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ABSTRACT

An abstract of the thesis of Craig O. Smith for the Master of Arts in German presented August 2, 1996.

Title: *Dramatic Conflict and Historical Reality in Carl Zuckmayer’s Hauptmann von Köpenick*

Carl Zuckmayer drafted his drama, *Der Hauptmann von Köpenick*, as an intended contribution to the Heidelberger Festspiele in late 1930. He chose Wilhelm Voigt’s 1906 seizure of the Rathaus in Köpenick as the theme best suited for the realization of his twofold intention — the combination of an Eulenspiegel figure and criticism of contemporary events. The following thesis analyzes the relationship between theatrical and historic event through an examination of the composition of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick’s* generic elements. Through an evaluation of Zuckmayer’s drama in terms of form, technical composition, and socio-political environment, this study intends to arrive at a complete understanding of the thematic construction of the play’s central dramatic conflict.

The central conflict of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* is analyzed in terms of its relation to history and society. This study evaluates the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* in terms of structure and genre. It presents the composition of the drama’s plot as fully symmetrical, then considers the way in which the varying composition of each act brings that symmetry about. This study examines the significance of the play’s structural numerical relationships and their connection to fairy tale. An examination of the drama’s fairy tale elements and their impact on the drama’s central conflict
follows. The Volksstück acts as the ideal genre for a consolidated attack against National Socialism. The genres of Expressionism and Neue Sachlichkeit bring Voigt’s subjective struggle for identity against the objective powers of military bureaucracy to full contrast. The dramatic conflict of the Hauptmann von Köpenick is examined next in terms of its relevance to contemporary events, an aspect that brings Zuckmayer’s drama into consideration as Zeitstück. The analysis of the Hauptmann von Köpenick concludes that Zuckmayer, by drawing upon the widest possible range of elements, formulated his dramatic conflict into an objective attack against subjective conceptions of struggle supported by the NSDAP.
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INTRODUCTION

The breadth of popularity that Carl Zuckmayer's *Hauptmann von Köpenick* was able to claim makes it stand out not as a monument to, but against the times. At the time of its premiere on March 5, 1931 at the National Theater in Berlin, battle lines of civil unrest had already been drawn. The Weimar Republic was torn by internal divisions from top to bottom. Hermann Müller's resignation from the post of Chancellor on March 27, 1931 "marked the end of the German democracy in Weimar."1 The Center Party supported a program of "sensible" authoritarianism with provisions for rule by emergency decree under Article 48 of the constitution if the Reichstag could not resolve its internal divisions.2 Since 1928, "the old schemes for staging a *coup d'état* and setting up a directorate had been surreptitiously circulating in various quarters of the Reichswehr. In short, everything the Republic had spent so long trying to escape from was back again."3 Following a vote of no confidence on July 18, 1930, Chancellor Brüning informed Parliament that Hindenburg had ordered its dissolution.4 The results of the election of September 14, 1930 increased the threat of a revolution from both sides:

The principal gainer was the National Socialist Party with its 6.4 million votes (18.3 per cent), won for the most part in Protestant rural areas. Instead of the little band of twelve members they had hitherto had, 107 uniformed(!) National Socialists filed into the Reichstag as the second strongest party — with the declared aim of abolishing that institution. On the opposite wing, the Communists gained 4.6 million votes and now had seventy-seven seats instead of fifty-four.5

With the threat from the left by no means ignorable, the predominant menace to the Weimar Republic was mounting with alarming rapidity from the reactionary right. The prevailing tendency was either to step back totally from society and politics, or to cross party lines with the sole intention of doing physical and verbal battle.6
In contrast to the ideologically polemical style of many of his contemporaries, Zuckmayer’s message in *Der Hauptmann von Köpenick* is clearly peaceful. His remarks in *Als wär’s ein Stück von mir* give every indication of his intention to address contemporary events. In the “Geleitwort” to Ingeborg Engelsing-Malek’s *Amor Fati* in Zuckmayer’s Dramen, Zuckmayer emphasizes the same intention with respect to his complete works:

Solche Art von Dichtung, die, ohne im ideologischen Sinn Partei zu ergreifen, dennoch in ihrer Gegenwart wurzelt und sich bemüht, zeichnend zu wirken, ist wohl schwer ‘einzuordnen’. Aus der Tradition ins Künftige wachsend, ohne Richtung oder Eingruppierung innerhalb der eigenen Epoche, darin liegt sicher beides, eine Schwäche aber auch eine Stärke. Hier sehe ich auch den Grund, weshalb trotz vielfacher Versuche und Bemühungen bisher darüber keine zusammenfassende Darstellung, keine literaturkritische Diskussion entstanden ist. Es läßt sich da bislang keine Formel finden, keine These, die zur Antithese und Synthese herausfordert, — höchstens Eigenschaften, Züge, vielleicht ein Grundzug.7

Zuckmayer refused to adapt his work to any particular doctrine in addressing the reality of the times. His method clearly indicates an attempt to compose his work within the *Zeitstück* genre, free of the outward bias of the *Lehr- oder Tendenzstück*. Many critics place his drama within the *Neue Sachlichkeit* movement for precisely this reason. Its open criticism of Prussian militarism makes the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*’s call to lay down arms in pursuit of a peaceful solution plainly evident. Zuckmayer’s elaborate dramatic composition of the events surrounding Wilhelm Voigt’s seizure of the *Köpenicker Rathaus* in 1906 successfully crosses class and party barriers with its message of peace.

In the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*, Zuckmayer formulates his dramatic criticism of Prussian militarism into an harmoniously unified whole. He creates of the historical Voigt a figure of guiltless determination in his struggle against bureaucratic and societal forces united against him. Zuckmayer’s plot reflects the same unity with
respect to both the overall dramatic composition and its subdivision into twenty-one scenes. The first and third acts contrast in terms of structural simplicity with the structurally complex second act. The result is a symmetrically unified whole. The closed construction of the second-act dramatic core reflects itself in each individual scene and character of the Hauptmann von Köpenick. Zuckmayer maximizes the possibilities for the interrelationship between individual dramatic components by providing each with the distinctive traits through which differentiation and comparison become possible. His inclusion of the triple relationship of the Zahlenmystik at various levels forms the principal structural bond between Zuckmayer's "Märchen in drei Akten" and the world of fairy tale. Zuckmayer composes the tripartite division of the Hauptmann von Köpenick into a structurally unified statement of internal harmony.

In transforming the folk-hero, Wilhelm Voigt, into a fabulous character for dramatic presentation, Zuckmayer combines the traditional and timeless elements of fairy tale with the socially critical and entertainment demands of the Volksstück. Voigt corresponds to the third royal son of Wilhelm Grimm's fairy tale interpretation, the subjective spirit of humanity in conflict with the objectifying forces of bureaucracy. Zuckmayer transforms and lends new sense to the sentences he takes from Rumpelstilzchen and the Bremer Stadtmusikanten. Both fairy tale and Volksstück complete the bond between stage, author, and audience. The author performs his societally critical function as author in the Volksstück genre. He transforms socio-political reality into a piece of dramatic entertainment fit for public performance. Zuckmayer draws on the principal genres from his era and the Western literary tradition in formulating his attack against the spirit of militarism. Yet the Hauptmann von Köpenick preserves an objective attitude of presentation throughout, never lapsing
into defamatory language or tendentiousness. The Märchen element provides the timeless quality that permits Zuckmayer to address his anti-military theme to the contemporary events of 1931. The Voigt Zuckmayer transforms into the fairy tale figure of his Volksstück represents the subjective human will at odds with the gathering forces of objective military absolutism.

In the Hauptmann von Köpenick, Zuckmayer takes an objectively critical look at societal indifference to the plight of a man without work and official identity. Through a contrast of similar but distinct objects of the stage, Zuckmayer draws out the subjective-objective distinction that reaches the height of contrast in the Expressionistic twelfth scene. To this he opposes an overall construction in the Neue Sachlichkeit genre. Within the Hauptmann von Köpenick, the element of Sachlichkeit reflects the spirit of indifference of the leaders of Weimar to the economic hardships of the lower classes and mounting threat of military authoritarianism.

The timelessness of fable clears the ground for the Hauptmann von Köpenick's assault on the traditional roots of Prussian militarism. By bringing Wilhelmine Germany into direct relationship with Weimar, Zuckmayer exposes the conservative German justice system and military objectives of the NSDAP at their traditional authoritarian core. Joseph Goebbels' open defense of his party's objectives against the Hauptmann von Köpenick's satire of militarism demonstrates the relevance of its author's Zeitkritik. Zuckmayer's drama links the democratic present of 1931 to the looming spectre of its undying authoritarian past.

Zuckmayer unites historical and social criticism at the psychological level — at the level where individual confronts society. He bases his drama on the publicly sensational criminal prank of a cobbler become folk hero:
Zuckmayer intensifies the effect of Wilhelm Voigt’s metamorphosis into the “Captain of Köpenick” by transforming the historical Voigt into a victim of societal circumstance. He strays from factual presentation of the events surrounding October 16, 1906 in order to preserve the spirit of the Köpenickiade as reflected in the German press. The original Voigt was by no means beyond guilt. The fictive Voigt is. Zuckmayer shifts the full motivation for Voigt’s coup from the scheming individual onto the military bureaucracy. The authoritarian Prussian military system imposes its psychology over von Schlettow’s aristocratic sense of propriety, Obermüller’s bourgeois intellectualism and Voigt’s lower-class common sense. Schlettow, Obermüller and Voigt, as psychological victims of authoritarian ideological control, are the characters through whom Zuckmayer exposes the nonsense in the well-ordered authoritarian system.

The broad comedic genre is the vehicle Zuckmayer uses to span class barriers and objectify authoritarian thought for an effective catharsis. Through the method of the Neue Sachlichkeit, Zuckmayer exposes the absurdity of the sort of bureaucratically objective thinking that loses sight of its human subject. Voigt’s purely subjective surrender to righteous self-justification enters the domain of the absurd as he, despite meticulous attention to detail, loses sight of the entire object of his Rathaus seizure. Zuckmayer examines the absurdity of a militarily controlled society at all class levels and, through Voigt, from both outside and in.
Zuckmayer’s *Hauptmann von Köpenick* presents a dramatic conflict that directly confronts the National Socialist conception of struggle in appeal and content. Voigt is a symbol of the part of the German people disinherited by the Depression. By extension, he symbolizes the German people as a whole. Zuckmayer combines the full range of literary techniques at his disposal to contemporize what he sees as the ongoing struggle of the German people for sovereignty against its age-old foe: the stubbornly rigid spirit of Prussian militarism. Zuckmayer brings the central dramatic conflict to the level of psychological confrontation with a repetition of the antagonistic opposition between the interests of the civil individual and military society that spans history and class. The central dramatic conflict of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* becomes the people’s struggle between exclusion and integration defined in structural terms. In the language of poetry it is the struggle of democracy against the unseen forces of history incorporated in the military bureaucracy. Zuckmayer uses the techniques of Expressionism and the *Neue Sachlichkeit* in order to raise the subjective-objective dischord between the humanitarian ideal and its subversion by bureaucratic order to the level of open confrontation. As a criticism of contemporary developments in the *Zeitstück* genre, the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* embodies the battle of the people for autonomy. It describes the people’s battle for hegemony against the constricting power of traditional authoritarianism under resurrection by a new order composed largely of military upstarts. Zuckmayer’s objectification of societal relationships appeals to the reason of the people. The baldly subjective arguments of the leaders of the NSDAP appealed to public emotion. Voigt’s comic struggle for identity is the German people’s attempt at maintaining autonomy against the stifling powers of a military bureaucracy. The leader of the NSDAP formulated the struggle of the German people and military against the powers of Parliament into the personally
subjective language of *Mein Kampf*. Zuckmayer, on the other hand, appeals to the objective power of reason. Hitler appealed to public emotion. Zuckmayer confronts German society with his own all-encompassing version of struggle that directly opposes the views of the writer of *Mein Kampf* in both its method of appeal and in its placement of loyalties.
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6 Zuckmayer describes the spirit of violence that ruled the streets at the time of his drama's premiere. See below, page 65, note 36.


EVENTS OF THE PLOT

The *Hauptmann von Köpenick*’s internal divisions provide for the greatest number of interrelations between character and elements of the plot. Zuckmayer divides the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* into three acts of seven scenes each. Each act forms a closed unit, as do each of the scenes. Zuckmayer thus lends the acts and scenes of his “deutsches Märchen in drei Akten” the possibility for forming comparative relationships within the text. He provides each member of his cast of seventy-three characters with the distinguishing features necessary for their wide-scale comparison. “Die Figurenkonstellation entspricht dem dramaturgischen Grundprinzip der kontrastiven, additiven oder differenzierenden Verklammerung von Szenen.”

Each scene rounds out with some sort of capping statement, appearing in most cases at the scene’s end. The first act is an Expressionistically disconnected series of scenes in the form of a comedic *Stationendrama*. The second act is a symmetrically constructed *Trauerspiel*. The scenes of the third act run through the series of logical steps of the “slapstick comedy” of the *Köpenickiad*. The first and third acts form a comparative bond on the basis of uniformity. The unidirectional motion of the third act, however, forms a unified contrast with the monotone atmosphere of stagnation of the first act. The second act opposes both on the basis of its complexity of dramatic motion and its intricate structural relationships. The internal components of Zuckmayer’s drama form wide-ranging interrelationships at all levels.

Adolf Wormser’s “Uniformladen” in Potsdam constitutes the setting for the first scene of Zuckmayer’s drama. Wormser is fitting Hauptmann von Schlettow for a new uniform when the latter detects that, “mit der Uniform da stimmt was nicht. Da is was nich in Ordnung. Das hab ich im Gefühl” (7). To Wormser’s initial resistance to the idea of making a slight alteration in the distance between the “Gesäßknöpfe” in
compliance with military regulations, Schlettow mentions to Wormser that one
notices “auf Schritt und Tritt, daß Se nich gedient haben.” As arrangements are being
concluded for the alterations in tailoring, the specter of Wilhelm Voigt appears twice
“an der Glastür.” Voigt silently departs after his first appearance. But when asked a
second time what he wants, Voigt says: “Ick wollte mir nur mal erkundigen —,” to
which Wormser responds with, “Raus!! Hier wird nich gebettelt!!” (11). The scene
closes with Schlettow’s statement: “Wenn ich mir eine neue Montur bauen lasse, denn
muß nu alles tadellos in Form sein, da hab ich meine Freude dran, verstehense?” (11).

In the second scene, Voigt appears in the bureaucratic sphere represented by
the Polizeibüro in Potsdam. He repeats the line of the first scene: “Ick wollte mir nur
mal erkundigen —” (12), this time about a residence permit. The “Oberwachtmeister”
recites Voigt’s official history in examining his file: “Fuffzehn Jahre Zuchthaus,
wegen Posturkundenfälschung” (13). Voigt describes his subsequent employment by
a Jewish shoe manufacturer in Bucharest and the reasons for his return to Germany:

Da unten, da sinse alle janz anders, und da redense ooch janz anders.
Und da hat nu schließlich der Mensch seine Muttersprache, und wenn
er nischt hat, denn hat er die immer noch. Det glaubense jarnich, wie
scheen Deutschland is, wenn man weit wech is und immer nur dran
denkt. Aber ick sage ja, det war dumm von mir (15).

Zuckmayer places the Pointe of the second scene within a few verbal interchanges
before the conclusion, as indicated by the Oberwachtmeister’s command, “Jetzt
machense mal ’n Punkt” (17). Voigt’s answer cuts to the central Heimat theme that
forms a main ingredient in the structuring of the core of Zuckmayer’s drama: “Nee,
nee ick reg mir jarnich uff, aber’t muß ja nu ’n Platz geben, wo der Mensch
hingehört!” (17). The scene concludes with a bureaucratically abrupt command for
Voigt to leave. Voigt has interrupted the Oberwachtmeister and Wachtmeister during
their lunch-break with his awkward inquiries.
The publicly diverse intercultural realm of the Café National in Berlin forms the setting for the third scene. Zuckmayer elevates the scene to the status of fable through his integration of a self-fulfilling prophecy paralleling Aesop's "slow and steady wins the race." The grenadier coaxes the Plöösennmetze to his table. Tensions rise as Kalle objects. Schlettow ignores protocol to check the grenadier's militarily inappropriate behavior. A comic scene results in which the rankingly superior Schlettow scuffles with the grenadier, who rejects Schlettow's call to obedience with an insult: "Det kann jeder sagen! For mir bist'n deemlicher Zivilist!" (29).

The fourth scene takes place in the public sphere of the "Axolotl" shoe factory's personnel office, where Voigt inquires after a job. This is the only scene for which the stage instructions give no details regarding location in the Berlin area. The clerk asks Voigt, "Wo hamse gedient?" He turns Voigt away in repetition of the same theme of exclusion of the first and second scenes. The clerk repeats his "Wo hamse gedient??" to the next comer as the lights go down (32-33).

The private sphere of Schlettow's elegantly furnished room in Potsdam sets the atmosphere for the fifth scene. Wabschke appears with his tailored uniform. Schlettow announces his military resignation to Wabschke. Wabschke consoles Schlettow with the consideration, that "wenn eener 'n richtiger Mensch is, det is doch de Hauptsache, nich?" Schlettow soliloquizes over these words: "Vielleicht — vielleicht hat er recht — Nee, pfui!" (36).

The public "Herberge zur Heimat" in north Berlin forms the setting for the following scene. Its setting is really a cross between the private and public spheres. A representative body of the male unemployed from all over Germany constitutes the cast. Voigt reveals his plan for erasing his criminal record by breaking into the Polizeirevier in Potsdam (40-41). A Wachtpatrouille appears to enforce curfew, check
passes and impose silence. The lights of the sixth scene are extinguished as Voigt states to the nearly sleeping Kalle, "Herrgott — wenn ick erst raus bin —" (47).

The seventh scene returns the action to the setting of scene number one. Dr. Obermüller comes to order a uniform as an officer of the reserve (49). Wormser convinces Obermüller to accept the alterations in Schlettow's former uniform. He remarks, as Obermüller gets out of ear shot: "Der hat's geschafft. Was heutzutag nich alles Offizier wird! Nemm dir e Beispiel, Willy!" (52). The first act thus establishes Voigt's exclusion from society and ends with an indirect solution to his problem as exemplified in the person of Obermüller.

The second act commences with the eighth scene. The Zuchthauskapelle of the Prussian corrections facility of Sonnenburg provides the setting. A celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the victory of Prussian troops over French forces is held — "Sedantag" (Zuckmayer has added four years to the original date of Voigt's Köpenickiade, so the year is now 1910). In a mock-up reenactment of the battle, Voigt tests his abilities in the role of commander and excels. The scene concludes with the prison director's praise of Voigt's talent for marshaling troops:


The living room of Voigt's sister and her husband in Rixdorf forms the private atmosphere of the next scene. Frau Hoprecht receives her brother and offers him shelter (63). Her husband is a soldier in the reserves (63). Hoprecht returns from work, welcomes Voigt and sustains his hopes for fair treatment by the authorities:

Das geht alles seinen Gang, Willem. Machen kannst du gar nichts. So wolln wir jetzt auch gar nicht anfangen, was? Da mußte den
richtigen Weg einschlagen, denn klappt das auch. Hintenrum, das wär ein Delikt! Und was dir zusteht, das kriegste, dafür sind wir in Preußen. Also prost, Willem, aufs neue Leben! Da mach dir man keine Sorgen. Das geht alles seinen Gang!

The ninth scene closes as Voigt clinks glasses with Hoprecht: “Na, prosit!” (65).

The tenth scene takes place in the private bedroom of Obermüller and his wife in Köpenick. Obermüller needs his new uniform for the “Kaiserliche Manöver,” but the new uniform must be expedited by telephone from Wormser’s (66). The former uniform of Schlettow has grown too small to fit Obermüller’s present proportions (67). Wabschke arrives with the uniform’s replacement. Taking the used uniform with him in departing, Wabschke states as the lights go down: “Na, fiern Maskenball wird se vielleicht noch jehn.” (69).

The setting of the eleventh scene is provided by the foyer of the Einwohnermeldeamt of the Polizeirevier in Rixdorf. Voigt waits for entry to room number nine, where he has been instructed, “probiernse’s mal drin” (71). The officer of the police responds to Voigt’s pleas that his case must be heard, “— denn is ja zu spät” (71), with the repeated command for Voigt to take a seat. The police officer disappears into his office. The reader of the Social-Democratic Vorwärts announces that time has run out, and leaves (73). Voigt remains on his own. The voice of the officer can be heard with increasing volume from inside his office: “. . . kann ich keine Rücksicht nehmen! Befehl is Befehl, darnach habense sich zu richten!!” Voigt then rises from his seat, tiptoes to the office door and peeps through the keyhole as the lights go out (73).

The highly private realm of the garret at the Hoprechts’ in Rixdorf lends an atmosphere of seclusion to the twelfth scene. Voigt comforts the ailing Liesken. Court musicians sing their songs outside. Liesken evidences her slipping health by
begging Voigt not to leave her. While reading her a passage from the *Bremer Stadtmusikanten* of the Brothers Grimm, Voigt receives the order of expulsion from a bureaucratic representative. He reads the notice *sotto voce*, believing that Liesken has fallen asleep. He stops reading, and she prompts him to continue. As the lights fade, he resumes his reading of the fairy tale lines: “Komm mit sagte der Hahn — etwas besseres als den Tod werden wir überall finden” (78).

