attract ever more of man's and nature's attention:

> Besticht man dich mit blutendem Entsagen?
> Durch eine Hölle nur
> Kannst du zu deinem Himmel eine Brücke schlagen?
> Nur auf der Folter merkt dich die Natur?
>
> O diesem Gott laßt unsre Tempel uns verschließen,
> Kein Loblied feire ihn,
> Und keine Freudenträne soll ihm weiter fließen,
> er hat auf immer seinen Lohn dahin! (81-88)

Thus far, the focus has solely been on the image of God, merely implying the role and character of a church that represents him. The last of Schiller's early poems that will be discussed in this chapter is *Rousseau* (1781). Here, we finally find a direct reference to Christianity and the Church in general. In accordance with Albrecht von Haller's (1708-1777) and after him Jean-Jacques Rousseau's views of "einer auf Natur gegründeten Gemeinschaftsordnung der Menschen" (von Wiese, 89), Schiller sees in the latter a martyr for the struggle for a 'natural' society that is free of any religious or secular dogma and restrictions. Already in the second stanza, the speaker conjures up an image of a bigoted and envious environment that killed the great philosopher:

> Kaum ein Grabmal ist ihm überblieben,
> Den von Reich zu Reich der Neid getrieben,
> frommer Eifer umgestrudelt hat. (ll. 7-9)

As he does later in *Die Götter Griechenlands* (1788-93; c.f. III.5.), Schiller then contrasts the ancient world with the present; although Christianity has 'illuminated' mankind, great wise men like Rousseau still fall victim to a society that cannot cope with their genius:

Wann wird die alte Wunde narben?
Einst wars finster–und die Weisen starben,
Nun ists lichter–und der Weise stirbt. (ll. 37-39)

But now it is not envious contemporaries anymore who bring about the great men's demise, but Christianity that–and this must be understood as a direct blow against the institutionalization thereof–wants to prevent men like Rousseau from bringing humanness into religion:

Sokrates ging unter durch Sophisten,
Rousseau leidet–Rousseau fällt durch Christen,
Rousseau–der aus Christen Menschen wirbt. (ll. 40-42)

It is this act of turning Christians into humans that seems to be utterly destructive to religion; the term *Christen* is applied to people who follow the dogma of the Church, whereas *Menschen* represent the natural state of human religiousness without the need for a supporting institution.

On this basis, Schiller then uses biting irony to make his point; organized religion is attacked at its core, drawing particular attention to the violence it justifies and all the questionable dogma and ritual that is compared to the pagan worship of the Golden Calf in the Old Testament:

Ha! Mit Jubel, die sich feurig gießen,
Sei, Religion, von mir gepriesen,
Himmelstochter, sei geküßt! […]

Aber wehe–Basiliskenpfeile
Deine Blicke–Krokodilgeheule
Deiner Stimme sanfte Melodien,
Menschen bluten unter deinem Zahne,
Wenn verderbengeifernde Imane
Zur Erennys dich verziehn.

Ja! Im acht und zehnten Jubeljahre,
Seit das Weib den Himmelsohn gebare
(Chroniker, vergeßt es nie),
Hier erfanden schlauere Perille
Ein noch musikalischer Gebrülle,
Als dort aus dem ehrnen Ochsen schrie. (ll. 43-45, 49-60)

It is this world, ruled by *Vorurteil* and *Eigennutz*, that is responsible for Rousseau's death. In the last stanza, Schiller draws an interesting parallel to the Marquis von Posa in *Don Carlos* when he writes

Nicht für diese Welt warst du–zu bieder
Warst du ihr, zu hoch–vielleicht zu nieder (ll. 79-80)[17],

but concludes by characterizing Rousseau as "doch du warst ein Christ" (l. 81). At first glance, this statement sounds contradictory to what Schiller had to say before about Christians. But he seems to be trying to depict a representative of a true–i.e. natural–Christianity as opposed to the bigotry and

falsehood among the other members of this faith. Rousseau is presented as the only great soul among the rest of Christianity. As with all martyrs, he fights for truth and righteousness, but eventually falls victim to circumstance, here the lack of understanding and tolerance among his contemporaries.

As can be seen, in Schiller's early poetry, of which only four examples could be discussed in this chapter, the poet draws a clear line between the image of a vengeful, arbitrary and intimidating God of religious dogma and the bigotry and forceful submission among the followers of the institutionalized Church on the other hand, and true faith in the natural and original meaning of religion on the other. Although his views were at least in part influenced by personal experience and tragedy, this theme could already be observed in some of his other works. A similar trend seems to be emerging for the Schiller writings that follow.

4. Schiller's Prose: *Der Geisterseher* (1786-89) and its Religious Implications

A. Introduction

The fragmentary novel *Der Geisterseher*, written between the years of 1786 and 1789, is one of Schiller's works that has thus far been widely ignored in literary discourse. The fact that the novel remained a fragment, the little that is known about the work, the frequent lack of an explicit message, and the fact that Schiller himself regarded it only as *Brotarbeit*, may have played an important role in its neglect. However, one must not forget that in this work, which first appeared in the fourth edition of the *Rheinische Thalia* in January 1787, Schiller tackled a number of issues that would have great thematic significance for his later writings. Among those, probably the most important problem is the role of the Church and the liberties an individual can or cannot enjoy under its rule. This problem has already been analyzed in the discussion of *Don Carlos* (1787), and will later recur in the treatment of parts of the *Wallenstein*-trilogy (1797-1799), *Maria Stuart* (1800), *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* (1801), and *Wilhelm Tell* (1804).

On attempting to examine the role of the Church in *Der Geisterseher*, one encounters a number of problems, since the novel often does not treat this problem in an explicit manner. Most of the time, the reader finds an abundance of clues and allusions referring to this topic, but it is then up to him to piece together the hints that relate to the large conspiracy[18] that eventually leads to the protagonist's conversion to Catholicism. It is this conspiracy that forms the core of the narrative and provides the main vehicle for the description–and latent critique–of the Church. It must be noted at this point that for the first time in Schiller's writings the Catholic Church is the specific focus of the author's criticism throughout the narrative.

B. Historical and Sociological Background

As mentioned in II.1., the struggle between the two Christian denominations in the aftermath of the Reformation, and the problem of the diminishing power of the Church had dominated most of 18th century society and politics. In this context, mysticism played an important role as a counter-movement against the overly rational and scientific approaches to understanding the world. The emphasis on mysticism often resulted in a strong belief in miracles, which the Church then used to again gain

ground in the ongoing struggles about its function as an authority in religious and moral issues. This belief in mystical and supernatural phenomena had a direct impact on Masonic Lodges and other secret societies, and eventually found its way into literature.

These factors, in addition to the overwhelming majority's ever latent superstitious belief in ghosts and a world beyond human understanding, provided a fertile ground and a large audience for an author like Schiller, who was willing to use these popular topics in his works.

These topics were made even more explosive by a few other events at that time. In 1782, Elisabeth, Princess of Württemberg and a member of a traditionally Protestant family, converted to Catholicism (c.f. Hanstein, 67). On the basis of the facts about the life of the Prince of *** given in the novel, but in particular his conversion, Hanstein (1903) attempted to find models for the Prince, and named a few historical figures who went through the same process: Duke Karl Alexander of Württemberg, Friedrich II. of Hesse, and Johann Friedrich of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, all respected members of the nobility. It can be assumed that such events must have caused some outrage in a region of Germany that was almost entirely Protestant.

In 1786, a few months before Schiller began to write his *Geisterseher*, Friedrich Heinrich Eugen, Prince of Württemberg, published an article in the July issue of the *Berliner Monatsschrift* in which he expressed his contentment regarding the uncovering of the swindler, conman, and supposed necromancer Guiseppe Balsamo (1743-1795)[19], alias Duke Cagliostro, from Sicily. What caused a great controversy, however, was that Eugen defended the belief in supernatural phenomena and the opinion that there could be some truth in the ritual of necromancy. Through this essay the public got the impression that the rulers of their country were apparently alarmingly susceptible to the "Jesuiten und Seelenfänger Roms" (Hanstein, 71-72). The public's attention was again focused on the latent threat of the Jesuits, whose order had been prohibited by Pope Clemens XIV in 1773, but nonetheless still existed in secrecy as so-called "Kryptokatholiken" (c.f. Storz, 189):

> Es war die Zeit, in der die Jesuiten […] sich überall bemerkbar machten und, wie schon seit langem, evangelische Fürsten für den Katholizismus zurückzugewinnen suchten, wobei sie jene schwärmerische, die Vernunft umnebelnde Bewegung für ihre Zwecke ausnutzten. (Noch, 654)

For his novel, Schiller adapted this very situation of a Protestant prince and potential heir to the throne on his way toward Catholicism due to a conspiracy of the orthodox Church; for most readers this must have been a vindication of their darkest fears.

That this field was anything but new to Schiller is shown by a letter to Reinwald of March 1783, in which he asks his friend to send him certain book dealing with these topics:

> Die Bücher, wovon wir sprachen, über *Jesuiten* und *Religionsveränderungen* – überhaupt, über den Bigottismus und seltene Verderbnisse des Karakters, suchen Sie mir doch mit dem bäldsten zu verschaffen, weil ich nunmehr mit starken Schritten auf meinen *Friedrich Imhof* los gehen will. Schriften über Inquisition, Geschichte der Bastille, dann vorzüglich auch (was ich vorgestern vergeßen habe) Bücher, worinn von den unglüklichen Opfern es *Spiels* Meldung geschieht, sind ganz vortreflich in meinen Plan. (XXIII, 69-70)

Schiller, however, maintained a clear position in religious questions and defended his Protestant background; this can be seen in another letter to Caroline von Beulwitz and his future wife Charlotte von Lengefeld, dated January 26, 1789:

> Mein Geisterseher hat mich dieser Tage etlichemal sehr angenehm beschäftigt; er hätte fast mein Christentum wankend gemacht, das, wie Sie wißen, alle Kräfte der Hölle nicht haben bewegen können. (XXV, 190)

Since Schiller was a religious man, any criticism of the Church must therefore again be understood as a reproach against the institution and its religious dogma.

C. The Conspiracy

Early in *Der Geisterseher*, Schiller expresses his intentions to tell a "Geschichte des Betrugs und der Verwirrung des menschlichen Geistes" (XVI, 45), which Storz (1986) summarizes as follows, stressing the religious aspect of the novel:

> Das Ergebnis; auf das [Schillers] Entwurf [des Geistersehers] abzielte, lag somit mitten auf seinem Wege: die geistig-sittliche Vernichtung eines jungen Menschen, der allzu rasch einen »blinden, ungeprüften Glauben« aufgibt und sich der radikalen Rationalität, ja einem nihilistischen Agnostizismus ausliefert – andererseits die Freigeisterei, die in ihr Gegenteil umschlägt […]. (182)

Mayer (1996) emphasizes the conflict between the Protestant and the Catholic Church:

> Der Geisterseher bindet diese Gretchenfrage der Aufklärung [bezüglich der Wahrheit und Deutung von Geistererscheinungen zu religiösen Zwecken] in die Spannung zwischen Protestantismus und Katholizismus ein: Der Prinz konvertiert am Ende und gibt damit den Anspruch auf, sich seines eigenen Verstandes zu bedienen. (223)

It seems obvious that the attachment of a human being–in this case the Price of **–to the institutionalized_–here Catholic–Church goes hand in hand with the process of abandoning individuality, freedom, and morals, as well as spiritual self, which allows others to exercise complete control over this person. This circumstance is used in the narrative as a vehicle for a major point of critique against the Church.

In order to fully grasp the extent of the Church's[20] influence, it is necessary to examine the great conspiracy against the Prince of **, a plan that leads the reader into the deepest reaches of the human psyche and the pathology of power: "[T]he chief merit of the story lies in the marvelous insight it displays into the morbid side and pathological phases of the human soul" (Boyesen, 357). This examination will provide the basis for the interpretation of Schiller's criticism of the Church.

Near the end of the novel, the reader learns that the prince, who, during the entire narrative, resides in Venice, Italy, is financially dependent on his sister in Germany, a "fromme Schwärmerin [für die katholische Kirche]" (XVI, 136). In retrospect and on the basis of this fact, she emerges as one of the initiators of the plot, collaborating with the mysterious Armenian in Venice. This figure is introduced when he approaches the Prince and his friend, the Duke of O**, on St. Marcus Square and prophesies the death of a remote living relative that same night (XVI, 147). That the prophecy is fulfilled is revealed four days later (XVI, 148). This mysterious occurrence is the starting point for the plot and the prince's journey toward Catholicism.

Soon other unexplainable events and predictions, like his encounter with the Inquisition, begin to have the desired effect on the Prince: Although the Inquisition, whose leader appears to be the Armenian, is depicted in all its cruelty, arbitrariness, and power over people's life or death[21], the Prince is nonetheless introduced to a world that a) begins to awaken his craving for power, and b) reinforces his self-esteem. This introduction later drives him deep into the net of lies and superficial truths. It is the Prince's longing for power, however, that is strengthened through prophesies like "ein König ist unter uns" (XVI, 53)[22] and makes him susceptible to the doings of the Church. The Prince is soon convinced that he is chosen for a higher fate: "Eine höhere Gewalt verfolgt mich. Allwissenheit schwebt um mich. Ein unsichtbares Wesen, dem ich nicht entfliehen kann, bewacht meine Schritte" (XVI, 54). Although he senses that a unknown power starts to control his life, he still seems willing to accept this fact with the hope that he will eventually be part of this power. Yet, the ultimate effect is that he becomes increasingly vulnerable to the unraveling plot of the Church.

Before continuing the analysis of the conspiracy and its effect on the Prince, it is necessary to examine his character; in order to understand Schiller's development of it. The author himself characterizes the protagonist with the words: "Niemand war mehr dazu geboren, sich beherrschen zu lassen, ohne schwach zu sein" (XVI, 46), at first glance a paradoxical statement. Yet, it suggests that he would be a perfect puppet for a higher power without this fact being obvious to the general public. Therefore it can be assumed that he is not a random candidate for the conspiracy but rather

thoughtfully chosen, which again underlines the strong psychological aspect of the novel. A similar constellation has already been examined in *Don Carlos*, where the Grand Inquisitor emphasizes the fact that the Church had carefully manipulated Posa and Philipp for its own purposed. In this context Mayer (1996) writes:

> Eine "vernachlässigte Erziehung" hat den Geist des Prinzen nicht zur Reife kommen lassen, wahllose Lektüre und religiöse Melancholie prädestinieren ihn zum Spielball äußeren Einflusses. Seine Schwärmernatur manifestiert sich zunächst als Erbe pietistischer und besonders calvinistischer Strömungen […], steht aber auf zu unsicherem Boden, um dem ausgeklügelten Verführungswerk des Armeniers standhalten zu können. Der "vermeintliche Triumph" seiner Vernunft, als er die Machenschaften des Sizilianers und gar dessen Vernetzung mit dem Armenier aufdeckt, läßt ihn in eine Falle stürzen: Er mißtraut allem Übernatürlichen und befleißigt sich einer libertinistischen Freigeisterei in der Bucentauro-Gesellschaft, die ihn schließlich in Geld- und Liebesnöte bringt, aus deren Verstrickungen er sich nur noch durch Konversion 'retten' kann. (236)

The Prince's tendency to be manipulated and his weak religious foundation therefore make him a prime target for the conspiracy. Because such characteristics could be found in many members of the nobility in Schiller's times, this became a very explosive issue.

It can thus be seen that the plot utilizes a number of factors: The Prince's initial susceptibility for the supernatural[23] is used to provide the basis for the necromancy ceremony in the first book of the narrative (XVI, 60-63). As developed here, it serves a) as an introduction to the world of Catholic liturgy and tradition, and b) to enhance the Prince's positivism after the unveiling of the Sicilian necromancer's act of deception. The latter factor then induces a stronger proneness to the kind of flattering remarks that eventually introduce the nobleman to a society and environment that in the end completely changes his character, which, to a certain extent, anticipates the end of the novel.

In that respect, the First Book of *Der Geisterseher* can be seen as a preparation for the treatment of the actual core of the narrative in Book Two.

It is now important to examine how Schiller describes the Prince's childhood experiences with the Church[24], something that has thus far been left untouched. His understanding of religion was at a very early stage formed through a "bigotte, knechtische Erziehung" (XVI, 103), that conveyed only "Schreckensbilder" and "religiöse Melancholie" (ibid.). Religion appeared as a "bezaubertes Schloß" (ibid.) and served the sole purpose of smothering "alle Lebhaftigkeit des Knaben in einem dumpfen Geisteszwange" and as "zuverlässigste[s] Mittel, sich der höchsten Zufriedenheit der fürstlichen Eltern zu versichern" (ibid.). For the first time in the narrative, Schiller openly criticizes the Church and its means of educating the young prince. It is interesting, however, that it is the Protestant Church that is described in such a negative way[25]. Thus, religion in general must be criticized as soon it is abused to exert pressure on an individual in order to deprive him of his personal freedom. This is exactly what

the Prince's earliest experiences with this matter consisted of; the question of whether it is Catholicism or Protestantism is therefore, for the moment, secondary.

Yet, "[a]lle seine Vorstellungen von Religion hatten etwas Fürchterliches an sich, und eben das Grauenvolle und Derbe war es, was sich seiner Einbildungskraft zuerst bemächtigte und sich auch am längsten darin hielt" (ibid.). God is a vengeful spirit and his worship a "knechtisches Zittern oder blinde, alle Kraft und Kühnheit erstickende Ergebung" (ibid.). "Allen seinen kindischen und jugendlichen Neigungen […] stand die Religion im Wege; […] er lernte sie nie als eine Wohltat, nur als eine Geißel seiner Leidenschaften kennen" (ibid.), which is the reason why the Prince has thus far been a 'refugee' fleeing from and not coping with his fears. Ironically, in the end he becomes more and more entangled in the shackles provided by the Church. This is partly due to the fact that he mindlessly attempts to escape and does not wait until "seine reifere Vernunft sich gemächlich [von der Religion] abgelöst [hat]" (XVI, 104). Such a predisposition in character and upbringing provides a fertile ground for the Church's endeavors and later makes it impossible for the adult to free himself from its power. Ultimately, the Prince's only way of escape lies in the polar extreme, namely to embrace the supposed liberties, apparently offered by the Church. Given the importance of individual physical and intellectual freedom for Schiller, this development presents a further point of critique against the Church.

