

valeurs intertextuelles en assurant au texte-cible un ancrage culturel ou scriptural qui n'existait pas au départ. C'est ce qu'a fait, pour ne prendre qu'un exemple ponctuel, C.K. Scott-Moncrieff, le premier traducteur de Proust, qui, en rendant le titre *À la Recherche du temps perdu* par *Remembrance of Things Past*, a greffé sur un segment intertextuellement innocent des résonances shakespeariennes.³¹ Nous touchons ici, ponctuellement, à l'un des cas-limites où la traduction, en créant des valeurs qui n'existaient pas dans le texte-source — ne serait-ce que sous la pression d'un système culturel 'grevé' par la production shakespearienne — bascule vers une autre modalité de métatextualisation.

Ce phénomène, qui ne se manifeste que ponctuellement dans les titres de C.K. Scott-Moncrieff, se généralise avec les *Initiations* de Robert Lowell, fondées tout entières sur une substitution de références culturelles. Créés en anglais, mais en même temps ancrés dans des 'topoésies' en russe, en italien, en espagnol, en allemand, en français, ces poèmes se présentent comme des métatextualisations au deuxième degré, des acculturations. De tel poème de Quevedo, Lowell retient l'aridité du paysage espagnol, qu'il restitue sous forme du paysage pierreux de la Nouvelle Angleterre. De tel autre poème de Rimbaud, la thématique lancinante de l'enfant abandonné ressurgit dans un cadre américain. Ce qui est réactualisé dans les poèmes parallèles de Lowell, ce sont des connotés à ce point ancrés dans l'affectivité qu'on dirait de l'ineffable — si justement un Quevedo, un Rimbaud, un Lowell n'avaient trouvé le moyen de les parler.

Nous voilà revenus au point d'où nous sommes partis, avec ces traductions qui, pour restituer la charge affective et esthétique du texte-source, se font poésie à partir de la poésie, métatextes à la puissance deux.

Université d'Ottawa

31 Comme l'a fait remarquer P.B. Gobin ('Les Traductions de Proust en langue anglaise', *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* vii, 2 (Spring/printemps 1980) 157-8), il y a une disconvenance assez nette entre la démarche du sonnet shakespearien et celle de Proust. Il n'empêche que, dans le système métatextuel, les connotations dont est auréolé le prototexte sont le plus souvent fort imprécises, relevant bien plus d'un savoir diffus et superficiel que d'une lecture serrée du texte. C'est ce qui fait que, comme l'a remarqué C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni, le point de départ du jeu métatextuel est le plus souvent le type d'artefact culturel que l'on retrouve dans les pages roses du Petit Larousse.

E. HEIER

Schiller's *Die Räuber* in the Light of Tolstoj's Concept of Art

In his study entitled 'Schiller, the Inspirer of Russian Writers,' the academician Jurij Veselovskij, one of the foremost comparatists, stated in 1906 that Schiller meant much more to Russian society than to either the French or the English, and that there is no reason to assume that the fascination with Schiller will ever diminish. He concluded: 'For us he will remain the poet of inspiration, whose noble verse ... resounds like the bell from the towers of ancient Russia which summoned the people in days of joy and festivities and in days of grief and misfortune.'¹

The manner in which Veselovskij characterizes Schiller's reception in nineteenth-century Russia was subsequently substantiated with numerous studies by both Russian and Western scholars.² The enormity of Schiller's impact can only be fully appreciated if we keep in mind the prevailing discorded intellectual and social conditions of Imperial Russia. Throughout the nineteenth century, Schiller's 'Freiheitsdramen' received the greatest attention, as they always did whenever there was depression and oppression. Through his *Storm and Stress* plays, *Die Räuber*, *Kabale und Liebe* and *Don Carlos*, Russia's academic

1 J. Veselovskij, 'Šiller kak vodoznovitel' russkix pisatelej', *Russkaja mysl'* 2 (1906) 15. All translations from the Russian are mine.

2 Here is only a selection: Otto Peter Peterson, *Schiller in Rußland: 1785-1805* (New York: Bruderhausen 1934); Otto Peter Peterson, *Schiller und die russischen Dichter und Denker des 19. Jahrhunderts: 1805-1881* (New York: Ebd. 1939); C.E. Passage, 'The Influence of Schiller in Russia, 1800-1840,' *The American Slavic and East European Review* 5 (1946) 111-37; Rudolf Fischer, *Schillers Widerhall in der russischen Literatur* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1958); Roman Samarin, 'Schiller im Urteil der russischen Kritik,' *Weimarer Beiträge* 1 (1956) 18-31; Dmitrij Tschizewskij, 'Schiller in Rußland,' *Ruperto Carola* 27 (1960) 111-20; Edmund K. Kostka, *Schiller in Russian Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 1965); Hans-Bernard Harder, *Schiller in Rußland: Materialien zu einer Wirkungs-geschichte 1780-1814* (Bad Homburg: Verlag Gehlen 1969). Compare also: R. J. Danilevskij, 'Šiller i stanovlenie russkogo romantizma,' *Rannije romantičeskie vzgljadny* (Leningrad: 1972) 3-95.

youth perceived Schiller as a champion of human and social reforms. He became the spokesman of Russia's intelligentsia, who demanded not only the abolition of serfdom, but also dreamed of the establishment of an ideal Schillerian state, full of freedom and dignity.