The following scene takes place in the *Festsaal bei Dressel*. A celebration takes place, in which the Wormser and various representatives of the military caste take part. The thirteenth scene ends with an appearance by Wormser’s daughter, Augusta, dressed in the uniform previously owned by Schlettow and Obermüller. The uniform accidentally gets spotted with pineapple compote, champagne and water from a vase as Wormser reaches over the table to light the master of cavalry’s cigarette. In response to Augusta’s laugh, Wormser states: “lach nicht auch noch! Die schöne Uniform! Jetzt kannse zum Trödler.” Augusta answers irreverently: “Da gehört se auch hin!” (84).

The fourteenth scene returns the action to the private sphere of the Hoprecht’s livingroom in Rixdorf. Frau Hoprecht tells her husband of Liesken’s death and Voigt’s attendance at her funeral (85). Voigt returns and declares his departure in accordance with the official expulsion order (88). He remains oblivious to Hoprecht’s assertions that, “Bei uns gibt’s kein Unrecht! Wenigstens nich von oben runter! Bei uns geht Recht und Ordnung über alles, das weiß jeder Deutsche!” (90). Voigt departs with the laughing exclamation that, “Was de andern können, dat kann ick noch lange.” The scene lighting fades with Hoprecht’s remark: “Der Mensch — der Mensch is ja gefährlich!!” (92). The second act thus concludes with evidence that Voigt has decided on doing something drastic toward the improvement of his condition.
The fifteenth scene commences the final act as Voigt appears in the public realm of “Krakauers Kleiderladen.” Voigt buys Schlettow’s original uniform under pretense: “Ick brauchse fiern Maskenball” (93). Krakauer sends him on his way: “Adjeh, Herr Hauptmann, viel Vergnügen, Herr Hauptmann!! — Auch e Hauptmann!!” (96).

The public realm of the Sanssoucci Park in Potsdam provides the setting for the isolated mini-drama of the sixteenth scene. Apart from Voigt’s presence as observer upon the scene, its action is external to the developments of the main plot (thus serving as a *neu-sachlich* counterpart to the internally motivating events of the twelfth scene). Different pairs of uniformed members of society establish an external referent to the internal plot of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*. Voigt’s courteous comportment in comparison with the malicious behavior of a pair of young boys gains recognition in the remark of one of a pair of elderly women: “Bei jungen Leuten findet man heutzutage leider solche Höflichkeit nicht mehr.” To which her companion wisely answers, “Ja, ja, die alte Schule” (99).

The action of the seventeenth scene transpires in the public realm of the *Schlesischer Bahnhof*, in Berlin. Voigt, carrying a cardboard box, walks past a pair of railway officials, enters the public lavatory and emerges in military Captain’s attire. He commands one of the pair to consign his package to the *Gepäckaufbewahrung*. He then dismisses them from duty, to which the first official responds with “Jawohl, Herr Hauptmann” (102).

The foyer of the *Rathaus* in Köpenick, the bureaucratic sphere, is the setting upon which the action of the eighteenth scene intrudes. After a *pro forma* exchange between various officials, the sound of bootsteps and military commands enters the set from beyond the scenes. Wearing the *Hauptmannsuniform*, Voigt enters in command.
of a ten-man force and rapidly takes affairs under his own authority (105). He announces an order from above calling for the imposition of Belagerungszustand to the Stadtschutzmann Kilian, to whom he immediately delegates the responsibility of giving the command to “march” (106).

The action of the preceding scene carries directly over into the guardedly private bureaucratic realm of Obermüller’s gubernatorial office in Köpenick. Voigt takes everyone and everything into military custody with reference to a command issued from his superiors (107). His establishment of authority is primarily based upon his use of the previously ingrained rhetorical device, “Haben Sie gedient?” (107-108). Upon experiencing that passports are not issued in Köpenick (110), Voigt maintains his composure and orders his troops to confiscate the till’s contents, which he takes into personal custody before abandoning the set of the nineteenth scene (116).

The twentieth scene transpires in the open public setting of “Aschingers Bierquelle in der Neuen Friedrichstraße.” As the charwoman prepares to clean up before opening time, she discovers Voigt sleeping on a bench (116). The waiter explains that Voigt fell asleep in his dinner the evening before (117). A group of guests enters, and the chauffeur laughingly announces the news of events in Köpenick (118). Holding a copy of the “Extrablatt,” the driver reads the description of the “Hauptmann von Köpenick” aloud: “Mager und knochig — jebeugte Kopfhaltung — schiefe Schulter — bleiches häßliches Gesicht — krankhaftes Aussehen . . .” (119-20). Voigt listens silently as the lights go down.

The twenty-first scene takes place in the bureaucratic realm, in the interrogation room of the “Berliner Polizeipräsidium.” The inspector reads the report of the Kaiser’s reaction to the Köpenickiad: “Habense den Geheimbericht nich gelesen? Gelacht hat er, wie man’s ihm vorgetragen hat, und stolz war er noch drauf!
Mein lieber Jago, hat er zum Präsidenten gesagt, da kann man sehen, was Disziplin heißt! Kein Volk der Erde macht uns das nach!” (121). The inspector comments that forty arrests have been made and dozens of confessions given. The Passkommissar announces Voigt as the “Hauptmann von Köpenick” (122). He explains the declaration Voigt has made before him in the passport issuing office: “Er sei der vorbestrafte Wilhelm Voigt und brauche unbedingt einen Paß. Wenn ich ihm verspreche, daß er später einen Paß bekommt — er sagte ausdrücklich ‘später’ —, dann könne er mir den Hauptmann von Köpenick zur Stelle schaffen.” (122). He adds that he complied with Voigt’s request by making the promise, upon which Voigt revealed himself as the culprit (122-23). The uniform is also recovered. His captors treat Voigt with respect and hospitality, offering him a glass of port and something to smoke. “So gut is mir noch nich jegangen uffn Amt,” says Voigt. “Sonst hamse mir immer nur einjesperrt oder rausjeschmissen” (127). Voigt asks for a mirror, that he might view himself for the first time in captain’s uniform. Standing with his back to the audience, silent then with twitching shoulders, he begins to tremble and stagger to the point that wine spills from his glass (128). Voigt turns toward the audience and begins laughing with growing intensity, “mit dem ganzen Körper, aus dem ganzen Wesen — lacht, bis ihm der Atem wegbleibt und die Tränen herunterlaufen.” A word forms itself out of his laughter, “erst leise, unverständlich fast — dann immer stärker, deutlicher, endgültiger — schließlich in neuem, großem, befreitem und mächtigem Gelächter alles zusammenfassend Unmöglich!! Dunkel” (128).

Zuckmayer combines modern and traditional elements in laying out the structure for the Hauptmann von Köpenick. The “Stationendrama” of the first act forms the underlying theme for Voigt’s second-act decision to carry out the Köpenickiade of the final act. Despite Zuckmayer’s deft use of the techniques of
Expressionism and the *Neue Schichkeit*, the overall dramatical structure is very traditional. The peripeteia comes at the middle of the play (following the twelfth scene). The plot then follows the falling pattern of the traditional katabasis up to the closing scene. The general structure of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* is fairly traditional, but Voigt's direction of his final exclamation to the audience leaves the plot open-ended. In this respect, the close of the final act directly contradicts Aristotelian dramatic convention.
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3 The Sedantag was an outward manifestation of the German heroising trend that extends back into the nineteenth century with Germany’s 1813 victory over Napoleon at the “Battle of the Peoples” at Leipzig. “Militarism, heroism, and national unity were also the keynotes of the newly-instituted national feast day to celebrate the victory over the French at the battle of Sedan in 1870.” Ian Kershaw, The Hitler Myth: Image and Reality in the Third Reich (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987) 14.


5 In the Poetics (1449b), Aristotle’s designation of tragedy as “Nachahmung einer . . . in sich geschlossener Handlung” has had a strong impact on traditional dramatic theory in general, especially since the second book of his Poetics has been lost. Aristoteles, Poetik: Griechisch/Deutsch, trans. and ed. Manfred Fuhrmann (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun. GmbH, 1982) 18-19.
The historical dimension of *Der Hauptmann von Köpenick* is undeniable, and many see it as the definitive element of its content. Yet Zuckmayer’s portrayal of the social environment of the Wilhelmine era does not meet with universal acceptance by any means. His drama nearly always receives condemnation from Marxist critics for his failure to investigate the underlying capitalistic determination of the events of the *Köpenickiade*. The *Hauptmann von Köpenick* is, however, a masterpiece of synthesis of the genres of historical and social drama. By focusing his attention on the military theme, Zuckmayer offers a compelling picture of the military presence that pervaded Wilhelmine society down to the individual mentality of the citizenry. Behind the fabulous theme announced by Zuckmayer’s *deutsches Märchen in drei Akten*, its relevance to historical fact makes itself unfailingly clear:

Doch bricht das Geschehen um den historischen Hauptmann von Köpenick, seine Authentizität und komische Widerspiegelung im Stück, die Märchenwirklichkeit auf. Das Spiel um des Kaisers Kleid, die Uniform, weist hinaus auf die historische Wirklichkeit der Wilhelminischen Ära, der es entspringt.

In order to heighten that “authenticity” and more comically reflect the spirit of Germany under constitutional monarchy, Zuckmayer transforms the personality of the historical *Gauner* around whom he bases his plot. He cleanses Voigt nearly totally of culpability for the punishment he receives from society and bureaucracy, thus largely reflecting journalistic reception of the historical mini-coup of October 16, 1906. The actual Voigt was nonetheless a victim of circumstance. Zuckmayer reverses the element of motivation for Voigt’s crime, however. By making the military bureaucracy the culprit behind Voigt’s motivation, Zuckmayer is able to present a far broader picture of the bureaucratic apparatus in the social context. He moves Prussian militarism and bureaucracy into position for direct conflict with Voigt, enabling his
drama to demonstrate the underlying danger to German internal constitutional security posed by the expanding might of the military on the eve of the First World War. He describes the point at which the military comes into immediate contact with the individual at all levels of society, from aristocracy to bourgeoisie to working class. Zuckmayer exposes the trend of societo-militarily induced self-abnegation at all levels, each time showing the underlying irrationality in individual conformity to military principles.

Although remaining close to the skeleton of events around which his plot evolves, Zuckmayer liberally employs poetic licence in altering about every essential detail in the character of Voigt and the circumstances surrounding the Köpenickiade. "Die Vorgeschichte Voigts wird gänzlich umstrukturiert und anders akzentuiert."4 The same holds true for particular details of Voigt's character, of the manner with which he seizes the Rathaus and of succeeding events. Zuckmayer transfers the motivating impulse for the historical Voigt's action from the figure himself to the malevolence of military bureaucratic forces that implicitly receive the bulk of the blame.

In shifting the guilt from the historical Wilhelm Voigt to the bureaucratic milieu against which he launches his coup, Zuckmayer is fully in keeping with the event's original public reception as immediately manifest in most of the press. The left was jubilant. The bourgeois center criticized the power of the military, while the conservative right stood behind it and shifted the blame to the unmilitary conduct of the officials at Köpenick.5 With the anaphora! repetion of the words, "Die Welt lacht," the Social Democratic Vorwärts of 18 October 1906 seized upon the events at Köpenick as an opportunity to mock its aristocratic enemy from an international perspective.6 The more moderate Vossische Zeitung received Voigt's action as a
warning against similar occurrences because of the privileged aspect the uniform lent anyone, regardless of character. In an article entitled “Fetischuniform,” the Berliner Tageblatt criticized the way in which all political sectors prostrated themselves to anyone wearing the Prussian uniform, merely “weil er uniformiert ist.” To suit the political environment of 1931, Zuckmayer seizes upon the same critical feeling that had surrounded the uniform in 1906 and concentrates his attack.

The elimination of the guilt-aspect pertaining to Voigt is fundamental to Zuckmayer’s redefinition of the circumstances surrounding his leading character’s decision to take justice into his own hands. He thus exaggerates the severity of Voigt’s original conviction, thereby instilling his protagonist with sufficient righteous indignation to justify his ultimate breach with the law.

Zuckmayer in fact reinterprets the character of Voigt to such a degree, that the fictional Voigt really does become an inadvertant victim of a sort of unconsciously directed “brutal police and legal terror.” Zuckmayer deletes all traits from the fictional Voigt’s character that could create a bias against him. And while the Voigt of Zuckmayer’s drama strives for nothing more than a societally justified position, the historical Voigt was constantly searching for a new and better home along with improved military placement:

The Voigt who committed the sensational robbery of 1906 strove for material aggrandizement and had learned "von Kindsbeinen an den Glanz der Ordnung als höhere Wirklichkeit zu verehren." The "higher reality" of his fictive counterpart is the human dignity that he asserts against the bureaucratic forces of order. His humble desire for societal integration at the level of common citizen stands in marked contrast to the aspirations of the historical Voigt, who seems to have been obsessed with no greater notion than to raise himself above the common crowd. The fictive Voigt yearns to join society. When refused a residence permit for being unemployed, Voigt states to the Oberwachtmeister, "Nee, nee ick reg mir jamich uff, aber’t muß ja nu’n Platz geben, wo der Mensch hingehört!" (17). The actual Voigt was fully willing to divorce himself from society. There was no discrepancy between the actual Voigt's character and his criminal act. Zuckmayer purges all trace of guilt from the original Voigt in transforming him into the fabulous protagonist of the Hauptmann von Köpenick. The pureness of the fictitious Voigt's character stands in marked contrast to the criminality of his Gaunerstreich and constitutes one of the principal ingredients in the dramatic tension of the plot.

Yet as reflected in the popular press of 1906, the element of guiltlessness was not wholly absent from the character of the historical Voigt. The Berliner Morgenpost thus commented: "Die Traurigkeit, die in Voigts Schicksal liegt, ist nicht ganz vom Fatum, sondern zum guten Teile von der Unzulänglichkeit der von uns selbst gesetzten Institutionen verursacht." Zuckmayer applies the talents of his craft to shift the majority of the guilt from the character of Voigt to the institutions he skillfully represents as institutions of blind repression.

Zuckmayer reverses the impetus and intentions of the factual Voigt in transferring them to his counterpart in fiction. The fictional Voigt breaks the law with
the sole intention of rectifying a personal case of bureaucratic injustice and nothing more. Both his military training and the realization that “Kleider machen Leute” are either forced upon him or come directly from the milieu in which fortune places him.

In the fourth scene of Zuckmayer’s drama, Voigt experiences the importance society places on prior military service. The hiring clerk, Knell, flatly refuses Voigt’s inquiry into employment on the basis of his lack of military service (32). The attitude has already been established in General von Schlettow’s remark of the first scene: “Sehnse, Wabschke, bei Ihnen merkt man auf Schritt und Tritt, daß Sie nicht gedient haben” (8). All of the fictive Voigt’s military experience comes from first-hand subjection to the military’s universal influence upon society. The account of the real-life Voigt boasts of something approaching an historical mission:


The real Voigt was an autodidact who drew his military knowledge and ideas of revolt from the books of his choice.15 His motivation thus came internally and was linked to historico-literary visions of glory. Zuckmayer’s Voigt is driven by circumstances from without; his demands are humble and contrast drastically in magnitude with the course of action he takes toward their fulfillment.

The danger to public security represented in the actual Voigt’s coup of 1906 was even acknowledged by the aristocratic press. The Königlich privilegierte Berlinische Zeitung feared that the event could be repeated by members of the criminal underworld. Voigt’s coup demonstrated “wie gefährlich die gesetzlich angeordnete Ohnmacht der Polizei und des Publikums gegenüber dem Träger der
Uniform für die öffentliche Sicherheit und Ordnung ist.” Since: “In der Tat, des Königs Rock, oder vielmehr der Offiziersrock, ist eine rechtliche, vom Gesetz privilegierte Einrichtung, ganz unabhängig von der Person, die in dem Rocke steckt.”16 As events soon proved, the aristocracy had every cause for concern, since by arming the populace for “The Great War” in 1914, it extended its symbol of authority to a new body that could march home and exercise its authority in execution of its own command for revolutionary overthrow.

By making its presence ubiquitous throughout his drama, Zuckmayer demonstrates the deep social impact the military had on German society as well as history. The mass production shoe factory of the fourth scene is the only setting Zuckmayer provides without detail regarding location around Berlin. The factory could be anywhere in the Weimar Republic, thus symbolically indicating the ubiquity of capitalist forces as partner to the pervasive hold of the military on German society. The eternal return of the uniform into society under different owners in the Hauptmann von Köpenick is symbolic of the military’s unyielding historical influence on German politics. The uniform passes first from Schlettow to Obermüller, then from Obermüller to Voigt after serving as a costume for Wormser’s daughter at a cocktail party. When instructed by the Oberwachtmeister that he may obtain a residence permit once he has found employment, Voigt replies: “Ich bekom keene Arbeet ohne de Anmeldung. Ick muß ja nu erst mal de Aufenthalterlaubnis —” (16). The Teufelskreis in which Voigt becomes trapped reflects the historical divide separating the military and civilian spheres ever since 1848. German politicians failed repeatedly to impose an attitude of culpability upon the military subsequent to its participation in the revolutions of 1848 and 1918.17 Zuckmayer’s drama demonstrates the military presence in Wilhelmine Germany not only on the historical and social
levels. Through the behavior and speech of his characters, he demonstrates the societally dominant military attitude ingrained into the mentality of its people as well.

In the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*, Zuckmayer levels his wit against the steady tension of the authoritarian power structure's hold on society by concentrating on the single constituent elements of both at the immediate level — at the level where symbol of authority and societal individual come into direct contact. The spirit of authoritarianism eats deeper into its subjects than first appearances would reveal — a fact that Zuckmayer deftly shows through the behavior of his characters. Zuckmayer presents his social evidence with complete objectivity to his audience, thus placing it in the role of scientific observer. Since the spirit of authoritarianism founds itself upon the subjection of the true self to a higher Ordnung, the Mensch behind the public persona is often concealed beyond recognition but for brief moments, when the authoritarian personality drops its guard, and the captive Mensch emerges.

Von Schlettow's acceptance of his own failed career based on strict adherence to rules of formality represents an elevation of the military way of thinking to the level of idealism. The role played by Von Schlettow is, by means of historical analogy, that of the polically empowered aristocracy under the Second Reich. The outward appearance of that body's sovereignty is continually undergoing readjustment as new parties enter the German parliament of the late nineteenth century. In Zuckmayer's drama, the uniform represents that outward appearance, to which Wormser must make adjustments according to Von Schlettow's exacting demands (10-11). Von Schlettow's confrontation with a soldier of lower rank in the *Café National* shares outstanding parallels with the events of the First World War (and those thereafter). The derivation of the name of the cafe is recognizably French. Von Schlettow comes into conflict with the lower-ranking soldier as a result of an argument over the
“Plörösenmieze,” for whom Zuckmayer chose a name from both French (pleureuse, or “whining”) and German “Mietze,” meaning “pussycat.” The altercation in the Café National represents the engagement of German troops in France during World War I, toward the end of which the ordinary soldiery seized authority through the formation of Soldatenräte still clad in the uniforms of the Prussian military. Von Schlettow represents the powers of aristocracy that relinquished their military hold on society as Germany entered into armed competition with its more democratic neighbors.

A more profound dramatic exploration of Schlettow’s authoritarian personality would certainly have been possible had Zuckmayer brought his drama’s action closer behind the scenes. “Hätte Zuckmayer ihm mehr Raum gelassen, hätte eine psychopathologische Fallstudie entstehen können, eine Psychopathologie des autoritären Charakters, der auch im Untergang noch die Ursache seines Untergangs rechtfertigt.” But what does emerge from Zuckmayer’s work is a psychological case study of the effects of the authoritarian system treated from the social perspective. A Schutzmann arrests Schlettow for attempting to enforce military discipline out of uniform in the third scene (30-31). Schlettow announces to his orderly his intention to turn in his resignation (fifth scene). Deltzeit, the orderly, objects that Schlettow has done nothing wrong. Schlettow cuts him short: “Quasselnse nich, Deltzeit. Soviel Pech darf’n Soldat nich haben, das is es. Unglück is auch ’n Versagen.” (34).

Zuckmayer takes no pains to delve into the private motivating factors of Schlettow. In the purely objective world of military performance (and here Zuckmayer applies the methodology of Neue Sachlichkeit to perfection), failure can ultimately mean either defeat or even death. Von Schlettow’s retirement from the military is not fully tragic, and the luxury of his position prevents him from generalizing on the contradiction between proper military conduct and human happiness. His priorities
remain falsely placed. Wabschke departs scene five consoling Schlettow that, “wenn eener 'n richtiger Mensch is, det is noch de Hauptsache.” Von Schlettow considers the veracity of the inherently democratic principle of human rights for a brief moment: “Vielleicht — vielleicht hat er recht — Nee, pfui!” (36). From the moment of his discharge, Schlettow disappears from the social setting and hence from the stage. In full accordance with the aristocratic ideal of honor, von Schlettow not only causes, but as officer in charge, passes judgment on his own misconduct. He thus symbolizes the aristocracy’s surrender of its societally hegemonic position to an ancient institution with which it is no longer fully compatible.

