Coleridge thought he had learnt much about dramatic technique from his revisions of Osorio, and could now set his goal clearer for the next — and, incidentally, his last dramatic venture. "Before the third week in December," he writes to Lord Byron in 1815, "I shall, I trust, be able to transmit to your Lordship a Tragedy, in which I have endeavoured to avoid the faults and deficiencies of the Remorse by a better subordination of the Characters, by avoiding the duplicity of Interest, by a greater clearness of the Plot, and by a deeper Pathos. Above all, I have labored to render the Poem at once tragic and dramatic."\(^1\)

But, as E. K. Chambers says, "Coleridge was ill during the greater part of November and December, and when he recovered, it was not the tragedy, but the dramatic entertainment, henceforward known as Zapolya, which he resumed."\(^2\)

Financial difficulties and ill health may have forced him to write this kind of play which permitted a freer play of fancy; he did not have to strain his faculties as he had to do in writing Osorio and in revising it. He wrote to John May on 27 September 1815: "My highest object in writing for the stage was to obtain the means of devoting myself, a whole and undistracted man, to the bringing forth a work, for which I had all the materials collected & ready for use."\(^3\)
H. N. Coleridge wrongly claimed in *Quarterly Review* of August 1834 that *Zapolva* "was not composed with any view to scenic representation". Coleridge first thought of Covent Garden for staging *Zapolva* and went to London towards the close of March 1816 for making necessary arrangements. But it was rejected. Coleridge then submitted the play to Drury Lane through Byron. He also wrote a letter to Byron wherein, in a mood of extreme humility, he himself pointed out certain "irregularities" in the play. He admitted the weakness of the central character, *Zapolva*, who remains "passive" in the last Act. Coleridge requested Byron to read the play "as a Poem" and agreed to any revision and excision. He also offered to "re-commence the regular Tragedy" right then. However, Byron, who was on the committee, left England for good on 26 April 1816, and, as H. K. Chambers says, he was no longer a power in the theatre. Douglas Kinnaird and others, who managed the Drury Lane now, thought that "it would not do as a play" but that "it would answer very well as a Melodrama with some slight alteration". We have no evidence that Coleridge attempted any revision. Interestingly, Drury Lane preferred

* A melodramatic adaptation of *Zapolva*, which may not be Coleridge's work, was successfully produced by the Royal Circus and Surrey Theatre within three months of its publication. Although Coleridge received no share of the profits, his name was exploited. The advertisement in *Morning Post* (Monday, Feb. 9, 1818) proudly announced the "Grand Melodrama" "founded on Mr. Coleridge's favourite poem called *Zapolva*; or *the Warwolf*. (See *Letters*, Griggs, Vol. IV, 721n; See also Chambers, p. 277).
Maturin's *Bertram* — "the butterfly which Coleridge broke on the wheel in *Biographia Literaria*".  

Coleridge naturally felt that his dignity was outraged. He started writing about the evils at the two Metropolitan Theatres. In five angry letters for *Courier* (later turned into articles for the *Biographia*) Coleridge attacked the contemporary stage.  

In the first article he criticized the German drama. Then he made a direct attack on that "speaking monster imported from the Bank of Danube". In the last three he burst into a savage attack on the theatres as "mere cramps of weakness and orgasms of a sickly imagination".  

*Bertram* was first produced on May 9, 1816 and ran twenty-two nights, two more than *Remorse*. This was all the more shocking to him, for *Zanovla* was his attempt, as he wrote (Nov. 1819) on a fly-leaf copy of the play, to "make something that would do for the Theatre in its present state".  

---

* Some scholars have pointed out that *Bertram* had been submitted and approved a few months before *Zanovla* was submitted for consideration. (See *Letters*, Griggs, vol. IV, pp. 664n - 65n.) Hence Coleridge's outburst is not wholly justified. We may remember here that Coleridge condemns *Bertram* for pampering the low taste of the public by providing cheap sensationalism, and not necessarily out of spite.  

** Coleridge informs Alexander Rae (15 April 1817) that the letters on *Bertram* etc. published in *Courier* (August 29, September 7, 9, 10 and 11, 1816) and attributed to him, were written by Morgan, but admits that many of the "thoughts" were his and that he approves of the criticism. (*Letters*, Griggs, IV, 720). But E.L. Griggs categorically says that these letters were Coleridge's work, "Morgan being merely on amanuensis" (*Ibid.*, 664n).
We may refer here to a few more sentimental outbursts to show how deeply Coleridge suffered from a sense of injured merit.