Indeed, the veneration of Schiller in Russia was such that it can only be compared to Shakespeare's reception in Germany. In Russia, too, one spoke of 'our Schiller' and of a 'Russian Schiller.' And although no honorary citizenship was bestowed upon him, as the French had done after the Revolution of 1789, he remained the idol of nineteenth-century Russian intellectuals and received a degree of adulation which was never accorded to Goethe. Goethe was too classical, too restrained for the Russian spirit, which was totally attuned toward a radical change, if not revolution by violent means. Thus, it is not surprising that the enthusiasm for Schiller must ultimately rest on *Die Räuber*, generally considered the first revolutionary drama of German literature. Indeed, if one isolates Karl's famous monologues, in which he denounces with burning eloquence the defects of state and ruler, the church and moral order, then the play could be interpreted as a dramatic statement of a revolutionary. And although the 'das plumpe Motiv' 'in Tyrannos,' as H. Koopmann calls it, may express the spirit of the play and has contributed to a socio-political interpretation, the motto was not of Schillerian origin – it was attached to the second edition by the publisher.⁴ Schiller disdained it, as he did his honorary citizenship.

But whatever the origin of the various interpretations of *Die Räuber*, whether the play is viewed as a *Familiendrama*, or perceived from a religious-pietistic, from a socio-political, or from a purely Marxist point of view, it bears testimony that the play can be read on different levels and that, in the final analysis, the reader is free to resort to his own subjective interpretation and sensitivity. Indeed, the reader should have

3 Helmut Koopmann, *Friedrich Schiller, 1759-1794* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlerische Verlagbuchhandlung 1966) 10: 'the clumsy motto.'

4 For the various interpretations of Schiller's *Die Räuber* see: H. Koopmann, *Friedrich Schiller, 1, 4-19*, and H. Koopmann, *Schiller-Forschung 1970-1980: Ein Bericht* (Marbach: Deutsche Schillergesellschaft 1982) 54-66. The degree to which Schiller is still revered in the Soviet Union can be seen from the new translations of his works. Next to the voluminous edition of Schiller's work edited by N.N. Bil'mont and R.M. Samarin in 1955, there appeared four different translations of *Die Räuber* between 1950 and 1975.

the same full freedom of interpretation as the author had in the creation of his work of art. But what if the author is unwilling to leave his art to a free interpretation, as he is determined to convey a particular message, or have his work perceived in a specific spirit? Such was the case with Schiller's *Die Räuber*, which was prefixed by a four-page long commentary. Here Schiller clearly sets forth that his concern is with the innermost workings of the human soul, with characters in a crisis caused by extreme egotism and idealism, and the inability to reconcile their demands with their conscience. It is the imposition of the moral ideal, on the one hand, and complete moral dissipation, on the other, which become the driving force of the play. In the preface, Schiller clearly spells out the demands he placed upon the dramatist and in doing so he reveals also the manner of his own intention: 'Wer sich den Zweck vorgezeichnet hat, das Laster zu stürzen, und Religion, Moral und bürgerliche Gesetze an ihren Feinden zu rächen, ein solcher muß das Laster in seiner nackten Abscheulichkeit enthüllen und in seiner kolossalischen Größe vor das Auge der Menschen stellen. ...'⁵

Schiller expresses the hope that with his tragedy he has rendered no inconsiderable service to the cause of religion and morality and that he may justly claim for it a place among books of morality, for crime was met at last with the punishment it deserved and the lost one entered again the realm of the law, and virtue was triumphant. If this preface were taken into consideration more frequently, perhaps one would encounter a lesser variety of interpretations. But too frequently it is not, and often the play is printed without this preface. True, Schiller himself omitted the preface from later editions, but initially it was meant to be an integral part of the play.

