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I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Wordsworth, appraising the contemporary English literary situation in the preface to the second edition of the *Lyrical Ballads*, wrote:

The invaluable works of our elder writers (I had almost said Shakespeare and Milton) are driven into neglect by frantic novels, sickly and stupid German tragedies, and deluges of idle and extravagant verse.

The passing reference to the German dramatic invasion of England which was underway at that time (1800) hints at the strange and sorry state in which the English theater found itself at the end of the eighteenth century.

I propose to examine in this thesis that period in some detail. I have chosen the years 1793-1803 as limits because during those years German literature, to the Englishman, was German drama, which far exceeded the popularity of every other genre. German literature had begun making its way to England about the middle of the century, and *Werther* had the same success there as elsewhere. In 1798, largely because of a play by Kotzebue, there was a sudden rise in interest in German drama followed within a year by an intense reaction leading to a decline which reached its lowpoint in 1803.

A number of questions demand an answer. Kotzebue’s fame was by no means confined to England; and perhaps
through an examination of his course in England we may arrive at an explanation of his success in the narrower and the broader sense. Also, what was the cause of this abrupt rise and equally abrupt fall in the popularity of German drama? What was the role of Lessing and Goethe and Schiller and why did they receive only a small portion of that fame which the English so readily accorded Kotzebue? How did English literature, which itself was just entering the Romantic Period, respond to this influx of foreign drama?

We must first examine briefly the background of German literature in England and the state of English drama in 1798.
II. THE DEVELOPMENT LEADING TO KOTZEBUE

The first German grammar, however brief, appeared in England in 1639. For a hundred and fifty years grammars and translations appeared only at wide intervals. German literature made its first appearance in English in the form of an anonymous translation of Grobianus in 1739.

The American war for independence brought a large number of German soldiers to England, a factor which at least called the German language to the attention of a larger number of Englishmen than had heretofore been acquainted with it. Although as early as 1714 German royalty had ascended the English throne, there is little support for the contention that court influence played a role in the spread of German literature in England, as some writers maintain by further noting the German wife of George III.

Still, only a small amount of translating had been done, and that apparently at random without any consideration for German literature as an entity. The work of German authors was an unknown quantity.

In 1752 Gellert's *History of the Swedish Countess of Guildenstern* appeared in an anonymous translation; Rabener's *Satirical Letters* in 1757; Klopstock's *Messiah*
(the part completed at that time) in 1763. For several decades, Klopstock represented the best in German literature in England. Gessner was also comparatively well-known through the Death of Abel (1761) and the Pastorals (1762). When the latter was reprinted in 1776, the Monthly Review was moved to compare the author with Homer, Cervantes, and Ossian as a world figure in literature. Lessing was translated as early as 1773. I shall examine his works in England along with those of Goethe and Schiller in Chapter IV.

German literature might well have continued on this stagnant course for several more years had it not been for Henry Mackenzie, the well-known author of the sentimental novel, The Man of Feeling. In 1788, he read a paper to the Royal Society of Edinburgh entitled "An Account of the German Theatre." Stokes, in German Influence in the English Romantic Period (1926), notes that "Mackenzie's position in the social and literary world of his time, the circumstances in which he gave his opinion to the public, together with the very decided, the almost impassioned tone in which he characterised the genius of Schiller, must be taken into consideration in estimating the probable effect of his lecture on the public mind."

Since the lecture marks a turning point in the British view of German literature, his remarks warrant
closer examination.

One of his opening comments is revelatory of the widespread ignorance of the true state of literature in Germany at the time. "The language of Germany, however, has not yet attained, as those who know it inform us, that perfection and regularity necessary to stamp the highest value on the productions composed in it."\(^8\) (For the Englishman not familiar with German, there had been no opportunity up to this time to become acquainted with German literature. Before 1788, the only outstanding works which had appeared in English, in addition to those mentioned above, were The Sorrows of Werter, Emilia Galotti, Minna von Barnhelm and Nathan the Wise. See Chapter IV.)

Also of significance is the fact that he had read the works in question in French, in two anthologies which contained dramatic works of Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, and lesser dramatists.

He finds that Götz von Berlichingen "goes beyond the utmost licence of our Shakespeare, in its change of scene and multiplicity of incident."\(^9\) It is "a life thrown into dialogue rather than a tragedy."\(^10\) Stella "is strongly marked with that enthusiastic sentiment and refined sensibility, which in The Sorrows of Werther, Goethe has so warmly indulged; and in point of immoral
effect, the drama is equally reprehensible with the novel."¹¹

Turning to Lessing, he finds little humor in *Minna von Barnhelm*: *Emilia Galotti* is "in point of composition, character, and passion, a performance of no ordinary kind"; *Miss Sara Sampson* has no features which distinguish it.¹²

*The Robbers* is "the most strangely impressive of all the pieces contained in these volumes", a play marked by "a language in the highest degree eloquent, impassioned and sublime."¹³ After a lengthy plot summary, he admits that it is "confessedly irregular and faulty, both in plan and conduct; it were needless, and perhaps unfair, to offer any remarks on its defects. But its power over the heart and imagination must be acknowledged." The work is, however, a dangerous one. "It 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." He decides that "no modern poet seems to possess power so capable of bending the mind before him, of rousing its feeling by the elevation of his sentiments, or of thrilling them with the terrors of his imagination."¹⁴ We shall soon see that this remarkable appreciation of Schiller stood alone for some thirty years (with the possible exception of Coleridge's opinion, which, unfortunately, was hardly unwavering.)
As one would expect, he was not pleased with the moral tone of certain of the plays, which fact perhaps led him to the critical mistake of placing Brandes before Goethe and Lessing in value.  

His generalizations concerning dramatic art, German dramaturgy, and the state of the English theater reveal a receptiveness to the likes of Kotzebue which prepares us for the latter's inundation of England.

Besides the delicacy of decorum, and propriety in the manners and language of a play, there is a sort of delicacy in its very passion and distress, which highly polished theatres require, the neglect of which is disagreeable to the feeling and the taste of a very refined people.

The German theatre does not allow for this delicacy of feeling. Its horrors and its distress assault the imagination and the heart of the reader with unsparing force; it loves to trace those horrors and that distress through every scene and every situation in which they can be found. It gives room for that sublimity and boldness of picture, which is often ill exchanged for the flat, insipid representation of restrained passions and chastened manners.

He laments the state of English drama and "the pompous wordy declamation of virtue and sensibility" which "hurts equally the good effects of the drama, as a lesson of morals, and the entertainment to be deprived from it as a work of taste." Mackenzie's lecture is important because, through the stature of the author and the place of delivery, German literature was granted a seriousness of consideration.
which it had not hitherto enjoyed in England and also because it introduced, among others in Edinburgh, the young Walter Scott to Goethe and Schiller.

His dissatisfaction with English drama was not unique. Two movements were beginning which would have far-reaching effects on the English theater. Both were, in a sense, commercial undertakings, although the results of each were quite different.

As to the first movement, Allardyce Nicoll, in *A History of Late Eighteenth Century Drama, 1750-1800*, observes that "possibly the most outstanding theatrical event in these fifty years was the enlarging of the patent houses."18

At the time, there were three patent houses (theaters licensed for the presentation of drama) in London, Drury Lane, Covent Garden, and the Haymarket.

Drury Lane had begun enlarging in 1762. In 1791 the old site was abandoned and New Drury Lane was erected, opening in 1792. One contemporary account notes

the accommodations for the stage are upon a much larger scale than those of any other theatre in Europe. The opening for the scenery is 43 feet wide, and 38 feet high; after which the painter and machine contriver will have a large space of 85 feet in width, 92 in length, and 110 in height, for the exertion of their respective abilities.19

The auditorium was of corresponding dimension, being calculated to seat 3611 spectators, who together would pay
slightly more than 826 pounds for the privilege. The gallery audience was sent away aloft, and put far back, where they had, at most, but distant glimpses, and could hear nothing that was not declaimed loudly. The size of the theater might be thought satisfactory, but such advantages were dearly purchased by the certain destruction of fine acting and proscription of fine dramas; for on this occasion was inaugurated the principle that the performers and performance must suit the theatre, while the theatre itself must suit speculation. In other words, "the actors felt the need for adapting themselves to the altered conditions, and their performances became louder and more banal....the managers found that only the broadest effects could prove successful, and accordingly intensified that tendency towards spectacle in serious drama and towards farcical situation in the more risible types."

Covent Garden likewise underwent modification though it was not as extensive as that at Drury Lane. The Haymarket had a license which permitted drama only during the summer and is thus of secondary interest here.

Dramatists, critics and actors alike were quick to perceive the changes wrought by the larger houses. George Colman the younger responded perhaps most incisively at the conclusion of his *New Hay at the Old Market* (1795):
Since the preference, we know,
Is for pagaentry 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 Brydens 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,
'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.25

The second movement was concerned primarily with increasing the number of theaters in London licensed for drama, secondarily with the general expansion of the theater throughout England. Concerning the former, "the month of June, 1787, was to witness the first stirrings of serious revolt against the principle of the patent monopoly..."26 Significant for us is the fact that the monopoly was not completely broken until 1843. Thus, for the period under consideration, the three theaters mentioned retained a firm hold on what dramatic works were presented to the London public. Concerning the latter, the years 1750-1800 saw the rapid establishment of the provincial theaters. According to Nicoll, "All over the country new audiences were springing into being... The scope of English drama is, consequently being widened in these years, and even
begins to pass beyond the shore of the British Islands.... Contact with the continent, moreover, was becoming with every decade more close, and as a consequence, the prevalence of adaptation and translation increased."

If we consider for a moment the characteristics of the audience we are led to wonder if perhaps the attributing of the increased scope of British drama to the contemporary audience is not perhaps a bit too generous.

In attitude, the late eighteenth century audience was characterised by a sensibility, a morality, and a patriotism, extreme both in extent and expression.

Rudolf Stamm, in his history of the English theater, compares this audience with that earlier in the century.

Examples of this sensibility never seem to tire the twentieth century reader, so we shall add another. Doran's *Annals of the English Stage* cites a letter to the *Morning Post*, September 27, 1776:

A gentleman, said to be a captain in the army, was so very much agitated on Miss Brown's appearance on Wednesday night, that it was imagined it
would be necessary to convey him out of the house; but a sudden burst of tears relieved him.29

We should not be too harsh in our criticism, for "the sensibility of 1790 was 'correct' enough. Many original English plays, and plays taken from the German were deeply objected to."30

The strong patriotic feeling which we encounter at the end of the century is largely a result of the course of the French Revolution, an event first greeted with enthusiasm and approval. The Reign of Terror in 1793 and 1794 planted the first seed of doubt; Napoleon's rule starting in 1796 and his aggressiveness resulted in an about-face among the English, which expressed itself in a reactionary conservatism often bordering on the extreme (see Chapter V).

In makeup, the audience was of a heterogeneity which perhaps accounts for its temperamental nature. Garrick wrote, "We know it is the privilege of an English audience to indulge in riot, upon any pretence. Benches have been torn up, and even swords drawn, upon slighter occasions than the damning of a play."31

The concept of the theater as a place of art was aided little by what Thomas Holcroft referred to as "the nightly intrusion of unhappy and improper persons."32 Many scholars choose to ignore this problem, but one need only to glance through the letters to the Gentleman's
Weekly to realize how acute it was. In spite of the moralistic dramas presented, the prostitutes apparently found the theater a place ideally suited to the plying of their trade.

In an age when so many factors detrimental to the satisfactory presentation of good drama were present, the actors perhaps came off better than any other group associated with the theater. That from one point of view. From another, it was the actors themselves who prevented the period from being more lackluster than it was. Concerning the situation of the actors, "the great players had not only good salaries, benefits and road profits, but also, like the Elizabethans, additional income through their connections at court," but "it would be easy to exaggerate the prosperity of the players."33

In any case, "die Grösse der Theaterepoche, die wir betrachten, beruhte also durchaus auf ihrem Reichtum an leistungsfähigen Schauspielerindividuen."34 It was the age of Garrick, Kemble, Siddons, and soon, Keen. "All who have written on this period of our dramatic literature have emphasized the fact that the actor and not the dramatist ruled the theatre... Only by taking into account the magnificent declamation of the time can we explain the success of many dull tragedies and of countless foolish farces."35
The dramatist was not in such dire straits as these remarks might lead one to believe. "From the theatre the most successful writer could expect now to derive a fairly respectable income. Indeed we may almost say that the professional dramatist has at last in this period fully established himself."\textsuperscript{36} We shall see shortly in the large number of persons who took up translation that there was a sizeable demand for, and remuneration to be gained from, the writing of dramatic works acceptable to the public taste.

We have already, in the characteristics of the audience, an indication of what form such works might take. The strong patriotic feeling, the extreme morality and sensibility were, in the larger view, secondary features. "Augustanism \textit{[i.e., Neoclassicism]} held control of the stage and helped towards the suppressing of true dramatic emotion, and it was an Augustanism which had lost its first purpose and power. It had not the virile strength of Pope, but feebly clutched with trembling fingers its long useless sceptre and quivering crown.... At the same time, romance, in one or another of its many forms, was striving to win a place in the theatre."\textsuperscript{37}

During the last decade of the century, the classical reserve and precision of Augustanism was already
yielding to the insistent stirrings of pre-Romantic ideas. M. G. Lewis (see below) attained instant fame in 1795 with the publication of his gothic novel, *The Monk*. He matched that success with a gothic melodrama in 1798, *The Castle Spectre*.

Lewis’s success and that of authors of similar works (notably, Clara Reeves, Sophia Lee, Anne Radcliffe, and William Beckett) is indicative of the broadness of the popular base to which certain aspects of the Romantic movement appealed. The fact that pre-Romantic literature could achieve such a wide popularity is important to the consideration of Kotzebue’s success in England.

Ossian had harkened the English to the mysterious past, Rousseau had transmitted the "noble savage" and called for a return to nature. England had within herself the seed of romanticism. In 1709, the Earle of Shaftesbury had proclaimed the innate goodness of man in all his qualities; James Thomson, around 1730, had produced a long nature poem, *The Seasons*; a few years later had come the splendid darkness of Edward Young’s *Night Thoughts*.

While English poetry responded to these various stimuli with a prolonged outburst of great writing, English drama suffered one of its most dismal ages. Plays such as *The Castle Spectre* were popular, but they offered nothing startlingly new. With regard to drama, England
was ripe for the playwright who could combine some or all of the "new" concepts of the 1790's. In Chapter III, we shall see that Kotzebue, with a certain amount of English aid, was such a playwright.

For now it suffices to note that English drama had no real direction; although the forces of a new movement were making themselves felt, the theater continued to exist largely on its heritage.

Those persons who, for one reason or another, turned to the translation of German drama, form a large group, containing names well-known and names forgotten today. Because of the number involved it is desirable to have them introduced at one time, in as much as later references to these names will be frequent and it would be inconvenient to interrupt the text in order to observe the way in which a particular person got into the business of translation. A simultaneous consideration also graphically reveals the diversity of interests which led to the large number of translations.

Basically, there are two groups: English translators and Germans living in England who naturally turned more frequently to translation when that occupation became quite profitable in 1798.

The former group includes Coleridge, Scott and
Sheridan, in addition to many lesser-known dramatists.

Coleridge read A. F. Tytler's translation of *Die Räuber* as a student in 1794 and promptly expressed his enthusiasm in the well-known sonnet to Schiller. As early as May, 1796, he speaks of translating Schiller to defray expenses.\(^{38}\) In that same year, he began studying German and went to Germany with Wordsworth in September, 1798, staying until June, 1799. (He thus became the only major writer, William Taylor of Norwich excepted, who had a direct contact with the source of the dramas which abruptly became so popular.) The result was his translation of *Wallenstein* in 1800, which I shall consider in detail later. Coleridge's enthusiasm, like that of many others, was the enthusiasm of youth, and we shall see that in his maturity he had a decidedly limited appreciation for German literature.

Mackenzie's "startling praise of literary productions yet unknown in Scotland stirred in Scott, along with others, a desire to know more about them."\(^{39}\) The young Scott in 1792 formed a group in Edinburgh for the study of German and afterwards described the reaction of literary persons in Scotland to this new literature. It is a description interesting in that it reveals Scott's own reaction as a youth and valuable since it shows once again the receptivity of the British mind at this time to
something new and different in drama. Describing these persons, he says they

were from their youth accustomed to admire Shakespeare and Milton, [and they] now became acquainted for the first time with a race of poets who had the same lofty ambition to spurn the flaming boundaries of the universe and investigate the realms of Chaos and Old Night; and of dramatists who, disclaiming the pedantries of the unities, sought, at the expense of occasional improbabilities and extravagances, to present life on the stage in its scenes of wildest contrast, and in all its boundless variety of character.40

The result was Scott’s translation in 1799 of Götz von Berlichingen. "Though Scott’s subsequent reading of German authors was quite extensive, it never resulted in carrying forward his elementary study of the language with the Edinburgh class to an accurate and scholarly understanding of it."41 The truth of that statement will become evident when we come to the examination of Scott’s Götz. We shall also see that his appreciation for and understanding of German literature was quite limited.

Although Wordsworth was exposed to the new German literature along with Coleridge, only his early play, The Borderers, shows German influence to any extent. Thus his work is of no importance here.

Richard Brinsley Sheridan, born in Ireland in 1752, had early shown himself to be a dramatist of promise. The Rivals was produced at Covent Garden in 1775, The School for Scandal at Drury Lane in 1777. He had become
manager of Drury Lane in 1776 and in 1780 was elected to Parliament. The erstwhile Prime Minister, Pitt, an opponent of Sheridan the Tory, said of one of the latter's speeches, "He had surpassed all the eloquence of ancient or modern times and his speech possessed everything that genius or art could furnish to agitate and control the human mind." That he was also businessman and playwright is attested to by his later career. He was instrumental in the construction of the New Drury Lane Theater in 1794 and continued as manager until 1809, when it was destroyed by fire. His role is not that of translator but adapter. It was, in fact, his adaptation of Benjamin Thompson's translation of *Menschenhass und Reue* which loosed Kotzebue in England. "Nothing shows Sheridan's genius more than the mode in which he could adapt himself to different tastes, and when he put on the stage 'fustian' pieces, he brought all his skill and tact to make them thoroughly successful." As we shall see, Sheridan was a central figure in the realm of performed German drama.

Another figure, central in the realm of that larger body of unperformed drama and German literature in general, is William Taylor of Norwich, "der erste nun, der durch seine ganze Vorbildung, durch seine gründliche Kenntnis des Deutschen, durch sein kritisches Urteil wie durch
sein Formgefühl der eigentliche Herold und Bahnbrecher der deutschen Literatur in England wurde.\textsuperscript{44} Born in 1765 of well-to-do parents, Taylor received a thorough education and traveled widely. He had mastered French and Italian by the age of fourteen and in 1782 went to Germany for a year. In England he continued reading German literature and his translation of Bürger's "Leonore," circulated in manuscript for a number of years, is one of the earliest identifiable stimuli, along with Mackenzie's lecture, towards the advancement of German literature in England. He maintained his interest in that literature until his death in 1836 and is the author of the first history of German literature in English (1828-30), a compilation of his own articles (first published as early as 1796) and translations along with those of others.\textsuperscript{45}

J. C. Mellish is similar to Taylor in that he too had an abiding interest in all German literature, and is thus different from the other persons discussed here. In 1795, Mellish went to Weimar in the consular service, where he remained for a number of years. He came to know Goethe and Schiller and developed an appreciation for their work rare among English writers of the day. Schiller spoke of him in 1799 as "ein sehr gebildeter, in alter und neuer Literatur vollkommen erfahrener Mann"\textsuperscript{46} and Goethe called him the best translator Herrmann und Dorothea could have.\textsuperscript{47}
The most prolific translator was Benjamin Thompson who, as agent in Hamburg for his merchant father, spent his spare time rendering Kotzebue in English. His connection with Sheridan has been mentioned. His most successful work was the six volume *German Theatre* which first appeared in 1800-1801 and subsequently went through four editions.

The work of Thompson, however industrious he may have been as a translator, smacks of opportunism. Likewise that of Matthew Gregory Lewis. Lewis had spent a year in Germany as a youth and achieved overnight fame with the publication, in 1795, of *The Monk*, when he was twenty. His translations from the German appeared only after it was apparent that English taste was inclined in that direction. "Lewis is the typical representative of the love of crude sensationalism which characterizes the first outburst of enthusiasm for German literature in England."  

Mrs. Elizabeth Inchbald is another such opportunist. First successful as an actress, then as a dramatist, she provided Covent Garden with the necessary adaptations to match Sheridan’s successes at Drury Lane.

Alexander Thomson, poet and essayist, occupies a special niche, though perhaps one of dubious distinction, in this thesis. He is responsible for the first appearance of Kotzebue in English. Unlike many of his contemporaries, after this first venture (in 1796), he disappears from the scene.
J. G. Holman likewise occupies a unique position, though of less dubious distinction. Actor and dramatist, he was responsible for one of the few appearances of either Schiller or Goethe in performance during this miniscule age of Kotzebue in England. That work, *The Red-Cross Knights*, was an adaptation of *Die Räuber*, as we shall see. At no other time was he active in the movement.

Thomas Holcroft (1745-1809), a prolific dramatist in his own right, was the translator of one of the first German dramas to appear on the English stage. He later turned to French and took no part in the movement to German drama, in spite of his knowledge of the language.

There were of course other translators, but their minor importance makes it more convenient to note them as they occur.

When we come to the German translators, we find a situation which is probably simultaneously a cause and effect of the rising popularity of German literature.

