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I. THE ROLE OF GERMAN DRAMA IN ENGLISH-GERMAN LITERARY RELATIONSHIPS

A problem of recurring interest has been the literary relationship between Germany and England during the Goethezeit.\(^1\) Of the many facets of this relationship, perhaps the most striking is that there was no real exchange of ideas between the contemporary artistic leaders of the two countries, nor on the popular level. In the few instances where the ideas did flow from one land to the other, it seems that the direction was from Germany into England.\(^2\)

That the drama occupied a central position in the influx of German literature may be easily demonstrated. Only in the fourth decade of the nineteenth century did the English begin to discover the rich and rewarding diversity of the literature of the age just ended in Germany. Before that discovery, which is not yet finished in English-speaking lands, German literature, to the English, had consisted of some Klopstock, some Gessner, Werther, along with a great mass of plays, including The Robbers, Stella, and many of Kotzebue's

---

\(^1\)The chief works concerning the flow from Germany to England are: F. W. Stokoe, German Influence in the English Romantic Period (Cambridge, 1926); Vera Stockley, German Literature as Known in England, 1750-1830 (Cambridge, 1929); Walter F. Schirmer, Der Einfluss der deutschen Literatur auf die englische im 19. Jahrhundert (Halle, 1947); German Literature in British Magazines, 1750-1860, ed. B. Q. Morgan and A. R. Hohlfeld (Madison, 1949), pp. 37-114; and Eudo C. Mason, Die deutsche und englische Romantik (Göttingen, 1959).

\(^2\)Mason, Die deutsche und englische Romantik, presents the case clearly and succinctly.
crowd-pleasers. Drama enjoyed a central position by sheer weight of number, but also by the unique continuity of English interest in German plays. Of all the genres, only drama entered England early, became rapidly well-known, and remained popular throughout the early part of the nineteenth century. German prose, aside from Werther, and German poetry, aside from a few works by Klopstock and Gessner, remained unknown quantities until the second third of the century. Active interest in German drama, on the other hand, is evident as early as 1786 (List of Plays, 4-5). Shortly thereafter, the sensational (The Robbers, Stella) and the sentimental (the works of Kotzebue) brought German drama into England as an active and living force. While some of the plays entered the theatrical repertory, many more works were known as closet-drama to an even larger audience.

Simultaneous with this influx of German drama at the end of the eighteenth century came a turn in England toward markedly conservative moral and political attitudes, brought about largely by the widespread uncertainty concerning the course of the French Revolution under Napoleon. The new and immensely popular foreign drama, especially a play such as The Robbers, provided a ready target for conservative slings and arrows; and through guilt by association, the entire body of German literature was, in some circles, found suspect. As a result of this specifically anti-German feeling and also
of the tensions of war and near-war until 1815, only a small amount of German literature was published in England between 1800 and 1820, with the exception of the dramas which had become so popular at the end of the preceding century. The first decades of the nineteenth century in fact comprise the very period, indeed the only period, when certain German plays entered the repertory of the English theater. As peace returned to Europe, diligent and well-intentioned if not always successful scholars and translators set about transmitting a well-rounded picture of German literature, including drama, to their countrymen. By the middle of the century, when the earlier time-bound plays had all but disappeared from the repertory, all the major works (in all genres) which were known in Germany were at least available in adequate English editions.

While outlines of the course of German literature in England similar to the one just given may be found in a number of studies of the subject, the point of interest here is the role of drama, which has hitherto been either summarily dealt with as a homogeneous part of the larger picture of English-German literary relations, or has been investigated only with regard to the fate of a single work or the works of a single author.\(^3\) On the basis of these latter works and my own work

\(^3\)For example, on Kotzebue, see in the bibliography the investigations by Bahlsen, Sellier, Thompson, Kahn, and Matlaw.
supplementary to them, I propose to show that German drama did in fact play a unique and crucial role in the transmission of German literature to England. At the same time, the role which drama played was not necessarily beneficial, nor was it decisive; for I shall also show that the early reactions, both favorable and unfavorable, to German drama, found their echo even in the period of enlightened criticism which began with Carlyle.

To demonstrate this, I have constructed a picture of the English reception of German drama which is as complete as possible. In the process two approaches to the material were utilized. On the one hand, all available factual information concerning translations and performances was gathered into a List of Plays.⁴ This list, which by its very nature contains a wealth of previously overlooked information, was supplemented by means of reference to the investigations already carried out,⁵ filling in where necessary the gaps in that work.⁶

---

⁴ This list is intended to replace such piece-meal compilations as that in Vera Stockley's outdated but often-quoted German Literature as Known in England, 1750-1830, as well as to supplement the material in A Critical Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation, ed. B. Q. Morgan, 2nd ed. (Stanford, 1938). See the introduction to the List of Plays, below p. 128-130.

⁵ Largely confined to the tracing of German elements in and influence on English writers.

⁶ Chiefly concerning the popular reception of German drama in England.
Since the drama, apart from its illegitimate offspring, the closet-drama, is a genre vulnerable to and dependent on the whims of a fickle audience, it is necessary to devote considerable attention to the actions and reactions of the English audience with regard to German drama. In the case of foreign drama, one must also take careful note of the ways in which the intermediaries and the intellectual elite of the importing country behave toward the new drama. The paradoxical mixture of compatibility and incompatibility between the German drama and the English mind, which is evident on both the popular and the intellectual level, is an indispensable point for the proposed demonstration of fixed, recurring English reactions to German drama.

Also because of the basically popular nature of the theater, any worthwhile discussion of drama of necessity crosses disciplinary boundaries, trespassing most frequently in the general area of psychology and sociology. To what extent one deals with "national characteristics" in dealing with international literary phenomena is obviously a difficult question. One cannot say with any degree of certainty, "This characteristic has been handed down from generation to generation in this country," and then proceed to describe that characteristic in universality acceptable terms. But where in literature, whether national or international, behavior patterns in response to certain stimuli under certain circum-
stances occur which are clearly similar to behavior patterns in response to the same stimuli under analogous conditions a century later, then one must conclude that larger forces are at work, forces which are able to escape esthetic as well as temporal limitations.

English attitudes toward German drama may be best characterized as ambivalent; for in them one finds a mixture composed of warm appreciation and hostile reaction. In this age or that, the proportion of the one or the other may change, but the ambivalence appears to be permanent. By anticipating myself somewhat, let me offer a few examples from the many which I have encountered.

The English reaction to *Die Räuber* developed roughly along these lines: 1788, first review filled with praise, some doubts expressed about the extreme sentiments in the play; 1792, first translation, followed by others; 1792-1800, great interest in the work, a source of inspiration for the Romantics, the play achieves notoriety among the general public; 1798, *The Rovers*, a highly literate parody, is published; in the years around the turn of the century, numerous attacks, mostly of an irrational kind, are made on the play and others thought to be like it (*Stella*, *Götz*, even *Nathan*); the early 1800's, the play continues to be a source of inspiration--to the young Byron, for example; 1825, Carlyle's critical biography of Schiller is published, the youthful excesses of
Die Räuber are, because of the poet's later development, forgiven; in the following years, the rapidly expanding English appreciation of Schiller does not include the play.\footnote{See pp. 33-36, 37-40, 67-69}

The ambivalence can also be seen in the reception of \textit{Faust I}. Partially translated in 1823, a decade passed before anything like a complete translation was published. It was then another fifteen years before an accurate translation appeared. Although again a source of inspiration for the later Romantics, the English version of Goethe's play was quite different from the German \textit{Faust}, both for the poets and for the public. The play was extremely popular among the reading public, but the most widely-read version until the end of the nineteenth century was not so much a translation as a poem inspired by the reading of the original.\footnote{See pp. 112-113}

The most convincing indication of the ambivalence is this: of all the persons involved in these hundred years in the transmission of German drama to the English, not one exhibits a sustained interest in the task. Without exception, each shows first great interest in the literature, busies himself with translation or interpretation, then loses interest and turns away. This is the case with all the intermediaries, from Mackenzie in 1788 to Carlyle in the 1820's. If one could
explain away the English rejection of Die Räuber by placing
the blame on a supposedly unsophisticated reading public,
the task of delineating and explaining the fate of German
drama in England would be a relatively easy one. That the
ambivalence is also to be observed in the intellectual elite,
whose members were after all responsible for transmitting
the plays, enormously complicates the problem. How, to give
one final example, is one to explain the public expression of
regret made by the first translator of Die Räuber some eight
years after his translation appeared? It is this universal
aspect of the ambivalence which I have in mind when I say the
problem exceeds mere esthetic boundaries.

In this scarcely explored field, one must follow the
clues, wherever they may lead. Again and again they have led
me to the conclusion that the literatures of the two nations,
England and Germany, are to a rather great extent simply in-
compatible. To just what extent will begin to become apparent
as we look into the nature of the English theater.

---

9 See p. 40.
II. THE STATE OF THE ENGLISH THEATER: 1750-1850

Since the early eighteenth century, the theater in England had not witnessed within its confines the practice of high art, nor had England for that matter produced a writer capable of an extended and successful confrontation with the limitations and hidden promise of the dramatic form.¹

By 1800 the theaters had in fact developed into what amounted to one of the first systems for mass escapism. This development was brought about as the result of a new, expanding and largely traditionless middle-class which, exposed for the first time to the often boring and tedious novelty of idle hours, furnished a ready-made audience for low-quality, escapist drama. It was an audience ripe for theatrical exploitation. Thus, the English theatrical system, being an almost wholly commercial undertaking and hence of necessity acutely sensitive to the needs of the audiences, gradually during the eighteenth century became an arena devoted to popular appeal, hyper-responsive to the whims and fancies of the burgeoning middle-class audience.

At the same time, the theaters suffered greatly from the stupefying artistic limitations imposed by such a system. That the new leisure was enjoyed by more and more as economic

prosperity spread farther and farther down the social scale is shown by the rapid growth of the provincial theaters. By the end of the century, every town of any size had its own theater. Since the new provincial theaters were likewise commercial undertakings, they suffered from the same limitations as did the London theaters. Never innovating, they only reflected the taste which was set by the two largest of the three London theaters licensed for the presentation of drama, Drury Lane and Covent Garden.

Furthermore, innovation and experimentation in the London theaters themselves were discouraged not only by the strictly commercial nature of the theaters. Of greater significance for London and the rest of the country was the fact that the theaters were under the direct control of the government. As a result of the Licensing Act of 1737, the government, through the office of the Lord Chamberlain, was empowered to regulate drama in two ways. Not only was the government henceforth able to suppress drama by limiting its public performance in London to three theaters (Drury Lane and Covent Garden in the winter season, extending from September to July, and the Little Theater in the Haymarket, active from June through August); worse yet, every play to be presented there had to be submitted for approval by the Lord Chamberlain and thus was subject,

---

whenever deemed necessary, to censorship by him.

In the hands of an exceptional individual the powers of such an office can be exercised with discretion and thoughtful judgment, if not always perfunctorily (as is the case in England today). Dominating the period which interests us here was John Larpent, Lord Chamberlain from 1778 until his death in 1824. Larpent hardly possessed those qualities one might wish for in a censor. Although he was not without skill in the area of arbitration between playhouse owners and players, his handling of the plays submitted for his approval left much to be desired. Although paid 400 pounds a year plus two guineas for every play licensed, Larpent apparently was lax both in his reading duties and in his exercise of impartial critical judgment as well. One contemporary remarked that "...according to Mr. Larpent, an author may take what liberties he pleases with the scriptures, provided he takes none with the Methodists."

With these external limitations in mind, we now turn to the nature, at that time, of the three entities involved in

---

3 J. Genest, Some Account of the English Stage, from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830, VII(Bath, 1832), 482-85.
4 Genest, VIII, 404.
the theatrical experience: the actors, the audience, and the playwrights.

In retrospect, the actors undoubtedly discharged their artistic obligations more fully, more conscientiously, and certainly with greater élan than did the other two groups involved. Two significant, interrelated developments concerning the actors occurred during the period, 1750-1850. A new style of acting emerged as a result of the cavernous theaters which the proprietors erected to accommodate the money-bearing masses. This new method, typified by a grandiose rhetoric, was not unlike that employed by the emoting tenor today. In the vastness of New Drury Lane, Macbeth had to die both grandly and loudly if the gallery was to get the point. The period also saw the birth of the

---

7 New Drury Lane opened in 1792 with an auditorium to seat 3600; Covent Garden expanded in 1787 and again in 1792.

8 Cf. the remarks of George Colman the younger in New Hay at the Old Market (London, 1795), p. 32:

Since the preference, we know,  
Is for pageantry and shew,  
'Twere a pity the publick to balk—  
And when people appear  
Quite unable to hear,  
'Tis undoubtedly needless to talk.  
Let your Shakespeares and Jonsons go hang, go hang!  
Let your Otways and Drydens go drown!  
Give us but Elephants, and white Bulls enough,  
And we'll take all the town.

Or if, tardily, the sound  
Travels all the house around,
star-system in the English theater. One did not attend the theater to see Macbeth die so much as one went to see and hear Kemble, Cooke, or Kean expire. On the whole, the actors practiced their trade with competence, particularly in London, for all the performers, from the stars downward, had to prove their ability in the provinces before mounting the stage in London.

The audience, increased in size by the expanding middle-class, remained universal in scope as it has been traditionally in England. Drawing on all classes as it did, the audience in its reactions was a mirror of popular attitudes and tastes. Like any large group, this audience was fickle; and to generalize about its characteristics over any long period of time is hazardous. Three characteristics do become evident in the response to German drama, a certain sensibility, morality and patriotism; which is not to say that the English audience retained and displayed strongly moral or patriotic qualities every night or even every year from 1750 to 1850. It is rather only to point out that from time to time the viewers were capable of forthright responses which may be labeled thus.

In contrast to the inconstant display of these qualities

'Twixt the action and the words there's a breach:
   And it seems as if Macbeth,
   Half a minute after death
On his back, made his last dying speech,
Let your Shakespeares and Jonsons go hang, go hang, etc.
is the much more consistent, almost calloused insensitivity and blatant immorality revealed within the audience itself until well into the nineteenth century. The theaters, at least in London, were virtually home territory for a small army of prostitutes; and it was an accepted fact that the boxes themselves were the usual place for the plying if not the practice of the trade.  

Concerning the plays and their authors, the dramatic forms of the earlier part of the eighteenth century as well as those of earlier centuries continued to hold the stage. Shakespeare had survived the defiling revisions of Bowdler et al.; the genteel classical restraint of Augustanism remained an occasionally visible if not a dominating force. Furthermore, the troublesome and persistent spectre of bourgeois art was also present, had indeed been present since George Barnwell showed middle-class London its own portrait in 1731 in *The Merchant of London*.

As important artistically as the rise of the bourgeois viewpoint was the gradual emergence of the much less readily definable phenomenon of Romanticism. While the paths opened by the Earle of Shaftesbury, Macpherson, Rousseau, Thomson, and Young both evinced the emergence of this new and highly individualistic poetry and encouraged its further development, it remained just that in England: new and highly individualistic poetry. To be sure, as the movement developed,
it eventually engaged the attention of prose writers as well. Apart from the sub-genres of gothic melodrama, and the closet drama, itself a sub-genre of poetry, Romanticism made no inroads in the English theater until much later in the nineteenth century.¹⁰

Most significant is the early loss of the productivity of the most promising dramatic talent of the age, Richard Brinsley Sheridan. After the early success of The Rivals (1775) and The School for Scandal (1777), both of which showed evidence of the new age through attacks upon its sentimental representatives, Sheridan lost himself in the more secular aspects of the theater, becoming producer and director at Drury Lane, to say nothing of his lively political activities.

Otherwise, in spite of the great demand for drama, it is an age of writers who hardly deserve to be called dramatists. The names, Cumberland, Holman, Holcroft, Inchbald, Planché, are meaningful only to the specialist. Again, it is hazardous to generalize about the nature of the plays which were turned out in great quantities for the mass market. That these forgotten writers were not prolific is one charge which cannot be made against them. Toward the end of the eighteenth century, the Drury Lane repertory consisted of a number of sentimental pieces, various comedies, a smattering

of Shakespeare, melodramas, farces, a few historical plays, an occasional Augustan tragedy, and numerous spectacles. By 1830 the typical season's offerings had changed little; the number of sentimental plays decreased somewhat while the number of historical works increased considerably, largely as a result of the popularity of the Waverly novels.\textsuperscript{11}

Just how many new plays were being performed may be seen if we examine a particular season's offerings in detail. Taking the season, 1807-08, as an example, we find that Drury Lane offered fifty-seven different plays and forty-seven after-pieces, while Covent Garden presented sixty-six different plays and forty-five after-pieces. Of these, twenty were the same. More important, with the exception of no more than ten works, they were plays by English writers. In this season, seven new plays and four new after-pieces appeared at Drury Lane, while four new plays and five new after-pieces appeared at Covent Garden.\textsuperscript{12}

That there was a dearth of original, English plays of the first order is, unfortunately, not to be denied. Since such a situation is an indictment both of the times and of the poets, the theaters, and the audiences of the times, one must seek some reason, if not some justification for the situation.

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. the listings of performances in Genest, VIII and IX.

\textsuperscript{12} Listed by James Plumptre, Four Discourses on Subjects Relating to the Amusement of the Stage (Cambridge, 1809), p. 225.
The problem is particularly significant with regard to the failure of German drama in England for two reasons. One, the German theater of the Goethezeit was a place where high art was practiced and a place for which drama of the first order was being created. Two, this period also embraces in England some of the ablest, most gifted literary minds which the West has produced, minds fully capable of successful confrontation with the demands of art. Here we encounter a seeming contradiction. The English Romantic poets, almost without exception, were for a time interested in the drama and its unique problems and potentialities; each tried his hand at drama; and each failed, more or less spectacularly. Coleridge had his Osorio and his Remorse; Byron his Werner, Manfred, and others; Wordsworth his Borderers; Shelley his Cenci and others; and each failed in the theater of the day. The failure of Coleridge and Wordsworth is particularly significant, since their interest in drama coincided with the years which were crucial for German drama in England, that is, the period around 1800. Where they might have performed important roles as

---

13 The problem of the English Romantic poets and the theater has not been fully investigated. Allardyce Nicoll, British Drama, pp. 299-300, blames the failure of the Romantic poets in the theater on their lack of the common touch, which is a weak contention at best. The Lyrical Ballads are proof enough of the presence of the common touch. Ernest Bernbaum, Guide through the Romantic Movement, 2nd ed. (New York, 1949), discusses the various attempts at drama but avoids the larger question of the Romantic attitudes toward the theater.
intermediaries between the German and English theaters, especially in view of the fact that they had just returned from Germany, they turned rather to the more personal expression of lyric poetry.

The failure of Coleridge and Wordsworth (and the later English Romantics) to develop a lasting appreciation for the German drama which they so warmly greeted at the outset may be explained by the differing courses followed by English and German literatures at the end of the eighteenth century. In the early stages of the Romantic movement (Sturm und Drang in Germany, the early poetry of Coleridge and Wordsworth in England), the two literatures bear marked similarities in tone if not in content. We see in the plays and poetry of the Geniezeit a pouring forth of emotion which differs mainly in quantity from the sentiments of the Lyrical Ballads. This sincere expression of heartfelt emotion (as contrasted with the tear-laden, superficially sentimental English plays of the day) was the quality which appealed to the English Romantics as they read the plays of Goethe and Schiller. That this free expression of the free mind and not the outpouring of revolutionary grievances was the chief attraction is nowhere better illustrated than in Coleridge's sonnet, "To the Author of the Robbers":

Ah! Bard tremendous in sublimity!  
Could I behold thee in thy loftier mood  
Wandering at eve with finely-frenzied eye
Beneath some vast old tempest-swinging wood!  
Awhile with mute awe gazing I would brood:  
Then weep aloud in a wild ecstasy!^{14}

After the youthful immoderation of the *Sturm und Drang*, Goethe and Schiller recognized the artistic and psychological dangers of the "finely-frenzied eye" and the "wild ecstasy", as did Coleridge and Wordsworth in England. In Germany, a new generation appeared, the Romantic School proper, which then followed the liberated heart to the ends of the subjective universe; for this movement, there was no counterpart in England. Restraint became the means to the end of artistic expression for the Romantic poets in England as well as for the older generation in Germany. Wordsworth, as early as 1798, avers:

...That time is past,  
And all its aching joys are now no more,  
And all its dizzy raptures. Not for this  
Faint I, nor mourn nor murmur; other gifts  
Have followed; for such loss, I would believe,  
Abundant recompense....^{15}

And Goethe, who had undergone a similar change in outlook some time earlier, summarized his position thus in 1802:


Implicit here is an uncompromising dedication to the principles of high art. To practice high art was no less the aim of Coleridge and Wordsworth than of Goethe and Schiller. Whereas the poet and the novelist can confront and come to terms with the muse in solitude, the dramatist is lost, mute, and doomed if he does not have a theater and an audience. In Germany, at least some of the theaters of the patrons were open to the high art of the new classicism. But in England, the popular, commercial theaters could only present what pleased the audiences; and what pleased them was drama which aroused tears of sorrow or shudders of dread, the very emotions which were remembered but no longer celebrated by the Romantic poets. No wonder they turned from drama.

Two other factors were involved in their disenchantment with the theater, one artistic and one social. Shakespeare, the great, new stimulus for the Germans, was rather a discouragement for the English poets, since it seemed to them that Shakespeare had fully exploited the potential of the stage. Thus their revolution in esthetics in 1798 concerned itself only with lyric poetry.

16 Weimarer Ausgabe, Section 1, IV (Weimar, 1891), 129.
Socially, there was no revolution in England. In the comparatively open and unified English society the need for change was publicly recognized and, apart from the effects of occasional geographically restricted uprisings, proceeded by due process of law. Thus the powerful revolutionary impulses which found release in the early plays of Goethe and Schiller had no real counterparts in England. While the German Revolution sputtered and had countless false starts and showed innumerable symptoms of its presence (one being some of the Sturm und Drang plays), social change in England proceeded by evolution and did not move into the public arena of the theater.

One other factor remains to be considered which from the beginning has colored the literary relations of the Anglo-American and German nations. This factor and its effects are more easily described than named, for its manifestations are startlingly diverse. It is at work in the blasphemy and violence of Die Räuber, the tolerance of Nathan der Weise, the polygamy of Stella, the cosmic struggle of Faust. In English Romantic literature, for whatever reason, one finds only a trace here and there, in the supernatural elements in

17Nathan, an eminently rational work if ever there was one, is mentioned because of the English reaction to it. It seemed overdone, carried to an extreme; to the Englishman, Lessing was belaboring the obvious. See pp. 42-43.
Scott, perhaps in Byron's *Cain* and *Manfred*. One is tempted, for want of a better name, to call it the demonic: the artist, as if possessed, pursues his muse beyond the limits of rationality. That the Anglo-American literary mind, with a few notable exceptions such as Shakespeare and Poe, has not indulged its own darker urges nor explored its more remote realms as has the German, is indicative of the source of the futile or only half-successful communication between the two language groups. As pointed out before, this difficulty in communicating is best delineated in the fate of German drama in England.
III. THE FIRST PERIOD OF GERMAN DRAMA
IN ENGLAND: 1750-1798

It will not be necessary here to inquire into the broader, already much-discussed problem of the early course of German literature in England,\(^1\) since my chief concern is with the fate of the acted drama. Generally, a printed play will be considered only in one of three cases: first, if the play had a direct effect, positive or negative, on acted German drama; second, if the play was an extremely poor translation which gained wide popularity; third, if the play was one of the rare, first-rate translations.

