The Tower Study Guide

The Tower by Hugo von Hofmannsthal

BOOKRAGS

Contents

Introduction

Hugo von Hofmannsthal's five-act play *Der turm* (*The Tower*) was first published in book form in 1925. A revised version of *The Tower* was first performed on stage in 1927. Von Hofmannsthal adapted the story, set in seventeenth century Poland, from the play *La vida es sueno* (*Life Is a Dream;* 1635), by Pedro Calderon de la Barca, the great playwright of the Golden Age in Spanish literature.

The Tower concerns the fate of Sigismund, a young prince whose father, King Basilius, has kept him locked in the tower because of a prophecy that claimed he would rise up against his father in rebellion. As the play opens, Sigismund, now twenty-one years of age, has been locked in a cage like an animal, unaware of his royal heritage. A physician who has examined Sigismund convinces Julian, the tower governor, to persuade the king to restore his son as heir to the throne. But, as soon as the king grants Sigismund this power, the son rises up and attacks his father. After the king's attendants overpower him, Sigismund is sentenced to death. On the day of his execution, however, a planned rebellion among the noblemen dethrones the king and Sigismund ascends the throne as the new king. A peasant rebellion, however, lead by Oliver, results in the assassination of Sigismund.

As stated in *Contemporary Authors*, "*The Tower* expresses the hopeless fate of human existence ravaged by the brutal forces of a modern world devoid of a Christian mission."

Author Biography

Hugo Laurenz August von Hofmannsthal was born on February 1, 1874, in Vienna, Austria, the only child of Ann Maria Josefa Fohleutner and Hugo August Peter, the director of an investment bank. Von Hofmannsthal was raised in a prominent bourgeois family, which enjoyed both inherited wealth and professional success. His mother's father, originally Jewish, converted to Roman Catholicism to marry the daughter of an Austrian court official, and von Hofmannsthal's parents considered themselves fully assimilated into Austrian culture. Although they lost considerable assets in the stock market crash of 1873, his parents maintained a high standard of living, and von Hofmannsthal grew up with all the privileges of an elite education, cultural experiences such as regular opera and theater attendance, leisure activities such as fencing and riding lessons, and international travel.

Von Hofmannsthal attended Akademisches Gymnasium from 1884 to 1892. From 1892 to 1894, he attended law schools at the University of Vienna, but he left before earning a degree. From 1894 to 1895, he served in the Austrian army. In 1899, Von Hofmannsthal received a Ph.D. in philology, with a specialization in French literature, from the University of Vienna. However, he turned down the opportunity to pursue an academic career in favor of devoting himself to writing essays and plays. In 1901, he married Gertrud Schlesinger, with whom he had three children. During World War I, von Hofmannsthal served as a courier and translator. He died of a stroke on July 15, 1929, just before he was to attend the funeral of his eldest son.

Von Hofmannsthal was a noteworthy figure in the world of Viennese theater and letters. His first publication, a lyric drama, came when he was only seventeen, earning him the attention of such notable literary figures as the German Stefan George and the Austrian Arthur Schnitzler. After a period of mentorship under George, during which he published works in George's literary journal, von Hofmannsthal broke away from what he felt was an elitist literary philosophy. He formed the *Jung Wien* ("Young Vienna"), a literary circle concerned with the aesthetic principles of the French Symbolist Movement. Von Hofmannsthal became known internationally for his collaboration with the famous opera composer Richard Strauss. He was also one of the founders of the Salzburg theater festival, which continues to perform some of his works.

Plot Summary

Act 1

Act 1, scene 1, of *The Tower* takes place in front of the tower. The son of King Basilius, Sigismund, who was condemned to be locked in the tower for life because of a prophesy warning the king that his son would one day rise up against him in rebellion, is now twenty-one-years old. Sigismund, unaware of his royal heritage, lives and acts like an animal, locked in a cage and taunted by his keepers. Julian, the tower governor, has called in a physician to examine Sigismund; the physician makes note of his royal bearing. Act 1, scene 2, takes place in a room in the tower. Julian explains to the physician that Sigismund had been accused of murder and without a trial was condemned to death at the age of twelve. Julian had put him in the care of a peasant family until age sixteen, when he locked him in the tower to protect him from being murdered. Julian conspires with the physician to obtain a potion that they can give Sigismund, which will put him to sleep so they can transport him to a monastery for his own safety. Julian pays the physician with a purse of money and a valuable ring for this service.

Act 2

Act 2, scene 1, takes place in the cloisters of a monastery. King Basilius arrives with his attendants, and speaks with Brother Ignatius, the grand almoner, a very old and wise priest. The king explains to Brother Ignatius the prophecy that his son would one day rise against him in rebellion. Brother Ignatius chides the king for his behavior, and the king, in anger, has him taken away. Julian arrives and convinces the king to allow Sigismund a retrial to determine if he is fit to be restored to his proper place as heir to the throne. The king agrees and praises Julian for twenty-two years of loyal service. Act 2, scene 2, takes place in a room in the Tower. The peasant woman who raised Sigismund as a child is brought in, informs him that his stepfather has died, and prays with him. Julian then administers the potion that renders Sigismund unconscious.

Act 3

Act 3 takes place inside the queen's death chamber. Sigismund, restored to his humanity, rides up on a horse. The king grants him the power to succeed as the royal heir to the throne. But Sigismund immediately attacks the king and continues until attendants stop him. The king states that the prophesy has come true, as his son has risen up against him in rebellion. The king then sentences Sigismund and Julian to death for treason.

Act 4

Act 4 takes place in a hall in the castle. It is the day scheduled for the execution of Sigismund and Julian. On the way to his death, Sigismund is paraded through the streets. A planned rebellion breaks out, the king is ousted, and Sigismund ascends the throne in his place. He is informed, however, that the peasants have not accepted his rule, and, under the leadership of a man named Oliver, are in revolt.

Act 5

Act 5 takes place in an antechamber of the castle. Julian, who has been attacked by the rebels, is brought in to Sigismund, before dying. Oliver, who has taken control of the rebels, enters and challenges Sigismund's authority. Several of Oliver's attendants confirm that they have assassinated King Basilius. Oliver announces to Sigismund that he has taken control of the people. Sigismund is shot by Oliver's men and dies in the arms of Anton and the physician.

Act 1, Scene 1

Act 1, Scene 1 Summary

This poetic and highly allegorical play re-tells the Biblical story of Christ in the tale of Sigismund, a spiritual young man tortured and imprisoned by authority figures afraid of his power. Specific parallels to the Christ story appear throughout the play, making thematic points about the importance of integrity, faith and tensions between spiritual and earthly power.

In front of the tower, Olivier bullies and berates a young Recruit for not responding properly to his petty orders. After the Recruit goes off, conversation between the guards reveals that Olivier is the new Guard Commander. Olivier speaks arrogantly to them, and one of them comments that people with his kind of attitude go far.

At the sound of a muffled banging, Olivier orders whoever is making it to be silent. As the Recruit returns, a guard called Pancras tells Olivier that the Prisoner is making the noise. Olivier refers to the Prisoner as a prince and says that he's kept imprisoned wearing only a loincloth. Pancras reminds him that he's never to refer to the Prisoner as a prince, and Olivier arrogantly says there's no one strong enough to punish him for breaking the rules. A guard called Andrew explains the source of the noise, saying the Prisoner has a horse's bone that he uses to attack rats and other vermin when they get too much for him. Pancras suggests that because the Prisoner has been tormented since the day he was born, he torments whatever he can whenever he can. Olivier hears what he thinks are signals being passed back and forth between bands of Jewish smugglers, and Pancras comments with apparent irony on how clever he is. Andrew suggests they go out and find the smugglers, but Olivier says that because they're smuggling weapons they're to be left alone, suggesting they can sense "the bloodshed to come." The Recruit speaks superstitiously about what he thinks are other signs of bloodshed. Olivier speaks with pleasure about violence to come, and a Man with a Wooden Leg speaks in Biblical-sounding language about a man who will be raised to bring justice to the world.

As the Man and the Recruit continue to speak in poetic language about signs of approaching violence, Olivier grabs a weapon and prepares to beat the Prisoner into silence. The Recruit takes the weapon as Andrew reminds Olivier of the Ten Prohibitions, acts and behavior the guards are forbidden to do around the Prisoner. Andrew begins to list them, but Olivier says again that he can't be controlled. He, Pancras and Andrew argue over whether the Governor in charge of the tower truly has any right to issue orders. Olivier says he doesn't, and Pancras and Andrew say he does, all in poetic language. Olivier says that no one can give power to another unless he has it himself, pulling out a coin and referring to the face on it, which the audience understands to be the face of the King. Olivier demands to see the Governor, but Andrew tells him the Governor always communicates through a servant. Olivier says a servant isn't good enough to speak with him.

Anton, the Governor's servant, appears and with good humor futilely tries to pass on the Governor's orders that Olivier and the guards are to withdraw. Still silent, Olivier walks away from him, leading the other guards offstage. As he goes, Anton comments ironically on his good manners.

The Doctor comes in, asking for his patient. Anton tells him he needs to be asking for the Prisoner, not his patient. Conversation reveals that the Prisoner is kept in a cage, day and night, all year round, and that Anton sometimes talks to him, but only as much as he's allowed by the Ten Prohibitions. The Doctor tells him to bring the Prisoner out, saying he'll take the responsibility for anything that happens. Anton calls to the Prisoner by name - Sigismund. The Prisoner doesn't respond. Anton talks about how sometimes the Prisoner flies into a rage and attacks animals as though he were an animal himself. Anton says the Prisoner is actually educated, and then he goes to the cage, talking to the Prisoner in friendly terms. He opens the cage and withdraws quietly, saying the Prisoner must not be startled and urging the Doctor to give the Prisoner some medicine to calm him and make him happy. He sees the Prisoner is emerging from the cage and pretends to lie down and go to sleep.

The Prisoner - Sigismund - appears. Anton gently tells him to not be afraid of the Doctor, saying he can help him, and then assures the Doctor that Sigismund does know how to communicate, recounting how he spent much of his childhood with a family in the country. Anton tells Sigismund that today, speaking is allowed, and he promises that better times are coming. The Doctor comments on how what has been done to Sigismund is "monstrous" and asks whether he'd like to live in a different place. Sigismund responds in child-like, poetic language about beasts that all want to attack him and how he beats them back. Anton calls for a light so the Doctor can look into Sigismund's eyes. Sigismund asks the Doctor for help, and the Doctor says Sigismund seems to have difficulty telling the difference between his internal and external worlds. Sigismund speaks, again poetically, about how good he feels with the Doctor, and after Anton prompts him, he speaks in Biblical-sounding language about a prophecy contained in the "Seven Seals." A Soldier comes with a light, and the Doctor looks into Sigismund's eyes. He says he sees no madness, only "agony without end." As Anton puts the light out, Sigismund comments that life is good and says he has a star in him. This leads the Doctor to comment that because Sigismund clearly has a beautiful soul, the crime committed against him by imprisoning him is doubly awful.

Julian, the Governor, appears. Anton says that means the examination is over and tells Sigismund to go back into his cage. Sigismund refuses, and Anton picks up a weapon to prod him in. The Doctor tells him to tolerate his imprisonment one more day, until he can change the situation. As Sigismund goes in, the Doctor comments on his princely dignity. Anton locks the door, and he and the Doctor go up to see Julian.

Act 1, Scene 1 Analysis

This scene lays the play's core foundations of story and narrative style. In terms of the first, the situation is fairly clear. A prince is being kept prisoner and is being examined to

find out whether he's insane. The reasons for both sets of circumstances are unclear at this point, but there are several hints. This is where the play's sense of style comes into play, with those hints being couched in poetic language, enlarged upon through the utilization of defining contrasts and embedded in an allegorical sensibility.

The purpose of poetic language, in this play and in others that utilize it as a narrative technique, is to express emotions in a more vivid and evocative way and thereby awaken deeper responses and broader understanding in the audience than would be aroused by more prosaic writing. In this scene, for example, the frequent references to violence are expressed in language that expresses the profound effect that violence has, not only on the lives of individuals but also on society as a whole. Specifically, at one point Olivier refers to "what's left of the churches" as being swept up like "so much dirt." This image evokes several things, including extreme violence, disgust with the Church and its established authority and above all the sense that violence is not just that of individual against individual (which we see so much of in the treatment of Sigismund), but also of the human community against that which controls them. This image is particularly important given that Sigismund, in this scene and later in the play, leads both a personal rebellion against the people controlling him and a societal rebellion against the cultural forces that led to his imprisonment and that of others like him. The image of the destroyed churches, therefore, is one of those hints about why Sigismund is imprisoned. When it's juxtaposed with the comments made by the Man with the Wooden Leg about the "last" (Sigismund) becoming first, the audience understands that Sigismund has been imprisoned because someone is afraid of a rebellion he might lead. This idea is later revealed to be a core truth behind the King's actions in imprisoning Sigismund.

Another hint about the circumstances of the story's beginnings can be found through the contrast between Olivier and Sigismund . One is obsessed with power, and the other has no power whatsoever. One has no humility whatsoever, and the other lives in enforced humility to the point where he is completely repressed. This situation hints that Sigismund is being kept prisoner not just out of fear of the rebellion he might lead but also because someone with the same kind of arrogance as Olivier believes he shouldn't and mustn't be challenged. In other words, in the same way as Olivier belittles the Recruit and the other guards, Sigismund is belittled by whoever it is who has placed him in the cage and ordered the Ten Prohibitions. Later, the audience comes to understand that this person is the King. Other contrasts appear between the arrogant Olivier and Anton, who embodies compassion here and throughout the play, as well as between the Doctor and Julian. The Doctor is literally on the ground, confronting Sigismund face to face, and Julian is literally looking down from above, confronting Sigismund and his situation from a distance.

Another hint about the circumstances, or context, of the story can be found in the play's allegorical point of view. An allegory is a style of art in which a relatively commonplace story expresses a universal, psychological or societal truth, often Biblically related. Careful examination of the entire play, not just this scene, suggests that Sigismund is a Christ-like figure. Throughout the play, the audience can see this in several ways. Like Christ, he begins in obscurity. Like Christ, he is punished for no reason other than he is

who he is, and like Christ, he is tempted. Also like Christ, he is reluctant to accept his father's will (Sigismund's father being a king on earth in the same way as Christ's Father is King in Heaven). Finally, like Christ, Sigismund leads a rebellion. Like Christ, he passes on his authority to children, and like Christ, he dies so that others might live truly and fully. All these aspects to his story will be discussed in more detail as they appear in the story.

Images in the text also invoke Sigismund's Christ-like nature. In this section, these images include the reference by the Man with the Wooden Leg to a man who will carry "sword and scales" before him. A sword and scales are universal symbols of justice, which evokes an Old Testament image of God's justice being visited upon His people, a way of looking at Christ's mission on earth. Other images include the Man's comment about "the poor men's king" and reference to the lowest becoming the highest, both of which resemble ways in which Christ is referred to in both the Old and New Testaments. All of this means that in this scene, Sigismund's torturous living conditions represent the living conditions in which Christ began his life and his mission - specifically, his humanity. Because the Bible talks about Christ taking on and redeeming the sins of all humanity, the suggestion made by his being imprisoned in such awful circumstances is that in one way or another all humanity is imprisoned and tortured. A secondary suggestion is that all human beings are, like Sigismund, desperate for both the compassion represented by the Doctor and Anton and the freedom represented by Sigismund's desperate efforts to destroy the vermin attacking him. The fact that he does this wielding the bone of a horse is reminiscent of the Biblical strongman Samson wielding the jawbone of an ass and destroying an army. This image is another hint that the potential for destruction exists in Sigismund and that that's the reason he's being imprisoned.

Elements of foreshadowing include the reference to Sigismund's farm family, which foreshadows the appearance later in the play of his foster mother, and the prophecy involving the Seven Seals. This foreshadows the prophecy later revealed to be at the heart of the reason Sigismund was imprisoned and also foreshadows the repetition of the prophecy in Act 5, when Sigismund is confronted by the prophecies of the Gypsy Girl.

