

Robbing The Robbers: Schiller, Xenophobia and the Politics of British Romantic Translation

Peter Mortensen Aarhus University

I

The 1790s and early 1800s, as Allardyce Nicholl pointed out long ago, were the heyday of translation-drama in British theatrical history. At this time, both Drury Lane Theatre and Covent Garden Theatre routinely relied on foreign sensational matter to attract audiences and fill their vast galleries, with France and Germany supplying many of the period's most spectacularly popular plays.¹ For example, smash hits like James Boaden's *Fountainville Forest* (1794), J. C. Cross's *Julia of Louvain; or, Monkish Cruelty* (1797) and Thomas Holcroft's *The Child of Mystery: A Melo-drame* (1801), were all based on recent French plays allegorising the revolutionary upheavals that had transformed the nation into a republic.² Drury Lane's successful production of *The Stranger* (1798), Benjamin Thompson's Englished version of August von Kotzebue's *Menschenhass und Reue* (1789–90), blazed the trail for the 28 Kotzebue-translations that followed during the subsequent year alone.³ We are accustomed to viewing the Romantic period as a time of national isolationism and introspection, when Shakespeare was canonised as the quintessential English genius, and when fresh authoritative editions of Britain's classic authors enabled modern writers to encounter the products of their own literary past as though for the first time.⁴ Yet within the theatre, at least, other conversations took place as well, involving both British and non-British interlocutors. Indeed it may prove instructive to remember that at the exact time when 'the main current of Romanticism began to flow in full force', the 'vogue for German drama in England', particularly the aesthetically and politically progressive *Sturm und Drang* drama of

Goethe, Schiller and Kotzebue, ‘was sufficiently great to be referred to as “the rage”’.⁵

Britain, it might be said, did suffer an invasion during the war-plagued late 1790s, for it was ‘overwhelmed’, ‘deluged’ or ‘engulfed’ (all these metaphors were frequently used by contemporary commentators) by foreign fictions and plays. As the British counter-revolution set in and gained momentum, however, representatives of official culture increasingly frowned upon, and attempted to de-legitimize, the imported discourses of Continental sentimentalism and Gothicism.⁶ Rightwing cultural journalists and literary critics were painfully aware that the British nation’s theatres were, in the words of one concerned observer, being ‘inundated’ by ‘translated trash’ and ‘foreign novelty’, completing ‘the conquest of haste and incorrectness over the English stage’.⁷ Already at the beginning of the 1790s, Edmund Burke had established the theatre as an unstable and volatile site, vulnerable to subversion and contamination.⁸ By the late 1790s, ideologically freighted complaints about foreign dominance of English theatres, accompanied by warnings about the outlandish drama’s invasive ability to mislead the *ingenué* aficionados of playhouse and circulating library became almost inescapable, as British writers were gripped by an intense cultural xenophobia. In attacking European drama, polemicists began with ready-made arguments going back at least as far as Pope’s and Swift’s attack on the Grub Street hacks in the 1720s, impugning lowbrow romance and spectacle as unfit reading-material for women and members of the non-leisured classes. But as the soaring number of translation-plays was joined by rumours of secret societies intent on world revolution, and as the spectre of cultural invasion was linked up with very real fears of French invasion throughout 1797–98, the tone and terms of the Romantic reviewers’ abuse of Continental texts changed, moving from detached scepticism to controlled condescension and finally to exaggerated condemnation of a seductive form apparently without redeeming social value. The critic John Wilson Croker, for example, maintains that English stages, in being taken over by foreigners and foreign agents, have been exposed to no less than a ‘revolution’:

For I would seek the wond’rous cause,
That abrogates our ancient laws,
And like the Gallic revolution,
Subverts old Crow-street’s constitution;
Thus Shakespeare, Monarch of the realm
Of plays, his subjects overwhelm,
And mad with rebel fury grown,
Insult, and sentence, and dethrone;
Thus Fletcher, Jonson, Otway, Rowe,
The nobles of the stage, are low,
Or else dispers’d by barbarous arts,
Are *émigrés* in foreign parts;

Whilst in their places rise and sit,
The very *tiers-etat* of wit [...]⁹

These are strong words indeed, but Croker was not alone in using the loaded language of invasion, encroachment and usurpation to characterise developments in the theatrical world, nor was he the only writer who suspected that the British reading and viewing publics needed protection from impious and un-English forms of entertainment. William Wordsworth, as is well known, introduces *Lyrical Ballads* (1800) with a seemingly gratuitous slur on those 'frantic novels, sickly and stupid German Tragedies, and deluges of idle and extravagant stories in verse' which he has purportedly sought to 'counter-act'.¹⁰ Around the same time, too, Walter Scott swears off his experiments with Europeanised Gothic drama in *The House of Aspen* and *Goetz of Berlichingen* (1799), vowing instead a speedy return to 'dramatic composition' on 'the genuine old English model'.¹¹ A writer for the *Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine* crystallises these feelings of entrenched hostility and almost hysteric defensiveness, when in surveying the current pitiful situation of Britain's patent theatres he discerns 'a kind of systematic plan for corrupting the public taste and national morality of Englishmen by the undistinguishing praise and introduction of foreign trash'.¹²

No foreign play posed a larger problem, in this context, than Friedrich Schiller's *Die Räuber* (1781). On the one hand, the popularity of Schiller's tragedy speaks for itself. Although it was denied a license for performance and was never staged publicly, Alexander F. Tytler's translation *The Robbers* (1792) had already appeared in four editions by 1800, and the play was re-translated twice in 1799 (by William Render and Keppel Craven) and once in 1801 (by Benjamin Thompson). According to Carlyle, the publication of *Die Räuber* marked a new beginning 'not only in Schiller's history, but in the literature of the world'.¹³ Marilyn Butler likewise considers it 'one of the most influential books of the period', and Terence Hoagwood adds that 'Schiller's plays – particularly *The Robbers* – contain plot elements that became paradigmatic in the drama of the period'.¹⁴ On the other hand, although Schiller was never a Jacobin, and although *Die Räuber* was published before the irruption of large-scale war and rebellion, the play soon became the subject of international scandal, as it was almost inevitably caught up in the turmoil of the revolution-controversy. Lamartellière's French adaptation *Robert, chef de brigands* (1792) became a popular favourite on the revolutionary stage in Paris, where Wordsworth may have witnessed a performance of the play in 1792.¹⁵ It was another French version, Friedel and de Bonneville's *Les voleurs* (1785), that Tytler used for his English translation, and thus *Die Räuber* was from the outset tainted with connotations of French license as well as German excess. The identification of *Die Räuber* with levelling and libertarian principles, indeed, was so strong that the National Assembly in 1792 made Schiller an honorary citizen of

France. A German play appropriated for the image of the French Revolution, *Die Räuber* came to figure an amorphous, pan-European threat to English self-definitions: it seemed to epitomise everything that was menacing in recent Continental literature and politics.