What is forever puzzling and even paradoxical is the diametrically opposed opinion directed toward a work of art, like *Die Räuber*, by the giants in literature. While the patriarch from Weimar dismissed it as a youthful outburst, the oracle from Jasnaja Poljana was forever an admirer of the play. Imbued with the classical spirit of harmony and restraint, Goethe, naturally, viewed *Die Räuber* as 'Productionen genialer jugendlicher Ungeduld und Unwillen über einen schweren Erziehungs-

5 *Schillers Werke: Nationalausgabe* III (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger 1955) 5: 'Whoever proposes to discourage vice and to vindicate religion, morality, and social order against their enemies, must unveil crime in all its deformity and place it before the eyes of men in its colossal magnitude.' All translations from the German are mine.

druck,⁶ Yet, the seeming artistic weaknesses and discrepancies in the play, the exaggerated characters and implausible situations in which they find themselves, the naturalistic coarse rhetoric, which corresponds to the brutal violence of action, full of horror and atrocities – all this brutality and bestiality was not in the least offensive to Tolstoj, the pacifist and propagator of non-resistance to violence. On the contrary, like Schiller before him, Tolstoj at the height of his moralizing period, violates in his art the principle of pacifism and depicts extreme violence, only to have it serve both an aesthetic and a moral end. Even a fleeting juxtaposition of the central themes of their works reveals the striking resemblance of their objectives and concerns – to cure the ills of society through aesthetic and moral education. It is precisely the proximity of their thoughts and concepts, the Schillerian ideal of harmony among men and the Tolstojan sense of brotherhood, which caused Tolstoj to postulate *Die Räuber* not merely as the highest form of art, but as the highest form of religious art.⁷

It is true that after his conversion, beginning with the publication of his famous *Confession* (1882), not everyone accepted Tolstoj's criterion of artistic values. In consequence of the religious ethical essence, which he believed was indispensable for true literature, Tolstoj's analyses and conclusions regarding certain literary works had become highly controversial. His aesthetic judgement is, of course, bizarre when he condemns universally accepted masterpieces as bad art, including his own *War and Peace*. Goethe's *Faust* II was relegated to the realm of trifles, and in Shakespeare's plays he found no ethical tendency, only an exaltation of kings and princes, and English ones at that.⁸ As to the rejection of his own novels, it was never taken seriously. He could easily afford such a denial, especially since he continued to remain a prolific

Schiller's *Die Räuber* in the Light of Tolstoj's Concept of Art / 589

ic, supreme literary master, even after the 1880s. He merely added now, to his otherwise purely aesthetic art, a strong dose of ethics and morality.

Considering the fact that Tolstoj selected *Die Räuber* from among world literature as the work which best expressed his concept of art, he left us but a few meagre entries in his writings regarding both the play and its author. Most commentaries deal only with the impact, i.e. *Wirkungsgeschichte*, and the enthusiasm with which he read the play on various occasions. Through his own admission, we know that he read all of Schiller's dramas and that he disliked only *Wallenstein*. But *Die Räuber* was singled out as the drama which made the most profound impression upon him during his youth.⁹ On November 1, 1853, he entered in his diary: 'I was reading the biography of Schiller written by his sister-in-law. One notices the superficial view of a sentimental lady about a great human being... Too many domestic details have overshadowed the esteem he deserves.'¹⁰ The biography in question is Schiller's *Leben. Verfaßt aus Erinnerungen der Familie, seinen eigenen Briefen und den Nachrichten seines Freundes Körner* (1830) by Karoline von Wolzogen, which appeared serially in Russian in 1853. A year later, in the fall of 1854, Tolstoj complained that he was not doing what he should and entered in his diary: 'Instead of reading *Die Räuber*, I could have written something myself.'¹¹

A renewed interest in Schiller began with Tolstoj's preoccupation with aesthetics, which resulted in a number of articles over some fifteen years, and culminated in 1898 in his famous, albeit controversial treatise *What is Art?*¹² Although Schiller's writings on aesthetics were available to him in his own library, both in Russian and German, Tolstoj never made any direct reference to them. He was, however, rereading Schiller's dramas beginning with *Don Carlos*, in February 1890.¹³ On February 16, 1898, Sophia Andreevna, his wife, entered in her diary: 'Lev Nikolaevič read in the evening Schiller's *Die Räuber* and was delighted with them.'¹⁴ This is further substantiated by V. F. Lazurskij,

6 Compare Koopman, *Friedrich Schiller*, I, 15; 'a product of ingenious youthful impatience, and as an indignation against a difficult and intense upbringing.'
7 In the numerous studies dealing with Schiller in Russia, Tolstoj is hardly linked with Schiller. The reason is simply the fact that other writers like Žukovskij, Lermontov, Gercen, I. Turgenev, Gončarov and Dostoevskij, to mention only a few, provided much more substantial material for scholars, either through translation of his works or through prolonged commentaries thereof, while Tolstoj was content with only a few entries in his diaries and his theoretical writings, albeit they were of utmost importance.

