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1908
TO MY WIFE,

WHO HAS CHEERFULLY SHARED WITH ME THE DISADVANTAGES AND HAPPINESS INCIDENT TO MY STUDY FOR THE DEGREE IN QUESTION, I AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATE THIS DISSERTATION
A STUDY OF GRILLPARZER’S "AHNFRAU."

Critics have already done something by way of looking into the merits of Grillparzer. His worth as a writer is being properly appreciated. His "Ahnfrau", so long discounted because it had been considered to be a fate-play, is demanding attention.

It is proposed to discuss the above subject in the following order: (1) The Fate-play in General; (2) Historical Features of the "Ahnfrau"; (3) The Sources of the "Ahnfrau"; (4) Literary Structure; (5) Is the "Ahnfrau" a Fate-play or a Psychological Play?
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CHAPTER I.

THE FATE-PLAY IN GENERAL.

The typical fate-play is always a tragedy\(^1\). Yet it is reasonable to think that it might as well deal with things not pertaining to death.

Out of the great mass of such plays only a limited number can receive special attention. Of these the following have been selected: Sophocles' "Oedipus Tyrannus" (O)\(^2\); Lillo's "Fatal Curiosity" (FC); Tieck's "Karl von Berneck" (KB); Schiller's "Die Braut von Messina" (BM); Werner's "Der 24. Februar" (24th); Müllner's "Der 29. Februar" (29th); Müllner's "Schuld" (S); Houwald's "Der Lechtturm" (L).

Several of the fate-plays or all of them have some elements in common. These elements, woven into the general fabric, may be pointed out.

(a) Fate.

The fatal element appears in O in the form of an oracle (p. 152). By this the machinery of the play is supposed to be started and the motion sustained. In KB fate is brought into expression through wilful murder. The BM has fate reveal its antics through a dream (1307)\(^3\) and an Arabian interpreter. In the FC we again see the trouble arise through a dream. In the 24th Kunz threw a knife at his father but missed his mark. His father cursed him. That curse proved fatal (434). The 29th has a dream (77) by which the end of the play is fixed. The enraged old gipsy of the S pronounces a fatal curse on Laura's unborn son (1447). In the L there is a curse resting on a marriage (561) and consequently on the offspring.

A real fate-play would be a machine dominated by an external force and the characters would act as puppets.

(b) Time.

Time is not exactly measured in all the plays, but it is important

---

\(^1\) Grillparzer und das neue Drama. O. E. Lessing, p. 1.

\(^2\) O stands for "Oedipus Tyrannus."

\(^3\) Figures, as here used, refer to a line.
to notice that it is prominent. In the 24th the name is based on
time. On the 24th of February numerous things took place
(180, 480, 528, 555). Also the clock is in full view. In the
29th a fixed date is found in the name. Other events are attached
to that date (386, 828). S has a clock against the wall. A
special date receives emphasis (2488, 2208, 2391).
In any fate-play a good deal of time elapses between the pron­
nouncing of the curse and the final catastrophe.

(e) Knife.

A marked feature of the fate-play is the knife. This is of
different types. The sword and dagger figure in KB. In the
BM Don Cesar kills himself with the dagger (2840). The dag­
ger is the instrument of death in the FC. In the 24th a knife
hangs on the wall. This weapon is fatal (482, 920). The knife
again appears in the 29th. Walter uses it when he kills his own
son (862). In S. Elvire kills herself with a dagger (2502). Hugo kills himself with a sword (2532). In all cases the knife
has a bloody, deathly significance.

(d) Dreams.

In the BM the father dreams of laurel-trees and the lily (1307).
Isabella dreams of a lion and an eagle (1335). Lillo has a dream
in his FC. In the 29th Sophie dreams about an angelic child
(77) and the steel in her son’s bosom (88). Elvire in S dreams
of the tiger in her embrace (459). Otto dreams about his beau­
tiful mother (2419). In all cases the dream is considered to be
an instrument of fate.

(e) Church.

In the fate-plays the church and what belongs to it are in­
fluenced by the curse. In O the defense of the church is made
by the high-priest and Tiresius. Prayer is heard in the KB with
mingled accents of the curse. BM has Beatrice seized by terror
when she attempts to set her foot within the sacred enclosure of
the church (1071). In the 24th Kunz says that he cannot pray
(174). In the 29th the curse falls in line with the will of the
church (274). The church has few blessings for those of the
S (550, 1760). Caspar, in the L, wants to show the mercy of
God (1614). In these fate-plays the elements of fate and of the church are represented as one or as mixed together. But worshipping God, on the part of the doomed, is difficult.

(f) Gloom.

In the fate-plays there are gloomy, melancholy and even uncanny elements. We find night, snow, storms, a furious sea and the unhappy expectation of death.

(g) Unhappy Situations among Persons who Are Related.

King Oedipus murders his own father and, like Hartmann's Gregory, marries his mother. Lillo in his FC has a father kill his own son. In the BM brothers are hostile to each other and fall in love with their sister. Kurt, in the 24th, kills his little sister and Kunz kills Kurt. In the 29th Walter marries his own sister (585), and kills his son, Emile (862). In S Hugo kills his brother (1033) and Elvire kills herself (2511).

In these family troubles there is incest though there are various stages of guilt.

(h) Mysteries.

In family-life, as represented in the fate-play, there is many a mystery. Oedipus has been secretly brought up in ignorance of his parents (p. 183-4). The case is about the same with Beatrice in BM (2353-60). In FC the mystery is cleared up after young Wilmot's death. In the 24th Kurt ran away from home (527). Years afterward he returned, but his parents did not know he was their son until they had stabbed him (920). In the 29th Walter did not know who the father of Sophie was and the revelation was a severe shock (405). Hugo, in the S, was very much surprised to learn that he had murdered his own brother (1592). Walther of the L did not know who his father was until Ulrich had leaped into the sea (1866).

(i) Frequent Strange Arrivals.

Of these are the return of Oedipus to his own mother (p. 176); the appearance of young Wilmot in FC; the coming of Karl's father in KB; Beatrice, in BM, comes to her mother's home (1728); in the 24th Kurt returns to his parents in the Alps.
in the 29th Walter’s uncle reaches him as a stranger (296, 584); Don Valeros, in S, comes as a surprise to his son, Hugo (904); and in the L the count is not expected at the lighthouse (1128).

(j) Expressions of Relationship.

There are some peculiar expressions of relationship in the fate-plays. In O we have a reference to Oedipus himself: “Father now to my own brothers” (p. 188); in the 29th: “Euer Weib ist eure Schwester” (585), and “Du bist deiner Mutter Neffe, und dein Vater ist dein Ohm” (613).

(k) The Unities.

The Unities of time and place are quite well observed. There is less unity in action. In the O and BM there is a chorus. The chorus weakens the action.
CHAPTER II.

HISTORICAL FEATURES OF THE "AHNFRAU."

(a) The Composition of the "Ahnfrau."

A few things will be considered in regard to the composition of the "Ahnfrau." Before writing this play Grillparzer had not written anything of great importance. A "Volksmärchen" and the history of a robber came to his hand and he found it possible to join together what had seemed to him to be impossible. One morning, while in bed, Grillparzer formed the plan of his play. He detailed the case to Schreyvogel and the latter replied that the play was finished, that he only had need of writing it down. But Grillparzer discontinued the task for the present. Meeting Schreyvogel, on a walk, he was again induced to think the matter over. After returning from the walk he wrote down the first eight or ten lines and went to bed. The next day he continued the writing. In three or four days the first act was completed. The second and third acts were written with about the same haste. The composition of the whole play required no more than fifteen or sixteen days. The work was handed to Schreyvogel for examination. He wanted to see the play revised and proposed to do the work of revision. To this Grillparzer objected. Finally Grillparzer revised the play, but did not do so more than once. After some difficulty with the censor the play was presented to the public and the author's fame became established.

(b) Stage History of the "Ahnfrau."

The performance of the "Ahnfrau" was twice forbidden by the censorship. Finally it was advertised to be played. It was first played in 1817 in the "Theater an der Wien." Sophie Schröder played the parts of Bertha and of the ancestress,

Lange the part of Borotin, and Heurteur that of Jaromir. Apparently, through modesty, Grillparzer refused to have the play appear in connection with his name. The first performance was not well attended. Grillparzer was not at all pleased with the effect of the play. He then resolved never again to be present when one of his plays should be performed. When the "Ahnfrau" was performed a third time there was present a great crowd and the public changed its attitude toward Grillparzer. The play was successfully performed by other actors, but this did not mean a financial reward to Grillparzer. As late as 1891 the "Ahnfrau" was played in as many as sixteen theaters in Germany.

(c) Early Attitude toward the "Ahnfrau."

When Grillparzer wrote the "Ahnfrau" the influence of Müllner had not yet died away. Almost without exception Grillparzer's contemporaries received the "Ahnfrau" as a fate-play and this tendency continued throughout the period specially known as a fate-play period. After about 1825 there was a decline of interest in the line of fate-literature. Yet the "Ahnfrau" was not forgotten. It has always been classed as a fate-play, but during the last few decades the critics have again brought the play into prominence. Now more than at any earlier time emphasis is laid on the psychological side of the play.

(d) Why Was there a Change of Attitude?

This is not an easy point to settle. It may be said that during a little more than the first two decades of the nineteenth century the fate-play had favorable conditions in which to thrive. But everybody did not believe in the genuineness of fate. Perhaps the masses had been overcome by the spirit of the times in which Napoleon was considered to be the embodiment of fate itself. Later a larger spirit of human freedom began to assert itself.

3 Geschichte der deut. Nationallit. p. 139.
CHAPTER III.

THE SOURCES OF THE "AHNFRAU."

As to the sources of the "Ahnfrau" there is some definite knowledge. This definiteness will be indicated. There also is some chance for conclusions to be drawn from the possibility of Grillparzer's interest in certain works of which he makes no mention. Believing that Byron is a source of the "Ahnfrau," L. Wyple1 frankly admits the possibility of other sources: "Es ist wahr, Grillparzer schöpfte aus anderen Quellen, allenthalben fliessen ihm Anregungen reichlich zu."

It has seemed desirable to give rather, in close connection, all the points as they are found in one literary production than to find separate strings and then hang on them items of a kind taken from the different selections.

(a) Selbstbiographie.

Grillparzer2 says that his early discipline was severe and that the rooms of his father's house were quite gloomy. Those rooms he peopled with robbers, gipsies and spirits. Later he attended plays in which ghosts figured. He also relates that, while he and his brother were playing, they cried out that they saw a ghost. When asked about the general appearance of the ghost Grillparzer said that it looked like a black woman with a great veil. He also remembered quite well that the French soldiers had gathered about the unhappy city of Vienna.3

These cases remind one of the robbers and ghosts in the "Ahnfrau," of the veil that the ancestress wore, and of the soldiers who surrounded the count's castle.

Ehrhard and Necker4 say: "In seinem Drama steckt also nicht nur allgemeine Wahrheit, sondern auch ein Nachklang seines

3Selbst., p. 46.
eigenen Schicksals. Die ‘Ahnfrau’ war ein Bekenntnis.” This is an interesting comparison but “Schicksal” must not have the old Germanic, Roman or Greek meaning.

(b) “Jules Mandrin” and the “Volksmärchen.”