Act 1, Scene 2

Act 1, Scene 2 Summary

The setting is a room in the tower. Julian greets the Doctor, who describes what's happened to the Sigismund as a crime and an outrage against "the first born son of the supreme King," adding that what's wrong with the Prisoner's body can't be cured by medications. Julian accuses him of thinking too highly of himself, but the Doctor argues that he in fact thinks little of himself, talking poetically about how he ceaselessly studies the struggle between body and soul for mastery over human life, saying that strong will and strong faith are the same thing. He argues that the Prisoner's soul is noble and predestined for high distinction, while Julian suggests he's letting his imagination run away with him. The Doctor says that the time will come when the Prisoner will step forth and become master. Anton comes in with goblets of wine as Julian tells the Doctor he is expected to propose ways in which drastic improvements can be made to the Prisoner's physical health. He then explains food has been made ready and that an escort is standing by to accompany him out of the mountains. As he and the Doctor drink, Julian talks about how he's begun to have sleepless nights. He then confers with Anton, who tells him that Simon, a baptized Jew, has come with a letter.

As the Doctor goes out, Simon comes in, saying he was given the letter to bring to Anton in the usual way and that he rode all night in order to deliver the message promptly. He then goes out, and Julian reads the letter, which contains the news that the King's nephew has been killed in a riding accident and that the King's chief advisor has suddenly become a monk. Excited by this news, he calls Simon back in, asking him what the citizens are saying. Simon tells him the people and the world are miserable. Money is little use in these days, he says, and he speaks at poetic length about how the coinage with the king's face on it was developed and then devalued. The citizens are talking about a revolution that will end the lives of the nobility and the wealthy. He concludes by saying a nobleman equal in status to Julian is coming to discuss the situation. Julian sends him away and discusses with Anton whether Simon is telling the truth, revealing his excitement at the prospect of being asked to join the King's court. Anton tells him he'll be facing several new and difficult responsibilities and suggests they escape before they get involved in all the politics and manipulations of court life. Julian tells him to stop talking nonsense and issues detailed instructions on how to prepare for the nobleman's arrival. Anton speaks about how glad he'll be the nobleman has gone. Julian becomes angry and then tells him to arrange for watchmen to be alert for the nobleman's approach.

As Anton goes, the Doctor comes back in. The Doctor notices how jubilant Julian seems, but he hints that beneath his happiness evil lurks. Julian asks him to prescribe something that will calm him down, but the Doctor continues to talk about the war between good and evil that seems to be taking place in him, referring to a loneliness and pain that Julian says he's experienced since childhood. The Doctor tells him that since he became an adult, he's chosen a life of loneliness. He speaks in detailed poetic

length about how Julian's body and expressions appear strong but nevertheless betray his inner despair and awareness of the cruelty he's inflicting upon the noble soul of the Prisoner. As Julian protests that the Doctor doesn't know the facts, he takes down a sealed document, and speaks about how he was given orders to keep the Prisoner hidden from the world and therefore hid him with the farm family. He tells how he was accused of having ambitions for power based on the Prisoner's survival. There was a commission appointed to investigate what he was doing, and he lavishly entertained its members. The Doctor describes him as acting like Pontius Pilate. Julian then talks about how he was manipulated into putting the Prisoner into a prison cell with windows. The Prisoner was shot through the windows, and Julian has actually saved his life by imprisoning him in the way he has.

Julian unseals the document and shows it to the Doctor, who reads it and comments on how the Prisoner was convicted of plotting to assassinate the King when he was a child. Julian talks in poetic language about how the conviction was the direct result of a prophecy that appeared before the Prisoner was born, connecting him with acts of violence and revolution. He then locks away the document, saying there was nothing else he could do but obey the orders of the Prisoner's father.

The Doctor says he's made a list of things that would improve the Prisoner's living conditions, but then he tears it up, saying the Prisoner needs nothing less than to be spiritually reborn and freed as soon as possible. He adds that Julian's spiritual freedom depends on the Prisoner's physical freedom. Julian says he's only doing what he's been told, but the Doctor tells him his soul knows the truth, referring to a quote from the Bible that suggests a man's true soul can be identified by his actions. He accuses Julian of committing a crime against God himself, but Julian accuses the Prisoner of being a demon, saying the Doctor is overstepping his authority. The Doctor talks about how the Prisoner offers his words as though he's offering his soul, to be eaten like bread and drunk like wine, and how with each glance he offers his patience and holiness.

At the sound of a distant trumpet, Julian becomes nervous. The trumpet announces the approaching nobleman. The Doctor warns Julian to not betray the Prisoner, likening the sound of the trumpet to the sound of the crowing rooster that heralded Saint Peter's denial of knowing Christ. Julian quickly formulates a plan, asking the Doctor whether he can make a potion that will send the Prisoner into a deep sleep, enabling him to be transported safely. The Doctor understands him to be suggesting that the Prisoner and the King confront each other, but Julian tells him to not speak such things aloud. The Doctor then realizes that Julian means that if the Prisoner acts badly, his fate will be sealed. Julian agrees, saying the imprisonment will continue in the same way. The Doctor says he doesn't want to become involved, but Julian tells him if he doesn't participate the Prisoner is doomed. The Doctor agrees, and they make arrangements for the potion to be administered. The Doctor says that one of the side effects of the potion is that the deepest, holiest nature of the Prisoner's spirit will be briefly revealed.

The trumpets sound again. Julian gives the Doctor his fee and a ring to seal their deal. Anton comes in and helps Julian to dress to meet the nobleman, telling him a letter has been brought from the King and that a horse has also been brought for Julian to

accompany the nobleman to court. Julian tells him how the nobleman is to be greeted, and Anton comments ironically on how all the preparations will definitely make it look as though Julian has not been waiting for the nobleman's arrival for nineteen years. He is implying that this chance for gaining power and influence is exactly what Julian has been waiting for.

Act 1, Scene 2 Analysis

When considering the first part of this scene, the reader should remember that the Doctor doesn't know who Sigismund is. As he himself says, his comments about the Prisoner's nobility are based solely on what he saw in his eyes and behavior. He knows nothing of the Prisoner's identity, and Anton has been careful to say nothing that would let the Doctor know the identity of his patient. In other words, the Doctor's ignorance is evidence of the Ten Prohibitions at work. It's interesting to note that his belief in the Prisoner's spiritual nobility doesn't change once he discovers he's actually a prince. His language in praise of the Prisoner remains as spiritually elevated, and his attitude towards what Julian has done is equally negative. His belief that the Prisoner is destined for great things remains unchanged. This creates the impression that part of the play's thematic point relates to the value of the spirit, which the Doctor's words suggest is transcendent of both earthly glory, to which Sigismund has been born, and earthly squalor, to which he's been condemned.

This idea is defined further through the continued development of the Sigismund /Christ parallel, expanded further in this scene through several references to Biblical Scripture. Most notable of these is the Doctor's reference to Julian as Pontius Pilate, the Roman ruler who pronounced the judgment of execution on Christ. The reference introduces an idea discussed in detail later in this analysis, that Sigismund's being condemned to the tower is a parallel to Christ's Crucifixion. Other scriptural references include the reference to Sigismund's destiny as a master, a term by which frequently was used to refer to Christ. The final, and in some ways most obvious, scriptural reference is in the Doctor's comment about how Sigismund offers his soul to be eaten like bread and drunk like wine. This is a direct reference to Christ's comments at the Last Supper before the Crucifixion, in which he referred to the bread and wine being consumed as symbols of his body and blood. In making it, the Doctor is suggesting that Sigismund is as pure in soul as Christ was, that his life and death will be spiritually inspiring to others and that Sigismund's destiny is to die in order to make this inspiration fully possible. In short, again and again throughout this scene the audience is led to view Sigismund as representative of Christ, with the revolution that Sigismund is apparently destined to lead being the same kind of revolution in thought and morality, particularly in reference to wealth, as Christ led.

This raises the question of the relationship between the prophecy that Sigismund is destined to lead a violent life and Christ's life and teachings. There are certainly moments in Scripture in which Christ's influence, teachings and beliefs led to violence - not only violence against Christ himself but also his own violence, particularly the incident in the Temple when he overturned the tables of the moneychangers. This latter

story is particularly useful in considering the prophecy. As discussed in the previous paragraph, the Doctor's language seems to indicate that the prophecy relates to an overturning of the way money is viewed and used, exactly the same kind of revolution Christ advocated in the incident in the temple. This parallel is further reinforced in the speech of Simon the Jew, whose speech about the way money is being re-valued refers to Sigismund's upcoming revolution and, by implication, reinforces the Christ parallel. At this point, Simon is specifically referred to as a baptized Jew, meaning that he has converted from Judaism to Christianity. Because Christ himself was born a Jew but was in some ways the first convert to Christianity, the appearance of Simon represents and foreshadows the way the people in the world of the play are about to be converted to Sigismund's way of thinking in the same way as Simon has been converted to Christ's. The apostle Peter's name was originally Simon, and he is also known as Simon Peter. Peter was a leader among the apostles and the first pope, and this may be the origin of Simon the Jew's name.

The device of defining Sigismund and his character through contrast with other characters is used again in this scene, as Sigismund's apparent spiritual purity is clearly and vividly contrasted with Julian's equally clearly defined ambition. He wants earthly power, while Sigismund already has spiritual power and is destined for more. This contrast is pointed out not just by Julian's apparent excitement and not just by the Doctor's warnings against ambition. It's also made clear in Anton's clearly sarcastic comments on how awful it will be for Julian to meet with the other nobleman and accede to his demands to go to court and on how it will be clear to the nobleman Julian hasn't waiting for this visit. Juxtaposed with Julian's earlier excitement at the nobleman's visit, the comment points out that the encounter is exactly what Julian actually has been waiting for, and therefore suggests that both he and Sigismund are both about to encounter their destiny. The difference is that Julian has pursued this destiny, while Sigismund, in another Christlike parallel, is about to have his destiny imposed upon him, in terms of what his father the king expects him to be and also in terms of what the people need him to be.

Act 2, Scene 1

Act 2, Scene 1 Summary

The setting is a monastery. The King appears, followed by several courtiers. A Porter appears, unlocks the gate and tells them to wait. He tells a nearby Beggar that Brother Ignatius (the courtier who left the King's service so suddenly) will be glad to see him and tells him to wait as well. A Young Monk comes, and the King asks whether Ignatius is asleep. The Monk says he goes to bed at sunrise, and when the birds start to sing again, he wakes up. The Monk asks the Beggar what he wants, and as the Beggar repeatedly says he's not worthy of Ignatius' attention, the Porter tells the Monk that the Beggar wanders from monastery to monastery, is repeatedly turned back and prays for those who have rejected him. The King instructs the Monk to tell Ignatius that a man in great distress has come with an urgent petition. The Monk tells him to be patient and goes back out again.

In the distance, voices are heard singing in Latin as the King talks poetically and at length about the beauty of the evening. In the evening nature emerges from hiding, and the King speaks of a mighty stag, whose power and sexual attractiveness he likens to his own. He also says happiness has eluded him, and he's come for advice on how to regain both his happiness and his power. One by one his courtiers come forward. The First says that the "good money," with the King's head stamped on it, has disappeared from the country. A Second blames war profiteers and greedy Jews, and a Third continues to speak negatively about Jews. The Second urges the King to declare war on them. The King speaks, again at length. He cannot control the Jews, and his difficulties were foretold in the prophecy, he says. The prophecy contained horrifying images of war and violence, including one in which peasants turned their farming tools (scythes) into swords. He burned the paper upon which the prophecy was written, and its words continue to flame in his heart. The images showing his son rising up against him continue to appear in his mind. He expresses his hope that Ignatius will be able to help him, adding that he's still the king and still must be obeyed.

Ignatius, a very old man, appears, accompanied by the Young Monk. The voices singing in Latin become louder and more menacing as the Monk reads a section from a book that describes the presence of the world as a venomous fungus. This seems a reference to the King, but then Ignatius comments happily on seeing his visitor. The audience sees that he is, in fact, referring to the Beggar. Ignatius asks to bless the Beggar, but the Beggar runs away, saying again he's unworthy. The voices sing again. The Young Monk reads another quote, and the King tries to interrupt. Ignatius orders the Young Monk to continue, and the Young Monk reads a quote about how, in the world, men work without being paid, lie, betray and kill. The King again tries to interrupt, and again Ignatius tells the Young Monk to read. Again, the King insists upon being heard, pushing the Young Monk and his book aside. He talks at length about how his kingdom is falling apart and how he plans to attack the Jews. All the while, Ignatius indicates he's not interested, and the courtiers mutter about how rude he's being. The Young Monk

reads a quote about an innocent man being condemned, and Ignatius loses his temper and says angrily that nothing has any meaning but the judgment of God. Then he collapses, and the music stops.

The King tells the courtiers to back off and tries to speak with Ignatius alone, reminding him of the role he used to play at court. Ignatius says everything the King is and has ever been is nothing but vanity. The King reminds him that everything he did to his son, Sigismund, he did on Ignatius' advice when he was at court. Ignatius speaks poetically about what an animal the King is underneath his superficial manners. The King tries to justify what he did to Sigismund by referring to the prophecy, which the audience now learns also foretold of how Sigismund was to be conceived. Ignatius reminds him that Sigismund was conceived in Holy Wedlock, saying that marriage between a man and woman is as sacred as the union between the Church and God. The King falls to his knees, asking Ignatius' guidance in how to get his son back, but Ignatius tells him he's just acting. The King says he must have peace in his conscience, whether it comes from Sigismund being freed or being killed. He also asks whether God lies and how it's possible that even with Sigismund imprisoned, as God apparently decreed, rebellion and discontent still arose. Ignatius speaks at angry poetic length about how the terror and remorse the King is experiencing are part of the true face of God, the spirit of judgment. The King cries for help. He wants to forcibly take Ignatius back to court and make him give proper advice. The courtiers move forward, and the Monks block them. The music returns, and the First Courtier talks about how pleasant it would be to torture Ignatius. Then he orders him carried out.

A knock is heard at the gate. The Porter opens it and admits Julian, Anton and the Voivode (the nobleman who came to visit Julian at the end of Act 1, Scene 2). The Voivode greets the King, apologizes for the delay by saying they were held back by rebels and then introduces Julian as the man in charge of Sigismund's imprisonment. The King refers to Sigismund negatively, but Julian tells him he's well behaved and an innocent, proposing that the King put him to a test to find out his true state of mind. If he fails, he can and will be imprisoned. He also promises to take the responsibility for whatever happens. The King refers to him as a gentleman, says he will consider the proposal, tells the other courtiers that Julian's behavior is a good example of true devotion and wipes his eyes because he's so moved. He then expresses his desire to see the nearby grave of his queen, and as he goes, he tells Julian he will be welcome at court as his advisor. Julian bows to him, and the King leaves. Courtiers go to Julian, and Anton tries to hear their conversations. The courtiers flatter and compliment Julian. The King returns briefly and watches, and Anton crosses himself.

Act 2, Scene 1 Analysis

The dramatic and thematic point of this scene is to highlight the difference between earthly influence, as represented by the King, the courtiers and later by Julian, and spiritual power, as represented by Ignatius. This difference is illustrated in several ways.

First, there is the vividly drawn arrogance of the courtiers and the King. These characters' insistence that their wishes be gratified immediately, simply because they think it is their right, represents the control over spirituality that earthly power is constantly struggling to maintain. It also represents the same desire in humanity in general, the way that we as human beings are constantly searching for that which fulfils our immediate cravings as opposed to having the patience to wait for spiritual fulfillment.

The second way in which the contrast between earthly and spiritual influence is highlighted in this scene appears in the treatment of the Beggar. He is dismissed by the courtiers but attended to by Ignatius, reiterating the point that earthly power, represented by the King and courtiers, is essentially selfish, while spiritual power, again represented by Ignatius, is gracious and compassionate.