Perhaps the choice and arrangement of these criteria require some comment. To justify the emphasis on performance, one need only observe that drama is after all one of the living arts. The printed play is not unlike the musical score: on the printed page, a drama is merely a guide-book, a map, which at that is comprehensible only to the expert map-reader. Earlier studies of German drama in England have by and large been concerned with only printed drama (cf. the works cited in note 1) and have thus left a sizable portion of the problem uninvestigated. Not that the numerous printings of German

---

plays had no effect on the course of German drama in England; that was by no means the case. As it turned out, that which we today think of as German drama was an abysmal failure on the English stage, while a few, now forgotten plays enjoyed great success. Since this success on the stage was partly determined by the response to certain printed plays, obviously those must be taken into account. In a word, where earlier investigations have relied almost solely on the fate of German drama in print, this investigation, itself partially based on the results of those studies, is intended to offer a more complete view through the consideration of the vital factor of the drama in the theater.

To establish a scale of values for the criticism of the translations, both printed and performed, this much must be said. For some centuries now, the nations of the world have been living with for the most part mediocre translations of one another's literature. However deplorable that situation is, it is nonetheless a fact of life. If a critic seeks to blame international literary misunderstandings on deficient translations, we may admire the critic's idealism and perhaps envy him his rose-colored spectacles. We also lament his faulty sense of values. On all levels of literature in all genres, the mediocre translation is the rule, not the exception. To dwell, for example, on the numerous, well-nigh infinite faults to be found in the English Schiller translations is to
indulge in idle shelf-cluttering. Likewise, outstandingly bad translations, themselves hardly rareties, have no value except in their relative abundance at any given time. Only when a particularly bad translation gains undeserved prominence may one justifiably speak of, examine, and dissect the monstrosity to see what caused its success. Finally, the value of the response to the infrequent good translation, performed or unperformed, is, I believe, self-evident.

1. Knowledge of German and the Early Translations: 1750-1787

A number of factors controlled the intensity and rate of increase of the English interest in German literature in the second half of the eighteenth century. Among those responsible for the stimulation of interest are the German influence in the English court, the presence of German soldiers in England and the like. Far more important was to be the general disenchantment with the French and things French which was a result of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. By the mention of these factors, the obvious should not be overlooked, namely that the chief stimulus lay in the appearance in Germany of literature which, for the first time in a number of centuries, was worthy of perusal by foreign nations.

Acting as a hindrance to these stimuli was the virtually universal lack of knowledge of the German language. Even
though the number of teachers of German was increasing rapidly toward the end of the century, the quality of instruction was not of the highest kind. R. P. Gillies relates the following anecdote in his *Memoirs of a Literary Veteran* regarding his early attempts to locate a German teacher in Edinburgh around the turn of the century. He says he was directed to one James Pierard, "a Frenchman, who undertook to give lessons because he had sojourned many years at a German residenz, but unluckily, without acquiring the language which he professed to teach. 'I have von German book,' said he at our first inter-
view- 'Le voilà! mais il faut avouer, - dere are some sentences vich I do not understand!'" The anecdote is especially per-
tinent in that it reveals both ignorance of German and know-
ledge of French, the one condition about as widespread at that
time as the other.

Still, from 1750 to 1780 it gradually became evident to the English that the German muse was at least stirring, if not awakening. Gessner and Klopstock were already well-known by

---


4 It was in fact through the French that German drama made the first significant inroads in England. See p. 27; also Robert Alan Charles, "French Mediation and Intermediaries; 1750-1815," *Anglo-German and American-German Crosscurrents*, I (1957), 1-38.
1779; The Death of Abel and the Idylls of Gessner as well as Klopstock's Messiah found and retained a large English audience until the early nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{5} Werther, translated from the French, entered England in 1779 and was as popular there as elsewhere, with the result that well into the next century, Goethe was known as "the author of Werther."

As was repeatedly the case until the rise of enlightened criticism, this early interest in German literature was sporadic and as often misdirected as not.\textsuperscript{7} Knowledge concerning what was happening in all the genres in German was spotty at best. In drama, the first Sturm und Drang work was not translated until 1792 (Die Räuber), even then coming into England indirectly by way of a French translation.\textsuperscript{8} In fact, the first German play, if we may call it that because of its origin, was Sylla (List of Plays, 1), a bauble written in French by Frederick the Great and translated in 1753. This and a translation of Klopstock's Der Tod Adams (List of Plays, 2) constitute the total English exposure to German drama in the

\textsuperscript{5}See A Critical Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation, ed. B. W. Morgan, 2nd ed. (Stanford, 1938), entries under Gessner and Klopstock.


\textsuperscript{7}As may be seen in the entries for the years before 1798 in German Literature in British Magazines.

\textsuperscript{8}See pp. 33-36, 37-40.
three decades between 1750 and 1780.

Three of Lessing's plays were translated in the 1780's, none of them a result of a realization of the importance of German drama. One, Nathan the Wise (List, 3) by R. E. Raspe, the author of the Baron Münchhausen stories, came into existence only by chance. The translator had taken refuge in England after he found it prudent to flee his homeland because of items missing from the museum in his charge at Kassel.  

9 Another, Henry Maty's extracts from Emilia Galotti (4), although showing enthusiasm for Lessing, are hardly suggestive of the power of the original. The third play, James Johnston's adaptation of Minna von Barnhelm (6), was performed eleven times at the Haymarket in the summer of 1786 and after being printed in the same year was forgotten. Furthermore, while Maty may have worked from a French translation, there is no doubt that Johnston based his play on a French version.  
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2. The Problem of Intermediaries

The introduction of a new, foreign literature into a country is a phenomenon which proceeds on a large scale; it is the mingling of two not necessarily wholly compatible cul-


tures. Thus on the one hand we are dealing with the response of a mass of people to a new system of thought, to new artistic or pseudo-artistic viewpoints. On the other, we must account for the reactions and influence of a small number of poets and critics who presumably had, or should have had a better-rounded and deeper understanding of the new literature. It is too easy, in an investigation of the importation of a literature, to overestimate the importance of the role of this latter group, the so-called intermediaries. It is too easy to study their attempts at transmitting the new literature, their comments and their translations, and then consider the subject exhausted. Where a body of valuable literature suddenly appears in a land which for centuries has been barren literarily, as was the case in Germany in the last half of the eighteenth century, and where that country is as closely situated geographically to other cultural lands as was Germany, then the new literature is perforce going to make its way into those other lands. The process may be accelerated or retarded only somewhat by the actions of individuals or nations. The proximity of the nations involved and the commercial and artistic intercourse between all nations make the transmission of the literature inevitable. A complete picture of the process requires that attention be given to the flux of popular opinion as well as to the changing attitudes of the intellectual elite.
Especially in the case of drama is the popular reception important, for it is, after all, that amorphous and heterogeneous body, the audience, which passes effective judgment on that which it sees and hears. For that reason, one oversteps the boundaries of sound judgment if one attempts to attribute the success or failure of a play or group of plays to the words and deeds of one critic or one intermediary.

To be sure, in certain times and certain places, the critic may briefly obtain dictatorial powers; even then he operates within limits set by the reaction of the audience between the opening and closing of the curtains. A situation of total ignorance about a group of foreign plays is a somewhat different case, in which the judicious intermediary may well serve the useful function of transmitting the plays, serving them up, so to speak, to the populace for their judgment. Furthermore, if the intermediary is skillful and knowledgeable he may also succeed in directing and concentrating the attention of the populace on the worthwhile works. That the intermediary himself for one reason or another may have a false picture of the relative value of the works being transmitted is a weakness and danger inherent in such a system for the transmission of literature.

In the introduction of German drama into England, five intermediaries were involved: Henry Mackenzie, active between 1788 and 1792; William Taylor, active from 1790 to ca. 1818;
R. B. Sheridan in 1798 and 1799; Madame de Staël in 1813; and Thomas Carlyle from 1822 to 1830. This is not to imply that each rendered a service of equal value; nor is it to say that there were no other intermediaries who played a role in the spread of German plays. These five, whatever the present value of their work, at the time they were active, played decisive roles, whether they determined the course of English consideration of German drama (as Mackenzie, Taylor, de Staël, and Carlyle did) or reflected and stimulated the prevailing tastes (as Sheridan did).

Apart from their common association with German drama, these five markedly different persons shared one other characteristic. Each of them lost interest in things German after a longer or shorter period of activity. Mackenzie dropped from the picture after publishing a collection of translations in 1792 (15). Taylor lost interest around 1818.\(^{11}\) Sheridan's interest ended around 1800. Madame de Staël's germanophilic tendencies ceased with the publication of *De l'Allemagne* in 1813. Even Carlyle's interest, certainly the deepest and most sincere, waned with the death of Goethe and his own independent

\(^{11}\) The late date of publication of Taylor's *Historic Survey of German Poetry*, 1828-30, is deceptive. It was not a new work, but only a pasting together of old articles and reviews, written for the most part between 1790 and 1810. Taylor undertook the work near the end of his life not from any enthusiasm for German literature but because he needed the money which might be forthcoming from such a work.
intellectual growth. Although various students of German literature in England have noted that the interest in things German of this intermediary or that was chronologically restricted, none of the commentators has perceived the fact that the intermediaries all shared this syndrome. As indicated earlier, this loss of interest in the work which each undertook initially with almost missionary-like zeal is indicative of the barrier, which is yet to be fully penetrated, between the literatures of the two nations.

3. The First Intermediary and Schiller

Henry Mackenzie had been directed to German drama by articles on German drama which had appeared in 1786 and 1787 and particularly by the appearance in England of two French collections of German plays. By his own admission, his lecture on German drama before the Royal Society of Edinburgh

12 The articles were, "The German Drama," European Magazine, X(1786), 115ff.; and a note on the "Remarkable Effect Produced by the Representation of a Tragedy in Germany," Edinburgh Magazine, VI(1787), 225. The two French editions were, Friedel and Bonneville, Le nouveau Theatre allemand (Paris, 1782-85); and Junker and Liebault, Le Theatre allemand (Paris, 1785). They were reviewed in the Monthly Review, LXXIV(1786), 503-06.


in 1788 was based on his reading of the French collections.

Although the author of one widely-read sentimental novel, *The Man of Feeling* (1771), Mackenzie was not a literary figure of the first rank. Thus the possible extent of the influence of his comments on German drama should not be over-estimated. Not surprisingly, his style and manner of thought and expression exhibit that ingratiating gift of the eighteenth century critic by which he says a little in a great many words, only now and then to startle, as it were, to awaken the reader with an exceptionally well-turned phrase which reveals true insight, sometimes, it seems, accomplishing this feat involuntarily. Certainly the chief importance of the lecture lies in the fact that it was rather widely available in print, and in the fact that the enthusiastic remarks contained in it acted as a stimulus to the study of German drama.

In French Mackenzie had read *Minna von Barnhelm*, *Emilia Galotti*, *Götz von Berlichingen*, *Clavigo*, *Stella*, *Die Räuber*, and *Der Gasthof* by J. C. Brandes. About Lessing he says very little in many words; the larger significance of

---

Goethe escapes him completely; Brandes is harmless.

In contrast to this meaningless piling on of words is his enthusiastic reaction to Les Voleurs. Here we meet, in this initial encounter between an intelligent English mind and German drama, sentiments and attitudes which for the remainder of the period under discussion will be voiced again and again, at times more rationally and with greater restraint, at times irrationally and without restraint. Die Räuber even today is powerful theater; while reading it, the Man of Feeling, in a word, felt. His forthright comments on the play come as a breath of fresh air after his handling of Lessing and Goethe. The language of Die Räuber is, he says, "in the highest degree, eloquent, impassioned and sublime." A detailed plot summary is interspersed with enthusiastic remarks, concluding with the observation that "no modern poet seems to possess power so capable of bending the mind before him, of rousing its feelings by the elevation of his sentiments, or of thrilling them with the terrors of his imagination.""
Schiller certainly seems to receive his due here, even judged by the standards Mackenzie uses. But there is more yet. Unfortunately, the play "covers the natural deformity of criminal actions with the veil of high sentiment and virtuous feeling, and thus separates...the moral sense from that morality which it ought to produce."\textsuperscript{20} We cannot say that this statement reflects an inability or a failure on Mackenzie's part to judge the work by esthetic standards. In fact, he was doing just that. The difficulty, and thus the concluding remark just quoted, arises from the fact that he was passing judgment on the basis of dramatic standards acceptable in England in 1788. Mackenzie is by no means to blame for his error, for he knew nothing of that which was transpiring on the continent in the German theater. He was at least attempting to judge the work on an esthetic basis. The Robbers, with its youthful vigor and lack of subtlety, when released to the English public in 1792 and fed to a less gifted horde of critics, could hardly meet with even that less than happy reception accorded it by Mackenzie. Faced with a work so powerful and so different from anything seen on the English stage in centuries, the public and the critics could only respond defensively, on those very social, religious, and political bases which the play and others like it seemed to threaten.

\textsuperscript{20}Transactions, p. 192.
It cannot be correctly said that the seed of the failure of German drama in England is thus sown, since that statement necessitates the placing of blame somewhere on some person or persons. Mackenzie's reaction to Les Voleurs does not cause, but rather merely anticipates future reactions.

4. The First Stirrings of Real Interest: 1788-1798

In the decade leading up to the virtual explosion of English enthusiasm for (some) German drama, three lines of development may be traced. Though not totally independent of one another, each exhibits certain unique qualities. One consists of the translations directly attributable to Mackenzie's lecture. The second is the appearance of a new figure, independent of the happenings in Edinburgh but exercising some influence over Scottish developments in the future, namely William Taylor of Norwich, who in some respects was the first popular, in others the first real artistic intermediary. Third, there is the gradual growth of largely undirected popular interest in German drama. Obviously, the efforts of these early translators and the growth of popular interest are not only chronologically simultaneous but also causally interrelated. For the sake of clarity, it is necessary to discuss each in turn, bearing in mind their interdependence.
The first translation directly attributable to the influence of Mackenzie's lecture was Alexander Fraser Tytler's *The Robbers* (14) in 1792. In view of the notoriety which this work rapidly attained, the ignorance of later commentators concerning Tytler is astonishing. 21 Only two facts are known and repeated: one, that Tytler was a member of the Royal Society of Edinburgh and thus most likely heard or read Mackenzie's lecture; two, that he published a translation of *Die Räuber* in 1792 which was subsequently reprinted three times (26, 35, 151). Unwilling to be satisfied with this meager information about a translation which is one of the most influential of all, I found that the translator's relationship to German language and drama was perhaps not as straightforward as it has appeared, that he in fact may well have worked from a French source, as will be shown below.

By trade, Tytler (1747-1814) was a lawyer, who later held a high position, as Lord Woodhouselee, in the Scottish judiciary and gained some fame as a historian. 22 In addition he had active literary interests throughout his life. His most successful work was an *Essay on the Principles of Translation*,


read before the Royal Society in 1790 and first printed in 1791. By 1818 it had passed through five editions.  

The Essay, which is replete with examples of translation from Latin, Greek, Spanish, and French, is significant for Tytler's relations with German because of the fact that there is in it no mention of the German language or of a German work. In view of the enthusiasm with which, according to Tytler himself, he undertook the translation of Die Räuber hardly a year after the Essay, I suggest that either Tytler's study of German was just beginning when he wrote the Essay, or had not begun at all. If Tytler's enthusiasm was genuine, and the vigorous translation certainly indicates that it was, then it is difficult to understand why he would leave out references to the German.

Three possible explanations offer themselves. One is: Tytler did not know German at the time of the composition of the Essay. If this is the case, then one must conclude that his translation of Schiller was largely based on the French edition of Friedel and De Bonneville, the existence of which

---


he mentions in the preface to The Robbers. A comparison of his translation with that French edition, which was not available to me, might shed further light on the problem.

Another possible reason for there having been no mention of German in the Essay is that German was not at that time one of the recognized literary languages of Europe. The third possibility is indirectly connected to that. Tytler published The Robbers anonymously; thus it is possible he refrained from mentioning in the Essay his work in German simply because he did not wish it known.

Adding to the confusion is the undocumented statement of one scholar to the effect that Tytler was a member of the beginners' German class in Edinburgh to which Scott belonged and which was founded late in 1792. If this was the case, then it is even more astonishing that he was able to render a German play so rapidly. Another unclarified aspect of Tytler's Robbers is the German edition he is supposed to have used. He mentions a volume containing Die Räuber, Fiesko, and Kabale und

25 The Robbers, p. xviii.

26 Willoughby, p. 297. J. G. Lockhart, Memoirs of Sir Walter Scott, I (London, 1914), 174, does not mention Tytler as a member of this class; neither does he specifically exclude him. Stokoe, p. 61, assumes on the basis of the publication of The Robbers in 1792 that Tytler would not have attended a beginners' class.
Liebe, printed at "Manheim" in 1786. If such an edition exists records of it have been lost.  

Whatever its source, the success of Tytler's translation is not to be denied. Not only did it enjoy a moderate popular success but it also served to introduce Scott and Coleridge to German drama. The popular success of the play smacked more of notoriety than real success. In fact, the unfavorable reputation of the play far exceeded the relatively modest commercial success of its four editions and even caused a change in heart on the part of Tytler who, in 1800, in the fourth edition expressed misgivings about the moral value of The Robbers in particular and German drama in general. The expression of that sentiment by a man of Tytler's learning and at that late date, by which time the nature of Schiller's later dramatic activity was known to several of the literary elite of England, is a clear-cut example of the syndrome which I pointed out earlier: youthful enthusiasm, followed by mature reflection, then rejection.

---


28 Lockhart, I, 176.


Also a direct result of Mackenzie's lecture was the stimulation of Scott's interest in German drama and his various attempts at translation which culminated in the abortive and embarrassing Goetz of Berlichingen in 1799 (66). Goetz fortunately appeared at a time when the English were interested in another kind of German drama and was noted only in passing by the critics.32

5. The Second Intermediary

William Taylor of Norwich was one of those recurrent, peripheral figures of English literature who know almost everyone worth knowing and who, by means of a modest talent, enjoy a modest fame among their contemporaries. Taylor is important as an intermediary more as a result of his being virtually the only person at that time in England who could claim some direct knowledge of German than because of the quality of his work.33 He possessed the tools but not the


33. G. Herzfeld, "William Taylor von Norwich," Studien zur englischen Philologie, II(1897), 12, praises Taylor's work both as translator and critic, as does Stokoe, p. 38ff.
ability to play a significant role; he is the first English literary figure who had lived in Germany (1782-83) and mastered the language. Although Taylor was instrumental in the transmission of the German ballad, especially Bürger's "Leonore", his role as translator and critic in the spread of German drama is of doubtful value.

His activities as a translator of drama, though not entirely unpraiseworthy, were short-lived. In 1791 he had printed at Norwich his version of Nathan der Weise (12); and in 1793, his Iphigenia in Tauris was published in London. Taylor actually translated quite well, but in vain. Iphigenia was commented upon only twice, and Nathan was completely overlooked until the unsold copies were offered for sale by a London publisher in 1805. The critical response at that comparatively late date is indicative of the intellectual and cultural barrier existing between Germany and England. One London critic recommends the reading of Nathan as a quick cure for insomnia. In Scotland, Francis Jeffrey, the editor of the Edinburgh Review, used the work as proof of the irrecon-

34 J. W. Robberds, A Memoir of the Life and Writings of the Late William Taylor of Norwich, I (London, 1843), 92-93.


36 See Morgan, Critical Bibliography, Entry No. 5772.

37 Poetical Register, V (1805), 501.
cilable differences between German and English taste by observing that "a traveller may very erroneously suppose that he relishes German cookery or plum-pudding at Vienna; but if he take delight in sour krout and wild-boar venison, he may rest assured that he is under no mistake as to the proficiency he has made, and that he has completely reconciled himself to the national taste of his entertainers. The work before us is as genuine sour krout as ever perfumed a feast in Westphalia." Furthermore, Lessing's "antidote for religious intolerance is absolute indifference, or infidelity." As was true in the case of Mackenzie and The Robbers, there was no consideration given to the possible existence of other than English standards of judgment.

Perhaps discouraged by his unsuccessful forays in the field of translation, Taylor turned to criticism in 1793, remaining active as a critic for some twenty-five years. In spite of his thorough knowledge of German and his wide reading in that language, his critical remarks all too often are superficial and beside the point, if not entirely erroneous. Although he prided himself on being somewhat of a free thinker, he too is guilty of the fault common to most of the early critics, that of judging the German plays by the rapidly disintegrating standards of the eighteenth century. For example, Stella is

---

38 *Edinburgh Review*, VIII (1806), 149.
"one of Goethe's best plays, full of natural, new, pathetic and well-painted situations. The characters are various, distinct, and, notwithstanding their several faults, amiable." 39 Taylor's inherent critical conservatism, the extent to which he was lodged in the eighteenth century and far from being in a state of rapport with the new movement in literature and drama is revealed in his indictment of Lessing:

There is a principle in the theory of dramatic art, which Lessing had not discovered: it is this. The more nearly the forms of imitation employed by the poet approach to real life, the milder must be the distress, and the more probable the incidents, if the representation is to be kept within the limits of pleasure.... In proportion as the means of imitation intercept illusion may be the force of the emotions portrayed. For want of this precaution, Lessing has adapted violent situations to ordinary manners, and disappoints sympathy by the very means intended to push it to the utmost. 40

Not only the content of Taylor's criticism leaves something to be desired. The Taylorian style tended perhaps a trifle too much toward erudition:

[Wieland's] omnipresent fancy can evoke at will the divinities of every mythology, and enrobe them all with dazzling magnificence and classical propriety. Yet his heroes and heroines want, perhaps, a certain heroism of character: they are Sacripants, Zerbinos, and Rinaldos, Angelicas, and Armidas; they are neither Agamemnon, nor Achilles, not Diomed, nor Clytemnestra, nor Andromache: but, if they win less on the admiration, they gain perhaps more on the affection. The youngest of the Graces,


not the highest of the Muses, besought for him, of Apollo, the gift of song: Echo was his nurse, Pallas his preceptress, Venus his inspiress.  

In view of these deficiencies, only the sheer quantity of his critical writings can be seen as a positive step in the introduction of German drama to England. Many of the some 1750 articles and reviews attributed to him by his biographer, J. W. Robberds, were on German topics. The most valuable service which Taylor performed lay in merely keeping the names of German writers before the English public.