In a letter written to the actor-manager Alexander Rae (15 April 1817) for whose benefit *Remorse* was performed on 14 April 1817, Coleridge pours forth his agony more than a year after *Zanollya* was rejected by Drury Lane Committee. He writes Rae inter alia:

> And really if the mere existence of a few parts or scenes that do not happen to please some one of the Committee be a sufficing reason for rejecting a piece at once, without any suggestion for its [sic.] improvement, none but men of fortune can afford to write for the Theatre.¹⁵

Coleridge then quotes some passages from his play which were "declared intolerable, and enough to damn a piece by their metaphysical dullness" (his words are quoted here).¹⁶ In the same letter he refers to *Bertram* as "that infamous Abortion of Ignorance and Jacobinism", "a rank vapour from the condemned Hole of the pseudo-poetic Newgate".¹⁷ That the wound was not healed up even in November 1819 is borne out by what the aggrieved poet writes "To the Author of 'Peter's Letters to His Kinsfolk'" about his disgust "in writing Musis et Apolline nullo (a sin against my own ghost sufficiently avenged by the insolent and unfeeling caprice with which I was treated by the classical committee, one of which coolly informed me that after *Bertram* ("the public") would not be contented but with something truly Shakespearian, if not equal to yet like the BERTRAM !!)".¹⁸ He laments in the same letter that the "character of Glycine pleases me on a calm perusal of the work so much that I regret its being thrown away"."¹⁹
This is, in brief, the story of another struggle of Coleridge against the contemporary theatre. The story of his struggle against the contemporary publishing concerns is not less pathetic.

II

On October 7, 1815, Coleridge wrote to Daniel Stuart from Calne, Wiltshire that he was then at work with "a dramatic Entertainment" (Zapolya). It was being composed when Coleridge was enjoying the most sustained mood of inspiration for creative activity: beside Zapolya, the Biographie, the Sermons, and the revised Friend were composed within three years (1815 - 1817). Such a continuous concentration was rather unusual with the kind of genius that Coleridge was. Byron's generous comment on Remorse ("We have had nothing to be mentioned in the same breath with Remorse for very many years") must have acted as a spark that kindled Coleridge's dramatic imagination. We have already referred to Coleridge's promise to Byron that he would write a tragedy that would be free from the deficiencies that Remorse suffered from. Apart from the "dramatic Entertainment" under our discussion, Byron and Stuart were informed about many other

* He was deprived of home peace at that time as the estrangement with his wife was complete by 1810 and the breach with Wordsworth and the circle seemed unbridgeable. His financial troubles were at peak.
dramatic enterprises.\textsuperscript{23} E. K. Chambers gives a complete list of the projects contemplated during the period 1813-1817. "He had contemplated revisions of Shakespeare's Richard II, and Beaumont and Fletcher's Pilgrim and Beggar's Bush, but found that he had been anticipated as regards the first two of these. The third, under the title of The Merchant King or The King and Beggar, he could have sent at once, had not a journalistic engagement stood in the way. Also he could consider a pantomime, on a subject from the Tartarian Tales; and among his manuscripts were fragments of a tragicomedy on Love and Loyalty, a dramatic romance called Laugh Till you Lose Him, an entertainment, of which the scene lay in Arabia, and a mime or speaking ballet of The Three Robbers."\textsuperscript{24}

Byron, who showed considerable zeal in reforming the contemporary theatre, was happy to note that Coleridge contemplated writing a tragedy. He at once suggested to Moore that if Coleridge could keep his word, Drury Lane would get a new lease of life.\textsuperscript{25} But, as we have hinted earlier, it was perhaps Coleridge's illness and financial troubles that prevented him from writing the contemplated tragedy and, instead, the "entertainment" (Zapolva) was taken up after he had recovered from his illness in December 1815.* The winter months of 1815-16

* But the plan of the "Tragedy" was never given up, for Coleridge plaintively writes to Alexander Rae on 15 April 1817: "I have had a regular Tragedy on the stocks for some years." (Letters, Griggs, IV, p. 722.) It was perhaps never finished. (Chambers, edn 1950, p. 277.)
were devoted to this composition et cætera. He informs William Sotheby (31 January, 1816) in detail about the scheme of the play:

Of my dramatic Romance I have little more to do than to write I. a general Prologue, in which I shall endeavour in about 40 lines, as terse, pointed, and popular as possible to defend the judgment of Shakespeare in the construction of his Plays, and to expose the absurdity of the French Poets in mistaking the accidents of the Athenian Stage and the rules which the Tragic Writers were compelled to prescribe to themselves in order to make the whole piece harmonize as much as possible with the fortunate Fixtures (the Chorus, consequent confinement to one place, absence of a curtain & of Acts, &c.) which were independent of their choice for the essential Rules of Tragedy in general: and 2. a character-prologue spoken by Time, between the Prelude & the Play. For I have preferred this division to calling it a Play in 5 Acts — tho' I had the authority of Shakespeare's Winter's Tale for the letter — but for the former there is the analogy of the Diologies, Trilogies, and Tetralogies of the Greek Stage.

He further informs Sotheby that "I shall have the whole compleat / sic. / by Saturday next" and also assures him that it "will not be as interesting in the Closet, as the Remorse — I mean, that it is less a Poem — but I hope, it will be proportionally more so on the stage. All passages of independent or ornamental beauty I purposely avoided." 27

We already know how the contemporary theatre managers treated this dramatic enterprise.