Zuckmayer vividly portrays the rising spirit of opportunism in late Wilhelmine Germany through the character of the Bürgermeister, Dr. Obermüller. Obermüller utilizes the existing system to climb to a position of elevated social status, from which he readily adopts an elitist attitude. In the seventh scene, Wormser, the owner of the uniform shop, readily feeds on that attitude: “Das Schöne is, daß man was geworden is, was nich jeder werden kann, das macht Spaß” (51). Obermüller’s response shows him confidently justified in his position of social superiority: “Umgekehrt, lieber Herr Wormser, grad umgekehrt! Das Große ist bei uns die Idee des Volksheeres, in dem jeder Mann den Platz einnimmt, der ihm in der sozialen Struktur der Volksgemeinschaft zukommt. Freie Bahn dem Tüchtigen! Das ist die deutsche Devise!” (51). Psychological motivation is the underlying ingredient in Obermüller’s sophistic reformulation of societal conditions:

Die Intelligenz würde ihren Seelenfrieden nicht finden, wenn sie ihre Anpassung nicht auch intellektuell rechtfertigen könnte. Sie gibt sich liberal und argumentiert idealistisch: ‘Das System ist monarchisch — aber wir leben — angewandte Demokratie!’ (51) In diesen Verbalen Hochherzigkeiten entlarvt Zuckmayer den Konformismus und die Standpunktlosigkeit des zeitgeschichtlichen
Obermüller is every bit a representative of the rising power of the bourgeoisie in prewar Germany. He is literally symbolic of the expanding dimensions of that body. In the tenth scene, he has outgrown his uniform. His wife, frustrated over the prospect of trying to get him into it, exclaims: “Du bist viel zu dick geworden, du bist viel zu dick, ich sag’s ja schon lange” (67). More than half of the officers in the Prussian army came from the nobility in 1865. By 1913, 70 percent were of bourgeois origin. The reserve officers’ corps was, however, “almost exclusively drawn from the middle classes.” Bürgermeister Obermüller’s name indicates him as a striving member of the “Bürger” class attempting to set himself above the other “Müller” by rising in the reserves. Amongst the military staff, only reserve officers were allowed to take part in politics in pre-war Germany. An instruction book clearly stated, that:

the officer in reserve status must never, while an officer, belong to a party which places itself in opposition to the government of our Emperor or of the Landesherr. If he feels conscientiously restricted by this, then he must request his dismissal. As an officer, he is his imperial master’s ‘man’ in the old German sense of the word. Under no circumstances must he place himself in opposition to him. On the other hand, however, he is fully justified in making use of his political rights and intervening in the political struggle in behalf of the objectives which the government of the Landesherr and the Emperor pursue.

Obermüller’s statements reflect an allegiance not only to the Kaiser, but to the Kaiser’s political opinions. Given the historical context in which they are made, the comments of the Offizier der Reserve become typically accurate rhetorical reflections of the political agenda of Kaiser Wilhelm II.

Obermüller’s dictation to the Stadtschreiber directly preceding Voigt’s uniformed entry into the Amtszimmer des Bürgermeisters is a glaring parody of the anti-intellectual practice of protecting the national language from foreign influence:

Dr. Obermüller’s attempt to adhere to the purity of language dictated by Gemanismus leads him to doubt the propriety of the fully German word, “zusammensetzt.”

Zuckmayer makes clear by example what an inexpedient chore the task of Germanification really is. The passage brings fully to light the discrepancy between Obermüller’s identity as a member of the intelligentsia and his constrained support of the Germanizing agenda of the Kaiser. In order for the political persona to succeed, Obermüller is compelled to repress the “doctor” in his personality.

Zuckmayer’s Voigt is almost purely a victim of societal injustice. His natural teenage eroticism leads to punishment admittedly deserved, but in his opinion, too harsh (13 f.). The Voigt of Zuckmayer’s drama distinguishes himself above his fellow players with his incomparable power of judgment, which he comes to exercise with unequaled severity upon himself. The voice of God, as revealed to him through his inner voice, is uncompromising in shifting the full brunt of responsibility for his hardship — even down to his “Ausweisung” — onto Voigt himself (91). Through self-deprecation, Zuckmayer’s leading character internalizes the societal interdiction against self-gratifying behavior. In contrast to his historical counterpart, he is not only innocent of all criminal intention. Because of his maintenance of human dignity in times of severity, Voigt is an unexampled specimen of the model citizen.

Zuckmayer makes his leading character guilty of nothing but disrespect of divine will as received through the word of God precedent to scene fourteen, where he announces it to Hoprecht: “Und denn, und denn stehste vor Gott dem Vater, stehste,
der allens jeweckt hat, vor dem stehste denn, und der fragt dir ins Jesichte: Willem Voigt, wat haste jemacht mit dein Leben? Und da muß ick sagen, Fußmatte muß ick sagen . . .” (91). He curiously equates his failure to bring his existence to bear against the demands of the Prussian bureaucracy with an infraction of divine justice. But Zuckmayer places social circumstance in the position of prime motivating factor behind Voigt’s divine revelation. Voigt announces to Hoprecht his resolve to no longer take things lying down: “Und det Janze? Det Janze, Friedrich, für wem is det? Wat steht hinter, Friedrich, ’n Gott oder ’n Teufel?! Nee, mir hamse zu langjepufft, mir hamse nu wachjekrieft, da jibt’s keen Pennen mehr, ick will det nu janz jenau wissen!!” Voigt’s abandonment of his own human ideal as he grasps after the only apparent solution to the predicament of his expulsion is symptomatic not only of his position as victim of societal circumstance. It demonstrates the rising feelings of discontent in a society against which he revenges himself, although by unjust means. For in committing his act of vengeance by marching on a governmental office, Voigt surrenders his freedom into the hands of the real culprit: the military bureaucracy.

Zuckmayer takes the historically dramatic theme concerning an individual’s breach of justice and transforms into a form of social conflict. He downplays Voigt’s guilt to such a degree, that the bureaucratic system receives the brunt of the blame for his sensational Rathaus coup. But the social conflict Zuckmayer portrays is that of an individual against a politically powerful apparatus of state. His subtly observant neu­sachlich social analysis centers always on the individual, so it is understandable to see why the main argument of Zuckmayer’s Marxist critics centers around the Hauptmann von Köpenick’s lack of social critique.27 Zuckmayer heightens the socially critical aspect in the dramatic conflict between Voigt and the bureaucracy by transforming them into clearly recognizable representatives of the oppressed-oppressor categories of
the "soziale Dichtung" genre. Despite Zuckmayer's adherence to a *neu-sachlich* form of dramatic presentation, he reflects the spirit of the *Köpenickiade* 's reception in the press to a far greater degree than by sticking to the specific circumstances concerning the actual perpetration of Voigt's *Rathaus* coup. The coup's motivational impulse comes, in Zuckmayer's interpretation, not from Voigt himself, but from the system. And although the original Voigt was a victim of systematic oppression of sorts, Zuckmayer increases the socially critical aspect of his drama by removing any trace of the actual Voigt's vainglorious intentions in producing the fabulous Voigt, whose sole purpose ultimately becomes nothing more than to reveal the fault within the system. Zuckmayer thus concentrates his attack on the power of Prussian militarism. He portrays its appearance at all levels of society by constructing its presence thematically into every scene, except for one. Of twenty-one scenes, the only scene to exclude the atmosphere of pervasive Prussian militarism is the twelfth scene ("Dachstubenszene"), upon which it intrudes before the "Szenenschluß" in the form of the police order for Voigt's expulsion. His dramatical interpretation of historical military-civilian relationships descends to the personal level as Zuckmayer brings the fate of the uniform as symbol of military authority into direct contact with the men inside it. Von Schlettow selflessly inflicts the will of the uniform upon himself by relinquishing both uniform and position for attempting to assert his authority out of military dress. Doctor Obermüller is a bodily representative of the expanding bourgeoisie. His aspirations for political advancement cause him to repress the intellectual spirit in his title in support of the Kaiser's anti-intellectual program of language purification. Zuckmayer's socio-historical criticism of Wilhelmine society attacks the participation of the members of all classes in the prostitution of the human ideal to military means for the achievement of their various ends. Von Schlettow,
Obermüller and Voigt — the three estates — repress their true personalities in service to the uniform. They all become victims of the historically resurgent presence of the military. Through Zuckmayer’s dramatic vision, the uniform becomes a tool in a self-perpetuating class conflict in which each and every class eventually succumbs to the blind mechanism of an anti-societal military apparatus.
ENDNOTES
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Again in 1918 the army was faced with a revolution for which it was largely responsible, and this time the threat to its freedom was far greater than it had been seventy years before. The military collapse which the war-time policies of the Supreme Command had made inevitable released forces which, on 9 November, swept away the dynasty which the army had served since 1640 and transformed the Reich into a republic. Yet once more the army weathered the storm and once more it did so without any real loss of power."
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27 The essence of their critique is to be found in the fact that, as “soziale Dichtung,” Zuckmayer’s drama belongs to the same general category as the Communist dramas of the “sozialistischer Realismus.” To the latter movement Zuckmayer’s drama definitively does not belong. His critics obviously want to make the distinction clear (see above, page 20, note 1). Wilpert’s definition of “sozialer Realismus” begins as follows: “die einheitl. Literaturtheorie der sozialistisch-kommunistischen Länder, die seit ihrer Proklamation durch M. Gorkij und deren Annahme auf dem 1. Sowjet. Schriftsteller-kongreß 1934 zur maßgeblichen und obligatorischen Doktrin für das lit. Schaffen dieser Länder geworden ist.” Gero von Wilpert, *Sachwörterbuch der Literatur* (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1964) 657.

28 Wilpert, 655-66, defines “soziale Dichtung” as a poetic form, “die vom Erlebnis der sozialen Spannungen ausgeht und gesellschaftskritisch zu ihnen Stellung nimmt, in kämpferischem Angriff gegen die Oberschicht, mitleidsvoll von oben herab auf die Geschicke der sozial Unterdrückten, Entrechtteten und Verachteten blickend oder in Verbindung beider Haltungen.” Zuckmayer’s compassionate treatment of Schlettow and Obermüller as well as Voigt in no way represents a “Verbindung beider Haltungen” of Wilpert’s definition. The “Oberschicht” of Zuckmayer’s conflict cannot be defined in terms of class. It is the military bureaucracy as system in and of itself, of which he is uncompromisingly critical.

29 Jürgen Hein, 275, describes the twelfth scene as “Ruhepunkt in der Handlung und als Sperrung gegen die Szenen II, 11 (Ohnmacht der Bürger vor den Befehlen des Militärs) und II, 13 (Festsouper bei Dressel; Mädchen in Uniform)...”
STRUCTURE OF THE PLOT

That the composition of Zuckmayer's *Hauptmann von Köpenick* relies upon an intensive attention to structure is acknowledged by the author himself. In a questionnaire sent to him by a student of his literature, he speaks "von dem *Hauptmann von Köpenick* als einem symphonisch durchbauten Stück." Zuckmayer chooses a figure from contemporary history about whom to construct his plot. Wilhelm Voigt's notorious act of deception concluding with the confiscation of the treasury funds of the *Rathaus* in Köpenick on October 16, 1906 is an event still fresh in everyone's minds twenty-five years after the fact. The author of the drama of 1931 preserves the spirit of the original event's popularity by removing the element of criminal intent from a treasonable breach of justice. Zuckmayer's alteration of the character of Voigt distinguishes him as a poet actively at work in forming his dramatic material — an idea closely related to his notion of unity between the individual, the world and divine justice. Voigt is the microcosm of such a Weltbild. He achieves completion in active determination of his circumstances. He achieves true identity and spiritual unity in opposition to the Prussian system of military bureaucracy. But by actively participating in the determination of his status in the community, Voigt makes the long-delayed transition into the world of human affairs. The first act establishes Voigt's exclusion from society. The first, second and fourth scenes are the repetition of an archetypal event in which Voigt's requests for a residence permit and work are peremptorily rebuffed. Voigt reaches the decision to take matters into his own hands in the second act. He executes his plan of arch-deception in the final act. Zuckmayer places the audience beyond the region of dramatic action and shuts the first and third acts off from the cardinal second act. The first act is a demonstration of Voigt's apparent guilt before the system. The third act is an enactment of his apparent legitimacy. Society
determines the first state of affairs. Voigt's act of deception determines the appearance of legitimacy. The second act divides the diametrically opposed states of affairs constituted by the first and third acts of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*. The second act serves as a meeting point between the central dramatic themes of exclusion and integration, escape and invasion. The eleventh scene brings the archetypal exclusionary event to a climax. The themes of societal integration and bureaucratic invasion intersect in the secluded garret room setting of the twelfth scene. The eleventh and twelfth scenes interact on multiple levels as polar elements of the dramatic core. The dramatic core elevates the societal significance of the family. The family structurally embraces the core until a rupture makes itself evident in the fourteenth scene. The determined unidirectionality of the third act takes up the slackened tension of the monotone first act to tighten the intricately interwoven knot of dramatic intensity in the second act. Zuckmayer employs his talents of composition toward the achievement of a masterpiece of intercharacter relationships and thematic variations. He completes the structural whole through a multilevel connection of internal dramatic components to the mystical world of numerical formulœ.

Zuckmayer's attention to form extends beyond the literary work. As an agent of poetic transformation, he asserts his formative capabilities upon his subject matter. The tendency to radically reinterpret the characters he took from history must have become quite evident to the Weimar audience for whom he composed *Der Hauptmann von Köpenick*. He now chose a figure with whose deeds it was generally still highly familiar. His active exercise of the transformative technique with respect to Voigt reveals the poet, Zuckmayer, as every bit a participant in the structuralist task:

La structure est donc en fait un *simulacre* de l'objet, mais un simulacre dirigé, intéressé, puisque l'objet imité fait apparaître quelque chose qui restait invisible, ou si l'on préfère, inintelligible
Zuckmayer's Voigt is thus radically different in every way from the Voigt upon whom he bases his drama. In her dissertation on the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*, Sibylle Werner concludes that Zuckmayer has altered the actual events in favor of a higher reality: "It has been attempted to show that in a drama the actual facts can be altered to suit the purpose of the author as long as the new world that has been created is right and lives according to its own laws." But the world Zuckmayer creates in the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* is by no means perfect. The world he dramatically presents is a soberingly true-to-life reflection of a republic attired in the trappings of military absolutism.

The "structural concept" of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* is the product of its author's metaphysical convictions. The symmetry of Zuckmayer's plot construction is a reflection of his *Weltbild*, if perhaps not *Weltanschauung*: "Als ganze ist die Welt 'rund,' geordnet in einer umfassenden Symmetrie und Harmonie." Zuckmayer's conception of the world includes the principle of individual participation in the task of creation. That it contains the ideological principle of democratic participation is exceedingly obvious:


Zuckmayer applies a similar circular construction to his treatment of Voigt's character and *Werdegang*. He applies the same scheme to his treatment of the plot and his own
dramaturgical relationship to his audience. Zuckmayer performs an act in reconstitution of worldly unity in the closing scene of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*. Voigt’s laughter, “mit dem ganzen Körper, aus dem ganzen Wesen” (128), represents the unity of body and spirit. It is “alles zusammenfassend” and directed toward the audience. It forms a unity between himself, his worldly and divine creator, and — in truly catholic fashion — the audience. Zuckmayer’s structural conception is the expression of his belief in the active responsibility that democratically binds the individual to the immediate worldly environment as well as to the divine.

A principal underlying component of Zuckmayer’s drama lies in the metaphysical picture of wholeness presented to Voigt through the inner vision he receives before the fourteenth scene. God’s demand to know what Voigt has done with his life amounts to a command to the achievement of spiritual completion through action (91). The irony lies in the fact that Voigt achieves psychological wholeness by adopting a self-disconnected outward aspect that conditions have inadvertently forced upon him. Voigt’s *Erkenntnis* comes in two stages. He becomes aware of his predicament at the structural center of dramatic action of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*. Yet he achieves full self-completion in the final moment of self-capitulation and reckoning openly avowed to the theatrical audience in his final spoken line: “unmögliche” (128). The underlying reality of Voigt’s final revelation is his perception that there was never anything wrong with him to begin with. He has seen the world on the other side of the military-bureaucratic walls. He was made no freer by the uniform. By offering himself over to the authorities, Voigt restores his original sense of wholeness.

Voigt attains natural wholeness only in opposition to the closed uniformity of the system that allows him neither a residence permit nor passport. Voigt, “der arme
Teufel,” is confined to the “Selbstumkreisung” of Zuckmayer’s description (see above, page 39). Voigt describes the vicious circle of his predicament in the second scene: “Nee, nee, det is nu’n Karussell, det is nu ne Kaffeemihle. Wenn ick nich jemeldet bin krieg ick keene Arbeit, und wenn ick keene Arbeit habe, darf ick mir nich melden” (16). Not until he breaks the Teufelskreis of a bureaucratic ban, both resulting in unemployment as well as from it, does Voigt gain respect from his societal peers. Only by surrendering himself over to the authorities does he obtain the promise of a legitimate place in society. The perpetual eccentricity of his existence serves as evidence of the societal disharmony created when its civilian and military spheres remain unresolved.  

Zuckmayer emphatically places the audience beyond the dramatic activity of his play, to whom Voigt visually directs himself and ultimately delivers his epigrammatic statement: “Unmöglich!!” (128). But the Kaiser also remains beyond the events. Voigt surrenders in the final scene. The inspector mediates the Kaiser’s secret words in print: “Habense den Geheimbericht nich gelesen? Gelacht hat er, wie man’s ihm vorgetragen hat, und stolz war er nocht drauf! Mein lieber Jago, hat er zum Präsidenten gesagt, da kann man sehen, was Disziplin heißt! Kein Volk der Erde macht uns das nach!” (121). For the spectator of 1931, the repetition of the Kaiser’s remark of 1906 must have had an ominous effect upon Zuckmayer’s audience. Kaiser Wilhelm II, having fled the country in 1918, was still very much alive, although excluded from all determination of political events within Germany. Zuckmayer reflects the contemporary public state of affairs in Weimar Germany by excluding the Kaiser from any visible controlling role. Yet the Kaiser’s cryptic statement stands like an epitaph on the headstone of the Weimar Republic. For it openly acknowledges the enduring presence of monarchic tendencies as a surviving
Zuckmayer places the power of public decision and monarchical opinion beyond the realm of the obviously bureaucratically controlled events of his drama. He is calling for an objective reevaluation by the public of its stance within the Weimar Republic. Zuckmayer’s *neu-sachlich* dramatic presentation furnishes a vividly comprehensible abstraction of the prevailing political trends threatening the short-lived democratic tradition of Weimar. But the public of his day was used to overt ideological statement. Symbolic language such as Zuckmayer’s was losing its significance. The “kommt mit” of Zuckmayer’s quotation from the Brothers Grimm forms a bond between Zuckmayer and his audience. But the bond appears in retrospect nearly resigned, fatalistic or escapist. His style tends to reinforce the opinion that the unengaged objective reflection on current political phenomena is still valid. But by 1930, objective deliberation on affairs had grown dangerous to the survival of the trend it most supported.

Zuckmayer conceptualizes the plot of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* on a symmetrical axis. The construction of the plot is circular in the second act, rotating about the events of the eleventh and twelfth scenes in imitation of Zuckmayer’s “Weltbild” illustration of the bond linking humanity to the *Kosmos*. Between the central core and outer concentric circle is another concentric circle formed by scenes ten and thirteen. Passing out of the rings of the dramatic center, one emerges in the commencement of the third act: scene fifteen. From the fifteenth scene on, the plot again proceeds along linear lines until its conclusion. The first and third acts of Zuckmayer’s drama are linear projections radiating in and out of the spherical dramatic core of the second act.

The *Weltbild* structure of Zuckmayer’s drama, with its concentric rings, sharply draws out the distinction between outward appearance and *Innerlichkeit*.
The area excluded by the closed perimeter of the second act represents the combination of societal components in the public realm versus the closed spheres of its segregated components. Each scene of the Hauptmann von Köpenick takes place in either the public, bureaucratic or private sphere. But in the first act, the public and bureaucratic realms combine to form a private space excluding Voigt. The action of the first act moves from beyond the perimeter into the circular second act, then emerges once again on the outside as it proceeds toward the conclusion. In the second act (eighth through fourteenth scenes) the bureaucratic, public and private spheres separate more completely from one another. Zuckmayer brings the themes of acceptance and rejection to a peak. The commencement of the third act transmits the action once again into the public-bureaucratic realm, where it remains up to the finish. Voigt’s apparent guilt in the first act drives him deep into the secluded spherical core of the second act. The uniform lends Voigt the appearance of legitimacy in the third act. The public-bureaucratic combination is no longer to exclude the Voigt-uniform pair from its protected inner realm.

The Weltbild schema thus acts to mediate as a closed internal structure between the outward aspects of public guilt and legitimacy. By closing off the second from the first and third acts, it is the hinge about which the three-fold dramatic breakdown becomes poetic reality. The peripeteia lies at the core of the second act. It divides the dramatic action into two directional halves representative of the thematic processes of exclusion and inclusion. Seclusion represents the space of the second act. The plot carries Voigt deeper and deeper into the secluded familial sphere. The forces of police bureaucracy disrupt the spiritual harmony of the (twelfth) “Dachstubenszene” by invading its privately secluded atmosphere with Voigt’s order of expulsion (77-78). Repeated Ausgeschlossenheit leads Voigt back to his family roots, to the
Eingeschlossenheit structurally represented in the circular perimeter formed by the familial ninth and fourteenth scenes. The Ausweisungsbefehl repeats the theme of Aussgeschlossenheit of the first, second, fourth and eleventh scenes.18 With Liesken’s death, Voigt retreats to the Innerlichkeit, to the secluded realm of his thoughts. Here he receives his Offenbarung (91). Through divine revelation, Voigt reaches the state of Entschlossenheit he demonstrates to Hoprecht in the fourteenth scene. The Weltbild construction divides the dramatic space of the Hauptmann von Köpenick into public and private on varying levels. The processes of exclusion and inclusion, invasion and escape describe the dramatic conflict between the forces of bureaucracy and Voigt’s desire for liberation.

