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Abstract

Sisters in Sublime Sanctity:
Schiller’s Jungfrau, Euripides’s Iphigenia Plays, and Joan of Arc on the Stage

by

John Pendergast

Adviser: Professor Paul Oppenheimer

At the dawn of the nineteenth century, Friedrich Schiller reinvented the image of Joan of Arc in his play, Die Jungfrau von Orleans, with consequences that affected theatrical representations of Joan for the rest of that century and well into the twentieth. Regarding representations of Joan of Arc to be found in Shakespeare or Voltaire as unworthy of her nobility, Schiller set out to create a more powerful character who suffers at the hands of fate but changes history by sheer force of will. He took as his allegorical model the characterization of Iphigenia made famous by Euripides in Iphigenia among the Taurians and Iphigenia in Aulis, in which the ancient Greek tragedian transformed his heroine from a pitiable victim of fate into a fearsome priestess with the power to reverse a familial curse and unite a nation at war. Schiller was equally bold with the historical facts of Joan of Arc’s life. Inspired by Euripides, he introduced romance, paternal betrayal, and a rescue almost worthy of a deus ex machina. In Schiller’s alternate version, the enemy soldier who captured her in history becomes the object of her captivated gaze. In place of condemnation by the church, she finds herself denounced by her
own father. Instead of burning at the stake, she experiences a glowing vision of the heavens as she dies in the glory of battle. The effect was electric, and his play’s enormous (albeit short-lived) popularity gave rise to numerous subsequent treatments, including a translation into Russian by Zhukovsky, an opera by Verdi, and an opera by Tchaikovsky. This dissertation examines the literary and aesthetic context in which Schiller created his drama and proposes several reasons for its notoriously ahistorical character. The fundamental, guiding concept here is “sublime sanctity,” which I plan to argue is the product of Schiller’s appropriation of Euripides’ themes into his play. Sublime sanctity, as I plan to show, is the essential quality in Schiller’s depiction of Joan, an idea that seizes the willing spectator and enables the play to achieve its intended force. I plan to argue, moreover, that subsequent versions only achieve their force by retaining key salient qualities that Schiller’s Joan shares with Euripides’ Iphigenia. Without them, these versions must fail; with them, audiences may be introduced to sublime sanctity itself, irrespective of their aesthetic dispositions. After establishing the ideas and principles underpinning sublime sanctity, the investigation will proceed chronologically, with an examination of other manifestations of Joan of Arc, primarily in the theater, either tracing their provenance directly to Schiller or, in the case of Shaw’s Saint Joan, bearing a high degree of affinity with his creation. The discussion will return often to the fluctuating distinctions between classicism and romanticism, idealism and realism, philosophy and history, and the impact produced by these ideas on the creative artists, their works, and their audiences. I will attempt to account for the enduring appeal – or just as often the lack thereof – of the various plays and operas on the basis of these ideas throughout the nineteenth century across Europe. I plan to consider these ideas more as reflections of the circumstances in which the works were created than as the basis for assessing their dramatic impact. Ultimately, this dissertation contends that
the dramatic value of each of the theatrical incarnations of Joan of Arc under discussion must be judged by the degree to which the various authors and composers preserve the salient elements of sublime sanctity and create an atmosphere for the audience to respond to it.
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Prologue. The Palimpsest of Euripides, Shakespeare, and Voltaire

“Es lebe Friedrich Schiller!”¹ This is how the public in Leipzig expressed its enthusiasm for Schiller’s play, Die Jungfrau von Orleans, when he attended its third performance on 17 September 1801. His entrance into the theater that evening had been accompanied by drums and trumpets, an honor ordinarily reserved for visiting aristocratic dignitaries. At the conclusion of the play, the students and public of Leipzig cleared a path through town, with the men removing their hats and renewing calls for the playwright’s long life as he passed by.² Goethe himself had declared the singular high quality of the play in his first letter to Schiller after reading it: “Es ist so brav, gut und schön, daß ich ihm nichts zu vergleichen weiß” (NA.20 April 1801).³ Schiller, who was by that time very close friends with Goethe, was eager to share his opinion with Körner, another lifelong friend: “Goethe meint, daß es mein bestes Werk sei” (13 May 1801, NA.36).⁴ The publisher Unger reported to Schiller within days of the premiere, on 22 September 1801, his progress in binding a printed version of the play in Berlin, where the success of the work resounded in subsequent performances, enhanced further by a planned premiere in Vienna. After years of struggle and frustration, Schiller was at the pinnacle of his career.

Yet questions arise: why did it take two years for the play to be mounted in Weimar, where Schiller often directed productions at the ducal theater and where his more famous friend,
Goethe, was Privy Councilor to Duke Karl August? Why has the initial theatrical success of his play not endured, as with both his earlier and later works? Less than six years later, Goethe would write in his diary (27 May 1807) of what he saw as the “primary mistake” of the play:

“Der Hauptfehler in dem Motiv der Jungfrau von Orleans, wo sie von Lionel ihr Herz getroffen fühlt, ist, daß sie sich dessen bewußt ist und ihr Vergehen ihr nicht aus einem Mißlingen oder sonst entgegen kommt ” (Wiese 735-36). Given that Schiller had died 9 May 1805, this observation was probably prompted by the second anniversary of Goethe’s lost friend’s passing. Although the play would continue to be presented for many years throughout Europe and inspire the imagination of numerous artists, writers, and composers, the process of reevaluating it had already begun.

At the dawn of the nineteenth century, Friedrich Schiller had reinvented the image of Joan of Arc, with consequences that were to affect theatrical representations of Joan for the rest of that century and well into the twentieth. Before that time, if an educated person had possessed any knowledge of Joan, he would most likely have known her as the wily sorceress from Shakespeare’s *Henry VI, Part One* or as the stable girl from Voltaire’s *La pucelle d’Orléans*, cavorting around France, often naked and riding a flying donkey. Seeing these depictions as unworthy of her nobility, Schiller set out to create a more powerful character who suffers at the hands of fate but changes history by sheer force of will. He took as his allegorical model the characterization of Iphigenia made famous by Euripides in *Iphigeneia among the Taurians* and *Iphigeneia in Aulis*, in which the ancient Greek tragedian transformed his heroine from a pitiable victim of fate into a fearsome priestess able to reverse a familial curse and unite a nation at war.6

---

5 “The main mistake in the motive of the Maid of Orleans, where she feels her heart struck by Lionel, is that she herself is aware of it, and her offense is not obliged by a failure or something else.” The implications of this statement are addressed in the next chapter.

6 The reader is invited to consult the table comparing the spelling of names in Appendix 1.
Schiller was equally bold with the historical facts of Joan of Arc’s life. Inspired by Euripides, he introduced romantic interests, paternal betrayal, and a rescue almost worthy of a *deus ex machina*. In Schiller’s alternate version, the enemy soldier who captured her in history becomes the object of her captivated gaze. In place of condemnation by the church, she finds herself denounced by her own father. Instead of burning at the stake, she experiences a glowing vision of the heavens as she dies in the glory of battle. The effect was electric, and his play’s enormous, if short-lived, popularity gave rise to numerous subsequent treatments, including a translation into Russian by Vasilii Zhukovskiĭ, an opera by Verdi, and an opera by Chaïkovskiĭ. This dissertation proposes to examine the literary and aesthetic context in which Schiller created his drama, and to present several reasons for its notoriously ahistorical character. The fundamental, guiding concept here will be “sublime sanctity,” which I plan to argue is the product of Schiller’s appropriation of Euripides’s themes into his play. Sublime sanctity, as I wish to show, is the essential quality in Schiller’s depiction of Joan, an idea that seizes the willing spectator and enables the play to achieve its intended force. Additionally, I intend to argue that subsequent versions achieve their force only by retaining key salient qualities that Schiller’s Joan shares with Euripides’s *Iphigeneia*. Without them, these versions must fail; with them, audiences may be introduced to sublime sanctity itself, irrespective of their aesthetic dispositions. After establishing the ideas and principles underpinning sublime sanctity in Schiller’s play, the investigation will proceed chronologically, with an examination of other manifestations of Joan of Arc, primarily in the theater, that trace their provenance directly to Schiller or, in the case of Shaw’s *Saint Joan*, bear a high degree of affinity with his creation. The discussion will return often to the fluctuating distinctions between classicism and romanticism, idealism and realism, philosophy and history, and the impact produced by these
themes on the artists involved, their works, and their audiences. I will attempt to account for the enduring appeal – or just as often the lack thereof – of the various plays and operas on the basis of these very themes throughout the nineteenth century across Europe. I shall consider these ideas more as reflections of the circumstances in which the works were created than as the basis for assessing their dramatic impact. Ultimately, the dissertation will contend that the dramatic value of each of the theatrical works under discussion ought to be judged by the degree to which the various authors and composers preserve the salient elements of sublime sanctity and create an atmosphere in which the audience may respond to it.

The first clue that Schiller plans to radicalize Joan’s image comes from his play’s subtitle: *Eine romantische Tragödie*. The dissonance between the term “romantic” and the essentially classical notion of tragedy suggests that this is to be a play challenging conventional ideas of genre. Schiller had decided by this time in his career that tragedy was his natural medium, and therefore that this was the genre in which he felt that the story of Joan of Arc was best suited to be reconceived. He looked to the tragic method of Euripides to provide a model for his new drama. That model is found most explicitly in Euripides’ two plays, *Iphigeneia among the Taurians* and *Iphigeneia in Aulis*. Although it would cost him a good deal in terms of criticism, he was emboldened by Euripides’ treatment of Iphigenia to be inventive with the facts of Joan of Arc’s life, just as the Greek tragedian had altered conventional mythology for ironic effect. The specific choices of inventiveness constitute one of the “romantic” elements of the play and, along with the tragic Greek elements, contribute to its mythologizing effect. In formulating his plot, Schiller was determined to obliterate the impression left by Shakespeare and Voltaire’s scurrilous7 depictions of Joan. This accounts for the appearance and nature of

---

7 “Scurrility” is the term used by Shaw to describe specifically Shakespeare’s treatment of Joan (preface to *Saint Joan* xxvii). The relationship of his play to Schiller’s is examined in Chapter 5.
several characters and controversial episodes. Three examples based on Schiller’s predecessors will suffice for the present: 1) Thibaut d’Arc, Johanna’s father, who denounces her, as he had done in in the penultimate scene of Shakespeare’s *Henry VI, Part One*; 2) the English knight, John Talbot, who dies in the fourth act of Shakespeare’s play and in the third of act of Schiller’s, but outlived the actual Joan by twenty-two years; 3) the dauphin’s consort, Agnes Sorel, who is featured prominently in Voltaire’s *Pucelle d’Orleans* – primarily as an object of sexual interest and to distract the feckless dauphin from his duty to drive the English out of France – was only seven years old in 1429, when Joan actually met the future king of France. Schiller’s Sorel plays a much more beneficial role as both a support to the weak dauphin, Charles VII, and an important ally at court for Joan, whom Schiller calls Johanna.

Some commentators have objected to certain other moments in Schiller’s play because they are in various ways inconsistent with the true story of Joan. Three of them come in quick succession mid-way through the play. In Act III, Johanna kills a soldier named Montgomery, an act which contradicts all testimony given by Joan of Arc herself, as well as other witnesses at her trials, that she never killed anyone, despite active engagement in a full year of combat. Later in the same act, a Black Knight appears, a wayward specter (“ein widerspenst’ger Geist” 2447) who warns Johanna to end her military campaign and then sinks into darkness amid thunder and lightning. In the next scene, Johanna encounters an English officer named Lionel and briefly falls in love with him, a violation of the Blessed Mother’s command that Johanna recounts near the start of the play: “Nicht Männerliebe darf dein Herz berühren” (411). Finally, there is the objection that the play ends neither tragically nor accurately. Schiller’s Johanna is not tried and burned at the stake; instead, she escapes her English and Burgundian captors and dies honorably.

---

8 “The love of men is not permitted to stir your heart.”
on the battlefield, surrounded by her brothers in arms, including King Charles VII himself. For these reasons, it is perhaps useful to think of the play as a palimpsest, on which one discerns the residue of Shakespeare’s play and Voltaire’s poem, as well as the more constructive presence of Euripides’s Iphigeneia plays. In doing so, the sometimes puzzling aspects of Schiller’s play come to be seen more clearly as his attempt to eradicate Shakespeare and Voltaire’s influence, while the Euripidean elements emerge as hallmarks of the aesthetic potential he believed only tragic drama could unleash to create a sublime experience for the viewer.

Before pursuing these important aspects of Schiller’s adaptation, it might be useful to offer a list of the primary sources to be considered here and elsewhere, along with a brief description of the story that each respective source tells and when it appeared:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td><em>Iphigeneia among the Taurians</em></td>
<td>Greek tragedy about the reunion of Iphigeneia with her brother, Orestes, and their reconciliation with their homeland</td>
<td>413 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td><em>Iphigeneia in Aulis</em></td>
<td>Greek tragedy about the sacrifice of the virgin, Iphigeneia, to expedite the Trojan War</td>
<td>407 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td><em>Henry VI, Part One</em></td>
<td>A history play about the siege of Orleans during the Hundred Years’ War</td>
<td>1592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltaire</td>
<td><em>La pucelle d’Orléans</em></td>
<td>A mock epic loosely based on the lifting of the siege of Orleans</td>
<td>1730, 1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiller</td>
<td><em>Die Jungfrau von Orleans</em></td>
<td>A romantic tragedy based on the life of Joan of Arc</td>
<td>1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhukovskii</td>
<td><em>Orleanskaia deva</em></td>
<td>A translation into Russian of Schiller’s play</td>
<td>1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdi</td>
<td><em>Giovanna d’Arco</em></td>
<td>An opera based on Schiller’s play</td>
<td>1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaïkovskii</td>
<td><em>Orleanskaia deva</em></td>
<td>An opera based on Schiller’s play</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td><em>Saint Joan</em></td>
<td>A chronicle play based on the life of Joan of Arc</td>
<td>1923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Voltaire commenced the poem around 1730 with no intention of publishing it. It became so popular, however, that unauthorized versions began appearing all over Europe, with the consequence that he finally decided to publish an edited version in 1762.
The history of Joan of Arc herself is unquestionably equal in importance to these artistic creations, if not more important, in fact. The closest we come to an objective source, universally acknowledged as reliable, is the transcripts of her two trials: the condemnation trial in Rouen of 1431 and the rehabilitation (or nullification) trial, which began in Paris in 1455 and ended in Rouen in 1456. Given that many of the 115 witnesses in the rehabilitation trial were the same people whose testimony had resulted in Joan’s condemnation 25 years earlier, perhaps “reliable” is not the right word to describe this testimony. The unfortunate reality is that there is no completely objective, or fair-minded, source on the life of Joan of Arc. The transcripts of her trials are, nonetheless, enormously valuable in the attempt to separate facts from pure speculation and rumor. They were first made available to the public by Jules Quicherat between 1841 and 1849 (Pernoud 286), which means that the documents were unknown to Shakespeare, Voltaire, and Schiller. These earlier authors drew upon other sources, which will be cited in the text. Quicherat was the first in a long and still growing line of historians and scholars to attempt to bring the true story of Joan of Arc to the attention of the world. His seminal work has been re-edited several times (Pernoud 286-87). Pierre Champion’s publication of the condemnation trial in 1910 is valued, alongside that of Quicherat, especially for his commentary on the events and personages surrounding Joan of Arc’s history. The list of subsequent biographies, revisions, redactions, and reevaluations is voluminous, and many will find mention in this dissertation, but each of their writers ultimately seems to lose a degree of objectivity in service to some political or theoretical purpose. One French historian, an acknowledged expert on the Middle Ages, Régine Pernoud, stands out for her balanced approach to Joan of Arc. Recalling her first visit to the United States in 1950, she asserts:
[…] I was told of no fewer than twenty-eight Roman Catholic parishes dedicated to her in that country – my hosts assumed that this information would please me because I was French, even though I made a point in those days of declaring (quite truthfully) my indifference to Joan of Arc.

But soon after that moment, I was imprudent enough to open the documents of her nullification trial and I found myself literally incapable of closing them. Since then Joan has led me to new horizons and fresh interests… (xi).

That the author established her academic credentials as a medievalist with indifference to Joan of Arc, and then subsequently immersed herself in the competing and contradictory sources that have accrued over time, seems to save her writing from the bias and preconceived notions that permeate so much of Joan of Arc scholarship. For this reason, when points of fact are adduced in the present work, more often than not, the source consulted will be Pernoud’s *Joan of Arc: Her Story*, translated by Jeremy duQuesnay Adams, published in New York by St. Martin’s Press in 1999.
Die Jungfrau ist in ihrer Art ein einziges Süjjet und ein beneidenswerther Stoff für den Dichter, ungefähr wie die Iphigenie der Griechen.
(Schiller to Böttiger NA.42 333)\textsuperscript{10}

Euripides and Iphigenia

In speaking of Euripides’s Iphigeneia, we have in mind a character who appears in two different plays: \textit{Iphigeneia among the Taurians} and \textit{Iphigeneia in Aulis}. The first, referred to here as \textit{IT}, is generally acknowledged as a product of 413 BCE, whereas the second, denoted as \textit{IA}, was written in approximately 407 BCE and produced posthumously some two years later. Both plays turn on the impulse to commit human sacrifice at the bidding of divine power and the effect of this act on the family and community surrounding the ritual. The instances in Greek myth of the legend of Iphigenia are broad and varied, but among the most famous, before the appearance of Euripides’s plays, was in the \textit{Oresteia} trilogy by Aeschylus (458 BCE). Although she never appears on stage, her ritual sacrifice by her father, Agamemnon, is a foregone conclusion that leads his wife, Clytemnestra, to murder him in revenge. When the presumably murdered child suddenly appeared on the stage at the beginning of Euripides’s \textit{Iphigeneia among the Taurians}, the audience at the festival in Athens must have been bewildered. Euripides had re-opened a previously closed narrative. This re-evaluation of received wisdom, of a history being re-written, is very likely what attracted so many Europeans to Euripides’s version of the story in the eighteenth century. We have only to consider the way in which Goethe reinvented Faust to see why Schiller was so interested in doing the same with historical figures such as Mary Stuart, Don Carlos of Spain, and most relevant to the present discussion, Joan of Arc.

\textsuperscript{10} “The Maid is in her manner a singular subject and enviable material for the poet, rather like the Iphigenia of the Greeks.”
With Joan, one of his goals is to draw her out of the shadows of history, and out of the margins of other people’s stories, and place her at the center of the drama, as Euripides did with Iphigeneia. Instead of providing a mere footnote to the legend of the Trojan War, in Euripides’s final tragedy, Iphigeneia becomes the linchpin for the entire expedition. Her rescue at the last moment of IA, moreover, casts a shadow over the role of tragedy across the centuries into the tragedies of both Goethe and Schiller.

As noted above, Euripides wrote the two plays six years apart. It is reasonable to assume that he initially wrote the first without any thought of ever writing the second, especially since he sets the action of the first play after the Trojan War, whereas the second play takes place earlier, before the Trojan War. These two plays do not constitute portions of a trilogy, such as was the custom in Athens in the annual spring festival of the god Dionysus. In fact, the only extant trilogy of this sort is Aeschylus’ Oresteia (Ewans, Wagner and Aeschylus 18). Often the Greek playwrights submitted three works with rather different subject matter, but just as often they would return to explore again topics or characters they had treated earlier, as Sophocles does with Oedipus. The last play of that trilogy, Oedipus at Colonus, was written in 406 BCE, twenty years after its predecessor, Oedipus the King, 425 BCE. (Ewans, Opera 106f) To compound the complexity of this timeline, Antigone, generally considered the final play of the Oedipus trilogy, was written first, around 441 BCE. Nevertheless, scholars generally consider the three plays a trilogy, albeit written over the span of some three decades. Scholars have not deemed Euripides’s two Iphigeneia plays a cycle, perhaps for the simple reason that there is no relevant

---

11 Readers only familiar with Homer’s version of the Trojan expedition in the Iliad may be puzzled by the myth of Iphigeneia, since she has no place in it. Other daughters of other kings and princes form the subject of the disputes that must be resolved to permit the Greek fleet to sail. But among the ancients, Homer seems to be in the minority in excluding the sacrifice of Iphigenia to appease Artemis. In addition to Euripides’s plays, the episode is mentioned in Aeschylus’s Oresteia, as well as in Ovid’s Metamorphoses Book 13, 180-190.
third play with which to complete the trilogy. Although versions of other Euripidean plays dealing with the unfortunate Atreides family, most notably *Elektra* and *Orestes*, are extant, the plots of these plays keep well beyond the timeline of the two Iphigeneia plays and are generally in accordance with the more conventional narrative of the *Oresteia*. They essentially take place in the intervening years between Iphigeneia’s abortive sacrifice at Aulis and the reunion of Iphigeneia with her brother, Orestes, years later in Tauris. Ultimately, it is not necessary to prove conclusively that the two plays form a continuous narrative, although much evidence exists for this purpose. It is more important to see that Schiller thought of the two plays as a continuous narrative and felt it appropriate therefore to draw upon elements from both in formulating his Joan of Arc play. To this end, a short look at the synopses of the two plays may be helpful.

Euripides’s *Iphigeneia among the Taurians* (*IT*)

As previously mentioned, *IT* opens the action previously closed in Aeschylus’ *Oresteia*. The girl whose sacrifice by her father, Agamemnon, led to a chain of revenge murders – of Agamemnon by Clytemnestra, then of Clytemnestra by Orestes – appears on stage, telling us her story and that of her family. She did not die; she was rescued by the intervention of the goddess Artemis, who replaced her with a deer on the sacrificial altar and transported her to the savage land of the Taurians that is now her home. In Tauris, she serves as priestess to King Thoas, who has ordered all Greeks who venture into his kingdom to be sacrificed in the temple of Artemis. The public nature of her office is in sharp contrast to the private, familial connections on which the plot of *IT* turns. This course will be reversed in *IA*, the plot of which follows an arc
stemming from concerns about ostensibly private family matters to public actions with national consequences. Iphigeneia oversees the rituals in Tauris, but “the slaying is the concern of others” (Kovacs IV 157); that is, it is carried out by attendants in the temple. As the play begins, she is on her way to the temple to offer libations for the memory of her brother, Orestes, whose death she interprets as having taken place on the basis of a dream. We immediately learn that her interpretation of the dream is false, because as Iphigeneia disappears into the temple, Orestes comes onto the stage with his friend, Pylades. Their arrival is eventually reported to Iphigeneia by a shepherd, although he learns only the name of the friend, who is unknown to Iphigeneia. The two men are brought before her, and she learns that they are not only from Greece, but from Argos, her native town. Iphigeniea decides that Pylades will be spared to return to Argos to inform her family of her survival. Still ignorant of his identity, she gives the order to prepare an altar for the sacrifice of Orestes, and departs to write her message on tablets to give to Pylades. He worries that he may lose the tablets at sea and be unable to fulfill the oath he has sworn to deliver the message. Then follows the famous recognition scene, praised by Aristotle for its dramatic motivation, in which Iphigeneia reveals that the message is for Orestes, her brother. Pylades gladly takes the tablets and hands them to the man standing next to him. The joy of the reunion is tempered by the details that Orestes then shares with his sister, concerning the circumstances of their parents’ deaths, with their mother killing their father, followed by her own murder, committed by Orestes at Apollo’s command. The result is that he has been hounded by the Furies, who have not been satisfied by the outcome of the murder trial at Areopagus. The continued pursuit of Orestes by the Furies functions as the second tear in the fabric of the Aeschylean plot, the first being Iphigeneia’s survival. In the earlier trilogy, the outcome of the

12 Cf Aristotle *Poetics* Book 16.
trial is final and serves as an illustration of the capacity for law to resolve the blood feuds of the Atreides. In *IT*, Euripides seems to prefer the counterargument that the law is clearly not sufficient to placate all feelings of injustice. It is probably no coincidence that Euripides wrote this play, concerning the descendants of Pelops, at the height of the war between Athens and Sparta, involving the land mass that derives its name from Pelops: Peloponnesia. In any case, Orestes now informs Iphigeneia of Apollo’s promise to free him from the Furies’ torment, if he travels to Tauris to secure the statue of Artemis and bring it back to the temple at Brauron. The remainder of the play is concerned with fulfilling this mission.\(^{13}\) King Thoas opposes this mission, but he is prevented from destroying Iphigeneia, Orestes, and Pylades at the end, by the appearance, *dea ex machina*, of Athena.

When we reach the discussion of Schiller’s play, it will be appropriate to address in detail the connections between the Tauric Iphigeneia and the German *Jungfrau*, in addition to the enriching influence of Goethe’s *Iphigenie auf Tauris*. For the moment, it may be helpful to observe that Euripides’ play, just summarized, resembles Joan of Arc’s history and Schiller’s version of it, in several ways. A virgin is entrusted with a mission by a virginal supernatural personality to put to death unwanted foreign visitors. Joan of Arc has this much in common with Iphigeneia. The virgin is diverted from this mission following a prophetic vision, after which a young man enters her life and presents her with another mission. The career of Schiller’s Johanna – faced with the Black Knight’s warning before meeting Lionel – follows a similar line. While there is no reason to suppose that Joan of Arc would have had any knowledge of the Iphigeneia myth – or if she had, would have seen any relevance of the story to her own life – it

\(^{13}\) An example of aetiology, the use of some generally known fact as the impetus of a play or story’s plot.
seems plausible that Schiller, presented with the myth at the time he was contemplating the life of Joan, sensed such a connection.

The types of rituals and pervasive themes in *IT* form striking contrasts with those in *Iphigeneia in Aulis (IA)*. In the former, references and allusions to birth rites in the choral *parodoi* are set beside actual preparations for rituals of death, and the dramatic action signals a shift from the public sphere to the private. In contrast, rites of human sacrifice masquerade as preparations for the marriage ritual in *IA*, and the dramatic action signals a shift from the private sphere to the public.

Euripides’s *Iphigeneia in Aulis (IA)*

When Euripides returned to the topic of Iphigeneia six or seven years later, he was apparently more interested in telling the story from within the homeland, in the time immediately preceding the expedition to Troy. The difficulty and importance of making a choice is shown to have national consequences, a notion that ties this story to Schiller’s conception of his *Jungfrau*. One of the plot developments in progress at the start of the play is the assumption that Iphigeneia is coming to Aulis to marry Achilles, which suggests a family affair. Her arrival with her mother, Clytemnestra, only reinforces the familial importance of the plan. All of this is a ruse. Agamemnon has summoned his daughter to Aulis at the urging of the priest, Calchis, who has consulted the oracle to determine why the gods have stilled the winds needed to permit them to sail for Troy. Agamemnon’s famous sister-in-law, Helen, has been abducted to Troy, and the

---

14 Cf Wolff: “Birth and marriage (not fully achieved without the production of offspring) as well as the close relations of parent and child are important in the play. The chorus women elaborately celebrate Artemis Lochia in Delos, Leto's giving birth there, and the locheia kleina of Apollo (1097-1102, 1234-42). The dangers of pollution attendant on birth and approaching marriage are evoked (382, 1228)” (321).
Greeks have decided that the restoration of their patriotic honor depends on fighting for her return. The priest has advised Agamemnon that the only solution is to sacrifice his daughter at the altar of Artemis in Aulis. Clytemnestra only discovers the truth when she attempts to discuss the marriage plans with an uninformed Achilles. Initially, Iphigeneia is horrified and cannot understand how her father can simultaneously love her and contemplate such an act. Not for the first time, Agamemnon expresses ambivalence about the plan but begins to be concerned that the army may be on the verge of revolt. Achilles conspires with Clytemnestra to rescue his supposed bride from this inhuman act, but Iphigeneia in the meantime has reconsidered. She sees that resistance to her father will quickly lead to dissension in the army and perhaps even to general public violence. She believes that the Greeks need to be united against further barbarian incursions and is willing to let her death be the means of uniting them. Agamemnon’s ultimate decision to sacrifice his daughter and Iphigeneia’s willing participation in the sacrifice are doubly rewarded: the wind will fill the sails heading off to Troy, and Iphigeneia will be rescued in a kind of apotheosis. Her rescue takes place off stage, and a messenger arrives to inform Clytemnestra that, at the moment the priest sank his sword into the victim, Iphigeneia vanished, and a deer lay panting its last breaths in her place.15 Agamemnon, feeling as much relieved as redeemed by this turn of events, tells Clytemnestra: “My wife, where our daughter is concerned we can be blessed: truly her life is with the gods” (Kovacs VI 341).

Despite the fact that Euripides makes it clear in other works that he sees the Trojan War as a poor emblem of patriotic virtue, it seems that the ironic tragedian intended his audience to be impressed by the singularly heroic and selfless act of Iphigeneia’s sacrifice for the sake of the

---

15 The final scene of this play is a matter of scholarly debate, with some observers arguing that it has been lost, and others arguing that it is hopelessly corrupted. On the evidence of the earlier play, which depends on Iphigeneia’s survival, it seems credible that, irrespective of the precise details, Euripides did not envision for his audience to believe that Iphigeneia was actually sacrificed at Aulis.
Greek expedition. The unique nature of her selflessness and her nearness to the gods themselves provide her with what may be termed a measure of sanctity. Although there is no tradition in Greek mythology, as in contemporary Christianity, of a communion of saints, it is not difficult to conclude that one of the many features that attracted Schiller, Goethe, Gluck and others to this story is its resemblance to the sorts of stories that we can find in lives of the saints, or hagiography.

“Sanctity” should not be confused with “saintliness,” a term which has been thoroughly co-opted as a religious idea, especially by orthodox Christendom of both the Western and Eastern varieties. “Saintliness” has come to signify a kind of piety and meekness, the complete submission of the individual will to that of a biblical godhead. “Sanctity,” however, may also be understood as an individual’s determination to stand apart in nearly every sense from ordinary human behavior, whether sexual, political, or moral, on the grounds that the saint conceives of doing so as essential to achieving a divine aim. In Schiller’s Johanna, as in Euripides’s Iphigeneia, sanctity is expressed by the will of an individual to complete her task without regard for reward or personal danger.

Euripides establishes the “holy” status of his Taurian Iphigeneia early in the play. In her first appearance with her ritual servants, played by the chorus, Iphigeneia reveals a dream that has disturbed her. The chorus enters in a solemn procession, calling on the goddess Artemis. In the course of this invocation, the servants identify both themselves and their priestess, Iphigeneia, with the following words:

I walk in holy procession on maiden feet, όσίας ὅσιον πόδα παρθένιον
servant of your holy temple warder… κληδούχου δούλα πέμπτω [...]

(Kovacs IV165) (130-131)
Here, the Greek words “osias osion” refer to both the servants and their priestess, with the following phrase, “poda parthenion,” syntactically embedded and intensifying the link between the physically virginal condition of their “maiden feet” and their holiness. Indeed, Schiller seems to have this moment from Euripides in mind during an exchange between the Dauphin and the Archbishop in Johanna’s company:

Karl. Wo ist Johanna? Warum fehlt sie uns in diesem festlich schönen Augenblick, Den sie uns schenkte?

Erzbischof. Sire! Das heil'ge Mädchen Liebe nicht die Ruhe eines müß'gen Hofs, Und ruft sie nicht der göttliche Befehl, Ans Licht der Welt hervor, so meidet sie Verschämt den eitlen Blick gemeiner Augen. Gewiß bespricht sie sich mit Gott, wenn sie Für Frankreichs Wohlfahrt nicht geschäftigt ist; Denn allen ihren Schritten folgt der Segen. Karl. Du kommst als Priesterin geschmückt, Johannas Bund, den Du gestiftet?

Charles. Where is Johanna? Why is she absent At this lovely festive moment That she made possible? Archbishop. Sire! The holy Maid Does not care for the calm of courtly leisure, And when the divine command does not call her Into the light of day, she modestly avoids The curious gaze of ordinary eyes. Indeed, she converses with God, whenever She is not busy with the welfare of France; For blessing follows all her steps. Charles. Do you come attired like a priestess, To consecrate the bond that you have forged?

(III.iii-iv 2016-27) (III.iii-iv)

Echoes of the Euripidean Iphigeneia resonate as the Archbishop pronounces Johanna a “holy Maid” and in the physical movement he describes. Iphigeneia and her servants “walk in holy procession on maiden feet,” while “blessing follows all [Johanna’s] steps.” Like Iphigeneia “the holy temple warder,” Johanna keeps her focus on the sanctity of her task, uninterested in the “curious gaze of ordinary eyes.” As a final point of comparison, Charles describes her as “attired like a priestess.”
The over-arching message of the *Oresteia*, arguably, is the transition from a society and history based on vengeance and blood feuds to one based on the rule of law. The political implication of Aeschylus’s cycle, however, is that this new order exists for men only. Orestes, the male progeny, returns to kingship in Argos, yet Electra exits the stage and seems entirely forgotten. The women who are wronged in the *Oresteia*, chiefly Clytemnestra, but also Cassandra and the absent but significant Iphigeneia, are defeated, annihilated, or no longer merit mention. Whether these sexist injustices motivated Euripides in his decision to create his first Iphigeneia play, *Iphigeneia among the Taurians*, and then to return six years later to the subject in Aulis we will probably never know, absent the kind of information that one can often glean from diaries and correspondence in the modern era. A compelling interpretation develops if one considers these two plays as the start and end of a cycle divided by some six or seven years. This interpretation permits us to consider the cycle as a kind of Euripidean response to Aeschylus’s *Oresteia*. The thematic lines are thus intriguing: The god driving the plot throughout the *Oresteia* is Apollo; the goddess driving the plot of the Iphigeneia cycle is Artemis. These two gods are brother and sister, as are Orestes and Iphigeneia, but the point of view in Euripides’s plays is, significantly, that of Iphigeneia, under the influence of Artemis. The Euripidean response to Aeschylus, therefore, becomes something of a proto-feminist vision, one suitable as a basis for constructing a new legend on the history of Joan of Arc.

In his *Jungfrau*, Schiller accomplishes a similar proto-feminist reinterpretation of the literary history of Joan of Arc, by actively recasting her older Shakespearean and Voltairian depictions in a positive light. Where men are the driving forces in both *Henry VI* and *La pucelle d’Orleans*, the woman-warrior Johanna, with her holy intuition and selfless determination, impels the plot of Schiller’s play from start to finish. His new incarnation of Joan uses aspects of
both Iphigeneia scenarios as the myth exemplum, taking more material from Aulis, but with Goethe’s Taurian Iphigenie constantly in view. He also uses several “biblical exempla,” which merit mention below, but these tend to appear sporadically, never seeming to develop into thematic devices operating throughout the scope of the play as the myth exempla do.

Shakespeare and Joan

The Shakespeare play in which Joan of Arc makes her appearance is *Henry VI, Part One*, which appeared in 1592 (Boas 35). Many critics, including Shaw, have argued that the play is not entirely Shakespeare’s, citing its clumsiness of plot and a dramatic style less effective than his other works. Those who credit it to Shakespeare take it for an early effort that does not represent the playwright at his best. Others are convinced that bits of the text show the influence of Christopher Marlowe and other Elizabethan playwrights. Schiller and his contemporaries seem not to have questioned its authenticity. Joan is not the central figure in the play, but appears in four of the five acts.

Of the three authors – Euripides, Shakespeare, and Voltaire – haunting the palimpsest of Schiller’s play, Shakespeare is the one about whose *Henry VI* Schiller has the least to say. The general familiarity with Shakespeare of Schiller and all his circle in Weimar, not to mention the broader significance of the English playwright to German romanticism, has often been cited. On 28 July 1800, Schiller wrote a letter to his life-long friend, Gottfried Körner, outlining his plan to write a play about Joan of Arc. In it, we find the work in progress named for the first time and an oblique reference to the sorcery to be found in Shakespeare’s Joan:

In his reply (6 Aug 1800), Körner mentions the service Schiller will be doing to improve the image of Joan left by Shakespeare’s ignominious depiction: “Die Wahl Deines neuen Stoffs ist sehr Glücklich. Er muß ein reiches und lebendiges Gemälde geben. Shakespeare hat im 1sten Theil von Heinrich VI. nur wenig davon benutzt, und als ächter [sic] Engländer die Französ in durch Talbot zu verdunkeln gesucht” (NA.38 317). Körner’s comment reveals considerable familiarity with one of Shakespeare’s more obscure works. He is obviously aware of the marginalization of Joan in Shakespeare’s play and clearly identifies one of its principal protagonists: John Talbot. Furthermore, he recognizes the possibility of chauvinism as the explanation for Shakespeare’s promotion of the significance of Talbot over Joan. In Schiller’s letters and commentaries, we do not find any overt references to his familiarity with Shakespeare’s play, but we can deduce from the presence of several plot elements and

---

16 Not yet die Jungfrau.
17 “The maiden of Orleans is the material that I am developing. The outline is almost ready; I hope to be able to get on with the execution within 14 days. The material is poetic to an exquisite degree, insofar as I have conceived it, and stirring to a high degree. I am anxious about the execution, however, because while I think very highly of it, I fear that I will not be able to attain my own idea. In six weeks I must know how I stand with the matter. I plan to allow little of the old black magic stuff into it, and as far as I need it, I hope to enrich it with my own fantasy.”
18 “The choice of your new material is very fortunate. It cannot fail to produce a rich and vital portrait. Shakespeare made very little of it in the first part of Henry VI, and as a true Englishman sought to cast a shadow over the French girl with Talbot.”
characterizations in his *Jungfrau* that he wanted to provide an alternate version to that of the English playwright. These chiefly involve five characters from the French side: Charles VII, Count Dunois, the vacillating Duke of Burgundy, Joan (called “La Pucelle”), and very briefly but significantly, a French shepherd claiming to be Joan’s father; and four from the English: Henry VI, John Talbot, Salisbury, and less significantly, Fastolfe.¹⁹

Drawing upon Holinshed’s *Chronicles* of 1589, the English dramatist (or his collaborators) selects and interposes events that in fact took place over the course of 31 years, from the death of Henry V in 1422 to the death of Talbot in 1453, and condenses them into eight days of dramatic time (Herford 4). As is typical of Shakespeare’s history plays, the action shifts rapidly from the perspective of one side to the other. On the French side, the inclusion of Charles is unavoidable, as arguably is Dunois, given their prominence historically in the events of the siege at Orleans. On the English side, Talbot functions as something of a Lancastrian mascot, having served and fought under Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI. Both the English and the French regarded him as an honorable warrior (Pernoud 202-03). Henry VI is as unavoidable as Charles, but his significance to the first part of Shakespeare’s historical trilogy is much less than in the second and third parts. He appears in about as many scenes as Joan. When one considers that he was actually crowned only in December of 1431, some two years after the action of the first play in the Shakespearean trilogy, and that he was only ten years old at the time, his minimal presence is more understandable, as is his absence from Schiller’s drama, which ends shortly after the coronation of Charles VII at Rheims cathedral in July of 1429.

¹⁹ Fastolfe will actually be discussed in Chapter 1, but if he had not appeared in Shakespeare, Schiller would likely have ignored him.
Talbot’s death and its significance in Schiller’s play will be considered in Chapter 1. In Shakespeare, Talbot is killed by the French (IV. vii), after a farewell exchange in verse with his son, who has died earlier in the same act.

Talbot. Come, come and lay him in his father’s arms:
My spirit can no longer bear these harms.
Soldiers, adieu! I have what I would have,
Now my old arms are young John Talbot’s grave. [Dies] (29-32)

It is easy to imagine that the pathetic power of this scene inspired Schiller to produce an equally compelling Talbot for his play, despite his status as an enemy combatant. Earlier in the play (I.iv), Talbot describes his time in French captivity, which actually takes place following the battle in Patay, a major victory for the French side. Regarding Talbot’s capture in this decisive battle, there is an astonishing coincidence, which joins the historical Joan of Arc with the Iphigeneia plays. Pernoud informs us that the French are approaching Patay, uncertain of the position of the English troops, when “by luck the scouts in front [see] a stag leap from the woods and take the road toward Patay. It jump[s] into the English formation, whereupon it utter[s] a great cry. The French [did] not know that their enemies were so close to them” (Pernoud 61).

This discovery leads to an engagement, in the course of which, according to Burgundian chroniclers, three French soldiers die, as opposed to over two thousand English soldiers. It seems strange to consider that this great victory for Joan of Arc and the French side is precipitated by the sudden appearance of a stag, in the same sudden manner that Iphigeneia’s place on the altar at Aulis is taken by the divine provision of a stag at the decisive moment. Adding to the humiliation of this costly defeat is Talbot’s capture in Patay.
In Shakespeare’s play, Talbot recounts his experience in a dialog with the earl of Salisbury as they stand on the turrets of the walls of the fortress at Orleans. After Talbot finishes the story of his captivity, Salisbury invites him and two other English military leaders, Gargrave and Glansdale, to use their vantage point to observe the French fortifying their positions and decide how to improve their defenses. Mid-conversation, the playwright gives this stage direction: [Here they shoot. Salisbury and Gargrave fall.] (I.iv 69). “They” in this instance must be taken in the sense of “the enemy,” that is, the French. In Schiller’s play, Salisbury does not appear on stage, but in Act I, Johanna prophesies his death at Orleans, in a manner that strongly resembles his death scene in Shakespeare:

Johanna. [...] Diesen Morgen
Strecket’ ihn ein Schuß aus Orleans zu Boden,
Als er vom Turm La Tournelle niedersah. (I. xi 1195-97)  

Johanna here ironically contradicts a herald who says he has just come with a message from Salsibury. She accuses him of lying, since only the living can send messages, and then relates the manner of Salisbury’s death. This prophecy concludes Johanna’s first scene with Karl in Schiller, preceding which she has also picked him out of the crowd at court and revealed, to his amazement, the content of his private prayers. Both feats appear in the testimony of witnesses at Joan’s condemnation and rehabilitation trials. Shakespeare retains the documented feat of Charles VII’s recognition by Joan but does not include her subsequent description of his dreams, opting instead for a swordfight between the king and the young woman, in which Joan is the victor. The invention of the so-called “recognition scene” can be credited to Shakespeare as a theatrical set piece, although it has a basis in history. When Joan gained entry to the dauphin’s

20 “This morning a shot from Orleans struck him down, as he looked down from the turret tower.”
court on 6 March 1429, Charles merely waited among those assembled at court without trying to stand out. The chronicler of the dauphin’s court, Jean Chartier, informs us that Joan:

[…]

made the curtsies and reverences that customarily are made to a king as though she had been nourished at the court and, her greeting having been delivered, said in addressing the king, “God give you life, gentle king,” even though she did not know him and had never seen him, and there were many pompous lords there more opulently dressed than was the king. Wherefore he replied to Joan: “What if I am not the king, Joan?” Pointing to one of the lords, he said: “There is the king.” To which she answered, “In God’s name, gentle prince, it is you and none other.” (Pernoud 22-23)

Shakespeare adds a bit of dramatic tension to all this. Count Dunois, the so-called Bastard of Orleans, announces Joan’s arrival and extols the aid that she promises to bring. Before she enters, Charles orders Reignier, the duke of Anjou, to stand in his place:

Charles.  Question her proudly; let thy looks be stern:

By this means shall we sound what skill she hath.

Re-enter the Bastard of Orleans with Joan La Pucelle

Reignier.  Fair maid, is’t thou wilt do these wondrous feats?

Pucelle.  Reignier, is’t thou that thinkest to beguile me?

Where is the Dauphin? Come, come from behind;

I know thee well, though never seen before.  (I. ii. 62-67)

At this point, Count Dunois, nearly vanishes from the play. He makes only brief appearances with scarcely any lines in Act III, during the action in and around Rouen. In each of these appearances, he seems something of a cypher, offering vacuous patriotic and encouraging
rejoinders whenever Joan does anything remarkable. This is in sharp contrast to his historical role as a critical leader at Joan’s side in all of the actual military skirmishes that turn the tide against the English in 1429 and 1430. The consistent note between his depiction in Shakespeare and his historical role, perhaps, is that he remains a stalwart supporter of the real Joan, and his eloquent testimony proves instrumental in her rehabilitation trial years later. His final appearance in *Henry VI* comes during the scene in which Charles recruits the Duke of Burgundy from the English to the French side. This scene signals a change in the characterization of Joan from an instrument of God into something quite different.

Charles. Speak, Pucelle, and enchant him with thy words. (III.iii.40)

When Burgundy begins to feel convinced of Joan’s argument to return to the French side, he remarks:

Burgundy. Either she hath bewitch’d me with her words,

Or nature makes me suddenly relent. (III. iii. 58-59)

Joan’s power is here compared to “enchantment” and called “bewitching,” and this darker side of her nature becomes more and more prominent as the action continues, especially in Act V, where we come upon the Shakespearean invention with probably the greatest influence on Schiller’s play.

In this penultimate scene of the play, an unnamed Shepherd appears, claiming to be Joan’s father, who has been seeking her and is now ready to die with her. She denies anything of the sort, avowing that she is of noble birth:

Pucelle. Decrepit miser! base ignoble wretch!

I am descended of a gentler blood:

Thou art no father nor no friend of mine. (V. iii. 6-8)
He responds indignantly that he wishes she had never been born or that she had not lived to adulthood:

Shepherd. [...] when thou didst keep my lambs afield,

I wish some ravenous wolf had eaten thee!

Dost thou deny they father, cursed drab?

Oh burn her, burn her, hanging is too good.” (V. iii. 30-33)

To this it may be added that Jacques d’Arc, Joan’s actual father, was a relatively prosperous and respectable farmer and shepherder in the village of Domrémy:

He seems to have enjoyed an honorable position in this countryside, whether he was rich, as some have implied, or not. In 1419 he was the purchaser of the Château de l’Ile, with its appurtenances, put up at auction that year. In a document of 1423 he is described as doyen or sergeant of the village; he therefore took rank between the mayor and the provost [...] We know that he opposed with all his power the mission of his daughter, whom he wished to marry off, without a doubt. However, he went to Rheims for the coronation of the King, and the King and the municipality defrayed his expenses and gave him a horse for his return to Domrémy. He was ennobled in December 1429. Jacques d’Arc died, it is said, of sorrowing over his daughter’s end. (Champion 391)

While Champion may indulge in some speculation or hyperbole in recounting the cause of Jacques d’Arc’s death, the state of affairs he describes stands in diametrical opposition to the reciprocal denunciation provided by Shakespeare. His invention, however, seems to have struck Schiller as the perfect climax to his play. The denunciation scene in Jungfrau is arguably the disaster, in the sense that this term has in Greek tragedy (δυσαστήρ), which signals a complete
reversal in the protagonist’s fortune (περιπέτεια). All the action in Schiller’s play leads up to the denunciation scene and causes it to be of critical importance, as will be explained in greater detail below.

The depiction of Johanna herself depends to a significant extent on the factors that cause her denunciation to make sense in Schiller’s play: she undertakes her mission to save France, as previously noted, understanding that she must renounce any hopes for “Männerliebe”; yet she falls in love with the English officer, often seen as her tragic error, for which her father’s subsequent denunciation, along the lines of her Shakespearean father, seems just. Shakespeare’s Joan, since she is not the central character, cannot be considered a tragic protagonist. Her role is actually much more a stereotype, according to Paxson, surviving from medieval miracle and mystery plays and born of a cultural prejudice leading to the condemnation of Joan of Arc herself: “problematic or evil women equate to a demonization of the feminine” (129).

Shakespeare’s Joan is duplicitous and seems to contradict herself in ways which make her character not only unsympathetic but also unbelievable. Immediately after she “enchants” the duke of Burgundy into switching from the English to the French side, she remarks: “[Aside] Done like a Frenchman: turn, and turn again!” (III. iii. 85) Such a comment from one of the English characters is perhaps to be expected, but it strains logic to hear it from Joan herself. Just before her capture by the English, she enters into hand-to-hand combat with the Duke of York, who teases her by attributing her military skill to witchcraft:

York. […] Unchain your spirits now with spelling charms And try if they can gain your liberty. A goodly prize, fit for the devil’s grace!

See how the ugly witch doth bend her brows,
   As if with Circe she would change my shape!
Pucelle.    Changed to a worser shape thou canst not be.
York.       O, Charles the Dauphin is a proper man;
No shape but his can please your dainty eye.
Pucelle.    A plaguing mischief light on Charles and thee!
And may ye both be suddenly surprised
By bloody hands, in sleeping on your beds!
York.       Fell banning hag, enchantress, hold thy tongue!
Pucelle.    I prithee, give me leave to curse awhile.
York.       Curse, miscreant, when thou comest to the stake.

(V. iii. 31-44)

The playwright here draws on rumors common among Joan’s enemies, to the effect that she was anything but a pure maiden and that her amorous adventures would have included the Dauphin himself. These insulting and – to borrow Shaw’s word – scurrilous scenes pale in comparison, however, with her final scenes, preceding and following her denunciation by her shepherd-father.

Just before her combat with York, Shakespeare prepares the audience for her condemnation with a soliloquy during which Joan converses with silent demons, whom Shakespeare presents as “fiends.” She enters the stage alone and conjures up these evil spirits with stock words and devices:

Pucelle.    […] Now help, ye charming spells and periapts;
And ye choice spirits that admonish me
And give me signs of future accidents.  [Thunder.]
You speedy helpers, that are substitutes
Under the lordly monarch of the north,
Appear and aid me in this enterprise.

[Enter Fiends] (V. iii. 2-7)

Herford informs us that “periapts” are “amulets about the neck or arms,” while the “monarch of the north” should be understood as “the king of evil spirits; whose chief seat was held in popular demonology to be the north pole” (115). It seems clear that this scene is designed to serve as a “Eureka” moment: “Aha! She really is a witch in league with the devil!” The execution of the scene is, however, rather clumsy and possibly self-contradictory. After the fiends appear, she repeats her request for help, but the stage directions have them “walk and speak not”; “they hang their heads,” and “they shake their heads.” Joan makes a final plea:

Then take my body, soul and all.

Before that England give the French the foil.

[They depart.] (22-23)

When the fiends reject her request, she says:

Pucelle. [...] Now the time is come

That France must vail her lofty-plumed crest

And let her head fall into England’s lap.

My ancient incantations are too weak,

And hell too strong for me to buckle with:

Now, France, thy glory droopeth to the dust. (24-29)

If the fiends are not on her side and will not help her, are we not to conclude that hell is on the side of the English? If the war now turns in favor of the English, can the audience now maintain
the impression that the forces of good have prevailed? Perhaps we are to conclude that evil forces abandon those they are helping when they begin to lose and prefer to remain on the sidelines. Although such superstitions were commonplace at the time, the quandary posed by the vacillating fiends probably supports the theory that the play is the work of hands other than Shakespeare’s.

As previously mentioned, after Joan fights York, is captured by the English and then makes her last appearance in the play, there follows the scene with her shepherd-father already discussed (V. iv.). As it progresses, York commands that she be taken away “for she hath lived too long” (34), and she realizes that she will be executed. She makes several attempts to ask York and Warwick, who is also present, to spare her life. Seeming to forget that she is the enemy of the men to whom she is making her appeal, she first repeats her claim to be of royal birth, and that she is “virtuous and holy,” “chaste and immaculate” (39, 51). When these fail, she claims to be pregnant. Assuming the child to be the Dauphin’s, they assert that it is even more important that neither the potential heir nor its mother survive, and repeat their order for her execution. Joan announces that the prospective father is the Duke of Alençon, which does nothing to change their minds. Finally, she proclaims that the father is Reignier, the king of Naples, but York and Warwick laugh off these protestations, mocking her duplicity and cowardice. Joan curses them and their country, expressing the hope that one day their despair drives them to suicide. York sends her off to be executed: “Break thou in pieces and consume to ashes, thou foul accursed minister of hell!” (92-93). With this, Joan’s participation in

---

22 Claims of Joan’s royal lineage, usually that she was a bastard child, are part of her legend. In one version of the story, she is the illegitimate daughter of the dauphin’s mother, Queen Isabeau of Bavaria (Pernoud 222). Her intimacy with the dauphin, Charles, usually an aspersion, becomes a plot device in the libretto of Verdi’s opera on the subject, which is discussed in Chapter 2. The combination of the two unsupported claims is tantamount to an accusation of incest, one of the few crimes Shakespeare does not heap upon her head overtly, although perhaps it could be inferred in this ignominious scene.
Shakespeare’s drama comes to an end, and she makes no further appearance in the two subsequent parts of the trilogy.

Despite the absence of any reference by Schiller to *Henry VI* in his papers, the large number of characters and events exhibiting parallels to Shakespeare’s play seems to offer compelling evidence of his close familiarity with it. Of greater significance is the presence of depictions, both with and without historical basis, that serve to diminish Shakespeare’s rough treatment of Joan, who is to be replaced with Schiller’s more idealized Johanna.

_Ein edler Sinn liebt edlere Gestalten._
(Schiller “Das Mädchen von Orleans” 1801)\(^{23}\)

Voltaire and Jeanne

The other controversial depiction which Schiller had to overcome was Voltaire’s _Pucelle_. This presented a three-pronged challenge: Voltaire’s mock epic was extremely well known; it was admired by some for the sharpness of its language; and it represented Jeanne\(^{24}\) as an utterly ordinary stable girl whose singular virtue was her constantly threatened virginity. Schiller was aware of what he was up against, as he revealed in a letter to Wieland, written after the play’s premiere on 17 October 1801. He was, on this occasion, comparing his depiction of Johanna with that of Wieland’s Lais in _Sokrates mainomenos_\(^{25}\):

\(^{23}\) “A noble spirit loves noble forms.” The final line of a poem published the same year as _Die Jungfrau_, 1801.

\(^{24}\) See the Table Comparing the Spelling of Names, Appendix 1

\(^{25}\) This comparison is complex and subtle. Lais is generally regarded as a notorious courtesan of the time of Socrates. Wieland’s work imagines Diogenes as a “Socrates gone mad” (*Sokrates mainomenos*, an epithet attributed to Plato) to whom the courtesan offers her services at no charge.
Voltaire started working on the poem around 1730, intending to entertain educated and liberal-minded readers of the upper classes with whom he had direct or close relations. Some of them were so enthusiastic that they made copies, which began to be circulated more and more widely, in a kind of pre-revolutionary, French version of the Soviet-era tradition of samizdat. The poem became so popular, however, that unauthorized printed versions began to appear all over Europe, with no profits accruing to the author, a fact that led Voltaire finally to publish an edited version in 1762. A great deal might be said about this brilliant and controversial work, although Schiller and many of his contemporaries saw it as merely salacious. Given contemporary tastes and attitudes toward sex, it is likely that it would be received much more favorably today than was the case in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. The discussion here will be limited to connections between Voltaire’s poem and Schiller’s Jungfrau.

Nora Heimann has examined Voltaire’s and Schiller’s versions of Joan’s story. Her book follows the legacy of their conceptions, much as this dissertation does, but it does so through the

26 “Both moreover have this in common, that they seek to restore two terribly ignominious and admirable ladies to a proper reputation, and you will agree, that Voltaire has done his utmost to make the game difficult for any dramatic successor. If he has dragged his Pucelle too deeply in the mire, I have perhaps elevated mine too drastically. But there was no other way, if one wanted to remove the mark with which he had branded his Beauty.”
art and culture of France. Her commentary reveals a deep familiarity with Voltaire’s entire work and some of its many spurious versions, but even a scholar as intimate with the nuances of the distinction between what people think Voltaire has to say about Jeanne and what he actually writes about her lets prejudice get the best of her. When she describes a 1795 painting by Charles-Étienne Gaucher, to which he added a quote from Voltaire’s *Pucelle*, her description of the image of Joan of Arc includes the following remark: “…this playfully coy maiden takes the form of Voltaire’s alluring protagonist. With her head tilted in a come-hither glance, her breasts pushed forward, and her left hand holding the pommel of a down-turned sword like a jaunty cane, Gaucher’s Joan is patently sexy” (49). A look at the painting confirms the accuracy of the description, but when Heimann says that this is the look of “Voltaire’s alluring protagonist,” it seems that she is making the same mistake that Schiller and many others seem to have made. They confuse the compromising and salacious settings into which Voltaire places Jeanne with the much more innocent personality which he supplies to her. As Heimann explains it, one of Voltaire’s inspirations for writing the poem was to poke fun at Jean Chapelain’s entirely earnest *The Maid, or the Heroic Poem of France Delivered*. Where Chapelain is perhaps creative in his accounts of Jeanne’s biography, Voltaire is utterly inventive: Jeanne is the illegitimate daughter of a priest; a stable girl; she rides a flying donkey. Voltaire clearly does not intend his readers to confuse his *pucelle* with the actual historical figure, but that is what they did.

This kind of confusion, a risk generally in satire, can be found in a more recent treatment of Christ. When the comedy troupe, Monty Python, produced a religious satire in 1979 called *The Life of Brian*, they provoked controversy because some saw the film as making light of Christian teachings, rather than making light of excessive religious dogma. The film’s hero, Brian, was clearly not presented as an actual messiah; and the satire was directed against extreme
ideology. Similarly, the erotic situations in which Voltaire places his Jeanne should not be construed as attempts to suggest that Joan herself was immoral or corrupt. Her first encounter with the Dauphin leads immediately to an examination to confirm her virginity. Voltaire gleefully informs us that the examination actually occurred, and Pernoud confirms that it took place in Poitiers on or about 11 March 1429. It was to be repeated during her trial two years later, with the same result. Admittedly, Voltaire’s Jeanne ends up naked on several occasions and is almost raped several times, but each time her virginity is maintained. A notable exception occurs at the end, when she finally surrenders to her stalwart companion, Dunois, eliciting, even at the moment it is no longer true, the proud boast of Brother Lourdis: “Anglais! elle est pucelle!” (Ye Britons! She’s a maid!) The fact that the French public was eager to attach such importance to her virginity is precisely the issue in Voltaire’s satire.

Henri Bernardin de Saint-Pierre has taken appropriate note of Joan’s odd career in Voltaire’s poem: “The death of Joan of Arc would yield yet greater insight if a man of genius would dare to confront the ridicule which we have showered on this respectable and unfortunate girl, to whom Greece would have raised altars” (Pernoud 238). Bernardin’s reference to Greek altars calls to mind the mission of Iphigeneia and Orestes to return the statue of Artemis to Brauron, another example of the almost inevitable link between the myth of Iphigeneia and Joan’s French history. One man of genius who appears to have accepted Bernardin’s challenge is Schiller, and it is worth pondering how much Greek technique may be found in the altar he raises to his Johanna.

In the same year Schiller produces the play, he publishes a poem that he hopes will explain his plan to treat the subject that had earned Voltaire such notoriety. He originally plans to call it, “Voltaire’s Pucelle und die Jungfrau von Orléans,” but decides ultimately to go with
the more poetic title of “Das Mädchen von Orleans,” omitting the specific reference to the man he believed had ridiculed Joan. Its first stanza makes clear Schiller’s view of Voltaire’s treatment of Joan:

Das edle Bild der Menschheit zu verhöhnen, To mock the noble image of humanity
Im tiefsten Staub wälzte dich der Spott, Scorn dragged you through the mud,
Krieg führt der Witz auf ewig mit dem Schönen, Wit always wages war with beauty,
Er glaubt nicht an den Engel und den Gott, It believes in no angel or god,
Dem Herzen will er seine Schätze rauben, It will rob the heart of its treasures,
Den Wahn bekriegt er und verletzt den Glauben. It clashes with delusion, wounding faith.

“Scorn” and “wit” in this context may be allegorical labels for Voltaire, an interpretation given further impetus by the masculine gender of the German word, “Witz,” requiring the use of the pronoun er (“he”). The “it” in English can be read as “he” in the German lines: “He believes in no angel or god,/He robs the heart,” etc. Although Schiller decides to remove Voltaire from the title of his poem, his criticism of the French poet’s treatment of Joan is implied.

Notwithstanding the possibility that Schiller’s perception of Voltaire’s Pucelle suffers from excessive conventionality, his negative perception was entirely in accord with the public’s opinion, which conflated Voltaire’s poem about Joan with Joan herself. The need to overcome the prejudice against the reputation of Voltaire’s maid was not merely an artistic problem but also a practical one, which blocked the premiere of the play in Weimar. Some commentators have suggested that this was because certain persons involved in the theater life of the city were not convinced of the play’s quality. The eventual success of the play belies this suggestion. Passage informs us that in light of Voltaire’s notorious poem, concerns about the appropriateness of Joan of Arc as the subject of a play at first concerned Schiller’s patron in Weimar, Duke Karl August. After reading the play, he realized that Schiller had exalted Joan’s chastity and heroic
nature, and that created a different problem: “No actress in the Weimar troupe was thinkable in the role save Karoline Jagemann, and Karoline Jagemann was his own mistress” (Passage 150). To have the duke’s mistress playing a role that most of the potential theater-goers of Weimar associated with Voltaire’s much-maligned *Pucelle* appears to have seemed scandalous. As a result, the premiere of the play was relocated to Leipzig and took place on 11 September 1801, with subsequent performances in Hamburg and Berlin. When it had finally gained a sufficient degree of acclaim and respectability, it played on the Weimar stage on 23 April 1803.
Chapter 1. Towards a New Tragic Joan

_Groß kann man sich im Glück, erhaben nur im Unglück zeigen._
(Schiller NA.20 “Vom Erhabenen” 185)\(^{27}\)

Schiller’s earliest reference to Joan of Arc as the subject for a play appears in a letter to one of his publishers, Friedrich Gottlieb Unger. Sent from Weimar, on 17 April 1800, a Thursday. He begins the letter with a remark on his poor health: “wie wenig der vergangene Winter bei mir den Musen günstig war”\(^{28}\) and goes on to describe two subjects he is considering for development. The first, to judge from the letters that follow this one, appears to be material related to _Maria Stuart._ He had begun research for this play the year before, but progress on it had been hampered by his chronically poor health and lack of confidence in his ability to do it justice. The second item, to judge from how he describes it, seems to be _Die Jungfrau_, about which he writes to request Unger’s view of the suitability of the material for a calendar to be published the next year: “Was den Calendar anbetrifft, so wünschte ich zu wissen, ob es Ihnen recht ist, wenn ich zur Basis deßelben ein dramatisches Werk mache; denn da ich jetzt mit der vorzüglichsten Neigung in diesem Genre arbeite so wünschte ich dabei zu bleiben und mir durch eine anderweitige Arbeit keine zu große Diversion zu machen” (NA.30 17 Apr 1800, 151-52).\(^{29}\)

Astonishingly, less than three weeks later he writes to Goethe (Weimar 5 May 1800 Montag), after a brief summation of his moderately improving health, “Sonst habe ich in diesen Tagen mich damit beschäftigt, die vier ersten Akte der Maria für den Theaterzweck in Ordnung zu

\(^{27}\)“Greatness shows itself in good fortune; the sublime only in misfortune.”
\(^{28}\)“…how little favor the Muses bestowed on me over the past winter.”
\(^{29}\)“Regarding the Calendar, I wanted to know whether you think it suitable for me to make a dramatic work its basis, for since I am just now working in this genre with the greatest enthusiasm, I wanted to stick to it and not be greatly distracted by a work in another direction.” Here again he is referring to the coincident work on _Maria Stuart_, as well as to his recent translation of Shakespeare’s _Macbeth_.

bring und bin auch damit fertig, so daß ich jetzt schon den fünften Akt zu Hand genommen. 
Von Macbeth [Schiller’s translation of Shakespeare’s play] sind mehrere Proben gewesen, und ich hoffe alles Gute davon. Doch wird die erste Vorstellung erst am Mittwoch über 8 Tage statt finden können” (154-55). Thus, while he is overseeing rehearsals for the premiere of his translation of Macbeth, he is nearly finished with Maria Stuart, which itself is scheduled to begin rehearsals only slightly more than two weeks later. On 23 May, Schiller expresses regret that Goethe has missed a read-through of the previous day of the completed play, which was to see its premiere on 14 June 1800. All of this activity, it is worth noting, comes from a man professing to have been shown “little favor” by the Muses.

By the middle of 1800, Schiller was already famous as a playwright and poet and the acknowledged confidant and closest friend of the far more famous Goethe. During their years together in Weimar, he and Goethe had brought German Classicism into existence, against the prevailing winds of Romanticism that were blowing throughout most of the rest of Germany and Europe. Given that his stature in German literature is exceeded only by Goethe, it is easy to forget that his path to fame was circuitous at best, and full of hardships, sickness, and disappointments. Many biographers have examined the details of his life and work: the concern here is to take cognizance of those of his efforts leading most directly into the creation of Die Jungfrau von Orleans.31 The discussion here will address Schiller’s development of the Joan of Arc material, the role of both his and others’ literary works in that development, the emergence of

30 “I have also been busy these last few days bringing first four acts of Maria into order for the acting script and am almost finished with it, so that I can now take up the fifth act. There have been several rehearsal for Macbeth, and I have high hopes for it. And so the first performance will take place on Wednesday only eight days from now.”
31 The following biographers are cited often in the text: Benno von Wiese, Henry Garland, Heinrich Düntzer, Thomas Carlyle, Heinrich Döring. Publication information can be found in the Bibliography.
of his Johanna, and the argument for what this dissertation calls sublime sanctity, of which Johanna’s incarnation by Schiller is the dramatic distillation.\(^{32}\)

The production of Schiller’s first play, *Die Räuber* (1781) in Mannheim, caused a sensation and gained him the attention of the German theatrical world. He would not experience a similar success until the premiere of *Jungfrau* twenty years later. It also resulted in his detention for two weeks in the military barracks in Stuttgart, where he was a physician in service to Duke Karl Eugen of Württemberg. Schiller had left the duchy to attend the performances without permission, and the play contained a disparaging reference to the Graubünden canton in Switzerland, provoking a “semi-official *démarche* by the government of the canton” (Garland 48). The Duke threatened to have Schiller arrested if he published any non-medical literature. The father of one of Schiller’s classmates at the Duke’s *Hohe Karlschule*, Christian Daniel Schubart, had written some verses satirizing the Duke and his mistress, and by that time had already been imprisoned without trial for four years at the fortress of Hohenasperg. Schiller had gotten his inspiration for the play from a story by Schubart, whom the Duke would not release for another six years. Schiller very much wanted to abandon the military career the Duke had thrust upon him and pursue his literary ambitions, but he knew he could not accomplish this in his native Stuttgart. He decided to flee Württemberg for Mannheim on 22 September 1782 at night under an assumed identity, conditions rather befitting a hero of the *Sturm und Drang* literature then in fashion, of which *Die Räuber* remains one of the most famous examples. It seems that the vividness of Schiller’s depiction in *Jungfrau* of the struggle against authority perceived as unjust and the pain of being an outcast are similarly based on his personal experiences. In Mannheim he wrote two more plays, *Die Verschwörung des Fiesco zu Genoa*,

\(^{32}\) Johanna is Schiller’s name for Joan; the German equivalent of Jehanne, Joan’s original French name.
and *Kabale und Liebe* (both 1784) and began work on *Don Carlos*. He completed the first act in autumn of that year.

A close admirer and sometime lover in Mannheim, Frau Charlotte von Kalb sent a letter of introduction to Duke Karl August of Weimar in 1784. Schiller read a fragment of *Don Carlos* to Karl and his court when they visited Darmstadt and was granted the title of Sachsen-Weimarer Rat (Saxon-Weimar Adviser). There followed a period of close association with his lifelong friend and enthusiast, Christian Gottfried Körner, who provided Schiller with companionship and material support in Leipzig and Dresden 1785-1787. Much of what we know about Schiller’s thinking as he created *Jungfrau* and many other works derives from their correspondence, which continued until Schiller died in 1805. In 1788, Schiller came to Weimar even as Goethe was famously off in Italy, arriving on the heels of the success of his *Don Carlos* in Hamburg and Leipzig the year before. He began work on *Die Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande von der Spanischen Regierung*, the content of which had grown out of his research for *Don Carlos*. He met Wieland and Herder during this time and gave each a copy of the published version of *Don Carlos*. The Weimar court of Duke Karl August was not entirely receptive to Schiller initially, partially via the influence on the duke’s mother, the dowager Duchess Anna Amalia, of the playwright, Friedrich Gotter, and the actor-playwright, August Iffland, who were Schiller’s rivals from his Mannheim days. Accordingly, Wieland, who had been hired years earlier as tutor to Karl August by Anna Amalia, was initially reluctant to comment on the play, but eventually he and Schiller became friends. Where Winkelmann had introduced the generation of Lessing and the youthful Goethe to ancient Greek art, in like

---

33Despite the resemblance of her married surname to that of the foppish Kalb from *Kabale und Liebe*, her husband, whom Schiller admired, could not have been the inspiration for that character, as Schiller had written the play before he met the Kalbs. In fact, the coincidence was likely a cause of some embarrassment when he first made their acquaintance (Düntzer 143).
manner, Wieland introduced the subsequent generation of German readers to ancient Greek poetry. The effect of his knowledge of the ancient world on Schiller was profound. “Guided by Wieland, he came upon a new and hitherto unsuspected world; but it was a world which for all its attractions, was gone past recall” (Garland 128). During this time of intense interest in Greek classicism, Schiller produced, among other works, *Die Götter Griechenlands* and his German blank verse translation of Euripides’s *Iphigenia in Aulis*, both of which would provide Schiller a chance to explore the creation of the kind of classical atmosphere with which he would fill his *Jungfrau*.

The translation of *Iphigenia in Aulis* is somewhat problematic because it is not a translation from Euripides’s original Greek to German, but in fact a translation from both Latin and French versions into German. In his introduction to the volume of Schiller translations in the collected works of 1904, Albert Köster informs us that Schiller had first become familiar with Euripides’s play in a French translation: “Es war in jenem schönen Sommer 1788, daß Schiller in Volkstadt und Rodolstadt mit Caroline von Beulwitz und Lotte von Lengefeld den modernsten aller griechischen Tragiker in der französischen Übersetzung des Pater Brumon oft bis zu Tränen gerührt las” (Page x).34 His two fellow readers were sisters (The former, born Lengefeld, was still married to her first husband and would become one of his earliest biographers, Karoline von Wolzogen. The latter would become his wife, Charlotte Schiller). Köster goes on to explain that Schiller promised the two women that he would translate *Iphigenia in Aulis* and *The Phoenician Women* into German. He completed both translations by November. In the estimation of most observers, they do not count among the highest

---

34 “It was in that lovely summer of 1788 in Volkstadt and Rodolstadt when Schiller, often provoking tears, read the most modern of all the Greek tragedians to Caroline von Beulwitz and Lotte von Lengefeld in the French translation of Father Brumon.”
achievements of his artistic life. Von Wiese and other observers have reluctantly shared August Schlegel’s sardonic comment on Schiller’s efforts:

\[
\text{Ohn’ alles Griechisch hab’ ich ja}
\]

Verdeutscht die Iphigenia (Wiese 417)\(^{35}\)

Wolzogen argues, however, that the act of immersing himself in the life and texture of the ancient dramas represented a turning point in Schiller’s own approach to writing: “…daß dies Leben und Weben in diesen Urgebilden auch ein Wendepunkt für seinen eignen Geist wurde, ist wohl nicht zu verkennen” (x).\(^{36}\) Wiese echoes a similar sentiment: “Dennoch sind diese Bemühungen für Schillers geistige Entwicklung außerordentlich fruchtbar. […] die bereits geleistete Arbeit bedeutete ein wichtiges Vorspiel für sein eigenes Schaffen, für ‘Simplicität in Plan und Stil’” (417).\(^{37}\) Combined with his subsequent efforts to produce a German Aeneid, these preliminary exercises in translation helped Schiller to develop confidence in employing the phraseology, style, and tone of the ancients in his later plays, especially Jungfrau and Die Braut von Messina, but also Maria Stuarda.

Wiese is convinced that Schiller’s departures from history, and indeed the insistently pantheistic tone of Jungfrau, is part of the playwright’s plan to stylize Joan’s story into legend. “Überall zeigt sich Schillers Neigung, die geschichtliche Überlieferung noch stärker ins Legendäre zu stilisieren; die Prophezeiungen werden gehäuft, so daß Johanna Züge einer heidnischen Sibylle annimmt” (729).\(^{38}\) Wiese sees a pagan prophet in Schiller’s Johanna. For

\(^{35}\) “To Germanize the Iphigenia/ Required of me no Greek arcana.” Despite their adulation of Goethe, the Schlegel brothers had little use for his friend, Schiller, other than as an object of derision. Their persistent resistance to acknowledging Schiller’s importance in German literature is a rare blind spot for these influential German writers.

\(^{36}\) “It cannot be denied that the living and moving of these primal images even became a turning point for his intellect.”

\(^{37}\) “Nevertheless, these efforts are extraordinarily instrumental to Schiller’s intellectual development […] the ready-made work provided an important prelude to his own creation, to ‘simplicity in organization and style.’”

\(^{38}\) “Throughout, Schiller’s intent is revealed to stylize the historical tradition into the legendary; the prophesying accumulates to the point that Johanna assumes the traits of a pagan Sibyl.”
him, the conventional analogy with the Sibyl suffices, but it seems relevant to point out that in Tauris, Euripides’s Iphi-geneia also prophesies, although as with the dream she mistook to predict the death of her brother, she sometimes fails to interpret her prophecy correctly. Likewise, although Johanna foresees the death of Salisbury and other events of political and military importance, she fails to see the critical threat posed by physical love, incorrectly assuming that her vow of chastity will “lead her not into temptation.”

Wiese is sensitive to the criticism that, by having Johanna kill Montgomery in battle, Schiller is both departing from history and lowering Joan from a sublime aesthetic ideal. He argues: “Schiller’s Johanna wird nicht etwa idealisiert, wohl aber auf mythisch verfremdende Weise stilisiert” (730). What this seems to suggest is that Schiller’s intent is not to represent Johanna as a model for human behavior, rather that Schiller is casting her in a mythic stylization that exempts her from ordinary human standards. Along these lines, he observes that when Johanna kills, she takes on the role of an “avenging angel” (Racheengel), and that her unique spiritual purity sanctions her to commit that act and others as the will of God. “In der Welt bleibt sie die radikal Fremde, die Unbegreifliche, vielleicht ein Engel Gottes, aber dann ein ‘Racheengel,’ der in aller Lieblichkeit seiner schönen Erscheinung mit dem Schwerte kommt, um, entgegen aller geschichtlichen Überlieferung, auch noch den Wehrlosen und Sich-Ergebenden auf finstere Weise zu vernichten” (733). A major theme in Wiese’s interpretation is the depiction of Johanna as an “alien” or “foreigner” (Fremd), as much from humanity as from her family and people. “Denn Verfremdung bedeutet hier die Anwesenheit des Transzendenten”

---

39 “Schiller’s Johanna is not so much idealized as stylized in a mythically alienating manner.”
40 “In the world she remains the radical stranger, the incomprehensible one, perhaps an angel of God, but if so, then an ‘avenging angel,’ who comes in all her sweet loveliness with a sword to annihilate both the unarmed and those who surrender, against all historical tradition.”
Furthermore, her status as an alien signifies her transcendence of the mundane. It may also be recalled that the Taurian Iphigeneia is an exile in a foreign land as well, elevated to a sanctified god-like status when she is rescued from being sacrificed at Aulis. Seeing Johanna as a sanctified exile in the manner of Iphigeneia does not so much contradict Wiese’s interpretation as give it a more specific literary provenance, either from Euripides or Goethe.

Garland sees the operation of Greek tragedy clearly in Schiller’s Die Braut von Messina, with its plot constructed on the model of Sophocles’ Oedipus the King, but not so directly in Schiller’s earlier works, such as Maria Stuart and Jungfrau. Yet there seems to be ample evidence in Schiller’s papers that he was very much under the sway of ancient Greek dramatic principles while he was composing all three plays, and that the most prominent influence was Euripides.

While he was working on Stuart, he requested a copy of Aristotle’s Poetics, translated by Buhle, along with the newest publication of Euripides’ tragedies, edited by Beck (NA.30 13 April 1799). He remarked in a letter to Goethe a few weeks later, “Ein paar tragische Hauptmotive haben sich mir gleich dargeboten und mir großen Glauben an diesen Stoff gegeben, der unstreitig sehr viel dankbare Seiten hat. Besonders scheint er sich zu der Euripidischen Methode, welche in der vollständigsten Darstellung des Zustandes besteht, zu qualifizieren, denn ich sehe eine Möglichkeit, den ganzen Gerichtsgang zugleich mit allem politischen auf die Seite zu bringen, und die Tragödie mit der Verurtheilung anzufangen” (NA.30 45 26 April 1799). Schiller thus confirms his use of “the Euripidean method” in Stuart, a play written one year

---

41 “Since alienation here signifies the presence of transcendence.”
42 “A couple of tragic subjects have just occurred to me and given me great hopes in this material, which has indisputably very many welcome aspects. It particularly appears to qualify for the Euripidean method, coming through in its most complete representation of the condition, for I see a possibility of setting to the side the entire court proceeding along with everything political and starting the tragedy with the death decree.”
before taking up the theme of Joan of Arc the following summer. The precise method he refers to in this case is not the employment of a particular myth as a motive; rather it seems that he has Euripidean irony in mind, a type of traditional dramatic irony, in which the audience knows more than the characters on stage. The Verurtheilung (“death decree”) mentioned in the quote refers to whether or not Queen Elizabeth plans to execute Mary, a dilemma based on history and central to the play. It does not appear he intends to use the second layer in Euripidean irony, which is the manipulation of presumptions about a familiar myth or legend. In the case of Maria Stuart, the form of the signing and execution of the death warrant is faithful to historical accounts, including even Elizabeth’s blaming of the execution on the bungling of her privy councilor, Davison. On the other hand, the invention of the character of Mortimer, the face-to-face encounter of the queens, and the assassination attempt that immediately precedes the command by Burleigh to draw up the death warrant are manipulations of the facts, although it is unclear whether Schiller’s audience would have recognized these inventions as false. In any case, long before the more obvious employment of Greek dramatic principles in his Braut, Schiller identifies its place in this play, written before Jungfrau, with the additional clarification that the Greek method he uses is Euripidean.

