

GERMAN TRIVIAL DRAMA OF THE LAST THIRD OF THE 18TH CENTURY

Arkadii N. MAKAROV
Vyatka State University, Russia

Oleg Yu. POLYAKOV
Vyatka State University, Russia

Olga A. POLYAKOVA
Vyatka State University, Russia

Irina A. TYUTYUNNIK
Vyatka State University, Russia

Svetlana I. TYUTYUNNIK
Vyatka State University, Russia

ABSTRACT

The paper is concerned with the works of F. L. Schroeder, A. W. Iffland, and A. von Kotzebue, the most prominent representatives of German trivial drama of the last third of the eighteenth century. F. L. Schroeder and A. W. Iffland were successful actors and playwrights, and none of the stage authors of the period could compete in popularity with A. von Kotzebue whose plays were staged in Germany for many decades. F. L. Schroeder and A. W. Iffland knew very well the problems of the national theatre. Their plays, which exposed the problems of German life of the second half of the eighteenth century, did not fail to meet the demands of the audience.

Keywords: German literature of the 18th century, trivial drama of the last third of the eighteenth century, German theatre of the 18th century, F. L. Schroeder, A. W. Iffland, A. von Kotzebue.

INTRODUCTION

The development of “high” and trivial literature in Germany in the last third of the eighteenth century reflected the evolution of the national culture of the period. Contradictions of social life resulted in opposing the ideal and the real which were to become antagonists in the Romantic epoch. In the 1770-1790s, the search of the prominent men of letters was leading them to the realm of “spirit”, to speculative ethical and aesthetic conceptions. The systems of the late Kant and Hegel were based on the ideas of Herder who emphasized the diversity of artistic manifestations of man (including different folks). In this aspect, Goethe’s concern with cultures of various peoples is rather instructive. In a talk with Eckermann (3 December 1824), Goethe advised his secretary to read everything if he wanted to form an objective opinion about modern literature (Eckermann, 1981). K.-H. Klingenberg justly notes in “Iffland and Schröder as Dramatic Writers” (“Iffland und Schroeder als Dramatiker”), that this remark, made by Goethe, is of interest for two reasons. Firstly, Goethe implied that both trivial and “high” authors’ works are worth reading, and, secondly, that one should consider the existence of different literary groups whose works must be evaluated differently (Klingenberg, 1962: 9). According to Goethe, literature includes not only outstanding texts.

Social changes in 18 c. Germany led to a gradual evolution of literary conceptions. The lower social stratum was becoming much more significant due to a dramatic increase in general literacy. In this sense, both theatre and literature were influenced by two traditions, “high” (“learned”) and folk (“trivial”), which had existed in art for a long time. “Learned” literature, being a sophisticated phenomenon, did not appeal to common readers. That is why in the second half of the eighteenth-century lower literature started to compensate for a discrepancy between the general spread of literacy and the inability of the major part of the population to comprehend complicated problems of reality.

REFERENCES REVIEW

At the end of the eighteenth century, “high” and trivial varieties of literature had almost equal impact on German culture, and later trivial literature started to prevail. Yu. M. Lotman, commenting on the principles of functioning of different systems, justly noted that “the given information (contents) cannot exist or be rendered outside the given structure” (Lotman, 1970: 17). In our case (if we turn to Goethe’s idea articulated in his conversation with Eckermann) it means the relevancy and the necessity of studying both varieties of literature, which enables a researcher to comprehend the dialectics of development and strengthening of trivial literature, its evolution from imitating West European models (in Schroeder’s works) to creating relatively independent and original specimens of artistic elaboration of the national problems (Iffland & Kotzebue).

One of the sources of trivial literature was urban culture which influenced characterization most of all: thus, it shaped the protagonist who was depicted as an honest, just, brave and clever man (Hoffmeier, 1955: 29). In the trivial drama, a city dweller (burger) becomes an ideal character formed under the influence of the Enlightenment ideology. While in the first half of the century neither Gottsched nor Klopstock commented on trivial pieces, in the 1770-1790s the situation drastically changed. Thus, Schiller, following literary fashion, created “Der Geisterseher” (“The Ghost-Seer”), and Goethe, influenced by the widely spread trivial works, wrote “Stella” and other works of the kind. This concern with genres which were not ranked high in the hierarchy of literary kinds, confirms our thesis about the changes in the literary process of the epoch.