The third way the contrast is defined appears in the scene's final moments, when the courtiers sense that Julian is moving into a position of power and immediately suck up in order to gain favor. This is very different from the way the Porter and the Young Monk function in relation to Ignatius. Yes, they serve him in the way the courtiers serve the King, but the difference is that they don't do it selfishly. The courtiers act the way they do so they can gain favors and influence. The Young Monk and Porter serve Ignatius out of a sense of selfless devotion to Ignatius' spiritual aims. This is why they're so strict when confronted with the arrogance of the King and his entourage - their goals are Ignatius' goals, whereas the courtiers' goals are their own.

As was the case in previous scenes, there are several Biblical references in this scene. These include the Beggar, who is a reference to several Beggars who appear throughout the Bible and who receive various blessings. The difference between these beggars and this Beggar is that the Biblical beggars accept the blessings that are offered. In his rejection of Ignatius' blessing, the Beggar here is an ironic representation of the King and the way that he and his courtiers do not receive Ignatius' blessing. The point here is that the Beggar knows he's unworthy, while the King refuses to believe he's unworthy. This is the point of Ignatius' increasingly angry responses to the King's pleas - he's trying to make the King see how unworthy he truly is.

Another Biblical reference can be found in the King's reference to the peasants turning their scythes into swords. This is in fact a reversal of a Biblical image, Christ's prophecy that when the Kingdom of God appears men will turn their swords into ploughshares, or scythes. The image reinforces the earthy nature of the King's power and that the revolution to come has less to do with spiritual values than it does with earthly values like money and proper wages. This idea is reinforced by the courtiers' repeated references to currency and coins.

Repeated negative comments about Jews appear in this scene and throughout the play, and it's easy to see them as being representative of anti-Semitic beliefs in the author. It becomes even easier when it's remembered that the author is German and the play was written in the years after World War I, in which Germany suffered a humiliating military defeat and the discontent and anger that gave rise to Hitler and the Third Reich was beginning to form. It must be remembered, however, that it's only authority figures like

Olivier (in Act 1, Scene 1), the King and the courtiers who make the references. Ignatius, Sigismund and other spiritual figures don't. This suggests that the anti-Semitic references are in fact pointed commentary on the intolerant nature of power in general, and power in Germany in particular.

Act 2, Scene 2

Act 2, Scene 2 Summary

The setting is another room of the tower. Sigismund, barefoot but wearing a good suit, waits. In the background is a pile of charred straw. Anton comes in, saying that Sigismund is about to have a visitor. He becomes angry as he sees from the straw that Sigismund has been playing with fire, and he insists that Sigismund tell him what he's been doing. Sigismund says his fire was great, and Anton calls him foolish. Sigismund says his father appeared to him in the fire, and Anton says he was dreaming and that the room is a disgusting mess. Any human being would be ashamed to live there. Sigismund asks whether he actually is a human being, but Anton appears to ignore the question, telling him to wash himself.

A Peasant Woman comes in. Conversation reveals that she is Sigismund's foster mother from the farm family with whom he lived early in his life. She combs his hair as she tells him his foster father has been dead for years. Sigismund mentions that he has visions of his foster father, and the Peasant Woman urges him to pray. Sigismund says he feels so powerful that he can blow away a straw and a stone tower with equal ease. The Peasant Woman speaks poetically about how beautiful his soul is. He speaks with vivid imagery about how he identified with the death cries of a slaughtered pig. She tries to get him to pray with her, but he asks to be taken back home. She says that if they pray together, they'll be at their spiritual home. He cries out to his real mother. She points to a Crucifix on the wall and tells him to be less concerned with his physical mother and more concerned with his spiritual father. He imitates the posture of Christ on the Crucifix, and then he lowers his arms and says again that he identifies with animals. With increasing intensity, she tells him again and again to pray, and he tells her again and again that there's anger in him. Finally, when she prays to the saints to help him, he asks her whether she knows what's going to happen to him.

Julian appears, carrying a vial that contains the Doctor's potion. The Peasant Woman kisses the hem of his robe. Conversation reveals that Anton and the Peasant Woman were brought in to calm Sigismund. Julian tells Sigismund he's come to bring him joy and that he believes Sigismund's ordeal has made him not insane but wise. Julian reminds Sigismund of how they studied the Bible together and learned its lessons of God and life, and he tells Sigismund to do what the Peasant Woman did and kiss his robe. Sigismund asks to see his father and mother. Julian tells him he was banished from his parents' sight. In poetic language, Sigismund protests his innocence. Julian tells him that he, Julian, has made Sigismund spiritually powerful. Sigismund asks what he's holding, and Julian speaks poetically about how he holds freedom in his hand. He then whispers to Anton, and Anton cheerily tells Sigismund to get ready for a journey. Julian tells him he has to drink the potion to go on that journey, but Sigismund reminds him that people have been killed by drinking potions and asks to be told who he truly is before he drinks. Julian threatens him with violence, and Sigismund agrees to drink. As

he does, he tells Julian he'll be dragged with him before God to face judgment. He then falls unconscious. Julian says that Sigismund will actually drag him up to the throne.

Anton cradles Sigismund in his arms, speaking poetically about how beautiful and saintly he is. This is a reference to what the Doctor described earlier (at the end of Act 1, Scene 1) as the potion's side effects. Sigismund then wakes up, speaking poetically of how he feels his father is with him. He feels the whole world is contained in his room, and he feels he could fly. As Julian calls for the guards, Sigismund speaks, again poetically, about how glorious man is. He's ready to walk into the fiery furnace, and he begins to speak Christ's final words, "Father, into thy hands - " but collapses before he can finish. Julian orders that Sigismund be dressed in royal clothes and that all other preparations for departure be completed.

Act 2, Scene 2 Analysis

The idea that Sigismund and his experiences are intended to represent Christ and Christ's life is reiterated several times throughout this scene. This occurs most notably in the way Sigismund spreads his arms in imitation of the posture of Christ on the Cross and also in his final lines, which are a direct quote of Christ's final words at his Crucifixion. The full quote is "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." The use of the quote here suggests that on some level, Sigismund is aware that his fate is in the hands of his earthly father, an awareness that is even stronger in us given that we know that his father is the King and that Sigismund's intuition is absolutely right. Other resemblances between Sigismund and Christ also appear. The conversation with the Peasant Woman has echoes of the various conversations Christ has with his earthly mother, the Virgin Mary, and Sigismund refers to identifying with animals, echoing Christ's identifications with people like lepers and prostitutes who were themselves treated like animals. Finally, a Biblical reference not directly connected to Christ can be found in Sigismund's comment about the fiery furnace, representative of the Old Testament story of three young men whose faith was tested by a king who literally threw them into a furnace and who emerged unscathed. The fire that Sigismund creates simultaneously foreshadows and symbolizes the fire of revolution the King fears and that Sigismund himself ignites later in the play.

Act 3, Part 1

Act 3, Part 1 Summary

The setting is a room that used to be the queen's bedchamber, which has been untouched since her death. A complicated ritual begins the scene in which the King ritually purifies himself and the room. Anton and Julian also participate.

The Doctor appears and confirms with the King both his intention to not participate in the testing of Sigismund and that a trusted assistant has been briefed on what to do if Sigismund should become unstable. He refers specifically to a sponge that has been soaked in a powerful narcotic, the vapors of which will calm Sigismund immediately. The King expresses his gratitude, and the Doctor kisses his hand and leaves.

The King speaks with his Confessor (the hearer of his prayers and confessions) about his guilt over what he did to Sigismund. The Confessor repeatedly reassures him that he did the right thing, saying there are historical and legal precedents and that the King's power to make decisions his decision about Sigismund comes directly from God. A courtier appears with news that the Sigismund, the prince, is expected at any moment. Another courtier, who rode with Sigismund, says he's a born rider. Julian tells the King that Sigismund has never been on a horse in his life, and the audience understands that that was one of the Ten Prohibitions. He also assures the King that Sigismund's language will be respectful, but natural and raw. Conversation reveals that a nobleman named Adam has been appointed to pose as Sigismund's friend and get him to talk about his true feelings. The King will listen to the conversation from a hiding place, and Julian believes Sigismund to be guileless and innocent. The King comments that he is prepared to do whatever is necessary to ensure that power and order in the kingdom continue, and Julian falls to his knees and urges compassion. The King urges him to be a better counselor to Sigismund than Ignatius was to him. As a courtier reports on Sigismund's desire to rest, the King becomes aware of music being played on an organ. He orders that it be stopped, but Julian urges him to let it continue, saying it calms Sigismund. The King dismisses his courtiers, and Anton leaves with a warning that the meeting between Sigismund and the King will not go well.

The King tearfully recalls an occasion when a fellow king turned over his throne to his heir and urged him to bless the people of the kingdom in the same way that he himself had been blessed. He suggests that he might like to withdraw to a monastery the way Ignatius did. He then asks the Confessor what would define a bad enough act by Sigismund that he could be executed. The Confessor tells him how five year old children, who have been able to tell the difference between an apple and a coin, have been executed. In other words, even children can tell the difference between right and wrong, and the King takes him to mean that no matter how slight Sigismund's transgression, the King has the right to execute him. A courtier reports that Adam and Sigismund are on their way up. The King dismisses the Confessor and then withdraws with Julian to observe the conversation between Adam and Sigismund.

Act 3, Part 1 Analysis

The first section of the third act serves mostly to build suspense about what will happen when the King and Sigismund finally confront each other. This is done through the repeated reports of Sigismund's progress, the King's questioning of the Confessor about how badly Sigismund will have to behave in order for execution to be justified and the increasing sense that Sigismund, in his own way, is as regal as the King. The sense of Sigismund's impending death, however, is created most vividly in the Doctor's reference to a soaked sponge. This is yet another reference to Christ's crucifixion, since the Bible describes how, in his final hours on the cross, Christ said he was thirsty and was given a sponge soaked in vinegar to drink from. The reference here suggests that Sigismund is about to reunite with his father in the same way as Christ was about to re-unite with his and also that Sigismund is about to die, perhaps not physically but at least spiritually.

The confrontation between Sigismund and both his past and his destiny takes place in the chamber where his mother lived, in which he was both conceived and born. The suggestion here is that as a result of his confrontation with the King in this room, Sigismund is reborn, an idea supported by his becoming a revolutionary later in the play - being reborn into a new life.

Act 3, Part 2

Act 3, Part 2 Summary

Music from the organ continues as Adam and Sigismund come in, with Adam speaking reassuringly and Sigismund communicating only through gestures, which the King describes to Julian as being thoroughly regal. He then comments that Sigismund is the very image of the queen. He tells Julian to go in and tell Sigismund everything.

Julian reveals himself, and when Sigismund reacts with fear, Julian speaks both reassuringly and flatteringly that whatever he wants he can have. Julian reveals that Sigismund is in his father's house and says that Sigismund doesn't ask what's happened to him or why because his noble soul knows he's there for a noble purpose. He refers to Sigismund as crown prince, announces the King, and as the music becomes louder, refers to the King as "Father, Creator of Heaven and Earth!" The King prays briefly that Sigismund accept him. Sigismund falls to his knees, and the King comes in. He opens his arms and says everything is forgiven, meaning everything in the prophecy. Sigismund turns away.

The King repeatedly asks him to speak and then says that he must be obeyed because as King he has the ultimate authority and was given that authority by God. He talks at poetic length about how God's power and the King's power are the same. He points out that Sigismund was conceived in this very room and emphasizes that becoming King is a God-given destiny. Sigismund pleads with him to reveal the humanity they share, but the King tells him to remember he is a prince and orders him to sit at his feet. As Sigismund sits, the King tells him he is ambitious and cunning. Sigismund has to trust in the King and learn from him, and his first responsibility as prince will be to get rid of Julian, whom the King describes as a scheming serpent. He blames Julian for Sigismund's imprisonment, saying he wanted to become heir to the throne in his place, and he also blames Julian for beginning the revolution. He says Julian's fate is in Sigismund's hands, gives him a ring as a symbol of his authority and urges him to arrest Julian and thereby show the rebels how terrible and mighty he is.

Sigismund calls the King Satan and strikes him, referring to him as being the same as an old fox he strangled with his bare hands. The King calls for help, but Sigismund grabs the King's sword and threatens him with it, saying that since Sigismund walked in the door he has been king, and takes the King's robes for himself. The King collapses. Several courtiers and soldiers rush in, and Sigismund tells them to obey only him and get rid of the King's body. Julian rushes in and kneels to Sigismund as if he were king. Adam examines the King and says he's still alive. Courtiers rush to overpower Sigismund and carry him off while others help the King back to his feet and return his robes and sword to him. The Confessor, the Doctor and Anton, who is carrying the dish with the sponge, all appear. Courtiers grab the dish and run off with it, quickly coming back with the news that Sigismund has been subdued.

The King is back on his feet. Julian kneels before him, but the King ignores him, saying to the Confessor that Sigismund must be executed. The King speaks of hearing the sounds of iron doors closing and chains rattling when Sigismund had the sword to his neck. The Confessor tells him they were the sounds of Sigismund's imprisonment. The King, Confessor and courtiers leave, with some of the courtiers spitting contemptuously on Julian as they pass. Julian speaks poetically to Anton about how the devil must still, and always, be fought and about the folly of being too submissive.

A courtier returns, saying the King's judgment is that Sigismund should be imprisoned again and that even though he thinks Julian should be executed for treason, the King will be merciful. He says Julian has been ordered to be Sigismund's keeper for the rest of his life. If anyone sees either of them they will be executed, and Julian's privileges of office are to be taken from him. After the courtier goes, Anton tries to comfort Julian, but Julian is having none of it. As he sits in shock, the Doctor appears and issues orders for the care of Sigismund. He gives Julian a potion to restore his spirit and then supervises as his assistants carry Sigismund out. When Sigismund is gone, the Doctor promises Sigismund will be taken care of and hints that his struggle for freedom isn't finished.

Adam appears, saying that departure for the tower (where Sigismund is to be imprisoned) is going to be delayed. Peasants and other citizens are blocking the roads as they flock to the churches, wanting to pray for the appearance of a "beggar king" who, in chains, will lead them into a new age. After he goes, Julian urges the Doctor to stay with him, but the Doctor says his part in Sigismund's life is over, adding that the journeys of such men as him are governed by much higher powers.

Act 3, Part 2 Analysis

The second part of the third act contains the play's first climax. The confrontation between Sigismund and the King is the dramatic and thematic high point of the action so far. In terms of the play's central metaphor, Sigismund as a Christ figure, the confrontation here is one that Christ never really got to have, a confrontation with the higher power that placed him on his destined path. Because the Christ metaphor has been so vividly defined throughout the play, the audience might reasonably wonder at this point whether showing this confrontation is in fact one of the play's key purposes, to play out an imaginary confrontation between Christ and God. We might also reasonably wonder, however, whether the confrontation is symbolic on a more general level. Is Sigismund's confrontation with his father in fact a confrontation that none of us gets to have, a clash between humanity and the higher power, however we as individuals define it, which decides our destiny?

The key issue at the core of this confrontation, whatever its metaphoric value, is power - who has it, who refuses it, who grabs it and how it's wielded. The King has it and tries to use it to both dominate his son and destroy Julian. Sigismund grabs it, and the King and his courtiers take it back. At the end of the scene, Julian is stripped of it. Perhaps most interestingly, however, the Doctor speaks in support of a different kind of power from that which has dramatically powered the rest of the scene, true spiritual power. In his

words can be found the suggestion that Sigismund has succumbed to the kind of violence-based power held by his father and that's the reason why he's been subdued. The Doctor is suggesting that if Sigismund had instead drawn upon his own spiritual power, the outcome of the confrontation would have been different. The play's suggestion, therefore, and one of its key thematic points, is that if we as human beings respond to confrontation and challenge through spiritual power rather than earthly, physical power, we are less likely to find ourselves imprisoned and/or dominated by others.