There is a report on the robber who represents Jaromir, and on the ancestress, by Grillparzer himself. This testimony should give some light. Yet it is far short of what is needed. “Ich hatte in der Geschichte eines französischen Räubers, Jules Mandrin, glaub ich, die Art seiner Gefangennehmung gelesen. Von den Häsichern verfolgt flüchtete er in ein herrschaftliches Schloss, wo er mit dem Kammermädchen ein Liebesverhältnis unterhielt, ohne dass diese, ein rechtliches Mädchen, ahnte, welch einem Verworfenen sie Kammer und Herz geöffnet hatte. In ihrem Zimmer wurde er gefangen. Der tragische Keim in diesem Verhältnis oder vielmehr in dieser Erkennung machte einen grossen Eindruck auf mich. — Ebenso war mir ein Volksmärchen in die Hände gefallen, wo die letzte Enkelin eines alten Geschlechts vermöge ihrer Ähnlichkeit mit der als Gespenst wandelnden Urmutter Anlass zu den schauerlichsten Verwechslungen gab, indem der Liebhaber einmal das Mädchen für das Gespenst, dann wieder bei einer beabsichtigten Entführung das Gespenst für das Mädchen nahm.”

(c) “Die blutende Gestalt.”

L. Wyplel states that he found a “Schauerroman” called “Die blutende Gestalt mit Dolch und Lampe oder die Beschwörung im Schlosse Stern bey Prag.”

A question has been raised regarding the time of the appearance of the “Roman.” Perhaps it appeared earlier than the “Ahnfrau” yet J. Kohm raises an objection to this. Probably he is mistaken. On page 14 of “Die Ahnfrau” Kohm says that the “Blutende Gestalt” is a “Roman” and that Grillparzer speaks of a “Volksmärchen.” It certainly does not argue exclusively in favor of the acceptance of the “Blutende Gestalt” as the story that suggested the ancestress to Grillparzer. We might about as well suggest other types of literature as the “Roman.”

2Selbstb. p. 62.
“Es liegt mir fern, an Wyplels sehr sorgfältigen Untersuchungen mutwillig zu rütteln; allein diese haben doch bloss bewiesen, dass die betreffenden Motive in beiden Werken vorkommen, und dass die 'Blutende Gestalt' unzweifelhaft das Buch ist, von dem Grillparzer an der zitierten Stelle spricht: dass sie seine Quelle war, können wir nicht beweisen und ich glaube, es ist auch nicht notwendig.” Such are the words of Egon v. Komorzynski.”

Yet with Wyplel we may, in an interesting way, compare the “Blutende Gestalt” with the “Ahnfrau.” In each were the ‘Urmütter’ of noble standing, faithless to their husbands, and, in the same way, they atone for their guilt. They die by means of the dagger. “Die blutende Gestalt” must wander three hundred years. Wyplel points out numerous cases in which he thinks that “Die blutende Gestalt” has furnished hints for the “Ahnfrau”. However, all is guessing at what may be the facts.

(d) Literature about Murderous Parents.

There are certain writings of the seventeenth century, records of parents who kill their children, that may receive mention in connection with the remote sources of the “Ahnfrau.” These are chronicles and books of devotion. In this list of literature may be found such authors as Abraham a Santa Clara. In this connection mention may also be made of the “Volkslied.” To this may be added writings of English and Italian origin. An English pamphlet of the sort just mentioned is the basis of Lillo’s “Fatal Curiosity.”

(e) Calderon.

Grillparzer was acquainted with Calderon’s “Devotion de la Cruz” as translated by Schlegel. This is not a fate-play but one that bears the impress of fanaticism. The cross is very prominent and protects Eusebio. Grillparzer read the play and that fact must have had something to do with his adopting the trochaic measure in his “Ahnfrau.” The play may have suggested other points. Like Jaromir Eusebio is the captain of a band of rob-

---

1Euphorion. 13. Band. p. 188.
bers. He loves Julia, his sister (A2-405), and plans to elope with her (A3-389). He is guilty of incest (A2-48) and the murderer of Lisardo. Soldiers surround Eusebio to take him captive (A2-483).

(f) "Walhaide."

Körner's Walhaide had an ancestress who was known as Walhaide (W109, A1-483). She wanted to marry a certain young man. Her father objected. Her lover wanted to carry her away at midnight (W81, A3-554). Trying to take her away the young man was killed and the father of the ancestress killed her with a dagger (W127, A1-493). For this reason her spirit had no rest in the grave (W129, A1-112). She often went to the gate and waited in vain for her lover until the break of day. She wore a blood-stained white dress. Walhaide knowing that the guards let the ancestress pass when she wore that dress, proposed to her own lover that she would secure the dress and the veil (W155, A1-321). They agreed to elope at midnight that her objecting father might not interfere. Thereupon Rudolph, the lover, departs with a kiss. At twelve he returns and takes away with him the ancestress. Embracing her she is found to be very cold. She said that she was now free. She gave him a cold kiss from which he sank down dead (W241, A5-556).

We see in this a number of points that may have suggested the ancestress of Grillparzer. The ancestress and Walhaide have the same name; the time for the elopement is midnight; the ancestress was killed with a dagger by a near relative; there is no rest in the grave; there appears a flowing veil; the ancestress comes instead of the real sweetheart; finally the lover dies from a kiss of the ancestress.

(g) "Claudine von Villa Bella."

It is interesting to note the resemblance of the "Ahnfrau" with "Claudine von Villa Bella" by Goethe. It is known that Grillparzer² read the play. There is a castle in which live Alonzo, his daughter, Claudine, and his niece, Lucinde. Rugan-

---

²Figures refer to line.
³Selbstb. p. 25.
tino meets Lucinde in the forest (C210, A1-219). Rugantino is of a noble family but Rugantino is not his real name. Like Jaromir he becomes a wild robber and, in a friendly manner, Alonzo admits him to his castle (C825, A1-592). During the play there is a great deal of night. Rugantino loves Lucinde and his motives are not altogether pure. He goes even to the extent of wishing to take her away by force (C445, A5-584). A number of persons go to the castle in pursuit of the robbers (C1022, A2-434). Before Rugantino had been admitted to the castle he met his brother and, not knowing who it was, they had a fight. Pedro received a serious wound (C740, A4-162). They learned the facts of the case after the fight (C1330-51, A5-255).

(h) "Die Braut von Messina."

In Schiller's "Braut von Messina" there is a pending curse coming from a dream but explained by an Arabian. Because of the dream Isabella hides her little daughter. She grows up and becomes an attractive young woman. Here we have a case in which not only one but two noble brothers were carried away by the charms of their sister (B1153, 709, A2-40). As with Jaromir so here, the relationship had been discovered before marriage took place (B2469, A5-579).

(i) "Die Räuber."

It has been suggested that Schiller's "Räuber" has contributed some elements to the "Ahnfrau." Probably there is truth in the conjecture. Grillparzer was familiar with the work. He was present when it was played. It may at least be supposed that the robbers in the "Räuber" may have suggested the robbers in the "Ahnfrau."

Only certain points in the "Räuber" will be noticed. There is a curse pronounced by the count upon his son (R48 s-34, A1-498). Here the time between the pronouncing of the curse and the death of its bearer is brief. The suppressed sound of the lute is heard (R75, A1-292). There is a castle, possessed by a count, in which abides a marriageable young woman; there is an

3Page and line.
attempted, but happily prevented, case of adultery (R77-24, A2-31); a young robber-captain, Karl, enters the castle; he and Amalia look at a portrait (R90-31, A1-465); they fall in love with each other. We have a band of robbers, wilder, however, than those found in the "Ahnfrau." These robbers, while in the woods, are surrounded by their enemies (R5th Act, A1-636). Now and again shots are fired (R108-29, 33, 30, A1-865). Karl kills his own father (R134-31, A5-292) but not without knowing his deed. Then there is a vault in which the father had been confined by his son, Franz (R114-29, A5-541).

(j) "Der 24. Februar."

Grillparzer wanted to have nothing to do with Werner and Müllner. There is found the dagger, with which the ancestress had lost her life, hanging in full view; it is cold and white with snow (F61, A1-21); the owl hoots and the curse has been pronounced (F152, A1-491). Jaromir also kills his own father (F426, A4-164). Whether Grillparzer intended to have all this as a label for a fate-play is, by no means, evident. When speaking of Schreyvogel reference will again be made to this.

(k) "Fatal Curiosity."

In this play by George Lillo some striking resemblances with the "Ahnfrau" are found. Perhaps Werner copied from Lillo. Directly or indirectly Lillo must have had a bearing on the "Ahnfrau." There is a winter with its sleet and hail. A son, who, for a long time, has been absent, reaches the home of his parents. They do not know who he is. After the death-blow from a dagger his relationship is revealed.

(l) "Oedipus Tyrannus."

A glance may also be taken at Sophocles' "Oedipus". Grillparzer read this work during his last year at the gymnasium and was impressed by it. In this work he probably had been influenced by the case of the early training of Oedipus away from his own home. As with Oedipus so Jaromir recognized as his father

1Selbstb. pp. 64, 70.
2Selbstb. p. 30.
one who never had been such (O, p. 184, A5-120). Note also the
near relationship of Oedipus and the one whom he married.

\(m\) The Bible.

There is also brief reference to the Bible. Lichtenheld\(^1\) says
that there are only two references to the Scriptures. These, he
says, are the mention of Cain (5-59) and Abel (5-441). But are
there not even more important biblical characters mentioned in
the play? There are statements concerning a holy angel (2-26),
the Virgin Mary (4-55) and the Saviour (5-454) who is the
central figure of the whole Bible. After the count had met
Boleslav and had learned the story of the stealing of Jaromir, he
broke out in the following language:

“So begrabt mich denn, ihr Mauern,
Und Verwüstung, brich herein,
Stürzet ein, ihr festen Säulen,
Die der Erde Ball getragen” (4-353).

This reminds one of the biblical passage: “And he said to
the mountains and rocks, Fall on us and hide us from the face of
him that sitteth on the throne.”\(^2\)

\(n\) “Karl von Berneck.”

The play having the above name is by Tieck. Judging from
points of similarity it looks as though Werner and Grillparzer
read it carefully. The latter has several points that recall Tieck.\(^3\)
A spectre appears in the castle every midsummer night and then
retires to the chapel. The spectre is an ancient knight who once
occupied the castle. He killed his brother. As a punishment
he had no rest in the grave and had to wander about until, of two
brothers, the one killed the other. These brothers were not to be
enemies. The spectre was anxiously waiting for final rest. There
also is an unlawful love affair ending in the death of Karl’s
father.

\(o\) Lord Byron’s Poems.

A few years ago L. Wyplel\(^4\) advanced a theory that one of

---

1 Die Ahnfrau. p. 158.
2 Rev. 6:16.
the sources of the "Ahnfrau" is to be found in Byron's: "The Bride of Abydos", "The Corsair", "Lara", "The Giaour" and "The Siege of Corinth."

In "The Bride of Abydos" there is a man who left home when young (A4-278, B76, 102). There is a case of two who pass as brother and sister loving each other as lovers (A4-328, B86), and who plan to elope (A3-389, B112). In this they are hindered (A5-563, B116). The lover is a leader of pirates (A3-232, B109). He is wounded by a bullet (A3-135, B118). The maiden is the last of the race (A1-14, B120).

In the "Corsair" Conrad, the pirate, had not always been bad (B148). So with the child Jaromir. Conrad is represented as having escaped from the pirates (A1-636, B165). He destroys the castle of Seyd (A2-515, B171).

