

# **SCHILLER**

WALLENSTEIN

11.

WALLENSTEINS TOD

# **C**AMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press 978-1-107-61991-3 - Schiller: Wallenstein: Ein Trauerspiel Edited by Karl Breul Frontmatter More information



# **SCHILLER**

# WALLENSTEIN

EIN TRAUERSPIEL

EDITED BY
KARL BREUL

II. WALLENSTEINS TOD

Cambridge: at the University Press 1956



#### CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107619913

© Cambridge University Press 1896

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1896 First edition 1896 Reprinted 1900, 1903, 1913, 1927, 1939, 1956 First paperback edition 2013

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ısвn 978-1-107-61991-3 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



# PREFACE.

THE text of the present edition of Wallensteins Tod has been prepared according to the principles which were adopted in the case of Wallensteins Lager and Die Piccolomini. The German type has been kept, because the editor is of opinion that as long as it is used by the large majority of the German nation, English students of German should be early accustomed to the German characters. Any change in this matter, desirable as it may be, must be initiated by the Germans themselves, and so long as it is not made by them it seems best that editors of German texts for the use of English students should adhere to the German practice. For a similar reason the modern German spelling has been adopted throughout. A few interesting specimens of various readings have been taken from W. Vollmer's excellent and handy critical edition.

In the notes a few parallels from Schiller's History of the Thirty Years' War have been given, and many references to the points of difference between the historical facts and those which form the groundwork of the drama. These notes have been given in the briefest possible form, as detailed notes on such points might obscure in the minds of young readers the picture of Schiller's Wallenstein. Everything should in the first instance be explained from the play itself, and the characters should be judged merely



vi PREFACE.

from the part they play in the drama. Those who wish to obtain more information as to the actual facts of the great war may consult Chapter IV. of the Introduction, the books of reference mentioned in Appendix IV. and also the Introduction to the present editor's edition of the third book of Schiller's History, which in some respects forms a companion volume to this edition of Schiller's greatest drama. Very many cross-references have been given which will prove especially useful to students who after having once read through the drama are anxious to go through it carefully for a second time. All deviations from modern prose usage have been noted, foreign terms and their German equivalents not lost sight of, peculiarities of Schiller's poetic language pointed out, but mere translations without explanation have not been given.

In a play which has now for nearly a century been studied and commented upon by German and foreign critics, there are but few passages in which it is possible to propose an absolutely new explanation. It has been the editor's aim not to pass over any difficulty without a note, and to err rather in giving too much help than in giving too little to such as may have to read the play without the assistance of a teacher. Want of space and regard to the main purpose of the book have prevented the editor from discussing any controversial points at length. In such cases he has merely given the explanation which seemed to him to be the most plausible, and briefly stated his reason for adopting it. He is anxious to commend some of his own explanations of doubtful passages to the consideration of scholars.

In the references in the Notes to passages from Wallenstein and also from other German plays, not only the numbers of the lines have been quoted, but also the acts and scenes,



# PREFACE.

vii

because in most editions the lines are not counted at all, in some the lines of each scene are counted separately. The quotations from Shakespeare are given from the text of the Globe edition.

Coleridge's translation has been briefly discussed in the Introduction. It is easily accessible in Bohn's Standard Library. Many interesting pictures illustrative of the men and events important for Schiller's drama may be found in G. Winter's History of the Thirty Years' War and in P. Knötel's Bilderatlas zur deutschen Geschichte, Leipzig, 1895.

It did not seem necessary again to add a list giving the full titles of the works chiefly used for the linguistic part of the notes. Students may now consult the present editor's *Handy bibliographical guide to the study of German* (London, Hachette, 1895), or his edition of Schiller's *Maria Stuart* (Cambridge, 1893).

Much help for the Notes has been derived from Vollmer's critical edition, and from the annotated editions of Kern, Berndt, Bellermann, Funke, Carruth, and others. Carruth's edition was not used for the edition of Wallensteins Lager and Die Piccolomini (1894). The sixth edition (1895) of H. Düntzer's well-known commentary has been consulted for this second part. It has proved most serviceable, but the critical remarks of the veteran commentator on the German classics would be much more acceptable if he would abstain from the fruitless enterprise of continually criticising the great poet and saying what he ought to have written. By this excessive and unwarranted fault-finding the pleasure of studying Düntzer's commentaries is very largely spoilt. In writing the Introduction the editor has availed himself, beside the before-mentioned works, of the books and articles by Werder, Fielitz, Kühnemann, Hettner,



viii

### PREFACE.

Bulthaupt, Freytag, Franz, Strauss, Irmer, Vetter, Imelmann, Winter, Lamprecht and others, also of Hohlfeld's suggestive review of Part I. in *Modern Language Notes*.

The two parts of the present edition with the introductory chapters, commentaries and appendices should be considered to form but one general commentary to the play, which it is hoped will be found sufficient for all ordinary purposes of study in the highest forms of schools and in the universities. A bibliographical appendix has been added for the use of those who are anxious to make the great drama the subject of special study.