It becomes obvious that Schiller's hidden reproaches against the Church in the First Book begin to give way to increasingly more explicit criticism in Book Two. This development must be seen parallel to Schiller's work on *Don Carlos*, the drama in which his critical view of the institutional Church reached an unprecedented clarity and explicitness, climaxing in the encounter between King Philipp and the Great Inquisitor (c.f. III.2.B., III.4.D.).

In further analyzing the conspiracy, one finds that the solving of the apparently unsolvable mystery behind the Sicilian's necromantic ceremony[26] is an important step along the Prince's way toward Catholicism: it has the effect of disenchanting and annihilating both his belief in miracles on one hand, and his old image of the Church on the other. The destruction of his image of the Church is achieved by the construction of a strong but devious network of lies and truths, resulting in a "Zweifelsucht" (XVI, 104) within the Prince. Eventually even his strong resentment against religion falls victim to these doubts. Finally, the Church steps into this void, into his search for something new, and offers the Prince a "zerstreuungsvolle Lebensart" (XVI, 105). It makes him sociable again and awakens a "Bedürfnis höherer Bildung" (ibid.)[27]. Eventually, he finds all these things in the secret

society Bucentauro, a circle that bears the "äußerlichen Schein einer edeln vernünftigen Geistesfreiheit" (XVI, 106). However, the reader soon learns that among the members of this society are several clergymen and even cardinals. This is very likely not a coincidence, and neither are the changes that soon begin to occur in the Prince's character:

> Der Prinz vergaß hier, daß *Libertinage* des Geistes und der Sitten bei Personen [des geistlichen] Standes eben darum weiter um sich greift, weil sie hier einen Zügel weniger findet und durch keinen Nimbus von Heiligkeit, der so oft profane Augen blendet, zurückgeschreckt wird. […] Aber schon durch die bloße Vertraulichkeit mit dieser Menschenklasse […] ging die reine, schöne Einfalt seines Charakters und die Zartheit seiner moralischen Gefühle verloren […] und unvermerkt hatte dieses schreckliche Korrosiv alles – beinahe alles verzehrt, worauf seine Moralität ruhen sollte. Die natürlichen Stützen seiner Glückseligkeit gab er für Sophismen hinweg, die ihn im entscheidenden Augenblick verließen und ihn dadurch zwangen, sich an den ersten besten willkürlichen [die Kirche] zu halten, den man ihm zuwarf. (XVI, 106-107)

Soon afterwards, a relative of the Prince–probably sent by the Church–travels to Venice and presents himself as his rival for the attention of the society. This forces the Prince into a lifestyle that helps him to maintain his prestige, but he eventually falls into enormous debts. In addition to this, the payments from his sister miraculously stop, driving him deeper and deeper into financial dependence. Again, one sees how Schiller gradually and intricately constructs the Prince's entanglement in the web of the Church.

This institution has thus far mainly operated in the background. In the second letter written by the Baron of F** to the Duke of O**, however, an event is described that ultimately deepens the Prince's financial dependence and leads him closer to the Church: The Prince manages to save the life of the Marchese of Civitella, who happens to be the nephew of the Cardinal of A**i. He then becomes closely involved with this family and begins to receive financial support from them. The reader soon recognizes this occurrence as a plan executed by Biondello–the Prince's personal servant[28]–, in which Civitella himself is a victim. It is the fact that the cardinal is willing to sacrifice a member of his own family for the Church–something that could already be observed in *Don Carlos*, in which the King is willing to sacrifice his own son–that emphasizes the already emerging image of this institution as one that arbitrarily assumes power over everyone's life.

The Prince and the Marchese soon become close friends. Civitella, however, begins to have a very positive influence on the Prince and distracts him from the members of the society that he was led to accept as an authority. Therefore Civitella has to die in order to assure the success of the plot, and he suffers the same fate as the beautiful *Griechin* shortly afterwards.

The encounter between the Prince and the Greek woman in a church on the Giudecca[29] is probably the most important and mysterious event in Schiller's *Geisterseher*. The woman's assignment

is to bring the conspiracy to an end by fully drawing him onto the side of the Church; and in the beginning she seems to succeed. In this scene (XVI, 129-134) the Prince's drastic change of attitude towards the Church is of great interest: As soon as he enters the little church, he describes it as "leer – eine schaurigkühle Dunkelheit", which almost instantly changes into a "feierliche Grabesstille" that emphasizes the "große[n] Verhältnisse dieses majestätischen Baues" (XVI, 129-130). When he sees the *Griechin*, she begins to have a similar effect on him: Within a very short period of time, she turns from a "Schrecken" into a "Dame" and eventually into a "himmlisch schöne[s] Angesicht" of a "Madonna" (XVI, 130). The latter is described as follows

> Mit unaussprechlicher Anmut – halb kniend, halb liegend – war sie vor einem Altar hingegossen – der gewagteste, lieblichste, gelungenste Umriß, einzig und unnachahmlich, die schönste Linie der Natur. (ibid.)

and has a dual effect on the Prince: For the first time since he began to change character with all the distractions in his new environment, he feels "Ruhe, unaussprechliche Ruhe" (XVI, 132), but also a previously unknown nearness to God through the prayer of this heavenly being: "Sie betete zu ihrer Gottheit, und ich betete zu ihr – Ja, ich betete sie an – […] jetzt zum erstenmal ergriff es mich's, als ob ich in einem Heiligtum wäre" (XVI, 131-132). Although the presence of a 'Greek lady'–who turns out to be a German noblewoman–in a Catholic Church is strange in itself, and a fact later dismissed as merely "etwas Geheimnisvolles" (XVI, 135), it is left to the reader's intelligence to recognize this occurrence as part of the greater plot. The proof that this was indeed Schiller's intention can be found in the letter to Caroline von Beulwitz and Charlotte von Lengefeld of January 26, 1789[30]:

> Ich möchte gern ein recht romantisches Ideal von einer liebenswürdigen Schönheit schildern, aber dieß muß zugleich so beschaffen seyn, daß es – eine eingelernte Rolle ist, denn meine liebenswürdige Griechinn ist eine abgefeimte Betrügerin.

Again, the Church ruthlessly plays with the Prince and his emotions. As intricate and bulletproof as this plan seems, the initiators have not taken into account the possibility that the man's worldly love for the *Griechin* could supersede his spiritual love for God and through him the Church: "Sie ist vielleicht das kräftigste Mittel, den Prinzen von seinen metaphysischen Träumereien wieder zur ordinären Menschheit harabzuziehen" (XVI, 136), which is exactly what begins to happen. Finally, the Church has no other choice but to brutally eliminate the woman and her potentially dangerous knowledge. The lady's death and its devastating effect on the Prince is the final step toward his final acceptance of the Church as the only true authority.

Near the end of the novel, the letter "An den Prinzen von *** von seiner Schwester" reveals to the reader the full extent of the conspiracy: "Die alleinseligmachende Kirche, die an dem Prinzen eine

so glänzende Eroberung gemacht hat, wird es ihm auch nicht an Mitteln fehlen lassen, die Lebensart fortzusetzen, der sie diese Eroberung verdankt" (XVI, 158). But a future abuse of the Prince's influence can now be assumed since statements on his side like "O es ist unerträglich hart, einen Herrn über sich zu haben!" (XVI, 155) or "Der elendste unter dem Volk […] oder der nächste Prinz am Throne! Das ist ganz dasselbe. Es gibt nur *einen* Unterschied unter den Menschen – Gehorchen oder Herrschen!" (XVI, 156) anticipate a murder in the near future with which he could ascend to the throne. Although not explicitly stated, this is implied as the ultimate goal of the Church, which would tremendously increase its power in the Prince's home country. Ironically, the Prince still attempts to free himself from the control of a higher power, which he sees possible in the fight for the throne. Yet, he is completely oblivious to the fact that the exact opposite has been the case since his conversion to Catholicism. Although the Church is now really his master, he seems ultimately to have found happiness (XVI, 158).

What should have become clear during the above analysis of the plot is the elaborate technique the Church uses to abuse and manipulate it's victims' minds, as well as the cold elimination of everyone and everything that might pose a threat to its endeavors to satisfy its lust for power. Most readers might have read Schiller's *Geisterseher* as a fascinating story about mystery, love, and deception, but it can be assumed that the author's actual intentions lay in the depiction of the dangers of the Church and its blind followers. Here, the narrative touched on an especially explosive topic, since similar occurrences of Catholicism entering politics could be observed in Schiller's own time. The great success of the novel among such a broad audience, however, was most likely due to the subject matter rather that the author's strong critique of the institutionalized Church.

D. *Der Geisterseher* and *Don Carlos* as Milestones in Schiller's View of the Church

Burschell (1968) summarizes Schiller's intentions in writing *Der Geisterseher* as follows: "Er wollte seinen Prinzen, einen Stiefbruder des Don Carlos, unter dem Einfluß einer geheimen Gesellschaft aus einem jugendlichen Schwärmer und Idealisten zu einem Freigeist und schließlich zu einem Verbrecher werden lassen" (217). Although the Prince becomes anything but a *Freigeist* and finds his individuality and power to see the truth gradually taken away from him, it is nonetheless interesting that Burschell draws a parallel between the protagonist in the *Geisterseher* and the figure of Don Carlos.

What both these works undoubtedly have in common is a strong criticism against the Catholic Church, whereas his earlier writings offered hardly any distinction between the two Christian denominations. In concluding this section on Schiller's early works, the question therefore needs to be examined as to why the author suddenly turns so explicitly against Catholicism during the second half of the 1780s, something that later again disappears or is even reversed. Here, Schiller's letters offer no help; his biography, however might be able to shed some light on this problem. Through his success with *Die Räuber* and *Kabale und Liebe* (1784) and his developing close friendship with Christian Gottfried Körner, Schiller developed a new sense of self-esteem and trust in his abilities, which can also be observed in his poetry[31]. This development might very well have given him the courage to openly attack this institution, while drawing a line between the Church itself and his own religious heritage.

More than that, however, the beginning of his intensive historical studies could be attributed to this change of attitude. When he first began to conceive the plan for *Don Carlos*, he was forced to study the historical context and sources for his plot (c.f. Koopmann, 73-74). After the drama was published in 1786, he continued these studies and in the following two years completed his first major historical work, the *Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande von der spanischen Regierung* (1788). With respect to Schiller's interest in a rebellion against an authoritarian regime–here the Spanish rule–this work made a strong impression on the author:

> Das ganze Interesse des jungen Schiller für Verschwörungen , für das *große* Verbrechen und die *merkwürdige* Tat scheint darin noch einmal wachzuwerden, und die Geschichte der niederländischen Verschwörung wuchs ihm derart unter den Händen an, daß er sich, auf Anraten Wielands, schließlich entschloß, die Niederländische Rebellion nicht in der Reihe 'Merkwürdige Rebellionen' zu veröffentlichen, sondern als eigenes Werk bei Crusius herauszugeben, um sie so vor den 'Verschwörungen' ganz zu trennen. (Koopmann, 75)

During this in-depth preoccupation with the subject matter, it is likely that the Inquisition must have appealed to Schiller as an institution that in his opinion represented the epitome of the *tyrannis* through its deprivation of physical and spiritual personal freedom, something that he had learned to despise deeply at the *Karlsschule*.

Whatever the reasons may have been, his attacks against the Catholic Church and institutionalized religion in general soon vanished and gave way to a different and extremely important chapter in Schiller's growth as an author: his aesthetic and philosophical writings. The following chapter on Schiller's pre-classical poetry–and here in particular *Die Götter Griechenlands*–shall serve as a preparation for the treatment of these works, and form the transition between his striving for

primarily physical freedom in his literature and critique of the Church and his later views based on his aesthetic and philosophical concepts (c.f. III.6.).

5. Pre-classical Poetry: *Die Götter Griechenlands* (1788/1793)

In spring of 1788 Schiller published a poem that is of extreme importance for both his later works in general and this analysis of the image of the Church in his creative writings: *Die Götter Griechenlands*. Since Schiller later revised this poem under the influence of Goethe and Humboldt, it will be of some interest to compare the two versions. It is important to note at the start , however, that the general tenor of the first, a "manifesto of artistic paganism, an aesthetic protest against Christianity" (Boyesen, 371), was maintained in the second. Gerhard (1994) summarizes the poem's main ideas as follows:

> In den "Göttern Griechenlands" führte [Schiller] der freie Flug der Vorstellungen über den Bereich des sicheren, christlichen Glaubens hinaus und damit in eine Haltung, die falsch oder einseitig als "Atheismus" gedeutet worden ist und doch aus seiner neuen Auffassung vom Göttlichen im Griechischen Menschentum entsprang. (116)

As he had done in many works before, Schiller criticizes here a cold and cruel God, removed from all beings on earth. But in this poem, he introduces two elements new to his literature: He a) broadens his criticism to encompass the entire Christian world, and b) abandons the form of a mere critique and gives a positive counterexample by contrasting modern Christianity with the world of ancient Greece and its gods[32]:

> Da ihr noch die schöne Welt regieret,
> An der Freude leichtem Gängelband
> Selige Geschlechter noch geführet,
> Schöne Wesen aus dem Fabelland!
> Ach, da euer Wonne dienst noch glänzte,
> Wie ganz anders, anders war es da!
> Da man deine Tempel noch bekränzte,
> Venus Amathusia! (ll. 1-8)

This people of this vanished world had the ability to recognize and comprehend a higher order, an expression of the divine in nature:

> An der Liebe Busen sie zu drücken,
> Gab man höhern Adel der Natur,
> Alles wies den eingeweihten Blicken,
> Alles eines Gottes Spur. (ll. 13-16)

It is interesting how well this image cues in with Goethe's view of nature (c.f. II.3.A) and Schiller's dissertation *Philosophie der Physiologie*. At the beginning of the first chapter in the latter he writes:

> Soviel wird, denke ich, einmal fest genug erwiesen sein, daß das Universum das Werk eines unendlichen Verstandes [Gottes] sei und entworfen nach einem trefflichen Plane. (XX, 11)

In this poem, however, Schiller adds an element to the description of the participation of man and the gods in each other's lives, namely his evolving concept of aesthetics and beauty:

> Zwischen Menschen, Göttern Heroen
> Knüpfte Amor einen schönen Bund,
> Sterbliche mit Göttern und Heroen
> Huldigten in Amathunt.
> […]
> Damals war nichts heilig als das Schöne [!],
> Keiner Freude schämte sich der Gott,
> Wo keusch errötende Kamöne,
> Wo die Grazie gebot. (ll. 37-40, 45-48)

Although Schiller does not offer a definition of beauty (*das Schöne*), but merely uses this term in order to emphasize the liveliness, holiness, and nearness to the Gods enjoyed by the Greeks, it nonetheless sheds some light on the philosophical foundation of his future works. At this point, it must be mentioned, however, that this last stanza (ll. 41-48) did not appear in the original version of the poem, but was added during the revision. This shows Schiller's progression and development in his views of what he later called *schön*: the Greeks, living in a "schöne Welt" (l. 89) were free[33] in their exercise of religion and worship of the gods who did not force them into slavery, but rather encouraged man's devotion by giving something of themselves.

This image of the pagan world of the Greeks that was filled with truth expressed through poetry[34], is then set in contrast to the relationship of modern man to God and religion, which is characterized by "finstere[n] Ernst und trauriges Entsagen" (l. 41), dread and complete absence of compassion. Instead of anticipating a transcendental transfiguration in the hereafter, man must now anxiously face a "gräßliches Gerippe" (l. 65), a manifestation of the Church's play with the human fear of death. This institution abuses the latter to exert power over the people:

> Stille, Dunkelheit und Entsagung schienen der freudlose Weg zu [Gott] zu sein. Fern stand er den Menschen, die er von seiner Höhe herunter richtete und thronte einsam über der Welt, sich selbst genug. Vor ihm beugten sich die Menschen so tief, daß ihr Auge ihn nicht mehr erreichen vermochte. (Wentzlaff-Eggebert, 118-119)

To prove the validity of this position, which reminds the reader of similar images in *Die Räuber*, *Don Carlos* and *Der Geisterseher*, Schiller himself characterizes the God he describes so critically. In a letter to Körner, dated December 25, 1788, he writes:

> Der Gott, den ich in den Göttern Griechenlands in den Schatten stelle, ist nicht der Gott der Philosophen oder auch nur das wohltätige Traumbild des großen Haufens, sondern er ist eine aus vielen gebrechlichen schiefen Vorstellungsarten zusammengeflossene Mißgeburt. […] Hingegen glaube ich auch fest, daß es gerade auf diesem Wege auch alle übrigen Forderungen mittelbar befriedigen muß, weil sich jede Schönheit doch endlich in allgemeine Wahrheit auflösen läßt. (XXV, 167)[35]

Two more passages that must be mentioned in this context are a few stanzas that appear only in the first version of the poem:

> Wohin tret ich? Diese traurge Stille
> kündigt sie mir meinen Schöpfer an?
> Finster, wie er selbst, ist seine Hülle,
> mein Entsagen – was ihn feiern kann. (ll. 101-104),

and later in the poem, God is depicted as a divinity who replaced the old gods of the Greeks and now rules as an eternal but utterly lonely and self-centered being, completely detached from his human worshippers[36]:

> Freundlos, […]
> Herrscht ein Andrer […].
> Selig, eh sich Wesen um ihn freuten,
> selig im entvölkerten Gefild,
> sieht er in dem langen Strom der Zeiten
> ewig nur – sein eignes Bild.
>
> Bürger des Olymps konnt' ich erreichen,
> jenem Gotte, den sein Marmor preißt,
> konnte einst der hohe Bildner gleichen;
> Was ist neben Dir der höchste Geist
> derer, welche Sterbliche gebahren? (ll. 177-189)

Where, in the days of the Greek gods, an artist was able to achieve a quasi godlike status, this has now become impossible.