The internal delimitation of dramatic components is elemental to the structure of Zuckmayer’s drama. As closed dramatic structural components, the eleventh and twelfth scenes interact at multiple levels. The twelfth scene (“als Ruhepunkt der Handlung” and “Märchenintermezzo”) acts as a “Sperrung” against the eleventh and thirteenth scenes.19 In the eleventh scene, the “Blick durchs Schlüsselloch” of the police station in Rixdorf instructs Voigt in the possibilities offered by wearing a uniform.20 It symbolically represents the first stage of his intrusion into the secret bureaucratic space of the system closed against him. The twelfth scene (“Dachstubenszene”) is “der Integrationspunkt und die Peripetie (der Umschlag der Handlung in ihr Gegenteil) nicht nur des Zweiten Aktes, sondern des Dramas überhaupt.”21 Liesken is a societal victim in a Naturalistic tragedy in contrast to Voigt, who saves himself with a fabulous salto mortale into the “slapstick comedy” of the third act.22 The “rührende Elemente” (e.g. “Dachstuben-atmosphäre”) and the expulsion order represent the Heimat-Thema on two levels. But the dramatic reversal is only indicated or foreshadowed at this point.23 In the twelfth scene, Voigt’s efforts
center on sheltering Liesken from the outside world, on secluding her through the fantasy of fairy-tale from her impending death. Liesken perhaps attempts to preclude Voigt from facing a similar fate when she begs him, “Nich wechjehn!!” (76). The dual “Heimat” motif represents the thematic opposites of acceptance and rejection, which in all of Zuckmayer’s work naturally relate to “Heimat” on varying levels. The eleventh and twelfth scenes together form a contrast between objective curiosity (peeping through the keyhole) and the deeply subjective reflection into which Voigt is driven upon Liesken’s death. Both events are directed away from the stage. Voigt’s almost scopophilic curiosity with respect to the secret of the uniform directs itself into the mysterious guarded realm of bureaucratic Sachlichkeit behind the keyhole. After Liesken’s death following the twelfth scene, Voigt descends into the personally subjective sphere of his innermost thoughts. A divine voice reveals the secret meaning behind his bureaucratic maltreatment. Both events direct the audience’s attention through identification with Voigt into the the space behind the Bilderbogen façade Zuckmayer presents to it. The eleventh and twelfth scenes contrast on the basis of exclusion and seclusion. The eleventh scene draws Voigt’s gaze into the objective beyond. Following the twelfth scene, his gaze is directed into the realm of highest subjectivity, demanding that he account for his actions. Voigt visually invades the private space of the bureaucracy in the eleventh scene. In the twelfth it invades Voigt’s privacy with an order excluding him from its public territorial realm. The notable division of the eleventh and twelfth scenes into independent dramatic units increases their possibilities for thematic interplay.

Zuckmayer encloses the pivotal twelfth scene within a perimeter formed by the family. The familial enclosure formed by the ninth and fourteenth scenes stresses the human environment as the sphere in which important decisions are made. A structural
analysis of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*’s second act in terms of *Weltbild* describes the tenth and thirteenth scenes (enclosing “das kleinbürgerliche Trauerspiel” core) as a farcical dramatization of gentle bourgeois society. The outer concentric circle embeds the tenth through thirteenth scenes “in das — nach Zuckmayers Perspektive — eindeutig bewahrende und heilende Element, die Familie.” Zuckmayer’s structure provides the key to the location of Voigt’s internal revelation by enclosing its dramatic space within familial scenes: “Das Humanum sollte in der natürlichen Gemeinschaft des Menschen geborgen sein.” Heimat and family are significant themes in the works of Zuckmayer. But in the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*, Voigt’s return to family differs a great deal from his reception in the local offices of bureaucracy. After hearing of his difficulty with the “Behörden,” Hoprecht offers him shelter until “de ne Anstellung hast” (63). But when Voigt departs, the only significant difference between his treatment by the bureaucracy and by the remaining members of his family is one of degree. His brother-in-law Hoprecht’s capping statement upon Voigt’s departure from the family (resulting from the local “order of expulsion”) is purely sachlich in its absense of empathy for a brother-in-law’s despair over the system: “Der Mensch — der Mensch is ja gefährlich!!” (92). Zuckmayer demonstrates the power of a bureaucracy to unjustly divide society at its roots. The last remaining members of his family receive Voigt into their home with open arms, but when he must depart, they do not bid him farewell with anything but Sachlichkeit. Zuckmayer emphasizes the societal importance of the family through ironic negation: Voigt’s final treatment within his sister’s family is a sachlich reversal of the ideal family relationship.

The flat construction of the first and third acts forms the foundation upon which Zuckmayer builds the structurally complex second act. The first act is fully sachlich in its swiftly moving realistic portrayal of social circumstance and usage of
natural dialect. But structurally, it is a repetition of Zuckmayer’s first drama, *Kreuzweg*, “konzipiert noch im Schema des expressionistischen Stationendramas, das Stationen episch reiht und auf die dem Drama eigene Zielgerichtetheit verzichtet.”28 The last act comes under the category of “slapstick comedy.” Zuckmayer noticeably abandons the closed-scene technique that combines scenes into the complex relationships upon which he constructs the preceding plot. With the exception of the sixteenth scene, each scene leads directly into the next, through to the completion of the *Köpenickiade* in the nineteenth scene. The drama “wird zum Ende hin seinem Eigengewicht überlassen, die Dynamik aus dem historischen Ereignis gewonnen.”29 In the fifteenth scene, Voigt buys the old uniform for an alleged “Maskenball” (93). The sixteenth scene ends with Voigt in captain’s uniform, demonstrating his position by having the pair of railway officials execute his commands. Voigt’s “Vorwärts marsch” concluding the eighteenth scene (106), carries the action directly over into the nineteenth, in which Voigt concludes his *Rathaus* coup. The stagnantly flat construction of the first act is like a barrier in which each scene interlocks with the next to continually close Voigt out of society. The third act demonstrates Voigt’s mental conviction through its employment of a unidirectional plot-line leading directly into the office of Bürgermeister Obermüller.30

The structure of *Der Hauptmann von Köpenick* is so intricate, that a great variety of comparisons present themselves on all levels. The dual plot relationship of the uniform and Voigt constitutes one of the principal structural ingredients in the plot of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*. It has been exhaustively treated in other interpretations, so here no attempt will be made to give it extensive structural treatment.31 Yet it should be noted that, just as Voigt’s plot-line follows a circular pattern, “Der zweite Handlungstrang, der von der ersten Szene ausgeht, vollzieht
ebenfalls die Figur des Kreises." The uniform’s circulation between owners makes a direct comparison between them inevitable. The contrasts and similarities between individual figures indeed provide the possibility for an in-depth character analysis that will not even be attempted here. Zuckmayer’s careful attention to dialect and individual character traits causes each of the seventy-three characters of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* cast to stand on their own. The tendency becomes nowhere more evident than in the sixth scene, in which characters from all parts of Germany come into contact with military-bureaucratic officials in the “Herberge zur Heimat” (36-47). Each character distinguishes himself with his distinctive regional dialect and traits. The same holds true for each analytical division of Zuckmayer’s drama. “Die offene Form des Dramas verbindet sich mit Strukturprinzipien der Geschlossenheit; die episch angelegte Bilderfolge, nicht selten satirisch erzählend, wird zum Schluß auf die für Zeit und Gesellschaft prägnante Pointe zugespitzt.” Zuckmayer presents each character, scene and act of his drama as a closed entity, thus maximizing the possibility for their interrelationship within the text of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*.

Zuckmayer’s integration of mystical numerical significances into the structure of his drama forms the bond with which he links it to the world of *Märchen*:

Das Gliederungsschema (drei mal sieben Szenen) billigt dem Untertitel (*ein deutsches Märchen*) strukturbildende Funktion zu. Durch die Zahlenmystik schon läßt Zuckmayer erkennen, daß er den Gesamtrahmen der Handlung als Märchen verstanden wissen will.

Zuckmayer repeats the three-fold breakdown of the plot in the triple relationship of Schlettow, Obermüller and Voigt as consecutive owners of the uniform. He further divides the stage settings into three separate classifications: private, public and “amtlich polizeilich.” His construction of the first scene reflects the same tripling of internal elements:
Zuckmayer forms triple interrelationships of character, setting and event with which to express the opposition of acceptance and rejection on at once a personal and then purely *sachlich* level with respect to Voigt and the uniform. "Die Drei bestimmt das Baugesetz des Märchens, das Zuckmayer im ersten Akt am konsequentesten durchhält. Dem Zauber der Uniform entspricht der Zauber der Struktur." The triple structure of Zuckmayer’s *Märchen in drei Akten* prepares the ground on which its interaction with the world of fairy-tale becomes possibility.

Zuckmayer’s metaphysical concept of world unity manifests itself not only in the treatment of his leading character, but in the structure of his drama as well. Zuckmayer changed motivational attributes in the character of the historical Wilhelm Voigt to suit his *Weltbild* metaphysical and dramatic concept: a practice indicative of the formative task of structuralism, in Barthe’s definition. Voigt is Zuckmayer’s *Weltbild* in miniature, confined to orbit in a vicious circle between the disunity of the civilian and military-bureaucratic sectors of society. He performs his *Rathaus* coup in an attempt to fulfill the “deepest need of man, ... to overcome his separateness, to leave the prison of his aloneness.” Voigt reestablishes his unity and integrity, not in opposition to society, but through surrender to its institutions of justice. The laughter he directs toward the audience in the closing scene underscores the division between dramatic activity and the passive spectator. But it acts as a bridge through which the world of theater integrates itself into the public sphere of reality. The laugh reconstitutes the all-embracing harmony of Zuckmayer’s *Weltbild*. The plot of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* is conceived about a symmetrical representation of the
Weltbild located at the dramatic core. It divides the two worlds of appearance represented by the first and third acts. The second act transforms Voigt's apparent guilt before the law into apparent legal legitimacy founded on the strength of his resolve and the means within the system. The second act brings the conflict between societal inclusion and bureaucratic exclusion to a head in the diametrical opposition of the eleventh and twelfth scenes. The private realms of both are ruptured through intrusion, first by Voigt and then by the bureaucracy. The familial perimeter encloses the space of the peripeteia, through which it too undergoes a Wendung. Voigt's warm reception into the family in the ninth scene switches over into a coolly objective farewell in the fourteenth. The bureaucratic principle of divide et impera causes the familial rupture. The disconnected scenes of the first act slacken the pace of Voigt's development as they rapidly and indeliberately close the societal barricade against him. The structural intricacies of the second act taughen the dramatic tension into a tightly interwoven Verflechtung der Handlungsstränge. The knot of dramatic tension unravels into the third act as Voigt marches scene by scene toward the inner chamber of the Rathaus in Köpenick. Zuckmayer's compositional talents allow for a maximum of interpretational solutions to the intricate details of his plot. The unified three act construction repeats itself in triple parallels of plot-line, event and character relationships. It forms the Hauptmann von Köpenick's primary structural bond to the world of Märchen in reiteration of the tripartite unity that descends to all levels.
ENDNOTES


2. In composing the events for his 1927 drama, Schinderhannes, Zuckmayer transformed the "Wegelagerer," Johann Bücker, into "den edlen Räuber, der ein Helfer der Armen ist." His version corresponded closely to the spirit of the folk tale that had grown around the figure of Bücker following the revolt of the Silesian weavers of 1844. Thomas Ayck, Carl Zuckmayer: in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten (Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, 1977) 68.


6. Frizen, 40. Frizen thus completes the circle of his argument, which is in no way circular, by connecting the disjointed "Einfälle," upon which Zuckmayer depends for dramaturgical inspiration, to the mental picture underlying Zuckmayer’s productive concepts, or so it at least appears. Zuckmayer’s portrayal of the natural in his work is so immediate, that Wolfgang Paulsen disregards any metaphysical underpinnings: "Der reinen, und zwar ganz und gar unmetaphysischen Zustimmung zu Natur wie Leben verdanken wir einige der schönsten Szenen in Zuckmayers Werk ..." Wolfgang Paulsen, "Carl Zuckmayer," Deutsche Literatur um 20. Jahrhundert: Strukturen und Gestalten (Bern: Franke, 1967) 1: 302.

7. Frizen, 40. Herbert Jhering’s generally favorable reception of the premiere of Zuckmayer’s play nonetheless condemned it for failing to offer a clear "Weltschauung" to its audience. See below, page 60.

Werner Frizen attributes (somewhat rhetorically) Voigt’s repeated rejections and expulsions to the ubiquitous “Prinzip Uniform.” Frizen, 21.

In describing the regulations for the expansion of the army, or “Heeresergänzungsbestimmungen,” of June 1921, Gordon Craig states: “These provisions were applied in such a way as to exclude Jews, socialists, communists, and even outspoken democrats from the army.” Gordon Craig, *The Politics of the Prussian Army: 1640-1945* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956) 394. In response to the Versailles Treaty’s limitation of the German army to 100,000 troops, the German military had shifted many of its troops into the Sicherheitspolizei, and then into the Ordnungs- and Schutzpolizei units. Craig, 404-405. This development surely had an impact on the relationship between the police and citizenry under Weimar, especially in terms of police indifference to right-wing attacks against racial minorities and members of the political left, which were later institutionalized under the Third Reich.

The Kaiser’s approval of Voigt’s escapade rests upon the actual event. Zuckmayer’s representation of the fact within his fabulous reworking of the events is not easy to interpret. But within the simple analogy of the ever-present uniform, the message becomes doubly clear. As just another man, the Kaiser would have realized the sheer humor in the ability to command on the basis of purely outwardly vested authority. Yet placing oneself within the immediate period to which the author of *Der Hauptmann von Köpenick* meant to refer, one sees a monarch deposed by the arbitration of might — a deposed leader who would have gained the last laugh upon seeing anyone reestablish total sovereignty through dutiful adherence to the militaristic precedence of Prussian might. The same “might” that remained the “may-as-well-be” through which Hitler claimed hegemony over German sovereignty.

The former emperor died in 1941. Following the discovery by police of secret plans for an SA seizure of power in the event of a Hitler election victory in late March 1932, a decree had been formulated for the dissolution by force of the armed Nazi Kampfbrigaden. Crown Prince Wilhelm communicated his dismay to Reichswehrminister Groener that the latter should desire the destruction of “the wonderful human material that is gathered together in the S.A. and S.S. and which is getting valuable training there.” Lieutenant-General Wilhelm Groener, “Groener Correspondence: Crown Prince to Groener,” 14 April 1932. Quoted in Gordon Craig, 450, n. 3. Schleicher subverted the order, and it was never carried out. Craig, 449-50.

It seems probable that Zuckmayer recognized the dilemma with which German politics were faced without wholly realizing his personal responsibility for open engagement on the side to which he was most proximate. It seems indeed reasonable that he viewed the anti-fascist message present in the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* as a sufficient contribution to the early resistance effort against Hitler’s forces, particularly in view of its popular reception. The assumption that his audience in no way fully comprehended the gist of his message is evident enough in the reports of his critics, for neither did he. The reluctance in figures like Zuckmayer’s showing of open political resistance to Nazism by joining the “Eiserne Front” could only have served to support the prevailing public sentiment of fatality in the face of the threat...
posed by the growing ranks of the highly conservative “Harzburger Front.” Cf. Carl

14Frizen, 40. See also note 15 directly below.

15Frizen, 24, 28 and 37 offers three diagrams to serve as reference to his
structural analyses. He provides a diagram in which the first eight scenes linearly
approach the outer concentric circle (composed of scenes nine and fourteen) and
surround the eleventh-twelfth scene dramatic core.

16Frizen’s model is similar in conception, although less complicated in outline
than that of Jürgen Hein, who places the eleventh scene at the dramatic core. Hein
provides four sources of influence upon Zuckmayer’s choice of dramatic form:
“Kortners ursprüngliche Anregung zum Film-Drehbuch, Nachwirkungen des
expressionistischen Stationendramas, Piscators Theater und die Erneuerungsversuche
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MÄRCHEN AND VOLKSTÜCK

Zuckmayer had been working on a dramatic concept that would unite fable and contemporary events since receiving the dramatic prize of the Heidelberger Festspiele in 1929. As Zuckmayer describes: "The prize carried no obligation, but it was hoped that the prize winner would write a play suitable for performance at the Festival."\(^1\) Earlier performances at Heidelberg had been limited to "Glanzinszenierungen" of great works in world literature. But in hopes of acquiring "die dafür passenden Stücke" in contemporary literature and theatrical premieres, the bestowers of the prize turned generously to Zuckmayer and two other popular dramatists.\(^2\) The reception of the Dramatikerpreis in Heidelberg thus provided Zuckmayer with the impetus for composing a drama that would fulfill the literary traditional requirements of the Festspiele while being modern at the same time.

Zuckmayer planned on employing an Eulenspiegel figure in a comedy of rhymed verse fit for performance at the festival. He further intended upon lighting upon a particularly modern theme. Zuckmayer regarded the script of Kakadu-Kakadu and the adaptations of Anderson and Stallings' What Price Glory and Heinrich Mann's Der Blaue Engel merely as "Handwerksarbeiten, Fingerübungen, Ettiden."\(^3\) He describes the difficulty of accomplishing the projected task:

Aber der 'Eulenspiegel', den ich als meinen dramatischen Hauptplan betrachtete, kam nicht vom Fleck. Er scheiterte, mußte scheitern, an der Diskrepanz zwischen dem Vorwurf des alten Volksbuchs, an das ich mich zu halten versuchte, und der Zeitnähe, dem Gegenwartsgehalt, der lebendigen Wirklichkeit, die ich erstebe.\(^4\)

Zuckmayer thus intended on combining traditional fable with a commentary upon the reality of the times.

By combining fabulous elements with those of satire in Der Hauptmann von Köpenick, Zuckmayer distances his drama from contemporary events to a degree that
allows it to serve as a metaphor for the times. Zuckmayer’s subtitle, “ein deutsches Märchen,” is a “contradictio in adiecto.” The “Zeitlosigkeit des Märchens und die Zeitgebundenheit des deutschen Wesens schließen sich aus.” Zuckmayer’s drama takes a recent historical event as theme and translates it into fable. The full impact of the contradiction comes with reading its title from beginning to end: Der Hauptmann von Köpenick: ein deutsches Märchen in drei Akten. Zuckmayer’s title is like a parody of headlines often found in the ideological press, which take their ideological preconceptions and present them as political fact. Zuckmayer reverses the tendency, taking historical fact and headlining it in fabulous terms. He imbues his “deutsches Märchen in drei Akten” with the intertextual imagery of the third prince, the struggle between good and evil, and seemingly direct references to the Bremer Stadtmusikanten and Rumpelstilzchen from fairy tale theory and fairy tale itself. His alteration of the lines in the Märchen corresponds perfectly to the popular practice of the Erzähler, who preserves the gist of the story and its underlying truth — even if, however, failing to transmit the exact details. Zuckmayer preserves the popular spirit by including the Märchen element in his Volksstück, a genre that tolerates his inclusion of every dramatical technique possible toward achieving the entertaining and contemporarily critical aims of the tradition it represents.

The character of Wilhelm Voigt is a representation of the archetypal fairy tale figure of Wilhelm Grimm’s analysis. Zuckmayer gives indirect evidence of his dramaturgical objectives with respect to fabulous elements in Der Hauptmann von Köpenick in his essay upon “Die Brüder Grimm: Ein deutscher Beitrag zur Humanität.” The hero of his drama, Voigt, is linked to monarchical power only through the uniform. Yet as the third in line to its inheritance — a factor
reemphasized by Voigt’s acquisition and employment of the uniform in the third act

— Voigt relates in poetic terms to the “third son” of Wilhelm Grimm’s analysis:

Verschiedentlich wird die Geschichte von einem König erzählt, der drei Söhne hinterläßt und nicht weiß, welchem er Krone und Reich nach seinem Tode überlassen soll. Er macht daher eine Aufgabe, sei es nun etwas Schweres zu vollbringen, etwas Seltenes und Kostbares zu holen oder eine große Kunst zu erlernen.7

Engelsing-Malek is not far off when she states that Voigt “gleicht dem jüngsten und oft dümsten Bruder im Märchen, dem es gelingt, den Zauber zu lösen.”8 Under an interpretation linking Voigt to the “third son” described in the passage above, Zuckmayer instills fable with both historical and sociological meaning. Kaiser Wilhelm has abdicated, leaving only the uniform as symbol of Prussian rule and might. Von Schlettow has his uniform tailored to suit the Kaiser’s demands, but loses it through an incapacity to fulfill his role in bourgeois society. Obermüller, the representative of the bourgeoisie, inherits the uniform for which he has grown too large. The third in line, Voigt, accomplishes “etwas Sonderbares und Kostbares” as attested by the Kaiser’s laughing approval of the Gaunerstreich. Voigt corresponds to the third in line of Wilhelm Grimm’s fairy tale analysis: he accomplishes his amazing feat to the pleasure of the royal patriarch.