It is the editor's pleasant duty to acknowledge gratefully in this place the very kind and careful assistance once more rendered to him while the proofs were passing through the Press by his friend the Rev. J. W. Cartmell, M.A., Fellow and Senior Tutor of Christ's College.

K. B.

Englemere, Cambridge, Fanuary 18, 1896.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

											PAGE
Introdu	JCTION		•	•	•	•	•	•		•	xi—lxvii
I.	The n	nanus	cripts	and	the	editi	ons			•	xi—xii
II.	The o	rigina	l and	l the	final	div	ision			•	xii—xiv
III.	Time	and p	olace	of a	ction				•		xv—xvii
IV.	Schille	er's d	rama	in i	ts rela	ation	to h	isto <b>ry</b>	•	x	vii—xxxiii
v.	Gener	al dis	cussio	on of	Schi	ller'	s dran	na		х	xxiv— <b>xl</b> i <b>x</b>
VI.	Coleri	dge's	trans	latio	n and	Co	nstant	's ad	apt <b>a</b> ti	ion	xlix—liii
УII.	Other	poen	ns an	d dra	amas	rela	ting to	Wa	llenste	ein	liii—lviii
VIII.	Argun	nent			•					. 1	viii—lxvii
TEXT.		•	•	•			•	•			1-171
Notes			•	•	•				•		173-281
APPEND	ICES										282-298
1.	Scene	s omi	tted	in th	e pri	nted	editio	ns			282-285
II.	Poem				-						285-286
III.	Chara	cter	of W	allen:	stein	(fror	n the	Hist	ory)		287-288
IV.	Biblio	graph	y						•		289-298
INDEX 1	то тн	No	res	•	• .						299-305
I.	Genera	al Inc	lex								299-303
II.	Index	of N	ames	(a)	Perso	ns.	b) Pla	ices			304-305

# **C**AMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press 978-1-107-61991-3 - Schiller: Wallenstein: Ein Trauerspiel Edited by Karl Breul Frontmatter More information



# INTRODUCTION.

I.

#### THE MANUSCRIPTS AND THE EDITIONS.

Before Schiller's great drama appeared in print it had been acted in various places, and the manuscripts from which the acting copies were made show in many cases a different text from the one contained in the first printed edition of the play. The first manuscript sent off by Schiller was the one forwarded at Christmas 1799 to the great actor and stage-manager Iffland at Berlin. The first edition, printed at Weimar under Schiller's own eyes, was published by Cotta in the summer of 1800. Schiller had carefully revised his drama before it was printed, and introduced many alterations which show how earnestly he strove for the perfection of his great work. All the many subsequent issues of the drama have no independent critical value, as they were not revised by the poet himself.

In the manuscripts some of the variations from the printed editions are due to their preserving an older state of the text, some to the necessity of shortening the long drama for the purpose of representation on the stage, some again to the self-imposed 'censure' practised by Schiller out of consideration for certain theatres. In the manuscript sent to Stuttgart it was for instance necessary to modify considerably all the passages referring in an uncomplimentary sense to the House of Habsburg and the Court of Vienna, on account of the connexion of the Duke of Würtemberg with the Austrian government. Although Schiller



xii

Cambridge University Press 978-1-107-61991-3 - Schiller: Wallenstein: Ein Trauerspiel Edited by Karl Breul Frontmatter More information

#### INTRODUCTION.

himself carefully removed from his text all passages which might have given offence, yet the play was not allowed on the boards of the Stuttgart Court theatre.

Of the various manuscripts sent out by Schiller in 1799 four have been preserved (of the text sent to London, which was translated by Coleridge, the portion containing the Camp has disappeared), others are lost, e.g. the Weimar acting copy and the manuscript sent to Iffland. Of the latter there exist, however, pretty complete copies and collations, so that the loss of it is not serious.

More information about the nature and importance of the various manuscripts is easily accessible in W. Vollmer's excellent and handy edition (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1880), which gives the various readings in full and affords the most reliable material for the study of the gradual formation of the text.

#### II.

# THE ORIGINAL AND THE FINAL DIVISION OF THE DRAMA.

The subject has been treated at greater length on pp. xlv and following of the Introduction to Volume I.

The drama of Wallenstein passed through three distinct stages of development.

- 1. The tragedy at first formed one very bulky drama of five acts, preceded by a 'Vorspiel.' With this form the present form of 'Die Jungfrau von Orleans' may be compared.
- 2. In accordance with Goethe's advice (to whom he showed the drama as it then stood in Sept. 1798) Schiller split the huge mass into several portions, which were not intended to be acted all on the same night. This is the second stage represented by the acting manuscripts. The Prologue was enlarged to at least twice its original length, and became a sort of independent poetic introduction to the tragedy. It was originally



#### INTRODUCTION.

xiii

called Die Ballensteiner, subsequently Ballensteine Lager. The real drama was split up into the portions called originally Die Biccolomini and Ballenstein. In this division Die Piccolomini originally comprised nearly the same number of scenes as at present, but in November 1798 Schiller altered the arrangement. In its new form Die Piccolomini was made to include the first two acts of Ballenstein (now Ballensteins Tod).