Taylor, like the other intermediaries, lost interest eventually in the study of German; unlike the others, he made one last effort. To his great discredit, his *Historic Survey of German Poetry* in three volumes (London, 1828-30) was a work ill-conceived, hastily assembled, and desperately published as a means of alleviating his embarrassing financial condition. It is, in fact, little more than a pasting together of various articles written around 1800. As such, it gives the modern reader a fairly accurate, though not always clear picture of

---


42 Robberds, *A Memoir*, I, 126. His figures are based on marks in Taylor's private library:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Review</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1793-1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Review</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1803-1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>1802-1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Magazine</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>1796-1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Review</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1810-1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeum</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1807-1808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From other evidence, Robberds offers these additional figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Review</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeum</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
the state of English knowledge of German literature in 1800. Thirty years later, when the *Historic Survey* appeared, the English understanding of German literature was far advanced, largely through Carlyle's efforts. In 1831, Carlyle himself viciously and somewhat irresponsibly attacked the work in the *Edinburgh Review*. 43 Carlyle's judgment on most points was correct. His anger, which was that of the devoted disciple toward the meddling dilettante, reached its peak in his consideration of Taylor's treatment of Kotzebue. Since it is exactly there that Taylor's position in regard to German drama in England becomes clear, detailed comment must be withheld until the problem of Kotzebue in England has been discussed. Only then will it be possible to show that Taylor has become an object of ridicule for the wrong reasons, not because of his manifold stylistic and contextual sins, but because he passed favorable judgment on Kotzebue. True he was a dilettante, but the dilettante's words often give articulate voice to public sentiment. To damn him out of hand for his favorable opinion of Kotzebue is to damn who knows how many of our direct ancestors.

Simultaneous with the efforts of Mackenzie and Taylor and those influenced by them was the moderate growth of popular interest in German drama. A glance at the List of Plays will

43 *Edinburgh Review*, LIII(1831), 151ff.
illustrate the way in which it was increasing from 1788 to 1798. Here one laments the lack of a guiding hand, the lack of an influential intermediary. At the same time, I find in the motley assortment of plays translated in these years further support for my contention that the importation of German drama (and literature) was a mingling of two national literatures on a mass, popular scale and hence was beyond the control of any one man. Lessing (12, 19), Goethe (9, 13, 16, 18), and Schiller (10, 14, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 33) were all translated, but so too were Klinger (23), Meißner (31), Gemmingen-Hornberg (17 and #21), and Kotzebue (27, 31, 32), by a variety of hands. For a time, the number of translations increased only slightly: three in 1790, one in 1791, three in 1792, one in 1793, four in 1794, four in 1795, four in 1796, three in 1797. A play by J. C. Brandes had a short run in 1790 (#11), as did one by Gemmingen-Hornberg in 1794 (#21). Also in 1794 Emilia Galotti was un成功fully attempted at Drury Lane (#22). The Robbers was privately performed in 1797 (#36). Then in 1798, sixteen translations appeared and five German works were staged; in 1799 we find forty-two translations and ten productions. For reasons to be enumerated, German drama rather abruptly came into its own.
IV. THE SECOND PERIOD: 1798-1803

1. The Performances: Kotzebue Dominates the English Stage.

In its day to day, century to century existence, the theater obviously does not subsist on greatness, neither of plays nor of performances. Great drama is too scarce a commodity to be put on the boards every night. Likewise, the actor as an artist is incapable of rising to the very heights of his art night after night, even under the best of conditions. Yet the living theater is a continuous web, active and alive in an unbroken chain, often for years at a time in the same hall. It is in the great body of time between the occasional peaks of greatness that the theater fulfills its basic function, that of entertainment. To keep the theater alive in those long periods when greatness is lacking, a mass of mediocre but entertaining plays suffices. Amidst this mediocrity, occasionally a producer comes across a play which, so to speak, is outstandingly mediocre, that is, a play which is entertaining without being overly disturbing, provoking, or stimulating. When this happens, the producer finds himself in possession of what is known as a hit. Three consequences follow rapidly. One, the producer reaps a bountiful financial harvest. Two, desirous of increasing his good fortune, he begins looking for other plays of a similar kind. Three, others in the business of theater, desirous of equally good
fortune, set about imitating the original hit. This, briefly, was the course of German drama on the English stage in the years, 1798-1803.

Late in March of 1798, Sheridan, the managing director of Drury Lane, found himself in happy possession of such a hit. His adaptation of Menschenhaß und Reue as The Stranger (#63), the first appearance of Kotzebue on the English stage, can only be viewed as a reflection of the taste and temper of the times. However much the English theater needed renovation on all levels and the injection of new artistic life, this play and the mass of plays from Kotzebue which followed it did nothing toward that end. Sheridan had simply stumbled onto the mine of commercial theatrical success which the body of Kotzebue's early plays offered to any enterprising director. As in many lands, Kotzebue enjoyed immense success in England, but not because of any germanophilic tendencies on the part of the English. His success there, as everywhere, was founded on his ability to capture on stage in a relatively unobjectionable yet entertaining manner the prevailing winds of the times.

Sheridan was fortunate enough to perceive the potential in *The Stranger*.

The appearance of Kotzebue's plays in England marks the first and only success of any duration of German drama on the English stage. As the List of Plays shows, twenty-eight of Kotzebue's plays were translated between 1796 and 1801, half of which appeared on stage, with varying degrees of success. Because this period is a crucial one, it is important to develop a perspective regarding the distribution of plays translated and performed by year and by author. The information in the List of Plays may be condensed in the following manner:

1796: Kotzebue, 2 plays, 2 editions, none performed; Schiller, 2-3-0; Other, 1-1-0.

1797: Kotzebue, 1-1-0; Schiller, 3-3-1.

1798: Goethe, 2-2-0; Kotzebue, 6-27-3; Schiller, 2-6-0; Other, 3-3-2.

1799: Goethe, 1-2-0; Kotzebue, 17-77-15; Lessing, 2-2-0; Schiller, 1-3-0; Other, 4-4-0.

1800: Kotzebue, 6-11-7; Schiller, 3-4-0; Other, 2-2-0.

1801: Kotzebue, 1-1-8; Schiller, 1-1-1; Other, 2-1-0.²

²Not including Benjamin Thompson's six-volume collection, *The German Theater* (List of Plays, 170).
1802: Kotzebue, 1-1-5; Other, 0-0-1.
1803: Kotzebue, 0-0-6; Schiller, 0-0-1.

In combination with the figures given at the end of Chapter III on the early translations of Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller, this condensation makes clear the fact that, until 1798 the penetration of German drama into England was proceeding at a slow but fairly constant rate. (Cf. Graphs I and II, Appendix.) More important is the relative completeness of the English inquiry into German drama. By 1801, the English had translated most of what Kotzebue had written up to that time, all of the major plays of Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller (with the exception of Egmont), as well as a good sampling from the minor playwrights. Thus the full range of German dramatic offerings was available, from the highest to the lowest.

There are some who argue that the success of Kotzebue's plays was responsible for the few translations of the more important plays at this time. As we see from the figures just given, the fad for Kotzebue actually had little effect, either positive or negative, on the rate of appearance of other German dramatists in print. In England, the spread between the popu-

3Walter Sellier, Kotzebue in England (Leipzig, 1901), p. 91. More widespread is the belief that Kotzebue's works were responsible for the reaction to things German around 1800 and for some years afterwards. The fallacy of that statement may be easily shown by a review of the introduction of the plays to England (below, p. 84ff.).
larity of Kotzebue and that of Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller was simply broader than in Germany. This situation is hardly unexpected, for the English reading- and play-going public could easily understand and appreciate Kotzebue's plays, while that same public could not possibly possess the degree of patient, intellectual inquiry necessary for the comprehension of *Iphigenie auf Tauris* nor the moral tolerance (lassitude, as it seemed to Jeffrey) to accept the less subtle outpourings of *Stella* or *Die Räuber*. Which is by no means to imply that the English public was retarded, or some such thing. If the leading literary lights of the two countries were for the most part unable to surmount the intellectual and artistic barrier separating them, it is certainly too much to expect the somewhat less enlightened public to have been able to perform such a feat. ⁴

It is true that for a time the English audience was blind to all but Kotzebue. So for that matter were French and German audiences. It must be understood, I am speaking here of the audience of the living theater, not of any group of the literary or intellectual elite. To soften the censure of the English for their "unbalanced" view of German drama in these years, one need only glance at the situation in Germany.

---

⁴Eudo C. Mason, *Die deutsche und englische Romantik* (Göttingen, 1959) describes many manifestations of the incompatibility of the leading German and English literary minds of the day.
Are the English to be specially censured for translating twenty-eight of Kotzebue's plays and performing many of them a number of times, when, for example, between 1788 and 1808 no less than 116 of his plays were presented more than 1700 evenings in Mannheim? Or when at Weimar, for another example, between 1806 and 1832, works by Kotzebue were played 638 times, works by Schiller 331 times, and works by Goethe 259 times? This despite Goethe's supervision of the Weimar stage.

Kotzebue, the playwright, worked on a more readily comprehensible, hence more readily translatable level than did his more gifted German contemporaries. His artistic standards, if we may thus describe them, did not result from any confrontation on his part with esthetic values; rather his standards, such as they were, arose from his confrontation with the heterogeneous group seated in the darkened auditorium waiting to be not enlightened but merely entertained. He admits, "Ich habe zu allen unhiliigen Urteilen geschwiegen, und werde auch ferner schweigen, so lange meine Stucke, trotz alles Pauderns diejenige Wirkung auf das Publikum machen, die ich davon erwarte; denn vox populi, vox Dei." This formula, combined

---

5 Max Marterstieg, *Das deutsche Theater im 19. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1904), p. 120.


7 Kotzbues Theater, *II*(Vienna, 1840), 125.
with Kotzebue's astonishing dramaturgical ability and inventiveness, could only result in widespread popular acclaim.

In the case of the popular acclaim which was his in England, four aspects must be considered: 1. which of his plays appealed most to the English; 2. the reasons for the success of those plays; 3. whether the plays were really translations or adaptations; 4. the popular and critical response to the plays.

Kotzebue's scope as a dramatist embraced virtually every kind of play. By 1801 the English had been exposed to one or more of each. The range is thus: historical drama, Adelheid von Wulfingen (39), Graf Benjowski (40), and others; sentimental drama, Menschenhaß und Reue (49f.), Das Kind der Liebe (44f.), and many others; philosophical drama, Die Indianer in England (31), Die Sonnenjungfrau (93f.), and others; political comedy, Der weibliche Jakobiner-Klub (167); romantic tragedy, Die Spanier in Peru (99f.), Johanna von Montfaucon (141); farcical comedy, Der Wildfang (148); and the dramatic trifle, Die Witwe und das Reitpferd (114f.).

Altogether fifteen plays were performed. Of these, two (Menschenhass und Reue, The Stranger, #63; and Die Spanier in Peru, Pizarro, #128) were immensely popular. Three (Das Kind

der Liebe, Lovers' Vows, #62; Die Versöhnung, The Birthday, #129; and Der Wildfang, Of Age Tomorrow, #158) met with moderate success. The others were forgotten after one or two seasons. One of the plays accepted, Die Spanier in Peru, is a romantic tragedy (and is also a special case, see below). Another, Der Wildfang, is a comedy. The others are all sentimental dramas. Thus the English audience rejected the historical, philosophical, and political plays. Of historical plays, the English theater had enough of high quality from English pens. Philosophical drama, of the German kind, was totally foreign to the popular English stage. English writers were themselves past masters in the production of farces, be they political or whatever. Kotzebue's popularity in England rests therefore on a double base of the sentimental plays on the one hand and one romantic tragedy on the other.

Of the sentimental plays, Menschenhaß und Reue was the most popular and most typical. One can say neither anything very good nor very bad about the play. It was a perfectly satisfactory period piece and should be viewed as such. Character development is limited; the language is often florid. The plot is so unoriginal as to be banal: The adulterous wife, lamenting her error, goes to live as governess on a secluded estate, where she enjoys a high reputation because of the many good deeds she performs there. Unknown to her, the misanthrope who inhabits a cottage on a remote corner of the estate is her
husband, who, embittered by her treachery, has withdrawn from society. He too is shown to have a still warm and generous heart toward those in need. A reconciliation is effected in the end in an emotionally over-charged scene in which the couple's children appear on stage.

To be sure, the plot is developed skillfully. The excesses of language are excesses only to the modern ear. Suspense is carefully built so that the audience is not certain of the identity of the misanthrope, the "Stranger", until late in the play. The stock comic characters are well-drawn. Furthermore, Kotzebue handles classic comic devices, the repeated line, the insolent servant, the high-born person reduced to absurdity, in a way which reveals a sure sense of successful dramaturgy. Where, in the eyes of the modern reader, the play seems to falter in forced soliloquies or in excesses of emotion, the reader need only browse among other works of the period to develop an appreciation for the dramaturgical skill which Kotzebue brought to bear on an ordinary theme.

In a recent work, Arthur Sherbo has shown that sentimental drama actually reached the peak of its popularity around 1800, not several decades earlier as was once believed. Thus a play such as Menschenhaß und Reue was quite in tune with the times.

Although the popularity of The Stranger certainly re-

sulted to a large extent from the sentimental atmosphere in
the English theater, the play held other attractions for the
English. Most remarkable was the ending of the play. The
English audience was not unaccustomed to the theme of seduction
and adultery; but to see the adulteress forgiven, as she is in
The Stranger, was a new experience. In fact, Kotzebue's re-
peated utilization of mildly sensational elements in his
various plays, sentimental or otherwise, must surely be one of
the chief factors contributing to his popularity in England
and elsewhere. The sentimental plays which were popular in
England are all characterized by a certain flirtation with the
titillatingly immoral. The Stranger forgives his adulterous
wife; the German title of Lovers' Vows, Das Kind der Liebe, is
self-explanatory; in The Birthday, Die Versöhnung, a daughter
gives her all to a man who might help her debt-ridden father;
Of Age Tomorrow, Der Wildfang, is a humorous examination of
marital difficulties. "Mildly sensational" is an apt descrip-
tion of these works. As a dramatist subservient to the whims
of the public, Kotzebue could never present those revolutionary
sentiments in his plays which the English were to find so dis-
tasteful in the plays of Goethe and Schiller.

For the most part, the translations of the sentimental
plays were fairly close to Kotzebue's original works. In con-
formity with the somewhat less patient English audiences, the
plays were generally shortened. Menschenhas und Reue for
example probably required some four hours on stage, while
The Stranger could have lasted no more than three. Also, in
conformity with the widespread taste for melodrama, songs and
dances were freely interspersed.  

Aside from an occasional remark about the dubious morality,
the critics' responses to the sentimental plays only mirror
the harmless, superficial tastes and emotions of the audiences.
The Times review of the premiere of The Stranger is filled with
the meaningless comments so typical of the day. In a word, the
play improves the heart and entertains the fancy. Its beauties,
the critic decides, "are not of an age, but of all times."  

In response to Drury Lane's success with this play, which
was performed twenty-six times the first season,  
Covent Garden brought forth Lovers' Vows, Das Kind der Liebe (#62), at
the start of the following season (1798-99) and enjoyed similar
prosperity as a result. Lovers' Vows was played forty-two
times that season.  

Covent Garden was slightly less successful in the same season with its production of The Birthday,
Die Versöhnung (#137), which was performed fourteen times.  

---

10 Sheridan introduced a group of "rustic dances" in Act
II of The Stranger and composed one song for use in Act IV.

11 London Times, March 26, 1798.

12 Genest, Some Account of the English Stage, VII (Bath, 1832), 336.

13 Genest, VII, 427.

14 Genest, VII, 434.
Drury Lane far surpassed these figures with the staging of *Pizarro* (#128), Sheridan's adaptation of *Die Spanier in Peru*. Following the premiere on May 24, 1799, *Pizarro* was performed sixty-seven times in two seasons. This play, which marks the high-point of German drama on the English stage, owed a large part of its success to the fact that it contained most of the same sentimental elements which rendered *The Stranger* so popular. *Die Spanier in Peru* is another of the Rousseau-like attacks on civilization: the dastardly and brutal acts of the Christian, civilized Spaniards are contrasted with the simple, natural piety and gentleness of the pagan, uncivilized Peruvians.

Although the debt to Rousseau is still evident, Sheridan's *Pizarro* is basically a political spectacle, as compared with the sentimental spectacle of *Die Spanier in Peru*. Here Sheridan bested Kotzebue at his own game of pleasing the audience. In *Pizarro* (read "Napoleon") the Peruvians are still called Peruvians, but it is evident that they are in fact Englishmen; the Spaniards are but poorly disguised Frenchmen. The popularity of such an openly political work was closely connected with the precarious state of relations between France and England at that time. Since 1797 the insular security of the English had been threatened by more or less clearly stated

---

15Genest, VII, 468.
plans on the part of the French to invade England. The frantic, emotional responses to this threat reached their peak in the spring of 1798, subsiding only slightly when Napoleon turned his attention to Italy and Egypt. Until peace was finally achieved in 1815, the spectre of French military power set the conservative, at times reactionary tone of English political life. While other German dramatists, notably Goethe and Schiller, suffered from this conservatism in England, Kotzebue with Sheridan's aid was put firmly on the side of that conservatism, for Sheridan had indeed produced in *Pizarro* a piece which was an ideal sounding board for the overt patriotism of the times.

That *Pizarro* owed as much to Sheridan as to Kotzebue has been shown. The plot, the sentimental tone, the spectacular elements were Kotzebue's. The patriotic attitudes which pervade the whole of the play were Sheridan's. In addition to introducing music in the form of an occasional chorus, he also altered the denouement to suit the political character of the play. Kotzebue ended with the heroic death of the innocent Peruvian, Rolla, at the hands of the Spaniards. Sheridan added


a scene in which Pizarro (Napoleon) is killed in revenge for Rolla's death. The viewer's sympathy for the heroic and noble savage is thus transmuted into elation over the downfall of the tyrant.

One other factor contributed to the success of Pizarro and other of Kotzebue's works in England, that being the splendid opportunity for the display of thespian ability which the lead roles offered the actors and actresses of the day. Mrs. Siddons for example made Mrs. Haller in The Stranger and Elvira in Pizarro into her own property.18 Kemble likewise made Rolla in Pizarro synonymous with his own name,19 as did Kean after him.

To comprehend the nature of the immense popularity of Kotzebue in England we must review briefly the chronology of his appearance there. Before 1798, three of his plays had been printed in England. Then in March, 1798, The Stranger was produced at Drury Lane (#63). The success of that production led to a number of printings of the work (49-52). Covent Garden responded with Lovers' Vows (#62) in October, 1798, which in turn brought forth another group of editions (44-48). The same theater offered another play (#61) in December, 1798, and two more (#124 and #129) in April, 1799.

---

18 Genest, VIII, 302.
and yet another (#130) in May, 1799, all except one (#124) meeting with moderate success. By this time (May, 1799) Kotzebue was enjoying a relatively modest fame in England in the theater. Especially regarding his popularity among the reading public, it is important to note that neither The Stranger nor Lovers' Vows, the two most popular plays up to that time, were reprinted in 1799, the year after their introduction.

The turning point, after which Kotzebue's name became a household word, occurred in May, 1799, with the premiere of Pizarro. Not only was the play repeatedly performed at Drury Lane in that year, but in the remaining seven months no less than twenty editions (107-108) were published. By the end of the year, virtually everything Kotzebue had written had appeared in English and most of the plays had been performed. Without Sheridan's Pizarro, English interest in Kotzebue would most likely have continued to develop at a moderate pace, since, as I have shown, his sentimental plays had a great deal to offer the audiences of the day. Pizarro, through Sheridan's infusion of political elements, both increased Kotzebue's hold on the English stage and moved his works beyond the theater into the larger audience of the reading public. Then, as the patriotic appeals in Pizarro lost some of their force, as the threat of French invasion moved farther and farther to the east, the English interest in Kotzebue returned to a more
nearly normal level, particularly among the reading public. In 1800 we see only one new play (148) and a handful of reprints (140-147). In the years following further editions appear, but only sporadically.

To assume that Kotzebue thus disappeared from the English scene as rapidly as he appeared there has been a widespread error. The fact is, the most popular of his plays, though no longer being read, entered the English repertory and remained there for a generation (to be discussed in Chapter V).

Throughout this Pizarro-period (1798-1800), William Taylor of Norwich, the second intermediary, was one of Kotzebue's staunchest supporters. As I noted earlier, Taylor's reputation has suffered most because of his favorable attitude toward Kotzebue, which brought down the wrath first of Carlyle, then of a whole series of later scholars. I have already pointed out the stylistic and contextual weaknesses which should properly be the focal point of any attack on Taylor's work as a critic. A review of Taylor's position not only reveals some justification for his view of Kotzebue but also illuminates another facet of the situation of German drama in England.

As has happened to others, one remark has fixed Taylor's reputation for following generations. As is also often the

---

case, this one remark has been lifted from context. The statement runs, "According to my judgment Kotzebue is the greatest dramatic genius that Europe has evolved since Shakespeare." If placed back in its proper context, at least the statement does not make Taylor the absolute idiot that he otherwise appears to be:

According to my judgment Kotzebue is the greatest dramatic genius that Europe has evolved since Shakespeare. In the hundredfold variety of his effusions are comprehended plays of every form: farces..., comedies..., melodramas..., sentimental dramas..., household tragedies..., classical tragedies...; and especially that vaster and more difficult form of art which may best be denominated the gothic tragedy\(^2\) of which Kotzebue has added a full score to the dramatic repertory of Europe... Rapid in his habits, Kotzebue has seldom time for an artful structure of plot, or a profound estimate of character; but he is well aware how entirely the arts of the theatre concentrate the attention of an audience on the passing scene; and that provided the present situation be stimulant, and the actual effect impressive, the spectator has not the leisure to care or enquire whether the personages were brought together by the wand of a conjurer, or by the pretended fortuitousness of a nicely contrived probability.... His dialogue is written with a liveliness, a variety, and a boldness of appeal to the fairest sentiments and dearest feelings of our nature, which never fail to arrest attention, to captivate sensibility, and to provoke applause.\(^2\)

In context Taylor's remark is clearly intended to imply that Kotzebue was the most prolific dramatist since Shakespeare and

\(^{21}\)Taylor used the term "gothic tragedy" as a counter-term to "classical tragedy," that is, for tragedy involving the fall of high persons but written outside the limitations of the Greek form, e.g., *Macbeth*.

also the dramatist best equipped for the entertainment of audiences. One is hard put to contradict his view on that basis.

Certainly Taylor failed to see Kotzebue for what he was, an artisan of the drama; but then most likely Kotzebue himself was not entirely aware of his place in the theater. Only very recently have critics ceased their sometimes vehement raving about Kotzebue's supposed prostitutions of art. Kotzebue was no more of an artist than any of the army of writers who today fill the air-waves with dozens of new "plays" every week. Although much reduced in scope, the English theatrical audience around 1800 was comparable in nature to the vaster television audiences of today. Essentially the same type of theatrical escapism appeals to both audiences, however much they differ in size. One cannot doubt that, were he alive

---

23See Thompson, Kotzebue, a Survey, Chapter I, for a review of the attacks. Robert L. Kahn, "Personality Factors in Kotzebue's Work," Philological Quarterly, XXX(1951), 69-85, and "Kotzebue's Treatment of Social Problems," Studies in Philology, LXIX(1952), 631-42, places Kotzebue in his proper position in the history of the theater. For an interesting variant interpretation, see Karl-Heinz Klingenberg, Iffland und Kotzebue als Dramatiker, Beiträge zur deutschen Klassik, XV(1962); from the Marxist viewpoint, Kotzebue's dramas failed simply because they lacked "national character" and "Geschichtlichkeit," the two qualities seen as essential to the success of the works of Goethe and Schiller (pp. 159-60). By that standard one could construct a beautifully simple and compact theory: Kotzebue succeeded in England because he was not "German," while Goethe and Schiller failed because they were! Would that the situation were that straightforward.
today, Kotzebue would be a highly successful television
writer. The application of the highest esthetic criteria to
the work of such a time-bound, crowd-pleasing artisan is
not only wasteful use of the critical faculties but also re-
veals a misunderstanding of the forms into which art degener-
ates when it moves into the area of mass-culture. In Taylor's
day, the world had not seen the likes of Kotzebue, before or
after Shakespeare. Only the emergence, in this century, of
mass-culture on a grand scale, only the democratization of
art has made it possible to see Kotzebue as the first of a
long line of technically gifted popularizers, who take the
forms and ideas of the preceding artistic generation and mold
them and remodel them into a seemingly endless number of "new"
combinations. Their goal is always the same: to please the
mass-audience and help it escape.