On 16 June 1800, two days after the premiere of Maria Stuart, in a letter to Körner, he provides an assessment of his play and again refers to his plans for Jungfrau: “vorgestern ist sie gespielt worden, und mit einem Success, wie ich ihn nur wünschte konnte. Ich fange endlich an, mich des dramatischen Organs zu bemächtigen und mein Handwerk zu verstehen” (NA.30 162).43 The experience of translating Macbeth and writing Maria Stuart has left him with a new sense of confidence in his craft and a desire to continue his efforts along the same tragic, neo-

43 “It was performed the day before yesterday with such success as I could only have wished for it. I am finally beginning take control of the living dramatic body and understand my craft.”
classical vein. Later in the same letter, he explains that his health is improving and attributes it to his keeping active: “Mit meiner Gesundheit gieng es in den zwey letzten Monaten sehr gut […] Dieß ist zum Theil das Werk meiner Thätigkeit; denn ich befinde mich nie besser, als wenn mein Interesse an einer Arbeit recht lebendig ist. Ich habe auch deßwegen schon zu einer neuen Anstalt gemacht” (NA.30 163).44 In his last sentence here he announces his intention of beginning a new “preparation,” or researching and planning Die Jungfrau von Orleans. Only three weeks later, Schiller writes to his wife, Charlotte: “Mir ist bißher auch ganz wohl gegangen, und der Plan zu meiner neuen Tragödie ist bald fertig” (NA.30 169 Weimar, 4 July 1800).45

In the midst of writing Jungfrau, Schiller was engaged in mounting the Weimar premiere of Gluck’s opera Iphigénie en Tauride, which had originally premiered in Paris 1779. The Weimar premiere took place on 27 December 1800. It is likely, under the circumstances, that the performance was of the German version Gluck had produced in Vienna in 1781 and given the title associated with Goethe’s play, Iphigenie auf Tauris. Schiller writes to Goethe on 24 December 1800, expressing his enthusiasm for the success of the rehearsals: “Die Musik ist so himmlisch, daß sie mich selbst in der Probe unter den Poßen und Zerstreuungen der Sänger und Sängerinnen zu Thränen gerührt hat. Ich finde auch den dramatischen Gang des Stücks überaus verständig; übrigens bestätigt sich Ihre neuliche Bemerkung, daß der Anklang der Nahmen [sic] und Personen an die alte poetische Zeit unwiderstehlich ist” (224)46. A few lines later in this same letter he reports his progress on Jungfrau:

44 “My health has gotten much better the last two months […] This is partly on account of my activity, because I never feel better than when my interest is engaged by really lively work. Because of this, I have even started on a new preparation.”
45 “So far I am very well, and the plan for my new tragedy is almost ready.”
46 “The music is so heavenly that in rehearsal, even amid the burlesque and the distractions of the singers, I find myself moved to tears. I find the dramatic course of the piece generally intelligible; additionally, it proved your recent observation that the recollection of names and persons from the old poetic time is irresistible.”
Ich habe seit Ihrer Abwesenheit meine Tragödie auch um einige bedeutende Schritte vorwärts gebracht, doch liegt immer noch viel vor mir […] Das historische ist überwunden, und doch soviel ich urteilen kann, in seinem möglichsten Umfang benutzt, die Motive sind alle poetisch und größtentheils von der naive Gattung (224).  

His remark about having employed the historical element to the greatest extent possible is significant because it shows that portraying history in this play was not of primary importance. Indeed, in Letter 26 of his Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen, he argues that to produce a sublime moral effect, aesthetic semblance (Schein) is preferable to strict adherence to reality: “Die Realität der Dinge ist ihr (der Dinge) Werk; der Schein der Dinge ist des Menschen Werk, und ein Gemüth, das sich am Scheine weidet, ergötzt sich schon nicht mehr an dem, was es empfängt, sondern an dem, was es thut” (NA.20 399 parentheses Schiller’s). It is significant that the “taking of pleasure” (weidet) in semblance is not merely an experience but an action, something which the aesthetic nature does, which is similar to the action of a character in a play. Schiller does not wait long for his reader to wonder what the limits are to this notion of preferring semblance to reality: “Auf die Frage ‘In wie weit darf Schein in der moralischen Welt seyn?’ ist also die Antwort so kurz als bündig diese: in so weit es ästhetischer Schein ist, d.h. Schein, der weder Realität vertreten will, noch von derselben vertreten zu werden braucht. Der ästhetische Schein kann der Wahrheit der Sitten niemals gefährlich werden, und wo man es anders findet, da wird sich ohne Schwierigkeit zeigen lassen, daß der Schein nicht ästhetisch

---

47 “In your absence I have made significant progress on my tragedy, but I still have a lot to do […] [I have] overcome the historical element, and as far as I can tell, have used it to the greatest extent possible; the motives are all poetic and for the most part of the naïve type.”

48 Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man, 1793-95.

49 “The reality of things is the work of things themselves; the semblance of things is the work of man; and a nature that delights in semblance no longer takes pleasure in what it receives, but what it does” (trans. Hinderer and Dahlstrom 166-67).
war” (NA.20 403). As long as the representation makes no claims to be reality, Schiller argues, no moral danger is posed by any degree of fantasy or fabrication. A play is not history; therefore from Schiller’s viewpoint, it need not conform to history, as long as it maintains its inner logical coherence.

Another significant phrase from the December 1800 letter to Goethe is his assertion that the motives are all poetic and “for the most part of the naïve type.” Here, the author of *Naïve and Sentimental Poetry* describes his contemporary work on the life of a medieval martyr using the term, naïve, which he essentially coined to characterize the work of the ancient Greek poets. That is, he uses the term “naïve,” which distinguishes ancient Greek from modern poetry, to describe the aesthetic nature of his play about Joan of Arc.

By the time the new year began and the century turned, he had already enjoyed the actual performance of Gluck’s opera. Haydn’s *Creation*, which had been performed in Weimar on New Year’s Eve, gave him “wenig Freude. Dagegen hat mir Glucks Iphigenia auf Tauris einen unendlichen Genuß verschafft, noch nie hat eine Music [sic] mich so rein und schön bewegt als diese, es ist eine Welt der Harmonie, die gerad zur Seele dringt und in süßer hoher Wehmut auflöst” (NA.31 1, to Körner 5 Jan 1801). The effect of the music on Schiller is precisely the kind of experience he sees as essential in his essay *Über die tragische Kunst* (“On the Art of Tragedy”), which is discussed below.

50 “To the question ‘How far can semblance legitimately exist in the moral world?’ the answer is then, briefly and simply, this: to the extent that it is aesthetic semblance; that is to say, semblance that neither seeks to represent reality nor needs to be represented by it. Aesthetic semblance can never be a threat to the truth of morals; and where it might seem to be otherwise, it can be shown without difficulty that the semblance was not aesthetic” (trans. Hinderer and Dahlstrom 169-70).

51 This essay will be examined in greater detail in Chapter 3 as it relates to Zhukovskii’s translations of Schiller.

52 “Little enjoyment. As opposed to Gluck’s *Iphigenia auf Tauris*, which gave me endless pleasure. Never before has music moved me so purely and beautifully as this. It is a whole world of harmony, that cuts straight to the soul and dissolves into the most melancholy sweetness.”
On 11 Feb 1801, he reports to Goethe that he believes it is finally time to acquaint him directly with the work in progress. “Drei Acte sind in Ordnung geschrieben” (8). Schiller invites Goethe to come over for dinner to read him the completed three acts. Goethe replies the same day, saying that his eye doctor has forbidden him to go out and inviting Schiller instead to join him for dinner at his house. The commentary to the exchange of letters in the NA confirms that the visit and the reading took place, but Schiller seems to have had nothing to say about it. His next letter to Goethe was on 26 February 1801 and reports only that he has not been able to do anything with the tragedy for the last three days. The NA commentary also asserts that Schiller moved to Jena in March of 1801 with the intent of completing the last two acts, but in fact, finished only Act IV there. Schiller wrote to Unger and Körner about these plans as well. From Jena he writes Goethe (10 March) confessing serious concerns about the awkward grounding of the play midway between history and philosophy:

In Rücksicht auf die Preißfrage kann ich Ihnen noch nicht viel brauchbares mittheilen. Das Einzige gebe ich Ihnen zu bedenken, ob man die Frage nicht ganz aus dem Gebieth der Geschichte hinweg in das Gebieth der Anthropologie verlegen sollte [should remove], wobei man einer ungeheuren Moles los würde, die noch dazu viel hilft, denn die Geschichte ist für den philosophischen Gebrauch zu unzuverlässig (unreliable) und empirisch. Für die Sache selbst ist es, däucht mir, ganz gleichgültig ob die Untersuchung nach der Länge oder nach der Breite angestellt wird. Denn wenn man, wie Sie selbst meinen, den Naturstand zur Basis macht, so ist man gleich gut bedient, man mag nun das Ganze der Gegenwart anthropologisch ansehen, oder die verschiedenen Erscheinungen des
Menschen rückwärts in der Geschichte aufsuchen, der Mensch ist in jeder Zeit ganz zu finden.

Ich erwarte in Ihrem nächsten Brief noch bestimmter zu hören, wie ich die Frage eigentlich faßen und aussprechen soll, um mit unsern Philosophen umständlicher zu conferieren. (NA.31 13) 53

Schiller had been so assiduous in his historical research while preparing to write Don Carlos that it resulted in the volume on the Thirty Years’ War that gained him a temporary professorship in history at the University of Jena from 1789-1791. The historical resources for Joan of Arc were less abundant, however in the NA commentary to the play, Wiese and Blumenthal inform us that during this time, Schiller consulted Claude François Xavier Millot’s Universalhistorie alter, mittler und neuer Zeiten (Comprehensive History of the Ancient, Middle and Modern Ages, NA.9 404). Ulrich Karthaus mentions that Schiller also came into contact with François Gayot de Pitaval’s collection Merkwürdige Rechtfälle als ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Menschheit (Noteworthy Legal Cases as a Contribution to Human History), which alerted him to the existence of the transcriptions of the trial of condemnation and the rehabilitation of Joan of Arc (137). Carlyle writes of the transcripts: “Schiller had been moved in perusing them: this tragedy gave voice to his feelings” (135). These had been published in French by Clément de l’Averdy in 1790 as Notices et extraits de la biblioteque du roi; they were divided into two sections related to the condemnation trial of 1431 and the rehabilitation of

53 “Looking back at the main question, I still can’t share anything useful with you. The one thing I ask you to consider is whether one should remove the question from the realm of history into the realm of anthropology, by which one could remove a huge blemish, which is very helpful at the same time, since history is too unreliable and empirical for philosophical purposes. It seems to me that it’s all the same for the matter itself whether you pursue it its whole length or width. If, as you yourself put it, one takes the state of nature as the basis, then one is served equally well, whether one prefers to view the present anthropologically, or seek the various manifestations of humanity retrospectively in history: one finds the person whole in every period. In your next letter, I look forward to hearing more specifically how I ought to come to grips with the question and express it, so as to take full account of our philosophers.”
nullification trial of 1456. Many of the peculiar details of the individual characteristics of the historical personalities, especially as they diverge from their depiction in Shakespeare, come from these documents. Sometimes odd specificity in names or places in the play can be traced to the *Notices*. At the end of Act I, following her prophecy on the death of Salisbury, Johanna delivers a speech that she intends for an English messenger to take back to his lords. It is remarkable in its similarity to the actual letter that Joan dictated to King Henry VI:

> – König von England und ihr, Herzoge
> Bedford und Gloster, die das Reich verwesen!
> Gebt Rechenschaft dem Könige des Himmels
> Von wegen des vergoßnen Blutes! Gebt
> Heraus die Schlüssel alle von den Städten,
> Die ihr bezwungen wider göttlich Recht!
> Die Jungfrau kommt vom Könige des Himmels,
> Euch Frieden zu bieten oder blut'gen Krieg.
> Wählt! Denn das sag ich euch, damit ihr’s wisset:
> Euch ist das schöne Frankreich nicht beschieden
> Vom Sohne der Maria – sondern Karl,
> Mein Herr und Dauphin, dem es Gott gegeben,
> Wird königlich einziehen zu Paris,
> Von allen Großen seines Reichs begleitet.

(I.ii. 1207-21)\(^54\)

> Roy d’Angleterre, et vous, duc de Bedford, qui vous dicit regent de royaume de France; vous, Guillaume de la Poule, conte de Sulford; Jehan, sire de Talebot; et vous, Thomas, sire d’Escales, qui vous dicit lieutenans dudit duc de Bedford, faictes raison au Roy du ciel; rendez la pucelle, qui est cy envoiee de par Dieu, le Roy du ciel, les clefs de toutes les bonnes villes que vous aves prises et violees en France. Elles est toute preste de faire de paix, se vous lui voulez faire raison, par ainsi que France vous mectres jus et paierez ce que vous l’avez tenu… Et n’aiez point en vostre oppinion, quar vous ne tendrez point le royaume de France [de] Dieu, le Roy du ciel, fils saincte Marie; ains le tendra le roy Charles, vray heriter; car Dieu, le Roy du ciel, le veult, et lui est revelé par la Pucelle; lequel entrera a Pris a bonne compagnie. (Pernoud 249)

---

\(^54\) The translations of these two letters are to be found in Appendix 2.
Especially striking is the inclusion in the list of Johanna’s addressees of the Duke of Bedford, who otherwise does not appear in the play. On the other hand, it is curious why Schiller’s Johanna does not mention John Talbot, who figures prominently in the play. Perhaps because Schiller depicts Talbot as a rather unusual adversary with uniquely redeeming qualities, he chooses not to associate him with enemies of the more conventional sort. The reference to giving up the keys to the cities is another unusually specific detail. This kind of detail demonstrates that with the Universalhistorie and Notices, Schiller had plenty of factual material on which to base his play. Furthermore, his decision to employ ahistorical elements was not the result of lack of information, but of a conscious artistic preference.

It is possible that Schiller avoided employing the historical in depicting Joan’s death out of a desire to avoid repeating himself. After all, the endings of his two previous plays, Don Carlos and Maria Stuart, on the basis of history, involve the destruction of the protagonists on ostensibly religious grounds. At the conclusion of Don Carlos, when King Philip says to the Grand Inquisitor, “Kardinal! Ich habe/ Das Meinige getan. Tun Sie das Ihre” (V.xi 5369-70), it is utterly clear from his previous behavior that the Inquisitor’s next act will be to kill the king’s son, Carlos, and that he will invent a doctrinal reason for his murder. Likewise, in Maria Stuart, Protestant religion fans the flame that fires the passion of Queen Elizabeth and her supporters in their quest to find a suitable reason to get rid of Maria. Although her execution ultimately takes place only with Elizabeth’s ambivalent endorsement and is based on rumors of rebellion, Schiller strongly emphasizes the religious element in the final act. Just before ascending the scaffold, Maria makes her last confession and receives holy communion from her steward, Melvil, whom we have just learned is a priest:

55 “Cardinal, I have done my part, now do yours.”
Melvil. Nimm hin den Leib, er ist für dich geopfert!
Nimm hin das Blut, es ist für dich vergossen!
Nimm hin! Der Papst erzeigt dir diese Gunst!
Im Tode noch sollst du das höchste Recht
Der Könige, das priesterliche üben! (V. vii 3747-51)\(^{56}\)

Schiller never alludes to a desire to avoid religion in his letters about *Jungfrau*, although he refers to making substantive changes late in the development of the last acts (Doering 174-176).

By the third of April, the tone of his letters reveals that he has found the solution to his problems and can see the successful conclusion of the play in the immediate future:

In etwa 14 Tagen hoffe ich am Ziele zu seyn. Von meinem letzten Act auguriere ich viel Gutes, er erklärt den Ersten, und so beißt die sich die Schlange in den Schwanz. Weil meine Heldin darinn auf sich allein steht, und im Unglück, von den Götter deseriert ist, so zeigt sich ihrer Selbstständigkeit und ihr CharacterAnspruch auf die Prophetenrolle deutlicher. Der Schluß des vorletzten Acts ist sehr theatralisch und der donnernde Deus ex machina wird seine Wirkung nicht verfehlen. (27)\(^{57}\)

These last few sentences reach in several directions at once. Above all, Schiller clearly sees his new play as containing the “Euripidean method” that he has employed in *Maria Stuart*.

Referring to the penultimate act, that is, Act IV, he describes her condition using the same words:

\(^{56}\) “Take the body, which was sacrificed for you/Take the blood that was shed for you/ Take it! The Pope grants you this privilege! In death, you shall enjoy the highest right of kings and priests!” Ordinarily, Roman Catholic congregants received only the communion wafer or “body.” The wine or “blood” was reserved for priests and, by papal exception, kings.

\(^{57}\) “I hope to reach the goal in about fourteen days. It seems to me that the last act will work really well; it explains the first, and thus the snake bites its tail. Because my heroine stands all alone during it, in misfortune and deserted by the gods, her self-sufficiency and her character’s claims to the role of prophet reveal themselves more clearly. The penultimate act is very theatrical and the effect of the thundering deus ex machina can’t miss.”
he uses to define the sublime in his essay of the same title, “On the Sublime:” *im Unglück* ("in misfortune"). This essay and this scene will be analyzed in more detail below. It is striking that he describes Johanna as being deserted by “the gods” rather than by God. He identifies her as a Prophet, as opposed to an ecclesiastical martyr. His reference to the *deus ex machina*, a clear Euripidean allusion, however, is somewhat puzzling. This device is almost uniformly associated with a divine rescue at the conclusion of a tragedy, which I shall argue is exactly what Schiller employs at the conclusion of *Jungfrau*. In this letter, however, he is referring to the “penultimate act” and describes the device as “thundering.” He can only be referring to the thunder that accompanies Johanna’s silence after she is condemned by her father as a follower of Satan, following the coronation of the Dauphin at Rheims cathedral in Act IV.

On 7 April, he sends Unger directions on how to print the play, including instructions on the portraits to be depicted: “Agnes Sorel, Carl VII, Queen Isabelle und die Jungfrau qualifizieren. Die letztere wünschte ich nach der schönen Antiker Minerva gemacht” (Bd 31 28).58 Two weeks later, he promises to send Unger a copy via Meier of a Minerva bust from Goethe’s own collection. The choice of Minerva (the Latin name for Athena) to represent Johanna does not accord completely with the Iphigeneia plays. Although the choice clearly supports the connection to ancient tragedy, it does so in a somewhat vague manner. Admittedly, the *dea ex machina* at the end of *IT* is Athena, but the goddess driving the plot of *IA*, the play that *Jungfrau* follows more closely, is Artemis. Perhaps Schiller’s decision to use an image from Greek antiquity is the most compelling factor. Depictions of Joan existed, as did depictions of Agnes Sorel, King Charles and Queen Isabeau. That Schiller never considered the use of a

---

58 “Agnes Sorel, Carl VII and the maid qualify. I would like the last [Johanna] made in the likeness of the lovely ancient Minerva.”
historical portrait says as much about the character’s distinction from any of her eponymous predecessors as it does about the classical effect he hoped to produce with it.

He completed Act V in Weimar on 16 April 1801 (NA.39 II 65). Goethe read it almost immediately and had this to say: “Es ist so brav, gut und schön, daß ich ihm nichts zu vergleichen weiß” (20 April 1801 NA.39 I 57).59 Schiller was understandably pleased with Goethe’s high opinion of the play: “Goethe meint, daß es mein bestes Werk sei” (to Körner 13 May, NA 36).60

On 26 November 1801 several scenes of Jungfrau were presented privately at the Weimar home of the dramatist August von Kotzebue. Karl Böttiger, director of the Weimar gymnasium, recorded the details of a conversation he had with Schiller that evening, bits of which have been cited above: “Das Mädchen von Orleans ist ein in seiner Art einziges Sujet in der Geschichte und ein beneidenswerter Stoff für den Dichter, ohngefähr wie die Iphigenie bei den Griechen” (NA.42 33361). Here we have the closest approximation of a statement by Schiller himself of his intent to model Johanna on Iphigeneia. Böttiger had read the complete play a few weeks earlier. Along with the aforementioned confirmation of the Black Knight as the ghost of Talbot, he reports other devices that Schiller explained to him that evening. The playwright’s decision to employ hexameters in the scene in which Johanna kills Montgomery is apparently motivated by his sense that the knight should resemble Lykaon in Homer’s Iliad, in his

59 “It is so noble, good, and beautiful that I know nothing to compare to it.”
60 “Goethe thinks that it is my best work.” These quotations were already used in the Prologue but seem to bear repeating here.
61 “The Maid of Orleans is in its way a unique subject in history and an enviable subject matter for the poet, somewhat like the Iphigenia of the Greeks.” Böttiger’s second-hand quote, albeit from a reliable source, was presented as a direct quote from Schiller by Döring in his biography (174). Carlyle, whose biography of Schiller is often merely a translation of Döring, paraphrases it: “She resembled, in Schiller’s view, the Iphigenia of the Greeks; and as such, in some respects, he has treated her” (137).
confrontation with Achilles from canto 21, verse 74. Lykaon is infamous there for failing to
die bravely in battle, and instead resorting to begging for his life from Achilles, who kills him as
a coward, with un concealed disgust. Johanna and Montgomery’s hexameters are entirely
analogous in form and feeling:

Montgomery. O ich muß sterben! Grausend faßt mich schon der Tod!
Johanna. Stirb, Freund! Warum so zaghaft zittern vor dem Tod,
Dem unentfliehbaren Geschick? – Sieh mich an! Sieh!
Ich bin nur eine Jungfrau, eine Schäferin
Geboren; nicht des Schwerts gewohnt ist diese Hand
[…]
Muß ich hier, ich muß – mich treibt die Götterstimme nicht
Eignes Gelüsten – euch zu bittern Harm, mir nicht
Zur Freude […]
Denn nicht den Tag der frohen Heimkehr wird ich sehn:
Noch vielen von den Euren wird ich tödlich sein,
Noch viele Witwen machen, aber endlich wird
Ich selbst umkommen und erfüllen mein Geschick.
– Erfülle du auch deines. Greife frisch zum Schwert,

Schiller identifies Montgomery for some reason as “ein Walliser,” or as coming from a region of Switzerland not
generally listed among the warring factions of the Hundred Years’ War. The name Montgomery is a corruption of
the Latin Mons Gomeris, Gomer’s hill, ostensibly based on the biblical patriarch, Gomer, but in this context, the
knowledge that “Gomer” is a version of “Homer” adds another piece to the puzzle without quite solving it. Perhaps
the choice of Switzerland as Montgomery’s homeland is a barb flung back at the rulers of the Swiss canton whose
démarche had stung Schiller and forced him to leave his own home so many years earlier.
Lykaon should not be confused with Laocoön. Although both characters are Trojan, only Lykaon appears in
Homer. Laocoön’s agonies, depicted in the famous ancient sculpture with his sons, are described in the Aeneid.
Und um des Lebens süße Beute kämpfen wir.

(II.vii. 1652-69, emphases Schiller’s)

Montgomery. Oh, I have to die! Gruesome death seizes me already!

Johanna. Die, friend! Why do you tremble so timidly at death, 
The unavoidable fate? - Look at me! Look! 
I’m just a young maiden, born to be a shepherdess, 
My hand is unaccustomed to the sword

[…] 

I must be here, I must – the voices of the gods compel me, 
Not my own wishes – do you serious harm, 
Not for my own enjoyment […]

For I will never see the happy homecoming day:

Many more of you must I kill 
And make many widows, but finally 
I myself will die and fulfill my fate. 
You fulfull yours, too. Pick up your sword again, 
And let us fight for the sweet reward of life.

One reason that she describes herself as a maiden unaccustomed to the sword, fighting against her natural inclination is to shame Montgomery into picking up his own sword, which he has thrown down in despair. She will not simply kill him unarmed, and she is squeamish about his cowardly behavior. On a more interpretive level, however, Schiller is displaying one of the conditions which must confront a hero in a tragedy, to be compelled by circumstances beyond
one’s control to act against one’s inclination in fulfillment of one’s fate. He addresses this
notion in philosophical writings like Über die tragische Kunst, which will be discussed below.
Montgomery picks up his sword, they fight, and Johanna kills him. Johanna delivers the
following lines, after which, Schiller shifts from the hexameters he has used for this entire scene
back to the pentameters that he uses in all the other scenes of the play.

Erhab’ne Jungfrau, du wirkst Mächtiges in mir!
Du rüstest den unkriegerischen Arm mit Kraft,
Dies Herz mit Unerbittlichkeit bewaffnest du.
In Mitleid schmilzt die Seele, und die Hand erbebt,
Als bräche sie in eines Tempels heil’gen Bau,
Den blühenden Leib des Gegners zu verletzen;
Schon vor des Eisens blanker Schneide schaudert mir,
Doch wenn es not tut, alsbald ist die Kraft mir da,
Und nimmer irrend in der zitternden Hand regiert
Das Schwert sich selbst, als wär es ein lebend’ger Geist.

(1677-86)

Sublime virgin, you rouse the might within me!
You equip my unwarlike arm with power,
And my heart with mercilessness.
The soul melts with pity, and the hand trembles,
Though they could break the holy frame of a temple,
To wound the enemy’s healthy body;
I shudder at the sight of the naked iron blade,
Yet as soon as the need arises, I find the power,
And though my hand shakes, the sword
Never wavers, as if it were a living spirit.

Superficially, this moment can be seen as an example of the kind of supernatural hocus-pocus
that Schiller’s critics find problematic in the play. Johanna thanks the Blessed Virgin for helping
her in combat, steadying her hand to overcome her disinclination to harm another human being
and causing her sword to fight as if miraculously guided. Such an assessment fails to take into
account that the Blessed Virgin is only present in Johanna’s prayer. Schiller is careful in each
instance to identify the Macht and Kraft (“strength” and “power”) that Johanna describes as being
under her own physical control. The strength that she attributes to the working of the Virgin is
within her. It is her own unwarlike arm that has the power. Although the sword makes her
uncomfortable, when the need arises, the power to wield it comes back to her. The words that describe the operation of the sword, moreover, do not suggest an enchanted object. Schiller’s use of the subjunctive wäre (“as though it were”) makes that clear. The lebend’ger Geist is Johanna’s own spirit, roused, against her natural predispositions, to do what she is certain must be done. The adjective which Schiller puts in Johanna’s mouth to describe the Virgin is key: Erhab’ne (“sublime”). Johanna is not merely evoking the exalted status of the Blessed Virgin; she is acknowledging the suffering that Mary, the mother of Christ, endured for what she believed to be a higher cause, just as Iphigeneia suffers for a higher cause, and just as Johanna herself will do. The willingness on the part of all three virgins to sacrifice their happiness for the good of others is what Schiller describes as the power of the sublime. This idea will be taken up in greater detail below.

Returning to Böttiger’s summation of Schiller’s comments, he offers the explanation that Johanna’s falling in love with Lionel is the punishment (“die Strafe”) for having attained the pinnacle of fame, from which she, like all the great, must fall. This kind of punishment conforms to the sublime purpose of suffering, especially since Schiller (via Böttiger) goes on to say that it is a test. “Am Ende ist doch der ganze Handel mit der Verliebung nur eine Prüfung. Nur die geprüfte Tugend erhält zuletzt die kanonisierende Palme” (335).64 One might wonder how it can be that love should be interpreted as punishment. It is important to recall that Johanna has sworn to avoid Männerliebe, but she has incorrectly assumed that this vow will actually prevent her from experiencing such emotions. Her incorrect assumption, it later becomes clear, causes her luck to change after the coronation of the Dauphin as King Charles VII, when she is denounced by her father, ejected from the community, and captured by the English. Up to this

64 “Ultimately, the whole love-interest development is simply a test. Only virtue that has been tested finally earns the canonizing palm.”
point, the plot follows the information Schiller would have gleaned from the accounts of Joan’s life in De l’Averdy’s *Notices*. From the time she is captured in Schiller’s play, however, art diverges dramatically from history, which saw Joan cast in prison by the English, handed over to the church, tried for heresy, and burned. Because Johanna submits her will to the test of human love, bears its consequences and perseveres in her mission, however, Schiller rewrites her story to conclude with her victory in battle and a glorious death, in the manner of Iphigeneia at Aulis. Her actions become a manifestation of his conception of the power of the sublime, and her character is marked with the sanctity that distinguishes her literary sister, Iphigeneia.

To this it may be added that the conclusion of Euripides’s final play, much like the ending of Schiller’s *Jungfrau*, has been the subject of considerable discussion, especially in the modern era. In some versions the rescue of Iphigeneia is merely reported second hand by a messenger to her parents. In a text on the nature of animals from the third century CE, Aelian quotes what he says is a passage from *Iphigeneia*, which suggests that the goddess Artemis herself appears at the end of the play to announce that she has replaced Iphigeneia with a horned deer as the sacrificial victim. While these disparities pose significant problems for criticism of Euripides’s original text, they do not disturb the argument here. When Schiller wrote the conclusion to his translation, he avoided the final scene entirely, with his Iphigenie making the following speech as she ascended the steps to the sacrificial pyre:

65 An example of a theriomorphic transformation that, among other things, elevates Iphigenia’s status to divine, since such metamorphoses were usually reserved for gods. The numerous versions of the play form the subject of Sean Alexander Gurd’s *Iphigenias in Aulis*, Cornell University Press, 2005. The discovery of the lines from Aelian was published by Musgrave in 1762 and was familiar to most classicists by the time Schiller undertook his translation, perhaps explaining his choice to conclude the work with a synopsis. It is striking that two of the major sources Gurd uses to describe the reception and interpretation of Greek drama among the German romantics are Schiller’s *Briefe über die aesthetische Erziehung des Menschen* and *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung*. 
O Fackel Jovis! Schöner Strahl des Tages! Oh, torch of Jove! Lovely ray of daylight!

Ein ander Leben thut sich mir jetzt auf, Another life now awaits me,

Zu einem andern Schicksal scheid’ ich über. I choose another fate.

Geliebte Sonne, fahre wohl! (Sie geht ab) (160) Beloved sun, farewell! (exit)

Following this Schiller merely adds:

Hier schließt sich die dramatische Handlung.

Was noch folgt, ist die Erzählung von Iphigeniens Betragen beim Opfer und ihrer wunderbaren Errettung. (160)

Here the dramatic action ends.

What follows is the account of Iphigenia’s behavior during the sacrifice and her miraculous rescue.

This suggests that he has in mind the *dea ex machina* ending, with Artemis appearing in person to rescue Iphigenie, but the choice of version is not finally the point. The most significant implication is that in Schiller’s conception, Iphigenie’s sacrifice is averted by a *wunderbaren Errettung* (“miraculous rescue”).

Here, then, are the salient features of sublime sanctity as Schiller seems to present them. As in Euripides, a supernatural mission is undertaken to rescue an imperiled national aspiration; a father betrays his daughter; virginity is seen as challenged by the threat of sexuality or marriage: a mortal sacrifice looms; and finally, the sacrificial victim is rescued by supernatural means. All the components short of the rescue consist in the suffering of one or more of the characters, and suffering is the critical element in Schiller’s notion of sublimity. This idea is developed in his essay, *Vom Erhabenen* (“On the Sublime”), written several years before he was
writing Jungfrau. In that essay, we discover that actual suffering is not to be confused with its depiction. As Benno von Wiese points out, the enthusiasm of Lessing, Winckelmann, and Herder for the Laocoön, which they believed dramatically depicted Schönheit im Schmerz (“beauty in suffering”), most clearly demonstrates this notion (403). Wiese asserts that Schiller acquired many of his ideas on the sublime from Winckelmann’s interpretations of the art of the ancient Greeks and provided some of his earliest expressions of his affinity for these ideas in his 1785 piece, “Brief einen reisenden Dänen,” for the journal, Rheinische Thalia, which he wrote under an assumed identity. Expanding on these Greek ideals, as well as on ideas advanced by Burke and Kant, Schiller was to argue in Vom Erhabenen that suffering must be real and imposed by external forces, but even more important, that the suffering person must prevail over these forces by personal will, even if the triumph is only one of conscience. The occurrence of this last possibility, Schiller observes, is extremely rare: “Dieser letzter Fall is aber höchst selten und erfordert eine Erhebung der menschlichen Natur, die kaum in einem Subjekt als möglich gedacht werden kann” (NA.20 179, emphasis Schiller’s).66 Thus, extreme singularity of nature, what the argument here terms sanctity, is scarcely to be expected, but its appearance is sublime.

Vom Erhabenen was originally prefixed to Über das Pathetische (pathetic in the sense of Greek pafos “suffering”), 1793, and later removed by Schiller because he concluded that it added nothing new to Kant. The significance of the sublime is sharply characterized for the first time here in Schiller’s writing:

Groß ist, wer das Furchtbare überwindet. Erhaben ist, wer es, auch selbst unterliegend, nicht fürchtet. […]

Groß war Herkules da er seine zwölf Arbeiten unternahm und beendigte.

66 “This last case, however, is extremely rare and demands an elevation [or sublimation] of human nature, which can scarcely be considered possible in an individual.” [emphasis Schiller’s]
Erhaben war Prometheus, da er am Kaukasus angeschmiedet, seine That nicht bereute und sein Unrecht nicht eingestand.

Groß kann man sich im Glück, erhaben nur im Unglück zeigen.

(NA.20 185, emphasis mine)⁶⁷

For Schiller, it is not enough merely to be of noble birth or to accomplish great deeds. Hercules was a son of Zeus and did marvelous things, but this made him magnificent, not sublime. Prometheus was, if not a god, then a being of higher origin than Hercules, but his sublimity is not related to his position, rather to his fall from it and his eternal punishment. Schiller also expects his reader to recall that the Olympian gods punished Prometheus for having tried to share with mortals the gift of fire, which only the gods possessed previously. The gods saw this as a transgression and chained Prometheus to a rock in the Caucasus for his crime. As human mortals, we know that fire is an element of vital importance, and Prometheus, for his part, never acknowledges that his gift was a crime. To achieve the sublime, one must be in pursuit of a noble endeavor and subsequently overpowered by forces beyond one’s control without surrendering to misery, dejection, or spite. Happiness and success may be magnificent, but they cannot be sublime. One way of interpreting this concept for dramatic purposes is that only tragedy can reveal a sublime nature. Additionally, in Schiller as in Aristotle, the progression of the sublime actor must always be from happiness to misfortune, precisely the trajectory that Johanna follows after lifting the siege at Orleans.

The ideas expressed in Vom Erhabenen were refinements, more broadly applied, of lectures he had delivered on the dramatic arts in 1790. He published these lectures in 1792 under

⁶⁷ “The one who overcomes what is fearful is great. The one who shows no fear even in defeat is sublime. […] Hercules was great because he accepted and completed his twelve labors. Prometheus was sublime because, chained to the Caucasus, he did not regret his act and admitted no transgression. Greatness shows itself in good fortune; the sublime only in misfortune.”
the title, *Über die tragische Kunst*. We see in this essay the simultaneous working of the influence of Greek poetry and the inspiration of Goethe, as well as Schiller’s sense of his own shortcomings as a writer. He criticizes playwrights’ use of villains for instigating suffering as a cheap device of limited effectiveness and includes the example of his own Franz Moor from *Die Räuber*: “Es wird jederzeit der höchsten Vollkommenheit seines Werkes Abruch thun, wenn der tragische Dichter nicht ohne einen Bösewicht auskommen kann, und wenn er gezwungen ist, die Größe des Leidens von der Größe der Bosheit herzuleiten. Shakespears Jago und Lady Macbeth, Kleopatra in der Rodogune, Franz Moor in den Räubern, zeugen für diese Behauptung” (*NA.20 155*).

He holds up King Thoas in Goethe’s *Iphigenie auf Tauris* as an example of the “vorzügliche Schönheit” (“superior beauty”) of a character who can serve as both the origin of misfortune while still earning the love and respect of the audience: “Zu einem weit höhern Grad steigt das Mitleid, wenn sowohl derjenige, welcher leidet, als derjenige, welcher Leiden verursacht, Gegenstände desselben werden. Dieß kann nur dann geschehen, wenn der letztere weder unsern Haß noch unsre Verachtung erregte, sondern wider seine Neigung dahin gebracht wird, Urheber des Unglücks zu werden. So ist es eine vorzügliche Schönheit in der deutschen Iphigenia, daß der Taurische König, der einzige, der den Wünschen Orests und seiner Schwester im Wege steht, nie unsre Achtung verliert, und uns zuletzt noch Liebe abnötigt” (*NA.20 156*).

This is only the first time that Schiller will identify Goethe’s particular gift as a writer as sharing

---

68 Sometimes rendered as “On Tragic Art,” sometimes “On the Art of Tragedy.” The latter seems the more accurate translation, since it makes clear that the subject concerns the theatrical genre of tragedy, rather than the description of other possible art forms.

69 “The supreme perfection of a work always suffers when the writer of the tragedy cannot make do without a villain and is forced to derive the degree of suffering from the degree of malice. Shakespeare’s Iago and Lady Macbeth, Kleopatra in the *Rodogune*, Franz Moor in the *Räuber*, testify to this claim” (trans. Hinderer and Dahlstrom 8).

70 “Sympathy rises to a much higher degree when both the person suffering and the person causing the suffering become objects of the same [sympathy]. This can only happen when the latter rouses neither our hatred nor our contempt but is rather brought against his will to become the harbinger of misfortune. Thus is it an exquisite beauty in the German Iphigenia, when the Taurian king, as the only obstacle blocking the wishes of Orestes and his sister, never loses our attention and in the end, even demands our love.”
the power of freshness and artless simplicity with the ancient Greek poets, while lamenting the
artifice of modern writers, including himself. He would return to this theme in his essay *On
Naïve and Sentimental Poetry*, which it has been observed, “has a title which we may well
translate into modern prose as *On Goethe and Schiller*” (Ungar 112).71

It is appropriate to wonder to what extent the notion of the sympathetic villain relates to
the depiction of the characters in *Jungfrau*. Which characters might reasonably be construed as
villains, and do they, like Goethe’s Thoas, arouse our sympathy? The English knight, Talbot,
and his subordinate officer, Lionel, as combatants from the enemy camp, clearly meet the
definition. Schiller takes great pains, however, to depict Talbot as a military leader of bravery
and distinction. Some may object that Talbot comes across as an atheist, but he is a memorable
and sympathetic one. One of Talbot’s final lines before he dies has become one of the most
famous lines in German literature: “Mit der Dummheit kämpfen Götter selbst vergebens”
(2319).72 The line is directed against the Maid of Orleans, who, Lionel has just informed him, is
advancing with French forces on their position. In it, the rational, worldly warrior expresses his
frustration with his credulous countrymen’s lack of self-confidence:

Unsinn, du siegst, und ich muß untergehn!  
Delusion, you triumph and I must fall!

Mit der Dummheit kämpfen Götter selbst vergebens  
With stupidity the gods themselves contend in vain

**Erhabene** Vernunft, lichthelle Tochter  
**Sublime** reason, bright daughter

Des göttlichen Hauptes, weise Gründerin  
Of the godhead, wise founder

Des Weltgebäudes, Führerin der Sterne,  
Of the globe, guide of the stars,

Wer bist du denn, wenn du dem tollen Roß  
Who are you then, if bound to the tail

---

71 Ungar offers this suggestion because much of what Schiller has to say in the essay about the ancient Greeks,
whom he terms “naïve,” he might just as easily say about Goethe. Similarly, he uses the term “sentimental” to refer
to modern writers, like himself, whose very modernity manifests itself in the self-conscious artificiality of their
works. In this essay, Schiller gives voice to the notion that Goethe’s poetry, like that of the Greeks, proceeds from a
pure union with nature, whereas modern poetry, represented by him, is irrevocably and painfully alienated from
nature.

72 “With stupidity the gods themselves contend in vain.”
Des Aberwitzes an den Schweif gebunden,  
Ohnmächtig rufend, mit dem Trunkenen  
Dich sehend in den Abgrund stürzen mußt!  
Verflucht sei, wer sein Leben an das Große  
Und Wür’d’ge wendet und bedachte Plane  
Mit diesem Geist entwirrt! Dem Narrenkönig  
Gehört die Welt --  

Of the mad steed of superstition,  
You, like the drunkard calling feebly  
Who sees you in the abyss, must jump in!  
Cursed is he, who devotes his life  
To well-laid plans of greatness and dignity,  
Made in the spirit of wisdom! The world  
Belongs to the king of fools --

In his dying moments, Talbot thus calls upon “Erhabene Vernunft” ("sublime reason") to help him to make sense of his defeat at the hands of the French, whom he has beaten handily on many other occasions. His description of wisdom as “Tochter des göttlichen Hauptes” draws a clear parallel with the traditional birth of Athena from the head of Zeus, recalling the Iphigeneia myth exemplum. He sees the world as a place of senseless superstition, intoxicated with the arbitrariness that brings all the plans of the great to nothing and concludes that the world belongs to the king of fools. Lionel is disturbed by such faithless words coming from a man on the brink of death and begs him to turn his thoughts to God, but the battle rages on, and he must leave Talbot alone. The dying knight continues:

Bald ist’s vorüber, und der Erde geb ich,  
Der ew’gen Sonne die Atome wieder,  
Die sich zu Schmerz und Lust in mir gefügt –  
Und von dem mächt’gen Talbot, der die Welt  
Mit seinem Kriegsrühm fülle, bleibt nichts übrig  
Als eine Handvoll leichten Staubs. – So geht  
Der Mensch zu Ende – und die einzige  
Ausbeute, die wir aus dem Kampf des Lebens  
Wegtragen, ist die Einsicht in das Nichts  
Und herzliche Verachtung alles dessens,  

It’s all over soon, and I will give back  
To the earth and the eternal sun my atoms,  
That made me heed both pain and pleasure –  
And nothing will remain of mighty Talbot,  
Whose fame in war the world resounded,  
Other than a handful of dust. This is how  
A man meets his end – and the only bounty,  
That we can plunder from life’s battle  
Is the calm contemplation of oblivion  
And hearty contempt for all that to us
Talbot’s speech is full of pride in the potential of great men (using himself – “dem mächt’gen Talbot” – as an example) and contempt for the illusions of wishful thinking (“wünschenswert”). He himself, however, shows enormous dignity as he looks his own death in the face, expressing graceful resignation, like Prometheus in the Caucasus, to the fate that he cannot change (“die Einsicht in das Nichts”). He is Johanna’s adversary, but it seems clear that Schiller expects us to admire him, yet with the sort of admiration that we might have for Byron’s Manfred, who also looks into oblivion without fear or remorse. At the beginning and ending of his speech, Talbot evokes a sublime reason that fails and vanishes (“Erhabene Vernunft”… “alles dessens, was uns erhaben schien”) as a hollow retort to Johanna’s earlier evocation of the sublime power that will ultimately guide her to resounding victory and enduring fame.

Unsurprisingly, Lionel is determined at first to defeat Johanna at Orleans and destroy the French army. Once Johanna falls in love with him, however, he becomes infatuated with her. Johanna almost instantly regrets her surrender to sexual feeling as a violation of her vow of chastity. Lionel, on the other hand, only regrets that Johanna is French and will not abandon her military mission. After she is captured in Act V, Queen Isabeau and Fastolf, also on the English side, argue with Lionel that they should meet the demands of the English soldiers to kill Johanna:

Fastolf. Ihr widersteht vergebens. Tötet sie

Und werft ihr Haupt von diesen Turmes Zinnen,

Ihr fließend Blut allein versöhnt das Heer.

Fastolf. You resist in vain. Kill her

And throw her head down from the battlements of this tower,
Only her flowing blood will appease the army.

(V.ix. 3326-28)

Fastolf’s reasons for demanding Johanna’s death recall the clamoring of the Greek army in Aulis for the death of Iphigeneia. When Agamemnon’s ruse of marrying Iphigeneia to Achilles is exposed, he explains the situation to his daughter and her mother Clytemnestra:

Agamemnon. [The Greeks] cannot go to the towers of Ilium or capture the glorious plain of Troy unless I kill you: so Calchas [the priest] says. A great longing runs riot in the Greek army to sail with all speed to the land of the barbarians and stop the abduction of Greek wives. The Greeks will kill my girls in Argos and the two of you and me if I make void the goddess’s oracle.

(1260-62, Kovacs VI 301)

Achilles tries to defend Iphigeneia from the army, but as he later tells Clytemnestra, they shout him down and threaten to kill him instead:

Achilles. The Greeks are shouting terrible things…concerning your daughter…that she must be killed. At me they shouted…that I should be stoned to death.

(1346-49, 309)

He announces his plan to fight the army, now headed by Odysseus, with a group of his own men. It seems clear that a terrible skirmish will develop, pitting Greek against Greek. At this moment of crisis, Iphigeneia stops Achilles and tells her mother that she has decided to submit willingly to being sacrificed:

Iphigeneia. If Artemis has decided to take my body, shall I, who am mortal, oppose a goddess? That is impossible: I shall give myself to Greece.

(1395-97, 319)
In *Jungfrau*, Lionel ignores Fastolf and Isabeau, continuing to try to woo Johanna and convince her to join the English side willingly, or at least not to try to escape:

Lionel. Begrab ich mich, eh’ mich ihr Wille zwingt
   -- Antworte mir, Johanna! Sei die Meine,
   Und gegen eine Welt beschütz ich dich.

Isabeau. Seid Ihr ein Mann? (V.ix. 3336-39)

[...]

Lionel. Gib mir
   Dein Wort, Johanna, dich nicht zu befreien!

Johanna. Mich zu befreien ist mein einz’ger Wunsch.
   (V. x. 3390-92)

Lionel. I’ll be buried, before I submit to their will
   -- Answer me, Johanna! Be mine,
   And I’ll defend you against the whole world.

Isabeau. Are you even a man?

[...]

Lionel. Give me
   Your word, that you won’t escape!

Johanna. To escape is my only wish.

Lionel continues to be motivated in a manner that is designed to arouse the sympathy of the audience. He loves Johanna and wants to protect her but can only imagine a future together if she changes her allegiances. It is significant that he insists that he would rather die than compel
her against her will (line 3336) because his insistence shows the degree to which he respects Johanna’s commitment to her mission. In this manner, he behaves rather like Achilles at Aulis. Johanna, like Iphigeneia, as an expression of her personal will, has conquered her fears and now refuses to be diverted from her goal.

Queen Isabeau and Fastolf, on the other hand, appear to be villains of the type Schiller regards as less effective. Fastolf is based on a historical character, but most likely finds a place in Schiller’s play because of his namesake, Fastolfe, in Shakespeare’s Henry VI, Part One. In Shakespeare, we see him acting in a cowardly fashion when he runs from the French, abandoning Talbot at Rouen (III. ii. 105-07). Later he is denounced as a coward and stripped of the Order of the Garter by Talbot for his cowardice at Patay (IV. i. 14-15). The Shakespearean character is thus certainly akin to the role of Schiller’s Montgomery.73 Queen Isabeau, as shown in just one of her lines in V.ix: “Seid Ihr ein Mann?” plays the role of an abusive shrew, questioning the manhood, bravery, and intelligence of all the men around her, much as her historical counterpart questions the legitimacy of her own son, the Dauphin, as rightful heir to the French crown. The real Queen Isabeau’s manipulation of inconvenient reality, it is worth noting, was the equal of an Aeschylean Clytemnestra, except that the Queen of Argos at least loved her children. After Fastolf and Lionel exit the stage to fight the advancing French army, Queen Isabeau taunts Johanna to rescue herself in much the same manner that the thief taunted Christ on the cross: “Jetzt, Retterin, errette!” (“Now, Savior, save yourself!” V.x. 3462) When the battle turns against the French, and Johanna learns that the Dauphin and Dunois are in danger, she calls upon God to give her the strength of Samson to break her chains, which she

---

73 It is fair to wonder why Schiller did not merely use Fastolf as Johanna’s antagonist for the Homeric Lykaon scene previously discussed, instead of inventing Montgomery. Perhaps he wanted to have a larger array of characters from the English side, to provide Talbot with company familiar from the Shakespearean example, and to confront Johanna in the final scene with a Shakespearean nemesis.
then proceeds to break, to the astonishment of all onlookers, an act followed by her swift escape. Significantly, Christ and Samson are biblical figures, similar to those used by Schiller in *Die Räuber*, as opposed to the characters from the myth-based Iphigeneia plays.\(^7\) Strikingly, despite the word *Jungfrau* in the title, most of the biblical figures to which Johanna is compared are masculine. The most prominent is the motif of the shepherd leading the flock, first introduced in the soliloquy that concludes the Prologue and reappearing occasionally throughout, which again casts Johanna into a masculine, Christ-like role. It is only in exploring the myth exemplum, with Iphigeneia at its center, that we find agreement in gender between the protagonist of Schiller’s play and her Euripidean model.

Some feminists argue that in Schiller’s *Vom Erhabenen* and its predecessor, *Über die tragische Kunst*, he essentially repeats Burke and Kant’s definitions of the sublime and the beautiful. They reject these philosophers’ assertions about the inferiority of the female and her unsuitability for embodying the sublime (Lokke 127). While it is true that Schiller may have added nothing new to Kant, it seems clear that he did not share the belief that women were inherently incapable of serving as exemplars of the sublime on the basis of their sex. Before devoting himself to his philosophical studies in 1793, he had written two plays with men as their central protagonists, *Die Räuber* (1781) and *Don Carlos* (1787). After his philosophical interlude, he wrote two plays with women as their central protagonists, *Maria Stuart* (1800) and *Jungfrau von Orleans* (1801). *Jungfrau* could be described as the first theatrical experiment in which he explores his fully developed notions of the sublime. That it is a story about a young woman who turns the course of history is further repudiation of his supposed anti-feminist bias.

\(^7\) In his first play, the prominent biblical themes come from Genesis, specifically the story of Jacob stealing his brother Esau’s birthright (Gen. 27: 1-33), and later that of Jacob’s son Joseph and his brothers (Gen. 37-50).
Isabeau, Fastolf, and Talbot, ultimately, do not bring about Johanna’s tragic reversal of fortune, another requirement for Schiller’s effective villain, as he defines the idea in *Über die tragische Kunst*. Arguably, that role might be assigned to Lionel as the man who almost compels her to break her vow of chastity. This emotional experience is not her reversal, although it is the moment of her painful discovery that her vow is not a shield against emotion. The pain which she suffers in that discovery begins to elevate her condition to a sublime state, but she is, at that point in the play, still in the good graces of the Dauphin’s court and the hearts of the French people. The person who truly reverses Johanna’s fortune is her own father, named Thibaut in Schiller’s play.\(^7\) If it is true that Thibaut meets Schiller’s definition of the effective villain, then a fuller examination of the character is warranted.

Thibaut d’Arc is the first character to appear in the play. The derivation of the name Thibaut is open to speculation, but the surname d’Arc accords with history.\(^6\) Schiller’s characterization of him as *ein reicher Landmann* (“a rich farmer”) perhaps goes a bit farther than the “honorable position” Champion describes in the trial transcript notes (391), but it is closer to history than Shakespeare’s Shepherd or Voltaire’s profligate priest, neither of whom even merits a name in those works. In the opening scene, Schiller sows the seeds for conflict between filial duty and personal will. Thibaut announces that his two daughters, Louison and Margot, are engaged to marry Claude Marie and Etienne, respectively. Raimond has made an offer of marriage to Johanna, but she has refused. This displeases Thibaut more than Raimond, who seems to sense that Johanna has a higher calling. Thibaut, on the other hand, thinks that there is

---

\(^7\) As noted above, Joan’s actual father’s name was Jacques.

\(^6\) A Gobert Thibault was present in the court of Charles VII and provided testimony of Joan’s exploits that can be found in de l’Averdy’s *Notices*. A very strange coincidence is that the name at birth of one of Joan’s most popular biographer’s was François-Anatole Thibault. He later changed his name to Anatole France.
a more sinister explanation and complains to Raimond that his daughter spends too much time under a *Druidenbaum* (“Druids’ tree”), consorting with evil, pagan spirits.

Thibaut. […] Ich sehe sie zu ganzen Stunden sinnend
Dort unter dem Druidenbaum sitzen,
Den alle glückliche Geschöpfe fliehn.
Denn nicht geheu’r ist’s hier: ein böses Wesen
Hat seinen Wohnsitz unter diesem Baum
Schon seit der alten grauen Heidenzeit.

I’ve seen her lost in thought for hours on end
Sitting there under the Druids’ tree
Which all lucky creatures avoid.
There’s something eerie here: an evil being
Has made its home under this tree
Since the awful old pagan times.

(Prologue ii. 92-97)

Raimond points out that a chapel with a painting of saints is also located there, which is more likely the reason Johanna enjoys the place. Thibaut answers that he has had dreams on three occasions of Johanna seated in royal finery on the throne of Rheims cathedral, with her family, the whole court, and even the king himself bowing before her:

Thibaut. Zu dreien Malen hab ich sie gesehn
Zu Reims auf unserer Könige Stuhle sitzen,
Ein funkelnnd Diadem von sieben Sternen
Auf ihrem Haupt, das Zepter in der Hand,
Aus dem drei weiße Lilien entsprangen,
Und ich, ihr Vater, ihre beiden Schwestern
Und alle Fürsten, Grafen, Erzbischöfe,
Der König selber neigten sich vor ihr.

Zu dreen Malen I’ve seen her
Sitting on our king’s throne at Rheims
A shining diadem of seven stars
On her head, the scepter in her hand,
From which three white lilies sprout
And I, her father, her two sisters
All the princes, earls, archbishops.
and the king himself bowed down before her.

(Prologue ii. 114-21)

One way to interpret this dream is to see that the gift of prophecy Johanna will display later comes from her father. According to history, a coronation will take place in Rheims cathedral, but Thibaut misinterprets the scene. Schiller probably intends the audience to imagine that what Thibaut has actually seen is the coronation of the Dauphin as Charles VII, with an image of the
coronation of the Blessed Virgin hovering over the action. A similar image actually appears over
the main central door of the cathedral. The crown with seven stars and the three white lilies are
conventional symbols associated with paintings of the subject.

In Act IV, as the coronation sequence begins, we see Johanna’s two sisters arriving with
their husbands in the thronging crowd. The mood is festive. They have come without telling
their father and imagine that he is not there. The procession comes on stage, including
musicians, Count Dunois, the Archbishop, the whole court, and finally, Johanna carrying her
banner, followed by the king under a canopy borne by four barons. They go offstage into the
cathedral. Almost immediately, Thibaut appears with Raimond on another part of the stage and
beyond the scrutiny of his daughters. Raimond seems to have convinced Thibaut to attend, but
now that the procession has passed, wants to get Thibaut away from the crowd. Thibaut’s only
impression of what he has seen is that his daughter moved unsteadily and looked downcast.

Thibaut. […] Die Unglückselige fühlt ihren Zustand; Thibaut. She senses her situation, the unfortunate one;
   Das ist der Augenblick, mein Kind zu retten, This is the moment to rescue my child.
   Ich will ihn nutzen. (Er will gehen.) I will use it. (He starts to go)

Raimond. Bleibt! was wollt Ihr tun? Raimond. Wait! What are you trying to do?
Thibaut. Ich will sie überraschen, will sie stürzen Thibaut. I’m going to surprise her. I will thrust her down
   Von ihrem eitlen Glück, ja mit Gewalt From her vain happiness, yes by force
   Will ich zu ihrem Gott, dem sie entsagt, I will lead her back to her God,
   Zurück sie führen. Whom she has renounced.

Raimond. Ach! Erwägt es wohl! Raimond. Oh, reconsider!
   Stürzt Euer eigen Kind nicht ins Verderben! Don’t be the cause of your own child’s ruin!

Thibaut. Lebt ihre Seele nur, ihr Leib mag sterben. Thibaut. As long as her soul lives, her body may die.

(VI. ix. 2837-45)
Thibaut believes that he must rescue his daughter from the danger of unholy pride. To do so, he is prepared to kill her; at least doing so will send her soul to God. It can be no accident that Thibaut states his intention to cast down his daughter Von ihrem eiteln Glück. He is in effect announcing that he will be the agent to reverse her situation vom Glück ins Unglück, according to the proper trajectory of the tragic hero. The motivation is different, but, like Agamemnon, he is ready to sacrifice his daughter to a higher cause. Johanna emerges from the cathedral alone without her banner and elicits the adoration of the crowd to the greater consternation of her father, who retreats into the background. She is briefly reunited with her sisters and asks them whether their father is there. They inform her rather euphemistically that he has been schwermütig (“melancholy” 2889) since her departure. The coronation is meanwhile presumed to have taken place, and the newly crowned King Charles VII emerges from the cathedral to the cheers of his people. The king praises them for their steadfast love and then turns to Johanna, declaring:

King. Here stands the emissary of God, who has
Returned to you your native-born king,
And smashed the yoke of foreign tyranny!

Volk. Heil! Heil der Jungfrau, der Errettin! (VI. xi. 2954-2960)

77 The character’s designation in the script changes from “Karl” to “König” from the moment he enters with the procession in IV. vi and remains that way.
People. Hail! Hail to the virgin [maid], our rescuer!

As the cheers die down, Johanna suddenly notices her father among the crowd and shouts: “Gott! Mein Vater!” (2969), and Thibaut believes he is witnessing the manifestation of the premonition from his dream. He emerges from the crowd and addresses the king directly, mocking the presumption that his daughter is an emissary of God:

Thibaut. Gerettet glaubst du dich durch Gottesmacht?

Betrogner Fürst! Verblendet Volk der Franken!

Du bist gerettet durch des Teufels Kunst. (2974-76)

You believe yourselves rescued by the power of God?

Deceived prince! Blind people of France!

You have been rescued by demonic arts.

Dunois thinks that Thibaut must be raving, to which Thibaut replies that the court, the king and the people are the ones raving. He demands that Johanna speak for herself:

Thibaut. […] Antworte mir im Namen des Dreieinen:

Gehörst du zu den Heiligen und Reinen? (2984-85)

Answer me in the name of the Trinity:

Do you belong to the holy and pure?

At this, Johanna falls silent, and the crowd becomes alarmed. The king’s consort, Agnes Sorel, who has been Johanna’s supporter at court, begs her to deny the charge. Dunois, who is presented as in unrequited love with her in Schiller’s play, now steps forward, appealing to the
assembled princes not to tremble before such insane accusations. He stakes his honor as a nobleman on Johanna’s innocence and asks who will declare her guilty. At that moment, a loud clap of thunder rumbles above them, and Thibaut declares this to be a sign that God himself is answering. He repeats his question, and a second clap of thunder can be heard. The Archbishop, displaying an abundant equanimity, asks Johanna to clarify whether they should understand her silence as a sign of her guilt or innocence. A clap of thunder can now be heard for a third time, arousing general superstitious medieval terror, at which nearly everyone runs off stage. For a moment, Dunois and Johanna are left alone on stage. He asks her to give him her hand as a token of her trust in him; she spurns him wordlessly. Another nobleman comes on stage to announce to Johanna that the king has granted her permission to leave the city undisturbed and that Dunois must not remain. They leave Johanna entirely alone, but then Raimond appears and quickly convinces her to go with him. Johanna’s denunciation seems complete. She is asked directly three times whether she is pure and holy. Each time she remains silent, letting three separate claps of thunder serve as her answer. 

Because in Act III she has experienced physical love for Lionel, and because he is an officer in the forces that have invaded France, she believes that she is no longer pure or holy. While it is painful for her to have been denounced in so dramatic a fashion by her father, her suffering may be seen to have resulted more from her having to face an unresolvable conflict of will and conscience. She wants to fulfill the mission with which the Blessed Mother charged her, but now that she has broken her vow, believes herself unworthy of it.

At this moment in the play, Johanna finds herself caught between pangs of conscience at her father’s accusations and acknowledgement of her feelings for Lionel. Her feelings have

---

78 The situation clearly suggests a parallel with Peter’s denial of Christ outside the court of Pilate but not without some confused assignment of roles. Is Johanna supposed to be Peter?
nothing to do with the demonic arts that her father says she is practicing, but nonetheless she feels unable to call herself pure any longer. The knowledge that both of these problems now stand in the way of completing her mission presents her with a dilemma of will and conscience, about which Schiller had written at length six years earlier. They are among the primary subjects in Schiller’s *Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man*, which he wrote in a series of letters as a kind of self-appointed commission composed in gratitude to his patron, the Danish Archduke Friedrich Christian von Schleswig-Holstein-Augustenburg. The Archduke had made possible his retreat from writing and teaching to focus on philosophy, especially that of Emmanuel Kant. It was originally published in 1795 in three installments of *Die Horen*. The importance of semblance (*Schein*) and of the aesthetic preference for semblance over reality in that series of letters was addressed above in relation to Schiller’s willingness to be free with historical facts. The two other major ideas that emerge in the series are the three major stages of human development and the three drives that must be present in the final stage. He names the three stages in Letter 24: the physical, aesthetic, and moral. The physical stage is taken to refer to the individual’s experience of sensations, both painful and pleasurable, and the growing realization that sensations come from outside his person and occur without his participation. The aesthetic phase begins when the individual begins to take note of the relative order or disorder in his environment and the degree to which its conditions affect his physical state. The moral phase begins when the individual notices that he must judge the desirability of his own condition and the extent to which it affects the society around him.

---


80 In November of that year, *On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry*, would appear in the same journal.
In the first phase, the individual is essentially a slave to what Schiller calls the *Stofftrieb* ("material drive" or "physical impulses") and subject to the whims of the passage of time and the demands of nature. In the second, he becomes aware of the *Formtrieb* (or "rational drive" or the "desire for order") and develops the capacity to distinguish variety and organization beyond the limits of time, constrained only by the laws of reason. In the moral phase, he must contend with resolving the never-ending competition of the material and rational drives. Schiller asserts that the individual’s consciousness of this dilemma activates the *Spieltrieb* (or "the impulse to play"), which is not a distinct drive, but a phenomenon that causes the other two drives to operate in concert: “Beyde Triebe nöthigen also das Gemüth, jener durch Naturgesetz, dieser durch Gesetze der Vernunft. Der Spieltrieb also, als in welchem beyde verbunden wirken, wird das Gemüth zugleich moralisch und physisch nöthigen; er wird also, weil er alle Zufälligkeit aufhebt, auch alle Nöthigen aufheben, und den Menschen, sowohl physisch als moralisch, ins Freyheit setzen” (NA.20 354). The exercise of free will develops in the moral stage from the activation of the *Spieltrieb*. Schiller argues that this phenomenon allows an ethical person to act reasonably when their physical instincts may dissuade them from a rational response, and to act naturally when social norms do not provide a clear example of correct behavior. The examples he employs are the exertion of will necessary to interact cordially with someone whom one despises (in which reason overpowers nature) or, on the contrary, the exertion of will necessary to be hostile to someone whom one ought to regard highly (in which nature overpowers reason). It is somewhat puzzling that after establishing this interplay, he does not remark upon the

---

81 More often than not, Schiller uses the term *sinnliche Trieb* ("sensual drive"), but most observers prefer the one-word term.

82 “Both drives, therefore, exert constraint upon the psyche; the former through the laws of nature, the latter through the laws of reason. The play drive, in consequence, as the one in which both the others act in concert, will exert upon the psyche at once a moral and a physical constraint; it will, therefore, since it annuls all contingency, annul all constraint too, and set man free both physically and morally.” (trans. Hinderer and Dahlstrom 127)
applications of this kind of morality in the spheres of social and political interaction. Perhaps he does not because he intended for the Letters to be as broad in application as possible. It is no mere coincidence that Schiller’s use of the word “play” (Spiel) calls to mind the genre of literature in which a character, particularly the protagonist of a Greek tragedy (Trauerspiel), exercises her free will, as with Iphigeneia, against nature or destiny in an action that will ultimately turn on her moral integrity.

While the tone of the argument presented here suggests that Schiller has in mind a program of education for children, this was not at all his purpose. The true inspiration of the Letters was Schiller’s horror at the outcome of the French Revolution, which he saw as reason and empiricism carried to their logical and tyrannical ends. The stages which he describes are those of the development of humanity, for which he fervently believed that active participation in the creation of beauty was the solitary hope. Although the guiding light of the Letters is Kant, in at least two instances Schiller’s ongoing engagement with Greek poetry shows itself to be of equal importance in the development of his theories.

In Letter 9, in which he abjures artists not to be slaves to the fashions of their times or places but to be brave enough to seek and find truth and beauty on their own terms, he uses the following analogy: “Eine wohlthätige Gottheit reisse den Säugling bey Zeiten von seiner Mutter brust, nähre ihn mit der Milch eines bessern Alters, und lasse ihn unter fernem griechischen Himmel zur Mündigkeit reifen. Wenn er dann Mann geworden ist, so kehre er, eine fremde Gestalt, in sein Jahrhundert zurück; aber nicht, um es mit seiner Erscheinung zu erfreuen, sondern furchtbar wie Agamemnons Sohn, um es zu reinigen” (NA.20 333).

---

83 “At a certain time, a beneficent deity should snatch the suckling child from his mother’s breast, nourish him with the milk of a better age, and let him to come to maturity under a distant Greek sky. When he has become a man, let him return to his own century, a stranger, not to please it with his appearance, but to strike fear into it like Agamemnon’s son, in order to purify it.”
clearly an allusion to the episode in the *Oresteia*, when Orestes returns to Argos and, acceding to the command of Apollo, “purifies” the house of Atreus by murdering his mother, Clytemnestra, and her lover, Aegisthus. Schiller would also have known that this episode provides the background for the setting of Euripides’s *Iphigeneia among the Taurians*. We find further evidence linking these mythic stories to the thought processes in the Letters in number 24, in which Schiller describes the three stages completely for the first time. He employs the following passage to illustrate what he has in mind in referring to man in his first, brutal, physical state:

\[
\text{Zwar die gewalt’ge Brust und der Titanen}
\]
\[
\text{Kraftvolles Mark ist sein ….}
\]
\[
\text{Gewisses Erbteil; doch es schmiedete}
\]
\[
\text{Der Gott um seine Stirn ein ehern Band,}
\]
\[
\text{Rath, Mäßigung und Weisheit und Geduld}
\]
\[
\text{Verbarg er seinem scheuen düstern Blick.}
\]
\[
\text{Es wird zur Wuth ihm jegliche Begier,}
\]
\[
\text{Und grenzenlos dringt seine Wuth umher. (NA.20 389, ellipsis Schiller’s)}^{84}
\]

These lines are from Goethe’s *Iphigenie auf Tauris*. The passage is from I.iii, in which Iphigenie tells King Thoas the terrible story of her cursed family. Schiller actually paraphrases Iphigenie’s speech, without altering its meaning, to conform to the singular *Mensch* (“person”) that has been the subject of his foregoing argument. As a result, in the lines cited here, we see forms of *sein* (“his”), whereas the original phrases, referring to Iphigenie’s ancestors as a whole, employed forms of *ihr* (“their”). It may be recalled that Goethe’s depiction of King Thoas had been

\[^{84} \text{His violent passions and the Titans’/ Vigorous marrow are his…/Certain heritage; yet round his brow/Zeus forged a brazen band./Counsel and Patience, Wisdom, Moderation/He shrouded from his fearful sullen glance./In him each passion grows to savage fury./And all uncheck’d his fury rages round” (trans. Hinderer and Dahlstrom 157).} \]
Schiller’s prime example of the ideal sympathetic villain when Schiller lectured on tragic art five
years earlier. Beyond the influence of Greek poetry on Schiller’s thinking, this example also
illustrates Goethe’s influence, especially that of his Iphigenie auf Tauris, and illuminates
important contrasts and connections between German neo-classicism and Romanticism, and
humanism and patriotism.

Johanna Schmidt sees a connection between Schiller’s Johanna and Goethe’s
Iphigenie, but primarily in terms of how they represent a bridge between humanism and
patriotism, which at the time of Schmidt’s writing was discredited in the aftermath of German
National Socialism. Schmidt’s reading of Goethe’s Iphigenie is especially helpful because of the
distinction which she draws between Euripides’s depiction of Iphigeneia in a foreign, barbaric
land, from which rescue is possible only by dea ex machina, and that of Goethe’s Iphigenie, who
is able to secure her release from service to King Thoas by appeals to his reason and humanity.
Similarly, Schmidt makes the point that Johanna’s love for her “Heimat” is only as strong as her
love for her fellow man. Schmidt seems to agree with Schiller that Goethe’s King Thoas is a
sympathetic villain, and the capacity for sympathy is what she seems to have in mind in her use
of the word “Humanismus.” Referring to Schiller’s previously mentioned translation of
Euripides’s Iphigeneia in Aulis, Wiese informs us that “Ganze Auftritte davon hat er noch in
seine Besprechung der Goetheschen ‘Iphigenie’ verwoben” (416). The fact that Schiller felt it
appropriate to interweave scenes from Aulis into a discussion of Tauris strongly suggests that he
saw the two Euripidean Iphigeneia plays as a continuous narrative.

86 “He wove whole scenes of it [his translation of Euripides’s Iphigeneia in Aulis] into his discussion of Goethe’s Iphigenie.”
John Prudhoe offers an interesting interpretation of Goethe’s play as a struggle between reason and understanding, but overlooks, as do many other commentators, the notion that Goethe develops in the play, that human beings are capable of both great good and great evil, and that in fact, the failure to explore the ethical potential of both sides of our human nature can diminish our humanity. The idea appears in a speech of Orestes’ friend, Pylades:

Zu einer schweren Tat beruft ein Gott  
A god summons to a hard task

Den edlen Mann, der viel verbrach, und legt  
The noble man, who has transgressed, and compels

Ihm auf, was uns unmöglich scheint, zu enden.  
Him to finish what seems impossible to us.

(lines 744-46)  
(translation mine)

Pylades makes this speech after noticing Orestes’ despair at having killed his mother, which he does at Apollo’s command, to avenge her murder of his father. Prudhoe’s translation of these lines supports the idea of humanity’s dual nature: “The gods assign the greatest tasks to those/Whose nature mingles nobleness with evil” (25). It is clear that Goethe associated this duality more closely with Orestes, but also clear that it interested him greatly, since it is a theme that he explores further in Faust. There is more than a thematic link between Goethe’s play, which is arguably about a man who is redeemed by the woman he destroys, and Schiller’s play, which is arguably about a woman who is redeemed after men attempt to destroy her. Goethe had begun work on the Helena act of Faust, even while Schiller was writing Jungfrau: “Mit Vergnügen lese ich, daß Sie unterdeßen bei dem Faust geblieben sind und noch ferner dabey bleiben wollen” (NA.30 197, 17 September 1800).87 They would meet several times during this period and discuss Goethe’s conception of the entire second part (NA.30 202, 26 September 1800), although Goethe would not finish it until years after Schiller’s death and would not allow it to be published until after his own death. While the second part of Faust remained unknown to the

87 “I am very pleased to read that you are still occupied meanwhile with Faust and want to continue with it further.”
world at that time, Goethe made no secret to Schiller of his intent to fly in the face of tragic tradition with his *Faust*. One of his most significant innovations in the play was his presentation of the Faust character as much more than a doomed genius. Goethe’s Faust seems to agree with Pylades’s argument, just quoted from Goethe’s *Iphigenie*, that individuals – “zu einer schweren *Tat berufl*” – must examine both the noble and evil aspects of their nature.

The obligation for the elect to explore their noble and evil sides may explain why Schiller felt it necessary to include two episodes in *Jungfrau* that are both ahistorical and seemingly inconsistent with the Iphigeneia myth: Johanna’s encounter with the Black Knight, and her amorous attraction to Lionel. When Johanna meets the Black Knight in battle, he warns her that she is on the verge of making a great error and that the only way to avoid it is to abandon war for good. She dismisses his warning as a “false oracle” (12442) and tries to engage him in a swordfight, only to have him mysteriously disappear. In the following scene, she encounters the English knight, Lionel, a character seemingly without any relation to the historical accounts of Joan of Arc. She immediately falls in love with him, though she realizes that to do so constitutes a breaking of her vow of chastity, made to the Blessed Mother (as presented in the play’s prologue). It seems that Schiller expects his audience to recall the Black Knight’s warning. He seems to want the audience to realize that the error which the Black Knight is trying to prevent is Johanna’s encounter with Lionel and the sexual attraction that he arouses. These episodes not only lack any historical foundation, but seem to find no direct analogy in Euripides’s *Iphigeneia* plays. Although Euripides invents a marriage betrothal to Achilles for *Iphigeneia*, at no point does she exhibit any amorous attraction to him. Johanna’s sexual temptation is entirely original to Schiller’s depiction of Joan of Arc and serves to demonstrate that her human vulnerability causes her to suffer.
The conflict between physical desire and moral will, as well as the potential for resolution between these forces on the stage, had interested Schiller since at least 1790, when he gave a series of lectures on dramatic art. In them he explores the curious pleasure the audience receives from watching a character suffering on the stage. He concludes that, far from signaling a kind of moral defect, this pleasure and the playwright’s success in causing the audience to attain it are the surest measure of the value of tragedy. He turned these lectures into two articles, Über den Grund des Vergnügens an tragischen Gegenständen and Über die tragische Kunst, which were subsequently published in Die neue Thalia in 1792 (Hinderer and Dahlstrom 1f, 6f). He expanded on his ideas in a broader philosophical context in 1793, in Über Anmut und Würde (“On Grace and Dignity”), in which he defines dignity in a manner relevant to his work on the Johanna play: “Beherrschung der Triebe durch die moralische Kraft ist Geistesfreiheit, und Würde heisst ihr Ausdruck in der Erscheinung” (NA.20 294). It is worth noting that the notion of “impulses” or “drives” (Triebe) as Schiller uses it here refers to physical urges that the individual experiences involuntarily. The individual who exhibits the ability to behave in this manner is a schöne Seele and achieves a state of grace: “In einer schönen Seele ist es also, wo Sinnlichkeit und Vernunft, Pflicht und Neigung harmonieren, und Grazie ist ihr Ausdruck in der Erscheinung” (NA.20 288). For Johanna to express grace and dignity, as surely a character of her stature must, and to do so in a manner consistent with the formula which Schiller himself has outlined, it is not enough that she simply be pure and righteous. She must also be tempted by physical desire, and in consequence of suffering from the temptation, choose to disregard it.

88 “On the Source of Pleasure in Tragic Subjects” and “On the Art of Tragedy”

89 “Control of the impulses by moral power is freedom of the spirit, whose visible expression is dignity” (trans. Garland 161).

90 They are clearly the forerunners of the three significantly modified categories, Stofftrieb, Formtrieb and Spieltrieb in his “Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man,” published two years later and discussed in more detail above.

91 “Thus it is in the beautiful soul that sensuality and reason, responsibility and inclination, harmonize, and grace is their visible expression.”
When we apply these notions to the way Schiller presents Johanna and the difficulties she overcomes in the course of the play, they align with the features of sanctity that this dissertation seeks to identify as a critical element in Schiller’s conception. Wiese seems agree: “Mit ihrer Überwindung beginnt der Eintritt in das Geisterreich, die Verwandlung des Menschen in den Gott” (739). The prominent missing element in this definition, which finds its inspiration in *Iphigenie* and its expression in *Jungfrau*, is some rescue by supernatural means, sometimes called salvation. Before continuing the argument for the prominent role of salvation in Schiller’s conception, Johanna’s interactions with the Black Knight and Lionel need further discussion, in part because of the critical response to them to date, but more importantly, because of their significance in establishing Johanna’s sublime sanctity and the extent to which it depends upon Euripides’s Iphigeneia. An analysis of the two scenes will follow their order in the play: the encounter with the Black Knight, followed by Johanna’s meeting with Lionel.

The encounter with the Black Knight has provoked especially controversy. Charles Passage observes that

this much-debated passage, which sounds like an angry *jinn* from an Arabian Nights tale, may suggest a parallel with the death of Moses within sight of the promised land (Deuteronomy 34:4) or, more likely, the notion of Greek *moira*, that predetermined maximum of one’s achievement. We suggest a “dark power in human life” whose nature is a grudging envy of achievement. In any case, Schiller assigned no allegorical label (159).

For Garland, the Black Knight is the ghost of Talbot, whose battlefield death Schiller invented and depicted in III. vii. As Passage puts it, this view is supported by “no allegorical

---

92 “By surmounting the obstacle, she begins the entrance into the spirit realm, the transformation of the human to the divine.”
label.” Nonetheless, Schiller is reported to have remarked that evoking Talbot’s ghost was his intention: “Der schwarze Ritter soll dazu dienen, uns mit einem neuen Band an die romantische Geisterwelt zu knüpfen, da hier immer zwei Welten mit einander spielen. Eigentlich dachte sich Schiller dabei den Geist des kurz vorher verschiedenen [...] Talbot” (Bd.42 334).93

In resolving this problem, it will probably be helpful to look at the text. As the scene begins, Johanna is shown alone on the battlefield with the Knight. They begin taunting each other with insults and challenges. Suddenly, the Knight’s tone changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schwarzer Ritter. Johanna d’Arc! Bis an die Tore Reims</th>
<th>Black Knight. Joan of Arc! To the very gates of Rheims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bist du gedrungen auf des Sieges Flügeln.</td>
<td>You have floated on the wings of victory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir gnüge der erworbne Ruhm. Entlasse</td>
<td>You’ve had your share of fame. Leave behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das Glück, das dir als Sklave hat gedient,</td>
<td>The good fortune that has served as your slave,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eh es sich zürnend selbst befreit, es haßt</td>
<td>Before it angrily frees itself; it hates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Treu und keinem dient es bis ans Ende.</td>
<td>Loyalty and serves no one to the end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna. Was heißest du in Mitte meines Laufs</td>
<td>Johanna. What do you mean, interrupting me mid-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mich stille stehen und mein Werk verlassen?</td>
<td>To stop me and have me abandon my work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich führ es aus und löse mein Gelübde!</td>
<td>I will fulfill it and keep my oath!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwarzer Ritter. Nichts kann dir, du Gewaltge, widerstehn,</td>
<td>Black Knight. Powerful one, nothing can withstand you,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In jedem Kampfe siegst du. - Aber gehe</td>
<td>You win every battle. But engage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In keinen Kampf mehr. Höre meine Warnung!</td>
<td>In battle no more. Heed my warning!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna. Nicht aus den Händen leg ich dieses Schwert,</td>
<td>Johanna. This sword will not leave my hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Als bis das stolze England niederligt.</td>
<td>Until proud England is defeated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was maßest du dir an, mir falsch Orakel</td>
<td>What do you presume, you false oracle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betrüglich zu verkündigen?</td>
<td>Making announcements in this deceitful manner?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

93 “The Black Knight can therefore serve as a new thread tying us to the Romantic spirit world, as here two distinct worlds interact with one another. Schiller himself actually had in mind the ghost of the just departed Talbot.” From a conversation with Böttiger, described at greater length below. The ellipsis marks the absence of Böttiger’s parenthetical observation: (als Atheist der Hölle zugehörigen) [“as an atheist belonging to hell”].
Garland is frustrated by the presence of so many historical inaccuracies and sees this episode as merely one more example of them:

So numerous are these fantasies, so romantic and sentimental is their character, that Die Jungfrau von Orleans can scarcely claim to be anything more than a dramatized fairy-tale. The lavish use of pageantry and music, most conspicuous in the fourth act, is symptomatic of Schiller’s abandonment of a tragic purpose; the play needs their help because it does not possess the intensity of tragedy.