Near the end of the revised version of 1793, Schiller expresses his melancholic craving for the return of the Greek world to rejuvenate the current "entgötterte Natur" (l. 112), a symbol for the loss of not only a friendly, approachable God, but also humaneness in modern times. The latter ultimately reflects on religion as a whole:

> Schöne Welt, wo bist du? Kehre wieder,
> Holdes Blütenalter der Natur!
> Ach, nur in den Feenland der Lieder
> Lebt noch deine fabelhafte Spur. (ll. 89-92)

The only thing that has survived the disappearance of the old world is art, here represented by song. Schiller's mentioning of the poet's responsibility to express truth (l. 9-10), his repeated reference to beauty as a vital part of a free and happy existence, and his final regret that all that is left in the present is "das entseelte Wort" (l. 124) must be understood as a reproach against Christianity that has a) fully detached itself from a natural–aesthetic–religiousness, and b) now makes it impossible for a modern poet to attempt to relive the example of the Greeks. This is important, since it differs from all depictions of Christianity and the Church found in previous works.

Already in the first, but particularly in the second version of *Die Götter Griechenlands*, Schiller shows a trend away from only criticizing the physical restrictions imposed by the Church, and toward a much broader approach to Christian belief as a world view that does not allow beauty to exist. It is this "Klage um die verlorene Schönheit, Farbigkeit und Lebendigkeit griechischen Wesens" (Wentzlaff-Eggebert, 120) around which Schiller constructs in the poem; Christianity is both a manifestation and the trigger of the new order and is not criticized for its religious content:

> No one will seriously maintain that this beautiful elegy is meant as a protest against any single doctrine of Christianity, far less against its moral code. […] If, however, a controversial purpose (which was far from Schiller's mind) is attributed to the elegy, then it strikes not only at religion, but at science and the whole structure of modern society. (Boyesen, 372)

Schiller's contemporaries' strong rebukes against the author and this poem were based on the misconception that Schiller wanted to promote a polytheist religion in place of current monotheistic Christianity. Such critique came for example from Leopold Duke of Stolberg, who in his essay *Gedanken über Herrn Schillers Gedicht: Die Götter Griechenlands* (1788) accused the author of blasphemy (c.f. Sengle, 57-58).

That, on the contrary, Schiller was a deeply religious man has been pointed out several times in this thesis. Brief mention of another of his works, *Die Sendung Moses* (1790), gives further emphasis to this point. This piece of literature expresses Schiller's view of the important role played by religion in unifying and maintaining a working government and country:

> Wir wissen, daß Schiller von der unabdingbaren Bedeutung der Religion für den Zusammenhalt einer Gesellschaft überzeugt war. Die Religion schafft Einheit, wo die Gesetze nicht hinlangen, und sie garantiert den Gehorsam gegen die Gesetze auch dann noch, wenn ihre Befolgung eine Gefahr für die persönliche und vitale Sicherheit des Menschen mit sich bringt." (von Wiese, 348)

Thus in Schiller's eyes religion and Christian belief cannot be neglected. This fact supports the argument that any accusations like the ones mentioned in the previous paragraph cannot be validated.

As mentioned above, it is interesting to note how the views that Schiller expresses in *Die Götter Griechenlands* both coincide with, and at the same time contradict ideas found in Johann Wolfgang Goethe's writings. This is of some significance for the future development of Schiller's literature, particularly after his first personal encounter with Goethe (c.f. III.6.B.). At this point, a brief summary of the similarities and differences between these two authors' views will suffice. In this respect, Wentzlaff-Eggebert (1963) writes:

> Der augenfällige, unversöhnte Dualismus in den 'Göttern Griechenlands', die extreme Beurteilung der Verstandes- und Sinnenkräfte, die Anklage gegen die abstrahierende Form des modernen Denken, gegen jede

> naturwissenschaftliche Betrachtungsweise überhaupt, waren [Goethes] eigenen Anschauungen nicht mehr gemäß, zumal auch jede ehrfürchtige Würdigung der Natur fehlte (122),

and states that the fact that

> Die Götter […] hatten sich gebeugt und waren vor der Kraft der Vernunft dem "Einen", dem Christengott gewichen in die Gefilde der Poesie. Das war die tiefste Klage dieses Gedichtes, daß die Natur entgöttert und der Mensch einsam der für das Gefühl und die Kunst gleich tödlichen Kraft des Verstandes ausgeliefert war (118),

something that shows Schiller in all his remoteness from Goethe's pantheistic view of nature. Although nature in modern times does not show any of the pantheistic dimensions suggested in Goethe's writings, Schiller still conjures up such an environment in the description of the ancient world of the Greeks, a world that is highly superior to modern reality. This poem therefore depicts a Schiller "der die antike Welt gegen das Christentum ausspielte, also auf einem Standpunkt, den auch Goethes antik-heidnisches Menschenbild einnahm" (Rieder, 116). Both Wentzlaff-Eggebert and Rieder are right: It is true that Schiller's image of nature in his time partially contradicted Goethe's views, but this poem must also be recognized as the starting point for a literary approach shared by the two authors. Goethe, for example, in his *Iphigenie auf Tauris* (1786), had already taken the step into the classical phase of his literature, and Schiller just now began to follow him. *Die Götter Griechenlands* can be seen as making the latter's entry into this literary movement, in which the two authors eventually founded a friendship that lasted even beyond Schiller's death in 1805.

6. Enhancement of Schiller's View of Religion

A. Schiller's Philosophical and Aesthetic Writings

As mentioned in the previous chapter on Schiller's pre-classical poetry, his evolving concepts of beauty and aestheticism began to influence his writings and eventually his image of the Church. When Schiller published the first version of *Die Götter Griechenlands* in 1788, his idea of *Schönheit*–particularly in religious terms–was not yet on a solid foundation. It required intensive studies of the philosophy of Immanuel Kant and the influence of important figures like Herder, Humboldt, and Goethe to come to a definition on which he could later construct his most important–mostly dramatic–works.

Where Schiller in the mid 1780s still strongly supported German idealism and thus the possibility that love, friendship, and God can be vehicles to perfection (c.f. Gerhard, 114), reading Kant's works soon changed this perception.

Schiller began his in-depth studies of Kant in March of 1791 during a time when he began to suffer seriously from a sickness that would cost him his life in 1805. Unlike Kleist a decade later, he immediately found support and vindication for his old notion that the conflict between *Sinnesglück* and *Seelenfrieden* was a given fact, rooted in the nature of man. Kant stated in *Kritik der reinen Venunft* (^{1}1781, ^{2}1787) and *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (1790) that perception does not enable man to understand the true nature of the world. This utterly subjective and misleading approach to human surroundings results in a focus on the individual and his possession of practical reason, which now raises man above nature. For Schiller, this idea had the effect that the individual's self-determination became the focus of his endeavors. In a letter he writes to Körner in 1791:

> Es ist gewiß von keinem sterblichen Menschen kein größeres Wort noch gesprochen worden, als dieses Kantsche, was zugleich der Inhalt seiner ganzen Philosophie ist: Bestimme dich aus dir selbst! Sowie das in der theoretischen Philosophie: Die Natur steht unter dem Vestandesgesetze. Diese große Idee der Selbstbestimmung strahlt uns aus gewissen Erscheinungen der Natur zurück, und diese nennen wir Schönheit.[37]

It is interesting, how Schiller gradually approaches the concept of *Schönheit* that we later encounter as the core of his aesthetic concepts: "In diesen […] Worten ist Schillers Ästhetik, wie er sie in den verschiedensten Schriften entwickelte, selber schon im Keim enthalten" (Burschell, 319). Yet, despite the priority of reason, man–particularly from an historical standpoint–is still determined by nature:

> Der Garant und Träger eines Sinnes in der Geschichte ist aber nun für Kant nicht der Mansch in seinem ungeklärten Freiheitsstreben, sondern die Natur, die in der Geschichte und durch die Geschichte ihren verborgenen Plan vollzieht. (von Wiese, 332)

Kant tried to bridge this clash between necessity and freedom with respect to man's actions by his Ethical Law (*Sittengesetz*): the combination of exercising free will and abiding by the imperatives given by nature. The effect on Schiller can be described as follows:

> Erst Kants Sittenlehre zeigte Schiller einen neuen Weg, nämlich den, den scheinbar unlösbaren Zwiespalt von der menschlichen Willensfreiheit her auf einer höheren Ebene aufzulösen: wenn Neigung und Pflicht in einem Willensakt zusammenfallen, wenn ihre Vereinigung durch eine freie Willensentscheidung herbeigeführt wird, dann gelingt dem Menschen in diesem Augenblick die Erfüllung des sittlichen Menschen-Ideals. (Rieder, 154).

Schiller, however, takes these ideas one step further and eventually annihilates the rule of nature through necessity by stating that nature itself is as free as only practical reason was for Kant. Upon this freedom of all natural beings Schiller bases his concept of *Schönheit* (c.f. Gerhard, 162), and detaches himself from the idea that reason and nature cannot be combined.

In his letters to Körner of 1792/93, later collected and published under the title *Kallias oder über die Schönheit* (1793), and on which Schiller based *Über Anmut und Würde* (1793) in the same year, Schiller expresses these ideas for the first time. The most important aspect of this work is the definition of beauty as "Freiheit in der Erscheinung", a concept he introduces in the letter of February 23, 1793. Where Kant saw a moral act as one dictated by nature, Schiller replaces it through a "schöne Handlung" in the letter of February 19, 1793:

> Also wäre eine moralische Handlung alsdann erst eine schöne Handlung, wenn sie aussieht wie eine sich von selbst ergebende Wirkung der Natur. Mit einem Worte: eine freie Handlung, wenn die Autonomie des Gemüts und Autonomie in der Erscheinung koinzidieren. […] Daher kann eine moralische Handlung niemals schön sein, wenn wir der Operation zusehen, wodurch sie in der Sinnlichkeit abgeängstigt wird. (XXVI, 198)

Gerhard summarizes Schiller's ideas as follows:

> Gegenstände der Natur sind nur dann schön, wenn sie durch sich selbst bestimmt erscheinen, denn alle Dinge wirken notwendig nach ihrer Natur. Der Darstellende darf seine Natur nicht einmischen, sondern allein die Natur des Dargestellten zur Geltung bringen." (Gerhard, 169)

This concept of a beauty in nature is ultimately transferred to the human soul. The result is the "Vorstellung, daß jede Persönlichkeit 'einen reinen idealischen Menschen' in freier Selbstbestimmung aus sich heraus zu entwickeln vermöge" (Gerhard, 194), which then defines the idea of the *schöne Seele* as expressed in *Kallias*.

The effect of these thoughts was that from now on Schiller saw the priority of his writings in depicting beauty on the basis of the development of his aesthetics. A change of focus like the one observed in the revision of *Die Götter Griechenlands* (c.f. III.5.) can then be understood.

Schiller soon found support for these purely theoretical concepts in an important contemporary who also initiated and influenced their application in the field of religion: Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803). Herder, the "Prophet des Christentums der Humanität" (Burggraf, 76), had a particularly strong influence on the religious environment in Weimar at that time. He emphasized an image of Christianity based on the free exercise of personal beliefs:

> Schiller wird […] von Herder bestätigt und Herder bestätigt ihm umgekehrt, daß das wahre Christentum, die wahre Religion letztlich im Mensch selber ruht. […] Darum lebt das Christentum in der menschlichen Gesinnung, nicht in Formeln, Gebräuchen. Herder fordert darum eine Säkularisierung des Christentums, als einer Angelegenheit des inneren Menschen, nicht nur vor der 'Juden- und Römerkirche', von den Ständen und dem Staat. (Rieder 122)

That Herder's ideas did not leave Schiller untouched becomes obvious in a letter to Goethe of August 17, 1795[38], in which Schiller writes:

> Ich finde in der christlichen Religion virtualiter die Anlage zu dem Höchsten und Edelsten, und die verschiedenen Erscheinungen derselben im Leben scheinen mir bloß deßwegen so widrig und abgeschmackt, weil sie verfehlte Darstellungen dieses Höchsten sind. […] Es ist also in seiner reinen Form Darstellung *schöner* Sittlichkeit oder der Menschwerdung des heiligen und in diesem Sinn die einzige *aesthetische* Religion; […] (XXVIII, 27)

In order for religion to be aesthetic, it must be unspoiled by an orthodox understanding of Christian faith as something that is defined through dogma and ritual. In Goethe, Herder induced a strong resentment against an orthodox and pietistic religiousness:

> Alles ist Gnade Gottes! – daraus glaubte er den Zuruf hören zu müssen: du Erdenwurm, du bist nichts und hast nichts zum leben, kein Können, keine Entscheidung, keine Einsicht, *über* dir wird dein Geschick bestimmt, *außer* dir liegt, was dein Dasein gestaltet, was dich zum Werden und handeln befähigt; von deinem Schöpfer da oben muß dir alles erst gegeben werden, du bist eine leere unproduktive Kreatur. Und dabei fühlt er in sich das Schaffenkönnen!" (Burggraf, 178).

The second figure who had a strong influence on Schiller was the great humanist Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835). On his ideas Schiller based his concept of the *schöne Seele* which he first expressed in *Kallias* and later in his letters to Friedrich Christian Duke of Schleswig-Holstein-Augustenburg, which were the foundation for his essay *Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen in einer Reihe von Briefen* (1793)[39]. However, the emphasis of the morally strong and self-determined individual as depicted in these works led to a virtual annihilation of the Church as a necessary vehicle toward perfection:

> Auch von der Religion war nichts zu erhoffen, glaubte Schiller jetzt schroff erklären zu müssen. In den ersten Augustenburger Briefen hatte er noch Religion und Geschmack "in eine Klasse" gesetzt, freilich mit dem Vorbehalt: "[…] Die Religion ist dem sinnlichen Menschen, was der Geschmack dem verfeinerten; der Geschmack ist für das

> gewöhnliche Leben, die Religion für die Extremität. An eine dieser beiden Stützen aber, wo nicht lieber an beide, müssen wir uns halten, solange wir keine Götter sind. (Burschell, 368)

This lack of applicability of religious faith ultimately brought about its substitution through art and the idea that an individual seeking harmony can achieve this goal by an ethical and aesthetic education, as stated in *Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*:

> In der schönen Seele verwirklicht sich der 'Gott in uns'. Der Schöpfer wird immanent, als menschliche Erscheinung, Spiegel einer inneren Gleichgewichts- und Harmoniestruktur, sichtbar. Der außerweltliche Gott der Religion ist in diesem Säkularisationsprozeß dem Harmonie-Ideal anverwandelt worden. […] Religion ist also in einem bestimmten, noch unvollkommenen Stadium menschlicher Entwicklung notwendig. Der höchstentwickelte Mensch der schönen Seele bedarf der Religion nicht mehr, nur der Mensch, der nicht zum inneren Gleichgewicht der Harmonie und der Unterdrückung seiner Triebwelt gelangen kann. Hier hat die Religion bei Schiller ohne Zweifel ihren tiefsten Kurs erreicht. […] Tatsache bleibt, daß der so entschieden betretene Weg der Immanenz Schiller in dieser Phase seines Denkens vom Christentum und damit von der Religion im üblichen Sinne entfernt hat. (Rieder, 78-79)

In this context, Schiller writes to Goethe on July 9, 1796:

> Innerhalb der aesthetischen Geistesstimmung regt sich kein Bedürfniß nach jenen Trostgründen, die aus der Speculation geschöpft werden müssen; sie hat Selbständigkeit, Unendlichkeit in sich; nur wenn sich das Sinnliche und das Moralische im Menschen feindlich entgegen streben, muß bey der reinen Vernunft Hülfe gesucht werden. Die gesunde und schöne Natur braucht keine Moral, kein Naturrecht, keine politische Metaphysic; Sie hätten eben so gut auch hinzusetzen können, sie braucht keine Gottheit, keine Unsterblichkeit um sich zu stützen und zu halten. (XXVIII, 258-259)

A similar situation of abandoning Church dogma and even the eternal authority of a single God can be found for example in Schiller's epigram number 30, *Mein Glaube*, of 1797 (c.f. III.8.).

In the course of Schiller's intense treatment of philosophical and aesthetic questions, issues pertaining to religion itself are explicitly mentioned only in the *Augustenburger Briefe*, and are then neglected (c.f. von Wiese, 483). Through Schiller's later statements based on the results of the philosophical discourse, however, one can draw conclusions as to how the role of religion and its institutionalized form, the Church, had changed in favor of art and aestheticism as the predominating factor. Temporarily, religious faith as a vehicle to personal freedom and an aesthetic existence is completely substituted by art; only organized religion is left, yet reduced to a mere socio-political function with the purpose to unify, regenerate and maintain the stability of the state, and thus ensuring the individual's physical freedom (ibid.). Since art is a part of this world and a vehicle to a possible aesthetic life, it is given priority over the intangible transcendental world of heaven:

> Wenn Religion auf dem Verhältnis des Menschen zum Heiligen beruht, so darf ohne Übertreibung gesagt werden, daß Schiller eine im höchsten Maße religiöse Existenz gewesen ist. Aber er besaß keinerlei irdische oder überirdische Garantien mehr dafür, ob es dieses Heilige auch wirklich gibt, ob es für den Menschen je erreichbar werden kann. (von Wiese, 722-723)

When Schiller returns to religion to again serve aesthetic purposes, it is seen in alliance with nature and its detachment from Christian dogma, providing a vehicle for man to express his free will:

> Die Frage nach der Religion Schillers und ihrer Erscheinungsformen […] [umfaßt] ja auch noch jenen Bereich der "Natur", der seit der Begegnung mit Goethe eine ständig wachsende Bedeutung gewonnen hat. Das Entscheidende bleibt indessen die Vereinigung des Menschen mit einer Transzendenz, die er auf Erden nie ganz erreichen kann […]. Hier wirkt ständig das christliche Erbe bei Schiller weiter, mag auch die Person Christi bei ihm keine Bedeutung haben. (von Wiese, 758)

B. Goethe

Ever since Schiller had read *Die Leiden des jungen Werther* (1774) during his time at the *Karlsschule*, he had been watching the development and growth of Goethe as a literary figure, and had secretly yearned to establish a closer relationship with him (c.f. Boyesen, 86).