8 L. N. Tolstoj, *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij*, 90 vols. (Moskva: 1928-58) xxx, 349, 378-9. D. M. Makovičskij, 'Jasnopoljanskije zapiski', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 90 (Moskva: 1970) I, 134

9 P. I. Biriukov, *Biografija L'va Nikolaeviča Tolstogo* I (Petrograd: 1923) 60; Tolstoj, xxxv, 558

10 Tolstoj, XLVI, 186, 439-40

11 Tolstoj, XLVII, 22

12 For details and publication of these works see Tolstoj, xxx.

13 S. A. Tolstaia, *Dnevnik*, 2 vols. (Moskva: 1978) I, 151, 154, 551, 558

14 Tolstaia, I, 356

a tutor to Tolstoj's children, when he recorded in his memoirs of 1895 that Tolstoj treasured also *Maria Stuart* and *Die Jungfrau von Orléans*, but above all he preferred *Die Räuber*, about which he said: 'And although everything is somewhat exaggerated it will remain for eternity — Karl Moor and Franz Moor.'¹⁵

In rereading the world classics for the purpose of selecting some works which would correspond to what he considered true art, Tolstoj could point to only a few writers. When it was implied to him that to undertake such a task is like 'emptying the sea with a spoon,' he could only reply: 'But there is not much to empty.'¹⁶ Nonetheless, Tolstoj initially considered several of Schiller's dramas as representative of good art.¹⁷ But in the final version of *What is Art?*, Tolstoj had only chosen *Die Räuber*, which headed the list of other acceptable examples like V. Hugo's *Les Misérables*, Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*, Dostoevskij's *Memoires from the Dead House*, George Eliot's *Adam Bede* and Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. These are the factual data of Tolstoj's preoccupation with Schiller, which tell us very little as to why he had reserved such an exclusive place for *Die Räuber* in world literature. The full answer can only be deduced from his aesthetic and ethical precepts, an indication of which can be derived already from the above selected works as they all reflect a deeply rooted edifying and moral sense.

However, in 1905, the centenary of Schiller's death, Tolstoj was directly confronted with the question: What influence did Schiller have upon him? This question was posed by the *Berliner Tageblatt* and the Vienna newspaper *Die Zeit*, both of which had planned a special commemorative issue. Although Tolstoj had started to refresh his impression of the author of *Die Räuber* by reading in Schiller's *Sämtliche Werke* (1840), the posed question was never answered. Ill health prevented him from doing so. He wished, however, that he could dispatch a telegram saying simply: 'Schiller is alive, he has not died.'¹⁸ Like Schiller, Tolstoj conceived himself as an educator of mankind and, like him, he felt that art should serve in the establishment of the ideals of humanity. Having embraced the Sermon on the Mount as

the formulation of his moral code, Tolstoj was forever guided by the precepts which would replace discord and violence with free accord, truth and brotherly love. Thus, it was only natural that he should allocate to art an important function in the moral and spiritual regeneration of mankind. In his long and earnest search for clarity and the relationship between aesthetics and ethics, Tolstoj came to the conclusion that in a talented artist there is always complete harmony between aesthetics and ethics. In fact, he maintained in 1896 that 'aesthetics is an expression of ethics ... i.e., art expresses those feelings which were experienced by the artist. If his feelings are noble and good, then his art will be noble and good and vice-versa. If the artist is a moral person, then his art will be moral...'¹⁹

When Tolstoj finally pronounced his aesthetic theory in a systematic manner in the treatise *What is Art?*, he surprised his contemporaries, for it was a formulation without the traditional concept of beauty. In the first part of his treatise he reviewed the various aesthetic theories up to his own time and discovered no less than seventy different definitions of beauty — this diversity in itself was already proof to him that beauty in itself cannot be the essence of art.²⁰ If it is with regard to the idea of beauty, which is the determining element in Schiller's concept of art, that Tolstoj necessarily had to dissociate himself from the aesthetics of the past. He neither attempted to define the elements of beauty nor did he believe in an objective principle of beauty. As far as the formal elements were concerned, Tolstoj demanded from the artist brevity, originality, exactness, clarity and simplicity; excellence of form was a prerequisite for all the arts.

Although Tolstoj did not find an ally among the traditional aestheticians, he praised Schiller's efforts and singled him out along with Jean Paul and Lessing, as possessing that rare combination of being at once critic, theoretician and creator, who was able to fully translate his theories into living works of art. Needless to say, Tolstoj considered himself one of those endowed with that rare combination²¹ and legitimately entitled to deal with aesthetics.