Among the more prominent members of this "propagandist group" is Dr. William Render, "a teacher of the
German language in the University of Cambridge,\textsuperscript{51} author of a German grammar as well as translator of two dramatic works.

Rudolf Erich Raspe, whose fame rests on more tangible work in his own language, is notable for his early activity. He had come to England under rather suspicious circumstances, the authorities in Kassel being desirous of his apprehension for allegedly having removed certain items from the museum there.\textsuperscript{52}

We shall encounter other names; but, with this brief introduction it will be unnecessary to amplify their position in England.\textsuperscript{53}

It is to the credit of the Germans in England, who translated at this time, that they devoted much of their time to that part of German literature which England, for the most part, ignored, namely the works of Lessing and Schiller.
III. KOTZEBUE

The 1823 edition of the *Mirror of the Stage* (London) has on the cover, in the top left hand corner, an illustration of Rolla, one of Kotzebue's most famous heroes, carrying the child over the bridge. Opposite that illustration is the balcony scene from *Romeo and Juliet*.

We may draw two conclusions from this interesting juxtaposition. One, the reverberations of Kotzebue's brief, intense period of fame in England were several years dying out. Two, for a time at least, Kotzebue occupied a position on the English stage matched only by Shakespeare.

The position of August von Kotzebue in the world of drama is a strange one. Although almost universally deprecated today, in his own time he was a dramatist of unequalled renown. Chamisso's sarcastic comments in his *Reise um die Welt* attest to this fact:

> So werde ich auch gleich, um nicht wieder darauf zurück zu kommen, ein vollständiges Zeugnis ablegen, dass für die, welche die Regierungen de facto erkennen, dieser selbe Kotzebue der Dichter der Welt ist. Wie oft ist mir doch, an allen Enden der Welt, namentlich von O-Wahu auf Guajan u.s.w., für meinen geringen Anteil an dem Beginnen seines Sohnes mit dem Lobe des grossen Mannes geschmeichelt worden, um auch auf mich einen Zipfel von dem Mantel seines Ruhmes zu werfen. Überall halte uns sein Name entgegen.

During his life (1761-1819), he far surpassed Goethe and Schiller in number of productions both in Germany and elsewhere. From 1788 to 1808 at the theater in Mannheim,
116 of his plays were presented on 1728 evenings. During the same twenty years, five of Schiller's works were played twenty-eight times. Turning to Weimar, we find the same situation during Goethe's twenty-six years as director. From 1806 to 1832 2797 evenings were devoted to dramatic presentations. In that number, Kotzebue was presented 638 times, Schiller 331 times, and Goethe allowed himself 259 performances.

Kotzebue wrote 211 plays, ranging from the early Rührstücke through farces, Schausstücke, historical dramas, to tragedy. For a time director of the Burgtheater in Vienna and of the German Theater in St. Petersburg, he made Weimar (where he was born) his home. The proximity to Goethe and Schiller and the superiority which Kotzebue surely recognized in them, led him to an attitude of disdain toward their work revealed in repeated attacks which he made upon them. Goethe despised him personally, but was helpless in the face of the popularity of his work. His words reveal his attitude, "Was der Autor schreiben, der Schauspieler spielen, das Publikum sehen und hören will, dieses ist's, was die Direktionen tyrannisirt und wogegen ihnen fast kein eigener Wille übrig bleibt." Goethe did, however, attempt to improve the pieces by revision. In the most nearly standard edition of Kotzebue's works (there being no complete edition) Kotzebue's Theater (Wien, 1840), these changes are not noted. They may be
seen in the Deutsche National-literatur edition of Menschenhass und Reue, volume 139, part 2, pp. 23 ff. Kotzebue met death at the hand of a student assassin in 1819; it was believed that he had returned from Russia as a spy. His death, in fact, brought him more lasting fame than his life; for the student involvement resulted in a sharp restriction of the activity of the liberal student associations.

Since that time, German scholars have tended to ignore Kotzebue, especially as regards his role in the development of German drama; and it is the rare German literary history which has more than a sentence or two about his work. It is not the purpose here to determine the justice of that attitude. Goethe is reported to have said, "Nach verlauf von hundert Jahren wird schon sich zeigen, dass mit Kotzebue wirklich eine Form Geboren wird." Kotzebue recognized the criticism himself:

Ich habe zu allen unbilligen Urtheilen geschwiegen, und werde auch ferner schweigen, so lange meine Stücke, trotz alles Plauderns diejenige Wirkung auf das Publikum machen, die ich davon erwarte; denn vox populi, vox Dei.

Written on this basis, his plays reveal a curious mixture of what we might call conservative dramaturgy and pseudo-radical content. This point will be clearer when we come to the examination of two of his works. Briefly, what I have reference to is, on the one hand, his use of reliable dramatic forms without any attempt to break with the past,
and, on the other hand, his exploitation of various sentimental and Romantic elements which were fashionable at the time.

Whatever later critical response may have been, such a formula for the writing of plays certainly brought Kotzebue fame and success in his own day. His plays were translated into English, French, Spanish, Dutch, Russian, Greek, Swedish, Danish, Rumanian, and Italian. This broad success, combined with the disdain since accorded it, has produced a well-meant but mis-guided feeling of sympathy in at least two writers. L. F. Thompson, in Kotzebue, A Survey of his Progress in France and England (Paris, 1928), writes,

The position of Kotzebue in literary history is, we suggest, almost unique. That a writer of such distinction should have enemies in his lifetime is credible; that such enmity should persist in those of his contemporaries that survived him is natural enough; but that the majority of literary histories, published at various times from the date of his death in 1819 till almost the present day should so far as Kotzebue is concerned, be characterised by the same hostile tone is to say the least surprising. If the dramatist in question were insignificant so far as his literary influence is concerned, if he were forgotten, then there would be little excuse for attempting to state his case anew. The contrary is, however, the fact, and the somewhat superficial investigation that we have been able to make has led us to conclude, though we make the statement with every reserve, that the contribution that Kotzebue has made to the development of the drama of the Nineteenth Century not only in his own country but in Europe in general is far greater than has hitherto been suspected.8

In Kotzebue in England (Leipzig, 1901), Walter Sellier arrives at a different conclusion; it too is a far more
favorable judgment than other critics have passed. He agrees that Kotzebue's works are valueless today but finds that he performed a great service in introducing German literature to the world. These two critics stand at the opposite extreme from those of the majority opinion. Had both groups been somewhat less emotional, they might have arrived at a more reasonable answer.

Through a consideration of Kotzebue's success and the corresponding failure of Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller in England, such an answer may be arrived at.

In Chapter Two, I considered the coincidence of a number of factors which prepared England for the importation of German literature, especially drama. In that atmosphere, Kotzebue made his first appearance in England in 1796, a remarkably quiet appearance considering later developments. Alexander Thomson included his own translation of Die Indianer in England in his German Miscellany published in that year. Except for the play, the work is an apparently random collection of German prose. The European Magazine first noticed the volume in 1798 and devoted four pages to a review including the translation of a short story by Meissner entitled "The Nutshell". The critic begins with a few general remarks about the condition of literature on the continent: "The literature of Germany seems for some time to have taken the lead among the nations of Europe...we peruse the pages of Gessner and Klopstock
with repeated delight." Turning his attention to Kotzebue's work, the writer says, "Though it displays a great deal of good sense and moral observation and might, for ought we know, be very delightful to a German auditory, it must appear improbable and incorrect to a British reader or spectator." Hewing to the eighteenth century critical concept of art as nature copied, the critic observed, "Mr. Kotzebue had probably many originals before his eyes in his own country, from which his copy might be taken and he has availed himself skilfully of the advantage." The play is a Lustspiel and Thomson probably chose it because of the English setting. To that extent, he misjudged the taste of the English public, for the play was not performed. Furthermore, the European Magazine's belated notice of the collection was probably a result of the fact that only in 1798 did Kotzebue become a name to be reckoned with, and then, because of an entirely different type of play.

Another of Kotzebue's early works, The Negro Slaves, a topical piece, appeared in England in 1796, and met with equally topical reviews which give no hint of the response to the later Kotzebue. The Monthly Review was concerned only with what it considered to be the author's successful polemics against the evils of the West Indian slave trade; likewise, the Monthly Mirror. The latter publication did find the space for a few critical remarks: "The Germans
have unquestionably a strong notion of the drama, but they are more powerful in sentiment than character. This drama possesses all the faults and all the merits of their tragedy, then lapsed back into praise of the presentation of the evils of slavery. The observation of Kotzebue's strength in sentimental writing is interesting in that it hints at the success Kotzebue was soon to know in England.

"Monk" Lewis translated Kotzebue's *Die Spanier in Peru* in 1796, but in spite of its later popularity, the work went unnoticed at that time.

In 1797, there was a lull in publication although there was a certain amount of activity behind the scenes in the theaters as we shall see shortly.

Just as it is one of the small ironies of German literature that Kotzebue was born in Weimer, so it is with the fact that he was released on the English stage in 1798, the year of publication for the *Lyrical Ballads*. I shall come back to the relation between the English Romantic movement and Kotzebue's popularity in England. The point is, 1798 is the beginning of Kotzebue's inundation of the English stage. A summary of the works translated and performed will reveal the extent of the inundation.

The following list is a combination of that in B. Q. Morgan's *A Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation* (Stanford, 1938) and Allardyce Nicoll's *Eighteenth Century Drama, 1750-1800* (Cambridge, 1927). An
asterisk indicates the work was performed. The name following the title is that of the translator unless otherwise indicated. The number following the name is the number of editions printed in that year. Unless noted, place of publication is London.

1796  The Indians in England (Die Indianer in England), A. Thomson in his German Miscellany. 1.

   The Negro Slaves (Die Negersklaven), anon. 1.

   Pizarro in Peru, or The Death of Rolla (Die Spanier in Peru), M. G. Lewis, 1.

1797  None.


   *Count Benyowsky (Graf Benyowsky), W. Render. 2.

   *The Count of Burgundy (Der Graf von Burgund), A. Plumptre. 3.

   Ildegarte, Queen of Norway (Ildegarte, Königin von Norwegen), B. Thompson. 2.

   Joanna of Montfaucon (Johanna von Montfaucon), anon. 1.

   *Lovers' Vows (Das Kind der Liebe), E. Inchbald. 9.

   Same, S. Porter. 1.

   The Natural Son (Das Kind der Liebe), A. Plumptre. 4.

   *The Stranger (Menschenhass und Reue), B. Thompson, revised by R. B. Sheridan. 1.

   Same, A. Schink, 6.

   Same, G. Papendick, 4.

   The Wild Goose Chase (Der Wildfang), W. Dunlap. 1.

1799  The Corsicans (Die Korsen), anon. 2.
False Shame (Falsche Scham), anon. 1.
The Force of Calumny (Die Verleumdung), A. Plumptre. 1.
The Happy Family (Die Silberne Hochzeit), B. Thompson. 1.

Same, M. G. Lewis. 1.

La Perouse (La Peyrouse), B. Thompson. 1.
La-Peyrouse (same), A. Plumptre. 1.

The Noble Lie (Die edle Lüge), M. Geisweiler. 2.
Same, anon. 1.

The Peevish Man (Üble Laune), C. Ludger. 1.

Pizarro (Die Spanier in Peru), a North Briton. 1.

Same, T. Dutton. 2.

Rolla (same), M. G. Lewis. 3.

The Spaniards in Peru (same), A. Plumptre.

*Pizarro (same), adapted by R. B. Sheridan. 20.

Poverty and Nobleness of Mind (Armut und Edelsinn), M. Geisweiler. 2.

*Sighs, or, The Daughter (same), Prince Hoare. 4.

The Reconciliation (Die Versöhnung), C. Ludger. 4.

Self-immolation (Der Opfertod), H. Neumann. 2.

*Family Distress (Der Opfertod), anon. 1.

The Virgin of the Sun (Die Sonnenjungfrau), A. Plumptre. 2.

Rolla, or, The Virgin of the Sun (same), B. Thompson. 1.

*The Horse and the Widow (Die Witwe und das Reitpferd), adapted by T. Dibdin. 1.

The Widow and the Riding Horse (same), A. Plumptre. 1.

The Writing Desk (Das Schreibepult), anon. 1.
The Wise Man of the East (same), E. Inchbald. 2.

1800
The Birthday (Die Versöhnung), adapted by T. Dibdin. 1.
The Corsicans (Die Korsen), by "Eleanor" in the Lady's Magazine.

Count Benyowsky (Graf Benyowsky), B. Thompson. 1.
False Delicacy (Falsche Scham), B. Thompson. 1.
Johanna of Montfaucon (Johanna von Montfaucon), anon. 1.
*Joanna of Montfaucon (same), adapted by R. Cumberland. 3.

Lovers' Vows (Das Kind der Liebe), B. Thompson. 1.
The Negro Slaves (Die Negersklaven), A. Thomson. 1.
Pizarro. (Die Spanier in Peru), B. Thompson. 1.
Same, adapted by R. B. Sheridan. 6.

1801

Deaf and Dumb (Der Taubstumme), B. Thompson. 2.
The Female Jacobin Club (Das weibliche Jakobiner-klubb),
J. C. Siber. 1.
The Happy Family (Die silberne Hochzeit), B. Thompson. 1.

*Perouse (La Peyrouse), adapted by J. Fawcett.

Rolla, or, The Virgin of the Sun (Die Sonnenjungfrau),
B. Thompson. 1.

1802
The Female Jacobin Club (Das Weiblich Jakobiner-klubb),
J. C. Siber. 1.
The Stranger (Menschenhass und Reue), B. Thompson. 1.

1803 None.

A number of translations appeared after 1803 but none
met with the success of these, the last being of Der Mann
von vierzig Jahren in 1880.

The following graph reveals the abruptness of the rise and decline of Kotzebue in England. It is based on the number of editions noted in the above list.

The chief cause for the abrupt rise in 1798 was Sheridan's staging of *Menschenhass und Reue* under the title, *The Stranger*. Preceding that production there had been considerable activity among translators and producers regarding the work. It appears that one A. Schink submitted
his own free translation to the management of Drury Lane late in 1796. According to his account, they, "after having had it in their possession eight or ten days, returned it; with an answer, politely signifying 'that they did not think it would succeed in representation.'" The foreword to Schink's work from which those remarks are taken is dated March 26, 1798, only two days after the opening at Drury Lane of The Stranger in which Sheridan utilized Benjamin Thompson's better translation.

In May, yet another edition appeared, this one the work of George Papendick. In the publisher's foreword, dated May 9, we see further evidence of the interest which predated Kotzebue's popular debut. The foreword states that Papendick first became interested in and translated the drama five years earlier when abroad, submitting it at that time to Covent Garden only to have it rejected three weeks later as unsuitable for presentation. The manuscript was then given to a literary friend with a view to its publication, in whose hands it remained until after Sheridan's production, when it was submitted for publication after having been prepared for the press by one Stephan Jones, "who was presumed to be competently skilled in English composition."

The play was an immediate success. Before going into the critical and popular reception I would like to consider the German original and the English versions in
some detail so that the reader may have a better understanding of that which formed the basis for its popularity.

Because the name Kotzebue is a name known at best vaguely today, I have outlined the plot of Menschenhass und Reue at length, in order to show, first of all, the sort of play which made Kotzebue world famous, and secondly, to illustrate what type of play grasped the English imagination as no work had done for a number of years. The summary allows the reader who is unfamiliar with Kotzebue to get some idea of his dramaturgical ability (which was not as slight as later critics have asserted; note especially the compactness of the story, the natural unraveling of events, and the skillful buildup of suspense). The reader should also bear in mind those elements of Romanticism and sentimentality referred to in Chapter II and at the beginning of this Chapter. An examination of those elements and the play as a whole follows. References in the summary are to the volume (I) of Kotzebue's Theater (Wien, 1840).

Act I. The setting is the estate of Graf von Wintersee. Peter, the son of Bittermann, the overseer, is revealed chasing butterflies. "Der Unbekannte", who lives in a cottage on the edge of the estate, appears with his servant, Franz, as Peter leaves. In a brief exchange between Franz and the stranger, it becomes clear that the latter is a misanthrope. Peter has gone into a nearby cottage where, according to Franz, an old man lives on the verge of
starvation since the Count took his son for the army. The stranger says nothing but disappears into the cottage, presumably to give the old man money with which to buy his son's freedom. The stranger and Peter reappear and we learn that Peter was also there on an errand of mercy, having been sent by "Madame Müller", the mysterious lady who has been residing in the castle for two years. Peter relates that she has been sending money and food regularly to the old man and further describes her strange manner, sometimes weeping days on end, but always benevolent. After Peter leaves, the stranger reveals his donation of money to the old man, who appears and recounts the tragedy of his life, which the stranger takes as further justification for misanthropy.

The scene shifts to the castle, where Eulalia (Madame Müller) has just received word of the Count's impending arrival. She laments the loss of solitude which the arrival of his large retinue implies. Bittermann enters and shows himself to be the typical courtier, bowing and scraping. For comic effect, he dwells at length on his numerous epistolary connections throughout Europe. Left alone, he ponders Eulalia's case. She arrived two years ago; according to the Countess she was to take care of the "innere Wirtschaft." Bittermann sees this as an encroachment on his own realm of power, and his natural curiosity leads him to greater unrest since he has been
able to learn nothing about Eulalia's origins.

II. Major von Horst, the brother of the Countess, appears. Bittermann converses obsequiously with him; Peter mimics his father. The major, who did not know about Eulaia, is astonished by her beauty and air of nobility when she enters. She praises the beauties of nature and the country life to the enchantment of the major:

Wenn ich an einem heitern Morgen mir den Kaffee auf den grünen Hofplatz heraushilfesse, dann ist mir das süße Bild der auflebenden Geschäftigkeit und Tätigkeit um mich her immer neu. Die Schwalben schwirren, die Enten und Gänse schnattern, das Vieh wird ausgetrieben, der Bauer zieht hinaus auf's Feld, und wünscht mir im Vorbeigehen einen freundlichen guten Morgen; alles lebt und webt, und ist froh. (I, 99)

Tobies, the old man, enters and expresses his gratitude for all she has done. He leaves and Eulalia is embarrassed that the Major should overhear the old man's words. He, however, is hopelessly lost and inquires about her marital status. She falls into sadness and diverts his questions. The Count and Countess arrive. Bittermann reports briefly to the Count on the condition of the estate and they leave for a tour of the grounds. Having seen the Count's children, Eulalia soliloquizes about her two whom she has not seen for some years and speaks of herself as their "unnatürliche Mutter" (I, 109). Lotte, the Countess's young maid enters and torments Eulalia with her probing questions and insolent manner. Lotte is broadly drawn as the uncultured girl who imitates her mistress's every word and gesture.
Peter rushes in to announce that the Count has fallen in the pond. It seems that Bittermann had erected, in addition to "eine Einsiedelei, krumme Gänge, ein Obelisk, und Ruinen eines alten Raubschlosses" a Chinese bridge "mit Ökonomie" from the wood of a collapsed chicken house. The bridge proved unable to support the Count, who, Bittermann later remarks, is "nur ein wenig schwer bei Leibe." Peter tells that the stranger appeared only long enough to save the Count, who at this moment appears, dripping, but otherwise hale. The group exits to have tea. Bitterman and Lotte remain behind for a short comic scene in which he puts on airs of nobility to impress her.

III. The scene returns to the field of the first act. Franz tries to praise his master for his generosity toward the old man, but the stranger will have none of it. Franz wonders about the origin of his misanthropy. Lotte appears to invite the stranger to dinner at the castle but he refuses to speak to her and she leaves hautily. Franz tries to persuade him to go to the castle but he is adamant and praises Franz as his only friend.

Franz is alone when the Countess and the Major enter. He explains to them the reason for his master's refusal to have dinner at the castle, the reason being his misanthropy. While he goes to fetch the stranger, they discuss the Major's sudden love for Eulalia and the Countess is persuaded to try to find out more about Eulalia's background. They are inter-
rupted by the appearance of Madame Müller and the Count. The two men leave the women alone, and the Countess succeeds in inducing Eulalia to tell her story. Her name is really von Meinau, she is the adultress of whom the Countess has heard. Eulalia married as a girl of fourteen and, after having two children, was seduced by "a Lovelace" who took her away with him. She soon came to her senses and left him, seeking quiet in the country where she could repent, knowing she could never find the forgiveness of her husband whom she still loves but of whose whereabouts she is ignorant. The Count and the Major return and the Count bids the Major speak with the stranger in hopes that he can be more persuasive than Lotte. Peter provides a bit of comic relief as he tries to join the men in smoking.

IV. The Major is at the stranger's cottage discussing the man's misanthropy when he appears. The two men recognize each other as old comrades-at-arms. The stranger's name, we learn, is von Meinau. The stranger, in reply to the Major's astonished inquiries about the change which has come over him, relates his story. He, of course, is Eulalia's cuckolded husband. Her infidelity led him to misanthropy and his only goal in life is complete seclusion. With some difficulty the Major elicits his promise to dine at the castle and departs. Von Meinau immediately makes plans to leave the country in the morning; he feels he is becoming involved in society once again. He
orders Franz to fetch the children who have been living with a peasant nearby. He wants to spare them the sorrows of growing up in civilization and plans to take them to some faraway isle.

Back in the castle, Bittermann and Lotte discuss the apparent nobility of Eulalia and marvel enviously at the way in which she traffics with their employers, apparently trying to rise above her menial station. The major appears and exploits Bittermann's own pseudo-nobility in a well-drawn comic scene. He is frustrated by the Countess's refusal to tell him what she learned from Eulalia, who appears with the Count. The stranger is announced and enters unexpectedly. Eulalia espies him and faints as he exits hastily.