3. For various reasons the third and final version, in which Schiller went back to his previous division, is a decided improvement. Not only is the proportion of the two parts of the great Wallenstein tragedy now much more evenly balanced, but another great advantage is that the last part of the play now begins with Wallenstein's decisive step, and includes the immediate consequences of it, the action of Octavio and the resolution of the generals to leave their disloyal chief. If all this had remained in Die Biccolomini a great deal of the interest in the third part would have been lost. The disadvantages of the final division seem to lie in the somewhat unsatisfactory end of Die Biccolomini, which also has no real centre of interest. But the want of a real conclusion of the action, more especially of the action of Max, in Die Biccolomini must be explained by the fact that Schiller did not intend to write two independent plays, and that the first scenes of Wallensteine Tod run parallel with the last scenes of Die Biccolomini, so that there is really no break whatsoever in the action. The great questions raised in Die Piccolomini are only settled in Wallensteins Tod. The play was certainly never intended by Schiller to be a trilogy in the classical sense of the word. (See pp. xxxiv-xxxv.)

A short survey of the original and the present division of the drama and of the relation of the acting copies (stage 2) to the printed editions (stage 3) is given in the Table on page xiv.



THE	ORIGINAL AND	THE ORIGINAL AND THE PRESENT DIVISION OF THE DRAMA.	OF THE DRAMA.
PLACE	ORIGINAL (acting copies)	PRESENT (printed editions)	TIME
Pilsen	Prolog or Vorspiel	= Wallensteins Lager	Day I. morning
:	Piccolomini I.	= Piccolomini I.	morning **
:	Piccolomini II.	= Ficcolomini II. = Piccolomini III. Piccolomini IV	,, late afternoon
•	Piccolomini 111.	= Piccolomini v.	DAY II. dawn
:	Piccolomini IV.	= Wallensteins Tod I.	dawn and morn.
:	Piccolomini v.	= Wallensteins Tod II.	" afternoon
:	Wallensteins Tod I.	= Wallensteins Tod III. 1—12	DAY III. morning
:	Wallensteins Tod II.	= Wallensteins Tod III. 13—23	" midday
Eger	Wallensteins Tod III.	= Wallensteins Tod IV. 1—8	Day IV. afternoon
:	Wallensteins Tod IV.	= Wallensteins Tod v. $1-2$ ; IV. $9-14$	,, evening
	Wallensteins Tod v.	= Wallensteins Tod v. 3-12	" night
	Each part of the I	Each part of the Drama originally occupied two days.	



Cambridge University Press 978-1-107-61991-3 - Schiller: Wallenstein: Ein Trauerspiel Edited by Karl Breul

Frontmatter More information

TIME AND PLACE IN SCHILLER'S WALLENSTEIN. (The following Table is intended to give a short survey of the Structure of the Play.)

				TIME			PLACE
	Dawn	Morning	Midday	AFTERNOON	Evening	Night	Scene of Action
DAY I.	1	Lager Piccol. 1, 11. 1—6	Piccol. 11. 7	Ricol. III. (late in the afternoon)	Piccol. IV.	Piccol. IV.	Pilsen
Day II.	Piccol. v. W. L. 1. 1—3	W. L. 1. 4—7	[Wrangel leaves]	W. L. 11. 1—7	[Octavio leaves]	[Isolani and most of the other generals leave]	Pilsen
Day III.		B. L. III. 1 —12	W. L. III. 13 —23	28. £. III. 13 [Max leaves in the —23 early afternoon]	[Wallenstein leaves] [Max fights against the Rheingraf at Neustadt and dies]		Pilsen
Day IV.		[Max is buried] [Wallenstein and Octavio are marching towards Eger	[Max is buried] [Wallenstein and Octavio re marching towards Eger]	3B. £. IV. 1—8 (the last scenes late in the aft.) (Octavio fights against the Rheingraf at Neusladt. Battle II.]	®. \$. IV. 9—14	∰. 9. 9. <b>V.</b>	Eger



xvi

# INTRODUCTION.

#### III.

### TIME AND PLACE IN WALLENSTEIN.

The action of the drama comprises four days, the events taking place at Pilsen, with the exception of the last two acts of Ballensteins Tob, where the scene is at Eger. In the five acts of Die Piccolomini and in the first act of Wallensteins Tob, the scene never changes, but in each of the last four acts of the play as it now stands we find two scenes of action. As to the time of action there has been a great difference of opinion with regard to one point only, viz. as to the chronology of the events occurring and related in Act IV. of Wallensteins Tob (ll. 2619 sqq.). The question is briefly this: How is it possible, if the firing which Wallenstein heard on his march towards Eger on the afternoon of the fourth day is taken, as it usually is, to proceed from Max's attack on the advancing Swedes, that the Swedish captain can speak of him as having been buried on the morning of that day (Il. 3062 sqq.)? The views of critics as to the proper explanation differ (see Appendix IV. p. 296). It has been proposed to translate biefen About by 'last night,' which is impossible; it has been suggested that Max really died on the evening of the fourth day, and that the report of the Swedish captain concerning his burial was a late interpolation of Schiller, who did not notice the discrepancy with his former statement. It is, however, unnecessary to assume this. An easy way out of the difficulty is afforded by the assumption of two battles of Neustadt, in the former of which (nightfall of day 3) Max and his regiment meet with a glorious death at the hands of the Swedes, while in the latter (afternoon of day 4) the Swedes are attacked once more and driven back by Octavio, who enters Eger the night after his victory. In this way his unexpected appearance at the end of the drama is very satisfactorily explained. It is very probable that Schiller, who as a rule is most careful in his calculations of the time of action, left the matter intentionally somewhat vague in Act IV., so as not to prepare the hearer or reader for the sudden appearance