In "Lara" he, after whom the poem is named, left home when young (A4-297, B222) to return after a long absence (A1-593, B233). Lara is of noble birth (A4-322, B239). He strikes down Otho (A5-49, B249).

In the "Giaour" Leila is faithless to Hassan, her husband (A1-489, B39):

"Faithless to him, he gave the blow;
But true to me, I laid him low" (A1-489, B54).

Giaour, who misleads Leila, kills Hassan (B38). Giaour is cursed to wander after death:

"But first, on earth as vampire sent,
Thy course shall from its tomb be rent;
Then ghastly haunt thy native place,
And suck the blood of all thy race;
There from thy daughter, sister, wife,
At midnight drain the stream of life."

"Thy victims ere they yet expire
Shall know the demon for their sire"

In "The Siege of Corinth" Francesca is ghostly like the ancestress (A1-321, B304-6). Alp says: "Fly with me!" Immediately she is gone but he knows not where (A1-337, B310). Minotti says that Francesca died the evening he had words with Alp (B317). What appeared to Alp seems to have been Francesca's form as it was after death.
It is quite possible that Wyplel emphasized Byron too much. In his article, "Byron und Grillparzer,"² he mentions numerous details that seem to have but little value. Many of them are omitted here. The general impression that one is liable to receive from reading Byron is not that which one receives from the "Ahnfrau". In "The Bride of Abydos" Selim and Zuleika are not brother and sister while Jaromir and Bertha are. Selim is not, like Jaromir, only hit by a bullet but he is killed. In "The Giaour" the seducer of Leila kills her husband. The seducer is cursed in much the same manner as the ancestress. In "The Siege of Corinth" the comparison of Francesca with the ancestress often is anything but clear. Would it be out of place to suppose that both Byron and Grillparzer consulted common sources and thus have some points of contact? Yet Wyplel’s statements are worthy of careful thought.

(\textit{p}) Conclusion as to the Sources.

There being much uncertainty in regard to "Jules Mandrin" and the "Schauermärchen" one is permitted to draw somewhat independent conclusions. It seems reasonable to think that, whatever documents Grillparzer took as the basis of the "Ahnfrau", other characters were added to the original ones. The elements of these undoubtedly are both original and drawn from other readings. From all the sources Grillparzer formed, as it were, a composite picture—the "Ahnfrau."

CHAPTER IV.

LITERARY STRUCTURE

(a) The Unities.

It may be remembered that, in the “Ahnfrau”, unity of time is quite well observed. The play begins at seven in the evening (1-32) and ends during the progress of the night. There is, however, a rather critical point in connection with finding Bertha already in the coffin (5-649). The unities of place and action are good. The numerous monologues have a tendency to retard the action, but this is atoned for, in part, by the fact that elsewhere the action is very much crowded by condensed thought. One illustration will help to make this clear: “Hundert Schritte kaum gegangen—fällt ein Schuss—ob Freund, ob Feind weiss ich nicht—genug—er traf” (3-54).

(b) Rapid Turns.

There are rapid and important turns of thought in the play. The changes are never from a very happy mood to the other extreme but from a serious frame of mind to something more intense. These are occasioned under various situations. Jaromir breaks in upon the scene in a very unexpected and informal manner (1-592). Without much ceremony or deliberation the count receives Jaromir as his son-in-law. Jaromir leaves the room, to which he had retired, with the idea that ghosts had come to torment him (2-1). There is a rap at the door (2-407). A sudden outcry is heard (4-88) and the firing of shots (2-848). The captain has come to search the castle (2-433). Jaromir recognizes the dagger, and soon knows its history (3-494). Bertha is suddenly alarmed on hearing of her father’s misfortune (4-172). Boleslav is captured and the count meets him (4-227). Through him Jaromir learns of his father’s death. Add to these the sight of Bertha in the casket (5-649). The appearance of the ancestress creates rapid turns (1-321, 2-39, 5-563).
Rapid turns may be recognized between words and phrases (3-323). We can also see them in the interruption of sentences (2-187). It frequently happens that one person cuts short the thought of another (3-422).

The lyric and dramatic elements follow each other in close succession.

To this interruption of the monotonous the play owes much of its dramatic strength.

(c) Confusion.

Usually the “Ahnfrau” is clear. Confusion is in connection with the ancestress who leads Borotin (1-322), Bertha (1-437) and Jaromir (2-40) to get an uncertain vision of her. When Jaromir finds the captain in the castle he also is perplexed with reference to what he ought to do. Until we know that the pursuers of Jaromir are not robbers, but soldiers, we are considerably confused. Both Borotin (4-325) and Bertha (4-358) were surprised to learn that Jaromir belonged to their family.

(d) Repetition of Passages.

In the “Ahnfrau” a certain occurrence is narrated and then again repeated in somewhat different form by the same person or by another. The author may have desired to bring before the mind of the hearer a particular point and, to emphasize it, resorted to repetition. The effect of this should mean that the spectator gains special familiarity with such points.

There is a brief statement of the history of the ancestress (1-108) by the count. Günther gives a much fuller account (1-481). Later the count begins to repeat his narrative, then suddenly stops (2-354). Again he gives it brief mention (4-385). We may observe repetition in the case of Bertha's deliverance from the robbers in the forest. The count begins the narrative and then Bertha continues at some length. When the count recognizes Jaromir's worth he cheerfully recalls the case (2-400). After the captain had entered his house the count was glad to tell him about Jaromir's brave deed in behalf of his Bertha (2-451). When Jaromir was a child he had been stolen from his home. The count is the first to tell the story (1-139). Then, when the robber, Boleslav, had been captured, he told the
story in its final shape. He had stolen the child and could clear up the mystery (4-279).

Jaromir grew up to maturity. He reached the castle and told the count that he had just been attacked by robbers (1-634). He should have said soldiers. After the arrival of the captain the count states the case for him (2-457).

The count is killed and a statement of the fact is given by the captain (4-158), also by Jaromir (5-31).

(e) Poetical Measure.

It is known that Grillparzer was acquainted with the "Devotion de la Cruz" by Calderon. The study of the work may have led Grillparzer to a special consideration of the four-footed trochaic measure. Perhaps Müllner's "Schuld" was influential here. That this measure adds a charm to the play no one can deny. This is seen in the capacity it affords for speed and intensity of action. Usually the four feet are complete but very often the second syllable is wanting in the fourth foot. We find the one and a half foot measure (1-29); some with two full feet (2-538). We meet lines with three full feet (1-344). We also find four feet and a half (1-188). A few lines have five full feet (1-189). There are also a few iambic lines (1-460, 2-849, 4-340). We have the dactylic measure (1-304, 321). But this measure is slightly interrupted (1-315).

(f) Rhyme.

The rhyme is irregular. The most of the poetry is blank verse. The rhymed portions are found at random. For some unknown reason there is less rhyme in the first half than in the rest of the work. Speaking of the most elementary type we have two lines that rhyme. In a few cases the rhyme is of three successive lines (3-114). We also have the first rhyme with the second and the third with the fourth (2-779). Another type is that in which the first rhymes with the fourth and the second with the third (2-386). Often the first line rhymes with the third and the second with the fourth (2-799). Other combinations occur. Notice especially the dactylic specimen (1-304) and that of the chorus (5-415).

1Selbstb. p. 64.
(g) Proverbs.

There are expressions in the "Ahnfrau" that have a proverbial bearing. They occur mostly in the first, second and fifth acts. Out of a larger number there are quoted only some of the shorter and more important ones. "Giebt die Hoffnung schnelle Füsse" (1-648); "Ziert Bescheidenheit den Jüngling" (1-692); "Ei, bei Gott, ich bin ein Mann! Ich vermag, was Einer kann" (2-71); "Steht auf meiner offnen Stirne doch der heitre Name: Mensch!" (2-120); "Bis hierher und weiter nicht!" (2-128); "Flieh, entflih! noch ist es Zeit" (5-640); "Ist kein Dorn doch also schneidend, dass er nicht auch Rosen trägt" (2-269); "Räubers Segen ist wohl Fluch" (5-93); "Ist der Stamm gleich schon gefallen, haften doch noch manche Wurzeln" (2-484); "O, es lässt der Binse wohl, der gebrochenen Eiche spotten!" (2-556); "Kann die That die Schuld beweisen?" (5-330); "In des Waldes Nacht und Graus fühlt der Räuber sich zu Haus" (5-108).

(h) Monologues.

Not considering a few side remarks there are seven monologues (1-293, 3-111, 3-496, 4-439, 5-1, 5-267, 5-445) of which we may speak. These vary from a few lines to several pages in length. They are largely lyrical in character. The speaker expresses his inmost feeling, plaintive or dramatic in character. The subjects covered in a single monologue range from a dagger (3-496) to great breadth. We find nature portrayed in flower, wind, cloud and wave. Sometimes there is a mild beginning and a vigorous close (4-478). Often at the close there is an abrupt change introduced to give strength by way of contrast. This occurs through the appearance of the ancestress (1-321), of a soldier (3-116), of the robber Boleslav before Jaromir (5-76), of the chorus at the funeral of the count (5-414), of the soldiers with Boleslav as a captive (5-523).

(1) Fatal, Romantic and Classical Elements.

As we shall see there are some external features of the fate-play in the "Ahnfrau." We shall not now discuss these, but see whether we can find anything of the romantic. Anyone who
reads the play is impressed with the fact that there is but little romanticism. The ancestress must come rather under the classification of ghost-literature. The only romantic feature comes to our notice in the case of the fatal dagger that killed the ancestress and the count. From its keen edge there proceeds a glowing light (3-527). Then, too, we have a very brief mention of classical antiquity. This is seen in the use of the two words "Charybdis" (2-835) and "Hymen" (5-492).

(j) Picturesque Language.

The play has a great deal of picturesque language to which only a few references can be made. Bertha stands looking out through the window and, in well selected words, speaks of the darkness, the cold, the moaning of the wind, the snow, the fields, hills and mountains. She sees the starless sky staring out of hollow eye-sockets down into the immense grave (1-17). She describes, in a more cheerful way, the month of May when the fields put on a new dress, the breezes gently blow and the flowers are resurrected (1-38). Bertha feels the dark power hovering about her temples with the wings of owls. She sees the stars hide themselves and hears the angry thunder (2-779). In the storming of Jaromir's pulse she concludes that he is sick (2-429).

The count speaks of fields of verdure, of brooks flowing and of the flower awaking out of its long sleep (1-42). For a second time he has in his mind a tree. The tree that now lifts up its naked, thin arms, imploring help, will soon be clothed in living green (1-51). Borotin desires that Jaromir may rest well during the night. Then, thinking that Jaromir has a clear conscience, he speaks of this as a soft pillow (1-732). He also speaks of a fog of recollection (2-350). When he is about to die the count thinks of the uselessness of trying to stop the course of death. It would be no better than for a child to put his little hands into the spokes of the chariot of destiny (4-223).

Jaromir sees grinning spectres about him and anxiety, as a vampire, sucks the blood out of his veins and his brains out of his head. He sees angels and hell (2-9). He speaks of having escaped a shipwreck and of the failing of strength on the expanse of the water (3-331). He compares lovely sounds with
silver swans on the disturbed sea (5-399), and spirit-voices are compared with honey-bees (5-424). He says that, when fleeing from the robbers, hope gave him quick feet and that terror furnished wings (1-649). He declares that the spirits of heaven, innocence, love and hope come to bless the tie (3-380).
CHAPTER V.