By taking Taylor's reception of German drama in general
and Kotzebue in particular as representative of English
critical opinion around 1800, I have perhaps done him some
injustice. He did after all consider himself a serious stu-
dent of German literature. That he was not without insight
may be seen from this attempt to evaluate the three ranking
German dramatists of the day:

To Kotzebue must be conceded the praise of su-
perior invention: his dramas are more numerous,
more different from each other, than those of
Schiller, or even of Göthe.... To Schiller belongs
the merit of deeper pathos and of higher majesty....
To Göthe must be awarded greater truth of nature than to either of his competitors; but for that very reason he produces less immediate effect. Kotzebue appeals to the sympathy, Schiller to the admiration, but Göthe to the experience.\textsuperscript{24}

Turning now to the reception of Goethe and Schiller on stage and in print in England, one only wishes that the populace or even a few other critics, however superficial, had at least shared some of Taylor's limited impartiality and appreciation.

2. Other German Plays Performed

The assertion that the Kotzebue inundation had little real effect on the course of other German drama on the English stage is further verified when we find in the List of Plays that during these five years (1798-1803) only four plays by writers other than Kotzebue were performed: \textit{Curiosity} (#60), Covent Garden, March 17, 1798, from an obscure play by Gruttschreiber; \textit{The Inquisitor} (#64), Haymarket, June 23, 1798, adapted by Holcroft from Unzer's \textit{Diego und Leonore}; \textit{The Red-Cross Knights} (#131), Haymarket, August 21, 1799, adapted by Holman from \textit{Die Räuber}; and \textit{The Harper's Daughter} (#197), Covent Garden, May 4, 1803, adapted by M. G. Lewis from \textit{Kabale und Liebe}. With the exception of \textit{The Red-Cross Knights}, each of these plays appeared and disappeared with

\textsuperscript{24}Taylor, \textit{Historic Survey}, III, 327.
equal rapidity.

More significant than the small success which Holman's adaptation of Die Räuber enjoyed are the difficulties which he encountered in attempting to bring Schiller's play out on the English stage. In 1799, when the Napoleonic threat was at its peak, Holman submitted to the Licenser a stage version which was apparently quite close to Schiller, i.e., to Tytler's translation of Schiller. In the preface to The Red-Cross Knights Holman related that the Licenser rejected that first version because of the "objectionable", that is, revolutionary and blasphemous elements which it contained. But "still unwilling wholly to abandon a favourite object, I determined on forming a play, which should retain as much as possible of the original, with the omission of all that could be deemed objectionable." In this Holman succeeded, altering the play to such an extent that almost nothing of the original remained. A wretched stage-piece concerning knights-errant in Spain, it probably owed its small success more to the notoriety of Schiller's play than to any of its own qualities. Each of

25 Performed eight times at the Haymarket in 1799 (List of Plays, #131) and was revived there and at Bath for one season in 1801 (#184, ##185).

26 J. G. Holman, The Red-Cross Knights (London, 1799), pp. i-iii. An earlier private performance in 1797 (#36) was followed in 1799 by the publication of the version which had been used (118) to prove, according to the adaptor's preface, "the acted play was free of all the Jacobinical speeches which abound in the original." (The Robbers, adapted by Keppel Craven [London, 1799], Preface.)
three contemporary reviews mentions the unsavory nature of the source-play. 27

Other than these, no attempts were made at staging other specimens of better German drama, even though all the major plays of Goethe and Schiller had been translated by 1801. Not only were these plays decried, if not totally overlooked, by the critics and the reading public, they furthermore aroused neither curiosity nor enthusiasm among those directly responsible for dramatic presentations in London. Aside from social and political differences between Germany and England, the patently commercial nature of the English theater was the chief factor in this neglect. Although this period in England brought forth literary minds of astonishing sensitivity and diversity, these minds unfortunately moved in a sphere which had no contact with the living theater. On the other hand the persons who were involved in the theater itself lived on tradition alone and sought only commercial success. In a word, the theatrical personalities of the day were totally incapable of meeting the challenge of drama as high art, the very challenge which many of the plays of Goethe and Schiller offered.

---

27 Gentleman's Magazine, LXX(1799), 1, 7; Monthly Mirror, VIII(1799), 289; Monthly Review, XXXII(1800), 322-23.
3. German Drama in Print: Lessing, Goethe, Schiller and Others

That the immense popularity of Kotzebue acted as only a mild stimulant at best to English interest in other German dramatists may also be demonstrated by examining the evidence in the List of Plays. By dividing the plays of other writers into two groups, those translated before 1798, and those translated during the mania for Kotzebue (1798-1801), one may see what effect, if any, that mania had.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before 1798</th>
<th>1798-1801</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goethe:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Geschwister (13)</td>
<td>Clavigo (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iphigenie (16)</td>
<td>Stella (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Götz (65,66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan (3)</td>
<td>Miss Sara Sampson (112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minna (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilia (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiller:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Räuber (14)</td>
<td>Wallenstein (152-153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Carlos (24)</td>
<td>Maria Stuart (168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabale und Liebe (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Verschwörung (29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Others: Klopstock (2)  
Brandes (7)  
Emdorff (15)  
Gemmingen-Hornberg (17)  
Klinger (23)  
Meißner (31)  

Kratter (53, 54)  
Unzer (59)  
Gruttschreiber (60)  
Iffland (67, 68, 69, 70)  
Iffland (139)  
Törring-Jettenbach (154)  
Babo (169)  
Leisewitz (169)

The appearance of three of the translations in the 1798-1801 group may be shown to have almost no connection with the popularity of Kotzebue. Of the others, some were translated for their shock value, e.g., Stella and Clavigo; the remainder, a sorry selection of plays if there ever was one, appeared as a result of the feverish activity on the part of the translators who were intent on unearthing another Kotzebue. The three exceptions were: Scott’s Götz (65), Coleridge’s Wallenstein (152-153), and Mellish’s Maria Stuart (168).

We have already seen that Scott’s active involvement with German drama was primarily motivated by Mackenzie’s lecture and that it was, furthermore, short-lived. The situation was much the same with Coleridge, the difference being, Coleridge, having just returned from Germany, at least knew something of the language. Although the facts concerning the way in which the Wallenstein manuscript made its way to
Coleridge are not known, it is known that the presence of the manuscript in England was in part a result of the success of Kotzebue at Drury Lane. Schiller, in a letter to Noehden, one of the translators of Don Carlos (55), says he has heard "daß Hr. Sheridan... deutsche Originalstücke... annimmt und die übersetzen läßt, um sie spielen zu lassen." At length, a manuscript copy was sent to London and by a devious process was given to Coleridge who translated the work in six weeks, had it published, and in response to one of the first reviews, wrote a letter to the reviewing magazine in which he attempted to dissociate himself from German drama. The letter reads in part, "The mere circumstance of translating a manuscript play is not even evidence that I admired that one play, much less that I am a general admirer of the plays in that language." Thus ended Coleridge's active involvement with German drama in England.

The third of the translations which appeared more or less independently of the Kotzebue fad was Joseph Mellish's Maria Stuart (168) in 1801. Mellish, an Englishman who was living in Jena, worked directly with Schiller, translating each act as it was completed. The translation was printed in Germany by Cotta who, unable to find an English publisher to

\[\text{29} \text{Schillers Briefe, ed. Fritz Jonas, VI(Stuttgart, n.d.), 39-40.}\]

\[\text{30} \text{Monthly Review, XXXIII(1800), 336.}\]
handle the book, distributed it finally through two London booksellers, the result being a financial loss to all concerned.

What is significant about Coleridge's Wallenstein and Mellish's Maria Stuart, in addition to their appearance independent of the Kotzebue flood, is the fact that both translations are first-rate and that they were forgotten for many years after the first reviews. Neither has been surpassed since. Wallenstein is still printed in Coleridge's works. Mellish's Maria Stuart continues to live its own existence, the most recent edition coming in 1959.

If we thus remove these two plays and Scott's Götz from the 1798-1803 list, we are indeed left with a sorry represen-

---

31 Coleridge's Wallenstein has been examined three times: P. Machule, "Coleridge's Wallensteinübersetzung," Englische Studien, XXXI(1902) 182-239; Hans Roscher, Die Wallensteinübersetzung von Samuel T. Coleridge und ihr deutsches Original (Leipzig, 1905); and B. Q. Morgan, "What Happened to Coleridge's Wallenstein," Modern Language Journal, XLIII(1959) 195-201. Machule's work is the most thorough. Morgan shows that in the light of later manuscript discoveries, some of Coleridge's "errors" were actually correct translations.

Mellish's Maria Stuart cannot be accurately compared, since Schiller's manuscript from which Mellish worked has been lost. Mellish's reliability was acknowledged by the editors of the 1948 Weimar edition of the play in which a lengthy comparison is presented between the play as Schiller finally published it and Mellish's translation. (Werke, IX [Weimar, 1948], 341-56.)

tation, especially in view of the extent to which the various translators were involved with the mass of Kotzebue's works at that time. It must be remembered in this connection that even the Kotzebue fad was not brought about solely by accurate or fairly accurate versions of his plays. I have shown that it was to a large extent the result of Sheridan's re-working of *Die Spanier in Peru* and that if that play in its many editions is removed from the List, the popularity of Kotzebue in England returns to a more nearly normal level. In fact, if *Pizarro* is omitted, his popularity was only slightly greater than that of the other German playwrights as a group. In other words, the English interest in Kotzebue's works was neither more nor less superficial than the interest in the works of the other dramatists. While the public found in Kotzebue the possibility of successful production and pleasure-able reading, they found nothing of the sort in the other writers.

Two developments following this period of interest in German drama must now be traced. One concerns the living theater; the other, printed plays. On the one hand, certain of Kotzebue's plays now moved into the repertory of the English theater and remained there for some three decades. Most significantly, no further additions from Kotzebue or other German playwrights were made during that time, or later,
for that matter. On the other hand, after the large number of editions put out around 1800, German drama in print virtually disappeared from England for over two decades.

The enduring popularity of Kotzebue on the English stage has been underestimated or entirely overlooked by modern critics, while the apparent reaction to German drama in print after 1800 has been misunderstood. This misunderstanding has come about in part because of the failure to bear in mind Kotzebue's continued success on the stage and in part because of a failure to see that the reaction after 1800 was as much against drama in general as against German drama. I shall first consider the plays which entered the English repertory and then turn to the reaction against drama.
V. GERMAN PLAYS IN THE ENGLISH REPERTORY: 1799-1850

The success of a play, whether a farce or a tragedy, whether by Kotzebue or by Shakespeare, is not determined by the enthusiasm of the first-night audience, nor by the comments of the first critics, nor by the number of editions in print. Rather, the standard of success is the extent to which the play remains alive on the stage. If we apply that standard of success rigorously to German drama in England, we are forced to conclude that the genre was a complete failure there. Having been exposed to all the major works of the German theater as well as many lesser ones, the English audience even today has yet to respond to a German play in a way which would cause that work to be placed beside Shakespeare as an indispensable part of the repertory. The standard then is obviously too high. If we relax the standard somewhat, as we must, and inquire about those plays which entered the repertory for a time, then we are of necessity embracing works which taste and a not entirely jaded sense of esthetics cause us to condemn today. In other words, we are dealing with two incompati-ble factors here: if high (German) drama failed in England, it was for the same reason that the works of Kotzebue succeeded. That reason I have alluded to before, the absence of an elite audience, or conversely, the domination of a popular audience which seeks to be soothed, lulled, made forgetful, even
titillated, but never stimulated intellectually.

By the relaxed standard, Kotzebue is the only German playwright to have penetrated the English repertory. To put it more precisely, two of his works entered the repertory of the English theater and remained there until the second half of the nineteenth century; they were *The Stranger* and *Pizarro*. Furthermore, for some thirty years in London, no less than seven of his plays were performed repeatedly.

Table I, compiled from the List of Plays, shows in abbreviated fashion every German play which was performed more than one season between 1799 and 1850. From this we see that as many as seven (in 1801) and until the fourth decade never fewer than two of Kotzebue's plays were to be seen every season. Table I also reveals that after the period of greatest interest (1798-1801) only one new play by Kotzebue was successful, *The Wanderer*, taken from *Eduard in Schottland* (#238).

Besides Kotzebue, Schiller was represented by three plays, Goethe by one, and Iffland by one. While in the case of Kotzebue, the plays offered were fairly close to the original, the plays taken from Schiller, Goethe, and Iffland had little in common with the German works other than either the title or the names of the characters.¹

Table II shows more readily the relative popularity of

¹e.g. List of Plays, #406.
the various plays. Most popular was Pizarro (performed in sixty-five seasons), followed closely by The Stranger (fifty-eight seasons). Considerably less popular were Lovers' Vows (twenty-two seasons), Of Age Tomorrow (sixteen seasons), The Birthday (fifteen seasons), and The Wanderer (five seasons). One play, Sighs, was a specialty of the Haymarket, where it was performed in six seasons.

As the nineteenth century advanced, the five less popular plays gradually disappeared from the English stage, as may be seen in Table I. During the same period, The Stranger and Pizarro truly became a part of the repertory. For example, in 1832 Pizarro opened the Covent Garden season, with Kean as Rolla. In the thirty-odd years since the premiere at Drury Lane the play had become so integral a part of the repertory that the reviewer of that performance made no mention whatever of the origin of the play. In addition, his lengthy comments were written in such a way that it is apparent he took for granted every reader's familiarity with plot and characters.\(^2\) Or, for another example, a newspaper advertisement for a performance of the same play in 1830 referred to it as "the grand national drama of Pizarro."\(^3\) The Stranger endured longer. On January 18, 1849, it was presented with Kean in the title role

\(^2\)London Times, October 8, 1832.

\(^3\)London Times, October 11, 1830.
at Windsor Castle as one of a series of five evenings of dramatic entertainment by royal command. The series also included Kean's Hamlet and his Shylock as well. Shortly afterwards, the production moved to the Haymarket where, according to one account, it had the same lachrymose effect on the nineteenth century audience which the original Drury Lane presentation had had on the audience of 1798.\footnote{The Court Theatre, and Royal Dramatic Record, ed. John K. Chapman (London, n.d.), p. 71.}

For the very reasons they succeeded, plays such as The Stranger and Pizarro were doomed. By reflecting the popular temper of an age, they had to die when the age died. It is probably easier to determine when the Nineteenth Century began in the English theater than in other fields of activity. When the shackles of limited production and strict regulation were removed in 1843, when Drury Lane and Covent Garden lost their monopoly on drama, one age ended and another began. The way was thus opened by which the English theater could both receive and reflect the diverse stimuli of the multi-level world of the new century. Only the best of the old century survived. Obviously, Kotzebue's plays did not belong to that select group.
TABLE I. German Plays in the English Repertory: 1799-1850

Seven plays, all by Kotzebue, recur frequently. They are abbreviated thus:

A- **Armut und Edelsinn; Sighs** (#122).

E- **Eduard in Schottland; The Wanderer** (#238 and #451).

K- **Das Kind der Liebe; Lovers' Vows** (#62).

M- **Menschenhas und Reue; The Stranger** (#63).

S- **Die Spanier in Peru; Pizarro** (#128).

V- **Die Versohnung; The Birthday** (#129).

W- **Der Wildfang; Of Age Tomorrow** (#158).

The other plays, which recur infrequently but were performed more than one season, are listed thus:

(a)- **Die Witwe und das Reitpferd; The Widow and the Riding-Horse**, Kotzebue (#130).

(b)- **La Peyrouse; Perouse; or, The Desolate Island**, Kotzebue (#171).

(c)- **Die Räuber; The Red-Cross Knights**, Schiller (#131).

(d)- **Die Sonnenjungfrau; The Virgin of the Sun**, Kotzebue (#297).

(e)- **Blind geladen; How to Die for Love**, Kotzebue (#296).

(f)- **Maria Stuart; Mary Stuart**, Schiller (#346).

(g)- **Faust I; Faustus**, Goethe (#406).

(h)- **Wilhelm Tell; William Tell**, Schiller (#407).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Drury Lane</th>
<th>Covent Garden</th>
<th>Haymarket</th>
<th>Bath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>K, V, (a)</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>K, M, V</td>
<td>A, V</td>
<td>M, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>K, M, V, (b)</td>
<td>A, K, V, (c)</td>
<td>K, M, S, W, (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>K, M, S, W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A, K</td>
<td>M, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>K, M, S</td>
<td>M, S, (a)</td>
<td>A, K, M, W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>K, M, S, W</td>
<td>K, S</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>M, S, W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>K, W</td>
<td>K, M, S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>K, S</td>
<td>S, V</td>
<td>A, E</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E, S</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>K, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K, M, S</td>
<td>A, M, S</td>
<td>V, W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>M, W</td>
<td></td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S, W</td>
<td>K, S</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>M, W</td>
<td>M, S, V</td>
<td>K, V, W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S, (d)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td></td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>M, S, (d)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>K, V, W</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>E, M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td></td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S, (f)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>M, S, (f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 continued:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Drury Lane</th>
<th>Covent Garden</th>
<th>Haymarket</th>
<th>Bath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>S, (g)</td>
<td>S, W</td>
<td>S, W</td>
<td>S, (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>K, S, (h)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>K, M, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>M, S</td>
<td>E^5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^5 A new version. Cf. List of Plays, #238 and note; also #451.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Play</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>CG</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spanier in Peru</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65 seasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Menschenhaß</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kind der Liebe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wildfang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Versöhnung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Armut und Edelinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Eduard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N.B. The information in Tables I and II is depicted in the Appendix, Graph II.)
VI. THE THIRD PERIOD: THE PERIOD OF CONFUSION: 1798-1813

Much has been made of a reaction to German drama in England which occurred shortly after the peak of Kotzebue's popularity. The situation is generally described thus: this was a conservative period in England; because of this, the liberal and immoral plays of Kotzebue were objected to, attacked, and driven from the country; the liberal and immoral plays of Goethe and Schiller, largely through guilt by association with those of Kotzebue, were also attacked and rejected; the end result was the disappearance of German drama from England for some two decades. This argument, which has been presented with only slight variations a number of times, contains four important weak points. One, the cause-effect chronology is inaccurate. Two, although Kotzebue's plays were attacked, the main objections were to a few plays of Goethe and Schiller. Three, it was those plays (of Goethe and Schiller) which disappeared from England for a time, not the plays of Kotzebue (as shown in Chapter V). Four, through Sheridan's Pizarro, Kotzebue was placed squarely on the side of the patriotic, conservative critics (as shown in Chapter IV). It is true that there was a reaction, but it

\[1\text{See Stokoe, German Influence, p. 49; Morgan and Hohlfeld, German Literature, pp. 44f.; Stockley, German Literature, pp. 188-89.}\]
was a reaction on the part of the critics, not of the theater-going public.

It is easy enough to see how the argument outlined above has gained wide acceptance. Compared with the large number of editions and performances in 1798 and 1799, the small number of editions and first performances following 1800 (see List of Plays) leads one to assume that a large-scale reaction had occurred. Faced with such tangible evidence, one begins looking for reasons. Kotzebue is certainly a more acceptable whipping-boy than Goethe or Schiller.

A statistical interpretation of that statistical evidence for a reaction (that is, few editions and few first performances after 1800) shows that the reaction was much less intense than one might believe. In Graph I (Appendix) I have sketched a figure based on the number of editions of German plays published each decade in England in order to have a rough visual representation of the fluctuation of popularity. The graph shows that the decline in editions printed after 1800 was not so much a reaction as a return to an earlier level of interest. At no time in the entire century, 1750-1850, was there really far-reaching interest in German drama, with the exception of the 1798-1800 period; and it has been shown in the two preceding chapters that the abnormally high level of interest in that period was due largely to Pizarro, a play which is at the most only half-German. The graph also shows that after
German drama had been introduced into England, there was never a sustained loss of interest in the genre. In fact, it is perhaps surprising that the number of editions in the early part of the nineteenth century was not smaller since almost all the major German plays and many minor ones had already been translated.

On stage the decline of interest was much less marked. I have shown in the last chapter to what extent Kotzebue held a place on the English stage in the nineteenth century. To speak of the disappearance of German drama is, in view of the figures presented there, erroneous. Also, to blame the "reaction" on the very playwright who was able to penetrate the repertory is equally false. The audiences still came to see Kotzebue and were probably attracted by the very tinge of immorality in his plays which was supposed to have been responsible for the reaction to German drama.

It seems that scholars, in discussing the reaction, have been somewhat remiss in the exercise of their critical faculties. Those who have used the argument outlined at the beginning of the chapter have based their remarks not only on the smaller number of editions but also on the many utterances of critics who spoke in anger against the many subversive elements in German drama, while night after night the audiences filled the theaters to see plays which pleased them. Nothing better shows just how un-representative the attitudes of those
critics were, than the continuing success of certain of the plays in the theaters. Yet it is those critical attitudes which have been cited as evidence for a reaction on the part of the English public.

The decline in interest, as evinced by the dearth of new productions and new translations, and the critical reaction are in fact two effects with the same cause: the Napoleonic wars. Art, in any of its forms, in any period, is exposed to three external foes. The Moral Man objects to the undermining uncertainty of courageous explorations of darker realms of the soul. The Political Man objects to that which contradicts his own beliefs about the proper social order. The Practical Man objects to the wasteless exploitation of time and effort in the pursuit of the intangible. Their common negative behavior is only another manifestation of the universal human tendency to fall back on the instinct of irrationality when confronted with the unknown or the unknowable. If a given period is relatively enlightened, these voices are ignored in favor of more rational opinions. In times of national stress, when a way of life appears threatened as was the case in England around 1800, liberal elements in all phases of life are perforce suppressed in the interest of national survival. In such times, Art, the unnecessary, the incomprehensible, and hence the dangerous, is especially subject to attack.

After the first invigorating air from the awakened France
of 1789 was replaced by the stench of the Terror and the blustery winds of ambitious imperialism, the political sentiment in England became ever more conservative. As fate would have it, the introduction of German drama into England coincided with the rise of conservatism. Certain of the plays, such as Die Räuber, Götz von Berlichingen, and Stella, though twenty or more years out-of-date, offered an inviting target for the conservative critic.

The chronology of this critical reaction has been misrepresented. In the standard argument summarized above, we are given this sequence of events: a few German plays were introduced before 1798, most with no success; from 1798 to 1800 many plays were immensely popular; the critics, aghast at this situation, suddenly took up pen to do what they could to enlighten their countrymen concerning the dangerous sentiments expressed in these plays.