V. The castle. Bittermann gently reproves the Count for paying so much attention to a lady not of the nobility. The major enters to report that Eulalia is recovering and the major is left alone to soliloquize about his shattered hopes now that he knows Eulalia is his friend's unfaithful wife. When she and the Countess enter, the Major, in spite of her protestations to the effect that she neither asks nor expects forgiveness from her wronged husband, announces his intention of bringing about a reconciliation. Eulalia has only one wish—to see her children once more. The Major agrees to arrange this with the stranger.
The scene changes to the front of von Meinau's cottage where the Major stands alone, lamenting his fate. At first, he doubts the justice of it all. Should an exception be made with Eulalia; is she any different from other adulteresses? He decides in the affirmative. Franz appears with the children, and the Major realizes it is through them that a reconciliation may be effected and bids Franz hide them in the cottage until he signals for them. The stranger appears and once again declares to the Major his undying love for Eulalia but he doubts that she could ever be faithful to him again. The Major chides him for this attitude and blames her sin on her youth and calls her lengthy repentance and beneficence to von Meinau's attention. He agrees to see her and to let her see the children, but thinks no good can come of it.

Eulalia and the Countess enter. The former is reduced to tears when her husband addresses her with "du". She declares her love but admits that she does not, cannot, expect forgiveness. They agree they must part. Von Meinau offers her money on which she may live comfortably but she declines it. They are about to part when the children appear at a signal from the Major. The parents embrace the children, then one another. The stranger says to Eulalia: "Ich verzeihe dir!"

Kotzebue's play contains no distinguishing characteristics, none of the marks of genius evident in the writings
of his German contemporaries. At the same time, neither
does the play suffer from any great weaknesses; there are
no major flaws to be criticized. True, character develop-
ment is limited; the language is often florid, or so it
seems after a century and a half; and the plot is certain-
ly not original. On the other hand, the work is compara-
tively tightly-knit; the excesses of language are not in-
trusive and do little to hinder the forward motion of the
action; suspense is skillfully developed in such a way
that the audience slowly begins to suspect the truth but is
not certain until late in the play; the comic characters
(Bittermann, Peter, and Lotte), while by no means finely
drawn, are not exaggerated. Classic comic devices (the re-
peated line, the insolent servant, the high-born person
reduced to absurdity) are handled in a way which reveals
a sure sense of successful dramaturgy. In fact, the dis-
tinguishing characteristic of the play lies in the fact
that one can say nothing really good or bad about it.
Where, in the eyes of today's reader, the dramaturgy seems
to falter in forced soliloquies or in excesses of emotion,
the reader need only to browse among other works of the
same general type to appreciate the natural skill which
Kotzebue brought to bear upon an ordinary theme. All of
which is neither to praise nor to condemn.

Much the same may be said of Benjamin Thompson's
1798 translation. Somewhat shorter than the original, it
nonetheless retains the compactness of a well-executed plot, with no loose strings left dangling at the end. Sheridan, in the acting edition, himself made a few additions, none of great importance. A comparison of the translation with the original will reveal the extent and significance of any changes.

The *dramatis personae* remain for the most part intact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kotzebue</th>
<th>Thompson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Der Unbekannte (von Meinau)</td>
<td>The Stranger (Waldbourg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graf und Gräfin von Wintersee</td>
<td>Count and Countess Wintersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major von der Horst</td>
<td>Baron Steinfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotte</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bittermann</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madame Müller (Eulalia)</td>
<td>Mrs. Haller (Emilia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz</td>
<td>Francis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobies</td>
<td>Tobias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In structure, the two plays are alike. Thompson has added a poetic prologue, as customary, by W. Linley, and an epilogue by M. G. Lewis. The five acts with their various settings are retained as in the original.

In plot, one major and several minor changes were introduced. The Chinese bridge incident, probably the high point, comically, in Kotzebue, is given an entirely different aspect.

In Kotzebue, it is the Graf von Wintersee who, because
of his excess poundage as well as the rotten wood of which the bridge was made, tumbles into the stream to be rescued by the stranger. His appearance, dripping and disheveled, is, on the one hand a possible flaw in Kotzebue, and on the other, a well-wrought bit of buffoonery. The former, because the scene is treading perilously close to overdone slapstick; the latter, because the Count has been introduced to the audience as a stock character, a well-meaning nobleman concerned only with the pleasures of life.

Thompson, though willing to expose the English audience to the insidious morality of Menschenhass und Reue and expose himself, Sheridan, and Drury Lane to the reprobation of the reviewers, could not allow such a scene on the English stage. The humor of the situation would certainly not be lost on the audience; but, considering the differences between the English and German nobility and their relations to their respective countries, the scene could be disastrous in England. Indeed, with it, the play might never have gotten past the Examiner.

As a substitute, Thompson has Francis take one of the Wintersen children walking. The child falls into the stream and is saved by the stranger. Obviously, the comic effect is completely lost; still, the audience's sympathy and admiration for the stranger is further enhanced.

Also, Thompson has attempted to maintain the suspense farther into the play than did Kotzebue. In the German
original, the audience learns, in Act III, that Madame Müller's name is von Meinau and so is that of the stranger. Thompson allows Mrs. Haller to reveal her name but keeps that of the stranger unmentioned. Thus, presumably the audience does not fully realize that they are man and wife until the unexpected meeting at the close of Act IV.

In content and tone, we are struck immediately by a rampant sentimentalism marked by Romantic overtones. The entire play builds to the emotional reconciliation of the last scene. The misanthropy of the Stranger, one of the chief motives of the play, is itself a criticism of society and its lack of meaningful values. Both Waldbourg and Emilia turn to nature and the simple life of the country to assuage their wounds. And the forgiveness of Emilia can only be taken as an attempt on the part of the author at affirming the innate goodness of man. Sheridan has retained these characteristics in full. In this play, then, the English theater found expression for sentiments which were simultaneously finding expression on a higher level in the realm of poetry.

Other additions are minor and were made in keeping with the expectations of the English audience. For the last scene in Act II, Sheridan, somewhat inexplicably, as far as the plot is concerned, has a group of rustic dancers perform for Solomon and Peter. Likewise in the opening scene of Act IV, when two strolling singers appear and perform for
Francis and his master, singing one song by John Grubb and another by Sheridan. The latter poem is certainly in keeping with the mood of the play at this point, and, with the proper music could have added much to the effectiveness of the situation:

I have a silent sorrow here,
A grief I'll ne'er impart;
It breathes no sigh, it sheds no tear,
But it consumes my heart!
This cherish'd woe, this lov'd despair,
My lot forever be;
So my soul's lord, the pangs I bear
Be never known by thee!

Concerning the translation itself, Thompson, for the most part, has written well and accurately. The length of the original, some four hours on the stage, was prohibitive; thus, in many places, he has shortened lengthy speeches while retaining the sense of what is said. As an example, in Act IV, the Baron is trying to persuade the stranger to come to the castle; the latter is stoutly maintaining his misanthropic attitude:

Unbekannter. Bruder, es gibt auch Dinge in der Welt, die sich besser predigen, als befolgen lassen. Wenn du wüstest, wie ich jedes fremde Menschengesicht anekelt, wie ich lieber auf Millionen Nadeln sitzen möchte, als auf einem gepolsterten Stuhl in euren eleganten Zirkeln; wie mir das auf den ganzen Tag meine beste Laune verdirbt, wenn ich nur von ferne einen Menschen auf mir zukommen sehe, dem ich nicht mehr ausweichen kann, und vor dem ich also meinen Hut ziehen muss. -- O, lass mich! lass mich in Ruhe!
-- Jeder Mensch sucht um sich her sich einen eigenen Zirkel zu bilden, dessen Mittelpunkt er selbst ist; so ich den meinigen. Solange noch eine Vogelkehle in diesem Walde ist, welche die Morgensonne begrüßt; so lange wird mir's an Gesellschaft nicht fehlen (I, 151).

Thompson has reduced this in the following manner:
Stranger. Leave me! Leave me! Every one tries to form a circle, of which he may be the centre. As long as there remains a bird in these woods to greet the rising sun with its melody, I shall court no other society. (German Theatre, I, 56)

Such examples are abundant throughout the play.

In the shorter exchanges, Thompson shows himself to be the competent translator. In I, ii, Franz and der Unbekannte are discussing Peter and Tobias:

Unbekannter. Wer ist der Mensch?
Who is that?
Franz. Der Sohn des Verwalters.
The steward’s son.
Unbekannter. Auf dem Schloss?
Of the castle?
Yes.
Unbekannter. (nach einer Pause). Du sprachst gestern abend—
You were speaking last night—

Franz. Von dem armen Bauer?
Of the old countryman?
Unbekannter. Ganz recht.
Ay.
Franz. Sie antworteten mir nicht?
You would not hear me out.
Unbekannter. Sprich weiter!
Proceed.
Franz. Er ist arm.
He is poor.
Unbekannter. Woher weisst du das?
Who told you so?
Franz. Er sagt es.
He himself.
Unbekannter. O, sie sagen und klagen viel.
Ay, ay; he knows how to tell his story, no doubt.
Franz. Und betrügen viel.
And to impose, you think?
Unbekannter. Richtig.
Right!
Franz. Dieser nicht.
This man does not.
Unbekannter. Warum nicht?
Franz. Das fühlts sich besser, als es sich sagt.

Unbekannter. Narr!

Franz. Ein Gefühlvoller Narr ist mehr wert, als ein eiskalter Klüger.
A feeling fool is better than a cold skeptic.

Unbekannter. Das ist nicht wahr.
False!

Franz. Wohltaten erzeugen Dank.
Charity begets gratitude.

Unbekannter. Das ist nicht wahr.
False!

Franz. Und beglücken mehr den Geber als den Empfänger.
And blesses the giver more than the receiver.
(Kotzebue, I, 72-3; Thompson, I, 8-9)

The emendations apparent here typify the whole of Thompson's work. While it could hardly be called a close translation, it is nonetheless acceptable, especially as regards presentation on the stage.

Papendick's translation is much less satisfactory and was obviously published to exploit the fame of the play resulting from the Drury Lane production.

Schink's translation is likewise mediocre; but he did not content himself with translation. In the foreword, he observes that he has "not made the wife actually commit that crime which is a stain to the female character, tho' she was on the brink of ruin, by eloping from her husband" for two reasons. One, "according to the dictates of nature, reconciliation would in such circumstances be more easily obtained" and two, he believes his alteration to be "more consistent with the moral sentiment and more congenial to the heart of an English audience."16
In that respect, he was quite mistaken. In addition to the Drury Lane Production, there were shortly two others. The play opened at Covent Garden, January 27, 1801, and at the Haymarket, August 18, 1803.

Early critical response was highly favorable. The review in the *London Times* on March 26, 1798 is indicative of the immediate acceptance which Sheridan's production found:

> The spirit of the original is happily preserved, while the wild and irregular flights into which the fertile, but licentious imagination of the German dramatists frequently transports them are carefully suppressed. There is no opposition of contrary incidents, but a connection and stability of all that are congenial, and which promote the great end; the heart is improved, and the fancy entertained, while a confirmed detestation of conjugal infidelity, which forms the chief moral of the play, is irresistibly impressed. There is, we grant, no novelty of character, but there is novelty of sentiment, passion, diction, and above all, there is that which we but rarely meet in our modern dramas, novelty of virtuous example and edifying morality, judiciously diffused throughout the serious scenes. These beauties

> "Are not of an age, but of all times."

The lighter scenes display a coarseness of language and a vile attempt at humour which would with difficulty be admitted in the lowest degree of farce.

Of the acting we cannot speak too favorably. Mrs. Siddons succeeded in producing the most unrestrained detestation of the crime to which Mrs. Haller is supposed to have fallen victim... Mr. Kemble has not displayed more real talent in any product in the whole round of the Drama, than in *The Stranger*.

The house overflowed at an early hour and was the fullest we have seen this season.

I have quoted at length because the reviewer makes a number of points worthy of closer examination.
His perceptive remark about "no novelty of character" is noteworthy in that it strikes at Kotzebue's greatest weakness.

Kotzebue's Gestalten sind wie die pappenen Figuren der Kindertheater, auf einer Seite in bunten Farben das Abbild eines Menschen und sonst nichts als eine leere Kehrseite. Blosse Aushängeschilder von Menschen, die nur mit Bühnengewandtheit so geführt werden müssen, dass nichts als die bemalte Seite zu sehen kommt. Darum sind Kotzebue's Stücke von blossen geschickten Routiniers zu vollem Genüge darzustellen.17

This fact did not prevent either the Times critic or the English audience from liking the play.

The German writer quoted above errs, however, in his belief that only technically skilled actors can play Kotzebue to full satisfaction. The Times critic is certainly not in accord with that idea, and The Stranger did, in fact, become a standard vehicle for both Kemble and Mrs. Siddons.18

Also noteworthy is the fact that the reviewer found the humor objectionable. We have noted that Sheridan had reduced the amount of humor considerably, so that we may assume that a more literal translation would have met with a much sharper review.

The most interesting parts of the review are those dealing with the play's morality. The fact that this reviewer refers to the forgiveness of Mrs. Haller's sin as "the great end" and "edifying morality" puts him in opposition to a large number of later critics. In fact, "for over fifty years after its first representation, European opinion was
sharply divided over the question as to whether this play was immoral or the reverse. One party maintained that the forgiveness of an adulteress was abhorrent to human nature and if persisted in would shatter the foundations of society. The other side held with equal vigor that he who refused forgiveness to the repentant Eulalia was an inhuman wretch. In any case there was no doubt as to the views of the great majority in Germany or rather in Europe—since this play was performed on the stage of every civilized nation—, in 1789 and for many years after, in regard not only to this play but the other works of Kotzebue.¹⁹

English critics were, almost to the man, opposed to Kotzebue's morality, or lack of it, as may be judged from later reviews of the first printings of Thompson's translation.

The moral of this play is unquestionably of dubious nature; we fear it may tend to make adultery appear less odious than it ought—there is no dramatic justice. The death of the heroine is the only just solution, but we have heard it reported, that, on this suggestion being made to Mr. Sheridan, he replied, "if he killed Mrs. Haller, he must kill the audience too." Who or what can place a woman who has resigned her virtue in the situation she held before she fell? Not her own repentance—the husband's forgiveness—the art of the poet—nor the sighs of the audience.²⁰

Obviously, this reviewer, as well as Schink, failed to understand that which Sheridan, as an experienced director, was obviously aware of, namely, the financial value of such an "immoral" ending.
The British Critic, apparently not especially taken by Kotzebue but at the same time unwilling, in the light of his popularity, to denounce him, ambiguously summarized its feelings about Papendick's translation in the following manner: "We are clearly of the opinion that British taste cannot be improved by imitation of German authors; though hints may undoubtedly be taken from them, which, properly used, will have a very different effect."21

Kotzebue himself resolutely, if not eloquently, defended his works against the widespread charges of immorality.

Man dichtet mir Sittenlosigkeit und Unmoralität an, obgleich in dem dicksten Bande Predigten nicht mehr Moral enthalten ist, als in meinen Schauspielen, die überdies nicht so langweilig sind als jene. Menschenauss und Reue, weit entfernt, Schaden zu stiften, hat wirklich eine verirrte Frau zu ihrem Mann zurückgeführt; das ist eine wahr Anecdote, deren Andenken mir noch meine letzte Stunde versüßen wird, eine Belohnung, die von keinem Golde aufgewogen, von keinem Journal-Lobe erhöht, von keinem Tadel verbittert wird.

Ich lass zuweilen schwangere oder verführte Mädchen in meinen Schauspielen auftreten, darüber schreit die ganze Welt, warum? ...Ich muss also endlich glauben, nicht der Gegenstand, sondern das Bisschen Ruhm des Verfassers sei den Herren unliebig.22

August Wilhelm Schlegel offered a concise explanation of this immorality. "Jene Idee, dass die Stimme der Natur sich nie verleugnet, und dass, wo ihr gefolgt wird, von Sünde nicht die Rede sein kann, zieht durch alle seine rührenden Dramen hindurch."23 The German critic resorted to English poetry on one occasion to give vent to his feel-
ings about Kotzebue:

With morals spice the pastry of his muse,
And fish from out her flat, broad stagnant pool
Beauty of Kotzebue, fit for the brutes.  

Later works achieved even greater notoriety in England, particularly, The Noble Lie, a wonderfully contrived continuation of The Stranger, in which von Meinau pretends to commit adultery to put at ease the still troubled conscience of his wife.  

Sheridan, always sensitive to the currents of public opinion, "had Kemble and Mrs. Siddons walk off the stage in opposite directions at the end when critics were most vociferous in their protests. And by 1853, Mrs. Haller either fainted or died at the end."  

The play was performed periodically in England for almost a century. "Sir Henry Irving seriously considered producing it at the Lyceum in 1879 and it was actually played at the Olympic in 1891 with Wilson Barrett as Meinau."  

The last printing was in 1883 in Dicks' Standard Plays (New York and London).  

Sheridan's Stranger was the first stimulus behind the sizable group of translations and performances. Covent Garden was not, however, to sit idly by and observe his success. Mrs. Inchbald's translation of Das Kind der Liebe, Lovers' Vows, opened there October 11, 1798, played forty-two nights that season and went through nine editions, thus adding impetus to the movement which Sheridan had started.
It, too, is a *Rührstück*, concerned with a wronged woman, deserted by the nobleman who fathered her illegitimate child. Years later, the nobleman returns and the couple is reconciled.

A close examination of the play itself is unnecessary, since it differs in plot but not type from *The Stranger*.

Critical response was, once again, generally favorable. The *British Critic* characterizes the piece as "good writing" and notes that "the effect on the audience is prodigious." (One has the feeling the reviewer himself was unable to resist the sight of the wronged mother and son at last gaining retribution, for he at times seems on the verge of losing control of his critical reserve.) He concludes, in fact, by saying, "we who have both witnessed and contributed to 'the sanction of the applauding theatre'" commend Mrs. Inchbald for her translation.28

The *Monthly Mirror* also appears to have been moved, devoting six pages to its review, in which, for the first time, Kotzebue is viewed as a playwright of the first order.

He has not half the fancy or the terrific grandeur of his countryman Schiller; but he has infinitely more tenderness, and a surer command over the affections of his readers. He has less poetic genius, but more nature; he is not so bold in his conception of character, so artful in its development, or so consistent in its preservation; but he has a most intimate acquaintance with the human heart; its avenues are all open to him; not to affect it with terror, or chill its faculties with images of sublime horror; but to soften, to melt,
and occasionally to agonize it almost beyond endurance.

Kotzebue always writes with a view to the moral purpose; but his success is at least doubtful. Kotzebue, also, is content to show us the dreadful effects of seduction, and the wretchedness into which it plunges the innocent; but he does not deter the libertine, by bringing his representative to punishment. Certainly this is one of the most remarkable and revealing contemporary comments. The comparison with Schiller goes a long way toward explaining the English dislike for him and for Goethe which we shall find in the following chapter and also gives us an insight into the composition of the personality of the late eighteenth century English playgoer. Kotzebue was different, but not markedly so; Schiller, we see, was so alien in his "terrific grandeur" as to be repulsive at first encounter.

Again, in spite of the questionable morality, the critic recommends *Lovers' Vows*. "It is certainly, notwithstanding its faults, a production of unusual and superior merit."  

*Lovers' Vows* appeared in other translations (see list of works above) but, as noted, the play does not differ sufficiently from *The Stranger* to warrant close examination. It was, in fact, the last of Kotzebue's sentimental pieces to be translated.

The translators were, however, kept busy. It seemed that any work bearing Kotzebue's name would find a publisher
and great numbers of readers. Many works—farces, historical dramas, comedies—were staged (see list of works) but none matched the success of *The Stranger* and *Lovers' Vows*.

It is interesting to conjecture what might have become of Kotzebue in England had not Sheridan hit upon the idea of turning *Die Spanier in Peru*, a "romantic tragedy," into a political work of extreme patriotism; for Sheridan's next production of Kotzebue met with such approbation as to dim all that which had come before. *Pizarro* (Sheridan's title) marks the highpoint of Kotzebue's English popularity.

In 1799, the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane, the financial success of the preceding year notwithstanding, was close to bankruptcy. It was not an unusual condition, but this time it seemed Sheridan was in danger of seeing his theater become insolvent. Kemble was forced to tour the provinces for a time in order to increase his income.

Politically, the times were unstable. The French Revolution had failed to live up to its early promise. The ascendancy of Napoleon and the rise of French imperialism had numerous effects in England. As a reaction to the liberalism of the Revolution, there was a sharp rise in conservative (anti-Jacobin) opinion. The attempted assassination of the king at Drury Lane in 1798 only served to heighten already strong feelings of patriotism. Thus it was a stroke of managerial genius which led Sheridan back to Kotzebue.
Die Sonnenjungfrau, of which Die Spanier in Peru is a continuation, had already been translated, without success. For that matter, Die Spanier itself had been translated three times. The "romantic tragedy" seemed to hold little appeal for the English.

What could be more ideal than the solution Sheridan hit upon? Adapt the work, with its exotic setting, for the English stage as a piece designed to show the evils of tyranny and the tyrant's unhappy end. A play such as that, in a year of political uncertainty, bearing the name Kotzebue, could hardly fail.

Opening at Drury Lane May 24, 1799, with Kemble and Siddons starring, it played sixty-two nights.