IS THE "AHNFRAU" A FATE-PLAY OR A PSYCHOLOGICAL PLAY?

(a) Is the "Ahnfrau" a Fate-play?

First of all an examination will be made to find out whether there is any correspondence between the "Ahnfrau" and the fate-plays.

Earlier in our study some statements were made regarding what constituted the typical fate-play. Having these in mind we can proceed a step further.

The "Ahnfrau" has in it the form of fate very much as it has been found in the plays already discussed. The curse came upon the ancestress because of her faithlessness to her husband (1-489). The curse remains with her while she wanders as a ghost. She can have no rest until the death of her last descendant (1-110). Already the count had lost by death three brothers and a wife. With his son and daughter he still remains burdened with the fatal curse. In the presence of Bertha Jaromir takes the dagger (3-523) with which the ancestress had been killed (3-480). It is his wish to defend himself with this weapon but, not knowing whom he meets, he kills his own father (4-357). But one death is not sufficient. The ancestress draws away the shroud from the coffin in which Bertha lies and the astonished Jaromir sees her dead form (5-649). Then the ancestress, to end her misery, embraces Jaromir and gives him the kiss of death (5-656).

If a person must believe in the fate-play in general he can perhaps believe that the motive force of the "Ahnfrau" centers in fate. Thus fate must guide the human agent whether he wishes such guidance or otherwise. The curse goes on "vom Vater zu dem Sohne und vom Enkel hin zum Enkel" (4-393). This reminds one of the curse pronounced upon the evil-doer in the Old Testament in which it is stated that the curse of sin
shall extend as far as to the third and fourth generation. But, when this biblical thought is used to support the idea entertained by the writers of fate-plays, it should be remembered that the curse of God and the curse of fate in literature do not always have like results.

We find a clock in the “Ahnfrau” (1-321). We notice it, as in Werner and others, but time here is not so important an element. Yet we do well to bear in mind Jaromir’s words: “Um Mitternacht” (3-554). We may also note that the space between the pronouncing of the curse and the death of Jaromir is that of generations.

The dagger is a prominent figure in the “Ahnfrau.” It hangs in clear view and is covered with rust.

What influence has the church in the “Ahnfrau”? As has already been stated, fate and God do not always work together but we read: “Und des Blitzes glühnder Brand liegt in Gottes Vaterhand” (4-44). In the “Ahnfrau” a careful distinction between God and fate must be made. In the fate-plays of the Werner type it was a difficult matter to pray. In the “Ahnfrau” prayer is not out of harmony with the fixed onward current. Jaromir hears Bertha pray (2-23) and then he prays that the angel may protect them. Feeling his worthlessness he again addresses God in prayer (3-278). He also prays for the wicked Boleslav (5-154). Bertha addresses the Virgin Mary and asks her that Jaromir may escape the robbers (4-65).

In the fifth act of this play there is a chorus. This is in the chapel. There is a Christian funeral service held for the murdered count.

The condemned still trust in God’s final blessing. In the “Ahnfrau” there is happiness after death: “Scheid in Frieden, Friedenloser!” (5-656). But fate is out of harmony with heaven.

There is a melancholy strain stealing its way through the play. We feel something that goes even into the uncanny.

Perhaps it is by accident, but here we are again introduced to the gloomy owl (2-783). We are conscious of the fierce winds of winter howling their notes of despair (4-34). The snow covers the landscape (1-21). It is night (1-1) throughout the whole play and the lights are on the table. The torch (4-52) and the wax-taper (1-425) are present. At the appearance of
the ancestress the light goes out (1-321), so also in the chapel (5-467).

The uncanny parts of the play are quite prominent. They are more marked than in the other plays we have examined. The appearance of the ancestress is exceedingly uncanny and we may trace her spectral influence in the acts of the other characters. While she resembles Bertha (1-321) she has a peculiar ghastly look. This and the veil, worn by the ancestress, mark the difference between the two. The very presence of the ancestress provokes a shudder. When she comes out of the vault there are thunder-storms (1-507). Jaromir himself, in the thick darkness, sees grinning spectres and hell (2-3). His experience in the castle, after he had retired for the night, was of the same character (2-131). Add to this the scene where the ancestress draws the shroud from Bertha's body in the coffin (5-649).

There are mysterious and unhappy situations in the family-life of the "Ahnfrau." The ancestress is a mystery. Bertha sees her in the mirror and is puzzled at the queer movements (1-437). Let us rather look into the case of her descendants. Robbers stole Jaromir when he was a mere child. He was enticed with flowers and cake (4-278). The father thought that his boy had disappeared in the mud. When a young man he escaped from soldiers, who were pursuing him, and took refuge in the count's castle (1-592). The count was his father. Then Jaromir and Bertha became acquainted. They love each other and, ignorant of the relationship, they wish to marry (2-404). Without any hesitation her father grants the wish. In this Grillparzer does not follow Werner. The unhappy situation is made known (4-358).

In the "Ahnfrau" there is a case of adultery. The ancestress failed in being faithful to her husband (1-489) and has brought the curse upon her race. After enjoying the count's hospitality, Jaromir would not hesitate to ruin Bertha. While he stands at the door, desiring admittance, the ancestress comes and interferes (2-39). Bear in mind also that, even after Jaromir knew that Bertha was his sister, he had criminal intentions (5-566) and wished to elope with her. Again the ancestress came and interfered.
As in the fate-plays so in the “Ahnfrau” there is a strange return—the return of Jaromir.

Taking the above statements concerning the “Ahnfrau” and placing them by the side of those made in regard to the fate-play in general we cannot help being impressed with a striking similarity of formal structure.

On the other hand, it is proper to note an important point. The parents in the “Ahnfrau” do not kill their own child as they do in the old seventeenth century chronicles and other writings of that period. This is also seen in the FC, “Blunt oder der Gast” by K. Ph. Moritz, in the 24th and 29th.

In the “Ahnfrau” very little is made of the sea. The sea is prominent in the FC, in the BM, in the S and in the L.

As shall be seen the internal evidence of the play is weightier than this formal element just considered.

J. Minor\(^1\) sees external resemblances between the “Ahnfrau” and the fate-plays, yet he observes: “Ein innerer, wesentlicher Unterschied kann trotzdem bestehen; er legt uns die Frage nach dem Wesen der Schicksalstragödie nahe.”

(b) Is not the “Ahnfrau” a Psychological Play?

(1) Definition of “Psychological.”

To prevent misunderstanding, it may be well, at the outset, to indicate what is meant by a “psychological” play. Considering Lessing and Goethe a definition may be obtained. Lessing tried to write plays in which the action might spring rather from character than from situation. His “Emilia Galotti” and his “Nathan der Weise” are illustrations of this point. It is with this significance that we shall use the adjective “psychological.” Or take Goethe’s “Iphigenie” and his “Tasso.” There the same point is illustrated. In the old play of “Iphigenia” by Euripides the fates drove Orestes. This makes his play one that is governed by situation. In Goethe’s “Iphigenie” it is remorse within his soul that leads to action. In the case of Iphigenie we notice that Euripides represents her as trying to escape from Thoas. Thoas objects. Then Minerva tells him that the gods will have it thus. Iphigenie goes away because the situation

favors it. In Goethe Iphigenie overcomes the strong will of Thoas and goes away because the condition of the human soul favors it.

In all cases the psychological play is one in which action springs from the souls of those who take part in the play.

(2) Attempts Made to Classify the "Ahnfrau."

Grillparzer did not call his "Ahnfrau" a fate-play. He named it a "Schauermärchen." This statement is made by Sauer: "Der Verfasser kennt die Schule nicht zu der man ihn zu zählen beliebet." 

Why cannot the "Ahnfrau" be called a ghost-play as well as a fate-play? Not only is the ancestress herself a ghost but we learn of uncanny ghosts haunting Jaromir's bed-room in the castle. The spirits drag about their clothing and dance, the eyes of a corpse glare at him, etc. (2-156). Then, to close the ghastly scene, the ancestress hugs and kisses Jaromir to death. This reminds one of Bürger's "Lenore" in which Lenore thought that she was riding away with Wilhelm, on a spirited steed, but finally discovered that she was riding away with a ghost to her grave. The ghosts are not so much cog-wheels in the machinery of fate as forces that excite to independent action. In Bürger's ghost-story one can tolerate the death-scene but, in an intelligent age, murder by ghosts is not specially dramatic on the stage.

Laube gives a statement from Grillparzer's own lips that should convince one of his purpose. The author of a play should have a good idea of his own composition. "Sie finden darin Anmerkungen von Schreyvogel,—dass er die Veranlassung gewesen ist zu denjenigen Stellen in der Ahnfrau, welche mich in den Geruch eines Schicksalstragöden gebracht haben." In the revision of the "Ahnfrau" Grillparzer uses the title "Trauerspiel."

Grillparzer did not want to be called a writer of fate-plays: "Genau genommen nun, befindet sich die Schicksalsidee gar nicht in der Ahnfrau.—Damit will ich nicht gegen das Schicksal

\(^3\)Die Ahnfrau. A. Sauer. p. 128.
eifern, sondern gegen sein krudes Vorkommen in der Ahnfrau.”

He did not care to be classed with Werner, Müllner and others of their stamp. Yet, in spite of this, many called the “Ahnfrau” a fate-play. Among these are Minor, Bartels, Kirchner, Leixner, Volkelt, Lichtenheld. There are many others. Grillparzer’s contemporaries, almost to the last man, hooted the idea that the “Ahnfrau” could be anything else than a fate-play.

There are some critics who do not care to call the “Ahnfrau” a fate-tragedy. Even Vogt and Koch are led to qualify their statement that the “Ahnfrau” is a fate-play. Scherer was not far from correctly stating the case when he said: “His (Werner’s) ‘Twenty-Fourth of February’ began that series of so-called ‘Fate-tragedies,’ in which the most horrible crimes are made to result from improbable coincidences or trivial motives.”

In “Die verhängnisvolle Gabel” Platen ridicules the fate-plays in general and the “Ahnfrau” in particular. In a narrower sense he seems to call it a fate-play while, in a broader and better sense, it is no fate-play.

Here one can also look at the words of Laube: “Uebrigens ist es auch in solcher Gestalt eigentlich nicht die volle Schicksalsidee, deren man das Stück anklagt, sondern es ist eine Theorie der Vererbung, welche in dichterischer Charakteristik gar oft eine Rolle spielt, ohne dem Worte der Dichtung Abbruch zu thun. Sie ist eben wahr, die grelle Ausdehnung nur, wie hier in der Ahnfrau, erweckt gerechtes ästhetisches Bedenken, ein Bedenken, welches aber doch immerhin einen andern Ausdruck suchen muss als den Ausdruck mit dem Stichworte ‘Schicksaltragödie’”. On the same page he says that Grillparzer, notwithstanding the critics, held that the “Ahnfrau” was not a fate-play: “Er war unerschütterlich in seinen Meinungen und Ansichten. Man liebt wohl auch ein verfolgtes Kind mit doppelter Liebe.”

---
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It may be said that if there are fate-tragedies there may also be fate-epics. But how many friends of so-called fate-plays have made such an assertion? In the Nibelungenlied Kriemhild dreams of eagles devouring a falcon. This is to prefigure the death of Siegfried by the Burgundians. Also the mermaids by the Danube tell what later happened to the Burgundians. Who calls the Nibelungenlied, in part or as a whole, a fate-epic?

(3) Fate Defined.