On the one hand, it is evident that works of the two studied streams of literature tended to get closer and, on the other hand, they were distinctly different. The prominent men of letters paid attention to the works of their second-rank contemporaries; it was not impossible for an outstanding writer to be an author (a co-author) of a trivial piece. Neither Klopstock nor Lessing could have imagined such poetic freedom, as hierarchy of genres had been a major principle of art in their epoch. In Goethe’s time it started to be questioned but still it was rather authoritative. Gradual destruction of literary borders was influenced by both “high” and trivial literature (Wellershoff, 1983). The latter reflected the general cultural strive after overcoming all obstacles a person could confront. A concern with private sphere was evident in the object of artistic portrayal (a family) and genre properties of the works of art.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

The shift from “high” to trivial culture produced a great impact on German drama whose leaders were not only Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, Wieland, and Herder, but also Schroeder, Iffland, and Kotzebue. The last three authors were “lords of the minds” of theatre goers. More than that, Iffland and Schroeder, besides being prominent playwrights, were gifted actors.

Statistical data show that in German theatre of the late eighteenth – early nineteenth century no playwright could compete with Kotzebue. For instance, in Weimar theatre, directed by Goethe, there were staged 87 plays by Kotzebue in 1791-1817 (and 19 Goethe’s works). In Mannheim, his plays were put up 1487 times in 1779-1839 (Hoffmann, 1939). Besides, Kotzebue’s journal “Der Freymuethige oder Berlinische Zeitung fuer gebildete, unbefangene Leser”, 1803–1806) was considered one of the most important German periodicals (History of German literature, 1985; History of German literature, 1986).

Analysing Kotzebue’s dramatic works which enjoyed unprecedented success, one should bear in mind that their great influence on the minds of his contemporaries can be explained not only by the author’s simplification of significant domestic and foreign problems (straightforward trivialization) but, first of all, by his ability to move the audience.

Among the representatives of the trivial theatre were Iffland and Schroeder whose talents and popularity enabled them to try to renew the repertoire, to create dramatic works which were consonant with the “spirit of the age”. F. L. Schroeder (1744-1816), who was the prototype of Serlo in Goethe’s “Wilhelm Meister”, considered it necessary for a playwright to be responsive to the tastes of the

audience. Lessing's reform, ventured in Hamburg, was not successful for several reasons (the spectators' habits, the actors' ambitions, the unwillingness of the theatre owners to make changes, etc.). And Schroeder, to escape failures, tried to adapt his art to the taste of his time (Goethe, 1971, book 13), (Litzmann, 1894). On the one hand, it was a tragedy for him, and on the other, it was an attempt to find an adequate stage embodiment of his theatrical conception aimed at combining the needs of art with popular demands.

The works of Schroeder, Iffland, and Kotzebue complied with the artistic standards of the second half of the eighteenth century which included integrity, poetic freedom, originality, taste, etc. Dramatic art of this period is uneven, it includes both plays of considerable artistic merits (Lessing's "Minna von Barnhelm" - "Minna of Barnhelm", and "Nathan der Weise" - "Nathan the Wise", plays by Goethe, Klingler, Lenz) and works of trivial authors, Iffland, Schroeder, Kotzebue, and others.

It is important to mark two essential points of difference between the two groups of writers, the two traits which would distinguish the genuine masters of drama from their second-rank colleagues a decade later: the masters' ability to portray individual characters and their talent organically to combine the general and the particular without exposing the author's intentionality in the sphere of characters and action. Writers of all groups and trends strived to create original works which could meet the demand of good taste. As for the criteria of measure and artistic freedom, they followed different ways or, to be more exact, they interpreted these notions differently. Some of them tried to achieve originality by the neglect of rules. Others also strived to create original pieces, but they tended to use conventional means elaborated by more talented authors whose concern was to keep form and contents in harmony.

Schroeder was aware that theatre, being dependent on the devoted audience, had to regard current literary and political contexts, trends of public consciousness, which could not but affect individual freedom of a playwright. In spite of these limitations, Schroeder made good achievement. F. Matthisson called him "German Garrick" (Matthisson Fr. von., 1810-1816: 313).

For German audience, Schroeder was an actor and playwright akin to Shakespeare. According to Matthisson, Shakespeare and Schroeder show the depth of human character (Matthisson Fr. von., 1810-1816: 315). Indeed, plays, written in the manner of Shakespeare, as it was justly noted by critics, imitated only formal traits of the Elizabethan's works (see: Lessing on Goethe), but they contributed much to the development of German theatre as they made feeling an object of deep dramatic concern. This focus on emotivism led to exaggerations, overemphasis on the affective side of dramatic pieces (for instance, in Klingler's plays). As a result, there appeared more "serene" plays which tended to the "gold mean", a kind of a balance. Their characters do not have to overcome social obstacles.