As a social outcast and victim of repeated bureaucratic rejection, Voigt represents Grimm’s third-in-line prince in yet other ways:

Der Dummling aber zieht in kindlichem Vertrauen aus, und wenn er sich ganz verlassen glaubt, hilft ihm eine höhere Macht und gibt ihm den Sieg über die andern. Ein andrer Mal hat er weltliches Wissen hintangesetzt und nur die Sprache der Natur erlernt, darum wird er verstoßen, aber jene Erkenntnis hebt ihn bald über die andern.9

Voigt’s command of the Berliner dialect and Lebensweisheit evinced throughout by his cutting wit clarify Voigt’s identity as natural outsider to the system; they naturally oppose the artificial Beamtensprache and bureaucratic logic of the officials against
whom he contends. But upon realizing the task of overcoming the forces of the authoritarian system that has held him down, Voigt magically assumes overbearing command of the *Beamensprache* that has formerly been used to exclude and expel him. Voigt’s naïveté and stubborn refusal to accept the unnatural complexity of the bureaucracy leave him abandoned by the system. At the moment when his rejection becomes absolute, the higher power of the uniform elevates Voigt to a position of temporary supremacy.

Like the third prince of fairy tale theory, Voigt excels in powers of mimesis and riddle solving. He is “aller List und Behendigkeit voll” and apes everyone. Voigt does an even better job of taking command of a situation than the *Schutzmann* who steps in at the end of the third scene to arrest Schlettow and the grenadier (30-31). He repeatedly parrots Knell’s interrogative from the fourth scene (“haben Sie gedient?”), in order to intimidate his opponents within the system (101, 107, 108). Like Grimm’s third royal son, “Er allein kann die vorgelegten Rätsel lösen.” The twist is that in solving the riddle, Voigt himself falls victim to its powers. In the third scene he remarks to his comrade, Kalle: “Wie de aussiehst, so wirste anjesehen” (28). His observation fulfills the same function as the moral to a fable at the conclusion the third scene. Hauptmann von Schlettow, out of uniform, becomes powerless against the improprieties of a drunken grenadier, and Voigt reiterates, “Siehste Kalle — wat hab ick immer jesagt? Wie der Mensch aussieht, so wird er anjesehn” (30-31). Voigt’s abilities of imitation lead him to command full military authority once in uniform. Yet upon discovering that his authority still cannot get him a passport, he solves the real riddle to the system — the fact that everyone is playing along in a masquerade of self-deception.
Whether through a personal act of will or because of his rejection by the system, Voigt also fits the description of Grimm’s “Däumling,” who never develops beyond the stage of infancy. The bureaucracy withholds from Voigt the status of a grown man by denying him work and an official identity. In fact, the only person with whom Voigt is able to make himself understood is Liesken, the young boarder in his sister’s home (twelfth scene). Even after confiscating the funds of the Rathaus in Köpenick and appearing to have effectively outgrown the system, Voigt renders the funds and himself back into the hands of the authorities. The Wilhelm Voigt of Zuckmayer’s fairy tale fulfills the function of Wilhelm Grimm’s fabulous third royal son through position, character and perception. Yet through a significant adherence to noble propriety, he renounces the monetary privileges of his act for an assurance of legitimation in his original role as member of the third estate.

The fabulous Voigt of Zuckmayer’s drama becomes the representative of the subjective human spirit over and against the dehumanizing power of a purely objective bureaucracy. “Schon das Hauptthema, der Gehorsam der realen Welt gegenüber der Kraft, der auf Gott vertrauenden Seele, entspricht den von den Brüdern Grimm gesammelten Märchen.” Zuckmayer takes up the fabulous theme of a struggle between the powers of good and evil as well: “Der Held kämpft allein gegen das Böse, im Hauptmann von Köpenick gegen die anonyme und unbegreifliche Macht der Behörde.” Voigt cannot obtain work without a residence permit. And in the second scene, the Oberwachtmeister refuses to allow an unemployed ex-convict to register: “Einem stellungslosen Zuchthausler können wir keine Aufenthaltserlaubnis geben” (16). In the role of Däumling, Voigt is like Hansel of Hansel and Gretel, who dissembles a withered finger with a splinter to outwit the witch; or the soldier who places the hole in his boot over a hole in the ground, so that the devil can never fill his
boot with gold nor claim his soul. "Derart sind diese Märchen der Aufstand des kleinen Menschen gegen die mythischen Mächte, sie sind die Vernunft Däumlings gegen den Riesen." Yet although Voigt's struggle brings him into continuous conflict with representatives of the bureaucratic apparatus symbolic of the fabulous element of evil, Zuckmayer takes care to let none of its representatives assume the demonic qualities reserved for the bureaucratic system itself.

The subtlety of Zuckmayer's humor extends to the liberality with which he cites excerpts from the fairy tales of the Brothers Grimm. He uses the transformed lines as a framing device for the text of Der Hauptmann von Köpenick. Zuckmayer excerpts the line preceding his drama from the tale of Rumpelstilzchen: "'Nein', sagte der Zwerg, 'läßt uns vom Menschen reden! Etwas Lebendiges ist mir lieber als alle Schätze der Welt!' " (3). Zuckmayer's only technical deviation lies in the replacement of the original "Lebendes" with "Lebendiges." His alteration appears at first glance to be an insignificant error of transcription. But the cardinal distinction in the tale of Rumpelstilzchen is between an animate and inanimate object. In Der Hauptmann von Köpenick, it is between the activity versus inactivity of the living Voigt. There appears every reason to assume that Zuckmayer's liberality of translation was intentional.

Zuckmayer's epigrammatic twisting of roles in the quote from the Bremer Stadtmusikanten must be intentional as well. The meaning inherent in the transition corresponds too closely to the dramatic elements with which Zuckmayer surrounds it to be otherwise. The version in the Brothers Grimm reads "'Ei was, du Rotkopf,' sagte der Esel, 'zieh lieber mit uns fort, wir gehen nach Bremen, etwas Besseres als den Tod findest du überall' " (Märchen, I, 130). Midway through the dramatic action, "Komm mit" is the convocation Zuckmayer places in the mouth of the creature
last in line of the original fairy tale (78). In this respect, the rooster becomes the symbol of the socially last in line of the Depression, reinforcing Voigt’s representative role as a member of the third estate. The *Bremer Stadtmusikanten* is a tale of various creatures struggling against their cruel human masters. Zuckmayer repeats the *Aufforderung* of the twelfth scene with a quotation appended to the conclusion of his drama. His alteration is so subtle that his critics seem to have thus far regarded it as an insignificant detail attributable to poetic carelessness. But through the addition of a single letter to a verb in the singular, Zuckmayer shifts the direction of Voigt’s rousing call to action from a single dramatic character to the plurality of his living audience. This time he quotes the line from the *Bremer Stadtmusikanten* as follows:

‘Kommt mit’, sagte der Hahn,  
‘etwas Besseres als den Tod werden wir überall finden!’  
(Brüder Grimm, Die Bremer Stadtmusikanten) (128)

The significance of Zuckmayer’s shift in diction lies in the subtle message it imprints on the lines, since by changing them, Zuckmayer appropriates the lines to himself. Zuckmayer, the playwright, now assumes the role of the rooster as wakener — a role thematically represented by God and society within the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* text. Zuckmayer’s final linguistic alteration thematically underpins Voigt’s post-coup realization that true happiness cannot be achieved in the gratification of his own needs alone. Through his transformation of the line from the *Bremer Stadtmusikanten*, Zuckmayer places the passively last-in-line creature of fairy tale into a rousingly active role by lending it voice.

The “Kommt mit” of the conclusion represents Voigt’s final entry into society. It also suggests public cooperation toward the discovery of happiness (“etwas Besseres als den Tod”) by peaceful means, thus reinforcing the significance of Voigt’s surrender to the public authorities. The reversal of speaking roles between the Grimm
and Zuckmayer versions corresponds quite nearly to the different attitudes voiced by Hoprecht and his brother-in-law, Voigt. Similar to the donkey of Grimm’s tale, the stubborn Hoprecht attempts to persuade Voigt to follow the rules of the expulsion order commanded by the system (87-92). Voigt struts like a rooster into the action of the seventeenth scene, commanding a corps of soldiers to fall in line behind him (101). As in the reversal of the logic of ideology presented in his drama’s title, Zuckmayer reverses the tag-along role of the rooster in the *Bremer Stadtmusikanten*, making him the leader of the band of oppressed animals by implication. The symbolic imagery of the rooster’s role in rousing to wakefulness lends a further dimension to the transition. Zuckmayer’s alteration of the line from *Rumpelstilzchen* reinforces the call to human awareness and activity inherent in his drama. His restructuring of the line from the *Bremer Stadtmusikanten* redirects an exhortation addressed to a single character and shifts it to the plurality of his audience.

Zuckmayer combines fairy tale elements with those of the *Volksstück* to establish a dramaturgical interconnection between stage, author and audience.

“Zuckmayer’s Märchenverständnis hat die romantische Poetik geprägt. Für die ist alle Poesie märchenhaft, das Märchen Grundlage der Poesie, das Volk selbst also der poetische Genius.” Zuckmayer’s work, “wie Märchen,” strives to be “‘Volks’tück im eigentlichen Sinne, weil Ausdruck des Volksgeistes, oder besser: der Volksseele.” Zuckmayer viewed the actual Wilhelm Voigt “bei einer Mainzer Fastnacht” in 1910. His childhood memories of the popular folk-hero were directly linked to popular festival tradition as he seized upon Voigt’s sensational *Köpenickiade* as the theme for his contribution to the Heidelberg festival. Voigt filled the gap Zuckmayer hoped to fill with a popularly traditional Eulenspiegel figure: “der arme Teufel, der — durch Not helle geworden — einer Zeit und einem Volk die Wahrheit exemplifiziert.”
Zuckmayer leaves his imprint as *Märchenerzähler*, or popular interpreter of myth, upon his drama. He alters the figure of the historical Voigt to correspond to his "Märchengedanke." He transforms the lines of the Brothers Grimm to add intertextual dimension to the elements of myth within his dramatic folk tale (see the paragraph above). Zuckmayer places himself in the role of intermediary between the spaces of historical fact, myth, dramatic event and audience.

The poetic bond between the *Volksstück* and its audience is an enduring tradition: "Das Volksstück und Vorstadttheater lebte von Anfang an in der Spannung zwischen Unterhaltung und Kritik." The *Volksstück* directs its criticism at society through the establishment of a theatrical link with its audience: "Der Begriff Volksstück, ursprünglich wohl österreichisch-süddeutscher Herkunft, meint den lebendigen, historisch-sozioökonomisch konkreten Bezug des Theaters auf Publikum und Gesellschaft in ihrem wechselseitigen Verhältnis." Zuckmayer, Anzengruber, Thoma, Kaiser, Horváth and Brecht transported the *Volksstück* concept into the modern theater. Zuckmayer serves the entertainment over the critical function of the genre in many of his *Volksstücke*. Yet in *Der fröhliche Weinberg* and *Der Hauptmann von Köpenick*, his criticism of contemporary society elevates both to the true *Volksstück* level. Zuckmayer’s dramatic tale of the *Köpenickiad* could alone, "als Persiflage des wilhelminischen Militarismus wirklich für sich in Anspruch nehmen, ein Volksstück zu sein." The lasting popularity of Zuckmayer’s "deutsches Märchen in drei Akten" shows not only its continuing ability to entertain. The struggle of an average citizen toward the attainment of societal identity against the depersonalizing forces of bureaucracy is as relevant today as it was in 1931. The *Hauptmann von Köpenick*’s enduring themes continue to address the lasting societal issues still affecting its audience.
The *Hauptmann von Köpenick* has been classified under various categories for just reasons. It incorporates a wide range of elements of many genres or types. Yet the one genre that truly defines its position in German theater is that of the *Volksstück*. It allows for an extensive variety of generic elements to be subsumed within it.31 The *Volksstück* exercised a liberating function upon the German stage with its return to popularity during the nineteen-twenties:

The *Volksstück* was thus a vehicle for elements of Realism or Naturalism, *Zeitstück* and *Neue Sachlichkeit*. Zuckmayer employed the tolerantly inclusive potential of the *Volksstück* to the utmost by employing every generic element within its dramatic structure that would not conflict with its overall attitude of patient integration.

The *Hauptmann von Köpenick*’s tolerant incorporation of wide-ranging elements allowed it to mirror the times. It stood in marked contrast, however, to the heated political tensions of 1931, which it was largely able to overcome.33 Zuckmayer’s drama also contradicted the growing popularity of radically ideological styles of dramatic presentation. It was outwardly antithetical to the *Lehrstücke* or *Tendenzstücke* that attempted to convince their audiences through open adherence to politically ideological themes.34 Violent threats from the right accompanied its opposition by Goebbels’ radically ideological *Angriff*:

There were no riots in the theaters, although the Nazi press waxed rabid over the play, especially the Berlin *Angriff*. Referring to one scene in prison, that paper — edited by Goebbels — predicted that I would soon have the opportunity to become acquainted with a
Prussian prison from the inside. I was even then threatened, in anticipation of the coming seizure of power, with expatriation, exile, or simply the hangman. Defamatory letters arrived. I threw them into the waste paper basket and chose to believe the others, the letters of approbation and encouragement.35

The Hauptmann von Köpenick produced mildly violent repercussions from supporters of the reactionary cause of Goebbels and others. Yet it presented its political message in extremely moderate terms when compared to the general atmosphere of discontent in the streets. Zuckmayer’s drama performed the contemporary-critical function of the Volksstück with a clarity that one can only attribute to its author’s concerted attempt to avoid an openly polemical form of presentation.

Behind its politically objective outward aspect, however, Zuckmayer’s drama contained a scathing attack against the spirit of militancy brewing in 1931:

All the anger, the hatred, the sense of outrage were directed against this ‘government’ which the rightists denounced as ‘the Jews’ republic’ and the leftists as ‘the capitalist state.’ The emergency ordinances with which the administration tried to curb extremism from both directions achieved the opposite effect. Open warfare broke out between the Communists and the Nazis; hardly a night passed without bloody skirmishes with clubs and guns. But the most fateful development of all was the impoverishment of the lower middle class.36

Zuckmayer toned down the heated battle-zone atmosphere of Weimar reflected in the Hauptmann von Köpenick. The open stylistic form of the Volksstück rendered itself freely to historical interpretation: “Zugleich erhält die Komödienfabel die Potenz der Aktualisierbarkeit; das Geschehen ist auf ähnliche Fälle in der Geschichte übertragbar.”37 The third-scene scuffle between Schlettow and the grenadier reflects the daily public street-fights of 1931 Germany in gentle miniature. It contrasts with the inability or unwillingness of Weimar government army officials to step in and halt the violence. In the Hauptmann von Köpenick, a military Schutzmann steps in to enforce law and order as soon as the fighting erupts (30-31). But despite the contrast
with contemporary political tensions represented in its stylistic form, Zuckmayer’s
drama ranges its generic *Volksstück* elements in well-reasoned resistance to the greater
historical trends behind the open violence of Weimar. By means of the
*Komödienfabel*, Zuckmayer is able to transport the actuality of events of late
Wilhelmine Germany into the late Weimar context. He calls attention to the enduring
spirit of militarism of both periods with the inherent distinction that, in contrast to
conditions under Weimar, the policing authorities of Wilhelmine Germany are still in
position to control civil disruption.

The timelessness of the *Köpenickiade* fairy tale upon which Zuckmayer based
his *Volksstück* allowed it to critically interact with the socio-political developments of
its premiere, as was its author’s intent.\(^{38}\) The new generation of creative talents
proved more resistant to the turbulent period of the rise of the NSDAP than the older
generation of authors working in the *Volksstück* genre:

> es waren die Theaterstücke von Bert Brecht und Carl Zuckmayer, die
die Dauer und dichterische Lebenskraft aus der Erneuerung des
Volksstücks gewannen. Georg Kaiser und Carl Sternheim gehörten
beide dem Jahrgang 1878 an; Zuckmayer ist 1896, Brecht 1898
geboren. Man kann dabei mit Hegel von der ‘List der Idee’ sprechen,
die im Werke dieser beiden Dramatiker gerade die vitalen Energien
des Volksstücks herausruft, um damit das Drama gegen die
Tendenzen des ‘Dritten Reichs’ zu behaupten, das die Mobilisierung
der ‘volkhaften Kräfte von Blut und Boden’ für sich selber in
Anspruch nahm.\(^ {39}\)

As a member of the new generation of German playwrights, Zuckmayer posed his
Wilhelm Voigt as representative of the German people as symbolic rival to the
gathering forces of the movement of National Socialism.

Zuckmayer lampoons the *Blut und Boden* myth of the NSDAP with Voigt’s
claim to Prussian blood-lines in the eighth, or “Zuchthaust” scene (53-58). Voigt
demonstrates his field-marshaling talents in a disciplinary prison exercise. When the
prison director inquires after the source of Voigt’s military knowledge, Voigt replies: “Det hat ’n Preuße im Blut, Herr Direktor,” and turning to the man at his rear, “In Gruppen rechts schwenkt — marsch! Grade — aus!! Ohne Tritt — marsch!” (57). Voigt’s answer here is as if in response to the Prokurist Knell’s dismissive statement regarding his lack of military service: “wennse gedient hätten, wär Ihnen das in Fleisch und Blut übergegangen” (33). Voigt makes ironic usage of Blut und Boden argumentation at the point where it most obviously fails: no-one is merely born a commander just as no-one is automatically born with German traits.40 In the final scene, Voigt reveals the true source of his military knowledge as he reflects upon his prison sentence: “Und in Zuchthaus Sonnenburg, da ham wa in den Freizeiten immer de Felddienstordnung zu lesen jekriegt, und det Exerzierreglement. Da hatt ick mir immer sehr für interessiert” (126). Zuckmayer exposes the perversity in purely authoritarian thinking through Voigt’s conversation with his brother-in-law of the fourteenth scene. Between Voigt and his autochthonous claims to Boden or Heimat, the dehumanizing bureaucracy inserts itself as the prime obstacle:

VOIGT Mensch, ick häng an meine Heimat jenau wie du! Jenaud wie jeder! Aber se sollen mir mal drin leben lassen, in de Heimat!! Denn könnt ick auch sterben für, wenn’s sein muß! Wo is denn de Heimat, Mensch? In ’n Polizeibüro? Oder hier, ins Papier drinnen?! Ick seh ja gar keene Heimat mehr, vor lauter Bezirke!! (90)

One of the hidden contenders in the ideology of the NSDAP was the growing German population, upon which it based its demands for greater Lebensraum. Voigt’s complaint is directed against the sort of local politics that excluded less desirable elements in the German population in exchange for the promise of future territories in which to settle them. It could easily be directed at the following passage from Mein Kampf: “Die Erwerbung von neuem Grund und Boden zur Ansiedelung [sic.] der überlaufenden Volkszahl besitzt unendlich viel Vorzüge, besonders wenn man nicht
The enduring militant spirit was again making its return into the open field of battle in 1931. Zuckmayer chose the Volksstück as the preferred medium to attack its reentry into the public sphere. He chose the Kopenickiade because it attacked the eternally recurring demon of aggressive militarism at its anti-societal and anti-humanitarian roots in nationalism.

Zuckmayer takes Wilhelm Voigt's outrageous political prank of 1906 and imbues it with fairy tale imagery in drafting a Volksstück to rival the Nazi myth of the unified cause of people and army. In shifting the responsibility for Voigt's predicament completely over to the system, Zuckmayer creates a conflict between good and evil in which Voigt represents the German people in their struggle against the military bureaucratic powers of evil. The National-Socialist ideology unites the people and military against the so-called "Schwätzer" of the German Parliament. Hitler describes the relationship between people and military in what effectively amounts to contractual terms of infinite obligation: "Was das deutsche Volk dem Heere verdankt, läßt sich kurz zusammenfassen in ein einziges Wort, nämlich, Alles." Zuckmayer divides the elements of people and military into a fabulous conflict that more closely reflects reality. His Märchen becomes an ironic fable in the process. Its desperate Hauptfigur commits a miniature coup d'état in demonstration of the fable's dystopian moral: "Kleider machen Leute." Zuckmayer's Voigt unveils the system as a blindly false representative of the German Volk, as an ignorant Leviathan whose full attention is captivated by strict adherence to its own self-imposed rules regarding the formality of appearance.

By entitling his drama "ein deutsches Märchen in drei Akten," Zuckmayer creates an interplay between fact and fiction that corresponds to a thematic undercurrent linking dramatic action to political reality. Voigt represents the fabulous
third royal son of Wilhelm Grimm’s theory, in which aspect he symbolizes the third estate (“der dritte Stand”). The German people, from the lower middle class on down, became dispossessed by the Great Depression beginning just a year and a half before the premiere of Zuckmayer’s drama. Zuckmayer illustrates Voigt’s struggle against an impersonal bureaucracy with fabulous imagery, through which he reflects the social reality of 1931. The principal dramatic conflict was at that time highly pertinent to the Zeitumstände: the struggle of over six million unemployed to sustain their existence against forces that preferred to ignore their presence. Zuckmayer restructures the fairy tale lines placed at the beginning, middle and end of his drama, thus reinforcing the call to action already present in their content. His incitement to action binds Zuckmayer to his audience. The Hauptmann von Köpenick addresses itself to the spirit of the people in true Volksstück fashion. Zuckmayer utilizes the Volksstück possibility for the integration of varying dramatic genres and types to the utmost. The Hauptmann von Köpenick is a dramatically effective synthesis not only of Märchen and Volksstück. It formulates its dramatic conflict through an antithetical, additive and synthetic combination of the styles of Expressionism and Neue Sachlichkeit on many levels. Zuckmayer’s comedy addresses itself to the increasingly modern themes of social identity and alienation with a plea for a peaceful solution. It still holds a good deal of the relevance to the Zeitumstände of today that it had upon its premiere on March 5, 1931. The Hauptmann von Köpenick’s Volksstück ingredients brought its author into direct open conflict with the publisher of the Angriff and the author of Mein Kampf. Zuckmayer formulates his attack against Nazi ideology into an unmasking of the glaring contradiction inherent in the combination of Blut und Boden nationalism and military expansionist aims. He exposes the vicious circle (“Teufelskreis”) created in a society dominated by military authority. A military
functioning on its own logic systematically excludes the human being it is there to protect (Zuckmayer demonstrates proper military function through the action of the Schutzmann of the third scene). The animals’ revolt of the Bremer Stadtmusikanten carries over as underlying theme into the Märchen Zuckmayer creates of the notorious Köpenickiade of 1906. By means of his extreme ingenuousness, Voigt is a comic exaggeration of the Dummling of Grimm’s description. He not only apes those who surround him. He imitates fairy-tale as well. The animals’ revolt and deception provide Voigt with the concepts for the execution of his coup. Zuckmayer transforms history into fable in an attempt to appeal to the German people’s will to peace against the spectre of destruction looming on the contemporary German horizon. He directs his polemic against Nazi ideology by reversing the direction of argument taken by Nazi propagandists, who upon seizing absolute political control transformed the fable of the German people and nation into a political reality of disastrous consequences.
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21 Frizen, 97.