Because of its extreme popularity and equally extreme unpopularity, *Die Räuber* posed a challenge to conservative British critics, poets, playwrights and translators. The popularisation of *Die Räuber*, these writers understood, could well be seen as part of a conspiracy to erode British readers' morals and manners. But if Schiller's early masterpiece were imaginatively reconceptualised and carefully refashioned – if the play were subjected to a rigorous revisionist criticism – it could still become a powerful, economically propitious instrument in the ideological re-consolidation of British nationhood during the French Revolution crisis. By a daring sleight of hand, Schiller's plot, characters and imagery could still become powerful weapons in the battle against the Britain's internal and external enemies. To be successful, British writers must both tap the success of *Die Räuber* and cleanse Schiller's play of all its Jacobinical associations, in essence reinventing it as an apolitical or even an counter-revolutionary tract. More than a few writers, not surprisingly, decided to take up this challenge. The British Library on-line catalogue lists no fewer than eight direct translations of *Die Räuber* published between 1792 and 1827. Provoking a considerable number of additional British responses which, although not exactly translations, veer between adaptation, imitation, parody and pastiche, the play also attracted the interest of several canonical Romantic writers, including Coleridge, Wordsworth, Shelley, Byron and Hazlitt.¹⁶ In the following pages, I will dwell on two lesser-known texts, both published within the crisis-year of 1799, whose authors openly declare their debt to Schiller: Keppel Craven's *The Robbers, A Tragedy in Five Acts. Translated and Altered from the German. As it was Performed at Brandenburgh-House Theatre* and Joseph George Holman's *The Red-Cross Knights; a Play, Founded on the Robbers of Schiller* (1799). By making these plays the focal points of my analysis, I want to show that the writing and rewriting of Schiller's play became a site of social, cultural and political contestation, engendering a fraught conflict over signs and meanings. More specifically, I aim to highlight the dilemma faced by pro-establishment British writers who confront un-British playwrights whose imaginative powers they both admire and fear. I wish to speculate, in other words, about the ways in which translation was used, during the Romantic period, to 'inoculate' illicit and pernicious texts, suppressing their dangerous tendencies and replacing them with more wholesome fare.¹⁷ Craven and Holman make no secret of their patriotically motivated desire to accommodate, nationalise and domesticate Schiller's rebel-drama; both wish to exploit its extreme popularity, while also assimilating it to the anti-revolutionary agenda of Edmund Burke and William Pitt. Yet both also encounter problems in the process, and both find it difficult to arrive at an end-product that is satisfying to themselves and their

critics. Ultimately, then, I will also want to address the contradictions and ambiguities that inevitably result when playwrights try to rewrite Jacobin plays from an anti-Jacobin perspective.

II

At the beginning of *Die Räuber*, the honourable and talented Karl Moor has been unfairly dispossessed of the title and the property that is rightfully his by his evil brother Franz, who takes advantage of his father's feebleness. In response to being ostracised, Karl pledges his life to the protection of those who have been unjustly trampled upon by the powers that be, and he directs his titanic anger not just against the aristocratic tyrant directly responsible for his own disinheritance, but against all of respectable society. In swiftly changing scenes alternating between Franconia and Bohemia, Schiller then pits the egalitarian camaraderie and bonhomie of Karl's robber-band against the decadent absolutism of Franz. After a series of more or less heroic acts, involving the sacking of a town and the defeat of an entire imperial army, Karl and his rebels return to his native region. Here Karl exposes the tangled plot that his brother has contrived, and releases his father who has been left to die in a dungeon. Finally, the two brothers confront each other, and Franz is vanquished in a violent showdown singled out by the critic Henry Mackenzie for its 'barbarous heroism'.¹⁸

Whatever else the plot might have meant in its original, pre-revolutionary, German context, turn-of-the-century British reviewers were almost bound to consider it a thinly veiled endorsement of Jacobinical ideas and beliefs: a piece of radical propaganda intended to foment destructive desires and encourage anti-social forms of behaviour, by presenting outlawry and brigandage in an ethically understandable and even attractive light. Tytler's English rendition of *Die Räuber*, consequently, was received and excoriated as a malicious and incendiary play, advocating violent retaliation as the only proper reaction to social suppression and economic inequality. Already Mackenzie, in his otherwise positive discussion of *Die Räuber* in 'Account of the German Theatre' (1788), alerts his readers to the moral and political malignancy implicit in Schiller's alluring representation of Moor. To point his audience to the potentially baleful effects that Schiller's play and protagonist may have, 'especially on young minds', Mackenzie narrates an anecdote concerning a group of Freiburg university-students, who, having read *Die Räuber* and having been 'struck and captivated with the grandeur of the character of its hero Moor', formed their own gang of cutpurses in the forests of Bohemia. 'Hence', Mackenzie deduces, 'the danger of a drama such as this. It covers the natural deformity of criminal actions with the veil of high sentiment and virtuous feeling, and thus separates (if I may be pardoned the expression) the *moral sense* from that morality which it ought to produce' (pp. 191–92). With his manifest anxiety about Schiller's spellbinding play's

socio-political influence, and with his remarks about Moor's power to incite lax morality and bewitch readers into civic insubordination, Mackenzie anticipated later critics' fascinated yet overwhelmingly negative reception of *The Robbers*. So universal and so vociferous was the critical condemnation of *Die Räuber* that even A. F. Tytler himself, in the preface to the second edition of his version (1795), somewhat disingenuously declares that the translator wishes 'earnestly [...] that he had *left undone* what he *has done*'.¹⁹ And so powerful were the objections mounted against Schiller's tragedy that even the Scottish hero-worshipper Carlyle, writing more than thirty years after the publication of *The Robbers* in *The Life of Friedrich Schiller* (1825), evidently still feels that he has to rehearse the apocryphal tale of the misled Freiburg-scholars. In his portrait of Moor, Carlyle cautiously adds, Schiller may well be accused 'of having set up to the impetuous and fiery temperament of youth a model of imitation, which the young were too likely to pursue with eagerness, and which could only lead them from the safe and beaten tracks of duty into error and destruction' (Carlyle, *Works*, XXV, p. 2.).

III

In the preface and prologue of *The Robbers*, Keppel Cravens boasts of having metamorphosed *Die Räuber* into a tasteful and decorous tragedy perfectly suitable for middle- and upper-class country families. A younger son of the sixth Baron Craven, and a man whose connections within the highest echelons of élite society made him a chamberlain to the Princess of Wales, Craven is highly cognisant of Schiller's troublesome reputation as a playwright who possessed immense powers of imagination, but who also aired hazardous opinions that made him the enemy of aristocracy, monarchy and established religion. In *The Robbers* Craven attempts to solve this problem by presenting a softened version of the play. *The Robbers*, Craven assures his readers at the outset, can be enjoyed without scruples or anxieties, and it may be placed before even the youngest and most innocent readers. No longer a text which fastidious gentlemen and – women must think twice to put into the hands of their sons, daughters or servants, the play has in fact become a didactic instrument, useful for instructing 'every child' with lessons of 'humanity', 'patience' and 'forgiveness'.²⁰

To accomplish this feat, Craven points out, he has 'prun'd' the play 'with British care', divesting it of 'all the Jacobinical Speeches that abound in the Original' (i). Critical scrutiny of the Craven-version of Schiller bears out these preliminary remarks. Where Tytler's relatively faithful 1792 version of *Die Räuber* weighs in at 220 pages, Craven's version takes up only 101 pages, and this considerable reduction in scope has been achieved primarily by patiently eliminating virtually all the play's most controversial elements.