Political issues were conscientiously subdued in such plays. Schroeder, who knew very well the political situation all over Europe, was concerned not only with the performances of Shakespeare's works. He was aware that the society expected German theatre to mirror the most urgent problems of the epoch. Schroeder was to solve a dilemma: whether to take risk and put up actual plays (he was conscious of the necessity of staging them) or to create such pieces, including adaptations of well-known plots, which would contain implicit social information (Tronskaya, 1963: 317). The heroes of his plays are burgers who achieve success by following high moral principles and being thrifty ("The Will", 1781; "The Ring", 1783; "The Portrait of the Mother", 1785, etc.) (Tronskaya, 1963: 318).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Schroeder and other trivial playwrights knew very well the limits of what they could do. Though their stage talents enabled them to play naturally, realistically, the maximum affinity with life in the plane of dramatic content might end in punishment (Schubart's fate was a warning for them). Schroeder was unlikely to take such risk. Even the geni of the epoch tended to portray actual problems abstractly or to show their happy solution.

One of the most famous plays by Schroeder is “Das Portraet der Mutter; oder Die Privatkomoedie” (“The Portrait of the Mother; or A Private Comedy”) (Schroeder, 1786). The scholars consider it his typical work (Hoffmann, 1939), (Lukov, 1985). This comedy is an unsophisticated specimen of Schroeder’s art, describing a theft, blackmailing, justification and bliss. Its plot is simple: the son, blackmailed by his enemies, leaves his house and, many years later, comes back and rehabilitates himself. The villains are exposed but forgiven. All lost things are found, including the most important one, the portrait of the mother, for the disappearance of which the father had ordered his son out of the house. The conflict, based on a mistake, is happily resolved, which evokes general pleasure. Schroeder’s comedy is an artificial work which reminds us of the oblique world of neo-classicism. Its characters are the bearers of generalized human traits, reflecting the traditions of German “learned theatre” of the first half of the eighteenth century.

Schroeder’s plays gained popularity due to realism of the characters. His personages are ordinary people with their common habits and flaws (like counselor Waker). The virtues of a German family help them to resist worldly temptations and sins, although the family home does not protect a man from suffering. The family hearth is the beginning and the end of the action. It throws the protagonist out into the world, but it also saves him from injustice. “Oh, my home, home! The place where I have not enjoyed a single happy moment – shall I ever find peace and joy here?”, asks Rekau, the hero of “The Portrait of the Mother”. He wants to come back home, but he is hesitant about confiding to his father. A set of circumstances enables him to reveal the intrigues and regain his father’s love.

The father, counselor Waker, is not a mean man. But he is so much fond of theatre that he fails to discriminate between the stage and real life and, consequently, takes the confessions of two villains, who were plotting against his son, for a continuation of the performance. The play ends in the triumph of reconciliation and forgiveness, which was a distinctive trait not only of comedy as a genre, but of Schroeder’s epoch as well, which was characterized by a strong belief in humanity and the man’s ability to defeat evil. In Schroeder’s comedies, absolutely faultless characters tend to forgiveness.

Schroeder’s fame did not eclipse that of A. W. Iffland (1759-1814), who was, together with Eckhof and Schroeder, among the most popular actors of his time (Kuerschner, 1881: 6). It was Iffland who hugely raised the prestige of the actor’s profession. His theatrical conception was formed under the influence of French neo-classical traditions. According to Iffland, theatre must be “a school of wisdom and nice feeling” (Kuerschner, 1881: 6). Iffland’s works are distinguished by accuracy of characterization (Kuerschner, 1881: 11) and strong didactic load supported by truthful dramatic representation, convincing actors’ play which did not fail to produce a strong impression on the audience.

It must be added that “domestic drama which flourished then in German and Austrian theatres, made the actor’s skills more significant than it was in France” (Polyakova, 1987: 225). The demands of the Enlightenment realism were associated with the traits of domestic drama, such as concern with details and depiction of a man in his habitual environment. Maybe, these features were a factor which contributed to the expansion of trivial theatre and trivial literature.

Iffland’s works, viewed in the context of German literature of the last third of the eighteenth century, may be regarded as pieces seemingly belonging to Sturmiers tradition (Wagner and Lenz) which was connected with staging sharp domestic conflicts revealing the tragedy of human existence (Silman, 1936: 423). Iffland’s protagonist became less pathetic, and the bright, unusual world of Shakespeare or Sturmiers was replaced by the sphere of everyday life (Silman, 1936: 425). The spatial dimension of drama had degraded from the sphere of the whole world to the limited area of a flat. T.I. Silman called Iffland’s genre “the flat tragedy” (Silman 1936, p.318). “The airy images of “Sturm und Drang” (“Storm and Stress”) got a solid realistic basis at last. They “launched” on the provincial soil of Germany, thus denouncing the necessity of imitating Spanish adventures or staging sham versions of Rousseau. Iffland’s rather successful usage of Shakespeare’s tradition is the best characteristic of the potential and the further progress of German bourgeois realism” (Silman, 1936: 415). T.I. Silman

marks the degradation of “high concerns” in the works of the playwright, which was quite natural, because German reality of that time did not beget bright, outstanding characters. It was only in the character of Goethe’s *Goetz* that all-German problems were reflected (later they appeared in *Babo’s* and *Gemmingen’s* works). Thus, Iffland created personages which were in agreement with public concerns and current literary and theatrical trends.