If we go back and check the chronology of harsh critical comment, we find that the so-called critical reaction had begun well before the peak of popularity was reached in 1799. For example, the most intelligent attack on German drama, the satirical play, The Rovers, was published early in June of 1798.² In the same month a year later, Pizarro was playing every night at Drury Lane while Covent Garden and the Haymarket

²Anti-Jacobin, June 4 and June 11, 1798.
were offering various other German plays (#122-#138). It seems likely that The Rovers, which is more humorous and much less irrational than other attacks, may have actually served to popularize German drama rather than destroy it. In fact, a stage version was later brought out, The Quadrupeds of Quedlinburgh; or, The Rovers of Weimar (#281). At the Haymarket in 1811, that is, more than a decade after the presumed death of German drama in England, The Quadrupeds was played as an after-piece to Kotzebue's The Birthday. 3

The fact that there was a critical reaction which was only partially effective is a crucial point in the history of German drama in England, in that it both exposes the national incompatibility of the German and English elite and also casts in perspective the converse, namely the success among the people of less important but more accessible German drama and literature. While the critics attacked Goethe and Schiller, the audiences applauded Kotzebue, some of whose works entered the theater with much the same success as the fairy tales of the Grimms later entered English home libraries. The English public sampled all German drama, accepted what it liked, and ignored or forgot what it disliked. The critics, being vocal by their very nature, felt constrained to pass judgment, which they did.

---

3 Genest, Some Account, VIII, 248-49.
For clarity, we may divide the critics of the period into four groups:

1. Anti-drama.
2. Anti-German.
3. Anti-German-drama.
4. Pro-German.

Particularly significant is the first group, yet it has been largely overlooked in previous considerations of German drama in England.

The theater, in England and elsewhere, has a long tradition of confrontations with attempted suppression and censorship. The Moral Man, the Political Man, the Practical Man, all find frightening, subversive, and wasteful elements set free in the darkened auditorium of the theater. Given this tradition, the widespread reaction to theatrical presentations in England during the extended crisis of the Napoleonic Wars is hardly surprising. As always, the would-be censors did not object to all drama, but only to that drama which did not satisfy their own particular, one-sided views. In effect, they thus rejected and censured ninety-nine per cent of the plays performed, English and German.

This is not to say there was agreement among the critics on what was good and what was not good for the country. On the one hand we may find a sweeping denunciation such as this: "The natural tendency of all evil things is from bad to
worse.... It is readily conceded... that evil is not essential to mere dramatic representation, but it is essential to a Theatre.... The recent introduction of the German Drama may be considered as a phenomenon in the world of dissipation. The writings of Congreve and Dryden are absolutely pure, when compared with the vile disgusting offspring of the profligate Kotzebue...."⁴ On the other hand, we find another critic of the theater citing The Stranger as a play rich in moral improvement.⁵ This same critic also finds religious edification in The Robbers,⁶ while yet another attacks the "daring impiety" of the play.⁷ The attitude behind such remarks seems to be this: since the theater is evil, then we must seek out the most evil part of the theater; that obviously is that part dominated by the German plays.

A more dangerous group was the one whose members found release in attacks on all things German. Here we enter an area far removed from the realm of art. Two examples of the sentiments expressed will illustrate the degree of frantic and


⁵James Plumptre, Four Discourses on Subjects Relating to the Amusement of the Stage (Cambridge, 1809), pp. 240-49.

⁶Plumptre, Four Discourses, p. 154.

⁷Monthly Mirror, VIII(1799), 173-74.
frightened irrationality displayed by this group. A series of letters from an Englishman living in Germany, published in the Anti-Jacobin Review, is a tour de force. After dismissing Kant as a sophist and concluding that the German language is barbaric, the writer reviews, in an almost gossipy fashion, the personal qualities of the better-known German writers. Wieland and Kotzebue lead lives which are judged to be unobjectionable (sic). However, "the equally renowned author of Werter is avowedly a man of pleasure and possesses not a single grain of morality in his composition. The only system of morality which he professes, is private convenience.... Against the private character of the author of The Robbers I have heard nothing particular. His temper is said to be very unequal, and his moral principles somewhat too modish." But this is weak stuff when compared with the immoderation of Hannah More in 1799. An exemplary member of the anti-drama group, the anti-German-drama group, and the anti-German group, she gives the breath of life to age-old prejudices which appear to be immortal, hibernating now and then only to reappear at the proper time. Specifically attacking German drama, she rapidly broadens her range as she speaks of

those swarms of publications now daily issuing from the banks of the Danube, which, like their ravaging predecessors of the darker ages, though with far other and more fatal arms, are over-running

\footnote{Anti-Jacobin Review, V(1800), 571-72.}
Reaction of this kind moves us entirely from the realm of art and brings us face to face with the brutal reality of the inertia of prejudice and momentum of fear of the unknown. German drama, Mrs. More says, is not the work of divinely inspired genius but of infernally inspired barbarians. For such a view there is no adequate reply just as there is no adequate explanation. One cannot reply on the basis of the esthetic strivings of the German dramatists; one cannot speak of the humanitarian ideals of the Goethezeit; one cannot say, "Ah, if there had only been an intermediary of Carlyle's stature to clarify matters." One can only retreat and await more favorable times, times of peace and security, when the old prejudices are dormant again; for apparently also immortal are the calmer persuasa-

sions of man the thinker. The violently prejudiced, when aroused, speak with a louder voice, being sure of themselves and of the correctness of their conviction. Through it all, the voice of reason continues to speak, though it may be ignored for a time.

One such voice, which was not heeded, was that of the young Crabb Robinson, who was living in Germany at the time (1800-1805). In 1802 the Monthly Register published a series of letters from him, the first of which began thus:

You know nothing about German literature. Kotzebue's and Iffland's plays and LaFontaine's novels are not German literature; though popular German works, they are not considered as classical here.... It is really distressing to those who, like me, look on the German literature and philosophy as the spring whence we must take new draughts of science and taste, to behold that, in being imported they are polluted by coming through impure channels.... You have, it seems, a "German Theatre". [Benjamin Thompson's collection; List of Plays, 170] I heard it remarked-"It will be curious to see how long the translator proceeds, before he, by good luck, stumbles on one of our good pieces." After all, it is not so much to be regretted that such inferior works should be translated, which at least answer their end, as it would be, were the real masterpieces of German literature delivered by the same hands.10

---

10 Monthly Register, I(1802), 397-98. Robinson, who was acquainted with the leading literary figures of both England and Germany, devoted considerable effort to establishing lines of communication between them. The futility of his attempts is best described by Eudo C. Mason, Die deutsche und englische Romantik (Göttingen, 1959), pp. 63ff.
Robinson did not know that those masterpieces had already been translated, and ignored.

Otherwise, the List of Plays shows little evidence of the continuing activity of the voices of reason between 1802 and 1813; we see there little more than reprints of Kotzebue's plays. In addition to the artistic, theatrical, and social reasons for the decline of interest which I have been discussing, there was another cause. War in Europe during these years reduced commercial and artistic traffic between England and the continent to a minimum. Although peace and a new generation farther removed from the upheavals after 1789 had to appear before a more balanced evaluation of German drama could be achieved, it was the fortunes of war and a quirk of history which resulted in the publication in London in 1813 of the first intelligent, thorough examination of German drama, indeed of all things German.
VII. THE FOURTH PERIOD; SUCCESS AS LITERATURE
AND FAILURE AS DRAMA: 1813-1850

1. Mme. de Staël in London

Toward the end of a life of insatiable curiosity and
frustrated intrigue, Mme. de Staël made her way to London, ar-
iving with her retinue in 1813.\(^1\) Her exile and her brief
visit to English soil mark a turning point in English attitudes
toward German literature, hence toward German drama. Napoleon,
although he had a thousand other good reasons to be rid of the
troublesome woman, had taken offense at the "anti-French"
nature of her critical survey of Germany, De l'Allemagne, which
she had attempted to publish in France in 1811. His anger
was not entirely unjustified, for in the work, Mme. de Staël
succeeded in skilfully damning the French ruler, not so much
with faint praise of France, as through elaborate praise of
German civilization and culture. Three years passed, during
which she continued to intrigue against Napoleon in Switzer-
land, Russia, and Sweden. Preceded by a not entirely ground-
less reputation (a popular joke existed to the effect that
there were three great powers in Europe—England, Russia, and
Mme. de Staël),\(^2\) she was triumphantly received in London
society. By a clever piece of trickery she had kept the

\(^1\)Biographical information taken from J. Christopher
Herold, Mistress to an Age (New York, 1958).

\(^2\)Herold, Mistress, p. 433.
manuscript of De l'Allemagne out of the hands of Napoleon's henchman who had orders to destroy all copies of the work. It was this manuscript which she brought with her to England and which was published in London in October, 1813 (304). The French version, which sold 3500 copies in six weeks, was followed in the same year by an English edition, called simply, Germany.

The work is a compendium of German culture. The first volume deals with society and customs and begins a survey of literature which is completed in the second volume; the third volume is devoted to a review of German philosophy and religion. Here, for the first time, the English were exposed to reasonably authoritative comments as well as first hand knowledge concerning Germany. Mme. de Staël's critical remarks probably owe more to August Wilhelm Schlegel's abiding presence than to her own insights, since she had been toying with him amorously and intellectually for a decade. But the fact that she had also seen the country and talked to most of the men whose work she described gave her book a unique and captivating immediacy which won her more readers than she would otherwise have enjoyed. In December of 1803 and January of 1804, she had conquered Weimar much as she later conquered London. From this and another later visit to Germany came the impres-

3 Herold, Mistress, p. 391.
sions which she communicated with such a disarming straightforwardness in *De l'Allemagne*. As an example, her comments on Goethe:

When Goethe is induced to talk, he is admirable; his eloquence is enriched with thought; his pleasantry is, at the same time, full of grace and of philosophy; his imagination is impressed by external objects, as was that of the ancient artists; nevertheless his reason possesses but too much of the maturity of our own times. Nothing disturbs the strength of his mind, and even the defects of his character, ill-humour, embarrassments, constraint, pass like clouds round the foot of that mountain, on the summit of which his genius is placed.⁴

With this sort of first-hand knowledge, Mme. de Staël virtually seduced the English readers into a perusal of her literary survey. What they found there was occasionally absurd but frequently sound critical appreciation. The bounteous literary feast of the *Goethezeit* was laid out for the English public to sample and to judge. Not only were the works of Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller treated at length; the new Romantic School was also discussed for the first time in English.

As an intermediary for German drama, Mme. de Staël's attitude is significant not because it established a trend but because it anticipated one. Although she had a life-long interest in the living theater and even acted frequently in private productions, her interest in German drama clearly lay in its possible value as a source of meditative enlightenment,

not in its effect on the stage. She concludes her long dis-
cussion of Faust I by observing that "it is impossible to
read Faustus without being excited to reflexion in a
thousand different manners: We quarrel with the author, we
condemn him; we justify him; but he obliges us to think upon
everything...."5

Since the validity of this idea that German drama was
actually closet-drama came to be almost universally recognized
in England in the nineteenth century, something must be said
here in defense of the suitability of German drama in the
living theater. Certainly it is possible to argue that the
finest dramatic products of the Goethezeit, or of any age
for that matter, can be fully appreciated only through a line
by line study. The argument is as valid for Goethe as for
Shakespeare. Who is to say whether the viewer of Faust or the
viewer of Hamlet overlooks more, as the multi-level spectacle
of the play unfolds rapidly before him? More important is
the question as to whether it is the reader of the play or
the viewer who comes away a better man from his meeting with
the work of art. Basically, this is but another aspect of
the conflict between the relative value of passive thought
and active experience; and here, in the case of drama, a com-
bination is as usual the best solution. What Mme. de Staël

5 De Staël, II, 225.
and the English did not see in regard to German drama was the fact that a combination is possible. *Faust*, as written, is obviously unsuited to the stage. But then, how often is *Hamlet* performed as written? The point is, the English from the beginning overlooked or ignored the fine acting versions of the plays which both critics and public came to value highly in the German theater.

Be that as it may, Mme. de Staël performed the important service of making available to the English a thoroughgoing survey of German dramatic activity. The general effects of her work on the English have been examined at length only once, and then, unsatisfactorily. In comparison with the dearth of intelligent critical material available before 1813, the mere existence of such a work was a giant step in the direction of genuine appreciation and understanding. To a lesser or greater degree, it was a stimulus for any Englishman who might be curious about the state of German thought and letters.

---

6 Emma Jaeck, *Mme. de Staël and the Spread of German Literature* (New York, 1915). Of the 358 pages in this work, less than ten (141-150) are concerned with the subject given in the title; the remainder is a hodge-podge of information about German literature in England. As such, it is not entirely worthless but still has very little to do with the effects of *De l'Allemagne* on the spread of German literature in England.
2. The Rise of Enlightened Criticism: Carlyle and Others

The final standard in judging the success of a literature in a new land can only be the extent to which an enlightened criticism of that literature arises in that land. Enlightened views held on a wide, popular basis cannot be hoped for, at least in a non-utopian society. Likewise neither can the sales volume of works from that literature be taken as a standard. It is rather the development of a core, a group of enlightened critics, be they professional or amateur, active privately or in the universities or the magazines and newspapers, which reflects a deep and abiding interest in the new literature and which keeps that literature alive in the alien atmosphere from generation to generation. The success of foreign drama is subject to more stringent requirements, for it must please both the critics and the audience. We have already seen what type of German drama pleased the audience in England around 1800 and what type failed to find an audience, being rejected at first meeting by critics and public alike. That critical hostility may be attributed to what Goethe called "eine zerstörende Kritik." His characterization of destructive criticism is a remarkably accurate summary of the critical attitudes which we have observed in earlier chapters. To indulge in destructive criticism, he says,
But there is also an enlightened criticism,

eine produktive Kritik...; sie fragt: Was hat sich
der Autor vorgestellt? Ist dieser Vorsatz vernünftig
und verständig? und inwiefern ist es gelungen, ihn
auszuführen? Werden diese Fragen einsichtig und
liebevoll beantwortet, so helfen wir dem Verfasser
nach, welcher bei seinen ersten Arbeiten gewiß schon
Vorschritte gethan und sich unserer Kritik
entgegengehoben hat."

That such an enlightened criticism of German literature at
last arose in Great Britain was primarily a result of the con-
tinuing Scottish interest in that literature. Three new maga-
zines, the Edinburgh Review founded in 1802, the Quarterly
Review (1809), and Blackwood's (Edinburgh) Magazine (1817),
though not always exhibiting a pro-German editorial policy,
at least provided a place where both sides of a critical ques-
tion could be discussed. They thus offered the new generation
of critics a forum where their thoughts could be aired. Even
the Quarterly Review, which was published in London, in 1826
came under the editorship of J. G. Lockhart, a native of
Scotland and a great germanophile.

7 Weimarer Ausgabe, Section 2, XLII, i(Weimar, 1904), 161.
8 Weimarer Ausgabe, Section 2, XLII, i(Weimar, 1904), 161.
Of the new generation, another Scotsman, Thomas Carlyle, is the most important representative, not because of a particular interest of his in German drama but because between 1819 and 1837, the years of his lively interest in the subject, he succeeded in transmitting to his fellow countrymen something of the age which was just coming to an end in Germany. From his earliest publication in 1822, through the Wilhelm Meister translation of 1824, the Life of Schiller in 1825, the admirable series of essays in the Edinburgh Review, 1827-30, through the last formal essay on German literature in 1832, Carlyle combined intellectual honesty with the fervor of a missionary. At the same time, his attitude toward German drama further reveals the intensifying estrangement between the English intellectuals and the living theater. Everywhere Carlyle is concerned with drama as a written means to an enlightened end. The popular acted plays of Klingemann and Müllner, even those of Grillparzer, call down his wrath, since he views them as existing far below the summit of Parnassus. He has nothing but scorn for such poetasters,


11 In the essay, "German Playwrights," Foreign Review, III (1829), 94-126, Carlyle develops an elaborate image of Parnassus, with Schiller and Goethe at the summit, while the poetasters are scattered about the lower rocky slopes, across which
and woe be unto the English critic who ventures a word of praise for one of their number.\textsuperscript{12} Whatever the good works Carlyle performed in the criticism of German drama and literature, and certainly they were of a considerable magnitude,\textsuperscript{13} even Carlyle was not free from the ambivalence which we have already seen a number of times. It apparently was not so much Goethe's death which caused Carlyle's loss of interest in German literature in the years following 1832 as it was his continuing growth away from the realm of art.\textsuperscript{14} The fact remains that he did lose interest, as had Mackenzie, Taylor, and the others before him.

Another, lesser intermediary, Robert Pearse Gillies, differed from Carlyle in that his interest lay almost entirely within the field of drama. In fact, the general level of translating activity would be much lower in the years, 1818-28, were it not for Gillies' numerous translations published in that decade in Blackwood's Magazine. Though not unskilled as

\textsuperscript{12} See p. 46.

\textsuperscript{13} Here everyone is in agreement. Cf. Morgan and Hohlfeld, German Literature, p. 50; Carré, Goethe, pp. 101-65; and especially Wolfgang Streuli, Thomas Carlyle als Vermittler deutscher Literatur und deutschen Geistes (Zürich, 1895); and Carlyle's Unfinished History of German Literature, ed. Hill Shine (Lexington, 1951), pp. xxii-xxiv.

\textsuperscript{14} Hill Shine, Carlyle's Early Reading to 1834, with an Introductory Essay on His Intellectual Development (Lexington, 1953), pp. 1-23.
a translator, Gillies in temperament was closer to Taylor than to Carlyle.

After a decade of feverish activity, Gillies also lost interest. In 1851 in his Memoirs of a Literary Veteran, he succinctly summarized the reasons for his youthful interest in German drama. His remarks remind one of Coleridge's sonnet addressed to Schiller. Indeed, they have a broader application, for they hint at that element of the demonic, foreign to the English muse but so familiar to the German. It is the old temptation of the forbidden, the illusory reward of the exotic. What youth saw as a source of Ultimate Knowledge, maturity sees as a different, possibly valuable but not necessarily invaluable perspective. Gillies says that, to him, the plays were only "stepping-stones into the deeper mines of German literature. Or to improve the metaphor, they were like a bridge across the dark waters hitherto thought impassable, leading away into the stupendous cavern, with its glittering stalactites, and its various treasures guarded by the Teutonic genii, who could be propitiated by one who came before them humbly, but courageously."  


This remark is surprisingly similar to a statement of Shelley's:

I have been reading over and over again Faust, and as always with sensations which no other composition excites. It deepens the gloom and augments the rapidity of ideas, and would therefore seem to me an unfit study for any person who is a prey to the reproaches of memory, and the delusions of an imagination not to be restrained. And yet the pleasure of sympathising with emotions known only to few, although they derive their sole charm from despair, and the scorn of the narrow good we can attain in our present state, seems more than to ease the pain which belongs to them. Perhaps all discontent with the less (to use a Platonic sophism) supposes a sense of a just claim to the greater, and that we admirers of Faust are on the right road to Paradise."

The implication, by Gillies and by Shelley, is that the Germans have entered where the English have not yet trod. Though infinitely more subtle in motivation and expression, this is the same attitude which was at work in the period around 1800. The suspicion, sometimes verbalized, sometimes not, that German drama and literature had exceeded the boundaries not only of decorum and good taste but of sanity as well, was present in Mackenzie, in Tytler, in the numerous critics around 1800, in Taylor, and in Gillies and Shelley. This suspicion, which may manifest itself in a wide range of subtlety or crudeness, must surely be one of the chief sources of the continuing difficulty in literary communication between the German and the Anglo-

---

17Shelley, letter to John Gisborne, April 10, 1827 (Shelley's Prose Works, ed. H. B. Foreman, IV [London, 1880], 262-63.)
American worlds. In time of stress, it may bring forth violent, irrational critical attack; in calmer times we find a poet and even a dilettante marveling at beauties hidden in the strange literature. In this connection it is highly significant that of all German art only music has made permanent inroads on the Anglo-American consciousness. I shall return to this problem, which I hold to be crucial, after showing the form taken by the English acceptance of German drama in the nineteenth century.

3. The Discovery of Goethe and Schiller; Translators and Translations: 1813-1850

With the comparatively unhindered flow of commercial and intellectual commerce assured by the artificial status quo settled upon at the Congress of Vienna, Europe entered a period of deceptive peace and superficial tranquillity. While those in power sought to ignore the manifold and justifiable political grievances of the people, and while those out of power only occasionally succeeded in making something of the injustices which were so widespread, the artistic and intellectual intercourse among the states of Europe flourished. One of the many consequences of this state of affairs was the rise to respectability in England of German drama. The appearance of a relatively impartial critical forum along with the curious and thoughtful critics to speak in that forum is surely
as much a result of this period of calm as is the increase of popular interest in the finest products of the German theater.

To the peace in Europe and the new generation of critics must be added a third factor important for the rise of interest in German drama. During the first third of the nineteenth century, the universities and the public schools gradually accepted German as a part of the curriculum. Among the first to do so were the University College and King's College in London and the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich. At the same time, the various tools, the dictionaries and grammars necessary for the proper study of a language also became available.

The fourth and most important factor I have mentioned before. A nation as literarily-minded as England could not long remain ignorant of the products of any other member of the Western community. Because of geographical proximity and cultural ties, it was only a matter of time until the English began to investigate seriously the drama and literature of the Goethezeit.

In the List of Plays we see the result in the large number of translations and editions produced by various hands

---

between 1813 and 1850. A cursory glance at the list is deceptive, for closer examination reveals that this not inconsiderable amount of translating activity was devoted almost exclusively to the works of Goethe and Schiller. In fact there were so many editions that one can almost speak of their popularization at this time. Table III offers a summary of the centers of English interest in German drama between 1823 and 1850. Faust with thirty-eight printings was most popular, followed by Die Jungfrau von Orleans, Wilhelm Tell, Tasso, Don Carlos, and Maria Stuart.

Highly significant are the two groups of plays which were not translated while so much attention was given to Goethe and Schiller. On the one hand, there were, with minor exceptions, no plays from the eighteenth century before 1785. On the other hand, also with few exceptions, there were no plays of the immediate present, i.e., of the years, 1823-1850. Consequently it is not possible to speak of the appearance in England of a balanced view of German drama; virtually to the exclusion of all else, interest was focused on Goethe and Schiller. There was curiosity neither about what came before them, nor about what came after them, nor, for that matter,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1780-89</th>
<th>1790-99</th>
<th>1800-09</th>
<th>1810-19</th>
<th>1820-29</th>
<th>1830-39</th>
<th>1840-50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lessing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss S.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goethe:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clavigo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egmont</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Götz</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iphigenie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schiller:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Carlos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungfrau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Stuart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Räuber</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiesko</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallenstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kotzebue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menschenhaß</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanier</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
about what was simultaneous with them.

This situation points up a revealing similarity between this later period of interest, 1823-50 and beyond, and the earlier one, 1798-1803. Both periods were largely popular in nature. To be sure, both were given their initial impulse by more or less gifted critics, Mackenzie and Taylor in the first, Carlyle in the second. After the first impulse, it was basically the ebb and flow of public opinion and not any critical pronouncements which determined the course of development. The difference between the two periods is this: although both abounded with exaggerated and misguided enthusiasm and superficiality, the first period of interest expired in the morass of that superficiality, while the second period, which actually ended only when political catastrophe finally overtook Europe in the twentieth century, saw the appearance of a large body of fine translation and relatively enlightened criticism. First, two examples of the absurdities evident in the second period.