# INTRODUCTION.

xvii

of Octavio in Act v. This satisfactory explanation was first proposed by G. Kettner, and deserves general acceptance. The Table given on p. xv will afford an easy survey of the probable distribution of Time and Place in Schiller's somewhat complicated drama. Compare with this Table the arguments in the two parts of the present edition.

## IV.

# SCHILLER'S DRAMA IN ITS RELATION TO HISTORY'.

In considering Schiller's drama in its relation to History and in answering the questions, how much of the abundant historical material was used, what was altered and for what reasons, and what was freely invented by the poet for his special dramatic purpose, we shall here, for the sake of brevity, only discuss Schiller's principal deviations from history, while a short sketch of Wallenstein's Life at the end of this chapter will show how much of it was interwoven by the poet into his play.

In comparing Schiller's drama with the historical facts of Wallenstein's life a distinction must be made between the history of Wallenstein as it was known to Schiller and our present historical information about that famous general. The opinions of scholars concerning Wallenstein's real plans still vary in many respects; even though state-archives have been carefully searched and innumerable documents contained in them have been examined with great ability, the verdict of History as to the actual amount of his guilt has not yet been finally pronounced and perhaps never will be. It was therefore only natural that

<sup>1</sup> For more information on the subject consult the authorities mentioned in Appendix IV., H, especially the works of Ranke, Winter, Lamprecht, Kluckhohn, and v. Liliencron. The article by G. Heide in Lyon's Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht VIII. (1894), 497—517 is useful for obtaining a rapid survey of the actual facts.



xviii

### INTRODUCTION.

Schiller, who wrote his 'History of the Thirty Years' War' over a hundred years ago in a very short time and with very insufficient material, no part of which had been critically sifted by former historians, was unable to arrive at a full understanding of the many obscure points in Wallenstein's political career. discussing the deviations of our drama from the historical facts as they appear in the light of modern research, we have therefore to bear in mind that those deviations may be explained by either of two suppositions: either Schiller was himself misinformed about the facts—or he altered the real facts for poetical reasons and in the exercise of his poetical freedom. In his famous Hamburgische Dramaturgie (Stück 11; 19; 24) Lessing has shown that a dramatic poet in dealing with historical events and personages is fully entitled to transform them in order to suit his special purpose. The notes of the present edition in which the principal deviations from History are mentioned and also the present Chapter, are not only intended for the information of those who wish to know what really happened, but are given in order to stimulate readers to reflect on the causes which led the great poet to give free play to his imagination in so many cases. The Duke of Friedland of Schiller's tragedy is certainly in many respects a more sympathetic character than the historical Wallenstein. Even at the end of his History Schiller arrived at a more just conception of the character of Wallenstein than could be directly obtained from his sources. It has been well said by the epigrammatist Haug:

Erftunde Ballenftein, er mußte fich bequemen, Des Schillerischen Denfart anzunehmen, Bo nicht, fich ob bem beffern Bruder schämen.

In comparing the earlier sketch of the historian with the later portrait of the poet, we realise what Schiller meant by the words of the Prologue to his play (ll. 102—105):

Bon ber Parteien Gunft und Sag verwirrt, Schwanft fein Charafterbild in ber Geschichte; Doch euren Augen foll ihn jest bie Runft, Auch eurem herzen menschlich naber bringen.



### INTRODUCTION.

xix

At the end of the fourth book of his *History* Schiller has indeed represented Wallenstein as a man of broad views and a champion of a new order of things, and has endeavoured to arouse the reader's interest in the Duke. In the play he has gone further in this direction. It must be remembered that before writing his drama Schiller once more made a most careful study of the sources of the history of Wallenstein (see the Introduction to Vol. I., p. xlii.), and gradually formed for himself a more just idea of the Duke's character and aims than he had when he wrote the *History*. In many points the views of the poet have been fully borne out by modern historical research.

In Schiller's *History* Wallenstein appears in books 2, 3 and 4. The second book contains his early campaigns and his first dismissal in 1630. The third book gives an account of his campaign against King Gustavus Adolphus after his reappointment in 1632 and winds up with a brilliant description of the battle of Lützen. The fourth book contains the last portion of Wallenstein's life and ends with his murder at Eger.