When on July 21, 1787, Schiller came to Weimar for the first time, he was full of anticipation and excited to finally meet this great man. Their first personal encounter occurred in September 1788 and disappointed Schiller profoundly. From then on, any closer acquaintance between the two authors seemed an impossibility, and Schiller focused his endeavors on convincing his 'rival' Goethe of his abilities in the literary field. Gerhard (1994) summarizes this relationship a follows:

> Der Abstand, der sich zwischen Schiller und Goethe im menschlichen aufgetan hatte, blieb für lange Zeit unüberbrückbar bestehen. Anstelle des Wunsches, ihn als Mensch und Freund zu gewinnen, trat das Bestreben, Goethe als Dichter durch die eigene Leistung zu überzeugen. In Schillers künstlerischem Schaffen begann eine neue Phase seiner Beziehung zu Goethe. Sein Gedicht "Die Künstler", das unter Wielands und Körners fördernder Kritik eine lange, an Umarbeitungen reiche Entwicklung durchlief, sollte vor Goethe bestehen können. (Gerhard, 34)

and Schiller himself writes in a letter to Körner of March 9, 1789:

> Dieser Mensch, dieser Göthe ist mir einmal im Wege, und er erinnert mich so oft, daß das Schicksal mich hart behandelt hat. Wie leicht ward *sein* Genie von seinem Schicksal getragen, und wie muß *ich* biss auf diese Minute noch kämpfen! Einholen läßt sich alles Verlorene für mich nun nicht mehr – nach dem 30gsten bildet man sich nicht mehr um – und ich könnte ja selbst diese Umbildung vor den nächsten 3 oder 4 Jahren nicht mit mir anfangen, weil ich 4 Jahre wenigstens meinem Schicksale noch opfern muß. (XXV, 222)

In 1789, Schiller published a critical review of Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris* (1786), a drama he would revise for the stage in 1802. Although he recognized Goethe's genius as an author and his impressive approach to the subject of antiquity in general, he nonetheless criticized the theatrical inconsistencies and problems in Goethe's works. Through this, Schiller not only emphasized his refined abilities as a dramatic author, but also, for the first time, presented himself at a level equal to that of his idol (c.f. Wentzlaff-Eggebert, 140-145). For Goethe this was an outrageously presumptuous act on Schiller's side. Yet, the main reason for the incompatibility of the two authors was undoubtedly

their very contrary concepts of aesthetics: “Daß sich Goethes Kunst- und Literaturtheorie bewußt von der Schillers distanzierte, lag zweifellos daran, daß im Gegensatz zu Schillers begrifflicher Bestimmung des ästhetischen Phänomens, diejenige Goethes von den Grundeinsichten seiner naturwissenschaftlichen Arbeit ausging” (Lange, 211). The fact that Goethe, for example in his *Werther*, had very early begun to incorporate the idea of aesthetics into his works and eventually even his view of religion (c.f. II.3.B)–which was a step Schiller did not take until the early 1790s–at least partially explains this temporary clash between the two authors.

When Schiller–under the influence of Kant–began to develop his idea of man as a natural and ‘beautiful’ being in 1791, Goethe evolved for him as the personification of this ideal (c.f. Gerhard, 202). This eventually prepared the ground for Schiller and Goethe to come together at last. The important encounter between them occurred sometime between the 20th and the 23rd of July in 1794, and ultimately led to a friendship that resulted in one of the most productive collaborations in German literary history. However, at first “it was no fervid and youthfully enthusiastic attachment, but a deliberate union, based on intellectual kinship and community of interest” (Boyesen 91), and many long conversations were necessary to establish an intimate friendship of a kind that “if there was any man whom Goethe may be said to have admitted into the inner sanctuary of his mind, it was surely [Schiller]” (Boyesen 92). From 1794 on each author had a lasting impact on the other’s productivity

> Wiederholt bekundeten beide, wie sehr ihnen das häufige Zusammensein, der fruchtbare Ideenwechsel, zu Lebensnotwendigkeit wurde. Das klärende Gespräch, in dem sich Goethe von der Last der auf ihn eindringenden Materie befreite und sie sichtete, bevor er sie endgültig gestaltete, war für ihn ebenso wichtig wie für Schiller, der “sich kaum gewöhnen” konnte, Goethe mehrere tage nichts sagen und nichts von ihm zu hören. Diesem engen Zusammenleben entsprang ein immer stärkeres Gefühl der Zusammengehörigkeit, das sich auch nach außen in einer wachsenden Annäherung an das gemeinsame Ziel kundtat und eine Angleichung des Stils mit sich führte, die der Umgebung nicht entgehen konnte. (Gerhard, 256-257)

and Goethe once said to Schiller: “Sie haben mir eine zweite Jugend geschenkt, mich wieder zum Dichter gemacht.”[40]

Although before 1794 it was primarily a matter of Schiller being interested in Goethe and of Goethe providing literary stimulation for Schiller, the fact must not be ignored that the year after Schiller published both *Don Carlos* and his completed essay, *Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande von der spanischen Regierung*, Goethe published his drama *Egmont* (1788), in which he tackles many of the same problems that Schiller treated in his *Carlos*: bigotry and cruelty among the clergy, which were encouraged by the Catholic Church and its dogma, the Protestants’ striving for deliverance from the Inquisition and the restrictive rule of Spain in the name of religion, the abuse of religion for the sake of maintaining power, the sacrificing of great men for the good of the Church, and

finally the strong conflict between two generations, one representing the old and one a new world order.[41] The fact that the Duke of Alba appears in both works and represents the orthodox Catholic Church and its dogma[42] will further underline a possible influence of Schiller on Goethe. Finally, the figure of Egmont bears a striking resemblance to Schiller's Posa, who–in his great monologue in Act V–expresses his belief that the Church's doings are a violation of natural law, and demands "Freiheit" from Spanish rule[43]. At the end, Egmont–like Posa and Carlos–dies as a martyr for the new order he wants to establish. In 1796 Schiller also revised *Egmont* for the stage, a fact that gives further evidence of Schiller's influence on Goethe.

In the discussion of Goethe's *Iphigenie* in III.2.A., the similarities to Schiller's *Räuber* have already been pointed out, in particular with regard to the issue of the relevance of the doctrine of original sin. Iphigenie, however, must have had an even further impact on Schiller. In this drama, Goethe describes the dependence of man on the gods' supreme will, his deliverance from their power, and ultimately the annihilation of their significance for human fate in favor of humaneness and the importance of the individual: "Die Götter existieren lediglich als Bilder in den Herzen der Menschen, und diese bedürfen ihrer, um sich, an ihnen Maß nehmend, vervollkommnen zu können" (Pütz, 293).

> Indem Iphigenie eine Humanität vertritt, die den Teufel erübrigt, stellt sie die Grundlage des Christentums in Frage. […] Der explosive Sprengstoff dieser nur scheinbar sanften und besänftigenden Humanität liegt demnach nicht allein in der Ablösung des antiken Schicksalszusammenhangs durch das Prinzip menschlicher Selbstbestimmung, sondern auch im Gegenentwurf gegen die im 18. Jahrhundert immer noch herrschende Lehre vom absolutistischen Primat der göttlichen Gnade. (Pütz, 295)

The fact that Orest finds autonomy and self-determination in the end could have been interpreted by Schiller as a vindication of his studies of Kant and his concept of aesthetics[44]. But current religious questions retained their significance.

Where Goethe at that time built his philosophy mainly on the empirical and later the Greek ideal, Schiller strongly emphasized religious questions in their collaborative endeavors:

> Aber auch dem Nachbarn seiner Gegenwart, Goethe, wollte Schiller zeigen, daß eine Abwandlung und Weiterentwicklung des antik-humanistischen Menschenbildes in die Sphäre des Christlichen hinein möglich war. Es lag eben in der Natur dieser Frontstellung, daß Schiller auf das Christentum stoßen mußte, daß er gerade im Christlichen Helden den Antipoden der Aufklärung und somit die Verkörperung seines Standpunktes finden mußte. (Rieder, 127)

One of Goethe's works in which Schiller's influence with regard to religious questions can be clearly observed is *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* (1795/96). Around March of 1795, Schiller and Goethe wrote a great number of letters back and forth, pertaining to various issues of the novel. Burggraf (1902) states: "Schiller hat ganz richtig beobachtet, der Pietismus hat hier in Goethe eine ihn

vermenschlichende Purifikation durchgemacht" (413). This suggests that Schiller's religious views, combined with his newly found concepts of aesthetics and their focus on individual freedom, started to be reflected in Goethe's works as well. The question of whether this phenomenon was triggered by Schiller or was mere coincidence will remain unanswered in this discussion, but Goethe's statement in Chapter 17 of Book 1 of *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*

> Wir bilden uns ein, fromm zu sein, indem wir ohne Überlegung hinschlendern, uns durch angenehme Zufälle determinieren lassen und endlich dem Resultate eines solchen schwankenden Lebens den Namen einer göttlichen Führung geben. (X, 73)

clearly coincides with Schiller's ideas at this point of time. The two authors saw the danger of the individual's submission to a blind trust in divine providence, and emphasized man's striving for autonomy before God. This becomes especially obvious in Book 6 of the *Lehrjahre*, Natalie's *Bekenntnisse einer schönen Seele*. In contrast to the "häßlichen Zerrbilde des religiösen Ernstes", Goethe now draws "das Bild der evangelischen freigesinnten Pietistin, die zwar ganz in der orthodoxen Vorstellung ihrer Umgebung lebt, deren Seele sich völlig in geistlicher Richtung bewegt, aber doch so durchaus in der Richtung der Liebe und des kindlichen Zutrauens und der freudigen Hingabe an den Höchsten, daß all der unwahre satanische Spuk sie kalt läßt, und kein Gefühl der Furcht ihre Frömmigkeit zu verwirren vermag" (Burggraf, 421). Natalie completely detaches herself from any form of strict orthodox and ritualistic religion and exercises a natural religiousness like the one both Schiller and Goethe encountered in their earliest years (c.f. II.2.):

> Auf Gott zielende Eindrücke verschaffen uns kirchliche Anstalten, Glocken, Orgeln und Gesänge, und besonders die Vorträge unserer Lehrer. […] [A]ber ach! Wie geschah mir. Ich fand das nicht mehr was ich sonst gefunden. Diese Prediger stumpften sich die Zähne an den Schalen ab, indessen ich den Kern genoß. (X, 414)

> Ich erinnere mich kaum eines Gebotes; nichts erscheint mir in Gestalt eines Gesetzes; es ist ein trieb, der mich leitet und mich immer recht führt; ich folge mit Freiheit meinen Gesinnungen und weiß so wenig von Einschränkungen, als von Reue."[45]

She then rediscovers a mild and forgiving God who promises eternal life in the hereafter: "Ich habe einen gnädigen Gott, das Grab erweckt mir kein Grauen, ich habe ein ewiges Leben" (X, 433).

Yet, Goethe cannot and will not abandon the pantheistic aspect of religion. When Natalie says after finding freedom through her father's death

> Wie gerne sah ich nunmehr Gott in der Natur, da ich ihn mit solcher Gewißheit im herzen trug, wie interessant war mir das Werk seiner Hände, und wie dankbar war ich, daß er mich mit dem Atem seines Mundes hatte beleben wollen. (X, 435),

a similarity to a depiction of nature in Act I of Schiller's *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* (c.f. III.7.C.) becomes obvious[46].

It is clear, however, how closely related Goethe's and Schiller's ideas are in this work. In particular the idea of freedom–immediately connected to Schiller's philosophy–and the resulting characterization of Natalie as a *schöne Seele* shed a bright light on the influence generated through his correspondence with Goethe.

One last work of Goethe that needs to be briefly mentioned here is *Hermann und Dorothea* (1798). The priest in this epic represents a form of religiousness that was already discussed in *Wilhelm Meister*, namely natural faith without any dogmatic features:

> Er fühlt sich nicht als der Anwalt der himmlischen Gerechtigkeit, der überall nach der Sünde zu spüren hat und der auf Schritt und Tritt Böses bekämpfen zu sollen für seine eigentliche Pflicht betrachtet, sondern bei dem vollen Ernst seiner seelsorglich bildenden Aufgabe doch als der Bote der ewigen Liebe, der gesandt ist, das in der Gemeinde bereits vorhandene Reich Gottes zu bauen und zu fördern, den damit auch im einzelnen vorhandenen rechten Menschensinn zu heben, zu erläutern und zum Bewußtsein seiner selbst zu bringen. (Burggraf, 443)

As one can see, the two authors greatly influenced each other in their creative endeavors. Goethe's main impact on Schiller, however, was that he brought him back to his most important literary field–drama:

> Nach fast zehnjähriger Pause begann auch Schiller unter dem Eindruck Goethes intuitiver Schöpferkraft wieder mit eigenen dramatischen Dichtungen. So wie Goethe sein Schaffen unter dem Einfluß von Schillers idealisierender Weltsicht zur Klassizität erhoben hatte, so gewann jetzt Schillers Dichtung größere Wirklichkeitsnähe durch Goethes Vorbild. (Wentzlaff-Eggebert, 267)

But although Schiller began to abandon philosophy more and more, his view on aesthetics grew increasingly stronger, which was one main area in which he greatly differed from Goethe's more scientific approach to his environment:

> Je mehr er selbst zum Dichter wurde, desto mehr trat die Bedeutung der Philosophie für ihn in den Hintergrund. Das Bemühen, die Kräfte des Verstandes und der gestalteten Einbildungskraft in seiner Dichtung in harmonischem Gleichgewicht zu halten, entfernte ihn von jeder nur theoretischen Spekulation. Wissenschaft und Kunst rückten in einen immer größeren Gegensatz zueinander. (Gerhard, 275)

Directly connected with the idea of beauty was freedom, something that is of tremendous importance for the understanding of his classical dramas (c.f. III.7.). Yet, as Goethe pointed out in a discussion with Eckermann on January 18, 1827, Schiller's idea of freedom drastically changed following his years at the *Karlsschule*: For the young Schiller priority lay in physical freedom, "dann aber in seinem reiferen Leben, wo er der physischen Freiheit genug hatte, ging er zur ideellen über"[47]. This concept of freedom is also reflected in his perception of the Church. For the author of *Die Räuber* and *Don Carlos* the physical and intellectual restrictions that the Church imposed on the individual had to be fought. But now Schiller's goal was to promote a form of religion that facilitates man's spiritual liberation, as demanded by Herder and Kant. The protagonists in the author's classical dramas discussed in the

following chapter all have in common that they stand in the middle of the struggle for freedom, physical but chiefly spiritual. This could not be understood without the foundation of Schiller's philosophical and aesthetic ideas as discussed in this chapter.

7. The Classical and Late Classical Dramas

A. The *Wallenstein* Trilogy (1796-99)

In 1790, two years after Schiller had been appointed as a Professor of History at the university in Jena, he published his *Geschichte des Dreißigjährigen Krieges*. It then took another five years until he decided to write a drama–the first for almost a decade–about the Thirty-Years'-War, and in particular the historical figure of Wallenstein (1583-1634). On the basis of his friendship with Goethe and his philosophical and aesthetic studies in the first years of the 1790s, it is interesting to examine how Schiller's view of the Church and religion changed from the attitude portrayed in works like *Don Carlos* or *Der Geisterseher*.

The Thirty Years' War lasted from 1618 to 1648 and originally began as an attempt of the Holy Roman Empire under the rule of the Austrian house of Habsburg to expand its domain beyond the existing borders and to broaden the influence of Catholicism in Europe; this was chiefly a countermeasure against the increasing popularity of the Protestant Church after the beginning of the Reformation in 1517. Soon, virtually the entire European continent was engulfed in war. The Protestant Church was supposed to be annihilated, but ultimately survived and even managed to strengthen its power.

Schiller's *Wallenstein* is set in the year 1634, 16 years after the war erupted. What soon becomes obvious, though, is that the original struggle for Catholic supremacy had long ago given way to much more secular goals of power and wealth. As Schiller states in his Prologue to Wallensteins Lager: "Um Herrschaft und um Freiheit wird hier gerungen" (VIII, 4), and it is not about religious issues. The war has escalated, "keine Ordnung gilt mehr und keine Zucht. – / […] der Krieg hat kein Erbarmen" (VIII, 19), and anarchy has replaced nearly all morality and humaneness. Only a few figures still maintain their moral values; those will be discussed later.

In Scene 8 of Wallensteins Lager, a Capuchin monk appears and tries to remind the men and women in the camp of all the brutality, the loss of moral and religious guidance, and the abuse of the situation for their own profit:

> Die Christenheit trauert in Sack und Asche
> Der Soldat füllt sich nur die Tasche. […]
> Die Arche der Kirche schwimmt in Blute,
> Und das römische *Reich* – daß Gott erbarm!