Thus, in England, Pizarro exceeded The Stranger in popularity. When we come to examine the former, however, we find a strange situation. In the following plot summary of the original play, the reader will note that Kotzebue has retained many of those elements which brought him such success in Menschenhass und Reue--characters wrought to show the goodness of man, the praise of nature and the simple life, the evils of civilization--and that he has furthermore added another concept which was finding nobler expression on a plane far above him, the equal validity of great religions. The strange situation lies in the fact that the play, as it was known in England, has almost nothing of these qualities in it, as we shall see.
The full title is, Die Spanier in Peru, oder:
Rollas Tod, ein romantisches Schauspiel. References again are to Kotzebue's Theater.

Act I. Elvira, Pizarro's mistress, is revealed asleep in the Spanish camp near Quito. Velverde, Pizarro's secretary, awakens her with a redeclaration of his love and brings her to discuss her wretched situation. (As a girl, she admired Pizarro's valor and, enamored of him, allowed him to take her from Spain on his wanderings in the New World. Now that he is possessed of an overweening ambition to conquer the Incas and become King of Quito, she has lost her admiration for him although love remains. She is fearful that, by his cruel actions toward the naive Indians, he will taint the glory of his name for posterity.) Valverde tries in vain to undermine her loyalty. Pizarro enters to find her weeping. We learn that on a previous expedition, Pizarro's protege, Alonzo, deserted to the Incas and has now become one of their chieftains. Pizarro blames his desertion on the influence of the Dominican, Las Casas, who preaches a doctrine of humanitarianism regarding the Indians. He has received information that sacrifices are to be offered today and has decided that they must strike during that time of military weakness. Alonzo's weapons carrier, Diego, an old friend of Pizarro, has been captured and is led in. After relating that Alonzo is married to an Indian and has a child, he is released. Las Casas, having heard of
the impending attack, comes in to defend the Indians, "ein Volk, das harmlos seine Felder baut und in reiner Unschuld der Sitten den Schöpfer nach seiner Weise lobt." (IV, 221). Pizarro and his men persist in their fury against the Incas and Las Casas, despairing, announces his will to retire to the solitude of nature rather than be witness to their attack. "In Höhlen und Wäldern will ich mich begraben, zu Tigern und Leoparden will ich reden." (IV, 223). He bids Elvira stay and try to induce reason into the madmen. A prisoner is brought in who defies every attempt at prying information from him. Angered, Pizarro's men kill him; his dying words are a plea for divine mercy for the Spaniards. Valverde, left alone with Elvira, once again offers his services, this time more bluntly. Upset by the display of cruelty which she has just witnessed, she decides to give Pizarro one more chance to prove himself.

II. The scene is set around an altar in the Peruvian camp. Cora and Alonzo are shown in a brief scene of happy domesticity playing with their child. The other Inca chieftain, Rolla, enters. He was formerly married to Cora but gave her up when it became clear that she loved Alonzo. They persuade Cora to flee with the other women. Atilba, the king, and his retinue appear. A religious ceremony is held in which hymns are sung and the Sun God is asked to bestow his favor on the Incas in battle. A guard enters and announces the enemy has started the attack. Preparations
are made for the engagement; and Alonzo asks Rolla, before they go to battle, to take Cora as his wife again should he be killed.

An old man and a boy remain on stage. The boy climbs a tree and reports the battle's progress. The Spaniards gain the upper hand, the Peruvians retreat, Atilbe is wounded and brought on stage. The old man is blind, and not recognizing the king, asks about him and praises him for his benevolence. Fleeing Indians appear but Rolla enters to rally them to victory. In the flush of triumph, it is learned that Alonzo has been captured.

III. The forest where the women have taken refuge. Rolla appears and tells Cora of Alonzo's disappearance and repeats the latter's parting words. She is unbelieving, thinking that Rolla could have saved Alonzo but let him be captured because of jealousy. Enraged, she leaves with the child to search the battlefield for some sign of Alonzo. Rolla, alone, announces his intention to prove Cora wrong in her distrust.

The Spanish camp. Pizarro's lamentations are interrupted by Elvira who brings news of Alonzo's capture. He is brought in and Pizarro condemns him to death at sunrise because of his treason. Elvira tries vainly to dissuade him from his vengeful intent. If Alonzo dies, she says, she will desert Pizarro. He remains adamant.

IV. The tent where Alonzo is prisoner. A soldier
brings wine from Elvira. She appears forthwith and, because of her admiration for his bravery offers to help him escape if he will kill Pizarro. Alonzo is stirred by memories of former comradeship with the Spaniard and refuses. She leaves, saying she will return shortly. Alonzo soliloquizes about death and his confidence in heavenly reward. He prays, "Du Jehova! oder Sonne!—gleichviel, wie ich dich nenne—erhalte den Meinigen Gesundheit und Sitten!" (IV, 261). Rolla enters, disguised as a priest and persuades Alonzo to escape in the same disguise for Cora's sake. Rolla takes his place in the prison. Elvira, returning, is astonished at Rolla's loyalty and bravery. She makes her offer to him. He is noncommittal and they go to Pizarro's tent. Elvira leaves him alone with the sleeping Pizarro, who is tossing and muttering vengeful words. Rolla awakens him and reveals Alonzo's escape. Pizarro, stirred by Rolla's action ("Die Helden Haben überall nur einen Glauben." (IV, 293) releases him.

The Peruvian camp. Atilba's grief for Alonzo is ended when he appears, only to be renewed when he hears of Rolla's imprisonment.

V. Cora is wandering aimlessly about in the forest searching for Alonzo. She hears his voice and leaves the stage; from her words it is apparent that Alonzo has found her. Two drunken Spanish soldiers enter and take the child, which Cora has left behind, back to the camp. She and Alonzo
appear and she is distraught when they discover that the child is gone. They meet Las Casas who is able to offer little consolation for their anguish.

The edge of the Spanish camp. As he left, Rolla was captured by a guard who did not know of his release. Pizarro is about to let him go again when the two soldiers appear with the child. Pizarro rejoices in the thought of using the child as bait for Alonzo. Rolla, whose demands for the child are refused, snatches him from Pizarro’s arms and escapes. Soldiers pursue and wound him, but he reaches the Peruvian lines.

The Peruvian Camp. Cora, Alonzo, and Las Casas appear and add their grief to that of Atilba. Cora curses the King for not being able to return her child. Rolla, dying, appears with the child, and expires as he hands it to Cora.

Rolla. (schwer verwundet, sinkt einige Mal in die Knie, ehe er sich der ohnmächtigen Cora nähern kann. Er ruft mit schwacher Stimme). Cora!—dein Kind!—
Cora (erwacht. Der Anblick ihres Kindes gibt ihr neue Kraft. Sie streckt die Arme darnach aus). Mein Kind! Mit Blut besteckt!—
Rolla. Es ist mein Blut. (Er reicht ihr das Kind hin.)
Cora (schliesst es in ihre Arme). Mein Kind!—
Rolla!—
Rolla. Ich liebte dich—du thatest mir unrecht—ich kann nicht mehr!—(Er sinkt nieder.)
Alonzo (sich auf ihn werfend). Rolla! du stirbst!
Rolla. Für Cora—(Er stirbt.)
Cora (schmerzhaft auf die Leiche herabblickend).
Oi! wer hat geliebt wie dieser Mann!—Knabe! du bist teuer erkauft!
It is readily apparent that, in the eight years since the appearance of Menschenhass und Reue, Kotzebue had, if anything, regressed. True, Die Spanier in Peru shows the same skill at handling the stage machinery necessary for a smooth unraveling of the story-line. Regarding tone, dialogue, and originality, one can only resort to negative criticism. Whereas Menschenhass is a satisfactory period-piece, Spanier is an exploitation of an audience's love for spectacle, the language is verbose and pompous, and the tone might best be described as that of the dregs of Romanticism.

To examine these points individually, the spectacle is apparent in the title of the play. An exotic setting involving a heathen people offered great possibilities to the ingenious set-designer of the late eighteenth century.

The language is unpardonable: in attempting to mount the heights of classical rhetoric, Kotzebue slips unawares into the abyss of redundant, exaggerated, sentimental language. In order to spare the reader those pains which the writer endured while reading the work, I shall cite only two particularly offensive passages.

Las Casas to Pizarro in defense of the Incas:

Ist das Blutmass eurer Grausamkeiten noch nicht voll? Diese Kinder frommer Unschuld, die euch gastfrei aufnahmen, wann haben sie genug gelitten?—Allmächti-
gelt dessen Donner Felsen zerschmettern, und dessen Sonne Eisberge schmilzt, leih meinen Worten deine Kraft, so wie deine Gütte meinen Willen beseelt. (IV, 221)

Or Elvira's piquant reaction to the murder of the Peruvian prisoner in Act I: "Stirbt der Christ schöner?" (IV, 228)

This expansive dialogue makes for a play which lasted almost five hours on the stage. Apparently, the version in Kotzebue's Theater is the acting version, for, in the foreword, the author speaks of certain revisions made by F. L. Schröder (first, director of the National Theater in Hamburg, then, 1781-1785 director of the Burgtheater in Vienna where he made Kotzebue's acquaintance) which he (Kotzebue) has retained in the printed edition.

These criticisms notwithstanding, the chief fault of the play is a characteristic which Kotzebue most likely thought to be its outstanding virtue. Kotzebue has been criticized for failing to write dramas of ideas in which great thoughts and concepts were portrayed. Die Spanier in Peru is itself a refutation of the claim. The theme being elaborated on here is not that of the evils of tyranny (as the bare plot summary might lead one to believe) but that of the Noble Savage (as I have tried to indicate by my choice of quotations in the plot summary.) Pizarro is not presented to us as the tyrant of tyrants, but simply as the "civilized" European who has lost contact with a
correct sense of values because of his civilization, and we are supposed to experience catharsis not because of his tyranny but because of the infinite virtues of the simple, naive people who are the victims of that tyranny. Certainly we are horrified at the cold-blooded actions of the Spaniards, but it is a Peruvian, Rolla, who is the hero of the play and whose death at the hands of the Spaniards forms the climax of the play.

Such was the material Sheridan had to work with.

There is some doubt about which of three possible translations he used for his adaptation. Morgan, in the Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation, says, "Sheridan seems to have based his very free adaptation on Lewis's translation." Marcella Gosch, writing in the Monatshefte fur den deutschen Unterricht thinks he used that of Anne Plumptre, while a contemporary reviewer leaves the impression that it was the work of Maria Geislerweiler. It is certain that all three translations were available to him; but, in the light of the extensive changes he made, the problem of which translation was used is irrelevant. The best case can probably be made out for Lewis, since his is the most correct translation of the three.

Technically, Sheridan shortened the work considerably, often inserted his own dialogue and omitted whole speeches, and in general lessened the exaggeration of the
language. We may take Rolla's death scene as a comparison:

Enter Rolla, bleeding, with the child, follow'd by Peruvian soldiers.

Rol. Thy child! (Gives the child into Cora's arms, and falls.)
Cora. Oh God!—There's blood on him!
Rol. 'Tis my blood, Cora!
Alon. Rolla, thou diest!
Rol. For thee, and Cora-- (Dies.)

Sheridan expanded the stage directions, exploiting the spectacular. For example, the scene described at the beginning of the chapter, in which Rolla takes the child and flees:

The Out-Post of the Spanish Camp.—The Background wild and rocky, with a Torrent falling down the Precipice, over which a Bridge is formed. A fell'd Tree.

The religious ceremony in Act II is greatly expanded and he composed a song for Cora while she is wandering through the wilderness seeking Alonzo. To complete the political justice (see below), Sheridan has Alonzo kill Pizarro after Rolla's death, which is the only major structural alteration.

More significant, is the change in tone. Kotzebue's emphasis on a sort of diluted pantheistic humanism (an aptly contradictory description of Kotzebue's dilettante mixture of philosophical and literary ideas stirring around him) is gone completely. There is no feeling of sympathy for the innocent natives who are threatened by the evils of civilized man; we have, instead, the feeling that the
Peruvians are in fact Englishmen in New World dress, and
the Spaniards are the French, little altered from real
life. This symbolism is clearly established in Act II for
those spectators who might not have guessed it already.
Rolla's call to arms which Sheridan added there is un-
deniably an effective bit of stagecraft:

My brave associates—partners of my toil, my feel-
ings and my fame!—can Rolla's words add vigour to
the virtuous energies which inspire your heats?—
No--YOU have judged as I have, the foulness of the
crafty plea by which these bold invaders would
delude you—Your generous spirit has compared as
mine has, the motives, which, in a war like this,
can animate their minds, and OURS.—THEY, by a
strange frenzy driven, fight for power, for plunder,
and extended rule—WE, for our country, our altars,
and our homes.—THEY follow an Adventurer whom they
fear—and obey a power which they hate—WE serve
a Monarch whom we love—a God whom we adore.—
Whene'er they move in anger, desolation tracks
their progress! Wheree'er they pause in amity,
affliction mourns their friendship!—They boast,
they come but to improve our state, enlarge our
thoughts, and free us from the yoke of error!—
Yes—THEY will give enlightened freedom to our
minds, who are themselves the slaves of passion,
avarice, and pride.—They offer us their protec-
tion—Yes, such protection as vultures give to
lambs—covering and devouring them!—They call on
us to barter all of good we have inherited and
proved, for the desperate chance of something better
which they promise.—Be our plain answer this: The
throne WE honour is the PEOPLE'S CHOICE—the laws
we reverence are our brave Fathers' legacy—the
faith we follow teaches us to live in bonds of
charity with all mankind, and die with hope of
bliss beyond the grave. Tell your invaders this,
and tell them too, we seek no change; and,
least of all, such change as they would bring us.39

The speech achieved a fame far greater than that of the play
itself. The foreword to an 1837 edition informs us that it
"has long been a favorite piece of declamation with school—
The *Times* review of May 25, 1799 shows how these sentiments were received.

To gratify the present taste in favor of the German drama, and to strengthen a performance constructed after that manner, with the additional attractions of striking machinery, scenic grandeur, and the fascinations of appropriate music, were objects that seemed calculated to combine the different suffrages of the votaries of extreme sensibility and the admirers of romance and spectacle.

Pizarro's Pavillon, and the Temple of the Sun, are equal in point of brilliant effect to the best scenes of any of our theatres; and the machinery, decorations, and dresses were marked with appropriate taste and splendor.

The morality of the play is of the purest kind and the Stage is in this instance, as it ever ought to be, made subservient to the purposes of truth and honor.

The diction is so happily managed as to be free from the slightest suspicion of translation, but the ideas remind us, sometimes by their extravagance, of the boldness and eccentricity of Kotzebue's genius.

In the Second Act some very happy allusions to the contest in which we are at present engaged with the inveterate enemies of happiness and social order, were received with repeated bursts of applause.

Kemble's Rolla is alone sufficient to center popularity on the piece.

The critic's only complaints lie with the dialogue ("too prolix") and the stage machinery ("ill-conducted"). In spite of Sheridan's abridgment, the play lasted five hours, chiefly because of the numerous changes of scenery which he called for.

The writer for the *Monthly Review* found much to his liking in *Pizarro*, particularly as regards the spectacular
aspect of the play. He laments the lack of extravagance in English plays, noting only *The Tempest* as a possible exception.

It is agreeable to trace, however, even in this state, symptoms of an approaching union between sense and splendour in the theater. In the last age, good writers were apt to disregard the allurements of spectacle ... It has long been our opinion, that some of our finest dramatic pieces would admit the display of stage magnificence and deception, in a degree superior to any of the present vehicles.

Thus Sheridan had another success which kept him from financial ruin a while longer. The Drury Lane advertisement in the *Times* for May 27 noted simply, "Pizarro will be repeated every evening until further notice." It was repeated sixty-one times at that theater; and Sheridan's adaptation went through twenty printings before the year was out.

To the spectacular element and the appeal to patriotic sentiment, a third cause for the play's popularity must be added. The parts of Rolla and Elvira offered great opportunity for the actor or actress willing to exploit their grandiloquence. Kemble was such an actor and for a time he made Rolla synonymous with his own name.

A total of six translations had appeared by 1800. Myron Matlaw fully discusses these and later translations (the last coming in 1818) in "English Versions of *Die Spanier in Peru*," *Modern Language Quarterly*, XVI, 63-67. The absolute high point of Kotzebue's popularity in
England may very well be the twenty-sixth edition of *Pizarro*. Interleaved with Sheridan’s work is a translation back into German of his adaptation by Constantin Geisweiler.

There were later successes of lesser magnitude. The *Horse and the Widow*, a farce, had a run of twenty nights at Covent Garden in 1799 and 1800. As the graph of printed editions (p. 34) shows, interest in Kotzebue dropped sharply after 1799.

The sentiment leading to this about-face is already evident in the review of *Pizarro* in the *British Critic*.

We have yet seen nothing to justify the rage which prevails... It is very evident that the object of Mr. Sheridan was more to exhibit a drama which might allure and fascinate, from the splendor of its presentation, than a tragedy that could improve or delight.

We may venture to affirm without scruple our belief that the author Kotzebue has obtained all that he claims or expects, in the temporary acclamations of an applauding theatre.

The bombast of the language only denotes the wretched state of public taste, which tolerates it.44

The responsibility for the decline lies, strangely enough, not so much with Kotzebue as with the greater German dramatists who were much less popular. We must first consider that group before turning to the causes of the decline.
IV. IN THE SHADOW OF KOTZEBUE

It is one of the more interesting ironies of this period that the works of Lessing, Goethe and Schiller are perforce placed in the shadow of Kotzebue. Compared to the super-abundance of Kotzebue's works, we have here only a handful of translations to examine. Furthermore, recognition of quality is as rare as the number of works is small.

If we confine ourselves to the years, 1798-1803, we find little worth discussing besides Coleridge's Wallenstein and Mellish's Maria Stuart. Thus, I have chosen to begin with the first appearance of Lessing's dramatic works in English, while allowing the year 1803 to stand as the other limit. This approach provides a much needed view of English taste before Kotzebue and also reveals the fate of better German literature during the years in which Kotzebue dominated the English stage.

Here we pick up that line of interest stemming from Mackenzie's lecture in 1788. We shall see that the interest and appreciation which he fostered is confined to a small group, the members of which, in spite of their literary qualifications and influence, did little toward advancing the cause of German drama in England.

A summary of translations printed gives some idea of the paucity of material and of the lack of enthusiasm for the works published. An asterisk indicates the work
was performed. Place of publication is London unless otherwise noted. Where I give no English title, the original was retained.

Lessing:


Benjamin Thompson, in The German Theatre, 1801.

Minna von Barnhelm: *The Disbanded Officer, or the Baroness of Bruchsal, adaptation by Major Johnstone, 1786.*

The School for Honor, or the Chance of War, anon., 1799.


Goethe:

Die Geschwister: The Sister, H. Mackenzie in Dramatic Pieces from The German, Edinburgh, 1792.

Iphigenie auf Tauris: William Taylor, 1793.

Die Leiden des jungen Werther: *Werter, a Tragedy, adapted to the stage by F. Reynolds, 1796.*

Clavigo: Clavidgo, Charles Leftley, 1798.

Clavidgo: anon., 1798.

Stella: Benjamin Thompson, 1798.

anon., 1798.
Götz von Berlichingen: Gortz of Berlingen, Rose Lawrence d'Aguilar, Liverpool, 1799.
Walter Scott, 1799.

Schiller:

anon. (Tytler), 1795.
anon. (Tytler), 1797.
W. Render, 1799.

*Stage edition, Keppel Craven, based on Tytler's translation, 1799.
anon. (Tytler), 1800.
B. Thompson, in The German Theatre, 1801.

Don Carlos: anon., 1795.
G. H. Hoehden and J. Stoddart, 1798.
anon., 1799.
B. Thompson, in The German Theatre, 1801.

Kabale und Liebe: anon., 1795.
The Minister, M. G. Lewis, 1797.

Walter Scott, unpublished, MS apparently lost, see below.

Wallenstein: S. T. Coleridge, 1798-1799.

Maria Stuart: J. C. Mellish, 1801.
We are immediately struck by the fact that only four (five, if Werter is included) plays were performed. We may attempt to explain away this phenomenon by asserting that the plays in question were of a high quality and were, because of their foreign nature, unsuited to the English stage. That is all well and good; we may even go farther by noting that around 1800 the closet-drama (that is, drama unsuited to presentation on the stage, intended only for private reading) was rising in popularity. Unfortunately, these arguments are invalid. Consider Kotzebue; not only was he widely acted in England, but his works were reprinted time and again. Then scan the above list. Not a single work found an audience large enough to justify a second edition. (Thompson's collection, The German Theatre, was reprinted in 1806. Over half of the plays were by Kotzebue.) Even a work such as Nathan der Weise, ideally suited as a closet-drama, met with hostile criticism. Thus, it becomes necessary to seek other solutions to the problem of the failure of German drama in England.

I shall consider Lessing first, since his work appeared first in England; then Goethe, whose dramas were an abject failure at this time, and Schiller, whose works produced, on the one hand, the most enlightened, and on the other, the most reactionary response.

1. Lessing

In some ways, the story of Lessing's works in England
is the most interesting and puzzling of all. Here we have a writer with a firmly established reputation, a writer long enough deceased to have the advantage of temporal perspective in his favor, a writer unblemished by the emotional extremes and moral degeneracy which English critics found in Goethe and Schiller. Yet even Lessing’s noblest thoughts (principally Nathan) were attacked as subversive and dangerous.

The English were aware of his great reputation in Germany and dutifully translated his plays and performed them, but with little success. Laokoon was not translated until 1836. Coleridge is the lone exception; during his stay in Germany he developed an appreciation for Lessing and collected considerable material for a biography which met the same fate as so many of his undertakings.

In 1786, Henry Maty published a number of excerpts from Emilia Galotti in the New Review. We find in his introductory remarks an admiration for Lessing rare among his contemporaries as well as the expression of a desire for something new and different from that which the French had been producing.