19 K. Lomunov, *Estetika L'va Tolstogo* (Moskva: 1972) 122; Tolstoj, LXXX, 119

20 Tolstoj, xxx, 41-61. In preparing his treatise, especially in the part dealing with the survey of various aesthetic views, Tolstoj relied heavily on Max Schasler, *Kritische Geschichte der Aesthetik* (1872), Eugène Véron, *L'Esthétique* (1878), W. A. Knight, *Philosophy of the Beautiful* (1886), John Todhunter, *Theory of the Beautiful* (1872), R. Kraik, *Weltschönheit: Versuch einer allgemeinen Aesthetik* (1880), and Hippolyte Taine, *Philosophie de l'art* (1865).

21 Lomunov, 11

15 'Dnevnik V. F. Lazurskogo,' *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 37-38 (Moskva: 1939) 487

16 Ibid., 459

17 Tolstoj, xxx, 413-14, 548

18 Makovičskij, 235, 249-50, 510. For Tolstoj's library holdings see: *Biblioteka L'va Nikolaeviča Tolstogo v jasnoj Poljane* (Moskva: 1972).

Unable to find accord with existing concepts of art, Tolstoj provided his own definition which was complete and categorical. Although some of his ideas echoed the past, like that of 'infectiousness,' Tolstoj made it the corner-stone of his concept of art. According to Tolstoj, art is a human activity which consists in that the artist transmits feelings which he, the artist, has experienced. This has to be done by accepted means, through colour, lines, movement, sound and word, in such a manner that it infects others with identical feelings. Everything else which does not infect with a specific feeling is not genuine art, for it was mechanically produced, albeit skillfully, without the original experience, the source of inspiration.²²

Art is thus a communication of feelings, which may be either morally good or morally bad.²³ Tolstoj's gradation of art is based on the degree and the kind of feelings evoked by the subject of art. In the realm of good art, which is infused with a morally uplifting spirit, Tolstoj permits the depiction of two kinds of feelings, and accordingly he postulates two kinds of art. One category is art which transmits simple feelings, joy and pity, humour and tranquility, feelings associated with daily life. The other category is religious art, the highest form of art — 'art transmitting feelings flowing from a religious perception of our kinship with God and of the brotherhood of man.'²⁴

After repeated emphasis on the depiction of feelings, which brings about a union of people through their common aesthetic experience, Tolstoj in his final formulation added a new dimension as to the subject matter suitable for the highest form of religious art, and thereby provides greater accommodation for Schiller's drama. This statement, which is too frequently disregarded, permits now not only the depiction of 'positive feelings of love of God and one's neighbour,' but also 'negative feelings of indignation and horror at violation of love, which manifests itself chiefly in the form of words....' Immediately following this pronouncement, Tolstoj states: 'If I were asked to provide examples of the highest form of religious art ... in literature, I would have to name Schiller's *Die Räuber*.'²⁵

In essence then, Tolstoj defines good literary art as a form of communication, as an expression of feeling experienced by the author; the

experience must be unique, original and sincere, and should arouse the same feeling in the reading public. The ultimate aim must be an expression of feeling, a feeling of universal quality which leads to the fraternal union of all men. Thus, the work of art should be accessible to everyone, touch all people of all nations and classes. The aesthetic ideal, advanced by Tolstoj, which was to replace the old concept of beauty, is in reality identical with his moral ideal. Aware, however, of the difficulties of achieving this ideal, he insisted that art nonetheless should depict the ideal, it should be there like a lantern, always ahead of us, showing us the way.

In perusing Tolstoj's later works, i.e., those after his conversion, one will discover that even before the final formulation of his concept of art, he produced stories and dramas which were totally in harmony with his newly found ideals.²⁶ These works, most of which are based on Tolstoj's own experience, depict profound psychological torment and despair, brutality and violence and the ensuing process of purification and conversion.

Only *Hadji Murat* (1912), Tolstoj's last masterpiece, is different; here there is no conversion, and none of the Tolstojan precepts are extolled. Tolstoj depicts here in a colourful fashion hatred and vengeance, savagery and killing, as if evil was man's most powerful attribute. In dethroning man as never before and in denouncing church and state and modern civilization as corrupt and hypocritical, *Hadji Murat* comes to bear a striking resemblance to *Die Räuber*.

The portrayal of 'the violation of love,' to arouse a feeling of indignation and horror at man's behaviour, was the aim of the story. Tolstoj overtly expounds no moralizing view and depicts only violence, deceit and butchery, and people who, like hunters, inflict deadly blows upon those who merely desire to live and be free. The sadism reaches its climax when: 'Hadji Aga [once a friend of Hadji Murat] stepped on the back of the corpse [Hadji Murat's], cut the head off with two blows and carefully rolled it away with his foot, so as not to soil his boots with blood.'²⁷ The tragedy of this act lies not so much in cutting off the head, as in the phrase 'and carefully rolled it away with his foot, so as not to soil his boots with blood.' This is equal only

²² Tolstoj, xxx, 149

²³ Tolstoj, xxx, 64-8

²⁴ Tolstoj, xxx, 159

²⁵ Tolstoj, xxx, 159-60

²⁶ Compare: *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* (1886), *The Power of Darkness* (1886), *The Devil* (1889), *The Kreutzer Sonata* (1889), *Father Sergei* (1898), *Resurrection* (1899), and *Master and Man* (1895).