Sollte jetzt heißen römisch *Arm*;
Der *Rheinstrom* ist worden zu einem *Peinstrom*,
Die *Klöster* sind ausgenommene *Nester*,
Die *Bistümer* sind verwandelt in *Wüsttümer*,
Die *Abteien* und die *Stifter*
Sind nun *Raubteien* und *Diebesklüfter*, […]
Woher kommt das? Das will ich euch verkünden:
Das schreibt sich her von euern Lastern und Sünden
Von dem Greuel und Heidenleben,
Dem sich Offizier und Soldaten ergeben.
Denn die Sünd' ist der Magnetenstein,
Der das Eisen ziehet ins Land hinein.
Auf das Unrecht, da folgt das Übel,
Wie die Trän' auf den herben Zwiebel,
Hinter dem *U* kömmt gleich das *W*eh,
Das ist die Ordnung im Abc.

Ubi erit victoriae spes,
Si offenditur Deus? Wie soll man siegen,
Wenn man die Predigt schwänzt und die Meß,
Nichts tut als in den Weinhäusern liegen? […]
Aber wer bei den Soldaten sucht,
Die Furcht Gottes und die gute Zucht
Und die Scham, der wird nicht viel finden […] (VIII, 30-31)

It is interesting that the monk even criticizes various organizations of the Church, although he ultimately blames the soldiers for this situation. This critique of the Church's institutions becomes understandable when one considers the fact that the monk belongs to the Capuchin mendicant order, a strict sub-group of the Franciscans[48]. That even the Capuchins are not immune to the degenerating influence of that time is shown in Act I, Scene 2 of *Die Piccolomini*. Here Isolani tells Questenberg about his visit to Vienna–the capital and seat of the Catholic Emperor–seven years earlier:

Zuletzt– da schickten sie mir einen Kapuziner,
Ich dacht', es wär' um meiner Sünden willen!
Nein doch, das war der Mann, mit dem
Ich um die Reitpferde sollte handeln. (VIII, 66)

Even this early in the trilogy, a religious situation evolves that seems to retreat from a confrontation of the two Christian denominations. In *Wallensteins Lager* the First Rifleman talks about his experiences with both parties of the war; while fighting for the Swedish Protestants, he suffered from an overdose of Christian ritual

Was war das nicht ein Placken und ein Schinden
Bei Gustav dem Schweden, dem Leuteplager!
Das machte eine Kirch' aus seinem Lager,
Ließ Betstunde halten, des Morgens, gleich
Bei der Reveille, und beim Zapfenstreich.
Und wurden wir manchmal ein wenig munter,
Er kanzelt' uns selbst wohl vom Gaul herunter (VIII, 20),

which brought about his decision to change sides to the "Ligisten", the league of Catholic Dukes under Maximilian of Bavaria and their commander Tilly. The life that is now offered to him under the Catholic rule is much more agreeable, though devoid of all morality:

> Ja, das war schon ein ander Ding!
> Alles da lustiger, loser ging,
> Soff und Spiel und Mädels die Menge!
> Wahrhaftig, der Spaß war nicht gering,
> Denn der Tilly verstand sich aufs Kommandieren. […]
> Dem Soldaten ließ er vieles passieren,
> Und ging's nur nicht aus seiner Kassen […] (VIII, 21)

Here, Schiller depicts two polar sides of the religious spectrum, but neither one is shown as unambiguously representing virtue rather than vice. Although the situation in the Swedish army is by far not as uncontrolled as it was under Tilly–and therefore perhaps a little more positive–, Gustav's policy of prayer and imposed worship restricts the men's life and religious habits. On the other hand, prostitution and alcoholism under Tilly contradicts any image of an army fighting in the name of the Church. It is obvious here that denominational questions lose weight in favor of more fundamental religious issues like the abuse of power under a degenerate Church.

As soon as the protagonist Wallenstein is introduced in Act II, Scene 2 of *Die Piccolomini*, the focus partially returns to the issue of Catholicism versus Protestantism, yet it is certainly not as explicit as in Schiller's earlier dramas. In *Wallensteins Tod* the reader learns that Wallenstein–like the Prince in *Der Geisterseher*–converted to Catholicism on the basis of the belief that he was chosen by God, and soon afterwards began to show signs of insanity and an insatiable lust for power:

> BUTTLER: Von diesem Tag an, sagt man, ließen sich
> Anwandlungen des Wahnsinns bei ihm spüren.
>
> GORDON: Tiefsinn'ger wurd' er, das ist wahr, er wurde
> Katholisch. (VIII, 289)

Yet, Wallenstein attempts to protect the Protestants in Eger from the brutality of the Catholic army. He hates the Jesuits[49] and helps the other side:

> Ich hasse
> Die Jesuiten – […]
> In Glogau hab' ich selber eine Kirch'
> Den Evangelischen erbauen lassen. (VIII, 290-291)

Despite his support of the Catholics, he remains a Protestant at heart. But his behavior does not openly reveal this attitude; the individual's contribution to the war–regardless of his denomination–, and his desire to avoid battle in order to protect his troops fully dominate Wallenstein's policy:

> Er ist ein großer General, der, obgleich protestantisch geboren, der kaiserlich-katholischen Vormacht in Europa gewaltige militärische Dienste geleistet hat. Aber er führt den Krieg nicht um des Krieges willen, und wenn er durch Diplomatie und bloßen Druck der Riesenheere, die ihm sein Name erwirbt, das Schlagen vermeiden kann, so weicht er ihm aus. (Mann, 33)
>
> Papistisch oder protestantisch – in seinem nach Herkunft und Glauben buntscheckigen Heer entschied die Tüchtigkeit für den Dienst, die unbedingte Gefolgschaft für ihn den Feldherren und nichts anderes, – eine pragmatische Freigeisterei, zu der die astrologische Gebundenheit und träumerische Umfangenheit seines Denkens in so sonderbarem Widerspruch steht. (Mann, 36-37)

Questenberg, on the other hand, is a faithful follower of the Catholic rule, and a leader who is willing to abide fully by orthodox dogma and defend his superiors' belief that Protestantism represents the work of the devil:

> […] Seine Majestät will Regenspurg
> Vor Ostern noch vom Feind gesäubert sehn,
> Daß nicht länger im Dome lutherisch
> Gepredigt werde – ketzerischer Greul'
> Des Festes reiner Feier nicht besudle. (VIII, 106)

It must be noted, however, that all positive figures of the drama defend a non-denominational philosophy in favor of humaneness, love, and peace. It is exclusively the negative characters that support war, murder, and religious bigotry.

In the quotes from Thomas Mann (1955) the author mentions a factor that–above all others–influences and controls Wallenstein: astrology. By comparing the "astrologische Turm", the place where Seni makes his astrological predictions, to a "Heiligtum" (VIII, 122), the duchess Terzky alludes to an aspect of Wallenstein's character that supports the above statement that denominational issues are of relatively little significance for the plot. Wallenstein himself says

> Die Sterne lügen nicht, […].
> Die Kunst ist redlich, doch dies falsche Herz
> Bringt Lug und Trug in den wahrhaft'gen Himmel.
> Nur auf der Wahrheit ruht die Wahrsagung;
> Wo die Natur aus ihren Grenzen wanket,
> Da irret alle Wissenschaft. War es
> Ein Aberglaube, menschliche Gestalt
> Durch keinen solchen Argwohn zu entehren,
> O nimmer schäm' ich dieser Schwachheit mich!
> Religion ist in der Tiere Trieb […] (VIII, 251)

and hereby substitutes astrology for religion:

> Der autarke Mensch Wallenstein, der an keinen Gott zu glauben vermag, baut sich in diesem Sternenglauben eine Art von Religionsersatz auf. (Rieder, 99)

This trust in the supernatural even goes so far as to cause Wallenstein to procrastinate decisions concerning war activities. At one point, Wallenstein flees disgracefully from victory on the battlefield because of Seni's predictions (II/7).

To what extent the historical Wallenstein was influenced by astrology is uncertain. Yet, Schiller, in a letter to Goethe of December 4, 1798, states that he felt himself bound to stick to the historical truth: "[Ich] *mußte* dem Geist des Zeitalters nahe bleiben, dem das gewählte Motiv sehr entspricht" (XXX, 9). Finally, Goethe reinforced Schiller's plan to emphasize the astrological aspect in the drama, which also contributed to the tragic predisposition in Wallenstein's character (c.f. von Wiese, 635).

The important fact is that in Schiller's drama Wallenstein is anything but free in his decisions, bound both by his belief in astrology and his orders from the royal court in Vienna. When he becomes a threat to the plan of the Emperor and the Church, he has to die, similar to Don Carlos and Posa in Schiller's *Don Carlos*, and Civitella and the Greek woman in *Der Geisterseher*.

None of the characters discussed so far is free, a *schöne Seele* in Schiller's philosophy, who could shed light on the author's attitude toward religion and the Church. Max Piccolomini and Thekla as the corresponding female figure are the only main characters in the trilogy who represent spiritual freedom and true Christian faith. Although both Max and Thekla are purely Schiller's invention and have no model in history, this fact only further reinforces the point that Schiller tries to emphasize individual freedom by setting these ideal characters in contrast to the other figures of the play.

That Max possesses "Geistesfreiheit" is explicitly stated by his father Octavio (VIII, 74), and Max maintains this characteristic until his death in *Wallensteins Tod*. When all seems lost, he turns to Thekla, finds peace in their love, and ultimately dies a free and happy man:

> Weh mir! Ich habe die Natur verändert.
> Wie kommt der Argwohn in die freie Seele?
> Vertrauen, Glaube, Hoffnung ist dahin,
> Denn alles log mir, was ich hochgeachtet.
> Nein! Nein! Nicht alles! Sie ja lebt mir noch,
> Und sie ist wahr und lauter wie der Himmel.
> Betrug ist überall und Heuchelschein
> Und Mord und Gift und Meineid und Verrat,
> Der einzig reine Ort ist unsre Liebe,
> Der unentweihte in der Menschlichkeit. […]
> Kein Kaiser hat dem Herzen vorzuschreiben. (VIII, 227)

Apart from his freedom, something clearly characterized by Schiller as being dictated by nature, Max embodies attributes that make him the most positive character: humaneness, love, compassion, and natural religiousness. Max says at one point:

In der Kirche war ich.
Es ist ein Kloster hier, zur Himmelspforte,
Da ging ich hin, da fand ich mich allein.
Ob dem Altar hing eine Mutter Gottes,
Ein schlecht Gemälde war's, doch war's der Freund,
Den ich in diesem Augenblick suchte. (VIII, 118)

Despite the poor quality of the image of the Virgin Mary, he sees it as what it is, a connection to heaven and a symbol for the expression of his faith. Here, Schiller gives a strong contrast to the wealth and bigotry that characterize the institutionalized Church.

Thekla, like Max, is a person who follows her heart ("Wir wollen […] uns / Im übrigen – auf unser Herz verlassen", VIII, 127) and ultimately dies a victim of the circumstances: after Max's death she commits suicide–an act of free will and thus beauty–and remains true to herself to the very end. The religious aspect becomes important in Thekla's dialogue with the Duchess Terzky (*Die Piccolomini*, III/8). According to Church dogma–here represented by the Duchess–, Thekla is anything but free in making decisions about her life, in particular her love for Max:

GRÄFIN: Das Weib [Thekla] soll sich nicht selber angehören,
an fremdes Schicksal ist sie fest gebunden; […]

THEKLA: So wurd' mir's im Kloster vorgesagt.
Ich hatte keine Wünsche, kannte mich
Als seine Tochter nur, des Mächtigen,
Und seines Lebens Schall, der auch zu mir drang,
Gab mir kein anderes Gefühl als dies:
Ich sei bestimmt, mich leidend ihm zu opfern. (VIII, 133)

This description of the Church's restrictive tradition forms a powerful contrast to Max's understanding of natural religiousness as discussed above. Thekla, however, eventually frees herself from these shackles through her free death; love conquers all worldly restrictions imposed by an institution like the Church. But unlike the Duchess, God for Thekla is not a being for whom man is merely a possession[50], but one who promises forgiveness and the eternal unification of Max's and Thekla's souls in heaven. Although this is not explicitly stated in *Wallenstein*, it can nonetheless be observed in Schiller's poem *Thekla, eine Geisterstimme* (1802), a poem that is directly connected to the drama:

Ob ich den Verlorenen gefunden?
Glaube mir, ich bin mit ihm vereint,
Wo sich nicht mehr trennt, was sich verbunden,
Dort, wo keine Träne wird geweint.

Dorten wirst auch du uns wiederfinden,
Wenn dein Lieben unserm Lieben gleicht;
Dort ist auch der Vater, frei von Sünden,
Den der blut'ge Mord nicht mehr erreicht.

Und er fühlt, daß ihn kein Wahn betrogen,
Als er aufwärts zu den Sternen sah;

> Denn wie jeder wägt, wird ihm gewogen,
> Wer es glaubt, dem ist das Heil'ge nah. (ll. 9-20)

Similar liberation of strong female figures from the Church's power in connection with the beauty that lies in this act, and the belief in a natural form of religion can be found in the stories and characters of Maria in *Maria Stuart* and Johanna in *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* (c.f. III.7.B., III.7.C.).

Other than Max and Thekla, the only other figure in *Wallenstein* who portrays some greatness of character is Gordon, the commander of Eger. When he warns Buttler

> O wenn das Herz Euch warnt, folgt seinem Triebe!
> Das Herz ist Gottes Stimme, Menschenwerk
> Ist aller Klugheit künstliche Berechnung. (VIII, 304)

he expresses an attitude that not only resembles Schiller's metaphysics of love (c.f. III.3.), but also promotes man's self-determination and contrasts this character trait with the overly rational world of religious warfare.

In the *Wallenstein* trilogy, Schiller creates an image of a form of religiousness that coincides with his philosophical and aesthetic findings during the years before his friendship with Goethe. Similar images are used in Schiller's later works, in particular *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* (c.f. III.7.C) and *Wilhelm Tell* (c.f. III.7.D), where the aspect of an individual's freedom in his–or her–(religious) beliefs is of special importance. Furthermore, without reference to the philosophical-aesthetic dimensions, the role of religion and the Church in *Maria Stuart* cannot be fully understood.

B. *Maria Stuart* (1800)

One year after *Wallenstein's Tod*, Schiller published *Maria Stuart*, the second great historical drama of his classical period. This play differs from the *Wallenstein* trilogy in that it contains a clear confrontation between Catholicism and Protestantism. The two Christian denominations are represented by the Catholic Queen Mary of Scotland and the Protestant ruler Elisabeth Tudor. In analyzing the role of the Church in this drama, one can therefore not avoid a closer look at the two opponents' characters.

In a letter to Goethe, written on June 18, 1799, during the preparation phase of creating the drama Schiller describes his intentions in characterizing Maria as follows:

> Meine Maria wird keine weiche Stimmung erregen, es ist meine Absicht nicht, ich will sie immer als ein physisches Wesen halten, und das Pathetische muß mehr eine allgemeine tiefe Rührung, als ein persönlich und individuelles

> Mitgefühl seyn. Sie empfindet und erregt keine Zärtlichkeit, ihr Schicksal ist nur heftige Paßionen zu erfahren und zu entzünden. Bloß die Amme fühlt Zärtlichkeit für sie. (XXX, 61)

This intended image, however, stands in almost complete contrast to the Maria in the drama; one might even argue that it more closely corresponds to the figure of Elisabeth. But, when compared with the situations in earlier works, this constellation contradicts almost all expectations: The Protestant Schiller paints a favorable picture of Catholicism and criticizes his own denomination with every act performed by members of the English court: "Die Rolle der düsteren mitleidlosen Kirche eines rächenden Gottes übernimmt nun die protestantische Kirche Elisabeths" (Rieder, 116). If the situation were reversed, Schiller's intentions would be obvious and in agreement with the image of Catholicism in *Don Carlos* or *Der Geisterseher*.

Rieder (1966) continues and suggests a comparison with an important poem that–with different imagery–depicts a very similar relationship: *Die Götter Griechenlands*.

> Nicht mehr die Finsternis der katholischen Inquisition ist es, die zur unmenschlichen Gegnerschaft des Helden berufen wird, sondern der finstere Puritanismus der anglikanischen Ketzerkirche, der gegenüber die katholische Religion und ihr Kult in einem hellen, freundlichen Licht erscheint. (115)

The poem of 1789/93 sets pagan and Christian belief in contrast. The former represents a world of harmony humaneness, and love, whereas the latter is full of restrictions, inhumane laws, religious dogma, and lack of emotions and compassion (c.f. III.5.). The situation in *Maria Stuart* is similar: In the figure of Maria Catholicism is substituted for paganism, and in Elisabeth Protestantism takes the place of the Christianity depicted in the poem.

The relationship between the two women is marked by great contrasts: Elisabeth–and later Johanna in *Die Jungfrau von Orleans*–represents a feminine type that does not correspond to the traditional female role. She seems almost completely devoid of true emotions like love and behaves in a manner reminiscent of a figure like Philipp II in *Don Carlos*. Maria, on the other hand, represents the traditional female, although her strength of character is equal to Elisabeth's in every way. It is, however, her ability to love, to treat other human beings with dignity, and ultimately the harmony between acts of reason and emotion that present this figure to the reader in such a pleasant manner. These factors immediately give the role of the victim to Maria. The differences in character create the main tension and conflict in the drama:

> Maria ist aber nicht bloß die große Liebende, die alle Männer 'in Feuer setzt', sie ist auch die von Natur mit Schönheit Bedachte, die überall dort Elisabeth entgegentritt – und sei es auch durch ihre bloße Existenz und nicht durch ihr Zutun –, wo diese selbst triumphieren möchte. In jedem Akt, in jeder Szene spürt man die Überlegenheit Marias, begreift man gleichzeitig den ohnmächtigen Haß Elisabeths gegen sie. Der Gipfel unter den Niederlagen Elisabeths ist der Abfall Leicesters zu Maria. (Rieder, 113)

Had Schiller further pursued his plan to present the negative force of the play in the figure of Maria and to reveal the evil side of her character, the great confrontation between her and Elisabeth (III/4) would have provided ample opportunity to do so. But Maria remains morally victorious in this scene through her inner strength. This power is rooted in three areas: her will to humble herself, her inner harmony between emotion and reason, as well as "Hoffnung und Genuß"[51]–something Elisabeth never finds in the play–, and her true and natural Christian faith.