Emilia Galotti is evidently the story of Virginia, adapted to modern names and modern manners; but the author has displayed great art and ingenuity in the manner of telling it, and several of the characters, sentiments, and situations are truly tragical. Indeed I have seen no work of genius of foreign growth that may so properly be called an imitation of Shakespeare. It is indeed so much so,
that I may venture to call it a work which our refined neighbors never could nor never did produce the like of; they may do better or they may do worse, as this may be a matter of dispute, but this they will never do.3

He translates II, vii-ix; IV, v-vii; and V, vi-viii, with connecting summary passages. His work is remarkable alike for accuracy, fidelity to English style, and tone. One only regrets that it was not completed; since it was not, there is no question of publication or performance.

Emilia was performed, however, at Drury Lane from an unpublished translation by one Dr. Berrington. The date was October 28, 1794. Kemble had the role of the "Duke" (Prinz in the German) of Guastalla and Mrs. Siddons played the Countess Orsina. The only contemporary mention of the performance I have been able to locate is the London Times review of October 29, from which we may glean some insight into the English reaction to Lessing.

We are a little astonished that the translator, with such strong materials, did not endeavor to render his dramatic structure a little more consonant to the taste of the English audience. Emilia Galotti, in the first three acts, abounds with striking incident, and nervous point of diction; but the winding up of the Drama...betrays not only a terrible falling off in novelty of situation, but a total want of probability of character or poetical justice. The Dramatis Personae are disposed of without a shadow of rhyme or reason; the Countess, after endeavoring to make a madman and assassin of Galotti, very obligingly sets his wife down in her carriage quietly at the town house. Marinelli, a most disinterested murderer, it must be confessed, walks off quietly without any stage hue-and-cry being issued; and the Duke, the fondly doting Duke, tamely submits to survive the loss of his adored
Emilia—that Emilia lying dead at his feet—and so the curtain, according to the established rule, drops to soft music.\(^4\)

Not a word about the controversial ending; so that one is left wondering whether it was not actually an adaptation. Surely the English morality of the day would have reacted in some way to the sight of a father killing his daughter to protect her from violation. The critic's remark about Marinelli leads one further to believe that perhaps the ending was changed so that it is he who takes Emilia's life.

The play was repeated three times: October 30, and November 1 and 4. A later critic noted that "the tragedy, from a ludicrous circumstance of a picture, was laughed at, and consequently perished."\(^5\)

Benjamin Thompson published his translation in his anthology, The German Theatre in 1801. Here we see that although his talents were suitable for such as Kotzebue, Lessing was beyond him. A comparison of Thompson and Maty with the original work reveals the shortcomings of the former and the superiority of the latter. As an example, take Odoardo Galotti's lines to his daughter, Act V, Scene vii:

Odoardo. Hal wenn du so denkest!—Lass dich umarmen, meine Tochter!—Ich hab' es immer gesagt: das Weib wollte die Natur zu ihrem Meisterstücke machen. Aber sie vergriff sich im Tone; sie nahm ihn zu fein. Sonst ist alles besser an euch als an uns.—Ha, wenn das deine Ruhe ist, so habe ich meine in ihr wiedergefunden! Lass dich umarmen, meine Tochter!—Denke nur: unter dem Vorwande einer gerichtlichen Untersuchung,—o des höllischen Gaukel-
spieles!—reisst er dich aus unsern Armen und bringt dich zur Grimaldi.

Thompson has:

Ha! If such be thy sentiments, come to my arms, my daughter. I have ever said, that nature, when forming woman, wished to form her masterpiece, and failed in only one respect. The clay she chose possessed too much tenuity. In every respect but this, man is inferior to woman. Ha! If this be thy composure, I recognize my daughter. Come into my arms. Now mark me. Under the pretence of legal examination, the Prince—the robber tears thee (Oh, infernal villany!) tears thee from our arms, and places thee under the protection of Grimaldi.  

Maty renders the passage thus:

Ah, if thou thinkest so, let me embrace thee, my daughter. I have ever said it, woman is the master-piece of nature; but she forgot herself, and made them of too fine materials; otherwise everything is better in you than in us. --Ah, if that be thy quiet, I have found mine again in you. Let me embrace thee, my daughter. Bethink thee, that under the pretence of judicial investigation—Oh, the hellish farce—he tears thee from our arms, and carries thee, to Grimaldi.  

Whereas Thompson is guilty of outright mistranslation (villany for Gaukelspiel) and expansion of dialogue, Maty remains quite close to the German, while writing in good English idiom.

James Johnstone adapted Minna von Varnhelm to the stage under the title, The Disbanded Officer, or the Baroness of Bruchsal, in 1786, and saw his work produced at the Haymarket July 23 of that year with moderate success, the work being performed either nine or eleven times. The translator himself admits in the preface that "this play and Lessing's are materially different: but I have endeavored
to make it what he would have done, had he written at the present moment and for an English audience.\textsuperscript{10} He dedicated the work to the Queen, the former Princess of Sachsen-Koburg.

The plot remains the same; it is the tone which suffers. There is an emphasis on sentimentality and a tendency to moralize which is hardly surprising.\textsuperscript{11} For example, Johnstone gives Holberg (von Tellheim) these lines at the close of the play:

I am happy, as happy as man can be. False pride has governed both of us. Generosity, it is true, is a rare virtue; but gratitude still rarer: and perhaps it denotes a greater mind to acknowledge a benefit, than to confer one.--Generosity may proceed from ostentation or vanity; but gratitude must flow from the heart, or arise from true feeling.\textsuperscript{12}

Critical reaction was varied. The \textit{Critical Review} referred to Lessing as the "Shakespeare of German" and is on the whole pleased by the work.\textsuperscript{13} The \textit{Monthly Review} is somewhat more critical: the play is inferior to English drama, but there is "a vein of sentiment, a glow of generosity, that pervades and animates the scene, and renders it both interesting and entertaining." There follows a long quote from the humorous scene in the second act where the Baroness (Minna) and Lisetta (Franziska) are interviewed by the innkeeper.\textsuperscript{14} The \textit{English Review} saw it as a "bourgeois play" and a failure at that.\textsuperscript{15}

\textit{Minna} was translated anonymously in 1799, in a way
which is best described as unobjectionable. The translator had apparently learned something from Sheridan's alteration of *Die Spanier in Peru*; at one point he lets Werner praise Nelson and the campaign against "the Republicans" in Egypt.16

It was the opinion of the *Monthly Review* that "this comedy is superior to most of those of Kotzebue and Iffland... the language of the present translation is good."17 The remarks of the *British Critic* are as unjustifiable as they are extreme.

The story does not appear to us to deserve one translation, being highly improbable itself, and almost wholly barren of incident... Upon the whole, we have never met with, even in a German drama, more extravagance, or more insipidity... the whole is here flat as well as improbable.18

Raspe's 1781 prose translation of *Nathan* met with an equally cool reception, a fact to be explained by the low quality of the translation and also by the fact that such sentiments as found in the play and taken out of its German context, as it were, simply were not acceptable to the English critics at this time. As a sample of the critical temper, the sarcasm of the *Monthly Review*:

One design of this drama is to show, what surely no person was ever silly or illiberal enough to doubt of, or deny, that men of virtue and principle are to be found among the professors of every religion. Another object which the Author has in view, is, to insinuate that the Christian, the Jew, and the Mohammedian, have each of them equal reason to believe their own religion the true one. The inference from this is, that as all cannot be true, it is most probable that all are false... Considered merely as
a drama, whatever may be the Author’s reputation in Germany, it is unworthy of notice. 19

To William Taylor of Norwich goes the credit for the first blank verse translation of Nathan. He finished the work in 1790 and it was printed privately in Norwich in 1791. Basically, it is an accurate rendering, although the style leaves one dissatisfied. 20

There is no critical notice of the work until 1805 when it was published in London. We must go beyond our limit of 1803 for a moment to look at the reviews, for they are revelatory of the spirit of the times.

That of the Poetical Register reveals a complete failure to appreciate the value of the work:

It is tedious beyond human endurance. There is nothing, however, or at least few things, that may not be made of some utility. Those who have suffered from the want of sleep, may receive relief by perusing "Nathan the Wise" before they retire to bed. 21

Francis Jeffry, in the Edinburgh Review, states at the outset that the point of his review is to prove, through Nathan, that there is considerable difference between English and German taste. His remarks are pointed and politely vicious.

A traveller may very erroneously suppose that he relishes German cookery, when he gormandizes on fricandeau 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. 22
He decides that Lessing's "antidote for religious intolerance is absolute indifference, or infidelity," thus proving to his own satisfaction that there exists a marked difference between German and English taste. He further criticizes the style and concludes by naming the translator.

(The work had been published anonymously.)

Taylor was not the only one upset by Jeffry's review. Southey, in a letter to Taylor on May 27, 1806, stated his feelings:

I cannot express to you how strongly I am displeased with Jeffrey's conduct about "Nathan." It was at his option to review it civilly or not, as the laws of courtesy and decorum are not compulsory; but it was not at his option to publish the name of the translator, after the sort of language he had thought proper to use: this was a breach of confidence. I am the more angry because it is a rascally hypocritical article.23


The Annual Review of History and Literature was more just and perceived the reasons for which the play could not succeed in England.

Of all the pieces, which have been translated from German, "Nathan" is the one which, from beginning to end, excites the greatest interest. It never agitates, it rarely affects. The gentle stimulus of curiosity is more delightful than stronger emotions to us who are "falling into the sere, the yellow leaf"; but it is the young who are the most frequent and most eager spectators of the drama, and they require to be agitated and affected. In the present age of orthodoxy, it will however find no favor.24
One has the feeling the writer perceives something of value in the piece; and, being unable to find it, he is not willing to commit himself either for or against.

Finally, Miss Sara Sampson has the dubious distinction of being the only dramatic work which was serialized during the period. "Eleanor H." published her translation in the Lady's Magazine, 1799-1800, under the title, The Fatal Elopement. It is a close translation marred only by small errors and the abridgement of some longer speeches.25

It is obvious that Lessing was widely known in England at this time but rarely appreciated. This failure can be explained by the fact that much is lost when Lessing is lifted from his German context and viewed solely as a dramatist, as the English tried to do. The failure also points up the difference in atmosphere between England and Germany at this time. The concept of Bildung which produced the works of Lessing (and Goethe and Schiller, for that matter) were not present in England, or if present, existed in a form quite different from that in Germany. For that reason, where Kotzebue succeeded, Lessing (and Goethe and Schiller) failed. As we might expect, Minna von Barnhelm, the least controversial of Lessing's three great plays, was most warmly received. Even that work was not free from the distortions which apparently marred Emilia Galotti. Concerning Nathan der Weise, Jeffry was not completely wrong in asserting that there existed a great dif-
ference between English and German taste. It is inconceivable that such an outstanding example of the emergent German humanism could have found more than a few admirers in the England of 1805. In spite of their failure, it is to the credit of the writers mentioned here that they undertook to introduce Lessing to the English audience at all.

2. Goethe

Whereas Lessing had come into England slowly over a period of years, Goethe made the same abrupt entrance there as elsewhere in the civilized world with the aid of Werther's misfortunes. It was the Reverend William Render, whom we have already encountered as a translator of Kotzebue, who introduced Werther to England in 1779 in a crude translation from the French. The success of the work was immediate and other translations, adaptations and continuations issued forth until the end of the century. Goethe's English reputation undoubtedly suffered from the fact that for a number of years, actually until the 1820's, he was known popularly by Werther, and, to a lesser extent, Götze and Stella.

As is evident from the list above, the translators paid him little attention, even during the height of the craze for German plays. Götze von Berlichingen passed virtually unnoticed; and what attention the work did receive
was for the most part unfavorable because of its revolutionary atmosphere. *Stella* is another matter. It first appeared in England in the original version with the somewhat questionable ending, and the moralists were quick to take up pen against an author who would condone such an arrangement as concludes the play. The picture of Goethe's introduction to England would indeed be a bleak one were it not for the first translation of *Iphigenie auf Tauris*.

William Taylor's *Iphigenie in Tauris* (1793) is noteworthy for a number of reasons. It is the first of Goethe's major dramatic works to appear in English; thus, it is the first English translation of *Iphigenie*; it is a remarkably faithful rendering. Later critics have tended to ignore Taylor's work; it is certainly not without its flaws, but when one considers the circumstances under which it appeared, one appreciates his effort all the more. To undertake a translation of a work such as *Iphigenie* in 1793, in the original meters, was an act which perhaps betrayed more foolhardiness than talent. It is obviously a labor of love; Taylor observed that little more than 150 copies had been sold by 1804. Whatever the outcome of his undertaking, the result would warrant close examination simply because it is the only instance of an attempt to transmit the mature Goethe to England.

The quality is uneven (Taylor was twenty-seven at the time); the meters often leave much to be desired; the
language, the choice of words, is sometimes unfortunate.\textsuperscript{29}

On the other hand,

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{Es ist ihm denn auch in seltenem Masse gelungen nicht nur die melodisch hinfliessenden Verse Goethes im Englischen nachzubilden, sondern auch den Sinn und Ausdruck im einzelnen getreu und erschöpfend wiederzugeben.}\textsuperscript{30}
\end{align*}\]

Henry Crabb Robinson, in a letter to Goethe, January 31, 1829, observes that "Taylor's 'Iphigenia in Tauris,' as it was the first, so it remains the best version of any of your larger poems."\textsuperscript{31}

In order to make my point, I should like to compare two passages from Taylor, one in which the work is of high quality, the other in which he fails rather badly, with a modern translation of some repute, that of B. Q. Morgan.

In Iphigenia's opening soliloquy we find some unexpected similarities, both in suitable choice of words and in metric shortcoming.

First, Taylor:

\textbf{Iphigenia}. Beneath your waving shade, ye restless boughs
Of this long hallow'd venerable wood, as in the silent sanctuary's gloom,
I wander still with the same chily awe As when I enter'd first: in vain my soul attempts to feel itself no stranger to you.
A mightier will, to whose behest I bow, for years hath kept me here in deep concealment; yet now it seems as foreign as at first. For, ahi the sea, from those I love, divides me;
and on its shore I stand the live long day seeking, with yearning soul, the
Grecian coast,
while the waves only echo back my sighs
in hoarser murmurs. O how luckless he,
who from his parents and his brethren far,
lonesome abides. The approaching cup of joy
the hand of sorrow pushes from his lip. 15

Morgan has:

Iphigenia

Out here beneath your shadows, stirring boughs
Of this old, sacred densely foliaged grove;
As into Dian's silent sanctuary,
E'in now I step with shuddering emotion,
As if I never had entered them before,
Nor does my soul yet feel itself at home.
For years a higher Will, to which I bow,
Has hidden me away, preserved me here;
Yet I am alien as I was at first.
For ah! from those I love the sea divides me,
And long long days I spend upon the shore,
Seeking with all my soul the land of Greece;
To meet my sighs, the hollow-sounding waves
Bring to me only murmurs dull and dead.
Alas for him who, orphaned and alone,
Must lead a lonely life! Each promised joy
Is snatched by sorrow from his very lips. 32

While Morgan's is more nearly a literal translation,
it still purports to be poetry. (On the title page,
"Iphigenia etc. as translated into English verse.") As examples of close translation, take line two ("Des alten, heil'gen, dichtbelaubten Haines"), line nine ("Doch immer bin ich, wie in ersten, fremd"), or lines thirteen and fourteen ("Und gegen meine Seufzer bringt die Welle/ Nur dumpfe Töne brausend mir heruber.") Other lines are as far from the original as some of Taylor's. Compare, for example, line six ("Und es gewöhnt sich nicht mein Geist hierher"), or line twelve ("Das Land der Griechen mit der Seele suchend."
As poetry, Taylor's version is to be preferred. His poetic diction contrasts nicely with Morgan's combination of poetic and homely, almost colloquial language. Neither writer has successfully solved the problem of meter. Both fail at the beginning of line eleven with the same word; Taylor further aborts the meter in lines thirteen and sixteen, while it is Morgan who is guilty in line fourteen.

Taylor's limitations, for the most part, unobjectionable as long as the lines remain iambic pentameter, are brought into focus in the difficult dactylic stanzas of Iphigenia's "Parzenlied" at the end of Act IV. The opening stanza suffices. First Goethe:

Es fürchte die Götter
Das Menschengeschlecht!
Sie halten die Herrschaft
In ewigen Händen
Und können sie brauchen,
Wie's ihnen gefällt.

Taylor:

Fear the gods, ye sons of men,
in eternal hands they hold
might resistless. Who shall ask them
how they wield the dreadful trust. 34

Morgan:

To mortals beseeareth
The fear of the gods!
They hold their dominion
In hands everlasting,
And they can employ it
As pleases them best. 35

In spite of its flaws, and, conversely because of its occasional beauties, Taylor's work, as the first English
version, deserves more recognition than it has received.

Although only two periodicals noticed the translation, their comments are as unexpected in 1793 as the translation itself.

The Monthly Review devoted eight pages to a detailed discussion of the play. The comments seem anomalous in the context of the last decade of the century and for that reason bear repeating. The critic compares Greek and modern tragedy, noting the advantages and disadvantages of each.

The due medium would perhaps be best attained, not by abandoning altogether these ancient models, but by keeping them before us as successful attempts on which it is our business to improve, rather than as finished productions of which we are only to be servile copyists.

This appears to have been the light in which the German poet Goethe [sic] considers the writings of the ancients.

There follows a lengthy comparison of Euripides and Goethe, with numerous passages quoted from the latter.

On the whole, we do not hesitate to give it as our opinion that Goethe's Iphigenia in Tauris is superior to that of Euripides. Goethe, indeed, appears to have made Sophocles, rather than Euripides, his model; and among all the moderns, perhaps no one has more successfully imitated that great master.36

One can forgive the critic his failure to perceive the humanistic implications. He perceives its value as a work of art. In an age when Augustan drama was still exerting some influence, his conclusions regarding Goethe and Greek tragedy stand virtually alone for their insight and ob-
jectivity.

The other critical notice, in the Critical Review, is equally noteworthy. In a seven page review the writer arrives at the same conclusions as did his counterpart above, namely that Goethe is superior to Euripides. The review is also virtually unique in that it devotes four pages to a comparison of the English and German version, including several valid criticisms of Taylor's rendering of difficult passages. During these years, the critics usually ignored the fact that the works they were reviewing were translations; if cognizance was taken of that fact, then some comment would be made about the French version. This review is, in fact, the only instance I have found, where excerpts from a German original are printed alongside the English.

The readiness of the English to receive German Dich-tung (timeless works) as opposed to German Literatur (timebound) at this time is sufficiently revealed by the 150 copies sold in eleven years.

The young Frederick Reynolds, who later achieved some fame as a popular dramatist, adapted Werther to the stage in 1785 and submitted it to the three leading theaters in London, each of which rejected it as unsuitable for presentation. He persevered, and the work was performed at Bath "unter vielen Tränen, Ohnmachten, und Bravos." Covent Garden rescinded its earlier decision and the play
was performed there in 1786 but was not printed until 1796, by which time England had cooled somewhat to *Werther*. Critical reception was indifferent and *Werther* saw no further activity on the English stage.39

*Clavigo* was translated twice in 1798, by one Charles Leftley, and anonymously. Both mediocre translations, they passed virtually unnoticed in the maelstrom of Kotzebue. One review of Leftley's version, which appeared inexplicably under the title, *Clavidgo*, reveals the state of Goethe's early reputation in England. The reviewer concludes, the play is "worthy of the author of the Sorrows of *Werther*; higher praise it is perhaps impossible to bestow."40 Hardly a value judgment, but indicative of popular opinion.

The critical storm broke with the appearance of *Stella* in 1798. The two translations, one by Benjamin Thompson, the other anonymous,41 were based on Goethe's first version, which ends with Fernando accepting the magnanimity of his two women who agree to share him. (Goethe later allowed Fernando to commit suicide instead.) Carré, in *Goethe en Angleterre*, observes, with Gallic tongue in cheek:

> Lorsque Fernando rencontre chez sa maîtresse Stella sa femme abandonnée, il veut d'abord se suicider: solution qu'aurait peut-être accepté, comme un inévitable pis-aller, la critique anglaise. Mais lorsqu'abandonnant son projet, il consent à vivre, pour fîler avec toutes les deux jours variés et satisfaits, les honnêtes gens protestent contre tant d'impudeur. Deux femmes! c'est trop pour la coutume, surtout en Angleterre.42
The quality of the two translations is of no importance. The work could have appeared in Cockney and would have had a similar effect, an effect quite out of proportion to the sale of the works (there was not even a second edition) and their stage history (performance was out of the question.)

One reviewer hopes that "the want of morality in their [the Germans'] works of fancy, will, always, prove an obstacle both to our imitation and approbation of them." There follows a plot summary and the conclusion:

What more destructive to the peace of society; what more adapted to burst asunder every solemn tie, can be presented to the world, we do not know.43

These words (one can almost see the images of imperialistic France and immoral Germany swirling through the writer's mind) clearly reveal the strong atmosphere of conservatism which was pervading England.

Stella had a primary role in the almost violent reaction to German literature which became evident in 1799, growing stronger in following years. Stella will thus come under closer examination in the following chapter and the discussion of that reaction.

William Taylor's favorable review in the Monthly Review should be mentioned, since it includes what is apparently the first English reference to Faust. He begins with a summary of Goethe's works and judges Iphigenie and Tasso to be superior to Racine and Corneille. Also, "in his
Faustus, he has not feared to enter the precincts of the invisible world."

Goethe's English reputation was growing. He was now spoken of as the author of Werther and Stella. In 1799, another work, Götz von Berlichingen, which to the English seemed of a kind with the former two, was added to the list when two translations were published.