Even the existence of a group of enlightened critics was not enough to control the popularity of Faust, which reached

---

20 That this should be the case was largely because of the continued prevalence of a one-level world well into the nineteenth century. As the multi-level world gradually emerges, the populace as a whole plays a smaller and smaller role in determining the course of development. Each world develops its own centers of interest, its own critics, its own enthusiasts, and its own relatively enlightened audience.
such proportions that one is justified in speaking of a Faust-craze, similar to the earlier Kotzebue-craze. The statement is justified both because of the large number of Faust translations and because of the nature of the translations. Once known only as the "author of Werther," Goethe by 1841 was known to many only as the author of Faust, "that untranslatable poem which every Englishman translates." 21 The mass of translations, which has already been examined, 22 displays not unexpectedly a wide variation in quality. Most astonishing is the nature of the most popular translation in its day, that of John Anster in 1835 (495). More an attempt to translate the spirit of Faust rather than the substance, Anster's version though repeatedly attacked 23 went through some thirty-two editions by 1925, a number exceeded only by Anna Swanwick's 1849 translation (590, forty editions by 1928).

21 Sarah Austin, Fragments from German Prose Writers (New York, 1841), p. 275.


23 For example, the comments in the Westminster Review, XXV(1836), 203ff., and the remarks by another translator, Robert Talbot, Faust, 2nd ed. (London, 1839), p. xviii. On the other hand, the Edinburgh Review, LXII(1835), 37, was quite taken with Anster's rendition.
and Bayard Taylor's translation in 1870 (forty-nine editions by 1946). 24

Schiller's works also enjoyed considerable popular acclaim and were thus subject to some distortion. 25 Although no one of his plays achieved the fame of Faust, his works as a body were as popular as were those of Goethe. (See Table III.) His popular acclaim reached an embarrassing peak on November 10, 1859, when the centennial of his birth was celebrated at the Crystal Palace. In its lack of restraint and abundant bad taste the celebration reminds one of Kotzebue's opening nights at Drury Lane. Following a laudatory address by a German exile, the highlight of the program was a lengthy musical paean to Schiller featuring among other pieces the "Song of the Bell" performed by a thousand-voice-chorus. 26 Recurring exhibitions of unrestrained enthusiasm such as this make clear the unstable nature of the popular reception of German drama in England. Such displays of enthusiasm are unfortunately more subject to control by the capricious winds of history than the calmer persuasions of man's reason.

In contrast to the dearth of good work in the first per-

---

24 Figures compiled from Morgan, A Critical Bibliography.


26 Athenaeum, XXXIV(1859), 639ff.
iod of interest, this later age did produce several translations of an enduring and worthwhile character. In 1849 the first English edition of Schiller’s works (593) appeared, containing all the major plays in translations whose quality ranged from good to excellent; and in 1850 the first English edition of Goethe came out (596). These two editions, which soon became the standard editions, mark at one and the same time the climax of the English discovery of Goethe and Schiller and the beginning of a real appreciation. Reprints of the Schiller edition were so numerous that the authoritative bibliographer of Schiller in England, R. Pick, admits that it was impossible to trace them all. 27

Concerning other German playwrights, the situation was much less satisfactory. The lack of interest in the more distant past may be attributed to the fact that the field of Germanics had not yet been entered by English scholars; but the lack of interest in works of the present, 1820-50, cannot be explained away so easily. The phenomenon on view here is that of a time-lag in the transmission of the plays. Even in a period of enlightenment, the critics as well as the translators and the public appear to have remained approximately a generation behind artistic events in Germany, in some cases, more than a generation. In the case of Goethe and Schiller,  

the time-lag varied considerably. *Faust I* (379) was fifteen years coming into English; *Faust II* (513), six years. *Tell* (404) required twenty-one years; *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* (393), twenty-three years, and so on. Among other playwrights, the time-lag is with one exception much larger. The period, 1820-50, is certainly not a bleak one in the German theater. While the Kotzebue tradition was carried on by a host of theatrical artisans, a number of able, even gifted dramatists were at work. One thinks of Büchner, Grillparzer, Grabbe, Gutzkow, and Hebbel. With the misleading exception of Grillparzer, not a single contemporary German dramatist of the first order appears in the List of Plays. Grillparzer's presence there is misleading because the various translations from his work (341, 353, 402, 420, 426, 436, 446, 455) were largely the work of one man, R. P. Gillies, and one periodical, *Blackwood's Magazine*. With the cessation of Gillies' activity as a translator in 1830, Grillparzer's name disappears from the list. Hebbel, to take the most prominent dramatist as an example, was not translated until the early years of the twentieth century.

Table IV, a summary of the time differential between the appearance of plays in Germany and their appearance in England, shows that the time-lag has continued to exist, year after year, generation after generation. With little change in the result, the table could be continued up to the present, for
Table IV. Time-lag in the Transmission of Plays.
(Number of years since first German edition given after each play.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of 1st Eng. Edition</th>
<th>Lessing</th>
<th>Goethe</th>
<th>Schiller</th>
<th>Kotzebue</th>
<th>Selected Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Nathan- 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Emilia-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minna-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Räuber-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Iphigenie-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Don Carlos-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiesko-13</td>
<td>Indianer-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kabale-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neger.-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanier-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Clavigo-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stella-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adelheid-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graf Ben.-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graf v.B.-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kind-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Menschen.-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wildfang-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Miss S.S.-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Götz-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Armut-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corsen-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Üble L.-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edle L.-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Falsche S.-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opfer.-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schreib.-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silb.H.-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sonnen.-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peyrouse-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Brandes(7)-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gemmingen-Hornberg (17)-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Klinger(23)-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kratter(53)-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kratter(54)-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unzer(59)-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

116.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of 1st Eng. Edition</th>
<th>Lessing</th>
<th>Goethe</th>
<th>Schiller</th>
<th>Kotzebue</th>
<th>Selected Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verleum.-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Versöhn.-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Witwe-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wallenstein-0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iffland (139)- 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Stuart-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Johanna-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weiblich.-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gefang.-5</td>
<td>Grillparzer (341)- 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trunken.-0</td>
<td>Grillparzer (353)- 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eduard-2</td>
<td>Müllner (356)- 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kreuz.-3</td>
<td>Müllner (357)- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wirrwarr-2</td>
<td>Grillparzer (341)- 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blind-1</td>
<td>Grillparzer (353)- 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Klinge.-13</td>
<td>Müllner (356)- 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hussiten-15</td>
<td>Müllner (357)- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faust I-15</td>
<td>Rehbock-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jungfrau-23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raupach (438)- 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tell-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tasso-38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demetr.-31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Braut-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faust II-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verwandt.-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organe-32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Egmont-61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raimund (599)- 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the phenomenon is a continuing one. It should be borne in
mind that the tabulation as presented says nothing about
acceptance but is concerned merely with the first transla-
tion. If we were to speak of a time-lag with regard to
acceptance, we should in the case of Goethe and Schiller have
to speak in terms of fifty years or more.

What gives the phenomenon its significance is the one ex-
ception, the period, 1798-1803, when for a while, there was
almost no time differential. The fact that the time-lag was
greatly diminished during those five years must be attributed
largely to the immediacy of the theater and of theatrical per-
formance. It was not the printed translations which brought
about the rise in interest in German drama but the stagings
themselves. When The Stranger night after night moved the
audience to tears, more plays from the same language were in-
vestigated. The appeal of Kotzebue was in the theater, in the
fleeting moments of actual time. In seeking other such works,
the English translated everything which was available. No
less than eight of Kotzebue's plays appeared in England in the
same year as the first appearance in Germany.

On that basis, the significance of the time-lag with re-
gard to the English acceptance of Goethe and Schiller becomes

---

28 Morgan, A Critical Bibliography, for example, entries
under Hauptmann, Brecht, and others; also C. R. Decker,
"Ibsen's Literary Reputation and Victorian Taste," Studies in
Philology, XXXII (1935), 632-45.
clear. Their appeal, among the English, was more to the reader, lost in the subjective time of leisurely meditation. The immense complexity of the dramatic heritage of Goethe and Schiller, instead of arousing and widening the interest of the English in German drama as the immediacy of Kotzebue had done, served rather to concentrate and limit that interest. The popular mind, having forgotten Kotzebue, thus came to comprehend German drama much as Gillies had, as something remote, lofty, and noble, hardly suited for representation on the stage. The few attempts at performance during these years could only confirm that impression.

4. The Performances

Repeated, though sporadic attempts were made to put Schiller on the English stage: Kabale und Liebe in 1819 (#345); Maria Stuart the same year (#346); Die Jungfrau von Orleans in 1837 (#509); Maria Stuart in 1840 (#534); Don Carlos in 1848 (#589); Kabale und Liebe in 1850 (#604); and Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua also in 1850 (#605).

Whatever the fate of the plays, and they were, without exception, failures on stage, it is encouraging to find that the critical enlightenment of the period had spread to include even the anonymous newspaper reviewers. As early as 1837, the writer for the Times, discussing Joan of Arc at Covent Garden (#509), displays knowledge not only of the form of
Schiller's play but also of Schiller's place in German drama. Consequently he is harshly critical of the spectacle which had been concocted from Schiller. The reviewer for the same paper responded to the Strand's mutilation of Kabale und Liebe in 1850 with the observation that Power and Principle (#604) was "so much altered from the original that it may be considered an independent piece." Furthermore, "those who go to the New Strand Theatre with any expectation of seeing the stormy and lengthy play of Schiller, bubbling up as it is with the rude strength of his Titanic youth will not find their expectations realised." Those remarks assume the existence of a fairly large group which might be interested in the original play and also display a confident assessment of the position of the play in Schiller's development as a dramatist. We have come a long way from the reviews of 1800.

Most revealing are the comments of the reviewer of Planché's staging of Fiesko at Drury Lane (#605), also in 1850. A long discussion of the German play, with references to Schiller's sources and purposes, is followed by a detailed consideration of the changes made by the English adaptor, which consisted mainly of abridgment. The critic's sympathy lies with Planché: "Let us turn the matter about as we may, we find that with all due respect to the work of a standard

29 London Times, November 29, 1837.
30 London Times, June 11, 1850.
European author, the cause of the very cool reception given by the London audience to Schiller's *Fiesco* lay with no less a personage than Friedrich von Schiller himself. His play will always be read with interest..." but he concludes it is totally unsuited to the stage. 31 Although *Fiesko* is not the most theatrical of Schiller's plays, the *Times* critic's attitude is significant on two counts. One, it brings us back to the feeling, traced above, in regard to the popularity of the printed plays of Goethe and Schiller, that they were works of literature, not drama, whose meaning is accessible only to the reader. Two, one is reminded once again of the continuing superficiality of the English theater. Here at the end of our hundred years, one finds that none of the three elements of the theatrical experience have changed greatly in England. The actors are still capable enough; the playwrights, ever subject to the whims of the audience, must still work in the limited realm of that which is momentarily pleasing.

As another example, two attempts were made on stage to exploit the popularity of *Faust* among the reading public, one in 1825 (#406), and one in 1842 (#552). So limited was the range of that which the audiences would accept that neither piece had much more than the title in common with Goethe's work. 32

31 *London Times*, February 5, 1850.
The failure of German drama in England might be blamed on the chauvinism or the xenophobia of the English theater were it not for the continuing great popularity of French plays. Once, for a brief time, in the years following 1798, German drama supplanted French drama as the most popular source of foreign models. That popularity reached its peak and subsided, the only lasting result being the acceptance of a few of Kotzebue's plays in the English repertory for a generation or so. 33 We contrast this with the history of French drama in England, and the failure of German drama is placed in perspective. Through the years, the quantity of translation and adaptation for the English stage from the French has been so great that the author of the most complete work on English drama must content himself with the statement that "fully one-half of the plays written between 1800 and 1850 must have been suggested by Parisian models, and many were literally adapted by English authors." 34 Even at the height of the French-English conflict, around 1800 when German plays were most popular, such

LXX (1951), 150-85.

33 Another, less significant peak was reached in the season of 1805-06 when a troupe known as "Schirmer's Children" acted various plays in German at the Sans Souci Theatre, which during that season was called the German Theatre. Aside from the records of three of the plays performed (#226, #227, and #239) nothing is known about this endeavor. See Nicoll, History of English Drama, IV, 225.

34 Nicoll, History of English Drama, IV, 79f.
adaptations continued to be made. Furthermore, plays given in French were by no means uncommon. When, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, Maria Stuart gained some popularity on the English stage, it was as Marie Stuart, a French adaptation.

35 Edith Wray, "English Adaptations of French Drama between 1780 and 1815," Modern Language Notes, XLIII (1928), 87-90.

36 The Times theater listings in 1850, for example, contain numerous references to French-language performances.

VIII. THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

In 1824 a theatrical piece of German origin conquered the English stage much as Pizarro had in 1799. No less than six versions were performed in 1824; and by May, 1826, the version at Drury Lane had reached its hundredth presentation. Moreover, the same piece was played in German by a German company at Covent Garden in 1829\(^1\) and has since continued to hold a place in the repertory. These facts are not a refutation of the arguments contained in this dissertation concerning the failure of German drama on the English stage but, rather, a confirmation. The work in question was not a play but an opera, Weber's Der Freischütz. It is not mere coincidence that the Covent Garden performance in 1829 marked, to the best of available knowledge, the first time the German language was heard on a major London stage.

Any English or American opera-goer can respond fairly intelligently to a question about Fidelio or Tristan. Any Anglo-American concert-goer can at least nod his head knowledgeably at the mention of Bach, Beethoven, or Brahms. But how many English or American theater-goers can name more than two or three German plays, to say nothing of showing familiarity with them? The cycle of interest traced for the period, 1750-1850, continues today. At the moment, the English play-

\(^1\)Genest, *Some Account*, IX, 283-85.
goer might be able to mention a play or two of Brecht's,
just as around 1900 one might have heard Hauptmann's name,
or in the 1840's perhaps Goethe and Schiller, or around
1800, Kotzebue. German drama has only occasionally succeeded
in offering the English play-goer that immediacy and accessi-
bility offered by German music or German music-drama. A
French musical adaptation of Faust succeeds where Goethe's
play never could.

The continuation of the cycle and the popularity of
German music are just causes for pessimism regarding the
development of any widespread English appreciation and accept-
ance of German drama. I am unfortunately able to offer an all
too timely example as further cause for pessimism. In 1961
Maria Stuart appeared on American television in a highly satis-
fying production. One result was the following letter, which
I quote in full, to the editor of a local newspaper:

A short time ago, I read in your Sound-off
column a letter concerning the Play of the Week
on Sunday night television. Last Sunday (April
23) I made it a point to watch it. The name of
the play was "Mary Stuart." The first act con-
tained more foul, unprintable language in that one
act than in one of our "adult" movies. Since
The Post is one of the sponsors of the channel
that carries this program, can you, or won't you
do something about it?2

The chronological proximity of those remarks causes one to
realize that the "reaction" to German drama around 1800 was

not caused so much by its being German drama as by its being new and quite different drama. The writer of the letter would surely respond in the same way to an invasion of her living room by Anouilh or Osborne, just as she with mute delight accepts the harmless outpourings of numberless modern Kotzebues. Seeking some source of optimism, one must turn to the increasingly complex and diversified nature of the world of art, which was already discernibly taking its present form in the nineteenth century. That century was paradoxical in many ways, in one way because it saw the accelerated germination of the seeds of the most violent sort of nationalism and at the same time the germination of the seeds of the noblest kind of cosmopolitanism. In the long view, the nation, Germany, exhibits a flowering of the nationalism; and the poet, Goethe, represents a flowering of the cosmopolitanism. If for a moment one takes the shorter view in regard to the situation of German drama in England, we encounter this situation: there, it was Goethe (and Schiller) who provoked expressions of hostility, while Kotzebue succeeded in leaping national boundaries and even became for a time a figure of world literature. From the viewpoint of the European of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, the "art" of Kotzebue, however mediocre it seemed to his fellow dramatists in Germany, was timely, arresting, entertaining, touching, and even mildly provocative. From the viewpoint of the
Englishman of that time, the dramas of Goethe and Schiller were patently subversive, politically, socially, and morally. The reasons for this are clear. Kotzebue was working, by his own admission, on a popular level; the voice of his audiences was the voice of the gods. He succeeded on an international scale because the popular audiences in the civilized countries of the West, by the end of the eighteenth century, were more alike than different, sharing as they did a common cultural, political, and religious heritage. Kotzebue appealed to the new, international, popular audience of his own day, while Goethe and Schiller were writing for their own captive audience as well as for the international audience of a later day. To be just to the English audiences of 1800 and even 1850, it must be pointed out that only recently has a sufficiently large international audience of sufficient enlightenment emerged to support anything like an international repertory. If we are ever to escape the cycle of ambivalent popularity it will be through the continuing growth of such an enlightened audience.
LIST OF PLAYS

German Plays Published and Performed in England from 1750 to 1850

This list is intended to be a complete reference list for German plays in England from 1750 to 1850. It includes the first listing in one place of English performances of German plays. It also should serve as a convenient supplement to the listing of editions by B. Q. Morgan (source 2, below), to which I have added several editions contained in the Axson Collection at Rice University (source 1, below).

Arrangement:

The plays are numbered and arranged chronologically. Where necessary, each year has these subdivisions:

1. Printed plays, alphabetically by German author, then by German title, and under each title, alphabetically by translator.

2. Collections, alphabetically by editor or translator, whichever is applicable.

3. First performances, alphabetically by German author, then by German title. See below, Symbols.

4. Repeat performances, i.e., plays in repertory or revivals, alphabetically by German author and title. See below, Symbols.

An index by author follows the List of Plays.
Sources:

Sources for printed plays:

4. Various other works cited in notes to the List.

Sources for performances:

5. Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage*, VI-X (Bath, 1832).
6. Allardyce Nicoll, as above.
7. London newspapers and magazines.
8. Various other works cited in notes to the List.

Symbols and Abbreviations:

#- indicates first performance; printed before the number of the play in the List.
##- indicates repeat performance.
X- number of times performed, e.g., 14X.
"....."- indicates the seasons in which the Drury Lane and Covent Garden companies were not playing in their own theaters.
Ax.- refers to editions contained in the Axson Collection which have not been recorded by other bibliographers.
Mor.- refers to works, which I have not seen, listed by Morgan, source 2, above.
Nic.- refers to works, which I have not seen, and which Morgan also did not list, listed by Nicoll, source 3, above.
ad.- adapted by.
anon.- anonymous.
ext.- extracts.
trans.- translated by.

1753
1. Friedrich II. **Silla, Drama per Musica. Sylla, a Dramatic Entertainment.** Samuel Derrick. 1753. (Mor.)

1763
2. Klopstock. **Der Tod Adams. The Death of Adam.** Robert Lloyd. 1763. (Mor.)¹

1781
3. Lessing. **Nathan der Weise. Nathan the Wise.** R. E. Raspe. 1781. (Mor.)

¹Nicoll III, 282, attributes part of Act II to George Colman, the elder.
1786


1790


8. Same. Same. 2nd ed. 1790. (Nic. III)


#11. Brandes. Der Gasthof. (7) Covent Garden, Nov. 11, 1790. 13X.

1791


1792


Contains: Goethe: Die Geschwister - The Sister;
Emdorff: Der Postzug - The Set of Horses;
Gessner: Conversation of a Father with His Children.

1793


1794


18. Goethe. Iphigenie auf Tauris. (15) Berlin, 1794. (Mor.)

19. Lessing. Emilia Galotti. Emilia Galotti. Dr. Berrington. 1794. (Mor.)³

20. Schiller. Die Räuber. The Robbers. M. G. Lewis. 1794. (Mor.)⁴

²Morgan 2150 lists as first printed in 1799. Genest, VII, 160, says it was printed the year it was performed, i.e., 1794.

³Doubtful. Morgan 5712 did not see the edition. Genest, VII, 180, knew nothing of it.

⁴Doubtful. Cf. Morgan 8040; he did not see the edition and cites conflicting statements about its existence.
   Covent Garden, Feb. 5, 1794. 6x.

   Drury Lane, Oct. 28, 1794. 3x.

1795

   The Modern Arria. Anon. 1795. (Mor.)

   (Mor.)

   1795.


1796

   1796.

   1796. (Mor.)

29. ———Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua. *Fiesco; or,
   1796.

30. ———Same. Same. 2nd ed. 1796.

31. The German Miscellany. Perth, 1796. Contains:
   Kotzebue, *Die Indianer in England. The Indians in
   England,* Alexander Thomson; *Maïner, Bianca Capella,
   Bianca Capella,* Ext. Benjamin Thompson.
1797

   Rolla; or, *The Peruvian Hero.* M. G. Lewis. 1797.5
   (Mor.)

   Lewis. 1797.

34. ------Same. (25) 2nd ed. 1797.

35. ------*Die Räuber.* (14) 3rd ed. 1797.

    Private Performances, Brandenburgh House, London, June
    1 and 7, 1797.6

1798

   1798. (Mor.)

38. ------*Stella.* Stella. Anon. 1798.

   Benjamin Thompson. 1798. (Mor.)

40. ------*Graf Benjowski.* Count Benyowsky; or, The Conspiracy
    of Kamtschatka. W. Render. 1798.

41. ------Same. Same. 2nd ed. 1798. (Ax.)

42. ------*Der Graf von Burgund.* The Count of Burgundy. Anne
    Plumptre. 1798.


6Dates of performance given on title page of 1799 edition. (118)
43. ----Same. Same. 3rd ed. 1798. (Mor.)
44. ----Das Kind der Liebe. Lovers' Vows. Mrs. Inchbald. 1798.
45. ----Same. Same. 9th ed. 1798.
46. ----Same. The Natural Son. Anne Plumptre. 1798.
47. ----Same. Same. 4th ed. 1798. (Mor.)
49. ----Menschenhass und Reue. The Stranger; or, Misanthropy and Repentance. George Papendick. 1798.
50. ----Same. The Stranger. A. Schink. 1798.
51. ----Same. Same. 6th ed. 1798. (Mor.)
52. ----Der Wildfang. The Wild Goose Chase. William Dunlap. 1798. (Mor.)
54. ----Die Verschwörung wider Peter den Großen, oder Menzikoff und Natalia. Natalia and Menzikoff; or, The Conspiracy against Peter the Great. Anon. 1798.
55. Schiller. Don Carlos. Don Carlos. G. H. Noehden and J. Stoddart. 1798. (Mor.)
56. ----Same. Same. Symonds. 1798. (Ax.)
57. ----Same. Same. 3rd ed. 1798. (Mor.)
58. ----Kabale und Liebe. (33) 2nd ed. 1798.
59. Unzer, Johann Christoph. Diego und Leonore. The Inquisi-
tor. Ad. J. P. Andrews and H. J. Pye. (Mor.)
    Covent Garden, April 17, 1798.
or, The Victim of Constancy. Ad. Samuel Birch.
    Covent Garden, Dec. 22, 1798.
#62. -----Das Kind der Liebe. (44) Covent Garden, Oct. 11,
    1798. 42X.
#63. -----Menschenhaß und Reue. The Stranger. Ad. R. B.
    Sheridan. Drury Lane, March 24, 1798. 26X.
#64. Unzer, Johann Christoph. Diego und Leonore. The Inquisi-
    3X.