An interesting question to examine at this point is what the character of the King is all about. The audience sees his sentimentality as he weeps at the memory of his queen and at seeing Sigismund. We also see his ruthlessness, his insecurity, his desperation to maintain his power and his capacity for manipulation. Many of these aspects to his personality seem to be contradictory, but it must be remembered that the goal of any king, at least in the medieval-ish time the play seems to be set, is to ensure he has someone worthy to pass his throne and power to. Following the death of his nephew earlier, Sigismund is his only option, in spite of the warnings of the prophecy. The Children's King, whom we discover later is also his son, was born out of wedlock and is therefore not an option.

If the audience accepts that the King's primary motivation is to ensure the succession and that the status of the kingdom will be maintained, everything he says and does and feels makes sense. His weeping and sentimentality become connected to grief over lost hopes for a safe succession. His insecurity becomes connected to fear that the succession will not be safely passed, and his ruthlessness and desperation become aspects of his desire to establish a succession that can't and won't be disrupted. Most importantly, his manipulations, such as his testing of Sigismund and his command that he get rid of Julian, are connected to his desire to ensure that Sigismund is a worthy successor. In short, the King is all about making sure he has a strong, sane heir. This means that his testing of Sigismund is prompted by the death of the nephew. His sentimentality is prompted by his belief that his family (the queen and Sigismund) has provided, or will provide, that heir, and his capacity for manipulation is employed to ensure that he gets the heir he wants. At the end of this scene, however, everything he wants and dreams about has been effectively destroyed.

A key element of foreshadowing occurs late in this scene, as the Doctor's cryptic hints that Sigismund's fate has not yet been completely decided foreshadow both his increasingly important role in the revolution and his eventual death.

Act 4

Act 4 Summary

The fourth act takes place in Sigismund's new prison cell, a subterranean chamber beneath the tower. Sigismund sits on his bed. Julian and Anton appear, with Anton carrying a bundle of robes. Conversation reveals that it's been a long time since Sigismund saw Julian. Julian has been making plans for Sigismund's escape, but Sigismund believes there is no chance of true freedom for him. Every time Julian visits, though, Sigismund finds it possible to imagine himself back in the world again. Julian tells him that he and not the King is his true spiritual father, and he encourages Sigismund to be brave. Anton says he's just heard a shot, but Julian tells him to listen for a knock on the door and nothing else. He then tells Sigismund in intensely poetic language that while he was away, rebellion against the King and the Government came out into the open.

The rebels are using Sigismund's name as their battle cry, and the time has come for him to lead the rebellion in person. Sigismund insists he's only dreaming and refers to how Julian taught him everything other than true spiritual communion between spirits was vanity. Julian tells him power awaits, and Sigismund says he doesn't want it. Julian struggles to persuade him to take it, and Sigismund struggles to make Julian remember that he was the one who taught him to value spirit over anything else. They argue with increasing poetic intensity as Anton says he can hear rebels approaching and can smell things burning. Julian unwraps the bundle of royal robes brought in by Anton and insists Sigismund put them on. Sigismund refuses, saying as Julian continues to argue that he, Sigismund, belongs to himself and that nothing can touch him.

A Messenger appears, followed by a Boy. The Messenger prays in Latin, and Anton says that speaking in such language was the way he managed to pass through the ranks of the rebels. Julian insists the Messenger be searched for a written message. Sigismund again refuses to take the power Julian is offering. The Boy says the peasants are executing the nobles, and that Olivier (the arrogant soldier from Act 1, Scene 1) is taking command of the rebellion. The Messenger disappears as Julian comments that he has unleashed hell and goes to see what's going on. As the Boy follows, Anton tries to force Sigismund's feet into his boots, saying they have to escape. Sigismund says he's happy where he is. The Boy shouts down that Julian is trying to calm the rebels, but they're not listening. Anton tries again to talk Sigismund into running away, but Sigismund says he won't. He senses something important is about to happen to him, and when Anton threatens him with violence, he says that when he leaves the tower it will be in glory.

Offstage voices are heard, and Anton runs and hides as Sigismund speaks poetically about how beauty is coming into the tower. Olivier appears, followed by several peasants, frightened of the animal they think Sigismund has become but also eager to place him at the head of their rebellion. Sigismund sits quietly, and Olivier orders

weapons to be drawn to test whether he's capable of recognizing objects. Sigismund speaks poetically about how "the tools of the field" have been remade in order to purify the world. He refers to Olivier as being the right kind of violent man for the job and then says he is his "own father and son." Olivier urges him to remember whose son he truly is and to take his revenge on him. Sigismund speaks poetically about how Olivier smells of death and revenge, saying that the smell makes him thirsty.

Olivier demands that Julian be brought in, calling him a Judas and urging Sigismund to take revenge. He says Julian was responsible for drawing up the Ten Prohibitions and for washing his hands of all responsibility for Sigismund's suffering. Sigismund suggests that Julian may not have kept him well, but Julian kept him as he was meant to by destiny. Olivier then issues a series of orders. Peasants are all to rise up and rebel, and merchants are to be chained to the farmer's plows. All the food and produce of the land is to be put at the disposal of the army of rebels. He turns his attention back to Julian, demanding that Sigismund accuse him so he can be condemned and tortured. Sigismund says that Julian is responsible for teaching him who he truly is, adding that he has knowledge while Olivier doesn't. As he continues, a rebel named Jeronim tells other rebels that Sigismund's insane-sounding words are proof of how the King and nobility drove him mad and are therefore evil and must be punished. Anton frantically asks Sigismund to tell the rebels he had nothing to do with how Sigismund was treated. Meanwhile, Olivier orders Julian to try to defend himself, saying he has as long as it takes for him to wash his hands before Julian will be executed.

A Gypsy Girl brings a basin and towel. Olivier washes his hands as Julian speaks in poetic language about how he can't and won't be intimidated. Sigismund asks why he's protesting, saying everything Julian taught him has led him to this place where his destiny is about to be truly realized. Julian suggests that Sigismund is betraying him and falls silent. Sigismund tries to get him to see that what he's done is good, but Julian refuses. Olivier orders that Julian be hanged, but Sigismund tells him Julian is already dead. He then asks Anton to stay with him. Olivier says he didn't give him permission, and Sigismund tells him he doesn't need permission. Olivier mocks him for assuming he has power.

Olivier then issues a series of orders. Sigismund is to be used as a figurehead but never listened to, and the nobles will continue to be destroyed. Olivier, as leader, is to be well fed, served only by the Gypsy Girl. Sigismund warns him that one day he too will have to drink the dregs of the conquered in the same way as the nobility, but Olivier disregards what he says and goes out to dinner, referring to himself as "my gracious magnificence." The Gypsy Girl and other rebels go with him, but a few rebels (including the Man with a Wooden Leg from Act 1, Scene 1) remain. They speak poetically in praise of Sigismund, prepare to robe him in golden clothes, shout about how the world will change once he proclaims his power and call for food and drink for him. As heaps of food and jars of wine are brought in, Sigismund eats only a little and drinks from the earthen jug he says provides him with the only beverage he needs. He prepares to go out, saying he senses the break of day. A Messenger from Olivier appears, saying he wants Sigismund to join him in a toast to victory. Sigismund goes out, with many of the rebels following and crying out for his protection.

Act 4 Analysis

The essential purpose of the fourth act, aside from the dramatic point of showing how the revolution is proceeding, is to reiterate a point first made in Act 1 and several times throughout the play, the contrast between earthly and spiritual power. As was previously the case, earthly power is represented by Olivier and Julian, with spiritual power represented by Sigismund. Olivier is, if possible, even more unrepentantly arrogant than he was before, while Julian is still as ambitious as he was but is less secretive about it. His desire for power has become as obvious as Olivier's, making the thematically relevant point that the craving for power, no matter how well it's concealed, is still destructive and antithetical, or a negative value when compared to the positive values embodied by Sigismund.

The question throughout this scene is how sane Sigismund actually is. His apparent calmness, his sense that he's about to embark on his destined mission and his insistence that he drink only from his earthenware jug are all developed with enough ambiguity that it's difficult to define whether he is divinely inspired or crazy. If the question is examined within the context of the ongoing Christ metaphor, an answer to the question becomes clearer. That being said, the metaphor, for some reason, is much less present in the dialogue and action of this scene, and indeed the rest of the play, than it was earlier. Olivier's reference to Julian as a Judas (the betrayer of Christ) is the only direct allusion. The adoration of the peasants and rebels at the end of the scene is an indirect one, suggesting the adoration with which Christ was greeted by both the individuals whose suffering he ended and the crowds of followers who greeted him upon his entry into Jerusalem. Another indirect allusion can be found in the repeated references to hand washing, which echo the way Pontius Pilate is portrayed as washing his hands before condemning Christ to death. In the Bible and today, the image represents a refusal to take responsibility. Used in this context, the image suggests that both Olivier and Julian, who are portrayed as washing their hands, are refusing to take responsibility for their actions - Olivier in causing so much death and destruction, and Julian for the inhumane way in which Sigismund was treated.

Another indirect allusion to the Sigismund/Christ metaphor can be found in Sigismund's comments that he is his own father and son. These echo Christ's comments in the Bible that he and God are the same. His references to his destiny are also indirect allusions, and when combined with the other references, they suggest that in spite of how he appears, Sigismund is quite sane but focused on life beyond the earthly, in the same way as Christ was. It's possible, in fact, to see both Sigismund's attitudes and actions in this scene as being metaphors for Christ's attitudes and actions following his Resurrection. In the same way as Christ is portrayed in the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament as being infused with the Holy Spirit, radiating grace and peace and patience, in this scene Sigismund radiates those same characteristics. He also seems reluctant to accept the adoration of the masses in the same way as Christ did. He seems just as aware that such adoration is inevitable and also seems aware that his destiny lies in the direction of leading a rebellion. This latter point is reinforced by the references early in the scene to fire, with the charred straw reiterating the image of

burned churches and farms that appeared earlier and therefore reinforcing the twined ideas of Sigismund and rebellion. This parallels the idea that Christ was also a rebel. In the rebellions led by both men, the disadvantaged and dominated are given a voice. Herein lies the play's key thematic statement, the same one as the thematic statement of the Gospels - that all humanity, not just the wealthy or the learned or the influential, has spiritual value and must be respected as such.

What's interesting about the thematic statement here, however, is that the arrogant Olivier proclaims himself the leader of the rebellion inspired by Sigismund. There is a warning in this against being taken in by people trying to claim earthly power but using spiritual language and purpose as a disguise. Given the previously discussed context of the play's creation - in Germany between the two world wars - this warning can be seen as a warning against the rise of Nazism, which clothed racism and the quest for power in the language of a quest for ethnic and spiritual purity. Looked at in a contemporary light, however, the character and attitude of Olivier might also be interpreted as a caution against intolerance and violence from those whose attacks on humanity are clothed religious language. This might include to various people, in different points of view, Islam's oppression of women, Christianity's oppression of non-heterosexuals and Israeli Judaism's oppression of Palestine or alternatively Palestine's non-acceptance of Israel.

Act 5, Part 1

Act 5, Part 1 Summary

This act is set in a tent, with the occasional offstage gunshot and other sound effects indicating that it's in the middle of a military encampment. The Doctor, Adam, Simon and other rebels are in the tent as a Rebel brings in the Gypsy Girl. Conversation reveals that she is Olivier's lover. He makes her walk behind his horse as he rides, and she's pregnant. Also in conversation, Sigismund is referred to as King. Olivier and his rebels destroy every village they pass through.

Two Tartars, or Turkish soldiers, come in with two noblemen as their prisoners. The noblemen comment ironically on how clever Adam has been to ally himself with the right side, and Adam shows them into a side area where they're to wait for Sigismund. One of the rebels asks the Gypsy Girl where Olivier is, but she refuses to speak. Sigismund appears, in royal robes. He tells the Tartars to tell their leaders that they are to destroy only what they are ordered to destroy. Otherwise they will be hanged. He tells the Doctor, who appears shocked by his apparent brutality, that he's only speaking the language of the dreadful world and that everything he said has been said before. He and Adam study a map and discuss their plans for defeating Olivier, and Simon presents the Gypsy Girl, who he says has greater knowledge of Olivier's activities than any spy. Sigismund orders Simon and other rebels to make her reveal what she knows, but without torture. After they go out, Sigismund speaks with the Doctor about his hopes for discussing philosophy. He tells Anton to take better care of himself and then asks what caused the shooting he just heard. Adam tells him it came from members of the Green Faction who have camped nearby. Sigismund describes the Green Faction as made up of deserters from both the King's army and the rebels, and Adam refers to them as being adolescents led by a Children's King. The Doctor explains that the Green Faction is made up mostly of children who've been left without parents because of the fighting. They live in the mountains, and they have knowledge about the medicinal properties of herbs.

Simon and the Gypsy Girl return as Adam says the Green Faction has thousands of members. The Children's King is the King's son by a servant, and he was kidnapped by his mother and raised in the woods. Sigismund asks to see him, promising his safe passage. As a rebel goes out to deliver the message, Sigismund asks how the interrogation of the Gypsy Girl went. Simon tells him she refused to answer, saying they might get more information if she was left alone with him. Sigismund agrees, and Anton warns that she might have a dagger. Adam says she's been searched. Sigismund orders that the two captured noblemen be given breakfast and that a messenger be sent to fetch a book recommended by the Doctor written by Marcus Aurelius, a Roman philosopher/warrior whom Sigismund says had plans for his world in much the same way as Sigismund has plans for his. He then dismisses the others so he can talk with the Gypsy Girl alone, saying she repulses him, but because she, like all women, has the

capacity for motherhood, she must be respected. Anton suggests that her hands remain tied, but Sigismund orders her to be freed from her ropes. Everyone else goes out.

Sigismund tells the Gypsy Girl of a rumor that Olivier has been killed in battle, but she just laughs. He then refers to her pregnancy, and she says mysteriously that soon he'll see what she's pregnant with. She evokes mystical lights, shadows and sounds. She shouts that fear is what she's pregnant with and seems to expect Sigismund to be frightened, but he remains perfectly calm, telling her to tell him what he wants to know or else he'll turn her over to the Tartars. She tells him his army is nothing but phantoms and devils. She refers to him as Judas and says he's driven God away. Sigismund asks again whether Olivier is dead, calling him "Red Satan." The Gypsy Girl magically causes human bones to emerge from the earth and also a duplicate version of herself to emerge from the air. Sigismund then repeats the prophecy about the Seven Seals he made in Act 1, Scene 1, attempting to drive the bones and the duplicate Gypsy Girl away.

The two Gypsy Girls speak in turn about how Olivier's march to power is unstoppable and how the King will ultimately triumph over Sigismund and see him dead. Spirit representations of both the King and Julian appear, taunting Sigismund. He says he can't pay attention because he's still got a war to fight. The Spirit Figure of Julian removes his head, giving it to Sigismund so he can see the war from above. Sigismund says he learned how to do that while still in the tower, and Julian and the King both disappear. The Gypsy Girls then call forth the spirit of Olivier, but Sigismund shouts for him to go away. He does, leaving the Gypsy Girls so frightened that the second one disappears and the first one collapses. Sigismund calls for help. The Doctor and Anton run in, and Sigismund tells them Olivier is dead, explaining he's seen visions that have told him so.

The Doctor notices Sigismund is bleeding and sees that he's been cut across his hand. As he prepares a bandage, he asks how it happened. Sigismund explains that he must have been cut when he was standing next to the Gypsy Girl. Anton finds a tiny dagger, and the Doctor theorizes that must have been what she cut Sigismund with. He sends Anton out to fetch some brandy. Sigismund again looks at the map, planning his attack on what remains of Olivier's army. Adam comments that he's not looking well, and Sigismund asks why everyone is looking at him with such concern. The Doctor suggests he might have been poisoned, and as Anton returns with the brandy, he says it's the only cure for the poison the gypsies use. Protesting that he doesn't care for brandy, Sigismund nonetheless drinks it down. He allows his hand to be bandaged and continues to make his plans for attacking Olivier's army. The Doctor orders another brandy, but Sigismund says he's fine, except for a heaviness in his legs which he blames on having ridden a horse too much.