(220).
Garland summarizes Johanna’s decision to go on despite everything after the warning from the Black Knight: “This is the hubris of the Greeks” (221). Despite his condemnation of the play, Garland acknowledges the aesthetics of ancient Greek tragic art at work in this scene. It seems possible to suggest that in their interpretations both he and Passage have overlooked Johanna’s own description of the Black Knight, delivered immediately after his disappearance: “Ein trüglich Bild der Hölle war’s, ein widerspenst’ger Geist!” (lines 2446-47)94 It is possible to interpret the motivation of this statement as an emotion-driven exclamation of amazement, but such an interpretation overlooks the possibility that Bild and Geist could both be German translations of the Greek word eidolon, a word and concept tied to depictions of Iphigeneia and to Euripides.

In the early Echoi95 versions of the Iphigenia story, her place on the sacrificial altar is taken not by a deer but an eidolon, something akin to the German notion of Doppelgänger.96 In his Helen, for example, Euripides has Helen of Troy spirited away to Egypt before the commencement of the Trojan War, her place in Troy taken by an eidolon. Given Helen’s role in Homer’s Iliad, Euripides’s Egyptian eidolon-Helen amounts to another unconventional treatment of an ostensibly established narrative tradition. The seeming purpose of the deception in his Helen is to permit a restoration of kleos, “fame” or “good reputation” to the family of Agamemnon’s ignominious brother, Menelaus.97 Seen from this perspective, Garland’s suggestion that the Knight is Talbot’s ghost increases in likelihood, although in addition to representing Johanna’s hubris, he may also represent the possibility of restoring her kleos. What seems clear, regardless, is that Schiller’s employment of the Knight as a dramatic device is far

---

94 “It was a deceptive phantom of hell, a wayward specter!”
95 “The Catalogue of Women,” published in the sixth century BCE. (Gantz xv).
96 Gantz 583.
97 Gantz 664.
from evidence that the play is a “dramatized fairy-tale.” Instead, it seems yet another example of his careful incorporation of the Euripidean method in constructing his tragedy.

Even among admirers of Schiller’s play, a tendency emerges to dismiss certain passages as missteps without asking why Schiller felt it necessary to include them. In the preface to his translations of *The Maid* and *Maria Stuart*, Charles Passage concludes that “the Maid of Orleans, we venture to assert, was, in its totality, admirable only to a certain period, which may be broadly defined as the Romantic Period. Its partial excellence will not redeem the whole. Authentic genius is stamped on more than one page of this text, but the complete drama must be termed an interesting failure” (Passage iii – iv).

Goethe himself had a significant change of heart in his appreciation of the play, tied specifically to the depiction of Johanna and her relationship with Lionel (previously noted in the Prologue to these pages). The reconsideration which he describes in his diary for 27 May 1807 bears repeating: “Der Hauptfehler in dem Motiv der Jungfrau von Orleans, wo sie von Lionel ihr Herz getroffen fühlt, ist, daß sie sich dessen bewußt ist, und ihr Vergehen ihr nicht aus einem Mißlingen oder sonst entgegenkommt ” (Wiese 735-3698). It seems that in his use of *Mißlingen* (“failure”), Goethe perhaps has in mind Aristotle’s notion that the best motivation for a tragedy is the protagonist’s *hamartia* (ἁμαρτία), usually understood as tragic flaw, miscalculation, error, even in Biblical translations, sin.99 Although Aristotle stated a clear preference for Sophocles’s *Oedipus the King* as a model for tragedy, he was quick to defend the less conventional dramatic devices of Euripides. Goethe’s criticism suggests that he believed that the tragic protagonist should, like Oedipus, be unaware of the error he is making and that the mistake should arise from

---

98 “The main mistake in the motive of the Maid of Orleans, where she feels her heart struck by Lionel, is that she herself is aware of it, and her offense is not compelled by a failure or something else.”
99 Cf. *Poetics*, Book 13
the protagonist’s inherent nature. For him, Schiller's Johanna lacks the unconscious fatal flaw that one would expect in Greek tragedy. Apart from this diary entry, however, it seems that Goethe did not publicly criticize Schiller’s play. The point is a sensitive one, since at least two of Schiller’s modern biographers, Wiese and Burschell, have felt it necessary to include Goethe’s disparaging assessment. The interpretation has thus become a kind of final critical verdict.

Goethe, in this assessment of the drama’s “Hauptfehler,” is focusing only on the attraction that Johanna feels for Lionel as the ostensible motivation for her subsequent fall from grace and pronounces this unsuitable on the basis of Johanna’s awareness of it. He, along with Wiese and Burschell, appears to overlook the mistake which she makes in disregarding the warning of the Black Knight, whether that enigmatic figure is the ghost of Talbot or his eidolon.

Wiese’s interpretation of the Black Knight also calls to mind the role of the Furies in the Greek tradition. This character’s appearance, he remarks, signals Johanna’s imminent “Abfall vom Geisterreich und von…Transzendenz. Die von Geistern Beschwingte wird nunmehr die von Geistern Gejagte.” (743) Traditionally, the Furies are depicted as vengeful creatures, chasing criminals until they either die or give themselves up. Their appearance usually signals a moment of painful clarity for the troubled protagonist. As Wiese sees it, after her encounter with the Black Knight in Act III, Johanna is pursued by such vengeful spirits. Legend has it that the Furies scene in the third play of Aeschylus’s Oresteia trilogy, Eumenides, terrified the audience at the festival, even causing some pregnant women in the audience to miscarry. Schiller had previously dealt with both Aeschylus’ Oresteia and more specifically, with the appearance of the

---

100 “…fall from the spirit realm and from transcendence. She, set aloft by the spirits, becomes the one pursued by them.”
Furies in the last play of the trilogy, the title of which is Greek word for “Furies.”

His ballad, *Die Kranische des Ibykus*, tells the story of a Greek poet who is murdered by highwaymen on his way to the festival. The murderers head into town, but give themselves away during the performance of the play, at the moment when the Furies appear. In Tauris, Orestes’s madness is a manifestation of the Furies’ vengeance, willed by Clytemnestra from the grave. It is finally relieved by his reunion with his sister, Iphigeneia. Johanna, on the other hand, after ignoring the warning of her “Fury,” the Black Knight, and encountering Lionel, experiences the opposite of relief: her good luck turns to bad.

The Lionel character is not, however, merely a sign of the influence of Greek classicism. He has a basis in history. Regine Pernoud and several others, identify Joan’s captor in the battle of Compiègne as Lionel de Wandomme. Christiani, the German translator of Millot’s *Universalhistorie*, provides this footnote: “Denn [Johann von Luxembourg] hielt sie als seine Gefangene, obgleich ein burgundischer Edelmann, Lionel von Vendome sie dazu gemacht hatte” (380). According to the *Nationalausgabe*, Millot’s history was one of Schiller’s primary sources. With this information, it may be concluded that Christiani’s footnote seems to have been Schiller’s inspiration for Lionel.

For his efforts, this soldier was paid a pension of 300 pounds by Henry VI. He was the subordinate of John of Luxembourg, the man who took Joan first to Beaulieu, then to

---

101 The literal meaning of *Eumenides* is “kindly ones,” providing an example of inherent irony in a standing literary tradition. The kindness of these creatures is perhaps to society at large, certainly not to the miserable objects of their relentless pursuit.

102 This poem will get a closer textual reading in Chapter 3, discussing Zhukovsky’s translations of Schiller.

103 The spelling is sometimes Wandonne, Vendomme or Vêndome, the last of which Pernoud identifies as a confusion with Louis de Bourbon, count of Vêndome (86). In their Joan of Arc biographies, Anatole France, Sackville-West and Waldman identify this individual only by his title. Marina Warner provides the name Lyonnel, Bastard of Wandomme (75).

104 “[John of Luxembourg] then held her as his prisoner, although a Burgundian nobleman, Lionel of Vendome, had taken her.”
Beaurevoir, where she stayed during negotiations for her transfer from military to church authorities, conducted primarily by the rector of the University of Paris and future judge in her trial, Pierre Cauchon. When Joan learned that she might be given to the English, she made her famous escape attempt - depicted in Schiller’s Jungfrau – by jumping from the tower of Beaurevoir. Eventually money was raised, and the political and military situation developed to the point that John of Luxembourg agreed to give Joan to the English for a ransom of some 5,000 pounds (Pernoud191-92, 205).

With this knowledge, it becomes possible to offer the following interpretation of Schiller's most nettlesome plot developments. The encounter with the Black Knight, which comes in the middle of the play, represents a kind of nexus of possibilities. Certainly, from the standpoint of history, Joan's encounter with Lionel de Wandomme represents the moment when her campaign ended and her captivity began. In Schiller, however, just before she meets Lionel, she meets the Black Knight, a succession of two eidola, who - like Helen's eidolon in Euripides - open a portal to an alternate reality. Instead of being captured, she falls in love with Lionel and he with her, which has the consequence of risking her mission and causing her eventual capture, but the sheer exertion of her will to overcome her temptation to love in this alternate reality allows her to escape (by leaping from the tower of her prison, the same means she attempted in history), to fall to her death in battle surrounded by her comrades, and to be rescued by a vision of the Blessed Virgin at the last moment.

This interpretation finds additional support in the metaphor of captivity that pervades the moment when Johanna encounters Lionel on the battlefield. Initially, Johanna and Lionel regard one another as enemies. Referring to Talbot, Lionel declares to Johanna:

Lionel. – Ich räche Lionel. I will avenge
The brave one or share his fate. And so that
You might know who robs you of your fame
Whether he dies or wins – I am Lionel.

In Schiller’s stage directions, Johanna seizes Lionel from behind, ripping off his helmet and throwing it down violently, in order to reveal his face, while simultaneously waving her sword with her right hand. She declares: “Endure the thing you seek, the holy Virgin sacrifices you through me!” The stage directions run on: “at this moment she looks him in the face, sein Anblick ergreift sie” (“his look captivates her”), she remains standing motionless and then lowers her arm slowly. In the act of seizing Lionel, intending to kill him, she herself is captivated by his look. As a metaphor to signify falling in love, capture is perhaps not in itself unique, but Schiller returns to it in Johanna’s soliloquy at the start of Act IV:

Unfallen! Ein blindes Werkzeug fordert Gott,
You were supposed to perform with blind eyes!
Unfallen! God requires a blind instrument,
Mit blinden Augen mußtest du’s vollbringen!
As soon as you saw, you lost God’s shield,
Mit blinden Augen mußtest du’s vollbringen!
Sobald du sahest, verließ dich Gottes Schild,
Ergriff dich der Hölle Schlingen!
And were caught in the snares of Hell!

(IV.i. 2577-81, emphasis Schiller’s)
Here, the capture metaphor is again associated with seeing Lionel and expanded by the use of the phrase “the snares of hell.” Additionally, Schiller contrasts the infernal bondage which Johanna experiences on seeing Lionel with the freedom she had formerly experienced when she acted as a blind instrument. In her meeting with Lionel, Johanna enters a captivity different from that of the historical Joan at the hands of Lionel, Bastard of Wandomme. Consequently, she experiences a different fate.

Yet another Euripides-derived interpretation of Lionel’s role in Schiller’s Joan play is as a stand-in for Orestes. This is not to suggest any role for incest in the Euripides or Schiller plays, but to point out that Gluck’s opera, *Iphigénie en Tauride*, as well as Goethe’s play, contains a scene based on the famous recognition scene in Euripides.\(^{105}\) Ewans points out that in Gluck’s *Iphigénie en Tauride*, at the moment when Iphigénie is about to murder her as yet unrecognized brother, Oreste, he cries out: “Iphigénie, dear sister, this is how you died at Aulis” (2007 48). Ewans goes on to observe, compellingly, that this moment is reminiscent of Orestes’s line in Euripides’s drama, also prior to the recognition scene in that play, when he learns of the sacrificial role which Iphigeneia plays in Tauris: “Will you, a woman, sacrifice men by the sword?” (Euripides 617ff., Ewans 48). If we consider that in both the opera and the tragedy Iphigeneia is a priestess who sacrifices foreigners to the virgin goddess Artemis, then the line cited above which Johanna delivers just after she removes Lionel’s helmet resonates fairly clearly with the Iphigeneia myth: “Die heil’ge Jungfrau opfert dich durch mich!” (*The holy virgin sacrifices you through me!*)

While Schiller finds rich source material in the works of Euripides and Goethe, he constructs the dramatic twists and turns confronted by his tragic heroine in a highly original

---

\(^{105}\) Where the French spellings of the names, Iphigénie, Oreste, Pylade, etc., appear, I am referring to the characters in Gluck’s opera.
manner that exploits the theatrical potentiality of sublime sanctity. In the play’s prologue, Johanna bids farewell to worldly glory and sensual love, understanding that to do so is the will of God. Johanna wants to drive the English invaders out of France because she believes she has been chosen to fulfill a mission requiring her to do so, but her encounter with the Black Knight causes her to question her selflessness, while her attraction to Lionel causes her to doubt her commitment to chastity. As the audience comes to grasp Johanna’s painful dilemma, they respond to its sublime nature. Her persistent will, here described as her sanctity, in the face of all obstacles, carries her on to her goal and provides a meaning for her struggles at the moment of her death, with which the play ends.

After the denunciation scene, as previously noted, Raimond escorts Johanna from Rheims into the countryside, where in Act V they encounter English troops, along with Queen Isabeau and Lionel. Johanna is taken prisoner and Raimond escapes. He goes to the French camp to inform them of Johanna’s capture and her whereabouts. The news rouses them from the gloom of their regret at having treated Johanna so faithlessly, and they rush off to rescue her with renewed enthusiasm for defeating the invaders. The next scene consists of the aforementioned exchange among Lionel, Fastolf, Queen Isabeau, and Johanna, at the conclusion of which Johanna breaks her chains and leaps from the tower to join the advancing French forces. It is significant to note that the trial transcripts record that while she was being held captive by the English side in autumn of 1430, Joan of Arc actually leapt from the tower of Beaurevoir and survived the fall. The breaking of the chains, however, is Schiller’s invention. One imagines, in addition, that Johanna is inspired to these feats not out of a survival instinct, but because the English soldier describing the battle says that the king is in danger. As the next and final scene begins, we learn that the king is safe and that the French have won the battle. Unfortunately,
Johanna has been mortally wounded. She is carried onto the stage unconscious by King Charles and the Duke of Burgundy, arguably the two men who most owe their own good fortune to her. Johanna briefly regains consciousness, and paying no attention to her serious injuries, she is ecstatic that her friends and colleagues no longer harbor any doubts about her:

Und bin ich wirklich unter meinem Volk
And am I really among my people

Und bin nicht mehr verachtet und verstoßen?
And no longer despised and rejected?

Man flucht mir nicht, man sieht mich nicht güütig an?
They don’t curse me or disregard me?

(V.xiv. 3525-27)

She asks for her banner, which she has not carried since before the denunciation scene. Now that she has overcome the test of her commitment to her mission, she believes herself worthy of carrying it again. She looks up at the sky:

Sieht ihr der Regenbogen in der Luft?
Do you see the rainbow in the sky?

Der Himmel öffnet seine goldnen Tore,
Heaven open its golden gates.

Im Chor der Engel steht sie glänzend da,
She stands there gleaming amid the chorus of angels

Sie hält den ew’gen Sohn an ihrer Brust,
And holds her eternal son at her breast.

Die Arme streckt sie lächelnd mir entgegen.
She reaches out her arms to me smiling.

Wie wird mir – Leichte Wolken heben mich –
What is this? – light clouds lift me up –

Der schwere Panzer wird zum Flügelkleide.
The heavy armor becomes feathery wings.

Hinauf – hinauf – die Erde flieht zurück –
Upward – upward – the earth falls away –

Kurz ist der Schmerz und ewig ist die Freude!
Pain is brief, but joy is eternal!

(3536-44)

After this, she drops her banner and dies. There is a long silence, after which the king gives a sign for the assembled soldiers to cover Johanna with all the banners available, until she cannot be seen beneath them.
Wiese describes the final scene as *die Verklärung* (“the transfiguration”). While acknowledging the operatic and pageant-like qualities for which the conclusion has been criticized, he asserts that these are necessary to communicate Schiller’s lofty conception of restoring the alienated angel to her divine status (744). In the vision that Johanna describes – an unidentified “she stands gleaming” amid a choir of angels and holding her “eternal son at her breast” – we are perhaps meant to recognize a purer reflection of Thibaut’s vision, except that the diadem he saw has been transformed into beams of light and the scepter into the “eternal son.” Seen this way, the vision that has driven Thibaut to denounce his daughter becomes a redemptive transfiguration in Johanna’s final vision.

The scene also bears some similarities to that which concludes Schiller’s translation of *Iphigenie in Aulis*. As she ascends the sacrificial altar, Iphigenie also looks up at the sun and notes the beauty of the beams of light, in much the same way as Johanna notes the rainbow and the golden gates of the sky. Iphigenie states that another life and fate await her.\(^\text{106}\) She will experience a double transfiguration, with her place on the altar taken by a deer and her own body removed to Tauris in the guise of a priestess. Johanna’s armor is transformed into feathers as the clouds lift her upwards, an image that Christians probably recognize as a soul entering heaven. Iphigenie experiences a “wonderful rescue,” orchestrated by the virgin goddess, Artemis. Johanna does not name the “she” who holds the “eternal son at her breast,” but we can deduce it to be the woman whom Christians call “the virgin.” This virgin is present to Johanna at the moment when she experiences a glorious transfiguration, a rescue from the ignominious death Joan actually experienced. It is also a rescue, created by Schiller, of Joan’s story from the abuse of Shakespeare and Voltaire. One other “she” is present in Johanna’s final lines in the original

\(^{106}\) See quoted excerpt p. 64.
German text. The word *Freude* ("joy") is feminine in gender. Recalling the argument made earlier that the Virgin is never depicted as actually being onstage, it is possible to assert that the "she" rescuing Johanna at the end is her own joy, earned at the price of great suffering and attained through her extraordinary exertion of will. At the moment of her death, she experiences this joy as a sublime sensation, seemingly eternal, brought about by the restoration of her reputation among the people through the sanctity of her singular devotion to their shared mission.

Johanna is not Joan, after all, nor does she need to be. Schiller created a character who thrilled his audience, even as she thrills the other characters in the play with her. She is not any farther removed from her historical model, however, than Maria Stuart is from the last Catholic monarch of England or Don Carlos from the Infante of Spain. Schiller is not trying to teach us history. He is, in fact, not trying to teach us at all. He is showing us that we can learn. What we can learn from Johanna is that she achieves her sanctity – and we perceive it – only after the sublime experience of her suffering.

The powerful effect of the play is certainly what drew subsequent artists to attempt to create their own versions of it: Zhukovsky’s 1824 translation, Verdi’s opera of 1845, and Tchaikovsky’s opera of 1879. In constructing their versions, however, each of these artists alters the salient features of Johanna’s sublime sanctity which Schiller devises so carefully: a) a virgin, like Euripides’s Iphigeneia, is entrusted with a mission of national importance by a supernatural force akin to the Greek gods; b) a two-fold threat to this mission is posed by a paternal figure on one hand and a love interest on the other, compromising the integrity and chastity of the girl; c) the threat intensifies to the point that it poses a mortal threat to the suffering virgin; d) she exerts her personal will to overcome her suffering by the sublime decision to choose death, which
becomes a transfiguration, confirming her sanctity. Discussion of the works related to Schiller’s play, their inception and the manner in which they conform to or diverge from his conception forms the basis of the chapters to follow.
Chapter 2. The Schillerian Lacuna: Verdi’s *Giovanna d’Arco* and the Curious Absence of German-Language Operas Based on Schiller’s Plays

“Noemand hatte tiefern Sinn für Musik als Schiller.” (Karl Friedrich Zelter)

This chapter considers the progeny of Schiller’s plays, that is, the operas based on them, and especially from the viewpoint that they are all peculiarly in Italian, French, and Russian. Rossini wrote one; Donizetti and Tchaikovsky have one each; Verdi four. Why none in German? The discussion here pursues two different but related questions. Why have Germans avoided making Schiller’s plays into operas, and what were the results when non-Germans created operas out of Schiller’s plays, and especially out of *Jungfrau*? Parallel to these questions, an argument emerges to suggest that opera libretti based on Schiller’s plays expose moments of tension between the passing of the Baroque and Classical operatic traditions and the emergence of the Romantic. Schiller’s admiration for operatic composers, such as Gluck, seems to have inspired him to incorporate operatic elements in his plays, especially *Jungfrau*. On one hand, perhaps his blending of Baroque and Classical features into Romantic tragedy contributed to his German contemporaries’ reluctance to make his plays into operas. In Italy and elsewhere, on the other hand, this blend captured the attention of eminent librettists and composers, albeit with mixed results. Rossini’s *Guillaume Tell*, Donizetti’s *Maria Stuarda*, and Verdi’s *Don Carlo* can be found on the stages of opera houses all over the world to this day.

---

107 “No one had a deeper appreciation of music than Schiller.” (25 November 1823 NA.42 336)
108 Tchaikovsky’s Schiller opera will be discussed in Chapter 4.
109 Despite this composer’s German origin, in English language scholarship his name is rendered without the umlaut, according to the custom in Italian and French, the languages in which he wrote most of his operas.
Verdi’s *Giovanna d’Arco*, however, is largely unknown, and when performed, it appears more often as a novelty item in the concert hall, rather than on the stage.

Regarding the absence of operas based on Schiller plays, there was certainly no shortage of eminent opera composers alive during his lifetime composing in German. Mozart (1756-1793) wrote two *Singspiele* in German that remain in the repertoire today, *Die Entführung aus dem Serail* (1782), and *Die Zauberflöte* (1791), along with a small number of other *Singspiele*, but there can be no doubt that he is best known for his Italian operas, for example, *Le Nozze di Figaro* (1786) and *Don Giovanni* (1787). Beethoven (1770-1827) wrote several *Singspiele* that are largely forgotten and worked for ten years, editing and revising his only opera, *Fidelio* (1804-1814). The fourth movement of his Ninth Symphony, in which he famously set portions of the text of Schiller’s “Ode an die Freude” attests to the composer’s admiration for Schiller’s poetry. Schubert (1797-1828) and Mendelssohn (1809-47) were born too late to have had personal interaction with Schiller, but they lived and composed in the years when appreciation for Schiller’s works was spreading across Europe. Additionally, they were personally acquainted with Goethe, who remained a staunch advocate of Schiller’s until his own death in 1832. Both of these composers wrote a considerable number of songs for voice and piano, called *Lieder*, based on poems by Schiller and Goethe, as well as music for chorus and orchestra, one of which, *Die erste Walpurgisnacht*, merits discussion below.\(^\text{111}\)

---

\(^\text{110}\) The term *Singspiel* (“singing-play”) describes a work in which there is spoken German-language dialogue interspersed between the musical numbers, which were usually, but not always, also in German. It is similar in many ways to the Italian *opera buffa* and French *opéra comique*, which also include spoken dialogue. *Opera containing sung dialogue*, or *recitative*, was called *opera seria* in Italian and *tragédie lyrique* in French. Later these genres would develop into *bel canto* and *grand opéra*, respectively. Cf. Dahlhaus 227 and Kerman 58.

\(^\text{111}\) The *First Walpurgisnacht*, a poem by Goethe describing pagan rituals in pre-Christian Germany. It should not be confused with the “Walpurgisnacht” scenes in *Faust*. It would be equally fair to ask why Goethe’s great works have found themselves made into opera only by non-Germans (*Le Damnation de Faust* by Berlioz, *Faust* by Gounod, *Werther* by Massenet, all in French), but this question ventures beyond the scope of this dissertation.
Given that Italians had created the genre of opera in the early seventeenth century, it is not surprising that many spectators considered this – and decidedly not German – its natural language. The linguistic proximity of French to Italian as Romance languages seems to have permitted the genre to thrive in that tongue, albeit under rather divergent aesthetic conditions. The disparity between the recitative-driven French opera and the aria-driven Italian opera was among the number of factors that led to the “querelle des bouffons” in 1752-54, which saw defenders of the French composer Rameau and defenders of the Italian style in France, led by Rousseau, waging an artistic battle over the two Baroque styles’ relative merits. “The debate between Rousseau and Rameau as to whether melody takes precedence over harmony, or vice versa, actually hinged on the problem of whether musical expressivity was based primarily on the adoption of speech inflections or on tonal relations governed by harmonic and motivic logic” (Dahlhaus 368). A hundred years later, Wagner and others would weigh in on this debate. The argument as to whether melody or harmony should take precedence in opera, which began in the Baroque era, continued unresolved into the Classical and Romantic eras and has never been completely settled. In any case, the enormous popularity of opera in Italian and French, and the equally enormous disinclination against opera in German, had already been well established in the Baroque era, resulting in German composers of opera who did not compose in their own language. The most famous of these are Handel (1685-1759) and Gluck (1714-87). Gluck composed largely in Italian, but often in French. Handel composed almost all of his operas in

---

112 *L’Euridice* by Peri and Caccini in 1600 and *La favola d’Orfeo* by Monteverdi in 1607, Kerman 21.
113 The moniker “bouffons” has its source in the name of the Italian comic opera company whose arrival in France initiated the controversy. It should be noted that the motivations behind the “querelle” were enhanced by its ability to serve as a proxy for the more palpable tensions between monarchists and liberals, like Rousseau and the other Encyclopedists. (Cook. “Querelle des Bouffons.” *Grove.*)
Italian. Both of these composers experimented briefly with German opera, but the scant surviving evidence of these productions attests to the fleeting nature of their success.

Handel was involved in the isolated experiment in German Baroque opera that took place in Hamburg at the Gänsemarkt (“Goose Market”), adjacent to the site of today’s Staatsoper. Although it lasted for 60 years, this theater failed to influence other major population centers or gain a permanent hold in the broader culture. Hamburg had survived largely unscathed from the military and political vicissitudes of the Thirty Years’ War, which partly explains the emergence of an independent theater there in 1678. The theater was modeled on the Teatro di Santi Giovanni e Paoli in Venice and seated two thousand, with spectators regularly attending from all strata of society, as in its Venetian model. This was in marked contrast to the court theaters that served smaller, exclusively aristocratic audiences everywhere else (Warrack 38). The ducal theater in Weimar, in which Schiller mounted Gluck’s *Iphigénie en Tauride*, is an example of the small, exclusive court theater.

Georg Friedrich Händel had arrived in Hamburg in 1703 at the age of eighteen as a second violinist in the opera’s orchestra and was composing operas within two years. He wrote three operas while there, of which only *Almira* (1705) survives (Warrack 55). Händel left Germany for England in 1710, where he became the undisputed master of Italian *opera seria* for decades, before becoming even more famous for his English-language oratorios, like *Judas Maccabeus* and *Messiah*, and resulting in his adoption of the English respelling of his name as George Frideric Handel. He learned a great deal from two composers who had preceded him to the Gänsemarkt, Reinhard Keiser (1674-1739) and Johann Mattheson (1681-1764).

Keiser composed a remarkable sixty-six operas, while Mattheson composed only five. By sheer volume, it seems likely that Keiser’s compositional skill had greater influence on
Handel and other composers. Mattheson, for his part, was more influential as a theorist and made a lasting contribution to the aesthetics of opera while defending the Gänsemarkt against Pietist clerics in Hamburg who opposed opera as an inherently immoral genre. His rationale lays a clear foundation for the notion of opera as a total art work which Wagner would later propound:

[...] eine hohe Schule vieler schönen Wissenschaften, worinn zusammen und auf einmal Architectur, Perspective, Mahlerey, Mechanik, Tanzkunst, Actio oratoria, Moral, Historie, Poesie und vornehmlich Musik, zur Vergnügung und Erbauung vornehmer und vernünftiger Zuschauer, sich aufs angenehmste vereinigen, und immer neue Proben geben.\textsuperscript{115}

This argument falls short of asserting that opera is inherently moral, but leaves open the possibility, according to Wagner, that the combination of its effects has greater power to persuade and edify than any one of the arts on its own. While the cultural significance of an independent German opera is great, it must be admitted that linguistic purity was never completely maintained at the Gänsemarkt, because the surviving libretti show clearly that the popularity of the French and Italian styles often resulted in the interpolation of mixed features that, judged by today’s standards, hang together somewhat awkwardly. Handel’s \textit{Almira} has passages in Italian mixed in among the German and includes ballets and pantomimes in the French style. Mattheson’s \textit{Boris Goudenow} (1710) is almost entirely in German, but includes an aria in Italian, as a concession to the prevailing fashion. The existence of this opera,

\textsuperscript{114} Warrack suggests that Keiser’s style of recitative was influential on the composition of certain \textit{arioso} passages of Bach’s Passions. Keiser had been trained at the Thomasschule in Leipzig, of which Bach was later the Kapellmeister (54).

\textsuperscript{115} “…a lofty school of many fine arts, in which together and at the same time architecture, scenic design, painting, machinery, dance, declamation, morality, history, poetry and above all music unite in the most agreeable manner and continually explore new ideas for the pleasure and edification of a distinguished and intelligent audience” (Warrack 58).
unperformed in Mattheson’s lifetime, invites speculation about its possible relation to Schiller’s play, left unfinished at his death nearly a century later. *Demetrius* tells the story of Boris Godunov from the perspective of the pretender who ultimately usurps him. The tenor who sings the aria mentioned above is named Iwan, presumably Boris’s predecessor on the Russian throne. No such character appears in Schiller’s planned scenario, significantly reducing the likelihood of any connection. The appearance of a travelling Italian opera company in 1738 coincided with the closing of the Gänsemarkt. Whatever the reason – isolation, lack of stylistic integrity, Italian operatic hegemony – the German genre failed to take root elsewhere at this time.

Half a century later, Christoph Willibald Gluck, after establishing a career composing in French and Italian, inspired a momentary resurgence of opera in German. During the 1781-82 season in Vienna, the Habsburg Emperor, Joseph II, ordered four of Gluck’s operas to be performed as the centerpiece of the festivities welcoming the Russian Grand Duke Pavel Petrovich and his wife, Maria Feodorovna. At this time, Gluck occupied the position of court composer to Joseph II. The Emperor requested productions of Gluck’s *Orfeo* and *Alceste*, in the original language, along with two works displaying the novel abilities of his German *Singspiel* troupe. These were a translation of *La rencontre imprévue*, rendered in German as *Die Pilger von Mekka*, and a new adaptation by Gluck himself of *Iphigénie en Tauride*, translated by Johann Baptist von Alxinger as *Iphigenia auf Tauris*. The last of these was delayed until October by the temporary paralysis of Gluck’s right arm.

116 The distraction caused by this visit as the entourage subsequently passed through Württemberg in September 1782 would provide Schiller with the opportunity to escape from Stuttgart and the tyranny of Duke Karl Eugen. The daughter of this match, Maria Pavlovna, later married the son of Duke Karl August of Weimar, Goethe and Schiller’s benefactor (Dünzter 96). Both marriages were arranged by the husband of Baroness Henrietta von Wolzogen. Henrietta von Wolzogen had rescued Schiller from destitution after his flight from Stuttgart (Dünzter 291, 314).

117 “Unable to attend performances himself, Gluck received the compliments of Grand Duke Paul in his home” (Brown and Rushton “Gluck”).
Mozart’s German-language Singspiel, *Die Entführung aus dem Serail*, had actually been scheduled for a performance before the visit of the imperial Russian entourage, but this development interrupted these plans. This was because many of the singers were engaged for Gluck’s *Die Pilger von Mekka*. Ultimately, Mozart’s opera was mounted in August 1782 at Gluck’s request in his capacity as court composer, which meant that it reached the imperial stage before Gluck’s *Iphigenia auf Tauris*. “Several numbers in *Die Entführung* are indebted to Gluck's opera, not only in regard to ‘janissary’ style and instrumentation, but also in terms of form (e.g. the major–minor alternation and run-on construction of the overture and first vocal number).” (Brown and Rushton “Gluck”) Nearly a decade later, Mozart achieved resounding success with *Die Zauberflöte*, but German opera continued to appear as a novelty item, always yielding precedence to the Italian variety.

Engländer argues that the struggle by German composers to supplant Italian opera was waged fitfully in four cities: Vienna, Dresden, Munich, and Berlin. During Schiller’s lifetime, brief surges of German operatic success were followed by equal resurgences of preference for the Italian tradition. Apart from the previously mentioned spurt of *Singspiel* in Vienna at the court of Joseph II, if opera appeared in German there, it was only in translation. Before that, however, in Dresden in the 1770’s, *Singspiele* appeared from several composers. Wieland, who inspired Schiller’s passion for ancient Greek poetry, produced a German translation of Gluck’s *Alceste*, which was intended to win over the public for “grand” opera sung in German. It inspired no immediate successors, but the dramaturgical innovations of Gluck’s opera seem to have provided the direct precedent for Johanna’s soliloquies in *Jungfrau*.

118 Discussed below in this chapter, in the section on the resemblance of Act I, Scene ii of Verdi’s *Giovanna* to the opening of Act IV of Schiller’s *Jungfrau* (pp 139-44).
“In Munich three names especially stand out: Johann Lukas Schuhbaur, Franz Danzi, and Baron von Poissl. Before Weber they were the strongest representatives of German large-scale opera of the type of [his] Euryanthe. Danzi’s Iphigenie in Aulis (1807), an Athalia (1814), and Poissl's Wettkampf zu Olympia (1815) appeared and were celebrated as national achievements” (Engländer 482). In Berlin, Frederick the Great, was a musical conservative, preferring Italian opera seria. He allowed German composers to have their works performed at the court theater, but only with Italian libretti. Upon the accession of Friedrich Wilhelm II in 1788, a renewed interest arose in German opera, resulting in a 1794 German-language production of Gluck’s Iphigenie in Aulis and a revival in 1806 of his Alceste in Wieland’s translation (484), but little more. When the use of Italian in opera was abolished in 1815 by the Intendant of Prussia, Count Brühl, it initially meant only that operas originally composed in Italian would now be sung in German translation. The subjects favored by the Italians and the French, dating back to the Renaissance and Baroque periods, remained the only topics found on the stage throughout the German-speaking world. Schubert wrote and published roughly a half-dozen operas and Singspiele, but the conditions in the Viennese theater world, hostile to the development of German opera and eagerly receptive to the genius of Rossini, led him to focus his talents on Lieder and instrumental music (Denny 226-29). The appearance of Carl-Maria von Weber’s Der Freischütz in 1821 and Euryanthe in 1823 would change all this, largely because they paved the way for the operatic style of Wagner.

Two decades earlier, the lively music scene in Dresden, where Schiller’s friend Körner lived, led to his personal association with the composer Johann Gottlieb Naumann and to several important instances of his involvement in opera and vocal music. Engländ er informs us that at one time there were plans for Schiller to write a German opera libretto for Naumann (490).
Naumann had set a poem of Schiller’s to music, but it seems unlikely that Schiller would have been inclined to create a libretto for him: “Im Gegensatz zu Körner scheint Schiller von Naumann, der einige seiner Gedichte vertont hatte, nicht besonders viel gehalten zu haben” (NA.31 323). The poem which Naumann had set was “Ideale,” published in 1796 ("Naumann” Oxford Music Online 29 April 2014). Karl Friedrich Zelter, a composer and director of the Singakademie in Berlin, was friends with both Schiller and Goethe and set many of their poems to music. He writes a letter to Goethe that conveys Schiller’s opinion of Naumann’s abilities very plainly:

[...] Schiller war nicht längst in Dresden gewesen, Naumann hatte die ‘Ideale’ in Musik gesetzt und sie dem Dichter durch seine Schülerin, eine Mademoiselle Schäfer, vorsingen lassen. Das erste, wovon Schiller zu mir sprach, war diese Komposition, über welche er ganz entrüstet war: wie ein so gefeierte berühmter Mann ein Gedicht so zerarbeiten könne, daß über sein Geklimper die Seele eines Gedichts zu Fetzen werde, und so ging’s über alle Komponisten her.

(24 February 1802 NA.42 337)

It would seem that Schiller’s love of Gluck’s music was a special case. Zelter comes to Schiller’s house on that day with his bag full of Schiller and Goethe’s poems, intending to play his setting of “Der Taucher” for him. Schiller’s condemnation of Naumann – and all other composers – leaves his hopes in tatters, much as Naumann’s “Geklimper” had done to the soul of

---

119 “Unlike Körner, Schiller does not seem to have thought very much of Naumann, who had set one his poems to music.” This observation comes from the NA editors’ remarks.
120 “Schiller had recently been in Dresden; Naumann had set his ‘Ideale’ to music and had one of his students, a Miss Schäfer, sing it to the poet. The first thing Schiller spoke about to me was this composition, which had shocked him. How could such a celebrated, famous man ruin a poem this way, so that the soul of the poem is left in tatters over his clinking, and so it was with all composers.”
Schiller’s “Ideale.” Frau Schiller reminds them that he and Schiller are supposed to be dining with Goethe that evening:

Die Frau kam und sagte: ‘Schiller, du mußt dich anziehn, es ist die Zeit.’ So geht Schiller ins andere Zimmer und läßt mich allein. Ich setze mich ans Klavier, schlage einige Töne an und singe ganz sachte für mich den ‘Taucher.’ Gegen das Ende der Strophe geht die Tür auf, und Schiller tritt leise heran, in der Linken die halbgezogenen Hosen, mit der Rechten nach obenauf schwingend: ‘So ist’s recht, so muß es sein!’ (337) 121

It seems that Schiller was rather eager to protect his poetry from the potentially corrupting influence of a poorly conceived musical interpretation. Assuming that what Zelter knew was not a closely guarded secret, this situation would not lend itself to enthusiastic experimentation by other composers of his time. Zelter taught a great many composers at the institutes he founded for teaching church and school music in Berlin and elsewhere. Two of them went on to become more famous than their teacher: Meyerbeer and Mendelssohn. It is easy to imagine him recounting the experience above to his students, especially since the Nationalausgabe informs us that he shared it orally with Friedrich von Müller more than twenty years after it took place. 122

In addition to providing amusement, such an anecdote might have given Meyerbeer and Mendelssohn pause before attempting to set Schiller’s texts in their own music.

When one considers the vicissitudes to which German opera was subjected, as well as the cautionary tale from Meyerbeer’s teacher just mentioned, it is small wonder that he elected to

121 *‘His wife came and said, ‘Schiller, it’s time to get dressed.’ So Schiller goes into the other room, leaving me alone. I sit down at the piano, strike a few notes and begin singing the ‘Diver’ to myself very quietly. Toward the end of the first stanza, the door opens, and Schiller steps in lightly, his left leg half-dressed in his trousers, the right leg dangling about: ‘That’s right! That’s how it should sound!’”*

compose primarily in French. Similarly, when Caroline Schlegel reports Goethe’s plans to collaborate on a German-language opera with Zelter on 4 March 1802, it is not surprising to realize that they came to nothing (NA.42 657). In Munich in 1825, King Ludwig discontinued the Italian opera ensemble, once more offering an opening for German opera (Engländer 482). Weber’s *Freischütz* had opened a door through which no one but Wagner was willing to enter, and he would never do so with a text based on Schiller.

To be fair, Wagner did not trust anyone but himself to serve as his librettist. In *Oper und Drama*, Wagner offers at least two compelling reasons for his avoidance of Schiller: he felt that that Schiller tended to emphasize the details of history over their potential dramatic impact, and even when he seized the dramatic essence, tended to give greater priority to form than content.

Selbst Schiller war es aber auch nicht möglich, den noch so absichtlich von ihm zugerichteten historischen Stoff zu der von ihm ins Auge gefaßten dramatischen Einheit zusammenzudrängen: Alles, was der Geschichte erst ihr eigentliches Leben giebt, die weithin sich erstreckende, und wiederum nach dem Mittelpunkte bedingend hinwirkende Umgebung, mußte er, da er ihre Schilderung doch als unerläßlich fühlte, außerhalb des Dramas, in ein ganz selbständig abgeschlossenes Sonderstück verlegen, und das Drama selbst in zwei Dramen auflösen, was bei den mehrtheiligen historischen Dramen Shakespeare's eine ganz andere Bedeutung hat, da in ihnen ganze Lebensläufe von Personen, die zu einem historischen Mittelpunkte dienen, nach ihren wichtigsten Perioden abgetheilt sind, während im „Wallenstein“ nur eine solche, an Stoff verhältnißmäßig gar nicht überreiche, Periode, blos wegen der Umständlichkeit der Motivierung eines zur Unklarheit getrübten historischen Momentes, mehrtheilig gegeben wird.
Shakespeare würde auf seiner Bühne den ganzen dreißigjährigen Krieg in drei Stücken gegeben haben. (133)

In this example, Wagner has in mind the *Wallenstein* trilogy, and it would not be difficult to find commentators to agree with him that Schiller spends too much time in this trilogy on too slight a subject. The counter-examples of *Don Carlos* and *Maria Stuart*, dwelling in the Shakespearean manner on the “ganze Lebensläufe von Personen” (“entire life-careers of persons”), find no place in Wagner’s disquisitions. His other primary complaint about the unsuitability of Schiller’s works for opera is that the poet, especially in his later dramas, became obsessed with form over substance:

> Was Schiller besonders charakterisirt [sic], ist, daß in ihm der Drang zur antiken, reinen Kunstform zum Drange nach dem Idealen überhaupt sich gestaltete. Er war so schmerzlich betrübt, diese Form nicht mit dem Inhalte unseres Lebenselementes künstlerisch erfüllen zu können, daß ihm endlich vor der Ausbeutung dieses Elementes durch künstlerische Darstellung selbst ekelte.

> Goethe’s praktischer Sinn versöhnte sich mit unserem Lebenselementen durch Aufgeben der vollendeten Kunstform und Weiterbildung der einzigen, in der dieses Leben sich verständlich aussprechen konnte. (135)

---

123 “Even for Schiller, it was not possible, no matter how deliberately he prepared it, to compress the historic material into the dramatic unity he had in mind. Everything that gives history its actual life, the setting that stretches out in all directions even as it particularizes the central point, he had to shift into an entirely independent, self-sufficient entity, because he felt its delineation was indispensable. Therefore, he split his drama itself into two dramas, which is quite different from Shakespeare's handling of his multi-part historic dramas, where the entire life-careers of persons, who serve as the historical focus, are divided into their most important periods. In *Wallenstein*, however, one such single period, relatively weak in subject matter, is divided into several sections merely for the ostensible motivation of an obscure historical moment. Shakespeare would have given the whole Thirty Years’ War in three plays on his stage.”

124 “What particularly characterizes Schiller is that in him the impulse towards the pure, antique art-form took on the character of an impulse towards the ideal in general. He was so painfully distressed at not being able to fill this form artistically with the content of our life-element that he was finally loathe to employ that element by artistic representation at all. Goethe's practical sense reconciled itself with our life-element, by abandoning perfect art-form in favor of the further development of one that can express itself intelligibly.”
Wagner seems to mean that Schiller tended to avoid plots drawn from modern life, preferring to set medieval histories in a form based on ancient tragedy, precisely because he believed, unlike Goethe, that the purity of form would bring his material closer to the ideal. In this instance, Wagner is talking about *Die Braut von Messina (The Bride of Messina)*. He expressly excludes *Wilhem Tell* from this criticism, because he sees “poetische Frische” (“poetic Freshness”) in Schiller’s final play, but his comments, whether one agrees with them or not, could be applied equally to *Maria Stuart* or *Die Jungfrau von Orleans*, which did not prevent Donizetti or Verdi from making operas out of them. Wagner’s argument also flies in the face of Schiller’s own *Spieltrieb* concept from *Aesthetic Education*, since it does not account for the power of the play, when performed on stage, to enliven the supposedly dry form. Wagner uses Schiller’s presumed condition of frustration, stuck between an antique art-form and the practical Romance of modern times, as an analogy for the condition of all contemporaneous art. Perhaps he engages in such critical cherry-picking, focusing on two of Schiller’s less successful dramas and consistently extolling Shakespeare’s superiority to them, because one of his earliest operas, *Das Liebesverbot*, is loosely based on Shakespeare’s *Measure for Measure* (Millington 43).

Ultimately, the only significant large-scale setting of a text by Schiller in German taken up by a major composer remains Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony. Wagner has strong opinions about Beethoven’s setting of Schiller’s “Ode an die Freude” in the fourth movement of that symphony, taking it as an example of the resolution of the conflict of absolute music with

---

125 Brahms’s “Nänie” perhaps deserves mention here, but given that it is based on a 14-line Schiller poem with a duration of some twelve to fifteen minutes in performance, the description “large-scale” does not seem to apply.

126 An extremely fraught term that is generally understood to mean instrumental music, as opposed to vocal music, which does not attempt to represent anything beyond itself. Its opposite is “program music,” or an attempt to tell some kind of story. Sonatas, preludes, and fugues are the examples used by proponents of this idea to claim that such “absolute” music is of greater purity and aesthetic value. Contemporary music critics have generally concluded that these claims cannot be supported. Wagner’s use of the term tends toward merely positing it as music without a programmatic intent, but not necessarily of higher value.
poetry. The resounding and enduring triumph of the symphony, Wagner asserts, is attributable to Beethoven’s success in combining his melody with Schiller’s words in such a way as to allow each to retain its independence.


\textsuperscript{127} “Once he feels the hand of the poet in his own in this simple, reduced melody, he strides towards the poem itself. And from this poem, moving forwards according to its spirit and form to ever bolder and more manifold tonal structure, we finally sense wonders as we have never sensed them before: “Embrace one another, you millions!” and “Do you feel the presence of the creator, world?”, and finally the sure, wondrous intelligibility of: “Embrace one another” resonating with “Joy, lovely spark of the gods!” – emerges from the wealth of the poetic diction. Now, when we compare the broad melodic structure in the musical setting of the total “Embrace-one-another” verse to the melody, which out of the wealth of absolute music the master [Beethoven] likewise merely spread over the “Joy-lovely-spark-of-the-gods” verse, then we gain a precise understanding of the distinction between the patriarchal melody – as I have called it – and the melody rising up from the poetic intent for the word-verse.”
The genius of Beethoven’s compositional skill, Wagner asserts, is his ability to retain “das Vermögen der dichtenden Tonsprache” (“the wealth of poetic diction”) even as it becomes part of “das absolute musikalische Vermögen” (“the wealth of absolute music”). Significantly, the key to the success of the setting is Beethoven’s use of what Wagner calls “the patriarchal melody,” the famous tune of the fourth movement whose simplicity and directness have earned it a place even in hymnbooks. The moment when this rather strict tune meets with the freer, more symphonic themes in the development section of the movement contains what Wagner describes as “Wunder, wie wir sie bisher noch nie geahnt” (“wonders as we have never sensed them before”). The problem with setting Schiller to music does not appear to be insurmountable, and in the proper hands, yields previously unimaginable music. Wagner’s analysis makes clear, however, that he believes the distinctiveness of expression that Beethoven achieves with this poem would have been impossible with the text of an entire Schiller play. Beethoven himself, in his diaries and letters, made clear that he admired Schiller immensely, but it seems he never looked upon Schiller’s plays as operatic source material.

Given the fact that Schumann and Brahms lived during the decades when Schiller’s works were still popular and his literary influence still palpable, they might have been expected to compose an opera based on a Schiller play. When one considers that all the non-German composers who chose to write operas based on Schiller are their approximate contemporaries, their failure to do so requires some explanation. In the case of Schumann and Brahms, the explanation lies in their general reluctance to produce music for the theater. Einstein observes: “Romanticism is, by its very nature, a revolutionary movement directed against the fathers and grandfathers of the revolutionary generation; accordingly Romanticism hates Classicism – or what it considers to be Classical” (4). It would be unjust to lump Schiller in with the purely
classical categorization, given his inclination to pursue the lofty ideals inhabiting the sanctity of
the sublime. He also made it very clear that he rejected the extreme measures to which
rationalism resorted in the aftermath of the French Revolution.\textsuperscript{128} It is difficult, however, not to
admit that Schiller embraces classical formalism thoroughly and that the choice for many of his
projects tends toward politically and philosophically charged historical subjects. With the
exception of Wagner, most of the German Romantics “– Weber, Schubert, Schumann, Brahms,
each in his own way – did not wish to break the ties that linked them with the popular mind.
They loved homely things; they were afraid of departing too far from them, so they reworked
these elements without changing their content” (Einstein 5). If we agree that the German
Romantics loved “homely things,” then their failure to embrace the court intrigues of Maria
Stuart and Don Carlos, as well as the historical romance of Die Jungfrau von Orleans, requires
no further explanation. Why they would not have been attracted to Luise’s bourgeois plight in
Kabale und Liebe, however, leaves the question open.\textsuperscript{129}

One advantage non-German interpreters of Schiller possess is that they are, so to speak,
freed of the responsibility to be true to the Weimar Classical poetic style. Here again, it must be
allowed that Schiller and Goethe created polished and elegant verse that the German Romantic
composers admired. Brahms’s Nänie and Schubert’s “Gretchen am Spinnrade” – to name but
two works among many – attest to this. Perhaps they simply could not embrace this poetry on a
large scale. Even if a German composer found himself attracted to the passionate voice of a Posa
from Don Carlos or the glorious apotheosis of Johanna at the conclusion of Jungfrau von
Orleans, he still had to deal with Schiller’s verses and forms, which pulse with an intellectual
elegance that perhaps seems incompatible with the Romantic spirit. The alternative was to

\textsuperscript{128} Discussed in Chapter 1 p. 83
\textsuperscript{129} That Schiller play is the source of Verdi’s Luisa Miller.
paraphrase Schiller, which would have been as unthinkable to them as paraphrasing Shakespeare would be to speakers of English. Mendelssohn attempted to fly in the face of this conundrum when he set Goethe’s elegant verses in *Die erste Walpurgisnacht*.

Mendelssohn’s teacher, Zelter, had originally received the text of this remarkable paean to paganism from Goethe in 1799 and attempted three times over the next dozen or so years to set it to music. As Seaton informs us, however, “[it] is clear from the correspondence between the two men, Zelter's main problem was that the poem was of a new type that could not be set in his musical language” (399). Zelter’s settings of Goethe’s poems were those which the poet himself considered best. As mentioned above, when he played his setting of “*Die Taucher*,” it struck Schiller so strongly that the poet came back into the room half-dressed for dinner. Clearly, Goethe and Schiller thought he would be the man to set their poetry to music, and yet it eluded him. Seaton surmises that the unconventional nature of the work as a quasi-operatic *Gesamtkunstwerk* left Zelter feeling out of his element, which was utterly classical in temperament. When Mendelssohn decided to make his own attempt in 1830, his personal acquaintance with Goethe through his teacher permitted him to keep the poet apprised of his progress. Unfortunately, Goethe died before the work was completed, so we will never know his opinion of it. When it appeared in 1843 at the Leipzig Gewandhaus with Mendelssohn conducting, Hector Berlioz, the *ne plus ultra* of Romantic composers, was present and gave the work unreserved praise:

> His work is perfectly clear notwithstanding its complexity; the vocal and instrumental effects are marvelously intermingled, in an apparent confusion that is

---

130 One has only to compare his setting of Goethe’s “Erlkönig” to Schubert’s to be convinced of this. While Zelter’s vocal line possesses clarity and directness, which explains Goethe and Schiller’s high opinion of his compositional skill, the sense that the piano is an equal participant in the artistry of Schubert’s song and its through-composed dramatic quality mark it as utterly Romantic.
the very acme of art. Two magnificent features, in absolute contrast, are the mysterious piece of the placing of the sentinels ("Disperse, disperse "), and the final chorus, where the voice of the priest rises calm and reverent at intervals above the infernal din of the mock demons and sorcerers. One scarcely knows what to praise most in this finale, the instrumentation, the choruses, or the whirlwind movement of the whole. (52-53)

Berlioz was so transported by both the work and Mendelssohn’s conducting that he requested the baton the composer had used as a memento. Most telling in his review is the use of the words “confusion that is the very acme of art,” as well as “mysterious,” “infernal din,” and “whirlwind.” These are hallmarks of romantic aesthetics used by the self-appointed dean of the Romantic school of music. This ought to suffice as evidence that the work may safely claim its place in the Romantic canon. It has, however, failed to retain this status, which Mendelssohn’s music itself can only partly explain. The other explanation is Goethe’s verse, which, for all its evocation of “mock demons and sorcerers,” is infused with the same Weimar Classicism that pervades the verse of Schiller’s plays and posed an apparently insuperable challenge even to those of Mendelssohn’s compatriot composers inclined to write opera. The Weimar Classical style seemed to be missing the features demanded by the German Romantic composers.

The need to combine styles and features is one of the defining qualities of the Romantic in general. It began in the realm of literature in Germany in the late eighteenth century and eventually made its circuitous way around Europe. “Around 1800 Friedrich Schlegel linked the notion of the Characteristic with romanticism in the same way that the idea of the Beautiful appeared central to a classical, or classicizing, aesthetic” (Dahlhaus 69). Dahlhaus explains that the sense of “Characteristic” meant here is uniqueness of quality, as in individual personality or
national character. The Classical notion of beauty was always linked to the appreciation of forms and genres. Romantic poets would begin to modify or abandon classical forms and experiment daringly with verse meter and rhyme schemes. In music, as the example of Mendelssohn’s *Die erste Walpurgisnacht* shows, this transition posed a formidable obstacle because music depends upon structure – melodic, harmonic, and formal – to achieve organic integrity. As composers in the Classical tradition sought to bring forth the Characteristic in their works, the demands of originality became ever more difficult to meet. In purely instrumental music, which does not rely on text, the result produced by the demands of the Characteristic is striking. Taking the genre of symphony as an example, the quantity composed by its most eminent practitioners is as follows: Haydn – 104 symphonies; Mozart - 41; Beethoven - 9; Brahms - 4. There appears to be an inverse relationship between the prolific potential of formalism and the captivating originality of the Characteristic. The German composers, already frustrated in their attempts to create German opera, now found themselves challenged – albeit for a completely different reason – in their previously uncontested realm of symphonic creation and sought their inspiration more and more in the “homely” genres of chamber music and lied.

While it may not be possible to explain with complete satisfaction the dearth of German-language operas based on Schiller, the abundance of operas written in other languages based on his works strongly suggests that Wagner’s opinion was not shared by some of his fellow opera composers. Verdi seems to have written more operas based on Schiller than anyone else. Four were published and produced, among them *Giovanna D’Arco*, loosely based on *Jungfrau*

---

131 Dahlhaus is quick to point out that what some interpreters are eager to identify as typically “Polish” in, say, Chopin – such as the Lydian fourth and the bagpipe drone – can be found in the music of other nations (38).
132 The decision to abandon melodic, harmonic and rhythmic strictures, most notably by Schoenberg, Webern, and Stravinsky, later gave rise to modernism in music.
The following discussion will examine a few of the dramatic transformations in his and others’ settings of Schiller’s plays (Rossini Guillaume/Guglielmo Tell 1829; Donizetti Maria Stuarda 1835; Verdi Don Carlo 1867; Verdi Giovanna D’Arco 1845). Verdi’s setting of Giovanna D’Arco and its relation to Schiller’s notion of sublime sanctity will form the centerpiece of the remainder of this chapter. Additionally, just as Schiller’s Jungfrau builds upon the dramaturgical and aesthetic principles he first explored in Don Carlos and Maria Stuart, the Italian operas based on these plays form links in the chain that leads from Baroque operatic practice (opera seria and opera buffa), through the flowering of bel canto, to the threshold of mature Verdian opera.

The first of Schiller’s plays to be set to music was the last that he wrote: Wilhelm Tell. Despite being written by the most famous composer of Italian opera buffa Gioachino Rossini, when it first appeared, Guillaume Tell (1829) was an early example of French grand opera. Rossini composed the work under the patronage of a wealthy French banker, and the work was conceived with an eye to appealing to the aristocratic expectations of Restoration Paris (Keys 224). The impresario of the Opéra, Louis Véron, said that the audience wanted to see: “dramatic events …comprehensible as visible action without regard for the text, just like the scenario of a ballet […] It is not the dialogue, which is virtually swallowed up by the music, but the striking, ‘speech-like’ arrangement of the agents [including] the chorus, that constitutes the expressive means” (Dahlhaus 126). What this meant was that a successful grand opera in Paris must include a series of tableaux vivants, of which Guillaume Tell, like Schiller’s original play, suffers no shortage. Each act either begins or concludes (or both) with a massing of choral forces.

133 The Italian version was translated by Calisto Bassi and first appeared in 1831 in Lucca and Florence (Keys 226). The significance of grand opera as a genre is a critical component in Tchaikovsky’s treatment of Schiller’s Junfgrau, discussed in Chapter 4.
When the July Revolution took place a year later, the anti-oppression theme of the opera preserved its popularity, although the resulting change of attitude at the state treasury forced Rossini into lengthy legal wrangling to acquire the payment he had been promised under Charles X (Keys 225). Rossini’s final opera was extremely influential on the further development of Italian opera, including that of Verdi, especially in the scoring of the vocal lines.

Carrying forward a tradition from eighteenth-century Baroque practice, early nineteenth-century singers would often add extremely elaborate embellishments to the vocal lines, with results that varied greatly according to their degree of taste. “Performer’s license amounted to a disease, and Rossini treated it homeopathically” (Budden, Verdi 10). Rossini began marking these embellishments directly into the score, codifying the kinds of elaborations that would be deemed appropriate for recitative, cavatina, arioso, cabaletta, and all the various set-pieces that comprised Italian opera of both the seria and buffa forms.

Donizetti’s Maria Stuarda is a very late example of opera seria (1835), probably better comprehended as bel canto. Schmidgall suggests that the difficulty of assigning the opera to a particular genre seems to arise from the complex nature of Schiller’s Maria Stuart: “Opera, especially bel canto opera, requires in some degree a stylization of literary sources, and one reason that Donizetti’s version of the play works is that Schiller himself intended his play to have a stylized quality” (129). This “stylization,” as Schmidgall has it, resulted from Schiller’s incorporation of Greek tragic dramaturgy, which he experimented with in Stuart, before exploring it much more broadly in Jungfrau. A significant rearrangement of Schiller’s dramatic structure is evident. Schiller arranged the acts to give prominence to either Maria or to Elisabeth in each act: Act I Maria; Act II Elizabeth; Act III – their encounter; Act IV Elizabeth; Act V Maria, with Elizabeth returning for the last five short scenes. In the Donizetti-Giuseppe Bardari
libretto, the action is turned inside-out somewhat: Act I begins with Elizabeth at court, very analogous to Schiller’s second act. The next act contains the ahistorical confrontation between the two queens. The final act is divided into two scenes, with the first similar to Schiller’s Act IV and the second similar to Schiller’s Act V. The most striking difference is that in Donizetti’s opera, Maria truly gets the final word. There is no scene in which Elizabeth can second-guess the death sentence. While it would be difficult to argue that even Schiller’s Elizabeth is a sympathetic villain (according to the formulation discussed in Chapter 1) in Donizetti, she is shorn of her ambivalence toward the political need to commit regicide and comes across as a tyrant. Nonetheless, the opera works exceedingly well on its own terms, with the Act II confrontation representing the dramatic pinnacle of the opera, and the finale, with Maria’s prayer accompanied by a mournful chorus, its musical and emotional peak.

Compared to Donizetti’s Maria Stuarda, Verdi’s Don Carlos in 1867 undergoes much more substantive dramaturgical changes from its Schillerian forebear. Act I of the opera is devoted to depicting the romance between the Infante of Spain, Carlos, and Elisabeth, who will marry his father, King Philip, an intrigue we only learn about in retrospect in Schiller. Musically, this precipitates a love duet for Carlos and Elisabeth that can be contrasted with their duets in later acts, which emphasize the forbidden nature of the relationship between the erstwhile lovers, called Carlo and Elisabetta in the Italian version. Interestingly, this opera, like Rossini’s Guillaume Tell, was originally composed and produced in French for the Paris Opéra.

---

134 Danilo Perfumo, in the Notes to the 2001 Bergamo Foundation recording, informs us that Bardari was a seventeen-year-old, last-minute replacement for the more experienced librettist, Felice Romani. Consequently, most scholars believe Donizetti had a strong hand in the creation of the libretto.

135 Schmidgall’s full analysis of Donizetti’s Maria Stuarda is highly recommended for his sensitivity to Schiller’s play and the degree to which the opera owes its emotional power to it (118-33).

136 It is common to cut this act in modern performances.
with a libretto by Joseph Méry and Camille du Locle. Additionally, Act I provides an occasion for the introduction of a four-note pattern that comes to be associated with, as Budden puts it, “the iron authority of Church and State that hangs over the opera” (Operas 280).

Whereas Budden characterizes it as a “thematic matrix,” this sequence of notes, introduced in one context and recalled later to add psychological depth, is what Dahlhaus calls a reminiscence motive (70-71). The finale is also radically different from Schiller. For anyone who becomes familiar with Schiller’s play before seeing Verdi’s opera, A.C. Keys’s synopsis captures the sense of incongruity:

Whereas in Schiller's final scene Philip with icy calm hands his son over to the Inquisition, the spectacular operatic version invents a more sensational ending. In self-defence Carlo backs towards the tomb of Charles V, which opens to reveal a monk in the guise of the dead Emperor, who covers the hero with his cloak and spirits him away. Five lengthy acts, seven changes of scene, settings including romantic gardens, a prison, moonlit cloisters, an auto-da-fé and the forest of Fontainebleau (with the inevitable offstage double hunting-chorus), to say nothing of the indispensable ballet – all this was in the tradition of the grandest of grand operas in the grand manner of the Second Empire. (235)

In addition to the love theme, another memorable musical idea from the opera is the duet from Act II for Carlo and Posa, given the name Rodrigo in the opera, “O Dio, che nell’alma infondere.” In this rousing piece of music, set against the chorus of monks that follows it, we see

---

137 It was translated into Italian by Antonio Ghislanzoni and first appeared in 1867 in Bologna at Teatro Communale (Castel 3). While the French demand for these operas (albeit by Italian composers) might suggest that interest in Schiller was lower in Italy, this was not the case. Andrea Maffei’s repeated success in publishing Italian translations of Schiller’s plays supports this.

138 Admittedly, it also bears a considerable resemblance to the leitmotiv, strongly associated with Wagner, and hence usually excluded from Verdi criticism. Cf. the discussion of this topic in Chapter 4.
the mix of high style in the manner of grand opera (the monks’ chorus and the recitative between Carl and Rodrigo) and low style (Carlo and Rodrigo’s duet feels more like a soldiers’ chorus) from the opéra comique. Dahlhaus asserts that this blending of styles is the “Characteristic” feature of romantic music in general. Additionally, Verdi’s extraordinarily successful combination of elements from opera seria and opéra comique met the demands of the public, following the revolutions of 1848 and the risorgimento, for art to fuse with politics in the creation of musical drama.

The libretto of Giovanna d’Arco (1845), which appeared over two decades earlier, is efficient and effective, providing an interesting condensation of the action of Schiller’s Jungfrau, despite the fact that the librettist, Solera, denied any connection. Budden writes: “It was, he declared in a letter to Ricordi, an entirely original drama bearing no relation to Schiller’s Jungfrau von Orleans— which was clearly untrue. It is indeed Schiller’s drama reduced to its essentials and with a love-interest between Joan and the Dauphin added; but it provided opportunities for certain untried effects, and Verdi set to work on it with much zeal” (Verdi 30). Rizzuti offers the complete text of Solera’s refutation, which was apparently provoked by concern on the part of Ricordi, the publisher, that it might arouse a complaint of plagiarism from the authors of the large number of other similar treatments of the subject of Joan of Arc then circulating in the theaters and bookstores of France and Italy. Among these were a “cronaca narrativa di Alexandre Dumas père e di una tragedia di Théodore de Puymaigre”:

Non conosco il dramma francese di cui mi parli. Ti affermo dunque rigorosamente che la mia Giovanna d’Arco è dramma affatto originale italiano; solamente ho voluto come Schiller introdurre il padre di Giovanna come accusatore; in tutto il resto non ho voluto lascarmi imporre né dall’autorità di
Schiller né da quella di Shakespeare i quali fanno Giovanna bassamente innamorata dello straniero Lionello. Il mio dramma è originale; anzi ti prego far annunciare sul giornale [la Gazzetta musicale di Milano] che, avendo alcuni profetizzato che io avrei desunta la tela dello Schiller, ho studiato per iniziare un dramma affatto originale. (80).

Although the discussion to come will show that Solera’s denial is specious, to say the least, his statement reveals gaps in his knowledge of both Schiller and Shakespeare. He seems unaware, for example, that Schiller borrowed the paternal denunciation from Shakespeare. Likewise, he seems to believe in a love interest for Joan named Lionel in Shakespeare, which is not the case. This plot development is Schiller’s invention, based on Joan’s capture at Compiègne in 1430 by Lionel de Wandomme. The Italian translation of Schiller’s play by Andrea Maffei had been published in Milan in 1830, and it seems highly likely that Solera either read it or discussed it with others (79f). The fears of reprisals for copyright infringement were apparently unfounded, and Ricordi published the score with no mention of Schiller. Solera’s libretto is also innocent of any knowledge of the accounts of Joan of Arc’s trials, which Quicherat began publishing in 1841, or of the commentary on Joan of Arc in Michelet’s Histoire de France, published in 1843. Perhaps even more surprising is that the publisher, librettist, and composer all seemed unaware that an opera on the same subject with nearly the same title had appeared in Milan.

---

139 “I have absolutely no knowledge of the play you mention; I assure you positively that my Giovanna d’Arco is an entirely original Italian drama. I merely wanted, like Schiller, to have Joan denounced by her own father; in all the rest I have not allowed myself to be imposed upon by the authority of Schiller or Shakespeare, both of whom make Joan fall basely in love with the foreigner Lionel. My play is original; and in fact I would like to have it announced in the papers that I have been very careful to make it original knowing that people have been saying that I would naturally take my plot from Schiller” (trans. Budden, Operas 205). Budden is of the opinion that the potential plagiarism was of a play by Soumet.

140 These publications, providing the first full-length accounts of Joan’s trial in vernacular, acquainted the public at large with Joan of Arc’s history and revealed the significant departures Schiller made from it in his play. It is probable that they contributed to obscuring his play and the operas based on it.
fifteen years earlier: *Giovanna d'Arco, azione drammatica musicale*, with music by Giovanni Pacini and libretto by Gaetano Barbieri. It ran at La Scala for a few weeks, beginning 14 March 1830, and then vanished into obscurity (79). Although Solera’s protestations of originality cannot be taken at face value, the manner in which he constructs the various elements of the libretto remains inventive.

The synopsis of Verdi’s *Giovanna d'Arco* is as follows: the principal characters are: Giovanna; her father, named Giacomo here; and Carlo VII, king of France. These three truly move the plot, and at least one is onstage in every scene. There is one supporting role on the French side, Delil, who functions as an approximate composite of the characters of Dunois and Philip of Burgundy from Schiller’s play. The only named English character is Talbot, whose rank in the published list of *Personaggi* as “supremo comandante degli Inglesi” is analogous to Schiller’s *Feldherr der Engelländer* (Ricordi 1950, unpaginated). Solera’s ability to create a story involving only five named characters is admirable; Schiller’s play has twenty-five. The driving force necessitating the condensation was probably commercial. An opera with too many principal soloists was unlikely to receive royalties from opera houses for the rights to perform the work because the cost of paying the soloists was always a large portion of the production budget. On the other hand, seventeen distinct choral ensembles are listed, all performed by various configurations of the chorus, including: *Ufficiali del re* (“the king’s officers”),

---

141 The entry on Giovanni Pacini in *Oxford Music Online* indicates that the score is available in the Ricordi Library in Milan. Depending on when it appeared there, the publisher’s ignorance of the opera would thus seem strangest of all. Barbieri’s libretto (accessible on Archive.org) was published by Antonio Fontana in 1820 in Milan, clearly for use during performance in the theater because it includes the names of the singers. In some respects, it is closer in content to Schiller than Solera’s, primarily resulting from the retention of a Lionel stand-in, called Leonello. On the other hand, Giovanna does not die at the end. The librettist appears to have been better known as a professor of mathematics, but also apparently produced a translation of *Romeo and Juliet* the following year (Collison-Morley, Lacy. *Shakespeare in Italy*. 1916. Reprint. London: Forgotten Books, 2013. 134-5). Another eponymous opera appeared in Venice in 1827 by Gaetano Rossi and Nicola Vaccai (Rizzuti 79).

142 Giacomo is closer to Joan’s father’s actual name, Jacques, whereas in Schiller, he is Thibaut.
Borghiniani ("townspeople"), *Soldati francesi, Soldati inglesi, Spiriti eletti*, and *Spiriti malvaggi*. The latter two are conventionally translated as "chorus of angels" and "chorus of demons," although this arguably misrepresents the terms in an oversimplification. The sheer number of choral groupings attests to the remarkable importance of the chorus throughout the opera, consistent with the Véron’s grand opera principle of *tableaux vivants*.

The action takes place in a Prologo and three acts. In the first scene of the Prologo, the choruses of king’s officers and townspeople lament the fate of France at the hands of the invading English. The mood is similar to Schiller’s Prologue, but in the play, Johanna’s father addresses his fellow villagers, and Karl the Dauphin is far away. In Solera’s libretto, King Carlo enters and declares himself resigned to his loss of the crown and plans to surrender. He has seen in a dream "dapinta vergine" ("a painted virgin"), in which she commanded him to lay down his helmet and sword at the foot of an oak tree (Castel 570). The villagers tell him that such a painted image exists in the nearby town of Dom-Remi, but that it is in a forest haunted with evil spirits. The king, certain that evil could have no congress with the pious virgin, sets off to find the tree. In the next scene, Giacomo watches as his daughter conducts her nightly visit to the shrine located under the tree. First he, then Giovanna, bemoans the plight of France, but Giovanna goes on to pray to be given a helmet and sword so that she can go into battle for France. She falls asleep beneath the oak tree. Carlo enters, sets down his helmet and sword and kneels to pray. Giovanna, still asleep, hears a chorus of demons taunting her plans for chastity and combat, followed immediately by a chorus of angels declaring that Giovanna’s prayers have been heard. She must rise and take the helmet and sword, but: “Guai se terreno affetto accoglierai nel cor” (“Woe to you, if you harbor worldly affection in your heart” 577). She rises

---

143 For translation of the Italian libretto, the series of Verdi libretti from Layerle Publications with Nico Castel’s word-by-word translations and commentary is invaluable.
and, as she takes the helmet and sword, Carlo sees her. She informs him that she will be his guide to victory, as long as he fights alongside her, but: “Guai, mortale, se manchi di fè!” (“Woe to you, mortal, if you break the faith!” 578). Solera has made Carlo part of the pact for divine aid. Carlo is overcome by emotion and inspired to resume his kingly duty to defend France. Before they depart, Giacomo, unobserved, sees them and declares that, since Giovanna has given herself to demons out of an insane love for the king, his anger will destroy her. Already in the Prologo, Solera has modified Schiller almost beyond recognition, setting into motion the two driving forces of the opera: the problematic love interest between King Carlo and Giovanna, and Giacomo’s suspicions that his daughter’s motives are nefarious.

In Act I, Giacomo enters the defeated English camp in the first scene, offering to turn his daughter over to Talbot and his soldiers, convinced that in doing so, he is saving both his daughter and France from corruption. Unlike Schiller’s Talbot, whose characterization as a sublime realist offers a critical alternative to Johanna’s sublime sanctity, Solera’s Talbot is merely a generic “English officer.” He and his soldiers are struck by Giacomo’s grief but delighted to avenge their loss. The second scene depicts an extended duet between Giovanna and Carlo, in which he declares his love for her and, over her repeated objections, asks her to confirm hers in reply. She finally does, and the chorus of angels repeat their admonition from the Prologo, although they are invisible and inaudible to Carlo. Giovanna regrets having declared her love and believes that she sees a white-haired phantom in the shadows declaring her sacrilegious. Carlo’s officers and Delil enter to announce that all is ready for Carlo’s coronation in the cathedral.144 They hand Giovanna her banner, which she mechanically accepts. Everyone notices her reluctance, but Carlo sends them off, promising to join them at once. Giovanna

---

144 One of the weaknesses in the libretto. If Carlo is already king, why does he need to be crowned?
wonders why she has not died in battle and begins to think that perhaps she can take solace in lifelong remorse and penance, when the chorus of demons returns, announcing that her soul is already lost, and that Satan is victorious. Carlo, once again unable to hear or see Giovanna’s apparitions, is perplexed and leads her away to the cathedral.

Act II is closest to Schiller’s play, presenting a condensed version of his fourth act. It runs as one continuous scene, beginning with a triumphal march, choruses of townspeople, and an off-stage church choir singing praise and thanks to heaven for the defeat of the English. Giacomo appears and declares that he is no longer a father but the instrument of righteous vengeance. When Giovanna emerges from the cathedral, she is followed by Carlo. The chorus sings “Viva Giovanna,” and the king proclaims that he will raise a temple to her. Giacomo interrupts to forbid this blasphemy and denounces Giovanna, referring to the place where she and Carlo first met:

La, sua fede rinnegata,  
questa figlia sciagurata,  
a superbia aprendo il seno,  
per iniquo amor terreno,  
se dannando a eterno scempio,  
coi demoni pattegio.  
Re tradito or leva un tempio.

There, denying her faith,  
this wicked daughter,  
opening her heart to pride,  
for an evil worldly love,  
damning herself to eternal destruction,  
made pacts with demons.  
The betrayed king now raises a temple.

This arouses the townspeople’s horror. Carlo begs Giovanna to deny the accusation, but Giovanna is silent. Three times, Giacomo demands: “Dimmi […] non sacrilege sei tu?” (“Tell me, are you not sacrilegious?” 600-01), and each time Giovanna is silent. After the third
demand, thunder rumbles, and everyone is terrified. Giovanna throws herself into her father’s arms and declares herself ready for punishment. Carlo is distraught at the people’s lack of faith, but they demand that the impure woman go and, with some sarcasm, invite her to take her supposedly brave deeds to England.

In Act III, Giovanna is in chains in an English prison and hears the heralds announce the advance of the French troops, reminiscent of Schiller’s Act V, from scene ix onwards. Although the stake awaits her, all she wishes is that she could fight for the French. Giacomo enters and observes her as she becomes more inspired by the images she pictures of the ongoing battle, which seems to be turning against the French. Her devotion and commitment with no thought of her own fate convince Giacomo that he was mistaken about her motivations, and he runs to her to remove her chains. They are reconciled. Giovanna asks for his blessing, and she rushes off to battle. Giacomo describes the scene, as she turns the course of the battle, rescues the king and leads the French to take the fortress. Carlo enters, acknowledging his gratitude to Giovanna, who has told him to return and rescue her father. Delil enters and announces Giovanna’s death. Soldiers carry her in on a stretcher. The chorus sings that her body emanates a pure fragrance.

Giovanna rises, “as if compelled by supernatural force” (610), and is overjoyed to learn that she is once again with her companions, her father, and her king, who no longer believe her to be a wicked enchantress. She asks for her banner, in order to take it to heaven, then has a final vision of heaven opening, with “la Pia” (“the [female] pious one” 611) descending to greet her:

O mia bandiera! Oh, my banner!
s’apre il ciel, discende la Pia, heaven opens, the pious one descends,
che parlarmi solea dalla balza. who used to speak to me from the rock.
Mi sorride, m’addita una via, She smiles at me, she points a way,
Par che acceni che seco mi vuol.
Ecco! …nube dorrato m’innalza,
oh! l’usbergo tramutasi in ale!
Addio terra! Addio, gloria mortale!
Alto io volo già brillo nel sol!

seems to beckon that she wants me with her.
There! a golden cloud lifts me,
Oh! my cuirass transforms itself into wings!
Farewell earth! Farewell mortal glory!
I fly high and already glow in the sun!

(Castel 611-12)

The chorus of angels sings of her return to them. The chorus of demons complains that heaven has triumphed. Giovanna falls, and the soldiers, mimicking Schiller’s stage directions, lower their standards over her, and kneel before her.

The opera was received well by the public at La Scala in its premiere 15 February 1845, but the critics, including Verdi’s own publisher, Ricordi, were not as enthusiastic. The experience caused Verdi to foreswear both the venue and the publisher.\(^{145}\) Undaunted, he decided to open the 1845-46 carnival season in Venice with a revival the following December, featuring the soprano Sophie Loewe. Teresa Stolz, the leading soprano of many of Verdi’s later works, like La Forza del Destino and Aida, appeared in a revival at La Scala in 1865 (Phillips-Matz 11). In general, the opera seems to have fared well during Verdi’s lifetime, especially in his homeland. After his death, however, the work all but disappeared.

One might be inclined to blame the opera’s loss in stature on the libretto, but Solera had been the librettist for the composer’s first success at La Scala in 1842, Nabucco, with which Verdi entered the pantheon of Italian composers then living, previously the realm of Rossini and Donizetti. Given that Schiller would be the provenance of three more operas by Verdi, it is

\(^{145}\) His displeasure was long standing, but not permanent. He would return to La Scala for four of his late masterpieces: the Italian premiere of Aida (1872), the Italian revision of Don Carlo (1884, originally performed in French in Paris, 1867), Otello (1887), and Falstaff (1893) (Budden Verdi 374-77).
tempting to look upon *Giovanna d’Arco* as the start of a new compositional approach to operatic style, but this does not seem to be the case: “There is nothing in his letters to suggest that he was any more committed to this subject than Donizetti to *Maria Stuart*” (Budden, *Verdi* 189). It would be wrong to attribute the opera’s failure to hold the stage to its being an early work. *Nabucco*, composed three years earlier with the same librettist, has been in the repertory of operas worldwide since its premiere. With the earlier opera, Verdi discovered an intense affinity, beginning, if we can believe his own memory of the experience, with the text of the famous chorus of Hebrew slaves “Va, pensiero."