After rejection by both Covent Garden and Drury Lane Committees the play was first printed as a pamphlet before Christmas 1817. But Coleridge's initial plan was to publish a volume of his dramatic works including Zapolya, Remorse, his translations of Schiller's plays, along with a long promised critical essay on the nature of dramatic poetry and the state
of the contemporary theatre. That he was particularly keen about this critical Preface is evident from his letter to John Murry (May 8, 1816):

Mr Morgan has, I find, placed my Christmas Tale in your hand; and has informed you, that out of this Poem in dialogue a Melodrama is to be constructed, with additional Songs and Choruses; that Mr Kinnaird thinks, that the publication of the former immediately, as a Poem, will be of advantage rather than disadvantage to the latter; and finally, that in the terms for the Poem I propose to secure to you the offer of the Melodrama, should it be theatrically successful. Indeed, I should have had no objection to have included both in one bargain, with such subfraction of price, as the degree and nature of the chances might render equitable & honorable to both parties. But Mr Morgan has not, it seems, yet mentioned to you that I have the whole outline, and a sheet or so finished of the Essay promised in the Preface to the Remorse on 'Dramatic Poetry exclusively in its relations to Theatrical Representation: 1. generally, 2. specially & in detail, to the present state and circumstances of the two Metropolitan Theatres, Dr. Lane & Covent Garden — with a distinction between evils that are necessary, & those that may be and ought to be removed.' — It would make a pamphlet from 150 to 200 pages — Now as the subject is of necessity to a certain degree personal & immediate, I have some reason to hope that it would excite interest among the frequenters of the Theatre, coming from a successful Dramatist. — Now which would be the more prudent plan, to publish this Essay separately? or as a part of the Volumes with the Christmas Tale? —

We may also refer here to Coleridge's letter to Thomas Curtis (14 March, 1817):
If I published the Zapolya at all, it should be with a Dramatic Essay prefixed, and two other Tragedies, the Remorse greatly improved as one. —

In the same letter Coleridge expresses his "dislike of having the Zapolya appear as a separate work". However, financial difficulties led him to change his plan and on 18 August 1817 Rest Renner of the firm Gale and Fenner drew up a formal agreement. Coleridge had received £50 from Murray for an edition of Zapolya; but Murray allowed Coleridge to recover the right of publication by repaying the amount, and the play was finally published in November 1817 by Rest Renner. (An "Advertisement" in defence of the "form" of the play was now included.) The publication of Zapolya caused considerable misunderstanding between Coleridge and John Murray, and we may refer here to certain passages in Coleridge's letters to Murray:

I sincerely believed that it would be neither for your advantage or mine that the Zapolya should be published singly — it appeared at that time that the annexing it to a collection of all my Poems would enable the Work to be brought out without delay — and I therefore applied to you, offering either to repay the money received for it, or to work it out by furnishing you with miscellaneous Matter for the Quarterly, or by sitting down to the Rabbinical Tales as soon as ever the works now in the press were put out of my hand: i.e. as far as the Copy was concerned. Your answer impressed me with your full assent to the Plan — Nay, however mortifying it might in ordinary circumstances have been to an Author's Vanity, it was not so to me that the Zapolya was a work of which you had no objection to be well rid.

* Campbell thinks that Coleridge may have written another play in the winter of 1815-16, which was rejected by Covent Garden and that the MS of the second play may have been lost. He bases his conjecture on, among others, Lamb's letters to Wordsworth written on April 9 and 26, 1816. (See PW, Campbell, Notes, p. 652n.)
Again:

Mr Randall will be so good as to pay you the 50 £ — and I understand from Mr Gilman that you are willing to receive this as a settlement respecting the Zapolya. 35

The whole trouble was due, as F.L. Griggs points out, to the unscrupulous conduct of Thomas Curtis — then partner to Gale and Fenner. 36 Fenner's action in publishing Zapolya separately was justified by the success of the publication, from the publisher's point of view, at least, for two thousand copies were sold. 37 There was no second edition of the original issue. In the reprints in 1828 and 1829 a few alterations were made which were of little significance. 38 The motto was first added in 1828. 39

III

Zapolya did not receive much notice in contemporary journals; what is, however, remarkable is the critical perspicacity shown by some reviewers. Reference may be made first to the dissenting voices. The Monthly Magazine (January 1818) is sorry to observe that the "poem" cannot add much to Coleridge's fame and notes few strong delineations of character, or poetical combinations which one would wish to remember. The Theatrical

* Interestingly, Coleridge writes "To the Author of 'Fater's Letters to his Kinsfolk' " in November 1819: "A thousand were to be printed of Zapolya; and the half profits given me as soon as the printing had been paid — I was informed that a hundred had been sold. On the Publisher's bankruptcy it came out that 2000 had been printed and 1100 sold". (Letters, Griggs, IV, 971, P.S.)
Inquisitor (February 1818) remarks that the language is often disfigured by the author's "quaintness and childishness" and expresses some reservations about the merit of the play; but the reviewer hastens to add that the play has "abundant beauties", that it abounds with images which are just and expressive, and that "fine declamation" is the chief merit of the work. "Mr Coleridge's mind", the reviewer concludes, "is highly gifted, and were he to get rid of his peculiarities and affectation, he would become one of the most pathetic and original writers of the age." The notice published in New Monthly Magazine (January 1818) is brief and rather undiscerning: "There is a considerable beauty in the language, and the characters are all delineated in a manner that would, we are inclined to think, render the play attractive upon the stage."