Act 5, Part 1 Analysis

Because *The Tower* has, to this point, added layer after layer of symbolic meaning to the parallels between Christ and Sigismund, it seems both reasonable and logical to

analyze its final act along the same lines and in the same terms. The difficulty is that in the Biblical story of Christ there are no clear parallels with Sigismund's experiences in the final act. In fact, throughout this act the parallels seem to almost disappear from both the play's dramatic action and thematic development. The obvious exception from this is the way Sigismund is wounded in his hand, a clear reference to the wounds Christ suffered from being nailed to the Cross. On the other hand, the parallels may simply be less obvious, meaning that the appearance of the Gypsy Girl and her "magic," for lack of a better term, is possibly still a parallel but a very broadly defined one. From a very broad perspective, for example, it's possible to see how their confrontation represents Christ's appearances before Doubting Thomas and the other apostles, proving and defining his spiritual power in the same way as he's able to prove his power by resisting the Gypsy Girl's magic.

However, the author may have downplayed the parallels to make the thematically relevant point that after all is said and done, each human being stands on his/her own. Like Sigismund, we encounter our destiny without anything but our own experiences and beliefs to support us. In other words, because Sigismund is now more Sigismund and less a representation of Christ, the audience is meant to understand that we are just us and can only face destiny in the same way as Sigismund does, from a place of personal integrity.

The audience sees Sigismund's integrity in several ways. Aside from his withstanding of the Gypsy Girl's mystical assault, we see his graciousness towards the captured nobleman. We see his insistence that the Tartars rebel in the way they're told to rebel and not from some base urge towards random destruction. We see his faith that the Gypsy Girl means him no harm. We also see integrity in his reference to Marcus Aurelius, a Roman warrior/philosopher whose spiritually influenced theories of governance have been considered wise and pertinent throughout history. In short, in spite of being placed in a position of power, Sigismund still is essentially who he is, reinforcing the play's secondary point that the kind of spiritual life he leads is an ideal.

All of this suggests that the Gypsy Girl's reference to Sigismund as a Judas is actually ironic. We can understand why she calls him that, since it seems as though in both going after Olivier and acting as generally authoritative as he is, Sigismund is betraying the ideals of the rebellion. In terms of the larger context of the play and as evidenced by his compassionate treatment of her and the captured nobles, we see that her calling him a Judas is an inaccurate representation of who and what he is. We also see this through his actions in the second half of this act. His treatment of the Noble Officer, his treatment of the Children's King, and his call for the Tartars and the nobles to live in peace, which we can easily interpret as a call for all people to live that way.

There is some question here as to what happens to the King and to Julian. Specific references to their fate, or even to whether they're alive or dead, are never made. Later in this act the King is mentioned as having suffered from an illness, but Julian is only mentioned as Sigismund is dying and calling out to him. The fact that representations of the King and Julian both appear in the Gypsy Girl's hallucination, and the fact that Sigismund interprets a similar appearance by Olivier as meaning that he's dead,

suggests that the King and Julian are themselves no longer alive. Without any clear reference, however, it's difficult to say for sure.

Act 5, Part 2

Act 5, Part 2 Summary

Three officers come in, each bearing flags of the armies they represent - one from the nobility, one from the peasants and one from the Tartars. Sigismund greets them, saying he's been waiting for the chance to receive their homage. The Noble Officer speaks poetically about how pleasant it is to be greeted in such a generous way after having suffered the horrors of war. He refers to the pain of seeing the country pulled apart, father fighting against son and power against power, saying it was like living through the Last Judgment. He says that Sigismund caused all the suffering by rebelling against the "sacred authority" of his father. Sigismund says the old ways represented by the nobility are dead, leading the Noble Officer to say true power and true kingship are now apparent in Sigismund. Sigismund says he wants consent rather than submission from the nobility and that he wants to both impose a new order and transcend the limits of the old. He talks at length about how the old order was founded on greed and how the new order he wants to establish is based on selflessness. He refers to the officer from the Tartars, saying that the time has come for great powers to live in peace together. The Noble Officer pleads with him to keep the two populations separate, and the rebels urge him not to. Sigismund says he has plans to bring about lasting, positive change.

Sigismund suddenly calls out for windows to be opened, saying that it's getting dark, and collapses into Anton's arms as the main entrance to the tents is opened, revealing a rebel army waiting for orders. One of the nobles asks whether Sigismund has "the falling sickness like his father." The Doctor insists that Sigismund be given room. Sigismund calls for Anton and demands to see the sun, talking about how his teacher in the tower taught him to call things by their real name but how he now sees the sun as his true dwelling place. He then talks about how, in his years in the tower, he may have been deprived but never "longed," suggesting that wherever he was, he was enough for himself. He apologizes for being sharp with the nobles, but he suggests that in spite of their resistance there was still part of them that agreed with him. He says he's about to die, but others try to convince him he's going to live.

One of them refers to Ignatius, who still lives even though he's beyond a hundred years old. For a moment Sigismund believes himself to be back in the tower, but then he shouts out that he's the only one who can see the world as it is because he's been dead already. He stands, picks up a sword and urges everyone to follow him into a new age, but then he collapses. The people cry out, and the Doctor checks his pulse. Sigismund opens his eyes. The Doctor says he has cause for new hope, but Sigismund says he's "far too well" to hope. A nobleman shouts that holy oil is on its way, and another shouts that Ignatius is coming to bless him. Then, a Rebel appears with news that the Children's King and many of his followers are coming.

The Children's King comes in accompanied by two boys whom he says can determine whether the tent is safe. The Doctor asks whether he has any knowledge that can save

Sigismund. The two boys speak in poetic language about how Sigismund is close to death but does not fear it. Sigismund and the Children's King greet each other, with the Children's King saying Sigismund was only a temporary king and that he is the true one, adding that he has made new laws and that all new laws should come from children. As he kneels beside Sigismund everyone else kneels as well. The Children's King says divinity is crossing Sigismund's face, and Anton asks whether he has anything further to say. Sigismund tells him to bear witness that he was there, "even though no-one knew [him]." The rebels cry out for him to stay, and the two boys cry out that he should be allowed to die happily. Sigmund calls out to Julian and then dies.

The rebels shout that they must now end their rebellion, but the Children's King calms them, saying Sigismund's influence is timeless. The two boys sing quietly in Latin as the Children's King takes up Sigismund's sword and orders his body to be carried out. He leaves, followed by the two boys carrying Sigismund's body.

Act 5, Part 2 Analysis

The key to understanding the symbolic meaning of this climactic section of the play can be found in Sigismund's comment that he's been dead already. At the same time as he is referring to his imprisonment, he's also making a metaphoric reference to Christ having been dead already. This point in the play doesn't mark a parallel with Christ's resurrection, though. That parallel appears earlier, at the end of Act 3 when he walks out from his cave-like prison beneath the tower in the same way as Christ walked out of the cave in which he had been buried. The parallel in this scene is to the Transfiguration, the point in the Bible at which Christ was bodily taken into heaven after the Resurrection. This means that the moment of Sigismund's death represents his reunion with his true spiritual father, which in turn means that when Sigismund calls out to Julian at the moment of his death he is recognizing Julian as the man who truly inspired his spirit. This reinforces Sigismund's earlier comments that Julian taught him everything he knew and Julian's own comments to the same effect. The fact that Julian tried to manipulate Sigismund for his own personal gain is ultimately irrelevant. The most important thing to Sigismund, and therefore to the audience, is that Julian was the one who ultimately made Sigismund the spiritual being he is.

The importance of the relationship between Sigismund and the Children's King is reinforced by several elements. One is the way Christ, in the Bible, was portrayed as being eager to embrace and welcome children, and another is the way that the Child King refers to the necessity for new laws to come from children. This statement that itself refers back to Christ's admonishment that we should all look at the world through the eyes of a child. The idea that the Children's King has as much right to respect and reverence as Sigismund is reinforced by the reference in Part 1 of this act to the Children's King's background. Because Sigismund's father fathered him too and because he too was taken away and raised in a natural environment, it follows that the spiritual leadership of both men is to be held in the same regard and viewed by us as making the same thematic point. This can be summarized in the statement that simple, natural faith and action is preferable to the political and selfish actions taken by the King

and others. It may be, in fact, that the Children's King is a symbol of the Christian Church, to whom the Bible and history have given Christ's power and authority.

The tower has significant symbolic value, both as an image and as a title. As previously mentioned, the room beneath the tower in which Sigismund is imprisoned in Act 3 bears a significant metaphoric resemblance to the tomb in which Christ was laid following the Crucifixion. This suggests that the tower itself, which stands over the site of Sigismund's first imprisonment, can be interpreted as representing the Cross. This idea is supported by the repeated references to the way Sigismund was banished there in the same way as Christ was banished to death on the Cross. Other elements supporting this idea include the cruel comments of Olivier in Act 1, Scene 1, which can be seen as representing the equally cruel comments and jokes made by the Roman soldiers at the foot of Christ's Cross. The compassionate Doctor can be seen as representing the compassionate Joseph of Arimathea, who oversaw the removal of Christ's body from the Cross and burial in the tomb in the same way as the Doctor oversees the removal of Sigismund from the tower and transportation into the cave-like second prison.

In short, the tower as a symbol represents Sigismund's transcendence of his human nature and confrontation with his ultimate spiritual nature, in the same way as the Cross represents Christ's own transcendence and confrontation. *The Tower* as a title guides the audience to the understanding that we are also challenged to face our dual human and spiritual natures. The hope is raised that we, like Sigismund, will rise to the occasion and use the tower, or the confrontation, as a stepping-stone to glory, represented in Sigismund's last moments by the sun.

Bibliography

Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. "The Tower" from *Selected Plays and Libretti*. Trans. by Michael Hamburger. Pantheon Books. 1963.

Characters

King Basilius

King Basilius is the father of Sigismund. Because he heard a prophesy that predicted his son would rise up against him in rebellion, the king had Sigismund locked away in a tower until he was twenty-one years old. After Julian, the governor of the tower, convinces him to take Sigismund back into his good graces, the king arranges for his son to become his successor. However, as soon as he does, Sigismund attacks his father—but he is overpowered by the king's attendants before he injures the king. The king then sentences his son to death, but, on the day of the execution, a rebellion breaks out. The king is dethroned, and Sigismund is made the new king. Sigismund then sentences the king to be locked up in the tower. The king is later assassinated by the rebels who follow Oliver.

Julian

Julian is the governor of the tower in which Sigismund has been locked until the age of twentyone. Julian is influenced by the physician to convince the king that Sigismund be restored to his rightful place as heir to the throne. When the king sentences Sigismund to death for attempting to rise up against him, Julian plots a rebellion on Sigismund's behalf. The rebellion succeeds, and Sigismund replaces his father as king. But Julian is killed by the rebels who have risen against Sigismund under the leadership of Oliver.

Oliver

Oliver takes command of the peasant rebellion that rises up after King Basilius is ousted by supporters of Sigismund. Oliver has King Basilius killed and then has Sigismund killed.

Physician

The physician is first brought to the tower to examine Sigismund, the prince who has been locked up like an animal until the age of twenty-one. The physician immediately perceives that Sigismund is of royal descent. He provides Julian, the governor of the tower, with a potion to put Sigismund to sleep while he is transported to a monastery for protection. After Sigismund is brought to the castle and sentenced to death for attempting to rise up against his father, the physician aids Julian in planning a rebellion. With the help of the physician, the rebellion succeeds, and Sigismund replaces his father as king. The physician remains loyal to Sigismund, even after Oliver has taken command of the rebellion. After Sigismund is assassinated by Oliver's men, he dies in the arms of the physician.

Sigismund

Sigismund is the son of King Basilius. King Basilius was warned by a prophecy that one day his son would rise up against him in rebellion, and so he had the child locked up in a tower. At the age of twelve, Sigismund was accused of murder, and without a trial he was sentenced to death. Julian, the governor of the tower, however, placed him in the care of a peasant family until the age of sixteen, when he brought him to the tower to protect him from attempts on his life. As the play opens, Sigismund is twenty-one years old, and has been kept in a cage like an animal throughout his life. Julian convinces the king to take Sigismund back as his successor. As soon as the king grants Sigismund royal power, Sigismund attacks him—but is soon overpowered by the king's attendants. The king then sentences Sigismund to death. On the day of the execution, a planned rebellion succeeds in dethroning the king, and placing Sigismund in power. Sigismund gains the loyalty of the peasants, as well as the nobility, but he is assassinated by Oliver, who has taken control of the rebellion.

Themes

Christian Faith

Critics agree that the character of Sigismund in von Hofmannsthal's play represents the figure of a Christian martyr. Various characters, particularly the physician, directly refer to him in such terms. Upon his initial examination of Sigismund, the physician declares that he is the essence of "the highest earthly virtues." When he is asked to look upon an image of Christ on the cross, Sigismund "looks at it for a long time, mimics the posture, with spread-out arms." When Julian is attempting to convince Sigismund to take the elixir that will make him sleep so that he may awaken to a new life, Julian tells him, "the chosen one is born twice," thus comparing Sigismund to "the chosen one," Jesus Christ. Once Sigismund has taken the elixir, Anton cries out, "he has a halo above his face!" and he refers to him as "my saintly blessed martyrized —" before he is interrupted by Julian. When the impoverished rebels face Sigismund, declaring their loyalty to him, a man "almost naked," calls him a "Lamb of God." Aron claims that images of Sigismund have been spread throughout the country, "and they light candles before it as before an ikon." In other words, Sigismund's image is worshipped as an icon, an image of God.

The physician further describes Sigismund as a Christian martyr, demanding, "Look over the whole world: it has nothing nobler than what confronts us in this human being." Alfred Schwarz explains that the character of Sigismund "imposes the role of savior on a time-bound creature"; furthermore, "his name and figure have stirred messianic hopes in the hearts of the poor and the oppressed. He is the nameless beggar king who comes in chains to deliver them." According to Schwarz, von Hofmannsthal's characterization of Sigismund provides a vision of "the salvation of humanity."

Politics and Power

A central theme of this play is the nature of power in the role of world politics. The struggles between the various key characters are essentially political struggles over who has the power to rule over the people of a nation. The king has imprisoned his son for fear that Sigismund will rise up and usurp him in a rebellion. As the play opens, rebellion is growing throughout the land, despite the fact that Sigismund is locked away in the tower and unaware of his royal heritage. The named successor to the king has died in a hunting accident, thus leaving the throne in question. Julian hopes to seat the twentyone-year-old Sigismund as the rightful heir. Julian sends out other men to stir up rebellion in support of Sigismund. However, Oliver, one of Julian's men, takes charge of the rebellion, ultimately killing both Julian and Sigismund.

Critics have referred to Oliver as a "demagogue," a false leader of the people because he usurps Sigismund's power while maintaining the loyalty of the rebels who support Sigismund. Toward the end of the play, Oliver plans to find a man who looks like

Sigismund and parade him through the streets so no one will know that he has actually killed the young prince.

Although Sigismund has been raised in imprisonment, without knowledge of his royal heritage, he both fears and strives to obtain power. Sigismund's urge to exert his power over others is expressed even within his cage as he strives to overcome and dominate the beasts and insects that plague him: "Beasts are of many kinds, all rushing at me. I cry: Not too close! Wood lice, worms, toads, goblins, vipers! All want to fall upon me. I beat them to death." When he is brought before the king for the first time, Sigismund is overwhelmed by the great power he represents. In wonder, Sigismund asks the king, "From where—so much power?" The king replies, "Only the fullness of power profit. . . . Such is the power of the king." The king perceives that Sigismund strives for power and tells him, "The desire for power consumes you. I can read it in your features." And, indeed, Sigismund soon seizes the opportunity to rise up against his father, declaring his own claim to power in the statement, "My power will reach as far as my will." Von Hofmannsthal's play explores the morality of absolute political power.