I ran through the lines that followed and was much moved, all the more because they were almost a paraphrase from the Bible, the reading of which had always delighted me. I read one passage, then another. Then, resolute in my determination to write no more, I forced myself to close the booklet and went to bed. But it was no use—I couldn't get *Nabuco* out of my head. Unable to sleep, I got up and read the libretto not once, but two or three times, so that by the morning I knew Solera's libretto almost by heart. (Budden, *Verdi* 19)

Although he goes on to suggest that the composition of the opera was slow work, he completed it within six months. The enduring success of *Nabucco* attests to power of his music and Solera’s words to create a moving and compelling drama that audiences still want to experience in the theater.

With *Giovanna d’Arco*, however, the pressure to produce was extremely strong and seems to have made an impact on the resulting work. He was under contract with the impresario of La Scala, Merelli, to supervise rehearsals of his just-completed *I Lombardi* in 1844, while simultaneously facing the need to complete the new opera within four months (Budden, *Operas*
These conditions led Verdi to refer this period of his career as the “anni di galera” ("prison years" Budden, *Verdi* 185). The pressure led him to accept the libretto as it was, in contrast to the collaborative, sometimes dictatorial, role he would assume with his later librettists. As a result, sometimes the character of Verdi’s music seems at odds with the text supplied by the librettist. While he writes in a style somewhere between that of Rossini and Donizetti, Solera seems to have in mind the mood of a Renaissance or Baroque masque. This dichotomy is especially strong in the choruses. Those of the soldiers and townspeople, like the choruses for the angels and demons, affect Giovanna’s actions on stage. They do not merely comment on the action, but function as participants in the plot, a quality that served Verdi well in Solera’s libretto for *Nabucco*. The texts in *Giovanna* for the supernatural choruses – those heard only by Giovanna – are rhetorical, exhorting her to either blissful redemption or sinister condemnation, and seem as if extracted from a medieval morality play. Verdi’s music for the angels, set as a soli of contraltos, is serene even as it conveys a message of admonition; it does not jar the spectator out of the action of the opera. The demons, on the other hand, sing their taunts with an involuntarily infectious glee and vibrant Italian coloration. They are – like Goethe’s Mephistopheles – much more interesting than the angels. In the Chicago Opera Theater production discussed below, the director had a number of the men strip off their shirts during this scene, don red carnival masks and gather around Giovanna, caressing and groping her in a kind of lurid bacchanal. The jaunty, beguiling music for the demons in this portion of the Prologo “Tu sei bella” (Ex. 2.1) has the effect of captivating Giovanna’s attention and serves well as an example of the attractions of earthly pleasure.

---

146 A possible alternative translation is “galley years.”
Ex. 2.1 (Tu sei bella, Ricordi 62-71)

(Alla sola anima di Giovanna si fa sentire questo coro.)

Sop. (grazioso)

Ten.  Tu sei bel-la, tu sei bel-la!

Bassi  Tu sei bel-la, tu sei bel-la!

Coro di Demoni  Tu sei bel-la, tu sei bel-la!

p leggerissimo e grazioso

staccato

pazze-rel-la che fai tu?  Se d'amore per di il

pazze-rel-la che fai tu?  Se d'amore per di il

pazze-rel-la che fai tu?  Se d'amore per di il
Interestingly, in the subsequent *Scena e Romanza*, which takes place after the French have begun to get the upper hand against the English, this melody reappears several times as a reminiscence motive (Ricordi 107-109), while Giovanna expresses her doubts about the source of her inspiration. The music provides a clear sense of the emotional and psychological conflict that Giovanna experiences, but it is almost too convincing on the part of the demons. Emmanuele Muzio, who was Verdi’s pupil and sometime copyist and assistant, flew into ecstasies about the opera, and especially this number, which he described as “a most graceful waltz, full of seductive motifs that, after two hearings, can be sung straight away” (Osborne 107). “Soon the streets [of Milan] were ringing to the sound of the demons’ chorus played on innumerable barrel-organs” (Budden, *Operas* 206). Given that the demons also deliver the last words in the opera, *il trionfo del ciel* (“The triumph of heaven”), and in the same mocking tone as they deliver their triumphant ditty at the conclusion of Act I, the listener is left with a sense of ambiguity unusual in Verdi’s operas.

Verdi’s theatrical mastery seems to conform most closely to the effects that Schiller envisioned for his play in the prominent role, both musically and dramatically, of the chorus of
soldiers and townspeople. As with the aforementioned chorus of Hebrew slaves in *Nabucco*, on-
stage action is almost non-existent, while the ideas and implications of the text are treated very
powerfully and boldly in the music. In the denunciation scene, the chorus responds to
Giacomo’s accusations of his daughter’s consorting with the devil in a paradoxical atmosphere
of horror and enthusiasm, isolating the principal characters from each other. The pain and
suffering that Giovanna endures during the denunciation, her eventual release by her father,
together with her death on the battlefield under a spray of banners, are retained from Schiller and
offer the possibility of sublimity. Sanctity, as we are to understand it here, is undermined by the
necessity of truncating the action and telescoping the personalities of several characters.\[^{147}\]
This telescoping and its consequences create the most serious departure from Schiller’s play and seem
to present the most formidable obstacles to its successful production.

The result of the telescoping of characters from Schiller’s twenty-five to Solera’s five is
that Giovanna ends up tied amorously to King Carlo. As outrageous as it might seem to imagine
Joan of Arc allowing herself to be wooed by Charles VII, within the constraints imposed by the
truncated libretto, this relationship becomes plausible because there are no other characters for
either of them to fall in love with. Carlo, Giovanna, and her father, Giacomo, are the only
principal characters in the opera. There is no Lionel. Although perhaps no less plausible than
the relationship between Giovanna and Carlo, in Schiller’s *Jungfrau* the love interest between
Johanna and Lionel, as mentioned earlier, seems to have its roots in the equally implausible

\[^{147}\] As many will recognize, truncating and telescoping are necessities of all operas based on literature because the
music requires considerably more time than simple speech. As a result, librettists often find it necessary to collapse
or telescope the actions and personalities of two or more characters into a single operatic persona, often with
consequences that are themselves very interesting. In *Giovanna*, Schiller’s Dunois and Philipp are truncated into
Verdi’s Delil, reducing the complexity of the plot. In *Maria Stuarda*, Schiller’s Mortimer and Davison are truncated
into Donizetti’s Cecil (Burleigh), significantly increasing the scheming intrigue of the operatic character’s actions,
while Schiller’s already benevolent Talbot, Lord of Shrewsbury gains even greater moral stature in Donizetti by
becoming Maria’s confessor, a feature truncated from Schiller’s Melvil.
betrothal of Iphigenia to Achilles. In both plays, however, the emotional connection occurs between two potential lovers of equivalent social stature and serves to highlight the human vulnerability of the heroine. Because the love interest between Giovanna and Carlo, followed to its logical conclusion, could result in her coronation as his queen, with implications for material and political gain, Giovanna’s motivations seem utterly earth-bound, effectively eliminating the selflessness demanded by the sanctity formulation as crafted by Schiller for his Johanna. Giacomo’s knowledge of the amorous connection between his daughter and Carlo in turn weakens the dramatic impact of the denunciation scene. In Schiller, when Johanna remains silent after her father Thibaut denounces her, the audience experiences the dramatic irony of knowing that she feels guilty because of her unwilling attraction to Lionel, rather than her supposed involvement in witchcraft. In Solera’s libretto, Giacomo knows, or thinks he knows, that there is a connection between Carlo and Giovanna from the moment of their first encounter in the Prologo, and he vows to punish her for it:

Ella si cesse ai démoni per folle amore del Re.

per l’empio sentiero gravi l’ira del padre su te.148

(Ricordi 77-79)

Additionally, Giovanna’s feelings for Carlo are much less ambivalent in Solera than Johanna’s are for Lionel in Schiller. Where Johanna debates with herself the nature and implications of her feelings for Lionel, Giovanna eventually declares her love for Carlo. A close comparison of these two analogous scenes will prove useful.

In the soliloquy opening Act IV in Schiller, Johanna laments her moment of weakness for Lionel on the battlefield. As the scene progresses, the depth of her feelings becomes clear, but

148 “She gave herself to demons out of a mad love for the king. May the anger of your father fall upon you along the evil path” (Castel 579-80).
she never calls it love, and only she and Lionel are aware of it. The stage directions indicate accompaniment by flutes and oboes: *Ein festlich ausgeschmückter Saal, die Säulen sind mit Festons umwunden, hinter der Szene Flöten und Hoboen* (“A festively decorated hall; festoons are wound around the columns; behind the scene, flutes and oboes”). She expresses her awareness that her weakness has endangered the sanctity of her mission. The stage directions then indicate a change in musical mood: *Die Musik hinter der Szene geht in eine weich schmelzende Melodie über* (“The music behind the scene changes into a gently melting melody”). She recites a three-quatrain-long verse that strongly resembles a song, expressing her anguish over the fact that everything she sees and hears reminds her of his voice and his face:

Wehe! Weh mir! Welche Töne!  
Wie verführen sie mein Ohr!  
Jeder ruft mir seine Stimme,  
Zaubert mir sein Bild hervor!  
Daß der Sturm der Schlacht mich faßte,  
Speere sausend mich umtönten  
In des heißen Streites Wut!  
Wieder fänd ich meinen Mut!  
Diese Stimmen, diese Töne,  
Wie umstricken sie mein Herz,  
Jede Kraft in meinem Busen  
Lösen sie in weichem Sehnen,  
Schmelzen sie in Wehmutts-Tränen!  
(2551-63)

Woe! Woe is me! What sounds!  
How they lead my ear astray!  
Each one recalls his voice to me,  
Conjures his image to me!  
If only the storm of battle had held me,  
Whizzing spears deafening me  
In the hot fury of the fight!  
I would have regained my courage!  
These voices, these sounds,  
How they constrict my heart,  
All power in my breast  
They dissolve into gentle longing,  
They melt into melancholy tears.

Following her momentary melancholy regret, Johanna realizes that her eyes have led her astray, and that now her ears are confirming her weakness. As mentioned earlier, Johanna has made the mistake of thinking that her sacred vow of chastity will protect her from the temptation of a physical love. But when she sees Lionel’s face and hears his voice, she unexpectedly

---

149 This moment bears a more than passing similarity to the song of Gretchen at the spinning wheel, in Goethe’s *Faust*, in the scene “Gretchens Stube” (lines 3373-3413). Its musicality is most famously expressed in Schubert’s setting, “Gretchen am Spinnrade.”
experiences a physical response to him, for which she was unprepared. This moment becomes
the theatrical analogy for the actual capture of Joan of Arc by Lionel de Wandomme. In the final
section of her soliloquy, she addresses the Himmelskönigin ("Queen of heaven"), admitting her
perceived unworthiness to fulfill the vision she experienced under the sacred oak, when she
exchanged her shepherd’s crook for a soldier’s sword. Sensing the role of personal will in her
dilemma, she rhapsodizes: “Ach! es war nicht meine Wahl!” ("Ah! it was not my choice! 2612).

The resemblance of this scene in Schiller’s play to the text of an opera libretto is
astonishing, and Schiller’s stage directions with musical instruments reinforce the possibility that
he intended it to be experienced in a quasi-operatic manner. The structure of the scene would be
completely at home in an opera by Gluck, conforming entirely to his typical sequence of vocal
numbers: recitative, arietta, arioso and aria. Johann’s first thirty-two lines have the character
of the refined, formal style of recitative favored in French opera, broken into four stanzas of six
lines with the rhyme scheme a-b-a-b-a-b, followed by a rhyming couplet. In the iambic
pentameter that prevails throughout the play, she outlines her situation, asking how it is she came
to be in it. The second section, quoted above, is much simpler in form, rich in poetic imagery,
with the trochaic tetrameter reminiscent of a folk-song. The third section is freer in form,
retaining the meter of the first section but without a distinct rhyme scheme, again raising
questions of “who? why?” and “what if?” consistent with an eighteenth-century arioso. The

150 Dahlhaus offers a helpful glossary that defines these terms. Recitative: “speech-like singing with
accompaniment”; Arietta: “a simple piece for solo voice, distinguished from the aria by its brevity and folk-like
tone”; Arioso: “a cross between recitative, from which it derives its open-ended form, and the aria, the source of its
melodic style” (395-404). Dahlhaus, writing mostly about the nineteenth century, defines the aria from that
perspective, which is not appropriate in this case. In the eighteenth century, the three numbers cited in the main text
would usually lead to a da capo aria (literally: “an air, which goes back to the head,” often expressed in the formula,
A-B-A). These were somewhat strophic in form, rather similar to a contemporary pop song, with one or two verses
of similar musical material (the “A” section), followed by a bridge (the “B” section) of different material often in a
different key, and finishing with a return to the opening musical material (the “A” section). Usually the da capo A
section repeats the initial text, sometimes there is new text reflecting the lesson, as it were, learned in the course of
the text and signaling a decision of some sort. Budden’s Verdi includes a similarly helpful glossary (404-406).
fourth and final section is divided into four stanzas of eight lines each, like the first section, but without rhyming couplets, instead following the rhyme scheme a-b-a-b-c-d-c-d, in stanzas one, two, and four. The scheme in the third stanza is slightly different: a-a-b-c-c-d-d. This form approximates the conventional structure of the *da capo* aria, a type preferred for the central episodes of all the operas of the baroque period. Admittedly, the form had begun to lose its popularity in the Classical era, but Schiller would have been familiar with it from the operas of Gluck, and especially *Iphigénie en Tauride*, which he admired. By 1845, when Verdi was rapidly composing *Giovanna*, this sort of set piece would have had to conclude with a *cabaletta*, a faster movement that generally requires a text illustrating the character’s new-found resolve to embark on some new action. Given the mood of resignation that prevails in this section of Johanna’s soliloquy, the text would not have been suitable for a *bel canto cabaletta*.

In Act I, Scene ii of Solera’s libretto, the chronotope of Johanna’s Act IV soliloquy is transformed into a duet between Giovanna and Carlo in the garden court near the cathedral where the coronation will take place. Carlo has already declared his feelings for Giovanna in the Prologo, although he has stopped short of calling them love. Giovanna has resisted, declaring her intent to return home in a preceding aria (“O fatidica foresta”) that is based on Johanna’s “Lebt wohl, ihr Berge” soliloquy from Schiller, and now repeating that intent. In this scene (“Dunque, o crude”), Carlo is much more direct, and demands the same of Giovanna:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carlo.</th>
<th>a151 Carlo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunque, o cruda, e gloria e trono offeristi a Carlo in dono per serbarlo a’lai più vivi, per ferirlo in mezzo al cor. Fin dal di che m’apparvi io t’amai d’immenso amor.</td>
<td>a And so, oh cruel one, glory and throne. b you offered to Carlo as a gift. c only to lay in store for him deepest lamentations. d to stab him in the middle of his heart. e From the day that you appeared to me. f I loved you with immense love.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

151 The rhyme scheme indicated here will be discussed below. The hyphen indicates dialogue in recitative, which often follows no particular meter or rhyme scheme.
Giovanna.
Oh, pietade!...io non più non sono l’inviata di Maria;
Solo usbergo al dolce suono degli affetti è debil sen.
Deh, reispettami qual pria!
Ch’io non sugga il tuo velen!
Carlo.
Ma l’amor è santo, è puro…
Giovanna.
Taci, ah taci!
Carlo.
A Dio lo giuro!
Sol lo spirto mi concedi e all’incendio basterà.
Giovanna.
La mia mente va smarrita! ahi, si perde…
Carlo.
Ah! Cedi!
Giovanna.
Pietà, Carlo!
Carlo.
A te, mia vita, a te chiedo io pur pietà.
Giovanna.
T’amo, si, t’amo!
Carlo.
Oh detto! chi più felice?
Giovanna e Carlo.
Oh amor!

(Castel 587-89)

The declaration of love here, then, is utterly overt, with none of Johanna’s oblique allusions and disquisitions, although Giovanna does express a fear that she will betray her mission and perhaps
lose her mind. There is a clear reference to the analogous scene in Schiller discussed above in the imagery Giovanna uses to describe the physical nature of her attraction: *dolce suono degli affetti* (“the sweet sound of affections”). In many respects, however, the scene is a conventional set piece, with the tenor wooing the reluctant soprano, the obstacle in this case being more complicated than usual. In the end, Giovanna “gives in,” but the conventional love duet is thwarted by the sudden sound of the chorus of Angels repeating its admonition from the Prologo: “Woe to you if you harbor worldly affection in your heart!” They are quickly joined by the return of the chorus of demons, announcing Satan’s victory in winning over this descendant of sinful Eve. Consequently, during the denunciation by Giacomo in the next scene, there is no surprise when Giovanna does not defend herself. She has stated that she loves the king, which would probably be a shocking admission to his officers and the townspeople by itself, and she already believes herself to be damned. The moment is full of pathos but has none of Schiller’s dramatic, Euripidean irony.

Another truncation drastically detrimental to Schiller’s poetry takes place earlier in the opera, in the opening scene of the Prologo, in which Carlo reveals his dream of the virgin in the forest. His lines offer a clear analogy to both Thibaut’s dream and Johanna’s revelation of the dauphin’s dream in Schiller.

Carlo.

Le tue parole, o Vergine, Carlo umilmente adora
Ti fregierò l’ammagine di mia corona ancora…
Ma il sangue si deterga ond’è la patria in duol;
Ma la straniera verga sia mite al franco suol.

Carlo.

Your words, o Virgin, Carlo humbly worships;
I will yet adorn your image with my crown…
But let the blood that steeps our country in grief be cleansed;
But let the foreign lash fall gently on French soil.

(Castel 570)
Carlo’s pledge to “adorn” the virgin’s “image” recalls Thibaut’s dream from Schiller, in which Johanna’s father believes that he sees the deluded people worshipping his daughter, as well as the visions that Johanna has of the virgin, most notably that before her death. Assigning this vision to Carlo, instead of Giacomo, denies the audience the opportunity they have in Schiller’s version of seeing the image turn from Thibaut’s nightmare of vanity into Johanna’s vision of sublime redemption. Likewise, in Schiller, we learn that the dauphin has prayed for an end to the suffering of his people only when Johanna reveals it in front of the whole court. When Carlo declares it, as a king engaged in a war to the death, it seems fatuous.

It is also puzzling trying to understand how Giacomo moves around the theater of war so freely. To make the opera more attractive to potential producers, Solera had to limit the number of principals. Of Giovanna, Carlo and Giacomo, the father is the clear choice as the character to move the action between the French and English sides, but the economizing produces some dubious results. Giacomo leaves Dom-Remi and walks unarmed and unopposed into the English camp. After conspiring with the English, he returns to the coronation on French soil, where his word suffices for the people to turn their backs on Giovanna. After that, he again has no trouble entering the English prison, where Giovanna is being held. Because she is in prison without a Queen Isabeau or Fastolf to spar with on the rightness of her cause, we lose a key scene and discussion. As Budden correctly observes, “It is precisely during this intervening time that the psychological climax of Schiller’s drama occurs; where Johanna’s mind is suddenly cleared of her sense of guilt and her faith in her mission restored” (Operas 219). All these elements combine to obliterate the features of sublime sanctity that permit Schiller’s text to resonate both poetically and dramatically.
Solera’s contention that his libretto was “entirely original,” as Budden says, is “clearly untrue” as may be demonstrated. The main evidence is the denunciation of Giovanna by her father Giacomo in Act II, which has nothing to do with Joan’s history and, if not entirely Schiller’s invention, at least owes something to Shakespeare’s shepherd-father. In this scene, after Giacomo calls on Giovanna to confess her sacrilege three times (as in Schiller), Giovanna remains silent, and the score calls for “tuono e lampi” (thunder and lightning), to convince the assembled people of her pact with the devil. Finally, Solera must have derived the final scene with the banners covering Giovanna from Schiller’s ahistorical invention, including even the reference to her armor turning into feathers: “oh! l’usbergo tramutasi in ale!” (“Oh! my cuirass transforms itself into wings!” (Castel 612). For all his deforming of Schiller, he takes his role as a librettist seriously and hews to the more dramatic action, at the expense of discourse. Schmidgall asserts that such a course of action is entirely appropriate: “A librettist, then, fashioning his text from a literary source, will naturally gravitate away from the passages of discursive complexity and toward those that issue in psychological or physical action” (15).

Irrespective of its consistency or inconsistency with Schiller’s text, Solera’s libretto contains several admirable qualities, the chief of which are its economy and the effective integration of the choral elements. Additionally, he indulges in some intriguing word play and organizes the numbers precisely as a composer of Verdi’s time needed them. He maintains an interesting distinction between the words that Carlo and Giovanna use respectively for “sword” and “helmet.” Carlo always uses: brando e elmo (Castel 570); whereas Giovanna uses: spada e cimier(o) (575, 578). This distinctive word choice reflects the difference in meaning between the king’s dream and Giovanna’s prayer; that is, Carlo’s dream does not summon him to surrender his arms, as he believes, but to give them to Giovanna. He also engages in an interesting piece of
suggestive orchestration in the second demon chorus at the conclusion of Act I, when he has them refer to dancing while playing “ai cembali ai sistri” (“on the cymbals, on the sistrums” 593). Castel informs us that: “sistrums were rattles or noisemakers which the Egyptian priests of Isis used to shake at the festivals of that goddess. It consisted of a thin lyre-shaped metal frame through which passed a number of loosely held metal rods” (593f). The words themselves offer an intriguing example of onomatopoeia. Verdi did not have these instruments available in his orchestra. Budden observes, however, that the percussion instrument called the triangle in English is sometimes rendered in Italian as *sistro* (*Operas* 212f). This explains why Verdi indicates “Triangalo o sistro” over the harmonium in the orchestration when the demons appear earlier, in the Prologo, to sing “Tu sei bella.”

The structure of the libretto has a wealth of features that lent themselves to Verdi’s talents as a composer by providing him with the skillfully crafted components that he demanded. Senici identifies three operatic conventions that Verdi employed successfully throughout his long career, which are all evident in *Giovanna*: 1) poetry in stanzas; 2) word-painting; and 3) the so-called “parola scenica” (“theatrical word”). There is nothing radical or innovative in any of these three conventions; in fact, they are all remnants of operatic conventions dating to at least the Baroque period. They are remarkable because they are hallmarks of Verdi’s style which can be found in his earliest works – imitative of Rossini and Donizetti – as well as his mature ones, in which his style is entirely his own. He explained his preference for stanzas to the librettist, Antonio Somma, in 1853: “to make music, one needs stanzas for cantabile sections, stanzas for ensembles, stanzas for largos, for allegros, etc., and all these in alternation so that nothing seems cold and monotonous” (Senici 89). In the chapter, “Words and Music” in the *Cambridge Campanion to Music*, Senici applies his analysis to *Luisa Miller* (1849), the last work from
Verdi’s so-called “prison years.” In addition to being a product of the same period of Verdi’s career, *Luisa Miller* is also based on a Schiller play, *Kabale und Liebe* (“*Intrigue and Love*”). For these reasons, it seems appropriate to apply the same analysis to *Giovanna*.

Poetry in stanzas can be found by looking at any of the excerpts already cited from the libretto. As previously established, the text cited above (Dunque, o cruda) on pp. 140-41 is based on Johanna’s soliloquy in Act IV of *Jungfrau*. The subsequent text, “T’arretri i palpiti,” (Ex. 2.2) ventures into material entirely of Solera’s invention, which is perhaps why Verdi’s music in this number seems to reach a height of newer freedom and expression.152 The poetic structure of the stanzas can be determined by the rhyme scheme. The text of “Dunque, o cruda” has the rhyme scheme a-a-b-c-b-c-a-d-a-e-d-e, running across both Carlo and Giovanna’s lines. Carlo is professing his love, as well as the wounds he feels in the face of Giovanna’s rejection; Giovanna is resisting for the sake of her mission. The “a” rhymes link the two stanzas, while the appearance of the new rhymes “d” and “e” in Giovanna’s lines reinforce their distinct character, spurning Carlo’s amorous attentions. According to Senici, the appearance of a *verso tronco*, that is, a line with the final syllable accented, signals the end of a sequence of lines that the librettist intends as a complete thought, which is to say, the end of a stanza. This is necessary because the stanzas in libretti are generally not formed with a prescribed number of lines or rhyme scheme like sonnets, for example. The final word in Carlo’s *verso tronco* is “amor,” while in Giovanna’s it is “velen” (“poison”). Each of these words provides an effective snapshot of the respective character’s point of view. As the recitative proceeds, Giovanna finally relents: “T’amo, si, t’amo!” The scene is interrupted by the chorus of angels’ admonition against worldly affection.

---

152 In Chaïkovskii’s *Orleanskaïa deva*, the Scena and Duet with which Act IV opens is analogous to this scene, both in its content and its provenance from Schiller. It will be examined in Chapter 4.
This is followed by a few lines of recitative, in which Giovanna, hearing the angels and shaking
with fear, tears herself away from Carlo. The scene continues with the following text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carlo.</th>
<th>Carlo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T’arretri e palpiti!</td>
<td>- You draw back and tremble!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>che mai t’apparve?</td>
<td>a But what has appeared to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardami, nun ti miniaccia.</td>
<td>b Look at me, no one threatens you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Che fai?</td>
<td>- What are you doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Che mormori di vane larve?</td>
<td>a What are you murmuring about futile spirits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Carlo, o vergine</td>
<td>c O virgin, of Carlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stai fra le braccia.</td>
<td>b you are in the arms [you are in Carlo’s arms].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>È puro l’aere, limpido il cielo</td>
<td>d It is pure as the air, limpid as the sky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siccome il velo</td>
<td>d like the veil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di nostra fè.</td>
<td>e of our troth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giovanna.</th>
<th>Giovanna.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Für dessi!...gli angeli!</td>
<td>- It was them!...the angels!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non hai veduto?</td>
<td>f Didn’t you see?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasciami, son maladetta!</td>
<td>g Leave me, I’m accursed!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual fra tenebre torvo e canuto</td>
<td>f What among the shadows there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grim and white-haired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appar’ fantasima</td>
<td>h appears like a phantom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>che accenna e aspetta?</td>
<td>g points at us and waits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Muori, o sacrilega!</em></td>
<td>i <em>Die, oh sacrilegious one!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual voce, O Dio!</td>
<td>j That voice, oh, God!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>il padre mio!</td>
<td>j my father!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Che vuol da me?</td>
<td>e What does he want from me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ricordi 119-21)</td>
<td>(Castel 589-90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, the rhyme scheme links the two sides of the dialogue, although only on each singer’s
*verso tronco* (e). This signals that their thoughts and actions are now growing farther apart, as
Carlo continues assurances of the purity of his love, while Giovanna is tormented by her voices
and the awareness of her broken vow of chastity. Giovanna’s words, even as they show a
disintegration in her thought process, retain a distinctive rhyme scheme. She has a fleeting
vision of her father, and even hears what she believes is his denunciatory command, “*Muori, o sacrilega!*” In the course of the succeeding denunciation scene, Giacomo will ask her three
times to swear that she is not sacrilegious, but he will not command her to die. One must
conclude that this is something of a false oracle, although the moment passes so quickly in performance, its profound implications are probably lost on the audience. Carlo’s *verso tronco* on “nostra fè” signals a very brief stanza of just two lines, which as we see below, Verdi uses to create a graceful rising line. This is a fine example of the second convention under discussion, known as word-painting, which Verdi also employs in setting Giovanna’s lines.

The *cantabile* in G major of Carlo’s vocal line (bars 10-14 of Ex. 2.2) on the words “È puro l’aere, limpidio il cielo/siccome il velo di nostra fè” gives a melodic picture of song, rising pure and clear into the sky. It is in sharp contrast to Giovanna’s halting, disjointed exclamations: “Fûr dessi!...gli angeli! Non hai veduto? Lasciami,” in a fitful, frightened G minor (bars 14-17 of Ex. 2.2). The accompaniment to Giovanna’s words mimics the accompaniment to Carlo’s previous lines “T’arretri e palpiti” (this time an octave higher, bars 1-8 of Ex. 2.2), when he remarked that she was drawing away and trembling. This is word-painting on several levels: the trembling in the accompaniment to Carlo’s words becomes, in a higher octave, a more fitful accompaniment to Giovanna’s hallucinations. Even as Carlo tries to reassure her with his graceful *cantabile*, all Giovanna retains is the trembling fear. We can see a more conventional sort of word-painting on the words “son maledetta!” (“I’m accursed!” bars 17-18), in which Giovanna’s vocal line descends in a galloping dotted-eighth rhythm, a texture that stands out amid all the rest, from a high A to a middle Bb. Giovanna’s line depicts her fear that she will descend to hell.
Ex. 2.2 (Dunque, o cruda; T’arretri e palpiti, Ricordi 119-21)
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The third convention, examples of which appear throughout the opera, is “parola scenica.” In a letter to Ricordi, Verdi describes the convention in these terms:

By theatrical words I mean those words that carve out a situation or a character, words whose effect on the public is always most powerful. I know well that sometimes it is difficult to give them a properly literary and poetic form. But . . . (pardon the blasphemy) both poet and musician must sometimes have the talent and the courage to make neither poetry nor music . . . Horror! Horror! (Senici 103).

In a letter to his librettist for Aida, Antonio Ghislanzoni, he adds that such words: “powerfully sum up the situation and make it immediately clear and evident” (103). It is clear that Verdi is aware that this convention was of dubious interest to librettists when he sardonically refers to the blasphemy of calling upon the librettist and the composer to “make neither poetry nor music.” This is because a “parola scenica” amounts to stating the obvious. One example that appears several times in the opera is the announcement “Il re!” (“The king!”). In the Prologo, Delil announces it as Carlo enters (Ricordi 22), and Giacomo utters it when he sees Carlo and Giovanna together at the haunted oak (76). In each instance, Carlo is already on stage, yet the purpose in each case is different. In the first instance, the announcement allows the audience to identify the singer who will be playing Carlo. Anyone who has attended an opera can appreciate the service this provides to comprehending the action. Delil’s identification of Carlo as the king at his first appearance also serves, intentionally or not, as a sign that the ensuing drama will not proceed entirely in accord with Schiller, since in that play, Karl is assiduously indicated by his name – and called “dauphin” by everyone else - until his coronation. In the second instance of “il re,” we understand that Giacomo himself has recognized Carlo.
Another illustrative example of “parola scenica” comes at the conclusion of the opera, when Giovanna rises from the stretcher before her final vision and death. Initially confused, she recognizes that she is with her father, her king and comrades, and is no longer mistaken for an enchantress. She notes the presence of the French banners: “Ecco le franche insigne”; and she asks where hers might be: “la mia dov’è?” She wants to take it along on her journey to the gates of heaven. Carlo hands her the banner, but asks her not to leave them: “Prendi…ma non lasciarne!” With banner in hand, after it has already been referred to twice, she sings: “Oh mia bandera!” In this instance, the intent of the parola scenica is to sum up the situation. Giovanna is reconciled with her father and her people. The sign of that reconciliation is the banner, and as the stage direction notes, she is “rapita in ecstasi,” once more to proclaim it her own. As with the best placed theatrical words, this one launches the finale terzo that concludes the entire opera (Ricordi 235). As noted earlier, these features were already old-fashioned when Verdi began using them. Composers of grand opera were already looking askance at these conventions, and Wagnerian opera would find no place for them at all.

Another intriguing piece of stagecraft which Solera’s libretto affords to Verdi is the opportunity to compose a Soldiers’ chorus for the scene in Act I in the English camp (Ex. 2.3). The Italian words translate as follows: “Oh, leader, you always saw us flying, fighting on the battlefields with bold souls” (Castel 581). Most critics agree that the melody Verdi uses for this chorus owes a debt to the English tune “Heart of Oak” (Budden, Operas 213; Keys 229; Osborne 116), allowing a distinctive national color to permeate this scene in the enemy camp.
Ex. 2.3 (Soldiers’ chorus, Ricordi 84)

This chorus encapsulates quite neatly the paradoxical problems inherent with the whole opera. It is undeniably singable and “catchy.” It is effective and musically appropriate. The *Oxford Dictionary of Music* takes the position that its forebear, “Heart of Oak,” was written by David Garrick in 1759, with music by William Boyce, and that it refers in the second line of the first verse to the “wondrous year” (that is, 1759), when the English were engaged in combat against French colonial forces. Its national qualities are therefore in accord with the situation in the opera, albeit anachronistically. The title also resonates with an important symbol in the opera,
the oak tree, which is the site of origin for Giovanna and Carlo’s dreams and visions, as well as the place where they first meet. Unfortunately, a dissonance emerges in consideration of the refrain: “Heart of oak are our ships, heart of oak are our men.” This tune is not a soldiers’ but a sailors’ song, and in fact, the official march of the Royal Navy of the United Kingdom (Ex. 2.4).

Ex. 2.4 (Heart of Oak” IMSLP, accessed 30 May 2014)
Notwithstanding the power of these Verdian conventions and innovations to provide a permanent foothold in the operatic canon for so many of his other operas, for half a century after Verdi’s death in 1901, Giovanna was not performed. When the work began to attract attention again, it did so Italy, but unsurprisingly, not at La Scala, where the publisher and critics had been so unreceptive to its premiere. Renata Tebaldi performed the opera in Naples in 1951, and RAI released a recording the same year, featuring Tebaldi, but with different supporting singers, conducted by Alfredo Simonetto. Perhaps in keeping with Verdi’s dejected renunciation, the recording features the Milano Symphonic Orchestra and Chorus, and not those of La Scala. In the United States, James Levine conducted a noteworthy recording of the work with Montserrat Caballé, Placido Domingo, Sherill Milnes, the London Symphony Orchestra, and the Ambrosian Opera Chorus on the Angel-EMI label in 1972. It was not produced on the stage. The work was
performed with Carlo Bergonzi as the Dauphin, Margaret Price in the role of Giovanna, and Sherill Milnes reprising his role as Giacomo in a concert version at Avery Fischer Hall in 1985.\textsuperscript{153} The Opera Orchestra of New York (with a less notable cast) also did a concert version in 1996.\textsuperscript{154} More recently, Anna Netrebko performed the role in August 2013 in a concert version in Salzburg. Clearly, Verdi’s music retains its appeal, but the desire to experience the action – notwithstanding the star-driven Tebaldi exception – and more importantly, secure the commitment of resources necessary to produce the work as a theatrical drama, has been sporadic. With rare exceptions, the work has become a novelty consigned to the concert hall, rather than the operatic stage.

One of the few recent performances was released as a video recording by Kultur in 1990 on DVD. Riccardo Chailly conducts Susan Dunn, Vincenzo La Scola, and Renato Bruson in a performance at the Teatro Comunale di Bologna the same year. The staging of the opera benefits from direction by Werner Herzog, even as it raises some questions. One wonders, for example, why he chooses to have the choruses of officers and villagers don the robes of Spanish Nazarenos for the opening scene of the Prologue. The spectacle of the black hoods and crosses moving across the stage is certainly dramatic, but what has a Sevillian tradition associated with Holy Week observances to do with the problems facing the dauphin in early fifteenth-century France? When the English soldiers, singing their complaints to Talbot about the unsuccessful siege of Orleans in Act I, also turn up in hoods, although red rather than black, the confusion is increased. The black hoods and crosses even take part in the coronation festivities.

\textsuperscript{154} See Bernard Holland’s unflattering review in the \textit{New York Times} “A Young Verdi's Bold and Vivid Joan of Arc,” 11 May 1996.
The specter of war and its consequences are prominent throughout, which is apparently Herzog’s guiding impulse, a strange one in a story whose heroes are all committed to the battlefield glory of their respective homelands. The corpses scattered all over the stage during the exchange between Talbot and Giacomo strongly illustrate the idea of the suffering caused by war. They remain there for the subsequent duet between Carlo and Giovanna, where their presence seems especially gruesome as Carlo declares his love for Giovanna. One very successful theatrical decision is to have the demon and angel choruses sung exclusively from off-stage, which enhances the sense that both sets of voices are merely figments of Giovanna’s imagination. The active working of her imagination may in fact be what Herzog was going for in his production. Perhaps all those ubiquitous penitents of the Inquisition are supposed to remind the audience of Joan’s actual fate.

The Chicago Opera Theater staged the complete opera in 2013, with the premiere taking place on 21 September. Just before the performance began, the director explained that the selection of this particular opera had been the result of an audience vote. In recognition of the impending bicentennial of Verdi’s birth, the audience the previous season had been asked to select one of Verdi’s lesser-known operas to be produced by the theater the following season, and Giovanna received most votes. This is a clear illustration of the opera’s status as a novelty item. As John von Rhein noted:

David Schweizer's production attempts to sidestep the shortcomings by turning "Giovanna" into that cliche beloved of clueless stage directors: a modern-dress play within a play. The drama is enacted by members of a fanatical religious sect on a largely bare stage, with metal folding chairs as props. Fired up by viewing snippets of the 1948 Ingrid Bergman film based on the life of Joan, they assume
positions and carry out a kind of redemption-ritual that's stage-managed by the barefoot sect leader, who doubles as Giacomo.
I'm not sure that piling new artifice upon old is in any way helpful in introducing the local public to the merits of a flawed but fascinating opera. Indeed, a misbegotten concept actually calls attention to the inherent problems more than it minimizes them.\textsuperscript{155}

The “viewing” of the film takes place during the overture. Among the numerous problems with the directorial conception is the casting of the chorus as members of a religious sect. While it ostensibly provides a modern perspective on the vengeful and erratic behavior of their “leader” (Giovanna’s father, Giacomo), it permits no differentiation of the chorus into the factions of court officials and the townspeople who appear in the “racconto” of the first act, when Carlo expresses his reluctance to lead as king and reveals the content of his prophetic dream. When Carlo refers to the image of the Blessed Mother that appears in his dream, members of the chorus roll out a box, which opens to reveal a portable votive grotto, with a little statue surrounded by candles. The abrupt manner in which the box is wheeled out and then plopped open elicits laughter from the audience. It seems that the director intends for the moment to be humorous, an incongruous attitude that presents a persistent problem with the production. Perhaps most shocking of all is the final moment, which the director, like Herzog, tries to display as an execution, rather than as a battlefield death. Although this comes closer to Joan’s history and may meet the expectations of the audience, it shows lack of trust in both Schiller and Verdi’s conceptions. As Giovanna, Carlo, and Giacomo sang the final terzetto with chorus (only the angel chorus; the demon chorus is cut), objects are passed around under white cloths only

\textsuperscript{155} John von Rhein, “Opera Theater's ‘Joan of Arc’ yields mixed results.” \textit{Chicago Tribune}, 22 September 2013. I was present at this performance, and the subsequent comments are based on my own observations.
vaguely disguising that these are automatic weapons. At the final chord, the cloths drop, but instead of pointing the rifles at Giovanna, the members of chorus point their weapons out at the audience. The effect is certainly dramatic, but seems, as with much else in this production, to have nothing to do with Verdi’s opera. Giovanna’s final moment of spiritual triumph, as envisioned by Verdi, is twisted into a confusingly ineffective indictment of the religious right’s obsession with the Second Amendment. Throughout the performance, in passages during which Verdi creates moments of tender piety for Carlo, Giovanna, or Giacomo, the sincerity of the character’s sentiments, as suggested by Verdi’s music, is often undermined by the staging, inviting a viewer to wonder whether the director wants us to question Verdi’s sincerity.

Verdi was writing, one might say, in the shadow of Rossini and Donizetti, striving to develop his own voice but still firmly entrenched in the conventions of bel canto. Stendahl observed: “melody can do nothing with emotional half-tones and suggestions; these qualities are found only in the under-currents of orchestral harmony” (Schmidgall 132). Schmidgall suggests that Stendahl had in mind the orchestral psychology to be found in the operas of Berlioz and Wagner. Verdi would eventually achieve deeply affecting “half-tones and suggestions” in the “under-currents of orchestral harmony” of his later masterpieces, most notably Otello. These works so embody Dahlhaus’s Characteristic that they defy the genre labels of opera seria, opera buffa, bel canto, or grand opera. They are known simply as mature Verdian opera and belong to the pantheon of works that seek to resolve the debate begun in the eighteenth century whether melody or harmony should take precedence in opera. In mature Verdian opera, melody and harmony are equals. With Giovanna, however, he was still navigating through uncharted waters. Solera’s libretto provided the monochromatic extremes of emotional states that ordinarily served bel canto well, but in his attempt to economize the forces of Schiller’s expansive drama, he
demands too much of the audience, expecting us to suspend our disbelief while insisting that this is the true story of Joan of Arc. Although conjecture is hazardous in such circumstances, it seems that Solera’s narrative might have made a more successful opera with a title that was less insistently historical. The name that the 2008 Verdi Festival in Parma gave to its study of the opera comes to mind: _La Pulzella d’Orléans_. While Schiller makes no attempt to dissociate his Johanna from Joan of Arc, he almost never gives her that name, and the _Jungfrau_ in the title might just as well be the Blessed Mother or Artemis as Joan. Insofar as it may be judged for its suitability as a libretto, Schiller’s play is an eclectic mix of classical declamation in a structure of set pieces more congenial to the Baroque era. As noted earlier, Solera’s libretto seems much more suited to a Renaissance masque than a _bel canto_ opera. On the other hand, without Verdi’s music, the libretto would probably be even more obscure.

Without Joan of Arc, Schiller or Verdi in mind, Wagner provides food for thought, in this case about a composer whose success in setting Schiller’s verses to music was resoundingly successful. In his biography of Beethoven, he makes this observation:

There is but one state which can surpass the musician’s: the state of the Saint; and that especially because it is enduring, and incapable of being clouded, whilst the ecstatic clairvoyance of a musician alternates with an ever-recurring state of individual consciousness, which must be thought all the more miserable as in the inspired state he was lifted higher above the barriers of individuality. (21)

Schiller’s proto-saint, Johanna, along with all his other memorable characters, eluded all composers in Germany as subjects for opera because of the overwhelming consciousness that _opera seria_ belonged to the French and Italians. Under Schiller’s influence, Solera and Verdi

---

156 The encounter with the Black Knight is an intriguing exception (III.ix. 2420). In this pivotal scene, which begins the sharp departure from history, Schiller has a ghost call her “Johanna d’Arc.”
set out to attain the “ecstatic clairvoyance” of Wagner’s musician-saint. The conventions peculiar to the making of opera in mid-nineteenth century Italy, however, prevented them from retaining the features of sublime sanctity, resulting in a creation that could not surmount the “barriers of individuality.” Although their effort cannot be called an unqualified success, the fascination with rising above misery and going beyond the clouds to the surpassing state of the saint, for both musicians and their audiences, endures.
Chapter 3. The Patriotic Elegy: Zhukovskii’s Translations of Schiller

*Von einer Übersetzung fordere ich, daß die Treue mit Wohlklang verbinde; daneben den Genius der Sprache, in der sie geschrieben ist – nicht aber den der Originalsprache atme.*

The distance between Verdi's Milan and Zhukovskii's Petersburg is great enough, but the difference between Italy of 1845 and Russia of 1824 is greater still. Whereas Western Europe had by then already experienced revolution, restoration, and counter-revolution, Russia was locked in the grip of an aristocracy heedless of change. The result of this difference meant that the two decades dividing Verdi's Giovanna from Zhukovskii's Ioanna actually amounted to a cultural divide at least twice that size. Just as Milan represented an aspirational pinnacle fraught with infuriating disappointments and frustrations for Verdi, so Petersburg became the place where Zhukovskii’s hopes for his art failed to translate into positive change for his homeland. The Russian poet’s enormous talent represented the foundational efforts to bring forth Romanticism in Russian literature and inspired a generation of reform-minded thinkers, but the hostility between the forces supporting the Russian aristocracy and those resisting it would continuously impede chances for a broad reconciliation. Vasiliĭ Andreevich Zhukovskii (1783-1852) spent his entire career convinced that poetry and literature were the keys to raising the consciousness of Russia’s ruling classes and that this in turn would resolve the larger social problems facing the Russian empire. Those whom he persuaded, much to his dismay, often concluded that reform would never be enough: the monarchy and aristocracy themselves were

---

157 I demand of a translation that it unite fidelity with euphony, and at the same time that it breathe the genius of the language in which it is written, not that of its original language. (Säkular-Ausgabe Bd. 16, 158) Schiller was referring to Stäudlin’s translation of Vergil’s *Aeneid.*
the problem. Zhukovskii would never accept this. One of the pinnacles of his creative output is his translation of Schiller’s *Jungfrau von Orleans*, published in 1824 as *Orleanskaià deva* (“The Orleans Maid”). The works related to its creation and the forces that prevented its performance during his lifetime coalesce to provide a study of the inherently patriotic and elegiac quality of all of Zhukovskii’s work and the disparity that exists between his lofty aspirations and the historical circumstances that doomed them.

Zhukovskii had genuine and ardent ties to the royal family. Beginning in 1815, he was reader to the dowager Empress, Mariia Fëdorovna, who had been Tsar Pavl’s Tsaritsa. This was essentially a sinecure that provided him with some income, while allowing him to continue other literary activities. In 1817, his duties expanded to include teaching Russian to the young German bride of Grand Prince Nikolaï Pavlovich, the future Tsar Nikolaï I (1796-1855). She was Princess Aleksandra Fëdorovna (Charlotte of Prussia, 1798-1860), whose brother was Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm III, future King of Prussia (Semenko 26-27). When their son, Aleksandr Nikolaevich, reached eight years of age in 1826, Zhukovskii became tutor to the future Tsar Aleksandr II (1818-1881). Although these aristocratic appointments were significant and afforded him broad access to confidence and privilege, Zhukovskii was prevented from promotion in rank or advantageous marriage by the circumstances of his birth.

Zhukovskii was born on an estate in the Tula province on 9 February 1783 (NS). Although his father was a wealthy landowner, his mother was a slave who had been acquired during the war in Turkey in 1770 (Semenko 13-15). His illegitimacy demanded that he be denied

---

158 Tsar from 1825-1855 (*PSSP.XX* 674)
159 Tsar from 1855-1881 (*PSSP.XX* 562)
160 This is the date according to the Gregorian calendar, which Russia only adopted after the October Revolution of 1917. According to the Julian calendar observed during his lifetime, his birth date is 29 January 1783. In nineteenth century Russian scholarship, this distinction is made by referring to the Julian date as “Old Style” (“OS”) and the Gregorian date as “New Style” (“NS”). Unless otherwise noted, dates given here are New Style.
the patronymic\textsuperscript{161} and surname of his father, Afanasii Ivanovich Bunin, and instead have that of his godfather, Andrei Zhukovskii, an impoverished nobleman. His noble blood secured a degree of material security for the boy but made him an outsider in his own family. “I was not left behind or cast aside; I had my corner,” he wrote of his childhood: “but I was no one’s favorite and felt no one’s love” (Makogonenko 248).\textsuperscript{162}

Zhukovskii found solace in the company of works of literature. At the age of fourteen, he moved to Moscow and was provided a place at a pensionat for the children of nobility, where he met the Turgenev brothers, Andrei, Nikolaï, and Aleksandr.\textsuperscript{163} Their father, Ivan Petrovich Turgenev, was the director of Moscow University and was on good terms with Zhukovskii’s father (Semenko 15-16). The pensionat was a subsidiary of Moscow University. The primary venue for Zhukovskii’s exposure to literature – especially contemporary literature – was not the classroom. He was initially encouraged to take up Schiller by Andrei Turgenev, who was the leader of their literary society, which existed outside the confines of the university but took its mission very seriously: “The friends were concerned with social and moral issues – about man, his rights and obligations before the people and homeland – they were interested in the fate of literature, the creativity of modern writers” (Makogonenko 247-48).\textsuperscript{164} One month after the coronation of Tsar Aleksandr I in 1801, Turgenev gave a speech at a meeting of the society,

\textsuperscript{161} This word refers to the Russian custom of adding a sexually defined suffix – -evich for males, -evna for females – to the father’s first name in the creation of the middle name. Had Zhukovskii been permitted to take his father’s name, his patronymic would have been Afanas’evich. As it was, since his godfather’s first name was Andrei, his patronymic became Andreevich.

\textsuperscript{162} "I͡A ne byl ostavlen, broshen, imel ugol, … no ne byl li͡ ubim nikem, ne chuvstvoval nich’eĭ li͡ ubvi ”

\textsuperscript{163} These names should not be confused with the much more famous novelist a generation later, Ivan Turgenev. It is tempting to look for a family connection here, but the connection is extremely distant, if not completely coincidental. In the case of the Nobel Prize-winning author, Ivan Bunin, it seems that he himself claimed to be descended from Zhukovskii’s father.

\textsuperscript{164} “Druzeĭ volnovali voprosy obshchestvennye i moral’nye – o cheloveke, ego nравы i obi͡ azannosti͡ a pered narodom i rodinol, – interesovali sud’by literature, tvorchestvo sovremennyx pисателей.” Many of these friends would later participate in the influential Arzamas literary society.
professing fervent feelings of love for his homeland and calling for his fellows, “to be its sons, to sacrifice all in danger for its well-being” (248). Zhukovskii very likely heard these words, but his poetic sentiments, no doubt influenced by his childhood experiences, tended initially to be more concerned with the individual’s struggle for personal happiness as against the exigencies of fate. Bowman, Terras, and Pein all agree that Zhukovskii’s enthusiastic commitment to rendering Schiller, as well as Goethe, Tieck and others, into Russian made him a primary conduit for the transference of German Romanticism into Russia. Many of the German ideas, particularly Schiller’s, were significantly altered in the process, which shall be seen in the examples to follow. These alterations seem to consist of three broad types: a tendency to embrace antiquated or intentionally conservative styles, especially those expressive of loss or longing; the prominence of explicitly religious terminology, in place of the more generally spiritual; the exaltation of patriotism over nationalism, a distinction more significant than it may seem at first.

Given the largely conservative nature of the literary atmosphere in which Zhukovskii began writing, it is perhaps not surprising that the Russian poet’s output, from roughly 1802 to his death in 1852, is concerned primarily with poetic genres – odes, elegies, and ballads – that began appearing four or five decades earlier in western Europe. His immediate forebears, such as Derzhavin and Karamzin, had been pioneers in public- and civic-minded odes and elegies, whereas Zhukovskii’s achievement in poetry consisted primarily in refining the quality of the verse and in lending it more personal content. Given his immutable outsider status, it is also not surprising that he consistently invested this poetry with the themes of loss and longing, arising from his own deeply painful personal experiences. For example, although he eventually

---

165 “…byt’ ego synami, s opasnostiiu [sic] vsego zhertvovat’ ego blagodentviu.”
developed affectionate ties with both his birth mother, Elizaveta Dementevna, and his adoptive mother, Mariĭa Bunina – that is, his father’s wife – he lost both of them when they unexpectedly died in 1811 (Semenko 23). Prior to that, Andreĭ, the Turgenev brother to whom he was closest, had died in 1803 (Semenko 16). He experienced a hopeless romance with his half-sister’s daughter, Marii͡ a Protasova, who actually returned his affection. Her mother, however, rejected his proposal of marriage before he left to join the war against Napoleon in 1812, and in 1817, she married Johann Moĭer. The marriage made their social interaction easier, and although all three remained on friendly terms, Zhukovskii’s love poetry continued to be filled with his unresolved feelings for Protasova.

Despite the somewhat antiquated forms that Zhukovskii preferred, for Russian readers of the early nineteenth century, almost anything written in the Russian language, as opposed to French, German or English, was still a novelty. Throughout the eighteenth century, anyone in Russia who could read would have found very little literature in Russian. In fact, most Russian aristocrats only mastered enough Russian to be able to communicate with their servants or with merchants. It seems appropriate to cite two literary examples of this situation. When Tolstoĭ published the first complete edition of War and Peace in 1869, the extensive conversations critical of Napoleon in the salon of Anna Scherer that make up the opening chapter were printed in French. This was because the language of the court in the early decades of the nineteenth century was French. By Tolstoĭ’s day, this had changed, largely because of anti-French sentiment resulting from the Napoleonic and Crimean wars, but the setting of his novel is half a century earlier. Pushkin set his novel in verse, Evgenii Onegin, in precisely the period in which he was writing, roughly the mid-1820’s, which means that, although it was written forty years before War and Peace, it takes place ten or more years later. One of the most famous episodes
in that novel is the letter Tat’iana writes declaring her love for Onegin. Pushkin explains the linguistic situation in stanza XXVI of Canto 3:

XXVI
Eshche predvizhu zatrudnen’ia: Yet I foresee some hardship:
Rodnoi zemli spasaiucha chest’, To save our homeland’s honor,
IA dolzhen budu, bez somnen’ia, I must without a doubt,
Pis’mo Tat’iany perevest’. Translate Tat’iana’s letter.
Ona po-russki plokhoo znala, Her Russian was quite weak,
ZHurnalov nashi ne chitala, She did not read our journals,
I vyrazhalas’ia s trudom And expressed herself with effort
Na iazyke svoem rodnom, In her own native language,
Itak, pisala po-frantsuzski... And so, she wrote in French…
CHto delat’! povtoriaiu vnov’: What’s to be done! I say again:
Donyne damskaiia liubov’ Ladies in love heretofore
Ne iz”iasnialas’ia po-russki, Did not reveal it in Russian,
Donyne gordyi nash iazyk Our proud language was heretofore
K pochtovoi proze ne privyk. Unaccustomed to prose epistles.

(Pushkin 58)

Additionally, literacy in Russia was extremely limited, causing the relatively few practitioners to have enormous influence over their captive audience: “In the early nineteenth century, five percent of Russia’s people could read. The fate of literature was in the hands of several dozen gifted, well-born multilingual innovators concentrated in the two capitals and writing for one another” (Emerson 99).

Zhukovskii’s first major literary success was his 1802 translation of Gray’s “Elegy Written in a Country Church-yard,” which he rendered as “Sel’skoe kladbishche: Élegiia” (“Country Church-yard: an Elegy”) and published at the age of nineteen.166 “Zhukovskii’s

166 I have translated the title to conform to the subsequent quote from Semenko, but it bears noting that a more accurate translation might be “Village Cemetery: an Elegy.” Of course, graves are a common feature in church-
‘Country Church-yard’ was immediately acclaimed as a model of elegiac form; it was quoted in one breath with verses by the best poets of his day” (Semenko 17). As significant as are the extreme youth and talent of the poet-translator, two other characteristics of this poem stand out even more sharply and paradoxically: although the translation is based on an elegy written fifty years earlier, it contains features representing innovations for Russian poetry that would serve the poet for the remaining fifty years of his life. Thus, the conservative form becomes the medium for inventive expression. This expression includes such devices as personification, degeneralizations, intentional use of archaisms, and emotional intensification, all of which will be explained in the analysis below. Although the cumulative effect of all these changes subverts the sublime sanctity of Schiller’s Johanna, Zhukovskii makes these changes to communicate his own aesthetic ideas, which in turn prove to be enormously influential in Russian literature.

In the two stanzas which begin the poem, the adherence to Gray’s original is quite striking, with two exceptions: Zhukovskii removes the sound of the curfew bell, and the figure of the “day” gains a higher degree of personification, a prevalent feature in this poem and many of his translations. The day does not merely part, it grows pale and hides itself beyond the mountain. Although the romantic prefiguration of death associated with “knell” is temporarily lost, Zhukovskii brings it back in the second stanza in the company of several of the words that one finds over and over again in his poetry. He amplifies Grays’s “solemn stillness” into ubiquitous silence, ubiquitous deathly slumber. These five words - Povsiūdu tishina; povsiūdu mertvyi son – and even the repetition of povsiūdu (“ubiquitous” “everywhere”) are hallmarks of Zhukovskii’s lyric style. The sound of the sheep bells ringing in the distance becomes the mournful tone of the horns, and here again, the use of unylyi (“mournful” “melancholy”) to

yards, and “country” is not far from “village,” but this translation of the Zhukovskii title bears out the points to be explored in the analysis of his eschewing generalizations for concrete types and increasing emotional content.
describe the sound of the horns is a lyric password that he will employ in his translations of Schiller.

The curfew tolls the knell of parting day.                   Uzhe bledneet den’, skryvaias’ za goroii;
The lowing herd wind slowly o’er the lea,                Shumiashchie stada tolpiatsia nad rekoii;
The plowman homeward plods his weary way,                Ustalii selianin medlitel’noi stopoiu
And leaves the world to darkness and to me.            Ideti, zadumavshi, v shalash spokoynyi svoii.

Now fades the glimm’ring landscape on the sight,         V tumannom sumrake okrestnost’ ischezaet...
And all the air a solemn stillness holds,                povsiudu tishina; povsiudu mertvyi son;
Save where the beetle wheels his droning flight,        Lish’ izredka, zhuzhzhza, vechernii zhuk mel’kaet,
And drowsy tinklings lull the distant folds;            Lish’ slyshitsa vdalii rogov unilyi zvon.

Save that from yonder ivy-mantled tow’r                   Lish’ dikaia sova, tais’ pod drevnim svodom
The moping owl does to the moon complain             Toi bashni, setuet, vnimaema lunoii,
Of such, as wand’ring near her secret bow’r,                  Na vozmutivshego polunochnym prikhodom
Molest her ancient solitary reign.                      Ee bezmolvnogo vladychestva pokoii.

(Gray 94-96)                                              (PCCP.I 53)

In the third stanza above, the owl loses some of her autonomy to the moon, to which she does not complain, as in Gray. Instead, she is vnimaema lunoii (“heeded by the moon”), and although the tower and bower are rendered as faithfully as her reign over them, there is a sense that the whole scene falls under the watchful gaze of the personified moon. The rendering of “ancient solitary reign,” bezmolvnogo vladychestva, replaces the lonesome quality of the original (surprisingly absent from the entire translation) with silence and manages to condense “ancient reign” into one word by using an archaism for the word “reign” itself.

The subsequent stanza contains an important instance of de-generalization, that is, a word or concept that appears in a generic form in the original, which Zhukovskii chooses, for one reason or another, to render with a higher degree of specificity. In this instance, Gray’s
“heraldry and pomp” and “the inevitable hour” transmute into “death, the terrible, flaring up over all, including tsars and the favorites of glory” (the image of death as a terrible brightness is especially imaginative poetically). In both Gray and Zhukovskii, this stanza is the moment when the message of the elegy becomes resoundingly clear: in the face of death and after it, all of us are equal. This message figures among the many reasons that so many readers found the original so inspiring. The “us” in this analysis is not merely rhetorical. From start to finish, Gray’s poem makes a very subtle journey from third person omniscient, to third person narrative (in the person of the villager who remarks on the departed youth), to second person in the epitaph, with a strong sense that the epitaph is addressed to all readers, that is, to “us.” Zhukovskii faithfully retains these transitions in perspective. In his version, however, the specificity of mentioning a tsar or favorite, even without names as he does in the lines below, is even more striking because any mention of the tsar, especially in the context of death, was dangerous. The fact that the poem was not censored for this reason is surprising. The verb in the phrase *Puskaĭ ... vnimaiŭt* (“Let them heed”) in the stanza below permits a connection to the rendering of the owl heeded by the moon above, which adds a new personality feature to the watchful satellite and enriches the choice by associating the action with the *raby suet* (“slaves of vanity”), who stand, in another example of de-generalization, somewhat more explicitly in place of Gray’s abstract “ambition.”

Let not ambition mock their useful toil,  
Their homely joys, and destiny obscure;  
Nor grandeur hear with a disdainful smile  
The short and simple annals of the poor.

The boast of heraldry, the pomp of pow’r,  
And all that beauty, all that wealth e’er gave,  
Awaits alike th’ inevitable hour.

---

Let not ambition mock their useful toil,  
Puskaĭ raby suet ikh zhrebiĭ unizhaiŭt,  
Smeiasia v slepote poleznym ikh trudam,  
Puskaĭ s kholodnost’iu prezreniia vnimaiŭt  
Taiašchimsia vo t’me ubogogo delam;

The homely joys, and destiny obscure;  
Nor grandeur hear with a disdainful smile  
The short and simple annals of the poor.

The boast of heraldry, the pomp of pow’r,  
And all that beauty, all that wealth e’er gave,  
Awaits alike th’ inevitable hour.

---

Na vsekh įaritsia smert’ — įsaria, ĭubimio sa slavy,  
Vsekh ischchet groznai... i nekogda naîdet;  
Vsemoshchnyia sud’by nezyblemy ustavy:
The paths of glory lead but to the grave.  
I putʹ veličiïa ko grobu nas vedet!  
(98-99)  
(54)

We see two more examples of archaism in the lines below: Votshche in place of the more modern naprasno, and glas in place of golos. Admittedly, the choice of these words can be explained by their metrical qualities, that is, the number of their syllables and syllabic stress, but their usage after Zhukovskii becomes a hallmark by which later poets can express their solidarity with the egalitarianism implicit in poetry of this style.

Can honour's voice provoke the silent dust,  
Votshche glas pochestei gremit pered grobami —  
Or flatt'ry soothe the dull cold ear of death?  
Ugashhiī pepel nash oni ne vospalīat.  
(100)  
(54)

The next two stanzas contrast inventiveness and fidelity. In Gray, the first of the stanzas conveys the sense that knowledge and penury (that is, poverty – Gray also indulged in some grand archaisms) engaged in a conspiracy to keep the departed villagers from gaining the skills needed to achieve an ostensibly better life. Zhukovskii’s verses strongly suggest that they may be better off without the gift of knowledge. Especially telling is his consolidation of the two personified entities – knowledge and penury – into the просвещений (prosveshchen'ia khram) (“temple of enlightenment”) that governs the action of burdening the villagers with the chains of poverty in order to kill their genius with harsh need. The short-form adjective umershchvlen (“is killed”) is another archaism.167 That the villain in this stanza is Enlightenment itself is completely in accord with the Romantic project to oppose the Age of Reason’s supposedly soulless obsession with science and logic, a project to which Schiller was fully committed. The second stanza in

167 See the discussion of this word choice in the section dealing with the scene with the Black Knight in Orleanskaiā deva, p. 200-01.
the example contains one of Gray’s most famous phrases: “Full many a flow’r is born to blush unseen.” The Russian poet renders this and the line about the gem with remarkable accuracy, departing from the original only in de-generalizing Gray’s gem and flower. Zhukovskii names the only gem one would likely find in the ocean, the pearl, and selects as his desert flower, perhaps oddly, the lily. Nonetheless, as a symbol of natural purity, its whiteness provides a clear parallel to the rare pearl.

But knowledge to their eyes her ample page
Rich with the spoils of time did ne’er unroll;
Chill penury repress’d their noble rage,
And froze the genial current of the soul.

Full many a gem of purest ray serene,
The dark unfathom’d caves of ocean bear:
Full many a flow’r is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air.

(101)

The final three stanzas are marked in the Gray poem as the “Epitaph.” Zhukovskii seems to trust his reader not to need this subtitle and leaves it out. The first of the stanzas is generally very faithful, with the exception that he chooses to render “Fair Science” as muzy (“the muses”). Not surprisingly, he retains the word “melancholy,” although unlike elsewhere, he chooses not to personify the idea: “And melancholy’s stamp was on him.” In the final two stanzas, Zhukovskii seems to decide to be freer than in his preceding verses, and to lay the groundwork for what Lebedeva calls “signal-words” of lyric poetry: sensitivity, misfortune, tears. These are words that signal a connection between the emotional themes found in much of Romantic poetry and liberal political ideas, such as individual rights and freedom. Signal-words will be explored in
greater detail below in connection with his translation of Die Jungfrau von Orleans. Their presence in one of his earliest published poems, as well as in all his later poetry, suggests that Zhukovskii’s aesthetic and political convictions, unlike those of Schiller, were formed in his youth and remained unchanged throughout his life.

Here rests his head upon the lap of Earth
A youth to Fortune and to Fame unknown.
Fair Science frown’d not on his humble birth,
And Melancholy mark’d him for her own.

Large was his bounty, and his soul sincere,
Heav’n did a recompense as largely send:
He gave to mis’ry all he had, a tear,
He gain’d from Heav’n (’twas all he wish’d) a friend.

No farther seek his merits to disclose,
Or draw his frailties from their dread abode,
(There they alike in trembling hope repose)
The bosom of his Father and his God.

Zhukovskii maintains faithfully the gift of “a tear” offered by Gray’s youth. Whereas Gray describes the departed youth as having a “sincere soul,” Zhukovskii’s rendering conveys the idea “sensitive of soul” and then repeats the adjective to define the youth’s entire character: “the Creator laid the prize on the sensitive one.” The religious tone, implicit in Gray, especially in his final line, is considerably greater in translation. In place of the more cosmic “Heaven,” both times Zhukovskii chooses Tvorets (“the Creator”). While in lower case, this word might have been equivalent in religiosity to “Heaven,” that is to say, its interpretation could depend on the
reader’s perspective. With the initial letter capitalized, the reader familiar with the Russian translation of the Bible can infer no one but the celestial entity credited in the Old Testament with making the universe and humanity. Additionally, the passerby is not merely requested to refrain from passing judgment on the departed youth: “No farther seek his merits to disclose/ Or draw his frailties from their dread abode.” Zhukovskii’s speaker invites the reader to “pray at the grave” (“pomolis’ nad ėtoï mogiloï”). Additionally, the departed youth is not merely in repose, but has “left behind all that was sinful in him.” Gray at no time mentions sin, and the phrase “Zdesʹ vse ostavil on, chto v nem grekhovno bylo” is arguably the most religious reference in the poem. The literary success of this religious tendency would again depend on the perspective of the potential reader, but regardless of one’s religious inclination, the context raises the stakes for the departed youth and diminishes the possibility of disinterest in his fate, which is to say that Zhukovskii’s use of de-generalization and preference for explicitly religious overtones increases the emotional intensity.

One anachronism embedded in the translation is the Russian meter. The shift which he makes from the original meter is not mentioned in most of the commentary on this translation. Unlike the iambic pentameter of Gray’s original, the preferred verse form of Elizabethan poetry, Zhukovskii’s verses are in the Alexandrines preferred by French Baroque poets. The anachronism is complex. Alexandrines have their model in ancient classical poetry, yet their adoption by the French, which began in the early modern era, continued in full flower well after the Elizabethan adoption of iambic pentameter. The Elizabethan meter signaled modern innovation, whereas the French meter was an intentionally conservative aesthetic. Zhukovskii’s fidelity to Gray’s a-b-a-b rhyme scheme in each stanza precludes the possibility of the couplets usually present in Alexandrines, but it cannot be denied that nearly every verse contains the
Alexandrine’s twelve syllables with a caesura at the mid-point. Harder finds fault in Zhukovskii’s early translations of Schiller precisely for his persistent use of Alexandrines:

“Solange er aber über den Alexandriner, die metrische Fessel aller Poesie, nicht hinauskam und vor Schillers Trochäen stutzte, war auch zur Verniedlichung des Inhalts wohl nur noch ein kleiner Schritt” (169).168

In 1806, Zhukovskii published the first of his poetic creations that was not in some sense a translation, “Vecher” (“Evening”). In this poem, he uses an unusual blended meter: three Alexandrines followed by a line of iambic tetrameter. Much of the mood certainly owes something to Gray’s “Elegy,” but in this poem, perhaps because he was under no obligation to adhere to the pattern of another author, Zhukovskii’s lyricism achieves greater intensity. Additional analysis of this poem and its significance cannot improve upon Semenko’s (45-47). Among the most noteworthy features she finds in the poem is its musicality: “Perhaps no other Russian poet’s work was so organically connected with music” (Semenko 46). As a confirmation of this quality, we find the text used as a set-piece duet in Chaïkovskii’s opera, Pikovaïa dama (The Queen of Spades). The next chapter of this dissertation examines Chaïkovskii’s setting of Zhukovskii’s Orleanskaïa deva (his translation of Schiller’s Jungfrau von Orleans), for which the composer served as his own librettist.

The librettist for The Queen of Spades was the composer’s brother, Modest. The choice to use Zhukovskii’s “Vecher” in the libretto of an opera based on a story by Pushkin appears to have been inspired by its conformity to the librettist’s intention to set the opera several decades earlier than the original setting of the story. “One deviation of the libretto from its literary original had consequences that proved crucial for the meaning of the opera: the shift of the

---

168 “As long as he remained trapped by Alexandrines, the metrical fetter of all poetry, and hesitated to attempt Schiller’s trochaic meter, he was only a small step from impairing the content.”
implied time of the narrative. Pushkin’s story was written in 1833-34 and evidently takes place at about that time […] At a later stage, Chaïkovskiï made his own alterations to the libretto in order to reinforce and make more explicit the references to the 1790’s” (Gasparov 139, 141). Gasparov identifies a number of other anachronistic interpolations to reinforce the antiquated modality of the opera’s chronotope, including a pastoral by Pëtr Karabanov from 1786 (244). Gasparov correctly observes that Chaïkovskii’s use of Zhukovskii’s “Vecher” actually constitutes an anachronism of fewer years than, for example, the physical appearance of Ekaterina II in the opera, but clearly both the composer and his librettist found the selection of “Vecher” to be in a mood consistent with all these earlier works.

One of Zhukovskii’s first articles on criticism to appear in print is “O poëzii drevnykh i novykh” (“On the Poetry of the Ancients and Moderns”), which was published in the *Messenger of Europe (Vestnik Evropy)* in 1811. He had taken over the editorship of this journal in 1808 when Karamzin decided to devote himself fully to his seminal work, *The History of the Russian State*. Much of the article is concerned with the merits of classical Greek tragedians’ depictions of persons and actions relative to those by poets of the modern era, such Racine, Lessing, Goethe, and Walter Scott. This particular question concerned the Turgenevs and other members of Zhukovskii’s Arzamas circle around this time, with some saying that the moderns create incomparably better poetry than the ancients, and others arguing exactly the opposite. Significantly, this nineteenth century debate was carried out along lines that had been drawn by

---

169 The differences in the spelling of Tchaikovsky’s name arise from the perennial problems associated with Romanization of the Cyrillic alphabet. MLA Style demands the use of the Library of Congress Cataloguing and Acquisitions Guidelines for Romanization, which are periodically updated. The most recent update took place in 2012, resulting in the spelling used in this dissertation, whereas Gasparov, Vinitsky and others used other earlier guidelines.

170 Gasparov identifies Ekaterina II’s appearance in this scene as being based on a famously sumptuous feast that took place on 28 April 1791 (140).
the French in the seventeenth century. Although Zhukovskii provides a rather thorough summary of the major proponents of these ideas, he never mentions the name of Schiller. Nonetheless, the article is redolent with Schiller’s ideas, especially the epistemology of On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry, in which ancient poetry is classified as “naïve,” while modern poetry is seen as “sentimental.” Pein, in her dissertation on Schiller’s influence on Zhukovskii, points to this article as an example of this influence. She sees the Russian writer turning away from the naïve as unattainable for modern writers: it is the inaccessible province of the ancients. Zhukovskii re-defines Schiller’s “sentimental” category as precluding idealization of either the reader’s experience or the poet’s moral-ethical state, rather as a mode of feeling by which modern sentimental poetry synthesizes the “sensory” (чувственное) and the “miraculous” (чудесное).

The poetry of the ancients is original, sensory, unrelated to any alien perspectives; the poetry of the moderns is imitative, concerned with conceptions related to alien perspectives. [...] The examination of nature, the living depiction of the sensory, the continual focus of attention on the object depicted – such are the main features comprising the character of the ancients; deep penetration into the inner person, the depiction of the mental, the joining of external circumstances with the depicted object – such is the distinctive character of the modern poets” (Zhukovskii 125, 129, emphases mine).172

171 The pro-“modernist” argument was based on a series of articles by Charles Perrault from 1668-1697, while the pro-ancient perspective was based on an article by H. Boileau-Despreaux from 1694.
172 “Поэзия древних оригинальная, чувственная, не соприкасается ни с какими сторонними видами; поэзия новой подражательная, занимавшаяся размышлениями, соприкосновена с видами сторонними” (125). “Рассматривая внешнюю природу, живое изображение чувственного, всеобщее устремление внимания на предмет изображаемый - таковы главные черты, составляющие характер древних; глубокое проникновение в внутреннего человека, изображение мысленного, соединение обстоятельств сторонних с предметом изображаемым - таков отличительный характер поэзии новой” (129).
Thus the ancients possessed a capacity for connection to the sensory world which has either been lost in the modern era, or simply no longer commands the interest of the modern poet. The modern poet is concerned with his interior world or that of his characters. The ability to convey that feeling to his reader is a kind of creative miracle. “The whole business of the artist consists only in looking at the objects that fall under his gaze and depicting them with potential vitality; then his creative talent seems miraculous, while his inspired songs will have the power of enchantment” (129, emphasis mine).173

The religious overtones in Zhukovskii’s use of the latter term are not at all accidental. A sensitivity to the implications of Christian interpretation permeates all of his work, both the critical and the creative. This is not to suggest that he is a religious writer, but that he is a proponent of the idea that Christianity, especially of the Russian Orthodox type, is a key component to the unique potential offered by Russian literary thought. Later writers as varied as Tolstoï and Dostoevskii built upon this idea, albeit from opposite ends of the political and philosophical spectra and with perhaps little understanding that it originates in Zhukovskii. This idea of Russia as possessing a kind of messianic mission is completely in accord with Zhukovskii’s generally conservative, monarchist leanings and counts among the primary reasons that his translations of Schiller, especially The Maid of Orleans, often fail to achieve the effect of sublime sanctity. Schiller’s proto-saint achieves a national victory by the force of her singular personality, unwilling to bend at any cost. Zhukovskii’s Ioanna, on the other hand, is most effective when she surrenders herself to being the instrument of God to do his will on earth. In

173 “Vse delo khudozhnika sostoit edinstvenno v tom, chtoby smotret’ na predmety, vzoru ego podlezhashchie, izobrazhat’ ikh s vozmozhnoi zhivosti; togda tvorcheskoe darovanie ego pokazhetsia chudesnym, a vdkhnovenie pesni ego budut imet’ silu ocharovaniia” (129).
spite of this disparity, however, what he achieves in his translations of Schiller comes to have resounding significance for Russian literature and the Russian monarchy.

Although he may not have gotten the love and acceptance he craved from his aristocratic family and associates, he never for a moment doubted that his place was there among them. It is clear from the recollections of others that he felt completely free to be himself in the company of his noble language pupil, Princess Aleksandra Fëdorovna. Of her lessons with him, she said: “As a teacher, I was given Vasily Andreevich Zhukovsky, a poet already famous; he was too much the poet to be a good teacher. Instead of keeping to the study of grammar, a single word would inspire him with an idea, the idea demanded to be expressed in a poem, the poem became a subject for discussion, and in this way almost all our lessons were spent; that is why I have such a poor command of the Russian language” (Semenko 26). During one of his many travels with the princess to her home country, he made a peculiar impression on August Theodor Grimm, another tutor in the royal household, who incidentally also seemed to disagree with the princess’s assessment of her language lessons:

[…] but under the tutelage of Zhukovskii, she [Aleksandra Fëdorovna] devoted herself much more seriously to the study of the Russian language. Already an acclaimed poet of his nation by this time [1826], he engaged more in lively discussions with the Grand Princess about Russia than in the correct and regular study of grammar, and was just as attracted to German literature under the influence of his student, as she under his influence was attracted to that of Russia. The soul of Zhukovskii was good-natured as a child and timid as a little girl, his kindness was boundless. His social interaction was lively, sometimes confused or absent-minded, but in the final analysis, always conquered all with his kindness,
particularly in those circles most natural to his soul, devoid of any harsh court intrigues. In the whole court, Zhukovskii singled out above all the great femininity of the Grand Princess, and in all the years that followed, she remained for the poet the ideal of womanhood. (Lebedeva 347-48)\textsuperscript{174}

Had he lived long enough to see them (and to learn the Russian language), it seems plausible that Schiller might have praised Zhukovskii’s translations of his works for “breathing the genius” of Russian. Over the centuries, many of Zhukovskii’s compatriots have certainly credited him with creating the poetic language of Russia’s so-called “Golden Age.” Pushkin, who was initially his protégé and saw him as his \textit{geniĭ-khranitel’} (“guardian genius”), supplied a striking inscription for a portrait of Zhukovskii that appeared in issue No.92-6 of the journal \textit{Vestnik Evropy} in 1817:

\begin{quote}
On stal izvesten sam soboĭ;  
Na lire on ljubov’, geroev vospevaet;  
Liŭbimets muz soediniaet 
Prekrasneĭshiĭ talant s prekrasneĭsheĭ dushoi. 

He became famous entirely on his own;  
On the lyre he sang of love and heroes;  
The muses’ favorite combines 
Most excellent talent with a most excellent soul.
\end{quote}

(Lebedeva 508)

Pushkin was not unaware of the distracted otherworldliness that essentially comprised so much of Zhukoskiĭ’s personality: “He’s a saint, although he was born a romantic, and not a Greek or a person of some other sort!” (Lebedeva 276)\textsuperscript{175}

\textsuperscript{174} “[…] no eshche serëзnee ona [Aleksandra Fëdorovna] zamîlas’ izucheniem russkogo iazyka pod rukovodstvom ZHukovskogo. K tomu vremeni uzhe proslavlennyĭ poët svoeĭ natśii, ZHukovskii bolee vdaval’sia s velikoi kniaginiyi ozhivlennye besedy o Rossii, chem v pravil’noe i reguli͡ arnoe izuchenie grammatiki, i tak zhe uvleksia nemetskoi literaturoi pod vlianiem ego uchenerrickoi, kak ona pod ego vlianiem uvleklas’ russkoĭ. Dusha ZHukovskogo byla detski dobrodushnoi i devstvenno-repeetnoi, ego dobrota – bezgranichnoi, obrashchenie v obshchestve – ozhivlennoe ili, naprotiv, smushchennoe, rasseiannoе, no v konechnom schete vsegda pobezhdennoe, osobennno v takikh obshchestvakh, kotorye byli rodstvenny ego dushe i lishedny kakikh-libo ostrykh pridvornyh intrig. Vo vsem pridvornom okruzheni Zhukovskii vydelil prezhd e vsego vysokuui zhenstvennosti’ velikoĭ kniagi, i vo vse posleduiushchee gody ona ostalas’ dla poïta idealom zhenschchiny.”