Edinburgh Magazine published the longest and the most perceptive review (December 1817). The reviewer describes Coleridge as an artist "who has suffered much from the injudicious panegyrics of friends, and the exaggerated and malevolent misrepresentations of enemies, as much almost as from the awkward bent of a restive imagination, and powers of judgment rather imperfectly developed". The italics is mine, and this is indeed a significant commentary on Coleridge's art. This "restive imagination" has indeed a bearing on what the reviewer considers the chief deficiency of the play — that much of the most striking parts of the story is related, and not acted: "he has always
before him, as it were, a good map of the chief lines and figures of passion, but than he does not enforce these with the exact sentiment which is to body them forth to the reader or hearer, and to serve also, in pushing on the story, that purpose of dramatic action for which they were copied or sketched out, both at once, and in the quickest possible manner. But this is what a dramatic writer must do." As a drama, the reviewer thinks, Zapolya will never succeed, and his final estimate is that it must exist as a poem. However, the reviewer pays the poet a generous compliment when he says that Coleridge "has tried the bold, vigorous, and sinewy style of tragedy which prevailed from the Elizabethan age down to Dryden's time." Seventeen years after the first publication of the play, H.N. Coleridge, the poet's nephew, published a long unsigned article on Coleridge's genius in Quarterly Review (August 1834). He praised Coleridge's dramatic talent as of "a high and original kind" and deplored that Zapolya has never been appreciated as it deserves: "it has some situations of dramatic interest in no respect inferior to the most striking in the Remorse; the incidents are new and surprising, and the dialogue is throughout distinguished by liveliness and force ...

It is, in our opinion, the most elegant of Mr. Coleridge's poetical works; there is a softness of tone, and a delicacy of colouring about it, which have a peculiar charm of their own, and amply make amends for some deficiency of strength in the drawing."
The contemporary reviewers saw in the play little dramatic potentiality, and what appealed to them was its poetry. Charles Lamb, however, wrote to Wordsworth that he saw "no reason upon earth why it might not have run a very fair chance". Twentieth-century critics, with a few exceptions, ignore the play both as a drama and as a poem. B. K. Chambers, in his well-known biographical study, does not make it a subject of analysis and calls it merely a "dramatic entertainment". Allardyce Nicoll ignores the play totally. His critical works — the bigger volume on early nineteenth-century drama and British Drama (1973) — are both silent about Zapolya. The Cambridge History of English Literature (Volume XI) has nothing to say about Coleridge's dramatic writings in the relevant chapter. George Sampson in the Concise Cambridge History of English Literature (1970) makes a brief mention of the play. "Zapolya", he comments, composed "in humble imitation of The Winter's Tale" is less static but less successful than Remorse."

George Watson in his book Coleridge: The Poet condemns the play as "a feeble imitation of Shakespeare's 'Winter's Tale'". Legouis and Casamian, like Nicoll, ignore the play in their famous History. Fletcher in his
English Romantic Drama calls it a "fantasy play".\(^{44}\) Lowes in his monumental *Road to Xanadu*,\(^{45}\) C. H. Herford in his *The Age of Wordsworth*,\(^{46}\) and Paul Harvey in *Oxford Companion to English Literature*\(^{47}\) just mention the play. S. C. Chew in the chapter on "Nineteenth-century Drama" (A Literary History of England, ed. A. C. Baugh) condemns "the large borrowings from Shakespeare"\(^{48}\) and the play receives no further notice. David Daiches has nothing to say about this play in his *Critical History*. G. Wilson Knight and his pupil Patricia M. Ball are the only twentieth-century critics who treat the play seriously and subject it to detailed analytical scrutiny. Wilson Knight's analysis is directed chiefly to the images of the play and the symbolic layers of meaning;\(^{49}\) Patricia M. Ball sees in the dominant action a quest for identity.\(^{50}\) J. B. Beer, following Wilson Knight, relates the cluster of images to *Christabel* and to Coleridge's metaphysical preoccupation with evil.\(^{51}\)

IV

The play is divided into two parts, and there is an interval of twenty years between the parts. (Coleridge justifies the violation of unity of time by referring to Shakespeare's
practice in *The Winter's Tale* and also to the trilogy of Aeschylus. The first part is described as "The Prelude, Entitled 'The Usurper's Fortune'" and the second part is called "The Sequel, Entitled 'The Usurper's Fate'". Actually it is a five-act play, but, "The Prelude" being a separate portion, the second part opens with Act I. In the "Prelude", some major characters are introduced: Emerick, the Usurping King of Illyria, Raab Kiuprili, an Illyrian Chieftain and the Commander-in-chief, Casimir, son of Kiuprili, Chef Ragozzi, a Military Commander and Zapolya, Queen of Illyria.