Style

Setting

The play, written in twentieth-century Austria, is set in seventeenth-century Poland. The historical setting of the play, as well as the historical and cultural context of its initial production, are significant in several ways. Von Hofmannsthal wrote *The Tower* in the aftermath of World War I, as a commentary on political and cultural changes in Europe that resulted from the Great War. Von Hofmannsthal set the play in a distant century and location to remove it from the immediate experiences of his audience. By setting his play in this context, von Hofmannsthal creates a distancing effect on the audience, allowing them to view the political struggles represented in the play from the perspective of an observer. Writers often use such distancing techniques to present strong social and political commentary on current or recent events in a manner that is easier for the reader to accept because it does not immediately strike so close to home.

Choral Music

The play calls for a choir that can be heard singing religious hymns in Latin in the background during several scenes. Act 2, scene 1, takes place in the cloisters where the king converses with Brother Ignatius regarding the fate of Sigismund. As soon as a young monk informs the king that Brother Ignatius will be there shortly, "a muffled sound of singing voices becomes audible." The introduction of religious music at this point indicates the spiritual power of Brother Ignatius, as if the choir were announcing his imminent arrival and spiritual force. Once Brother Ignatius, the "Grand Almoner," enters the room, the sounds of the choir are amplified, as "The singing becomes distinctly audible." But, when the king asserts his royal power over the room, the singing of the choir stops, as if the king's power were in opposition to the religious power of Ignatius.

Act 3 takes place in the death chamber of the queen. As the scene opens, "the sound of the organ and the singing voices of nuns become audible." This chamber is presented as a very spiritual place, which none but two nuns have entered in twenty-one years, and the sound of nuns singing confirms the holiness of this death chamber. The king enters with his confessor, sprinkles holy water, and both kneel to pray. Once the king rises from prayer, the music stops. This implies once again that, however much he goes through the motions of religious faith, the king's will is at odds with that of the divine spirit. However, when Sigismund enters to face his father, "the organ sounds for a moment a little louder." Thus, while the king's presence seems to cause the religious music to stop, the presence of Sigismund, like that of Brother Ignatius, causes the religious music to increase in volume and force.

Latin

In addition to the Latin used in the choral singing at key points during the play, Latin is also occasionally used in the dialogue by certain characters. When the physician is first brought to see Sigismund, Anton assures him that "He [Sigismund] knows Latin and runs through a stout book as if it were a flitch o'bacon." This statement immediately establishes the fact that, though Sigismund appears to be little more than an animal in his behavior, he has been taught to read the Bible in Latin and is therefore a staunchly religious person. The only other character in the play who speaks Latin is the physician. The physician is one of the few characters who remains faithful to Sigismund, convinced that he is a sort of religious martyr to the cause of the people. The physician's association with Latin, and therefore with the Bible, confirms the righteousness of his religious conviction and his unfailing faith in Sigismund.

Historical Context

Austria

Von Hofmannsthal was born in Vienna, Austria, in 1874. Vienna is the capital of Austria, which was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, ruled by the Hapsburg dynasty, from the thirteenth into the twentieth centuries. The Hapsburg Empire included areas that are now parts of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Austria. A revolution in 1848 lead to the emancipation of the serfs in Austria. Francis Joseph ruled the empire from 1848 to 1916, when Charles succeeded him. The Hapsburg Empire was formally dissolved in 1918, in the wake of World War I, when Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Austria each became independent nations.

Seventeenth-Century Poland

Poland in the seventeenth century was much different than it is today. Geographically, the Kingdom of Poland included what are now Lithuania, Belarus, and half of what is now the Ukraine. Also, half of contemporary Poland used to belong to Prussia. This century was a period of great upheaval for the Republic. Poland was trying to expand while defending its borders against other countries, mainly against Russia, which planned on inhabiting all lands of the Orthodox faith. Poland engaged in a war with Russia in 1610 and a war with Turkey in the years 1620-1621. In 1648, the Cossacks, joined by Ukrainian peasants, raised a mutiny against Polish rule. King John Casimir tried to negotiate with the mutinous parties but failed. The Cossacks accepted protection from Moscow, and in 1655, two Russian armies invaded the Republic. The Swedes invaded in 1655, taking Warsaw and Krakow. King John Casimir fled the Republic. The Swedes were eventually driven from Poland, and a peace treaty was signed between the two countries in 1660. The last years of the seventeenth century saw many wars also being fought on Polish territory. They left much of the country in devastation. The wars had left the Republic largely depopulated from over ten million citizens to merely six million. Plague, famine, and economic difficulties also increased during these years.

Despite all these difficulties, the seventeenth century was a great time for artists in Poland. Baroque was in its heyday, and many Baroque art pieces were crafted here. The royal residence at Wilanow and the magnate residences at Lancut, Wisnicz, and Zolkiew are all wonderful examples of the Baroque style. The Vasa's court in Warsaw was the center of painting, opera, theater, and science. Poetry and literature also bloomed in these years. Unfortunately, the poor economy and the political and social chaos of this century hindered schooling and education, limiting people in reaching their full potential and expression.

Pedro Calderon de la Barca

Von Hofmannsthal's play, *The Tower*, is a loose adaptation of the play *Life Is a Dream* (1635) by Pedro Calderon (1600-1681). Calderon de la Barca was one of the greatest playwrights of the "Golden Age" of seventeenth-century Spain. *La hija del aire* (1653; *The Daughter of the Air*) is considered by some to be his masterpiece. In 1651, he was ordained into the priesthood, thereafter writing mostly religious plays. Although he still wrote plays for the court of King Philip IV, he renounced his involvement in public theater. Calderon wrote his first opera in 1660. Calderon succeeded Lope de Vega as Spain's leading playwright; Calderon, however, remained unchallenged as Spain's leading playwright for two centuries after his death. According to *Encyclopedia Britannica*, "Strained family relations apparently had a profound effect on the youthful Calderon, for several of his plays show a preoccupation with the psychological and moral effects of unnatural family life, presenting anarchical behavior directly traced to the abuse of paternal authority." In regards to the play on which *The Tower* is based, "Philosophical problems of determinism and free will are vividly dramatized in [*Life Is a Dream*], in which the escape route from the confusion of life is shown to lie in an awareness of reality and self-knowledge."

Richard Strauss

Von Hofmannsthal is known for his operatic collaborations, for both the German and Austrian stage, with the great German romantic composer Richard Strauss (1864-1949). The two collaborated on a total of six operas, for which Strauss wrote the music and von Hofmannsthal the libretti (which is the text of the opera). Their collaborative works include: *Elektra* (1903), *Der Rosenkavlier* (1911), *Ariadne auf Naxos* (1912; *Ariadne on Naxos*), *Die Frau ohne Schatten* (1919; *The Woman Without a Shadow*), and *Die agyptische Helena* (1928; *The Egyptian Helen*). The two were working on *Arabella* at the time of von Hofmannsthal's death in 1929.

Critical Overview

Writing in 1966, Alfred Schwarz asserts that *The Tower* is "one of the masterpieces of contemporary drama." Michael Hamburger refers to it as von Hofmannsthal's "most personally committed play." Von Hofmannsthal first began the effort of adapting a play from *La vida es sueno* (*Life Is a Dream*; 1635), by the great Spanish playwright Pedro Calderon de la Barca, in 1902, but he did not produce the first completed version until 1925. According to Schwarz, von Hofmannsthal's early acquaintance with Calderon's play "arrested his attention," and it's central allegory "exercised a fascination on him which lasted for the rest of his life." In reconceptualizing and revising his adaptation, von Hofmannsthal "radically reshaped the play in the course of many years during which he pondered the subject."

It was only the debacle of World War I that provided von Hofmannsthal with a meaningful context for his adaptation: "The experience of the first world war and its aftermath in central Europe, the vision of a world in dissolution, a tradition demolished, at last rendered the full possibilities of the subject conceivable." Michael Hamburger concurs that *The Tower* "was his reckoning with the postwar world, a last attempt to embody the substance of his own life in a myth, and a kind of moral and spiritual testament." T. S. Eliot comments that "Calderon's play is for Hofmannsthal hardly more than a point of departure; two plays could hardly be more different in spirit and intention than those of the Spaniard and the Austrian." Schwarz elaborates upon von Hofmannsthal's central ideas in adapting Calderon's play to express his own thematic concerns:

As the material of *The Tower* takes shape in his mind, Hofmannsthal sees it as the tragedy of a time-bound world gone astray, a world which needs deliverance in the person of a savior; for it is altogether deprived of the sound of God's voice and suffers the torments of guilt. But the potential savior of a forsaken humanity is himself human. Drawn into a world which is torn by rebellion and suppression, he suffers the tragic fate of all humanity betrayed in the life-and-death struggle of contending powers. In the figure of Sigismund, Hofmannsthal represents first the allegory of the Fall, man's tragic attempt to capture the world into which he is thrust, and the individual's tragic subjection to time, conceived as history.

Von Hofmannsthal's 1925 version of *The Tower* was published as a book, but not produced on the stage. At the suggestion of Max Reinhardt, von Hofmannsthal then revised it significantly for a 1927 stage production. Schwarz notes that, after extensive revision, "A more austere dramatic economy informs the revised version, and the action moves relentlessly to its stark conclusion."

Schwarz notes that "Since its publication, *The Tower* appears to have become the poetic chronicle of our time. It is that rare instance in our time of a tragedy which touches at so many points the human situation essentially and the politics of human action historically that it belongs with the best traditional examples of great theater." Schwarz concludes that, in *The Tower*, "Hofmannsthal succeeded in recreating an

ample and representative theater in which to mirror the tragedy of a century of totalitarian ways of life." Describing *The Tower* as "difficult," T. S. Eliot observes that, "I doubt whether this play can be called a 'success,' but if not, it is at least a failure grander and more impressive than many successes." Eliot goes on to comment that, "if *The Tower* is unplayable, we must attribute this not to failure of skill but to the fact that what the author wished here to express exceeded the limits within which the man of the theater must work." Hamburger observes that "The distinction of *The Tower*, both in absolute sense and in the context of Hofmannsthal's work as a whole," is that "It is the one completed work of Hofmannsthal that fully engaged all his disparate faculties and energies— the mystical and the worldly, the visionary and the analytical, the adventurous and the conservative— and coordinated his many-sided experience within a single imaginative structure."

Describing the evolution of von Hofmannsthal's "tragic theater," Schwarz explains: "Chronologically, there are first the lyric playlets of the last decade before the turn of the century; then, in the years preceding the first world war, a period of search and experimentation, a wrestling with larger dramatic structures, the attempt to discover a theater of significant action for the times; and after the major catastrophe of the war until his death in 1929, years of personal restlessness and significant achievement, the poet's last works which revolve around the idea of universal world theater."

Schwarz notes: "Hofmannsthal's career as a playwright is the record of his effort to revitalize the great tradition of European drama on the modern stage. He tried in several ways to reestablish the authority of a truly representative theatre." Furthermore, "He viewed the theater in terms of its intermittent and ideal function in society. Therefore, ignoring the modern renascence of the drama since Hebbel and Ibsen, he turned deliberately to the past for his idea of a theater." Schwarz adds, "In comparison with the starkly realistic social and psychological dramas of his day, Hofmannsthal's work appears to have an old-fashioned, strongly literary flavor. He revived the figures of the ancient Greek drama and the Christian allegories, and brought them back on the modern stage. . . . Hofmannsthal re-dramatized ancient subjects and asserted his orthodox Christian reading of the human condition in traditional theatrical forms."

Criticism

- Critical Essay #1
- Critical Essay #2

Critical Essay #1

Brent has a Ph.D. in American Culture, specializing in film studies, from the University of Michigan. She is a freelance writer and teaches courses in the history of American cinema. In the following essay, Brent discusses the father-son relationship in von Hofmannsthal's play.

The Tower explores the theme of fathers and sons in terms of Sigismund's relationship to two central father figures: King Basilius, his biological father, and Julian, his lifelong jailer and caretaker.

The relationship of King Basilius to his only son, the Prince Sigismund, fluctuates dramatically several times throughout the play. The king is torn between his fear of being usurped by his son, as stated in a prophesy and the natural love of a father for his offspring. Throughout the play, the king alternates between these two impulses. The desire to maintain his sovereign power, however, always wins out over his paternal affections for Sigismund.

Because of a prophesy that stated that the king's son would one day rise up against him in rebellion, King Basilius sentenced his only son, Sigismund, to be imprisoned for life in the tower. The king justified this act by accusing his son, at the age of twelve, of "high treason." Julian, the governor of the tower, however, had pity on the young prince and placed him in the care of a peasant family for four years. At this point, Julian reasoned that Sigismund, now sixteen, was too vulnerable to assassination and thereafter kept him locked in a cage in the tower like an animal.

With the encouragement of the physician, Julian decides to make a plea to the king to retry Sigismund, now twenty-one, thus giving the young prince a second chance to demonstrate his innocence. In making his decision, the king seeks council with Brother Ignatius, the grand almoner of the monastery. He asks Brother Ignatius if the prophesy is in fact true, to which the grand almoner responds ambiguously. He chides the king, however, for mistreating his own son, "your child, got in holy matrimony!" The king nonetheless declares that, if Sigismund is found to be "a demon and a rebel," then "his head shall fall and roll before your feet," but if he is found to be innocent, "I shall take my child into my arms, and the crown, a triple crown wrought into one, will not be without an heir." Brother Ignatius replies that, in effect, the king has already been condemned for his sins against his son, telling him that God "knows you and means to punish you." Upon hearing this, the king becomes angry, and has the grand almoner carried out. The king is, in effect, pronounced guilty for mistreating his own son but refuses to accept responsibility for his guilt, justifying it by his own fear of rebellion.

Yet, while he fears his own son, whom he has imprisoned for life and has never seen, the king also expresses deep sentiments in regard to Sigismund. When he meets with Julian at the monastery, the king states that he is "moved . . . deeply," by Julian's loyalty to him as the guardian of Sigismund, sentimentally embracing him with the words, "It is your arms that shield our kin."

Fearing his first meeting with Sigismund, the king turns to prayer and religious council in the hopes that his son will remain loyal to him. The king consoles himself regarding his mistreatment of his child by asking his confessor if he may be absolved, should he once again condemn "my own son" to life imprisonment in the tower. Under this current of morbid fear of his own son, the king is deeply moved by the thought of restoring Sigismund to his rightful role as heir to the throne. The king even muses that, were he to allow Sigismund to succeed him, he might retire peacefully. He imagines that "Perhaps I too will retire into a monastery for the remainder of my days," and that his son will regard him with "gratitude." The king nonetheless asks his confessor if he may be justified in inflicting "the extremest harshness" upon the prince, "if he were to raise his hand against me." The confessor has clearly been appointed for the purpose of justifying any action, no matter how immoral, the king undertakes and relieves the king's every fear of being accused of wrongdoing against his son.

Before the king lays eyes upon his son for the first time, Julian attempts to impress upon Sigismund the importance of obeying his father, without questioning his ill treatment up to this point. Julian equates Sigismund's conception of a Christian God as the Father with the figure of his biological father, the king. He tells Sigismund, "You have said to yourself that it is your father who thus governs over you. You comprehend that your father's ways had to be inscrutable to you. . . . You would not wish to live unless someone higher were above you, that is the sense of your thinking—You do not ask: What has happened to me?"

Upon seeing Sigismund for the first time, the king, impressed by his son's instinctively regal manner, is so moved that he must support himself on Julian's arm, as if he were weak in the knees with emotion. His impulse to fatherly affection toward his son is expressed when he sees in Sigismund, "The very image of my wife!" The king is literally moved to tears as he gazes upon his son and rightful successor. The king's feeling for the son, whom he has feared and imprisoned for twenty-one years, is sincere and heartfelt. He tells Sigismund, "You have returned home. Our arms are open." The king continues this emotional plea, "will you come to our heart, into its undivided warmth?"