First of all let it be understood that there is only one kind of fate that needs to be considered. It is useless to speak of antique and modern fate.²

(4) Fate and Predestination.

Sometimes there is confusion of thought arising from a lack of knowledge relative to the difference between fate and the theological doctrine of predestination. This is not only an American tangle but it may be seen in the case of those Germans who believe in fatalism. Discussing fate Ehrhard and Necker² speak of a "predestinated knife" in fate-plays. That there is such a thing as predestination one may admit. The laws of science, including those of body and mind, are themselves a part of the divine plan, or if another phraseology is preferred, they may be said to be predestinated to certain ends. Law is eternal in God and springs from that source. Predestination, therefore, which is divine is eternal. The aim here is by no means to uphold narrow ideas on the subject of predestination. Whatever else may be true predestination includes within itself free-will by which man is permitted to make independent choices. Within given limitations God himself may have certain desires with regard to us but, having come within the scope of human free-will, we can even do contrary to the desire of our Creator. And human self-activity affords a basis for psychological expansion. We can see reasons for human responsibility and guilt.

²Franz Grillparzer. p. 206.
(5) Fate is not a Part of God’s Law.

We hear of a Lisbon destroyed by an earthquake, of cities covered with ashes from Vesuvius and of people dying because of a volcanic eruption in the Island of Martinique. All this is not in line with fate but is governed by God’s laws of nature. To say that persons thus “met their fate” is irregular. “To meet one’s fate” should not necessarily contain an unlucky meaning. We might as well say that those who had not thus been killed also met their fate. Indeed one often speaks of such, with some reservation, as being under a “lucky star.” It is not at all denied that fate is used with this meaning but it really implies a denial of the presence of a living and acting deity. God and fate are separate. There are many other ways in which our thought in this matter may receive expression. Really there is no fate of the higher God-controlling or of the lower man-controlling order.

Gustav Waniek¹ is mistaken when he makes this statement: “Ob man indes ein derartiges Walten einer übernatürlichen Macht ‘Akte geheimnisvoller Gerechtigkeit’ oder ‘Schicksal’ nennt, bleibt im Wesen dasselbe.” Call to mind that fate is materialistic while “acts of mysterious justice” are in harmony with God.

Among those who have an incorrect view of fate—a view that includes the ordaining of God—a few persons may receive mention.

In his poem: “Coplas de Manrique” Longfellow says:

“Well in the most exalted state,
Relentless sweeps the stroke of fate.”

He really does not mean what he says. In the third stanza following the lines quoted he makes the thought clear.

“The will of Heaven my will shall be,—
I bow to the divine decree.”

In the province of philosophy Halleck² denies that we are as incapable of improving ourselves as is the tree to change its leaves. And yet he says “We may concede the fact that the nervous systems of us all become by middle life largely machines,

²Education of the Central Nervous System, pp. 28, 35.
which react fatally in a given way when prompted by a given stimulus.” What he ought to say is *unconsciously* and not “fatally.”

Materialists, who believe that there is no duality of substance as matter and mind, accept only matter. To them the mind is nothing but matter and must be controlled by the laws of matter. The materialists,¹ as those of France and Germany, Helvetius, Frederick, LaMettrie and d’Holbach give no place to the existence of moral ability and independence of mind. There can also be no God and, of course, no responsibility to him. Man is a machine dominated by the hard rule of fate.

It may be well to examine Kleist’s “Familie Schroffenstein.” Ottocar and Agnes exchange clothing. Not knowing his own son Rupert kills him, and Sylvester kills his own sister Agnes, thinking that she is Ottocar. Is there any fate here? Why not call the play a play of character and of situation? After all has been said it must be admitted that death resulted through the exercise of free-will.

It should also be noticed that in the case of Johanna, in Schiller’s “Die Jungfrau von Orleans,” it was not fate that controlled her but a free choice based on her religious convictions.

In the Christian system of thought some practically believe that a man can do nothing of himself, yet it is not fate that controls. With them it is God. We should never call such control the result of fate. In no way does fate exercise any power over God. This is the Christian conception of the Deity.

A special illustration may be in place. We can see in the theory of evolution, founded on a loving, personal God, a different outcome from what we find in a theory founded on fate. If there is a God the plan of evolution is permeated with wisdom and there can be no fate. What seems to be of fate is all taking place according to divine law. Some things that God does not want he permits. Results growing out of many situations may, at first sight, look like those of fate but they are not such. The survival of the fittest is not in accordance with fate. If there is a survival of the fittest it is of God.

¹Littérature française au 18e Siècle. P. Albert, p. 155
Another point of supreme importance in the study of the "Ahnfrau" comes out of the fact that fate and Christianity do not harmonize.

J. Minor\(^1\) is correct when he says: "Dieses grause, blinde, unerbittliche Schicksalswalten verträgt sich nicht mit der Idee eines himmlischen Vaters."

"Wir Christen und Weise glauben kein Schicksal!" said Herder,\(^2\) "So nenne mans Schickung, Begebnis, Ereignis, Verknüpfung der Begebenheiten und Umstände, unentweichlich stehen wir unter der Macht dieses Schicksals.—Freilich solche Missgriffe im Gebrauch dieses Wortes zeigten ein klägliches Schicksal!" To many a reader of the "Ahnfrau" Christianity and fate are confused so that he cannot say that it is a genuine, true fate-play. In fact the evidence gathered is sufficient to show that the "Ahnfrau" is no fate-play at all.

Ehrhard and Necker,\(^3\) though they are critics of good standing, have not helped us out of the confusion. In the "Ahnfrau" fate, according to them, is "eine Art von immanenter Gerechtigkeit, gleich jener, von der die heilige Schrift spricht."

Or take the words of Terlitza:\(^4\) "Die Schicksalsidee ist also ein religiöses Moment."

(7) *Doubt.*

By quoting the words of Borotin Lichtenheld\(^5\) thinks that he has proved that there is fate in the "Ahnfrau."

"Die sich immer mehr bewährt,
Dass das Schicksal hat beschlossen,
Von der Erde auszustossen
Das Geschlecht der Borotin (1-89)."

This may look as though Borotin believed that he was under the influence of the curse of fate but does this, perhaps spoken when he had the "blues," prove the point? Even Borotin, at times, is skeptical about the truth of the statement referring to

---


\(^3\)Grillparzer. p. 215.


\(^5\)Ahnfrau. p. 22.
the ancestress and the curse. As we have seen, he calls it a fairy-tale (1-476). But we also remember that he labored under the fear that his race was doomed (1-88). Fear at least did not paralyze his mind. The burden of years rested on him yet he thought and acted.

It may also be remembered that the count, having the ancestress in mind, urged action independent of her and the curse: “Lass uns eignen wertes freuen und nur eigne Sünden scheuen” (1-582). At a previous time he expressed his doubt when he said: “Ich hab geträumt (1-398)”! Be it also remembered that the count is considered to be one of the most passive characters in the “Ahnfrau.” We now have another light in which to see whether Lichtenheld is correct.

It may be that in the characters of the “Ahnfrau” some, at times, really believe in fate as a force by which they are controlled. Should even such a view be taken it, by no means, would prove that the “Ahnfrau” is a fate-play. Belief is not full proof.

(8) “Macht.”

Franz Streinz\(^1\) certainly is mistaken when he says: “Ferner sind alle Personen des Dramas von dem Walten eines unerbittlichen und unversöhnlichen Schicksals überzeugt; sie sprechen es wie eine über dem Menschen thronende Macht an und scheuen sich nicht einmal, durch Gebete seine Huld zu erfliehen.” J. Minor says: “Von dem Walten eines unerbittlichen Schicksals sind sie alle überzeugt; sie beten zu ihm ohne das Bewusstsein, die Dinge ändern zu können.”\(^2\) It looks as though the one critic copied the other.

Some passages need special attention.

“Unerbittlich strenge Macht,
Ha, nur diese, diese Nacht,
Diese Nacht nur gönne mir,
Harte! und dann steh’ ich dir (1-750).”

Here we may, at first sight, believe “unerbittlich strenge Macht” to refer to fate. But must it refer to fate? In the first

\(^1\)Ahnfrau. F. Streinz. p. xv.
\(^2\)Forschungen zur neueren Litteraturgeschichte. R. Heinzel, p. 391.
place, Jaromir addresses it as a personality and that in prayer. Ordinarily fate is conceived as impersonal. In the second place, "Macht" may be considered to be God. J. Kohn is of the same opinion: "Bertha fleht am Schlusse des zweiten Aufzuges—zu der unerklärbar hohen Macht (offenbar Gott)." We speak of the "Almighty." He is firm and, in some cases, inexorable. If Jaromir's motive is not Christian his God is not expected to grant the favors asked. Who knows his motive in the prayer? His resignation is, at least, not perfect. Perhaps the "Macht" may even refer to devils and their power.

Consider also these words by Bertha:

"O, ich kenn' dich, finstre Macht,
Ahne, was du mir gebracht (2-786)."

Here "Macht" may mean a juxtaposition of circumstances issuing from God or it may mean the Almighty himself. Again, it may mean Satan.

Elsewhere Bertha says:

"Kann mein Flehen dich erreichen,
Unerklärbar hohe Macht (2-843)."

Here the personality of the object addressed is again clear and fate need have no consideration.

At the close of the "Ahnfrau" the ancestress says: "Sei gepriesen, ew'ge Macht!" It is not necessary to justify the ancestress in her killing Jaromir in order to say that here "Macht" refers to the power of God and not to fate. It was neither God nor fate that did the killing; it was the ancestress who did it.

The count says:

"Tiefverhüllte, finstre Mächte
Lenkten seine schwanke Rechte (4-383)!

Then Jaromir repeats some of the count's words:

"Tiefverhüllte, finstre Mächte (5-347)."

He also says:

"Heilen müssen seine Wunden,
Die der Hölle gift'ger Trug,
Nicht der Sohn dem Vater schlug (5-377)."

Here the agent is supposed to be "der Hölle gift'ger Trug." This is the equivalent of "Tiefverhüllte, finstre Mächte." We

thus see clearly that "Mächte" is connected with hell, and no Christian conception can join fate to hell.

That Jaromir does not believe in fate should be clear enough from the following:

"Nein, in jenen düstern Fernen
Waltet keine blinde Macht,
Über Sonnen, über Sternen
Ist ein Vaterraug', das wacht.
Keine finstern Mächte raten
Blutig über unsre Thaten.
Sie sind keines Zufalls Spiel;
Nein, ein Gott, ob wir's gleich leugnen,
Führt sie, wenn auch nicht zum eignen,
Immer doch zum guten Ziel (5-384)."

Here he believes in God as one who directs the affairs of men, and yet J. Minor says: "Man darf ohne Anstoss behaupten, dass in keiner andern Tragödie das Schicksal eine so grosse Rolle spielt wie in Grillparzer's "Ahnfrau."

(9) Clear References to Christianity.

Lichtenmeld says that the "mächt'ger Finger" (1-119), that had to do with the ruin of the count and his family, must be understood to mean God. If this is true fate is absolutely without significance.

Jaromir says: "Teufel zögen mich zur That, Gottes Engel mich zurücke (5-29)"! If he is led by devils and the angels of God he surely is out of the hands of fate.

The count says: "Mein Weib gieng ein zu Gott" (1-131). Bertha prays for Jaromir (2-23). Jaromir even prays for Boleslav (5-154).