Andreas, the king of Illyria, is at the point of death, and the atmosphere is surcharged with suspense. Emerick, the ambitious and unprincipled brother of the king, is already in command; none is allowed access to the king, as Chef Ragozzi says, "Prince Emerick trusts his royal brother's help to an unscrupulous physician". The death of the king is announced soon, and the document possessed by Raab Kiuprili shows that he has left the queen, prince Emerick and Raab Kiuprili as regents of his kingdom and guardians of his child. Emerick ignores this document and usurps the sovereign power dismissing as fanciful the claim that Zapolya is about to deliver a child. Intrigue thickens — the situation is reminiscent of *Richard III* — and Raab Kiuprili who openly defies the usurper, is taken prisoner. Chef Ragozzi feigns submission to the tyrant with a view to subverting his
evil desires, and his subsequent action determines the course of events: he releases Kiuprili and helps the queen escape with her infant boy.

The lofty moral idealism of Raab Kiuprili has a disarming effect on the usurper, but he gains the allegiance of Casimir, the son of Kiuprili. It is rather difficult to say whether Casimir's motives are wholly honourable: he believes that Illyria's sceptre demands "a manly hand, a warrior's grasp"; but we also note an inner corruption. The "Prelude" shows the usurper's firm grip on the situation and his unmistakable sway. But Raab Kiuprili's moral idealism and the Queen's prophetic warning carry the necessary assurance that the moral order will be finally restored.

The moral order is restored in Part II. As Coleridge states, between the flight of the king, and the civil war which immediately followed, and in which Emerrick remained the victor, a space of twenty years marks a decisive change in the course of events, but the new direction gathers momentum slowly and almost imperceptibly. The scene of action is shifted from the court to a sylvan mountainous country where the young Andreas, the royal child, grows into his youth, gifted with the qualities of manhood, under the solicitous care of his foster parent old Bathory. He is courageous, courteous and sensitive, tormented by want of identity. His quest and his discovery of his royal origin constitute the central action of the second part of the
play, and the fall of the usurper results as a natural corollary. Several new characters are introduced in this part, and of them Lady Sarolta, wife of Casimir, plays the most significant part. Her role is almost expiatory, and in offering her protection to Glycine, the orphan daughter of Chef Ragozzi, young Andreas (who is known as Bethlen Bathory), and old Bathory, she quickens the pace of the restoration of the moral order. Destiny works itself out in various ways, and if in Act I of the second part we note the emergence of Andreas into manhood, the second Act takes us to a mysterious cave where Zapolya and Kiuprili await in despair and in eager expectancy the dawning of a new day. The reunion of Zapolya and her child in the strange cave marks a decisive moment in the course of the action, and events now take place in quick succession. Emerick's attempt to violate the chaste Sarolta shows how corruption at the political level leads to moral corruption, and we know that his end is imminent. He is finally slain by Casimir, and the wheel comes full circle.

V

In Zapolya Coleridge is not interested in the complex workings of an individual's mind, he is interested in the broad sweep of events, moulded and directed by Destiny. This change in perspective has its bearing on characterization: they are all
instruments in the hands of Providence and they hardly exist for us as individuals having private minds of their own. In his lecture notes on Richard II Coleridge says that in classical tragedy fate is pitted against the individual will; while in the epic, fate overrules the will. In Zapolya, the individual will of characters is submerged in the overall design wrought by a higher benign power, and two characters in particular—Raab Kiuprili and the young Andreas known as Bethlan—serve, as it were, as earthly surrogates of this mighty power. Raab Kiuprili's speeches in the "Prelude" have the effect of deafening thunder:

Was it for this, Illyrians! that I forded Your thaw-swoln torrents, when the shouldering ice Fought with the foe, and stained its jagged points With gore from wounds I felt not? Did the blast Beat on this body, frost-and-famine-numbed, Till my hard flesh distinguished not itself From the insensate mail, its fellow warrior?

(Prelude, i, 152-58)

This brother-blight, this Emeric, as robes Of gold plucked from the images of gods Upon a sacrilegious robber's back.

(Prelude, i, 170-72)
— Mark how the scorpion, falsehood,
Coils round in its perplexity, and fixes
Its sting in its own head!

(Prelude, i, 348-50)

To Bethlen, Raab Kiúrili looks like "some God disguised / In an old warrior's venerable shape / To guard and guide my mother" (Part II, III, i, 83-85). His is a "majestic form" (IV, i, 181); his is a "Voice of command", "a hidden light", (II, i, 196) and he impresses Casimir as "Heaven's immediate minister" (IV, i, 262). Young Andreas' yearning for illumination carries a similar sense of mystery. He was abandoned in the forest by his apparently dying mother and reared up by an old faithful mountaineer. His meeting with Sarolta marks a critical moment in the process of his self-discovery ("I feel and seek the light I cannot see". I, i, 324), and the urgency of his craving for knowledge acquires a symbolic character:

I am rooted to the earth
And have no power to rise! Give me a father!
There is a prayer in those uplifted eyes
That seeks high Heaven! But I will overtake it,
And bring it back, and make it plead for me
In thine own heart! Speak! Speak! Restore to me
A name in the world!