²⁷ Tolstoj, xxv, 117

to the romantic barbarism of Schiller's robbers, who relate their atrocities with a callous enjoyment and sadistic humour, as when an infant is thrown alive into the blazing flames with the words: 'Armes Thiergen! sag' ich, du verrierst ja hier, und warst in die Flamme.'²⁸

It is that tragic finality, the glaring baseness which looms over the work of Tolstoj and Schiller, which makes it possible for these stories to serve, simultaneously, a specific aesthetic and ethical purpose. The underlying idea is precisely to arouse a feeling of indignation at man's behaviour. In this sense, their work is akin to the feeling of horror evoked by Picasso's *Guernica*. Only in this spirit could Tolstoj conceive *Die Räuber* and elevate it to the acme of good religious art.

Like Schiller, Tolstoj considered the drama the highest literary form and the most suitable manifestation of art through which the aesthetic experience could serve the advancement of humanity. The dramatist should be more than just an entertainer; he should be a teacher of life. In his essay 'About Shakespeare and the Drama' (1906), which reveals striking parallels to Schiller's 'Die Schaubühne als moralische Anstalt betrachtet' (1784), Tolstoj reinforces his criterion of good dramatic literature and demands from the dramatist verisimilitude of action and language, originality and sincerity, infectiousness and the presentation of an important and moving theme. In applying his own theory of art to Shakespeare's dramas, Tolstoj provides us with an additional measure in determining, albeit indirectly, his preference for *Die Räuber*.

Although Tolstoj insists on the religious essence as an indispensable element of dramatic literature, he did not advocate morality plays. Aware, however, that with his insistence on the religious content of the drama he would be accused of demanding 'religious teaching, didacticism, and tendentiousness,' all of which are incompatible with true art, Tolstoj anticipates his critics by stating: 'By religious content in art ... I do not mean the direct teaching of some religious truth in an artistic guise and not an allegorical depiction of those truths, but an expression of a specific outlook on life ... corresponding to the highest religious understanding, an outlook which was the impelling force to create the drama and which permeates the entire work without the author being aware of it.'²⁹ The permeation of that specific and important outlook on life – a plea for the restoration of humanity without preaching it – this Tolstoj perceived most vividly in Schiller's drama.

By including Schiller's dramas in the repertoire for the theatre of the people, Tolstoj implied their educational quality.³⁰ It is of course not surprising that, when Tolstoj was asked in his later years which drama in world literature he considered most important, Tolstoj answered: '*Die Räuber* by Schiller,' and added: 'The theatre needs that which is simple and powerful without any frills.'³¹

In characterizing *Die Räuber* thus, Tolstoj once again affirms that the play is a composite of all the elements of good art. Already the fact that Tolstoj considered Schiller a great human being presupposes that he would create only true dramatic literature, which in the opinion of the Russian writer is totally imbued with the religious essence. We may recall here Tolstoj's dictum that, if the artist's feelings are noble and good, then his art will be noble and good.³² As to the sincerity of the feelings experienced by the author, we only need to recall Goethe, who viewed *Die Räuber* as the product of Schiller's indignation against 'einen schweren Erziehungsdruck.' In his biographical account in the *Rheinische Thalia* (1784), Schiller tells us how he had to spend eight years, against his will, in the military school where his plans and love for poetry were thwarted by the spirit of absolutism. In doing so, he also reveals the creative impulses, the adverse reaction to those unpleasant memories which made the drama an expression of a sensitive and intense personality, of an abused youth and the outcry of an angry spirit which is longing for justice.³²

While these personal indignations and pent-up resentments against the forces which threatened Schiller's talent and freedom were the initial impulses to create *Die Räuber*, the final version of the drama culminated in an expression against the evil and corruption of society, a society permeated with irreligion, where basic human values were no longer upheld. What had started out as a *Familiendrama*, which was to depict the consequences of the disintegration of the family order through intrigues and the loss of moral guidance, surged up into a universal hatred and denial of public institutions, state, church and even humanity itself. It is this rebelliousness of Karl Moor against the morality of the social order, unwarranted and unmotivated as it may

³⁰ Lomunov, 320-2

³¹ V.E. Vatsuro et al., eds., *L.N. Tolstoj v vospominanijax sovremennikov* II (Moskva: 1978) 92

³² Compare the introduction (by the editor) to *Die Räuber* in *Schillers Werke* III, vii-ix.