The playwright demanded that the actors’ play should be true to life, which ran counter to Goethe’s neo-classical ideal of the Weimar period. For Iffland, “play” was unacceptable in theatre: the actors were to show real life (Tronskaya, 1963: 318).

Iffland’s goal is instruction, but his plays, unlike the works of outstanding authors, teach too straightforwardly. His characters are non-heroic. Their conventionality reflects the condition of his time. Iffland’s oeuvre, like that of Schroeder, mirrors his epoch by means of burger’s (i.e., higher) drama, rather than domestic one. H. Holstein called Iffland the most sincere depicter of life, maximally close to reality. In his memoirs “Ueber meine theatralische Laufbahn” (“On My Theatrical Career”, 1798), Iffland traced the development of German theatre and recollected the words of G.K. Eckhof, one of the most prominent actors of the older generation, who was wary about Shakespeare’s excessive influence on German stage (Iffland, 1886: 38). Eckhof was convinced that the English playwright’s works were dangerous as they were “too strong” for German audience and might “spoil” German actors who, in his opinion, did not need to play. It was enough for them to pronounce Shakespeare’s bright texts. The Elizabethan’s plays corrupted the stage because they let actors take their art carelessly. Shakespeare’s plays and chivalrous dramas, Eckhof noted, weaned the actor off acting, living on stage. In his opinion, the traditional repertoire was devoid of human feeling which concerned the audience of the 1770s very much.

Iffland strived to equalize dramatic representation of reality with the truth of life. He wanted to work in the “natural” theatre whose analogues he did not see in France or Italy (Iffland 1886, pp. 41, 42). Iffland’s realism, like Lessing’s and Sturm’s programmes, is directed against artificiality of French theatre. Iffland, so highly appreciated by German enlighteners, was struggling for German national theatre. Like Schroeder, he was determined to write plays based on familiar and understandable subjects. From his point of view, it would lead not to primitivism but to the involvement of the nation in the sublime and important ideas of his time.

The requirement for the dramatic art to be plain and comprehensible, in his opinion, was essential for the development of German stage, for fostering the spectators’ taste. It was natural that Iffland turned to the part of Franz Moor. Playing it, he succeeded in presenting the evolution and complexity of a human character. L.-S. Mercier, who visited Mannheim and saw a performance of this play, admired Iffland’s convincing acting (Iffland, 1910: 76).

Iffland played successfully different parts (F. Moor and *King Lear*), striving to present the variety of manifestations of the human personality. The importance of his plays and the influence of his authority as an actor were considerable. It is quite natural that his play opened Weimar theatre on 8 November 1787. Schroeder and Iffland gained general popularity and enjoyed respect of the connoisseurs of art (Holstein, 1886: XL).

Iffland’s, as well as Schroeder’s, aesthetic views were influenced by several sources: “Du théâtre ou Nouvel essai sur l’art dramatique” (“The Theatre, or The New Essay on Dramatic Art”) by Mercier, “Hamburgische Dramaturgie” (“Hamburg Dramaturgy”) by Lessing and “Mannheimer Dramaturgie” (“Mannheim Dramaturgy”) by Gemmingen (Klingenberg, 1962: 43).

The most successful plays of Iffland, “*Verbrechen aus Ehrsucht*” (“The Crime Of Vanity”, 1784), “*Die Jäger*” (“The Hunters”, 1785) and “*Die Hagestolzen*” (“The Bachelors”, 1791), were enthusiastically received by the audience and brought good income to the company. The ticket prices were available for lower-class audience. Iffland’s highest grossing works could successfully compete

with the plays of the most famous authors (for example, Kotzebue). In Iffland's correspondence one can distinctly trace his influence on the dramatic conceptions of his contemporaries (Iffland, 1910: 15, Stern, 1888; Tronskaya, 1963). The actor defined the main directions of the playwrights' activities. It is curious that it was not Iffland who turned to his addressees for recommendations, but his more talented correspondents (Goethe, Schiller, Kleist) asked him for a competent advice.

Without belittling the genius of the great masters, we must note their dependence on Iffland's professional knowledge and skills, his ability subtly to instruct authors how to write plays fitting the needs of the theatre and the demands of the audience. Here we can speak again about "triviality" as an element of German cultural life of the last third of the eighteenth century, as there was an urgent necessity for the masters of drama to take into consideration the current political situation (Iffland 1910: 26). Thus, in his letter of 10 February 1799 Iffland states: in a military state, one must be careful when speaking about war affairs (Iffland, 1910: 26).