22 Stück von mir, 440.

23 Stück von mir, 440.

24 Stück von mir, 440.


27 The power of the Der fröhliche Weinberg’s social criticism was in fact so forceful that it caused riots all over Germany. It was also so popular, that it was played over 500 times during two years at the “Lessing-Theater” in Berlin. Thomas Ayck, Carl Zuckmayer in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, 1977) 54.


31 Gero von Wilpert defines the “Volksstück” as a “Gattung von Bühnenstücken für städtische Volkstheater und Vorstadtbühnen mit e. aus dem Volksleben entnommenen Handlung in volkstümlich schlichter, leichtverständlicher Form, die jedoch durch Einlagen von Musik, Gesang und Tanz sowie Anwendung von Effekten, Sentimentalitäten u. ä. niederen Elementen dem Geschmack des Großstadtpublikums entgegenkommt, ohne den oft ernsten und z. T. selbst tragischen Grundton zu verlieren.” Gero von Wilpert, Sachwörterbuch der Literatur (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1964) 770-71. The Hauptmann von Köpenick meets Wilpert’s definition in all respects: Zuckmayer composed it for the Heidelberger Festspiele and took a popular event as theme. Its form is “volkstümlich” and outwardly simple. It commences with military music. Knell sings a petit-bourgeois patriarchal ditty in the fourth scene. Clad in uniform, Augusta Wormser dances in the adjacent Festsaal of the thirteenth scene. Alfred Kerr criticized the twelfth scene for its sentimentality, which along with Voigt’s inability to solve the problem of his fate, serves to preserve the fundamentally tragic atmosphere upon which the Hauptmann von Köpenick’s plot builds.

“The effect of The Captain of Köpenick was deeper and more lasting than that of The Merry Vineyard. Friend and foe alike understood the play as the political act it was meant to be. And so far my friends, at least in that part of the population who went to the theater at all, or who read plays, were still in the majority. The very fact that here too the ‘other side,’ above all the military, was not simply castigated but represented with an attempt at justice, lent a special force to the play and its ideas, without the distrust and nasty aftertaste that a one-sided view, or propaganda, always inspires.” A Part of Myself, 315. The original is quoted in note 5 on page 51.

The attitude of general tolerance does indeed represent an ideology as well. It is the ideology of the Liberal Democrat or “Stadtbürger” in general terms, as reflected in Zuckmayer’s open avowal of the “political act” (Politikum) Zuckmayer meant it to be. See above, page 65 (note 33).
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Hein, “Zuckmayer, Der Hauptmann von Köpenick,” 270.


Adolf Hitler gives expression to his racially exclusive and antihumanitarian ideas of culture in such passages as the following from Mein Kampf: “Selbst in all- deutschen Kreisen konnte man damals die Meinung hören, daß dem österreichischen Deutschtum unter fördernder Mithilfe der Regierung sehr wohl eine Germanisation des österreichischen Slawentums gelingen könnte, wobei man sich nicht im geringsten darüber klar wurde, daß Germanisation nur am Boden vorgenommen werden kann und niemals an Menschen.” Mein Kampf (München: Zentralverlag der NSDAP, 1941) 428.

Hitler, 151.

For Zuckmayer’s fairy tale portrayal of the conflict between good and evil, see above, page 57.


See below, pages 59-68, and notes.
Zuckmayer's rejection of ideological expression in art coincides closely with the stylistic features of the Neue Sachlichkeit movement. The main period of the Neue Sachlichkeit stretches from 1925 to 1929: "Die Zeit vom Ende der Inflation bis zum Tod Stresemanns war die eigentliche Phase der Neuen Sachlichkeit, auch wenn ihre Anfänge weiter zurückreichen und sie nach 1929 nicht völlig verschwunden war." 1 Elements of the movement still find strong representation in Der Hauptmann von Köpenick. Among these is certainly the possibility it provides for reaching a wide audience. Zuckmayer's talent for filling the stage with rich visual imagery finds a parallel in the fact that the Neue Sachlichkeit has "als Epochenbezeichnung, allenfalls in der Kunstgeschichte, aber nie in der Literaturgeschichte durchsetzen können." 2 Zuckmayer incorporates the elemental contrast within the movements of Expressionism and the Neue Sachlichkeit by employing both to stylistically accentuate Voigt's subjective conflict with the sachlich forces of Prussian bureaucracy. Critics have always contrasted the Neue Sachlichkeit, as a concept, with the Expressionist movement, in this way enabling them to elaborate upon its distinguishing features. "Hier wurde jeweils dann deutlich, in welchem Maße der einzelne Kritiker geneigt ist, die Neue Sachlichkeit positiv als 'neue,' eigenständige oder gar auf den Naturalismus zurückgreifende Kunstrichtung zu werten." 3 Der Hauptmann von Köpenick presents its characters with natural accents and behaviors fully in keeping with the Naturalistic emphases upon temps and milieu. 4 But at the same time, Zuckmayer delineates the contrast between Neue Sachlichkeit and Expressionism by including both as stylistic and thematic elements of contrast in the Hauptmann von Köpenick. 5 Zuckmayer uses the methodology of the Neue Sachlichkeit to form the setting against which Voigt's subjective predicament rises to a position of absolute opposition. Voigt wages his
battle against the Prussian bureaucracy to settle his own account. The ideology presented in Zuckmayer’s *neu-sachlich* tale of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* is that of the individual against the powers of political absolutism.

Because of the expressed objectivity of its style, the *Neue Sachlichkeit*, “kann an keiner politischen Gruppierung festgemacht werden, vielmehr vereinigte sie zunächst alle Gruppierungen unter sich.” Herber Jhering’s reception of the premiere of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* both praises its author for not allowing his drama to become a “starres Tendenzstück,” but criticizes him on the same grounds for failing to offer a clear “Weltanschauung” to his audience: “Er lenkt nicht den Geist des Zuschauers dahin, von wo aus er betrachten soll. So kann der eine den Militärschwank, der andere eine leichte soziale Anklage, der dritte die Satire sehen.” Whereas the *Volksstück* allows for the unity of separate dramatic elements within an inclusive genre, the *Neue Sachlichkeit* appeals to a broad spectrum of the populace through its — at least apparent — lack of tendentiousness.

Through his treatment and application of objects of the stage, characters and dramatic techniques within the plot, Zuckmayer conceals the subjective elements of Expressionism within a *neu-sachlich* shell in order to heighten the dramatic conflict of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*. The result remains a lasting symbolic reminder of the prevailing attitude of indifference to the underlying spirit of societal discontent at the time of its premiere on March 5, 1931. Hauptmann von Schlettow represents the aristocracy. Once he lays down his symbol of military authority, he becomes powerless to check the social improprieties of a drunken grenadier (30-31). Bürgermeister Obermüller is the political representative of the republican bourgeoisie. He is incapable of preventing the forces of uniformed authority from marching in and placing him and his governmental office under a state of military occupation, even
when that authority is based purely on appearance (nineteenth scene). Voigt’s plight represents the tragedy of the lower classes. Stuck between a militarily hierarchical system of justice and an economy paying obedience to the same order, Voigt represents the members of German society disenfranchised by the calamity of the Great Depression. Through the technique of *Neue Sachlichkeit*, Zuckmayer’s *Hauptmann von Köpenick* subsumes the feelings of societal discontent affecting all political levels of Weimar Germany within his plot.

Zuckmayer uses a contrast of theatrical objects to symbolically divide the inwardly directed Expressionist viewpoint from the objective vision of the *Neue Sachlichkeit*. In “Zwischen Expressionismus und Faschismus,” Reinhold Grimm chooses Zuckmayer’s *Hauptmann von Köpenick* and Franz Werfel’s *Die Hose* as representative of the distinction between *Neue Sachlichkeit* and Expressionism. He opposes the “deutlich enthüllende Funktion” of the mirror at the end of Zuckmayer’s play, to the “verweisende Funktion” of Werfel’s mirror. Werfel’s mirror is supposed to, “wie es ausdrücklich heißt, eine ‘höhere Realität bedeuten’.” Werfel’s mirror is a flatly lit “geheimnisvolle Spiegelfläche” that transforms at a touch into a giant window.8 The subjective function of Werfel’s mirror in Grimm’s comparison corresponds closely to the function of the window in the twelfth scene of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*. Here Liesken begs Voigt to come back and turn the light on: “Es wird ja schon duster draußen — un denn wird det Fenster so blank, so weiß — wie’n Auge —” (77). In connection with the preceding conversation between Voigt and Liesken over their planned trip to the Carpathians (“über de Wolken”), the window reveals to Liesken a glimpse of the beyond, of her impending death. The metaphor of the photographer describes the Expressionist’s method in relation to a similar object of vision: “Der Expressionist dreht die Kamera um und richtet die Linse
auf sich selbst, nicht auf die Gegenstände." The blank window is Liesken’s inward projection. The mirror in which Voigt finally views himself in Hauptmann attire directs his attention to the objective world of appearances made the object of his cunning Staatsstreich. The function of the window in Zuckmayer’s drama serves as an Expressionistic contrast to the mirror of the closing scene, in which it serves to return Voigt to the sachlich world in which he has made himself the principal dupe of his own fantastic imagination.

Zuckmayer places a scene straight out of Expressionism at the center of a work widely held to be representative of the Neue Sachlichkeit movement. Apart from the transformation of certain qualities in the figure of Voigt and the events surrounding the Köpenickiaede, Zuckmayer’s close adherence to “Sachlichkeit, dokumentarische Genauigkeit und Wissenschaftlichkeit” of presentation certainly warrants the classification. But at the approximate center of the action he places a scene that, in marked contrast to his praise of the drama’s performance as a whole, Alfred Kerr deplores as an unfortunate confusion of “dichterisch” and “sentimental.” “Das kranke Mädchen wirkt furchtbar,” he adds, and possibly because he sees therein traces of a reversion to the Expressionist literary genre for which Zuckmayer had no recognized talent. The Neue Sachlichkeit developed as an antithesis to the style of Expressionism: “Die Betonung des Gebrauchwertes der Literatur habe notwendigerweise das Bemühren um einen ‘exakten Stil’ zur Folge, der in Ablehnung der expressionistischen Hypertrophien ‘unpathetisch, unsentimental, schmucklos und knapp’ sein soll.” In the twelfth scene of his drama, Zuckmayer breaks with the rigidity of an otherwise sachlich presentation by introducing a scene filled with pathos and sentiment. The voices of the unseen singers reinforce the mood as they sing their “larmoyantes Lied,” and the ailing Liesken is at first unseen but for her hand, which Voigt holds in his own
Along with the Expressionistic effect of the empty window noted above, the scene works as an interlude to the dramatic tension created by the “knapp,” tight-action *neu-sachlich* scenes preceding and following it. By means of the antithetical technical contrast inherent in the *Neue Sachlichkeit* and Expressionism, the twelfth scene reemphasizes the internalization of dramatic tension occurring in the character of Voigt.

The twelfth scene of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* is the subjective soul of the drama through which the central dramatic conflict between the subjective will of Voigt and the objective bureaucracy enters the realm of objective action. Voigt’s divine vision is subjective to the extreme — a factor reinforced by its exclusion from the dramatic action. Zuckmayer introduces Voigt’s vision into the action through the account Voigt gives to Hoprecht in the fourteenth scene: “De innere Stimme. Da hatse gesprochen, du, und da is alles totenstill jeworden in de Welt, und da hab ick’s vernommen ...” (91). Zuckmayer maintains the Expressionistic character in Voigt’s subjective revelation by presenting it realistically, in the natural dialect typical of the *Neue Sachlichkeit*. Voigt’s will is fully subjective throughout. But the art of Expressionism sets “das Ich absolut, fordert den reinen Ausschrei.” Voigt’s will and vision are Expressionistic elements of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* that begin to surface in the Expressionistic twelfth scene. The Expressionistic “Ich” achieves absolute dimensions in conflict with the absolute of the military bureaucracy. Expressionism provides the technical means through which the subjective element may be brought to a peak in conflict with its objective, *neu-sachlich* antithesis:

In neue und fremde Formen gewiesen, ist der Expressionismus erklärter Kampf. Alle überkommenen Formen, die er durchtobt, werden zu Reibungsflächen, an denen er sich zur Fackelglut entflammt. Kräfte ausschleudernd gegen ungezählte Widerstände, findet er nie Richtung ins Selbst, richtet das Selbst wider die Welt.
Expressionism lays the ground for Voigt’s seizure of absolute control in his conflict with the objective powers of military absolutism.

Der Hauptmann von Köpenick represents the movement of the Neue Sachlichkeit by inclusion in a plot that hinges on Expressionistic revelation. But because “der Expressionismus verabsolutiere das Subjekt, die Neue Sachlichkeit das Objekt,” the title of Zuckmayer’s comedy is “gewissermassen vertauscht.” Thus, in Der Hauptmann von Köpenick, “wo der Mensch den Namen liefert, herrscht ausgerechnet die Sache.” Zuckmayer’s comedy, then, “müßte eigentlich Die Uniform heißen.”

Zuckmayer’s elevation of an object to the role of leading figure in his drama shows his ability to use the objectifying principle of Neue Sachlichkeit through which to draw a more striking contrast with the humanly subjective element represented by his other main character, Wilhelm Voigt.

Neue Sachlichkeit defines the indifferent attitude of the authorities to internal developments that would soon be the means to their overthrow. In the opinion of its critics, Neue Sachlichkeit was, as a movement, very much a creature of its time. Type and genre correspond to a remarkable degree with regard to literary definitions of the Neue Sachlichkeit movement:

Fast immer aber kam bei diesem Vergleich der Neuen Sachlichkeit doch schon unversehens die Bedeutung eines Epochenbegriffs zu, so daß man einen wesentlichen Unterschied in der Anwendbarkeit beider Begriffe nicht genügend beachtete: die Tatsache nämlich, daß in der Literatur der zwanziger Jahre stilkünstlerische Intentionen und politische Überzeugungen einerseits gänzlich unabhängig voneinander operieren konnten, andererseits sich aber in einer Vielzahl von Möglichkeiten verbanden, ohne daß das eine oder andere notwendigerweise von dem praktisch-politischen Engagement des Autors als Staatsbürger oder den literar-theoretischen Einsichten determiniert worden wäre.

Neue Sachlichkeit represents an attempt at reaching objectivity of representation by distancing artistic intention from political opinion. “An die Stelle des visionären
Dichters tritt der geistige Arbeiter, an die des Genies der Könner und Handwerker, der zum 'Beauftragten des Objekts' wird, ohne eigenen Standpunkt und ohne Tendenz.'

The poet of the *Neue Sachlichkeit* is a dispassionate observer who constantly maintains his distance from his subject. Zuckmayer's *Hauptmann von Köpenick* shares a great deal with the *Neue Sachlichkeit* movement in its outward stylistic aspect.

Many historians still blame Germany's return to authoritarianism on the non-political masses. But, if anything, the attitude of political indifference at the top was even greater. After appointing Heinrich Brüning to the position of Chancellor in 1930, Hindenburg allowed him to rule increasingly by decree under Article 48 of the constitution. He thus avoided the complications of working with a Reichstag torn by political dissent. In a case before the *Reichsgericht* involving the dispersal of NSDAP literature by three lieutenants amongst members of a *Reichswehr* garrison in Ulm, Hitler was called to testify for the defense. After Hitler's testimony of September 25, 1930 denied involvement in plans for a coup d'état, the Reich Minister of the Interior, Zweigert, claimed he had documents that would prove the contrary. The court refused to see them. As reported in the findings of the court: "The Senate refused to examine evidence concerning the matter, since the question had no decisive bearing on the passing of judgment in the case." In deciding the question of guilt in any given case, the German courts were often led to consider the political intentions of the defendants. In the Ulm affair, the three accused officers were all convicted, while the court ignored Hitler's contradictory testimony:

'The fact that the National-Socialists' plan for a coup only existed in the minds of the accused did not affect the factual nature of their offence.' This point of view can be explained by the *Reichsgericht*'s constant application of the 'subjective theory.' 'Subjective' traitors
were found guilty. Hitler, who respected the law and was objective, left the court in triumph.  

Both the Reichwehr and the German judiciary hid their conservative politics behind a politically non-biased front. The judicial magistrates “considered themselves members of an exclusive caste endowed with many privileges. Their pretence of administering a justice free from and uncontaminated by any political influence was as invalid as the Reichwehr’s claim to be non-political.” Not only does Neue Sachlichkeit provide the ideal means for portraying the purely objective bureaucratic environment in which Zuckmayer’s Voigt is treated as a mere object, its style of presentation most accurately describes the prevailing mood of the German political authorities on the eve of Hitler’s rise to power.

In Als wär’s ein Stück von mir, Zuckmayer describes the general apolitical sentiment that the forces of reaction fed on in Germany during the early thirties — a tendency he neither excuses nor absolutely condemns:

War auch die Nazibewegung in ihren Anfängen von üblen, rachsüchtigen, nichts als machtlustigen Elementen getragen, so wäre es völlig falsch, ungerecht, abwegig, die große Menge von Deutschen, die Anfang der dreißiger Jahre dem Nationalsozialismus zuströmten, in Bausch und Bogen zu verdammen.

The NSDAP’s ranks swelled with bands of *Mitläufer*. Their political indifference ignored a *sachlich* appraisal of the situation and underlying sentiments of misgiving in favor of pasting their hopes on a set of fantastic and unfulfillable promises. *Sachlichkeit* can be described as the power of objective criticism. It can also describe unquestioning conformity to a set of preexisting rules. Zuckmayer used a technique combining the two-fold signification of *Sachlichkeit* in technical contrast to his subjective Expressionist method. His critically objective method of presentation most clearly demonstrates Voigt’s subjective battle against forces whose *sachlich* pursuance of bureaucratic protocol dipassionately denies him the right to existence. Upon Hitler’s rise to power, the general populace was perhaps best represented by people like Schlettow, Obermüller or Hoprecht: ready to repress personal sentiment to relinquish command, authority or the promise of promotion with classicly German *pro forma* adherence to an objectively formulated set of rules.

Zuckmayer incorporated the techniques of the *Neue Sachlichkeit* and Expressionism into his *Hauptmann von Köpenick* in order to intensify the dramatic conflict between Voigt and the forces of Prussian bureaucracy. The window of the twelfth scene is functionally important only as it appears to Liesken — as a purely subjective point of reference in the style of Expressionism. The mirror appearing at the dramatic conclusion appears like the uniform as an unmediated referent, as an object serving the dramatic functions of the *Neue Sachlichkeit* as described by the literary critic, Reinhold Grimm (see above, page 78). The mirror and uniform operate within the drama just as they would in the actual realm beyond the stage. Zuckmayer elevates the uniform to the level of *Hauptfigur* in playful exaggeration of the emphasis layed upon the “Sache” by the *Neue Sachlichkeit*. But as outward symbol of the objectively insoluble bureaucratic circumstances that hold him prisoner, the uniform
also serves to heighten the subjective dilemma of isolation and exclusion facing Voigt. The uniform is not only an eternally reappearing ubiquitous prop endowed with its own plot-line of descent and *Aufstieg*. Once in his possession, it carries potent meaning as an externalization of the subjective will to freedom brewing in Voigt. It is the means by which he liberates himself from his externally indifferent circumstances. The techniques of Expressionism and *Neue Sachlichkeit* heighten the dramatic conflict through the inherent contradiction manifest in their mutual opposition to each other. The unity of Voigt and the uniform represents a synthesis of the subject with the objective symbol of the forces of his contention. Zuckmayer uses the method of *Neue Sachlichkeit* to reflect the politically dispassionate mood dominating his period. Yet he maintains the subjectively Expressionistic stylistic element alive behind the *Neue Sachlichkeit* façade to represent the dormant feelings, desires and aggressions suddenly jolted into wakefulness by the severity of the Great Depression — the brewing spirit of social discontent regarded with too little interest by those within the system for political disaster to be averted.
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Zuckmayer's Zeitstück, Der Hauptmann von Köpenick, was a biting satire of the lasting tradition of Prussian militarism under revival by a body of military parvenues with only limited claim to authentic political authority. Zuckmayer composed the Hauptmann von Köpenick as an "Eulenspiegelbild" of the German political environment of late 1930. He clearly intended it as a portrayal of contemporary issues of highest relevance to his public at the time of his drama's premiere. Zuckmayer's drama was a social metaphor in which the public body could recognize itself for what it really was: a helplessly infantile outcast condemned to committing the same repeated mistake of self-deception. By 1931, the depression had economically disenfranchised the electorate from the lower middle class on down. A new class of military parvenues was attempting at that time to rise in the social ranks posing in borrowed, disgraced and previously discarded old military regalia to which it had no rightful claim but in fable. Zuckmayer formulated the literary assault of the Hauptmann von Köpenick against the rising power of the NSDAP into an attack on combined fronts. He brought the Volksstück elements present in his earlier works into direct confrontation with the Nazi myth of Deutschtum. He included a contemporarily critical attack of the NSDAP's ideological unification of the causes of the people and military. The Hauptmann von Köpenick assaults Prussian militarism at the root by reducing its symbols of authority to a discarded old uniform and the repetition of a childish interrogative. "Haben Sie gedient?" thus becomes the exclusive formula with which the military confines societal legitimacy to the members of its own caste. At this point in his literary career, the events of the time force Zuckmayer into an open reconfirmation of his earlier anti-war stance. The societally
critical function of the *Volksstück* gains new emphasis as Zuckmayer shifts his attention to themes of contemporary urgency:

Mit dem Hauptmann von Köpenick stehen wir an einem Höhepunkt in Zuckmayers Entwicklung. Das Schwerpunkt seines Schaffens verlagert sich von nun an vom Volksstück auf das aktuelle Zeitstück. Zweifellos haben die Zeitverhältnisse und die äußeren Lebensumstände zu dieser Entwicklung entscheidend beigetragen. 