(I, i, 314-19)
The impression that the human agents are ministers of Heaven in the appointed task of cleansing the moral order persists throughout the play. Zapolya is a "star-bright queen" (III, i, 327), a "heroic mother" (IV, i, 359), she is "the light that flashed from Heaven" (III, i, 325). Sarolta is a "Shape from heaven" (I, i, 308) Glycine is an "Angel of mercy" (II, i, 124); Old Bathory too is an "angel" bearing the queen's helpless baby upon his wings (IV, i, 107–8).

VI

In Osorio and Remorse Coleridge is concerned with complex psychological motivations and the moral problem of means and ends. Such psychological sinuosities are markedly absent in Zapolya: the theme is broad, centring on usurpation and reclamation and the characters are drawn in broad outlines. The usurpation of the throne is considered morally evil, and here moral evil takes on a political significance — Coleridge's emphasis being unmistakably on the divine right of the true King. The play has thus a conservative core, but what should interest a modern reader are the hidden layers of meaning, suggested especially by the play's images. The contrast with Remorse is also evident in the approach to evil. In Remorse, Alvar impresses us as an instrument of Destiny, but the play also underlines the decisive
role of the human agent. In Zanolya, the human role is almost superseded by Providence, and this gives the play the character of a Christmas Tale (Coleridge's words in the "Advertisement"). The pressure of anxiety has, however, greater emotional credibility than buoyant faith in a coherently organized moral order.

The emphasis in the play on a benignant moral order, on the final triumph of good over evil, and the theme of discovery, reunion and reclamation link Zanolya with Shakespeare's late work, and Coleridge himself says in the "Advertisement" that his dramatic poem is a "humble imitation of the Winter's Tale of Shakespeare". Coleridge's play shows indeed a certain kinship with the last plays of Shakespeare. In the Tempest, usurpation and the reclamation of the throne constitute one major theme. In Pericles, The Winter's Tale and Cymbeline we see the reunion of parent and child after long years of separation, and this is an important strand in the fabric of the story that Coleridge weaves. A recurrent character in Shakespeare's last plays is the foster-parent who rears up a royal child in a pastoral atmosphere, and Coleridge's old Bathory has evident kinship with Belarius (Cymbeline) and the Old Shepherd in the Winter's Tale. There are several other reminiscences — Emerick's entrance into Sarolta's bed-chamber recalls Iachimo's entrance into the bed-chamber of
Imogen (Cymbeline) and Coleridge's Laska is in someways a counterpart of Shakespeare's Autolycous (The Winter's Tale). But while we note obvious parallelisms, we also note evident contrasts, and the most marked contrast is in the approach to evil. In Shakespeare's final period, says Wilson Knight, "we have a victory for the musical over the tempestuous". Despite the predominance of music, however, the echo of the tumult persists, and characters like Cymbeline's Queen, Iachimo, and Antonio and Sebastian show how enormous the potency of evil is. The picture is darker in the Tempest. The deathbed confession by Cymbeline's Queen and Iachimo's similar repentance seem much too theatrical to be convincing, but the moral change that we note in these characters reinforces the triumph of good. In the Tempest, Antonio and Sebastian are exposed and subdued, but not morally cleansed, and their evil propensity is still menacingly real. The picture is much brighter in Zanolye: the demonstration of poetic justice at the end would have delighted Dr. Johnson, and the usurper's elimination from the scene along with his wicked associates satisfies and reassures our moral self. There are, however, certain lines and expressions in the play that carry a certain moral anxiety, and this moral anxiety counterbalances, to some extent, the triumphant chorus of jubilation.
That the moral order is controlled and directed by a higher power is a recurrent thought in Zapolya. The idea of divine guidance receives an urgency as the action moves towards its inevitable end; but even certain passages of the "Prelude" convey this assurance. As Chef Ragozzi meets the queen in a wooded park, fleeing with an infant in her arms, he exclaims:

Now then the miracle is full!
I see heaven's wisdom is an over-match
For the devil's cunning.

(Prelude, i, 465-67)

And it is this faith in the miracle that gives veracity to Zapolya's grim warning and prophecy:

Thou tyrant's den, be called no more a palace!
The orphan's angel at the throne of heaven
Stands up against thee, and there hover o'er thee
A Queen's, a Mother's, and a Widow's curse.

(Prelude, i, 516-19)
And thou, snatched hence,
Poor friendless fugitive! with mother's waiting,
Offspring of Royal Andreas, shalt return,
With trump and timbrel-clang, and popular shout,
In triumph to the palace of thy fathers!