That of Rose Lawrence bore the perhaps phonetic title, Gortz of Berlingen. In the preface, she assures the reader that Goethe has here kept himself free of the immorality of Werther and further notes the Shakespeare-like handling of historical material, the quick changes of mood, and the many characters. Actually, she has censored the work, omitting such anti-Royalist sentiments as appear in the chess scene at the beginning of the second act.

She was not sufficiently thorough. The Monthly Review speaks of the "vulgar prejudices" of German authors and continues:

With all the bold irregularity of our older writers, there is also, in Goethe especially, a striking attention to the manners of those ages to which we are thus recalled. Some of the scenes are flat and uninteresting, and consume the time in trifling and unnecessary details; of others, even when the action is hurried forwards, the effect must depend on the skill of the performers, since the dialogue furnishes little that is interesting. In attempting to avoid an over-strained and affected manner of writing, authors sometimes sink beneath propriety. Professor Goethe does not always appear to have distinguished between writing naturally, and writing trivially.
Later in 1799, another translation appeared. The title page read as follows:


The fact that Scott, a conservative, should associate himself so closely with a drama of such revolutionary tone has caused critics some discomfort. His interest in German literature did not stem from a feeling of philosophical kinship as in the case of William Taylor. In the introduction to Goetz, he describes at some length the chivalric background of the play; therein would seem to lie his reason for occupying himself with translation. And, of course, Scott is directly in the line of influence extending from Mackenzie's lecture in 1788.

The flaws in Scott's translation have already been belabored at length. Critics note the numerous mistakes, then conclude, "Scott's version is, in general, excellent, and his happy rendering of the racy dialogue reveals the hand of the future wizard of the novel," or they say that Scott conveys the powerful style and his characters retain "die rohe Kraft und eiserne Nervigkeit in Kampfe, die gesunde Erholung bei Festlichkeiten und vollen Humpen." It is difficult to reconcile such comments with the actual quality of the translation. Scott himself notes in
the preface, "Literary accuracy has been less studied in the translation, than an attempt to convey the spirit and general effect of the piece."51

Errors and omissions abound. (The chess scene is also lacking.) For example, page twelve, "The Prior carried me into their garden, where they had raised beans" for "Der Prior führte mich in Garten; das ist nun ihr Bienenkorb." On the same page, "My Abbot loves me; the convent is involved in business" for "Mein Abt liebt mich, mein Kloster ist Erfurt in Sachsen."

Naturally, the primary reason for interest in Scott's translation lies in the fact that it marks his first major appearance in print. Still, for a work which purports to be a translation and not an adaptation, it renders a judgment of "excellent" incomprehensible.

On this point, it seems that even the translation of Rose Lawrence is to be preferred. For comparison of language and style, the incident which Götz relates to Weislingen in the first act; first Scott, then Lawrence:

I can give you a handsome clean doublet, but it is only of linen--It has grown too little for me--I had it on at the marriage of the Lord Palgrave, when your Bishop was so incensed at me.––About a fortnight before I had sunk two of his vessels upon the Maine––I was going upstairs to the venison in the inn at Heidelberg, with Francis of Seckingen. Before you get quite up, there is a landing-place with iron rails––there stood the Bishop, and gave Frank his hand as he passed, and the like to me that was close behind him. I laughed in my sleeve, and went to the Landgrave of Hanau, who was always my noble friend, and told
him, "The Bishop has given me his hand, but I wot well he did not know me." The Bishop heard me, for I was speaking loud—He came to us angrily, and said, "True, I gave thee my hand, because I knew thee not indeed."—To which I answered, "I marked that, my lord; and so take your shake of the hand back again!"—The manikin's neck grew as red as a crab for spite, and he went up the room and complained to the Palgrave Lewis and the Princes of Nassau.—But we have had much to do together since that.52

I can give you a nice clean dress enough: to be sure it is only coarse stuff, 'tis grown too tight for me; I had it on at the marriage of his highness the Count Palatine, that day when your Bishop shewed so much rancour against me. I had sunk two of his vessels on the Mayne about a fortnight before, and as I and Francis of Sickingen went into the Hart inn at Heidelberg; half way up the stairs there is a landing place with an iron railing, you know; and there stood the bishop, who shook hands with Francis as he passed up, and as I followed gave me too his hand. I laughed within myself, and said to the Landgrave of Hanau, who was always gracious to me, "The bishop took me by the hand, I'd wager anything he did not know me." The bishop overheard me, for I spoke aloud on purpose, and coming up to me in a great passion, he said, "You have guessed right, it was only because I did not know you that I offered you my hand." My lord, I answered, I perceived you mistook me, and since that was the case, there you have your hand again. Then the little man grew as red as a lobster with rage, and ran to complain of me to Count Lewis, and the prince of Nassau. We have often laughed about it since.53

However much Scott may have retained the "rohe Kraft", it is difficult to appreciate a translation of "im Wirtshaus zum Hirsch" as "to the venison in the inn". The last sentence in Scott is a complete misdirection of meaning. The original reads, "Wir haben nachher uns oft was drüber zugute getan." Lawrence's choice is more in keeping with the tone of the story and also retains the meaning of the original.
Scott's reputation as a translator fortunately rests more on the poems (notably "William and Helen" from Bürger's "Leonore" and "The Erl-King" from Goethe's "Erlkönig") than on Goetz. Furthermore, there is a demonstrable influence of the German works on the later Scott. Actually, "the essential, almost the sole point of Scott's contact with German literature where influence made itself seriously felt is reflected by the fact that the vast majority of books in the German collection, numbering over 300 volumes, are of antiquarian and folklore interest....the intellectual and literary revival in Germany at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century had little meaning for him save in so far as it supplied him with materials for the study of customs and manners of past ages, or with models for their treatment in fiction." Such facts do not justify praise of a translation the quality of which is at best dubious.

Although Scott's translation passed virtually unnoticed at the time, it provided ample material for the reaction to German literature, as we shall see in the following chapter.

Goethe's works remained in this stagnant condition in England for some twenty years. It was 1815, when Shelley published his excerpts from Faust, before he was brought to the attention of the English again. He continued to be known as the author of Werter, Stella, and Götz.
3. Schiller

Schiller became known later in England than either Lessing or Goethe. It was 1792 before the first translation of Die Räuber appeared in English. His fame spread quickly; he was, in fact, more widely known and better appreciated among the English than Goethe until well into the next century. And around the turn of the eighteenth century, if an English critic referred to the greatest German writers, he connected Schiller's name with that of Kotzebue. The fame of the former was twofold in nature: on the one hand the early English critics saw in him a new spirit of dramaturgy and, for the most part, admired and appreciated the forcefulness, insight and style which mark his works. On the other hand, they could not help but be repelled by the youthful power and incisiveness which they found particularly in Die Räuber. Over the years, the former view prevailed; but by 1800, it seemed likely that Schiller and the whole of German literature was hopelessly alien to the English. The Schiller of Wallenstein was as yet comparatively unknown.

These two threads of opinion run through the early reception in England, at times intertwining in the same review, more often appearing separately. Two general comments, one from 1790, the other, 1797, will serve to delineate more sharply the division of opinion which existed:
Fiery and unfettered, his genius has delighted to seek the loftier and more inaccessible regions of tragic poetry; to expand, as in its native element, amidst the shock and tempest of the fiercer passions, which convulse the soul and lay desolate the breast of man. 57

We have always thought the tragedies of Schiller coarse and overcharged, notwithstanding the fame they have obtained... We cannot think that the English taste is likely to be improved by such importations. 58

It is with the movement from the former to the latter view of Schiller that we are concerned here.

Among the members of the German class in Edinburgh which had been organized as a result of Mackenzie's lecture was the young Alexander Fraser Tytler, who later achieved more lasting fame as judge and historian. Tytler was apparently strongly impressed by Mackenzie's praise of German drama as Scott, for in 1792, his translation, The Robbers, was published. L. A. Willoughby has shown, in his article on Die Räuber in England, 59 that the three anonymous editions published in 1795, 1797, and 1800, are actually Tytler's own with minor revisions and improvements. Here, then, we have the only instance of a German play by an author other than Kotzebue being thought worthy of more than one edition.

Willoughby has made a thorough study of Tytler's work as well as that of the other translators of Die Räuber so that it will not be necessary to repeat in detail his findings. With the exception of Coleridge's Wallenstein and
Mellish's *Mary Stuart*, the quality of translation is not of primary concern here. The general English reaction to Schiller is of greater import for an understanding of German drama in England at this time. Thus, I shall refer only briefly to the quality of the translations in question.

When one considers that Tytler had been studying German only two years, his work seems remarkable. To be sure, it is marked by errors, omissions, and paraphrases. When one considers that Tytler had been studying German only two years, his work seems remarkable. To be sure, it is marked by errors, omissions, and paraphrases. 60 Willoughby notes that,

Though not by any means a perfect translation, Tytler’s work is yet on the whole an adequate and literary rendering of the stage version by a man full of enthusiasm for his task. 61

To the reviewer of 1792, *The Robbers* must have presented a striking break in the everyday routine of journalism. The first critics were not insensible to Schiller’s power.

The *Critical Review* begins with a brief review of German literary activity in vague terms which reveal an ignorance of the state of letters in central Europe. Regarding *The Robbers*,

Many striking marks of superior genius stand forth in the present work; but it is often debased by the same irregularities that sullied the glory of the English stage in the time of our own great poet. 62

If one bears in mind the state of English drama at the time, there is something of the wistful here, for the reviewer
continues with a lengthy comparison between "Francis de Moor" and Richard III. He continues,

The character of Charles de Moor alone, however, is sufficient to vindicate Mr. Schiller's claim to originality. It is boldly conceived, and executed in a most masterly manner: so are those of the other robbers... Terror without a doubt, is the most striking feature in this drama; but many scenes are exquisitely pathetic.

The scenes of horror are sometimes too diffuse, too sedulously laboured, and often so highly improbable, that our minds will not assent to the delusion.

The Monthly Review expressed itself more strongly:

His tender scenes we always read with pleasure, but his scenes of terror are too horrible; and his frequent and solemn appeals to the Almighty, his shocking imprecations, and the curses which, as commissioned from the Deity, he denounces, make us shudder with dread, instead of inspiring us with awe.

Thus we have a mixture of admiration and fear.

Schiller's greatness is recognized, his fame spreads rapidly, but still, there exists, in the eyes of the critics, the "flaw" (the liberal, revolutionary sentiment) in The Robbers, and in fact, Schiller "shall in the general censure take corruption from that particular fault." Had the European political situation been otherwise, perhaps both he and his fellow dramatists might have fared better in England. Unfortunately, such is not the case.

In 1797, Tytler's translation was altered by Keppel Craven, the son of the Margravine of Anspach, and performed twice (June 1 and 7) at the private theater in the family
home, the Brandenburgh House in London. According to the preface, the work was finally published in 1799 "to prove the acted play was free of all the Jacobinical Speeches which abound in the original." Thus critical and popular opinion, by 1797, was already growing blind to the beauties of the play and focusing its attention more on the questionable political sentiment.

Regarding the next appearance of Die Räuber in English, one can only continue the pun first instigated by the Anti-Jacobin: it is not so much a translation, as a rendering. Dr. William Render it was who was responsible. The work is largely plagiarized from Tytler. Willoughby is perhaps a bit too harsh. He characterizes the work as "pedantic, literal, the work of a schoolmaster." Among Render's more glaring errors, he notes "She gave thee a basket" for "Sie gab dir einen Korb." Render actually has, "She gave thee a refusal" and edifyingly appends the following note:

She gave thee a refusal; literally, "She gave thee a basket," a common expression in Germany for a lady's refusal of a suitor, as, He received a basket from Miss N....

Render's translation went unnoticed by the critics, although Tytler called attention to it in his fourth edition (1800) when he inserted a note warning the reader about the "other translator who has servilely copied the work of another." Of greater interest in that edition are Tytler's
remarks about the play itself, for they reflect the change of feeling toward the "Bard tremendous in sublimity."
Tytler had read Hannah More's *Strictures* (1799) which will be examined more closely in the following chapter and had apparently taken her harsh criticism of Schiller to heart.
The 'Translator's Note' reads as follows:

He earnestly wishes, that he had left undone what he has done: as that man would wish, who had given wine to his friend, who in frenzy of intoxication had committed murder.--But still; it is of some alleviation of this unavailing regret, that he cannot, upon the strictest revision of this particular piece, and the most attentive consideration of its scope and tendency, judge it in any degree subversive either of Religion or Morality.70

There were obviously forces present in the England of 1800 stronger than Tytler's great enthusiasm for Schiller. The strength of those forces may be seen in his apparently sincere regret for having translated *Die Räuber*.

We have further evidence of the strong tide of anti-Schiller opinion in J. G. Holman's experiences in trying to bring the play to the stage. He revised Tytler's work slightly and submitted it to the licenser, who refused to give it his approval.71 Holman persevered, perhaps to a ludicrous extent. The play, as it was finally performed at the Haymarket, was set in Spain and the robbers had become a band of knights who are perpetually battling the Moors. Filled with songs and choruses, the play in which Kemble had the lead, was performed eight times.72

By this time, the attitude toward *The Robbers*, in
any form it seems, had become so fixed as to appear to be

dogma:

On the whole, this celebrated Tragedy is grand, horrid, and disgusting—it was at one time intended
to bring it out at Drury Lane for the sake of Keen’s playing Charles de Moor—if this intention
had been put into execution, it is to be hoped that no English audience would have tolerated such an
exhibition.73

The Gentleman’s Magazine maintains that Holman was only try-
ing to disguise the "rapine, impiety, and assassination in
splendid and imposing garb. Vain and criminal attempt!"74

The Monthly Mirror repeats the thoughts which probably went
through the licenser’s mind as he perused Holman’s first
attempt:

It was feared, we imagine, by the licenser, that the bold and captivating character of Charles de
Moor, might make men too much in love with principles inimical to the institutions of
society, and the moral obligations by which it is sustained; and that the daring impiety,
pecious argument, and desperate courage of his less refined comrades, might have a tendency,
in times like these, to do some political mis-

chief.75

One further translation appeared, that of Benjamin
Thompson, in 1801. It is distinguished only by the fact
that he did not make use of Tytler’s version to the extent
the other “translators” did. It is full of errors and
omissions and marred by the same poor style which detracted
from his translation of Emilia.76

Kabale und Liebe appeared twice, the only difference
between the anonymous Cabal and Love (1795) and Lewis’s The
Minister (1797) being that the latter is only slightly less inaccurate than the former. The political implications are overlooked ("The terrible effects of parental tyranny are the subject," says the Critical Review) and the play received favorable reviews. Lewis's version was adapted to the stage as The Harper's Daughter and presented without success at Covent Garden in 1803.

In the 1790's we encounter then what might be called a Schiller movement, although it is Lilliputian in comparison with Kotzebue's reception. Fiesko is translated twice in 1796 and Don Carlos is translated no less than four times. As with Kotzebue, so with Schiller: these translators were not motivated so much by a desire to introduce German drama to the English as to gain some profit from new authors of considerable, if somewhat dubious, repute. The inept products of their endeavors have been examined elsewhere. It remains for us to consider the two outstanding translations of the period.

Coleridge's Wallenstein is a work which has been highly praised and harshly criticized. Only recently has a more moderate opinion prevailed. The translation interests us here, not so much because of any effect it had upon the flux of English opinion regarding German drama in general but as a work of literature and as one of the few serious attempts to transmit German drama to the English reader in a form and style befitting the original.
The course of Wallenstein in England before its appearance in translation is as stormy as has been its fate since.

As early as 1797, Schiller was thinking of an English version of the trilogy and promised G. H. Noehden, the translator of Fiesko and Don Carlos, a manuscript copy as soon as one was available. In a letter to Noehden, June 5, 1799, Schiller remarks that the manuscript is ready, but that, since his publisher (Cotta) has received offers for the work from two other English publishers, it behooves him to request Noehden to inquire whether his own publisher is willing to make such an offer, "da ich nun in meinen Verhältnissen gegen merkantilische Vorteile nicht ganz gleichgültig seyn darf." He was also interested in the possibility of the staging of Wallenstein in London.

Auch habe ich erfahren, dass Hr. Sheridan, unter dessen Aufsicht das Theater zu Drurylane steht, deutsche Originalstücke dafür annimmt und die Übersetzen lässt, um sie spielen zu lassen... die Wallensteinischen Schauspiele bin ich gesonnen in ein einziges Theaterstück zusammenzuziehen, weil die Trennung derselben tragischen Handlung in zwei verschiedene Repräsentationen auf dem Theater etwas Ungewöhnliches hat und die erste Hälfte immer etwas Unbefriedigendes behält... Auch dieses Stück möchte Hr. Sheridan alsdann vielleicht brauchbar seyn.

It could have been only through Sheridan's association with Kotzebue that Schiller had heard of the Drury Lane performances of German plays.

Be that as it may, nothing came of the inquiries which were apparently put to Sheridan, who is reported to
have replied by asking why he should pay for the work when he could wait for the first edition and then use it without payment.\(^8^4\)

Negotiations for publication rights continued and it was finally agreed that a manuscript should be sent to Bell in London for sixty pounds. Bell received the manuscript sometime in November, 1799; and, when nothing was heard from England for some months, Schiller made inquiries, expressing a hope for prompt payment.\(^8^5\)

The answer was the news in August that a translation by Coleridge had been printed by Longman and Rees. Schiller was naturally upset and finally received fifty-eight pounds as remuneration for the pirated edition.

Somehow, Longman had obtained the manuscript and had offered the job of translation to Coleridge. Although his passion for Schiller had cooled considerably since his first encounter with Tytler's *The Robbers*, he applied himself assiduously to the task, completing it in about six weeks.\(^8^6\) Coleridge was not happy with the work because it wasted and depressed my spirits, and left a sense of wearisomeness and disgust which unfitted me for anything but sleeping or immediate society.\(^8^7\)

What of the result of this strange birth process? It is neither "more grand... than in the original of Schiller"\(^8^8\) as Scott asserted, nor a "schändliche Übersetzung"\(^8^9\) as Schiller believed. Three writers have subjected Coleridge's work to detailed analysis.\(^9^0\) Machule, in "Coleridges
Wallensteinübersetzung" (1902), comes to the harshest conclusion. The translation, he says, contains

die nicht allein eine beträchtliche reihe zum teil grober Übersetzungsfehler, sondern neben den vielen sehr gelungenen stellen, die sich eng an Schiller's text anschmiegen, eine grosse zahl von solchen, in denen der übersetzer kein treues bild des Originals gegeben hat. 91

Morgan is somewhat kinder: "Coleridge responded warmly and authentically to Schiller's dramatic fervor, and he adopted Schiller's drama, as it were, and made it his own. While passages have the sweep and fire of the original creation." 92

Coleridge himself was aware of the shortcomings of his Wallenstein; in the preface to The Piccolomini, he remarks,

In the translation I have endeavoured to render my Author literally wherever I was not prevented by absolute differences of idiom; but I am conscious, that in two or three short passages I have been guilty of dilating the original; and, from anxiety to give the full meaning, have weakened the force. 93

Machule takes note of Coleridge's apology but is unwilling to forgive the large number of errors, omissions, and changes which are apparent. 94

In the preface to The Death of Wallenstein, Coleridge explained that he had not translated Wallenstein's Lager, the one act prelude to the two longer plays, because it would not have been possible to render the rimed nine-syllable verse, and, also, because the Lager "is not necessary as a preliminary explanation." 95 There is another possible reason, which has escaped notice. The manuscripts of
Piccolomini and Wallensteins Tod which Schiller sent to England had been specially copied in Latin script for the convenience of the English; Lager, however, was sent in the German script version. It is possible that Coleridge had learned German script during his stay in Germany; it is also possible that he did not wish to take the time needed for a careful rendering of the rime Lager. Still, the possibility that the Lager manuscript may have very well been illegible to him should not be overlooked.

Whatever else may be said of the translation, it is at least comparatively free of those blind guesses at meaning which mar Scott's Goetz. And when he is rendering a passage which he likes, the quality of the translation is unquestionable. As an example, we might take the reflections of the young Piccolomini following Thekla's description of Wallenstein's astrological tower (II, iv).

O never rudely will I blame his faith
In the might of stars and angels! 'Tis not merely
The human being's PRIDE that peoples space
With life and mystical predominance;
Since likewise for the stricken heart of LOVE
This visible nature, and this common world,
Is all too narrow: yes, a deeper import
Lurks in the legend told my infant years
Than lies upon that truth, we live to learn.
For fable is Love's world, his home, his birth-place:
Delightedly dwells he 'mong fays and talismans,
And spirits; and delightedly believes
Divinities, being himself divine,
The intelligible forms of ancient poets,
The fair humanities of old religion,
The power, the Beauty, and the Majesty,
That had their haunts in dale, or piny mountain,
Or forest by slow stream, or pebbly spring,
Or chasms and wat'ry depths; all these have vanishe'd.
They live no longer in the faith of reason!
But still the heart doth need a language, still
Doth the old instinct bring back the old names.
And to yon starry world they now are gone,
Spirits or gods, that us'd to share this earth
With man as with their friend; and to the lover
Yonder they move, from yonder visible sky
Shoot influence down: and even at this day
'Tis Jupiter who brings whate'er is great,
And Venus who brings every thing that's fair!97

If the passage is compared with the original (see footnote),
it will be seen that several lines have been added to expand a thought contained in the original, but who is to deny the power of Coleridge's poetry? Morgan's judgment seems most just. This passage reveals to what extent Coleridge was translating and to what extent he was making the work his own.