1799
    Rose (d'Aguilar) Lawrence. Liverpool, 1799.
    1799.
    1799.
68. -----Die Hagestolzen. The Bachelors. Anon. 1799. (Mor.)
    (Mor.)

72. -----Same. Same. 6th ed. 1799. (Ax.)

73. -----Same. Sighs; or, The Daughter. Ad. Prince Hoare. 1799.

74. -----Die Corsen. The Corsicans. Anon. 2nd ed. 1799. (Mor.)


76. -----Same. Same. Maria Geisweiler. 1799. (Mor.)

77. -----Same. Same. 2nd ed. 1799. (Mor.)


80. -----Same. Same. Alexander Thomson. 1799. (Ax.)

81. -----Das Kind der Liebe. (44) 10th ed. 1799. (Ax.)

82. -----Menschenhasß und Reue. (49) 2nd ed. 1799. (Ax.)

83. -----Same. Same. 3rd ed. 1799. (Ax.)

84. -----Same. (50) 7th ed. 1799. (Ax.)

85. -----Der Opfertod. Self-immolation; or, The Sacrifice of Love. Henry Neuman. 1799.

86. -----Same. Same. 2nd ed. 1799. (Mor.)

87. -----La Peyrouse. La-Peyrouse. Anne Plumptre. 1799. (Mor.)

88. -----Same. La Peyrouse. Benjamin Thompson. 1799. (Mor.)
89. -----Das Schreibepult. The Writing-desk; or, Youth in Danger. Anon. 1799. (Mor.)

90. -----Same. The Wise Man of the East. Mrs. Inchbald. 1799.

91. -----Same. Same. 2nd ed. 1799.  


94. -----Same. Rolla; or, The Virgin of the Sun. William Dunlap. 1799. (Mor.)

95. -----Same. The Virgin of the Sun. James Lawrence. 1799. (Ax.)

96. -----Same. Same. Anne Plumptre. 1799.

97. -----Same. Same. 5th ed. 1799. (Ax.)

98. -----Same. Rolla; or, The Virgin of the Sun. Benjamin Thompson. 1799.

99. -----Die Spanier in Peru. Pizarro in Peru. Richard Heron. 1799. (Mor.)

100. -----Same. Pizarro; or, The Peruvian Mother. Dr. Ainslie. 1799. (Mor.)

---

7Nicoll, III, 275, has three editions in 1799.

8Genest, VII, 423, says first printing came in 1817.

Cf. Morgan 5302.
101. ----Same.  **Pizarro in Peru; or, The Death of Rolla.**  
     Thomas Dutton.  1799.

102. ----Same.  Same.  2nd ed.  1799.  (Mor.)

103. ----Same.  **Pizarro.**  James Lawrence.  1799.  (Ax.)

104. ----Same.  **Rolla; or, The Peruvian Hero.**  M. G. Lewis.  
     1799.  (Mor.)

105. ----Same.  **The Spaniards in Peru; or, the Death of**  
     **Rolla.**  Anne Plumptre.  1799.  (Ax.)

106. ----Same.  Same.  6th ed.  1799.  (Mor.)

107. ----Same.  **Pizarro.**  Ad. Richard Brinsley Sheridan.  
     1799.

108. ----Same.  Same.  20th ed.  1799.

109. ----Same.  **Pizarro.**  Ad. Matthew West.  1799.  
     (Nic. III)

110. ----**Üble Laune.**  **The Peevish Man.**  Charles Ludger.  
     1799.

111. ----**Die Verleumder.**  The Force of Calumny.  Anne  
     Plumptre.  1799.

112. ----**Die Versöhnung.**  **The Reconciliation; or, The**  
     **Birthday.**  Charles Ludger.  1799.

113. ----Same.  Same.  4th ed.  1799.

114. ----**Die Witwe und das Reitpferd.**  **The Horse and the**  
     **Widow.**  Ad. Thomas Dibdin.  1799.

115. ----Same.  **The Widow and the Riding-horse.**  Anne  
     Plumptre.  1799.

116. Lessing.  **Minna von Barnhelm.**  **The School for Honor;**
or, The Chance of War. [Robert Harvey] 9 1799.

117. ----- Miss Sara Sampson. The Fatal Elopement. Eleanor
H----. The Lady's Magazine, XXX(1799).

1799. 10

1799.

120. ----- Same. Same. Songs, Duets, and Choruses in The
Red-Cross Knights. 1799. (Nic. III)

121. ----- Same. The Robbers. W. Render. 1799.

#122. Kotzebue. Armut und Edelsinn. (73) Haymarket, July 30,
1799. 14X.

#123. ----- Graf Benjowski. Zelida; or, The Pirates. Ad.
Henry Siddons. Lancaster, 1799. (Nic. III)

#124. ----- Der Graf von Burgund. The Count of Burgundy. Ad.
Alexander Pope. Covent Garden, April 12, 1799.

#125. ----- Der Opfertod. (85) Haymarket, June 15, 1799. 4X.

#126. ----- Das Schreibepult. (90) Covent Garden, November
30, 1799. 14X.

#127. ----- Die Sonnenjungfrau. (93) Royal Circus, July, 1799.

---

9 The translator's name does not appear in the edition. William Taylor, Historic Survey of German Poetry (London, 1828-30), I, 356, refers to a translation of Minna at this time by Robert Harvey, a friend of Taylor's. For further evidence, see Notes and Queries, 5th ser. IV (1875), 260, 280, 320.

10 Printing of the version performed privately in 1797 (#36).
#128. ——Die Spanier in Peru. (107) Drury Lane, May 24, 1799. 31X.

#129. ——Die Versöhnung. The Birthday. Ad. Thomas Dibdin. Covent Garden, April 8, 1799. 14X.

#130. ——Die Witwe und das Reitpferd. (114) Covent Garden, May 4, 1799. 7X.

#131. Schiller. Die Räuber. (119) Haymarket, August 21, 1799. 8X.


#133. ——Menschenhas und Reue. (63) Drury Lane, 1799-1800.

#134. ——Same. Same. Bath, 1799-1800.

#135. ——Die Spanier in Peru. Drury Lane, 1799-1800. 36X.

#136. ——Same. Same. Bath, 1799-1800. 6X.

#137. ——Die Versöhnung. (129) Covent Garden, 1799-1800.


1800

139. Iffland. Verbrechen aus Ehrucht. Crime from Ambition. Maria Geisweiler. 1800. (Mor.)


141. ——Johanna von Montfaucon. Joanna of Montfaucon. Anon. 1800. (Mor.)
142. -----Same. Same. Ad. Richard Cumberland. 1800.
143. -----Same. Same. 3rd ed. 1800. (Mor.)
144. -----Die Negersklaven. (27) 1800. (Mor.)
146. -----Same. Same. (107) 26th ed. with translation back into German by Constantine Geisweiler. 1800. (Mor.)
147. -----Die Versöhnung. (129) 1800.
149. The Beauties of Kotzebue, Containing the Most Interesting Scenes, Sentiments, Speeches, etc., in All His Admired Dramas. W. C. Oulton. 1800. (Mor.)
151. -----Same. Same. (14) 4th ed. 1800. (Mor.)
155. The German Museum. 1800-01. See below, (169).
156. The German Theatre. 1800-01. See below, (170).
#157. Kotzebue. Johanna von Montfaucon. (142) Covent Garden,
Jan. 16, 1800. 14X.

#158. -----Der Wildfang. Of Age Tomorrow. Ad. Thomas Dibdin. Drury Lane, Feb. 1, 1800. 36X.

#159. -----Kotzebue. Armut und Edelsinn. (122) Haymarket, 1800. 2X.

#160. -----Das Kind der Liebe. (62) Covent Garden, 1800-01.

#161. -----Menschenhass und Reue. (63) Drury Lane, 1800-01.

#162. -----Same. Same. Covent Garden, 1800-01.

#163. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Drury Lane, 1800-01. 15-20X.11

#164. -----Same. Same. Bath, 1800-01.

#165. -----Die Versöhnung. (129) Covent Garden, 1800-01.

#166. -----Same. Same. Haymarket, 1800.

1801


169. The German Museum. 1800-01. Contains: Babo, Die Strelitzen, The Strelitzes, Anon.; Leisewitz, Julius von Tarent, Julius of Tarent, Peter Will. (Mor.)

11Genest, VII, 507.
1800-01. Contains: Vol. I: Kotzebue:
Menschenhaß und Reue- The Stranger
Die Sonnenjungfrau- Rolla
Die Spanier in Peru- Pizarro
Vol. II: Schiller:
Don Carlos- Don Carlos
Kotzebue:
Graf Benjowski- Count Benyowsky
Vol. III: Kotzebue:
Das Kind der Liebe- Lovers' Vows
Der Taubstumme- Deaf and Dumb
Die Indianer in England- Indian Exiles
Falsche Scham- False Delicacy
Vol. IV: Babo:
Otto von Wittelsbach- Otto of Wittelsbach
Dagobert- Dagobert
Kotzebue:
Adelheid von Wulffingen- Adelaide of Wulffingen
Vol. V: Schiller:
Die Räuber- The Robbers
Kotzebue:
Die silberne Hochzeit- The Happy Family
Iffland:
Das Gewissen- Conscience
Vol. VI: Schröder:

Der Fähnrich - The Ensign
Reitzenstein:

Graf Königsmark - Count Koenigsmark
Goethe:

Stella - Stella
Lessing:

Emila Galotti - Emilia Galotti


#173. -----Das Kind der Liebe. (62) Covent Garden, 1801-02.

#174. -----Same. Same. Haymarket, 1801.

#175. -----Menschenhas und Reue. (63) Drury Lane, 1801-02.

#176. -----Same. Same. Covent Garden, 1801-02.

#177. -----Same. Same. Bath, 1801-02.

#178. -----La Peyrouse. (171) Covent Garden, 1801-02.

#179. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Drury Lane, 1801-02.

#180. -----Same. Same. Bath, 1801-02.

#181. -----Die Versöhnung. (129) Covent Garden, 1801-02.

#182. -----Same. Same. Haymarket, 1801.

#183. -----Der Wildfang. (158) Bath, 1801-02.

#184. -----Schiller. Die Räuber. (131) Haymarket, 1801.
1802

186. Kotzebue. Menschenhaß und Reue. As in (170). 1802. (Mor.)


189. -----Das Kind der Liebe. (62) Drury Lane, 1802-03.

190. -----Same. Same. Haymarket, 1802.

191. -----Menschenhaß und Reue. (63) Drury Lane, 1802-03. 2X.

192. -----Same. Same. Covent Garden, 1802-03.

193. -----Same. Same. Bath, 1802-03.

194. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Drury Lane, 1802-03.

195. -----Same. Same. Bath, 1802-03. 2X.

196. -----Der Wildfang. (158) Drury Lane, 1802-03.

1803


199. -----Das Kind der Liebe. (62) Drury Lane, 1803-04.

200. -----Same. Same. Haymarket, 1803.
201. **Menschenhass und Reue.** (63) Drury Lane, 1803-04.
202. **Same.** Same. Covent Garden, 1803-04. 3X.
203. **Same.** Same. Haymarket, 1803.
204. **Die Spanier in Peru.** (128) Drury Lane, 1803-04.
205. **Same.** Same. Covent Garden, 1803-04. 12X.
206. **Same.** Same. Bath, 1803-04. 2X.
207. **Der Wildfang.** (158) Haymarket, 1803.
208. **Die Witwe und das Reitpferd.** (130) Covent Garden, 1803-04.

1804

209. Goethe. **Stella. Stella.** Frederick Shoberl. 1804.
   (Nic. IV)
   (Ax.)
211. Kotzebue. **Das Kind der Liebe.** (62) Drury Lane,
   1804-05. 2X.
212. **Same.** Same. Covent Garden, 1804-05. 2X.
213. **Menschenhass und Reue.** (63) Drury Lane, 1804-05.
214. **Same.** Same. Haymarket, 1804.
215. **Same.** Same. Bath, 1804-05.
216. **Die Spanier in Peru.** (128) Drury Lane, 1804-05.
217. **Same.** Same. Covent Garden, 1804-05.
218. **Same.** Same. Haymarket, 1804. 2X.
219. **Same.** Same. Bath, 1804-05.
220. -----Der Wildfang. (158) Drury Lane, 1804-05.

221. -----Same. Same. Bath, 1804-05.

1805


223. Lessing. Nathan der Weise. (12) 1805. (Mor.)

224. Schiller. (Wallenstein.) Die Piccolomini. The Piccolominis. Anon. 1805. (Mor.)

225. The Theatrical Recorder. 1805-06. See below, (237).


227. -----Der Trunkenbold. The Drunkard. Anon. German, July 17, 1805. (Nic. IV)


229. -----Same. Same. Covent Garden, 1805-06.

230. -----Menschenhasß und Reue. (63) Covent Garden, 1805-06. 2X.

231. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Covent Garden, 1805-06. 5X.


\[12^\text{Morgan believes it is Coleridge's translation. See Morgan 8167.}\]

\[13^\text{Nicoll, IV, 453, records an edition in 1805. Cf. note below to (267) regarding an 1809 printing. Morgan has neither.}\]
1806

1806. (Mor.)

235. ----Menschenhaß und Reue. As in (170). 1806. (Mor.)

236. ----Der Wildfang. (222) 1806.

237. The Theatrical Recorder. 1805-06.
Contains: Gellert: Die zärtlichen Schwestern-
The Tender Sisters,
    Thomas Holcroft

Lessing: Emilia Galotti- Emilia Galotti,
        Fanny Holcroft

Engel: Der dankbare Sohn- The Affectionate Son,
       Thomas Holcroft

Lessing: Minna von Barnhelm- Minna von
       Barnhelm,
        Fanny Holcroft

Weisse: Rosamunde- Rosamond,
        Fanny Holcroft.


#239. ----Der Wirrarr. All in Confusion. Anon. German,
March 10, 1806. (Nic. IV)

\(^1\)Genest, VIII, 86, lists Jan. 12, 1808, as first performance (at Covent Garden). Kemble had to make changes to suit Larpent, the Licensee. His original adaptation was performed in 1829. See below, (#451).
150.

**Kotzebue. Armut und Edelsinn.** (122) Haymarket, 1806.

--- **Das Kind der Liebe.** (62) Drury Lane, 1806-07.

--- **Die Spanier in Peru.** (128) Drury Lane, 1806-07.

--- **Same.** Same. Covent Garden, 1806-07.

--- **Same.** Same. Bath, 1806-07.

--- **Die Versöhnung.** (129) Covent Garden, 1806-07.

1807


(Ax.)

--- **Kotzebue. Eduard in Schottland.** (238) Covent Garden, 1807-08. 14 2x.

--- **Das Kind der Liebe.** (62) Bath, 1807-08.

--- **Menschenhaß und Reue.** (63) Haymarket, 1807.

--- **Die Spanier in Peru.** (128) Drury Lane, 1807-08.

--- **Same.** Same. Covent Garden, 1807-08. 2x.

--- **Same.** Same. Haymarket, 1807.

--- **Same.** Same. Bath, 1807-08.

1808


1808. (Morr.) 15

--- See preceding page.

--- Morgan apparently did not see the edition, as he is uncertain about the English title. Cf. Morgan 5357.
255. ----Same. (238) 1808. (Mor.)

256. ----Das Kind der Liebe. (44) In Inchbald's British Theatre. 1808. (Mor.)


#258. ----Das Kind der Liebe. (62) "Covent Garden," 1808-09.

#259. ----Menschenhaus und Reue. (63) Drury Lane, 1808-09.

#260. ----Same. Same. "Covent Garden," 1808-09. 2X.

#261. ----Same. Same. Haymarket, 1808.

#262. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Covent Garden, 1808-09. 3X.

#263. -----Same. Same. Haymarket, 1808.

#264. -----Die Versöhnung. (129) Bath, 1808-09. 2X.

#265. -----Der Wildfang. (158) Bath, 1808-09.

1809

266. Klopstock. Salomo. Solomon. Robert Huish. 1809. (Mor.)


#269. -----Same. Same. Haymarket, 1809.

---


1810


##276. "Menschenhass und Reue." (63) "Drury Lane," 1810-11. 2x.


1811


#281. Colman, George, the younger. The Quadrupeds of Quadlingburn; or, The Rovers of Weimar. Haymarket, July 26, 1811. 39x.


17 Parody of Die Räuber, based on The Rovers. See text, pp. 88-89.
### 283. Colman. *The Quadrupeds of Quedlinburgh.* (281) Drury Lane, 1811-12. 7X.

### 284. ---Same. Same. Bath, 1811-12.


### 286. ---Menschenhass und Reue. (63) "Drury Lane," 1811-12.

### 287. ---Same. Same. Covent Garden, 1811-12. 2X.

### 288. ---Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Covent Garden, 1811-12. 3X.

### 289. ---Die Versohnung. (129) Covent Garden, 1811-12.

### 290. ---Same. Same. Haymarket, 1811.

### 291. ---Der Wldfang. (158) "Drury Lane," 1811-12.

### 292. ---Same. Same. Haymarket, 1811.

1812


Anon. 1812. (Mor.)

### 294. ---Same. Same. 3rd ed. 1812. (Mor.)

### 295. ---Die Sonnenjungfrau. (93) in *The Dramatic Works of James C. Cross.* 1812. (Nic. IV)

### 296. Kotzebue. *Blind geladen.* (293) "Drury Lane," May 21, 1812. 20X.

### 297. ---Die Sonnenjungfrau. *The Virgin of the Sun.* Ad.

Frederic Reynolds. Covent Garden, Jan. 31, 1812. 33X.

---

18 Nicoll, IV, 480, lists four editions in 1812.
Kotzebue. Die Sonnenjungfrau. (297) Covent Garden, 1812-13. 2X.

Kotzebue. Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Covent Garden, 1812-13. 3X.


Same. Same. Haymarket, 1812.

1813


Mme. de Staël. Germany. 3 vols. 1813.


Goethe: Ext. Egmont, Faust I.

Iffland. Das Gewissen. (303) Covent Garden, April 27, 1813. 25x.

Menschenhass und Reue. (63) Covent Garden, 1813-14. 2X.

Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Covent Garden, 1813-14. 2X.

1814.

Kotzebue. Die beiden Klingsberg. Father and Son; or, Family Frailties. Anon. The New British Theatre, III.
1814. (Mor.)

###309. Kotzébue. *Menschenhaß und Reue.* (63) Covent Garden, 1814-15. 5X.

###310. ----- *Die Sonnenjungfrau.* (297) Covent Garden, 1814-15.

###311. ----- *Die Spanier in Peru.* (128) Covent Garden, 1814-15. 2X.

###312. ----- *Die Versöhnung.* (129) Drury Lane, 1814-15.

###313. ----- Same. Same. Haymarket, 1814.

---

1815.


###316. ----- *Das Kind der Liebe.* (62) Drury Lane, 1815-16.

###317. ----- *Menschenhaß und Reue.* (63) Covent Garden, 1815-16. 4X.

###318. ----- Same. Same. Bath, 1815-16.

###319. ----- *Die Spanier in Peru.* (128) Covent Garden, 1815-16.

###320. ----- *Die Versöhnung.* (129) Drury Lane, 1815-16.

###321. ----- *Der Wildfang.* (158) Drury Lane, 1815-16.

---

1816

###322. Kotzébue. Blind geladen. (293) "with additional

---

19From the American adaptation published in New York, 1809. See Morgan 5348-5350.
323.  -----Menschenhass und Reue.  As in (170).  The British Theatre, XXIV.  1816.


###325.  -----Das Kind der Liebe.  (62) Drury Lane, 1816-17.

###326.  -----Menschenhass und Reue.  (63) Covent Garden, 1816-17.  6x.

###327.  -----Same.  Same.  Bath, 1816-17.

###328.  -----Die Spanier in Peru.  (128) Covent Garden, 1816-17.

1817


###331.  -----Same.  Same.  Bath, 1817-18.

###332.  -----Die Spanier in Peru.  (128) Covent Garden, 1817-18.

###333.  -----Same.  Same.  Bath, 1817-18.

1818


###336. -----Same. Same. Covent Garden, 1818-19.

###337. -----Same. Same. Bath, 1818-19.

###338. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Drury Lane, 1818-19.

2X.

###339. -----Same. Same. Covent Garden, 1818-19.


1819


Blackwood's Magazine, VI(1819).


Blackwood's Magazine, VI(1819).

343. -----Die Schuld. Guilt; or, The Gipsey's Prophecy.

W. E. Frye. 1819. (Mor.)


Edinburgh, 1819. (Mor.)


#346. -----Maria Stuart. Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland.

Ad. Anon. Covent Garden, Dec. 14, 1819. 2X.


#348. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Covent Garden, 1819-1820.
1820

     Anon. Scots Magazine, VI(1820). (Mor.)

     Ext. Anon. 1820. (Mor.)


352. -----Same. Extracts from Goethe's Tragedy of Faustus. 21
     George Soane. 1820. (Mor.)

     (Mor.)

     wood's Magazine, VIII(1820).

355. -----Zriny. Ext. Robert Gillies. Blackwood's Maga-
     zine, VIII(1820).


357. -----Der 29. Februar. The Twenty-ninth of February.

358. Kotzebue. Menschenhaff und Reue. (63) Covent Garden,
     1820-21. 2x.


360. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Drury Lane, 1820-21.

20 Accompanied by Retzsch's drawings.

21 See Note 20.
1821
(1 Mor.)
365. Grillparzer. Sappho. (353) 2nd ed. 1821. (Mor.)
Paris, 1821. (Mor.)
367. Kotzebue. Menschenhass und Reue. (63) Covent Garden,
1821-22.
368. Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Drury Lane, 1821-22.

1822
The Liberal, I(1822). (Mor.)
Blackwood’s Magazine, XII(1822).
373. Schiller. Don Carlos. (366) 1822.23

22 See Note 20.

23 R. Pick, "Schiller in England: 1787-1960, a Bibliogra-
phy," Publications of the English Goethe Society, N.S. XXX
(1961), Entry No. 152. Nicol, IV, 390, erroneously (cf. Pick's
remarks, loc. cit.) attributes this translation to Lord John
Russell and records six printings in 1822.
160.

#375. -----Menschenhaß und Reue. (63) Drury Lane, 1822-23.
#376. -----Same. Same. Covent Garden, 1822-23.
#377. -----Same. Same. Haymarket, 1822.
#378. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Drury Lane, 1822-23.

1823

   (Mor.)

380. Schiller. Die Räuber. Lorenzo, the Outcast Son. Ad.
   Edward Gandy. 1823. (Mor.)

#381. Schiller. Wilhelm Tell. The Beacon of Liberty. Ad.
   Anon. Covent Garden, Oct. 8, 1823. 13X.

#382. Kotzebue. Menschenhaß und Reue. (63) Drury Lane,
   1823-24. 2X.


   3X.


1824

   (Mor.)

   (Mor.)

390. -----Same. Same. Dolby's British Theatre. 1824.
      (Mor.)