(Prelude, i, 536-40)

In Part II we find Zapolya and Raab Kiuprili in a horrid cave in rude and savage garments, and they have their moments of poignant despair; but the thought that their present privation and misery are part of a benign dispensation sustains and revitalizes them. They are afflicted with pain and hunger; Zapolya feels a strange faintness stealing over her and wonders whether "Death's lengthening shadow" would overwhelm "Life's setting sun" (II, i, 26-27). This is a moment of near-quiescence, a state akin to death. Raab Kiuprili's comforting words addressed to her in this moment of crisis are something more than mere consolation — they spring from an inward conviction that no misery and heart-break can shake:

Thou darest not doubt that Heaven's especial hand
Worked in those signs. The hour of thy deliverance
Is on the stroke: for misery can not add
Grief to thy griefs, or patience to thy sufference!

(II, i, 51-54)
In defeat, agony and triumph, Zapolya and Raab Kiuprili are guided by this inner light of faith that shines, as it were, with a gem-light flame:

**Zapolya.**

Your behest, High powers,

Lo, I obey! To the appointed spirit,

That hath so long kept watch round this drear cavern,

In fervent faith, Kiuprili, I entrust thee!

**Raab Kiuprili.**

Since Heaven alone can save me,

Heaven alone

Shall be my Trust.

(IV, i, 220-21)

**Zapolya.**

Heaven's work of grace is full!

(IV, i, 340)

**Raab Kiuprili.**

Royal Zapolya!

To the heavenly powers, pay we our duty first;

Who not alone preserved thee, but for thee

And for our country, the one precious branch

Of Andreas' royal house.

(IV, i, 341-45)

The reality of the miracle equally overwhelms young Andreas and he feels that his destiny is part of the great mystery:
Heaven leads me on

(II, i, 172)

The light hath flashed from Heaven, and I must follow it!

(III, i, 325)

VIII

References to Heaven are frequent, and the light of
divine justice radiates a translucent glow:

Doubtless they deem Heaven too usurped!

Heaven's justice

Bought like themselves!

(Prelude, i, 112-13)

By that blest Heaven I gazed at

(I, i, 319)

There is a prayer in those uplifted eyes

That seeks high Heaven!

(I, i, 315-16)

Righteous Heaven

Sent me a daughter once...

(II, i, 137-38)
Oh no, let me not perish
Despairing of Heaven's justice:
(IV, i, 222-23)

O sleepless eye of Heaven!
(III, i, 296)

A flash from Heaven hath touched the hidden incense
(IV, i, 180)

But Heaven is just:
(II, i, 36)

Thou darest not doubt that Heaven's especial hand
Worked in those signs.
(II, i, 51-52)

Instances can be multiplied. Divine light, as G. Wilson Knight says, is entwined with human actions, and the play, to quote Wilson Knight again, "blazes". 

The first stanza of Glycine's song (in Part II, Act II, scene i) underlines the tone and the atmosphere of the play:

A sunny shaft did I behold,
From sky to earth it slanted:
And poised therein a bird so bold —
Sweet bird, thou wert enchanted!
He sank, he rose, he twinkled, he trolled
Within that shaft of sunny mist;
His eyes of fire, his beak of gold,
All else of amethyst!

(II, i, 66-73)

The "sunny shaft" links heaven and earth: The enchanted bird and sparkling sunlight also mediate between the two worlds. Light "streams" (I, i, 418), "the oil of gladness" "glitters" (I, i, 173); "Heaven's lightnings" fall on evil (III, i, 356), and divine justice is as a "vision blazoned on a cloud/By lighting" (IV, i, 166-67). Images of gold are equally recurrent, reinforcing the effect of blazing light: "golden goddess", "golden casket", "hidden gold", "golden chain", "gold plucked from the images of gods", "beak of gold". In consonance with the spirit of the play, Nature and human life form an organic pattern and it is suggested throughout the play that significant human virtues are gifts from Nature.55 "Great Nature hath endowed thee/With her best gifts!" (I, i, 410-11), Sarolta says to Bethlen, and it is significant that Andreas sees himself as a flower coiling forth from a ruin (I, i, 323-24). Human instincts and human values are emanations from Nature and Heaven, (I, i, 374-78) and the supreme ideal to which man aspires is suggested through a conjunction of three images: sword, rose and dove.
Thou sword that leap'dst forth from a bed of roses:
Thou falcon-hearted dove?

(IV, i, 375-76)

The ideal is realized in the character of Glycine.
Innocence, tenderness and courage achieve here a remarkable
fusion. The play also underlines the virtues of disinterested
allegiance and disinterested love and the sanctity of motherhood, and it is suggested that these virtues and values find their
fruition in a haunted cave in a savage wood. The contrast with
Remorse is evident. Here the cave is something positive and
rich, it shows the significance of suffering and guides the
destinies of men leading them to the realm of glory.

The atmosphere is paradisial; the garden of Eden, however,
contains a serpent, and the serpent imagery is equally pervasive
in the play.

The venomous snake! My heel was on its head,
And (fool!) I did not crush it.