\textsuperscript{175} “On svïatoï, khotïăa rodîlsia romantikom, a ne grekom i chelopekom, da kakim eshche!”
Later, the famous socialist critic of the middle nineteenth century, Vissarion Belinskiĭ praised him as the poet whose translations of Schiller made the German poet seem like a Russian (Kostka 16). Semenko, referring to his translations of Schiller’s Greek-influenced ballads, such as “Der Ring des Polycrates,” “Klage der Ceres,” and “Das Eleusische Fest,” observes that in some cases, Zhukovskii exceeds Schiller in fidelity to the ancient style: “Sometimes Zhukovsky introduces features of the Homeric style lacking in Schiller’s original, for example, the use of compound epithets” (140). She attributes this to the skills he had gained in translating fragments of the *Iliad* earlier. The critic D.S. Mirsky goes a step further and asserts: “Schiller’s ‘Greek’ ballads, owing to Zhukovsky, are possibly more ‘classical’ in Russia than in Germany” (Kostka 16). Yet it is also arguable that the Russian breath in Zhukovskii’s translations of Schiller sometimes stifles the subtle classical spirit that the latter crafted so carefully in his poetry.

Two of Schiller’s works from 1788 offer some explanation for the irreconcilable differences of perspective between Schiller and his ardent Russian translator: *Die Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande von der spanischen Regierung* (*History of the Secession of the United Netherlands from Spanish Rule*) and *Die Götter Griechenlands* (*The Gods of Greece*). The *Secession* has been summed up as “the victory of freedom of thought over religious intolerance” (Garland 126), while the poem extols “the serene abundance of antiquity over the gloomy austerity of the present” and favors “the rich polytheism of the Greeks over the bleak monotheism of Christianity” (Garland 128). It is a fact of enormous consequence that the tumult in Western Europe that resulted from Lutheranism and the Protestant Reformation has no analogy in the history of Russia. True, at the turn of the eighteenth century, the reforms of Tsars Aleksei and Peter the Great resulted in a painful schism in the Russian Orthodox religion, but it never came to a complete rupture into separate professions of faith. Perhaps more important, the
schism in Russia never led the nobility to take up arms against one another in the name of religion, as was the case in the Dutch Revolt and the Thirty Years’ War. While Zhukovskii had observed the contrast between “abundant antiquity” and “austere present” in his essay, *O poëzii drevnykh i novykh* (*On Ancient and Modern Poetry*), he would have been utterly unwilling to share Schiller’s preference for “the rich polytheism of the Greeks over the bleak monotheism of Christianity” (Garland 128). The sincere admiration expressed by Schiller and Goethe for ancient Greek (and other forms of) pantheism might not have been possible had they not lived and worked in liberal Protestant prinicpalties. Wiese might argue that this characterization is an oversimplification of Schiller’s depiction of Christianity, saying specifically of *Die Götter Griechenlands*: “Jedoch das Eigentümliche des Gedichtes zeigt sich in der merkwürdigen Verschmelzung von Christentum und Aufklärung zu einem gemeinsamen Gegner. Der monotheistische Gott des Christentums verwandelt sich im Verlauf der Geschichte in den abstrakten Gott des aufgeklärten Denkens” (Wiese 408-409). Thus, the object of Schiller’s poem is to scorn the Enlightenment, with monotheistic Christianity as its embodiment.

Zhukovskii would have willingly joined in Schiller’s opposition to the Enlightenment, but his poetry, particularly his translations of Schiller, always promotes a conservative Christian theological perspective.

Acknowledging Schiller’s pantheism is critical to seeing the operation of the Iphigenia myth in his *Jungfrau*. In this play and his philosophical works, he is advocating for the freedom of individual conscience offered by the poetry of the ancients and the promise it holds for ending tyranny and improving the lives of ordinary people. Without pantheism, his play and other

---

176 “Indeed the uniqueness of the poem is demonstrated in the remarkable blending of Christianity and the Enlightenment into a single enemy. In the course of the poem, the monotheistic god of Christianity is transformed into the abstract god of enlightened thought.”
poetry on Greek themes lose much of their subversive and anti-clerical tone and can even seem stodgy. Zhukovskii, on the other hand, has no interest in subversion, and far from viewing monotheism as bleak, sees the Russian Orthodox Church as uniquely poised to preserve Russian culture. His attraction to Schiller and to Romanticism, although steeped in the potential for raising personal consciousness and refining taste, always stops short of anything truly rebellious.\footnote{Many of the aesthetic and political attitudes ascribed here to Zhukovskii could just as easily be ascribed to Chaikovskii.}

Shortly after taking over as the editor of Vestnik Evropy, Zhukovskii decided to try his hand at translating a Schiller ballad on a Greek theme. He had previously been successful with a free translation of Bürger’s ballad “Lenore” (Liudmila 1808).\footnote{He would in fact return to the same source with another version, Svetlana, in 1812 (Semenko 21).} In 1809, he published his rendering of Schiller’s ballad, “Kassandra” (Semenko 132-33). Both versions concern the agony endured by the prophet, Cassandra, who foresees the fall of Troy, but is unable to convince any of her compatriots to believe her. Throughout, the Russian poet employs the aforementioned archaisms: glas (“voice,” line 4), zlato (“golden,” 14), votshche (“in vain” 41). In the penultimate line, both Schiller’s original and Zhukovskii’s translation describe the departure of the gods: “Alle Götter fliehn davon” “bogi mchatsia k nebesam,” presumably leaving mankind to its own devices. Zhukovskii’s version names the gods’ destination, while Schiller’s does not, yet another de-generalization. Schiller’s original ends: “Und des Donners Wolken hangen/ Schwer herab auf Ilion (“And the thunder clouds hang heavy over the city of Ilium”).

Zhukovskii renders this as: “I karaushchii gromami/ Grozno smotrit na Pergam” (“And the wielder of Thunder/Looks with wrath upon Ilium”) (Semenko 133). Whereas Schiller’s final tone is, if not pagan, then godless, Zhukovskii invents the brooding, vengeful presence of a Zeus.
in the manner of an Old Testament Jehovah. Similarly, where Schiller’s Johanna, after the
manner of the pagan Iphigenia, draws moral inspiration to defy the authority of her father and the
trappings of conventional piety, Zhukovskii draws inspiration from the opportunity to exalt his
sovereign and the sacred duty to serve his homeland. Schiller’s Romanticism seeks the sublime,
with nationalistic overtones; Zhukovskii’s Romanticism is elegiac and devoutly patriotic.

His literary endeavors were interrupted, as was everything else in Russia, by the advance
of Napoleon, a development that was met with no small enthusiasm by the court. Tsar Aleksandr
I’s father had been murdered in a court intrigue, and many have argued that his successor was
one of the conspirators. It seems all but certain that the attempt to remove his father Tsar Pavl
from power began with that tsar’s mother, Ekaterina II, Aleksandr’s grandmother. It is doubtful
that anyone in Zhukovskii’s circle understood all this at the time. The new tsar was far from
being an effective and decisive leader, which was widely criticized. Aleksandr I unquestionably
owes whatever prestige is associated with his reign to the invasion of Russia by Napoleon and
the subsequent war.

Zhukovskii felt that it was his patriotic duty to join up. Because of the dangers he knew
he would be facing, he decided this was the moment to make his ill-fated bid to his half-sister for
her permission to marry her daughter. He would eventually serve on the staff of the great
commander Kutuzov, but before he had an opportunity to do so, he served in the reserves not far
from Borodino, where one of the most famous battles of the entire war took place. It forms a
significant portion of Tolstoi’s great novel, and was written about by Pushkin, Lermontov, and
virtually every other writer of the time, although the result was less of a victory over Napoleon
than proof that his forces were not themselves invincible. Zhukovskii’s contribution was an ode
entitled “Pevets vo stane voinov” (“The Bard in the Camp of the Warriors”). Although it has not
retained its place among the works of the other writers mentioned here, in its day it was hailed as a unifying work, drawing the admiration of his fellow soldiers, the royal family, and the Russian public at large. The poet and critic, Pëtr Pletnëv (1792-1865), later head of Petersburg University, was a close friend of the poet. He wrote a great deal on Zhukovskīĭ’s life and work and provides this assessment of the poem: “Vpechatlenie proizvedennoe im ne toľ'ko na voĭsko, no i na vsĭu Rossiiû, neizobrazimo. Ėto byl voinstvennyĭ vostorg, obniavshĭ serdtsa vsex. Kazhdyĭ stich povtorĭaem byl kak zavetnoe slovo. Podvigi, izobrazhennye v stixotvorenii, imena, vnesennye v ėtu letopisʹ bessmertnyx, siialî chudnym svetom. Poėt umel izbratʹ luchshiĭ moment iz slavnyx del vsiakogo geroĭa i vyrazil ego luchshim slovom: nel'ziâ zabyt' ni togo, ni drugogo. Ėpoxa byla besprimernaiâ – i pevets ūavilsia dostoiûmym eë” (Lebedeva 387).179 Even in Pletnëv’s description, we see the working of Zhukovskīĭ’s lyric style. The poet includes specific names (imenâ) and, by the accumulation of details, produces the effect of a chronicle (letopis’), one which clearly induced an intense emotional response. While this work may have diminished in familiarity since his day, another creation from six years later is very well known both inside and outside Russia, although few realize he was its author: the Russian imperial anthem.

The first imperial anthem was merely a setting by Zhukovskīĭ of Russian words to the tune of the English national anthem, “God, Save the King.” It appeared in 1818, when the poet and the nation were still flush with the excitement of victory over Napoleon and the subsequent gains achieved by Russia as part of the Restoration and the Council of Vienna. Its title was

179 “The impression it made, not only on the troops but on all of Russia, is indescribable. Here was the ecstasy of the warrior, embraced by the heart of all. Every verse was repeated like holy writ. The feats depicted in the poem, and the names of the immortals recorded in this chronicle shone with a miraculous light. The poet knew how to choose the best moment from the glorious acts of each hero and express it with the best word: one mustn’t forget the former or the latter. The epoch was unprecedented, and the poet was its worthy representative.”
“Molitva russkogo naroda” (“The Prayer of the Russian People”). The first two stanzas, of six total, give the general tone:

Bozhe, ŢSarăi khrani!  God, save the Tsar!
Slavnomu dolgi dni  Long days to the glorious one
Daĭ na zemli;  Grant on earth;
Gordykh smiriteĭu,  Subjugator of the proud,
Slabykh khraniteĭu,  Guardian of the weak,
Vsekh uteshiteĭu  Conoler of all
Vsë nisposhli!  Provide all!

Pervoderzhavnuiĭu,  First among powers,
Rus’ pravoslavnuiĭu,  Orthodox Rus’,
Bozhe, khrani!  God, save her!
ŢSarstvo eĭ stroĭnoe!  Let her empire be strong!
V sile spokoĭnoe!  Mild in her strength!
Vsë zh nedostoĭnoe  All that is unworthy
Proch’ otzheni!  Cast away from her!

(PSSP.II  99)

When Zhukovskiĭ revised the text to the familiar music by Aleskeĭ L’vov in 1833 (later incorporated by Chaĭkovskiĭ in his “Slavonic March” (1880) and “1812 Overture” (1882)), many of the basic components of the text remained the same. The autographed manuscript, which he called by its 1818 title, “Molitva russkogo naroda” (“Prayer of the Russian People”) is preserved, although it was published as the “Russkaia narodnaia pesnia (‘Russian National Song [Anthem]’)” and known by that name throughout the years of its usage:
Among the basic components of the older text, the most significant to be preserved in the new anthem can be summed up in three words: \textit{pravoslavie}, \textit{samoderzhavie}, and \textit{narodnost’} (“orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationalism”). \textit{Pravoslavie} appears as \textit{Rus’ pravoslavniū} in the earlier text, attributing the quality of orthodoxy to the ancient nation, whereas in the anthem, it is applied more allegorically to the tsar himself as the representative of the nation. \textit{Samoderzhavie} is reflected as \textit{pervoderzhavnii} in the 1818 text, and as \textit{derzhavnyi} in the anthem. Overtly, \textit{narodnost’} is absent in both texts but appears in the title of both. Despite the fact that Zhukovskii’s autograph title differs from the official title, we find \textit{narod} there, as well, in its adjectival form, rather than as a noun: \textit{Russkaiâ narodnaiâ pesniâ}. The use of the first person plural pronoun, \textit{nam} (“to us”), in the anthem also strongly suggests the presence of the people, especially when one imagines them singing it as a large group.

Those three words, \textit{pravoslavie}, \textit{samoderzhavie} and \textit{narodnost’} became the official ideology of the tsarist government the same year the anthem appeared. As newly appointed minister of education, Sergeî Uvarov declared “Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality” the
“sacred trilogy” of official Russian state philosophy (Billington 304). Uvarov was on friendly terms with Zhukovskiĭ and was a member of the literary society, Arzamas, of which Zhukovskiĭ was the leader (Lebedeva 85). His political and aesthetic inclinations were essentially the same as the poet’s: “…Uvarov was an urbane and effective apologist for the anti-Enlightenment, […] his] circular of the same year brought to a close hopes for educational reform. But in contrast to the law code, Uvarov’s writings helped open up new avenues for Russian thought by keeping alive some of the ideological passion of the preceding era” (Billington 304). The “new avenues” that many thinkers of the succeeding generations would pursue mostly concerned the third component of the trilogy, narodnost’, which can be rendered a number of ways in English. It can be “nationalism” or “nationality,” but it also conveys a sense of the mystical power endemic to the people (narod) itself. Consequently, it was appealing to both conservatives, who interpreted it as the devotion of the people to the tsar and his empire, and liberals, who interpreted it as the untapped power of the people to build a better nation. A century later, when Stalin’s cultural aide-de-camp, Andreĭ Zhdanov, proclaims the three tenets of baleful “Socialist Realism,” –ideĭnost’, partiĭnost’, and narodnost’ (“forward thinking, party loyalty, and nationalism”), we see that, although orthodoxy and autocracy were replaced with concepts more appropriate to communist ideology, narodnost’, with its multivalent potentiality, is still there (535). This is perhaps the clearest evidence of the slippery flexibility of the term.

Years later, when Zhuovskiĭ was living in Germany with his wife, he conveyed his impressions about the thoughts and feelings he would have upon hearing the anthem performed:

[…] pesni͡ a narodnaĭ, osobenno posvi͡ ashchennai͡ a t͡ sari͡ u i v ego li͡ t͡ se vsemi t͡ sarstvu, povtori͡ aemai͡ a pri vsi͡ akom vazhnom sobyti͡ i narodnoĭ zhizni, imeet glubokoe, eĭ odnoĭ prisvoennoe znachenie. […] Kogda zazvuchit dlĭa tebĭa
narodnoe slovo: Bozhe, ТSaria khrani! vsia tvoi Rossiia, s ee minuvshimi dniami slavy, s ee nastoïashchim mogushchestvom, s ee sviaïshchennym budushchim, iavitsia pered toboi v liïse tvoego Gosudaria. I mne bylo sladko podumat’ o svoem velikom semeïstve, o nasheï Rossiï, gde [...] blagogovenie pered sviatyneïu Bozhieï pravdy i istorii i blagogovenie pered sviatyneïu vlasti derzhavnoï, iz nikh iskhodiashcheï, sokhranilos’ neprikosnovennygm, v zalog nastoïashchego mogushchestva i budushchego blagodenstviïa, i v dushe moëi gluboko, gluboko otozvalisia slova nasheï narodnoï pesni, vsiu etu sviatyniu vyrazhaiûshchie:

Bozhe, ТSaria khrani!

(7 July 1848, PSSP.II 683-84)\(^{180}\)

Clearly, Zhukovskiï did not see the composition of the national anthem as a mere official commission. It represented a kind of lyric manifestation of his devotion to Russia’s past, present, and future, personified in the tsar himself. It is also striking to note in this example of his epistolary prose the presence of the features already mentioned as indicative of his lyrical, or elegiac style: archaisms (blagogovenie, blagodenstvie “reverence, blessings”); as well as explicitly religious allusions (sviaïshchennym budushchim, v dushe moëi, sviatyniu “sacred future, in my soul [the reversal of the noun and possessive pronoun is especially liturgical], shrine”). Although Peterson, the publisher, would remark in 1833: “But the people know nothing about it,” a decade later, the composer of the music asserted: “After ten years, it became popular” (PSSP.II 683).\(^{181}\)

\(^{180}\) “[…] the national anthem, dedicated to the tsar and in his person to the whole empire, repeated at all important events of national life, has a deep significance that belongs to it alone. […] When you hear the lyrics start: God, save the Tsar! all of your Russia, with its past days of glory, its present might, and its sacred future, appears before you in the person of His Majesty. And it was sweet for me to think about my great extended family, about our Russia, where […] reverence before the shrine of God’s truth and history, and reverence before the shrine of the powerful authority proceeding from them, is preserved inviolate, as a pledge to present might and future blessings, and deeply, deeply in my soul, the words of our national anthem rang out, expressing this whole shrine: God, save the Tsar!”

\(^{181}\) “A narod nichego ne znal pro nee,” “posle 10 let sdelalsia narodnym...”
Following the war, he returned to another Schiller ballad, “Die Kraniche des Ibykus,” published in 1813 as “Ivikovy zhuravli.” This poem concerns the murder of a famous Greek poet, Ibykus, which takes place as he heads to Athens for the Festival of Dionysus, where the tragedians would present their works in a contest each year. The murderers reveal themselves during the performance of Aeschylus’s play, The Eumenides. They are moved, along with the rest of the crowd, by the appearance on stage of the Furies.\footnote{An oblique, but possibly significant, reference to Iphigenia arises here. In this play, the Furies pursue Orestes for killing his mother Clytemnestra and her lover. Orestes has committed those murders to avenge the death of his father Agamemnon. Aeschylus has Clytemnestra state in this play that her motive for killing her husband was to avenge his murder of Iphigenia at Aulis.} Cranes, which had flown overhead at the time of the murder, reappear in the sky over the amphitheater just as the scene with the Furies take place. One of the murderers, overwhelmed with guilt by the coincidence, calls out the murdered poet’s name, and the crowd exacts revenge for the poet’s death.

Rather like his methodology in “Kassandra,” Zhukovskii makes his references to Zeus much more overt. He names the god in general much more often than does Schiller in the original and treats Zeus less as a member of a pantheon (as Schiller always does) and more as a stand-in for the Christian god. This in itself is consistent with the tradition going back to the Renaissance of equating Zeus and Jupiter with “God the father,”\footnote{Some have suggested that the name of the Roman god, Jupiter, is a Latin neologism derived from “Zeus’ pater.”} but Zhukovskii tends to choose words that hearken to Russian orthodox prayers (underscored).

Selected Texts for Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Die Kraniche des Ibykus</th>
<th>Ivikovy zhuravli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Von fern her kommen wir gezogen</td>
<td>«CHuzhogo brega posetitel’,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und flehen um ein wirtlich Dach.</td>
<td>Ishchu priuuta, kak i vy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sei uns der Gastliche gewogen,</td>
<td>Da otvratit Zeves-khranitel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der von dem Fremdling wehrt die Schmach.”</td>
<td>Bedu ot strannichei glavy.»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und munter foerdert er die Schritte</td>
<td>I s tverdoi veroiu v Zevesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und sieht sich in des Waldes Mitte – [...].</td>
<td>On v glubinu vstupaet lesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25-26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this particular case, the combination of pagan and Christian elements is not unlike the mood of Russian fairy tales (skazki) such as Ilia Muromets or Koshchei Bessmertnyi, where the hero is drawn from pagan myth and legend but invested with Christian beliefs and piety. Helios is described as “sviashchennym” (“sacred” 71), whereas in Schiller he merely “shines upon all earthly things” (“alles Irdische bescheint” 72). Likewise Schiller’s description of the chorus is generally colored by otherworldliness, whereas Zhukovskii makes it seem perhaps more like a procession of old believers (“po drevnomu obriadu”), exhibiting “holy terror.”185 Schiller’s “Fackel” (“torch”), a German word that Russians use with the same meaning, becomes “svechi” (“candles”). The song of the chorus itself provides the clearest example. While Schiller employs terms that indicate the religious nature of the function of the chorus, he avoids the patently biblical “Selig” in favor of the more humanistic “Wohl dem,” whereas Zhukovskii indulges in the clearly Judeo-Christian “Blazhen” (“Blessed”).186 Timotheus (one of Ibykus’s
murderers and the only one named) becomes Parfenii. This name is of Greek origin also, but interestingly, it is associated with several saints and beatified persons of the Orthodox tradition.

Zhukovskii decided to translate Schiller’s *Jungfrau von Orleans* sometime in 1818, and first mentions work on it, with the Russian title, *Orleanskaya deva* (*Orleans maid*) on 19 April 1818. He would finish his work three years later, on 1 April 1821 (*PSSP.VII* 591). He had considered translating others of Schiller’s works: *Don Carlos*, *Wallensteins Lager*, *Piccolomini*, *Wallensteins Tod*, and the unfinished *Demetrius*. Concerning the last, and important from our point of view here, he had considered writing his own play on the same theme and went so far as to create a scenario: “Plan original’noi tragedii na sushhet iz epokhi Smutnogo vremeni” (“Plan for an original tragedy on a subject from the Time of Troubles”).187 Apparently, he initially considered creating an opera libretto on *Orleanskaya deva* and even formulated a complete scenario with a Prologue and five acts (594-95). He accompanied the entourage of Aleksandra Fëdorovna to Western Europe and even saw a performance of Schiller’s play in Berlin on 8 December 1821 with “M-elle Franz” in the title role (*PSSP.XIII* 151-52). He noted in his diary that he did not find her to be a great talent with regard to declamation or stage movement, but he found her face to be very expressive. The ensuing commentary in his diary confirms the assertion of his friends that he knew Schiller’s play practically by heart: “V bol’shom monologe prologa ona ne sokhranila nadlezhashchei postepennosti. ‘Ispolnilos’, i shlem seǐ poslan im’ -- ètot stikh i prochie poslednie byli malo otdeleny. V chetvertom akte v nachale eǐ ne dolzhno vykhodit’, a uzhe byt’ na stsene; vo vremia marsha eǐ ne dolzhno tak teatral’no shatat’seǐ, a idti

---

187 Fragments of each can be found in *PSSP.VII* (Don Karlos 475-77; Lager’ Vallenshteina 495-96; Pikkolomini 493; Smert’ Vallenshteina 490-92; Dmitrii Samozvanets 477-79; Plan 493-95). As an indication of the importance of its theme, Pushkin eventually took up this topic and created two versions of the story, one a satirical comedy (1825, Cf. Dunning, Emerson et al. *The Uncensored Boris Godunov*, 2006), and the other a tragedy in the Shakespearean manner, *Boris Godunov* (1831), which became one of the primary sources for Musorgskii’s opera.
v glubokoĭ zadumchivosti i shagom, otlichnym ot drugikh” (151-52).\textsuperscript{188} His diary notes that he saw it again four nights later. In Milan, he saw the pantomime ballet, based on Schiller, by Vigano (598). His interest in the theater becomes clear from the fact that his diary records his attendance at theatrical performances of one kind or another nearly every evening that found the entourage in a major city.

His exposure to the exciting new ideas about human freedom, which he experienced first-hand in the performance of Schiller’s works, had a significant impact on his political beliefs: “Profoundly impressed by the humanitarian content of Schiller’s tragedies which he saw performed during his trip through Europe (1820-21), he resolved to buy back his former serfs, whom he had sold before his departure, and made written arrangements for their immediate release” (Kostka 16). In a similar spirit, he later became committed to the emancipation from serfdom of the Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko. To raise the money to buy him from his owner, Zhukovskii set up a lottery for the sale of a portrait of himself by the painter, Karl Briullov, and paid 2,500 rubles for Shevchenko’s release (Semenko 34).

He published portions of the play as he completed them from 1818-1821. In 1824 Orleanskaia deva was published in its entirety as part of a collection of his complete works (PSSP.VII 591,757). Many of the changes Zhukovskii makes to Schiller’s text are similar to those already mentioned: a preference for archaisms, emotional intensification, de-generalizations. In his translation of Schiller’s play, however, their preponderance introduces significant alterations in tone that affect the meaning of the play. Similar to those in “Die

\textsuperscript{188} “In the great monologue of the Prologue she failed to maintain the appropriate gradual change [in mood]. ‘It was accomplished, and this helmet was sent by him’ [Schiller: Er sendet mir den Helm, er kommt von ihm, line 426; the Russian words in the poet’s diary are precisely what he published in 1824]. This verse and others following were not made distinct. At the beginning of the fourth act, she shouldn’t enter, but already be on stage. During the march, she shouldn’t stagger so theatrically, rather she should go along in deep contemplation, with a stride distinct from all the others.”
Kraniche des Ibykus,” the archaisms very often have biblical and liturgical connotations. They are frequently words one would encounter in Russian Orthodox Church services, which use an older dialect of Russian known as Old Church Slavonic. Arguably, in a play about a girl who believes herself to be heaven’s emissary, such connotations should be appropriate, but the themes from ancient Greek tragedy, especially Euripides’s Iphigeneia plays, with which Schiller imbued his play, become almost indiscernible in Zhukovskii’s version. As a result, it produces a rather different effect, which is worth exploring.

In Thibaut’s opening speech, Zhukovskii changes Schiller’s “old soil” to “sacred soil.” In one of Johanna’s first speeches, he changes “temple violator” to “one who curses shrines,” shrine being a word nearly exclusively associated with saints and holy relics (examples are underscored in cited passages).

Prolog

Thibaut.
Ja, liebe Nachbarn! Heute sind wir noch Franzosen, freie Bürger noch und Herren Des alten Bodens, den die Väter pflügten; Wer weiß, wer morgen über uns befehlt!

(1-4)

Johanna.
Und diesen Salisbury, den Tempelschänder.

(321)

Tibo.
Tak, dobrye sosedi, synche my Eshche frantsuzy, grazhdane, svobodno Sviatoi zemle otsov svoikh vladeem; A zavtra... kak uznat’? ch’i my? chto nashe?

(1-4)

Ioanna.
S rugatelem sviatyni Salisbury (323)

In general, apart from a few antiquated poetic forms that appear in Ioanna’s farewell soliloquy («земныя… родныя» 413, 415), the translation of the Prologue is remarkably faithful and strictly follows Schiller’s meter and rhyme scheme.

---

189 The relationship of Old Church Slavonic to Russian is more complex than this statement suggests. Linguists are reluctant to classify it as a distinct dialect because the development of its syntax and phraseology cannot be consistently mapped across time and geography. In some instances, it is more similar to Bulgarian than to Russian, and it contains many words derived from Greek, rather than from Slavic.

190 Translations of these texts can be found in Appendix 3.
In the recognition scene (Act I, scene x), the transformations largely pertain to the nature of Ioanna’s powers. When the Dauphin asks Johanna who she is, he adds the appositive, “mächtig Wesen” (“Who are you, mighty creature?”). Schiller’s “mächtig” (“mighty”) is rendered as “chudesnaia” (“miraculous”) by Zhukovski, and when shortly afterward the Dauphin’s formulation is repeated by La Gir, the translation follows suit. The implication is perhaps that Ioanna does not have power of her own but merely the wondrous workings of supernatural forces behind her. When the archbishop asks Johanna her name, she replies in a manner perhaps consistent with medieval practice, more conscious of his aristocratic rank than his ecclesiastical one, addressing him as “Ehrwürd’ger Herr” (“Venerable Lord”). Zhukovski’s Ioanna completely eliminates the aristocratic title, saying instead: “sviatyi otets” (“holy father”). The spelling and pronunciation of “holy” are also archaic.

I.x. (Recognition scene)

Karl
Wer bist du, mächtig Wesen? Woher kommst du? (1032) No kto zhe ty, chudesnaia?.. Otkuda? (1027)

Johanna
Ehrwürd’ger Herr, Johanna nennt man mich (1047) Sviatyi otets, menia zovut Ioanna (1042)

La Hire
Sie führt uns an, die Mächtige, im Streite! (1135) My rady v boi. Chudesnaia, vedi! (1125)

In the Montgomery scene in Act II, there is another feature to account for, which is Zhukovski’s treatment of Schiller’s ancient trimeter, to which the German poet had resorted exclusively in the scene, in order to heighten the classical element. Lexically, again there are several instances of metaphors or attributes altered into either fatalistic or explicitly religious formulations. The “foot” that drags Montgomery to his confrontation with Johanna is identified by Zhukovski’s Ioanna as his “fate” (tvoi rok) Schiller’s verb “wirken” should not to be confused with “werken,” which would suggest that Johanna is something of an automaton.
endowed only with power from an external force. “Wirken” has more to do with an idea or vision coming into being, a semblance becoming a reality; in both interpretations Johanna is the apparatus for the development, and her personal will is the catalyst for the transition from seeming to being. Zhukovskii’s translation – “what do you create with me” – conveys the sense that Ioanna’s physical substance is key to the action, but seems to leave no room for her will in the process.

II.viii.

[Johanna to Montgomery, after killing him]

Dich trug dein Fuß zum Tode - Fahre hin! (Sie tritt von ihm weg und bleibt gedankenvoll stehen)

Erhabne Jungfrau, du wirkst Mächtiges in mir! (1676-77)

[Joanna to Montgomery, after killing him]

Tvoj rok privel tebja ko mne... prosti, neschastnyj! (Otkhodit ot nego i ostanavlivaetsja v razmyslenii)

O blagodatnaja! chto ty tvorish’ so mnoju? (1629-30)

The central point of this scene is Johanna insisting that Montgomery defend himself before her, a fellow human being, rather than the supernatural demon the English believe her to be.

Zhukovskii captures the ironic sympathy here but turns it into sympathy for a predetermined fate. Johanna herself asserts that Montgomery’s feet brought him to the spot where he now stands before her. If the significance of human will were not such a central point in the dramatic dilemmas that confront the characters in this play, perhaps this would seem like quibbling, but human will is indeed the central point. Johanna is not the only character to confront fate with her will. Montgomery does the same but with diametrically opposite consequences. He surrenders frantically and dies shamefully. Talbot, on the other hand, faces his fate with sublime equanimity and dies with dignity, as will be seen below. In Zhukovskii, “Sublime Virgin” becomes the Old Church Slavonic “blagodatnaja.” This is the epithet used by the angel Gabriel in addressing Mary the Virgin in Luke 1:26-38 on the biblical occasion known as the
Annunciation. Although the epithet charges the scene with an appropriately intense religiosity, with this one choice the Russian poet removes a word that signifies the principal idea as personified by Johanna’s experience, namely, that her struggle to overcome her obstacles is sublime, and that in perceiving the gradual success of her personal will, the audience must experience the sublime along with her.

Significantly, Schiller worked on Jungfrau at the same time as Über das Erhabene, one of the main themes of which is the predominance of human will in its assertion of humanity: Wer sie [die Gewalt] uns antut, macht un nichts Geringeres als die Menschheit streitig; wer sie feigerweise erledit, wirft seine Menschheit hinweg. “Whoever inflicts force upon us denies us nothing less than our humanity. Whoever submits to it out of cowardice casts away his humanity” (Ungar Anthology 24). While Ioanna may impress us with her insuperable blessedness, Johanna impresses us with her invincible humanity. When Zhukovskii was writing his translation, it appears that Russian had no word distinctly equivalent to sublime. While the notion would have been familiar to readers of Burke, Kant and Goethe, not to mention Schiller, it seems that these works had not yet been translated into Russian and were only familiar in their original languages. In Vestnik Evropy, the journal edited for a time by Zhukovskii, his and others’ commentary related to the sublime tended to use vysokii (“high, lofty”), which, while not exactly inaccurate, oversimplifies the idea.191 Schiller, more so than any of the writers just mentioned, went to great lengths to distinguish noble and dignified feelings from those which may be attained only after enduring pain and suffering. To describe that rarefied condition, he used the word “erhaben.” It seems that for this purpose the more precise Russian word is vozvyshennoe, which may be a neologism coined after Zhukovskii’s time. The word does not

seem to appear in any of his writings, including Orleanskia deva. Whether or not the word existed, these ideas did not accord with his conception of this translation.

In his last moments, Talbot also contends with insurmountable obstacles. Although Schiller paints the great commander as a godless rationalist, he imparts an impressive dignity to his depiction, particularly because Talbot faces his circumstances with steadfastness rather than resignation. Zhukovskii preserves Talbot’s rhetorical grandeur. In his translation of one of Schiller’s most famous lines from the play (underscored below), he also allows him one of the only truly polytheistic utterances to be found in it:

III.vi.

Talbot. Unsinn, du siegst und ich muß untergehn!
Mit der Dummheit kämpfen Götter selbst vergebens.
Erhabene Vernunft, lichthelle Tochter
Des göttlichen Hauptes, weise Gründerin
Des Weltgebäudes, Führerin der Sterne,
Wer bist du denn…!

Bezumstvo, ty prevozmoglo; a ia
Pogibnut’ osuzhden. I sami bogi
Protiv tebia ne v silakh ustoiat’.
O gordyi um, ty, svetloe rozhden’e
Premudrosti, verkhovnyi osnovatel’
Sozdaniia, pravitel’ mira, chto ty?

(2318-23)

[…] - So geht
Der Mensch zu Ende - und die einzige
Ausbeute, die wir aus dem Kampf des Lebens
 Wegtragen, ist die Einsicht in das Nichts,
Und herzliche Verachtung alles dessen,
Was uns erhaben schien und wünschenswert —

(2352-56)

Zhukovskii overlooks the role of the sublime (erhabene) in this speech, as with Ioanna’s soliloquy after killing Montgomery. In true anti-Enlightenment fashion, intelligence is called “proud” (gordyi), rather than sublime, while the spoils of life become cool disdain for what seemed great (rather than sublime) and worth wishing for.

Earlier in Act III, when Dunois and La Hire are arguing about their rival affection for Johanna, Dunois explains that, although he sees himself as her best choice, she should make the choice freely:
Schiller’s words Götterkind, Götterschein (as opposed to the singular forms of Gotteskind or Gottesschein) have an ancient, pantheistic feel that Zhukovskii shuns, opting instead for Old Church Slavonic “heavenly” formulas: “nebesnoe ditia” (simultaneously representing an archaism in the word for child) and “Luchi nebes.” Whereas Johanna “sets France free,” Ioanna “rescues [their] freedom,” which initially might seem objectively accurate. Spas, however, is also the Old Church Slavonic word for “redeemer.”

In the scene with Black Knight, Zhukovskii scrupulously maintains the tone, easily the most supernatural of the whole play. His tendency to intensify the supernatural and religious elements works to advantage here: “die Stimme des Prophetengeistes” is marvelously rendered as “glas prorocheskogo dukha,” “Gelübde” perfectly translates into “obet.” The Knight’s warning to release good fortune from its accustomed and devoted servitude is maintained with the same layers of Old Testament double meaning familiar from Exodus and the psalms. The knight’s final line: “Umershchvliai/Odno lish’ smertnoe” borrows its imperative verb from Exodus 23:7: Udaliśia ot nepravdy i ne umershchvliai nevinnogo i pravogo, ibo IA ne opravdaiu bezzakonnika.\(^\text{192}\) Schiller’s only connection to Lutheran language in this scene is

\(^\text{192}\) “Avoid falsehood, do not kill the innocent and the righteous, for I will not justify the lawless.”
what may perhaps be an oblique reference to the Fifth Commandment in: *Töte, was sterblich ist* (2445). Schiller’s knight, according to Johanna, is an “image of Hell” and comes from the “pit of fire.” Ioanna is less metaphorical; he is “from hell.” After his mysterious disappearance, as Johanna is contemplating his significance, Zhukovskii̅ once again asserts Ioanna’s sacred predetermination over Johanna’s individual will to act on behalf of freedom. Johanna’s “noble heart” – the source of her strength – is replaced by Ioanna’s “holy faith.”

III.xi.

Es war nichts Lebendes. – Ein trüglich Bild Der Hölle war’s, ein widerspenst’ger Geist, Herausgestiegen aus dem Feuerpfuhl, Mein edles Herz im Busen zu erschüttern. (2446-49)

To byl ne zdeshniĭ I ne zhivoĭ... to bylo prividen’e, Vrazhdebnûĭ dukh, izniknuvšiĭ iz ada, Chtoby smutit’ vo mne sviatuĭu veru. (2384-87)

Sworn testimony from Joan’s trial transcripts asserts the veracity of her leap from the tower of Beaurevoir and her surviving that leap. Nonetheless, when Johanna escapes in Act V, Schiller’s diction permits an interpretation within the realm of skeptical possibility. Soldier: “What? Does she have wings? Has some storm’s wind carried her off?” Zhukovskii̅ presents the action metaphorically, nonetheless emphasizing the miraculous nature of the situation: “She is on wings; she rushes headlong like a vortex.”

V.xiii.

Soldier to Isabeau
Wie? Hat sie Flügel? Hat der Sturmwind sie Hinabgeführt? (3483)

Ona na kryl’iakh; vikhrem mchitsĭa. (3460)

The one character who undergoes the most substantive changes in Zhukovskii̅’s translation is Queen Isabeau (Koroleva Izabella in Zhukovskii̅). With considerable historical support, Schiller depicts Isabeau’s nefarious rejection of her own son and her pernicious and politically-motivated preference for the foreign occupation of France in lines that Zhukovskii̅ drastically alters in his translation. He “omit[s] those passages in which Schiller had painted a
particularly telling picture of the Queen Mother’s cynicism and dissolute way of life” (Semenko 148). The most telling instance is to be found in Act II, scene ii, where Isabeau discovers that Talbot and Philipp, Duke of Burgundy, do not share her motivations for making war. Talbot asserts that he is fighting for the honor of his homeland, while Philipp claims to be avenging the murder of his father, ordered by Dauphin’s party. Isabeau mocks their intentions and scorns their supposedly noble defense of honor as nothing but hypocrisy. Of the three, she claims that only she has a valid reason, because she was personally disgraced and exiled by the Dauphin.193

As his mother, she occupies a unique position:

II.ii.

Isabeau.

Euch treibt die Ehreucht, der gemeine Neid
Ich darf ihn hassen, ich hab ihn geboren.

Koroleva.

O net! koryst’ i zavist’ vash zakon.
No mne on syn – vlastna iä nenavidet’.

(1423-24)

(1398-99)

Zhukovskiĭ follows Schiller in establishing the mother-son enmity between the Queen and the Dauphin, but assiduously avoids the Russian verb “to give birth,” possibly to lend credence to the rumor, supported by the Dauphin’s own mother, that Charles VII was illegitimate. This rumor, and the resulting dispute over French succession, gave the English their opportunity to stake a claim to France. A few lines later, Schiller’s Isabeau explains: “ich kam als Königin/In dieses Land” (1440-41), referring to the historical Queen Isabeau’s origins in Bavaria. She goes on to explain that when her husband went mad, she took the affairs of state into her own hands and did what she saw necessary to maintain her freedom and keep control. Zhukovskiĭ cuts these eighteen lines. One explanation for this is Zhukovskiĭ’s desire to avoid the clear parallels between this situation and the contemporaneous Russian monarchy. Tsar Aleksandr I had

---

193 Schiller allows these claims to stand, although in reality, the Armagnac party, which was not consistently supportive of the Dauphin, was responsible for exiling Isabeau (Pernoud 188-89).
ascended the throne in 1801 on the assassination of his father Tsar Pavl I, largely through a conspiracy hatched by his grandmother’s crowd of retainers, lovers and admirers. Those loyal to Ekaterina II (“Catherine the Great”), who came to Russia as a foreigner, deposed her erratic husband, and despised her son, Pavl (Semenko 147-48). Her penchant for courtiers and favorites cast doubts on his legitimacy (Billington 200). Thus the parallels between Isabeau and Ekaterina, to which must be added the issue of succession. Aleksandr I died unexpectedly without an heir in 1825, leaving his unpopular brother Nikolaï as his successor. Arguably, disputes over monarchial successions lie at the root of the entire Hundred Years’ War, that is, the setting of both Joan of Arc’s life and Schiller’s play. The accession of Nikolaï I, in turn, seemed the propitious signal for a secret, anti-monarchial society to make its move. Because they did so in December of that year, they became known as the Decembrists. Six years earlier, in 1819, Zhukovskiï had been invited by Sergeï Petrovich Trubetskoï to join the nascent movement, which he rejected, but importantly and perhaps paradoxically, he never betrayed to the authorities the confidence of his friends that such a society existed (Semenko 29). Despite his affinity for the royal family, Zhukovskiï had chosen a dangerous subject for his translation.

In her commentary in the 1999 complete collected works (PSSP), Lebedeva describes two distinct but related motivations at work in the poet’s choice of words throughout Deva. The first relates to the overall elegiac style of his translation of Schiller’s drama. The second concerns what she calls slova-signaly “word-signals,” which she argues would be picked up by

---

194 O.A Lebedeva worked with A.S. ÌAnushkevich on both the 20-volume collected works of 1999-2011 (abbreviated as PSSP) and the 1999 publication of recollections by Zhukovskii’s contemporaries (abbreviated as Lebedeva). ÌAnushkevich is the main editor of PSSP, whereas as Lebedeva is the editor of the 1999 collection. As it happens, she was also the main compiler of Volume VII of PSSP, specifically devoted to Zukovskii’s dramatic works, as well as the author of the commentary. For this reason, citations from collected works show PSSP as the source, while the text refers to her as the author, whereas citations from the 1999 recollections show her name as the source.
the Decembrists and take on a new meaning in the coming decades. The presence of the two in this translation, she argues, sets into motion two new aesthetic tendencies for Russian theater.

The elegiac style has arisen in the previous discussion of other works considered here: “Sel’skoe kladbishche” (“Country Churchyard”) and “Ivikovy zhuravli” (“Cranes of Ibykus”) among others. The specific examples which Lebedeva cites are already familiar from that earlier discussion: *tishina* “silence,” *mecha* “dream,” *priiut* “sanctuary,” *blagogovenie* “reverence,” *blagoslovenie* “blessing,” *zadumchivyī* “contemplative,” *pechal’nyi* “sad,” *milyi* “kind,” *mladaïa* “youthful,” *sviatoï* “holy.” Regarding the play, however, she argues that most of these words are not connected by a motif to their counterparts from the original. Their use in the play is intended to increase the emotional intensity of the language itself. A particularly striking additional example is Zhukovskii’s almost insistent rendering of Schiller’s “Hertz” (“heart”) as *dusha* (“soul”): “V sisteme poëticheskoï obraznosti ZHukovskogo ono iavliâetsia kraïne mnogoznachnym, a v glazakh sovremennikov bylo universal’nym atributivnym simvolom tvorchestva i lichnosti ZHukovskogo […] V êtikh perevorcheskichh transformatsiiakh nashel svoe vyrazhenie glubokiï psikhologizm romantizma ZHukovskogo, v naibol’sheï mere proïavivshïïa v interpretatsii kharaktera glavnoï geroini: v rechevoï kharakteristike Ioanny ZHukovskii maksimal’no aktsentiroval intensivnost’ dukhovnoï èmotsional’noi zhizni (*PSSP.VII* 601).195

Along the same lines, Lebedeva argues that still other lexical choices result in what she calls “word-signals” that would subsequently appear in the dissident works of Decembrist lyric

---

195 “In Zhukovskii’s system of poetic imagery, it [the word “soul”] is extremely polysemantic, and in the eyes of his contemporaries was the universal attributive symbol of Zhukovskii’s creativity and personality […] Zhukovskii’s deep romantic depiction of the psyche found its expression in these translational transformations. It appeared to the greatest degree in the interpretation of the character of the main heroine: in Ioanna’s speech characteristics, Zhukovskii maximally accentuated the intensity of spiritual, emotional life.”
poets and in anti-tyrannical theater. These include the archaisms that we have already explored to some extent (glas “voice,” otchizna “fatherland”), but also word combinations and politically charged language that fall outside lyrical or elegiac rhetoric. She cites the following examples:

*pyl dushi* “the ardor of the soul,” *vyshnee izbran’e* “the high elect,” *rokovoj chas* “the fatal hour,” *nadmennai͡a vlast’* “arrogant authority,” *otecheskie nivy* “paternal fields,” *narod* “the people,” *rodina* “the motherland,” *svoboda* “freedom,” *grazhdanstvo* “citizenship,” *spravedlivost’* “justice,” *muzhestvo* “courage.” In the play’s setting, these seemingly innocuous words and phrases would have carried an implication of criticism, owing either to the presumed absence of positive conceptions, such as freedom and justice, in Russian society, or to the presence of negative ones, such as the high elect or arrogant authority. The presumptuousness inherent in suggesting that authority can be arrogant may be invisible to eyes unaccustomed to censorship. Likewise, showing the struggle for freedom and justice long ago and in a foreign land might imply that such a struggle is alien to its audience. Finally, the notion of citizenship – as opposed to mere presence – which connotes full participation in the affairs of state by citizens possessing rights, was a new idea straight across Europe.

The cumulative effect of these elegiac lexical choices and word-signals, according to Lebedeva, is a kind of “civic pathos” (*grazhdanstvennyĭ pafos*): “V perevode Orleanskoĭ devy psikhologizm kak sposob izobrazheniâ dramatichekogo kharaktera soediniâetsiâ s patrioticheskim soderzhaniem etogo kharaktera, vysokii grazhdanstvennyi pafos oduševliâetsiâ tonkim i proniknovennym elegicheskim lirizmom. Blagodariâ etomu traditsionno ratsionalisticheskaiâ kategoriiâ grazhdanskogo dolga stanovitsiâ takim zhe tochno priâavleniem intimnoi émotsional’noi zhizni cheloveka, kak liubov’ ili élegicheskaiâ melankholiâ.”
By incorporating these words, therefore, into the context of a patriotic drama, ostensibly conventional notions, like “love” and “elegiac melancholy,” which pervade all of Zhukovskii’s lyric poetry gain a greater significance as evocations of the deep feelings that can be expressed toward one’s nation and people. Patriotism, seen in this light, can be a force for positive action motivated by emotions that had previously been relegated to melodrama. The result is the amalgamation of the two leading tendencies of incipient Russian drama of the nineteenth century: social political dramas of the sort that Pushkin, Gogol’ and Tolstoï would produce; and introspective psychological dramas of the sort for which Chekhov would become famous (602-03).

The censor, A.V. Kochubei, decided to approve the work for publication, but not for performance (PSSP.VII 604). Whether he was concerned about its “word-signals” or for some other reason is not entirely clear. What is known is that two years later not only Zhukovskii’s translation, but all works in blank verse were deemed inappropriate for Russian theaters (Semenko 148). Zhukovskii had wanted to exalt the regime and inspire the people. He had attempted to soften the political implications and had changed the subtitle. Yet one is not entirely surprised. Schiller’s “Romantic tragedy” was deemed provocative because of its associations with the liberal ideas of the Romantic movement in Western Europe. For this reason no doubt, Zhukovskii gave his work the subtitle “dramatic poem.” His efforts to be sensitive and discreet in respect to the possible concerns of the monarchy were ultimately not enough, however, and it is likely that the censor granted permission to publish the work as a dramatic poem largely on the basis of the poet’s intimacy with the royal family.

---

196 “In the translation of The Maid of Orleans the depiction of the psyche as the means of portraying dramatic character is joined with the patriotic content of this character; high civic pathos is animated with tender and heartfelt elegiac lyricism. Because of this, the traditionally rationalistic category of civic duty becomes the manifestation of a person’s intimate emotional life just as precisely as love or elegiac melancholy.”
Zhukovskii was livid. It is clear that the censor’s decision surprised him because he had already begun to make plans to mount the play in Petersburg, although he was on tour in Europe with the royal entourage. With his friend, the poet Nikolaĭ Ivanovich Gnedich (1784-1833), he had exchanged notes regarding costumes, actors, and scenery (PSSP. VII 602). In May of 1822, he was very frank, albeit typically poetic, with Gnedich in his assessment of the situation: “I Ioanna popala v uzniki k takomu tiuremshchiku, chto uzh ne vidat’ eĭ svobody! My, kazhetsia ne v Evrope, a u chërta v zhope” (604).197 The last sentence in Russian, despite its plain language, has the meter and rhyme of verse, and it is interesting that the suppression of one of the aforementioned word-signals (svobody “freedom”) figures as an element in the poet’s expression of indignation. Additionally, the word for “jailer” (“tiuremshchik”) is a colloquialism that carries a second meaning, according to Ozhegov’s dictionary: “An oppressor, one who flouts freedom and democracy” (710). He eventually tried with bitter irony to reconcile himself to the circumstances. In a letter of 18 February 1823 to his cousin, Avdot’ia Petrovna Elagina, hostess of a prominent Moscow literary salon, he remarks: “Vsë k luchshemu: zdestnie aktëry udalili by ee ne khuzhe tsenzury! (Lebedeva 64).198

It is also worth noting that in his translation Zhukovskii makes a consistent effort to associate the bravery and idealism of Ioanna and her compatriots with an analogous potential in Russia. Rather like his replacement of “heart” with “soul,” Schiller’s words “Frankreich” and “Land” are consistently replaced by the more emotionally charged and far more patriotic words rodina “motherland,” otchizna, and otechestvo, both of which mean “fatherland,” with the former an archaism and the latter the more contemporary vernacular. While this attempt to

197 “And Ioanna has been taken prisoner by the sort of jailer unlikely ever to let her see freedom! We are, it seems, not in Europe, but up the devil’s ass.”
198 “It’s all for the best: the local actors would have obliterated her no less than the censor.”
downplay the play’s foreign setting might have been a consolation to his liberal readers, it failed to impress the censor.

Despite all his changes, Zhukovskii is sensitive to Schiller’s text. The supremacy of freedom and the individual will that Schiller propounds and consistently demonstrates through Johanna’s actions (even in the face of the Black Knight’s warning) is subordinated to the ineluctable power of fate and the will of God, which for Zhukovskii seem to be the same thing. This alteration of Johanna’s motivation is particularly significant within the context of the main theme of these pages, to wit, that Johanna’s suffering was brought on by her consciousness of her human vulnerability, whose fatalism makes her suffering sublime. Her sanctity, on the other hand, derives from her persistent will to complete her mission, fully cognizant of her vulnerability. She is rewarded for her sublime sanctity in the final apotheosis. In Zhukovskii’s version, the relegation of Ioanna’s will to the background and her consistent characterization as an instrument of God diminishes the heroism of her decision to bear her suffering and to overcome it. This situation seems to diminish the sublime nature of her suffering. Additionally, the repeated preference for depicting Ioanna’s achievements as deriving from supernatural power, rather than from the indefatigable energy we see in Schiller’s Johanna, strips her of so many of the features of sanctity that one might mistake her for Shakespeare’s sorceress Pucelle were it not for the profusion of overt Christian terminology and symbology to focus the attention.

Clearly, Zhukovskii’s reasons for undertaking his translation differed from the motivations that inspired Schiller to produce his original. Notwithstanding these disparities, and in spite of the censor, his work had an enduring impact on Russian drama:

Up to the very beginning of the 1820s the ‘French’ alexandrine verse form had dominated Russian drama, making it virtually impossible to create new dramatic
characters or situations. Zhukovskii translated Schiller’s *The Maid of Orleans* in the meter of the original: in rhymed iambic pentameter with optional caesura and frequent enjambments. This form was subsequently (particularly in the 1830s) widely employed in Russian verse drama and facilitated its emancipation from the canons of French Classicism. (Semenko 146)

The play seized the imagination of the Russian literati, as Belinskiĭ’s assessment attests:

> Ne budem rasprostranitat’ sia o dostoinstve pervoda Orleanskoĭ devy SHillera: eto dostoinstvo davno i vsemi edinodushno priznano. ZHukovskii svoim prevoskhodnym pervodom usvoil russkoĭ literature eto prekrasnoe proizvedenie. I nikto, krome ZHukovskogo, ne mog by tak peredat’ etogo po preimushchestvu *romanticheskogo* sozdaniia SHillera, i nikakoĭ drugoi dramy SHillera ZHukovskii ne byl by v sostoiânnii tak prevoskhodno peredat’ na russkiĭ iazyk, kak prevoskhodno peredal on Orleanskuiû devu. (PSSP.VII 607, emphasis Belinskiĭ’s)\(^{199}\)

Belinskiĭ recognizes that Zhukovskii’s translation represents two significant accomplishments: it transmits and preserves the romanticism of Schiller’s play and does so in a native Russian vernacular which Zhukovskii was uniquely qualified to create. He furthermore implies that, although the poet might not have been prepared to achieve the same effect with others of Schiller’s plays, he has now made it a vital national possession, both important and necessary.

The urgency to develop literature to enhance national consciousness, even from foreign sources,

---

\(^{199}\) “We will not digress upon the worth of Zhukovskii’s translation of Schiller’s *The Maid of Orleans*: its worth is long-established and unanimously acknowledged. With his excellent translation, Zhukovskii gained possession of this excellent work for Russian literature. And no one except Zhukovskii could have rendered this inherently *romantic* creation of Schiller’s, nor would Zhukovskii have been in a condition to render into Russian any other drama of Schiller’s, as he has so excellently done with *The Maid of Orleans.*” (emphasis Belinskiĭ’s)
would have been familiar to Schiller and the other German Romantics, and Belinskiĭ is acknowledging here that, with Orleanskaïa deva, Zhukovskii has done just that.

Vissarion Belinskiĭ (1811-1848) is unquestionably one of the best-known early critics of Russian literature. Outside of Russia, he seems to be one of the few Russian critics of the early nineteenth century known to Europeans generally.\footnote{He is the only Russian critic included in \textit{Literary Criticism: Pope to Croce} by Allan and Clark, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1962. The anthology, spanning criticism from roughly 1710-1940, includes twenty or so speakers of English, seven Germans, and nine French critics.} He is credited with creating a Russian literary national consciousness, but it usually goes unnoticed that much of his work calls to mind the foundations laid by Zhukovskii some two decades earlier. A comparison of some of Belinskiĭ’s most influential critical works to analogous earlier essays by Zhukovskii suggests that the critic’s famous Russian literary nationalism was first propounded by the Romantic poet.

Belinskiĭ’s overview of Russian literature in “Thoughts and Notes on Russian Literature” (1846, Terras 98) owes a good deal to Zhukovskii’s “Overview on the History of Russian Literature,”\footnote{ (“Konspekt po istorii russkoï literatury,” 1826-1827 Zhukovskii 290), [for brevity, hereinafter referred to as \textit{Konspekt}].} with regard to both content and aesthetic perspective. Content here refers to the actual writers mentioned in both Zhukovskii’s \textit{Konspekt} and in Belinskiĭ’s “Thoughts and Notes,” as well as the specific reader responses to what each writer deems typical or exemplary literature. This list below identifies the writers mentioned in each work, in the order first mentioned:

\begin{align*}
\text{Zhukovskii ‘s } \textit{Konspekt}, \text{ (1826-27)} & \quad \text{Belinskiĭ’s “Thoughts and Notes,” (1846)} \\
\text{Kantemir, Lomonosov, Sumarokov,} & \quad \text{Lomonosov, Derzhavin, Kheraskov, Dmitr’ev,} \\
\text{Kheraskov, Maïkov, Kniazhnin, Kostrov,} & \quad \text{Sumarokov, Kniazhnin, Ozero, Karamzin,} \\
\text{Bobrov, Bogdanovich, Ozero, Petrov,} & \quad \text{Zhukovskii , Batiushkov, Pushkin, Griboedov,} \\
\text{Fonvizin, Murav’ev, Derzhavin, Karamzin,} & \quad \text{Gogol’, Lermontov, Kantemir, Fonvizin,} \\
\text{Dmitr’ev, Neledinskiĭ, Khemnitser, Krylov,} & \quad \text{Kapnist, Petrov, Bogdanovich} \\
\text{Zhukovskii , Batiushkov, Vyazemskiĭ,} & \\
\text{Vostokov, Gnedich, Pushkin, Kozlov} & \\
\end{align*}
The names shown in italics are those that appear in both articles. As can be seen, Belinskiĭ’s longer article (some thirty pages, as compared to Zhukovskii’s trim eleven) contains only four names not mentioned in Zhukovskii’s. Three of these were not yet writing when Zhukovskii wrote his article. This means that Belinskiĭ introduces only one writer into the discussion, Kapnist, and this writer was a satirist, a genre about which Zhukovskii is silent in his article.

Zhukovskii was among the first critics not only to recognize Pushkin’s talent but to foretell the enormous significance his output would have on Russian culture: “The present period is still in bloom. There is already a writer, who offers hopes to make him its representative. This is young Pushkin, a poet who has already achieved a high degree of perfection with regard to style, and is gifted with an original and creative genius” (Konspekt 166). The quality of Zhukovskii’s praise is similar to an 1834 Belinskiĭ article on Eugene Onegin. He held up Pushkin’s treatment of his tale as a naturalistic example of “the unconscious work of the artist […] The extreme influence of Pushkin proceeded from the fact that in relation to Russia he was the son of his time in the full sense of the word, that he moved forward in step with his nation and was the development of its intellectual life; hence his authority was legitimate” (Bowman 59).

---

202 Zhukovsky alludes to the inclusion of his own name on the list with a turn of phrase that is charming and yet innocent of false modesty: “It is awkward for me to speak about this author, whom I know personally, not because he was among the writers known to me for their excellent verses, but because I myself am this author. Nonetheless it is necessary to pronounce a just assessment” (Zhukovsky 165).

203 It is interesting to note the persistence of this influence into the mature stages of Communism. The editors of “Children’s Literature” published a four-volume anthology of Russian poets in 1965, the first volume of which contains almost exactly the same list of poets included by Zhukovsky in his Konspekt.

204 “Nastoaiashchi period eshche v tsvetenii. Uzhe est’ pisatel’, kotoryi podaet nadezhdy sdelat’sia ego predstavitelem. Eto – molodoi Pushkin, poet, kotoryi uzhe dostig wysokoii stepeni sovershenstva v smysle stilia, kotoryi odaren original’nym i tvorcheskim geniem.”
A much more striking parallel is the close proximity and similar context in their fleeting references to two relatively obscure writers. Belinskiĭ makes a dismissive comment comparing a poet of some two generations earlier to an emotional response attributed to spectators of a contemporaneous Russian tragedian: “Many old men are still convinced in all sincerity of the excellent merits of Kheraskov’s poems […] There are still many old men who are thrilled by memories of Sumarokov’s tragedies and are ready, in a dispute, to recite what they consider to be the best tirades from Dmitri the Pretender (Belinsky-Matlaw 6). Contrast this with Zhukovskii’s passing comment on the same playwright and poet: “They were thrilled by Sumarokov as a great tragedian; they saw an Iliad in the weak epic of Kheraskov” (Konspekt 162). None of this is to allege a lack of originality on Belinskiĭ’s part. These examples are admittedly cherry-picked for their conspicuous similarities. The intent is to show that Zhukovskiĭ’s criticism deserves to be considered as a forerunner for the much more familiar work of Belinskiĭ. Additionally, the social and historical aspect so important in Belinskiĭ seems to have some grounding in Zhukovskiĭ.

Writing about the poet Derzhavin, Zhukovskiĭ asserts that “he is a philosopher at the foot of the throne [of Catherine the Great]; he depicts himself in what he says of others; he awakens great and patriotic ideas, and at the same time depicts nature with inimitable features” (Konspekt 162). With respect to the awakening of patriotic ideas and their relation to German romantic nationalism, it is worth considering the metaphor which Zhukovskiĭ applies to Russia’s early forays into the creation of national poetry. In describing Karamzin’s History of the Russian State as a work that bridges the previous period with the present one, he proposes that its very language transmits features that will come to define the new period: “The appearance of the

205 “On – filosof u podnozhiî trona, on risuet samogo sebî v tom, chto on govorit o drugikh; on probuzhdaet velikie i patrioticheskie idei, i v to zhe vremîa on risuet prirodu nepodrazhaemymi chertami.”
History of the Russian State, which ends the previous period, transmits its characteristic features at the same time to the period that is just beginning. It is like flakes of gold discovered for national poetry” (Konspekt 167). He uses the term “flakes of gold” or “gold particles” (zolotye rossypi), which is reminiscent of a secondary signifier in Novalis’s novel, Heinrich von Ofterdingen. Semenko asserts that Zhukovskii “was deeply impressed by Novalis of the Jena Romantics” (25). For Novalis, as much as for Zhukovskii, the miner’s labor to bring up gold symbolized the commitment of the nation’s energy to the creation of her symbolic treasure: art.

In like manner, Zhukovskii’s translation of Schiller’s Jungfrau represented his commitment to serve as a conduit for the introduction of new language and ideas as Russian Romanticism took on a more nationalistic character. Belinskiĭ recognizes this in his review of the play noted above. In discussing the developing state of Russian literature in his “Thoughts and Notes,” however, in place of miners’ gold, he seems to prefer a metaphor of human development: the infant art matures into a child-like art, then to a mature adult art. In this aspect, it seems he thinks differently from Zhukovskii.

It is possible to argue that literary nationalism is the most influential of the ideas ordinarily associated with Belinskiĭ, and that it actually finds its roots in Zhukovskii. In his Konspekt, Zhukovskii asserts a nascent variety of this concept while never using the term, narodnost’ (“national character” or “nationalism”), although as previously noted, along with “pravoslavie” and “samoderzhavie,” it would become part of the official state ideology under Uvarov in 1833. Belinskiĭ would popularize narodnost’ in the context of literary criticism later.

National poetry for Zhukovskii grows out of the language “purified” by Karamzin in the History

\[\text{206} \text{ “Pojavlenie Istorii Gosudarstva Rossiiskogo, kotoroe zakanchivait predydushchi period, peredaet v to zhe samee vremia svoi kharakternye cherty i tomu periodu, kotoryi nachinaetsia. } \text{ Éto – zolotye rossypi, kotorye otkryty dla natsional’noi poezii.”} \]
of the Russian State. It cannot be overlooked that this notion is addressed in an enormous opus dedicated to the elevation of Russian history. Moreover, Zhukovskii declares that the History is not merely a slavish recitation of legend and lore, but a gateway to: “national poetry. Up to that time for our poets, national annals had been to a well-known degree concealed by the fog of chronicles, and histories that were even worse than the chronicles; the genius of Karamzin illuminated past times with a bright light. From his votive candle (svetil’nik) poetry lights its torch!” (Konspekt 167) Although Belinskiĭ feels that Karamzin sometimes relied too heavily on French models in his fictional writing, he agrees that in the History, Karamzin was the writer who was the “first in Russia [to] replace the dead language of books with the living language of social life” (Bowman 176). Zhukovskii and Belinskiĭ’s assessments of the role of historical writing in the development of literature are not far from the call for the development of national drama espoused in Germany by August Schlegel: “What a glorious picture is furnished by our history from the most remote times, […] What a field for a poet who, like Shakespeare, could discern the poetical aspect of the greatest events of the world!” (Allen and Clark 184). The German critics, however, were approaching nationalism from a perspective rather different from that of their Russian counterparts.

A feature of both Zhukovskii and Belinskiĭ’s criticism that stands in sharp distinction to Schlegel, Schiller and the German Romantics of every stripe is that the latter were concerned with creating a literature that they believed would – on the basis of its artistic power – assist in unifying and establishing a German nation of grand stature to take its place among the nations of the world. The Russians, on the other hand, were already conscious of the organic existence of the

207 “natsional’noй poezii. Do sikh por dla нashikh poéтов otechestvennye annaly byli do izvestnoи stepeni skryty tumanom letopiseй i istorii eshche khuzhe letopiseй; geniй Karamzina osvetil lárkim svetom minuvshie vremena. Ot ego svetil’nika poëzia zazhzhet svoи fakel!”
208 From “Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature Ancient and Modern,” delivered in Vienna in 1808.
their imperial state, one which was already under the unified control of the Tsar. Their task was to elevate the stature of the nation through the elevation of its literature. This point is central to the topic under discussion – the development of Romantic nationalism, and the history of Joan of Arc as depicted by Schiller in German and translated by Zhukovskii into Russian represents a momentous example of this development. Terras characterizes Belinskii’s conception of nation as decidedly “organic,” citing as an example this observation from Belinski’s review of Glinka’s “Sketches of the Battle of Borodino”: “A nation is not an abstract concept, but a living entity, a spiritual organism whose manifold functions serve a single end; a nation is an individuality in the sense a man is just that” (92). Although the evidence of Zhukovskii’s immediate influence on particular writings of Belinski is perhaps circumstantial, it is clear that the spiritual potential of national literature to animate the living organism of the nation is an idea that both men promoted vigorously throughout their careers.

Given the enormous importance which Zhukovskii placed on his service to the Russian people, it is perhaps ironic that the final phase of his career took place almost entirely in Germany. On 21 May 1841 in Düsseldorf, he married Elisabeth von Reutern (1821-1856) (Lebedeva 647). Her father, Gerhardt von Reutern, had served as an officer in the Russian forces. He was wounded in 1812 and became an artist. He was an old friend of Zhukovskii’s, and as the girl grew up, she developed feelings for the poet (Lebedeva 366). Although she converted from Lutheranism to Orthodoxy, in the last years of his life, it was Zhukovskii who came to embrace the more radical elements of his wife’s native Pietism, which “emphasized the need for personal repentance and salvation, often at the expense of the Lutheran dogma against which it had originally been a reaction. The influence led him to excessive religious exaltation; somber thoughts on sin and retribution weighed heavily on his spirit” (Semenko 38). Between
1845 and 1850, he wrote more than fifty very conservative essays, bearing a superficial resemblance to those of Montaigne in their subjects perhaps, but without the sympathy and humor that distinguish those works. His essays were met with considerable antipathy by his colleagues back in Russia and may explain the relegation of his earlier literary essays to relative obscurity. The one that aroused the greatest disapproval was “On Capital Punishment” (1850).

The work was provoked by the poet’s abhorrence of public executions as staged in western Europe, and particularly one that had taken place in London on 13 November 1849. The execution of the murderers, Frederick and Maria Manning, had resulted in a riot. (Vinitsky 3). Zhukovskii had written his article to propose that executions should take place indoors away from the public, under the ministrations of unnamed acolytes mystically performing orthodox death rites, to afford the condemned individual a chance for repentance. This reimagining of the procedures for capital punishment into a kind of religious drama becomes especially striking when one considers Schiller and Zhukovskii’s reimagining of Joan of Arc’s execution into a drama of national deliverance. Although capital punishment had been suspended under Elizabeth I and Ekaterina II in the late eighteenth century, Nikolaï I reintroduced it in the wake of the Decembrist revolt, sentencing thirty-one of the “criminals of the first rank…to death by beheading.” It should be recalled here that Zhukovskii had declined an invitation to join this movement several years before. The sentence would be commuted for all but five, who were executed on 13 July 1826 (Anikin 108). The intelligentsia, who took Zhukovskii for one of their own, were vociferously opposed to capital punishment. It was second only to agitation for the abolition of serfdom, the cause Zhukovskii had been inspired to champion after seeing Schiller’s plays in Germany. After the infamous “mock” execution of the Petrashevtsy (or “the followers of Petrashevsky”) in 1849, capital punishment became one of the most sensitive topics of the
time. In this astonishing display of the peculiar nature of Tsar Nikolaï I’s despotism, members of a social reform movement, including the writer, Fëdor Dostoevskii, were arrested and condemned to death: “All of them, like the Decembrists, were young men, none older than thirty. Petrashevsky, Dostoevsky and a few other young men whose entire guilt consisted in the fact that they discussed questions of socialism, were sentenced to death. At the last moment they were informed that this had been commuted to penal servitude” (Anikin 141, author’s emphasis). As with the objectionable signal-words that had barred Zhukovskii’s Deva from the stage in the 20’s, when confronted with dangerous words in the even more dangerous times of the 40’s, the state responded, this time in a drastic illustration of the censorious impulse, by condemning men to death. Given these conditions, Zhukovskii’s aim in writing the article was bewildering: “It was branded blasphemous, barbaric, pharisaic, medieval, worthy of Nero and the Grand Inquisitor, bigoted, ‘foully moving,’ ‘basely solemn,’ and ‘incomparably abominable’” (Vinitsky 1). Zhukovskii’s reputation among the intelligentsia never fully recovered from the impact of this essay. He remained in Germany, primarily because of his mentally ill wife, traveling from one spa to another, under the protection of his brother-in-law, King Friedrich Wilhelm. In the end, his wife outlived him by four years (Lebedeva 647). He died in Baden-Baden.

It is possible to conclude that the reform of the monarchy from within that Zhukovskii ardently believed in was partially fulfilled in his former pupil, Tsar Aleksandr II, who enacted sweeping reforms in the 1860’s, chief of which was the emancipation of the serfs. In March of 1881, Aleksandr II was ready to sign into law a constitutional program to include the intelligentsia and the bourgeoisie in the control of the government, in the manner of a parliamentary Duma (Billington 401). Unfortunately, the assassination of the tsar by the populist movement Narodnaïa volîa (“People’s Will”) halted that project, and the accession of his son,
Aleksandr III, who openly disregarded his father’s reforms, put an end to such hopes, arguably forever. A weak, ineffectual Duma was formed under Nikolai II in 1905, in the period of great unrest leading from the 1905 revolution to the First World War and the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. Following the fall of communism in 1991, the Duma was formed again, but if balance of power among the branches of government is any indication of the integrity of a constitutional democracy, the Russian Federation has yet to achieve it.

Shortly before his death, Zhukovski wrote to L’vov, the composer who had set the words of the imperial anthem to music, and pronounced those “humble verses” likely to outlast everything else he had written: “Nasha sovmestnai dvoînai rabota perezhivet nas dolgo. Narodnai pesnia, raz razdavshis’, poluchiv prava grazhdanstva, ostanetsia navsegda, poka budet zhiv narod, kotoryi ee prisvoil. Iz vseho moikh stikhov eti smirennye piat’, blagodaria Vashei muzyke, perezhivut vse bratii svoikh. Gde ne slyshal ia etogo peniia? V Permi, v Tobolske, u podoshvy CHatyrdaga, v Stokhol’me, v Londone i Rime!” (PSSP.II 684) In some respects, Zhukovski was entirely correct; the words and music would ring in the hearts of the Russian people for some sixty years after his death, after which they would come to represent the totalitarian extremes of the tsarist regime itself. The identification of Zhukovski’s high-minded anthem as a totalitarian motto is perhaps analogous to the appropriation of Schiller’s patriotic verses by the National-Socialists. The ode to Zhukovski’s beloved Russia that he thought would outlive him itself becomes an elegy to the Russia that is no more.

209 “Our joint two-fold work will long outlive us. The national anthem, once heard, having gained the right of citizenship, will remain forever, so long as the people endure who have taken it as their own. Of all my verses, these humble five, thanks to your music, will outlive all their brothers. Where have I not heard it sung? In Perm, in Tobolsk, in the foothills of Chatyrdag [a mountain range in Crimea], in Stockholm, in London and Rome!”
Chapter 4. Lyric Realism and Epic Illusion: the Genesis of Chaĭkovskii’s *Orleanskaïa deva* (“Maid of Orleans”)

*Nur als Sinnenwesen sind wir abhängig, als Vernunftwesen sind wir frei.*

*Denn da, wo wir uns wirklich in Gefahr befinden, wo wir selbst der Gegenstand einer feindseligen Naturmacht sind, da ist es um die aesthetische Beurteilung geschehen.*

Schiller “Vom Erhabenen”  
*(NA.20 171, 179)*

In 1975, a reviewer wrote of *Orleanskaïa deva* (*The Maid of Orleans*): “For the first time in France, one of Chaĭkovskii’s grandest operas was heard in a concert performance, on a subject that directly concerns France” (Arkhipova 269). Irina Arkhipova, one of the most noted Russian mezzo-sopranos of the time and a pre-eminent interpreter of Ioanna, appeared in the performance and observed in her memoirs: “An opera by a Russian composer about France’s national heroine became a very real discovery for the French, attested to by numerous newspaper reviews, one of which declared: ‘Joan of Arc has come in from the cold to us’” (269). The work was just as little known within Russia. It did not premiere at the Bolshoi Theater in Moscow until 1990, and even at the Imperial Theater in Saint Petersburg, where it had premiered in 1881, it was performed only seventeen times, disappearing from the repertory in 1884, the

---

210 We are only dependent as sensuous beings; as rational beings we are free.
211 For when we find ourselves in actual danger, when we confront a natural adversarial power; then our aesthetic judgment is done for.
212 "Vpervye vo Frantsii v kontsertnom ispolnenii prozvuchala odna iz samykh grandioznnykh oper Chaĭkovskogo, siuzhet kotoroi priamo kasaetsia Frantsii."
213 Ioanna is the Russian equivalent of Johanna.
214 “Opera russkogo kompozitora o natsional'noi geroine Frantsii stala dlia frantsuzov samym nastoioashchim otkrytiem, ehto podtyverzhdali mnogochislennye gazetnye retsenzii, v odnoi iz kotorykh bylo skazano: ‘Zhanna d’Ark, poiaivshaiasia u nas s moroza.’
same year that Evgenii Onegin premiered and began to claim its permanent place on the stage (Shaverdian 270).\textsuperscript{215} It seems strange that an opera by one of the nation’s most beloved composers, Pëtr Il’ich Chaïkovskiï (1840-1893), based on the most highly praised drama of Russia’s pre-eminent lyric poet Zhukovskiï, would slip into oblivion. It is stranger still that such a fate would befall a work by a composer whose immediate predecessor, Onegin, is among the most successful of Russian operas.\textsuperscript{216} Before settling on Joan of Arc as the subject of his next opera, Chaïkovskiï had considered returning to Romeo and Juliet, which he had treated in a celebrated “Fantasy Overture” in 1869 (ZC I 327). One of his most eminent modern biographers, David Brown, also expresses wonder at the disparate destinies of these two operas: “Having only recently, in Onegin, set a subject which abounded in those human qualities of character and feeling which he now discovered in Romeo and Juliet, Tchaikovsky’s attraction to this Shakespearean subject occasions no surprise. It is the more strange, therefore, that within a year he should have set the grandiose and misconceived libretto which he himself freely devised from Zhukovsky’s translation of Schiller’s Die Jungfrau von Orleans” (II 280). The success or failure of an artistic creation as complex as an opera cannot be accounted for by any one factor, if at all. The circumstances of its creation, however, can be studied. In the case of Chaïkovskiï, the amount of material available for study is extensive and often leads to a good deal of post-mortem psychoanalysis. This chapter will not explore that path, at least not in a conventional sense. Instead, the guiding question here will be: to what extent do the circumstances in Chaïkovskiï’s life and the aesthetic choices he made at the time of Deva’s composition compare

\textsuperscript{215} Deva premiered 11 February 1881 (ZC II 262). Contrast this with Onegin’s 192 performances from the time of its premiere at the Imperial Theater on 19 October 1884 through 1899 (Shaverdian 268, 327).

\textsuperscript{216} Although it premiered at the Imperial Theater later, Onegin was composed earlier. Chaïkovskiï completed sketches for the entire work in August of 1877 (ZC II 167), finishing the first version of the opera’s full score 20 January 1878 (ZC II 167). Sketches for Deva were completed 22 February 1879, with the full score finished 27 August 1879 (ZC II 261).
to Schiller’s aesthetic formulations with regard to poetry and drama? The primary works by Schiller that will drive the discussion are *Die Jungfrau von Orleans*, “Vom Erhabenen” (“On the Sublime” 1793), *Breife über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen* (*On the Aesthetic Education of Man* 1795), and *Über naïve und sentimentalische Dichtung* (*On Naive and Sentimental Poetry* 1795-96). The goal of looking at Chaïkovskii’s circumstances in this manner will be to explore such notions as the dilemma of subjective feeling versus objective reasoning, the anxiety between realism and idealism, and the solutions Schiller proposes to these problems in the aforementioned philosophical works, to provide an aesthetic context by which to assess the very different impressions created by the two operas, *Evgeniĭ Onegin* (1878) and *Orleanskaïa deva* (1879). What can emerge from this exploration is the sense that these two operas, composed almost in tandem by Chaïkovskii, represent radically different approaches to their subjects, yielding entirely different dramaturgical and musical results. The epic grand-opera idealism of the later work, *Orleanskaïa deva*, seems to indicate a temporary shift in his aesthetic approach away from the lyric realism of *Onegin*. The explanation for the shift will be sought in the unusual events of the period 1877-1879 in Chaïkovskii’s life. Along with the composition of the two operas in question, the aftermath of his ill-fated marriage to Antonina Ivanovna Miliukova (1849-1917) and his decision to leave his teaching post at the Moscow Conservatory will be explored briefly to provide biographical context.\(^{217}\) The relationship between the broad range of works composed in 1878 and the development of *Deva* will form the greater part of the discussion, the purpose of which will be to argue that when the composer was projecting what will be called here his lyric persona, he produced works of enduring interest and acknowledged importance; works either obscure or of questionable value are, it is argued, projections of what

\(^{217}\) Brown.II 310
will be called his epic persona. The argument emerges that *Onegin* is almost entirely a projection of the composer’s lyric persona; it is an enduring success, performed on the stages of opera houses worldwide and studied intensely. The works he wrote afterward and through 1879, among them *Orleńska deva*, are a peculiar blend of masterpieces, strikingly effective miniatures, and overblown “noisiness and hyperbole” (Wiley 196). Although ultimately obscure and problematic as a stage work, the opera’s libretto and score reveal that the composer was still strongly under the influence of the lyric voices of Pushkin, Zhukovskii (especially his translations of Schiller) and other Russian Romantic poets, while he continued to experiment with bolder and grander foreign ideas, especially Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* and Mozart’s *Don Giovanni*. In particular, considerable evidence exists to suggest that his fascination with Juliet’s desperate dilemma and, to a greater degree, with Mozart’s similarly desperate Donna Anna strongly influenced his depiction of Tat’iana in *Eugene Onegin*. All of these heroines found themselves in love with men in circumstances that offered no hope for happiness: Juliet’s Romeo had the wrong last name; Donna Anna’s Giovanni is the epitome of the faithless womanizer, as well as the passionate forebear of Tat’iana’s ice-cold Onegin. Subsequently, it seems that the composer’s decision to take up the subject of Joan of Arc, in Zhukovskii’s translation of Schiller, was made while still preoccupied with Juliet, Donna Anna, and Tat’iana. Stirred by the epic scope of Joan’s true history, yet touched by the lyric passion of the romantic dilemma Schiller creates for her in his play, Chaïkovskii’s retains both the historical and romantic features in his opera. As the argument to follow will attempt to clarify, any assessment of this opera is complicated by the realization that, while Chaïkovskii may be at his most effective when he creates music that reflects realistic suffering of a private and personal nature – the projection of his lyric persona – he is perfectly willing “to abandon real truth in favor of
artistic truth” (Wiley 353). Could this mean, conversely, that when he creates music that reflects idealized aspirations of a public and impersonal nature – the projection of his epic persona – he unwittingly abandons artistic truth?