In the Drama the last two months of his life (Jan. 5 to Febr. 25, 1634) have been compressed into four days. It is of course chiefly illustrated by the fourth book of the History, but numerous allusions to Wallenstein's earlier career, especially to the assembly of Regensburg, his siege of Stralsund, his reappointment, his agreement with the Emperor at Znaim and Göllersdorf, and his dealings with the Swedes, refer to events contained in the second and third books. In some cases the accounts given in the History and in the Drama are very similar, in others the poet has introduced alterations which are mostly due to an intentional transformation or re-arranging of the facts for dramatic effect. The general development of the play does on the whole correspond to historic truth, but throughout the whole drama the free hand of the poet is clearly noticeable: the characters of the historical personages are very freely modelled, persons and events which were of great importance for Wallenstein's life are passed over in silence for the sake of dramatic concentration, and again fictitious personages and



XX

Cambridge University Press 978-1-107-61991-3 - Schiller: Wallenstein: Ein Trauerspiel Edited by Karl Breul Frontmatter More information

#### INTRODUCTION.

events are added to serve Schiller's poetic purposes. Even the language used by the *dramatis personae*—with the exception perhaps of those who appear in the Lager—is not really true to history but bears the stamp of the poet's own personality; some of them even show traces of the refined philosophy of the eighteenth century.

We now proceed to the enumeration of the principal deviations of the drama from historical truth.

The reduction of the time of action from seven weeks to four days—the four last days of Wallenstein's life—has been mentioned before.

In many cases historical facts have been simplified for the sake of dramatic concentration. In some cases several events have been treated as one, viz.:

- (1) the two declarations made by the generals at Pilsen (see pp. xxvi. sqq.) known by the names of 'Erster' and 'Zweiter Pilsener Schluss.' The scenes occurring in the fourth act of Die Biccolomini are more closely related to what happened on the former of these occasions (Jan. 12), but the date is that of the second declaration (Feb. 19).
- (2) the two imperial decrees against Wallenstein have been joined into one which is transmitted by Questenberg to Octavio.
- (3) two imperial messages were brought to the camp, one by Questenberg, the later one by Quiroga. In Schiller's play only one is brought, a few days before Wallenstein's death, by Questenberg.
- (4) there were really two covenants in which Wallenstein made terms with the Emperor before helping him against King Gustavus Adolphus, the former at Znaim, the latter at Göllersdorf. Schiller only speaks of the Covenant of Znaim.

As to negotiations, only those with the Swedes have been treated in full, the Saxons being only just mentioned. The negotiations with the French and with the Bohemian exiled Protestants have been passed over in silence.

In several instances two historical persons have been combined in one for the sake of concentration, viz. Questenberg and Quiroga, Octavio and Gallas, Gordon and Lesley,



# INTRODUCTION.

xxi

Terzky and Kinsky. In each case the latter person though he really played an important part in the life of Wallenstein does not appear on the stage.

Several important alterations concerning Wallenstein himself were made by Schiller. In the first place, as to the motive for his action, Schiller represents him as striving to gain the crown of Bohemia (which indeed was offered to him more than once but which he has never acknowledged to be the aim of his ambition), and as desirous of marrying his daughter to a ruling prince. He represents him as having been declared an outlaw by the Emperor before the action of the play begins, but the Imperial decree containing the sentence which has been transmitted to Octavio by Questenberg is only to be used in the case of Wallenstein committing openly some treasonable act. Schiller gives special prominence to Wallenstein's negotiations with the Swedes, the foreign invaders of the Empire, and barely alludes to the Duke's far more important negotiations with the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, the leaders of the German Protestants, and his constant connexion with the exiled Bohemian Protestant noblemen. This was no doubt done chiefly for the sake of dramatic concentration, and Schiller obviously puts the alliance with the enemies of the Empire into the foreground, because by it Wallenstein's treason appears all the more black and consequently produces a great dramatic effect. The stipulations with the Emperor in the Covenants of Znaim and Göllersdorf were also stated positively by Schiller, although it is not known what the actual conditions were.

Another point introduced by Schiller is Wallenstein's belief in the stars. The influence of his astrological speculations on his actions has been fully worked out and in fact exaggerated. It gives quite a peculiar interest to the play. Wallenstein's tragical end is largely brought about by his excessive trust in the stars, and in the man whom the stars seem to have pointed out as his most faithful friend, Octavio Piccolomini. Thus Destiny has been accorded a very large place in the drama, and although the Duke brings ruin upon himself by his own act yet the poet wall be große Galfte seiner Schulb ben ungludseligen

S. W. T.



xxii

Cambridge University Press 978-1-107-61991-3 - Schiller: Wallenstein: Ein Trauerspiel Edited by Karl Breul Frontmatter More information

### INTRODUCTION.

Gestimen zu. The very great importance of the astrological motive was only gradually realised by Schiller, who in the first stage of his composition before the full working out of Wallenstein's astrological belief wrote to Goethe (on Feb. 28, 1796): Der Held thut noch zu viel und das Schickal zu wenig.