At the very beginning of the scene, Elisabeth assumes a position Schiller has already condemned in most of his earlier works: that of a human being staking a claim to a status equal to God. Elisabeth admits to committing this crime by saying

> Gott ist in mir, und der stolze Priester
> Behält das Feld nicht – […] (IX, 89)

Through this statement she strips her character of all possible humaneness, while at the same time sentencing Maria to death; by assuming God's power she assumes control over her opponent's life. But Maria, against all expectations, merely warns the other queen about her presumptuousness:

> Denkt an den Wechsel alles Menschlichen!
> Es leben die Götter, die den Hochmut rächen! (IX, 87)

Despite Elisabeth's display of power, she humbles herself and attracts the reader's sympathy.

Ironically, in Elisabeth's expression of sharp critique against the Catholic Church which Maria represents, she then equates herself with it

> Die [katholische] Kirche trennet aller Pflichten Band,
> Den Treubruch heiligt sie, den Königsmord,
> Ich übe nur, was Eure Priester lehren (IX, 89),

in justifying the Scottish queen's eventual death. A resemblance to the Grand Inquisitor's justification of Carlos' death by citing Jesus Christ's example is obvious.

Despite all these accusations, Maria still remains humble and appeals to Elisabeth to rule justly and humanely, something that she herself can no longer do:

> Regiert in Frieden!
> Jedweden Anspruch auf dies Reich entsag' ich.
> Ach, meines Geistes Schwingen sind gelähmt,
> Nicht Größe lockt mich mehr – Ihr habt's erreicht,
> Ich bin nur noch ein Schatten der Maria. (IX, 90)

Throughout the drama, Maria's sins–especially the murder of her husband at her order (II/3)–, and the cruelty and religious fanaticism of her followers (I/7, IV/7) are strongly criticized. However,

her guilt is ultimately almost disregarded, since she does not die for her crimes, but rather for her insults and attacks against Elisabeth, because she poses a tremendous threat to Elisabeth's power, and because of the treachery of her own secretary.

With respect to the image of the Catholic Church, Maria's relationship with Mortimer and the latter's experiences with Catholicism must be mentioned.

> Mortimer ist Maria zugeordnet, ihre eigene Vergangenheit lebt in seiner strahlenden Jugend, in seiner grenzenlosen Liebesfähigkeit, in seiner Neigung zum katholischen Glauben wieder auf […] während Elisabeths Härte durch Paulets Puritanismus vertreten wird. (Rieder, 114)

Although Mortimer's report on his journey to Rome (I/6) seems to show the Catholic Church with all its pomp and ritual in a very positive manner, an analysis from Schiller's perspective reverses this image. At the beginning of his account, he describes the Protestant environment in which he grew up as cold, utterly void of any sensual excitement, and strictly condemning Catholicism:

> In strengen Pflichten war ich aufgewachsen,
> In finsterm Haß des Papsttums aufgesäugt, […].
> Es haßt die Kirche, die mich auferzog,
> Der Sinne Reiz, kein Abbild duldet sie,
> Allein das körperlose Wort verehrend. (IX, 18-19)

Burggraf (1902) summarizes Mortimer's craving as follows:

> Das protestantische Christentum, das sich ihm daheim in der nüchternen Formenlosigkeit der Puritaner dargestellt hatte, war nicht zu seinem eigenen Selbst geworden. Es war ihm eine Buchreligion geblieben, da es mit seiner strengen Anforderung ans Leben so wenig seinen leichten Neigungen entgegengekommen war […]." (329)

Mortimer eventually satisfies his hunger for sensual stimulation in Rome through the ritual of orthodox Catholicism to which he eventually converts. His conversion, however, occurs not

> weil sie eine reinere, ihr inneres leben klärende Ueberzeugung, eine bessere und für ihre sittliche Vervollkommnung zuträgliche Geistesbeeinflussung gefunden hätten […], sondern überwältigt vom Opiumrauche einer mystischen Sinnenfreude (Burggraf, 330),

which sheds a critical light on his account.

Apart from the Pope himself, the Cardinal of Guise represents for Mortimer the epitome of a Catholic ruler:

> Welch ein Mann!
> Wie sicher, klar und männlich groß! – Wie ganz
> Geboren, um die Geister zu regieren! […]
> Er zeigte mir, daß grübelnde Vernunft
> Den Menschen ewig in die Irre leitet,
> Daß seine Augen sehen müssen, was
> Das Herz soll glauben, daß ein sichtbar Haupt
> Der Kirche not tut, daß der Geist der Wahrheit
> Geruht hat auf den Sitzungen der Väter. (IX, 20-21)

It is in this superficially positive description, however, that we find Schiller's strongest criticism against this form of religious expression. The Cardinal's explicit goal is "die Geister zu beherrschen", and thus to restrict the individual's free will and spiritual liberty. What he then begins to believe in is not the word of God and the Bible, but rather the Church's ritual and tradition. Catholicism is therefore depicted in all its remoteness from true religious expression and all its oppression thereof; any follower of the Catholic Church is ultimately deprived of his freedom. As liberating as the conversion to this denomination may have seemed to Mortimer, he has–through his abandoning of his spiritual self–lost all opportunity ever to advance to a *schöne Seele* in Schiller's sense. Thus, Burschell (1968) is right when he writes:

> Nichts aber wäre unrichtiger, als anzunehmen, daß Schiller mit seiner Glorifizierung der katholischen Maria schon in die Richtung eingeschwenkt wäre, die bald darauf so manch der Konvertiten oder ehrlich Ergriffenen unter den Romantikern genommen haben. (483)

Thus, the definition of religion in terms of its aesthetic value, as discussed in the letter to Goethe of July 9, 1796 (c.f. III.6.A.), is of great importance for the overall understanding of the positive presentation of the Catholic Maria:

> Damit und nur so läßt sich Schillers Sympathie für die katholische Maria erklären. Mit ihr will er Religiösität als ein rein ästhetisches Phänomen und als schöne Idee darstellen. Katholizität als Glaubensbekenntnis war Schiller fremd, wenn er es auch als Dramatiker nicht verschmähte, sich des Zaubers ihrer Formen und Riten zu bedienen. (Burschell, 483)

As in the *Wallenstein* trilogy, Schiller here shows a clear trend toward abandoning denominational issues, and the critical image of Catholicism in *Maria Stuart* can be explained as a means of giving an example that counters the type of religiousness represented by Maria.

For the protagonist, the Church is anything but a hollow, superficial, and dogmatic construction. Rather, it offers forgiveness for all sins; it is a Church "die den Löseschlüssel hat / Für jede Schuld, der Himmel hat vergeben" (IX, 14). This attitude and her pure devotion to God are the key to Maria's ultimate transfiguration and greatness in death. Before her execution, she confesses to a priest and is now officially free of sin.

> Von da aus läge es nahe, den Schlußakt von 'Maria Stuart' als ein Bekenntnis zur "philosophischen Religion" des Idealismus zu verstehen, das sich des christlichen Sakralen nur als theatralischen Mittels zur Versinnlichung bedient, um mit seiner Hilfe den Durchbruch in den "reinen Dämon", den Übergang in den Gott, bildhaft darzustellen. Christliche Heilsgehalte würden damit zu Chiffren für einen in Wahrheit aller konkreten Inhalte entkleideten Glauben, dessen eigentliche spirituelle Bedeutung allein noch im religiösen Akt als solchem bestände. (von Wiese, 721)

This scene, however, is quite ambivalent. It is true that Maria's confession is based on a free decision (c.f. Pütz, 301-302), but on the other hand, the fact that she feels the need for such a ritualistic

cleansing of her soul also indicates that she is not completely free in her will. The question remains whether Maria, the Catholic, faces her death as a *schöne Seele*. Due to the ambivalence of this scene, it can be left to the reader's personal interpretation. Yet, a few facts are certain:

> Schiller [lag] gewiß jede Profanisierung des christlichen Glaubens ferne; aber ebenso wenig dürfen die zahlreichen Anklänge an die Bibel, die zum Teil auf dem genauen Studium des Rituellen beruhen, als ein geheimes Bekenntnis zum Katholizismus aufgefaßt werden. Fällt ja doch gerade auf *Mortimer*, den Konvertiten, in dessen Phantasie sich die himmlische und die irdische Maria auf eine verzückt sinnliche Weise vermischen, ein durchaus kritisches Licht, und die Gestalt, ja auch noch ihr Sterben, werden nicht nur Verkörperung eines großartigen Aufschwungs in das "Intelligible", sondern des bloßen Schwärmertums, dem Schiller von jeher ablehnend gegenüberstand. (von Wiese, 720)

Maria's greatness and–possibly–spiritual liberation are due to the imposed physical restrictions:

> [Der] Verlust der äußeren Freiheit weckt und entfaltet erst die innere. Es ist dies die Freiheit, in der sich der Mensch über das Leiden erhebt. In diesem Zustande sah Schiller schon in dem Aufsatz 'Über Anmut und Würde' den Beweis für das Vermögen des menschlichen Geistes zur Freiheit. (Rieder, 111)

Schiller uses Maria as an example to show such a process. Portrayal of the process of liberation also provides the key for the analysis of *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* in the following chapter.

C. *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* (1801)

Among all the dramas of Schiller's classical period, *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* probably requires the most complex analysis of the role of the Church:. At first glance, the title figure Johanna is a woman, who, under the impression that she is personally chosen by God, leads the French army against the English occupying forces. But on the basis of the fact that she is a woman and that her behavior thus violates existing orthodox religious dogma, her deeds are misinterpreted as the work of the devil. She finds herself accused of witchcraft by her own father, Thibaud. The latter represents a form of religious Puritanism that ultimately does not even shy away from the Inquisition. A set of relationships similar to those in *Don Carlos* seems to emerge. But in contrast to the situation in that drama and the figure of the Grand Inquisitor, the Archbishop in *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* is willing to admit that the conviction of Johanna is a mistake:

> Wer ward nicht irr' an ihr und hätte nicht
> Gewankt an diesem unglücksel'gen Tage,
> Da alle Zeichen gegen sie bewiesen!
> Wir waren überrascht, betäubt; der Schlag
> Traf zu erschütternd unser Herz – Wer konnte
> In dieser Schreckensstunde prüfend wägen?
> Jetzt kehrt uns die Besonnenheit zurück;
> Wir sehn sie, wie sie unter uns gewandelt,
> Und keinen Tadel finden wir an ihr. (IX, 301-302)

Accordingly, the main point of Schiller's critique cannot lie in the depiction of Johanna's religious presumptuousness, in particular since she performs an act that must almost be considered a miracle: the liberation of the French people from the virtually inescapable oppression of the English.

By condemning Johanna, a young and simple shepherdess, and the miracle she performs,

JOHANNA: Hoch ehrt mich dieser edeln Ritter Wahl;
Doch nicht verließ ich meine Schäfertrift,
Um weltlich eitle Hoheit zu erjagen,
Noch, mir den Brautkranz in das Haar zu flechten,
Legt' ich die ehrne Waffenrüstung an.
Berufen bin ich zu ganz anderm Werk,
Die reine Jungfrau nur kann es vollenden.
Ich bin die Kriegerin des höchsten Gottes,
Und keinem Manne kann ich Gattin sein.

ERZBISCHOF: Dem Mann zur liebenden Gefährtin ist
Das Weib geboren – wenn sie der Natur
Gehorcht, dient sie am würdigsten dem Himmel! (IX, 252)

the Church even goes so far as to deny an important part of its own doctrine: the belief in miracles.

Des Himmels Herrlichkeit umleuchtet euch,
Vor euerm Aug' enthüllt er seine Wunder,
Und ihr erblickt in mir nichts als ein Weib […]. (IX, 254)

It can therefore not be Christian belief itself, but rather the Church as an institution that Schiller criticizes. Johanna's love for Lionel can only be a sin if the medieval ascetic interpretation of religious tradition and the "Wahngebilde der Klosterreligion" (Burggraf, 312) condemn all secular love between man and woman. Thus, it is now the institution that assumes the role of a tyrant and restricts the individual's freedom by clinging to old dogma that itself has increasingly lost the connection to its religious roots.

A similar constellation has already been examined in the *Wallenstein* trilogy: The Habsburg Emperor of Austria begins a war in the name of religion and the (Catholic) Church, which is ultimately not really about the deliverance of Europe from the 'threat' of Protestantism, but about gain for a few individuals, among whom is Octavio. Freedom of the individual has long since become obsolete in this war. In contrast, Johanna fights for the freedom of her fellow countrymen in the name of true faith–and not the Church–, and refuses all material gain. This character thus serves to express Schiller's "Widerlegung der thörichten Ansicht, daß das Christentum Passivität und Frömmigkeit weiche, energielose Empfindung sei. In der zarten Jungfrau erwacht die Heldenkraft des in Gott gebundenen und frei und stark sich aufrichtenden Gewissens" (Burggraf, 414).

Again we find Schiller's focus on the freedom of the individual, both in a physical and spiritual sense, to be concentrated in something Johanna demands from King Karl:

> Sei immer menschlich, Herr im Glück, wie dus
> Im Unglück warst – und auf der Größe Gipfel
> Vergiß nicht, was ein Freund wiegt in der Not;
> Du hast's in Erniedrigung erfahren.
> Verweigre nicht Gerechtigkeit und Gnade
> Dem letzten deines Volks; […]
> Dein Stamm wird blühn, solang er sich die Liebe
> Bewahrt im Herzen seines Volks;
> Der Hochmut nur kann ihn zum Falle führen […]. (IX, 248)

In further support of this argument, let us turn to the end of the play. At first glance, the fact becomes obvious that–unlike the historical Johanna–Schiller's protagonist does not die at the stake, but as a free active heroine fighting on the battlefield. Yet, it is not the physical aspect of her experience that makes her a true manifestation of a *schöne Seele*, but rather her spiritual detachment from any worldly mediator between her and God. When Johanna first becomes aware that she has been chosen, she herself receives the calling from God:

> So ist des Geistes Ruf an mich ergangen,
> Mich treibt nicht eitles, irdisches Verlangen. […]
> Ein Zeichen hat der Himmel mit verheißen,
> Er sendet mit den Helm., er kommt von *ihm*,
> Mit Götterkraft berühret mich sein Eisen,
> Und mich durchflammt der Mut der Cherubim; (IX, 180-181)

However, as she understands the conditions of her calling, she will lose this power should she ever love a man on this earth

> Nicht Männerliebe darf mein Herz berühren
> Mit sünd'gen Flammen eitler Erdenlust. (IX, 181)

Thus, when she experiences love, she is left without her strength, and has to give in to outside forces.

After being publicly accused of witchcraft, she–convinced that she has disobeyed God's will by falling in love with Lionel–refuses to defend herself, manages to escape at first, but is eventually captured and imprisoned by Isabeau. What then happens cannot be rationally explained[52]: In heavy chains, she is forced to witness the final battle between the French and their numerically far superior English enemy. Like the Queen of Scotland in *Maria Stuart*, who gains strength of faith through confession and faces her death in spiritual harmony, Johanna finds her way back to God:

> Höre mich, Gott, in meiner höchsten Not!
> Hinauf zu dir, in heißem Flehenswunsch,
> In deine Himmel send' ich meine Seele.
> Du kannst die Fäden eines Spinngewebs

Stark machen wie die Taue eines Schiffs,
Leicht ist es deiner Allmacht, ehern Bande
In dünnes Spinngewebe zu verwandeln –
Du willst, und diese Ketten fallen ab,
Und diese Turmwand spaltet sich – du halfst
Dem Simson, da er blind war und gefesselt
Und seiner stolzen Feinde bittern Spott
Erduldete. – Auf dich vertrauend faßt' er
Die Pfosten seines Kerkers mächtig an
Und neigte sich und stürzte das Gebäude – (IX, 311)

Although she tempts God and cites the example of Samson in the Old Testament, she nonetheless passes her test of faith by praying after a period of doubt in his higher plan:

Und bin ich strafbar, weil ich menschlich war? […]
Arglistig Herz! Du lügst dem ew'gen Licht,
Dich trieb des Mitleids fromme Stimme nicht![…]

Ein blindes Werkzeug fordert Gott,
Mit blinden Augen mußtest du's vollbringen!
Sobald du *sahst*, verließ dich Gottes Schild,
Ergriffen dich der Hölle Schlingen! (IX, 269-270)

God eventually helps her to throw off her shackles. She then rushes to the battleground, wins the war for the French, and dies a truly liberated being.

The fact that Schiller creates this unrealistic and historically incorrect image is neither due to an insufficient study of the historic sources, nor to the desire to follow the Romantic movement of people like the brothers Schlegel, Tieck, Wackenroder or Novalis[53]. Schiller's intention was to depict an ideal human being, a true *schöne Seele*, a person who embodies the idea of "Freiheit in der Erscheinung" both physically and spiritually. Johanna's physical liberation cannot be interpreted as a projection of reality, but solely as a symbol for the elimination of a mediator between man and God. Hereby, Schiller supports the idea of natural religiousness that is free of any form of religious dogma, yet more than capable of 'strengthening' the believer. The conflict between the two Christian denominations is of little importance, and gives way to a much broader depiction of an ideal image of the Church.