On the one hand, Iffland points out what the spectator may be interested in, and, on the other hand, he warns playwrights against excessive truth on the stage. He also carries out these principles in his own dramatic works. Iffland understands that success can be brought by the plays designed for an inexperienced theater goer who has seen an understandable and close to him life on the stage. With this aim in view the dramatist creates works that enjoyed a success. One of them is "Verbrechen aus Ehrsucht. Ein Familiengemälde in fünf Aufzügen» (Iffland, 1798a). The plot of the play is simple. A young man falls in love with a noblewoman and wants to help his family by marrying her. Because of debts he robs his father, then repents, receives forgiveness, although he has to leave the house. The Rubergs (father and son) love each other, try not to upset each other, but the young man has a lot of debts that he amassed trying to live like aristocrats, that was however characteristic of his father too, although he (such a course of the work) at first sight does not seek to penetrate into aristocratic world.

Senior commissioner Alden denounces Ruberg's family for their life beyond the means. He is a burger himself and proud that he does not owe anything to anyone (see: 4, 3). At this time, they get to know about the theft. The father suspects his son of having taken the money and is very much afraid of the young man laying hands on himself. Alden helps Ruberg and approves his son's decision to leave the house, that, in the dramatist's opinion, will help him to improve (5, 13). Iffland unequivocally condemns the bourgeois aspirations to enter the treacherous and sinful aristocratic environment. The same idea about the goodness of the burger and the commitment of the higher class to sin can be found in Iffland's play "Die Jaeger. Ein laendliches Sittengemaelde in fuenf Aufzuegen" (Iffland 1798b). Having passed through the trials caused by the intrigues of villains, the heroes are justified and find happiness. And here honest, hardworking and faithful burgers confirm their good human qualities. Their virtues are backed up by good family relationships, that is expressed as follows in the play "Die Hagestolzen": "No political connection will hold if the home one does not hold anymore"(3, 7) (Iffland, 1799).

In comedy, unlike the previous two dramas, Iffland repeats what has been stated in literature for a long time - true kindness, virtue, and love are possible only in the poorest environment where a person is valued for the human qualities but not for the wealth. Therefore, the Court Counsellor Reinhold makes a proposal to the peasant Margrete, about whom her brother says: "She is poor, but she has a golden heart" (5, 15). These are the people who live by the fruits of their labor. The main things for them are humanity, kindness and hope, which support them. They faithfully believe in the rewarding power of virtue, and the audience of Iffland also believed in it. In the preface to the play "Bewusstsein" ("Consciousness", 1787), the playwright reasoned about the morality of the play "Verbrechen aus Ehrsucht". Is the younger Ruberg happy? Iffland does not give an unambiguous answer. He was forgiven by the family but not by the society (Iffland, 1798-1802: 3-10). What is important for a person in this situation? The playwright believes that the answer to this question can be found only in the character's background, in the circumstances that have informed him.

From the author's point of view, his rather gentle treatment of the characters, which aroused the doubts of the Emperor Joseph, is justified by his belief in the all-conquering power of kindness, in which the greatness of the ruler should be manifested, although he is convinced of the need for severity and punishment in regard to the criminal. "... I would not have treated Ruberg as gently as the author did," the emperor observed (Iffland, 1798–1802: 3). It is important for Iffland to emphasize not the punishment of the hero, but his desire for reforming and goodness (Iffland, 1798–1802: 5). The characters of the playwright do not seek outstanding positions, they are contented with what they have. Any departure from their social stratum, their attempts to escape from it are punished. Overcoming class boundaries fails. The burger must be happy within his circle, for contentment, order, integrity, and honor are realized there. It should be noted that Iffland represents the men from the third estate as criminals too (Mattes in "Die Jaeger" or Franz and Gerhard in "Das Portrait der Mutter"). They want to be above their environment and dream of wealth, striving for it at any cost and not reaching it by means of honest and hard work.

Theatrical life of the writings, created in the late eighteenth century, reflects the contradictory literary situation of Germany at that time. On the one hand, the German intelligentsia studied spiritual achievements of the British and French. On the other hand, German drama began to influence cultural life outside Germany. German authors were known in England, and one of them, a popular German dramatist of the late 18th – early 19th century, A. von Kotzebue (1761-1819), was regarded as "German Shakespeare" on the British Isles (Guthke, 1958: 55, 56).

According to statistics, among German and foreign authors, whose works were staged in Germany, no one could compete with Kotzebue in popularity. Kotzebue worked in all dramatic genres of his time, but he gained the greatest popularity with middle-class drama. K. Koehler notes that by "using the tendency to sensationalism, dynamism of the action, characteristic of "Storm and Stress", Kotzebue creates a "drama of effects" to entertain the audience (Koehler, 1955). V. A. Lukov notes, that in creating the characters in Kotzebue's plays melodramatization wins (Lukov, 1985: 32). According to M. L. Tronskaya, the power of Kotzebue is in the development of newfangled problems (Tronskaya, 1963: 321).