Throughout the whole of Schiller's play Wallenstein is represented as being in the full enjoyment of bodily health. As a matter of fact he was completely broken down in health, in consequence of over-excitement of the nervous system and frequent and severe attacks of gout. He was often obliged to keep in bed, and walked with difficulty. This is not a condition fit for a soldier and the hero of a great tragedy, so Schiller makes no mention of his ailments, but on the contrary the physical vigour of the Duke is frequently mentioned. In his private life Wallenstein was a much more affectionate husband than readers of Schiller's drama would suspect. Indeed his tenderness towards his wife has been called by one of his biographers "a lovely idyll in the midst of a life spent amidst reckless speculations and horrible fights."

Again, in some cases motives of action are altered by the poet. This is best seen in the case of Buttler. Buttler's life and career were very different from what Schiller represents them to be. He was not of ignoble birth, he was not contemptuously treated by Wallenstein, and he did not bring about the Duke's death from any motive of revenge. He met Wallenstein by chance on his way to Eger, and was compelled to follow him to the fortress. The motives from which Gordon is represented as doing his utmost to save the life of the comrade of his youth are equally unhistorical.

Beside these groups of deviations from history a number of smaller points were altered, of which it must suffice briefly to enumerate the following:

- (1) The real Octavio at the time of Wallenstein's last days was only 35, and had no son. He was not by any means the virtuous person which he appears to be in the tragedy.
- (2) Questenberg was really up to the last one of the most devoted friends of the Duke. He sent reports from the camp



## INTRODUCTION.

xxiii

at Pilsen to Vienna of a most conciliatory character, and advised the Emperor to trust Wallenstein.

- (3) Gordon's character has been much raised by Schiller. His early history and companionship with Wallenstein at Burgau is an invention of the poet. He was not really the good-natured old man he shows himself in the tragedy.
- (4) The energetic Countess Terzky was modelled partly after her sister-in-law, the resolute wife of Count Kinsky, partly after her mother-in-law, the old Countess Terzky, who took a very active part in the politics of Bohemia at the time of the 'Winter-King.' In the drama she atones for her guilt by taking poison. The real Countess did not poison herself and had no reason for doing so.
- (5) Kinsky, a most important person, a Bohemian nobleman and an active political negotiator, who accompanied Wallenstein to Eger and was murdered there, is quite left in the background, and is only a few times mentioned. The reason for this seems to be on the one hand the poet's desire for simplification (Terzky and Illo being sufficient to represent this side of Wallenstein's surroundings), and on the other hand the impossibility of bringing him in without going into details as to Wallenstein's negotiations with the Bohemian refugees and also with the Saxons.
- (6) Most of the generals who sign the declaration of loyalty to Wallenstein (Piccol. IV.), e.g. Colalto, Marradas, Tiefenbach, were not really at Pilsen.
- (7) The 'Clausel' in the Declaration did not really exist, and the generals were not tricked in the manner described. The proviso was contained in the original draft of the document, but was probably struck out by Wallenstein himself, as the Declaration with such a clause would not have served his purpose. The document was in fact read out in full immediately before the generals signed it. Many other details in the scene so vividly sketched are historically incorrect. The fact was that Octavio nearly betrayed his true feelings at the banquet.
- (8) The capture of Sesina is fictitious. His report was made voluntarily after the death of Wallenstein. See p. 177.

62



### xxiv

# INTRODUCTION.

- (9) Neumann was not killed at Pilsen but at Eger, together with Terzky, Illo and Kinsky. See l. 2250 n.
- (10) The commander of the Swedes in the drama is the Rheingraf; in reality it was Bernhard von Weimar. The alteration seems to be due to consideration for the Weimar court. See l. 332 n. and l. 2633 n.
- (11) Pachhälbel was not the mayor of Eger at the time of the murder of Wallenstein. See p. 247.
- (12) Wallenstein's wife and daughter were not with him at Pilsen and Eger during the last days of his life. Countess Terzky really was with her husband.
- (13) The title of prince was not given to Octavio immediately after the murder, but much later. See l. 3867 n.

Many other small points of difference are mentioned in the notes.

Last of all we meet in Schiller's drama with several fictitious characters, two of whom are of the greatest importance for the play, viz. Wallenstein's daughter and Octavio's son. It is true that Wallenstein had a daughter, Maria Elisabeth, and also a son, who died early. But the daughter was only a child when her father was murdered. She subsequently married a Count Kaunitz. Thus Thekla as represented in the drama is an invention of the poet. The figure of the gallant Max also seems to be a creation of Schiller's brain. Wallenstein and Octavio each had a nephew called Max, the former being a great favourite with his uncle, but most probably Schiller was altogether ignorant of the existence of these men, as the documents concerning them were published much later than the drama.

The two Swedish officers who appear in the play, viz. Colonel Wrangel and the Captain who informs Thekla of the death of Max, are fictitious, as are some other minor personages, e.g. Fräulein Neubrunn, the old Kellermeister, and others. All the persons appearing in the Lager, the soldiers, peasants, citizens, are of course typical and fictitious. On the Capuchin see Part I. pp. 204—5.



# INTRODUCTION.

XXV

In order to give a clear idea of what really happened during the last months of Wallenstein's life it will be useful to append a brief account of the principal events between the fall of Regensburg and the murder of the Duke. It is based on the accounts given in the histories of Winter and Lamprecht.