The seeming paradox between Chaîkovskiĭ’s “real truth” and artistic truth is at the heart of the proposed distinctions between the composer’s lyric and epic personae. Bullock argues that the composer endeavors to say in his songs what was not permissible in the complex social landscape of his time, but that he did not do so with the explicit intent of conveying his own personal experience. He says of Chaîkovskiĭ’s songs that “their heightened self-consciousness renders them less subjective instances of Romantic confession than complex exercises in the projection of lyric personae” (97). Additionally, the composer seems to have engaged self-consciously in artistic fiction even in his correspondence. Bullock cites a passage from the composer’s diary: “To whomever and for whatever reason I write, I always worry about the impression that the letter will make, not only on the correspondent, but on any chance reader. Thus I pose.” (97-98). Morrison associates the composer’s pose with the source of his muse: “for his letter readers—indeed, even for his prospective diary readers—Chaîkovskiĭ often adopted the persona of a tormented and persecuted artist, finding within it a rich source for his music” (Bullock 97). Thus, the projection of the lyric persona describes the composer’s subjective approach to music, which achieves its most expressive potential when imbued with a sense of individual torment and persecution, arising less from his personal experience than from his sympathy with the source of inspiration. Describing the opposite mode for the composer as the projection of his epic persona is suggested by Novalis’s famous dictum: “der Mann [ist]

---

218 “I'IA niskol'ko by ne zatrudnil'sia naglo otstupit' ot real'noi istiny v pol'zu istiny khudozhestvennoi” (Letter to K. Romanov 3 August 1880, ZC III 343). Quoted in Wiley 353.

219 Bullock credits Morrison’s Russian Opera and the Symbolist Movement (56) as the source of this citation and the one immediately preceding (97f).
lyrisch, die Frau episch, die Ehe dramatisch.” Although the idea is not Schiller’s, the classical sense that Novalis seems to suggest with these three terms – lyrical, epic, and dramatic – is in keeping with Schiller’s aesthetic philosophy. Furthermore, the dichotomy between the composer’s epic and the lyric personae seems to be a reflection of the opposition posited by Schiller in defining the categories of Realist and Idealist in *Naive and Sentimental Poetry*, that is to say, Chaïkovskii’s lyric persona is a Realist as understood by Schiller, while his epic persona is an Idealist. Additionally, the sexual ambiguity implicit in suggesting that the composer passes back and forth from Novalis’s lyric to epic is something of a parallel to the complications arising from his sexuality, which were dramatically exacerbated by his decision to marry. Nonetheless, the sense that the lyric mode of composition is somehow true to Chaïkovskii’s sense of self, while the epic is not, is reinforced by association of the lyric persona with the male sex.

Most important, the notion of persona permits the discussion to focus on the aesthetic qualities inherent in the works under consideration, rather than on potentially irrelevant biographical details. With respect to the argument here, musical ideas seemingly at odds with compositional techniques developed by Chaïkovskii in works prior to 1878 – particularly his song style – constitute projections of the composer’s epic persona. In the period under discussion, they seem

---


221 The opinion maintained in these pages is that the composer’s homosexuality was a fact that demanded varying levels of discretion in dealings with his family, friends and the larger society, rather than a scandalous secret that he hid out of shame at all cost. The rumor, published as a fact by Alexandra Orlova in *Tchaikovsky: A Self-portrait* (1990), that the composer committed suicide to protect the honor of his alma mater has been called into question by more recent research (Cf. Taruskin *Music & Letters* 79.3, 1998; Wiley *Tchaikovsky* 2009; Poznanskiĭ *Chaïkovskii* 2010) and finds no place in this discussion. The point is sensitive not merely from a biographical perspective. The notion of critical reception being influenced by certain critics’ perception of the composer’s homosexuality has been explored by Malcolm Hamrick Brown in “Tchaikovsky and His Music in Anglo-American Criticisms, 1890s-1950s” *Tchaikovsky and His Contemporaries* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1999). The conclusion there is that critics who have tended to reject the composer’s works as effeminate and hysterical also betray barely concealed or open disgust at his sexuality, while critics with a more sanguine view toward his sexuality have tended to be more receptive, or at least more objective in their criticism.
to spring from the composer’s decision to pursue projects based on their objective commercial or ceremonial potential, rather than as a result of a deeply felt emotional prompting.

Although no evidence exists that he read *Naïve and Sentimental Poetry*, nor that he was aware of Schiller’s Realist and Idealist categories, Chaïkovskiĭ was himself conscious of approaching the act of composing in two distinct modes, which he referred to as compositional types (*vidy*) or categories (*razriady*). In a letter to his patroness of 24 June 1878, he attempts to explain his compositional process. Significantly, he writes this letter in the middle of the year in which most of the works being considered were either sketched or revised. This is how he defines the two types:

1) Works, which I write at my own initiative, resulting from a direct inclination and an irresistible internal need.
2) Works, which I write as a result of an external stimulus, at the request of a friend or publisher, or by commission, as was the case when the directorate of the Music Society commissioned the march (Slavonic March) from me for use at the Red Cross concert…

For works belonging to my first category there is nothing more than the slightest willpower needed. One only needs to obey the inner voice… Unfortunately, these external stimuli are unavoidable. One must get to work, come to dinner, answer the mail, etc. This is why works that achieve balanced musical beauty throughout are so rare. For this reason, they show their seams and patches, or the fabric is misaligned or mismatched…

*ZC II 148-49*

Given his recent completion of the sketches for *Onegin*, the fact that it was not commissioned by anyone, and the passionate sincerity he reveals in all the correspondence related to its composition, this opera, which he preferred to call “lyrical scenes” (*liricheskie stseny*), clearly
belongs to his first category. Arguably, it springs from the projection of lyric personae, resulting specifically from the composer’s sympathy with the characters of Tat’iana and Lenskiĭ in the novel. As he states outright in the letter, he considers the Slavonic March (1876), on the other hand, a work from his second category. It was indeed commissioned, yet the composer felt an emotional impact from the circumstances that led to its commissioning. He found it “gratifying” that Russia had decided to come to the aid of Montenegro and Serbia following the Ottoman Empire’s massacre of Christians in the Balkans (Brown II 99). On one occasion when the young son of a friend announced his decision to go off to war, he was present and was “terribly shaken by the scene” (100). In composing the march, he decides to make use of the Russian Imperial anthem, along with three Serbian folksongs (Brown II 100). While the work is arguably a projection of his epic persona, his emotional connection to the suffering of the Balkan peoples and the families of Russian volunteers, along with the use of folksong and the anthem with text by the Sentimentalist lyric poet Zhukovskii, provide a number of lyric qualities that make this work an extremely effective orchestral piece.222 When one considers the opera he would next compose, Orleanskai͡a deva, however, disparities arise. This work was not commissioned by anyone. As later examples will show, he speaks of Ioanna’s suffering with the sort of sincere sympathy that he expresses for Tat’iana, and he also expresses considerable satisfaction with the progress and outcome of his work. According to these criteria, Chaikovskii would himself place the opera in his first category. As the discussion here seeks to reveal, however, this work has no shortage of “seams and patches” showing, and its “fabric” has been routinely criticized for being “misaligned or mismatched.” The composer is both the client and the tailor of this piece, and yet it cannot reasonably be placed in the same category as Onegin. For these reasons, this discussion

222 At its premiere, “the march had to be repeated…Many in the hall were weeping” (Brown II 101).
prefers to analyze the works according to the proposed terms of lyric and epic personae. As the example of the Slavonic March above shows, however, it is not necessary to see these terms as applying uniformly to an entire work. Passages of inspired brilliance can be found alongside stretches of noisiness or kitch. *Deva* contains moments of all three.

The features common to works projecting the composer’s lyric or epic personae can be found throughout the period to which this chapter is devoted. To understand these features, it is important to look closely at these works and the circumstances of their composition, to consider Chaïkovskiï’s evaluation of them, and to compare his evaluation with the epic and lyric categories. In a letter of 29 July 1878 to his publisher, Pëtr Ùrgenson, Chaïkovskiï writes: “Dear friend, my manuscripts are now in your hands. You have received no small amount of material for your engravers” (*ZC* II 156).223 He lists the new works he has completed over the last six months, which are ready for publication, along with the honorarium he proposes for each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As listed in the letter</th>
<th>As designated among his complete works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the sonata</td>
<td>50 rubles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 12 pieces @ 25 ea</td>
<td>300 rubles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the children’s album @ 10 ea</td>
<td>240 rubles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 6 romances @ 25 ea</td>
<td>150 rubles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the violin pieces @ 25 ea</td>
<td>100 rubles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the Liturgy</td>
<td>75 rubles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Pieces of Medium Difficulty for Piano (Op. 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Album, 24 Easy Pieces (à la Schumann)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six Romances (Op. 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Souvenir d’un lieu cher, (Op. 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (Op. 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<em>ZC</em> II 166-69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this impressive collection, he also proposes honoraria for previously submitted works, for which he has not yet received payment: the opera *Evgenii Onegin* (Op. 24), 500 rubles; and the Violin Concerto in D (Op. 35), 50 rubles. “My dove, please review and settle the

---

223 “Milyi drug, tebe peredadut moi rukopisi. Ty poluchil nemalo materiala dlia svoikh graverov.”
state of our accounts; for me this is quite necessary” (157). A few sentences later, the urgency becomes clearer, as he lists the payments that his publisher has made for the last six months to Antonina Ivanovna Miliukova, that is, his wife, from whom he has been estranged since the previous September (Wiley 157). The composer’s sudden decision to marry in 1877 has been examined exhaustively by all of his biographers, and many of its implications extend far beyond the scope of this inquiry. Gasparov argues convincingly that Chaikovskiĭ saw Evgeniĭ Onegin’s rejection of Tat’iana in the novel as unjust and sought to avoid committing a similar injustice to a young woman, in whom he saw (perhaps blinded by an overly sympathetic aesthetic response) an analogous personality: “his relations with Miliukova had reached the point at which it became his duty to propose marriage” (65). They married in Moscow on 6 July 1877 (Wiley 149). He wrote Onegin over the next six months (ZC II 167). He regretted his decision to marry almost immediately and left for his sister’s estate in Kamenka twenty days after the wedding, enduring his final personal contact with his wife 24 September 1877 (Wiley 151, 155). Having made a decision based on a sense of duty influenced by aesthetic susceptibility, his feelings soon overpowered him: “My soul was filled with such fierce hatred of my unfortunate wife that I felt like strangling her” (PC I 66). The inspiration to continue work on Onegin, however, remained. It suffices to say that his decision, and its consequences, represents a critical period in the composer’s life that affected his compositional choices.

In the letter to his publisher, a moment crystallizes in which all the works and events in question appear, prior to the composer’s consideration of Joan of Arc as a subject. For the remainder of the chapter, the discussion will consider the argument that the composer developed

224 “Pozhaluĭsta, golubchik, ras’iâsnî i opredeli sostoiâanie nashikh schetov, - été dlîa menîa ves’mâ nuzhno.”
225 “Moïa dusha napolnîalas’ takoiu liutoi nenaâst’î u k moëi neschastnoi zhene, chto khotelos’ dushit’ ee” (PC I 66).
a distinct compositional style, which can be described in concrete musical and aesthetic terms consistent with Schiller’s philosophical writings. This style was already evident in works prior to 1877, such as the collection of songs Op. 28 and *Onegin*. Mid-way through that year, the composer married, following which he produced the works outlined above in 1878. Several of the works he produces in this period show features consistent with his pre-1877 compositional style; while others seem like failed experiments. Those consistent with this style, it is argued, are largely projections of the composer’s lyric persona, while those inconsistent with this style are largely projections of his epic persona. The table below organizes the works according to these terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projection of Lyric Persona</th>
<th>Projection of Epic Persona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Songs, Op. 28</td>
<td>Sonata in G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Evgenii Onegin</em></td>
<td>Souvenir d’un lieu cher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve Pieces of Medium Difficulty (piano)</td>
<td><em>Orleanksaia Deva</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Album (piano)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songs, Op. 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Concerto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (choral)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The thematic interrelationships – in terms of both music and subject matter – among the works in the left column are striking. The Violin Concerto, especially the melody of its middle movement, plays a surprisingly unifying role. It will be seen that among the vocal works there, texts devoted to love at first sight and hopeless romance predominate, as the examples below make clear. Furthermore, these subjects often refer with remarkable specificity to particular literary and operatic characters: Shakespeare’s Juliet, and Donna Anna from Mozart’s *Don Giovanni*. To varying degrees, both of these heroines play a role in Chaïkovskii’s depiction of Tat’iana in *Onegin*. In the song cycle, Op. 38, the composer’s selection of texts and musical ideas suggests that his conception of Tat’iana fuses with that of Juliet and Donna Anna as a muse-synthesis for the projection of his lyric persona. It is when the composer attempts to treat
Ioanna (Russian for “Johanna”) as an extension of this muse-synthesis that difficulties begin to emerge. Although there is evidence in *Orleanskaïa deva* of musical and thematic material from the lyric column, where they are employed effectively, their presence in the latter opera is either out of place or is manifested in isolated passages of effective material.

In 1875, before the idea of *Onegin* or *Orleanskaïa deva* had occurred to him, Chaïkovskiï produced a set of songs (Opus 28), which are called *romansy* in Russian, in which he develops a distinctive compositional method, which influences everything he writes for the next several years. Orlova observes: “For Chaïkovskiï, harmony never turns into a self-sufficient material, a stiff blotch of coloration, but is always connected seamlessly with the movement of the melody and fulfills a dramatic function” (91).226 This compositional technique can serve as the definition of the projection of Chaïkovskiï’s lyric persona: sensitivity to the melody inspired by the text above all, with demands regarding genre and form as secondary considerations. In this respect, despite a gap of some four decades between their lifetimes, he is a composer after Schiller’s own heart. It has been noted before in these pages that one of Schiller’s favorite composers was Gluck, who vindicated the melody-driven style of opera against its harmony-driven forebear, the *tragédie lyrique*.227 The composer whom Schiller felt did most justice to his poetry in his lifetime was Karl Friedrich Zelter, largely because he subscribed to the prominence of melodic momentum over harmonic form. In fairness, both Gluck and Zelter were bound to stylistic and formal genres that Chaïkovskiï eschewed in his vocal music, but the notion that harmony serves a dramatic function subordinate to the melody of the text is common to all of these composers.

---

226 “Garmoniiâ dlia Chaïkovskogo nikogda ne prevrashaetsia v samodovlevushchuiâ krasku, v koloristicheskoe zastvyshshee piatno, a vsegda nerazryvno sviazano s melodicheskim dvizheniem i vapolniaet dramaticheskuiu funktsiiu” (91).
227 Cf. Chapter 1 49; Chapter 2 104f.
According to Orlova, Chaïkovskiĭ develops a “conversational melodic language” in the collection of songs, Op. 28 (1875), which she calls a “laboratory” for the music he would create for *Onegin* (84). They are characterized by, as she describes it, “flexibility of musical speech…the ability to bring together improvisational freedom and a tightly constructed theme simultaneously…This collection of songs…played a huge role as a ‘laboratory’ for the melodic style of *Onegin*, an opera deeply bound to everyday inflections and to the style of chamber lyricism. Improvisational, speech-like ‘conversational’ melodic language is typical throughout this entire opera” (84-85).\(^{228}\) Significantly, she cites his compositional technique for *Deva* as an aberration from that which he had established and maintained prior to writing that opera. Her source is a letter of 11 December 1880 to the conductor Napravnik, in which he refers to changes necessary for the premiere of the opera: “It is better for the melodic line to be disfigured than for this to happen to the musical idea’s very essence, located in direct dependence on modulation and harmony, to both of which I have grown accustomed” (91).\(^{229}\) Two points here are surprising: Chaïkovskiĭ’s assertion that he has created an operatic moment with harmony as its musical essence; and his willingness to “disfigure” the melody that he has created for the singer for harmonic purposes. This approach is in sharp contrast to the methodology of *Onegin* and the songs that come before and after it. Its uncharacteristic manner is an example of the projection of the composer’s epic persona.

\(^{228}\) “Гибкость музыкальной речи…умение сочетать одновременно и импровизационную свободу и сконцентрированную собранность темы…Группу романсо́в…сгнала особенно больши́й роль как ‘лаборатория’ мелодии для Оне́гина оперы, глубоко связанной с интонациями биты, по стилю камерной лирики. Импровизационно-речевой, ‘разговорный’ мелодический язык тяготел дли́я вселенной всего этого опера” (84-85).

\(^{229}\) “Пуст лучшей буде́т искуство музыкальной мысли, нако́м мысли́ для полноты взаимосвязи с модулацией и гармонией, с коими я с восторгом” (91).
The primary feature common to the song collections, which comes to serve the composer in *Onegin* as well, is a melody for the voice that suggests improvised speech. Asaf’ev actually refers to the composer’s style in *Onegin* as *romansnoe* (“song-like”) and suggests that his juxtaposition of monologic (internal) and dialogic (conversational) themes influenced Chekhov and the Stanislavskii acting method (94). In the songs, the piano accompaniment follows a melodic line that also says something in addition to the straightforward meaning of the text, but guiding the structure of the whole is the overarching musical idea, whether expressed more strongly in the vocal line or in the piano line, rather than any preconceived generic form. An examination of the first verse of one song from Op. 28, “Strashnaia minuta,” and a comparison to examples in *Onegin* should serve to illustrate the features of this compositional method.

Ex. 4.1 “Strashnaia minuta” (*CPSS.44* 206)

---

230 Chaikovskii was not, however, as slavish to natural speech declamation as were Tsezar’ Kiui, Musorgskii or the other members of the so-called “Mighty Handful,” who insisted furthermore that the poet’s text should be reproduced inviolate, with no abridgements or repetitions.

231 The degree to which this model may have influenced his last three symphonies (4, 5, and 6) makes them a source of continual criticism, with some finding charm, expressive power, and originality in his symphonic experimentation, and others finding fault in his failure to adhere, in the manner of Brahms, to the symphonic model of Haydn and Beethoven.
“Strashnaia minuta” is No. 6 in the collection. It is one of the few songs for which Chaïkovskiî provides his own text, auguring his decision to serve as his own librettist for Deva. In it can be found the melodic seeds that come to full flower in Onegin. The text of the verse above can be rendered: “You listen, with your head bowed and your eyes cast down, quietly sighing. You don’t know how fearful these moments are for me, how full they are of meaning, how constrained I am by this silence. I await your condemnation. I await some resolution. You’ll either drive a knife into my heart or open paradise to me. Ah, don’t torment me! Say at least one word!” This moment vividly calls to mind the third scene of Onegin, when Evgenii comes
to Tat'iana after she has written the extraordinary letter proclaiming her love. The male-female roles in the song, however, seem to be reversed to be more in keeping with a conventional arrangement, with the man pursuing the woman. Significantly, when Chaïkovskiî composed this song in 1875, he had not yet considered Pushkin’s verse novel as a subject, thus the association with it can be taken as merely accidental, or perhaps incidental. An example of the “speech-like conversational” melody to which Orlova refers arises at the words: “îl’ nozh ty mne serdtse vonzish’” (“You’ll drive a knife through my heart,” mm 18-20). This passage interrupts the flow of the melody established and repeated in measures 6-16, as well as the second melody beginning on the words “îA prigor tvoï zhdu” (“I await your condemnation,” mm 16-18). There is a sense that the musical line in these measures is being made up on the spot, like improvised speech. Even in the melodic line at the words “and quietly sighing,” there is a rest just before the word “sighing” that functions to increase the anxiety of the moment and as a bit of word painting. The piano accompaniment starts with a musical idea that, according to Bullock (111) and Wiley (132), owes a debt to Schumann’s Dichterliebe. This reading seems apt, but the leaps in measures 1-3, the descending sequence of notes in 3-4, and the range of a minor sixth that spans the first part of the vocal melody (mm 6-8) also seem to be forerunners to the musical ideas that feature so prominently in Onegin. Recalling that Orlova refers to the collection from which this song comes as a laboratory for Chaïkovskiî’s lyrical scenes, the appearance of these musical ideas in the first eight bars of a text setting that resembles a moment in a work yet to be written can be seen as something of a Petri dish. Brown refers to these musical ideas in Onegin as “thematic germs” and identifies three in particular (II 194). One is the theme introduced in the overture of the opera. Brown calls this the “a” germ (II 199), which he sees as a highly
chromatic stringing together of two four-note sequences and one three-note sequence (Ex. 4.2).

For Asaf'ev, the eleven notes together comprise the “elegiac Tat’ìana sequence” (104).

Ex. 4.2. “a” germ or “Tat’ìana sequence” (*Evgenii Onegin*)

![Ex. 4.2. “a” germ or “Tat’ìana sequence”](image)

Ex. 4.3. “b” germ (Tat’ìana sixth) “Kto ty moï angel li khranitel’?" (Who are you, my guardian angel?)"

![Ex. 4.3. “b” germ (Tat’ìana sixth)](image)

Ex. 4.4. ‘b” germ (Lenskiï sixth) “Chto den’ griadushchiï mne gotovit?" (What does the coming day hold in store for me?)"

![Ex. 4.4. “b” germ (Lenskiï sixth)](image)

Brown’s “b” germ is the step-wise descent along the span of a major sixth (II 203-05). For Asaf’ev, this represents two themes known respectively as the Tat’ìana sixth (or, as he has it: *geksakhord*) and the Lenskiï sixth (98).
In “Strashnaia minuta” (Ex. 4.1), the vocal line in measures 6-8, descending over the interval of a sixth, seems to be a proto-type of the “b” germ. The leap in opening bars of the piano accompaniment, settling one step downward to a sustained note, presages Brown’s “c” germ. This thematic notion has no immediate parallel in Asaf’ev, except perhaps as an example of what he calls intonatsionnye kompleksy (“musical compounds” 102), which serve to unite the main protagonists of Onegin – Tat’iana, Lenski, and Onegin – and allow the music to function as a multi-layered and self-referential commentary on the action of the scenes. In some ways, Chaikovskii’s technique is reminiscent of Wagner’s leit-motifs, which tend to be associated with specific characters and function as a reminder to the listener at a performance of the impact on those characters of other characters’ actions, who may or may not be on stage at the same moment. As Brown observes, however, Chaikovskii’s use of these themes, “germs,” sequences – whichever term one wishes – “is always associated with emotions” (II 199). This means that when, as noted above, the themes sung by two different characters are as similar as are Tat’iana’s and Lenski’s (Ex. 4.3 and 4.4), the listener is asked to recall the emotion which each character expresses in his or her respective moments. In both of the scenes in which these passages are sung, each character expresses the fearful suspicion that those whom they love – Onegin for Tat’iana, Ol’ga for Lenski – do not return their affection, as was the case with the romans “Strashnaia minuta.”
The theme introduced in the overture tends to be associated with the power of suffering at the hands of fate. Tat'iana sings this sequence of notes several times to words of increasingly personal significance: in the duet No. 1, Scene 1 with her sister, “togda svireli zvuk unylyï i prostoi” (“then the melancholy and simple sound of the shepherd’s pipe” Ex. 4.5); later in the same scene, describing characters in the Sentimentalist novels she reads, “kak oni stradaiut!” (“how they suffer!”); then in Scene 2 No. 9, when she writes her famous letter to Onegin, “sud’bu moi u otnyne i tebe vruchaiu” (“From now on my fate is in your hands”). Although this theme is associated nearly exclusively with Tat’iana, the circumstances under which she sings it continue to evolve, and the suffering motif, which at first perhaps strikes a listener as merely melodramatic, becomes increasingly more vivid, especially when Onegin condescendingly rejects her in the subsequent scene. Although Pushkin, along with excessively literal minded Russians, might have seen the changes the composer made from the novel as strange, Schiller would surely have recognized this as the composer’s careful development of the plot’s sublime potential, especially in how Chaïkovskiï links the Letter-Writing scene to Tat’iana’s ultimate rejection of Onegin.

Earlier in the letter-writing scene, before Tat’iana sings with some resignation that she is putting her fate into Onegin’s hands, she has a moment of bravado, when she first decides to write her declaration of love for Onegin:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Puskaï pogibnu ia, no prezhdde,} & \text{Let me die, but first,} \\
&\text{ia v oslepitel’noi nadezhde} & \text{In blind hope, I seek} \\
&\text{blazhenstvo temnoe zovu,} & \text{an uncertain bliss,} \\
&\text{IA negu zhizni uznaiu!} & \text{I’ll discover life’s luxury!} \\
&\text{IA p’iu vol’shebnyi iad zhelaniï,} & \text{I drink the magical poison of desire,}
\end{align*}
\]

232 Later editions of the work divide it into the more conventional three acts of operas. Because its use corresponds neatly with the lyric-epic dichotomy and is in keeping with the composer’s original intention of presenting the work as seven lyrical scenes, the commentary here will refer to the numbers according to their place within that structure. For those perhaps more comfortable with the acts of the opera, the following comparison may be helpful: Scenes 1, 2, 3 = Act I; Scenes 4, 5 = Act II; Scenes 6, 7 = Act III.
Menià presleduet mechyty!
Vezde, vezde on predo mnoï,
Moï iskussitel’ rokovoï!
(Scene 2, No. 9)

In Scene 7, No. 21, Onegin realizes after meeting Tat’iàna at a ball that he is now in love with her. Chaîkovskii makes the decision to have Onegin repeat Tat’iàna’s lines, initially to different music, but at the words “Vkushchu vol’shebnyî iăd zhelanîî (I savor the magical poison of desire),” Onegin sings exactly the melody that she has sung in the Letter-Writing scene. The attentive listener cannot fail to recall the sting of rejection experienced by Tat’iàna at the hands of the man now singing her words and music. That listener also knows that Tat’iàna is now married to a friend of Onegin’s. She, in fact, was the glamorous hostess of the ball where they reunited. Although Chaîkovskii was inspired to create the melody under the lyric influence of Pushkin, the particular degree of pathos created in this moment in Scene 7 belongs to the composer. Tat’iàna’s words in Scene 2 are an example of libretto text quoted almost verbatim from Puskin’s novel, changed only to reflect the alteration of perspective. Pushkin’s narrator addresses the words rhetorically to his character in the second person; Chaîkovskii’s Tat’iàna sings them in the first person. In the analogous moment in the novel, Onegin writes a letter to declare his love for Tat’iàna, thus the irony of the role reversal comes from Pushkin. The composer retains only a few words from the letter for his passage from Scene 7, preferring to take advantage of an opportunity to employ a “musical compound,” to use Asaf’ev’s term, combined with a repetition of the text as catalysts to heighten the emotional impact of the scene.

In Scene 5, No. 18, the duel between Onegin and Lenskiî, Chaîkovskii combines and juxtaposes musical compounds from Scenes 1, No. 6 and from earlier in Scene 5, No. 17 to

233 The composer changes the latter portion of the text for Onegin, who describes Tat’iàna not as a “fateful temptress” (which would not do for one of the purest and most admired images of womanhood in Russian literature) but as an obraz zhelannyî dorogoî (dearly desired image).
generate an effect perhaps less pathetic than the above example, but possibly more poetic.

Lenskiĭ has two important arias in *Onegin*: “İA liubiüu vas, Ol’ga (I love you, Ol’ga,” Scene 1, No. 6); and “Kuda, Kuda? Chto den’ griadushchiï mne gotovit? (Where, where? What does the coming day have in store for me?” Scene 5, No. 17, Ex.4.4). In the first, he declares his love for his childhood sweetheart Ol’ga, Tat’iâna’s sister, in their garden, which is next door to his own home. On this occasion, he has brought along his new friend, Onegin, whose first sight causes Tat’iâna’s “soul to burn with love’s fire” (Scene 1, No. 5). As we have already learned, Onegin does not return Tat’iâna’s feelings, nonetheless, she must endure his presence at a ball in honor of her name-day, and in Scene 4, at the work’s center, all the passions thus set in motion come to a head.234 Onegin decides to flirt shamelessly with fickle Ol’ga, arousing Lenskiï’s jealousy. The lovesick poet challenges Onegin to a duel, inciting a scandalous thrill among the assembled guests and leading to Scene 5.

After Lenskiï bids farewell to life in his second aria, to be discussed in detail below, Onegin arrives, and they sing a duet in a canon form of very clever construction, recalling their close friendship and lamenting the circumstances that have brought them to this point. When the master of the duel commands them to measure their paces and take aim, the melody of Lenskiï’s first aria (“I love you, O’ga”) can be heard in the flute and clarinet, although the key has been changed from an ecstatic E major to its mournful relative key of C sharp minor. Missing from the musical compound of this reminiscence motive, however, is the name of his intended: Ol’ga. The woodwinds appear to be singing: “I love you, I love you;” but who loves whom? Ol’ga certainly does not love Lenskiii. Even at the conclusion of Lenskiï’s first aria, when Chaïkovskiï gives Ol’ga some lovely harmony for the two to blend together in the final bars, he is still

---

234 A name-day is the Russian celebration equivalent to the birthday tradition, with the exception that it is observed on the feast day of the saint after whom the person is named.
singing “I love you,” while she is remarking rather prosaically on the fact that they grew up
together and were promised to each other by their fathers. Her behavior at the name-day party
has confirmed that she does not return his ardent feelings. An additional thought-provoking
quandary arises at the conclusion of Lenskiĭ’s second aria. Onegin’s tardiness to the duel is the
occasion that provides Lenskiĭ the opportunity to sing the aria. It concludes with the words: “иа
zhdu tebiа, zhelannyи drug, priidi, priidi, иа tvoи suprug (I await you, desired friend, come, come,
I am your spouse”). Following this command, Onegin appears. The timing of this command,
followed by the ambiguous echoes of “I love you” that immediately precede the duel itself,
leaves one with the sense that the composer may be suggesting that the emotions between the
two men may not be confined to defending their honor. A moment later, Onegin kills Lenskiĭ.
Admittedly, Pushkin’s verses, from which the composer culled these moments, are so arranged
that the farewell (which is a poem kept as a memento by the narrator in the novel) is not uttered
aloud to anyone and is separated from the duel by several hours. It is Chaïkovskiï who puts
these moments in juxtaposition and adds the musical compounds, generating associations and
possibilities perhaps not intended by Pushkin.

This moment represents a poetic ambiguity of the sort that Schiller himself might have
appreciated. The scene is comprehensible on the basis of its own content: two men fighting a
duel over a coquettish girl, while echoes of a love song appear in the orchestration. Recognition
of the homoerotic implication that the composer seems to add to the chronotope, as noted above,
is not necessary for understanding the scene, but for listeners sympathetic to such an
interpretation, the moment is enriched and considerably intensified. Schiller also introduced
ambiguities into his Jungfrau von Orleans, beginning with the title of the play. In his first letters
about the play and in a poem written to introduce the play to his literary audience, he used the
word “Mädchen” (“maiden”), rather than “Jungfrau” (“virgin”) as Johanna’s titular epithet. Semantically, the words are similar, but the use of Jungfrau permits associations beyond the sexual and marital condition defined by Mädchen. While remaining relevant to Johanna, Jungfrau calls to mind the Blessed Mother, from whom Johanna receives her mission, as well as the much broader and poetic associations with the ancient Greek myth of the virgin Iphigenia, who is herself under the watchful eye of the virgin goddesses Athena and Artemis. That Schiller intended his audience to accept this poetic ambiguity is confirmed by his decision to have a bust of Minerva (the Roman name for Athena) printed on the cover of the published play. Like Chaïkovskii’s poetic treatment of the duel scene in Onegin, the action of the play can be understood without seeing the symbolic associations implicit in Schiller’s title, but the awareness of these associations permits the audience to experience the deaths of Schiller’s Johanna and Chaïkovskii’s Lenskiı̆ as sublime.

In Pushkin, Lenskiı̆’s death touches the reader but fails to achieve a pathetic effect because he treats the young poet as impulsive and somewhat silly. Chaïkovskii seems to have missed some of Pushkin’s derision, observing later: “Is not the death of a highly gifted youth in a fateful encounter with the vain demands of honor deeply dramatic and touching?” (ZC II 522). He instead responds to Lenskiı̆ with a sensitivity exceeded only by that of his response to Tat’iana. Much of Lenskiı̆’s characterization by the composer suggests that he sees Pushkin’s sentimental poet as a reflection of the actual poet Vasiliı̆ Zhukovskii. The evidence for this possibility comes from the textual choices Chaïkovskii makes in constructing the libretto.237

235 See Chapter 1, p. 34-35.
236 “Razve ne gluboko dramatichna i ne trogatel’na smert’ bogato odarenogo ūnoshi iz-za rokovogo stolknoveniia s trebovaniiami svetskogo vzgliiada na chest’?”
237 Gasparov and others remark that he received “help in putting the libretto together” from the actor Konstantin Shilovskii (65). How much help is uncertain. His brother Modest states: Uchastie K.S. Shilovskogo v sostavlenii libretto, krome tserariuma, ograničivaetsia frantsuzskim i russkim tekstom kupletov Trike; vse ostal’nye vstavnuye stikhi prineadlezhat kompozitoru (“Apart from the scenario, K.S. Shilovskii’s participation in putting together the
The opera opens with the sisters Ol’ga and Tat’iana singing a duet based on a poem by Pushkin, “Pevets” (the “singer” or “bard”). This poem is not from his novel in verse, but it serves as a splendid evocation of the pastoral atmosphere with which Chaikovskiĭ charges the entire first scene. Zhukovskiĭ had coined the use of the term pevets in its Romantic sense and had applied it to himself before the composer used it for this duet. Interestingly, Modest Chaikovskiĭ makes an uncharacteristically inaccurate statement in his synopsis of the lyrical scenes when referring to the source of this text: “Iz doma slyshno penie. Ėto Tat’iana s Ol’goi pod akkompanement arfy poiut duet na tekst Zhukovskogo” (“From inside, singing can be heard. Tat’iana and Ol’ga are singing a duet to the accompaniment of a harp on a text by Zhukovskii” (ZC II 166). Modest feels the connection between this text and the style and tone of Zhukovskiĭ so strongly that he mistakes him for the author, instead of Pushkin. The moment when Chaikovskiĭ’s sympathy with Lenskiĭ seems strongest, however, occurs in the scene just discussed, when an even more striking similarity with Zhukovskiĭ arises, which also happens to be connected directly to Schiller.

Lenskiĭ’s famous farewell aria, “Chto den’ griadushchii mne gotovit?” (“What does the coming day hold in store for me?” Ex. 4.4) is one of the excerpts derived almost verbatim from Pushkin’s novel; even the frequent need to alter the perspective from third to first person is dispensed with here because Pushkin’s narrator shares the lines with us as if they were a keepsake “retained by chance” from his personal association with the dead youth (EO Canto 6, stanza XXI). The text itself seems to be something of an ironic poke at the kind of  

---

238 Cf. “Pevets vo stane russkikh voinov” (The Bard in the Camp of the Russian Warriors”), a poem written in 1812, describing his impressions of his fellow soldiers during the war with Napoleon. See Chapter Three and the discussion of “Mechty” below.
sentimentality, endorsed wholeheartedly by Zhukovskii, which made Pushkin squeamish. As Lenskiï prepares for his duel with Onegin, Pushkin casts aspersions on the younger man’s poetry, as well as Schiller’s possibly, even as he prepares to share the lines with us:

Arriving home, the pistols
He first inspected, then laid
Them again in their case, undressed
By candlelight, and opened Schiller;
But a single thought absorbed him,
Preventing his troubled heart from dozing:
In ineffable beauty
He sees Olga before him.
Vladimir [Lenskiï] closes the book,
Grabs a pen; his verses,
Full of amorous nonsense,
Resound and gush. He reads
Them aloud, with lyric ardor,
Like Del’vig drunk at a feast.

EO 6 XX

Thus, under the immediate influence of Schiller, Lenskiï pours out his feelings for Ol’ga, with verses, as Pushkin describes them “full of amorous nonsense.” Upon completing the poem, Lenskiï declaims them aloud “with lyric ardor, like Del’vig drunk at a feast.”

It is striking to compare the word choice and content of Lenskiï’s “nonsense” with a poem published earlier by Zhukovskii, which itself is a free translation of Schiller’s “Die Ideale.”

---

239 Anton Antonovich Del’vig (1798-1831), a member of Zhukovskii and Pushkin’s circle, who published poems in Vestnik Evropy and elsewhere, hosted a distinguished literary salon in Petersburg and founded the still influential Literaturnaiâ gazeta. Although Pushkin valued his literary taste and prized his friendship, he teased him for being a lazy spoiled child, lacking the discipline to produce poetry commensurate with his talent (Nabokov I 73, III 23-24).

240 Translations of these texts may be found in Appendix 4.
Blagosloven i tʹmy priхod!
[...]
A i͡a -- bytʹ mozhet, i͡a grobnit͡sy
Soĭdu v tainstvennui͡u senʹ,
I pami͡atʹ i͡unogo poēta
Poglotit medlennai͡a Leta,
Zabudet mir meni͡a; no ty
Prideshʹ li, deva krasoty,
Slezu prolitʹ nad ranneĭ urnoĭ
I dumatʹ: on menia li͡ubil,
On mne edinoĭ posvi͡atil
Rassvet pechalʹnyĭ zhizni burnoĭ!
Serdechnyĭ drug, zhelannyĭ drug,
Pridi, pridi: i͡a tvoĭ suprug!.."

O ZHiznʹ, kotoroŭu vesʹ mir i͡a napolni͡al,
Gde vy? Pogiblo vse! pogib tvoriashchiĭ genii!
Pogiblĭ prizraki volshebnyx zablushdenii!
Kak nekogda Pigionion,
S nadezhdoĭ i toskoĭ ob"emli͡a xladnyĭ kamenʹ,
Vsĭu zhizinʹsvoei dushi v sozdanie reztsa,
Tak i͡a, vospitannik svobody,
S liŭovŭi̱u, s radostnym volneniem pevt͡sa,
I mnil bezdushnuiĭ sogreĭ, odushevitʹ'! [...] PSSP I, 73

Most striking are the simlarities between the first two lines of each poem, with the sentimentalist repetition of “kuda, kuda” (whither, whither?) and the characterization of the days of youth as “zlatye dni” (golden days: Pushkin) and “dneĭ moikh...zlataĭ, bystrai͡a fantaziĭ” (my days’ golden, swift fantasy: Zhukovskiĭ). No Sentimental Romantic poem would be complete without evoking images from ancient Greece. The image Pushkin chooses for Lenskiĭ is of the river Lethe. Zhukovskiĭ’s choice (via Schiller) is Pygmalion. Both poems depict mourning the beloved at the graveside (Pushkin ranneĭ urnoĭ “the early urn”; Zhukovskiĭ’s khladnyĭ kamen’ “the cold stone” referring more metaphorically to the lifeless statue of Galatea). The speaker in Zhukovskiĭ’s poem (who refers to himself as pevets) expresses the vivid desire to breathe new life into the departed by means of his poetry, while Lenskiĭ, on the other hand, cherishes the hope that, although the world may forget him, Ol’ga will mourn his loss with similar vividness.

Pushkin makes it clear that she will not; Chaĭkovskiĭ leaves it to the audience to guess. Gasparov points out that, while Lenskiĭ’s aria in Scene Five is the “highest lyrical moment in the opera” (89), Pushkin “had crammed Lensky’s verses with the clichês of elegiac poetry and followed them with an ironic remark” (89). As with most of Pushkin’s irony, Chaĭkovskiĭ did not retain
this remark in the opera, which appears in the following stanza of the novel, along with a
fascinating aside that further reinforces the Zhukovskii connection:

```
Tak on pisal temno i vialo
(CHATromantizmorjizovom, Xot' romantizma tut ni malo
Ne vizhu ia; da chto nam v tom?)
I nakonet' pered zarei,
Sklonias' ustaloi golovoi,
Na modnom slove ideal
TIkhon'ko Lenski zadremal.
EO 6 XXIII
```

emphases Pushkin’s

The italicized word *ideal* comes on the heels of the paraphrase of Zhukovskii’s translation of
Schiller’s “Ideale.” Even the static, “ineffable” manner in which Ol’ga appears before Lenskii in
the stanza that precedes the farewell seems to resemble Galatea appearing before Pygmalion. All
this, combined with the fact that Lenskii writes his poem immediately after he has opened and
then closed a book of Schiller’s poetry, leaves the strong impression that in this moment,
Pushkin creates something of a reenactment of Zhukovskii translating Schiller’s poem.241 It
should not be construed that Pushkin had such low opinions of Schiller or Zhukovskii, and
certainly Pushkin’s own death in a duel at a young age identifies him much more graphically
with the unfortunate poet in *Onegin* than Zhukovskii’s peaceful death at an advanced age would
suggest. The point is not that Chaikovskii intends that we see Lenskii as a stand-in for
Zhukovskii. Instead, the composer responds strongly and in the full projection of his lyric
persona when he is inspired by the Zhukovskian language that Pushkin provides for Lenskii.242

---

241 Svetlana Boym observes that, in addition to Zhukovskii, the lines in Lenskii’s elegy contain references to
Karamzin, Goethe, Baratynsky, and Kuchelbekker (*Common Places: Mythologies of Everyday Life in Russia*.

242 Irina Arkhipova unconsciously confirms Chaikovskii’s particular skill in setting Zhukovskii’s words to music.
She notes in her memoirs that her acquaintance with Chaikovskii began in her childhood, when she would sing the
duet of Polina and Liza from *Pikovai dama* with her mother and continued with her conservatory graduation
recital, which included several works by Chaikovskii, namely Ioanna’s farewell soliloquy “Prostite vy kholmy”
Musically, Lenskiĭ’s farewell aria has been identified as being an important companion to Tat’iana’s “Kto ty moĭ angel li khranitel’?” The connection between the two arias is one of Asaf’ev’s “musical compounds,” binding the entire work together with such compelling power (102). It must be considered a companion and not the originator of Tat’iana’s melody because Chaîkovskiĭ makes it clear that Tat’iana’s Letter-Writing Scene was among the first four scenes that he composed (ZC II 30). In the same letter in which the composer expresses his perhaps idealized version of Lenskiĭ, he shares his similarly lofty notions of Tat’iana. (ZC II 522)

In contrast to Deva, Onegin expresses sincere, human feelings on such a personal level that some critics felt it was actually unsuitable for the stage. Present at the premiere in March 1879, in a student performance at the Moscow Conservatory, was the famous pianist Anton Rubinstein, brother of Nikolaï Rubinstein, the director of the conservatory. His reaction regarding this aspect of the opera’s ostensible unsuitability is typical: “on raskritikoval operu v pukh i prakh, glavnym obrazom nedovol’nyi budnichnost’ i libretto i otsutstviem grandioznogo opernogo stilia v muzyke” (ZC.2 II 232). Indeed, this everyday quality (budichnost’), which Chaîkovskiĭ seems to have associated with sincerity and realism, had been exactly the impression he had hoped to create. He had shared manuscripts of the earlier scenes with one of his students, Sergeï Taneev, who loved the music but was concerned about the work’s stageworthiness. In a letter of 14 January 1878, Chaîkovskiĭ answers him, providing considerable insight into his ideas about opera:

Ochen’ mozhet byt’, chto vy pravy, govorìa, chto moïa opera ne stsenichna. No ìa vam otvechu, chto mne na nestsennichnost’ plevat’. Fakt, chto u mena net stsenicheskoi

It may well be that you are correct in saying that my opera is not stageworthy. But I reply to you, that I spit on stageworthiness. I acknowledged long ago the fact that I have no

from Orleanskaià deva. Thus, the two examples cited by Arkhipova to demonstrate her lifelong fondness for Chaîkovskiĭ both derive from the poetry of Zhukovskiĭ (267).

243 “He criticized the opera to bits; mostly he was dissatisfied with the everyday quality of the libretto and the absence of grand operatic style in the music.”
zhilki, davno priznan, i ĭa teper’ malo ob ětom sokrushaši'. Nestsenichno, tak i ne stav’te, i ne igraǐte!! Ia napisal ětu operu potomu, chto mne v odin prekrasnĭ den’ zakhotelos’ polozhit’ na muzyku vse, chto v Onegine prositsĭ na muzyku. Ia ěto sdelal, kak mog. Ia rabotal s neopisanym naslazhdeniem i uvlcheniem, malo zabortĭas’ o tom, est’ li dvizhenie, ěffekty i t.d. Plevat’ mne na ěffekty! Da i chto takoe ěffekty? Esli vy ikh nakhodite, naprimer, v kakoǐ-nibud’ Aide, to ĭa vas uverĭaĭ u, chto ni za kakie bogatstva v mire ne mog by napisat’ opery s podobnym sĭuzhetom, ibo mne nuzhny lĭudi, a ne kykly. Ia okhotno primus’ za vsĭakuĭ operu, gde khotia i bez sil’nuykh i neozhidannykh ěffektov, est’ sushchestva, podobnye mne, ispytyvausche oshchushcheniə, mnoĭ tozhe ispytannye i ponimaemye. Oshchushcheniə egiptskaï̆ printsessy, faraona, kakogo-to beshenogo nubiĭtsa ĭa ne zhaĭu, ne ponimaĭu. Kakoĭ-to instinct podskaazyvaet mne, chto ěti lĭudi dolzhny byli chuvstvovat’, dvigat’ sia, govorit’, a sledovatel’no, i vyrazhat’ svoi chuvstva, sovsem kak-to osobennno, – ne tak, kak my […] Ŋo budet lozh’ , i ěta lozh’ mne protivna. […] K sozhaleniiə, ĭa ne umeĭu naïti sam nichego i ne vtrechauĭĭ liudei, kotorye mogli by natolknut’ menĭa na tako isŭzhet, kak, naprimer, Karmen Bize, odna iz prelestnĭshikh oper nashego vremeni […] Mne nuzhno, chtoby ne bylo tsarei, narodnykh buntov, bogov, marshei, slovom, vsego, chto sostavliaĭt atribut grande opera [in French]. Ia ischu intimnoi, no sil’noi dramy, osnovnoi na konflikti polozhenii mnoĭ ispytannykh ili vidennykh, mogushchikh zadet’ menĭa za zhivoe.

scenic inclination, and now I distress myself about it very little. If it is not scenic, then don’t mount it, don’t play it!! I wrote this opera because one fine day I wanted to set to music all that cries out for music in Onegin. I did this, as I was able. I worked with indescribable pleasure and enjoyment, little concerned about action or effect, etc. I spit on effects! And what are effects? If you find them, for example, in some Aida, then I assure you that I could not write an opera on such a subject for all the riches in the world, for I need people, not dolls. I would apply myself eagerly to any opera in which, although lacking in powerful and unexpected effects, there are creatures like me, who have experienced feelings that I myself have experienced and understand. I neither know nor understand the feelings of an Egyptian princess, pharaoh, or some raging Nubian. Some instinct whispers to me that these people must have felt, acted, spoken, and consequently, expressed their feelings somehow quite peculiarly – not as we do […] That would be a lie, and this lie is disgusting to me […] Unfortunately, I am unable to find anything and know no one who could acquaint me with such a subject as, for example, Bizet’s Carmen, one of the most delightful operas of our time […] I need for there to be no kings, popular uprisings, gods, marches, in a word, all that applies to the attribute grande opera. I am seeking an intimate but powerful drama, based on states of conflict experienced or witnessed by me, capable of touching me deeply.
Thus, the composer associates stageworthiness and grand opera with falsehood and sees these as unsuitable for his music. This is the same letter in which he declares his intent not to call the work an opera but lyrical scenes. It is important to emphasize that he was an early champion of Bizet’s *Carmen*, which Parisian operagoers had initially disliked for exactly the reason against which he is defending his *Onegin*. The subject was too close to ordinary life. By this point, he has completed the sketches for *Onegin* and is already looking for another operatic subject. His assertion that he distresses himself very little about stageworthiness, and grand opera, will be called into question when he eventually chooses Joan of Arc as his next operatic project. Nine months earlier, when he had just begun to work on the lyrical scenes, he had written his friend, I. A. Klimenko, explaining his attraction to its source: “*Eugene Onegin* is full of poetry. I am not blind to its defects. I know well enough the work gives little scope for stage effects; but the wealth of poetry, the human quality and simplicity of the subject, joined to Pushkin’s inspired verses, will compensate for what it lacks in other respects” (Newmarch I 203).[^244]

Pushkin’s novel in verse, from which Chaĭkovskiĭ develops his lyrical scenes, occupies a place in Russian literature unlike few works in the national literature of any other country. It is known, or claimed to be known, and admired by Russians from all types of backgrounds, who all, somehow, seem to see something of themselves in it. Belinskiĭ called it “an encyclopedia of Russian life.”[^245] Nabokov believed that went too far, but acknowledged that the range of the work was, if not unprecedented, certainly on an equal footing with the epic poetry of Cervantes or Shakespeare (I 7; III 192). Beyond its poetic richness, however, the work is acknowledged as

[^244]: 8/20 May 1877. The work from which this citation is taken is itself an edited translation of Modest Chaĭkovskiĭ’s *Zhizn’ Chaĭkovskogo*, but in compiling her work, Newmarch added some letters and materials from other sources not to be found in *ZC*. For this reason, it is designated in the Works Cited under her name.

the starting point of realism in the Russian novel, which would be developed as the nation’s primary literary movement of the nineteenth century by the subsequent efforts of Turgenev, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy. “The realism of Onegin is that peculiarly Russian realism which is poetical without idealizing and without surrendering anything of reality” (Mirsky 91). As Gasparov points out, the composer’s decision to take on this realistic subject was problematic: “an opera so close to the contemporary world, whose characters’ feelings and behavior could be recognized by the listeners as something close to their own, represented a drastic deviation from the habitual operatic domain of the fantastical, the exotic, and the historical” (64). Chaïkovskiï recognized that he faced a challenge but could not resist it. When the work was complete, he found that even in private, he was deeply touched by its effect. Although he admits that he “poses” in many of his letters, he was consistently honest – sometimes brutally so – with his brother Modest. It is possible that this honesty was engendered by their shared experience of homosexuality, but whatever the reason, when he writes something to Modest, it is usually with complete sincerity:

Vecherom vchera sygral chut’ ne vsego Evgeniia Onegina. Avtor byl i edinstvennym slushatelem. Sovestno priznat’ siia, no tak i byt’,246 tebe, po sekretu, skazhu. Slushatel’ do slez voskhischalsia muzykoi i nagovoril avtoru tys’achu ljubeznosti. O, esli by budushchie slushateli mogli tak zhe umiliat’ siia ot etoi muzyki, kak sam avtor!!

(IZ II 144)

246 Although “no tak i byt’” is a rather conventional conversational phrase, it is striking to consider that these are the very words Tat’iána sings immediately before she sings “sud’bu moi u otorne i tebe vruchai,” which is set to the theme of the “Tat’iána sequence,” further reinforcing Gasparov’s assertion that the composer felt an overpowering personal connection to this work.
The themes from Onegin, both musical and textual, arise persistently in the composer’s work throughout the composition of Orleanskaïa deva and even afterward. In Op. 47, No. 3 (1880) “Na zemľu sumrak pal” (Dusk Fell over the Earth), the “b” germ, associated with Tat’iana and Lenskiĭ is reflected in the vocal line in the step-wise descent of the piano and vocal lines, which, in refusing to resolve to the tonic, almost seems to be doing its best to avoid mimicking those themes. The clearest musical echo comes after the words “i vsë krugom tebja unylo” (and around you all is melancholy, Ex. 4.6), itself a phrase that would certainly describe Tat’iana’s state of mind at the start of the opera before she writes to Onegin. The musical line follows that of “Kto ty, moĭ angel li khranitel’?” (Who are you, my guardian angel?). Rather interestingly, the vocal phrase on the words “s ulybkoïu privet na nebo shlët ona” (she greets the sky with a smile), repeats a short interlude between Lenskiĭ’s first-act aria and Onegin’s arioso “Moĭ diadja samykh chestnykh pravil” (My uncle has most honest principles) (Ex. 4.7). Additionally, on the words “Mne grustno, kak i prezhde” (“I’m sad, just as before”), the musical setting is quite similar to the moment in the opera when Onegin comes to reprimand Tat’iana for having written him so boldly (Ex. 4.8). He sees her outpouring of emotion as an indication of her excessive Romanticism and lack of experience, and has no idea – or concern – that his response is insulting to her. In a musical aside, Tat’iana sings: “O bozhe, kak obidno i kak bol’no!” (Oh, God, how offensive and how painful!)

---

247 Nabokov I 95
The primary link between the lyrics of the song and the moments when these musical ideas are heard in the opera is the pastoral quality that pervades the opera’s first scene, which seems appropriate to these moments in the song as well. What is confirmed by the presence of these musical ideas is the strong connection binding all three characters together in Chaïkovskiï’s conception of the opera, as well as their association with the ideas expressed in this poem, a translation by Nikolaï Berg from a sonnet based on Petrarch by the Polish poet, Adam Mickiewicz (Sylvester 136).

Na zemliu sumrak pal; ne shelokhnut kusty; Twilight fell to earth; the shrubs do not stir.
Svernulis’ lilii poblékshie listy, The lily’s faded petals have folded up,
I tixo ozero pochilo.
Pod obaianiem volshebnoi krasoty,
Stoi zadumavshis': «CHto grusten nynche ty,
I vsë krugom tebi unylo?»
Poutru prikhozhu: ozhivlena rosoi,
Prosnulas' liliia, blistaia krasotoi,
I milaia, v blistaushchei odezhde.
S ulykoi privet na nebo shlet ona.
I pleshchet v ozere veslaia volna...
A ia... Mne grustno, kak i prezhde!

And the lake sleeps peacefully.
Under the spell of this magic beauty,
I stand lost in thought: “Why are you so sad?
Why does everything around you seem melancholy?”

In the morning, I return. Refreshed by the dew,
The lily awakens, glimmering beautifully
And sweetly in her bright raiment.
She greets the sky with a smile.
And a wave breaks cheerfully in the lake ...
And I?...I’m just as sad as before!

Chaikovskii, although recognized as a proponent of realism, especially in the depiction of
the scenes from Onegin, had little use for a prosaic, mirror-like naturalism. He felt, in fact, that
this approach lacked artistic merit. Interestingly, he chooses Mozart’s Don Giovanni as the sine
qua non example for this argument. In the letter already cited in connection with his idealization
of Tat’iana and Lenski, Chaikovskii writes Mrs. von Meck to reply to her assertion that
theatrical music, particularly opera, has the inherent quality of nesostoiatel’nost’
(“groundlessness” or “poverty”). The notion is tied to her sense that symphonic music and
chamber music, being less driven by programmatic schemes or dramatic plots, are more pure,
and therefore more edifying. She had formed this opinion on her own. There were many in the
nineteenth century who had reached the conclusion that much vocal music, and particularly
operatic music, was inherently false and undesirable. Unsurprisingly, many of the proponents of
this idea, mostly German, were not themselves opera composers, including Brahms and
Schumann. Chaikovskii, admitting the paradox, replies that her opinion pleases him. He goes
on to say that Lev Tolstoy shared her opinion and had personally advised him to leave opera
behind. He then refers to the scene in War and Peace in which Natal’ia Rostova attends the
opera, then becomes physically ill from what she (and, one deduces, Tolstoy) perceives as the falsity of the experience. He attributes their opinion to their having lived away from cities for so long and having devoted their time to family, literature and education. As a consequence, a person such as Mrs. von Meck or Tolstoy “dolzhen zhivē drugogo chuvstvovat’ fal’shivost’ opernoi formy” (“must feel the falsity of the operatic form more strongly than others”).248 His insistence on associating Mrs. von Meck’s opinion with the famous author is clearly designed to flatter her and sets the scene for his rebuttal, which starts off somewhat timidly, but then gains strength and conviction:

Da, i ia, kogda pishu operu, chuvstvuui sebiia stesennnym i nesvobodnym, i mne kazhetsiia, chto v samom dele, ne napishu bolee nikogda opery. Tem ne menee nuzhno priznat’, chto mnogie pervostepennyie muzykal’nye krasoty prinadlezhат dramaticheskomu rodu muzyki, i avtory ikh byli vdognovleny imenno dramaticheskimi motivami. Esli by ne bylo vovse opery, to ne bylo by Don ZHuana, Svad’by Figaro, Ruslana, i t.d. Konechno, s tochki zreniia prostogo zdravogo smysla, bessmylsenno i glup po zastavit’ liudei, deistvuuiushchikh na stene, kotoraiia dolzhna otrazhat’ deistvitel’nost’, ne govorit’, a pet’. No k etому absurdru, liudi privykli, i slushaia sekset Don ZHuana, ia ne dumaiu o tom, chto proiskhodit nechto, narushauiushchee trebovanie khudozhestvennoi pravdy, a prosto naslashdaius’ krasotami muzyki i udivliaiaus’

Yes, and when I write opera, I feel restricted and constrained, and it seems to me that I really shouldn’t write opera anymore. Nonetheless, I must admit that many first-rate musical gems belong to the dramatic species of music, and their authors were inspired precisely by dramatic motives. If there were no such thing as opera, there would be no Don Giovanni, Marriage of Figaro, Ruslan [and Ljudmila], etc. Of course, from the standpoint of simple common sense, it is senseless and stupid to force people acting on the stage, who should reflect reality, not to speak, but sing. But people are accustomed to this absurdity, and listening to the sextet of Don Giovanni, I don’t think that what is happening is something that violates the demands of artistic truth. I simply enjoy the beauty of the

248 ZC II 522.
music and marvel at the striking artistry with which Mozart was able to provide each of the six parts a distinct quality, to paint each character with bold colors so that I forget the absence of truth in the thing itself and instead am struck by the depth of conditional truth, and this delight forces my intellect into silence.

The discussion below will return to the link which the composer sensed between Tat’iana and Mozart’s Donna Anna. Before moving on to that subject, however, it seems that a closer look is needed at the connection he saw between Tat’iana and Shakespeare’s Juliet, especially since the features of this connection figure so prominently in the changes he makes to Zhukovskii’s Ioanna. Chief among the similarities is the idea that each of the heroines falls in love at the first sight of her beloved. Initially, Juliet expresses doubt that any such thing is possible. In Act I, scene iii., when her mother advises her to consider marriage to Paris, Juliet responds (words referring to love at first sight underlined):

I'll look to like, if looking liking move:
But no more deep will I endart mine eye
Than your consent gives strength to make it fly.

In Act I, scene v., when Romeo crashes the Capulets’ feast incognito, he falls in love with Juliet before she has even seen him:

O, she doth teach the torches to burn bright!
It seems she hangs upon the cheek of night
Like a rich jewel in an Ethiope's ear;
Beauty too rich for use, for earth too dear!
So shows a snowy dove trooping with crows,
As yonder lady o'er her fellows shows.
The measure done, I'll watch her place of stand,
And, touching hers, make blessed my rude hand.
Did my heart love till now? forswear it, sight!
For I ne'er saw true beauty till this night!

An important difference between the two stories is that the love of Romeo and Juliet is mutual, while the feelings between Tat’iana and Onegin, at least in the first part of the story, rest entirely on her side. Some argue that it is not clear that Pushkin’s Tat’iana actually falls in love with Onegin immediately, and with respect to the novel this may or may not be the case. With regard to Chaïkovskiï’s conception of Tat’iana, his own words in a letter to his student Sergeï Taneev affirm his conviction:


Regarding your remark that Tat’iana does not fall in love suddenly with Onegin, I will say – you are mistaken. Quite suddenly: “You came here; I instantly recognized, completely stunned and set afire, said to myself: it’s him!” Of course, she does not fall in love with Onegin because of anything particular to him. Even before his arrival, she is in love with the hero of one of her unidentified novels. Onegin had only to show up for her to endow him instantly with all the qualities of her ideal and to transfer to a living person the love, which she had nurtured as the offspring of her enflamed imagination.

(ZC II 68)

The other important feature linking Shakespeare and Pushkin – and in Chaïkovskiï’s understanding, Schiller – is the circumstances that make fulfillment of the romantic relationship impossible. Shakespeare’s famously “star-crossed lovers” are the children of two families whose “ancient grudge” forces Romeo and Juliet first into a secret marriage and ultimately into something of an unwitting suicide pact. The impossibility of love for Tat’iana is perhaps less
fatal, but no less final. It begins with Onegin’s coldness, which completely vanishes when he sees Tat’iana at the ball in Scene 6. Similar to the circumstances in Shakespeare, familial and marital demands stand in the way:

‘A schast’e bylo tak vozmozhno, ‘And happiness was quite possible,
Tak blizko!.. No suď’ba moïa So close!...But my fate
Uzh reshena. Neostorozhno, Is already decided. Incautiously,
Byt’ možhet, postupila īa: Perhaps, did I act:
Meniā s slezami zaklinaniǐ With spellbinding tears
Molila mat’; dlīa bednoī Tani Did my mother plead: for poor Tania
Vse byli zhrebii ravny... All rolls of the dice were the same...
Īa vyshla zamuzh. Vy dolzhny, I married. You must,
Īa vas proshu, meniā ostavit’; I ask you, leave me alone;
Īa znaïu: v vashem serdiç est’ I know: in your heart there is
I gordost’, i priamai chest’. Both pride and upright honor.
Īa vas liūblīu (k chemu lukavit’?), I love you (why play games?),
No īa drugomu otdana; But I have been given to another:
Īa budu vek emu verna.’ I will always be faithful to him.’

EO 8 XLVII

The significance of visual infatuation (love at first sight) and – after the manner of the Schillerian sublime – the enormous potential for pathos afforded by impossibility in a love relationship feature prominently in the Collection of Songs, Op. 38, from the above list of works composed in 1878. An examination of these songs, composed in the months before he began work on Deiva, reveals that the composer still had Onegin much in mind, as well as Romeo and Juliet and Don Giovanni. The attraction that the composer clearly felt to these themes serves as at least a partial explanation for his decision to make Schiller’s Johanna into the love-sick Ioanna, at least in the last two acts of the opera. The sense of the sublime in the songs of this collection accords with that of Schiller, albeit in varying degrees from song to song. The subject in the text of each song suffers the misfortune of falling in love with someone who is
inaccessible. Four of the six songs are from texts by Alekseĭ Tolstoĭ, which von Meck had recommended to him (ZC II 107).

The first song he composed in February 1878 became the last song in the collection. He composed the remainder through May 1878 (ZC II 168). Song No.1., Don Juan’s Serenade, comes from Tolstoĭ’s dramatic poem Don Zhuan (Don Juan), written from 1859-60 (Sylvester 113). The music is based on the rhythm of the Spanish *jota*, but without much concern for true Spanish authenticity. Although remarkably well-traveled for a Russian of his time, Chaĭkovskiĭ never visited Spain, yet his lifelong fascination with the Spain of Mozart’s Don Giovanni and Bizet’s Carmen provides an interesting analogy to his notion of the preference for artistic truth over “real life” (ZC II 522; ZC III 343; Wiley 353). With no experience of the real thing, he nevertheless believed that these works, both written by non-Spaniards, captured something that he felt reflected the artistic truth of Spanish culture. This intentional removal to a realm beyond the merely real is an essential component in the sublime aspect of Chaĭkovskiĭ’s lyric persona and convinced him that the ahistorical component of Deva was not an artistic problem.

The mise-en-scène recalls the balcony scene in Romeo and Juliet: a man standing below the balcony of his beloved raises his voice to attract and seduce her by proclaiming his thoughts and feelings. Wiley observes that the piece is in B minor, “echoing the combat music from Romeo and Juliet [and] associated with death” (197). The important difference here is that the singer, Don Juan, is addressing a loose woman named Nisetta, to provoke the indignation of Donna Anna’s father and convince her that, as Sylvester has it, “he is not son-in-law material”

---

249 Although related to Lev Tolstoĭ, the poet Alekseĭ Tolstoĭ (1817-1875) is an utterly different writer of an earlier generation. Chaĭkovskiĭ wrote more songs to his poetry than of any other poet (Wiley 499).

250 No. 6 “Pimpinella.”

251 A year earlier, Chaĭkovskiĭ seems to have gotten inspiration for the second theme (in the violins) of his Fourth Symphony’s first movement from the Carmen’s Aragonaise jota, which appears in the Entr’acte before Act IV (in the oboe).
Here, as is always the case in Chaïkovskiĭ’s conception of Don Juan, the driving force is, ultimately, Donna Anna. In spite of Don Juan’s lilting and graceful vocal line, the anxious energy of the cross-rhythm piano part – ostensibly mimicking the plucking of a guitar – reminds us that Donna Anna suffers while Juan puts on an insolent display (Ex. 4.9).

Gasnut dal'neĭ Al’pukharry
Zolotistyje kraïa,
Na prizvyvnyi zvon gitary
Vyïdi, milaia moïa!
Vsekh, kto skazhet, chto drugaia
Zdes’ ravnjaetsja s toboï,
Vsekh, tïuboviui sgoraia,
Vsekh, zovu na smertyui boï!

Ot lumnogo sveta
Zardel nebosklon,
O, vyïdi, Niseta,
Skorei na balkon
Ot Sevil’i do Granady
V tikhom sumrake nochei,
Razdaietsia serenady,
Razdaïetsia stuk mechei;
Mnogo krovi, mnogo pesnei
Dlia prelestnykh l’etsia dam, --
IA zhe toï, kto vse prelestnei,
Pesn’ i krov’moïu otdam!

The golden crests dim
on the distant Alpujarras,
To the call of my guitar,
Come out, my darling!
All who claim that another here
Can compare with you,
All who burn with love,
I challenge them all to mortal combat!

From the light of the moon
The sky glows,
O, come out, Nisetta
Onto your balcony now!

From Seville to Granada
In the silent gloom of night,
Serenades ring out,
Swordfights ring out:
Much blood and many songs
Pour out for delightful ladies –
To her, most delightful of all,
I offer my song and blood!

Ex. 4.9. “Don Juan’s Serenade” (CPSS.44:213)

(112-13)
It may be recalled that in the name-day party scene in *Onegin*, Tat'iana suffers a similar public humiliation at Onegin’s hands, when he overtly flirts with Ol’ga. This event leads to the duel with Lenskiĭ, which places both him and his poetic forebear Zhukovskii within the allegorical margins of this song. While Chaïkovskii is engaged in composing the song collection and babysitting his sister’s children, he decides to read *Romeo and Juliet*, inspired by his sister and brother’s decision to see the play in Kiev (ZC II 141). In a letter of 23 May 1878, he writes to von Meck, that he: “prochel tu samui̇u “Romeo i Iūliu, kotorui̇u oni smotreli v teatre. Totchas zhe meni̇a zasela v golovu mysl’ napisat’ operu na ētot siūzhet…Budu mnogo dumat’ o
Thus, from the outset, we see in the first song of this collection the complete representation of the Juliet-Donna Anna-Tat’iana synthesis.

Song No. 2, “To bylo ranneĭ vesnoĭ” (It was in early spring) is also by Tolstoĭ, written in 1871. The importance of eyes and love at first sight permeates the poem. The reference to a shepherd’s horn increases the idyllic mood of this poem and establishes another connection to *Onegin*. In the novel, when Tat’iana awakens after writing her fateful letter, she sees a shepherd passing by her window. Chaïkovskiĭ retained a reference to this pastoral interlude with an elaborate oboe obligato that is heard in the opera as Tat’iana awakens after the letter scene. It thus serves as a musical synecdoche for the entire chronotope of that portion of the novel and the corresponding portion of the opera. The exclamation “O schast’el!” (O happiness!) in the final stanza seems to prefigure the peculiar moment in *Deva* when Ioanna utters the same words in her fateful first meeting with Lionel’. It is peculiar for two reasons. It has no basis in either Schiller or Zhukovskiĭ, which means that Chaïkovskiĭ created the moment for his own purposes. Additionally, this is precisely the moment when her successful campaign ends, which is to say it is the moment when her happiness ends. In the song, the words are sung to passionate and rueful music that seems more appropriate to subsequent “O sley!” (O tears!) than to an expression of joy. This is because the singer is not expressing happiness with his present experience, rather he is recalling his past happiness, as well as his lost youth and former hopes, with vivid regret. As with the other texts Chaïkovskiĭ chooses for this cycle, the physical
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252 “…read that same *Romeo and Juliet*, which they were watching in the theater. At that very moment, I was struck by the idea of writing an opera on this subject. I will think a great deal about the scenario of this opera, to which I would devote all of the powers still in my reserves."
manifestation of love and loss in these poems is almost entirely by means of the eyes. The eyes glance, see, and are lowered; they close, and they weep.

To bylo rannei vesnoi,
Trava edva vskhodila,
Ruch'i tekli, ne paril znoi,
I zelen' roshch skvozila;

It was in early spring,
The grass had just started sprouting,
The streams flowed, it wasn’t yet hot,
And the groves began to show green;

Truba pastush'ia poutru
Eshch' ne pela zvonko,
I v zavitkah eshch' v boru
Byl paporotnik tonki.

Mornings the shepherd’s horn
Did not yet ring out loudly,
And in the pine grove, still enfolded
Stood the tender ferns.

To bylo rannei vesnoi,
V teni ber'ez to bylo,
Kogda s ulybkoi predo mnoi
Tya ochi opustila.

It was in early spring,
It was in the shade of the birch,
When you stood before me with a smile
And lowered your eyes.

To na l'ubov' moiu v otvet
Ty opustila vezhdy —
O zhizn'! O les! O solntsa svet!
O iunost'! O nadezhdy!

It was in response to my love
That you lowered your eyelids —
O life! O forest! O sunlight!
O youth! O hopes!

I plkal ia pered toboi,
Na lik tvoi gliadia milyi,—
To bylo rannei vesnoi,
V teni ber'ez to bylo!

And I wept in front of you,
Gazing at your sweet face, —
It was in early spring,
It was in the shade of the birch!

To bylo v utro nashikh let —
O schast'e! O sl'zy!
O les! O zhizn'! O solntsa svet,
O svezhii dukh ber'zy!

It was in the morning of our years —
O happiness! O tears!
O forest! O life! O sunlight!
O fresh smell of the birch tree!

“Sred' shumnogo bala” (“Amid the din of the ball”), No. 3, is undoubtedly the best-known song from the collection. Tolstoï based his 1851 work on a poem by Lermontov (Sylvester 117) “Iz-pod tainstvennoi, kholodnoi pulomaskii” (Behind a mysterious cold mask, 1841), which was itself based on an earlier Pushkin poem “I'Am помним чудное мгновенье” (I remember the wonderful moment, 1825). This succession of inspiration invites the observation that although Tolstoï was a close contemporary of Pushkin’s and personally acquainted with
Zhukovskii, his poetic style often explored experimental techniques that they avoided. Orlova observes that in his poetry: “neredko vstrechaiut'sya nekotorye ‘sherokhovatosti’ v izlozhenii mysli, v stile rechi. Ego iazyku chuzha ‘otshlifovannost’,’ otdelka detalей. Dlia Tolstogo tochnost’ rifmy ne iavlyalas’ obiasatelnym usloviem poeticheskogo prizvedeniya” (48). This description would not apply to Pushkin and still less to Zhukovskii, and those poems of his that Chaikovskii selects he more closely to Zhukovskii’s lyric refinement that to Tolstoi’s more experimental creations.

In “Sred’ shumnogo bala” once again, the infatuation depends largely upon the action of the eyes, and every stanza contains a visual reference describing the progress of the poet’s fascination (underlined in the text). Admittedly, this poem adds the element of the voice and laughter of the beloved as another enchanting feature, but at the conclusion, when poet recalls the “sad eyes” and “happy conversation” and wonders whether he is in love, the final recollection arises in “daydreams,” which tend to be primarily visual experiences. Tolstoi wrote the poem to describe his first encounter with his wife (E. Orlova 51). A reader armed with this knowledge might see the final lines as the start of the poet’s relationship with his wife: “Liubliu li tebya — ia ne znaui./No kazhetsya mne, chto liubliu!” (I don’t know if I love you or not/but it appears that I do!) He is perhaps a bit bemused to find himself in love, but the promise of further development in the relationship is a reasonable expectation. Chaikovskii’s wistful waltz permits no such possibility. The key of B minor, as already noted with respect to the Don Juan Serenade, was associated by Chaikovskii with death. In the case of this song, it is far too melodramatic to suggest that the association should be taken literally, but at the very least, it suggests that this

---

253 “One often comes across certain ‘rough edges’ in the exposition of the idea and the style of speech. Polish and finished details are alien to his language. For Tolstoi, rhythmic precision was not a requirement for a work of poetry.”
should not be seen simply as a sweet love song. Additionally, the waltz tune in the piano accompaniment plays a dual role in conveying the sense that this moment represents a lost opportunity, rather than the start of a relationship. The fact that it is a waltz at a ball immediately calls to mind the problem of the falseness of social behavior, which the poet suggests with the words “mirskoĭ suety” (worldly vanity) and about which the composer often complained.254 When the vocal part ends, the opening strains of the waltz return while the singer and the object of his infatuation remain strangers (mm 8-15, Ex. 4.10). In this manner, Chaïkovskiĭ subverts Tolstoi’s “meet cute” and instead projects a lyric persona who experiences a sublime dejection as the music of the waltz carries the beloved away, along with any chance of meeting. Another small, but significant feature uniting this poem with both Onegin and Zhukovskii is the reference to the shepherd’s pipe (svirel’). As noted in connection with the previous song, this pipe appears metaphorically in the orchestra when Tat’iana awakens after the letter-writing scene. The word svirel’ also calls to mind the duet with which Onegin opens: “Slykhali ‘l vy…svireli zvuk unylyi i prostoï?” (Have you heard …the melancholy and simple sound of the shepherd’s pipe?). As noted earlier, this Pushkin poem, “Pevets” (“The Bard”), is replete with parallels to Zhukovskii, suggesting his association with the character Lenskiĭ. Even the mysterious beloved bears a resemblance to Tat’iana, partially because of her “sad eyes” but especially for her “pensive expression.” Tolstoï might not have intended all these associations, but it seems plausible that Chaïkovskiĭ was attracted to the text for at least some of these reasons.

254 When Chaïkovskiĭ completed the sketches of Deva in February of 1879, he began reading Rousseau’s Confessions, in which he discovered particular sympathy with the French philosopher’s description of “nevynosimoi tiazhesti podderzhivat’ po obiazannosti razgovor, prichem radi podderzhaniia razgovora prikhoditsia govorit’ pustye slova…Bozhe moi, do chego on tonko i gluboko verno rassuzhdает ob etom biche obschestvennoi zhizni” (the unbearable burden of maintaining obligatory conversation, in the maintenance of which one is obliged to utter empty words…My God, how subtly and truly deeply he expresses this scourge of social life!) (ZC II 228).
Sredʹ shumnogo bala

Amid the Din of the Ball

Sredʹ shumnogo bala, sluchaĭno,
Amid the din of the ball, by chance,
V trevoye mirskoi suety,
Under the nervous strain of worldly vanity
Tebia ia uvidel, no taĭna
I saw you, but mystery
Tvoi pokryvala cherty.
Concealed your features.

Lishʹ ochi pechalʹno gliadeli,
Only your eyes sadly glanced,
A golos tak divno zvuchal,
And your voice resonated so wonderfully,
Kak zvon otdalʹnoĭ svireli,
Like the sound of a distant shepherd’s pipe,
Kak moria igraĭshchii val.
Like the playful breakers of the sea.

Mne stan tvoĭ ponravilsia tonkiĭ
I found your tender figure pleasant
I vesʹ tvoĭ zadumchivyĭ vid,
And all your pensive expression,
A smekh tvoĭ, i grustnyĭ i zvonkiĭ,
And your laugh, both sad and resonant,
S tekh por v moĭm serdtse zvuchit.
Echoes ever since in my heart.

V chasy odinokie noch
In the night’s lonely hours,
Liĭbliŭ iă, ustaliĭ, prilech’ —
Weary, I love to lie back –
I ľa vizhu pechalʹnye ochi,
I see those sad eyes,
I ľa slyshu vesĕluiu rech’;
I hear your happy conversation;

I grustno iă tak zasypaiŭ,
And thus I fall asleep sadly,
I v grēzax nevedomykh spliŭ...
And dream strange daydreams…
Liŭbliŭ li tebia — iă ne znaĭŭ,
I don’t know if I love you or not,
No kazhetsia me, chto liŭbliŭ!
But it appears that I do!

CPSS.44 224-27
No. 4 in the collection “O esli b ty mogla” (O, if only you could”) is less distinctive as a piece of music or poetry. It is probably sufficient merely to point out that eyes, tears, and love at first sight feature prominently again. The irretrievable passing of the romantic intrigue is once more expressed in the words: “O, esli by khot’ raz i͡a tvoi̱ uvidel lik/Kakim i͡a znal ego v schastliveishie gody!” (“O, if only I could see your face once more/ As I knew it in the happiest years!”)

Song No.5, “Liubov’ mertvetsa” (“The Love of a Dead Man”) is distinct both musically and in terms of its subject, involving the thoughts and feelings of a man who has already died. It is additionally unique because it is the only one by Lermontov in the collection. The speaker of the poem expects, quite reasonably, one must admit, that his passion for his beloved will end once he is dead. In this respect, his delusion is similar to Johanna’s, in that she expected her vow of chastity to bring an end to temptation. While love at first sight and other visual hallmarks of
the Tolstoĭ poems selected by the composer for this collections are absent here, the hopelessness
of the poet’s romance is in full evidence and intensified to a supernatural, almost macabre,
extent. A central image of the poem is the self-referential *dusha* (soul) of the poet, describing his
experience of the afterlife, akin to Dante, and the references to fire in the final lines reinforce the
sense that this “paradise” is an infernal experience for the poet. It is also important to recall that
*duscha* is the translation that Zhukovskiĭ regularly prefers for rendering what Schiller calls
Johanna’s “Herz,” and that for Zhukovskiĭ, the “state of the soul” is the means by which he
evokes “a controlled but exalted intensity of reaction to the impression of the exterior world,
enabling the subject to penetrate its ‘mysteries’” (Semenko 60). Paradoxically perhaps, the soul
in Zhukovskiĭ’s poetry is the means by which he conjures up the material world. Its appearance
here in Lermontov’s poem doubtlessly owes a debt to Zhukovskiĭ’s enormous foundational
influence. Having recently set the poem to music, Chaïkovskiĭ perhaps recognized its
prominence in *Orleanskaïa deva* when he came across the play a few months later.