It would be misleading to see Kotzebue's dramas only through the prism of their dramatic effects or the author's ability to develop the most urgent problems of his time. What is more important, Kotzebue, Iffland, Schroeder and many other less talented playwrights with their works filled the gaps left by the great writers, so providing the succession in the development of the national theatre.

The problem of educating a virtuous honest citizen was posed by the Enlightenment. In varying degrees all the famous writers of this time were philosophers who fought against the superstitions and despotism for the emancipation of the individual. Therefore, one of the most famous Kotzebue's dramas "Menschenhass und Reue" ("Misanthropy and Repentance", 1787) (Kotzebue, 1790) expressed, on the one hand, the tenderness before the virtues of the German petty bourgeoisie, and, on the other, formed a positive ideal of man whose best qualities most closely met the conceptions of the time. The situations, reproduced by Kotzebue, were commonplace, drawn from life (in their original messages), but their development, especially the completion was not realistic. It was only the desire of the author, which was far from German reality.

The action of the play "Menschenhass und Reue", which attracted the attention of Sheridan in England and Gérard de Nerval in France, reflects an important problem not only for the Sturmiers, but also for the subsequent development of European literature. It is the problem of adultery in which a woman is traditionally considered the guilty party: a woman as a bearer of demonic qualities becomes attractive, and her betrayal is, firstly, treated as the realization of her individual right to choose her partner, and, secondly, it gives the opportunity to depict an active, strong and self-sacrificing person.

The sentimental bias of Kotzebue's works is extremely strong. A woman who committed a misdemeanor begs for forgiveness. Such outcome can be explained by the influence of tradition and

the caution of the author, who did not manage to risk fully to justify his heroine. Anyhow, he did cause the spectators' uncontrollable pity for her. This Kotzebue's drama was a unique success. It is based on the fate of a man and a woman. He hates people. She is full of remorse for the offense committed three years ago (she deceived her husband and fled away from her family with another man). Throughout the five acts, the main characters Eulalia (Madame Mueller, she is also Baroness Meinau) and a stranger (he is also Baron Meinau) do good deeds, but only at the end of the fourth act they meet and recognize each other. The fifth act is devoted to their reconciliation (sc. 9), which takes place just at the very end of the play, when the children appear and rush to their parents, and the husband, baron Meinau, forgives his wife.

Thus, the play's title, reflecting the main features of the characters, becomes clear. At the same time, Meinau is not a misanthropist, in fact he helps the indigent, and his servant is happy to serve him, as his master is a good man. So, already from the beginning of the play the spectator is ready for the metamorphosis of the stranger and Eulalia who are kind and generous, but face a cruel necessity to make a choice.

Kotzebue is quick at pushing the tension, thrilling the viewer's interest and intriguing him, for the outcome of the drama is not clear until the very end, when all the audience sigh with relief and are touched by the greatness of the soul of Baron Meinau. The most important line is connected with the image of Eulalia. It's solved in a traditional pattern of remorse after the committed deed. She is shown several years after she had left her husband and children. Quite quickly figuring out her lover, the baroness is ready to return to her family circle, begging her husband to forgive her. But he, insulted and dishonored, leaves for an unknown direction, keeping in his heart love for his unfaithful wife, in which he confesses to himself (5, 8). It is important to note that the actual forgiveness of Eulalia does not occur in the last scene of this drama, but it happens much earlier, when the major von der Horst, who wanted to marry her, renounces his intention and makes every effort to reconcile her with her husband (5, 5). The true kindness of this woman, the indiscreet care of the old and the poor, her repentance give the major an opportunity to justify her - she is above the prejudices of the higher society. The major is ready to support her, although the nobility condemned the baroness. In his opinion, Mrs. Meinau is worth of being happy. And he, realizing her refusal as a sign of loyalty to her husband, helps the beloved woman to return a good will of her husband, his friend.

The playwright presents to the viewer a work full of common truths about honour and kindness, but Kotzebue analyzes the motives that led one person to misanthropy, and the other to repentance, which gave K.-H. Klingenberg the right to call this work an analytical drama (Klingenberg, 1962: 115). It is scarcely possible to reproach the playwright for the obvious straightforwardness of the images of his characters, though, when designing them, Kotzebue built a certain model of unconventional human behavior in different situations. Indeed, we can talk about schematism, but schematism aimed at informing the public about the possibility to choose non-traditional patterns of behaviour. In this respect, the noble line, connected with the image of the count von Wintersee, who returns to his estate and banter over his relative von der Horst and Eulalia with a good-natured and understanding irony, is interesting. He is a kind but funny general, preaching family peace and peace in general (5. 1).

Those who wish to lead the rural way of life of the nobility (count, countess and her brother major) rise above class prejudices. In scene 4 (d.2) there are words that have been known for centuries, but which were more actively spoken in the last third of the century: "... appreciate more a good person without a name, than a fool whose name is three hundred years old." Rhetorics like this and glorifying honesty, justice and kindness are frequent on the pages of the works of Schroeder, Iffland, Kotzebue and other contemporaries.