To illustrate Craven's strategy of selective 'pruning', one might consider his rendition of the last scene of Schiller's second act. At this time in the play,

when the robber army seems hopelessly surrounded and outnumbered by imperial militiamen, a pompous and sanctimonious priest ('Pater') appeals to Karl to surrender himself to justice. In so doing, however, the preacher only elicits a page-long indictment of hypocrisy and priest-craft:

Da donnern sie Sanftmuth und Duldung aus ihren Wolken, und bringen dem Gott der Liebe Menschenopfer wie einem Feuerarmigen Moloch – predigen Liebe des Nächsten, und fluchen den achzig-jährigen Blinden von ihren Thüren hinweg; stürmen wider den Geiz und haben Peru um goldner Spangen willen entvölkert und die Heyden wie Zugvieh vor ihre Wagen gespannt – Sie zerbrechen sich die Köpfe wie es doch möglich gewesen wäre, dass die Natur hätte können einen Ischariot schaffen, und nicht der schlimmste unter ihnen würde den dreyeinigen Gott un zehen Silberlinge verrathen! O über euch Pharisäer, euch Falschmünzer der Wahrheit, euch Affen der Gottheit!²¹

F. J. Lamport, Schiller's modern translator, renders this passage in the following way:

Gentleness and tolerance they thunder from their clouds, and offer the God of love human sacrifices like a fiery-armed Moloch – they preach the love of their neighbour, and they curse the blind octogenarian at their door – they fulminate against covetousness, and they have slaughtered Peru for the sake of golden brooches and harness the pagans like beasts of burden to drag their wagons – they rack their brains in wonder that nature could have brought forth a Judas Iscariot, and he is not the meanest of them who would betray God's Holy trinity for ten pieces of silver! Oh , you Pharisees, you forgers of the truth, you apes and mockers of God!²²

Obviously appalled by Karl's virulent outburst against the establishment, however, Craven in his version not only tempers but virtually silences his protagonist's anti-clericism. First, he substitutes Schiller's priest with a more neutral 'commissary', making sure that Karl's insult will no longer have its original force, since it will no longer be aimed against the clergy as a profession and the church as an institution. Second, Craven drastically curtails and completely reformulates Karl's response, which now seems vague in its content and almost respectful in its address: 'Now, hear me, Sir; hear what Moor says [...] I scale no walls in the dark, and force no bolts to plunder. What I have done, shall be engraven in that book, where all the actions of mankind are recorded. But with you, poor ministers of earthly justice, I hold no further communing' (Craven, p. 49).

This method of surgically removing all elements likely to cause offence to chaste loyalist ears has been applied by Craven throughout his translation. Gone from Craven's version of the play, characteristically, are practically all scenes and speeches tending to challenge conventional truths, particularly

those in which the robbers harass representatives of the church, law and political establishment, and those in which they desecrate places of worship. Craven makes no mention, for example, of key episodes like Spiegelberg's tricks with the justice at Leipzig, of his and Grimm's carousing with the naked nuns at St. Cecelia's convent, or of the anonymous robber's plundering of St. Stephen's church during the raid of the Bohemian town where Roller is imprisoned (Schiller, pp. 53–55, 63). In shortening the play, Craven has also felt free to write out the lower-class revolutionary Kosinsky, who joins Karl's retinue because he values 'freedom' ('Freyheit') more than 'honour and life' ('Ehre und Leben'), who refuses to 'bow beneath the yoke of despotism' ('unter das Joch des Despotismus krümmen'), and who claims that Karl's name sounds sweet to 'the poor and the oppressed' ('den Armen und Unterdrückten') (Schiller, pp. 81, 86). In this new, demonstratively English version, not surprisingly, Spiegelberg is no longer allowed to recommend that Germany abolish the use of the Bible, and Franz no longer scoffs at Pastor Moser's religious authority (Schiller, pp. 55, 120–24). Missing from the play, even more significantly, are Karl's tirade against the 'weak century of eunuchs' (das schlappe Kastratenjahrhundert'); his rant against the 'law' that 'slows the flight of eagles to a snail's pace' ('Das Gesez hat zum Schneckengang verdorben, was Adlerflug geworden wäre'); his wish to turn Germany into a 'republic that would make Rome and Sparta look like nunneries' ('aus Deutschland soll eine Republik werden, gegen die Rom und Sparta Nonnenklöster seyn sollen'); and his call to 'raise the bears of the north against the race or murderers' ('die Bären des Nordlands wider dis mörderische Geschlecht anhezen') and 'blow the trumpet of rebellion throughout the realm of nature' ('durch die ganze Natur das Horn des Aufruhrs blasen') (Schiller, pp. 21, 31). Last but not least, Craven is also scandalised by the freedom that Schiller grants his feisty and independent-minded heroine Amalia. Overt disobedience in men is outrageous enough, but violent predilections in women is apparently more than Craven can stomach, or more than he believes that his readers will countenance. Hence, Craven's Amalia abuses Franz merely by calling him 'Worm' and 'Reptile' to his face, whereas Schiller's heroine uses much more compelling, if also more unladylike, arguments: she simply 'delivers him a blow across the face' ('gibt ihm eine Maulschelle') (Craven, p. 55; Schiller, p. 75).

Not only, however, has Craven cut out all elements of social invective, and not only has he excised all the expressions of frustrated longing and utopian desire that endeared Schiller with the French revolutionaries and gave his play its status as the master-text of late eighteenth-century radicalism. Craven's is a more thorough-going revision, which alters the form as well as the content of the original. According to one Europhobic writer, the contemporary critic William Preston, not only does Schiller exhibit 'active partizans of anarchy and disorder' in a positive light, by 'represent[ing] [...] inequality as a sufficient plea for the outrages of the robber and the pirate'. Even more incriminating is Preston's observation that

the author, that he may make the murderous crew, the associates of his hero, talk in character, fills the dialogue with horrid oaths and imprecations, with blasphemy and ribaldry, worthy of the refuse of a guard house, or a goal. Nor [does Schiller] confine the use of oaths and imprecations, the display of profane and impious sentiments, to characters which are meant and professed to be drawn as ferocious and censurable, to robbers and assassins. We find them ascribed to females, nay, to females which the poet announces as feminine, good and amiable, and exhibits, as objects of imitation, to their sex. (pp. 359, 11, 13)