**Liubov’ mertvetsa**

*Puskai khozhdnoi zemlei*

*Zasypan ia,*

*O drug! vsegda vezde s toboi*

*Dusha moia.*

*Liubvi bezumnogo tomleni,*

*ZHilets mogil,*

*V strane pokoia i zabveni*

*IA ne zabyl.*

**The Love of a Dead Man**

*Although the cold earth*

*Covers me,

*O friend, always and everywhere*

*My soul is with you.

*Love’s insane longing,

*This inhabitant of the grave,*

*In the land of peace and oblivion*

*Has not forgotten.*

*Bez straxas a chas poslednei muki*

*Pokinuv svet,*

*Otrady zhdat ia ot razluki —*

*Razluki net.*

*CHto mne siian’e bozh’ei vlasti*

*I rai sviatoi?*

*IA perenes zemnye strasti*

*Tuda s soboi.*

*Fearless in the final throes*

*Leaving the world behind,*

*I awaited comfort from separation –*

*But there was no separation.*

*What is the gleaming celestial realm to me*

*Or holy paradise?*

*I’ve brought earthly passion*

*Along with me.*
Laskaïu ia mechtu rodnuiu
Vezde onu;
ZHelaïu, plachu i revnuiu
Kak vstarinu.

I cherish an innate dream
Everywhere the same;
I desire, weep, and envy
Just as before.

Kosnêtsia l' chuzhdoe dyxan'e
Tvoix lanit,
Moia dusha v nemom stradan'e
Vsia zadrozhit.
Sluchitsia l', shepchesh' zasypai
Ty o drugom,
Tvoi slova tekut pylaia
Po mne ognom.

If another should breathe
Upon your cheek,
My soul in mute passion
Will tremble all over.
If it should happen, that falling asleep,
You whisper about another,
Your words will course over me
Like a burning fire.

No. 6, “Pimpinella,” is subtitled “a Florentine song” (Florentinskaïa pesnia), which in this case is meant quite literally. The composer became personally acquainted with a young Italian singer named Vittorio while he was in Florence in 1877 and was determined to find him again when he returned in 1878. Brown observes that “it is evident that Chaïkovskii’s sexual nature played a part” in the composer’s attraction to both the boy and his music and that “to find this captivating singer was his main aim in Florence” (Brown II 257-58). Chaïkovskii transcribed the original Italian text while the boy sang. Those words form a somewhat conventional love-song lyric, involving pleas to the beloved not to arouse the singer’s jealousy by either her behavior or appearance. Interestingly, the composer creates his own Russian verses, which are not a translation in the usual sense. He introduces the visual motif familiar from the other poems, as well as the captivating power of the beloved’s eyes, like the eyes of Lionel that captivate Johanna. Zhukovskii’s lyric “soul” is the object of the beloved’s torment. The sense of anxiety on the part of the poet, clearly a comic device in the Italian lyrics, seems more acute in Chaïkovskii’s text, which is fraught with a sense of suffering and powerlessness:
Esli ty khochesh', zhelannyaia,
Znat', chto ia v serdtsie taim;
Revnost' kakai-to strannaia
Dushu terzaet moi!  
(refix)
IA molui teiba: i vzgliadom i ulyboi
Radui menia odnogo, odnogo menia,
IA molui teiba: i vzgliadom i ulyboi
Radui menia odnogo, odnogo menia!

CHary, tebe bogom dannye,
Lish' dla menia rastocha,
I na priznan'ia nezhdanny
Gnevno, moi drug, otvecha!

Ochi tvoi tak svetly, tak prekrasny,
Krashe zdes' net litsa,
Rechi tvoi plenitel'ny, opasny,
Gubish' ty vse serdtsa!

Bu'd zhe dovol'na, zhelannyaia,
Serdsem pokorny odnim,
CHtob ne stradal neprestanno ia,
Bu'd nedostupna drugim!

If you wish, darling,
To know, what I feel in my heart;
Some strange kind of jealousy
Gnaws at my soul!
(refrain)
I beg you: with your glance and smile
Please me alone, only me,
I beg you: with your glance and smile
Please me alone, only me,

The charms given to you by God,
Lavish on me only,
And other uninvited advances
Answer angrily, my friend!
Your eyes, so bright, so lovely,
No face is more beautiful,
Your words are captivating, dangerous,
You destroy all hearts!

Be content, darling,
With one vanguished heart,
So that I won't suffer ceaselessly,
Be unattainable to others!

Shortly after composing the last song in this collection, he writes von Meck and sends her a copy of it. He also writes to thank her for the recommendation of the Tolstoĭ poems, particularly the selection from his dramatic poem Don Zhuan for the serenade that begins the collection. A few days later, perhaps still thinking of Don Juan, he wonders about von Meck’s dislike of Mozart. He acknowledges that Mozart’s music may not seize the imagination in the same way that Beethoven’s does, but:

IA bogtvoriu ego. Luchshaia iz vsekh kogda-
libo napisannykh oper - dla menia Don
Zhuan […] Pravda, chto Motsart zakhvatyvает
ne tak gluboko, kak Betkhoven; razmakh ego
menee shirok. Kak v zhizni on byl do kontsa
dnei bespechnym rebenkom, tak i v muzyke
ego net sub’ektivnogo tragizma, stol’ sil’no i
I idolize him. For me, the best opera of all
ever written is Don Giovanni […] True,
Mozart does not seize one as deeply as does
Beethoven; his range is less broad. Just as in
his life he was a careless child to the end of
his days, so does his music lack the subjective
tragic element that is so forcefully and
Brown has taken note of the composer’s attraction to this type of character: a “significant strand running through Tchaikovsky’s work – and one which invariably lifts the level of his inspiration, sometimes to its greatest heights – is that of the suffering woman, almost always young and vulnerable, and almost always innocent – or, at least enduring torments far greater than her failings” (II 320). In the case of Tatiana and Donna Anna, there seems to be evidence that even the composer’s musical conception of Pushkin’s heroine is influenced by her Mozartean older sibling.

The spooky chromatic sequence in the Overture to Don Giovanni seems to have some similarities with the Tatiana sequence (Ex. 4.11). Mozart’s chromaticism extends along an
octave, exploring nearly every pitch of the dodecaphonic sequence as the motive initiates one step – half-step or whole- – higher with each repetition.\footnote{“Dodecaphonic” because of the twelve pitches that occupy the scale between notes an octave apart.}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{ex_4_11}\caption{Ex. 4.11. Mozart, Overture to \textit{Don Giovanni}}
\end{figure}

The Tat’iana sequence, on the other hand, as an expression of Chaikovsky’s lyric romance technique, confines itself to the range of a sixth and consists primarily of a descending motive (see Ex. 4.2). Not long after the initial quotation of this sequence in the brief overture to \textit{Onegin}, an additional link to the \textit{Don Giovanni} overture crops up in the orchestral accompaniment to the subsequent duet between Tat’iana’s mother and her nanny. After singing a brief canon on the words “Privychka svyshne nam dana” (“Habit is sent to us from above”), the mother reminisces almost in a stream of consciousness about the trappings of her youth (“the corset, the visitor’s album, Princess Paulina, the notebook of sentimental verse!”), accompanied by flute with the clarinet echoing each statement (Ex. 4.12). As with the Mozart motive, each time it repeats, it rises a step higher, and as it does so over the ensuing six measures, it explores every pitch of the dodecaphonic sequence. At the end of the duet, before the entrance of the chorus of peasants, this motive is repeated once more in the string basses, modulated to a minor key to prepare for the new key in which the chorus will be sung, bringing the musical idea even closer to the mood of the chromatic sequence in the overture to \textit{Giovanni}. 
Apart from the overture, the other moment in Mozart’s opera when this music is heard is at the appearance of the supernaturally animated statue of Donna Anna’s father, the Commendatore, and many listeners would probably argue that this theme ought to be associated with him. It is important, however, to consider why he has come. Don Giovanni has invited him to dinner in an act of astonishing insolence, and so he has come. A statue, of course, cannot eat or drink; his real purpose is to avenge the notorious liberine’s treatment of the Commendatore’s daughter from beyond the grave. Thus, the composer’s sense of the centrality of Donna Anna’s character to the Mozart opera seems to be reflected in his decision to place Tat'iana more centrally in the lyrical scenes. Furthermore, the association seems to have inspired the music for one of the most potent of Onegin’s musical compounds.

By this point the examples of the projection of the composer’s lyric persona are perhaps sufficient to establish its features. Something of the same would seem necessary for the projection of the epic persona. The Piano Sonata in G seems to have been Chaïkovskii’s attempt
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256 Although Mozart’s Don Giovanni is connected to Byron’s Don Juan in name only, it is interesting that many critics see connections between the English poet’s novel in verse and Pushkin’s Evgenii Onegin. Schmidgall goes a step further: “Numerous important themes in Onegin and Tchaikovsky’s opera are prefigured in Don Juan” (222). Pushkin himself said that Don Juan “has nothing in common with Onegin” (Nabokov I 72).
to create a large, important solo work for the instrument in the manner of Beethoven, Schumann, or Liszt (Wiley 195). Wiley in fact cites the first movement of this sonata as an example of the composer’s poor taste and misguided technique. He particularly faults the interpolation of the medieval plainsong *Dies irae* toward the end. Chaîkovskiï “frequently alluded to other music and admitted it, but allusion is ambiguous in a piece this pretentious. The effect of quoting the Mass for the dead, bellowed out with accents at the approach of the final cadence, forces a distinction between loftiness and kitch, an ambiguity writ large across the Sonata which may speak to [his] state of mind at the time” (Wiley 196). It should be noted that the complex manifestation of the epic persona should not be construed as resulting in exclusively bad or forgettable music. The fault in the sonata is not with the Requiem tune itself apparently, for he had previously used it to better effect in the “Marche funèbre” (from *Six morceaux, composés sur un seul thème*, Op. 21, No. 4) in 1873, the construction of which Wiley calls “vision-like” (119), and in the “New Greek Song” (from *Six Romances*, Op. 16, No. 6) in 1872, cleverly serving as an allusion to the dedicatee’s impending conversion from Catholicism to Orthodoxy (114). In this respect the *Dies irae* crops up as a musical idea in the composer’s lyric and epic personae. Similarly, his use of the imperial anthem, which is effective and largely tasteful in the “Slavonic March,” comes across somewhat more bombastically when he employs it three years later in the “Ceremonial Overture 1812.” The aesthetic shift from one persona to the other, therefore, cannot be explained by musical ideas alone.

This chapter’s epigraphs are intended to suggest something of Chaîkovskiï’s aesthetics with regard to *Deva*, and likewise function to connect the composer’s lyric and epic personae to Schiller’s philosophical perspectives. They are from Schiller’s “Vom Erhabenen” (“On the Sublime”), in which he formulates his theory of the sublime as the experience of being
confronted by something frightening and then overwhelming the cause of the fear either mentally ("the contemplative sublime") or morally ("the pathetically sublime"). The experience of the contemplative sublime consists in choosing to regard the fear as either unfounded or not posing an immediate danger, "an abyss appearing at our feet, …a mass of rock looming over us as though it were about to plunge down on us… ferocious or poisonous animals" (NA.20 187). For many people, simply thinking about such things causes anxiety, which Schiller argues must be confronted by distinguishing between a danger that is actually present and a danger that arises purely from its contemplation. The pathetically sublime, on the other hand, demands that we sympathize involuntarily with the suffering of another, while retaining the consciousness of our independence from the cause of the other person’s suffering. While both types of sublime experience play a role in ordinary life, the latter type has its more proper place in the experience of the theater. Although Schiller would revisit the issue of the sublime in later writing, the basic defining components of contemplative and pathetic fears would remain the same. The aspect that would change in his later essays is the role of human will. In the epigraphs for this chapter, from an article written in 1793, the implication is that rational thought frees one from the bondage of physical needs. Two years later, he reconsiders the relationship of the sensuous and the rational in his Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung. In that work, he concludes that reason – if carried to its logical end without recourse to the moderating influence of humane sympathy – ultimately has as much destructive potential as uncontrolled physical passions, a conclusion he reached in observing the excesses of ideological zeal that followed the French Revolution. Because of those excesses, he proposes that these two drives, Stofftrieb and

257 “Ein Abgrund, der sich zu unsern Füßen aufthut,…eine Felsenmasse, die über uns hängt, als wenn sie eben niederstürzen wollte, …reissende oder giftige Thiere”
258 See Chapter 1 pp. 78-82 for a fuller discussion of this work.
Formtrieb (or “the instinctive impulse” and the “intellectual impulse” respectively), must be compelled to interact by the operation of what he calls the Spieltrieb (“the impulse to play”). The Spieltrieb represents the human ability to moderate physical impulses and excessive rationalization by distinguishing between moral and aesthetic choice. For Schiller, the most effective means for confronting these choices is active engagement in literature, poetry, theater, and all the pursuits that qualify as art. Although there is no overt evidence that Chaïkovskiï read these articles, we will see below that the ideas he expresses in his letters to Mrs. von Meck often reveal a very similar thought process.

Schiller returns to these questions, specifically as they relate to poetry, in Über naïve und sentimentalische Dichtung. In that work, he argues that ancient Greek poetry (in which he includes drama) had more vitality and freshness because the Ancient Greeks were closer to nature, and he encapsulates both their poetry and their culture in the word “naïve.” Modern poets, on the other hand, cannot escape consciousness of themselves or of the expectations of society – itself an artifice – and consequently he terms their sensitive, intellectualized poetry “sentimental.” In the final portion of the work, he proposes that, although modern society as a whole will never recapture the natural connection the Greeks felt toward their surroundings, naïve and sentimental types of people still exist, but that we now consider them respectively Realists and Idealists. Although these types are inherently inclined to view the world in opposing ways, each has the capacity to seek a common ground. Based on the conclusions of the contemporaneous Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung, it seems reasonable to argue that Idealists and Realists must seek the mediating influence of something like the Spieltrieb in order to achieve a balanced approach to life and art.
The first epigraph (“We are only dependent as sensuous beings; as rational beings we are free.”), representing an intermediary and incomplete aesthetic formulation, provides a possible perspective for the questionable approach Chaîkovskiĭ took toward his art at the time he decided to compose an opera on the subject of Joan of Arc. The creation of *Onegin*, an opera to be found in the repertoire of opera houses throughout the world, had begun before his marriage crisis. In it, we see his aesthetic idealism tempered throughout by humane realism, or the projection of his lyric persona. Although at moments he seems to want to place Tat’iana on a pedestal, Lenskiĭ on a cloud of lyricism, and Onegin in a vault of icy indifference, he finds numerous ways to restore each to the sphere of human interaction. In *Deva*, on the other hand, the often brilliant music fails to delineate the characters as believable people. This failure is arguably a fault it shares with a great deal of grand opera, but it leaves one wondering why Chaîkovskiĭ would have been attracted to this genre in the first place.

The second epigraph, (“When we find ourselves in actual danger, when we confront a natural adversarial power; then our aesthetic judgment is done for”), in the context of Chaîkovskiĭ’s biography, would seem to refer to one of the most disruptive events of the composer’s life: his disastrous marriage. He had initially entertained the idea of marrying as early as 1876, and even tried to convince his homosexual brother Modest of the wisdom inherent in such a course of action (Wiley 99). Days after the wedding, however, he experienced a nervous collapse, and his family insisted that he would only improve if he got away from his wife. Mrs. von Meck provides the financial means to facilitate his travel. He writes to thank her:

ÎÁ edu cherez chas […] Esli îa vyîdu pobeditelem iz ubiîstvennoî dushevnîbor’by, to budu ètim Vam obïazan, Vam, I’m leaving in an hour […] If I emerge victorious from this murderous spiritual struggle, then I will be endebted to you for this, to you, and only you. In a few more
iskliuchitel’no Vam. Eshche neskol’ko dnei, i, klianus’, ta by s uma soshel.

(CPM I 45)

Curiously, in the throes of this struggle, he manages to produce *Onegin*, a work for the theater in which he makes use of his most successful compositional techniques in the full projection of his lyric persona. It seems possible to suggest that his confrontation with a truly frightening situation had the impact – in Schillerian terms – of summoning the *Spieltrieb* in order to reconcile the *Formtrieb* and the *Stofftrieb*. In other words, the crisis activated his “impulse to play,” in order to reconcile his initial intellectual decision to marry with his instinctive impulse to reject it.

Chaïkovskiï seems to have a finely tuned sense of the sublime, one that is to a considerable extent in accord with Schiller’s. For him, at least during this period of his creative output, his sense of the sublime is almost entirely concerned with the experience of hopeless or unrequited love. His sensitivity to the sublime potential of hopeless or unrequited love becomes clear in his sympathy for the character of Donna Anna in *Don Giovanni* and, in the same mode, very likely informed his creation of Tatiiana and his determination to give prominence to her character, as well as Lenski’s, in the opera. The sublime potential of hopeless love also seems to have drawn his attention to *Romeo and Juliet* during this period, which can be seen not only in the sketches he creates for an opera on the subject, but in the corresponding moments in the cycle of romances from 1878. Admittedly, when Chaïkovskiï reads *Orleanskaïa deva*, the salient features of sanctity that Schiller imparted to his depiction of Johanna had already been diluted by Zhukovskiï’s translation, primarily by the Russian poet’s tendency to portray Ioanna’s strength as deriving from supernatural sources, rather than from her will. Chaïkovskiï’s inspiration, saturated with the personalities of Donna Anna, Juliet, and Tatiiana, leads him even farther
afield. As sublime as the predicaments may be in which these three heroines find themselves, the means by which each overcomes her fate does not call to mind the Schillerian conception of sanctity. Juliet perhaps comes closest: she chooses death rather than to be separated from Romeo. Her choice, however, cannot be called selfless. She acts entirely in her own interests, without any regard to the consequences for her loved ones. The retribution that Donna Anna seeks against Don Giovanni is, on the other hand, selfless, for she wishes to prevent him from harming other women, but this retribution is not hers. The supernaturally animated statue of her father is the avenger who drags Giovanni off to hell. Additionally, her relationship with Don Ottavio, which is apparently the goal to which she, her father, and Ottavio have committed themselves throughout the opera, is anything but extraordinary. It is a model of bourgeois respectability. The same can be said of marital fidelity, for which Tat’iana rejects Onegin, which is why, although we may experience sublime pity for her earlier in the opera, her situation also fails to produce any association with sanctity. For Romeo and Juliet, Don Giovanni, and Eugene Onegin, this omission is of no consequence. None of these stories depends upon sanctity for their dramatic impact. The dramatic and aesthetic impact of Schiller’s Jungfrau von Orleans, conversely, demands the sense of sanctity. Although Zhukovskii’s translation begins the watering down process, Chaïkovskii’s incorporation of elements from the stories of Juliet, Donna Anna, and Tat’iana serves to obliterate it.

His correspondence with his patroness Nadezhda von Meck often provides many illustrative and thought-provoking details on Chaïkovskii’s works in progress and his opinions on a broad range of subjects. In some of these letters, he reveals thought processes that would not be out of place in Schiller’s philosophical works. Nadezhda Filaretovna von Meck (1831-1894) was unlike almost any other woman of her time (Brown II 309). She had urged her
husband to compete for a concession in the early days of the railroad, and the investment eventually developed into one of the largest railroad empires in Europe. She and the composer exchanged twelve hundred letters over fourteen years, but they chose never to meet. On very rare occasions, they discovered themselves in the same theater or street, but behaved as though they were strangers (Brown II 224). It would seem that there were many reasons for this unusual arrangement, but the intent was to permit their correspondence to remain on a purely platonic level. This is not to suggest that they did not also often discuss family affairs and more mundane matters, but the complete absence of physical interaction permitted each of them to treat such matters in the idealized atmosphere of one-sided thought, without the deflating intervention of prosaic reality that comes with face-to-face conversation. Brown says this about the correspondence: “Her letters themselves are flowery, rambling, contain a good deal of nonsense, and reveal a thoroughly muddled, sometimes unbalanced mind quite incapable of distinguishing fact from fiction. At times their emotional pitch is heightened to a degree which verges on hysteria. His, conversely, even when he was writing on something on which his own thoughts were not clearly defined or digested, are lucid in exposition and argument. He was thoroughly aware of his reader – at times too aware of what she wanted to read; while her insincerity was guileless, he could plead less innocent intent” (II 225-26).

Poznansky has a somewhat more generous attitude toward Chaïkovskii’s patroness:

Besides her knowledge of music, which she had studied seriously in her youth, her letters to Tchaikovsky reveal her wide familiarity with literature and history, her mastery of foreign languages (including Polish), and her capacity for appreciating the visual arts. She read such philosophers as Arthur Schopenhauer and the Russian nineteenth-century idealist Vladimir Solovyov and often entered
into by no means trivial philosophical discussions, and she could make clear and perceptive judgments on matters of politics. This is not to say that Mrs. von Meck was a paragon of lofty intellectualism. She attained such a level only infrequently and her arguments could betray naivety and even banality. Yet, a general impression of their correspondence makes it possible to marvel at the ethical, spiritual, and mental compatibility of the two correspondents. (196-97)

It was certainly an unusual relationship, brought to an even greater apex of peculiarity by Chaikovskii’s marriage and subsequent reconsideration.

In his letters to his brothers just after deciding to leave his wife, expressing his frustration at his rash choice to marry in the first place, he refers to his wife as “the serpent” (Poznansky 324), “the reptile” (322) and at least once “the bitch” (298). Her characterization of him, on the other hand, is much more flattering.259 Undoubtedly, this discrepancy is in large part due to the circumstances in which she was writing. She had been asked by the Saint Petersburg newspaper, Peterburgskaia gazeta, to provide her recollections after her husband’s death in 1893. They published her detailed recollections in 1894. According to Poznansky, they constitute the “first important published accounts relating to the biography of the composer” (111). If she harbored any bad feelings toward him, she had evidently decided that it was better to keep them to herself.

In 1877, when his relationship with von Meck was only a little over a year old, Chaikovskii revealed a subtle appreciation for the line between the representation of truth and an escape from reality. He was in Venice, one of several places in which he carried on his composition of Onegin. In a lengthy letter written over two days, 29-30 November/11-12

259 Poznansky quotes these epithets from letters that Modest did not include in his Life and Letters (ZC), which is one of my two primary Russian-language sources. He cites them as follows: serpent Pis’ma k rodnym (Letters to Relatives) Ed. V. Zhdanov, Moscow, 1940, 496; reptile Pis’ma k rodnym, 488; Complete Collected Works, 1953, 7:551 bitch Pis’ma k rodnym, 402; Complete Collected Works, 1953, 7:242 (partial).
December, among a number of other topics, Mrs. von Meck had compared her response to music to the enjoyment of a bottle of sherry. Chaikovskyi finds this an unacceptable analogy, and replies on 5/17 December:

In your letter there is only one thing with which I could never agree – it is your opinion on music. I am particularly displeased by your comparison of music with intoxication. It seems to me that this is false. A person resorts to wine to deceive himself, to create for himself the illusion of satisfaction and happiness. And this deception comes at a cost! The reaction can be horrible. But no matter what, wine allows one, it is true, to forget one’s troubles and sorrows momentarily – and only that. And is this really how music acts? [...] It illuminates and makes one glad. To seize and investigate the process of musical enjoyment is very difficult, but it has nothing at all in common with intoxication. In any case, it is not a physical phenomenon. It stands to reason that the nerves, consequently, are material organs and participate in the perception of a musical impression, and in this sense, our body enjoys music, – but of course it is well known that drawing a sharp distinction between a person’s material and spiritual sides is very difficult: and of course thought is also a physiological process, because it belongs to the functions of the brain. However, this is all a matter of words. However differently we may explain the significance of musical enjoyment to ourselves, one thing remains without doubt – that you and I love music equally strongly.

After this disquisition, he goes on to address his opinion of her philosophy on the inherent qualities of good and evil in human nature, with which he agrees. Whether he drops his
argument about the sharp distinction between being drunk and enjoying music because he knows it will not please Mrs. von Meck, or because he is unsure whether she will grasp the subtlety of his argument, is unclear. What is striking is his discernment of the interweaving of the physical and spiritual processes in music and the resemblance of this idea, despite his sense that he has not yet fully developed it, with Schiller’s notion of the *Spieltrieb*, which is the operation that compels the instinct and the intellect to interact. This discernment is significant to the aesthetic discussion here, because it suggests that while he was composing *Onegin*, his aesthetic approach was very similar to Schiller’s fully developed notion of the *Spieltrieb* from *Ästhetische Erziehung*. Taking this point one step further, the projection of the composer’s lyric persona can be seen as akin to Schiller’s *Spieltrieb*, while the projection of the epic persona, prominent in the composition of *Deva*, seems to stem from an overreliance on something akin to Schiller’s *Formtrieb*.

Of the many differences between *Onegin* and *Deva*, Chaïkovskii’s involvement in the creation of the libretto is not one. In both operas, he served as his own librettist and drew a great deal of the text from their literary sources. In the case of *Onegin*, 570 of the one thousand lines of the libretto are lifted directly from Pushkin’s novel in verse. The portion of Zhukovskii’s translation that appears in Chaïkovskii’s Joan of Arc opera is smaller: 424 of 1002 lines. While this is a significant difference, it seems to be less important than the sources themselves. Pushkin’s *Onegin*, however much it may owe its inspiration to Byron, is not a translation; it is Pushkin’s creation. Chaïkovskii’s *Onegin* opera is, in many ways, radically different in tone and mood from Pushkin’s novel. Whereas Pushkin’s novel is by turns light or profound, ironic or
heartfelt, Chaïkovskii’s opera is almost unrelentingly sincere and somber. The exuberance of the peasant dances and the liveliness of social life in the ball scenes never completely dispel the fatalism that pervades most of the orchestral score and almost all of the solo and ensemble lines. The stark emotional contrast between the music in the choruses and that of the ensembles reinforces a theme of the opera, which is that the excitement and elegance of social life provides a false and misleading perception of reality. Only the sincere exchange of feelings in a private interaction can expose emotional and spiritual truth, the revelation of which, in turn, is often painful.

Before finally deciding to take up the subject of Joan of Arc for his next opera, Chaïkovskii seriously considered several other projects. He began revising his earlier Undina, based on Zhukovskii’s free rendering of la Motte Fouqué’s Undine, indicating his continued interest in the Russian poet (Brown II 320). The point to which Chaïkovskii seems to have been especially sensitive is Zhukovskii’s ability to express yearning for lost love and the desire to hold on to the pain of the loss rather than to reconcile oneself to it. Schiller would have recognized the purifying effect that such suffering produces as the experience of the sublime, the evocation of which he often identified as the poet’s primary task. Semenko identifies this quality as an important change the poet makes even in his translation of Goethe’s poem “An den Mond” (49). Eventually, however, Chaïkovskii decides against this subject and writes to his brother Modest in May 1878: “Prosti meni, moĭ milyĭ i bednyĭ librettist za to, chto iə darom promuchil tebía nad Undinoĭ. Chert s nei s eito Undinoi! … kak ěto glupo i poshlo…” (ZC II 143). The strength of his response seems to arise from his frustration with the fairy-tale aspects of the
subject, which is perhaps more familiar to contemporary audiences in the version of Hans
Christian Andersen’s “Little Mermaid.”

Elsewhere in the same letter, as he had already done with von Meck, he reminds Modest
of his incidental reading of Romeo and Juliet. Modest seems to have expressed reservations
about the subject, and the composer wants to dispel them:

Konechno, ia budu pisat’ Romeo i Juliet. Vse
tvoi vozrazheniia unichtozhaetsia pered tem
vostorgom, kotorym ia vozgorelsiia k etому
siuzhetu [...] Nichego net bolee
podkhodiashcheego dlia moego muzikal’nogo
kharktera. Net tsarei, net marshei, net
nichego, sostavliaiushchego ruintinnuiu
prinadlezhnost’ bol’shoi opery. Est’ liubov’,
liubov’, liubov’ [...] Pervyi liubovnyi duet
budet sovsem ne to, chto vtoroi. V pervom
vse svetlo, iarko; liubov’, ne smushchaema
nichem. Vo vtorom – tragizm. Iz detei,
bespechno upivaiushchikhsia liubov’iu,
Romeo i Julii sdelal’sliud’mi,
liublashchimi, strazhdushchimi, popavshimi v
tragichestkie i bezvykhodnoe polozhenie.

Of course, I’ll write Romeo and Juliet. All
your objections are annihilated in the face of
the burning ecstasy that feel for this subject
[...] There is nothing more appropriate to my
musical nature. No kings, no marches,
nothing that belongs to the usual routine of
grand opera. There is love, love, love [...] The first love duet will be nothing like the
second. In the first, all is bright and colorful;
love undisturbed by anything. In the second –
tragedy. Romeo and Juliet are transformed
from children carelessly intoxicated by love
into suffering lovers, who find themselves in
a tragic situation from which there is no
escape.

Hopeless love is undoubtedly one of the most prevalent of operatic subjects and cannot be
adduced as the distinctive theme that unites Chaikovskii’s work on Onegin and Deva. He
continues to ponder the possibilities of Romeo and Juliet for several months, eventually
sketching out the first of the duets mentioned in the letter above.263 Just before he returns to
Moscow to resume his duties at the Conservatory, he writes von Meck to say that he is still
“captivated by Romeo and Juliet, but in the first place, it is terribly difficult, and in the second,

263 This duet was finished and published posthumously by his student Taneev in 1893 (Wiley 466).
Gounod’s opera on this subject, although mediocre, nonetheless frightens me” (CPM I 458). After this, little more is heard about that idea. It is strange that a subject which he had seen as natural to his gifts only two months before has now become “terribly difficult.” One wonders whether the fear of having his work compared to Gounod’s perhaps lurks behind the “mediocre” assessment. The next major event in the composer’s life, the break with the Conservatory, follows shortly and consumes the next several weeks of his life. When, a few months later, he takes up the subject of Joan of Arc for his next opera, it seems that the image of Juliet, joining with those of Donna Anna and Tat’iana, will remain with the composer, adding the motifs of poison and the kiss before dying to those of love at first sight and hopeless romance to his list of operatic prerequisites, and perhaps explaining some of the changes which Chaïkovskiï makes in Deva, often to the apparent detriment of Schiller. Most significantly, the anxiety he experiences during this time seems to affect his aesthetic judgment, provoking the projection of his epic persona.

With regard to quitting the Conservatory, the composer reveals a number of impressions associated with this time, seemingly fleeting, but potentially significant to the epic mode of composition he will follow with Deva. En route to Moscow, he spends a few days in Petersburg, where he encounters Cossacks patrolling the streets and troops returning from the Russo-Turkish war, drawing from him an atypical foray into political commentary: “My perezhivaem uzhasnoe vremia, i kodga nachinaesh’ vdomyvat’siia v proiskhodiaschchee, to strashno delaetsia” (CPM I 477). He observes that the “disgraceful” terms of the truce (pozornogo mira) to which the Russian government agreed resulted from its failure to act quickly and that thousands of young

---

264 “ochen’ pleniàet menià, no, vo-pervykh, êto uzhasno trudno, a vo-vtorykh, Guno, napisavshiî na êtot siuzhet posredstvennuî operu, vse-taki pugaet menià.”
265 “We are living through a terrible time, and when you begin to think about recent events, it makes you frightened.”
people were sent off to their deaths for a lost cause. This situation is made worse by the masses’ indifference: “ravnodushnai͡ a ko vsemu, pogri͡ azshai͡ a v ėgoisticheskie interesy massa, bez vsiakogo protesta smotришчаи na to in a drugoe” (477).266

Somewhat like his decision to marry, his desire to leave Moscow and the Conservatory is at first a vague feeling, quickly becoming unbearable only after he is faced with the practical reality of his circumstances: “I arrived in Moscow with one very firm conviction: to leave here as soon as possible.” Later the same day: “I came to Moscow with revulsion, sorrow, and an uncontrollable, invincible desire to break away from here to freedom.”267 The moment that he fears above all else is explaining his decision to the director of the Conservatory Nikolaï Rubinshteĭn, both because he has many reasons to be grateful to him and because the director has revealed an explosive temperament in the past. Chaïkovskiĭ writes to von Meck on 4 September about his resolution; it is critical that she support his decision, both emotionally and financially. However tedious he may find his position at the Conservatory, it is his sole source of steady income, apart from unpredictable and sporadic royalties. After months of letters exchanged at intervals of no longer than three or four days – and usually shorter – over two weeks go by before he finally receives a telegram on 19 September, followed by a letter the next day inviting him to stay in her townhouse in Moscow until he is ready to leave, and explaining that the delay had been caused by her move from Paris to San Remo. Emboldened by her support, he speaks to Rubinshteĭn, who, to his great surprise, offers no resistance (493).

266 “the masses, wallowing in their selfish interests, indifferent to it all and regarding each without the slightest protest.”
267 “I̲A v’ekhal v Moskvu s odnim ochen’ tverdym ubezhdieniem: uekhat’ otsiuda kak mozhno skoree.” “I̲A priekhal v Moskvu s otvraschheniem, s toskoi i s neuderzhimym, nepobedimym zhelaniem otsiuda vyvat’sia na svobodu.” (CPM I 479, 481)
Perhaps the most significant of his remarks associated with this period are his impressions of a performance of his own opera *Vakula the Smith*.268 This had never been one of his favorite works. In listening to it with two more years of experience composing, he seems to have reached some conclusions about its shortcomings:

Gospodi, skol’ko neprostitel’nykh oshibok v etoi opera, sdelannykh ne kem inym, kak mnoiu! S sdelal vse, chtoby paralizovat’ khoroshee vпечатление vsekh teh mest, kotorye sami po sebe mogli by naravntsia, esli b ia bolee sderzhival chisto muzykal’noe vzdokhnovenie i menee zabyval by usloviia stsenichnosti i dekorativnosti, svoistvennoi opernomu stil’iu. Opera vsia splosh’ stradaet nagromozhdeniem, izbytkom detal’i, utomitel’noi khromaticnosti i garmonii, nedostatkom okruglennosti i zakonchennosti otdel’nykh nomerov […] IA ochen’ chutko soznaiu vse nedostatki opere, kotorye, k sozhaleniu, nepopravimy. No iz novogo proslushaniia, ia prines khoroshii urok dlia budushchego. Mne kazhet sia, chto Evgenii Onegin – shag vpered.

(CPM I 516)

The break with the Conservatory serves as a biographical reference point, but it seems that it is merely a coincidental event. The fear of confronting Rubinshtein turns out to be unfounded.

The more substantial fears that he carries with him as he leaves are those of Russia’s disinterested masses, of an increased and possibly misplaced dependency on Mrs. von Meck, and of the need to make changes to his operatic style. The last of these fears is probably the strongest of them. The curious aspect of his conclusions about *Vakula* is that, although he sees *Onegin* as a step forward, at the same time, he seems to sense a need to emulate the more theatrical and

---

268 Written in 1874 and first performed in 1876 (Wiley 465). The performance cited above took place in Petersburg on 28 October 1878 (CPM I 515-16).
decorative elements of grand opera, the very qualities he rejected in creating his lyrical scenes. This appears to be an example of the phenomenon Schiller observes in “Vom Erhabenen” of aesthetic judgment being left behind in the face of actual danger, and by extension the overrationalized working of the *Formtrieb*.

From Petersburg, he heads to the familiar environs of his sister’s estate in Kamenka. There, in November he finds himself once again thumbing through the pages of a volume of Zhukovskii’s poetry. He informs von Meck: “mena nachinaet sil’no manit’ odin novyi opernyi siuzhet, a imenno Orleiskaia deva Shillera.” Initially, he is concerned with getting his hands on a copy of the libretto for a Joan of Arc opera by the French composer Mermet and mentions that he is already familiar with Verdi’s *Giovanna d’Arco*, which he considers *do kraïnosti plokh* (“extremely bad” 180). Schiller’s sources on Joan of Arc were limited, but by the late 1870’s, Europe had developed a fascination with her. As a result, Chaïkovskiï was inundated by a nearly overwhelming variety of representations of her life: in literature, painting, drama, and opera. After he relocates to Florence, von Meck sends him a copy of Henri Wallon’s *Jeanne d’Arc* (1860), which he gratefully acknowledges as a “wonderful edition” and “well-written” also, “but with too obvious an intent to convince the reader that Joan truly was in the company of archangels, angels, and saints” (*ZC* II 195). Its index includes a list of literary and musical works about Joan of Arc, as well as two excerpts from Mermet’s opera, which he does not recommend, singling out that opera’s angel chorus as *donel’zi a plokh* (“impossibly bad” *ZC* II 195). Given Chaïkovskiï’s decision to include a chorus of angels in his opera, his criticism of

---

269 “A new subject for an opera begins to lure me powerfully, Schiller’s *Maid of Orleans*, to be precise” 20 November 1878 (*ZC* II 180).

270 “Ona chudnai kak izdanie. Napisana ona zhe khotia i khorosho, no so slishkom ochevidnym namereniem uveriat’ chitateli, chto Ioanna i v samom dele vodilas’ s arkangelami, angelami i sviatymi.”
the representations of Verdi, Wallon, and Mermet must perhaps be read as a determination to succeed where they had failed.

When he has already been working on the opera for about a month, he goes to Paris to seek the scores and libretti of the Mermet and Gounod versions of Joan. While there, he sees Gounod’s *Polyeucte*, based on the life of the eponymous saint and with the same librettist as that composer’s *Jeanne d’Arc*. He finds it unbelievable that the composer of *Faust* could produce such drivel: “Nevozmožno otritsat’, chto *Faust* napisan esli ne genial’no, to s neobyčajnym masterstvom i ne bez znachitel’noi samobytnosti” (ZC.II 203).271 His estimation of *Faust* was by no means an impulsive, fleeting impression. In April of 1892, when he was commissioned by the private Priŭannishnikov Opera to conduct three operas, along with Rubinshteĭn’s *Demon* and his own *Onegin*, he included *Faust* (Poznansky 545). Perhaps his respect for that opera explains his decision to incorporate elements from the Gounod-Barbier Joan of Arc opera, primarily the inclusion of a chorus of angels.

Chaĭkovskiĭ works on *Orleanskai͡a deva* from November 1878 to August 1879, a nine-month period, which he begins and ends as a guest of von Meck (ZC II 255). As with *Onegin*, he confides to her many details about his creative process. His choice to pursue the subject, as was also the case with *Onegin*, presents him with the significant problem of not having a complete libretto. Although he borrows ideas and effects from Barbier and Mermet, he ultimately finds their libretti unsuitable and develops the libretto “bol’she vsego u Zhukovskogo” (“mostly from Zhukovskiĭ” CPM I 620). He eventually settles upon a process of creating a scene of libretto on one day, which he sets to music the next. At one point, von Meck recommends that he simply order a libretto from Russia. The composer replies that he cannot because he has almost two acts

271 “It cannot be denied that *Faust* is written, if not with genius, then with unusual craftsmanship and no small amount of originality.”
completed. Additionally, he argues that talented writers come to see their work as sviatynia ("a shrine"), charge too much for their services, and object to having their work altered for theatrical purposes. While he believes that he could probably find a mediocre writer to do it: "ia sdelaui ne khuzhe ikh" ("I will do no worse than they would" CPM II 639). To his brother Modest he confesses that the effort is like a kind of "creative fever." Despite his criticism of Wallon's style, noted above, he reveals a response to the description of Joan's trial, condemnation, and execution as depicted there, which drastically affects his plan for the opera:

The last few days were spent in a very powerful creative fever. I have gotten to work on The Maid of Orleans, and you can't imagine, how difficult it's been for me. That is, the difficulty comes not from the absence of inspiration, but on the contrary, from its too powerful force. (I hope you won't accuse me of being conceited!) I am possessed by a kind of raving; for three whole days I've been tortured and torn by the fact that there is so much material and so little time or human strength. I'd like to get everything done in one hour, as sometimes happens in dreams. My fingernails are nubs, my stomach is a mess, in order to sleep I've had to increase my servings of wine. Reading the book N[adezhda] F[iloretovna von Meck] gave me (a magnificent edition, costing at least 200 francs), when I reach the trial, condemnation, and the execution itself (she screamed horribly the whole time, when they led her out, and begged them to cut off her head, and not burn her), I bawled terribly. I was suddenly so sick and sorry for humanity, and overwhelmed by inexpressible sadness.

272 It is of passing interest that wine enters into the discussion, given the prominence of its effect in the disagreement the composer had with von Meck on the operation of music, but his use in this instance is consistent with his earlier argument that it serves to allow one to escape from unhappiness or distress.
Along with this, I suddenly imagined that all of you were sick or dead, and that I was such a little wretch (just as though I had been viciously banished here), etc. Well, in a word, my powerfully aroused nerves needed a paroxysm [...] I’m constantly reworking the libretto and still can’t put together a decisive scenario. There is much that I like in Schiller – but I confess, his disregard for historical truth troubles me somewhat. If you are interested to know which scene I’ve just written, then I can tell you. It takes place at the court, beginning with Ioanna’s entrance; first, she recognizes the king, who wanted to test her and ordered Dunois to pretend to be him, then her narration, then an ensemble and a loud ceremonial finale. (emphasis Chaïkovskiǐ’s)

The composer’s letter offers many points to consider. First, it shows that he felt that he could not follow Schiller’s plot to the end, because he found the actual historical account so moving. His description of the emotions which he felt in reading Wallon’s account of the execution is remarkably similar to the sublime effect that Schiller argues is the reason that we derive enjoyment from tragedy. This situation is ironic because the composer’s response is precisely the stimulus that causes him to reject Schiller’s version of Johanna’s death. The power of his response causes him to prefer historical truth to artistic truth, which directly contradicts the argument he has made previously that artistic truth is always superior.²⁷³ He chooses to abandon the aesthetic approach that he has maintained in the projection of his lyric persona, admired in the works of Mozart, Bizet and others, in favor of its opposition, the epic persona.

²⁷³ One notes with regret that the composer did not seem to come across the Zhukovskiǐ’s own opera scenario while conducting his research (see p. 193).
In the dramaturgy of the libretto, Al’shvang identifies three primary mistakes: 1) the telescoping of the character of the vacillating Burgundy into Lionel, which has the result that Ioanna falls in love not with an enemy soldier but with a comrade-in-arms; 2) the removal of the Black Knight and his warning against continuing to fight, which eliminates the element of hamartia, or Johanna’s tragic mistake; and 3) the introduction of the angel chorus, which he compares, unfavorably, to a deus ex machina (484–85). To Al’shvang, Johanna’s love for the English knight Lionel in Schiller forms a critical component in the drama, a more severe crime than her broken vow of chastity. Al’shvang fails to note that much of the text from the Montgomery scene in Schiller is also given to Lionel, but as presented by Chaikovskii, these lines are sung before Lionel changes sides, thereby consistent with Al’shvang’s argument. In fairness, once the composer decides to prefer historical truth to artistic truth, it makes sense to eliminate the Romantic appearance of the Black Knight, although Al’shvang is correct in saying that this reduces the “mystic tendency” of Ioanna’s realization of her mistake (483). He also argues, convincingly, that having Lionel change to the French side confuses the operation of the vow of chastity itself within the opera. The audience is left with the impression that her affair with Lionel is the crime for which she is being burned at the end, although why the English would take the trouble to burn her for this crime is not at all clear. Conspicuously absent from the libretto is Talbot, Schiller’s sympathetic anti-hero, as well as Schiller’s Isabeau, the Dauphin’s villainous mother, whom Zhukovskii had already partially eliminated from his translation. Dropping these villains drastically reduces Ioanna’s vulnerability, or the sense of any real enemy or danger, further mitigating the plausibility of the finale. The appearance of the angels to announce Ioanna’s redemption as she burns also seems ineffectual to Al’shvang,
although for Schiller’s part, the invisible *deus ex machina* at the end of his play is an important component in his recasting of the story as a kind of Greek tragedy.

A point that seems to receive no attention, but which is of considerable importance to the interpretation of the opera in these pages, is its connection to some of the themes in *Romeo and Juliet*. As noted above, the composer had been seriously considering writing an opera on that subject when he came across Zhukovskii’s translation of Schiller. The notion of love at first sight and the impossibility of the relationship are already present in Schiller’s *Jungfrau*. What is missing are the elements of poison and the lovers’ kiss before dying. The strong desire to include these elements may offer another explanation for the composer’s decision to alter the relationship between Ioanna and Lionel. In the denunciation scene in Act III (No. 20), despite the fact that the chronotope is based on Schiller, Chaïkovskiĭ provides nearly all of his own text for the ensemble. This partly results from the inclusion of Lionel in this sequel to the French king’s coronation, which would have been unthinkable in his Schillerian incarnation as a hostile English knight. Although the impetus for this scene is consistent with Schiller’s original, Ioanna’s denunciation by her father Tibo for her supposed witchcraft seems to be tinged with something else. Four of the principal characters – Ioanna, Tibo, Diănua, and Lionel – sing about poison in various guises. For Diănua and Lionel, whose vocal parts follow the same text: “i ðad obidnogo somnen’ia im serdtse slaboe pronik” (“and the *poison* of offensive doubt penetrates their weak hearts” CPSS.37 360-61). For Tibo: “O kak uzhasno ðad tletvornyǐ v neǐ dushu padshuiu mutit” (“Oh, how terribly the fatal *poison* within her disturbs her fallen soul” (360-61). For Ioanna: “Soiuz bozhestvennyi navek narushen! V krovi gorit liubovnyi ðad” (“The union with God is ruined forever! My blood boils with love’s *poison*” (362-62). Unlike that of *Romeo and Juliet*, the poison here is metaphorical, but it is a metaphor chosen by Chaïkovskiĭ himself.
Ioanna kisses Lionel after he dies at the end of Act IV, scene i. (No. 22), which further strengthens the thematic relationship with Shakespeare’s star-crossed lovers. In a moment that could never have happened in Schiller, Ioanna and Lionel end their duet on the words: “Schast’em blesnul iz mraka tuch svetlyĭ luch lĭubvi!” (“From clouds of gloom, happiness shone the bright light of love!”) (436) The angel chorus appears abruptly and declares Ioanna a sinner for having broken her vow, with assurances that captivity and death now await her. To make matters worse, trumpets announce the imminent arrival of English troops, who rush onto the stage and surround the lovers. Lionel attempts to defend Ioanna but is killed. Before the English put Ioanna in shackles, she sings: “Primi poslednee lobzanie moe! I zdhi menia, svidan’e blizko!” (“Take my last kiss! Wait for me, our reunion will be soon!” 443). Thus, the sequence of deaths is the same as in Shakespeare: first the man, and later the woman. In Act V, scene iii in Shakespeare, thinking Juliet is dead, Romeo takes poison with his famous line: “Thus with a kiss I die.” Although Juliet eventually kills herself with Romeo’s dagger, she first tries to poison herself with the remnant of poison on Romeo’s lips by kissing him. Romeo and Juliet’s fatal kiss is followed by the approach of the Capulet guards, much as the approach of the English troops precipitates Ioanna’s farewell kiss. The composer’s perception of the suffering woman is so clouded by the images of Juliet, Donna Anna and Tat’iiana that he creates an impossible and illogical moment for Ioanna.

When the opera premiered in 1881, except for the first act, according to Modest, it was received coolly. The critics were generally unkind, but the “first-place prize for attack” belongs to Tzezar’ Kiui, whose review he quotes at length (ZC II 385):

Dazhe pozabyf o vysshikh opernykh zadachakh i primeniαia snishkoditel’skuiu merku k opera kak k prostomu predlogu vokal’noi muzyki Orleanskaia deva v

Even if one forgets about the higher aims of opera and accepts a condescending approach to opera as a simple pretext for vocal music, in its thematic respects The Maid of Orleans
tematicheskom otnoshenii slabeĭshe proizvedenii ČHaĭkovskogo. Tem malo, a te, kotorye est’, bestsvetny, banal’ny, bezlichny, a kotorye poluchshe, te napominaïut Aida, Fausta, Wil’gel’ma Tellia, Gugenotov, Proroka [...] V othoshenii garmonizatsii Orleanskaïa deva tozhe predstavliaet znachitel’noe oskudenie fantazii kompozitora.

Kiūi reserved praise only for the opening chorus of Maidens, which is discussed below, and for the composer’s orchestration. His aim was obviously to convince the public of the opera’s failure. Considering Chaïkovskiï’s intention to produce a work that would appeal to popular tastes, however, it must be admitted that he succeeded in emulating nearly all of the composers who appealed to those tastes. As illusory as his effort may have been, the discussion below will demonstrate that in projecting his epic persona, he created a grand opera reminiscent of its most admired practitioners.

Of all the composers mentioned, Gounod, and particularly his Faust, stands out in Kiūi’s criticism. It will be recalled that Chaïkovskiï “feared” Gounod’s treatment of Romeo and Juliet, respected his treatment of Joan of Arc, and revered his setting of Faust. Musically, several motives bear an unmistakable resemblance to the oblique inspiration of Gounod’s Faust, especially to Marguerite’s arpeggiated vocal line in the heroic trio finale of that opera (“Anges purs, anges radieux,/Portez mon âme au sein des cieux! /Dieu juste, à toi, je m’abandonne!” Ex. 4.13). Chaïkovskiï’s incorporation of organ music into the coronation scene (No. 20) calls to mind the scene in the church in Faust. The grand hymn “Tsar’ vyshnykh sil” from Act I (No. 6) and, above all, the severe chorus of the angels that appears in Act I, reprised by Ioanna in Act II, during the “Rasskaz Ioanny” (“Ioanna’s narration”) show the influence of Gounod (Ex.4.14). The redemption achieved by the heroine at the end of both operas is almost lost in the onslaught
of impressions surging forth simultaneously from the other principal singers, choruses, and the orchestra, although why one would want to emulate such theatrical ambiguity is an open question. Admittedly, two of the three examples just cited – the coronation and Ioanna’s narration – derive from Zhukovskii’s play, thus the influence of Gounod is probably unconscious on the composer’s part. The third example, the Act I hymn, is entirely the composer’s invention, and so pleased is he with the melody of the hymn that he reprises it in the intermezzo between the first and second acts, for which Brown observes, there is no “very compelling dramatic justification” (48).

Ex. 4.13. Gounod Faust, Finale, Marguerite: “Ange pûr”

Since music criticism always depends on taste and style, a truly objective assessment of the opera’s music is impossible. Brown’s analysis of the opera, although dismissive, offers the possibility of observing that the opera’s most effective moments are those consistent with the projection of the composer’s lyric persona. Brown quotes from the letter to Taneev cited above, in which the composer dismisses all the routine elements of grand opera, and concludes that: “in describing what he did not need, Tchaikovsky could have been talking about The Maid of Orleans” (II 61, emphasis Brown’s). Regarding changes such as those noted above, he remarks that “as a piece of coherent, serious drama Tchaikovsky’s scenario is … irredeemably flawed”

274 In fairness to Gounod, it must be allowed that this is entirely consistent with the almost fleeting redemption of Gretchen at the end of Goethe’s Faust, part one.
(45). He finds Verdi’s *Giovanna d’Arco* more “crisply dramatic,” with much more “psychological insight” than Chaïkovskii’s opera. “Certainly the dialogue is efficiently dispatched, but there is a cumulative impression of melodic parsimony. Only rarely in this flow of musical prose does some memorable phrase raise itself above the general level as a lyrical or dramatic landmark to give point to the listener’s journey. The paucity of inner drama and lack of thematic distinctiveness are by no means compensated by positive qualities in the opera’s numerous ensembles” (49). Given Brown’s willingness to provide objective, if not blunt, criticism of the opera’s flaws, it is interesting to take note of those moments in the opera that he sees as effective and to consider the qualities they have in common. What emerges here is that three elements seem to reflect the projection of the composer’s lyric persona, even in this opera: 1) lines borrowed directly from Zhukovskii; 2) music based on folk song; 3) dance music. It is important to explore how various moments correspond to these elements.

In Act I, Brown identifies three moments that contain “some positive things” (51). The first is the Maidens’ Chorus (No. 1) which opens the action. The chorus here is very similar to the opening of Mermet’s opera, from which the composer’s brother confirms this scene is borrowed (ZC II 258). As they dance, the maidens sing about the oak tree that Chaïkovskii’s libretto indicates should be on the left side of the stage, opposite a chapel with an image of the Blessed Mother. This arrangement is exactly as indicated in Zhukovskii’s stage directions. The appearance of the maidens and the text they sing, however, are inspired only obliquely by Zhukovskii’s translation of Schiller. In the translation, Ioanna’s father Tibo and Raîmond, the man he wants her to marry, merely discuss the pagan customs and traditions associated with the tree, which Schiller calls the “Druid tree” (line 93) and is identified in the transcripts of Joan’s trial as the “Fairies’ tree” (Champion 152). In the libretto, Chaïkovskii adds the direction: “As
the curtain rises, the maidens are decorating the oak with garlands” (21). The type of dance is not indicated, but the folk-like quality of the music strongly suggests a khorovod, precisely the type of singing dance used by the composer in Scene 1 of *Onegin* and common in Russian opera. Brown observes that this music “places the locale not in France but Russia; nevertheless, one forgives this geographical ineptitude when offered such an enchanting example of that species of female chorus whose origins lay deep in Glinka’s art” (51). This khorovod and the subsequent scene in the opera serve to heighten the dramatic tension created by Tibo’s suspicions of his daughter’s motivations. In the play, Thibaut expresses his concerns to Raimond that Johanna spends so much time at this tree in her presence, but she seems unaware that her father actually believes her to be in league with the devil until he denounces her at the coronation in Rheims. In a manner consistent with many other choices which he makes in constructing the libretto, Chaïkovskiï decides to make the moral dichotomy merely implied by the chapel on the right and the tree on the left much more straightforward by having Tibo express his concerns to Ioanna directly, adding this line for emphasis: “Opomnis’, Ioanna, strashnoi karoï/tebi nezhdanno pokaraet gospod’” (“Come to your senses, Ioanna, the lord will punish you unexpectedly with terrible retribution” (40). He also decides to omit the gypsy helmet and Thibaut’s vision of Johanna enthroned from Schiller, two elements used to considerable effect in Verdi’s *Giovanna d’Arco*. The addition of the khorovod, then, comes at a price, but its basis in Zhukovskiï and its folksong and dance qualities add a lyric quality to the opera.

Brown calls Ioanna’s farewell aria (*Prostite vy kholmy polya rodnye*, “Farewell, you native hills and fields,” No. 7) a “piece of some musical substance” (52). It is probably the work’s most familiar number. 275 Once again, he sees the music as more Russian in quality than

---

275 Perhaps better known by its French title “Adieu, forêts.”
French, but: “Its pathos is unfailing, while the firmness of the melodic line, already displayed in Joan’s first phrase and well maintained throughout the succeeding pages, ensures that pain is matched by resolve” (53). The text is taken verbatim from Zhukovskii, albeit with some cuts, and judging from Brown’s commentary, it seems that the composer achieves a moment of sublime lyricism in this aria that is in accord with Schiller’s vision of Johanna and true to his own compositional technique.

In the translation, this soliloquy continues with Ioanna recalling the pronouncement of her mission by a divine voice from within the tree. Later in the court of the Dauphin, she identifies this voice as the Blessed Mother’s. Chaîkovskii lifts most of this text verbatim from Zhukovskii’s translation of the Prologue soliloquy, but decides to have an angel chorus sing it, instead of Ioanna. The text of play itself suggests an angelic presence:

Mne obeshchal Nebesnyi izveschchen’e,   Heaven promised me a sign,
Ispolnilos’... i shlem seǐ poslan Im.   And it was fulfilled…this helmet was sent by Him.
Kak brannyi ogn’, ego prikosnoven’e,   Like the fire of battle, its touch brings with it
S nim muzhestvo, kak bozhiĭ xeruvim...   Bravery, like God’s cherubim…

As noted above, the composer dispenses with the helmet mentioned in these lines, replacing it with a sword. In Zhukovskii, the voice from the tree says:

\[
\text{Voz’mesh’ moǐu ty oriflammu v dlani} \quad \text{You will take the } \text{banner} \quad \text{in hand}
\]

In Chaîkovskii, the angels sing:

\[
\text{Ty mech voz’mesh’ i oriflammu v dlani} \quad \text{You will take the } \text{sword} \text{ and } \text{banner} \quad \text{in hand}
\]

The revelation by Joan’s voices of a sword to be found in a previously unknown location is based on testimony from her trial. Joan of Arc requested that a sword be brought to her from the Church of St. Catherine of Fierbois, about which no one had previously been aware (Champion
63). Schiller eventually also brings this up in his play when Johanna reaches Chinon. The decision to replace the helmet with the sword seems consistent with the composer’s attempt to simplify the presence of symbolic imagery, in this case, in favor of historical accuracy. Brown observes that the melody of the angel chorus is one of the few attempts by the composer in this opera to employ the reminiscence motives (or musical compounds) that he had used so effectively in *Onegin*.

Ex. 4.14. *Orleanskaia deva* Angels’ Chorus

The melody in the soprano line will return when the Archbishop in Chinon reports on Ioanna’s miraculous appearance on the battlefield (No. 14) and again in the same scene, when Ioanna reveals her mission to the court (No. 15). Brown criticizes the composer’s use of these repeated themes: “they are so explicit that their dramatic point is unmistakable; indeed their bluntness often makes them seem trite” (48). In any case, Zhukovskii’s text inspires the composer to employ a compositional technique associated with *Onegin*, albeit with limited success.

Brown commends the composer’s attempt to infuse what he sees as a more appropriate national color in the Chorus of Minstrels (No. 16) that opens the second act, saying that it “self-consciously attempts to confirm its location by employing the French song *Mes belles amourettes*”
It would seem that the idea to begin Act II of the opera with minstrels and dancers occurs to the composer because of a comment Dunois makes at the beginning of Act II in the play:

Diunua. \hspace{1cm} Dunois.
On okružhen tolpoĭ shutov; He is surrounded by crowds of jesters;
V krugu svoikh bespechnykh trubadurov In the circle of his carefree troubadours
Zabotitsia razgadyvat' zagadki He concerns himself with asking riddles
I lish' piry daet svoei Agnese. And only gives feasts to his Agnes.

PSSP. VII 239 (450-53)

Lucinde Braun identifies the tune as a *brunette* (Ex.4.15), which is an anonymous French contredanse melody intended for private entertainment, probably dating back to the sixteenth century (451). It had appeared in a collection of French tunes transcribed by Jean-Baptiste Weckerlin and published by G. Flaxland in 1853, later reprinted several times by Durand. Chaïkovskiï had included a shortened version of the tune in his “Detskiĭ al’bom” (“Children’s Album”), a collection of easy solo piano pieces published in 1878, which he composed in imitation of Schumann’s *Kinderalbum* (Wiley 198-99). The piece is No. 16 in that collection and titled “Starinnaia frantsuzkaia pesenka” (“Mélodie antique française”).

Ex. 4.15. “Old French Melody” *Children’s Album*

---

276 The French compiler’s name is spelled “Wekerlin” in French publications.
Braun surmises that its place in the piano collection potentially afforded listeners familiar with the album – which was indeed popular – an opportunity to recognize a familiar French feature in the scene that opens Act II of Deva: “Während Weckerlins Sammelbund in Russland kaum noch in Umlauf gewesen sein dürfte, gab es sicher Opernbesucher, denen Čajkovskijs Kinderalbum bekannt war […] Zumindest in Russland dürfte das Alte französische Liedchen bis jedem durchschnittlichen Klavierschüler ein Begriff sein, so dass bei einem Rezipienten der Oper ein Wiedererkennungseffekt eintreten kann” (452). Braun also notes that, despite the existence of a traditional French text associated with the tune, Chaïkovskiï created a completely new text in Russian that expresses a different poetic conception, as well as a new narrative perspective, as is demonstrated in its first two stanzas:

\[\text{[Music notation image]}\]

(CPPS.52 158-60)

277 “While Weckerlin’s collection could scarcely have been in circulation yet in Russia, there were certainly operagoers to whom Chaïkovskiï’s Children’s Album was familiar […] In Russia at least, every mediocre piano student would have had some notion of the Old French Melody, so that a reminiscence effect would result for a spectator at the opera.” Braun’s spelling of Chaïkovskiï’s name follows the German transliteration system.
Où êtes-vous allées
Mes belles amourettes?
Changerez-vous de lieux
Tous les jours.

Puisque le ciel le veut ainsi,
Que mon mal je regrette,
Je m’en irai dans les bois
Conter mes amoureux discours.

Where have you gone
My lovely little sweethearts?
You will change your place
Always.

Since heaven wills,
That I regret my error,
I will go into the woods
To tell the story of my loves.

Weckerlin 73-75

Begut goda i dni
Bessmennoï cheredoï̆u,
Ternistoï̆ stezëi k mogile
Vsĭak speshit.

Years and days run by
In changeless sequence,
Along the thorny path to the grave
Each one hurries.

(melodic refrain repeats)
Stezĭa ne daleka,
Mogila pod goroĭu,
No mnogo na puti sud’ba nam
Bed darit.
I lish’ odin tsvetok vol’shebnyï̆
Nam v uteshen’e nebom dan:
Siloï chudnôi i tselebnoï̆
Poln divnyï talisman.

The path is not long,
The grave is under the mountain,
But along the path fate
Presents us many sorrows.
And a single magic flower
Is granted us by heaven’s consolation:
A miraculous and healing power
Fills this wondrous talisman.

CPSS.37 152-55

Where the French text seems like an example of illicit love poetry fairly typical of the
Renaissance, Chaïkovskiï’s version presents an elegiac lyric, consistent with the melancholy
mood of Zhukovskii’s translation of Gray’s Elegy (Cf. Chapter 3). Unlike the amorous first-
person message of the French text, the Russian text initially conveys a morbid third-person sense
of life’s vanity. At the end of the subsequent verse, the text reveals the name of the magic
flower: this wondrous talisman is love. Consistent with the Zhukovskii’s elegiac style,
Chaïkovskiï uses several archaisms in his text: stezĭa (“[life’s] path”), vsĭak (“each one”).
Similarly, the references to the grave (“mogila”) and the wondrous talisman (“divnyï talisman”)
are in keeping with Russian romanticism, while the magic flower (‘vol’shebnyï tsvetok’) even calls to mind the “blue flower” of Novalis, itself a potent symbol of the German romanticism that informed most of Zhukovskii’s aesthetic. In addition to supplying verses that are evocative of Zhukovskii’s style, Chaïkovskiï incorporates them into an appropriately French musical setting that is furthermore entirely in accord with the melancholy, defeated mood of the court of King Charles, who is love-sick for his consort, Agnes.

Chaïkovskiï changed the tune in his album in two ways from the form as it appears in the French collection. He repeats the first eight bars as a kind of refrain and leaves out a four-bar bridge that modulates in Weckerlin’s setting from the minor key to the major key on the words: 

\textit{Je m’en irai dans les bois/Conter mes amoureux discours.} Presumably, he did this to keep the piece technically simple, since it was intended for children. In the so-called “Minstrel Chorus” of the opera (Ex. 4.16), he includes the additional refrain (bars 11-15), but also restores the key change on the words “siloï chudnoï” (“a miraculous power”) from G minor to G major (bars 19-23), as in the original Weckerlin version, adding an introductory counter-melody on the oboe in the first six bars.
Ex. 4.16 Minstrel Chorus, Act II. (CPSS.37 152-55)
Although the chorus is appropriate in both mood and style, Braun asserts that the Renaissance tune within the operatic context also demonstrates a striking juxtaposition of reality and fiction: “Aber es ist zumindest ein werkexterner Bezugspunkt vorhanden, eine Spur, die man weiterfolgen kann und die zur Entdeckung der ‘realen’ und nicht bloß ‘fiktiven Präexistenz,’ wie sie bei drameninhärenten Volksliedern oft vorliegt, führen kann ” (452-53).278 Seen from this perspective, Chaïkovskii’s minstrel tune signifies a moment when the “real” Renaissance coexists with the “idealized” Renaissance of the opera.

This tune must have appealed enormously to Chaïkovskii because it seems that even before he uses it in the opera, he makes use of a variation on the tune for the middle movement

---

278 “It exists, however, as a reference point outside the work, a trail, which one can follow further and which can lead to the discovery of the ‘real’ and not merely ‘fictitious pre-existence,’ as is often the case with inherently dramatic folksongs.”
of his Violin Concerto, which he composed with the help of his student Iosef Kotek in spring of 1878 (Brown II 263-65). The label the composer gives to this movement, *canzonetta*, invites one to consider it a song. If we compare the first five bars of the violin solo (Ex.4.17) with the first nine bars of the French tune as used by the composer in the *Children’s Album* (Ex. 4.15), the fact that the two are in the same key of G minor is striking. The difference in meter and rhythm is a bit more problematic. The piano arrangement is in 2/4 time, while the concerto movement is in 3/4. If we think of the concerto melody as a variation of the French tune, and consider that a beat has to be added in each measure for a 3/4 variation on a 2/4 tune, we can see that the D to G leap in the French tune is followed immediately by an eighth-note run back up to the D an octave higher. The only difference in the *canzonetta* is that the melodic line pauses after the leap for the length of two eighth notes before making its run up to the D. The remainder of the line in the French tune seems to gravitate one pitch above and one pitch below the dominant (D) for several bars before descending to the dominant an octave lower. Arguably, Chaïkovskiï approximates the same idea by having the violin sustain the D for three beats, followed by a trill on the D, and then a turn, culminating with a slight lift to F before resolving to D, and making the octave leap downward again. An important difference that the composer perhaps uses to mask the similarity is that the pitch below the dominant is raised a half tone to C sharp in the concerto, giving the line a more modern chromatic intonation than the C in the French tune. If one accepts this interpretation, the melody becomes a bridge spanning the entire period of composition in question, beginning with the concerto in March, continuing with the *Children’s Album* in May, and culminating with the opera at the end of the year (Brown II 263, 277; III 16).
Another interesting realization that arises if one accepts this interpretation is that it calls into question the frequent complaints from critics about the national character of Chaïkovskii’s music. Brown argues that, with the exception of the Minstrel Chorus, too much of Deva is suffused with music that sounds extremely Russian, rather than more appropriately French. Of Ioanna and Lionel’s duets, he complains that the “all-pervasive chromaticism…pronounces these lovers more Slav than Gallic” (57). The assumption that music can be distinctly national in character is a pervasive idea, albeit one that Dahlhaus finds “precarious” (38). Writing about the song sources of the composer’s symphonic music, Al’shvang asserts that nationalist characteristics gave Chaïkovskii and other Russian composers’ music its aesthetic grounding in the turbulent 1860’s:

V burnuïu ēpokhu shestidesi͡atnikov, kogda pul’s obshchestvennoï zhizni bilsia uskorenno i trevozhno, vernym kriteriem krasoty i sily realizma dla khudozhnika bylo narodnoe tvorchestvo. Dlia kompozitorov takim kriteriem byli starinnye russkie krest’ianskie pesni i pliaski, a takzhe natsional’nye ēlementy muzykal’nyx kul’tur drugikh narodov. Ėto pridavalo muzykal’nym proizvedeniam i kharakternuïu natsional’nuiu okrasku i silu obobshcheniia, In the tumultuous era of the 60’s, when the pulse of social life accelerated and became more alarming, popular creative output became the true criterion of the beauty and power of realism for the artist. For composers this criterion was ancient Russian peasant songs and dances, as well as national elements of other peoples’ musical cultures. This is what gave musical works their characteristic national coloring and broad power, accumulating and overflowing in
Thus, when Brown and others accuse the composer of supplying music of an inappropriate national character, they simultaneously imply that such music is somehow manifestly false as artistic expression. With this mind, it is interesting to note what Brown has to say about the melody of the violin solo in the second movement (canzonetta) of the Concerto. He pronounces it the “most consistently and wholeheartedly melodic Tchaikovsky had composed since the Andante cantabile of the First String Quartet…this canzonetta breathes a melancholy as deeply Russian as the folk-based quartet movement of seven years earlier” (265). Indeed, this melody is, as argued above, also folk-based, but it is seems to be a product of the French folk, not Russian. In fairness, the harmonization that Chaĭkovskiĭ provides for this tune is different from the French original, and it is possible that the harmony is where the “deeply Russian” melancholy of the melody breathes. Perhaps when Brown complains that, even in the French tune in the opera, the composer could not “silence his national voice,” he was unconsciously associating the tune with the sound of the canzonetta (51). The point here is not to cast aspersions on Brown’s analysis, but to consider the possibility that national character in music has much in common with Chaĭkovskii’s sense of truth. It exists not in the stark reality of the musical notes but in the artistic vision of the composer.

Brown points to three other moments in the opera that are worthy of note: Ioanna’s narration of her mission to the court in Chinon (No. 15), and Ioanna and Lionel’s duets in Act III (No. 17) and Act IV (No. 22). In each case, the degree to which the libretto relies on Zhukovskii’s translation of Schiller seems to inspire the composer to more effective music. The narration scene contains the moment when Ioanna recognizes the Dauphin, despite having never
seen him before. This is a chronotope that derives from history, and is retained in the versions of Joan of Arc by Shakespeare and Schiller. Brown pronounces it “the finest stretch in the whole opera” (59). Of the two duets, he says that they “cannot be charged with dullness” (54). Between them, however, the latter duet “lacks the expansiveness of Tchaikovsky at his best,” while the earlier one contains “much worthy of admiration in his handling of this evolving dialogue, from the plangent C minor music to which Joan admits the weakening of her lethal intent towards Lionel to that gentle, wondering phrase in which Lionel confesses the spell Joan’s femininity is weaving for him,” and in the phrase that signals the transition to the formal duet, there is a “quiet blend of warmth with pain” (58). It is no surprise that the duet found lacking is based on entirely original material with no connection to Zhukovskii or Schiller. This final duet seems to be the unfortunately logical conclusion of the mistake, identified above by Al’shvang, of having Lionel become Ioanna’s compatriot, removing the obstacle of patriotic loyalty from their potential romance.

The earlier duet, on the other hand, is based almost entirely on the Zhukovskii translation, albeit drastically redacted. Indeed, it is rather astonishing to compare the text of this scene in the opera with the play. The composer takes passages from five different scenes scattered among Acts II, III, and IV. Parts of Johanna’s confrontations with Burgundy and Montgomery are retained, but in reverse order.279 Since the composer has dispensed with these characters, their lines go to Lionel. Johanna and Lionel’s first encounter is largely unchanged. The text representing the “weakening of Joan’s lethal intent,” noted above by Brown, is actually taken from the opening soliloquy of Act IV, which was also the basis of one of the most striking scenes in Verdi’s Giovanna. Given all of this tailoring and patching, one would not expect a favorable

279 Act II, sc.ix is followed by bits of II.vi and II.vii, then by III.x and finally, IV.i.
result, and yet the scene in the opera is coherent. Most striking in Brown’s analysis is the composer’s achievement of the “blend of warmth with pain.” Despite the significant alteration of the text from its original organization, the composer is inspired to produce one of the most effective duets in the opera, seemingly on the strength of the poetry, and the effect is in accordance with Schiller’s sublime image of Johanna.

A comparison of the number of lines in Chaïkovskii’s libretto derived from Zhukovskii’s text supports the argument that those scenes identified by Brown as “worthy of admiration” are invariably inspired by the translation from Schiller:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of text in each scene of Chaïkovskii’s Deva libretto</th>
<th>Total lines</th>
<th>Number of lines retained from Zhukovskii</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>1-256</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>257-608</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.i.</td>
<td>609-716</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.ii.</td>
<td>717-886</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.i.</td>
<td>887-971</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.ii.</td>
<td>972-1002</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>≈ 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ioanna’s famous farewell aria is from Act I. The “finest stretch in the opera,” Ioanna’s narration occurs in Act II. Ioanna and Lionel’s earlier, more successful duet is from Act III, scene i. The meager two lines of the final scene, which actually only vaguely resemble Ioanna’s final words in Zhukovskii, are noteworthy for the chronotope created by the composer in his libretto. In Zhukovskii, Ioanna, dying on the battlefield, says: “Rastvoreny vrata ikh zolotye […] Minuta skorb’, blazhenstvo beskonechno” (“Their golden gates have opened […] A moment of sorrow; an eternity of blessedness” PSSP VII 373). In Chaïkovskii, the scene has been made to conform to the historical circumstances of Joan’s burning at the stake, borrowed from the Gounod-Barbier drame lyrique (ZC II 258). The borrowed scene includes choruses of saints and angels, which the composer retains. Ioanna sings: “Otkrylos’ nebo, koncheny stradan’ia” (“heaven has opened, my suffering is over” CPSS.37 459). The addition of the chorus encouraging the young girl to
embrace her fate makes the scene strongly reminiscent of the moment in Schiller’s translation of Euripides’s *Iphigeneia in Aulis*, when she ascends the sacrificial altar to permit the Greeks to sail to Troy. The moment passes so quickly amid a profusion of so much other sound from the orchestra that it would be easy to miss. That the composer was probably unaware of the Greek myth at work in Schiller’s *Jungfrau* plot and that his intention was to force the ending of his opera to come closer to history suggests that the resemblance is coincidental. Coincidental or not, however, it is striking that a finely woven remnant of Schiller’s dramaturgy can be discerned among the “seams, patches and mismatched patterns” of Chaïkovskii’s ill-fitting garment.

Although the composer’s anxiety about relying solely on Zhukovskii drives him to conduct research on all the sources he could find, the translation of Schiller’s Romantic tragedy remains the poetic inspiration that comes closest to serving his compositional demands. Midway through his composition, he writes von Meck and reports that, with the acquisition of Michelet’s biography on Joan of Arc his “reserve of necessary materials is complete,” however, “in the end, I have come to the conclusion that Schiller’s tragedy, while not consistent with historical truth, still surpasses all other artistic representations of Joan in its depth of psychological truth” (*CPM* I 616). In his illusory adoption of grand opera style, uncharacteristic of his natural mode of composition, the composer continues to subordinate the artistic truth he senses in Schiller to the exigencies of historical reality.

Chaïkovskii’s political leanings did not often come up in his correspondence during the period under consideration, but his devotion to the tsar and the imperial family was always clear when they did. Any departure from a life-long conviction must certainly represent a significant

---

280 “Zapas nuzhnykh mne materialov dlia Jeanne d’Arc [in French] gotov.” “V kontse kontsov iə prishel k zakliucheniu, chto tragedii Shillera khotia i ne soglasna s istoricheskoju pravdoju, no prevoskhodit vse drugie khudozhestvennye izobrazheniia loanny glubinoi psikhologicheskoj pravdy.”
change in one’s state of mind. In the context of the discussion here, this departure serves as an interesting example of the dichotomy between the composer’s Realist and Idealist tendencies, as defined by Schiller. The fact that it takes place while he is preoccupied with preparing his Joan of Arc opera for production further enhances its importance. In the book published following the symposium at Hofstra University convened on the one hundredth anniversary of the composer’s death in 1993, Alexandar Mihailovic offers a surprising deviation from the composer’s usual convictions: “the monarchist Tchaikovsky sounds unusually democratic when he writes from Paris in 1879 that ‘so long as all of us – the citizens of Russia – are not called upon to take part in our country’s government, there is no hope for a better future’” (3). It is noteworthy that he cites the quote from two other works, Crankshaw’s *The Shadow on the Winter Palace* (Viking 1976) and Weinstock’s extremely popular biography, *Tchaikovsky* (Knopf 1943, reprinted 1946, 1980)(13f). Given that Weinstock’s biography was probably the most widely read examination of the composer’s life and works until supplanted by Brown some four decades later, it seems likely that this quote found its way into several other books and articles during the Cold War. While it makes a nice example to suggest that Chaïkovskiĭ was sympathetic to liberal calls for representative government, nothing could be farther from the truth. He was a convinced monarchist his entire life, much in the same manner as Zhukovskiĭ, although perhaps to a less ingenuous degree. Prior to the point in the letter from Paris where the thrice-quoted sentence appears, he has just shared with von Meck his knowledge that his servant Alësia had seen the Grand Duke Nikolaï Nikolaevich with his entourage in full military uniform at church. He looks in the *Gaulois* newspaper and realizes it must be because of the unsuccessful attempt to assassinate Tsar Aleksandr II, which had taken place on 19 November 1879. This event therefore takes place toward the latter end of the period being considered here. The longer quote
The publication of a proclamation by the group behind the assassination attempt is a significant historical development that takes place between the two letters. It is still striking to compare the relative liberality of this quote from 21 November/2 December 1879 with what he has to say twelve days later on 2 December/14 December 1879.

The Temps newspaper correctly observes that the appeal made by His Majesty in his speech to the parents is not the way to root out the evil that is gaining strength in Russia. It seems to me that the tsar would do well to gather people elected from all over Russia and together with representatives of the entire nation discuss measures to deal with this terrible manifestation of the most idiotic revolutionary nonsense. Until all of us, that is, all Russian citizens, are called upon to participate in government, there is no hope for a better future.

(CPM II 910-11)

281 The reference to parents comes from the appeal made in the tsar’s speech to the “fathers of the families” (911f).
parlament. Ved’ im ne etogo nuzhno: oni idut
gorazdo dal’she i khoteli by sofsialisticheskoï
respubliki i dazhe anarkhii. No nikto na etu
udochku ne poddastsi, i esli v otdalennom
budushchem v Rossii ustroitsia
predstavitel’naja forma pravleniia, to pervym
delom budushchei zemskoi dumy budet
iskorenienie (same as word above in reverse)
toi otvratitel’noi kuchki ubiïts, kotoraiia
voobrazhaet, chto vedet za soboi Rossiiu. Eti
gospoda ne ponimaiut, chto my vse tochno tak
zhe i dazhe, byt’ mozhet, bol’she nenavidim
ix, chem gosudar’, kotoryi olisvetvioraet
Rossiiu i v liitte kotorogo oni oskorbliaiut i
ves’ russkii narod. Konechno, oni – sila, no
ved’ tol’ko potomu, chto b’iut iz-za ugla. Ax,
kak vse eto otvratitel’no, i kak serdise
ozhestochaetsia protiv podobnych
sooetchestvennikov! Pridoiteta radovat’sia,
kogda pravitel’stvo prinuzhdeno primitat’
za krutye mery.