D. *Wilhelm Tell* (1804)

Wilhelm Tell (1803/04) was Schiller's last drama and can thus be seen as the terminal point for the author's development of his view of the Church and religion in general. Direct references to the Church are scarce in the play, and the numerous allusions to God are merely phrases and expressions common at that time. They give little indication as to Schiller's opinion about this topic.

There is, however, one scene in *Wilhelm Tell* that has direct bearing on the current discussion. It is Tell's dialogue with Johannes Parricida after the latter confesses to Tell that he murdered the king (IV/2):

> Auch ich
> Hab' einen Feind erschlagen, der mir Recht
> Versagte – Er war Euer Feind wie meiner –
> Ich hab' das Land von ihm befreit. (X, 271)

Before one can analyze Tell's reply to Parricida's claim that he did nothing more than Tell had done with his murder of Gessler (IV/3), a few important factors must be examined. These will help to explain Schiller's message concerning the Church.

One of these elements is the image that Schiller creates with respect to God and religion in general. When Gertrud, Stauffacher's wife, states that God is the protector of the just, the brave and the innocent (I/2)

> So acht ich wohl, Gott würd' euch nicht verlassen
> Und der gerechten Sache gnädig seyn – […]
> dem Muthigen hilft Gott! […]
> Die Unschuld hat im Himmel einen Freund! (X, 144-145)

she only prepares the reader for Tell's claim that the Swiss people's fight for freedom is a mere restoration of God's original will and creation (I/3): "Das Haus der Freiheit hat uns Gott gegründet" (X, 149).

> Im 'Tell' zeigt Schiller, daß der Kampf um die Freiheit zugleich eine moralische Wertungsprobe darstellt. Nur der verdient die Freiheit, der sie mit reinen Händen erringt. Das moralische Recht zur Freiheit wird nun im Christentum verankert. (Rieder 139)

During the meeting on the *Rütli* (II/2), Rösselmann assures his companions that God will support their struggle for freedom,

> Doch Gott
> Ist überall, wo man das Recht verwaltet,
> Und unter seinem Himmel stehen wir (X, 179),

Stauffacher says

> Wenn der Gedrückte nirgends Recht kann finden,
> Wenn unerträglich wird die Last – greift er
> Hinauf getrosten Muthes in den Himmel
> Und holt herunter seine ewgen Rechte,
> Die droben hangen unveräusserlich
> Und unzerbrechlich wie die Sterne selbst – (X, 185)

and the presence of the local priest seems to underline this:

> Seht! Steigt nicht selbst der fromme Diener Gottes,
> Der würdge Pfarrer mit herab? Nicht scheut er
> Des Weges Mühen und das Grau'n der Nacht,
> ein treuer Hirte für das Volk zu sorgen. (X, 178)

It is this representative of God–although low in the ranks of the Church, but one who goes to endless trouble in order to be with the people in a time of need–who distances himself from the institutionalized Church and its representative, the pope who lives far away in an "unbekannte[n] Land" (X, 274), and symbolically allies himself with the men and their fight for freedom under a natural religious order.

This image of a forgiving and just God, helping a people in its struggle for deliverance from tyranny is only the first of the aforementioned factors that form the basis for understanding the role of the Church as it is presented in *Wilhelm Tell*. Of great importance is also the often used area of conflict between the cultural and the natural world. It is again Rösselmann who asks the men assembled on the *Rütli* to swear by the light of dawn an oath of unity in the fight against the tyrant

> Bei diesem Licht, das uns zuerst begrüßt
> Von allen Völkern, die tief unter uns
> Schwerathmend wohnen in dem Qualm der Städte,
> Laßt uns den Eid des neuen Bundes schwören. (X, 191-192)

In this scene Schiller confronts the reader with the idea that these people, including the clergyman, represent the law of nature that has been disturbed by the invasion of the king's troops. Tell later (III/3) describes to his son Walter the new world of culture as a realm of a lack of freedom. The boy thus learns to see the advantages of living in a natural environment, despite its hazards: "Vater, es wird mir eng im weiten Land, / Da wohn' ich lieber unter den Lawinen" (X, 208). Under these circumstances, Rösselmann's closing speech in the *Rütli* scene points directly not only to the problem of culture versus nature, but also to that of man versus God. He thus unmistakably connects freedom, nature, and God

> – Wir wollen trauen auf den höchsten Gott
> Und uns nicht fürchten vor der Macht der Menschen. (X, 192)

and combines the highest moral, aesthetic, and religious values in Schiller's philosophy into one image.

When, in IV/1, Tell escapes merely "Durch Gottes gnäd'ge Fürsehung" (X, 229), the reader is left with only one explanation: God intervened in order to ensure personally that Gessler's violation of the – as Rudenz puts it – "Bande der Natur" (X, 218) will not be left unpunished. Although Tell himself says "Es lebt ein Gott, zu strafen und zu rächen" (X, 244) and thus acknowledges that it is God

alone who is entitled to exercise vengeance, the reader is led to consider him to be acting according to God's will when he kills Gessler.

The image of religion created here is again one of natural religiousness, far from the strict dogma of an institutional Church. But even in this religiously natural environment, corruption and abuse of power cannot be disregarded. In the famous *Hohle Gasse* scene (IV/3), Stüssi mentions to Tell a rich 'Klostermeyer', who is an administrator of a property belonging to a monastery or convent and thus to the Church as a whole:

> Das ist der Klostermey'r von Mörlischachen,
> Der hier den Brautlauf hält – Ein reicher Mann,
> Er hat wohl zehen Senten auf den Alpen. (X, 246)

The fact that this person has become wealthy through his work for the church coincides with Stauffacher's explanation of Parricida's motive for killing his uncle, the king. Here, the craving for money and power led to murder; Parricida was not satisfied with the king's offer to bestow upon him an episcopate:

> Der Kaiser hielt das väterliche Erbe
> Dem ungeduldig mahnenden zurück,
> Es hieß, er denk ihn ganz darum zu kürzen,
> Mit einem Bischoffshut ihn abzufinden. (X, 262)

If a (secular) king can literally give away ecclesiastical offices, does this not illustrate the worthlessness of the institution 'Church' in providing a spiritual support for the people? The Church Schiller describes in *Wilhelm Tell* has become corrupt and alienated from the people and its original purpose. The same condition could already be found illustrated in most of his earlier works.

Eventually, Parricida himself enters the scene (IV/2): a murderer, disguised as a monk. The symbolism inherent in this image cannot escape the critical reader's observation. Hedwig, too, soon sees through Johannes' false appearance, but not before showing true kindness by offering shelter and food:

> Ihr seid kein Mönch! Ihr seid
> Es nicht! Der Friede wohnt in diesem Kleide,
> In Euren Zügen wohnt der Friede nicht. (X, 269)

Here we return to the scene at the beginning of this analysis. When Parricida compares his own actions to those of Tell as simple revenge ("Rach'"), the latter can argue against this on the basis of the overall image of religion and the Church thus far created:

> Darfst du der Ehrsucht blutge Schuld vermengen,

Mit der gerechten Nothwehr eines Vaters?
[…] Gerächt
Hab' ich die heilige Natur, die *du*
Geschändet – Nichts theil' ich mit dir – Gemordet
Hast *du*, *ich* hab' mein theuerstes vertheidigt. (X, 272)

While Parricida has acted solely to obtain material gain, Tell claims to have exercised God's will to restore as a manifestation of God himself the "heilige Natur", of which Tell and his comrades form an inseparable part. This argument pushes the two killings to opposite ends of the moral spectrum: Tell's murder of Gessler had been just, Parricida had committed an evil deed by acting against the law of nature. Tell, the prototypical *Naturbursche* of German literature, was swept away from his natural and righteous path as soon as Gessler forced him to shoot at his own son solely for the arbitrary *Landvogt*'s pleasure. His murder thus became necessary to enable Tell to restore the laws of nature that had been so severely violated.

So far, an important detail has been neglected, namely Tell's own religious beliefs. Many hints regarding his view of religiousness as a substantial part of nature have been analyzed in this chapter, but nothing has been said about whether Tell is Protestant or Catholic. Here, history provides the answer: Although Switzerland, unlike most of the surrounding nations, has historically been mainly Protestant, whereas Austria, the outspoken enemy in Schiller's drama, Italy, and France have always been strictly Catholic, the historical figure Wilhelm Tell lived in the first half of the 14th century[54]. Since the Reformation did not occur for another 200 years, the question of whether Tell represents the Protestant or the Catholic Church becomes insignificant. What remains important, however, is that Tell embodies a type of Christian belief that is utterly independent from any form of religious dogma or ritual. When Tell meets Parricida, the Austrian king's Catholic nephew, the scene can be interpreted as a confrontation between two polar ideas of Christianity. Tell remains morally victorious throughout his dialogue with Parricida, which may be interpreted as an expression of Schiller's attitude against the institutionalized Church. Parricida is bound by his religious heritage, whereas Tell is free and represents the *schöne Seele* of Schiller's aestheticism.

To conclude, Schiller's use of the aforementioned motif of the 'man of sin' lets Tell express his belief that only God can judge a person's actions. Therefore, Tell cannot forgive Parricida's murderous act

Kann ich Euch helfen? Kanns ein Mensch der Sünde?
Doch stehet auf – Was ihr auch gräßliches
Verübt – Ihr seid ein Mensch – Ich bin es auch (X, 274),

and sends him off to Rome, where he can beg for forgiveness before the pope, who is, from Parricida's perspective, the only true representative of God, instituted as such through the word of the Lord himself. However, by describing for him a passage through the Alps, he prepares him for both the long march ahead and the dangers that await him as a violator of nature's laws (X, 275-276). The mountains and nature–and through both eventually God–shall thus be his judge, an idea that is a remnant of Goethe's pantheism. The implication is therefore clear: If Parricida survives the journey, his sins will already have been forgiven even before he reaches Rome and the pope. The role of the latter is hereby substantially weakened.

Even though we find few unambiguous references to Schiller's view of the Church in *Wilhelm Tell*, we can still see that he combines two very important aspects of his religious beliefs in this drama: his still latent contempt for the Church as an institution and in particular the Catholic Church as a manifestation thereof, and the establishment of a natural religiousness, which could be observed in his earlier dramas.

Due to Schiller's early death in 1805, we can only make assumptions about the possible further development in the author's views, although we know that he was obviously concerned with questions pertaining to religion and the Church right up to his death; this is reflected in the fragments of such works as *Die Malteser* and *Dimetrius*. The direction until 1805, however, is clear: his strong opposition to Catholicism in the earlier writings had given way to a more moderate rejection of religious dogma after the development of his philosophy and his aesthetic concepts. This point can be substantiated through an examination of Schiller's late poetry.

8. Classical Poetry

In the preceding sections the attempt was made to give a comprehensive overview of the critical treatment of the Church in Schiller's works. To conclude this analysis, a few of his poems written after 1794–the beginning of his friendship with Goethe–will be examined in this chapter.

In the *Votivtafeln* of 1796, one epigram is of great importance and will be the starting point for this section on Schiller's classical poetry: *Mein Glaube*. In the two lines

> Welche Religion ich bekenne? Keine von allen,
> Die du mir nennst! "Und warum keine?" Aus Religion.

Schiller takes the step of removing religion completely from all historical and institutionalized appearances. As he later wrote in the introduction "Über den Gebrauch des Chors in der Tragödie" to *Die Braut von Messina* (1803), "Unter der Hülle aller Religionen liegt die Religion selbst, die Idee eines Göttlichen" (X, 15). In other words, religion must stand for itself and be unattached to any form of dogma. This religious freedom defines religiousness itself; the free choice of belief is a *schöne Tat*, and forms the core of true natural faith. Parallels to the image of religion in Lessing's *Nathan der Weise* (1761), namely the equal value of the Christian denominations as well as other world religions, are obvious.

Such a removal of religion from the an institutionalized Church in favor of free religious expression of the individual can also be found in *Die Worte des Glaubens* (1797). True faith (*Glauben*) can be characterized by three properties: a) "Der Mensch ist frei geschaffen, ist frei, / Und würd' er in Ketten geboren." (ll. 7-8), b) "die Tugend ist kein leerer Schall, / Der Mensch kann sie üben im leben, / Und sollt' er auch straucheln überall" (ll. 13-15), and c) "Und ein Gott ist. Ein heiliger Wille lebt, / Wie auch der menschliche wanke / […] Es beharret im Wechsel ein ruhiger Geist" (ll. 19-20, 24). Not a word about the Church–Schiller sees man as a naturally free being, who has the idealistic ability to reach virtue, and recognizes God directly as the only true authority. But even this God is reduced to a mere "heiliger Wille". It is interesting how far Schiller has come since he wrote his early poetry 15 years earlier and depicted a vengeful God of Wrath. Here, God is only a neutral but nonetheless good spirit, and is far from judging any person for his sins. This image of God makes an institutionalized Church and its role in preserving morality and faith completely obsolete.

In *Die Johanniter* (1796), Schiller reemphasizes another aspect of his image of religion: humaneness. The furthering of Christianity through cruelties and violence in the name of an organized

Church is set in contrast to humane acts of goodness, brotherly love, and compassion, all of which beautify the soul; only if man humbles himself in an act of free will, and follows the true meaning of Christianity, will he be morally and spiritually victorious:

> Herrlich kleidet sie euch, des Kreuzes furchtbare Rüstung,
> Wenn ihr, Löwen der Schlacht, Akkon und Rhodus beschützt,
> Durch die syrische Wüste den bangen Pilgrim geleitet
> Und mit der Cherubim Schwert steht vor dem Heiligen Grab.
> Aber ein schönerer Schmuck umgibt euch, die Schürze des Wärters,
> Wenn ihr, Löwen der Schlacht, Söhne des edelsten Stamms,
> Dient an des Kranken Bett, dem Lechzenden Labung bereitet
> Und die niedrige Pflicht christlicher Milde vollbringt.
> Religion des Kreuzes, nur du verknüpftest in einem
> Kranze der Demut und Kraft doppelt Palme zugleich.

This same struggle between the Church as a restrictive authority, demanding obedience above all, and the individual's free will is shown in *Der Kampf mit dem Drachen* (1798), one of the great ballads that Schiller wrote in friendly competition with Goethe.

The Church in this poem is represented by the master of the Order of John the Baptist, for whom the prime duty of a good Christian is obedience:

> "[…] Was ist die erste Pflicht
> Des Ritters, der für Christentum ficht,
> Sich schmücket mit des Kreuzes Zeichen?" […]
> "Gehorsam ist die erste Pflicht,
> Die ihn des Schmuckes würdig zeiget."
>
> Mut zeiget auch der Mameluck,
> Gehorsam ist des Christen Schmuck; (ll. 41-48, 277-278)

According to him, free will poses an enormous threat to the Church, and has to be suppressed. When the young knight disobeys his master and slays the dragon, he must then control his will and succumb to the power of the Church when facing its authority, or else be punished.

> Ein Gott bist du dem Volke worden,
> Ein Feind kommst du zurück dem Orden,
> Und einen schlimmern Wurm gebar
> Dein Herz, als dieser Drache war.
> Die Schlange, die das Herz vergiftet,
> Die Zwietracht und Verderben stiftet,
> Das ist der widerspenst'ge Geist,
> Der gegen Zucht sich frech empöret,
> Der Ordnung heilig Band zerreißt;
> Denn der ist's, der die Welt zerstöret. (ll. 267-276)

With respect to Schiller's concept of individual freedom, such an attitude and the system that supports it are responsible for a crime that violates the laws of nature. That religion itself is not criticized here

becomes obvious when one considers that fact that the knight finds strength only through direct prayer to God in a little chapel:

> Verächtlich scheint es, arm und klein,
> Doch ein Mirakel schließt es ein,
> Die Mutter mit dem Jesusknaben,
> Den die drei Könige begaben. […]
>
> Hin kniet' ich vor dem Christuskinde
> Und reinigte mein Herz von Sünde;
> Drauf gürt' ich mir im Heiligtum
> Den blanken Schmuck der Waffen um,
> Bewehre mit dem Spieß die Rechte,
> Und nieder steig' ich zum Gefechte. (ll. 173-176, 195-200)

Like Max in *Wallenstein*, the knight sees the true religious meaning of the chapel, despite its poor outward appearance. By living his non-dogmatic Christian faith, he is eventually able to kill the dragon. The end of the ballad is, if not fully negative, at least ambiguous: although victorious and a hero for the people, the young knight has to give in to his master and the institution he represents; he is again accepted into the order, but is not able to retain his newly won freedom. Despite that fact that he escapes punishment, he falls back into the dogmatic shackles of the Church. From Schiller's perspective, the poem thus has a negative ending.

That the direct and free worship of God can save lives is shown in *Der Gang nach dem Eisenhammer* (1797). When asked to pray for a friend's sick child, Fridolin sees this as his duty as a true Christian and puts aside his other, worldly obligations. Had he not followed this instinct of compassion and brotherly love, he would have fallen victim to the villain Robert's plan and died a cruel death in the flames of the fire in a smithy. In the end, this outcome is explained as God's will: "Gott selbst im Himmel hat gerichtet!"(ll. 232). God has lived up to his role as a 'shepherd' and protected his faithful 'lamb' against evil.