The threat that *Die Räuber* poses to religious and ideological orthodoxy, as Preston recognises, is not merely an effect of the political beliefs that Karl and his co-conspirators are allowed or not allowed to utter and act out. More fundamentally, the play's insolent rebelliousness is inscribed in its very linguistic fabric, for Schiller includes within his play a strong strain of what Mikhail Bakhtin has called 'grotesque realism': a style (or anti-style) characterised by a fondness for low and vulgar locutions, a tendency to travesty the serious and oppressive discourses of official high culture, and a constant movement towards the lower bodily stratum.²³

What seems so transgressive and what *is* transgressive about *Die Räuber*, ultimately, concerns not merely how the robbers act, or threaten to act, but also how they speak. Bakhtin accents the emancipatory and world-renovating power of grotesque rhetoric and exorbitant discourse, especially as these were applied by his hero Rabelais: 'No dogma, no authoritarianism, no narrow-minded seriousness can coexist with Rabelaisian images; these images are opposed to all that is finished and polished, to all pomposity, to every ready-made solution in the sphere of thought and world outlook' (p. 3). Schiller's robbers' singing, chanting and laughing, similarly, partake of carnival and its vision of a world beyond social and moral convention. The outlaws fashion an anti-official language of parody and excess, allowing them to establish a utopian space beyond the reach of religious edicts and ideological state apparatuses. One aspect that typifies the robbers' idiom is their constant references to the physical body, especially its lowest and least dignified aspects. Much of the robbers' conversation is couched in imagery of eating, drinking, consuming and digesting. The play's first scene from the robber camp shows Moor and Spiegelberg in their cups, reminiscing about the time when, 'in the heat of the wine' ('im Dampfe des Weins'), they bought up all the meat in Leipzig and stuffed themselves with food (Schiller, p. 22). Later on, the robber band itself is characterised as a 'corpus [...] growing hourly like a bishop's belly' ('das Korpus [...] schwillt dir stündlich wie ein Prälat's-Bauch') (p. 55). Along the same lines, the vulgar Schufferle speaks, in almost scatological detail, of 'babes in arms dirtying their linen' ('Wikelkinder, die ihre Lacken vergolden') and 'wrinkled grandmothers chasing the flies from them' ('eingeschnurrte Müttergen, die ihnen die Müken wehrten' (p. 64). Spiegelberg also describes

nuns 'wetting themselves with fright so you could have learnt to swim' ('Nonnen die [...] die Stube so besprenzten, daß du hättest das Schwimmen drinn lernen können'), and to entertain his fellows he pictures St. Cecilia's abbess as an 'old hag', a 'wizened, hairy old dragon dancing about in front of me, conjuring me by her maiden's honour' ('ein altes Weib, und nun denk dir einmal den Drachen vor mir herumtanzen, und mich bey aller jungfräulichen Sittsamkeit beschwören') (p. 54).

In addition, just as the robbers foreground and elevate the low, so they also denigrate the high. To a striking extent, the robbers intersperse their banter with elements of Classical culture and Scriptural learning, sacrosanct discourses which they subvert and demystify by inserting them into new, debasing contexts. For example, Schweitzer characterises the imperial priest as a 'worn-out sheepdog' ('abgerichteter Schäferhund'), and dismisses his pious harangue as 'a fine speech to keep one's belly warm' ('das war wohlgesprochen sich den Magen warm zu halten') (pp. 67, 69). We are told early on, similarly, that when Karl's dog was killed at Leipzig, the robbers composed odes in honour of the departed dog, staging an elaborate mock-heroic funeral which satirised the town's ruling caste of merchants and bureaucrats (p. 22). And later, Roller also describes his release from captivity in terms of an extended Biblical parody. The town of his captors, he says, was like 'Sodom and Gomorrha' ('Gomorrha und Sodom'), the ladder leading to the scaffold reminded him of 'the blessed ladder that was going to take me up to Abraham's bosom' ('der Sakerments-Leiter, auf der ich in den Schoos Abrahams steigen wollte'), and when delivered from bondage he left the company 'staring back petrified like Lot's wife' ('versteinert wie Loths Weib zurückschaun') (pp. 61–62).

Such acts of linguistic terrorism, short-circuiting discursive oppositions and resisting the prohibitions of proper speech and dignified writing, are part and parcel of the robbers' project. Even Karl, who is certainly capable of great moral seriousness, and who often speaks in lofty soliloquies, cannot refrain from engaging in anti-hegemonic verbal horseplay. In the second scene of the first act, for example, when Karl Moor and Spiegelberg are idly casting about for ideas about what to do next, Spiegelberg makes the following, facetious suggestion: 'suppose we all turned Jews, and began talking about the Kingdom again?' ('wie wärs wenn wir Juden würden, und das Königreich wieder aufs Tapet brächten'). Spiegelberg means that they should journey to Palestine and help the Jews 'establish the new Jerusalem' ('Jerusalem wieder aufbauen'). In answering, Karl refuses to take Spiegelberg's proposal seriously. Wilfully misunderstanding his friend's already-ironic idealism, Karl turns the Biblical reference into a scurrilous jest about circumcision and the mutilation of bodies: 'I see. You want to put foreskins out of fashion, because the barber has yours already?' ('nun merk ich – du willst die Vorhaut aus der Mode bringen, weil der Barbier die deinige schon hat?') (p. 22). Karl's clever repartee exemplifies the rhetorical strategy that

Bakhtin refers to as ‘Gay Grammar’ (pp. 468–69). By reducing the Bible’s Word to a matter of bodies and body parts, Karl breaks up codes and reconstitutes meaning, in such a way as to liberate himself and his interlocutor from the mental constraints imposed by autocratic culture and normative language-use.

Understanding that ‘Jacobinism’ is a form of linguistic as well as moral and political subversion, however, Craven purifies the robbers’ ‘Billingsgate’ (to use one of Bakhtin’s favourite terms) of its linguistic free play, verbal crudities, obscene references and sexual innuendoes. Absent from Craven’s play, significantly, are all the original’s disrespectful quotations from Scripture and Classical belles-lettres. Lacking, also, are most of *Die Räuber*’s references to sexuality and physicality: Franz’s reference to his ‘mother’s womb’ (‘Mutterleib’); Karl’s mockery of ‘fellows who faint when they have fathered a child’ (‘Kerls, die in Ohnmacht fallen wenn sie einen Buben gemacht haben’); Karl’s ribald joking about Spiegelberg’s ‘foreskin’ (‘Vorhaut’); Schwarz’s playful proposition that ‘all which remains for us is to turn into women and become bawds, or even hawk our own maidenhood on the streets’ (‘Izt fehlte nur noch, dass wir Weiber und Kupplerinnen würden, oder gar unsere Jungferschaft zu Markte trieben’); Spiegelberg’s grotesque description of St. Cecelia’s abbess, ‘dressed like Eve before the Fall’ (‘angezogen wie Eva vor dem Fall’); and Schufferle’s eyewitness account of ‘women in childbed, and pregnant women afraid of miscarrying under the gallows’ (‘Kindbetterinnen und hochschwängere Weiber, die befürcheteten, unterm lichten Galgen zu abortieren’) (Schiller, pp. 18, 20, 22, 28, 54, 64). The ‘courtesan’ (‘Meze’) whom Franz makes up to slander Karl has become merely a ‘woman’ in the new version, and Craven makes light of Franz’s subsequent claim that Karl has contracted syphilis by engaging in ‘filthy vice’ (‘garstige Laster’) (Schiller, pp. 34, 35; Craven, p. 14). Similarly, Franz’s threat that he will have Amalia for his ‘mistress’ (‘Maitresse’) and that he will ‘take your virgin bed by storm, and conquer your proud innocence with my greater pride’ (‘dein jungfräuliches Bette mit Sturm ersteigen, und deine stolze Schaam mit noch größerem Stolze besiegen’) has been replaced by his vow to ‘drag you by those locks to the altar, and with my dagger force from your quivering heart the nuptial oath’ (Schiller, pp. 74–75; Craven, pp. 55–56).