Zuckmayer composed the dystopian fable of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* as a biting satire on the politically ideological fable of the German race and the political danger its adoption represented to the German people. In true *Volksstück* fashion, he unmasked the essentially unchanged German political system and its inveterate court of monarchical legal representatives. With the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*, Zuckmayer composed a *Zeitstück* accurately portraying the mistakes of Germany's past and present that received a scathing review in Goebbels' reactionary *Angriff*. His drama served as a reminder that between 1906 and 1931 the institutions were essentially the same, but the people behind them were considerably different.

The element of fable with which Zuckmayer removed his satire of Prussian militarism from its chronologically specific setting leaves it in all ways open to interpretation in terms of contemporary events:

Wir wollen nicht bestreiten, daß der Dichter hier eine dramatische Fabel geschaffen hat, die nicht nur aus dem Leben geschöpft ist, sondern über den kritisch ins Auge gefaßten historischen Vorfall hinaus auf ähnliche "Zustände" anwendbar bleibt. Trotzdem gelingt es nicht, dieses Stück einfach als Zeitsatire zu verstehen, zumal es ja gar nicht einmal so sicher ist, daß diese "Zustände" so unbedingt als ausschließlich deutsche zu gelten haben.

While acknowledging the critical relation of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* to contemporary late Weimar political events, Paulsen recognizes the terms of universal applicability present in Zuckmayer's drama. Zuckmayer's comedy can thus be
understood as a satire of the early twentieth-century trend toward military government and rearmament the world over.

Zuckmayer's *Hauptmann von Köpenick* hoped to awaken his public to the reality that although the government of Weimar was nominally republican, its controlling institutions preserved the lasting control of military-absolutist powers from the days before the outbreak of World War I.

At the time of its premiere in 1931, Zuckmayer maintained an incredibly tongue-in-cheek attitude toward the criticism of contemporary events concealed behind the *Märchen* epithet of his drama. Zuckmayer's synoptic overview of *Der Hauptmann von Köpenick* thus closed with the following claim:

> Es will auch nicht mit den Leuten rechten, die die Verhältnisse gemacht haben, noch mit den Verhältnissen, aus denen die Leute wurden. Denn es ist ja nichts Neues, was es erzählt, sondern es ist ein deutsches Märchen und, wie alle Märchen längst vorbei, — vielleicht überhaupt nicht wahr? — und nur ein Gleichnis für das, was nicht vorbei ist!6

Behind the author's overt claim to purely fictional intentions lies an inherent truth with respect to chronological events. Despite the apparent transition to a more democratic form of government signalled by the proclamation of the Weimar Republic in 1918, the leading *Verhältnisse* had little changed since 1906 (or 1910, to which year Zuckmayer relocates the closing act of his play). Political events were in fact returning circumstances to an assertion of the stark authoritarian attitude of the prewar period. Zuckmayer's above claim that his drama does not desire to "dispute with those who have created the conditions" carries legal connotations. It is a satiric jibe at a justice system that blatantly supported reactionary political elements against the republican form of government of the Weimar Constitution. Zuckmayer had participated in a declaration in protest of Johannes R. Becher's prosecution for treason
in 1928 and spoke in December 1930 at a gathering of the “Kampfausschusses gegen Zensur” in protest of the ban on the filming of Remarque’s *Im Westen nichts Neues.*

Zuckmayer’s drama hoped to alert the German public to the fact that while their system was formally democratic, its controlling institutions were predominantly unaltered conservative-aristocratic survivals from the Wilhelmine era.

Through his efforts at obtaining a rudimentary position of personal dignity within society, Voigt represents the spirit of human rights as opposed to institutional justice. Voigt incorporates the people’s will to self-determination reflected in the Weimar constitution: “The German People, united in all their branches and inspired by the determination to renew and strengthen their commonwealth in liberty and justice, to preserve peace both at home and abroad, and to foster social progress, have adopted the following Constitution.” The Weimar constitution recognizes the people as the source of authority for Parliament. The judicial body adopted wholesale into the Weimar system of justice never had much intention of upholding the principle of the people’s sovereignty or the conception of “liberty and justice” intended by the Constitution. Voigt’s attempt at erasing apparent guilt by disguising himself in the costume of authority casts doubt upon the image of authority itself:

By demonstrating Weimar’s overobedience to symbols of authority and legitimacy, Zuckmayer launches his satire against one of the prime weaknesses in the system: its
adherence to legal formalism to the ignorance of the justice it was meant to represent. Zuckmayer’s description of the “‘Macht greifung’ in Deutschland, die nach außen hin scheinbar legal vor sich ging und von einem Teil der Bevölkerung mit Befremden, mit Skepsis oder mit einem ahnungslosen, nationalen Idealismus aufgenommen wurde,” calls attention to the similarity between Voigt’s action and that of his NSDAP counterpart. The difference is one of character and degree. Voigt strives to obtain a legitimate place among the Volk against the impediment of a legal technicality. Despite his repeated acts of treason, Hitler rose above the Volk behind a façade of legality. Zuckmayer’s Voigt shows what can and did happen to a system of justice that loses track of what it stands for by concentrating its attention solely on a set of legal formulæ while ignoring the people and principles they represent.

Zuckmayer not only attacked the National Socialists through reference to current German political developments. He chose those elements in the Prussian military and ruling tradition under revival by the NSDAP as targets for satire. Voigt’s slight criminal record condemns him to continual failure in finding work or obtaining a residence permit, both of which are contingent on each other. He finally decides to purchase a twice-discarded, champagne-stained old captain’s uniform (fifteenth scene). The uniform in general is a symbol of the age-old military tradition that had been recently disgraced in war and in repeatedly failed putsch attempts. Zuckmayer reduces the uniform to the level of the purely sachlich before mocking its lasting ability to command blind obedience from the members of the military. In the slapstick comedy of its third act, the Hauptmann von Köpenick openly mocks German society’s enduring obedience to the institution of Prussian militarism. It scoffs at the readoption of military traditions by a class to which military authority had never traditionally belonged. In the fifteenth scene, Voigt snidely remarks on the price of the uniform he
has just purchased. The second-hand dealer, Krakauer, responds: “Ich sag Ihnen: Se haben nich gekauft, se haben geerbt.” (95). Krakauer makes verbal mockery of the uniform’s power to command blind obedience: “Ihnen gesagt: es isse Wunder. Wenn die Uniform kennt allein spazierngehn, ohne daß einer drinsteckt — ich sag Ihnen, jeder Soldat wirdse grießen, echt isse!” (93). The National Socialists made full use of the uniform in attempting to provide themselves with the appearance of authority. Zuckmayer strips them of their apparent authority by placing the uniform in its historical context of disgrace and diminishing it to a second-hand article of reduced value. The crowning touch to Zuckmayer’s satire of militarism comes, of course, in an unemployed cobbler’s successful ability to retrieve the unwanted article and effectively use it in self-elevation to the status of commander.

Voigt’s metamorphosis would be incomplete without a mastery of Beamensprache down to the appropriate Redeformel to suit the situation. At the sign of the slightest resistance, Voigt, in his new role as captain, continually gains complete submission to his authority by repeating the same bark hurled his way for years. He emerges in full regalia from the restroom of the Schlesischer Bahnhof in the seventeenth scene. With the words, “Haben Sie gedient?,” he commands the attention and obedience of the railway officials. When Obermüller objects to Voigt’s marching into his official chamber, Voigt stifles him by snapping out with the same question (107). As Rosenkrantz, the city treasurer, reports to Voigt, Voigt barks out a quick “Haben Sie gedient?” (108). Rosenkrantz unquestioningly responds to Voigt’s command to close out the till. The military interrogative mirrors the claim to state authority with which the military had always asserted its position within society.

The Herrschaft of the Prussian state in Germany had long been founded upon a system of symbols designed to separate it from the common people. It was a heritage
it adopted from the days of absolute aristocratic rule -- from the days, when
“Insignias, coats-of-arms, dress, hair styles, gesture, forms of address, dialects, all of
these were used as status symbols, giving the public person an ‘aura’ of authority.”
Immediately following their stunning victory at the polls on September 14, 1930, the
National Socialists revived Prussian heritage in new form by dressing all of its 107
representatives in the uniforms of its party. Their attempt to gain control of the
ministries of the interior and army through propagandistic intimidation failed:

Aber der Anspruch auf Besetzung des Innen- und des
Reichswehrministeriums, mit dem sich die NSDAP vor ihrem
Wahlsieg noch eine Machtbasis für die weitere Eroberung des Staates
sichern zu können glaubte — denn er schloß die Verfügung über
Polizei und Reichswehr, die unmittelbaren Machtinstrumente der
Exekutive, in sich —, wurde sogleich durch weitergehende
Forderungen überholt.

Voigt makes a similar claim to military authority based completely on appearance.
Zuckmayer's Voigt makes a mockery of the National Socialist revival of the aura of
authoritarianism through his use of a uniform, official dialect and an implied claim to
military service — none of which legitimately belong to him.

The stir created by the Hauptmann von Köpenick in the politically reactionary
journal, Der Angriff, testifies to the effectiveness of its criticism of current
developments. Its satire of Prussian militarism cannot be denied even by Goebbels.
Hitler's future Minister of Propaganda attempts to reappropriate his position as voice
of the people by openly defending the primary objects Zuckmayer's dramatic satire
ridicules:

... wohl nicht zu betonen, daß besagter Herr Zuckmayer sich die
Gelegenheit nicht entgehen läßt, das alte preußische Regime, den
verruchten Absolutismus, den Kadavergehorsam des ostelbischen
Staates und den Blutbefleckten Militarismus mit Kübeln von Spott
und Hohn zu übergießen.
Goebbels’ reception of Zuckmayer’s drama recognizes with intense accuracy its criticism not only of Prussian absolutism, but of the aggressive instincts relied upon by radical supporters of militarism as well. “Kadavergehorsam” describes the logical result of the sort of blind obedience to authority portrayed in the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* when transported to the battlefield. In the thirteenth scene, Augusta Wormser wears the uniform to a party. It gets spattered with champagne and compote (84). Goebbels sees Zuckmayer’s symbolic degradation of the uniform as a reference to the blood with which it has been spattered in war. For this too, Goebbels praises the uniform. Goebbels’ reception of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* in the *Angriff* attempts to expropriate the dramatic appeal of the drama’s military criticism by openly affirming the very elements of its condemnation. Goebbels not only defends the spirit of Prussian absolutism and the outward expression of its authority from Zuckmayer’s satire. He uses the theatrical spattering of the uniform at a party as an occasion to glorify the reputation of death to which German militarism has become inextricably attached through the events of the First World War.

Contrary to Goebbels’ ascertainment of blatant military criticism in the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*, in Zuckmayer’s drama, obedience to authority never results in direct physical injury to anyone. The only parallels to Ernst Toller’s notorious 1932 jag, “Soldaten sind Mörder,” are indirect. Voigt states to Hoprechte in the fourteenth scene: “Aber se sollen mir drin leben lassen in de Heimat. Denn könnt ick auch sterben für, wenn’s sein muß” (90). Voigt’s complaint is a poke at the ludicrous expectation of “Kadavergehorsam” to military authority applied domestically. Subjects treated inhospitably at home by militaristic officials could hardly be expected to selflessly devote their lives to the system. Voigt’s reading of the passage from the *Bremer Stadtmusikanten*: “Komm mit, — sagte der Hahn, etwas
Besseres als den Tod werden wir überall finden” (78), echoes the same sentiment. The implicit message of peace is, however, anything but completely obvious. The ambivalence of comic irony certainly makes it possible to interpret Voigt’s coup as a justification for the exercise of military might, although Zuckmayer clearly strove for an opposite effect.\textsuperscript{19}

Zuckmayer’s comedy is by no means an open avowal of the glory of Prussian militarism. Yet even if it had been, its military theme would have made it a likely target for attack from the Nazi press anyway.\textsuperscript{20} The success of comedy depends largely upon its ability to transform even life-threatening themes into harmless objects of public amusement, “for laughter has no greater foe than emotion.”\textsuperscript{21} Zuckmayer’s \textit{Hauptmann von Köpenick} attacks the inevitably destructive results of the cult of militarism in only the subtlest of ways.

Zuckmayer’s satirical attack of the lack of true authority of resurgent military groups puts Goebbels on the defensive. Goebbels recognizes Zuckmayer’s criticism of the lasting power of militarism. He attempts to snuff out the meaning of its reference to misappropriation by a class lacking traditional authority:

\begin{quote}
Wir sind nicht gegen die Tendenz auf der Bühne; aber die Tendenz muß dann auch im \textit{Dienst des Besseren} stehen und darf sich nicht damit begnügen, aus der Tatsache, daß die \textit{Personen} gewechselt haben, auch die \textit{vermeintliche} Tatsache zu schöpfen, daß das \textit{System} anders geworden sei.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{quote}

Here Goebbels fully misses his mark (the same observation he claims to make about Zuckmayer).\textsuperscript{23} The heart of Zuckmayer’s critique of militarism rests on the fact that the system is indeed the same.\textsuperscript{24} Zuckmayer lampoons a system under which nobody wins. He mocks a system that holds the dispossessed at bay, until the dispossessed take revenge upon society by turning the system’s tools against it. Goebbels’ guile-ridden attempt to usurp this aspect of Zuckmayer’s appeal to the German people’s
sense of wakefulness to awaiting danger is typical. Goebbels attempts to expropriate Zuckmayer's exposure of politically current trends through blatant affirmation of their veracity. The reaction of the editor of the Angriff shows the effectiveness of Zuckmayer's Zeitstück at revealing the societally dangerous elements in the program of the rapidly swelling Nazi party. The fact that Goebbels proudly and openly acknowledges those elements indicates that despite his call to action, Zuckmayer appeals too much to human reason and not enough to feelings of indignation.

The Hauptmann von Köpenick directs its attention to life-like depiction at the lasting historical trends affecting the Weimar Republic and the lack of traditional authenticity in resurgent militarism of the NSDAP. The anti-militarism of the Hauptmann von Köpenick was generally applicable to military developments everywhere. Elevated from the immediate context of the original Rathaus Überfall, the Köpenickiade was now in a position to directly address the political developments of 1931. The Köpenickiade as fable was a symbolic demonstration of the fact that despite the Kaiser's abdication and the declaration of a democratic republic "auf deutschen Boden," the institutions of monarchy continued to hold their grasp upon society. Nothing had changed. A conservatively aristocratic judiciary assured the negation of the rights of the person supposedly represented by the system as it protected the interests of the resurgence of the lasting institution of Prussian despotism. Voigt's symbolic struggle against the mastery of the bureaucracy is thus a true-to-life depiction of the Weimar Republic's inability to free itself from the increasingly heavy yoke of Prussian tyranny. Goebbels' hefty reaction to Zuckmayer's drama shows the latter's effectiveness at getting to the root of the contemporary danger of European fascism. It also indirectly indicates that mere awareness of the problem was no longer an effective deterrent. The accurate
correspondence between the Hauptmann von Köpenick’s fabulous elements and the political environment at the time of its premiere truly make it “mehr Zeitstück als die Zeitstücke,” as Alfred Kerr so acutely observes. It is precisely this aspect that makes Zuckmayer’s drama an interesting contribution to the field of social history.
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Carl Zuckmayer’s *Hauptmann von Köpenick* draws on the full range of literary techniques to create a satire of the human will at odds with a system of bureaucratic order grown inhuman. The principal conflict returns drama to its ancient roots. Voigt’s conflict with the forces of bureaucracy repeats the opposition of the power of chaos to the societally ordering function of cosmos in the ancient Greek theater. But Zuckmayer makes the theme highly modern at the same time. He combines the most recently popular movements of Expressionism and the *Neue Sachlichkeit* into the formulation of the subjective-objective antithesis that forms the modern thematic underpinning to Voigt’s conflict with the military bureaucracy. Zuckmayer converts history into myth in repetition of the age-old literary practice dating back to Homer. The National Socialists used and created their own myth in a failed attempt to subject history to a Romantic ideology. Zuckmayer consolidates his attack against the rising power of the NSDAP by usurping the chief elements of their appeal to the German people. He establishes the traditional *Volksstück* link with the people by returning the *Volksstück* address to the people’s sense of social criticism to its former position of primacy. He reasserts the traditional German Humanistic ideal against reactionary parallels founded in the Prussian authoritarian tradition. The central dramatic conflict of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* symbolizes the enduring struggle of the German people for hegemony against its traditional military-authoritarian rival. Zuckmayer alters the excerpted line from the *Bremer Stadtmusikanten* while remaining true to its spirit, thus drawing attention to the curious relationship between *sachlich* appearance and meaningful content. His retelling of the sensational *Rathaus* seizure of 1906 appears harmless enough on the surface. But underneath lies the assertion that, upon the drama’s premiere in 1931, Germany was back in the same old position of
domination by the cult of the uniform that it had been under the Kaiser. It is the absurdity of the dilemma of the German people’s return to the yoke of military absolutism that the German playwright, Carl Zuckmayer, captures in his *Hauptmann von Köpenick: ein deutsches Märchen in drei Akten*.

By cleansing Voigt of personal responsibility for his placement at the fringe of society, Zuckmayer conjures up the traditional dramatic conflict between chaos and cosmos and revives the ancient thematic ingredient of superhuman fate. Zuckmayer returns drama to its natural roots in antiquity through close adherence to traditional structural and thematic elements. In terms of form, Zuckmayer’s drama conforms to the theatrical tradition passed down from the late antique period:

> Mit dem Dreischritt der dramatischen Entwicklung: Exposition (Protasis), Epitasis, Katastrophe (Lysis) übernimmt Zuckmayer eine ‘klassische’ Form, die schon in der Spätantike entworfen, vor allem im romanischen Sprachbereich praktiziert und in der Komödie vor allem von Cervantes verwandt wurde.¹

But in the dialectic of exclusion and inclusion represented by Voigt’s struggle against the bureaucracy, Zuckmayer returns to the thematic duality between chaos and cosmos of Ancient Greek theater:


Zuckmayer revives the ancient chaotic element in Voigt, whom he places beyond the pale of the organizing cosmos of bureaucratic society. The *Hauptkonflikt* of the plot of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* is that between *Mensch* and *Ordnung*. As an
outsider, a *Mensch* excluded from the orderly societal realm, Voigt’s *Naturverbundenheit* makes him a reincarnation of the natural forces of chaos within humanity. Voigt’s coup against the bureaucratically exclusive *Menschenordnung* finds conceptual motivation in the animals’ revolt of the *Bremer Stadtmusikanten*, the Grimms’s tale he reads to Liesken at the twelfth scene’s close. Through exclusion from the *Kosmos* of the bureaucratic system, Voigt becomes the incarnation of naturally animalistic drives (although Zuckmayer makes them appear harmless enough in preservation of their comic effect). Hoprecht’s statement at the end of the fourteenth scene signals Voigt’s entry into the realm of *Chaos* beyond the system’s control: “Der Mensch — der Mensch ist ja gefährlich!!” (92). The Wilhelm Voigt who achieved celebrity through his seizure of the *Köpenicker Rathaus* in 1906 was criminally motivated. The Voigt of the drama is completely driven by circumstance. By purging the character Voigt of the aspect of guilt, Zuckmayer places him in the hands of fate:

> Moira, das ist ursprünglich das Los bei der Verteilung der Beute, bei der Verteilung des Landes. Das Los entscheidet unparteiisch, unabhängig vom Willen und Hoffen der Menschen — es ist das Sinnbild einer Entscheidung, die vom Menschen unabhängig ist, aber sein weiteres Ergehen bestimmt.³

Zuckmayer revives the concept of *Los* in the form of a humanly created bureaucracy grown indifferent to humanity. Fate’s overbearing power reveals itself as it exerts its hegemony even over its leading human representatives, incapacitating the willpower of Schleitow and Obergäbler, Hoprecht and Voigt alike through its rigid enforcement of authoritarian principles. The twist Zuckmayer throws into the ancient scheme emerges at the point where Voigt asserts his will against a fate that has excluded him, enjoying a short-lived Pyrrhic victory in demonstration of the glaring weakness of the bureaucratic apparatus.⁴ The *Neue Sachlichkeit*’s goal of achieving realistically
impartial representation renders it the perfect form for the incorporation of the ancient element of fate. Zuckmayer's talent lies in rejuvenating theater not by revolutionary means, but by returning it in large measure to its original form. He founds his critique of modern society upon a return to the ancient formulæ of drama in the early stages.