(Prelude, i, 60-1)

Mark how the scorpion, falsehood,
Coils round in its own perplexity, and fixes
Its sting in its own head!

(Prelude, i, 348-50)
O rare tune of a tyrant's promises
That can enchant the serpent treachery
From forth its lurking hole in the heart.

(Prelude, i, 452-4)

So looks the statue, in our hall, o' the god,
The shaft just flown that killed the serpent:

(I, i, 258-9)

I dream'd I had met with food beneath a tree,
And I was seeking you, when all at once
My feet became entangled in a net:
Still more entangled as in rage I tore it.
At length I freed myself, had sight of you,
But as I hastened eagerly, again
I found my frame encumbered: a huge serpent
Twined round my chest, but tightest round my throat.

(II, i, 5-12)

The serpent is here, but in the context of the play,
its sting loses much of its venom; all disagreeables evaporate
in the final symphony. Sarolta's concluding speech produces,
however, a different impression. "Scenes so awful", she says,
"With flashing light, force wisdom on us all!" (IV, i, 388-89).
This wisdom is gained through suffering and pain, and the price is heavy. Casimir speaks of his miraculous release from the dreadful curse, but does the miracle convey the necessary assurance?

As I lifted it
Thy blessing did indeed descend upon me;
Dislodging the dread curse. It flew forth from me
And lighted on the tyrant!

(IV, i, 304-7)

IX

... Leave then to Heaven
The work of Heaven: and with a silent spirit,
Sympathize with the powers that work in silence!

(III, i, 100-3)

This is Zapolya's counsel to young Andreas, and in a work that exhibits the mysterious working of divine justice, both stern and benign, evil cannot be menacing, and it is not quite wrong to say that Zapolya shows an insufficient awareness of the potency of evil. In a note to his poem Religious Musings Coleridge writes: "Our evil passions, under the influence of
religion, become innocent, and may be made to animate our virtue." Seen in this perspective, Bmerick's villainy is part of a beneficent design to mould and strengthen the character of young Andreas. Zapolya and Raab Kiuprili suffer, but the suffering is positive and meaningful. In the idyllic mountainous scene, Nature is often fierce, with wolf, tiger and eagle, but this ferocity is counterbalanced by the sweetness of roses, bird-songs, and the "bright blue ether" (I, i, 50). All that is beautiful is not, however, always true, and the picture of a divinely ordained world hardly corresponds to our notion of truth and reality. Coleridge, however, never loses touch with reality even in the tranced moments of moral exultation, and the introduction of the character of Sarolta shows his unique powers of imaginative psychology. She passed her early years in a convent, and she is apparently simple, innocent and inexperienced; but she has almost an intuitive perception of evil, and her husband recognizes this trait in her character.

The traitor, Laska! —

And yet Sarolta, simple, inexperienced,
Could see him as he was, and often warned me.

...  
O surer than Suspicion's hundred eyes
Is that fine sense, which to the pure in heart,
By mere oppugnancy of their own goodness,
Reveals the approach of evil.

(IV, i, 69-71, 78-81)
"Beasts in the shape of men", Sarolta tells Glycine, "are worse than war — wolves" (I, i, 471), and this statement throws light on certain hidden layers of her consciousness. Her moral anxiety is indeed persistent. She is devoted to her husband, but she is keenly alive to his moral guilt, and the word "expiation" has for her a special poignancy:

Long time have I owed
Offerings of expiation for misdeeds
Long past that weigh me down, though innocent!

(I, i, 402-404)

The gnawing consciousness of her husband's misdeeds — Gasimir served as Emerick's accomplice and shared the usurper's guilt — explains her aversion to the royal court which for her is "a cold, drear, colourless void" (I, i, 48), and she prefers the quiet retreat of the valley with its "wild gladsome ministralsy of birds" and "its jewelry of flowers and dew drops" (I, i, 33-4). We have again her revealing soliloquy in Act III, scene 1, when she hears of the death of Glycine. She is perplexed by the paradox of the prosperity of vice and the suffering of the innocent and ponders over the mystery of the divine will:

Is it Mercy's hand, that for the bad man holds
Life's closing gate? —
Still passing thence petitionary Hours
To woo the obdurate spirit to repentance?
Or would this chillness tell me, that there is
Guilt too enormous to be duly punished,
Save by increase of guilt? The Powers of Evil
Are jealous claimants. Guilt too hath its ordeal,
And Hell its own probation!

(III, i, 236-44)

What particularly disturbs her is the fate of Casimir,
and she prays for his soul:

But only,
Only, O merciful in vengeance! let not
That plague turn inward on my Casimir's soul!
Scare thence the fiend Ambition, and restore him
To his own heart! O save him! Save my husband!

(III, i, 255-59)

Sarolta thinks of the dreadful vengeance of Heaven, but
she is also disturbed by the thought that "Vice grows old in
triumph" (III, i, 235). This moral anxiety balances and
buttresses the vision of a benign order. Evil is punished,
justice is finally established; but the triumphant harmony does
not quite silence the hiss of the serpent.
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