Schiller’s robbers feel at home within the language of the popular marketplace, a code replete with sexual double entendres and humorous references to bodily functions. The speech of Craven’s robbers, by contrast, is that of self-conscious British gentlemen worried about the impression that they will make. The criminals no longer express their outsider status through their eccentric sociolect, for in the new version everyone speaks Standard English – the socially homogenising code of the aristocracy and the conformist bourgeoisie.²⁴ At every point, Craven’s bowdlerised translation is marked by a grave concern, utterly alien to Schiller’s original, for taste and decorum. The few times when they try their luck with a pun or joke, Craven’s outlaws fall

on their face. Even Craven's oaths seem awkwardly blunted and colourless in relation to Schiller's. In *The Robbers*, for example, Franz's emphatic curse on his father, 'Feeble bag of bones!' ('Kraftlose Knochen!') becomes merely 'Damnation!'; and Old Moor's response, 'May a Thousand curses follow you' ('Tausend Flüche donnern dir nach!'), shrinks to 'Oh, misery!' (Schiller, p. 50; Craven, p. 37).

IV

J. G. Holman's *The Red-Cross Knights* is a much more ambitious project than Craven's *The Robbers*, and it goes much further in transforming Schiller into a mainstay of British establishment culture and ruling-class ideology. Unlike Craven Holman made his living as a professional actor and dramatist, and his production shows that he was a skilful cultural entrepreneur, who understood the volatile climate of British drama and acknowledged the conflicting demands made upon dramatists during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. Not only has Holman moved Schiller's story to sixteenth-century Spain, changing all the names in the process, and not only has he interspersed the dramatic action with abundant scenes of singing, dancing and clowning by the comic figure Popoli. Holman has also fundamentally altered the relationship between the play's two brothers, thereby purging Schiller's plot of ethical ambivalence, and polarising its characters in a manner that lends it an entirely new meaning.

In *The Red-Cross Knights*, the younger brother Roderic (Franz) still deprives Ferdinand (Karl) of his rightful inheritance by forging calumnies against him, and he still makes unwelcome sexual advances towards the virtuous Eugenia (Amalia). But, as Holman goes out of his way to point out already from the beginning, Roderic is not a legitimate son of Count Ladesma (Count Moor). He is, instead, Roderic de Froila, an illegitimate outsider whom Ladesma adopted after the death of his second wife:

Ferdinand dead, I am the absolute heir of my step-father, Count Ladesma's wealth and power. That was determined on my mother's union with him. Each by a former marriage having a son, the compact was, that on the failure of more issue, Ferdinand and myself were mutual heirs. A contract well stipulated by my prudent mother; as my inheritance is not a twentieth part of the rich lordships of Ladesma.²⁵

Insofar as Holman makes Roderic an adopted rather than a legitimate son, he also assigns him a more traditional, clear-cut villain-role. Where Schiller's Franz understandably feels that he has been overlooked and slighted by his father, Holman's Roderic conforms to the stereotype of the penniless, ambitious, lascivious interloper of obscure lower-class origin. He is a man who has no claims on anybody's emotions, who pretends to a status that he does

not deserve, and who brings corruption into the aristocratic family. Evil, in *The Red-Cross Knights*, does not originate within the beleaguered institutions of church, state and kinship relations, which are themselves pristine and beyond reproach. Rather, evil comes from without, which certainly makes it an all the more demonic and powerful force, but which also makes the malefactor easier to identify, confront and master.

More provocative still, however, are Holman's changes to the character of Karl, Schiller's charismatic and troubling villain-hero, whom the English writer resurrects as an unambiguous hero, a stalwart warrior for church, king and country. In *The Red-Cross Knights*, when Ferdinand discovers that he has been unjustly exiled from his family, he responds not by declaring war on princely tyranny and clerical hypocrisy, but rather by devoting himself wholeheartedly to the battle against the Moslem forces currently invading the country, to effect 'their total expulsion from Spain':

Yes, the wrongs and miseries of Spain shall rouse me from remembrance of my own. My poor Eugenia! one tear to thy loss and thy distress, and now I am all my country's. Come, fellow warriors, hasten to take the sacred vows of chivalry; and when its holy badge adorns your bosoms, the Infidels shall prove we wear the ensigns of Religion's soldiers, not for vain ornament nor empty form; but as the zealous active ministers of Heaven. Be it our glorious duty to redeem our altars from unbelieving impious violators; to release the groaning captive from the gloomy dungeon where he lies, body and mind in shackles. (Holman, pp. 16, 20–21)

Holman redirects Karl's antisocial energies, channelling them in a pro-establishment direction; the forces that Karl's brigands combat are the same forces that Ferdinand's troopers defend. Where Schiller lets Karl proclaim that 'my trade is retribution – vengeance is my calling' ('mein Handwerk ist Wiedervergeltung – Rache ist mein Gewerbe'), and where in Tytler's translation Moor commands his men 'to vindicate the rights of man!', Ferdinand in Homan's version preaches 'loyalty', 'virtue' and the soldier's 'duty' to 'quell an insurrection' against 'a monarch enthroned so firmly in his people's love' (Schiller, p. 71; Tytler, p. 218; Holman, pp. 14, 26). In *The Red-Cross Knights*, conversely, it is not Ferdinand but Roderic, and Roderic's vicious henchman Bertran, who espouse and pursue 'vengeance' (Holman, p. 14).