²⁸ *Schillers Werke* III, 64

²⁹ Tolstoj, xxxv, 267

be within the play, that aroused Tolstoj's feelings, since it corresponded totally to his own indignation over the corrupting influence of an irreligious society. What may appear exaggerated in 'Karl Moor's declaration,' to use Tolstoj's expression, was for the Russian writer the reality of the day. The similarity becomes obvious if one recalls how Tolstoj waged war against political and religious repression by the state, the deception by the church, and the abuses of the judicial and administrative systems.

True, in this sense Tolstoj conceived *Die Räuber* as the radical revolutionaries did; however, with a major difference. Tolstoj relentlessly demanded a change in society, but only through religious striving, through a moral and spiritual regeneration. Like Schiller, Tolstoj believed firmly that morality cannot be imposed, least of all by force, and that it must come from within, through re-education in how to be a human being again. The fact that Karl Moor surrenders to the authorities does not imply the acceptance of the prevailing moral order. His rebelliousness, however, and his ill-fated attempt to impose an ideal, is both an arrogant usurpation of divine rights, and at the same time an indication of the necessity of propagating a new moral ideal of justice.³³ Schiller does not yet speak of the ennoblement of men through an aesthetic education, but there are more than glimpses of his later ideas. Throughout the play we are constantly reminded that the idealist, Karl, embarked on the path of a robber only because of his disillusionment and feeling of betrayal by the very protector and guardian of the ideal of harmony and justice. This is constantly reinforced through the atrocities of the robbers, in contrast to the depiction of Karl's noble character and humanity, and the harmonious existence in his childhood. In moments of despair he is forever longing for that peace and harmony and exclaims: 'O, ihr Tage des Friedens, / 'O all ihr Elysiumsszenen meiner Kindheit!'³⁴ It is this naive, innocent, idyllic existence, where the moral and sensual are in full harmony, that foreshadows an ideal and ultimate goal of man, a higher moral order. In the interim, however, in the absence of that ideal moral order, and so as to avoid the inevitable disaster to which one is doomed without any guidance, Schiller's play becomes ultimately a plea for trust

33 F. W. Kaufmann, *Schiller: Poet of Philosophical Idealism* (Oberlin, OH: Academy Press 1942) 31

34 *Schillers Werke* III, 80; 'Oh, those days of peace, / 'Oh, all those heavenly days of my childhood!'

in man's individual sense of right and wrong. In appealing to the dictates of conscience, as a morally guiding force, inherent in all man, even in a criminal like Franz, Schiller approaches Kant's Categorical Imperative. The frequent references to 'Gott und Gewissen,' to the 'innerer Tribunal'³⁵ and the final victory of the dictates of the moral conscience, as embodied in Franz's suicide and Karl's voluntary resignation, bear testimony to this. Like Schiller, Tolstoj believed that man is neither totally bad nor totally good and this is the redeeming factor in their concept of man. Tolstoj embraced Kant's Categorical Imperative and, like Schiller, he appealed to the conscience as a 'moral regulator' of man's behaviour.

Karl Moor, the central figure of Schiller's drama, who renders reality to all other characters, is for Tolstoj an everlasting reminder of the tragic aspect of life and an advocate of the restoration of moral justice. Whether rightly or wrongly, Tolstoj considered Schiller's *Die Räuber*, and especially the ideas incorporated in Karl's monologues, not only as an expression of the feeling and experience of its author, but a universal expression of the time. Tolstoj maintained in his pedagogical writings that J. J. Rousseau was able to exert an enormous influence on his century, because in reacting against formalism and artificiality he expressed the spirit and feelings of his fellow contemporaries. Himself an ardent disciple of Rousseau, Tolstoj asserts further: '... and if only Rousseau alone had felt this — there would have been no romantic movement in literature, there would have been no universal conceptions to regenerate mankind, the declarations of rights of the type of Karl Moor.'³⁶

And just like Rousseau, Karl Moor became the voice of mankind at a crucial moment as he expressed feelings about man and society which were in full harmony with his creator, and no less so with his Russian admirer. That Schiller aimed at an emotionally effective presentation, or what Tolstoj would call infectiousness, and that he was extremely successful in transmitting those feelings in his first dramatic venture, is recorded in the frequently cited report of an eyewitness who attended the play's first production in Mannheim: 'Das Theater glich einem Irrenhause, rollende Augen, geballte Fäuste, stampfende Füße, heisere Aufschreie im Zuschauerraum! Fremde Menschen fielen einander