This is not their intent: they want to go much
further, and would like a socialist republic
and even anarchy. But no one is going to fall
for this trick, and if in some distant future a
representative form of government is
established in Russia, then the first act of the
future parliament would be the rooting out of
this same repulsive bunch of murderers, who
imagine themselves to be leading Russia.
These gentlemen do not understand that we
hate them perhaps even more than does His
Majesty, who personifies Russia and in whose
person they also offend the entire Russian
people. Of course, they are a force, but
indeed only because they strike from the
shadows. Ah, how disgusting this all is, and
how bitter one’s heart grows toward such
compatriots! It makes one rejoice that the
government must resort to drastic measures.

(PCM II 929)

It is difficult not to sense in the latter statement that Chaïkovskiï has – within his own political
parameters – come back to his senses. The Idealist, in Schiller’s sense, is once more reconciled
with the Realist. This should not be taken to imply that he will only compose in the lyric mode
for the remainder of his life. Unfortunately, commissions and other misbegotten projects will
still call upon the composer to project his epic persona from time to time.

Modest makes a fascinating observation toward the end of his brother’s biography. It is
18 October 1893, only a few days before the composer contracts cholera and dies:

V eti zhe dni on mnogo govoril so mnoi o
peredelke Oprichnika i Orleanskoi devy,
kotorymi khotel zaniat’sia v blizhaishem
budushchem. Dlia etogo on vzhal iz biblioteki

During this time, he spoke a good deal about
revising The Oprichnik and The Maid of
Orleans, which he wanted to work on in the
near future. For this purpose, he borrowed
The composer is intrigued by his brother’s suggestion, implying that he perhaps realizes that the ending of the opera suffers from departing too radically from Schiller. Modest certainly thinks so. Death itself prevents the composer from acting on this suggestion. Had the composer not died, it is tempting to wonder what he might have done in his revision.
Chapter 5. The Skeptic Doth Protest Too Much, Methinks: Shaw’s *Saint Joan*.
Concluding Thoughts on Joan in the Twentieth and Twenty-first Centuries

_Die Realität der Dinge ist ihr (der Dinge) Werk; der Schein der Dinge
ist des Menschen Werk, und ein Gemüth, das sich am Scheine weidet,
ergötzt sich schon nicht mehr an dem, was es empfängt,
sondern an dem, was es thut._
(NA.20 399 parentheses Schiller’s)\(^{282}\)

Following Joan’s canonization in 1920, Shaw’s *Saint Joan* recasts her in a new dramatic mold, and in his Preface to the play published in 1924, he demonstrates significant opposition to Schiller’s conception of the Orleans maid.\(^{283}\) Just as Schiller encapsulated his project in the subtitle of his play “eine romantische Tragödie,” so Shaw announces with the subtitle, “A Chronicle Play,” that his audience will finally be treated to the true story of Joan of Arc, and he boldly stakes his claims: “For the story of Joan I refer the reader to the play which follows. It contains all that need be known about her” (liii). He addresses others of his literary forebears. He heartily supports Voltaire’s *Pucelle*, although he acknowledges its “indecorum.” One must, he argues, simply recognize that “its purpose was not to depict Joan, but to kill with ridicule everything that Voltaire righteously hated in the institutions and fashions of his own day” (xxvii). Shakespeare’s depiction of Joan in *Henry VI, Part One* fares considerably worse: “This portrait of Joan is not more authentic than the descriptions in the London papers of George Washington in 1780, of Napoleon in 1803, of the German Crown Prince in 1915, or of Lenin in 1917. It ends in mere scurrility” (xxvii). He suggests either that Shakespeare did not write the

\(^{282}\) “The reality of things is the work of things themselves; the semblance of things is the work of man; and a nature that delights in semblance no longer takes pleasure in something it receives, but in something it does” *Briefe über die aesthetische Erziehung des Menschen. 26-er Brief* (Hinderer and Dahlstrom 166-67).

\(^{283}\) And, by extension, to those of Verdi, Zhukovskiĭ, and Chaïkovskiĭ.
most objectionable parts, or that he inserted the more libelous elements in order to make his play more appealing to his anti-French Elizabethan audience. Schiller’s Johanna, he asserts, has been: “drowned in a witch’s caldron of raging romance. Schiller’s Joan has not a single point of contact with the real Joan, not indeed with any mortal woman that ever walked this earth” (xxviii). Shaw dismisses Schiller and Shakespeare: the former for “beglamored sentimentality;” the latter for inconsistent scurrility (xxix). He is either not aware or chooses not to see that much of what he rejects in Schiller’s Idealist Romanticism is based on philosophical principles that are strikingly similar to the tenets of his own philosophy of Creative Evolution and Vitalism.

Regarding his dismissal of Shakespeare’s Henry VI, Part One, it must be argued that many of the most dramatic scenes in all three plays – that is, his own, as well as those of Shakespeare and Schiller – are derived from the events as presented by Holinshed in his Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland of 1587. Furthermore, the depictions of Joan in Shakespeare, Schiller and Shaw reveal almost mystically inevitable parallels with Euripides’s Iphigenia. Despite his protestations to have been distancing himself as far as possible from Shakespeare and Schiller, an analysis comparing the works and their underlying ideas suggests that Shaw produces a version of Joan that is consistent with the features of Schiller’s Euripidean sublime sanctity.

Of Die Jungfrau von Orleans, Shaw states categorically that: “There is nothing to be said about this play but that it is not about Joan at all, and can hardly be said to pretend to be; for he makes her die on the battlefield, finding her burning unbearable” (xxviii). After dismissing this and many other pre-Shavian literary efforts to tell Joan’s story, he advises his reader that Quicherat’s publication of the transcripts of Jeanne d’Arc’s condemnation and nullification trials in 1841 changed everything: “These entirely realistic documents created a living interest in Joan which Voltaire’s mock Homeric and Schiller’s romantic nonsense missed” (xxix). The
interesting point in this statement is not merely Shaw’s casually withering assessment of Homer, Voltaire, and Schiller, but the opposition he sets up between realism and romanticism, particularly the implication that he and his work are on the benevolent and illuminating side of the former, while Schiller is on the pernicious and misleading side of the latter. Shaw insists that his play is as close to a reflection of reality as a play can be and as such, is a balm for the harm done by others to the instructive potential of Joan’s story for posterity. His assertions to this effect were not limited to his Preface to the play. In the same year as it was published with the play, he wrote in *The New York Times*:

> Since the report of the legal case against Joan and her rehabilitation by Quicherat, there has been no room for opinion: the facts are all too simple. All controversies raised with regard to the subject are nothing but attempts to obscure the facts in order to satisfy one opinion or another, whether party or not … Romanticists insisted on the fact that she was a heroine … of striking beauty … A straightforward attempt to tell the truth is usually misunderstood. The French people are indignant in their belief that I have belittled their national heroine. Roman Catholics protest that I have written *Saint Joan* as an attack on their Church. Neither was intended or achieved. I have merely written a play based upon the facts as they exist. (Weintraub 163)

Clearly, Shaw’s *Saint Joan* had aroused controversy for a number of reasons, although he confidently (if not entirely convincingly) defended himself against them all. A year later in his *Table-Talk*, he returns to the subject with no change in tone: “The pseudo-Shakespearean Joan ends in mere scurrility. Voltaire’s mock-Homeric epic is an uproarious joke. Schiller’s play is romantic flapdoodle. All the modern attempts known to me are second-rate opera books. I felt personally called on by Joan to do her dramatic justice; and I don’t think I have botched the job”

---

284 April 6, 1924, p. X2.
The view to be expressed here is not that Shaw “botched the job.” Shaw’s play is a masterpiece of twentieth century drama, with poetry, wit, and pathos that place it on an equal footing with Schiller and Shakespeare. His assertion that Schiller botched the job, however, seems to be an expression of willful blindness to the significance of the ideas that the German playwright incorporated into his play, as well as a denial of the strong similarities between their motivations and of their joint debt to Shakespeare’s sense of the dramatic potential inherent in Joan’s story.

Whereas Schiller was generally convinced that Voltaire’s rationalism was wrong in all things, Shaw shared the French writer’s conviction that civilization was deeply corrupt and that the problem would never be corrected until children began to be educated differently. In an essay entitled “Parents and Children,” Shaw introduces the notion that children should be left to their own devices in their upbringing and education, for that would produce no worse result than do ill-conceived discipline and compulsory education, and might actually be pleasant for them. That he is being at least as satirical as his fellow Irishman Swift in the particulars of his argument cannot be denied, but his seriousness comes to the fore occasionally: “Most children can be, and many are, hopelessly warped and wasted by parents who are ignorant and silly enough to suppose that they know what a human being ought to be, and who stick at nothing in their determination to force their children into their molds. Every child has a right to its own bent” (Misalliance xix). The light that should guide children in pursuing that bent is their imagination. He argues a point reminiscent of Schiller’s in Naïve and Sentimental Poetry in his description of the two types of imagination:

One is the power to imagine things as they are not: this I call the romantic imagination. The other is the power to imagine things as they are without actually

---

285 1925 (Henderson xxx).
sensing them; and this I will call the realistic imagination. Take for example marriage and war. One man has a vision of perpetual bliss with a domestic angel at home, and of flashing sabers, thundering guns, victorious cavalry charges, and routed enemies in the field. That is romantic imagination; and the mischief it does is incalculable … A very little realistic imagination gives an ambitious person enormous power over the multitudinous victims of the romantic imagination … When you say to a realist ‘You must do this’ or ‘You must not do that,’ he instantly asks what will happen to him if he does (or does not, as the case may be). Failing an unromantic convincing answer, he does just as he pleases unless he can find for himself a real reason for refraining. In short, though you can intimidate him, you cannot bluff him … The campaigns of Napoleon, with their atmosphere of glory, illustrate this … Wellington was a completer realist than Napoleon. It was impossible to persuade Wellington that he was beaten until he actually was beaten. He was unbluffable; and if Napoleon had understood the nature of Wellington's strength instead of returning Wellington's snobbish contempt for him by an academic contempt for Wellington, he would not have left the attack at Waterloo to Ney and D'Erlon, who, on that field, did not know when they were beaten, whereas Wellington knew precisely when he was not beaten. The unbluffable would have triumphed anyhow, probably, because Napoleon was an academic soldier, doing the academic thing (the attack in columns and so forth) with superlative ability and energy; whilst Wellington was an original soldier who, instead of outdoing the terrible academic columns with still more terrible and academic columns, outwitted them with the thin red line, not of heroes, but, as this uncompromising realist never hesitated to testify, of the scum of the earth.

(cxxii-cxxiv)

Shaw is convinced that the romantic imagination is not only delusional, but also highly credulous. Its “mischief” is “incalculable.” Among the sources of its mischief, as he argues in the case of Napoleon, is its reliance on academic solutions. Although written over a decade before he takes up the subject of Joan of Arc, it is not difficult to see her in the “unbluffable” child of nature with her realistic imagination, set upon by the academic postulations of the
clerical court in Rouen, under the baleful influence of their credulous and romantic imaginations. For Schiller, the dichotomy arises between naïve Realist and sentimental Idealist, but unlike Shaw, he never implies that the one is good, while the other is bad. He merely insists that a personality tends to run to one type or the other. Additionally, Realists are mostly to be found among the ancients, whereas most individuals today are Idealists. For Schiller, the Idealist must summon enormous reserves of discipline to cast off subjective prejudice and think or act as a Realist. The unique individual who can do so accomplishes this by a singular exertion of personal will, and his Johanna is such an individual. Shaw repeatedly subjects romanticism to scorn, yet his underlying purpose in “Parents and Children,” which is the propagation of his quasi-religious philosophy of Vitalism, is far from conventional realism.

In this essay, he refers more than once to a force, which he feels guides the sometimes unpredictable behavior of living beings, as the Life Force. He describes it as a form of disembodied, parasitic energy that endows us with an inexorable compulsion toward perfection: “The Life Force either will not or cannot achieve immortality except in very low organisms … Death is not necessarily a failure of energy on the part of the Life Force” (ix). “The precise formula for the Superman … has not yet been discovered. Until it is, every birth is an experiment in the Great Research which is being conducted by the Life Force to discover that formula” (lx). It is a formulation derived by Shaw based upon his own sense of the power of Darwinian natural selection, which he nonetheless saw as inadequate because it apparently failed to account for elegance of design in creation and the role of human imagination in the process of evolution

---

286 By the time he writes the Preface to *Saint Joan*, he has apparently reconsidered Napoleon, whom he compares much more favorably there to Joan.

287 As noted in earlier chapters, Schiller’s use of the terms naïve and sentimental is not pejorative, as their meaning tends to be today. His sense of naïve is perhaps closer to “objective,” “straightforward,” or “unselfconscious,” while sentimental for him means “subjective,” “sensitive,” and “self-conscious.”
He is straightforward in his *Saint Joan* Preface about its role in explaining Joan’s voices and visions, renaming it the “evolutionary appetite:”

I cannot believe, nor if I could, could I expect all my readers to believe, as Joan did, that three ocularly visible well-dressed persons, named respectively Saint Catherine, Saint Margaret, and Saint Michael, came down from heaven and gave her certain instructions with which they were charged by God for her … But that there are forces at work which use individuals for purposes far transcending the purpose of keeping these individuals alive and prosperous and respectable and safe and happy in the middle station in life … is established by the fact that men will, in the pursuit of knowledge and of social readjustments for which they will not be a penny the better, and are indeed many pence the worse, face poverty, infamy, exile, imprisonment, dreadful hardship, and death … There is no more mystery about this appetite for knowledge and power than about the appetite for food … The appetite for food is necessary to the life of the hungry man and is therefore a personal appetite, whereas the other is an appetite for evolution, and therefore a superpersonal need. The diverse manners in which our imaginations dramatize the approach of the superpersonal forces is a problem for the psychologist, not for the historian. Only, the historian must understand that the figure Joan recognized as St. Catherine was not really St. Catherine, but the dramatization by Joan’s imagination of that pressure upon her of the driving force that is behind evolution, which I have just called the evolutionary appetite.

The challenge posed by Shaw’s description of this force is not that it is unconvincing as a literary conceit. On the contrary, consideration of these ideas adds immeasurably to analysis of the poetic motivations pervading the pages of his play. The challenge comes from his insistence that his version is more realistic than Schiller’s. There is no more scientific evidence for the Life

---

288 He and the writers upon whose work he based his Vitalism – Samuel Butler, Henri Bergson, and Francis Galton – all seem to have misconstrued Darwin’s use of the word selection, choosing to see it somehow as a choice made consciously by the organism, rather than a description of spontaneous mutation.
Force than there is for Schiller’s *Spieltrieb*, and Shaw’s clever coinage of the adjective “superpersonal” to describe the operation of this force does not disguise the fact that what he is describing is actually supernatural. Searle observes that, in equating Joan’s inspiration to literary inspiration, Shaw is emulating the conception of Joan’s voices argued by Michelet in his biography: “But Shaw’s Vitalism allowed him to go much further than Michelet in defining the analogy between hallucination and poetry, for it allowed him to derive, from the Romantic doctrine of inspiration which they shared in common, an aesthetic which virtually identifies artistic creation with organic process” (108). Shaw would presumably dispute the Romantic aspect of this conclusion.

Returning to Schiller’s *Spieltrieb*, Shaw’s own description of his dramatic principles also bears a striking similarity to Schiller’s formulation of the three aesthetic drives in *Aesthetische Erziehung*. The most conspicuous points are underscored below:

I am not governed by principles; I am inspired, how or why I cannot explain, because I do not know; but inspiration it must be; for it comes to me without any reference to my own ends or interests.

I find myself possessed of a theme in the following manner. I am pushed by a natural need to set to work to write down the conversations that come into my head unaccountably. At first I hardly know the speakers, and cannot find names for them. Then they become more and more familiar, and I learn their names. Finally I come to know them very well, and discover what it is they are driving at, and why they have said and done the things I have been moved to set down.

This is not being ‘guided by principles’: it is hallucination; and sane hallucination is what we call play or drama. (Searle 106)

---

289 To preclude the necessity of repeating the details of these Schillerian notions, the reader is referred to the discussion in Chapters 1 and 4 (pp. 78 and 273).
The “push by a natural need” calls to mind Schiller’s *Stofftrieb* (or “instinctive impulse”), while the playwright’s “discovery” of his characters’ intentions seems to be an example of the *Formtrieb* (or “intellectual impulse”). The characters’ intentions must be given form and motivation, which are supplied to them by the playwright. Shaw describes the phenomenon that enables him to put his “need” together with his “discovery” as a “sane hallucination” or “play,” very nearly approaching the compulsive interaction Schiller describes as the operation of his *Spieltrieb* (or “impulse to play”). After describing these impulses or drives, Schiller goes on to make the remark used as the epigraph of this chapter: “The reality of things is the work of things themselves; the semblance of things is the work of man; and a nature that delights in semblance no longer takes pleasure in something it receives, but in something it does.” Schiller’s semblance (or *Schein*) is Shaw’s hallucination. For both men, then, the key ingredient is an action, by which one reconciles impulse with intellect and moves forward.

Shaw argues that Joan’s impatience with the torpor at the court of the Dauphin and her opposition to Church doctrine, unwittingly expressed during her trial on the counsel of her voices and contributing to her condemnation, is a form of protest motivated by her evolutionary appetite. Furthermore, he argues that her actions are simply a part of her personality and her common sense. He develops these ideas throughout his play into an argument that Joan herself is the first Protestant in history and that her actions on behalf of the Dauphin represent an incipient form of European nationalism. These are not ideas that originate in *Joan* (Searle 121-22). Schiller’s Johanna is a nationalist after Iphigeneia’s heart, whether or not Shaw acknowledges it. He had begun to develop the notion of pre-Lutheran Protestantism more than two decades earlier in his book-length essay, *The Perfect Wagnerite*. 
Shaw’s earliest employment was as music critic for the London newspaper *The Star*, thus his authority to speak on the subject of Wagner’s operas is seemingly justified. He makes the startling argument in *The Perfect Wagnerite* that Siegfried in the Ring cycle should be understood as a Protestant, an assertion even bolder than his insistence upon a Protestant Joan. He cannot mean this in the usual religious or political sense, since the Ring is based on Norse pagan myth. His definition of Protestantism is helpful in beginning to understand what he means: “Four hundred years ago, when belief in God and in revelation was general throughout Europe, a … wave of thought led the strongest-hearted peoples to affirm that every man’s private judgment was a more trustworthy interpreter of God and revelation than the Church. This was called Protestantism” (66-67). Siegfried exhibits a “joyous, fearless, conscienceless heroism” that is poised to bring down the gods, according to Shaw, in the same manner that the insatiable demands of private judgment served to bring down the authority of the Church (72). Thus, for Shaw the Norse gods stand in for dogmatic authority, while Siegfried, in following the promptings of his irrepressible heart, represents strong-hearted private judgment. His description of the significance of Wagner’s opera to the artistic appetite of the nineteenth century is intriguing: “The most inevitable dramatic conception, then, of the nineteenth century, is that of a perfectly naïve hero upsetting religion, law and order in all directions, and establishing in their place the unfettered action of Humanity doing exactly what it likes, and producing order instead of confusion thereby because it likes to do what is necessary for the good of the race” (69). Two decades before Joan comes into his view, he partly describes what he intends to achieve in *Saint Joan*. Additionally, it must be noted that his use of the word naïve and his characterization of Siegfried as “unfettered” and “doing exactly as [he] likes” comes quite close to meeting Schiller’s definition of the naïve Realist.
Shaw would have us believe that his Joan is more realistic than Schiller’s Johanna and therefore free of the burden of any extraneous program being foisted upon her. This contention is undermined by the interpolation of the theme, asserted by Shaw through the agency of the characters surrounding Joan: that Joan is a proto-Nationalist, as well as a proto-Protestant. In early 15th century Europe, allegiance was first of all to one’s local feudal lord. The people were not Frenchmen or Englishmen, but vassals of these lords, who were themselves more or less equal in power – if not authority - to the king. This permitted a kind of feudal separation of powers. The point arises several times throughout the play, but is brought into its clearest focus in scene IV (the so-called “tent scene”), where the English nobleman, Richard de Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, and a chaplain emissary of the Cardinal of Winchester meet in the English camp in Burgundy with the French cleric, Pierre Cauchon, who would afterward mount Joan’s heresy trial:

Warwick. Her idea is that the kings should give their realms to God, and then reign as God’s bailiffs […] It is a cunning device to supersede the aristocracy, and make the king sole and absolute autocrat. Instead of the king being merely the first among equals, he becomes their master.

[…]

Cauchon. […] I see now that what is in your mind is not that this girl has never once mentioned The Church, and thinks only of God and herself, but that she has never once mentioned the peerage, and thinks only of the king and herself.

Warwick. Quite so. The two ideas of hers are the same idea at bottom. It goes deep, my lord. It is the protest of the individual soul against the interference of
priest or peer between the private man and his God. I should call it Protestantism
if I had to find a name for it. (52)

At the conclusion of the scene, once Warwick and Cauchon have clarified in very subtle terms
their willingness to participate in the pursuit and destruction of Joan, Shaw has Warwick sum up
his point quite directly:

Warwick. Well, if you will burn the Protestant, I will burn the Nationalist […]

(53).

Shaw has his protagonists propound their beliefs, which are frequently completely at
odds with one another, in thought processes with which any modern spectator can sympathize.
Their words are convincing, and their actions are fully motivated. The historical forebears who
inspired these characters would not, however, have conceived of these issues in these terms, fully
a century before Luther’s Protestant reformation and three centuries before Herder coined the
term Nationalism. This is not to denigrate Shaw’s brilliant and thought-provoking play. His
discernment of the roots of Protestantism and Nationalism in the life and actions of Joan of Arc,
and his desire to remove the cobwebs of legend and superstition from our understanding of her –
at the moment when she has just been canonized as a saint – is an indispensable contribution to
the enormous literature about this extraordinary woman. He wants to claim her for all humanity
in just the same way as Anatole France wanted to preserve her from clerical dogma. What
remains disappointing is his steadfast refusal to recognize any value in Schiller’s contributions to
the same end.

In his argument, Shaw is as emphatically anti-Romantic as Schiller was emphatically
anti-Enlightenment, and this prevents him from considering a key component in what he sees as
Schiller’s failed depiction: it is a Romantic tragedy. Apart from the lack of realism, two of his
most damning indictments of the work are that it is a “witch’s cauldron of raging romance” and that because Schiller’s Johanna possesses physical beauty, the work “may be at once classed as a romance.” This is akin to dismissing Homer’s *Iliad* for being too epic. Romance is bad; Schiller’s *Jungfrau* is a romance; therefore, Schiller’s *Jungfrau* is bad. The point here is not that Shaw is unaware of the unfairness of this kind of syllogism, but that he is so thoroughly convinced of the need for civilization to shake off the dust of romanticism – to remove the religious scales from our eyes and awaken from the slumber of fairytales – that he vitiates the entire program of which Schiller was a leading spokesperson. Schiller is equally convinced of the opposite opinion. He believes that the religious element in the ancient tragedies gives them their enormous power. The evocation of mythic connotations in historical settings of a tragic nature elevates the plot to the sphere of the sublime. The element of nationalism that he incorporates into his play, moreover, develops from Euripides’s *Iphigeneia in Aulis* and explains the play’s enormous popularity among German romantics, as well as romantics across Europe, including the Italy of Verdi, and the Russia of Zhukovskii and Chaïkovskiï. Unlike Shaw, Schiller acknowledges that he is employing myth in the service of burnishing a legend.

With regard to nationalism as Joan’s personal (or “superpersonal”) motivation, there is nothing in the trial transcripts to attribute such a conception to Jeanne verifiably. In her famous letter to the English, which she dictated because she herself was illiterate, she refers to the kingdoms of France and England, and speaks of the people living in each kingdom as French and English because they are the subjects of those crowns. She is thoroughly familiar with the feudal divisions within France, fully cognizant of the Duke of Burgundy’s allegiance to the English crown, and confidently allies herself and her family to the rival Armagnac party that supported the Valois Dauphin’s claims to the French throne (Champion 53). Perhaps the most telling
indication of Jeanne’s acceptance of the divided condition of the country in which she lived can be discerned in her answer to the court’s questions regarding her appeal to Robert de Baudricourt at Vaucouleurs to gain his support for her journey to the Dauphin in Chinon: “She went to him and told him she wished to go to France” (45). Jeanne recognized that the country was not a nation, at least not according to any clear definition of one, and that she and her family did not live in France. The word “nation” in this respect does not appear in her testimony. If she had been as unconcerned about the feudal system as Shaw would have us believe, she would not have felt the need to gain the support of her local lord before crossing into France. Jeanne acts at the urging of her “voices” in the service of the feudal lord of a land not her own, unaware of the resulting imbalance which she creates in the separation of secular and clerical power. Pernoud’s translator observes that modern liberal intellectuals are often disturbed by the “merciless fury of the Paris intelligentsia against the Maid … but it is easy to see how she must have represented for them a mindless regression to the inept tyranny of monarchic absolutism, whether royal or papal” (6). Protestantism and nationalism are developed and incorporated into Shaw’s play with as little regard for their historical inaccuracy as the elements of fantasy and mythology that Schiller introduces in his Romantic tragedy.

Although Shaw insists that he did not need to do anything more than present “the facts as they exist,” he does not hesitate in making use of the miraculous to increase the dramatic content of the play. In his view, miracles seem to be a reflection of the realistic imagination, as defined earlier. The perception of them by the faithful is an act that confirms faith, words that he puts into the mouth of the Archbishop in Scene II of the play. In this respect, they fill much the same role as Schein in Schiller’s Aesthetische Erziehung. Although he clothes them in

---

290 Shaw’s play is comprised of six scenes and an Epilogue, with no divisions into acts.
rational explanations, Shaw himself seems to have found their dramatic power irresistible and includes several that actually bear dubious relation to the facts. In fact, every scene of the play in which Joan appears contains at least one miraculous event, an attribute which it shares with Schiller’s “romantic flapdoodle.”

As Scene I begins, Robert de Baudricourt’s primary concern is a lack of eggs:

Robert. No eggs! No eggs!! Thousand thunders, man, what do you mean by no eggs?

Steward. Sir: it is not my fault. It is the act of God.

Robert. Blasphemy. You tell me there are no eggs; and you blame your Maker for it. (1)

Shaw burnishes this dialogue with a great deal of amusing banter before the Steward ventures his opinion of the cause.

Steward. Sir: I tell you there are no eggs. There will be none – not if you were to kill me for it – as long as The Maid is at our door. (3)

We learn that Joan is making her third attempt to gain an audience with Baudricourt and on this occasion is refusing to leave. He calls her in to explain herself, and while she does so, his provost-marshal Poulengy comes in as well. Joan’s impetuosity and Poulengy’s admiring recommendation eventually convince him to give Joan the armor and horses she demands, and Baudricourt sends her off with Poulengy as escort. Following this, according to the stage directions: “The steward runs in with a basket:

Steward. The hens are laying like mad, sir. Five dozen eggs!

Robert. [stiffens convulsively; crosses himself; and forms with his pale lips the words] Christ in heaven! [Aloud but breathless] She did come from God! (15)

This incident, which the characters themselves clearly perceive as a miracle, was invented by Shaw. It seems likely that he intended the audience to see it as miraculous, as well. Tyson
argues that the playwright had considered following the trial transcripts and having Joan gain entry after impressing Baudricourt with her prediction of a surprising victory in a skirmish known as the Battle of the Herrings, but decided that the exposition it would have required to be comprehensible to the audience would have been too lengthy (Tyson 22). Tyson surmises that Shaw drew his inspiration from the New Testament miracle of the loaves and fishes, arguing that it simultaneously serves to reinforce Joan’s peasant background (23). This overlooks another possibility: that the incident recalls the unusual behavior of the poultry reported to have occurred at Joan’s birth:

It was imagined that she was born on the night of the Epiphany. The shepherds of her village, moved by an indescribable joy, the cause of which was unknown to them, hastened through the darkness towards the marvelous mystery. The cocks, heralds of this new joy, sing at an unusual season and, flapping their wings, seem to prophesy for two hours. Thus the child in her cradle had her adoration of the shepherds. (France 467-68)

Anatole France identifies the source for these events as a letter from Perceval de Boulainvilliers, which appears in volume five of Quicherat’s 1841 transcripts of both trials. Presumably, so hagiographic a letter would have been part of the nullification trial transcripts. Shaw seems to have read France’s biography, but Tyson, Henderson and others observe that he relied especially on T. Douglas Murray’s Jeanne d’Arc, Maid of Orleans, Deliverer of France, which was an edited translation of Quicherat. Murray’s translation, however, does not mention this incident, unlike many of the others cited below. Whatever inspired Shaw to concoct the miracle of the eggs, it cannot be cited as a mere report of the facts, which brings it closer to the romantic imagination of Schiller.

In Scene II, Joan’s prophecy of the imminent death of so-called Foul-mouthed Frank is based upon testimony by Jeanne’s confessor Brother Jean Pasquerel, from Murray’s translation
(269). Pasquerel himself asserts that he heard about the event from Jeanne. In the play, Gilles de Rais, known as Bluebeard for the color of his facial hair, announces this event, providing the occasion for the Archbishop to make his remark on the purpose and nature of miracles, already noted above, and to dismiss this event as an example of how coincidence can be invested with the gravity of miracles by the credulous. Then comes the famous moment when Joan recognizes the Dauphin, without having seen him before. Schiller includes the moment in his own play, drawing from Shakespeare. Murray does not appear to be Shaw’s source for the episode. His translation, again based on Pasquerel’s testimony, describes a rather prosaic moment: “It was the Sieur Count de Vendome who brought her into the King's apartment. When he perceived her, the King asked her her name” (Murray 269). France’s biography scarcely diverges from Jeanne’s testimony at her trial: “She said that when she entered her king’s room she recognized him among many others by the counsel of her voice, which revealed him to her” (Champion 46). Pernoud suggests that Jean Chartier’s Chronicle of the Dauphin’s court may serve as the source that “caused the legend of the first encounter between dauphin and maid to swell into a theatrical set piece” (23-24). In any case, it seems that Shaw the skeptic stacks the deck against both the credulous and the incredulous, by having the Dauphin choose Bluebeard as his stand-in on the throne. Shaw notes in a stage direction that Gilles de Rais enters, “sporting the extravagance of a little beard dyed blue at a clean-shaven court” (17). The Archbishop, after making his comment on miracles, predicts that Joan will recognize the Dauphin immediately: “She will know what everybody in Chinon knows: that the Dauphin is the meanest-looking and worst-dressed figure in the court, and that the man with the blue beard is Gilles de Rais” (23). On stage, the moment seems wondrous, despite the fact that the girl has done nothing more than recognize that a man wearing a blue beard is not the Dauphin. The spectator’s willingness to suspend disbelief is
perfect proof of Shaw’s explanation for miracles, and he is as happy to make use of it as is Schiller.

In Scene III, Joan changes the wind at Orléans to permit Dunois and herself to cross the Loire and raise the siege. The entirety of this short scene turns on the tactical and historical importance of this miracle. Dunois’s testimony at the nullification trial is the source: “At that moment, the wind, being contrary and thereby preventing the boats going up the river and reaching Orléans, turned all at once and became favorable. They stretched the sails; and I ordered the boats to the town, which I entered with Brother Nicolas de Geresme, then Grand Prior in France of the Order of Rhodes. We passed before the Church of Saint Loup in spite of the English. From that time I put good hope in her, even more than before” (Murray 229). Here is the moment at which it may be opportune to recall that an ill wind was precisely the problem for which the sacrifice of Iphigenia was the solution at Aulis. Schiller does not retain this moment at the Loire, but he seems to have been aware of its significance, including at least two references to it.

Near the end of Act I in Schiller, during the first audience with the dauphin, Johanna compares the certainty of ending the siege at Orleans to the steadfast flow of the river Loire:

Karl. Und Orleans sagst du, wird nicht übergehn?  
Johanna. Eh siehest du die Loire zurücke fließen.291

It is possible that Schiller chose not to include the reversal of the wind because this earlier scene was already replete with miraculous events: Johanna’s recognition of the dauphin, her so-called narration, in which she describes the vision of her mission, and her knowledge of the content of

291 Karl. So you say that Orleans will not fall?  
Johanna. Not before you see the Loire flow backward.
the dauphin’s prayers. The transcripts of her trials corroborate these three events. Later, in Act V, a Burgundian soldier witnesses Johanna’s ability to reverse the direction of the wind:

   Soldat (auf der Warte). Wie? Hat sie Flügel? Hat der Sturmwind sie Hinabgeführt?²⁹²

He announces this observation to Queen Isabeau after Johanna has broken her chains and jumped from the tower of her captivity. Breaking her chains is a Schillerian invention, but her survival of a jump from a tower in which she was being held captive is based on an event corroborated in the trial transcripts. Shaw also addresses this leap in the course of the trial scene (scene VI), during an exchange between one of the French clerics and Joan:

   Courcelles. When you were left unchained, did you not try to escape by jumping from a tower sixty feet high? If you cannot fly like a witch, how is it that you are still alive?
   Joan. I suppose the tower was not so high then. It has grown higher every day since you began asking me questions about it. (80)

Shaw has Joan imply that the feat of the jump from the tower can be explained by the tower perhaps not having been so high as later claims would assert. This is consistent with his theme that extraordinary events, even when they can be explained on rational grounds, will seem miraculus to those who choose to see them that way.

To this remarkable incident, Schiller adds the breaking of her chains. There is no historical basis for this incident, but Johanna makes a clear comparison of herself to the biblical narrative of Samson as she asks God to release her from her chains: “du halfst / Dem Simson, da er blind war und gefesselt…” (V. xi 3471-72) [You helped/ Samson when he was blind and

---

²⁹² “What? Does she have wings? Has some storm’s wind carried her off?”
fettered]. The interweaving of the legendary with the historical may not suit Shaw’s taste, but it is entirely consistent with Schiller’s tragic method.

In Scene IV, Joan does not appear. This is the tent scene noted above in which Warwick, Cauchon, and Chaplain de Stogumber discuss how to deal with Joan’s success in battle against the English and Burgundians. Although the scene contains no miraculous events, the issue of the supernatural arises when de Stogumber accuses Joan of witchcraft and of being an instrument of the devil in full earnest. This is also the scene in which Warwick anachronistically coins the terms Protestant and Nationalist to describe Joan’s motivations.

Scene V takes place following the coronation, which Shaw does not present on stage, a decision he knows will anger his critics because it diminishes the pageantry of the production (lviii). Schiller, as well as Verdi, Zhukovskiĭ and Chaĭkovskiĭ, saw the procession to the cathedral as an excellent opportunity to demonstrate the grandeur of the occasion and strengthen the theatrical impression of their respective works. Shaw claims that he wants none of this. He allowed his play to be premiered in New York partly because the actress he wanted to play Joan in London, Sibyl Thorndike, was tied up in an extended and successful production of another play (Tyson 83). He was additionally quite pleased with the Theater Guild of New York’s willingness to follow his instructions regarding the stage setting: “The scenes in Joan can all be reduced to extreme simplicity. A single pillar of the Gordon Craig type will make the cathedral. All the Loire needs is a horizon and a few of Simonson’s lanterns. The trial scene is as easy as the cathedral. The others present no difficulty” (88). Although Shaw criticizes Shakespeare’s lack of medieval “breath,” he admires the simplicity of Elizabethan theatrical values, which allow the spectator to remain focused on the action.
Scene V begins with only Joan and Dunois on stage. Their conversation ranges from reminiscing about the battles that led to the coronation to Joan’s impatience with the timidity of the Dauphin’s court. Joan asserts that if it were not for the comfort she receives from her voices, she would not have the strength to prevail against her adversaries. She tells Dunois that her voices come to her in the ringing of bells: “Not today, when they all rang: that was nothing but jangling. But here in this corner, where the bells come down from heaven, and the echoes linger, or in the fields, where they come from a distance through the quiet of the countryside, my voices are in them” (57). Murray’s translation of Quicherat refers to Joan’s habit of kneeling and crossing herself whenever bells rang, but he does not explicitly put the ringing of the bells together with Joan’s voices (216-17). Anatole France’s biography contains a description very similar to Joan’s lines in the play: “It was in the woods, amid the light rustling of the leaves, and especially when the bells rang for matins or compline, that she heard the sweet words most distinctly.” (France 43) Tyson says the idea may have come to Shaw from similar imagery in a play about Joan of Arc by Percy MacKaye, or that it might have developed over the course of several conversations with a priest, Father Leonard, who served as something of a Catholic ecclesiastical sounding board for Shaw during the writing of the play (Tyson 42). Joan’s explanation of how the voices come to her provokes Dunois into saying that if he thought that all of Joan’s sound reasons for recommending particular military tactics came only from her voices, he would think her insane. She replies that she invents her reasons because she knows that he does not believe in her voices: “But the voices come first; and I have to find the reasons after: whatever you may choose to believe” (57). In this moment, Shaw once more forces the audience to consider skeptically the miracle of her inspiration, but he nonetheless includes ahistorical details. Tyson’s conclusion about the role of the voices in the bells within the context of Shaw’s
play is significant: “We are speaking, however, not of history, but of poetry” (42). As effective as the moment may be, the voices in the bells are another example of Shaw’s deploying poetry, rather than facts, to achieve an effect.

Following this conversation, Joan and Dunois are joined by the newly crowned King Charles VII, the Archbishop, Bluebeard, and LaHire. Continuing her complaint about the need to continue military action against the occupying English forces, Joan becomes frustrated when the king and Archbishop suggest that it would be better to conclude a treaty with the English than to try to take Paris from them. Joan insists that she knows better, asserting once again the authority of her voices. Her behavior and tone rouse the indignation of the Archbishop, who has heretofore been her ally:

Archbishop. When you first came … you would not have dared to speak as you are now speaking. You came clothed with the virtue of humility; and because God blessed your enterprises accordingly, you have stained yourself with the sin of pride. The old Greek tragedy is rising among us. It is the chastisement of hubris.

Charles. Yes: she thinks she knows better than everyone else.

Joan. [distressed, but naïvely incapable of seeing the effect she is producing] But I do know better than any of you seem to. And I am not proud: I never speak unless I know I am right.

Bluebeard. [exclaiming] Ha ha!

Charles. [together] Just so!

Archbishop. How do you know you are right?

Joan. I always know. My voices ---

Charles. Oh, your voices, your voices. Why don’t the voices come to me? I am king, not you.

Joan. They do come to you; but you do not hear them. You have not sat in the field in the evening listening for them. When the angelus rings, you cross yourself and have done with it; but if you prayed from your heart, and listened to
the thrilling of the bells in the air after they stop ringing, you would hear the voices as well as I do. (60)

As she has done earlier in this scene, she now repeats the description of hearing her voices in the ringing of the bells, although as noted, there seems to be no testimony or non-literary evidence on which Shaw may base this manifestation of the phenomenon. It seems appropriate to recall once more Schiller’s notion of Schein (or semblance): “and a nature that delights in semblance no longer takes pleasure in something it receives, but in something it does.” What Joan does after perceiving the voices is make up reasons for them to Dunois and assert her tactical superiority to the remainder of the king’s council. Additionally, Shaw puts words into the mouth of the Archibishop, characterizing Joan’s pride as the hubris of Greek tragedy. Such an observation from a learned medieval man is entirely plausible, but its presence in this scene is conjecture and advances the poetic element, rather than the historical. As the scene progresses, Joan finds herself denounced by the Archbishop. This denunciation will be addressed below in connection with the pre-Schillerian influence of Euripides and Holinshed.

Scene VI presents what is supposed to be the final day of Joan’s trial and makes reference to two miracles, both of which take place off stage and are reported by characters afterwards: another element borrowed from Greek tragedy. The first miracle is reported by the French cleric Martin Ladvenu, following a striking outburst from the English Chaplain John de Stogumber, while the second report comes from Joan’s Executioner. The trial began on 21 February and ended on 29 May 1431, with the sentence carried out the following day. (Champion 32, 358). Shaw encapsulates the most exciting and moving moments of three months of testimony in some thirty pages of taut dialogue. Tyson provides Shaw’s own summation of this scene: “Joan’s unconscious confessions of heresy at her trial, her recantation, her relapse and her execution, occupied several days. On the stage they occupy forty minutes; but nothing essential is
misrepresented; and nothing is omitted except the adjournments and matters irrelevant to the final issue” (49). He is mistaken about the length of the trial – it lasted months rather than days – but Shaw cannot be expected to produce a scene that captures all the vagaries of a medieval trial, for this would have failed altogether as theater. Nonetheless, he was determined to make the fullest possible use of the transcripts. Nearly all critics – even those who begrudge him his artistic license – grant him success in this effort. “In short, the brilliance of Shaw in this scene lies not in the creation but the selection of dialogue from his principal source. He clearly read Murray with his critical faculties astretch, alert for fine lines and central issues; for the best and apparently most Shavian lines in the Trial Scene are all to be found in Murray’s translation of Quicherat” (Tyson 58). The aspect of the scene that arouses the greatest controversy is Shaw’s implication that Joan got as fair a trial as her judges could possibly give her. Champion and Pernoud provide strong arguments to the contrary. Such an assessment cannot be judged adequately on the basis of facts because fairness is inherently a matter of perspective and opinion. Shaw adopts this opinion partly because its counter-intuitive nature is consistent with his skeptical rejection of conventional wisdom of any sort, but also partly because it allows the audience to consider to what extent they agree or disagree with the judges. This consideration lays groundwork necessary for the discussion that takes place during the Epilogue, in which each of the characters eventually concludes that the world remains as unready for Joan in the twentieth century as it was in the fifteenth. At the conclusion of the trial itself, Chaplain John de Stogumber says to the Executioner: “Light your fire, man. To the stake with her” (92). Joan is taken away to be executed, which is when the off-stage miracles occur.

293 Cf. Champion 480-491; Pernoud 107-108.
Chaplain de Stogumber, who has advocated for Joan’s burning since the earlier tent scene, “is avowedly a Shavian invention,” as Tyson has it, “drawn from a mere hint in Murray, where, according to Shaw, he is known only by his having lost his temper and called Cauchon a traitor for accepting Joan's recantation” (35). Cauchon’s retort during the trial to an unnamed chaplain in the service of the Cardinal of Winchester, when the latter had accused him of being too lenient with the Maid, is recorded in Murray’s translation of the trial transcripts:

A chaplain of the Cardinal of England [Winchester], present at the first preaching, said to the Bishop of Beauvais [Cauchon], that he was showing too much favor to Jeanne; but the Bishop said to him, ‘You lie! For in such a case I would show favor to no one.’ The Cardinal of England reproved his chaplain and told him to be silent. (206)

Shaw appears to have found this moment worth preserving, although he uses it in the Tent Scene, instead of at the trial. The Chaplain loses his patience at Cauchon’s assertion that he will do all he can to save Joan’s soul, even if it means guiding her away from implicating herself in the charges which the English and the Inquisition plan to bring against her:

Chaplain. [rising up in fury] You are a traitor.

Cauchon. [springing up] You lie, priest. [Trembling with rage] If you dare do what this woman has done – set your country above the Holy Catholic Church – you shall go to the fire with her.

Setting up this confrontation between Cauchon and Chaplain de Stogumber in Scene IV permits the conflicting themes of Nationalism and Protestantism to be carried forward into the trial in Scene VI. De Stogumber, although invented, or perhaps telescoped from several individuals into one, thus embodies for Shaw the English hatred of the Maid, which was certainly informed more by patriotism than by religious fervor. Cauchon, on the other hand, is portrayed by Shaw as passionately committed to the international anti-feudalist potential of the Church, which he seems to believe is the only hope for the preservation of the body and soul of Europe. For
Cauchon, Joan’s private conduit to the revelation of God – be it protestant or schismatic – poses a threat to all Christians, no less than to her own soul.

Arguably, Shaw has Cauchon remain true to his word: de Stogumber storms out after the trial concludes and follows Joan to the fire. He returns a few minutes later, filled with horror and remorse at the scene he has just witnessed and throwing himself on the stool in which Joan has just been interrogated. He describes to Warwick what he has just seen, falling to his knees and wailing: “O God, take away this sight from me! O Christ, deliver me from this fire that is consuming me! She cried to Thee in the midst of it: Jesus! Jesus! Jesus! She is in Thy bosom; and I am in hell for evermore” (96). He recalls that Joan asks for a cross before the fire was set; a soldier makes one out of sticks for her; and the Executioner sets the fire. Shaw remains faithful to details reported in the nullification transcripts, but his dramatic consignment of Chaplain de Stogumber to the hell of his conscience is pure poetry. The Chaplain’s infernal torment is not more historically sound, nor less dramatically intriguing, than Johanna’s romantic captivation at the sight of Lionel Wandomme in Schiller.

Ladvenu now enters to announce his miracle and to add another hint at the content of the imminent Epilogue:

I took this cross from the church for her that she might see it to the last: she had only two sticks that she put to her bosom … When I had to snatch the cross from her sight, she looked up to heaven. And I do not believe the heavens were empty. I firmly believe that her Savior appeared to her then in His tenderest glory. She called to Him and died. This is not the end for her, but the beginning. (97)

Martin Ladvenu testified at the nullification trial that he had been so moved by Jeanne’s final confession that he obtained permission to offer her the sacrament of the Eucharist (192). His sympathy for Joan’s plight is plausible, but his vision of the appearance of the Savior to Joan is
Shaw’s invention. Following this, the Executioner comes in to inform Warwick that Joan is dead. Warwick wants to be sure that there are no bits of her body remaining to be hoarded as holy relics.

Executioner. Her heart would not burn, my lord; but everything that was left is at the bottom of the river. You have heard the last of her.

Warwick. [with a wry smile, thinking of what Ladvenu said] The last of her? Hm! I wonder! (97)

The extraordinary resistance of Jeanne’s internal organs to burning comes from the testimony of those who recounted at the nullification trial what they claim the executioner had told them (Murray 204, Pernoud 137). None of these witnesses claims to have seen the bleeding heart or unburned entrails themselves, thus the story, fascinating as it is, cannot be verified. This Shavian “fact” is therefore nothing but hearsay, which permits Warwick to respond in a manner that sets the stage for the final scene.

Tyson provides a very informative summary of the critics’ response to the Epilogue:

When Shaw’s play first appeared, the Epilogue created more critical dissension than all the other scenes put together. Jack Crawford of the Drama stated: ‘If I were to find something too obvious in the play, I should choose the epilogue, for I believed all Mr. Shaw wanted me to believe without its being retold me once more.’ A more extreme view was expressed by J. L. Kimball, who, a year later described the Epilogue as ‘wanton destruction’ and a ‘perfectly appalling’ ending to the play. On the other hand, for R. Ellis Roberts, the Epilogue was ‘easily the most successful part of the play.’ And this opinion was seconded by Reginald Owen, for whom the Epilogue was ‘the finishing touch to a work of great genius.’ (71)

Shaw casts aspersions on Schiller’s Johanna, but it seems that he cannot resist drawing upon Schiller’s Euripidean model, including the kind of rescue provided for Iphigeneia. Tellingly, Shaw could not bring himself to let the play end as Joan’s life did: with her immolation. “As to
the epilogue, I could hardly be expected to stultify myself by implying that Joan’s history in the world ended unhappily with her execution, instead of beginning there. It was necessary by hook or crook to show the canonized Joan as well as the incinerated one” (Shaw lix). He shows “the canonized Joan” by means of an extensive sequence in the chamber of King Charles VII, in which Joan is resurrected to allow her a final conversation with former comrades at arms and adversaries. Admittedly, Joan’s joshing and bluster throughout this scene often bear little of the mark of sanctity, and the tone of the discussion at times approaches the embarrassing: “Why, if it isn’t Peter Cauchon! How are you, Peter? What luck have you had since you burned me?” (103).  

The scene is meant to take place on the evening following the conclusion of the nullification trial in 1456. Ladvenu appears in the king’s chamber to announce that “a great wrong is set right before all men” and that her judges at Rouen “were full of corruption, cozenage, fraud and malice” (100). As more and more dead or faraway characters assemble in the chamber, Shaw wants us to suspend our incredulity at this scene by suggesting it is all a dream. He takes pains to keep Shakespearean and Schillerian ghosts out of his play. When Joan appears, the king is frightened, and she tells him: “Thourt asleep.”

Charles. Joan! Are you a ghost Joan?

Joan. Hardly even that, lad. Can a poor burnt-up lass have a ghost? I am but a dream that thourt dreaming. Thou looks older, lad.

---

294 One is involuntarily reminded of the mood of the denouement of the movie version of *The Wizard of Oz*, which appeared only in 1939, when Dorothy recognizes all her family and friends at home as her companions from the yellow brick road. Dorothy is no Saint Joan, but she bears some similarities to Iphigeneia in Tauris: a virgin rescued from destruction to serve a ritualized function in a strange and hostile place, all the while longing for her homeland.  

295 The king’s only interest in this news is that people can no longer accuse him of being “crowned by a witch and a heretic” (100). Ladvenu’s speech characterizes the nullification trial as full of perjury and calumny, unlike the earlier trial, which Shaw insists – rather like a voice in the wilderness – was conducted with thorough judicial conscientiousness. This dichotomy is an example of what Tyson calls the theme of truth obtained paradoxically by falsehood. He cites the Archbishop’s argument in Scene II, that miracles are not “frauds” because they create faith, as another example (73). The “falsehood” of the Epilogue is itself such a paradox, as Shaw seeks to propagate Joan’s living memory, rejecting her historical death.
Charles. I am older. Am I really asleep?

Joan. Fallen asleep over thy silly book. (101)²⁹⁶

When Dunois shortly appears, he says, “My body is very comfortably asleep in my bed at Chateaudun; but my spirit is called here by yours” (104). It is plausible that both of these men might dream about Joan. Dunois, having provided testimony, might even have been informed about the results of the trial before going to bed. As his words in this scene confirm, the king apparently did not know; how can we account for his learning in his sleep about the results of the nullification trial? Later in the scene, the soldier appears who made the cross of sticks for Joan, on his once yearly twenty-four-hour respite from hell, which he has earned for his one good deed (105-07). The king is unlikely to have known anything about this incident either, since it only came to light in the testimony from the nullification trial. Finally, a “Gentleman in the fashion of the year 1920” appears and announces Joan’s canonization (109-111). He also shows them “visions” of statues erected to Joan’s memory at Winchester and Rheims cathedrals. Unless the audience is to ascribe the gift of prophecy to this king, whom Shaw has repeatedly demonstrated throughout the play to be lacking in the kind of imagination such a gift demands, one can only conclude that the scene is complete romantic fantasy.

Tyson argues, “that a ‘resurrection’ would follow the burning is surely signaled by the final events of the previous scene, thus, in the Epilogue, Shaw is able to reveal the Life Force making use of suffering and death to further its positive purposes. And this reminds us that not only is the Epilogue central to Shaw's drama, but that it might have been l’idée mère for the

²⁹⁶ Shaw identifies Charles’s “silly book” in his stage directions as Fouquet’s Boccaccio, suggesting probably one of the most popular works of medieval times, the Decameron. Gahan’s discovery bears noting, however, in that, instead of the Decameron, Shaw apparently had in mind Fouquet’s richly illustrated version of De casibus virorum illustrium, which only appeared two years after the setting of this scene, depicting the tribulations of “illustrious” (or aristocratic) men, in a series of images inspired by both the author and the artists’s dreams. In this admittedly minute, but fascinating, detail, Shaw is again indulging in highly poetic imagery, both ironic and anachronistic (91-97). One of the illustrious men Boccaccio describes in Book One of the work is Iphigenia’s father, Agamemnon.
whole play” (72). It seems that Shaw’s Vitalism induces him to rescue his heroine in a manner as fantastical as that of Schiller’s Idealism, and for the same reason Euripides has for rescuing Iphigeneia. The rescue in each case renders the earlier actions and fate of the character sublime and elevates her fate to an event of national consequence.

Many observers have held up Jungfrau as an allegory of Schiller’s philosophical ideas. As discussed earlier, the actions of the characters certainly provide a vivid example of Schiller’s ideas put into dramatic practice, as befits an allegory. Shaw has this to say about allegory in drama: “If you are now satisfied that The Rhine Gold is an allegory, do not forget that an allegory is never quite consistent except when it is written by someone without dramatic faculty, in which case it is unreadable. There is only one way of dramatizing an idea; and that is by putting on the stage a human being possessed by that idea, yet none the less a human being with all the human impulses which make him akin and therefore interesting to us.” (Perfect Wagnerite 30-31). For Shaw, however, Schiller’s play fails as an allegory on at least two counts: the characterization of Johanna is not of a convincing human being, and the subject matter is historical, rather than mythic or legendary. What Shaw overlooks in such a judgment is the action of the Iphigenia myth in Schiller’s play, not to mention the circumstances in which Schiller composed his play. In Schiller’s time, if Joan of Arc was on anyone’s mind at all, she was not a clearly defined historical figure. She was at best a legendary martyr, and at worst, in the hands of Shakespeare and Voltaire, a subject of ignominy and ridicule. Had Schiller not raised Europe’s consciousness of Jeanne by mythologizing his Johanna, Shaw might have had no Saint Joan to hold up in contrast to his play and that of Shakespeare.

When Shaw accuses Shakespeare of scurrility, he is overlooking the fact that Shakespeare derived the majority of his impressions incorporated in Henry VI, Part I – positive,
negative, or objective – from the *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* by Raphaell Holinshed. Boas writes: “The basis of the play is to be found in Holinshed's Chronicles, 2nd edition, 1589, but the dramatist treated it freely” (35). Shakespeare consulted Holinshed while writing nearly all of his history plays, and Huizinga claims that in *Richard II*: “Shakespeare, with only his knowledge from Holinshed, came closer than any chronicler to the core of the historical character of the last Plantagenet” (88). The following scenes in *Henry VI, Part One* derive from Holinshed: the recognition and revelation of the king’s dream by Joan (called “the Pucelle” in this play; Holinshed 163, 164, 165); the death of Salisbury (161-162); the cowardice of Fastolfe (165); and the scene in which Joan claims to be pregnant (171). It is true that Holinshed often seasons his descriptions of her with insulting epithets (“false miscreant” 170; “pernicious instrument to hostilitie and bloudshed in diuelish witchcraft and sorcerie” 171), but in these instances it seems he is quoting from the transcripts of her condemnation trial. His first mention of her is quite flattering:

> Of fauour was she counted likesome, of person stronglie made and manlie, of courage great, hardie, and stout withall, an vnderstander of counsels though she were not at them, great semblance of chastitie both of bodie and behauiour, the name of Iesus in hir mouth about all hir businesses, humble, obedient, and fasting dierse daies in the weeke. (163)

In the early stages of her career, he expresses admiration for her military skill and firmness:

> But in hir prime time she armed at all points (like a iolie capteine) roade from Poictiers to Blois, and there found men of warre, vittels, and munition, ready to be conueied to Orleance. (164)

---

297 Holinshed published his first *Chronicles* in 1577, then published a revised update in 1587. Boas puts the second edition of this revision from 1589 in Shakespeare’s possession (Collinson 20). The 1808 facsimile used by the author of this dissertation appears to have been based on the 1587 edition.
In the battle of Lagny, where she fought against Franquet d’Arras, he describes “this captinesse” in tones of near awe: “In great courage and force did she and hir people sundrie times assaile him” (169). Holinshed also seems to have been completely aware of the nullification trial and the transformation of Joan’s status from heretic to martyr following her death (171). This development takes place years after the events of *Henry VI, Part One*, for which reason its absence from the play is reasonable. It seems permissible to say that the strange mixture of awe and scurrility to be found in Shakespeare may result from the playwright’s fidelity to his source. When Shakespeare has his characters call the Pucelle a miscreant, a sorceress, or a strumpet, he is not being scurrilous, he is quoting Holinshed verbatim. It seems possible, therefore, to suggest that Shakespeare’s play is as firmly based on the historical sources available to him as is Shaw’s on those available to him.

It is significant, however, that one important moment which appears in Shakespeare, Schiller and Shaw, while obliquely connected to Holinshed, owes the particular details that heighten its dramatic tension to Shakespeare’s imagination. This is the denunciation scene. Holinshed provides the following description of the events surrounding the Pucelle’s trial:

But herein (God helpe vs) she fullie afore possest of the feend, not able to hold hir in anie towardnesse of grace, falling streight waie into hir former abominations (and yet seeking to eetch out life as long as she might) stake not (though the shift were shamefull) to confesse hir selfe a strumpet, and (vnmaried as she was) to be with child. For trial, the lord regents lenitie gaue hir nine moneths staie, at the end wherof she found herein as false as wicked in the rest, an eight daies after, vpon a further definitiue sentence declared against hir to be relapse and a renouncer of hir oth and repentance, was she therevpon deliuered ouer to secular power, and so executed by consumption of fire in the old market place at Rone. (171)
It is unclear what Holinshed’s source might be for the astonishing assertion that Jeanne declared herself to be pregnant after her relapse, and for which she supposedly received an eight-month stay of execution. Perhaps it is his way of accounting for the many months between her capture and the conclusion of the trial. In any case, from this spurious diversion, Shakespeare concocts the Pucelle’s final confrontation with York and Warwick in the penultimate scene of his play. They bring in a shepherd who claims to be her father. The Pucelle declares that she is of noble birth and denies any relation to him, which, as Boas has it, “makes Joan a heartless snob” (38). Her erstwhile shepherd-father then denounces her and indignantly demands that they burn her, for “hanging is too good” (V. iii. 30-33). This is followed by her pathetic and unsuccessful appeals for clemency to York and Warwick on the grounds of her pregnancy, consistent with Holinshed. The appearance of the Maid’s father and his denunciation of her is entirely Shakespeare’s invention, one that seizes upon Schiller’s imagination. The German poet makes this moment the central catastrophe of his Romantic tragedy, casting Johanna’s father into the role of unwilling executioner, after the example of Iphigeneia’s father Agamemnon. Joan’s father does not appear as a character in Shaw’s play, although there are references to both of her parents throughout. The paternal role is initially assumed by the Archbishop, who is instinctively protective of Joan’s simple faith. As noted earlier, however, in Scene V following the coronation, he loses patience with what he sees as Joan’s impudence: “You reject our protection, and are determined to turn us all against you. In future, then, fend for yourself; and if you fail, God have mercy on your soul.” Joan replies: “Yes, I am alone on earth: I have always been alone. My father told my brothers to drown me if I would not stay to mind his sheep while France was bleeding to death” (66). Thus, following a denunciation by her protector at court, Joan remembers her own father’s readiness to take her life.
Joan’s comment about her father’s willingness to drown her is based on her own testimony during her trial (Champion 101). In the trial, she explains it as her father’s response to a dream he has had about her going off to war in the company of men. In that context, it can be understood as a perhaps harsh determination on his part to protect her virtue. It also suggests that Jeanne’s gift of prophecy perhaps came from her father. Schiller explores this theme fully in his play, and it becomes a central component of Verdi’s opera, where the prophetic gift is ascribed to the king, as well. In both of those versions, the denunciation also takes place after the coronation. Shaw lifts Jeanne’s factual testimony from the context of the trial and places it in the scene following the coronation, where he knows its dramatic power will increase when juxtaposed to the Archbishop’s denunciation.

The power of Shaw’s creation apparently only increases in live performance. Huizinga shares his impressions from several performances, including two in London – at Haymarket and the Regent Theatre, and one in the Netherlands. He disputes Shaw’s assertion that he has achieved a close sense of the medieval in the play and finds it odd that a master satirist, the creator of man and Superman, would write a play about a saint:

Once one has realized, on reading Saint Joan, that it is too closely akin to *Man and Superman* and the rest of Shaw to be a satisfactory dramatization of its noble subject, it comes as a great surprise on seeing it to discover that the play is not only an exciting but also an affecting and elevating experience. This is undoubtedly so, in part (to leave aside the skill of the actors), because of Shaw’s vivid depiction: the excellent dialogue at the court before Joan’s entrance, the conversation between Warwick and Cauchon, the Inquisitor (especially in O.B. Clarence’s portrayal as a blushing, debonair graybeard in the London production). Still, the high points of the play are precisely those where the author merely presents certain essential elements of the action itself: the irresistible bravery with which Joan swept away the dauphin and the court, the simplicity of the words we
know she actually spoke. Shaw is at his best when he sticks closest to history. “Be you the bastard of Orleans?” This is the very phrase, Dunois testified in 1455, with which Joan first greeted him. Shaw formulated as faithfully as possible from the records of the hearings themselves all Joan’s answers to the judges, among them the moving reply to the query whether she thought that she was in a state of grace: “If I am not, may God bring me to it; if I am, may God keep me in it!” (89)

For Huizinga, it appears that Shaw gets closest to the real Jeanne when he merely quotes the transcripts of the trials. His opinion is borne out by the scenes in which the dialogue is based on the transcripts. What he fails to consider, however, is that Shaw borrows the dramatic moment of the denunciation from Schiller, by way of Shakespeare’s romantic imagination.

It also seems that Shaw could not avoid endowing Joan with the salient features of sublime sanctity, despite his protestations about the falseness of Schiller’s depiction of Johanna. Some of these features are simply the facts as history presents them: Jeanne believed herself to be the bearer of a mission from heaven to save her people from invaders, a notion recorded in her statements in the transcripts of her trial. She was willing to sacrifice herself in order to fulfill this mission. When she was captured and imprisoned and tricked into recanting, the moment of her abjuration called out to be presented as an example of Schiller’s pathetically sublime, although the German playwright does not include these events in his play. Shaw recognizes the dramatic potential of these events, without concern for which ones may bear affinity to Euripides. For all his insistence that he is merely presenting the facts that eventually convinced the Church to canonize her, the manner by which Shaw has his Saint Joan conform to his notion of “evolutionary appetite” is just as contrary to the ecclesiastical criteria for canonization as the Kantian expression of will that guides Schiller’s mythologized Johanna away from the stake.

Shaw repeatedly asserts the singularity of Joan’s nature and existence as evidence of her
reality. Such selfless singularity is also the hallmark of Schillerian sanctity. She was so unusual that she cannot be a mere invention. He compares her to Socrates, Napoleon and Christ, confers on her the title of genius, and clearly relishes her newly minted sainthood, a station that he treats without derision, rather with complete admiration. Given his advocacy of Joan’s fierce singularity, it is odd that he takes Schiller to task for his Johanna’s having no “single point of contact with … any mortal woman that ever walked this earth.” The real Joan, according to Shaw, did not possess these points.

He argues that: “a sculptor of her time in Orleans made a statue of a helmeted young woman with a face that is unique in art in point of being evidently not an ideal face but a portrait, and yet so uncommon as to be unlike any real woman one has ever seen. It is surmised that Joan served unconsciously as the sculptor’s model’” (xi). This conclusion requires some analysis. The fact that the face resembles no real woman means that it must resemble Joan? But Shaw has a point. There were no other women of that time wandering around Orléans wearing helmets. The sculptor could have chosen to give the sculpture a face of idealized beauty, if he had only been trying to produce a generic image. His decision to reject such a face supports the argument that he must have had a living model, or at least someone alive, in mind. Tyson explains that Shaw was mistaken, and that the sculpture in question is of St. Maurice, now on display at the Musée Historique in Orléans (20). While this information seems to disprove Shaw, it leaves open the question who served as the fifteenth century model for this third century saint.

The dubious question of “Joan’s good looks” is a criticism Shaw levels against several of her earlier literary depictions (xi). As suggested by the discussion above, he asserts that Joan was not likely a woman of great beauty. To use this particular argument as a weapon against Schiller’s depiction is one of several points that demonstrate Shaw’s failure to see the Iphigeneia
myth at work in Schiller’s play. In the opening monologue of Euripides’s *Iphigeneia Among the Taurians*, during her narration of the manner by which she arrived in Tauris, she explains that her sacrifice by her father was not instigated by the direct demands of war – on at Aulis do the poor sailing winds raise the question of what to do about them – but because Agamemnon failed to fulfill his promise to the gods. In the year Iphigeneia was born, he had promised that he would sacrifice “the fairest thing the year brought forth,” which the priest, Calchas, reminds him is the child of his wife Clytemnestra (20-21 Kovacs IV.155). Thus, in Euripides’s tragedy, Iphigeneia’s physical beauty (in the Greek “kalliston” or “kallisteion”) becomes the catalyst for her sacrifice. By extension, it is not enough for Schiller’s Johanna to be tempted by the sight of Lionel; she must be physically beautiful in order to attract his reciprocally dangerous attention.

While he may not endorse Joan as a beauty, Shaw heartily endorses her as “original and presumptuous” (v). She is not the meek virginal type familiar from many saints’ lives. Searle offers this observation: “This presumption, together with the fact that she shows more solicitude … for the fate of her reputation in this world than for her soul in the next, suggests that in Shaw’s opinion her ‘heroic virtue’ proceeded not so much from Christian faith as from personal pride. [...] Shaw] is careful not to give the impression that she was acting in conformity with the Christian ideal of sacrifice … and that she went to the stake largely in response to the irresistible demands of her own self-esteem” (134-35). While the Dauphin’s court complains of her willfulness, she can be considered a sister of Schiller’s Johanna, acting on the promptings of her will. For Euripides, presumption of this sort is reflected in the Greek concept of *kleos*, which is a combination of blessedness and glory that is conferred to the hero’s family or country as a result of his accomplishments (Zeitlin 188-90). When Iphigeneia chooses, in full consciousness of her value to her family, to be a willing sacrificial victim, her *kleos* is extended to the entire nation.
and serves as a benediction to ensure the success of their patriotic mission. Shaw’s Joan also decides that death is preferable to life imprisonment, and a few minutes later in the Epilogue, her canonization is announced, as a kind of universal *kleos* for all of humanity.

Joan’s final line poses a question to which the dialogue preceding it implies a clear answer: “O God that madest this beautiful earth, when will it be ready to receive Thy saints? How long, O Lord, how long?” (114) All of her comrades have made it clear that humanity is not now ready for her to return “as a living woman” (112). Shaw’s Vitalism seems to suggest that when all people are free to respond to their evolutionary appetite unimpeded, the world will be ready for saints, but will have no more need of them.

While the world may not be ready for a living Joan, it continues to yearn for her memory. Kathryn Harrison, whose recent biography (*Joan of Arc: A Life Transfigured*, Doubleday, 2014) has generated a great deal of discussion, published an article, “Enduring Power,” on the six hundredth anniversary of Joan’s birth, in which she summarizes the saint’s astonishing trajectory from obscurity to object of seemingly universal fascination:

Six centuries is a long time to continue to mark the birth of a girl who, according to her family and friends, knew little more than spinning and watching over her father’s flocks. But type her name into Amazon’s search engine and you get more than 6,000 results. France’s national archives include tens of thousands of volumes about her. She has been immortalized by Shakespeare, Voltaire, Twain, Shaw, Brecht, Verdi, Tchaikovsky and Rubens; more recently, her life was fodder for the CBS television series *Joan of Arcadia*. (*New York Times* 6 January 2012)

---

298 This sanguine attitude toward the Trojan War is atypical of Euripides, who more often refers to this war as a disaster in his plays. In the case of his final play, he seems to be eager to use the symbolic unity of the Trojan expedition as a counter-example to the strife of the Peloponnesian War then ravaging Greece.
Significantly, in her listing of nine different literary and dramatic depictions of Jeanne, she omits Schiller. This is an echo of Shaw’s insistent dismissal of Schiller, despite the abundant evidence of his influence on Shaw’s work, as well as on several of the other artists in Harrison’s list.

Schiller might have been troubled by the current trend among producers of movies and television, who seem to treat their audiences like blank slates, guiding them through the plot of a work with the assumption that they know nothing about the history, geography, or personalities involved in it. Nothing could be farther from the practice of Schiller’s day. He assumed his audience knew history and literature as well as he did. With this in mind, he constructed his Romantic tragedy with an ear for poetry that drew deeply from the well of classical and biblical sources, and trusted his audience to be able fill in the blanks between the acts of his plays with their own imaginations. As he argued in Aesthetische Erziehung, he expected them to exhibit a “nature that delights in semblance” and takes pleasure “not in something it receives, but in something it does,” which is to go home and think about the ideas he had just brought to life on stage. Shaw made similar assumptions in composing the rapid transitions between the scenes that make up his Saint Joan, although his expectations of his audience were different from those of Schiller. In an essay on Shaw’s unacknowledged debt to Schiller, Blankenagel quotes the playwright’s Preface, regarding his expectations of the audience, and suggests that he ought to consider these words as they pertain to Schiller’s Jungfrau: “The fashion in which we think changes like the fashion of our clothes, and … it is difficult, if not impossible, for people to think otherwise than in the fashion of their own period” (li). It is to be hoped, that the fashion of the

---

299 Apparently, between publishing this article and publishing her book a little over two years later, she decided this was an oversight, for Schiller appears prominently in her biography. Additionally, it should be noted that Jeanne’s actual date of birth is unknown, which was not unusual in the fifteenth century. The date of 6 January derives from the crowing of the roosters and the visitation of the shepherds on that date, which are legendary in origin.
current day will pass and that audiences who willingly accept the responsibility to educate themselves before watching will elicit drama that rewards such effort. Until that happens, readers who yearn for the memory of Jeanne may delight in her semblance and take pleasure in contemplating whether or not Iphigeneia, Johanna, Giovanna, Ioanna, and Joan are all her sisters in sublime sanctity.
APPENDIX 1

Table Comparing the Spelling of Names

In comparing the primary characters as depicted by the various authors under frequent consideration in this dissertation, I have decided to allow the spelling of the name or epithet in the author’s language (or, in the case of Greek or Russian, in the transliterated form) to improve the efficiency of the discourse. The point is to associate a spelling immediately with a particular author, to avoid having to repeat each author’s name unnecessarily. In some cases, e.g. Charles VII, the spelling is the same for more than one author, but not all. In a few cases, e.g. Agnes Sorel, no such uniqueness of spelling exists, so no further efficiency is possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>Conventional Historical Name in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joan of Arc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td>Joan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltaire</td>
<td>Jeanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gluck</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiller</td>
<td>Johanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdi</td>
<td>Giovanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhukovskii/Chaïkovskii</td>
<td>Ioanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>Joan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2
Translations of Johanna’s Speech and Joan’s Letter to Henry VI, cited on p. 51

– King of England and you, Dukes
  Bedford und Gloster, who putrefy the kingdom!
  Give account to the King of Heaven
  For this bloodshed! Give back
  The keys to all the cities
  That you occupy against God’s law!
  The Virgin [Maid] comes from the King of Heaven,
  Seeking peace with you or bloody war.
  Decide! For I tell you, that you might know:
  Lovely France is not granted to you
  By the son of Mary – rather it is Charles
  My Lord and Dauphin, to whom God has given it,
  Who will be escorted to Paris
  By all the dignitaries of his kingdom.
  (Lii. 1207-21)

King of England, and you, Duke of Bedford,
who call yourself regent of the kingdom of
France, you William de la Poule, Sir John
Talbot, and you, Sir Thomas of Scales, who
call yourself lieutenant of the aforesaid duke
of Bedford, render your account to the King
of Heaven. Surrender to the Maid, who is
sent here from God, the King of Heaven, the
keys to all of the good cities that you have
taken and violated in France. She has come
here from God to proclaim the blood royal.
She is ready to make peace, if you are willing
to settle accounts with her, provided that you
give up France and pay for having occupied
her … And have no other opinion, for you
shall never hold the kingdom of France from
God, the King of Heaven, the son of St.
Mary; but King Charles, the true heir will
hold it; for God, the King of Heaven wishes it
so and has revealed this through the Maid,
and he will enter Paris with a goodly
company. (trans. Pernoud 33-34)
APPENDIX 3

Translations of Texts Cited in Chapter 3

(Cited pp. 191-92)

Die Kraniche des Ibykus
The Cranes of Ibykus

“We have come here from afar
And appeal for a welcoming roof,
That the hospitable one might spare us,
And defend the foreigner from disgrace.”

Ivikovy zhuravli
Ibykus’s cranes

“Visitor from a foreign shore,
I seek refuge, just like you;
May Zeus the defender keep
Misfortune from the stranger's head.» (21-24)

And cheerfully he advances
And finds himself in the midst of the forest –
[...]
Only Helios is permitted to say,
Who shines upon all earthly things,
[...]
Who, in the old custom, stern and grave,
With slow and deliberate step,
Emerge from behind the stage,
And make a circuit of the theater.
[...]
The torch’s gloomy reddish glow
[...]
“Happy is he, who free from guilt and error
Keeps his soul child-like and pure!”

And with firm faith in Zeus
He strides into the depth of the forest (25-26)

According to the ancient rite, pompously,
With deliberate and heavy step,
Swathed in holy terror,
It makes a circuit of the theater. (97-100)

Candles, from whose gloomy light
“Blessed is he, who is unacquainted with guilt
And pure with a child-like soul!” (121-22)

Selections from The Maid of Orleans (cited pp. 195-202 passim)

Prolog

Thibaut.
Yes, dear neighbors! Today once again
We French are free citizens and lords
Of the old soil, plowed by our fathers;
Who knows what tomorrow will demand of us!
(1-4)

Tibo.
So, good neighbors, now we are
Once again French, citizens, freely
We control the sacred soil of our fathers;
But tomorrow…who can say? Whose we
will be? What will be ours? (1-4)

Johanna.
And this Salisbury, the temple violator,
(321)

Ioanna.
With Salibury, who curses shrines
(323)

I.x. (Recognition scene)

Karl
Who are you, mighty one? Where do you come from?
(1032)

But who are you, miraculous one?
Where do you come from?
(1027)
Johanna

Venerable Lord, I am called Johanna (1047)

La Hire

She leads us on, the mighty one, into battle! (1135)

Holy father, I am called Ioanna (1042)

We are fortunate in battle, miraculous one, lead on! (1125)

II.ii.

Isabeau.

You are driven by ambition, by petty jealousy.
I am permitted to hate him; I gave birth to him. (1423-24)

Koroleva.

Oh no! Greed and hatred are your law.
But he is my son – I am empowered to hate. (1398-99)

II.viii.

[Johanna to Montgomery, after killing him]

Your foot dragged you to your death – be gone! (Steps away from him and stands still in contemplation)

Sublime Virgin, you bring forth might in me! (She steps away from him and stands still in contemplation) (1676-77)

Ioanna.

Your fate drew you to me…farewell, unlucky one! (Steps away from him and stops in contemplation) (1629-30)

III.i.

Dunois (to La Hire).

She is the child of the gods of holy Nature, as am I, and is my equal.
She should disdain the hand of a prince,

As the bride of pure angels,
Whose head glows with the light of the gods,
That gleams more brightly than any earthly crown.

[...] She has made France free
And must herself give her heart freely. (1844-58)

She is the heavenly child of holy Nature, as am I; we are equals.
And should she give her hand ingloriously,

Flawless bride of the angels?
More brightly than earthy crowns shine
The rays of heaven around her head;

[...] She has rescued our freedom for us –
Let her remain free. (1794-1809)

III.vi.

Talbot.

Delusion, you triumph and I must fall!
With stupidity the gods themselves contend in vain. (2318-23)

Sublime reason, bright daughter
Of the godhead, wise founder
Of the globe, guide of the stars,
Who are you then,

Insanity, you overcome, and I
Am sentenced to die, and the gods themselves
Are powerless to stand against you.
O proud intelligence, you, bright parent
Of wisdom, supreme founder
Of creation, ruler of the world, what are you? (2254-59)
This is how
A man meets his end – and the only bounty,
That we can plunder from life’s battle
Is the calm contemplation of oblivion
And hearty contempt for all that to us
Seemed sublime and worth wishing for.

(2352-56)

A person dies completely – and the only recompense
From our burdensome struggle with harsh life
Is the certainty of oblivion
And cold contempt for everything
That to us seemed great and worth wishing for.

(2288-92)

III.xi.

It wasn’t alive. It was a deceptive phantom
From hell, a wayward specter,
Risen up from the fiery pit,
To shock the noble heart in my bosom.

(2446-49)

It was something otherworldly
And not alive… it was a ghost,
A hostile spirit, arisen from hell,
To obscure the holy faith within me.

(2384-87)

V.xiii.

Soldier to Isabeau
What? Does she have wings? Has some
storm’s wind carried her off?

(3483)

She is on wings; she rushes headlong
like a vortex.

(3460)
APPENDIX 4

Translations of Lenskiĭ’s “Farewell Letter” from Pushkin’s Evgeniĭ Onegin
and Zhukovskii’s “Mechty,” a translation of Schiller’s “Die Ideale” (cited p. 243-44)

Pushkin

Where, where have you gone,
My golden days of spring?
What does the coming day hold in store
for me?[…]
Blessed is the day of troubles,
Blessed is the coming darkness!
[…]
And perhaps, from the grave, I
Will go forth to the mysterious shelter
Where a young poet’s memory
Will be swallowed up by the slow Lethe,
The world will forget me; but you
Might come, maid of beauty,
To shed a tear over the early urn
And think: he loved me,
To me alone he devoted
The dawn of his sad swift life!…
Friend of my heart, desired friend,
Come to me, come: I am your bridegroom!…
EO 6 XX and XXI

Zhukovskii “Mechty”

O joy of my days! Where, where are you rushing?
Golden, swift fantasy, halt!
Unbearable! Can it be that you will never return?
[…]
The heart’s vision hides itself!
The sweet dreams of my soul hide themselves!
[…]
O Life, with which I filled the whole world,
Where are you? All is lost! The creative genius is lost!
The phantoms of magic prodigy are lost!
As once Pygmalion,
Embracing the cold stone with hope and sorrow
Strove to transfuse all the fire, all the passionate flame
Of his soul’s whole life into the chisel’s creation,
Thus have I, child of freedom,
With love, with the bard’s joyful excitement,
Breathed in the embrace of nature
Warmly envisioning the lifeless one, to give her life! […]

PSSP I, 73
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