How strange that Jaromir and Bertha address fate in prayer when Grillparzer has them actually address the holy angel (2-26) and the holy mother (4-55)!

These, and other references to religion not mentioned here, are a mark of positive belief in the Christian religion. This

2Ahnfrau. p. 42.
is not true of all the so-called fate-plays. In “Der 24. Februar” by Werner no one can pray. Therefore the logical conclusion must be that either Christianity or fatalism is in the “Ahnfrau” and not both. Even the ancestress has qualities that show she is in harmony with the religion of her offspring. She wants to protect them from sin and danger. If, after she is dead, God prompts some or all of her actions then we have a clear case that her relationship with fate is nothing.

(10) Fate-value.

It is seen, then, that those who believe the “Ahnfrau” to be a fate-play must have fate direct the characters. Fate is supposed to have, besides personality, enough intelligence to see beforehand and to lay out a well-defined plan that the ancestress and her posterity might suffer severely in consequence of the husband’s curse. Fate also would have a will but would lack sensibility. Here there is a necessary conflict and fate is a mere “château d’Espagne.”

In mythology one reads of three fates. They are supposed to have personality. Fate, as we have considered it, is entirely impersonal. In Greece and elsewhere even the gods were subordinated to the power of fate. In a country where such beliefs prevail it is possible to captivate people with a fate-play more easily than in a country where Christian ideas of God obtain.

The unreality of fate-plays is so great that in intelligent, Christian countries, as are those of Europe and America to-day, we should not expect the would-be fatalism of a play to bring tears to the eyes of any except children, weak minds and such few as are honest materialists. Keep clear the difference between the ordaining of a wise, loving God and that of a cold, loveless fatalism.

(11) The Curse.

(A) Curse by Inheritance.

A. Lichtenheld¹ says: “Wenn Reichthum, Ansehen, Eigenschaften vererben, warum soll es nicht das Unglück?” He is not making a very strong point in his favor. He should not as-

---

¹Ahnfrau. p. 20.
sociate this with fate-plays but with plays in which situation is very prominent as a controlling feature. During the long term of years, permitted by the fate-play, one can become poor or rich, distinguished or the opposite, even human qualities can, by force of will, become modified. In the “Ahnfrau” perhaps nearly a hundred years are necessary for the satisfaction of the curse by death. Common observation shows that one born with the silver spoon may not secure the favor for his grandson to use the same spoon. It is true that people too often measure the strength and value of a man by looking at his past and present surroundings. All these facts have a value but the laws that govern the universe also have a permanency far beyond that of property, influence and qualities. Free-will must put psychological life into the matter of inheritance.

Friedmann\(^1\) tries to attenuate the meaning of fate by the use of the word “Atavismus.” He has no right to say that fate is natural law. “Atavismus” means a harmonious agreement with the laws of nature. In other words fate has no connection with inheritance.

The disease of Oswald, in the “Ghosts” by Henrik Ibsen, has its seat in his mind. It is a case of “Atavismus.” Oswald could not help himself against the merciless force of violated natural law.

It is well here to take under review the words of J. Schreyvogel.\(^2\) Der verstärkte Antrieb zum Bösen, der in dem angeerbten Blute liegen kann, hebt die Willensfreiheit und die moralische Zurechnung nicht auf.”

A quotation from Ehrhard and Necker\(^3\) is in place: “Diese feurige Natur nun, die die jungen Leute beinahe zur Blutschande bringt, ist die Erbschaft von der Ahnfrau.—Der Instinkt reisst sie fort.” This means the same as the quotation from Schreyvogel. If we are to understand instinct to have the modern meaning of inherited qualities, and that is the drift of the quotations, we may as well say that the inheritance is not only physical but also of the mind. We know that the ancestress exercised independence of will and, to be consistent, she

\(^1\)Das deutsche Drama. I. Band. p. 274.
\(^2\)Vorbricht zur ersten Auflage.
\(^3\)Grillparzer. p. 220.
must have transmitted a strong will to her posterity. A strong will is the contradiction of fate.

(B) Curse by Mere Statement.

In fate-tragedies there is some particular event through which human beings come under the sway of fate. Freedom of the will, on the part of some individual, is the starting-point. That is, not all events are fated from all eternity. Bringing forth the power of fate one person, by word or deed, may destroy all further ability to act out any real self-will.

There are persons who, waiving the theory of evolution, look upon what they believe to be the sin of Adam as a crime for the curse of which all persons are equally responsible with him who committed it. However true this is, the curse that rests upon mankind has been pronounced by God and the Bible says that it can only be lifted by the shedding of Christ's blood. It differs from fate in that the curse can be lifted. In “Der 24. Februar” Kunz says: “Wer einmal ist verflucht, der bleibt’s!” Here we desire to look at the letter itself of the fate-play. Also the crime of one man, Adam, making all posterity responsible, as he is responsible, may need a different setting. Should we rather say that the tendency to sin comes to us through Adam or, what may be more scientific, through some ancestor according to evolution, and that we have inherited only the bad tendency? Yet this supposition does not mean that we inherited nothing but bad tendencies. Such a view would support the fact of personal responsibility, and responsibility would bring us to psychological interest.

Also the curse, of which mention is made in the Scriptures, reaching to the third and fourth generations, or even, as Grillparzer observes, to the seventh generation, may, when stress is laid upon the development of tendency in crime, lose its fatalistic or formal meaning. This, too, has a psychological significance. We hesitate very much to say that the Scriptural points brought forward are fatalistic. The Bible is not a fate-book. It has not the shadow of fate in it. It cannot be used to support the fate-play. It stands not for silly whims but for justice. In the Bible one sees that the curse of God was pronounced by God himself or by one of his representatives, against a given person or nation.

---

1Selbstb. p. 70.
and then, later, finds that what had been stated came true. One does not at all need to compare such proceeding with the curse and its outcome in a fate-play. The statement of the Almighty is different from that of one pronounced by a person backed by fate and not by God. The same may be applied in the case of dreams that are prompted by God. If God is in the case fate is out of it.

How contrary to modern views, tempered by Christianity, is the conduct of Walter in “Der 29. Februar” (862), where, for no valid reason, he heartlessly thrusts the knife into the bosom of his own son! Such an outcome of fate is horror not only to the eyes of civilized humanity but also to a loving Providence.

Very little better is the case in Carmen Sylva’s “Meister Manole.” There was a belief that, when, on account of a bloody deed committed in olden times, a curse rested upon any place, that curse could be atoned for only by walling a living being within the foundation of a building. That being had to descend without foreboding: The church-walls tumbled down until Gionetta was enclosed within the foundation and died there.

In the “Ahnfrau” we have a case where one man, because of the faithlessness of his wife, is said to have brought a curse indirectly, if not directly, upon his wife and her offspring for several generations (1-487). Here, as in many fate-plays, a single human being pronounces the curse. This is a great weakness when we expect fate to operate. Man’s importance is too highly magnified. Should the curse depend upon the person who pronounced it, or on the sinner for the sake of his sin? Should the word be more powerful than the deed? Adultery does leave a sinful curse to rest on the offspring but should the innocent suffer, to the extent indicated in the “Ahnfrau,” for the guilty? The count, his brothers and children are all included in the curse. According to the standard of the fate-play they are to suffer death simply because one man, through a whim, willed it thus. Under the circumstances the murder of his wife was itself cruel (1-493).

The nonsense of attaching any great importance to curses comes to light when we consider the rather popular use of the word “damn.” The word means that one wishes God to bring extreme punishment upon the object hated. We know, only too
well, that the curse comes upon no one except upon the one who utters it.

It seems quite evident that the curse should rest not on the count, his brothers, Bertha and Jaromir, but, on the one hand, on the ancestress and, on the other, on the wild robbers. It was the robbers who gave Jaromir his bad training that led to such bad results. Their influence had more to do with death than anything else had. We may even believe that this was the thought entertained by Jaromir when he addressed his supposed father, Boleslav (5-129). His true relationship is now dawning and his connection with the robber-curse is losing its hold on him.

Furthermore, it may be in place to ask why the curse should have dealt more lightly with the count, who was a nearer relative of the ancestress than his children were, and have been so severe with Jaromir, his son. The count had been killed by his son and that is bad enough. But Jaromir, who innocently killed his father, is placed in a worse situation. Jaromir also figures strongly in the death of Bertha. His death by the ancestress is a small matter in comparison with his previous experiences. Among these his desire to commit incest is not the least.

In the fate-plays much time is required to accomplish the curse of fate. If there is fate in the “Ahnfrau” it took presumably the larger part of a century to accomplish the curse of fate. In this connection J. Kohm¹ speaks of “ein jahrhundertelanges Unrecht.” Punishment followed crime too slowly. To make a strong case time should be short. It would intensify action. When a human being pronounces a curse he desires sudden destruction to come upon his victim.

The curse that the husband pronounced upon the ancestress is only one among other motives that give life to the play. Adultery itself, for which the curse was pronounced, is more dynamic. In the “Ahnfrau” fate has been too much taken for granted.

(12) *Fate and Free-will.*

The presence of free-will necessarily drives out fate. J.

Minor¹ says: "Der Gedanke eines finsteren und unvermeidlichen Schicksals verträgt sich nicht mit dem Princip der menschlichen Freiheit." Volkelt,² who believes that the "Ahnfrau" is a fate-play, says: "Das 'Schicksal' hebt sonach, so weit es waltet, das vernünftige, freie Wollen des Menschen auf." Coming from such a man the statement is valuable because it shows that the fate-tragedy would have spiritually dead characters. He³ is also frank enough to say: "So ist denn die moderne Schicksaltragödie ein Rückschritt hinter das moderne Bewusstsein." F. Paulsen⁴ says: "That there is psychological freedom has never been doubted." Human action is determined, in a measure, by one's nature and by external circumstances. But such determinism is not all-inclusive. The soul also acts as a determining force in human action.

(13) Development of Character in the "Ahnfrau."

Character is what the person really is. It gives an individual his peculiar meaning.

In the development of character in the "Ahnfrau" the author lets one become acquainted with a personage (1) by what he himself says and (2) by what others say about him.

(A) The Ancestress.

The ancestress casts a gloomy influence on the Borotin family (1-323, 1-572). It is ghastly and chilly. She never brings happiness. Her appearance always is at some time when she is not expected (1-321, 2-39). She is an example of one who has done wrong and who suffers on account of her sin (1-489). She shows that she does not desire harm to come to Bertha and Jaromir (2-39). She shows her interest in Jaromir and bids him escape (5-640). She tells him that she is not Bertha but the ancestress (5-642).

The count gives a history of the ancestress (1-108) and so

²F. Grillparzer. Volkelt. p. 162.
³F. Grillparzer. p. 176.
⁴A System of Ethics. p. 453.
does Günther (1-481, 1-554). Information about her is gained since the count (1-328), Bertha (1-437) and Jaromir (5-564) tell of their personal experience in her presence.

In addition to the information given by the characters in the play the author gives explanations that help one to understand the ancestress (1-321, 2-47, 63, 5-649, 656).

(B) The Captain.

Not much need be said about the captain. The point in his case that needs to be emphasized is that he was very loyal to his duty and to his king (2-713, 2-513).

(C) The Count.