With his crucial revisionist ploy of converting Karl's robber band into a troop of rank-and-file soldiers, Holman both reflects and augments the national chauvenism, masculinism and militarism that engulfed British public discourse during the 1790s and 1800s. It was precisely at this historical juncture that the nation, embroiled in all-out war on several continents, and confronting an implacable foe in Napoleonic France, found itself in need of heroic role-models. The demand, as Linda Colley explains, was met by the development of a cult of martial heroism enveloping figures like Pitt, Nelson and Wellington,

whose soldierly prowess was celebrated in lavish church-and-king spectacles like the Naval Thanksgiving Day (1797) and the Jubilee Day (1809).²⁶ By setting his play amidst a war of national survival, and by crowding his stage with uniformed knights errant, Holman not only alludes to the preceding years' recurrent invasion scares, but also seeks to capture and exploit the British public's enthusiasm for warfare and warlike deeds. The play's consistently aggressive and belligerent tone is perhaps best summed up by the crusaders' chorus, at the end of the first act:

To arms, to arms! each breast inspiring;
Glory leads us to the field:
Our country calls, our aid requiring,
'Gainst Pagan foes the sword to wield.
The righteous cause by Heaven is bless'd,
Hallow'd the arm that shields th' oppress'd.
The Red Cross let our symbol be,
And Victory crown our Chivalry (Holman, p. 21)

Whereas Moor burns down an entire village to release one captured confederate from churchmen and magistrates, Ferdinand, acting very much like an upright defender of hearth and home, goes on to deliver a Christian town from heathen bondage, which earns him profuse expressions of gratitude from a band of captured Spanish women. Afterwards, Ferdinand cogently chooses not simply to invest the injured with the power of their oppressors, and he delivers a Burke-inspired speech on the dangers of sudden social upheavals and the necessity of curbing the tyranny of unbounded 'Will':

Slaves who have burst their bonds, and seized on power, prove the worst of tyrants. And in the preference of wretchedness, he would be wise who rather chose to be enrolled the slave of the most lordly ruler of the East, than bear the mockery of a freeman's name where slaves are become rulers. No! there alone is happiness where Law is supreme, not Will. Will uncontrolled, even if prone to goodness, is clogged with Nature's passions and infirmities; Law speaks the dictates of unclouded Reason; and there only Justice dwells, where those who deal the law are subject to the law. (Holman, pp. 38–39)

Ferdinand's magisterial mien in re-establishing social hierarchies clearly betrays the influence of the counter-revolutionary rhetoric upon Holman's play, as does the hero's penchant for invoking allegorical absolutes like 'Law', 'Will', 'Reason' and 'Justice'. Thus, by re-imagining Karl Moor as a vigilant servant of the state, fighting to safeguard authority and uphold the rule of law, Holman moves his characters and audience away from the corrosive doubt and disruptive violence that dominated pre-revolutionary and revolutionary writing, instead steering them toward a new conception of national culture as constituting a unified front against the enemy.

Vanished from *The Red-Cross Knights* are even the last remnants of Karl Moor's irreligion, anti-authoritarianism and lawlessness. Most importantly, where Schiller critiques the patriarchal family, by representing a weak and fallible father, Holman painstakingly seeks to exonerate the very same institution and de-legitimise alternative forms of social organisation, such as the republican band of brothers. As one might expect, *The Red-Cross Knights* ends not tragically, with every major character either dead or imprisoned, but happily, with virtue rewarded and order restored. Holman unlike Schiller lets Count Ladesma survive the shock of re-encountering the prodigal son whom he believes dead, and this swerve more than anything else clarifies his wish to rehabilitate fatherhood and reconsecrate traditional forms of familial power. With the marriage of Ferdinand and Eugenia, moreover, the thwarted sexual desire that erupts at crucial points in Schiller's narrative is neatly (re-)contained within matrimonial bonds. The end of the play restores the traditional community, based on family ties and heterosexual, conjugal love, which Roderic and the Moors had threatened to demolish, and the subversive traces of sexual and materialistic passion engendered in the process seem almost to vanish in midst of this pastoral harmony. Roderic's machinations and the Moorish insurrection, the play argues, were not symptoms of an irresistible apocalypse shaking the foundations of the social fabric, but merely temporary aberrations, minor disturbances of a timeless moral structure grounded in sound family values and paternalistic authority:

Ladesma. My Ferdinand alive! Oh extasy! Come, my children – Here, Ferdinand, thy hand – and thine, Eugenia. Such happiness I never looked for in this life. Here let me bless your union, and for ever.

Ferdinand. (*To his troop.*) Ye dear companions of my toils, and instruments of my happiness, I know my joy has kindled transport in your friendly bosoms. By encountering danger for my country's happiness, I have attained my own. Thus Heaven ever blesses those who seek the bliss of others. (Holman, p. 68)

Once the barbarians have been cast out, and once the illegitimate intruder has been handed over to the police, then Count Ladesma can resume control of his possessions, and then he can bestow his blessings on the union of Ferdinand and Eugenia, who in turn are free to devote themselves to 'domestic happiness' (Holman, p. 5).

From European to English, Gothic to Classical, revolutionary to conservative: the transvaluation of values carried out by *The Red-Cross Knights* could hardly be any more complete. Holman even appears to thematise his strategy of simulation, when he has his hero Ferdinand disguise himself 'in Moorish vestments' to gain access to his father's castle. 'To combat villainy,' Ferdinand states on his own and perhaps his creator's behalf, 'tis sometimes needful that honesty should use the villain's weapon – cunning' (Holman, p. 45). The

appropriate generic designation for this cunning play, no doubt, is melodrama, which a number of critics have singled out as the dominant theatrical genre of post-revolutionary Britain. 'Like the Gothic novel and drama, and like the oratory of the revolutionary period, melodrama 'registers the final liquidation of the traditional Sacred and its representative institutions (Church and Monarch), the shattering of the myth of Christendom, the dissolution of an organic and hierarchically cohesive society, and the invalidation of the literary forms [...] that depended on such a society. But melodrama also resolves the anxiety over the collapse of traditional values by replaying again and again the re-sacralising triumph of virtue over villainy, thereby demonstrating that it is still possible to 'move toward a clear nomination of the moral universe'.²⁷ Melodrama thus perpetuates the submission of individual and collective desire to destiny; patriarchal power is challenged only to be resuscitated in strengthened and purified form, both in the familial microcosm and the national macrocosm. *The Red-Cross Knights*' formulation of a regressive family politics, to be sure, is far from irrelevant to the larger political issues that the play also raises, for during this period ideological conflicts were often conceptualised as struggles between parents, sons and brothers, and conservative writers frequently wielded the ideal of domesticity to envision the perfectly harmonious state.²⁸ The play's denouement leaves Count Ladesma more firmly in command of his domain than ever, and the song-and-dance routines of *The Red-Cross Knights* virtually swell with loyalist and royalist fervour – even more so than the very similar scenes which Richard Brinsley Sheridan incorporated into *Pizarro* (1799), his wildly successful reworking of August von Kotzebue's *Die Spanier in Peru* (1796).²⁹ Indeed, just as one may easily recognise Ferdinand's stirring battle cry against 'infidels' and 'unbelieving impious violators' as an allusion to Britain's military confrontation with the atheist armies of its current Continental enemy, so it is tempting to interpret the play's consistent celebration of the noble Spanish King Alphonso as a veiled reference to George III, the British nation's collective 'Father'. Furthermore, the patriotic connotations of Holman's title, with its inevitable echoes of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* and the chivalric cult of St. George, are surely no coincidence, for Holman consistently plays on the double meaning of the red cross, a symbol both of Christianity and English nationhood. Contributing to English empire-building and the ideological warfare against France and its allies, Holman deconstructs Schiller's drama by restructuring it along a set of binary oppositions – native and foreign, Christian and heathen, legitimate and illegitimate – perfectly consistent with the relentlessly Manichean worldview of British wartime nationalism.