Those critics who condemn him out of hand for his many errors, namely Machule and Roscher, would have done well to examine the first edition rather than adhering to the version which appeared in Coleridge's works. The 1800 edition contains many notes not in the later printing which reveal Coleridge's own attitude toward the work as a translation. For example, Coleridge gives no less than four renderings of Thekla's song (Piccolomini, III, vii). First comes his own rimed version, then the original, then a literal translation. The fourth is perhaps most interesting. He writes,

I cannot but add here an imitation of this song, with which the author of "The tale of Rosamund Gray and Blind Margaret," has favoured me, and
which appears to me to have caught the happiest manner of our old ballads.\footnote{98}

(The fact that Lamb thus had a hand in Wallenstein seems to have escaped critical notice.) Coleridge's attention to this song (see footnote 98), as well as his other notes, show that, when he felt accuracy to be of great importance, he did not hesitate to call attention to his difficulty in rendering a given passage.

Contemporary opinion ranged from the sarcastic to carefully considered words of praise.

The \textit{British Critic} was not impressed:

"May the wretch," said Horace, "who shall murder his aged father, eat garlic for his punishment!"-- "May the critic," we may justly exclaim, "for his highest offences, be doomed to review a German historical play!" The plot is summarized. The episodes, and circumstances by which this story is eked out into two long dramas, are scarcely sufficient to have formed one play, carried on with any spirit and vivacity... The most pleasing (indeed the only interesting) characters in these dramas are, Maximilian Piccolomini and Thekla. They are enamoured of each other, and placed in a distressing situation: but the gentleman has too much of the eccentricity of a German lover, and the lady not a little of the forwardness of German heroines. As to Wallenstein himself, his inordinate pride is so disgusting, and his attempted treason so profligate, that, with all his splendid qualities, we cannot feel interested for him.\footnote{99}

The \textit{Critical Review} has only praise for Wallenstein and refers to Schiller as "the Shakespeare of Germany."\footnote{100}

The \textit{Monthly Review} is impatient only with the length of the work.

To compensate for this defect, however, the pieces are more regular than many other productions of
the German theatre; and they are at least free from absurdity.

We have allowed an unusual length to this article, because we think that Mr. Coleridge is by far the most rational partisan of the German theatre whose labors have come under our notice; and because we are glad to see anything void of absurdity and extravagance from an author whose bold genius has so completely defied all rules.101

As we have seen, Coleridge was exhausted and unhappy after finishing the translation. Thus, the following letter to the Monthly Review (XXXIII, 336):

Sir,

In the review of my Translation of Schiller's Wallenstein (Rev. for October) I am numbered among the Partizans of the German Theatre. As I am confident that there is no passage in my Preface or Notes from which such an opinion can be legitimately formed; and, as the truth would not have been exceeded, if the directly contrary had been affirmed, I claim it of your justice that in your answers to Correspondents you would remove this misrepresentation. 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.

S. T. Coleridge

The dissatisfaction with Schiller which resulted from the work of translation grew and found more literate expression so that in later years, Coleridge had definite reservations about the German writer.102

What is significant about the reviews of Wallenstein is the fact that they are free of the rancor and bitterness which prevail elsewhere in 1800. In the following chapter, we shall see that by this time, the reaction to German drama had set in with some force; yet here we have proof
that it was not a reaction to German drama *per se*, for the worst these critics can say about *Wallenstein* is that it is too long. More significant is the fact that the reviews noted above are the first and last critical notices of the translation for some years. The play appears to have been forgotten until Scott took excerpts from it as chapter headings in the Waverly novels.

J. C. Mellish occupied a position ideal for the would-be translator. Fluent in the language, he was a close friend of the writer, living in the same town, and received the work to be translated act by act as the writer finished them in the final version in the original language. Mellish met the challenge and the opportunity thus offered him with talent and inspiration. His *Maria Stuart* is the only translation from this period which has not been surpassed by a later effort. Coleridge's *Wallenstein* is not excepted. Although both renderings are on the same stylistic plane, Mellish's is far superior because it is, in addition, a close translation.

As noted, Mellish worked from the first manuscript, act by act. The translation differs from the final form of the German only because Schiller made further emendations before the work was printed. Since Schiller's first German copy has been lost, Mellish's translation is an invaluable source for comparison of the first and final drafts of *Maria Stuart*.
German, not English, interest in Mellish's work resulted in its publication. Schiller was so pleased with it that he urged his publisher, Cotta, to have it printed in England at his own expense. The work was printed; and when Cotta was unable to find an English publisher to handle the book, he distributed it through two London book sellers. The undertaking was a failure financially.\textsuperscript{104}

It is also because of German interest that we have a detailed comparison of the translation with the original. In the 1948 Weimar edition of Schiller's works, volume nine, pages 341-356, we find a thorough-going comparison. Not only are those passages noted which are present in Mellish but lacking in Schiller (which would be of greater interest to the German philologist) but also word variants. Concerning the latter, it is to Mellish's credit that the differences are few in number and minor in nature.\textsuperscript{105}

The high quality and consequent value of the translation have been overlooked more often than not.\textsuperscript{106}

Where Coleridge had hesitated, Mellish perseveres. Coleridge asserted it would not be possible to render the "lilting meter" of the Lager (nine syllable, rimed lines, approximately half of which have feminine endings) because of the "comparative poverty of our language in rhymes."\textsuperscript{107} The problem facing the translator of Maria Stuart is not as acute as that facing the translator of the Lager, since not all of the former work is rimed. Mellish did not
falter before those passages which are rimed and in fact dispatched them with considerable skill.

An excerpt will illustrate his fidelity to the meaning, spirit, meter and rime of the original. At the beginning of the third act, Maria (Mellish retained the German form) is revealed running through the forest. She is followed by her attendant, Hanna Kennedy.

Kennedy

Ihr eilet ja, als wenn Ihr Flügel hät tet,
You hasten on as if endow'd with wings—

S o kann ich Euch nicht folgen, wartet doch!
I cannot follow you so swiftly—wait.

Maria

L ass mich der neuen Freiheit geniessen,
Freedom returns! O let me enjoy it—

L ass mich ein Kind sein, sei es mit! 
Let me be childish,—be thou childish with me!

Und auf dem grünen Teppich der Wiesen
Freedom invites me! O let me employ it,—

Prüfen den leichten, geflügelten Schritt.
Skimming with winged step light o'er the lea;

Bin ich dem finstern Gefängnis enstiegen,
Have I escaped from this mansion of mourning?

Hält sie mich nicht mehr, die traurige Gruft?
Holds me no more the sad dungeon of care?

L ass mich in vollen, in durstigen Zügen
Let me, with joy and with eagerness burning,

Trinken die freie, die himmlische Luft. 
Drink in the free, the celestial air!
Kennedy

O meine teure Lady! Euer Kerker
O, my dear lady! But a very little

Ist nur um ein klein wenig erweitert.
Is your sad goal extended; you behold not

Ihr seht nur nicht die Mauer, die uns einschliesst,
The wall that shuts us in: these plaited tufts

Weil sie der Bäume dicht Geschrieb versteckt.
Of trees hide from your sight the hated object.

Maria

O Dank, Dank diesen freundlich grünen Bäumen,
Thanks to these friendly trees, that hide from me

Die meines Kerker's Mauern mir verstecken!
My prison walls, and flatter my illusion!

Ich will mich frei und glücklich träumen,
Happy I now may dream myself, and free;

Warum aus meinem süßen Wahn mich wecken?
Why wake me from my dream's so sweet confusion?

Umfängt mich nicht der weite Himmelsschoss?
The extended vault of heaven around me lies.

Die Blicke, frei und fessellos,
Free and unfetter'd range my wandering eyes

Ergeben sich in ungemessnen Räumen.
O'er space's vast immeasurable sea!

Dort, wo die grauen Nebelberge ragen,
From where yon misty mountains rise on high,

Fängt meines Reiches Grenze an,
I can my empire's boundaries explore;

Und diese Wölken, die nach Mittag jagen,
And these light clouds which, steering southwards,

Sie suchen Frankreichs fernen Ozean.
Seek the mild clime of France's genial shore.
Eilende Wolkent Segler der Lüfte!
Fast fleeting clouds! ye meteors that fly;
Wer mit euch wanderte, mit euch schißfte!
Could I but with you sail through the sky.
Grüßset mir freundlich mein Jugendland!
Tenderly greet the dear land of my youth!
Ich bin gefangen, ich bin in Banden,
Here I am captive! oppress'd by my foes,
Ach, ich hab keinen andern Gesandten!
No other than you may carry my woes,
Frei in Lüften ist eure Bahn,
Free thro' the ether your pathway is seen,
Ihr seid nicht dieser Königens untan.
Ye own not the power of this tyrant Queen.

The beauty of Mellish's work is readily apparent.

One can have no quarrel with his poetic diction. The only questionable deviation in meaning occurs in line 2093, where Räume undoubtedly refers to the "weite Aussicht" called for in the stage directions and not cosmic space as Hellish seems to imply.

Concerning meter, in Maria's lines (2075f.), where Schiller has a dactylic foot alternating with a trochaic, Mellish matches him foot for foot, with the exception of 2076 where the abrupt change necessitates his addition of an extra foot. Also in 2090 he is unable to match Schiller's last trochaic foot. In the concluding lines (2098f.), although he is unable to reproduce the varying meter of the original, he establishes a dactylic meter for himself and maintains it consistently.
Mellish's work is the exception among English renderings of German dramatic works at this time. We have seen that it appeared in print only because the author desired it, not because of any English stimulus.

Following Maria Stuart, Schiller fell into the same English limbo with Goethe. The next translation did not appear until 1824.109

4. Others

For the sake of completeness I append here the translations of the minor dramatists, the interest in whose works was stimulated by the general rise in popularity of Kotzebue, as may be determined from the dates. The rise and decline in their "popularity" parallels that of Kotzebue.

Babo:

Die Strehlitzen: The Strehlitzes, B. Thompson in The German Theatre, 1801.

Iffland:


Die Hagestolzen: The Bachelors, anon., 1799.

Die Jäger: The Foresters, Bell Plumptre, 1799.


Verbrechen aus Ehrsucht: Crime from Ambition, Maria Geisweiler, 1800.

Kratter:

Natalia und Menzikoff: Natalia and Menzikoff, anon., 1798.

Leisewitz:

Julius von Tarent: Julius of Tarent, Peter Will, serialized in the German Museum, 1800.

Unger:


*The Inquisitor, adapted by Holcroft.
V. THE ROBBERS BECOME ROVERS

The dramatic excesses to which the English were subjected from 1798 to 1803 are apparent: Kotzebue overwhelmed the country by sheer number; Schiller and Goethe, by subject-matter. A reaction was inevitable. The only question was, how severe and how long-lasting?

Foreign influence played a large role in that reaction just as it had in the drama of the period. But it was French, not German influence. We have observed a rise in conservative sentiment in England which was to be expected in the face of the new French threat. It was a threat not only to sovereignty, but to all that the English held essential for their way of life; the Crown, parliamentary government, morality. The French Revolution had at first found diverse and widespread support among the English; but as its course became clearer, as the early, idealistic promise was dispelled by the Reign of Terror and Napoleon, that support waned and developed into extreme reactionary feeling. Liberalism in any form was decried.

German drama as it was known offered an obvious and inviting target. Carré is not completely correct when he says,

On réagit en Angleterre, au nom de la morale, contre le drame bourgeois et sentimental; on réagit, au nom du bon goût, contre le drame historique.  

It was more than a matter of good taste. Brandl is closer
to the truth:

Die Tories fürchteten die neuere deutsche Literatur, weil sie auf demokratischem Boden erwachsen und voll freiheitlicher Ideen war; sie wollten sie daher mit Stumpf und Stil ausrotten.  

He errs, however, when he goes on to assert that the English reactionaries exploited Kotzebue to undermine all German literature. The reaction was both moral and political. The most extreme violations of the former and the most liberal concept of the latter were to be found in Schiller and Goethe, not Kotzebue. It is on this point that earlier writers (as Carré and Brandl above) have stumbled. We have only to examine the reaction to perceive the validity of the point.

The Anti-Jacobin was a weekly, published for eight months in 1797 and 1798. The undated prospectus preceding the first issue stated the aims of the publication. It was to oppose "JACOBINISM in all its shapes, and in all its degrees, political or moral, public and private, whether as it openly threatens the subversion of States, or gradually saps the foundations of domestic happiness." The paper was founded unofficially by the Prime Minister, William Pitt, and enjoyed the talents of the later Prime Minister, George Canning, as well as those of John Hookham Frere, George Ellis and William Gilford.

During the eight months of its existence, German drama received not a small amount of attention. The most
literate (and, to a certain extent justified) attack was published in two numbers, June 4 and 11, 1798 in the form of The Rovers; or, The Double Arrangement, by "Mr. Higgins" (Canning). As Mr. Higgins says in his introduction, Its moral is obvious and easy; and is one frequently inculcated by the German dramas which I have had the good fortune to see, being not other than 'the reciprocal duties of one or more husbands to one or more wives, and to the children who may happen to arise out of this complicated and endearing connection.' The plot, indeed, is formed by the combination of the plots of two of the most popular of these plays... The characters are such as the admirers of these plays will recognize for their familiar acquaintances. There are the usual ingredients of imprisonments, post-houses, and horns, and appeals to angels and devils. I have omitted only the swearing, to which English ears are not yet sufficiently accustomed.

From the title as well as the content, it is obvious that the two works referred to are The Robbers and Stella.

The Rovers has been examined twice and the similarities to the German originals duly noted. It is a parody of content. There is a ménage à trois (Stella), an imprisonment scene (Robbers), an idyllic country meeting (Werter). It is also a parody of style. "Outward stylistic sins are typified by means of florid tropes, sententious trivialities, rancid maudlinism, and self-important balderdash."

The work was an immediate success (four editions in 1799) and has since, because of the skill and restraint with which it was done, achieved a modest, but lasting
Neither the humor nor the sharp point of the parody are dulled today. There are numerous passages which might be taken as representative; perhaps the best is Rogero's song.

The scene is

a subterranean vault in the abbey of Quedlinburg; with coffins, scutcheons, death's heads and crossbones.—Toads and other loathsome reptiles are seen traversing the obscurer parts of the stage.—Rogero appears in chains, in a suit of rusty armour, with his beard grown, and a cap of grotesque form upon his head.—Beside him a crock, or pitcher, supposed to contain his daily allowance of sustenance.—A long silence, during which the wind is heard to whistle through the caverns. Rogero rises, and comes slowly forward, with his arms folded.

He laments the eleven years and fifteen days he has been imprisoned and mourns for his lost love. [Then,]

Let me see whether the damps of this dungeon have not yet injured my guitar. (Takes his guitar, tunes it, and begins the following air, with a full accompaniment of violins from the orchestra.

I.

Whene'er with haggard eyes I view
This dungeon that I'm rotting in,
I think of those companions true
Who studied with me at the University of Gottingen.

II.

Sweet kerchief, checked with heavenly blue,
Which once my love sat knotting in!—
Alas! Matilda then was true!—
At least I thought so at the University of Gottingen.

(At the repetition of this line, Rogero clanks his chains in cadence.

VI.

Sun, moon, and thou, vain world, adieu,
That kings and priests are plotting in:
Here doom'd to starve on water gruel never shall I see the University of Gottingen.

The Rovers was later revised and presented at the Haymarket in 1811 under the title, The Quadrupeds of Quedlinburgh, or The Rovers of Weimar, Tragico-Comico-Anglo-Germanico-Hippo-Ono-Dramatico-Romance.

Imitations appeared (notably The Benevolent Cutthroat, a burlesque of Robbers, in The Meteors, 1799-1800), but none had the success of The Rovers. Kotzebue was also parodied on the stage but not for more than half a century. (Robert Reece's The Stranger: Stranger than Ever played in London in 1868 and 1870.) In 1800, Kotzebue did not have the immediacy which the critics found in Goethe and Schiller.

In 1798, the Anti-Jacobin became the monthly Anti-Jacobin Review; and with that change came a change in tone and quality. The attacks on German drama assume an air of desperation and, at times, viciousness which well illustrate the seriousness of the matter for the contemporary writers.

One critic regrets the fact that "the immortal bard of Britain should give place, in our theatres, to the mad effusions of such distempered heads as Kotzebue and Schiller... a most mortifying reflection to every Briton, capable of appreciating the merits of literary production." Such a comment seems mild in comparison with an Anti-Jacobin review of Mellish's Maria Stuart:
Certain it is that Schiller has, in all his pieces, presented some vice, and especially the want of chastity in women, under attractive colors... Mary is represented as a strumpet tolerably interesting, and the author has endeavored through the whole piece, to accept her as a good-natured frail one.

It is an additional and striking proof of the licentiousness of the German drama in general and of that author in particular.13

The fifth and sixth volumes of the same magazine contain an attack on German letters of the most vicious type, from an anonymous Briton living in Upper-Saxony. He begins with a general criticism of both the German language and literature, dismissing Kant along the way. Then comes an almost gossipy sort of review of the chief German writers. Wieland is unobjectionable, but,

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. [Kotzebue is tolerable.]

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 as appears, indeed, from such of his pieces as we have yet seen.14

In the second letter, he attacks German science, periodicals, universities (the students "have the appearance of a set of rude and insolent Jacobins"), and clergy.15

In an avowedly anti-Jacobin publication, we expect to find such sentiments. The reaction is not confined to the anti-Jacobins.

The only lengthy attack on Kotzebue was published in
1799: More Kotzebue! The Origin of My Own Pizarro, a Farce, a poem some thirty pages in length in which the anonymous author, in language which borders on, and occasionally lapses into, the obscene, laments more the quantity than the quality of Kotzebue.16

Another poetical outburst appeared in the European Magazine in the same year, this one somewhat more sophisticated. I quote two of the six stanzas.

Ode to the German Drama

I

Daughter of Night, chaotic Queen!
Thou fruitful source of modern lays;
Whose subtle plot and tedious scene
The monarch spurn, the robber raise—
Bound in the necromantic spell,
The audience taste the joys of hell;
And Britain's sons indignant groan
With pangs unfelt before at crimes before unknown.

II

When first, to make the nations stare,
Folly her painted mask display'd,
Schiller sublimely mad was there,
And Kotzebue lent his mighty aid—
Gigantic pair! Their lofty soul,
Disdaining reason's weak control,
On changeful Britain oped the blow,
Who, thoughtless of her own, embrac'd fictitious woe.17

Such remarks are profuse in the periodicals of the day, none having the sting of The Rovers, the value of which lies in the fact that its parody is a satire on the literary qualities of certain German dramas, whereas the other commentators are concerned with the works, not as
literature, but as works filled with revolutionary political sentiment and dubious morality.\textsuperscript{18}

The fact that, for a time, the literary value of German drama was completely obscured, is nowhere better illustrated than in Hannah More's \textit{Strictures on Female Education} (first published, 1799). This was the work which Tytler had read and which had given him second thoughts about his translation of \textit{Die Räuber}. Hannah More is the arch-moralist; and after she advances on the field against German literature, there is little left to say. 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 overrunning civilized society. Those readers, whose purer taste has been formed on the correct models of the old classic school, see with indignation and astonishment the Huns and Vandals once more overpowering the Greeks and Romans. They behold our minds, with a retrograde but rapid motion, hurried back to the reign of "chaos and old night," by distorted and unprincipled compositions, which, in spite of strong flashes of genius, unite the taste of the Goths with the morals of Bagshot.\textsuperscript{*}

* The newspapers announce that Schiller's tragedy of the Robbers, which inflamed the young nobility of Germany to enlist themselves into a band of highwaymen to rob in the forests of Bohemia, is now acting in England by persons of quality!\textsuperscript{19}

A lone voice against this storm was that of the young Crabb Robinson, who was in Germany from 1800 to 1805 and who later played an important role in the English resurrection of German literature because of his acquaintance with
the outstanding authors of both countries. In 1802, the
Monthly Register published a series of letters from him.

His first letter opens in the following manner:

You know nothing about German literature. Kotze-
bue'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]; I heard it remarked—"It will be curi-
ous 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 us
by the same hands.20

What Robinson failed to realize was that the English were
aware of more than Kotzebue and Iffland and that at least
some, though certainly not all, of the masterpieces had been
translated "by the same hands." (The German remark about
Thompson does him a certain injustice; Don Carlos appears
in the second volume of The German Theatre.)

Robinson was alone in print, but not in opinion. We
have seen that Coleridge, though disgruntled, found some-
thing of value in German drama. Scott is reported to have
lamented, "The better productions of the German stage have
never been made known to us; for by some unfortunate chance
the wretched pieces of Kotzebue have found a readier accept-
ance than the sublimity of Goethe, or the romantic strength
And Byron aired his view in "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers":

Oh, Sheridan! If aught can move thy pen
Let comedy assume her throne again,
Abjure the mummeries of the German schools;
Leave new Pizarros to translating fools;
Give us thy last memorial to the age,
Once classic drama, and reform the stage!22

Such a work was not forthcoming and the English stage continued in its decadent course, and the German literature, which it had had such a large hand in degrading, was three decades in gaining the respectability which it had never really enjoyed in England. Only in the 1820's do the later Romantics guide the English back to German literature.
VI. CONCLUSION

The results of this investigation may be summarized briefly and concisely. Prior to 1798, a certain amount of English interest in German literature showed itself in the form of a relatively small number of translations, none of which (with the exception of Werther) met with enthusiastic response. The rising romantic and sentimental atmosphere found lyric expression in Coleridge, Wordsworth, and others. No English dramatist appeared to fill the vacuum in the theater. Kotzebue provided both the quality and quantity which public taste desired in the theater. Following his introduction to the English stage in 1798, his works appeared in numerous translations. For a short time, almost any work bearing the words "from the German of ..." was assured of, if not immense success, at least moderate profit. With Kotzebue's rise there was new interest in other German writers, most of whom are forgotten now, but especially in Goethe and Schiller.