35 *Schillers Werke* III, 92-3, 122; 'God and conscience,' 'the inner tribunal or judgement'

36 Tolstoj, VIII, 329

schluchzend in die Arme, Frauen wankten, einer Ohnmacht nahe, zur Thüre. Es war eine allgemeine Auflösung wie im Chaos, aus dessen Nebeln eine neue Schöpfung hervorbricht.³⁷

If this is a true account of the reaction to *Die Räuber*, and there is no reason not to accept it as such, then this report is of utmost significance, as it establishes the element of infectiousness in the play, which in turn aroused the audience, but which ultimately has its origin in the author. We have no evidence of whether Tolstoj was aware of this report or not. Had he been, he would have discovered in it a confirmation of the validity of one of his primary premises, namely that true art must transmit and arouse genuine feelings previously experienced by its creator. 'The greater the infectiousness, the better the art, as art, irrespective of the merits of its content,³⁸ i.e., the greater the aesthetic experience, the more art fulfils its task and unifies people through that common aesthetic experience.

That this emotionally charged reaction, full of extremities ranging from despair and indignation to the point where strangers were falling into each other's arms, turned out to be an aesthetic experience of the Tolstojan variety, which could have originated only from the highest form of 'religious' art, i.e., art imbued with the idea of brotherhood, needs no further elaboration.

In setting out consciously to offend virtue and morality, dehumanize his heroes and bring them to the abyss of despair only to have them regain their humanity through the voice of their conscience, Schiller in fact demonstrates in practice what becomes later a theoretical presentation in his *Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*. No wonder, the wise man from Jasnaja Poljana selected the drama as a practical illustration of what he considered good religious art. He preferred *Die Räuber* over all other plays of Schiller, because it was not the product of thinking, it was an emotional release, a spontaneous outpouring of feelings full of natural vitality at times primitive, impulsive savagery, qualities with which Tolstoj loved to endow the natural man in his own fiction. Above all, he admired Karl Moor, his strength and vitality, the

tenacity and idealism of his action, misguided as it may have been. These aspects, coupled with the fiery, explosive and emotional language,³⁹ were most appealing to the irrational Tolstoj. However, Tolstoj, the pacifist and rationalist, who forever kept vigilance over that other side, the author of *The Kingdom of Heaven Is Within Us*, who could have used Karl Moor's declaration, 'Ich bin mein Himmel und meine Hölle,'⁴⁰ as the motto of his own inner torment and conflict, also discovered in *Die Räuber* a dual confirmation of his concept of art.

It is precisely for this reason, the depiction of violence which culminated in the mercy-killing of Amalia and to call forth 'negative feelings of indignation and horror at man's behaviour, the violation of love,' on the one hand, and on the other, the victory of the voice of conscience, the 'positive feelings of love of God and one's neighbour,'⁴¹ that Tolstoj became fascinated with Schiller's play. In the free moral act of resignation by Karl, Tolstoj saw the triumph of his highest aspiration – the triumph of love for God and for our fellow man. (God was conceived by Tolstoj as spirit, as love, as the moral law inside us, and the man called Jesus was but the incarnation of moral behaviour.) The entire play, and especially the fall and rise of Karl Moor, is but the same theme of Tolstoj's own work after his conversion. It is in the eyes of Tolstoj, as it is for Schiller, a vindication of religion and morality.⁴²

However meagre the direct evidence offered by Tolstoj regarding the artistic merits of *Die Räuber*, we know that he read Schiller's work several times throughout his life with an ever increasing enthusiasm; he attached timelessness and universality to the play and called it direct and powerful. Karl Moor, the embodiment of the Schillerian idealism, who evoked both pity and love, was, in spite of some exaggeration, created for posterity. However, the ultimate evidence of admiration of the play was expressed when it was presented as exemplary of the highest form of art, and that by no lesser an artist than Tolstoj. Moreover, Tolstoj came to this conclusion not as a result of a casual mood or superficial attitude, but through an intense sifting and repeated effort over many years, to find in world literature that work of art which harmonized with his own aesthetic concepts.

University of Waterloo

³⁷ See Koopmann, *Friedrich Schiller*, I, 14. 'The theater was like a madhouse, rolling eyes, clenched fists, stamping feet, hoarse outcries from the audience. Strangers fell sobbing into one another's arms; women staggered to the door, nearly fainting. There was a general confusion like a chaos, out of whose mists a new creation was about to break forth.'

³⁸ Tolstoj, xxx, 147

³⁹ L. N. Tolstoj *v vospomaniiax sovremennikov*, 143

⁴⁰ Schillers Werke III, 110; 'I am my own heaven and my own hell'

⁴¹ Tolstoj, xxx, 159-60

⁴² Schillers Werke III, 6-8