Frank morality is conducted in their plays in a straightforward manner, which does not cause ambiguity or evoke doubts. The works of this kind were not aimed at the public's intellectual sophistication, but it would be wrong to deny the importance of such dramas in transferring advanced ideas. Possessing the largest audience, trivial playwrights, for their part, implement the ideas

formulated by the time. Using traditional motifs, Kotzebue does not parody the Enlightenment, that M.L. Tronskaya sees in his play "Die Sonnenjungfrau" ("Virgin of the Sun", 1791) (Tronskaya, 1963: 321). Undoubtedly, the authors like Kotzebue preferred to follow the beaten paths, but the public's perception of their works testifies that they managed to touch such strings in the hearts of their contemporaries, that made their works interesting and beloved throughout the 19th century. A. Stern saw the merit of Iffland's and Schroeder's works in that they put competitive pressure on the influential chivalric dramas created in imitation of "Goetz". The scholar emphasized impartially that the plays of trivial authors attracted contemporaries' attention to the actual problems of life of a particular person, but, in his opinion, Kotzebue followed public taste (Stern, 1888: 556), although at the same time he was able to show what was happening around. This caused the colossal success of his plays. Therefore R. Prutz was right (M. L. Tronskaya refers to his opinion), thinking that not trivial drama was pitiful but life, which found its reflection in it (Tronskaya, 1963: 324). This remark was made in 1847, when the plays of the mentioned authors were still being put on the stages of German theaters. In Prutz's remark, an objective assessment of their creativity as a phenomenon of cultural life is important.

DISCUSSION

Thus, scenarios are a certain idea about prospects of developing of the economic and social and economic system they are developed for. Most often scenarios are a qualitative projection where some extremely important qualitative estimates are allowed and required. Thus, the scenario planning differs from forecasting that emphasizes the variety of stipulated qualitative indicators.

Scenario planning is an urgent tool of strategic planning and management in various sectors of economy, at enterprises and their strategic business units, as well as when estimating macro-economic factors of the environment and markets of raw materials.

The method of scenarios is useful when defining goals of the organization, its development strategy, as well as during the long-term forecasting when current achievements do not matter, and it is more important to apply new opportunities.

At the same time, when forming strategies in the mineral resources sector, they single out various types of scenarios: global, country, regional, and corporate.

The global scenario deals with the development of the global mineral resources sector and its sectors. It analyzes prospects of the economic growth of countries and regions, volumes of mining and demand for various types of mineral resources. It forecasts the change of prices and development of technologies, i.e. main factors that have an impact on the global demand and supply on markets of raw materials in the longer term.

Country scenarios are used both by state governmental bodies that form the strategy of the complex development within a certain country, and certain companies that work on the territory of a country (Russia, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, etc.).

The regional scenario is related to the development of certain regions, for example, Eastern, Northern, Southern, Kazakhstan, Eastern Siberia, etc. that have the high concentration of the mineral resources potential. If the scenario is planned by a company, it focuses its attention on the region where it works. Specialized corporate scenarios focus their attention both on every sector of the vertically integrated company (exploration, exploitation, concentrating and processing, and logistics), and when calculating indicators of the economic efficiency of the company as a whole while implementing a certain scenario.

CONCLUSION

In the works of Schroeder, Iffland and Kotzebue the audience found appealing current problems and observed concrete real life. The spectators could identify themselves with the plays' characters who

fought for happiness and sought their rights and their place in the system of social relations. Trivial drama contributed to the formation of ideas about the German national character which possessed many virtues. The moral nature of such plays is a typical time trait that is found in the writings of all the famous writers of the late 18th century. These works strengthened the interest to German life, which led to the development of interest to German history.

At the initial stage of its development, trivial drama performs an important function of the unifying center. Kotzebue's, Schroeder's and Iffland's work along with the work of outstanding masters prepares the German theater audience for the perception of highly artistic domestic and foreign, previously unaccustomed samples (Shakespeare). The works of trivial playwrights gravitate towards a clichéd representation of reality, following the usual ways of contemporary drama, but they also raise important and burning problems. The trivial literature of this time is able to reflect the world of a "little man", his joys and sorrows, disappointments and hopes. This is a sufficiently optimistic literature. Some reticence should be considered the peculiarity of the works of this kind. In the family and household trivial drama acute social conflicts that arise in "high" literature are alleviated but on the other hand, the most acute issues of the time are reflected in this genre: the oppression of Germans in Germany, racial problems and support for the liberation movement of America. American motives merge to a certain extent with the theme of personal freedom of a person. Trivial drama in this period is closer to real life than classical drama.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to the colleagues of the Department of Literature at Vyatka State University for the critical comments, received in the process of writing the article.