By equating historical event with fairy tale, Zuckmayer parodies the ideological practice of presenting preconceived myth as historical fact. He thus titles his drama, *Der Hauptmann von Köpenick: ein deutsches Märchen in drei Akten*:

> Die Bezeichnung *Märchen* ist zum Teil ironisch zu verstehen, sie bezeichnet das Geschichtsverständnis des unpolitischen Deutschen und seine Wirklichkeit. In einem weiteren Sinne ist aber das Märchenschema, wie bereits ausgeführt, ein Grundmoment der Zuckmayerschen Volksstücke.5

Yet the transformation of historical into fabulous event is the work of the dramatist. Zuckmayer's use of the phrase, "ein deutsches Märchen in drei Akten," to complete the title gives subtle indication of dramaturgical propriety with respect to historical fact. Zuckmayer's title is identical in form to ideological equations of history and myth. Its formal identity to ideological statements draws attention to the underlying difference contained within it. The transformation of historical events into mythical form is wholly in keeping with western tradition. The reality reflected in dramatic fiction may serve to increase humanity's understanding of human relations. The attempt to impose mythological conceptions upon the public realm is the work of the demagogue, and to the mind of a thinker like Zuckmayer, a perversion of justice in its purest form.

Zuckmayer's theatrical reflection of contemporary reality contrasts markedly with the mythological elements the National Socialists imposed upon political and social reality under the Third Reich. Zuckmayer incorporates the Romantic element of the fabulous third prince into his leading character in order to truthfully portray the
reality of situations in Germany in 1931. Hitler used the Romantic elements of nationalism and fable with which to create the myth of the Third Reich. Zuckmayer employs the symbol of the rooster as wakener to rouse the German people to awareness of the lurking danger represented by the human masters of the *Bremer Stadturmiskanten*. Hitler’s Nazis used the slogan “Deutschland Erwache” and the fiction of the German Master Race with which to enslave an entire nation like animals and elevate their leader to the status of prince, of Dark Prince, of the “Teufel auf Erden” of Zuckmayer’s *Teufels General*. Zuckmayer’s use of the techniques of *Neue Sachlichkeit* and Expressionism in the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* illustrate, through example, the attitude of detachment and hopelessness of which Hitler took advantage as he duped an entire nation into allowing itself to be subjected to his *Führerprinzip*. Its founders made every attempt to provide the Third Reich with mythical historical foundations:

Ein solch altes Wort ist das Dritte Reich, klangvoll allein schon durch die Dreizahl (‘wie im Märchen’), klangvoll als dritte Krönung Deutschlands (nach dem mittelalterlichen und dem Bismarckschen Reich). Damit aber der revolutionäre Schein nicht zu kurz komme, fügte Moeller van den Bruck, der eigentliche Erneuerer des Terminus, mystische Überlieferungen aus ganz anderen ‘Reichen’ hinzu. Denn im Original hatte das Dritte Reich den *sozialrevolutionären Ideal-traum der christlichen Ketzerei* bezeichnet: den Traum von einem Dritten Evangelium und der Welt, die ihm entspricht.7

Zuckmayer’s conception of the world as a unified whole finds structural and thematic reflection within his drama. The National Socialists projected their narrower view of a world in conflict onto Germany, Europe and the World. By taking an historical event and transforming it into a dramatic fairy tale, Zuckmayer reinforces the age-old traditional division between theatrical and political events. In his autobiographical *Pro Domo* he writes: “Die Schaubühne ist eine metaphysicshe Anstalt, mehr noch als eine
morals, and to be so, must she penetrate to all dimensions of vital reality, body, and essence of human life. The stage incorporates the broadest scope of reality to create its own mythical world separate from the reality of social and political events. The *Hauptmann von Köpenick* mirrors the socio-political consequences lurking in a system of bureaucratic forces grown indifferent to the society it has been created to serve. Zuckmayer demonstrates the inherent absurdity in the active translation of mythical vision into political reality through his account of Voigt’s divinely inspired Pyrrhic victory against the forces of bureaucracy. His *deutsches Märchen in drei Akten* correctly applies the relationship between history and myth to the fictional world of drama. He includes mythical elements in his drama to create a humanistic parallel counter to similar elements in National Socialist doctrine, thus bringing attention to the abuse of the historical-mythical relationship by the proponents of the latter.

Zuckmayer’s reliance upon tradition as well as his choice of dramatic genres and themes allow him, like Brecht, to consolidate his dramatic argument against National Socialism.

The *Volksstück* genre establishes the same immediate link to the German people that Hitler attempted to justify through his imposition of the *Führerprinzip*, or leadership principle. With remarkable constraint for a man whose partial Jewish parentage made him a target for Nazi slander and subsequent persecution, Zuckmayer confines racial references in the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* to the fringes in order to focus his attention on the inherent conflict between military and societal authority. The military bureaucracy in the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* undermines aristocratic principles, places the intelligentsia under military occupation and barricades the people from its rightful place in society. Von Schlelltow retires from military service
for attempting to maintain discipline out of uniform. An unemployed cobbler wrests governmental authority from Dr. Obermüller clad in the latter’s discarded old uniform. The bureaucracy denies Voigt entry into society through its adherence to an objective set of rules that fail to account for the welfare of the people. Zuckmayer metaphorically reflects the lasting struggle of the German people for self-determination against the forces of military authoritarianism. His drama attacks the coming reimposition of the Führerprinzip, “which effectively deprived any member of the Volksgemeinschaft of any active and positive participation in the political and institutional decision-making process.”

Before the Reichstag, Hitler placed the people above the system: “Party, state, army, the economic structure, the administration of justice are of secondary importance, they are but a means to the preservation of the Volk.” But in reality, the Rechtsstaat represented the interests of the Volk to the latter’s exclusion from decision making. The Rechtsstaat was subordinate to the authority of the NSDAP and its openly military aims.

Zuckmayer’s Volksstück leaves the power of judgment to the people against military-absolutist claims to hold and exercise that power in the people’s name. By demonstrating the societally deleterious effects of military authority from many angles, Zuckmayer’s drama urges its audience to a reevaluation of its actual political circumstance within the hollow exterior of Menschenordnung upon which the military authorities found their claims.

The Volksstück genre enables Zuckmayer to synthesize modern and traditional theatrical elements into an attack of a combination of revolutionary and conservative trends that are on the brink of destroying the established order of the Weimar Republic. Elementary to Zuckmayer’s keeping to the Volksstück genre in the Hauptmann von Köpenick is the possibility it allows for the combination of the styles of soziale and
historische Dichtung, Expressionism, Neue Sachlichkeit, and Zeitssstück. He relies on a full range of genres in concentrating his critique upon the lasting military-bureaucratic trend so threatening to the new German political order. Yet by operating within the Volksstück genre, he is able to compete in closed combat against the conservative reversion to traditional conceptions characterized by other of the genre’s adherents:

Unbekümmert um die Kritik, welche die große realistische Literatur an dergleichen Vorstellungen übte, gab die Gattung zu verstehen, kleinstädtisches, ländliches Leben, die Reste des vorindustriellen Zustands, taugen mehr als die Stadt; der Dialekt sei wärmer als die Hochsprache, die derben Fauste die rechte Antwort auf urbane Zivilisation. Im Volksstück tobte die Rancune derer sich aus, die, ausgeschlossen von der offiziellen Kultur oder nicht mitgekommen mit ihr, einen engen Sonderbereich sich reservierten, wo sie endlich Mensch sein, nämlich so unmenschlich sein durften, wie sie wollten.13

Adorno’s analysis attacks the Volksstück genre at the point of its greatest proximity to the same tendency in fascist ideology. Zuckmayer’s Volksstück attacks the same ideology by describing the struggle of the people against depersonalization and disinheritance by the military “state within a state” symbolic of the NSDAP. He thus attempts to wrest the Fascist appeal to the Volk by defining the Volksstück genre in his own terms. His definition of Volk refers to the German Humanistic tradition, and as concept, corresponds directly to that of humanity: “Erst der Mensch, Friedrich! Und dann de Menschenordnung!” (89). Like every so-called revolutionary movement, the National Socialists based their Weltanschauung upon a return to an idyllic state of affairs that they placed in the mythical past. In the fourteenth scene of the Hauptmann von Köpenick, Hoprecht attempts to convince Voigt to obey the order for his expulsion: “’n Mensch biste überhaupt nur, wenn du dich in ne menschliche Ordnung stellst! Leben tut auch ’ne Wanze!” (89). Voigt poses his own idea of the correct
relationship between institutions and the people they represent: “Richtig! Die lebt, Friedrich! Und weißt, warum se lebt? Erst kommt die Wanze, und dann die Wanzenordnung! Erst der Mensch, Friedrich! Und dann die Menschenordnung!” (89). Zuckmayer returns to the traditional genre of *Volksstück* to demonstrate to his audience that in the politically militaristic ideology of the NSDAP, the so-called “Menschenordnung” comes before the “Mensch,” and the “Wanzenordnung” before the “Wanze” it creates of the human spirit.

Zuckmayer uses the techniques of Expressionism and the *Neue Sachlichkeit* with which to accentuate the central dramatic conflict represented by an individual’s attempt to maintain his human identity against a hollow barricade of bureaucracy. In a critique of Erich Kästner’s use of the technique, Walter Benjamin describes the emptiness of feeling characteristic of the *Neue Sachlichkeit*:


Zuckmayer reduces the *Neue Sachlichkeit*, in part, to an internal stylistic component accentuating the central dramatic conflict of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*. The *neusachlich* “Hohlform” of Zuckmayer’s drama becomes the uniform: the symbol of bureaucratic authority made meaningless by an aging man’s masquerade against the system. The *Neue Sachlichkeit* is the “Hohlform” of a set of institutions whose claims to political impartiality render them powerless against the National Socialist seizure of power by technically “legal,” or perhaps more accurately, *sachlich* means. Zuckmayer reverts to Expressionist techniques in formulating the principal dramatic conflict of
Der Hauptmann von Köpenick against the bureaucratic powers of Sachlichkeit. The reversion signals an attempt at reevaluating theater in terms of the dramatic movement in popularity at the time of the foundation of the Weimar Republic. Zuckmayer uses the techniques of Expressionism and Neue Sachlichkeit in symbolic reformulation of the disparity between the democratic will of the German people and the inveterate spirit of monarchy in its adopted institutions.

The principal conflict of the Hauptmann von Köpenick is not only the subjective struggle of the enduring power of chaos against the objective cosmos of the German military bureaucracy. On the socio-historical level, it is the battle of the German people for sovereignty against the controlling grip of military absolutism. The constitution of the Weimar Republic reflected the spirit of republicanism. But its institutions concealed the unseen will of the Kaiser. Symbolic of the hidden forces of monarchy still thriving under the Weimar Republic, the Kaiser's laughter of approbation for Voigt's escapade enters the dramatic action of Zuckmayer's drama from beyond the scenes (121):


The judiciary, military and the police under Weimar were unwilling to protect the people's sovereignty against attacks from the reactionary right. The Brüning
government excluded the cornerstone of democratic representation, the German Parliament, by invoking Article 48 of the constitution. Voigt’s expulsion order is symbolic of the fact that, beginning in the 1930s, the German people had been excluded from a determining role in its affairs. The Ausschaltung had begun. The Gleichschaltung, the NSDAP imposition of a uniform structure on German society was well on its way before Hitler came to power on January 30, 1933. Voigt’s struggle for identity is the struggle of the German people against total subjugation to the inhuman mastery of an undignified military-bureaucratic apparatus.

Zuckmayer’s reformulation of the “Komm mit” invitation of the twelfth scene into the “Kommt mit” general convocation is typically sachlich in the subtlety with which Zuckmayer carries it out. Neither line fits the tale as told in the Brothers Grimm. But each fits the spirit of the tale directly to its circumstance. For the second variation appended to the conclusion of his drama, Zuckmayer includes a parenthetical citation of the authors and the tale from which he excerpted it. The underlying message behind Zuckmayer’s subtle alteration is that Sachlichkeit, like a uniform, is merely a façade. To actually get to the truth, one has to pay objective attention to detail as well as relying upon instinct to get to the spirit behind surface appearances. Otherwise one runs the risk of unjustly condemning an innocent man to societal expulsion, or of obeying the commands of what appears to be an army captain in a spattered old uniform.

The link Zuckmayer creates between contemporary reality and the timeless element of fable provides for the Hauptmann von Köpenick’s portrayal of the socio-political events of Weimar in terms of their relationship to enduring historical trends. Zuckmayer’s synthetic approach forces neighboring syntheses in broad terms. Historical events soon prove the predominant threat to the Weimar Republic to consist
in a reversion to lasting political, against cultural trends. The renowned twenties critic, Alfred Kerr, fully recognizes the elevated relevance to contemporary developments of Zuckmayer’s play, which he considers “Mehr Zeitstück als die Zeitstücke.” He sees in the uniform the lasting symbol of monarchical authority devouring the soul of the Weimar Republic from within. He concludes his Rezension with a plea to action echoing the same dramatic theme in Zuckmayer. It could easily serve as an epitaph to the Weimar Republic:

Aber wer schreibt mir ein Stück der deutschen Geschichte; der übel erprobten tausendjährigen Vergangenheit . . ., das vielleicht ihr abzuhelfen vermag? Heute das Schauspiel einer Republik . . ., die mit sehenden Augen alles zuläßt, was auf ihren Sturz gerichtet ist? Und die nicht eingreift. Wer schreibt es, . . . wenn auch zu spät???

The historical parallels between the events of the third act of Zuckmayer’s Der Hauptmann von Köpenick and the emergence of the Third Reich form a direct link between the irony of Zuckmayer’s Märchen in drei Akten and the reality of its historical context. Similar to the majority of later literary critiques of the drama, Ludwig Marcuse’s article of March 7, 1931 ignores the criticism of contemporary events contained in Zuckmayer’s depiction of what Marcuse calls, the “Despotismus der Uniform”:


Marcuse’s response is typical. It demonstrates that in the politically heated environment of the early thirties, Zuckmayer’s humor was either a little too subtle or too effective on the surface level for its public to grasp the connection between its underlying themes and immediate political reality. The supreme irony of Marcuse’s
statement is that eight years after Zuckmayer's version of the events surrounding the
"Hauptmann von Köpenick" premiered on stage, Germany was engaging in a second
"World War." Zuckmayer's Zeitstück so closely mirrors the actual history of its
period, that it would be hard to imagine an historical drama that could better capture
the spirit of events surrounding the period of its premiere on March 5, 1931.

Zuckmayer's synthesis of the Neue Sachlichkeit with Expressionistic and fairy
tale stylistic elements forms the bond between reality and fiction that makes the
Hauptmann von Köpenick "mehr Zeitstück als die Zeitstücke." Zuckmayer's use of
fable to establish the mimetic link between fact and fiction is fully traditional.18
Zuckmayer repeatedly combines his concept of Märchen as "Gleichnis" with the
interrelationship between historical past and present. He relies strongly on traditional
dramatic ingredients with which to form a connection with currents of modern
literature as well, so that the closing chant of the "Chorus Mysticus" in Goethe's Faust
could easily have been written as a description of Zuckmayer's dramatic technique
with respect to Zeitstück:

Alles Vergängliche
Ist nur ein Gleichnis;
Das Unzulängliche,
 hier wírd's Ereignis;
Das Unbeschreibliche,
 hier ist's getan;
Das Ewig-Weibliche
 zieht uns hinan.19

History, "das Vergängliche," forms the basis for Zuckmayer's fabulous "Gleichnis."
The "Ereignis" of the Köpenickiade results from the "Unzulänglichkeit" of the
Prussian military bureaucracy at reaching a humanly adequate solution for the
civically well-intentioned Voigt. Or as the Berliner Morgenpost stated in 1906: "Die
Traurigkeit, die in Voigts Schicksal liegt, ist nicht ganz vom Fatum, sondern zum
guten Teile von der Unzulänglichkeit der von uns selbst gesetzten Institutionen
verursacht.”20 “Das ewig Weibliche” is the German “Muttersprache” that attracts
Voigt back to Germany (15). It is also the ubiquitous uniform with which Zuckmayer
weds him before accomplishing the “Unbeschreibliche” through the publicly
demonstrative technique of drama.

With the Hauptmann von Köpenick, Zuckmayer presents the absurdity of
circumstances facing the German people mid-way between the collapse of the stock
market in 1929 and Hitler’s Machtergreifung of 1933. In his essay, “The Stage is all
the World,” Northrop Frye links the shift in critical emphasis from Shakespeare’s
Hamlet to King Lear with the “existentialist movement that grew so rapidly after the
French Resistance, when it was fashionable to speak of existence as absurd.”21
Zuckmayer’s dramaturgical conflict with the resurgence of Prussian absolutism finds
expression in Voigt’s dilemma. Voigt symbolizes the German people who, threatened
with exclusion from politics by the ancient forces of military authoritarianism, enters
into the awkward position of having to protect its autonomy by donning the cloak of
its traditional military opponent. Zuckmayer’s dramaturgical statement against the
gathering threat of the NSDAP shows the same avowal of the absurdity of existence
later embraced by the Existentialists:

Absurd meant among other things that the providential God who kept
grimicking his way through human history to some kind of future
happy ending was as dead as anything that had never been alive can
be. It also expressed what Browning summed up a century earlier in
the phrase ‘There may be heaven; there must be hell.’ Justice and
freedom may exist somewhere or somehow; Hitler and Stalin are
right there. The world-stage of fools in King Lear, then, is the theater
of the Absurd, where no hidden benevolent design becomes manifest,
where rebellion, obedience, courage, loyalty, acceptance or rejection
of religious belief, all seem to be without direction in a world set up
largely to benefit the Gonerils and the Cornwalls.22
Voigt’s self-directed anagnorisis by means of the mirror he requests in the closing scene of the *Hauptmann von Köpenick* is the recognition of the absurdity in his attempt to overcome societal exclusion by assuming the cloak of the forces barring his entrance.

On the broadest range of thematic levels, Carl Zuckmayer repeats the *Hauptmann von Köpenick*’s central dramatic conflict symbolizing the historical struggle of the German people for its sovereignty against military absolutism. Through Zuckmayer’s structural transformation and synthetic combination of varying styles, the conflict between Voigt and the bureaucracy becomes anciently traditional, highly contemporary and historically relevant all at once. Zuckmayer elevates the ancient Greek dramatic theme of the conflict between chaos and cosmos to the peak of tension. Voigt struggles to assert his natural right to existence against a military bureaucratic order that blindly condemns him to a fate of societal exclusion. Zuckmayer contemporizes the conflict by attracting attention to the relationship between myth and history. He objectifies myth by relegating it expressly to the theatrical realm of fantasy — the realm inherently separate from the sphere of public and political activity. His objectification of myth serves as a point of reference from which the objective audience may free itself from subjection to the ideological influences of the times. Zuckmayer restores his audience to its active social critical capacity through his concentration of the societally critical function of his *Volksstück* upon the most urgent problem of his day: the threat of the German people’s returning subjection to military-absolutist domination. He addresses his work to the people as a critically sovereign body in direct contradiction to National Socialist appeals to the instincts of the mass. The struggle between Voigt and the forces of bureaucracy is the ongoing political conflict between the German people and the forces of military
absolutism. It is the struggle of humanity for the assertion of its ideal against the machinery of repeated subjugation. On the rudimentary level, it is the individual’s struggle for autonomy against the compPELLingly subservient logic of the loyal Hoprecht: “n Mensch bist du überhaupt nur, wenn du dich in ne menschliche Ordnung stellst!” (89). The Hauptmann von Köpenick’s central conflict is humanity’s attempt to assert its right to self-determination against military conceptions of what humanity should be. Through a masterful combination of the techniques of Expressionism and Neue Sachlichkeit, Zuckmayer reduces the central conflict to the subjective struggle of the individual against the blind forces of military-bureaucratic Sachlichkeit. To counter the National Socialist myth of an invisible Jewish conspiracy, Zuckmayer poses his strikingly realistic portrait of the blind machinery of oppression just waiting to be set into motion. He depicts the realism of the hollow sachlich set of institutions symbolized by a uniform just waiting for another “Voigt” to use it against the public institutions it is meant to defend. On the eve of Hitler’s seizure of power, no Zeitstück could have been more überzeitlich. With amazing clarity and foresight, Zuckmayer’s Hauptmann von Köpenick shows the absurdity of a nation caught in a Teufelskreis between the protection of its autonomy by military means and unresisted obedience to political expulsion.

The Teufelskreis grew to engulf the whole nation as Hitler took his mythologically founded concept of conflict onto the world stage. Yet even after the Allies and Soviets freed the world of the National Socialist myth of world domination, the conflict between the people and uniform remained. Today in 1996, humanity can still identify strongly with Voigt as it looks back with disbelief on the high cost it has paid for the maintenance of its dreams of freedom and equality in support of uniform might.
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