V

Romantic literature has commonly been celebrated for its privileging of originality, creativity and spontaneity, but writers during this age of paradoxes also

increasingly resorted to translation and adaptation in order to fashion a career for themselves. One may cite several examples of translated non-English poems (like Gottfried August Bürger's *Lenore*) or novels (like Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *La Nouvelle Héloïse*) that substantially influenced the development of British Romantic discourse, but the impact of translation was especially powerful within the area we now label 'Romantic drama', rendering it an area 'of multiculturalism, not chauveinism'.³⁰ That said, Romantic translators did not always passively absorb foreign ideas into English, for translation often had the exact opposite function. The task of the translator, in this period, frequently cannot be separated from that of the expurgator. Trafficking in secondary representations and intertextual mimicry, Craven's and Holman illustrate how translation could be used, and was used, to effect the dispersal and evacuation of oppositional writing in Romantic Britain. To summarise, Schiller figures the feverish paroxysms, both erotic and ideological, of the body politic during the age of democratic revolution, whilst his English translators exert themselves to arrest the dissemination of tendentious fictions, and to promote the consumption of more benign cultural forms. Considered in its own right, these playwrights realised, European sensationalism may have been alarming, unsound, perhaps even degenerate: it directly or suggestively challenged reigning aesthetic, social and political orders. But if foreign writers' dangerously antinomian plots, characters, figures and conventions were redefined and reinvested, dressed in new clothes suitable for a different country and a new age, they could still be made subservient to the reconstruction of Britain along the lines of Burke's and Pitt's legitimist programme.

It may come as a surprise, given the observations that I have made so far, that Craven's version of *Die Räuber* was not welcomed by the critical establishment, and that the play was widely perceived as still falling somewhat short of the ideological consistency which was its declared aim. Ultimately, Craven could not convince his audience that *The Robbers* would serve as a politically and morally innocuous antidote to the diseased French and German drama. According to the *Morning Chronicle*, 'the Democratic points of this heavy play' are 'mostly cut out, but the tendency remains'. Other journalists expressed similar grave doubts about the play's moral effects. The *Morning Post and Gazetteer*, for example, cautioned its readers to 'take care of their pockets' when attending a performance at the Cravens' theatre.³¹ The influential moralist Hannah More, likewise, was not to be mollified by Craven's efforts. In her *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education* (1799), More notes with considerable dismay, and with clear reference to the unsavoury proceedings at Brandenburgh House, that Schiller's tragedy, which the English censor John Larpent had permanently banned from the scenes of the Theatres Royal, has nevertheless been smuggled onto the stage, and is currently being performed clandestinely in private aristocratic theatres very much like the makeshift playhouse that Thomas Bertram and John Yates construct in Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park* (1814).³²

It is surely even more puzzling that Holman's musical extravaganza, which was performed eight times in August and September 1799 at the Haymarket Theatre, once again failed to strike a chord with those contemporary critics who were otherwise clamouring for the very kind of salubrious entertainment which *The Red-Cross Knights* represents. On its first appearance, *The Red-Cross Knights* drew nothing but disapproving and even hostile reviews. Both the *Critical Review* and the *European Magazine* find that Holman's alterations, instead of giving new life and vigour to *Die Räuber*, deprived it of what interest it possessed.³³ The *Monthly Review* likewise calls Holman's play an 'insipid' example of 'the little benefit which our language derives from the Teutonic stage'.³⁴ The *Lady's Monthly Magazine* more forcefully describes *The Red-Cross Knights* as an incoherent and unattractive 'mélange of dialogue, decoration, scenery, and music'.³⁵ And even a writer for the staunchly High-Church *British Critic*, in an otherwise generally positive review-essay, wonders whether Holman's changes would be enough to give readers and viewers 'satisfaction [...] without danger to morals'.³⁶

Critics of Craven and Holman were remarkably sceptical about the attempt to alter outlandish plays by blue-pencilling their language re-tailoring their plots, and about the effect that this creative sabotage might have on a volatile, uneducated audience. Why did reviewers demanding theatrical reform fail to applaud plays expressly written, as Coleridge later put it, to facilitate the 'redemption of the British stage not only from horses, dogs, elephants, and the like zoological rarities, but also from the more pernicious barbarisms and Kotzebuisms in morals and taste', by 'exterminating the speaking monsters imported from the banks of the Danube'?³⁷ It may be, of course, that Craven and Holman simply underestimated the deterring power of the name 'Schiller' and the phrase 'German literature'. The mere admission that a play was somehow 'translated and altered from the German', that is, may have sufficed to cloud the critics' judgement and eliminate the possibility of a balanced reception. Still, we should not rule out the possibility that the lukewarm reception of Craven's and Holman's revisionist drama does more than illustrate the paranoiac perversity and unpredictability of turn-of-the-century British reviewers. Addressing a fundamental ambivalence that haunts several British Schiller-translators, in other words, the reviews may raise unresolved issues pertaining not only to Craven's *The Robbers* and Holman's *The Red-Cross Knights*, but to the very project of creating an anti-Jacobin drama by basing it on English, French or German plays of a previous generation.

There is, after all, something inescapably paradoxical in the attempt to efface popular representations with secondary substitutes, for appropriation is also, and cannot avoid being, a form of reinscription, which brings the original to consciousness. Romantic drama's anti-German plays remain predicated on, and hence inescapably indebted to, the foreign. Or, as John Barrell puts it, using the same medical vocabulary that many reviewers also favoured, '[t]he process of inoculation involves simultaneously protecting someone against a

disease and infecting them with it, and the troubling ambiguity of this process is often visible in the very language in which it is described' (p. 16). From this perspective, the severest limitation of Craven's and Holman's dramas, and of most if not all other *Die Räuber*-translations, derives not from the plays' moral content or ideological message, but rather from their subject matter. Although *The Robbers* and *The Red-Cross Knights* are no longer plays *advocating* revolution, they of course remain plays *about* revolution, and therefore they never become entirely safe. Even if they write from antithetical positions, after all, Schiller, Craven and Holman all respond to the same political questions and the same conflictual social reality, and in the reviews this shared reference-point comes to overshadow the differences that otherwise divide these playwrights into opposing camps. Insofar as Craven and Holman share Schiller's concern with militant acts of rebellion, invasion and usurpation, *The Robbers* and *The Red-Cross Knight* almost cannot but evoke the transgressive play which precedes them, and on which they are based. A perverse or merely strong-willed reader – the young William Hazlitt, for example – could still easily choose to read these plays against the grain, as instances of the Jacobin rather than the anti-Jacobin drama.³⁸ As the critics seem to have suspected, and as reader-reactions also documented, British playwrights unwittingly testify to the recalcitrant power of the same texts that they seek to displace, if only by the sheer act of choosing these plays for translation. Notwithstanding all efforts to prune, alter and redistribute, 'the tendency remains'.