Yet, while this "warmth" on the part of the king for his son may be heartfelt, the king maintains a sly, manipulative, and distrustful stance toward Sigismund, whom he will tolerate only if he can maintain his position of power over his son. He tells the young prince, "I look for child-like devotion in your eyes, and I do not find it." The king then tries to convince Sigismund that it was Julian who had deceived him, the king, into believing that his son was wild and harbored rebellious intentions against his father.

Despite the king's mighty efforts, however, Sigismund does, the minute he gets the chance, rise up against his father in rebellion. The king, dropping all notions of paternal affection, immediately sentences both Sigismund and his keeper, Julian, to execution for treason. The king declares Sigismund a "parricide"—a would-be murderer of his own father—thereby justifying his sentence of death upon his own son. The king's fear of being usurped outweighs any natural fatherly love or affection for his offspring. The king thus proves himself to be a sinner by valuing power over love.

Julian, the governor of the tower, serves as a second father figure to Prince Sigismund. The king has entrusted Julian for almost twenty-two years with watching over Sigismund. Julian at first appears to be an ambivalent figure in Sigismund's life, but he soon proves himself to be the young prince's most faithful caretaker. As Sigismund's guardian and jailer throughout the prince's life, Julian's relationship to him is fraught with ambiguity.

The physician, upon examining the imprisoned prince, quickly perceives the warring sympathies within Julian's heart over the proper action to take in regards to Sigismund. The physician tells Julian, "Your lordship is created of heroic stuff," but qualifies the statement by elaborating that "the source itself is troubled, the deepest root is cankered. In this your imperious countenance Good and Evil wage a fearful coiling battle like serpents." In other words, Julian has the potential to do heroic deeds in regard to Sigismund, but he is "troubled" at heart, hesitating between taking action against Sigismund, which the physician regards as Evil, and taking action to empower Sigismund, which the physician regards as Good. The physician goes on to describe the nature of Julian's troubles, stating that "you deny your heart—Heart and head must be one. But you have consented to the satanic split; you have suppressed the noble inner organ." The physician tells Julian, "I see heroic ambition in your carriage and gait, checked in the hips by an impotent will, gigantically warring with itself." The physician accurately perceives the desire within Julian to do right by Sigismund, also perceiving the extent to which his "will" is "warring with itself" over what to do. The physician concludes that Julian's "soul's wings" are "shackled in chains." Thus, the physician, regarding the cause of Sigismund as a higher moral Good, sees Julian's "soul" as a slave to the Evil impulse that causes him to keep Sigismund imprisoned like an animal. The physician tells Julian that his conscience in the matter is troubled: "The wrong done to this youth, the enormity of the crime, the complicity, the partial consent: all this stands written on your face."

Julian, however, protests that he has "saved his life, more than once," and that "Without me he would have been murdered." He explains that he has placed Sigismund under such base conditions, locked in the tower, to hide him from the world and protect him from assassins. But the physician's words inspire Julian to conceive of a plan whereby the prince may be restored to the good favor of his father, King Basilius. The conviction with which Julian undertakes this effort is indicated when he tells the physician, "I am risking my head" to do right by Sigismund. When he pleads directly to the king to give Sigismund a retrial, an opportunity to prove his innocence, Julian offers the king his own head in execution if Sigismund proves disloyal to his father. At this point, the king acknowledges Julian's role as Sigismund's caretaker, telling him, "It is your arms that shield our kin."

At this point, however, Sigismund both fears Julian as his jailer and reveres him as the life giver and father figure who has taught him everything he knows—in particular, Julian has taught him the Christian Bible. Sigismund cowers in fear when Julian enters the room, telling him, "You have supreme power over me. I tremble before you. I know that I cannot escape you." But Julian reminds him that "I was your rescuer. Secretly, I poured oil into the lamp of your life; because of me alone there is still light in you. Remember

that. . . . Did I not let you sit next to me at a wooden table and open before you the great book and pointed in it figure after figure to the things of the world and called them by name for you?"

When Sigismund does indeed rise up against his father, the king, he sentences Julian to death with the young prince. After the prince and Julian are both saved from execution by the rebellion, which deposes the king and places Sigismund on the throne, Sigismund directly acknowledges Julian's role as his father and teacher. He addresses Julian as "my teacher," and appoints him his "minister," his closest confident. Julian likewise passionately declares himself to be Sigismund's father in spirit, although the king and queen are his biological parents: "O my king! My son!—for you come from me who molded you, not from him who furnished merely the clump of earth, nor from her who gave birth to you."

When the rebellion, taken over by Oliver, turns against Sigismund, Julian is fatally wounded. In the moments before Julian dies, Sigismund directly acknowledges his importance as father, teacher, and caretaker. He tells Julian, "You have put the right word under my tongue, the word of comfort in the desert of this life." After Julian dies, Oliver, who has entered, notices Julian's dead body and tells Sigismund, "I know him. He was your jailer. He kept you worse than a dog." But Sigismund defends Julian as the man whose actions were always in the service of Sigismund's own good, asserting that "You are mistaken. He did not keep me as he was commanded to, but he kept me as he had planned in the fulfillment of his mind's work."

Thus, the true nature of Julian's relationship to Sigismund becomes increasingly apparent over the course of the play. Outwardly his jailer, Julian emerges as the one truly nurturing father figure in the prince's life. By the time of Julian's death, Sigismund has acknowledged him as a teacher, father, caretaker, and guide.

Sigismund's two father figures throughout the play, the king and Julian, ultimately show their true moral colors in terms of their relationship to the young prince. Julian at first appears to be the prince's oppressor and jailer, but he shows himself to be his most ardent caretaker and supporter. The king waivers between fear of the son who is destined to rise up against him and a natural fatherly love for his offspring. In the figure of the king, however, the love of his power ultimately overrides the love of his child.

Source: Liz Brent, in an essay for *Drama for Students*, Gale Group, 2001.

Critical Essay #2

Kelly is an instructor of Creative Writing and Literature at Oakton Community College and College of Lake County. In this essay, he examines the ways in which Hofmannsthal's version of this story differs from the play that it was based upon.

There is only a tenuous relationship between Hugo von Hofmannsthal's 1925 play *The Tower* and its inspiration, the 1635 romantic comedy *Life Is a Dream* by the Spanish playwright Pedro Calderon de la Barca y Henao. Both plays concern a king, Basilius of Poland, who has determined that his son is destined to one day overthrow him and take his place, and who has, therefore, taken the measure of having the child raised in captivity. Both plays follow the prince, Sigismund, as he gains his freedom, misuses it, and is sent back into captivity, only to be rescued later when a political uprising unseats Basilius and requires a royal heir to take his place. Beyond these similarities in their plots, though, there is a world of difference in the way the two authors develop the basic idea. For Calderon, the true story is a metaphysical one about the nature of human knowledge, which, as he presents it, is as "real" for one whose life is confined to a tower as it is for a monarch who reigns supreme. Hofmannsthal's take on the material stresses the opposite effect, presenting the king, in the end, as a convict in his own right. That the same story can bend to accommodate two such different viewpoints is a tribute to romanticism, to fatalism, and ultimately to every unified world view that helps humans interpret the world surrounding them.

In Calderon's version of the story, life really *is* a dream, just as the title says: a lively jumble of coincidence, intuition, and masquerade. The basic story that both plays follow, about a prince locked up in a tower, has been handed down through the ages, like many of the most potent fairy tales. As Calderon envisions it, the king's fear of his son began when the boy's mother died during childbirth and then continues with his own scholarly work. King Basilius explains that, in his extensive reading, he found it fore-written "that Sigismund would be the most cruel of all princes, the most audacious of all humans, the most wicked of all monarchs;" that he would split up the kingdom; and that he would take physical action against his own father. The play gives a vivid, lasting image of the cruelty he anticipates from Sigismund: "I saw myself downstricken, lying on the ground before him (What deep shame this utterance gives me!) while his feet on my white hairs were imprinted as a carpet." Readers can notice a similarity between the way that Calderon lets a premonition drive the plot and some of the later romantic tragicomedies of Shakespeare, particularly between this version of Basilius and Shakespeare's Prospero, the wizard king of *The Tempest*. The two plays were, after all, written a mere twenty-five years apart.

After establishing that Basilius' motivation for imprisoning the infant boy was rooted in his own predictions, *Life Is a Dream* goes on to raise questions about the source of that prediction. Sigismund does, in fact, proceed once he is free to strike out violently, killing a guard and threatening Basilius in a manner that seems to be a fulfillment of the prophecy. As this scene unfolds, though, questions arise about whether his long imprisonment held back his naturally violent impulses or if it might have actually caused

them. Sigismund's bitterness and horror boil over once he is told that he is actually a prince and that he was locked up by his own father before growing old enough to do anything to actually deserve it. Audiences are led to wonder whether Basilius might have created what we recognize today as a self-fulfilling prophesy.

Much is made in Calderon's version of the method of Sigismund's temporary release from custody. Unsure of how the prisoner will react to finding out that he is actually the royal heir, Basilius arranges for him to take a sleeping potion in his cell, so that, if his introduction to his rightful place in court goes as badly as predicted, he can be put back in his cell, with the whole incident explained away as a dream. While Hofmannsthal's version of the story does make use of the "sleeping powder" twist, it is not the king who devises this scheme, but rather Julian, who is sympathetic to Sigismund. Julian uses the idea of knocking Sigismund out to help him retain some innocence and vulnerability, so that he would not have to automatically be put to death if the experiment of telling the truth should fail. Sigismund in *The Tower* does not confuse levels of reality, the way that his counterpart from *Life Is a Dream* does—he does not think that dream life is real life and vice versa; he merely notes the similarity between the two.

As if this blurring of the line between life and dream did not give his play enough lighthearted fantasy, Calderon includes a romantic twist of mistaken identity that is only glancingly related to the play's main idea. The following section is very confusing. None of the readers will be familiar with these characters, nor do they need to be. The point can be made quite well without naming them all. [Rosaura has come to Poland disguised as a man, to avenge being dishonored earlier by Astolfo; she is aided by Clotaldo, the jailer who has been sympathetic to the prince, although she does not realize that Clotaldo is really her father; and Astolfo intends to be named Basilius' heir to the throne because his mother was Basilius' sister and he is poised to strengthen that birthright by marrying Estrella, the daughter of Basilius' other sister.] Little about these complications involves Sigismund finding himself a prisoner one day, a prince the next, and then a prisoner again, other than pointing out the uncertainty of the political system, a point that Hofmannsthal would later make much of. These subplots do, however, establish a lighthearted tone, where chance and fate bounce off each other in no controllable pattern. In the end of *Life Is a Dream*, when Sigismund is given his true place on the throne (affirming the Elizabethan faith in the natural rightness of succession), he shows royal wisdom by telling Astolfo to make good on his broken promise and marry Rosaura, and he shows compassion for Estrella, who has just lost her fiancée, by offering to marry her himself. Basilius, whose studious nature led to his reading false prophesies in the first place, is left to spend his retirement reading.

Sigismund thus ends up a hero in Calderon's version of this story, a man who overcomes social disadvantage and a natural propensity toward resentment, showing that royal blood does (or at least can) overcome adversity. He takes to heart the lesson he learned when his first release ends in failure, always questioning whether what he believes to be real is in fact reality or a dream. Modern audiences might summarize his lesson as, "Don't take everything so seriously." This version of the story shows, in a fashion as central to romantic comedy four hundred years ago as it is today, that anger and adversity are just the unfortunate byproducts of misunderstanding. It is Basilius'

misunderstanding of the prophesy that makes him lock his child away, and it is Sigismund's misunderstanding of power that makes him abuse it when he awakens one day to find himself a prince. Peace takes a bighearted gesture, such as Sigismund's willingness to end the cycle of revenge by conceding that the indignities that he suffered are no more important than a dream.

Hofmannsthal does not find humor or forgiveness in this situation, but instead he uses it to illuminate an entirely different view of the human condition. In his version of the story, King Basilius is not the primary mover who takes Sigismund's freedom, gives it back, takes it again, and eventually loses it to him. He is a loud, egotistical, obnoxious fool, whose people are tired of his unfair rules and his socially destructive proclamations. When Sigismund is brought from his jail in the tower, Basilius tries to use him as a tool to stop the popular revolution that he senses around him, but Sigismund rejects him and tries to steal the royal power for himself; when his power is restored, Basilius behaves all the worse, demanding for himself the virgin nieces of an innocent courtier and increasing taxes throughout the kingdom as a sort of victory celebration. If he understood the nature of his own power, Basilius would not be as likely to flaunt it in the faces of his subordinates, practically driving them to rebel against his rule.

The nature of political power in *The Tower* is such that it does not stem from the wisdom or intuition of those who have it, as it does in *Life Is a Dream*, but that it is a balance between opposing forces that will often settle upon one person to rule. Hofmannsthal's Basilius is as clueless about the source of his power as Sigismund is, when he finds himself suddenly wearing the royal seal on his finger. They both fail to acknowledge the fact that their power depends on the consent of the common people. The practical reason why Sigismund is brought out of his cell to take the throne is not because he has royal blood or natural intelligence, but because the rebel forces feel that it is necessary to have some justification that could support the legitimacy of their rule. They want him to stay quiet, to be seen but not heard. In act 5, Oliver, a rebel leader, explains that Sigismund is to be driven through the streets on a cart, to show that it is Basilius's son who has overthrown him. "In this way, the ignorant, tongue-tied people will be taught by us to read emblems with their eyes, and the lords will plunge head over heels into the earth." When Sigismund turns out to have ideas of his own, Oliver sends him back to prison and orders an aid to bring him another man who looks like Sigismund, who the crowds will think is him when he rides through the streets. Basilius is executed offstage, a deed mentioned in passing, and Sigismund is assassinated; neither member of the royal lineage is really necessary for running the kingdom in Hofmannsthal's view.

While the secondary characters in *Life Is a Dream* serve to loosen up viewers' expectations, the characters who surround the royal family in *The Tower* are there to inhibit any romantic hopes about the people who make governments run. For the most part, they are more craven, manipulative, and ruthless than is generally expected even if their goal to overthrow an unjust tyrant is noble. A notable exception is the character identified as "the Physician," a name clearly intended to put him outside of the circle of political machinations that decides many people's fates throughout the work. Because his job is to care for the flesh, the physician is outraged at the way he sees Sigismund treated, and he is willing to provide sleeping powders to control the wild Sigismund,

supporting a dangerous scheme to present him before his father. Aside from the physician's natural concern for human suffering, the key motivation for human behavior in *The Tower* is power. There is no draw of love, as in the subplots of the Calderon version, nor a drive to avenge the honor of a woman scorned. Hofmannsthal's view is completely modern, a twentieth century tale of political expediency, with no need for traditional dramatic concerns to be added to fulfill a dramatic code.

Students comparing the two plays would be right to wonder what was gained over the course of the three centuries that separated them. The Calderon version seems more lighthearted, and more imaginative; by comparison, Hofmannsthal's play is leaden, and thumps along the ground with a sense of pervading doom that seems more concerned with the harshness of political life than with shedding intellectual light on the dynamics of power. It is true that Hofmannsthal is something of a political insider, fascinated with the subtleties of politics, often at the expense of his play's dramatic interest. He does, however, avoid the trap of presenting his string of events entirely raw, too much like life to be of interest to viewers watching them on the stage.