The count reveals his character through his own language. At the beginning of the play he shows that he is a pessimist and, though he speaks of the return of spring (1-42), he thinks of the annihilation of his family. He is a pessimist until his death. At one time he may have believed in fate (1-1), at another he doubts the fatal element in the story about the ancestress (1-118). The count also believed that personal effort is capable of changing the course of events (1-583). He shows a deep interest in the welfare of his children (1-62), and manifests his gratitude in view of Bertha’s deliverance from robbers (1-281, 1-677). While the count is grateful to Jaromir for saving Bertha he also shows an impulsive spirit in the speedy acceptance of him as his son-in-law (1-667). Borotin extends a welcome to Jaromir (1-633), also to the captain (2-420). He is loyal to his king (2-748) and is obedient to the captain (2-506). He rebukes Jaromir for his hesitation to follow in the attack (2-570). After learning that Jaromir is his son he breaks out in an expression of despair (4-355).

Bertha speaks of her father as being sad (1-61). But she also says that once he had been cheerful (1-82).

(D) Boleslav.

Boleslav is a minor personage in the play but he stands out in the description of his robber character (4-278).
Looking into the statements of the count (4-346) and of Jaromir (5-129) it is seen that he became the cause of much trouble to them.

(E) Bertha.

Bertha shows that she is melancholy, yet several times she is cheerful (1-38, 2-309, 1-300). She proves to Jaromir that she is grateful for his having saved her (1-262). She shows herself to be sympathetic (4-172), and it is known that she can love as a woman loves (3-66). Bertha is a little doubtful about how some love. Some love love itself and not a person (2-298). She has a woman's curiosity (3-30). She appears in the role of a nurse (3-99, 4-128). She manifests devotion in prayer (4-172). Finally, in a gloomy state of mind, she contemplates suicide (4-485).

The count describes Bertha as good and guiltless though appearing to be guilty (1-416).

(F) Jaromir.

Jaromir's character is seen in his own words. He is cheerful in a very small measure (3-369) and shows much melancholy. He humbly admits his poverty (2-372). He shows his humility before Bertha and wants her help (3-346). He is brave (2-452, 2-73, 3-15, 3-144) yet he is frightened by pursuing soldiers (1-593). He is abashed (1-681) yet impetuous (2-48, 5-508). No one dares question his love for Bertha (2-403, 5-485). Jaromir helps in time of need (2-567) and is devout enough to pray (2-26). He claims to be a robber (3-218), yet he dares not claim to be an ordinary one (3-262). A bad robber-feature appears in Jaromir in connection with the money hidden in the castle on the Rhine (3-392). A similar trait is revealed in his proposed elopement (3-453). He thinks of suicide (3-467) and despair (5-255).

The count describes Jaromir's childhood (1-139). Bertha describes Jaromir to her father (1-220) and shows Jaromir's benevolent act (1-250). Günther says that Jaromir was frightened (1-621). The captain considers him to be a robber (5-524).

The ancestress is mysterious and gloomy. She is conscious of her past transgression. She is benevolent yet determined.
The captain is loyal and Boleslav is a low robber. In the case of the count it is seen that he is gloomy, magnanimous, hospitable, impulsive, grateful, humble, loyal, obedient, courageous, desperate, doubting fate and interested in his family. Bertha is melancholy, but cheerful by freaks, grateful, loving, sympathetic and curious as a woman, suspicious, devout, thinks of suicide and acts the part of a nurse. Jaromir is timid, brave, abashed, devout, unrestrained, helpful, impetuous. He is a robber and yet not as low as a common robber, he thinks of suicide and of eloping, yet he is humble and, at times, his gloom vanishes.

While the characters have some resemblance they also have marked differences. Bertha, Borotin, the captain and the ancestress are no robbers. The count, the captain and Boleslav have not the impulsive love of Jaromir. Bertha is cheerful at times while the count always is gloomy. Bertha is no fighter like Jaromir, the count and the captain. Bertha has not the aggressive spirit of Jaromir. Bertha is not so much disturbed by ghosts and the ancestress as are Jaromir and the count. The captain expresses no love except for his king and right. The ancestress has the distinguishing marks of a ghost. Bertha and Jaromir are developing characters while Günther, Borotin and Boleslav are more nearly stationary.

The author of the "Ahnfrau" makes one acquainted with a given character much more through what the character says than through what others say about him. The ancestress may be regarded as an exception. Evidently Lichtenheld and Ranft are mistaken when they say that "Charakteristik" in the "Ahnfrau" is a very weak feature. The characters in the play are not like bullets cast in the same mould.

In which was the author more successful, in the development of male or female characters? He represents the ancestress as a ghost. This does not require the greatest skill, but he has succeeded in gaining our attention. In the case of Bertha there is included a wider circle of feeling and activity. She represents much more than the ancestress.

It may be said that the captain is loyal and that Boleslav is a robber of low degree. These characteristics are very well devel-
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oped. Old age has left its impress on the count, yet he stands forth as one who is thoroughly human. As already noticed this is shown from many points of view. But the personage with which the author was most successful is Jaromir. This success has not so much to do with breadth as with depth. There is an aggressive intensity represented in Jaromir that is lacking in the count and Bertha. He is the leading character of the play while Bertha, all things weighed, should be ranked as second in importance.

The above statements on character ought to be sufficient to show that there is independent, developing character in the "Ahnfrau." If this can be found in the smallest degree the freedom of the will is established. And if the will is free there can be no fate.

(14) Feeling.

Nor is it fair to say that all feeling is a mixed quantity depending on fate. It would be nearer the truth to say that feeling is one of the motives to further action. Tragedy that lacks feeling prompting to activity is not worth much. That feeling may take the form of love, hatred and other passion arising out of varied human condition.

Undoubtedly much of the restlessness of mind in the "Ahnfrau" comes from fear of impending evil and this very fear is a steam-engine giving movement to the actors on the stage.

Take even the fear that is inspired into the mind of some one who superstitiously attaches something of fate to the number thirteen. The number thirteen kills no one but the fear of death does arouse in his being a psychological expression. He tries to avoid the evil threatened.

(A) Love for the Opposite Sex.

Let us examine Grillparzer's "Sappho." In it Sappho loves Phaon and he admires her talent. Because of inequality of station she does not marry but continues to love him. To free herself she plunges from the rock into the sea. The play is not called a fate-play, but could she help loving Phaon? Why do not the friends of fate-tragedy seize upon such a point and say
that the situation is connected with fate? On this point Volkelt\(^1\) says: "Seine zweite Tragödie, Sappho, weist nicht die leiseste Spur von Schicksalsspuk auf." Sappho is considered to be a strong psychological play. The motive-force is Sappho's love for Phaon.

Examine "Das goldene Vlies." Has not the golden fleece a fatal significance as great as any disappointed husband's curse? This remark is meant to have fate-play significance. Of course a husband's curse may have a tremendous, psychological meaning! Yet who calls the play a fate-tragedy? In it Grillparzer's romanticism is pointed out. It is a case of love.

Perhaps if there were more daggers, owls, howling winds and chilling snow some would accept these as fate-plays.

As love was a motive-power in "Sappho" and "Das goldene Vlies" so it is a very strong motive for action in the "Ahnfrau." The love of Jaromir for Bertha was as strong as the hatred of the husband of the ancestress was for her. There is very strong passion in the "Ahnfrau." The play does not all center on paralyzing terror.

Observe Jaromir and Bertha after they have learned to know each other. It was a case of loving at first sight, Jaromir saved her from the robbers and Bertha appreciates this generous act. They want to marry each other and the count quickly consents (1-667). Carried away through love Jaromir would undoubtedly have anticipated marital privileges had not the ancestress appeared and interfered (2-47). In a second case the ancestress prevented Jaromir from carrying away her whom he supposed to be his sister (5-563). At this time he already knew that Bertha was his sister. Whatever the crime Jaromir was mightily under the control of his inner, fiery being. It is true that finally the ancestress prevailed over him. As already stated, her ghostlike character is poorly adapted to meet the demands of a murder in tragedy. Tragedy should be more real.

The feeling displayed by Bertha in regard to the scarf, when she let her handkerchief fall upon it (3-156) to protect her Jaromir, reveals to us the state of mind that has full freedom of movement. She also accomplished the desired end. She showed that she had a distinct, loving individuality.

\(^{1}\)Franz Grillparzer. p. 171.
(B) Of Relatives.

But we may also say that, even in the relation between the ancestress and Jaromir, there was a psychological manifestation. The ancestress wanted to free herself from the bondage of a curse and, to do so, she needed to think and act. The propelling force was from within her own soul. Let it also be noticed that the ancestress, while she wants her own freedom that can be had only through the death of Jaromir, is even urging him to save his own life: "Flieh, entflieh! noch ist es Zeit." If the "Ahnfrau" is a fate-play it must be concluded that Jaromir had to die just as we read he did die. Is it not a fair question to ask why the ancestress told Jaromir to flee from death? The author of this dissertation cannot help believing that the ancestress is a very good psychological example.

(C) Love of Country.

The soldiers are not driven by fate but by inner forces. They act out of love for the reigning power and out of a sense of duty. They have driven Jaromir into final danger (5-538). The ancestress then rescues (?) him (5-654). Can we not even say that the ancestress perhaps killed Jaromir to save him from a more horrible death at the hands of the pursuing soldiers.

(D) Prayer.

A whole-souled expression is also seen in the prayers of the "Ahnfrau." Jaromir asks the gods of the castle, in which supposed innocence reigns, to receive him (1-743). Driven by the soldiers he implores the holy angel to stand by him (2-26). He prays that God may not entirely desert him (3-278). Bertha begs the Virgin Mary that she may lead Jaromir safely by the swords of the enemy (4-70). In these petitions they show earnestness and a desire for a good end. In the very nature of the prayers we know that they expect some change to result. The prayers are voluntary and not a product of fate. They arise from the depth of self-determining, individual personality. In the earlier fate-plays we noticed that those who were under the curse could not all pray. How different in the "Ahnfrau!"
Jaromir wanted weapons. He caught sight of a dagger, the history of which he soon knew (3-494). He had made up his mind to find his way clear or to make it so through the use of the dagger. This desperation, if such it may be called, stimulated to independence of procedure. Had Jaromir even been killed, instead of killing another, that would not have checked the freedom of his mind up to the time of his death. The hunted animal may be shot but that does not destroy his previous desire and attempt to escape. It is not fate that leads to escape or to be taken. Sometimes it is the result of a proper exercise of forethought. It is not fate but happening. In a mysterious way Providence may be in the event. But Providence, as we know, is not fate.

When Jaromir and Bertha learned that they were brother and sister another motive for action presented itself. The discovery of this and the consequent disappointment, coupled with the unhappy ending of her father's life, may be understood to be the indirect, if not the direct, cause of her death. It may be that she took poison (4-478) and died from it as the immediate agent. The fact remains that Bertha does not appear alive in the fifth act. Notwithstanding the statement of Lichtenheld¹ that the “Fläschchen” does not appear again Bertha spies the poison at the close of the fourth act. R. Mahrenholtz² says: "Bertha tötet sich durch Gift."

We next find her in the coffin. This has no necessary connection with fate, not a bit more than the plunging of Sappho into the sea.

Having escaped from the officers of the law Boleslav re­appears in the fifth act. He is a robber full of life and determination. He tells Jaromir that he is not his own father and this sets feeling and mind in rapid motion. He drives Jaromir to the greatest degree of excitement. Then Boleslav takes to his heels. Is this really a result of fate?

(15) Murder and Fate.