REFERENCES

- Eckermann, J.P. (1981). *Gespraeche mit Goethe in den letzten Jahren seines Lebens*. Frankfurt am Main: Insel-Verlag. Date View November 23, 2017. Kapitel 50: <http://gutenberg.spiegel.de/buch/gesprache-mit-goethe-in-den-letzten-jahren-seines-lebens-1912/50>
- Goethe, J.W. (1971). *Aus meinem Leben. Dichtung und Wahrheit. Poetische Werke*. Berlin; Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag. Bd. 13. (Berliner Ausgabe).
- Guthke, K. (1958). *Englische Vorromantik und deutscher Sturm und Drang: M.G. Lewis' Stellung in der Geschichte der deutsch-englischen Literaturbeziehungen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- History of German literature*. (1985). In 3 vls. Moscow: Raduga, V.1.
- History of German literature*. (1986). In 3 vls. Moscow: Raduga, V.2.
- Hoffmann, P.H. (1939). *Friedrich Ludwig Schroeder als Dramaturg und Regisseur*. Berlin: Selbstverl. der Gesellschaft fuer Theatergeschichte.
- Hoffmeier, D. (1955). *Aesthetische und methodische Grundlagen der Schauspielkunst Friedrich Ludwig Schroeders*. Dresden: Verlag der Kunst.
- Holstein, H. (1886). *Einleitung*. In: Iffland A.W. *Ueber meine theatralische Laufbahn*. Heilbronn: Henninger. P. III-XCVI.
- Iffland, A.W. (1798–1802). *Dramatische Werke*. Bd. 3. Leipzig, 3-10.
- Iffland, A.W. (1798a). *Verbrechen aus Ehrsucht. Ein Familiengemaelde in fuenf Aufzuegen*. *Dramatische Werke*. Leipzig: bey Georg Joachim Goeschen. Bd.2.
- Iffland, A.W. (1798b). *Die Jaeger. Ein laendliches Sittengemaelde in fuenf Aufzuegen*. *Dramatische Werke*. Leipzig: bey Joachim Goeschen. Bd.3.
- Iffland, A.W. (1799). *Die Hagestolzen. Ein Lustspiel in fuenf Aufzuegen*. *Dramatische Werke*. Leipzig: bey Georg Joachim Goeschen. Bd.9.
- Iffland, A.W. (1886). *Ueber meine theatralische Laufbahn*. Heilbronn: Henninger, CVI.
- Iffland, A.W. (1910). *Ifflands Briefwechsel mit Schiller, Goethe, Kleist, Tieck und anderen Dramatikern*. Leipzig: Reclam.
- Klingenberg, K.-H. (1962). *Iffland und Schroeder als Dramatiker*. Weimar: Verl.
- Koehler, C. (1955). *Effekt-Dramaturgie in den Theaterstuecken A. von Kotzebues*. Berlin.
- Kotzebue, A. von. (1790). *Menschenhass und Reue. Schauspiel in fuenf Aufzuegen*. Berlin: bei Christian Friedrich Himburg.

- Kuerschner, J. (1881). Iffland: August Wilhelm I. Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. Bd.14. 6-13.*
- Litzmann, B. (1894). Friedrich Ludwig Schroeder: Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Litteratur- und Theatergeschichte. V.1. Hamburg-Leipzig: Verl. von Leopold Voss.*
- Lotman, Yu.M. (1970). Structure of the artistic text. Moscow: Art.*
- Lukov, V.A. (1985). Preromanticism and the problem of character in European literature. The problem of character in foreign literature. Sverdlovsk, 30-41.*
- Matthisson, Fr. von. (1810-1816). Erinnerungen: In 5 Bde. Zuerich: bey Orell, Fuessli und Compagnie.*
- Polyakova, N.B. (1987). Friedrich Ludwig Schroeder. Moscow: Art.*
- Schroeder, F.L. (1786). Das Portraet der Mutter; oder Die Privatkomoedie. Ein Lustspiel in vier Aufzuegen. Beytrag zur deutschen Schaubühne: In 3 Thle. Berlin: bei August Heinr. Rittmann. T.3.*
- Silman, T.I. (1936). Dramaturgy of the era of "Storm and stress". Early bourgeois realism. Leningrad: The publishing house "Fiction", 401-432.*
- Stern, A. (1888). Geschichte der Weltliteratur in übersichtlicher Darstellung. Stuttgart: Riegersche Verlagsbuchhandlung.*
- Tronskaya, M.L. (1963). The philistine drama and the novel of the 80-90-ies. History of German literature: In 5 vls. Moscow, 2, 315-331.*
- Wellershoff, D. (1983). Von der Moral erwischt: Aufsätze zur Trivilliteratur. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer-Taschebuch-Verlag.*