In conclusion, the contrast between the Church as a dogmatic institution and free interpretation of Christian duties can be examined by comparing a passage from Schiller's *Deutsche Größe* (1799)[55] and *Der Graf von Habsburg* (1803). When Schiller writes in the former

> Schwere Ketten drückten alle
> Völker auf dem Erdenballe,
> Als der Deutsche sie zerbrach,
> Fehde bot dem Vatikane,
> Krieg ankündigte dem Wahne,
> Der die ganze Welt bestach.
> Höhern Sieg hat der errungen,
> Der der Wahrheit Blitz geschwungen,
> Der die Geister selbst befreit,

Freiheit der Vernunft erfechten
Heißt für alle Völker rechten,
Gilt für alle ew'ge Zeit. (XXI, 435)

he not only paints a patriotic picture of the German people, but also presents the Roman Catholic Church as the degenerate oppressor of many. This oppression takes the form of hiding truth and subduing spiritual freedom. Only the Germans–and this must probably be understood as a reference to the Enlightenment in Germany–managed to break through this wall of denial. Thus, free will is the highest achievable good, and it alone survives all attacks of outside forces. This is portrayed in the title figure of the *Graf von Habsburg*. Through his true and natural religiousness, compassion, and generosity he himself brings God's grace about and will forever live in the art of song. The bard "steht in des größeren Herren Pflicht" (l. 43), and thus expresses in his praise of the nobleman God's indirect praise. In Schiller's view, the duke represents the ideal ruler: merciful, humane, and true to himself in all aspects of physical and spiritual life. Such a rule can and will be tolerated by the people as an essential means of moral and political guidance. The rule of the organized Church with all its dogma, on the other hand, must be fought, so that man can again enjoy his freedom of mind. This is the core of Schiller's critique of the institutionalized Church, as opposed to his support of natural religiousness of the individual.

IV. Conclusion

Due to Schiller's intense and critical treatment of the Church in his works over almost a quarter of a century, from *Die Räuber* (1781) to *Wilhelm Tell* (1804), he was often regarded as an author who rejected Christianity and supported pagan beliefs. But his strongest critics condemned the pragmatic anti-authoritarian effect of his writings and the frequent "Relativierung bzw. Substituierung der christlichen Religion als einer zentralen Institution der aristokratisch-legitimistischen Hegemonie" (Gerhard, 163). Until the middle of the 19th century, the Church, fearing a loss of power, attempted numerous times to prevent the widespread circulation of Schiller's books and thus the reception of his anti-doctrinal ideas: "Offenbar wurde die christliche Religion in ihrer dominanten Funktion als konstitutives Element der Subjektbildung durch die pragmatische Applikation Schillerscher Texte ganz praktisch in Frage gestellt und ersetzbar" (Gerhard, 164). This struggle over power in the years after Schiller's death is clearly presented in the poem *Sinnesänderung* from the *Hallische Jahrbücher* (1839)[56]:

> Doch was hör ich? Mit Macht erhebt sich ein Pfaffengezüchte
> Hetzt das mißgeleitete Volk gegen das Götzenbild auf.
> Recht so! Da lernt ihr andern ein heilsames Entweder – Oder, […]
> Entweder Schillers Freund und ein Freund der Kritik und Freiheit,
> Oder des Fortschritts Feind, aber auch Schillers zugleich!

But the main fact which the Church authorities passionately refused to see was that Schiller was by all means a very religious man, who always gave priority to the expression of Christian faith. In terms of his aesthetics, he only criticized an institution that would dictate to the individual what to believe and how to exercise his creed. This, however, was the foundation on which the Church had built its power, and which, in their opinion, Schiller tried to undermine. In particular the incorporation of Christian ritual into literature was often condemned as an act of blasphemy; in reality, the masses were disillusioned and the veil of mystery around traditional ritual lifted, revealing the void inside.

> Mit der Vermischung von religiösen und ästhetisch-literarischen Elementen vollzieht die gesellschaftliche Rezeption also nur eine Tendenz nach, die bereits in den Schillerschen Texten selbst angelegt ist. Die davon ausgehende Bedrohung für die christliche Kirche als die zentrale Institution der aristokratisch-legitimistischen Hegemonie erklärt dann auch die vielfältigen Zensurmaßnahmen. Diese richteten sich nämlich zum einen gegen die offene Kritik an der Praxis der katholischen Kirche wie etwa im "Don Carlos", zum anderen aber auch gegen das Verfahren der Schillerschen Texte, christliche Elemente, wie das Ritual der Kommunion, Gebete oder Symbole in die komplexe ästhetische Struktur zu integrieren. (Gerhard, 165)

Throughout this thesis it should have become obvious that religion and the Church form an extremely important aspect of the works of Friedrich Schiller. Where he openly criticizes the organized

Church–and here in particular Catholicism–in his earlier writings like *Die Räuber*, *Don Carlos*, and *Der Geisterseher*, his perception of religion soon changes with his studies of Kant's philosophy, and under the influence of Goethe and Herder; almost all of Schiller's most important creations–those written after 1794–strongly promote natural religiousness as a vehicle to beauty as opposed to the restrictions of organized religion. By incorporating historical themes and figures, Schiller substantiates his endeavors even more. Without these different views of the role of the Church and their development over time, the interpretation of works like *Der Geisterseher*, *Maria Stuart*, and *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* would greatly lack in depth.

On the basis of the ongoing struggles over the role of religion and the Church in the last 25 years of the 18th century, the danger of large parts of the population following Schiller's example of abandoning the institution in favor of establishing a direct relationship to God, was fought by those who saw their mission in suppressing and abusing the power of religion. Schiller must have recognized the threat of such abuses very early in his life, but it took him many years of studying and refining his philosophy to develop a subtle way of appealing to his readers to move away from any dogma dictated by the Church and back to a natural religious order. This is probably one of the most important messages contained in his creative works.

* * *

NOTES

[1] Although Goethe was barely six years old when Lisbon was destroyed, it must still have left a lasting impression on him. In the first book of *Über Dichtung und Wahrheit* (1811) he explicitly recalls this event.

[2] It was not until after his experiences at the *Karlsschule* that he found the courage to openly express his criticism of society and the church in *Die Räuber* (1781).

[3] Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. *Goethe. Werke in fünf Bänden*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: VEB Bibliographisches Institut, 1959. p. 61.

[4] In a letter to Lavater, dated August 9, 1782, Goethe writes: "Du findest nichts schöner als das Evangelium, ich finde tausend geschriebene Blätter alter und neuer von Gott begnadigter Menschen eben so schön, und der Menschheit nützlich und unentbehrlich. […] Ausschließlich Intoleranz!" (Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. *Goethe. Werke in fünf Bänden*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: VEB Bibliographisches Institut, 1959. p. 33)

[5] For example in the letter of August 18 in the first part of the novel, one can find not only a direct representation of Goethe's pantheism, but also strong similarities to many of Klopstock's odes.

[6] Since *Die Räuber* will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter III.2.A., the following only represents a rough summary and generalization of the arguments found in that chapter.

[7] Schiller, Friedrich. *Schillers Werke*. Nationalausgabe. Vol. XX. Weimar: Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1967-1992. pp. 10-12. All future references to this edition will be given by volume and page number in the text.

[8] First Part, letter of June 16. (IX, 27)

[9] To Franz he says: "Ich stehe hier in den Angelegenheiten eines größeren Herrn, und rede mit einem, der Wurm ist wie ich, dem ich nicht gefallen will." (III, 121)

[10] For the following analysis of Don Carlos, I will refer to the first edition of 1787.

[11] A possible interpretation of Schiller's intentions to present a confrontation between these two Christian denominations in favor of Protestantism is ultimately contradicted when Posa–the representative of humaneness and truth–explicitly states that he is a Catholic like everyone else, including the king or the Grand Inquisitor (VI, 184).

[12] In the 10th scene of Act III, Posa characterizes himself as follows: "Das Jahrhundert / ist meinem Ideal nicht reif. Ich lebe / ein Bürger derer, welche kommen werden" (VI, 185). Although this reveals Schiller's perspective as an author looking back in time on the situation at the Spanish court in the 16th century, the ultimate effect on the reader of his time must have been a stronger tendency to sympathize with Posa and therefore enhance the critical view of the actions of the Church as depicted in the play.

[13] In Act III, Scene 2, he says about himself "Ich liebe / die Menschheit, und in Monarchieen darf / ich niemand lieben als mich selbst" (VI, 181) and expresses his view that a monarchic system cannot be combined with humanist ideals.

[14] 'Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might; Heaven and earth are full of your glory.'

[15] This aspect of Schiller's poetry can be clearly observed in his collection of *Odes to Laura* (c.f. von Wiese 119).

[16] The first lines of *Freigeisterei der Leidenschaft* are as follows:

> Nein–länger, länger werd ich diesen Kampf nicht kämpfen,
> Den Riesenkampf der Pflicht.
> Kannst du des Herzens Flammentrieb nicht dämpfen,
> So fordre, Tugend, dieses Opfer nicht. (ll. 1-4)

In the poem *Resignation* (1784) he describes the same conflict, using the phrase "Hoffnung und Genuß" (l. 90).

[17] The relevant passage in *Don Carlos* is Posa's self-characterization in the scene with Philipp (III/10, VI, 185).

[18] Such a conspiracy of the Church could already be observed in the chapter on *Don Carlos* (III.2.B.).

[19] This historical figure is very likely the model for the character of the necromancing Sicilian in Schiller's novel.

[20] In the following analysis of the conspiracy, the term 'Church' must be seen as a synonym for the Catholic branch of this institution, unless noted otherwise.

[21] At this point, please compare chapter III.2.B. on *Don Carlos.*

[22] It is important to understand here that the Prince is no direct heir to the throne at his home in Germany; this makes this prophecy even more strange.

[23] This character trait is explicitly mentioned by Schiller: "Mit der Geisterwelt in Verbindung zu stehen, war ehedem [des Prinzen] Lieblingsschwärmerei gewesen, und seit jener ersten Erscheinung des Armeniers hatten sich alle Ideen wieder bei ihm gemeldet, die seine reifere Vernunft so lange abgewiesen hatte." (XVI, 56)

[24] Certain parallels to Schiller's own childhood are obvious. As will be shown later.

[25] That the Prince was raised in a purely Protestant environment can be found early in the novel, although he never acquired a strong sense for his religious heritage: "Er war Protestant, wie seine ganze Familie – durch Geburt, nicht nach Untersuchung, die er nie angestellt hatte" (XVI, 46).

[26] The fact that the Prince is able to see through the deception after all, must be seen intended by those behind the conspiracy.

[27] It is interesting to see the degree of psychological intricacy used by the conspirators, which reflects back both on the cleverness of the people involved in the plot and the Church's overall ruthlessness in pursuing its goals.

[28] Biondello becomes the Prince's servant after his old one mysteriously disappears and thus vacates the position.

[29] The Giudecca is a group of six small islands in the Adriatic Sea near Venice; each of these islands has a little church on it.

[30] XXV, 190.

[31] In this respect, three of Schiller's poems–*Der Kampf* (1784), *Resignation* (1784) and *An die Freude* (1785)–can be used to trace his development from a man full of inner conflict and despair as to the purpose of life to a person in the midst of a harmonical environment of friendship, love, and hope.

[32] The quotes from *Die Götter Griechenlands* in this chapter are taken from the second version of 1793, unless otherwise indicated.

[33] About the role of freedom in Schiller's aesthetics and philosophy, please see chapter III.6.A.

[34]
Da der Dichtung zauberische Hülle
Sich noch lieblich um die Wahrheit wand –
Durch die Schöpfung floß da Lebensfülle,
Und was nie empfinden wird, empfand. (ll. 9-13)

[35] Again we find the term *Schönheit* associated here with truth, as a sign that Schiller's aesthetics are beginning to inform his literary creations.

[36] In a letter to Reinwald of April 14, 1783, Schiller writes:
"Gott, wie ich mir denke, liebt den Seraph so wenig als den Wurm, der ihn unwißend lobet. Er erblickt sich, sein großes unendliches *Selbst*, in der unendlichen Natur umhergestreut. – In der allgemeinen Summe der Kräfte berechnet er augenbliklich Sich selbst; *Sein* Bild sieht er aus der ganzen Oekonomie des Erschaffenen vollständig, wie aus einem Spiegel, zurückgeworfen, und liebt *Sich* in dem *Abriss*, das *bezeichnete* in dem *Zeichen*. Wiederum findet er in jedem einzelnen Geschöpf (mehr oder weniger) *Trümmer* seines Wesens zerstreut." (XXIII, 79)

[37] As quoted in Burschell (1968), page 319.

[38] Although this letter was written after Schiller and Goethe began their friendship in the summer of 1794, it is important to note that Herder had a lasting influence on Schiller, who clung to these ideas until his death.

[39] In *Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen* Schiller combines the concepts of freedom and beauty and treats their applicability for the education of man, who can then advance to a *schöne Seele*.

[40] As quoted in Mann (1955), page 58.

[41] In Act I Jetter says: "Klug ist [die Regentin], und mäßig in allem was sie tut; hielte sies nur nicht so steif und fest mit den Pfaffen. Sie ist doch auch mit schuld, daß wir die vierzehn neue Bischofsmützen im Lande haben. Wozu die nur sollen? Nicht wahr, daß man Fremde in die guten Stellen einschieben kann, wo sonst Äbte aus den Kapiteln gewählt wurden? Und wir sollen glauben, es sei um der Religion willen. […] Die Inquisitionsdiener schleichen herum und passen auf; mancher ehrliche Mann ist schon unglücklich geworden. Der Gewissenszwang fehlte noch! Da ich nicht tun darf was ich möchte, können sie mich doch denken und singen lassen was ich will" (VII, 491-492), and Soest adds: "Neulich hörte ich einen auf dem Felde vor tausend und tausend Menschen sprechen. Das war ein andrer Geköch, als wenn unsre auf der Kanzel herumtrommeln und die Leute mit lateinischen Brocken erwürgen" (VII, 492). Machiavell then criticizes the greed and lust for gold among the clergy: "Wie soll Zutrauen entstehen und bleiben, wenn der Biederländer sieht, daß es mehr um seine Besitztümer als um sein Wohl, um seiner Seele Heil zu tun ist? Haben sie Bischöfe mehr Seelen gerettet als fette Pfründen geschmaust, und sind es nicht meist Fremde?" (VII, 498). In Act II the people demand a democracy, based on "hergebrachten Rechten, Privilegien und Gewohnheiten" (VII, 510), and freedom and autonomy (VII, 511), something that bears a great resemblance to Posa's demands for the king (c.f. III.2.B.). With his idealism and assessment of the historical situation, Vansen–next to Egmont–can almost be compared to a figure like Posa in Schiller's drama. He is, however, misunderstood by the people who only see their advantages in fighting the Spaniards, where Vansen also recognizes their duties and sacrifices.

[42] In Act IV Alba states: "Die Religion, sagt man, sei nur ein prächtiger Teppich, hinter dem man jeden gefährlichen Anschlag nur desto leichter ausdenkt. Das Volk liegt auf den Knieen, betet die heiligen gewirkten Zeichen an, und lauscht der Vogelsteller, der sie berücken will. […] Freiheit? Ein schönes Wort, wers recht verstände. Was wollen sie für Freiheit? Was ist es des Freiesten Freiheit? – Recht zu tun! – und daran wird sie der König nicht hindern. Nein! Nein! Sie glauben sich nicht frei, wenn sie sich nicht selbst und anderen schaden können. […] Weit besser ists sie einzuengen, daß man sie wie Kinder halten, wie Kinder zu ihrem Besten leiten kann. Glaube nur, ein Volk wird nicht alt, nicht klug; ein Volk bleibt halt immer kindisch" (VII, 554-555).

[43] Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. *Poetische Werke*. Berliner Ausgabe. Vol. VII. Berlin, Weimar: Aufbau Verlag, 1964. pp. 566-567. All future references to this edition of Goethe's works will be given by volume and page number in the text.

[44] Of course, Schiller had to finish his treatment of Kant's philosophy before any such parallels could be drawn. This also explains the lack of reference to aesthetic issues beyond the admiration of the idealistic world of the Greeks in his review of 1788.

[45] As quoted in Burggraf (1902), page 423.

[46] In Johanna's first great monologue (I/4), she expresses her belief that nature is a representation of God, and a mediator between him and man:

> Lebt wohl, ihr Berge, ihr geliebten Triften,
> Ihr traulich stillen Täler, lebet wohl. […]
> Du Echo, holde Stimme dieses Tals,
> Die oft mir Antwort gab auf meine Lieder –
> Johanna geht, und nimmer kehrt sie wieder! […]
> Denn eine andre Herde muß ich weiden,
> dort auf dem blut'gen Felde der Gefahr.
> So ist des Geistes Ruf an mich ergangen, […]
> Denn der zu Mosen auf des Horebs Höhen
> Im feur'gen Busch sich flammend niederließ
> Und ihm befahl, vor Pharao zu stehen, […]
> Er sprach zu mir aus dieses Baumes Zweigen:
> "Geh hin! Du sollst auf Erden für mich zeugen. (IX, 180-181)

[47] As quoted in Rieder (1966), page 151.

[48] Although this order is Catholic and was founded by Matthew of Bascio (1492(?)-1552) in 1525–seven years after the Reformation began–it is important to note that it has its origin in the Franciscan order. This group of monks refused any worldly possessions and focused fully on the hereafter. Through this commitment, they differed greatly from the majority of the Catholic clergy, who frequently abused their status to gain wealth and power.

[49] Again, parallels to *Don Carlos* and *Der Geisterseher* are obvious.

[50] The image of man being treated a 'good' of the Church was already discussed in the dialogue between Philipp and the Grand Inquisitor in *Don Carlos* (c.f. III.2.B).

[51] Please see the discussion of Schiller's poem *Freigeisterei der Leidenschaft* in chapter III.3..

[52] The reader is reminded at this point that Schiller himself called *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* a "romantische Tragödie", thus justifying the occurrence of supernatural phenomena in the play.

[53] His constant disagreements with the brothers Schlegel, whose literature he frequently criticized, is a well-know fact.

[54] The oath on the Rütli was taken on November 7, 1304, and Tell's fateful encounter with Geßler, in which he had to shoot at his own son's hat, took place on the 18th of the same month. The historical Tell died in 1354 while rescuing a child who had fallen into a river.

[55] Although Schiller had planned to use his sketches, from which the following quotes are taken, to create a larger lyrical work, this poem remained a fragment and eventually received its name from Bernhard Suphan (c.f. von Wiese, 763-765).

[56] As quoted in Gerhard (1994), page 164.