The intensity of the English affair with Kotzebue undoubtedly resulted in a feeling of satiation. Political developments played a more important role in the reaction to German literature. The reactionary, conservative sentiment which pervaded England at the close of the century as a result of the course of the French Revolution expressed itself in various forms, one being that of biting attacks
upon "liberal" literature, which sometimes reached the point of viciousness. The most famous German author, Kotzebue, was relatively free of the seditious ideas, revolutionary attitudes, and general immorality which the Anti-Jacobins sought out everywhere. Goethe and Schiller were not. The attacks upon Stella and The Robbers resulted in a vilification and denunciation of all German literature. The reasoning was: German literature is bad, "X" is an example of German literature, therefore "X" is bad. By 1803, German literature had virtually disappeared from the English scene.

More concisely, the works of Kotzebue popularized German literature in England. Certain works of Goethe and Schiller depopularized it. Kotzebue's fame was not to be destroyed so easily. When the English turned to Germany once again in the 1820's, the bad taste left behind by Kotzebue was still present and had to be overcome before there could be widespread acceptance of better German literature.

With that summary as a guide, we may now consider certain aspects more closely.

It is not my purpose here to determine Kotzebue's place in world literature. Yet if anything of validity is to be said about this period in England, something must be said about his unique position in world literature. A
number of writers have turned their attention to the problem and have arrived (some at great length) at a number of theories, ranging from the view of Kotzebue as the "Kunstgärtner" of the seed of modern German comedy planted by Lessing to a psychological analysis of his life and times.¹

Such specific theories are fine, but the broader theory should not be overlooked because of excessive concern with detail. If the phenomenon of Kotzebue's unprecedented rise to world fame is to be explained at all, it is through the broader view.

Only toward the end of the eighteenth century were a number of factors simultaneously present, all of which were necessary to an achievement with the scope evident in Kotzebue's fame: 1) a European civilization which had expanded sufficiently so that large portions of the world enjoyed a common cultural background, 2) comparatively rapid communication between those areas, 3) a society, a sizeable percentage of whose members in all countries had the leisure necessary for the indulgence of their desire to be entertained.

Kotzebue, then, is the first writer to exploit a civilization which, in its art, requires a mass of mediocrity. One may call it the democratization of art. Kotzebue was also the first writer to exploit successfully the pseudo-artistic device of using the literary language and forms
of the previous generation in order to achieve popularity. Before 1800, such a situation and such an author are inconceivable. Previously, there had been neither great demand nor great need for a pseudo-art which might exist only to entertain and make lighter the heavy burden of time. Given the factors listed above, a figure such as Kotzebue is inevitable. Today, the situation and type of author are so well-known and so much a part of life that Kotzebue's original contribution to the culture of mediocrity in a time of literary greatness may appear puzzling if not paradoxical (as it has appeared to scholars who have undertaken to explain him.) Certainly it is no surprise to find contemporary critics reacting to him in the confused, often contradictory manner which we have observed. For his age, Kotzebue is as unique in his way as are Goethe and Schiller in theirs.

Bearing this in mind, we may dispel some of the confusion surrounding the meeting of Kotzebue and England.

*Menschenhass und Reue*, while hardly an auspicious beginning for a young playwright, is nonetheless a work of which no late eighteenth century dramatist would have had to be ashamed. Certainly, it is dated and seems perhaps ludicrous a century and a half later. But then, *Clavigo* and *Stella* are hardly works of lasting significance. (The story of German drama in England might have been quite different had Goethe written more dramas of that type,
which could have provided a wedge into England as did the works of Kotzebue.) Unfortunately, Kotzebue had nothing further to offer; there was no further development after Menschenhass and Pizarro.

The critic who today does not dismiss Kotzebue as totally worthless may refer to him as an important developer of European comedy and cite Die deutschenKleinstädter as an example of his early, crude comic technique, worthy of study because it presumably showed the way for later dramatists; in other words, it is a period piece, but a relatively valuable one.²

Menschenhass und Reue is also such a period piece. Judging from his later life, it seems likely that the author never recovered from the early fame which the play brought him (unlike Goethe and Werther). He later turned his attention to other types, notably the Schauspiel, and equaled with one blow his earlier success. But after Pizarro, there comes only an endless stream of works remarkable for their monotonous and monolithic nature. It is thus hardly unexpected that the aging Kotzebue should develop a deep bitterness toward the creators of the true spirit of Weimar.

This examination of the "Age of Kotzebue" in England has revealed that, in fact, that age consisted primarily of two works: one, The Stranger, is Kotzebue and is an adequate, if not outstanding, period piece; the other, Pizarro, as it was known in England, is only half Kotzebue and is
also adequate as a period piece. "Adequate" is by no means meant to carry with it any implications of hidden greatness or lasting significance, but simply a suitability to the times.

Kotzebue's English success rests, then, on a dual base. The sentimental content of works such as The Stranger (and Lovers' Vows) and the exotic content of Pizarro form one part of the base; these are factors which account in large measure for Kotzebue's popularity in every country. The other side of the base is unique to England, namely the patriotic sentiment with which Sheridan imbued Pizarro. The other translations from Kotzebue which appeared may be viewed as a result of the popularity accruing to any author who has been credited with a widely read or performed work.

The reader may well ask at this point why, then, did not Goethe achieve a similar fame after Werther, why was there no demand for other works by the same author? As we saw in the second chapter, there were a number of factors which combined in England to produce the proper environment for a Kotzebue, factors which were not present when Werther was introduced some two decades earlier.

Little remains to be said about the failure of the better German drama in England at this time (see Chapters IV and V). Contrary to popular opinion, it is neither Kotzebue's success nor the failure of Lessing, Goethe and Schiller which gives one pause; the surprising fact is
that the latter found as wide acceptance as they did. "It is perhaps permissible to assume that the attitude of the English toward German literature during this period differs considerably from their attitude subsequent, say, to the advent of Carlyle. Its appeal must have been to the mass of ordinary readers who demanded novelty, sensation and amusement, to the average playgoer who wished to laugh or to weep and, above all, to be entertained." We have seen that it was in fact that relatively small degree of popularity which better German drama attained which brought about the reaction. Stokoe is only partially correct when he explains the reaction by regarding "the taste for German horrors and sentimentalities as having at last been glutted by the trash so liberally provided for it; the swiftness and duration of the reaction was due no doubt to the deleterious nature of the matter absorbed." Therein lies Kotzebue's guilt with regard to the reaction to German literature; but, as I have tried to point out in Chapter V, the main force of the reaction was directed against German literature not as literature but as a group of literary works whose content was destructive to the social order, and thus not against the comparatively harmless Kotzebue, but "sublimely mad" Schiller and his compatriots.

Thus we come back to the title of this thesis. In a time of theatrical degeneracy, English poetry was having one of its grandest rebirths. The question, why did not the
young genius of English romantic poetry exert itself in
the theater, must be raised. Wordsworth dismissed the
state of the theater with a phrase. In all fairness, it
should be made clear that he had reference to Kotzebue when
he spoke of "sickly tragedies." He mentions Shakespeare
(see p. 1); for that reason alone we may assume he was
thinking of performed tragedies, which thus exempts Goethe
and Schiller. Coleridge tried his hand at translating, but
gave it up. Byron likewise expressed his discontent with
concise brevity. Nicoll, in A History of Late Eighteenth
Century Drama (1927), gives a lucid explanation: "The whole
melodramatic movement of the last years of the century was
a counterpart of the romantic element in poetry; it failed
in its office mainly because of the spectacle demanded in
the playhouse and because the dramatists had not made up
their minds as the poets had done concerning what they de¬
sired to achieve in their art. The first of these causes
led towards the production of the 'closet-play' because of
the poets' dissatisfaction with the theatre; the second
led towards the general pessimism concerning the contempor¬
ary state of drama.... The romantic sriters, in their en¬
thusiasm for Schiller, were led to pen plays which were
equally unactable, losing, in their desire to imitate Die
Räuber or Stella, the true note of the theatre.... The
poets, in the disdain which they displayed towards the
theatre of their time, were guilty of fostering that deca-
It was the time for German, not English, dramatic greatness; and when the two literatures met and mixed, the confusion which we have here observed was the result. The overall course of German drama during its first years in England was determined by a number of factors—social, political and moral—which are not always present in the specific forms they assumed at that time; but a century later we find a London critic writing on the occasion of the premier of Ibsen's *Ghosts*:

> An open drain; a loathsome sore unbandaged; a dirty act done publicly; a lazaretto house with all its doors and windows open... Kotzebue turned bestial and cynical... literary carrion.

The phenomenon itself is neither more nor less enduring than human nature.
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53. For details concerning the translators, see Stokoe, *German Influence*, 21-26; Stockley, *German Literature*, 282-304; also the *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* and the *Dictionary of National Biography* under the various names.
Chapter III


2. Max Marterstieg, Das deutsche Theater in Neunzehnten Jahrhundert. Eine kulturgeschichtliche Darstellung (Leipzig, 1904), p. 120.


5. Goethe, as quoted by Kindermann, 698.


7. Kotzebue's Theater (Vienna, 1840), II, 125.

8. Thompson, Kotzebue, A Survey, 1. Thompson offers a brief survey of German critical opinion of Kotzebue. The quotations are alike in denouncing the playwright; they differ only in the degree of intensity of the invective.

9. The fact that Sellier's work is cited by later writers on Kotzebue in England is indicative of the sorry state in which research on this subject finds itself. Later writers have foregone close examination of Kotzebue's works on the English stage because Sellier has purportedly thoroughly researched the problem. (See for example, V. Stockley, German Literature as Known in England, 1750-1830 (London, 1929), 181.) Research reveals that Sellier is fraught with errors. As examples, he explains away Sheridan's turning to Menschenhass und Reue by saying, "er mag die steigende Vorliebe des Publikums für deutsche Stücke gemerkt haben." (p. 10) Or, on the next page we read that, "abgesehen von einigen Ungenauigkeiten," Benjamin Thompson's Stranger is an accurate translation. On page 12, he is unaware of the fact that Thompson's original translation was published only once (in the German Theatre (London, 1801) and that other earlier and later printings were of the acting edition. Although Sellier offers a convenient reference to most of the plays which were performed, on the whole, he is unreliable.
11. Ibid., 387.
12. Ibid., 387.
17. Eduard Devrient, Geschichte der deutschen Schauspielkunst (Leipzig, 1848), 227.
18. For more information on Kotzebue and Kemble, see Herschel Baker, John Philip Kemble, the Actor in his Theatre (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), 229ff.
22. Kotzebue's Theater, II, 125. The petulant tone and rambling style of this Vorbericht to Das Kind der Liebe is typical of Kotzebue. He goes on to state his envy of Shakespeare (whom he describes as an often "riesenhaft" genius) because of his freedom from newspaper critics, then discusses various pirated editions of his works.
25. For examples of the reaction, see, Thompson, Survey, 26ff.; also Biographia Dramatica, III, 216.
27. Thompson, Survey, 62.
28. British Critic, XII, 598-600.

30. Ibid., 244.


32. B. Q. Morgan, Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation (Stanford, 1938), 285.

33. Marcella Gosch, "Translators of Kotzebue in England," Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht, XXXI, 175-183. One is led to wonder if perhaps Kotzebue has not been inflicted with the worst of all possible researchers. Miss Gosch's poor style is no excuse for her valueless comments. She completely misses the point in The Stranger. Concerning Thompson's translation, she says, "There is, thus, a definite attempt to get away from the sentimentalism and melodrama of the continental type and to follow the more conservative English tradition." She includes a lengthy comparison of Anne Plumptre's translation of Die Spanier in Peru and Sheridan's adaptation without mentioning the controversy concerning Sheridan's source.


36. R. B. Sheridan, Pizarro, a Tragedy (London, 1799), 74.

37. Sheridan, 69.

38. For a detailed comparison of Sheridan's adaptation and the original see, Leopold Bahlsen, Kotzebue und Sheridan; Kotzebue's Peru-Dramen und Sheridans Pizarro (Berlin, 1889). It is a comprehensive examination marred only by an underestimation of Sheridan's abilities (Pizarro is characterized as "eine bloße Bühneneinrichtung," p. 20) and uncalled-for generalizations (concerning Sheridan's new ending in which Pizarro is killed, he observes, without further comment, that the English audience "verlangt dramatische Gerechtigkeit und jubelt, wenn es den Schuldigen fallen sieht.")


43. It is unfortunate that Matlaw's fine article should contain what is surely a small classic in scholarly oversight. An anonymous translation appeared in 1800; the title-page informs us only that it is by "a North-Briton." Matlaw reports that the translation is by one "A. North-Briton."

44. *British Critic*, XIV, 64-69.
Chapter IV

1. See Nicoll, *History*, 72-73, 217-227, for the course of the closet drama.


27. Henry Mackenzie had published his translation of Die Geschwister, The Sister, the year before in Dramatic Pieces from the German (Edinburgh, 1792).


31. Quoted by Herzfeld, 24. Taylor had sent Goethe a copy of the translation in 1793 and was disheartened by the fact that he received no word of encouragement from Germany. Apparently Goethe possessed at least two copies. See Herzfeld, 25-26.

32. William Taylor, Iphigenia in Tauris (Norwich, 1793), 5.

Heraus in eure Schatten, rege Wipfel
Des alten, heil'gen, dichtbelaubten Haines,
Wie in der Göttin stilles Heiligtum,
Tret' ich jetzt mit schauderndem Gefühl,
Als wenn ich sie zum erstenmal beträte,
Und es gewöhnt sich nicht mein Geist hierher.
So manches Jahr bewahrt mich hier verborgen
Ein hoher Wille, dem ich mich ergebe;
Doch immer bin ich, wie im ersten, fremd.
Denn ach! mich trennt das Meer von den Geliebten,
Und an dem Ufer steh' ich lange Tage,
Das Land der Griechen suchend;
Und gegen meine Seufzer bringt die Welle
Nur dumpfe Töne brausend mir herüber.
Weh dem, der fern von Eltern und Geschwistern
Ein einsam Leben führt! Ihm zehrt der Gram
Das nächste Glück vor seinen Lippen weg...
41. A. R. Hohlfeld, in his review of Karl Blumenhagen, *Scott als Übersetzer* (Rostock, 1900), *Studien zur vergleichenden Litteraturgeschichte*, III, 501, n. 1, attributes the anonymous version to Thompson, without reason. Possibly, he was aware of only one edition. In any case, it is highly improbable that the two works are by the same translator because of the marked differences in style.
45. Rose Lawrence, *Gortz of Berlingen* (Liverpool, 1799), Preface.
48. Karl Blumenhagen, in Scott als Übersetzer, discusses the translation in pedantic detail. See Hohlfeld's biting review (above, note 41).

49. Needler, Goethe, 23.

50. Brandl, Aufnahme, 54.

51. Scott, Goetz, xii.


53. Lawrence, in Götz, as quoted in Monthly Review, XXIX, 224.


55. Stokoe, German Influence, 63-64.


57. The Speculator, I, 239.

58. British Critic, X, 551.

60. Willoughby, 300-301.

61. Willoughby, 301. Regarding the "stage version," Tytler says in his preface that he worked from a 1786, Mannheim edition. Goedeke does not have such an edition.


63. Critical Review, VI, 204-217.

64. The Margravine appears to have been something of a lesser de Staël. See Willoughby, "English Translations," 304, note, for a survey of her continent-wide affairs. She was at one time believed to have been the original for Lady Milford in Kabale und Liebe.

65. The Robbers, A Tragedy in Five Acts, translated and altered from the German of Schiller as performed at Brandenburgh-House Theatre (London, 1799), Preface.


68. The Robbers, Translated from the German by the Rev. M. Render (London, 1799), 49.


70. Quoted by Willoughby, 299.

71. Willoughby, 313.

72. A fact which escaped Willoughby. See Genest, Some Account, VII, 454.

73. Genest, Some Account, VII, 455.


78. Critical Review, XIV, 137.


81. See Thomas Rea's, Schiller's Dramas and Poems in England (London, 1906). Rea, for the most part, fails to consider the literary quality of the translations, confining himself to a discussion of outright mistakes. His work is valueless concerning Coleridge and Mellish, but is more than adequate for the lesser translations. Stockley, German Literature, 159-160, in 1929, laments the fact that there has been no adequate study of the first reception of Schiller in England. Such a work is yet to appear.


84. Machule, Coleridges, 189, n. 3.

85. Machule, 193.

86. A. Brandl, Coleridge und die englische Romantik (Strassburg, 1886), 271.


88. Scott, quoted by Ewen, Prestige, 51.

89. Schillers Briefe, VI, 241.

90. Machule, Coleridge; Roscher, Wallensteinübersetzung; B. Q. Morgan, "What Happened to Coleridge's Wallenstein," Modern Language Journal, XLIII, 195-201. Morgan shows that in the light of later manuscript discoveries, some of Coleridge's "errors" are actually correct translations.


97. Coleridge, Piccolomini, 81-82.

Oh nimmer will ich seinen Glauben schelten
An der Gestirne, an der Geister Macht.
Nieht bloss der Stolz des Menschen füllt den Raum
Mit Geistern, mit geheimnisvollen Kräften,
Auch für ein liebend Herz ist die gemeine
Natur zu eng, und tiefere Bedeutung
Liegt in dem Märchen meiner Kinderjahre,
Als in der Wahrheit, die das Leben lehrt.
Die heitere Welt der Wunder ists allein,
Die dem entzückten Herzen Antwort gibt,
Die ihre ewgen Räume mir eröffnet,
Mir tausend Zweige reich entgegenstreckt,
Worauf der trunken Geist sich selig wiegt.
Die Fabel ist der Liebe Heimatwelt,
Gern wohnt sie unter Feen, Talismanen,
Glaubt gern an Götter, weil sie göttlich ist.
Die alten Fabelwesen sind nicht mehr,
Das reizende Geschlecht ist ausgewandert;
Doch eine Sprache braucht das Herz, es bringt
Der alte Trieb die alten Namen wieder,
Und an dem Sternenhimmel gehn sie jetzt,
Die sonst im Leben freundlich mitgewandelt,
Dort winken sie dem Liebenden herab,
Und jedes Grosse bringt uns Jupiter
Noch diesen Tag, und Venus jedes Schöne.

98. Coleridge, Piccolomini, 89. Coleridge's Works, ed. E. H. Coleridge (Oxford, 1912), II, 653, does not include Coleridge's own rimed version which appeared in the 1800 edition. First, the original, then Coleridge's poetic attempt, then Lamb's.

Der Eichwald brauset, die Wolken ziehn,
Das Mügdlein wandelt an Ufers Grün,
Es bricht sich die Welle mit Macht, mit Macht,
Und sie singt hinaus in die finstre Nacht,
Das Auge von Weinen getrübet.

Das Herz ist gestorben, die Welt ist leer,
Und weiter gibt sie dem Wunsche nichts mehr.
Du Heilige, rufe dein Kind zurück,
Ich habe genossen das irdische Glück,
Ich habe gelebt und geliebet.

The cloud doth gather, the greenwood roar,
The damsel paces along the shore;
The billows they tumble with might, with might;
And she flings out her voice to the darksome night,
Her bosom is swelling with sorrow;
The world it is empty, the heart will die,
There's nothing to wish for beneath the sky;
Thou Holy One, call thy child away!
I've lived and loved, and that was to-day--
Make ready my grave-clothes to-morrow.

The clouds are black'ning, the storms threat'ning,
The cavern doth mutter, the greenwood moan;
Billows are breaking, the damsel's heart aching,
Thus in the dark night she singeth alone,
Her eye upward roving:
The world is empty, the heart is dead surely,
In this world plainly all seemeth amiss;
To thy heaven, Holy One, take home thy little one,
I have partaken of all earth's bliss,
Both living and loving.

102. See Stokoe, German Influence, 133-135.
103. Rea, Schiller's Dramas, 73.
104. Machule, Coleridge, 184-185, note.
105. The editors of the Weimar edition (1948, IX, 341) maintain that Mellish probably inserted a few lines of his own "für sein englisches Publikum." Unfortunately (or fortunately) neither Mellish's style
nor the nature of the purported insertions makes it possible to determine what Mellish added and what Schiller deleted.


107. S. T. Coleridge, *The Death of Wallenstein* (London, 1800), Preface. The level of Mellish's achievement becomes all the more apparent if one compares his smooth rendering of the anapest stanzas in the text with Coleridge's above (n. 98).


Chapter V


4. Prospectus, to the *Anti-Jacobin*, undated.


18. Some of the more literate attacks are: *Anti-Jacobin*, II, 100; Monthly Register, III, 175-177; William Preston, "Reflections on the Peculiarities of Style and Manner in the Late German Writers," *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, VIII, 15-79.

20. Monthly Register, I, 397-398; also, II, 26-27. For Robinson in Germany see Stokoe, German Influence, 51ff; E. J. Morley, Crabb Robinson in Germany, 1800-1805 (Oxford, 1929).


Chapter VI

1. Thompson attributes the "Kunstgärtner" theory to Gottschalk, cf. Thompson, Kotzebue, A Survey, 52. The psychological study is that of Kahn, "Personality Factors."

2. See, for example, J. G. Robertson, A History of German Literature (Edinburgh, 1953), 386.


4. Stokoe, German Influence, 49.

5. Nicoll, A History of Late Eighteenth, 52; 73f.
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