## The last months of Wallenstein's Life.

(Based on the Histories of Winter and of Lamprecht.)

It was in consequence of his failing to protect Regensburg, which was taken by the Swedes under Bernhard von November Weimar on November 14, 1633, that Wallenstein's 14, 1633. military authority first began to wane. In vain did he start at once to re-capture the city; the season was too far advanced, and he had to go into winter quarters in Bohemia. At Vienna the various parties hostile to him (Ferdi-1633nand's son, the Duke of Bavaria, the Spaniards) urged the Emperor to remove Wallenstein forthwith from his post. The opposition at the Court was still further increased by Wallenstein's refusing to send eight cavalry regiments in support of the Cardinal Infante, who was on his way from Italy to the Netherlands. Wallenstein justly feared this splitting up of his own forces, and also objected to it for political reasons. At the end of the year the Bavarian ambassador at Vienna reported to his master that the Emperor had secretly resolved to dismiss Wallenstein from the supreme command and was negotiating with the principal generals under him in order to secure their good services. The only difficulty was how to dispose of the Duke.

Wallenstein was not ignorant of the danger of his position. In January 1634 he tendered his resignation, which yanuary, was refused. The Court party was afraid of the 1634 influence he might exercise even in retirement. Thus he was compelled to turn to the German Protestants and the Swedes. He first wished to make quite sure of the allegiance of his army, and to attach the generals to his cause by some definite



xxvi

# INTRODUCTION.

promise. On Jan. 12, at his head-quarters at Pilsen, a great banquet was given by Ilow (Illo) at which 49 commanders pledged themselves unreservedly to be faithful to their general. This is called 'Der erste Pilsener Schluss,' but even in this first declaration of loyalty some generals had purposely written their names quite illegibly, in order that they might be able, if necessary, to repudiate their signatures.

Meanwhile—for the third time within a year—Wallenstein had made overtures to the Protestants, and this time he was really in earnest. In the first half of January he communicated to the Elector of Saxony the outlines of a definite and well-considered scheme, which, if executed, might have led to the establishment of peace. But Saxony and Brandenburg hesitated to accede to it. The Saxon chief commissioner, the well-known general and statesman Arnim, whom Wallenstein had urged to proceed at once to Pilsen, thought fit to go to Berlin first, in order to inform himself of the views of their Brandenburg ally, and he did not start for Berlin before February 3. This delay at a time when rapidity of action was imperatively necessary was fatal to the scheme.

In the meantime the Court party at Vienna had been busy undermining Wallenstein's influence. While the Emperor continued to write to his general in the old confidential style, in order to lull his suspicions, he deprived him by a secret decree of his command, released his officers from their oath of allegiance, appointed his son Ferdinand commander in chief, promoted Gallas, Aldringer, Piccolomini to independent commands and entrusted them with the execution of his orders. Aldringer, when he asked what was to be done, was told by the Spanish ambassador Oñate, speaking in the name of the Emperor, that the generals should without delay seize the person of the Duke, alive or dead.

Wallenstein had received some information as to what was going on at Vienna, and he fully realised the extreme danger of his position. He knew well that his very existence was at stake, and that only one event could change the situation in



#### INTRODUCTION.

xxvii

his favour, namely the speedy arrival of the Saxons. But Arnim did not come. Under these circumstances Wallenstein was anxious to avoid a premature rupture with the Emperor. On February 19 he held another meeting with the leading officers of his army, which was attended by a far smaller number of generals (Piccolomini, Isolano, Butler, Suys and others were absent), at which a second declaration, couched in much more cautious terms than the first, was signed by all the generals with Wallenstein at their head. declaration they protested against the views of those who considered the declaration of Jan. 12 as being directed against the Emperor or the Roman Church; they maintained that it was merely intended as a safeguard against machinations hostile to the army. It was expressly stated in this 'Zweiter Pilsener Schluss' that, if anything injurious to the Emperor or to the Church was undertaken by Wallenstein, every officer was at liberty to forsake him. A messenger was immediately despatched to Vienna to submit this re-assuring document to the Emperor.

It was, however, too late. On February 18 a second imperial proclamation had appeared accusing Wallenstein of 'perfidious treachery, barbarous tyranny, and conspiracy against the Emperor.' He was again deprived of his command, and his possessions and those of his confidential friends Ilow and Tržka were declared forfeited to the State. It was clear that his ruin had been resolved upon at Vienna. The proclamation of this decree was joyfully received at Prag.