Looking at the case of the murder of the count by his own
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son, Jaromir, we find abundant ground for psychological action. In the first place, Jaromir, having no malice, unwittingly killed him in self-defense. We need not call this a case of fate any more than the shooting of a soldier by the enemy in the dark. Barring out some particular cases of special Providence, the probability is that such death depends on free-will acting in partial ignorance. But here it is fair to consider Jaromir's own words: "Ja, der Wille ist der meine, doch die That ist dem Geschick" (5-350). "Geschick," as here used, may have a special interpretation. It may really mean a conjunction of circumstances that has nothing to do with fate. Jaromir is on the right track when he asks: "Kann die That die Schuld beweisen, muss der Thäter Mörder sein (5-330):" In this case it is safe to assert that the results are not dependent on fate but spring up otherwise.

It may be said that death is decreed by the Almighty in his own peculiar way. In the execution of this plan the forces of nature must be considered. The course of nature is far from being the idea of the fate-tragedy. The fate-tragedy, by a curse depending on the human will, forces the conclusion of life to an earlier date than nature suggests.

Observe the way in which Ehrhard and Necker1 explain "Schicksal:" "Im grossen und ganzen ist 'Schicksal' in der 'Ahnfrau' alles, was ohne Vermittlung des Willens menschliche Handlungen bestimmt oder zu bestimmen scheint." Here we cannot help seeing the inconsistency of the definition. No place is given to the interference of God in the affairs of men. This is a serious mistake. It might as well be said that the beating of the heart is according to the dictum of fate and that fate manages the reflex action of the spinal-cord. Life and death are according to God's plan but that plan embraces freedom.


(A) Grillparzer's Statement.

"Die Ahnfrau sei auch noch jetzt keine Schicksaltragödie, es geschehe alles unabhängig von diesem Gespenst, das nur den Zweck habe, den Helden des Stückes der Spähre der gemeinen

\(^1\)Grillparzer. p. 224.
Wirklichkeit zu entheben und ihn zu einem poetischen Phantasie-
bild zu machen." This is Grillparzer’s remark to Kuh. He shows the relative importance he attaches to the ancestress. In his own mind she is not the greatest character in the play.

(B) *Imagination.*

But it is possible to understand the "Ahnfrau" in different ways. Suppose the characters only imagine that they have relations with the ancestress whom we can consider to be unreal. The count imagines and then the others, in a frightened sort of mood, get his mood, as it were, by contagion. Such situations are often shown. Take a child six or seven years old. He awakens in the night and imagines that he sees bears, robbers and hobgoblins. Other children being with him are more than liable to imagine that they see similar things. People living in a period of great simplicity and of ignorance, might really imagine that they saw ghosts. Not only one might imagine seeing a ghost but many might imagine that they saw it. This, by no means, would prove that ghosts really existed but it would, in a very marked manner, prove that psychological expression, with the persons considered, was very great.

(C) *Symbol.*

According to Grillparzer Jaromir retires for the night (2-1). He is in a room in which he cannot sleep. Ghosts are represented as surrounding him. V. Terlitza² writes: "Aber die innere Gewissenspein, verbunden mit der Furcht vor entdeckung, lässt ihm keine Ruhe." Here the ghosts are considered to be mere symbols.

There were some who thought that they saw a symbol and not a ghost in the ancestress.³ On one occasion Grillparzer said: "Wenn ihr mir sagt, diese Hexen seien der eigene Ehrgeiz des Helden, so antworte ich euch: Tut die Augen auf! Was ihr da seht, das sind Hexen, und nicht Ehrgeiz." We know that, in his childhood, Grillparzer was interested in the subject of
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¹Geschichte des neueren Dramas. R. Prölss. 2. Band. p. 211.
³Grillparzer. H. Sittenberger. p. 79.
ghosts. This was by no means peculiar to him. He specially mentions that he saw a ghost in the form of a "black woman" with a veil. When he wrote the play he may have believed in ghosts. This is not probable. If he did not believe that the ancestress was a ghost, but only a symbol, then it is practically settled that he meant the play to be thoroughly psychological.

Herman Hango\(^2\) has the spirit say:

"Ich bin die Sitte, Hüterin des Rechts,
   Die ew'ge Ahnfrau alles menschlichen Geschlechts."

"Damit ist zugleich gesagt," says J. Minor,\(^3\) "dass er (Grillparzer) der Schicksalssidee eine bloss künstlerische, eine symbolische Bedeutung zuerkennt."

The ancestress being a symbol of an impersonal reality, would, of course, diminish the force of the fate-idea. The play would continue to be respectable as a play. Ambition, or something of the kind, would occupy a place in the "Ahnfrau" similar to remorse in Goethe's "Iphigenie." Such procedure, from the modern point of view, would be fully legitimate.

Should anyone believe the ancestress to be a ghost that belief would not remove the cause exciting to action. Those who believe in ghosts naturally would be influenced more than others not believing in them. At any rate the ancestress would be a spark to kindle interest.

\((D)\) Materialistic Conception.

Ehrhard and Necker\(^4\) take a similar view of the ancestress: "Die in ihrer Einbildungskraft entstandenen Gebilde verdichten sich zum Gespenst der Ahnfrau, das zugleich eine wirkliche und eine symbolische Gestalt ist. They\(^5\) also say: "Im Gespenst materialisierte er nur das furchtbare Jenseits."

It has been suggested that the ancestress had the substance of something more than spirit. The comparison has even been

\(^{1}\)Selbstb. p. 15.
\(^{4}\)F. Grillparzer. p. 224.
\(^{5}\)F. Grillparzer. p. 217.
made to show that she was a sort of being much like Goethe's Mephistopheles. It would be much better to hold to the idea that she is pure imagination or a ghost as that term is usually understood. A ghost is a thing appealing to the senses.

(17) **Spiritualism.**

Whatever one may think of those who call themselves spiritualists it must be admitted that they stand on about the same level as the characters in the "Ahnfrau" who are associated with the ancestress. Admitting that she is a ghost we find that there is actual communication between them. But she appears not only in visible but in tangible form which leads to a marked difference. The ancestress has no human body.

(18) **Motive-force in the Ancestress.**

In the "Ahnfrau" the ancestress is given to meditation during many years and if meditation is a sign of what is needed in a psychological play we certainly have the requirement here. She hesitates and waits and ponders. If her course seems fixed consider this in the light of the explanation just given. The destiny of her posterity depends on God and the way in which she exercises her free-will. Looking, then, at the subject broadly it may just as well be admitted that, if the ancestress were not in the play, there could be no possible chance of any fate controlling any of the other characters.

(19) **The Psychological Element in Action.**

A. Lichtenheld\(^2\) says: "Diese Vernichung, lange vorbereitet und dann Schlag auf Schlag in der kurzen Frist weniger Stunden sich vollziehend, dazu herbeigeführt durch eine Reihe von mehr als staunenswerten Zufällen, ist der Inhalt der Handlung." This changing of events into a new or old system of the fate-play was not Grillparzer's thought. The fact of the matter is that one must give correct order of succession to events in any play.

The same is true in the Nibelungenlied which is an epic

\(^{1}\)F. Grillparzer. Volkelt. p. 156.
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poem and not a tragedy. The prophecy of the mermaids by the
Danube came true, only through a most faithful expression of
fidelity on the part of the Burgundians. In their destruction one
step followed another in very dramatic and loyal fashion much
as though such a state of affairs had to be. But all this does
not prove the necessity of what happened. Much less does it
prove fate.

F. Streinz¹ says that in the fate-plays the real action pre­
cedes the development of the play and that what follows is
merely the disentangling of the knot. It would be wiser to say
that in the progress of the “Ahnfrau,” at least, the knot is drawn
tighter until the final catastrophe. Like a serpent misfortunes
wind about the count, Bertha and Jaromir until they are all cold
in death.

Rapidity of action does not destroy psychological person­
ality in the “Ahnfrau.” Nor does the gloomy appearance of
things in the play. The minds of the characters in the “Ahnfrau”
must do and act quickly much like that of Grillparzer when he
wrote the play. In spite of all the rapidity found in the current
of the play it may be well to keep in mind such language as
that used by Bertha:

“Stille, stille! Hier liegt mein Vater,
Liegt so sanft und regt sich nicht.
Stille! Stille! Stille! Stille (4-444)!”

Silence means time for meditation.

The numerous changes of thought brought about, in various
ways, in the “Ahnfrau,” and that have already been noticed,
furnish a valuable psychological consideration. The rapid
changes set the characters to thought and action. They think
as much in hours as many other persons do in as many months.

In the early Faust-plays twenty-four years are set as a limit
to Faust’s freedom on earth. This limit formed a hinderance to
previous usefulness. It suppressed the action and weakened the
play. In the “Ahnfrau” action is not retarded by such a limita­
tion though fate would make the “Ahnfrau” as bad as the
earlier Faust-plays with the twenty-four years as predetermined
conclusion.

¹Ahnfrau. p. xiii.
It may again be permitted to quote from Laube who sees within the “Ahnfrau” more than helpless puppets. He notices that there is life within the human characters and sees its expression. He says: “Es pocht und treibt darin ein Puls des Wortes, des Dranges, des Lebens, welcher außerordentlich ist.”

(20) How Should the Play Be Named?

Looking into the play one cannot fail to notice the comparative importance of the characters. It is true that the work bears the name of “Ahnfrau.” It may also be granted that, in the matter of giving a name Grillparzer blundered. This seems to have blinded the critics and of course the ancestress, for that reason, held a most prominent place. But why should she be of more importance than Jaromir? Hamerling declares: “Man könnte ganz gut aus dieser ‘Ahnfrau’ die Titelheldin selbst weglassen.” If we emphasize the ancestress we are more likely to lay stress on fate. If, on the other hand, Jaromir is considered to be the leading character, the psychological tendency is emphasized. From the time that Jaromir rushed into the castle until he died from the cold embrace and deadly kiss, he is very prominent. Had Grillparzer called his play “Jaromir” the ancestress would probably have retired to the region of spectres and, in the minds of some, even to the land of dreams. Thus flesh and blood would have held the place they deserve.

(21) Conclusion to the Psychological Treatment.

F. Streinz says that because of the period of “enlightenment” in the eighteenth century, the fate-play was suppressed. The same ought to be true under the reign of Christianity, not from any compulsion but because of the spirit of its teachings.

It is permissible to guess, as do Bartels and others, that, in the nineteenth century, the war with Napoleon and the discouraging circumstances attending it led the people of Germany to listen gladly to the plays that contained what appeared to them to be characters dominated by fate. It is strange, though, that

1Ahnfrau. A. Sauer. p. 131.
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they took so strongly to the idea, while, at other times, with wars and rumors of wars, they did not furnish the same sort of production.

The characters in the "Ahnfrau" are independent enough to act as though they meant to escape misfortune, or what may seem nearer the truth, they acted as though they were unconcerned about fate.

In studying the "Ahnfrau" one must carefully keep in mind the freedom of the will of man with its independent action. He must recognize the fact of human responsibility as an outgrowth of this. He must remember, too, that from responsibility comes merit for well-doing and guilt for bad conduct. In some cases it ought to be granted that there are special manifestations of a wise Providence.

As religion, in the Nibelungenlied, is only an external affair, so what may appear to be fate, in the "Ahnfrau," is a superficial matter. No fate is found, but the life of the play has its source in the depth of human feeling.

It is indeed strange that so many literary critics have said that the "Ahnfrau" is a fate-play. They look too much at the external features and upon these they base their conclusions. Instead of so doing they ought to go down into the depth of the real substance of the play and see the human soul at work.
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