391. Schiller. Kabale und Liebe. Ravenna; or, Italian
      Love. Ad. J. B. Clarke. 1824. (Mor.)

392. -----Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua. Fiesco; or,
      The Genoese Conspiracy. Dr. Reinbeck. 1824. 24

393. -----Maria Stuart; Die Jungfrau von Orleans. Mary
      Stuart and The Maid of Orleans. Hugh Salvin. 1824. 25

      Covent Garden, Feb. 6, 1824. 26

#395. Schiller. Kabale und Liebe. (391) Covent Garden,
      Dec. 3, 1824. 3X.

###396. Kotzebue. Menschenhass und Reue. (63) Covent Garden,
      1824-25.

###397. -----Same. Same. Bath, 1824-25.

###398. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Drury Lane, 1824-25.

###399. -----Same. Same. Covent Garden, 1824-25.

###400. -----Der Wildfang. (158) Haymarket, 1824.

---

24 Not extant. See Thomas Rea, Schiller's Dramas and


26 Genest, IX, 253, notes an earlier version called The
Roebuck at the Surrey Theatre and assumes on the basis of
plot similarity that it served as the model for the Covent
Garden production.
1825

401. Goethe. Faust I. (379) 1825. (Mor.)


404. Schiller. Wilhelm Tell. Wilhelm Tell. S. Robinson. 1825. (Mor.)


#411. ----Same. Same. Covent Garden, 1825-26.

#412. ----Same. Same. Haymarket, 1825.

With Lessing's "Faust" fragment.

Soane had earlier translated extracts (352). This adaptation has little more than the title and the names of the characters in common with the original. The title was changed, May 28, 1825, to The Devil and Dr. Faustus (Genest, IX, 295).
413. ----Same. Same. Bath, 1825-26.
415. ----Same. Same. Haymarket, 1825.

1826
    of Kamschatka. Ad. James Kenny. 1826. (Nic. IV)
417. ----Das Kind der Liebe. (44) The London Stage. 1826.
    (Mon)
418. ----Menschenschaft und Reue. As in (170). The London
    Stage. 1826. (Mor.)
419. ----Die Spanier in Peru. (107) British Drama. 1826.
    (Mor.)
    Blackwood's Magazine, XIX(1826).
421. Kotzebue. Graf Benjowski. (416) Drury Lane, March 3,
    1826. 11X.
422. Kotzebue. Menschenhaft und Reue. (63) Drury Lane,
    1826-27.
423. ----Same. Same. Covent Garden, 1826-27.
424. ----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Drury Lane, 1826-27.

1827
    (Mor.)

427. Körner, K. T. The Life of Carl T. Körner. G. F. Richardson. 1827. (Mor.)
Contains: Zriny- Zriny
Joseph Heyderich- Joseph Heyderich.

428. Kotzebue. Blind geladen. (293) 1827. (Nic. IV)

1827. (Mor.)
Contains: Die Piccolomini- The Piccolominis
Wallensteins Tod- Wallenstein's Death.

1827. (Nic. IV)


#432. -----Menschenhaß und Reue. (63) Covent Garden, 1827-28.


1828


Blackwood's Magazine, XXVIII(1828).

437. Lessing. Nathan der Weise. (12) in William Taylor,
Historic Survey of German Poetry, I(1828).

439. -----Same. Same. 2nd ed. 1828. (Mor.)


441. -----Wilhelm Tell. William Tell. S. Robinson. Liverpool, 1828.30

#442. Raupach. Isidor und Olga. The Serf; or, The Russian Brothers. (438) Covent Garden, Jan. 23, 1828. 4X.

##443. Kotzebue. Das Kind der Liebe. (62) Drury Lane, 1828-29. 2X.

##444. -----Menschenhass und Reue. (63) Drury Lane, 1828-29.

##445. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Drury Lane, 1828-29.

1829


447. Kotzebue. Blind geladen. (293) 1829. (Mor.)

448. -----Das Kind der Liebe. (44) 1829. (Mor.)

449. Schiller. Wilhelm Tell. William Tell. Anon. 1829. (Mor.)

---


30 According to Pick, "Schiller in England," Entry No. 242, this is a versification by Robinson of his earlier translation (404).
450. ----Same. Same. R. Talbot. 1829. (Mor.)

      Ad. Charles Kemble. Covent Garden, November 26,
      1829. 6x. 31

##452. Kotzebue. Menschenhass und Reue. (63) Drury Lane,
      1829-30.

##453. ----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Drury Lane, 1829-30.

1830

      (15) in William Taylor, Historic Survey of German
      Poetry, III(1830).


      (Mor.)

458. ----Das Kind der Liebe. (44) The Penny National
      Library. 1830. (Mor.)

459. ----Menschenhass und Reue. As in (170) Cumberland's
      British Theatre, XIV(183-). (Mor.)

460. ----Same. Same. The Penny National Library. 1830.

461. ----Die Spanier in Peru. (107) The Penny National
      Library. 1830. (Mor.)

31 See Note 14, under Entry No. 238 above.

463. ----Same. Same. George Moir. n.d.\textsuperscript{32} (Mor.)


\#465. ----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Surrey, 1830.

1831


467. Raupach. Die Tochter der Luftp. The Daughter of the Air. Anon. 1831. (Mor.)


469. ----Wilhelm Tell. William Tell. Thomas C. Banfield. 1831. (Mor.)

1832

470. Goethe. Faust I. Ext. (364) with Shelley's "May-day Night Scene." 1832. (Mor.)

471. Schiller. Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua. Fiesko. Sir G. C. D'Aguilar. 1832.\textsuperscript{34} (Mor.)

\textsuperscript{32}See Morgan 8191, where he sets 1830 as the approximate date.

\textsuperscript{33}Pick, "Schiller in England," Entry No. 287.

\textsuperscript{34}Performed, Dublin, Dec. 22, 1832. (Misc. IV, 287)

Kotzebue. Menschenhaft und Reue. (63) Drury Lane, 1832-33.

Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Covent Garden, 1832-33.

Der Wildfang. (158) Royal Victoria, 1832.

1833


Tasso. (425) 2nd ed. 1833.


Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Drury Lane, 1833-34.

1834


Faust I. Faust. Anon. 1834. (Mor.)

Same. John S. Blackie. Edinburgh and London, 1834. (Mor.)

Same. Faust, a Serio-comic Poem. "A. Crowquill." 1834. (Mor.)

Same. (476) 2nd ed. 1834. (Mor.)

---Morgan 2711 gives translator as Warburton Davies.
485. -----Same. Faust. David Syme. Edinburgh and Leipzig. 1834. (Mor.)


487. Kotzebue. Das Kind der Liebe. (44) The Acting Drama. 1834. (Mor.)

488. -----Menschenhaß und Reue. As in (170). The Acting Drama. 1834. (Mor.)

489. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (107) The Acting Drama. 1834. (Mor.)

490. -----The Beauties of Kotzebue. A. Howard. 1834.

Contains: Ext. Die Indianer in England; Das Kind der Liebe; Der Taubstumme; Graf Benjowski; Die Corsen.


492. -----Wilhelm Tell. (404) 1834.


###494. -----Die Spanier in Peru. (128) Covent Garden, 1834-35.

1835

495. Goethe. Faust I. Faustus, a Dramatic Mystery. John Anster. 1835. (Mor.)

496. -----Same. Faust. Robert Talbot. 1835. (Mor.)

1836

498. Goethe. Faust II. Ext. Anon. 1836. (Mor.)
499. ----- Tasso. (425) 3rd ed. 1836. (Mor.)
503. Hodges, Charles. Original Poems. Munich, 1836. (Mor.)

Contains: Schiller: Die Braut von Messina, Ext.; Demetrius;

Goethe: Faust I, Ext.

1837

505. Raupach. Isidor und Olga. (438) Cumberland's British Theatre, XVIII(1837). (Mor.)
506. Schiller. Die Braut von Messina. The Bride of Messina. George Irvine. 1837. (Mor.)


1838


512. -----*Faust I.* (476) 3rd ed. 1838. (Mor.)

513. -----*Faust II.* Faust. Will B. Macdonald. 1838. (Mor.)


Contains: *Der Freigeist*—The Freethinker;

*Der Schatz*—The Treasure;

*Minna von Barnhelm; Minna von Barnhelm, or, The Soldier's Fortune.*

516. Schiller. *Maria Stuart.* Mary Stuart. Anne Trelawny. 1838. (Mor.)

517. -----*Same.* Same. 1838. (Mor.)

1839

518. Goethe. *Faust II.* Faust, Part II. Leopold Bernays. 1839. (Mor.)

519. -----*Faust I.* Faust. Jonathan Birch. 1839. (Mor.)
520. -----Faust I. Ext. Stephan Naylor. Ceracchi, a
Drama, and Other Poems. 1839. (Mor.)

521. -----Faust I. (496) With German Text. 1839. (Mor.)

522. Schiller. Die Braut von Messina. The Bride of Mes-
sina. With German Text. E.L.Percival. Munich, 1839. (Mor.)

523. -----Maria Stuart. Mary Stuart. Ext. with German
text. E. L. Percival. Munich, 1839. (Mor.)

Heidelberg, 1839. (Mor.)

Grillparzer: König Ottokars Glück und Ende;
Schiller: Die Räuber;

Die Jungfrau von Orleans.

#526. Törring-Jettenbach. Agnes Bernauerin. Agnes
Bernauer, the Maid of Augsberg. Ad. Thomas J.
Serle. Covent Garden, April 20, 1839.

1840

527. Goethe. Faust II. (518) 1840. (Mor.)

528. -----Faust I. Faust. John Hills. 1840. (Mor.)

Magazine, XL(1840).

1840. (Mor.)
531. Schiller. *Wallenstein*. (152-153) 1840.36


1841

535. Goethe. *Faust I*. (495) Frankfurt, 1841. (Mor.)

536. -----Same. *Faust*. Lewis Filmore. 1841. (Mor.)

537. -----Same. Same. Sir George Lefevre. 1841. (Mor.)


---


1842

546. Goethe. *Faust II.* Faust, Part II. Archer Gurney. 1842. (Mor.)

547. *Same.* (513) 2nd ed. 1842. (Mor.)

548. *Tasso.* Ext. H. Reeve and J. E. Taylor. Translations from the German. 1842. (Mor.)


551. *Wallenstein.* (152-153) 1842. (Mor.)


1843


---Includes Birch's earlier translation of Part I (519).
554. ----- Faust I. (536) 2nd ed. 1843. (Mor.)
555. ----- Same. (537) Frankfurt, 1843. (Mor.)
556. Schiller. Don Carlos. (507) Mannheim, 1843. (Mor.)
557. ----- Same. Don Carlos. C. H. Cottrell. 1843. (Mor.)
558. ----- Same. Same. John Towler. Karlsruhe, 1843. (Mor.)
560. Swanwick, Anna. Selections from the Dramas of Goethe and Schiller. 1843. (Mor.)
     Contains: Goethe: Iphigenie auf Tauris- Iphigenia in Tauris; Tasso, Ext.;
     Schiller: Die Jungfrau von Orleans, Ext.

1844

563. ----- Same. Griseldis. Q. E. D. 1844. (Mor.)
564. Schiller. Don Carlos. (557) 2nd ed. 1844. (Mor.)
565. ----- Same. (558) 1844. (Mor.)
566. Werner. Der 24. Februar. The Twenty-fourth of February. E. Riley. 1844. (Mor.)
1845
567. Goethe. Faust. Sir George Floyd Duckett. (Mor.)
568. Tasso. Ext. Joseph Gostwick. The Spirit of German Poetry. 1845. (Mor.)
569. Körner, K. T. The Life of Carl T. Körner. (427) 2nd ed. 1845. (Mor.)
572. Wallenstein. Wallenstein. George Moir. 1845. (Mor.)
573. Wilhelm Tell. William Tell. H. Thompson. 1845. (Mor.)
574. Carlyle, Thomas. The Life of Schiller. (405) 1845.
1846
577. Lee, E. B. Correggio. 1846. (Mor.)

40(429) and (463) together.
41Nicoll IV, 358. Neither in Morgan nor in Pick.
Contains: Öhlenschläger: Corregio- Corregio;
Grillparzer: Sappho- Sappho.

578. Selections from the Dramas of Goethe and Schiller.
      (560) 2nd ed. 1846. (Mor.)

1847

      II(1847). (Mor.)

580. -----Faust I. (536) 3rd ed. 1847. (Mor.)

581. -----Same. (476) 4th ed. 1847. (Mor.)

582. -----Same. Faust. Charles Henry Knox. 1847. (Mor.)

      J. Hofstetter. Leipzig and Vienna, 1847. (Mor.)

      Hofstetter. Leipzig and Vienna, 1847.

      Mme. L. Darésiès de Pontès. 1847. (Mor.)

      (Mor.)

1848


588. Schiller. Die Jungfrau von Orleans. (497) in Specimens
      of Swedish and German Poetry. 1848. (Mor.)

#589. Schiller. Don Carlos. Don Carlos; or, Persecution.
      (366) Surrey, June 8, 1848.
1849

590. Goethe. Faust I. Faust. Anna Swanwick. 1849. (Mor.)

591. Kotzebue. Menschenhass und Reue. As in (170) in The Acting National Drama, XV(1848). (Mor.)

592. ----Same. As in (170) in The Series of Dramatic Entertainments at Windsor Castle. 1848. (Mor.)

593. Schiller. Works of Schiller, Historical and Dramatic. Ed. H. G. Bohn. 4 vols. 1846-49. (Mor.)

Contains: Vol. II: Wallensteins Lager (575);
           Die Piccolomini (152);
           Wallensteins Tod (153);
           Wilhelm Tell—William Tell, Sir Theodore Martin;

Vol. III: Don Carlos—Don Carlos, R. D. Boylan;
           Maria Stuart (168);
           Die Jungfrau von Orleans—The Maid of Orleans, Anna Swanwick;
           Die Braut von Messina—The Bride of Messina, Adam Lodge;

Vol. IV: Die Räuber—The Robbers, H. G. Bohn;
           Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua—Fiesco, H. G. Bohn;
Kabale und Liebe- Love and Intrigue, H. G. Bohn;
Demetrius- Demetrius, Sir Theodore Martin.


1850

L. Behr. 1850. (Mor.)

596. Goethe. Works. 14 vols. 1848-50. (Mor.)
Contains: Vol. III: Faust- Faust, Anna Swanwick;
Vol. VIII: Götz von Berlichingen (66)
revised by Anna Swanwick;
Tasso- Tasso, Anna Swanwick;
Egmont- Egmont, Anna Swanwick;
Iphigenie auf Tauris- Iphigenia in Tauris, Anna Swanwick;
Clavigo- Clavigo, Bouring;
Die Laune des Verliebten- The Wayward Lover, Bouring;
Die Mitschuldigen- Fellow Culprits, Bouring.

(Mor.)

598. Körner, K. T. A Selection from the Poems and
Dramatic Works. Mme. L. Darcies de Pontes. 1850.

Contains: Die Sühne - The Expiation;
          Toni - Antonia;
          Hedwig - Hedwig;
          Rosamunde - Rosamond;
          Das Fischermädchen - The Fisherman's Daughter;
          Die Bergknappen - The Spirits of the Mountain;
          Der Kampf mit dem Drachen - The Fight with the Dragon;
          Alfred der Große - Alfred the Great.

          John Baldwin Buckstone. Lacy's Acting Editions of Plays, No. 6 (1850). (Mor.)


          Morris Barnett. Lacy's Acting Editions of Plays, No. 2 (1850).

602. -----Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua. Fiesko; or, The Revolt of Genoa. Ad. James Robinson Planché. 1850. (Mor.)

\[42\] Pick, "Schiller in England," Entry No. 528.
603. Faust. Anon. 1850. (Mor.)

Contains: Goethe: Faust—Faust;

Schiller: Wallenstein—Wallenstein.


#605. ——Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua. (603) Drury Lane, Feb. 4, 1850.
INDEX TO THE LIST OF PLAYS

#-First performance.

##-Repeat performance.

Babo: **Dagobert**- 1801: 170; 1811: 280.


**Die Strelizen**- 1801: 169.

Brandes: **Der Gasthof**- 1790: 7, 8, #11.

Contessa: **Ich bin mein Bruder**- 1820: 349.

Emdorff: **Der Postzug**- 1792: 15.

Engel: **Der dankbare Sohn**- 1806: 237.

Friedrich II: **Silla**- 1753: 1.

Gellert: **Die zärtlichen Schwestern**- 1806: 237.

Gemmingen-Hornberg: **Der deutsche Hausvater**- 1794: 17, #21.

Gessner: **Conversation of a Father with His Children**-

1792: 15.

Goethe: **Clavigo**- 1790: 9; 1798: 37; 1834: 480; 1847: 579; 1850: 596.

**Egmont**- 1813: 304; 1848: 587; 1850: 596.

Goethe, cont.

Faust I and II: 1838: 511; 1843: 553; 1845: 567; 1850: 596.
Die Laune des Verliebten: 1850: 596.
Die Mitschuldigen: 1850: 596.
Das goldene Vlies: 1828: 436.
Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn: 1830: 455.
Gruttschreiber: Siri Brahe: 1798: #60.
Halm: Camoens: 1840: 529.
Griseldis: 1840: 530; 1841: #545; 1844: 562, 563.
Iffland: **Die Advokaten**- 1799: 67.

**Das Gewissen**- 1801: 170; 1811: 280; 1813: 303,
#305.

**Die Hagestolzen**- 1799: 68.

**Die Jäger**- 1799: 69.

**Die Mündel**- 1799: 70.

**Die Neffen**- 1802: #187.

**Verbrechen aus Ehrsucht**- 1800: 139.

Klinger: **Die neue Arria**- 1795: 23.

Klopstock: **Salamo**- 1809: 266.

**Der Tod Adams**- 1763: 2; 1810: 273.

Körner: **Alfred der Große**- 1850: 598.

**Die Bergknappen**- 1850: 598.

**Das Fischermädchen**- 1850: 598.

**Hedwig**- 1850: 598.

**Joseph Heyderich**- 1827: 427; 1845: 569.

**Der Kampf mit dem Drachen**- 1850: 598.

**Rosamunde**- 1820: 354; 1830: 456; 1850: 598.

**Die Sühne**- 1850: 598.

**Toni**- 1850: 598.

**Zriny**- 1820: 355; 1827: 427; 1845: 569.

Kotzebue: **Adelheid von Wulflingen**- 1798: 39, #61; 1801:
170; 1811: 280; 1832: #472.

**Armut und Edelsinn**- 1799: 71, 72, 73, #122; 1800:
##159; 1801: ##172; 1802: ##188; 1803: ##198;
Kotzebue, cont. 185.

1806: ##240; 1808: ##257.

_Die beiden Klingsberg_- 1814: 308.

_Blind geladen_- 1812: 293, 294, #296; 1816: 322, ##324; 1827: 428; 1829: 447.

_Die Corsen_- 1799: 74; 1800: 140; 1834: 490.

_Die edle Lüge_- 1799: 75, 76, 77.


_Falsche Scham_- 1799: 78, 79; 1801: 170; 1811: 280.

_Der Gefangene_- 1805: #226.


_Der Graf von Burgund_- 1798: 42, 43, #124.


_Das Kind der Liebe_- 1798: 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, #62; 1799: 81, ##132; 1800: ##160; 1801: 170, ##173, ##174; 1802: ##189, ##190; 1803: ##199, ##200; 1804: ##211, ##212; 1805: ##228, ##229; 1806: ##241; 1807: ##248; 1808: 156, ##258; 1810: ##274, ##275; 1811: 280, ##285; 1815: ##316;
Kotzebue, cont.


Die Kreuzfahrer- 1806: 234.


Die Negersklaven- 1796: 27; 1800: 144.

Der Opfertod- 1799: 85, 86, #125.

Die Organe des Gehirns- 1838: 514.

La Peyrouse- 1799: 87, 88; 1801: #171, ##178.

Der Rehbock- 1824: #394.

Das Schreibepult- 1799: 89, 90, 91, #126.
Kotzebue, cont.


Die Sonnenjungfrau- 1799: 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98; 1801: 170; 1811: 280; 1812: 295, #297; 1814: ##310.


Der Taubstumme- 1801: 170; 1811: 280; 1834: 490.

Der Trunkenbold- 1805: #227; 1809: 267.
Kotzebue, cont.

Üble Laune- 1799: 110.

Die Verleumder- 1799: 111.


Die Verwandtschaften- 1837: 504.


Der Wirrwarr- 1806: #239; 1842: 549.


Kratter: Das Mädchen von Marienburg- 1798: 53.

Die Verschwörung wider Peter den Großen- 1798: 54.


Der Freigeist- 1838: 515.


Miss Sara Sampson- 1799: 117.
Lessing, cont.

Nathan der Weise - 1781: 3; 1791: 12; 1805: 223; 1828: 437.

Der Schatz - 1838: 515.


König Ingurd - 1820: 356.

Der 29. Februar - 1819: 342; 1820: 357.

Die Schuld - 1819: 343, 344.

Öhlenschläger: Corregio - 1846: 577.

Raimund: Der Alpenkönig - 1850: 599.


Der Nibelungen Hort - 1847: 585.

Die Tochter der Luft - 1831: 467.


Demetrius - 1836: 503; 1849: 593.

Don Carlos - 1795: 24; 1798: 55, 56, 57; 1801: 170;

1811: 280; 1821: 366; 1822: 373; 1825: 405; 1837:

507; 1843: 556, 557, 558; 1844: 564, 565; 1845:

574; 1848: #589; 1849: 593.

Die Jungfrau von Orleans - 1813: 304; 1825: 405;

1835: 497; 1836: 500; 1837: #509; 1839: 525;
Schiller, cont.

1840: 532; 1841: 540; 1842: 550; 1843: 560;
1845: 570, 571, 574; 1846: 578; 1848: 588; 1849: 593.

Kabale und Liebe- 1790: 10; 1795: 25; 1796: 28;
1797: 33, 34; 1798: 58; 1803: #197; 1817: 329;
1819: #345; 1824: 391, #395; 1849: 593; 1850: 601, #604.

Maria Stuart- 1801: 168; 1813: 304; 1819: #346;
1820: #363; 1824: 393; 1833: 478; 1838: 516,
517; 1839: 523; 1840: #534; 1841: 541; 1843:
559; 1849: 593.

Die Räuber- 1792: 14; 1794: 20; 1795: 26; 1797:
35, #36; 1799: 118, 119, 120, 121, #131; 1800: 150,
151; 1801: 170, #184, #185; 1811: 280; 1823:
380; 1839: 525; 1840: 532; 1841: 542; 1849: 593.

Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua- 1796: 29, 30;
1824: 392; 1832: 471; 1841: 543; 1849: 593; 1850:
602, #605.

Wallenstein- 1800: 152, 153; 1805: 224; 1815: 405;
1827: 429; 1828: 440; 1831: 468; 1834: 491; 1836:
501; 1840: 531; 1842: 551; 1845: 572, 574; 1846:
575; 1849: 593; 1850: 603.

Wilhelm Tell- 1813: 304; 1823: #381; 1825: 404,
405, #407; 1827: 430, ##434; 1828: 441; 1829:
Schiller, cont.


Törring-Jettenbach: Agnes Bernauerin- 1800: 154; 1839:

#526.

Unzer: Diego und Leonore- 1798: 59, #64.


APPENDIX
Graph I. Editions of German Plays.
(For the few editions before 1790, see List of Plays.)
Graph II. Performances of German Plays.
(For performances before 1790, see List of Plays.)
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