Notes

1 Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Late Eighteenth-century Drama 1750–1800* (Cambridge, 1927), pp. 56–73.

2 Jeffrey N. Cox, 'Ideology and Genre in the British Anti-revolutionary Drama of the 1790s', *ELH*, 58 (1991), 579–610.

3 See Walter Sellier, *Kotzebue in England: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der englischen Bühne und der Beziehungen der deutschen Litteratur zur englischen* (Leipzig, 1902). On any given night between October 1798 and February 1800, Michael Gamer calculates, 'it was more likely than not that one the two major playhouses in London would perform a play by Kotzebue, and it was six times more likely that they would perform a play by Kotzebue than one by Shakespeare', Michael Gamer 'National Supernaturalism: Joanna Baillie, Germany, and the Gothic Drama', *Theatre Survey*, 38 (1997), 49–88 (p. 70).

4 For influential accounts see especially Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and the English Romantic Imagination* (Oxford, 1986) and Stuart Curran, *Poetic Form and British Romanticism* (Oxford, 1986).

5 Theodore Grieder, 'The German Drama in England, 1790–1800', *Restoration and 18th-Century Theatre Research*, 3 (1964), 39–50 (p. 39).

6 See Marilyn Butler, *Jane Austen and the War of Ideas* (Oxford, 1975) and David Simpson, *Romanticism, Nationalism, and the Revolt Against Theory* (Chicago, 1993).

7 William Preston, 'Reflections on the Peculiarities of Style and Manner in the late German Writers, whose Works have appeared in English; and on the Tendency of their Productions', *Edinburgh Magazine*, 20 (1802), 353–61, 406–08; 21 (1802), pp. 9–18, 89–96 (pp. 90, 93).

8 See Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, ed. by Conor Cruise O'Brien (London, 1969).

9 John Wilson Croker, *Familiar Epistles* (Dublin, 1804), p. 27 (ll. 21–34).

10 Wordsworth, 'Preface' to *Lyrical Ballads* (1800), in *The Prose Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. by W. J. B. Owen and Jane W. Smyser, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1974), I, p. 130.

11 *The Letters of Sir Walter Scott*, ed. by H. J. C. Grierson, 12 vols. (London, 1932), I, p. 24.

12 James Walker, 'The Literati and Literature of Germany', *Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine*, 5 (1800), 568–80 (p. 568).

13 Thomas Carlyle, *The Life of Friedrich Schiller*, in *The Works of Thomas Carlyle*, 30 vols. (London, 1896–99), XXV, p. 13.

14 Butler, *Jane Austen*, p. 116; Terence Hoagwood, 'Prolegomenon for a Theory of Romantic Drama', *The Wordsworth Circle*, 23 (1992), 49–64 (p. 54).

15 See Renée Lelièvre, 'Le Théâtre Allemand en France', *Revue de Littérature Comparée*, 48 (1974), 256–92 and Reeve Parker, "'In Some Sort Seeing With My Proper Eyes": Wordsworth and the Spectacles of Paris', *Studies in Romanticism*, 27 (1988), 369–90.

16 For accounts of Schiller's and *The Robbers*'s reception, popularity, and notoriety in England, see Frederic Ewen, *The Prestige of Schiller in England, 1788–1859* (New York, 1932); Margaret W. Cooke, 'Schiller's *Robbers* in England', *Modern Language Review*, 11 (1915), 156–72; L. A. Willoughby, 'English Translations and Adaptations of Schiller's *The Robbers*', *Modern Language Review*, 27 (1921), 297–315; and Douglas Millburn, Jr., 'The First English Translation of *Die Räuber*: French Bards and Scottish Translators', *Monatshefte*, 59 (1967), 41–53.

17 For the concept and process of literary 'inoculation', see John Barrell, *The Infection of Thomas De Quincey: A Psychopathology of Imperialism* (New Haven, 1991), p. 16.

18 Henry Mackenzie, 'Account of the German Theatre', *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, 2 (1790), 154–92 (p. 190).

19 Schiller, *The Robbers*, trans. by Alexander F. Tytler, second ed. (London, 1795), p. v.

20 Keppel Craven, *The Robbers, A Tragedy in Five Acts. Translated and Altered from the German. As it was Performed at Brandenburg-House Theatre* (London 1799), p. 3–4. The prologue was written by Craven's mother Elizabeth, also known as Her Serene Highness the Margravine of Anspach.

21 Friedrich Schiller, *Die Räuber: Ein Schauspiel*, ed. by Herbert Stubenrauch, Nationalausgabe (Weimar, 1953), p. 70.

22 Friedrich Schiller, *The Robbers*, trans. by F. J. Lamport (London, 1979), pp. 89–90.

23 Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. by Hélène Iswolsky (Bloomington, 1984).

24 For an astute analysis of the ideological underpinnings of Standard English, see Olivia Smith, *The Politics of Language 1791–1819* (Oxford, 1984).

25 Joseph George Holman, *The Red-Cross Knights. A Play [...] Founded on the Robbers of Schiller* (London, 1799), p. 6.

26 Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837* (New Haven, 1992), pp. 283–319.

27 Peter Brooks, *The Melodramatic Imagination: Balzac, Henry James, Melodrama, and the Mode of Excess* (New Haven, 1976), p. 15. Brooks's is the seminal account of melodrama, but see also the contributions to *Melodrama: The Cultural Emergence of a Genre*, ed. by Michael Hays and Anastasia Nikoloupolou (London, 1996).

- 28 Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley, 1992).
- 29 See Pizarro; *A Tragedy, in Five Acts; As Performed at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane: Taken from the German drama of Kotzebue; and Adapted to the English stage by Richard Brinsley Sheridan* (London, 1799).
- 30 Gillian Russell, 'Theatre', *An Oxford Companion to the Romantic Age: British Culture 1776–1832*, gen. ed. Iain McCalman (Oxford, 1999), 223–31 (p. 229).
- 31 Quoted in Willoughby, 'English Translations', p. 304.
- 32 '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!*' Hannah More, *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education* (London 1799), p. 42.
- 33 *Critical Review*, 2nd ser. 27 (1799), 472–74; *European Magazine*, 36 (1799), 187–89.
- 34 *Monthly Review*, n. s. 32 (1800), 322–23 (p. 322).
- 35 *Lady's Monthly Museum*, 3 (1799), 309–10 (p. 310).
- 36 *British Critic*, 14 (1799), p. 669.
- 37 Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, ed. James Engell and W. Jackson Bate, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1983), II, p. 208.
- 38 For Hazlitt's comments on *The Robbers*, see *Lectures on the Age of Elizabeth* (1818), in *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, ed. by P. P. Howe, 21 vols. (London, 1932), VI, pp. 362–63.

Address for Correspondence

Peter Mortensen, Department of English, Aarhus University, 800 Aarhus C, Denmark,
e-mail: engpm@hum.au.dk