The most interesting thing about Hofmannsthal's casting of these characters is the layer of symbolism that he gives to the story. While, in the Calderon version, the significance of all that happens to Sigismund has to do with how much life and the dream world sometimes seem similar—an interesting but somewhat lightweight observation—Hofmannsthal's play is built around beliefs about sin and rebirth that are at the root of the Christian tradition. It is, without a doubt, interesting to hear about a prince who is locked away so that he cannot overthrow his father, and in the post-Freudian era, the story has taken on an even more significant air, but neither its interest value nor its psychological value is worth much after audiences leave the theater. Hofmannsthal's approach, on the other hand, gives the story a deeper meaning. Sigismund may have thought that he was awakened, and then awakened again from that awakening, in *Life Is a Dream*, but in *The Tower* he is born anew, and he has to experience life with a new awareness of the guilt that has been hung upon him since childhood. Viewers who can forget about the scheming of Julian, Oliver, and Basilius himself, and who can put the excitement of Sigismund's assault against Basilius into perspective can understand the prince to be a man who received a second chance, had it taken from him, and learned to live a noble life even when nobility did him no good. He could have riches and comfort, and had every reason to believe that the world owed him them, but he decided, after being mistreated, to become less, not more, cynical. That is the value of *The Tower*, and it is more significant than the sense of contentment that Calderon made sure to leave at his play's end.

Neither version of the story of Prince Sigismund is better, but they both certainly reflect the literary tastes of their times. Calderon's is a complex tale of interwoven coincidences and brushes with fate. Hofmannsthal gives his viewers a darker piece, but one focused more closely on how we understand what it is to be human and live with the guilt of those who came before. The same incident—Sigismund's return to captivity—is seen as the driving force in a comic mix-up and a catalyst that starts an inquiry into humanity's most pressing concerns. The differences in these two versions only serves to prove that genius will always see old stories anew.

Source: David Kelly, in an essay for *Drama for Students*, Gale Group, 2001.

Topics for Further Study

Von Hofmannsthal's play takes place in seventeenth century Poland. Learn more about the history of Poland. What significant events and changes took place in Poland in the seventeenth century? What about the eighteenth to twentieth centuries? What recent events have occurred in Polish history?

Von Hofmannsthal was born and lived in the city of Vienna, the capital and cultural center of Austria, around the turn of the century. Learn more about Viennese culture in the *fin-de-siecle* era. What changes have taken place in Vienna over the course of the twentieth century?

Von Hofmannsthal lived and worked in Vienna over the same time period in which Sigmund Freud became prominent as the father of modern psychology. Learn more about the life and work of Freud. What were some of his major theories about human psychology and childhood development? What impact has Freud had on Western thought?

Von Hofmannsthal's maternal grandfather converted from Judaism to Roman Catholicism in order to marry a Catholic. While von Hofmannsthal grew up in a family fully assimilated into mainstream Viennese culture, the Jewish population of Austria was subjected to virulent forms of racism. Learn more about the history and status of Jews in Austria during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. What is the status of Jews in Austria today?

Von Hofmannsthal gained an international reputation for his collaboration with Richard Strauss writing librettos for the opera. Learn more about the history of German opera. Who are some of the significant figures in German opera? What were some of the key German operatic productions during the turn of the century?

Von Hofmannsthal was known as a leading figure in the German symbolist movement. The symbolist movement originated among artists and writers in France around the turn of the century. Learn more about symbolism in art. Who are some of the most significant artists of the symbolist movement? What are some of the central artistic works of the symbolist movement? What basic aesthetic principles were practiced by the symbolists?

What Do I Read Next?

The Correspondence between Richard Strauss and Hugo von Hofmannsthal (1961), by Richard Strauss, is a collection of letters between von Hofmannsthal and the famous opera composer Richard Strauss, with whom he collaborated on six operas.

Drawings and Watercolours by Vincent van Gogh (1955), with notes by Douglas Cooper, has color images by the Dutch painter van Gogh, accompanied by von Hofmannsthal's essay, "Colors."

Selected Prose (1952), translated by Mary Hottinger and Tania and James Stern, is a selection of prose works by von Hofmannsthal, with an introduction by Hermann Broch.

Selected Essays (1955), edited by Mary E. Gilbert, is a collection of essays by von Hofmannsthal.

Schnitzler, Hofmannsthal, and the Austrian Theatre (1992), by W. E. Yates, includes discussion of von Hofmannsthal's theatrical productions in the context of the history of theater in Austria.

Further Study

Bangerter, Lowell A., *Hugo von Hofmannsthal*, Ungar, 1977.

Bangerter's book is a biography of von Hofmannsthal, which discusses his important works in drama and poetry. It includes a chronology of his life.

Bottenberg, Joanna, *Shared Creation: Words and Music in the Hofmannsthal-Strauss Operas*, P. Lang, 1996.

This work is a discussion of the collaborative operatic works of Hofmannsthal and Strauss.

Del Caro, Adrian, *Hugo von Hofmannsthal: Poets and the Language of Life*, Louisiana State University Press, 1993.

This book is a discussion of von Hofmannsthal's poetic works.

Gray, Ronald, *The German Tradition in Literature, 1871-1945*, Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Gray's text is a literary history of German letters that covers the time period of von Hofmannsthal's life span.

Bibliography

Calderon de la Barca, Pedro, "Life Is a Dream," in *Six Plays*, Las Americas Publishing Co., 1961, pp. 13-96.

Eliot, T. S., "A Note on The Tower," in *Hugo von Hofmannsthal: Selected Plays and Libretti*, edited by Michael Hamburger, Pantheon Books, 1963, pp. lxxiii-lxxiv.

Hamburger, Michael, "Introduction," in *Hugo von Hofmannsthal: Selected Plays and Libretti*, Pantheon Books, 1963, pp. ix-lxxii.

Hofmannsthal, Hugo von, "The Tower (1927)," in *Three Plays*, Wayne State University Press, 1966, pp. 141-241.

"Hugo von Hofmannsthal," in *Contemporary Authors Online*, The Gale Group, 1999.

Schwarz, Alfred, "Introduction," in *Hugo von Hofmannsthal: Three Plays*, Wayne State University Press, 1966, pp. 13-42.

Copyright Information

This Premium Study Guide is an offprint from *Drama for Students*.

Project Editor
David Galens

Editorial
Sara Constantakis, Elizabeth A. Cranston, Kristen A. Dorsch, Anne Marie Hacht, Madeline S. Harris, Arlene Johnson, Michelle Kazensky, Ira Mark Milne, Polly Rapp, Pam Revitzer, Mary Ruby, Kathy Sauer, Jennifer Smith, Daniel Toronto, Carol Ullmann

Research
Michelle Campbell, Nicodemus Ford, Sarah Genik, Tamara C. Nott, Tracie Richardson

Data Capture
Beverly Jendrowski

Permissions
Mary Ann Bahr, Margaret Chamberlain, Kim Davis, Debra Freitas, Lori Hines, Jackie Jones, Jacqueline Key, Shalice Shah-Caldwell

Imaging and Multimedia
Randy Bassett, Dean Dauphinais, Robert Duncan, Leitha Etheridge-Sims, Mary Grimes, Lezlie Light, Jeffrey Matlock, Dan Newell, Dave Oblender, Christine O'Bryan, Kelly A. Quin, Luke Rademacher, Robyn V. Young

Product Design
Michelle DiMercurio, Pamela A. E. Galbreath, Michael Logusz

Manufacturing
Stacy Melson

For more information, contact
The Gale Group, Inc
27500 Drake Rd.
Farmington Hills, MI 48334-3535
Or you can visit our Internet site at
http://www.gale.com

Introduction

Purpose of the Book

The purpose of Drama for Students (DfS) is to provide readers with a guide to understanding, enjoying, and studying novels by giving them easy access to information about the work. Part of Gale's□For Students□ Literature line, DfS is specifically designed to meet the curricular needs of high school and undergraduate college students and their teachers, as well as the interests of general readers and researchers considering specific novels. While each volume contains entries on □classic□ novels

frequently studied in classrooms, there are also entries containing hard-to-find information on contemporary novels, including works by multicultural, international, and women novelists.

The information covered in each entry includes an introduction to the novel and the novel's author; a plot summary, to help readers unravel and understand the events in a novel; descriptions of important characters, including explanation of a given character's role in the novel as well as discussion about that character's relationship to other characters in the novel; analysis of important themes in the novel; and an explanation of important literary techniques and movements as they are demonstrated in the novel.

In addition to this material, which helps the readers analyze the novel itself, students are also provided with important information on the literary and historical background informing each work. This includes a historical context essay, a box comparing the time or place the novel was written to modern Western culture, a critical overview essay, and excerpts from critical essays on the novel. A unique feature of DfS is a specially commissioned critical essay on each novel, targeted toward the student reader.

To further aid the student in studying and enjoying each novel, information on media adaptations is provided, as well as reading suggestions for works of fiction and nonfiction on similar themes and topics. Classroom aids include ideas for research papers and lists of critical sources that provide additional material on the novel.

Selection Criteria

The titles for each volume of DfS were selected by surveying numerous sources on teaching literature and analyzing course curricula for various school districts. Some of the sources surveyed included: literature anthologies; Reading Lists for College-Bound Students: The Books Most Recommended by America's Top Colleges; textbooks on teaching the novel; a College Board survey of novels commonly studied in high schools; a National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) survey of novels commonly studied in high schools; the NCTE's Teaching Literature in High School: The Novel;and the Young Adult Library Services Association (YALSA) list of best books for young adults of the past twenty-five years. Input was also solicited from our advisory board, as well as educators from various areas. From these discussions, it was determined that each volume should have a mix of □classic□ novels (those works commonly taught in literature classes) and contemporary novels for which information is often hard to find. Because of the interest in expanding the canon of literature, an emphasis was also placed on including works by international, multicultural, and women authors. Our advisory board members□educational professionals□ helped pare down the list for each volume. If a work was not selected for the present volume, it was often noted as a possibility for a future volume. As always, the editor welcomes suggestions for titles to be included in future volumes.

How Each Entry Is Organized

Each entry, or chapter, in DfS focuses on one novel. Each entry heading lists the full name of the novel, the author's name, and the date of the novel's publication. The following elements are contained in each entry:

- Introduction: a brief overview of the novel which provides information about its first appearance, its literary standing, any controversies surrounding the work, and major conflicts or themes within the work.
- Author Biography: this section includes basic facts about the author's life, and focuses on events and times in the author's life that inspired the novel in question.
- Plot Summary: a factual description of the major events in the novel. Lengthy summaries are broken down with subheads.
- Characters: an alphabetical listing of major characters in the novel. Each character name is followed by a brief to an extensive description of the character's role in the novel, as well as discussion of the character's actions, relationships, and possible motivation. Characters are listed alphabetically by last name. If a character is unnamed□for instance, the narrator in Invisible Man-the character is listed as □The Narrator□ and alphabetized as □Narrator.□ If a character's first name is the only one given, the name will appear alphabetically by that name. □ Variant names are also included for each character. Thus, the full name □Jean Louise Finch□ would head the listing for the narrator of To Kill a Mockingbird, but listed in a separate cross-reference would be the nickname □Scout Finch.□
- Themes: a thorough overview of how the major topics, themes, and issues are addressed within the novel. Each theme discussed appears in a separate subhead, and is easily accessed through the boldface entries in the Subject/Theme Index.
- Style: this section addresses important style elements of the novel, such as setting, point of view, and narration; important literary devices used, such as imagery, foreshadowing, symbolism; and, if applicable, genres to which the work might have belonged, such as Gothicism or Romanticism. Literary terms are explained within the entry, but can also be found in the Glossary.
- Historical Context: This section outlines the social, political, and cultural climate in which the author lived and the novel was created. This section may include descriptions of related historical events, pertinent aspects of daily life in the culture, and the artistic and literary sensibilities of the time in which the work was written. If the novel is a historical work, information regarding the time in which the novel is set is also included. Each section is broken down with helpful subheads.
- Critical Overview: this section provides background on the critical reputation of the novel, including bannings or any other public controversies surrounding the work. For older works, this section includes a history of how the novel was first received and how perceptions of it may have changed over the years; for more recent novels, direct quotes from early reviews may also be included.
- Criticism: an essay commissioned by DfS which specifically deals with the novel and is written specifically for the student audience, as well as excerpts from previously published criticism on the work (if available).

- Sources: an alphabetical list of critical material quoted in the entry, with full bibliographical information.
- Further Reading: an alphabetical list of other critical sources which may prove useful for the student. Includes full bibliographical information and a brief annotation.

In addition, each entry contains the following highlighted sections, set apart from the main text as sidebars:

- Media Adaptations: a list of important film and television adaptations of the novel, including source information. The list also includes stage adaptations, audio recordings, musical adaptations, etc.
- Topics for Further Study: a list of potential study questions or research topics dealing with the novel. This section includes questions related to other disciplines the student may be studying, such as American history, world history, science, math, government, business, geography, economics, psychology, etc.
- Compare and Contrast Box: an □at-a-glance□ comparison of the cultural and historical differences between the author's time and culture and late twentieth century/early twenty-first century Western culture. This box includes pertinent parallels between the major scientific, political, and cultural movements of the time or place the novel was written, the time or place the novel was set (if a historical work), and modern Western culture. Works written after 1990 may not have this box.
- What Do I Read Next?: a list of works that might complement the featured novel or serve as a contrast to it. This includes works by the same author and others, works of fiction and nonfiction, and works from various genres, cultures, and eras.

Other Features

DfS includes □The Informed Dialogue: Interacting with Literature,□ a foreword by Anne Devereaux Jordan, Senior Editor for Teaching and Learning Literature (TALL), and a founder of the Children's Literature Association. This essay provides an enlightening look at how readers interact with literature and how Drama for Students can help teachers show students how to enrich their own reading experiences.

A Cumulative Author/Title Index lists the authors and titles covered in each volume of the DfS series.

A Cumulative Nationality/Ethnicity Index breaks down the authors and titles covered in each volume of the DfS series by nationality and ethnicity.

A Subject/Theme Index, specific to each volume, provides easy reference for users who may be studying a particular subject or theme rather than a single work. Significant subjects from events to broad themes are included, and the entries pointing to the specific theme discussions in each entry are indicated in boldface.

Each entry has several illustrations, including photos of the author, stills from film adaptations (if available), maps, and/or photos of key historical events.

Citing Drama for Students

When writing papers, students who quote directly from any volume of Drama for Students may use the following general forms. These examples are based on MLA style; teachers may request that students adhere to a different style, so the following examples may be adapted as needed. When citing text from DfS that is not attributed to a particular author (i.e., the Themes, Style, Historical Context sections, etc.), the following format should be used in the bibliography section:

□Night.□ Drama for Students. Ed. Marie Rose Napierkowski. Vol. 4. Detroit: Gale, 1998. 234-35.

When quoting the specially commissioned essay from DfS (usually the first piece under the □Criticism□ subhead), the following format should be used:

Miller, Tyrus. Critical Essay on □Winesburg, Ohio.□ Drama for Students. Ed. Marie Rose Napierkowski. Vol. 4. Detroit: Gale, 1998. 335-39.

When quoting a journal or newspaper essay that is reprinted in a volume of DfS, the following form may be used:

Malak, Amin. □Margaret Atwood's □The Handmaid's Tale and the Dystopian Tradition,□ Canadian Literature No. 112 (Spring, 1987), 9-16; excerpted and reprinted in Drama for Students, Vol. 4, ed. Marie Rose Napierkowski (Detroit: Gale, 1998), pp. 133-36.

When quoting material reprinted from a book that appears in a volume of DfS, the following form may be used:

Adams, Timothy Dow. □Richard Wright: □Wearing the Mask,□ in Telling Lies in Modern American Autobiography (University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 69-83; excerpted and reprinted in Novels for Students, Vol. 1, ed. Diane Telgen (Detroit: Gale, 1997), pp. 59-61.

We Welcome Your Suggestions

The editor of Drama for Students welcomes your comments and ideas. Readers who wish to suggest novels to appear in future volumes, or who have other suggestions, are cordially invited to contact the editor. You may contact the editor via email at: ForStudentsEditors@gale.com. Or write to the editor at:

Editor, Drama for Students
Gale Group
27500 Drake Road
Farmington Hills, MI 48331-3535