On Febr. 19 he sent the Duke Franz Albert of Lauenburg to the Duke Bernhard of Weimar, who was still at Regensburg, requesting him to send a large body of Swedish cavalry to meet him at Eger. Accordingly he started for Eger on February 21. The rupture between him and the Emperor was now complete. On his march large bodies of troops left him, and only a very few regiments remained faithful to him. On the way he met Butler with his regiment, whom he ordered to follow him to Eger. According to some authorities he once more sent in his resignation, but his messengers were arrested on their way to Vienna;



xxviii

#### INTRODUCTION.

according to others he was now firmly resolved to be his own master, as the Emperor no longer recognised him as his general. On February 24 he entered the fortress of Eger, where [Febr. 24.] he believed himself quite safe, as the place was commanded by two Scotch Protestants, Gordon and Lesley, the former of whom had only three days ago been promoted by him to the rank of Colonel. On February 25 Ilow and Tržka endeavoured to prevail on the two Scotchmen to make common cause with Wallenstein; but they loyally declared that they could not violate their duty towards the Emperor. Being informed of the approach of the Swedish corps under Bernhard von Weimar they approached Butler, and agreed with him that it was impossible to allow Wallenstein to remain The three officers proceeded to arrange everything for the speedy execution of what they deemed inevitable, Gordon even consented that the Duke's friends should be murdered at a banquet to which he invited them. After Ilow, Tržka and two more adherents of Wallenstein had been killed, the question was once more discussed, whether it was possible to save Wallenstein's life and merely take him prisoner. But the Swedes were too near, the endeavour seemed too risky. So the Irish captain, Devereux, received the order to murder him. With a few Irish soldiers he went up the spiral staircase leading from the street to Wallenstein's private apartments and killed the Duke, who, after having taken a bath, was just preparing to retire for the night.

In the conflict between Wallenstein and the Emperor the former is certainly not the only person who is to blame. There was a large and ever-increasing party at the Court of Vienna who did all they could to make the general's position untenable. The princes of the Catholic 'League,' especially Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, were sworn enemies of a man whose policy was on all the main questions of the time widely different from their own, and who treated them with not much more respect than his soldiers treated their subjects. The



# INTRODUCTION.

xxix

Spanish party at the Court could not forgive Wallenstein either his religious indifference or his well-justified repugnance to seeing the Spaniards settled in Germany along the Rhine. The son of the Emperor, afterwards Ferdinand III., wished to assume the supreme command himself, and was indignant that Wallenstein would not even allow him to stay in his camp. The Emperor himself felt that the position which he had been forced by adverse circumstances to concede to Wallenstein was altogether abnormal, and of such a character as could not be maintained for any length of time. He was afraid of the growing influence of the ambitious and all-powerful general, and, although not without some reluctance, made up his mind to get rid of him. He did not dare to attempt to arrest him in his camp, but he gradually undermined his influence, and won over some of his chief-officers. Even after having secretly issued the decree of deposition he still took care to write to his generalissimo as if nothing had happened, in order to make Wallenstein feel perfectly secure. The Duke, however, was pretty well informed by his political agents of what was going on at Vienna, and was driven in mere self-defence to make advances to the enemies of the Emperor. He repeatedly carried on negotiations with the Saxons and with the Swedes, but he never committed himself to making any definite agreement with them. He several times endeavoured to make his peace with the Emperor, and even sent in his resignation-but in vain. Thus he was at last forced to throw himself into the arms of the Swedes, with whom he made an agreement only a few days before his death.

Wallenstein was at least as great an administrator and statesman as he was an eminent general. He did very much for the improvement of the districts over which he ruled. He encouraged agriculture and trade, built schools and churches, planned the establishment of a university with the very best scholars obtainable as professors, and filled his towns with many new and some splendid buildings. When he held the office of admiral of the Baltic he cherished the bold plan of joining the Baltic with the North Sea by a large ship-canal, which has been carried out in our own day. He was also one of the most patriotic



### INTRODUCTION.

and far-seeing politicians of his time. His great aim seems to have been to re-establish in the empire a strong central power by increasing the power of the Emperor at the expense of the princes, to bring about a satisfactory peace on the basis of mutual religious toleration and equal political rights for Protestants and Catholics, and to restore the condition of affairs which existed in 1618 before the outbreak of the great war. He was not disposed to allow Sweden or any other foreign power, e.g. Spain or France, to gain a footing in Germany or to interfere in German affairs. He was anxious first to effect a reconciliation between the Emperor and his two principal German Protestant adversaries, the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, and subsequently to compel Sweden and France to accept a war indemnity and to remove their troops from German soil. He was even resolved, in case the Emperor should not be willing to make the necessary concessions to Saxony and Brandenburg, to satisfy the claims of the Protestants himself, to conclude on his own responsibility a treaty with them, and, if need be, to compel his imperial master by force of arms to accept such conditions of peace as he chose to dictate. If he had succeeded in this he would have achieved a glorious and a highly patriotic work; and would have saved his unfortunate country fourteen years of cruel warfare, which brought Germany to the brink of ruin1. He might have succeeded in his task, if, instead of being the generalissimo of the Emperor, he had been an independent Prince of the Empire; but unfortunately as the Emperor, led by his Bavarian and Spanish advisers, was not disposed to make the necessary concessions to the Protestants, Wallenstein was obliged to resort to measures which were watched by the Court party with ever-increasing suspicion, and which in fact went far beyond what was justifiable in his position. Of a great part of his negotiations with Saxony and Brandenburg the Emperor was fully aware, and gave him permission to carry

<sup>1</sup> See the description given by Gustav Freytag in his book Aus dem Jahrhundert des grossen Krieges which forms Vol. III. of his fine series of historical essays called Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit.