

**WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE AND SLOVENE DRAMATISTS (I):
A. T. LINHART'S *MISS JENNY LOVE***

Mirko Jurak

Abstract

One of the signs of the universality of William Shakespeare's plays is undoubtedly their influence on plays written by other playwrights throughout the world. This is also true of Slovene playwrights who have been attracted by Shakespeare's plays right from the beginning of their creativity in the second half of the eighteenth century, when Anton Tomaž Linhart (1756-1795) wrote his tragedy *Miss Jenny Love*. However, Slovene knowledge about Shakespeare and his plays reaches back into the seventeenth century, to the year 1698, when a group of Jesuit students in Ljubljana performed a version of the story of King Lear in Slovene. The Jesuits used Slovene in theatrical performances, which were intended for the broadest circles of the population. The first complete religious play, written in Slovene, is *Škofjeloški pasjon* (The Passion Play from Škofja Loka), which was prepared by the Cistercian monk Father Romuald. Since 1721 this play was regularly performed at Škofja Loka for several decades, and at the end of the twentieth century its productions were revived again.

In December 2009 two hundred and twenty years will have passed since the first production of Anton Tomaž Linhart's comedy *Županova Micka* (Molly, the Mayor's Daughter). It was first performed in Ljubljana by the Association of Friends of the Theatre on 28 December 1789, and it was printed in 1790 together with Linhart's second comedy, *Ta veseli dan ali Matiček se ženi* (This Happy Day, or Matiček Gets Married; which was also published in 1790, but not performed until 1848). These comedies represent the climax of Linhart's dramatic endeavours. Linhart's first published play was *Miss Jenny Love* (1780), which he wrote in German.¹ In the first chapter of my study I shall discuss the adaptation of Shakespeare's texts for the theatre, which was not practiced only in Austria and Germany, but since the 1660s also in England. Further on I discuss also Linhart's use of language as the "means of communication". In a brief presentation of Linhart's life and his literary creativity

¹ In my article I often use the abbreviation *ZD* for A. T. Linhart's *Zbrano delo* (Collected Works, ed. Alfonz Gspan 1950) and *MJL* for *Miss Jenny Love*, which was published in this edition. After acts and scenes I quote the number of the page of Linhart's original text (German and French are included) and the second page number which follows after /, is the number of the page of the Slovene translation. Translations into English are mine.

Acknowledgement. I sincerely wish to thank the following individuals and institutions for their assistance in my preparation of this study for publication: the librarians of the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures and the librarians of the Slavic Department of Languages and Literatures, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana; Ms Katarina Kocijančič and Ms Francka Slivnik, Slovene Theatre Museum, Ljubljana; Dr Malina Schmidt Snoj, Ljubljana; Dr Tomaž Toporišič, The Mladinsko Theatre, Ljubljana; Dr Jason Blake, Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, and particularly to my Scottish friend, Professor W. H. Fraser.

I shall suggest some reasons for his views on life, religion and philosophy. They can be seen in his translation of Alexander Pope's "Essay on Man" as well as his appreciation of Scottish poetry. The influence of German playwrights belonging to the Sturm and Drang movement (e.g. G. T. Lessing, J. F. Schiller, F. M. Klinger) has been frequently discussed by Slovene literary historians, and therefore it is mentioned here only in passing. Slovene critics have often ascribed a very important influence of English playwright George Lillo on Linhart's tragedy *Miss Jenny Love*, but its echoes are much less visible than the impact of Shakespeare's great tragedies, particularly in the structure, character presentations and the figurative use of language in Linhart's tragedy. I shall try to prove this influence in the final part of my study.

Because my study is oriented towards British and Slovene readers, I had to include some facts which may be well-known to one group or to another group of readers. Nevertheless I hope that they will all find in it enough evidence to agree with me that Shakespeare's influence on Linhart's play *Miss Jenny Love* was rather important.

I.

In the preface to the published version of his play *Miss Jenny Love* (which appeared in German, in Augsburg, in 1780) Linhart wrote the following motto: "Allow me, if you please, to tread with boyish steps in the path of Shakespeare! The path is slippery and one might fall at every step! Who shall lend me his hand?" (ZD 130/331). In a letter to a very close friend of his, priest Martin Kuralt (1757-1845), Linhart wrote on 1 January 1780 the following: "I have the pleasure to inform you that I have written a tragedy (MJJL, note by M.J.), which will be published in Augsburg. It is black, *a la Shakespeare*, and I am afraid that it will have the honour to be forbidden outside the Empire." (ZD 267/410) Two months later, on 24 February 1780, Linhart sent another letter to Kuralt in which he says, among others things, "Have you seen in the theatre the unreachable Shakespeare? It was *Hamlet*, I do not doubt it. If you had seen *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, but not Shakespeare's *Macbeth adapted by Mr Stephanie* but *Macbeth by Shakespeare*, you would have seen three plays which have enchanted me to madness." (ZD 270/412)

Let us have a closer look at these statements, which are related to Shakespeare's tragedies and to the productions of his plays in Vienna. Linhart's panegyrics on Shakespeare and his plays have been noticed by Slovene literary historians, particularly his rejection of adaptations of Shakespeare's plays by Austrian and German actors and directors. But Slovene critics have seen such adaptations as an isolated process which was happening in Central Europe in the second half of the eighteenth century and not as a process which started in England much earlier. One of the Austrian actors, directors and translators in Vienna who is often mentioned by Slovene critics and who is explicitly mentioned by Linhart, is Gottlieb Stephanie (1741-1800). He, for example, rather arbitrarily adapted Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, and his version of this tragedy was first performed in Vienna in 1772. A few years after Linhart's return from Vienna to Ljubljana, in 1780, Stephanie's adaptation was also criticised in the German newspaper issued in Ljubljana, in *Laibacher Zeitung* (no. 46, 15 November 1787). The editor of Linhart's collected work, Alfonz Gspan, surmises that the author of this article was Linhart himself (Gspan 1950: 529). Stephanie's revision of Shakespeare's plays is dealt with in detail in the monographic study on the early life and work of Linhart, which

was written by Mirko Zupančič (1972: 49-56). He believes that Stephanie's version of *Macbeth* was the result of the involvement of Queen Maria Theresa and her son Joseph in the theatrical life in Hapsburg Empire. The rulers disapproved of Shakespeare's combination of historical events in his plays and they criticised his "mistake" to include poetic phantasy in his tragedies and histories. Shakespeare's approach to the presentation of life in drama was in opposition to the prevailing rationalism of the age, which did not approve of "murders, madness, inexplicability" of Shakespeare's royal heroes, and who – in view of the then Austrian critics – did not support the stability of the state and its moral norms.

Many Slovene literary historians, including Zupančič, pay a lot of attention to the official censor of theatrical productions in Vienna, university professor Joseph von Sonnenfels (1733-1817), who may have been Linhart's teacher at the university. Sonnenfels was the main representative of the Enlightenment as led by the Austrian Emperor Joseph II, and he was also the author of the doctrine of theatre censorship. Sonnenfels was also a strong opponent of Shakespeare as well as of the new Sturm und Drang dramatic movement in the German speaking countries. As an advocate of French classical drama Sonnenfels strongly supported the three unities, opposed the inclusion of comic scenes in tragedies, and saw the aim of plays as a means of teaching theatre-goers the moral norms. He also rejected popular folk comedies in which playwrights freely inserted allusions to contemporary events and personages. Zupančič defines his attitude towards the theatre as didactic, because the theatre was for Sonnenfels "a school for noble characters and good manners" (Zupančič 1972: 22), an idea with which most theatre-goers and critics would disagree today.

The point made by Slovene critics about the arbitrary adaptations of Shakespeare's plays by German speaking translators and theatre directors is valid, although this process had started in England more than a century before Sonnenfels prepared his suggestions about theatre censorship. Since the beginning of the Restoration period in England, in 1660, Shakespeare's plays had been adapted also by English actors who directed his plays in London and elsewhere in Britain. They often changed the tragic original into a kind of a popular melodrama ("soap opera"), which was far below the aesthetic standards of the original. Let me cite some cases. For example, in the 1660s Sir William D'Avenant produced at Lincoln's Inn Fields theatre a number of "improved" versions of Shakespeare's plays, among them *Macbeth*, "in new clothes, new scenes, machines ... with music, singing and dancing ... in the nature of opera" (Halliday 127-9, 295). The history of stage productions of Shakespeare's *King Lear* is even more astonishing. The last original version of this play was done in England in 1675. In 1681, Nahum Tate, a minor Irish poet and playwright, adapted several Elizabethan plays, among them also *King Lear*. Tate believed that by his changes the play received a greater probability regarding fate in man's life. In his version *King Lear* is restored to his kingdom, and Cordelia marries Edgar. This adaptation of Shakespeare's text was even accepted by Samuel Johnson and some of the best English actors of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century (e.g. David Garrick, John Philip Kemble and Edmund Kean) performed in it until W. C. Macready returned to Shakespeare's text. But, surprisingly enough, this happened only in 1838 (!). There are several possible reasons for such adaptations.

With the Restoration of the monarchy by King Charles II Puritanism collapsed and the gravity of the previous period was no longer encouraged. Besides, some attempts to write tragedies in Shakespeare's manner, failed, and for example, Dryden's tragedies do not reach the aesthetic qualities of Shakespeare's plays. Dryden's tragedy *All for Love, or the World Well Lost* (1678), written on the same theme as Shakespeare's *Anthony and Cleopatra* (1606), is one of the best proofs for this assertion. Another reason for these changes can possibly be found in the happy ending of some of the plots which Shakespeare "borrowed" from English legends. Thus, for example, the first known legend about *King Lear*, which was written by Geoffrey of Monmouth in *Historia Regum Britanniae* in the twelfth century, and published in 1507, ends happily (See: Geoffrey of Monmouth 81-6). Besides, an anonymous version of an earlier play, *King Leir* (1594), also ends happily. Of course, the original legend reads like a fairy tale and the main characters lack the psychological development and personal integrity of Shakespeare's protagonists. Other characters connected with *King Lear* in this legend are also flat, one-dimensional, and there is no tragic development and no catharsis in this tale. From the aesthetic point of view Shakespeare's treatment of *King Lear*'s story is an artistic vision of life, with all its paradoxes and diversities, whereas the story about this hero as treated by Geoffrey of Monmouth, is a plain, linear narrative, a simple legend, with no artistic dimensions whatsoever. The happy end of *King Lear* is in opposition to the previous artistic development of the play, to its characters and their relations, and therefore such an end is artificially imposed upon the tragic subject-matter of the play. This is also true of the above mentioned Stephanie adaptation of *Macbeth* and of *Hamlet*. Such changes were introduced also in other German speaking theatres, for example, in Friedrich Ludwig Schröder's production of *Hamlet* in Hamburg in 1776. Slovene literary historians knew these adaptations (Zupančič 1972: 44-56) but they do not mention the English practice and some of the reasons why these adaptations took place.

The point which has been made in connection with Linhart's preference of the original Shakespeare's text, if compared with an adaptation, is that Linhart was obviously very much aware of the artistic difference of plays as they were written by Shakespeare and of their adaptations in the second half of the eighteenth century, which were still popular in Central Europe. Linhart's decision also shows his high artistic standards regarding the composition of plays, the presentation of characters and the totality of tragic vision of life which is presented by Shakespeare in his plays. It is very likely that Linhart knew enough English already during his stay in Vienna (1778-1780) so that not only did he see Shakespeare's plays performed in the original versions but that he understood English enough to read Shakespeare's plays in English. This could definitely help him to make his own judgment about Stephanie's productions and the artistic quality of Shakespeare's plays.

In the second half of the eighteenth century early romantic tendencies can be noticed in German plays belonging to the Sturm und Drang movement, which developed in German speaking countries. Its members included, besides some minor playwrights, also Goethe, Lessing, Schiller and Klinger. Slovene critics have often tried to find similarities between these playwrights and between English "domestic tragedies", especially with George Lillo's play *The London Merchant: or the History of George Barnwell* (1735). But they have neglected some important differences between Lillo's

tragedy and plays written by the German playwrights belonging to this movement, not to mention Lillo's tragedy and Linhart's *Miss Jenny Love*, which I shall discuss later. One of the more noticeable differences between German plays of the Sturm und Drang movement and Lillo's play are echoes of the English Restoration comedy. The differences include primarily witticisms, paradoxes, humour, vitality of characters, etc., which are all typical elements of the English Restoration comedy. The German dramatists – and Linhart too – still rejected comic elements in serious plays, and therefore their heroes are more like one-dimensional sketches than real human figures, embodying both serious and comic features, positive and negative moral traits. These plays often lack wit, their diction is contrived, the structure of their plays is sometimes rather complicated, their characters are not complex enough to portray people who are round characters. Briefly, these plays often lack some of the artistic qualities, which are present in the best works of dramatic art. Shakespeare successfully included even in his “great tragedies” some comic elements as constituent parts of his plays. This is an important difference between the English domestic tragedies like Lillo's *The London Merchant*, and the German tragedies of the second half of the eighteenth century. It is most likely that because the German literary historians have accepted Lillo's play as influential for the development of “Trauerspiel”, Linhart's *Miss Jenny Love* was more or less automatically included as a product of this manner of writing by Slovene literary historians too.

II.

In order to present Linhart's position in the development of Slovene drama as well as Shakespeare's influence on *Miss Jenny Love*, some basic historical and biographical facts about his life and his creativity may be helpful. Anton Tomaž Linhart was born on 11 December 1756, at Radovljica, and he died before the age of forty, on 14 July 1795, in Ljubljana. Radovljica is a small mediaeval town in the north-western part of Slovenia, a region which is called Kranjska (Carniola), and which was in Linhart's time a part of the Austrian Empire. The rule of the Hapsburg dynasty was represented in the 18th century mainly by the Empress Maria Theresa (who ruled between 1740 and 1780) and her son, Joseph II (r. 1780-1790). During their rule a number of progressive reforms in education, law and religion were enacted. However, in Austria, which was composed of heterogeneous peoples, as well as in some other European countries, the national movements began to grow in the second half of the eighteenth century, when non-dominating nations began to demand more cultural freedom. One of the main obstacles in the field of culture was the dominance of the German language in the whole of the Habsburg Empire in which this language was the official language of all nations belonging to the Empire (e.g. the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Hungarians, the Croatians, the Slovenes). Besides, the middle classes in these countries lacked political and also very often economic power and they resented privileges of German nobility, aristocracy, and administration. Therefore nations living in Central Europe, including the Slovenes, were inspired by the ideals of the French Revolution (July 14, 1789). These nations often expressed their demands for cultural freedom, for the non-discriminatory

use of their languages. This was done at first in their works of art, and later, in their political activities.

This is also true of Linhart and his period. He wrote two successful comedies, which stirred the Slovene national consciousness. His play *Županova Micka* received great public acclaim when it was performed on 28 December 1789 at the Stanovsko gledališče (The Theatre of the Estates) by the Družba prijateljev gledališča (The Association of Friends of the Theatre). This was an association of amateur actors: Linhart himself directed the play, and his wife acted in the leading role of Micka. Linhart's play is based on the comedy *Die Feldmühle* (The Country Mill), which was written by the Austrian playwright Joseph Richter and which was first staged in Vienna in 1777. Linhart's play was published in book form before its premiere, but dated 1790. Almost at the same time Linhart began writing another comedy, *Ta veseli dan ali Matiček se ženi* (abbr. as *Matiček*) which was based on Pierre Augustin Carron de Beaumarchais' comedy *La folle journée, ou le Mariage de Figaro*. Beaumarchais' play was originally shown in Paris in 1784 after the playwright's hard struggle with censorship. In it the author did not attack the weaknesses of an individual man, but of the society as a whole. In addition to the anti-feudalist sting of *Figaro* Linhart added to his play the anti-Germanising point by showing how the administrators used the German language "to sow confusion among the Slovene-speaking aristocrats and members of the 'third estate'" (Grđina 2005: 578). Linhart had the same kind of difficulty with *Matiček* as Beaumarchais did with his play in France: although *Matiček* was also issued in book form in Ljubljana in 1790 but it could only be first produced in Slovenia in 1848, owing to the increased censorship in the Habsburg Empire. In these two plays Linhart chose a typically Slovene setting and the plot of the play presents comic events in which simple Slovene villagers outwit the foreign noblemen. Linhart shortened the plot of both plays, he reduced the number of characters and he substituted the world of aristocracy with less noble Slovene background of the Carniola region. Linhart's adaptation of the originals is so thorough that we can definitely regard them as Linhart's own plays. Both comedies still belong to the standard repertoire of Slovene theatres and are regarded as the first two Slovene comedies.

Linhart's birth place, Radovljica, is situated at the bottom of the Julian Alps. This is a mountainous region, full of "rocky landscape" (Linhart uses these terms for the description of the setting in Scotland in *Miss Jenny Love*; 1.1, 133/332). In this small medieval town there are several manor houses and there are also a number of castles in its vicinity (e.g. the Castle Kamen, which is not far away from Radovljica and which was in Linhart's time still used; or, the medieval castle built on a hill by Lake Bled). This landscape most likely gave Linhart an idea what the mountainous Scottish landscape might be like. But in reality the countryside near Edinburgh (where Acts I-IV are set) is not surrounded by such high rocky mountains and the vegetation in the countryside is rather different from the landscape near Radovljica. Therefore it is not easy to accept the opinion of some Slovene critics that "one of the recognizable characteristics of Linhart's tragedy is its setting" (L. Vidmar 2005: 156), although even some earlier Slovene literary historians did not question Linhart's description of the setting in *Miss Jenny Love* and agreed that this "very vivid countryside ... was Scotland" (Pogačnik 33). The Scottish location is mentioned in the play, so that – technically speaking – we can rely only on

Linhart's directions about the specific locality of this play, but in reality, according to Linhart's brief description of the setting the play could also be set in Slovenia or in some other mountainous region in Europe. It is possible that Linhart chose Scotland as the setting of his play *Miss Jenny Love* because James Macpherson published in the 1760s his Ossianic poems, some of which Linhart knew, and as Professor W. H. Fraser says, "if you wanted a romantic tale then Scotland is the place to set it in the 1770s".² On the other hand, the nightmarish atmosphere of some scenes in Linhart's *Miss Jenny Love* does remind us of the setting Shakespeare used in *Macbeth*.

After Linhart had attended the elementary school in his native town, he was sent to the Jesuit College in Ljubljana, where he already distinguished himself with his knowledge of German, Latin and Greek. At the college he also prepared some occasional speeches for various social events, and wrote some poems. In 1776 he entered as a novice in the Cistercian monastery at Stična, a small place south of Ljubljana. He was rather disappointed with the low standard of teaching and bad relations among novices and the prior. His experience at the monastery must have been rather aggravating and it turned Linhart away from the established Church. After having spent two years at Stična Linhart left the monastery. His decision not to be a cleric and his later links with Slovene free masons have been much discussed by Slovene literary historians. However, from Linhart's writings and his correspondence it can be concluded that his religious and philosophical views remained deistic. We can agree with the conclusion made on this topic by Janko Kos (2005: 24-37), who asserts that even though Linhart was a free thinker who had distanced himself "from Christianity, the Bible, the Church and theism" his views were still deistic. Kos argues that there is no evidence of Linhart's adoption of the atheism and materialism of the French Enlightenment" (*ibid.* 37). Such suggestions had namely been made for example by Slovene literary historians Alfonz Gspan, Bratko Kreft and Josip Vidmar, but their view is not really firmly based either on Linhart's life or on his writing (even though Linhart and his literary patron Baron Žiga Zois were free masons). It is possible that for example Bratko Kreft's attempt to link Linhart with atheism and "revolutionary views" was made due to the impact of the historical and political situation in Slovenia after the Second World War.

In 1778 Linhart went to Vienna to study law and administration. We know from his letters written from Vienna that Linhart was particularly interested in theatrical life. He could have access there to plays written by famous European dramatists (e.g. by Shakespeare, Corneille, Voltaire, Calderon, Lessing etc.), although many of these plays were still produced in arbitrary adaptations, which often almost completely ruined the original text.

In the final months of 1779, while still in Vienna, Linhart wrote his first play, *Miss Jenny Love*. He sent it to the publisher in Augsburg, where it was published in spring 1780. One of the standard questions raised by Slovene literary historians is why Linhart wrote the play in German and not in Slovene, although printed books had been published in the Slovene language since 1550. There are several possible answers to this question. First, in his youth Linhart used German as his spoken language, and besides, it was the official language of the Empire. Therefore some critics think that Linhart

² W. H. Fraser, letter to M. J., 1 June 2009.

belonged then to “the German cultural sphere”. For the validity of this argument a line from a poem written by the greatest Slovene poet, France Prešeren (1800-1849), which was chiselled on Linhart’s tomb-stone is often quoted. Prešeren mentions in this epitaph that Linhart had left early “the German Parnassus” and that his comedies and historical works will be praised for ever by Thalia and Clio. A contemporary Slovene playwright and critic, Ivo Svetina (2005:107), has made an ironic observation about Linhart’s supposedly “German period” by asking Slovene critics, if France Prešeren, who also wrote at first some poems in German, was then also “a German poet” (2005: 107). Prešeren is not only considered the greatest Slovene poet but also as one of the main promoters of Slovene art and language; he is an icon admired by the Slovenes. In 1991, when Slovenia became an independent, sovereign republic, a stanza from one of Prešeren’s poems was even chosen as the Slovene national anthem. Therefore a suggestion about Prešeren’s “Germanic phase” is ridiculous. A more acceptable idea about reasons which can explain Linhart’s writing of his first play in German may be that in Linhart’s time plays were still mainly performed in Slovenia by professional travelling theatre companies from Germany (this was true also of other countries belonging to the Hapsburg Empire). Until the 1780s operas which were staged in Ljubljana were mainly sung in Italian. The Italian singers first visited Ljubljana already in 1531. Only in the final decades of the eighteenth century Linhart and his patron, Baron Žiga Zois, began to translate Italian arias into Slovene. Another explanation why Linhart wrote *Miss Jenny Love* in German is also his belief that he would have had a much better chance to see his play performed in “the official language” in other parts of the Empire than if it had been written in Slovene. His decision to have his play published in Germany was also practical, because there the censorship was not as strict as in Vienna. The Emperor Joseph II strongly rejected satirical attacks on the feudal system and on his absolute rule.

Linhart was sponsored in Vienna by some noblemen who had estates in Slovenia. Among them was also Count Johann Nepomuk von Edling (1751-1793), to whom Linhart dedicated the play and who may have suggested to Linhart the publisher from Augsburg. Edling also published a book of poems with the same publisher in the following year (Gspan 1950: 483, 530). Edling was of German background but he knew Slovene and he also encouraged Slovene authors to write text-books (in Slovene) for schools in Slovenia. Edling also helped Linhart to get an administrative job after his return to Ljubljana in August 1780. Another argument, which supports Linhart’s use of German in his later scholarly communication can be explained by the fact that in the eighteenth century the German language was *lingua franca* in Central Europe (as English is today). In 1781 Academia Operosorum (The Society of the Working Men) was reinstated in Ljubljana and both Edling and Linhart were its members (Gspan 1950: 536-8). Its primary aim was to publish works on Slovenia, its history and culture. In a letter written by Linhart on 5 April 1781 to his friend Kuralt, who then lived in Florence, Linhart asks Kuralt to send him some news for the Academia Operosorum and he tells Kuralt that he “ need not limit himself to any subject or any language” (ZD 276/416). Therefore it is most likely that Linhart’s decision to use German in his first play was based on several reasons, which I have mentioned above. Even in the final decade of his life Linhart used German for his scholarly work on the history of the Slavs in southern Austrian lands (*Versuch einer Geschichte von Krain und den übrigen Ländern der südlichen Slaven*

Österreichs, Vol. 1, 1788; Vol. 2., 1791). In Linhart's letter to Karl Gottlob Anton, a scholar from Leipzig, who was also interested in the research of Slavic history and with whom Linhart corresponded, Linhart says that he has "never used the language as the final aim, but only as a means for help" (Gspan 1966; 2 May 1789). In another letter which Linhart wrote to the same scholar (*ibid.* 26 January 1790), Linhart tells Anton that his play *Županova Micka* was successfully performed in Ljubljana: he adds that he was pleased to see that "these Slavs, who have been Germanized for centuries, still feel as Slavs; they still stick to their language, their customs, to their original 'roots' with enthusiasm". On 6 October 1790 Linhart expresses in his letter to K. G. Anton once again his attitude regarding the use of the Slovene language. He informs Anton that he is preparing a Slovene version of *Figaro* (*ibid.* 153). Linhart speaks here with special pride about the melodious qualities of Slovene and its ability to express in it the finest comic features. We may conclude that when the communication of ideas or knowledge was in question Linhart was obviously not a rigid linguistic purist but that he primarily wished to get the message across to other people and that he used the language as a means of communication. However, since 1780 Linhart had been fully aware of the aesthetic and social functions of Slovene and Slovene literature and of their utmost importance as the constituent elements of Slovene nation. Linhart believed that with his works of art he could prove to the world that the Slovene language was no less noble and less rich in expression than other European languages.

Several Slovene literary historians have speculated why so few copies of Linhart's first play, *Miss Jenny Love*, and also of his almanac *Blumen aus Krain* (Cvetje s Kranjskega, Ljubljana, 1781; Flowers from Carniola), which was also printed in German, have been preserved. In Gspan's edition of Linhart's collected works (ZD 494, 496) the editor believes that the assumption made by some literary historians that Linhart himself may have burnt these works, is possible. But he adds that due to the harsh censorship in the Habsburg Empire it is also quite possible that not many copies of *MJL* could be found anyway. Gspan also believes that in the 1780s Linhart raised his aesthetic criteria and that he did not consider that his first two published works had a permanent artistic value. Igor Grdina successfully argues that the almanac "bears witness to his (i.e. Linhart's, M.J.) total renunciation of certain goals which he had set for himself at the beginning of his career (when he wanted to wait for the day when German taste would be "joined" by that of the Italians)", when the Germans would accept the Slovene language as an equal language, as was the case with the Italians (Grdina 2005: 570). Although Linhart's view of the position of Slovene among the Italians was overrated there is no doubt that Linhart wished to see Europe as the place where all languages and cultures would be equally appreciated but it is clear that two hundred years had to pass before such attempts are – to some extent – becoming the reality! The Austrian rule in Slovenia had a typical character of linguistic subordination of the Slovene language. This pressure was different in its intensity in various historical periods and Linhart obviously became fully aware of this situation in the 1780s. However, in spite of these linguistic intricacies Linhart's tragedy *Miss Jenny Love* is nowadays considered by Slovene critics and literary historians as the first secular play written by a Slovene playwright – although it was written in German – and in spite of its dramatic shortcomings (e.g. the development of the plot and characters), which

do not place it in the file of those Slovene plays which are still nowadays easily and successfully produced on the stages of Slovene theatres.

III.

Among possible influences of German dramatists on Linhart's tragedy *Miss Jenny Love* several Slovene literary historians (e.g. Alfonz Gspan, Mirko Zupančič, Filip Kalan, Luka Vidmar etc.) have included dramaturgic similarities and philosophical views as expressed in the works of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing and his plays *Miss Sara Simpson* (1755), and *Emilia Galotti* (1772). Earlier criticism attached more importance to the influence of *Miss Sara Simpson* on *Miss Jenny Love* whereas Luka Vidmar quite successfully proves that in a number of aspects (e.g. in the outline of the plot, the main female character, the constellation of protagonists and antagonists) Linhart's play is closer to *Emilia Galotti* (Vidmar 2005: 150-67). These German plays were often produced in the Court and National Theatre in Vienna after 1776, where Linhart could see them.

There is another possible source which may have provided theoretical background for Linhart's dramatic concepts and which has often been rather neglected: these are Lessing's articles and essays on drama. It is most unlikely that at the time when Lessing's plays were regularly performed in Vienna and when his views on dramatic art were widely known through his papers published in *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* (1767-69) and *Laokoon* (1766), Linhart would not be familiar at least with some basic principles expressed by Lessing in his writing. In his "papers" Lessing tried to replace the convention of French classical drama by a freer approach, and he particularly stressed the importance of Shakespeare's dramatic practice. It is well-known how highly Lessing appreciated Shakespeare's work and the evaluation which is expressed on Shakespeare in Dryden's essay. Lessing knew Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesie* (1668), which is written in the form of a prose dialogue. He mentions this and other essays written by Dryden in his articles several times and he praises them very highly. Among the four speakers who discuss ancient and modern drama Neander is supposed to interpret Dryden himself, and his view on Shakespeare's greatness is "summarized" in the following passage:

To begin, then, with Shakespeare. He was the man who of all modern, and perhaps ancient poets, had the largest and most comprehensive soul. All the images of nature were still present to him, and he drew them, not laboriously, but luckily; when he describes anything, you more than see it, you feel it too. Those who accuse him to have wanted learning, give him the greater commendation: he was naturally learned; he needed not the spectacles of books to read nature; he looked inwards, and found her there. I cannot say he is everywhere alike; were he so, I should do him injury to compare him with the greatest of mankind. He is many times flat, insipid; his comic wit degenerating into clenches, his serious swelling into bombast. But he is always great, when some great occasion is

presented to him; no man can say he ever had a fit subject for his wit, and did not raise himself as high above the rest of poets.

(Dryden 363-64)

Lessing was not only impressed by Shakespeare's neglect of some traditional rules which had been recommended by Aristotle in his *Poetics* (e.g. of the three unities), but he also advised other playwrights to write plays in such a manner that their characters embody a variety of features and moral norms, and that the spectator feels empathy with the tragic character. In one of Lessing's remarks about the dramatist's lack of observation of the unity of place he says: "So what; and he did not (observe them, M.J.)" (17th paper; 26 June 1767). On another occasion Lessing declares that the smallest presentation of beauty in a play written by Shakespeare bears a unique stamp; and he also demands from German playwrights that Shakespeare's plays should be "studied and not robbed" (73rd paper; 2 January 1768); the point he makes is that Shakespeare's texts should not be simply copied or exploited. Linhart, who knew Lessing's and Shakespeare's work, was undoubtedly influenced by these ideas, and he was inspired also by the progressive, avant-garde Sturm und Drang movement.

IV.

Although Linhart's collection of miscellanea titled *Blumen aus Krain* was published almost a year after the appearance of *Miss Jenny Love*, in 1781, at least some pieces were written before this date so that the collection was ready for printing in autumn 1780 (Gspan 1955: 495). This collection has been analysed by several Slovene critics and I shall only briefly mention those poems which show Linhart's knowledge of English and Scottish literature. Linhart's poem about the tournament between the two knights, Pegam and Lamberg ("Der Tournier zwischen Ritter Lamberg und Pegam", ZD 201-206/377-79) was written in the form of hexameters and it was most probably inspired by the German translation (prepared by Michael Denis) of *Fragments of Ancient Poetry* (1760) prepared by James Macpherson. In Linhart's poem knight Lamberg, who resides at the castle Kamen in Carniola (which I have mentioned earlier in connection with Linhart's birth-place Radovljica) is summoned by court to Vienna to fight a duel with a fearful giant Pegam, who tyrannizes the city. The story in Linhart's poem is based on Slovene folk poems about Lamberg (*ibid.* 499-500). As it is common in the tradition of folk heroic poetry, Lamberg wins the duel and he cuts off Pegam's head. The legendary Gaelic warrior Fingal, who was celebrated by "an ancient bard Ossian", is replaced in Linhart's poem by Pegam, who comes from Carniola, from the castle Kamen. Macpherson used Gaelic tradition to promote Scotland, and Linhart used Slovene folklore in order to celebrate our national hero.

A number of poems printed in Linhart's collection clearly reflect motifs and attitudes of the poet, which are typical of English pre-Romantic poetry and which are in my opinion also thematically close to his play *Miss Jenny Love*. In his poem "Als die Glocke Mitternacht Schlug" (Ko je bila ura polnoči, When the Clock Struck Midnight, ZD 206-207/379-380) the speaker is woken up by his vision of venomous snakes which

splash their devilish poison (!) across the earth. Although castles seem to be built of hard diamonds, this cannot stop “the robber”. He cannot be stopped either by locks of conjugal fidelity, and the virginal flower of virtue is thus withering. The poem ends with the speaker’s remark that those who do not see this horror and who are protected by a benevolent angel are blessed. Mirko Zupančič comments on this poem that the speaker’s horror is presented in the poem in “intricate, hardly understandable metaphors” (Zupančič 1972: 75). These metaphors become clearer, if we connect them with the plot of Linhart’s play *Miss Jenny Love*. In this tragedy the heroine, Jenny, is kidnapped by an evil, sensuous villain, Lord Herington, who wishes to get rid of her lover, Eduard Sandwell, and “to possess her”. Herington, who is referred to by several characters in the play as “the devil”, keeps Jenny by force in his domain. Because of her “innocence” (which is reflected also in her emotional and intellectual simplicity), Jenny is referred to by several characters as “an angel”. Linhart probably wrote most of his poems for this collection while he was still in Vienna, at the time when he planned and wrote his tragedy *Miss Jenny Love*. I suggest that he also used themes of this and of some other poems as constituent elements of the story he created in his tragedy and some of which may be based on his personal experiences. The speaker in the poem is afraid that his tongue would betray the “consciousness of this terror” which he experiences in the middle of the night and which is based on sins involving a sexual act, connected with the breach of a marriage vow and with the loss of maid’s virginity. In the Freudian interpretation this dream may denote the speaker’s feeling of guilt, which is the result of his subconscious awareness of guilt and his moral responsibility for the acts committed.

Another poem which Linhart included in this collection is also “Die Reue” (Kesanje, Repentance, *ibid.* 210-211/381). The speaker has a vision of himself as of “a terrible monster”. Thousands of snakes appear, begotten by the speaker’s sin, which was the kiss between brother and sister, and which “shook the world and the firmament”. The speaker obviously has a very negative self-image, which reaches extreme proportions with regard to his supposed “crime”. In Linhart’s poem “Lied” (Pesem; Song, *ibid.* 220-223/386-87) the speaker expresses his sadness because the wind does not carry his sighs, his desires, to his beloved. The sun does not shine on him but her shadow will still “appeal to him” when he is dead, when she might visit his grave accompanied by her husband. The speaker ends his lament with the consolation that even a tear which she might shed for him would bring him back to life. Such exaggerated emotions are also typical of the lover’s feelings in Linhart’s tragedy, but the situation is reverse: Jenny dies and her lover, Eduard Sandwell, remains alive.

The fourth poem, which may be linked with Linhart’s play *MJL* is his “Die schlaflose Nacht” (Prečuta noč, A Sleepless Night, *ibid.* 213-14/383). The central motif in this poem is the speaker’s meditation on damages (on the ruin) he has caused to mankind by his evil deeds, by the pile of dead bodies which prevents him from sleeping. Whereas the first three poems discussed treat the connection between the heroine of the play and her lover, the theme of this poem may be related to the evil antagonist in *Miss Jenny Love*, to Lord Herington, to his murders and other crimes, which he had committed. Although the themes of these poems are dealt with by Linhart in a rather abstract manner, nevertheless the emotional impact of these images is very similar to feelings expressed by some of the characters in *Miss Jenny Love*. Could Linhart’s poems be the

source of his motifs, of the mood and emotions which he further developed in this play? The answer seems to be positive: although Linhart may have been inspired in his use of imagery by the pre-Romantic poetry, motifs which he treats in these poems were not likely used just as a “literary exercise” but they seem to be connected with the speaker’s personal experiences. This hypothesis offers a new possibility for the interpretation of Linhart’s *Miss Jenny Love*. Mirko Zupančič primarily sees Linhart’s choice of themes and imagery of his poems as the expression of the graveyard school of poetry. This is at least partially true but it would be a mistake to rule out the possibility that they are – at least to some extent – the expression of the poet’s own feelings at the time when he was writing his first play in Vienna. If we accept the assumption that the poet’s own feelings are the likely source for his characters and of the emotional background of *Miss Jenny Love*, then one of the riddles referring to the genesis of this play may have been at least partly explained.

In Linhart’s collection *Flowers from Carniola* there are also several poems expressing the speaker’s admiration of the beauty of nature (of the moon, the sun etc.) as well as poems, which Linhart wrote on themes Horace had used in his odes. In Linhart’s poem to the moon (ZD 218-19/385-86) Linhart asks the moon if it does not stop to listen to “sweet songs of Fingal’s son and his heroes”, to “pleasant sadness” of their melody, which would “bring light to souls of Morven warriors”. Gspan writes in his notes that the possible source Linhart used for these poems are the translations of James Macpherson’s *Fingal* by Melchior Cesarotti and Michael Denis (ZD 506). Zupančič mentions in his study Denis’s thoughts on the importance of folk poetry and he also points out that the Slovene translator of poems from this collection Damascen Dev inserted in his version a call urging the Slovenes to publish collections of Slovene folk poetry (Zupančič 1972: 78, 84-88). Linhart was familiar with English pre-Romantic poetry dealing with the images of nights, castles and graves (e.g. with Edward Young’s poems), but the heroic element of Macpherson’s *Fingal* must have also stirred in him patriotic feelings and an awareness of the importance of the hero’s actions for national consciousness, an aspect which has not received enough attention from Slovene critics. If we take into account the fact that Scotland was a separate kingdom until the legislative union with England in 1707, and that the Slovenes belonged to the Habsburg dynasty in Linhart’s time and even much longer (until the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy in 1918) we can notice in Linhart’s enthusiastic attitude to this Scottish hero (regardless of the historical truth) Linhart’s implicit desire for Slovene national independence. His choice of the subject-matter not only shows Linhart’s interest in the heroic past of the Scottish people but it also reflects his hope that both countries would be free, independent (however slight this hope was in Linhart’s time). Zupančič believes that Linhart as a state employee was “in a somewhat paradoxical situation” (102, 103): as a censor of books (and later as school inspector) he had to obey instructions he received from Vienna, and at the same time Linhart wished to stress his view on the historical significance and creativity of Slavic nations. His writings on Slavic history and his optimistic comedies are the best proof of his patriotic feelings.

In his collection *Flowers from Carniola* Linhart also published an interesting essay (written in prose, in German) titled “Über die Nutzbarkeit der natürlichen Philosophie” (Koristnost filozofije o naravi, On the utility of natural philosophy). The essay has a

subtitle, "From English" (ZD 253-59/402-406), and it is mainly based on the first epistle of Pope's philosophical poem "An Essay on Man" (1733-34). Mirko Zupančič at one point of his study (1972: 17) only surmises that Linhart's essays is "an adaptation of Pope's essay", but in his discussion of Linhart's philosophy he accepts the validity of this supposition (88-92). Alfonz Gspan believes that Linhart's article is a revised version of a paper which Linhart wrote while he was attending the sixth grade of the Jesuit college in 1772-73 (Gspan 1950: 516). Stanislav Južnič speculates that Linhart also used for his "translation" of Pope's essay an early German version of Pope's text (which was published in 1758) and possibly also a French translation (Južnič 2005: 319). If we compare Linhart's essay with Pope's treatise we see that Linhart shortened Pope's poem, but he may have been familiar with the whole poem, with all four epistles. Views which Linhart expressed in his essay are quite influential for the philosophical and religious background which is presented in Linhart's play *Miss Jenny Love* and therefore they are worth looking at more closely.

Pope's expresses in this philosophical poem his aim "to prove the ways of God to man and to define the universe as an entity". But – Pope states – we cannot see the universe as perfect or complete and because of our limited vision we cannot accept evil as the integral part of man's life. Linhart points out in his essay that man's existential duty is "his search for truth, wisdom and knowledge" and that the philosophy about the importance and value of nature can bring us "to heavenly scenes" where "beauty, order and harmony" were born (ZD 259/406). (Linhart's thoughts thus place him as one of the first Slovene intellectuals who was deeply conscious of the value and the necessity of preserving nature on the global level.) Linhart's theism is seen in his final demand expressed in this essay in which he states that we should never forget that God is the creator and supreme ruler of the universe who transcends his creation and that he is also the primeval and finite leader of man. Linhart concludes his essay by his plea to God to destroy those who deny God so that when "disappearing" they will say: "He is." (*ibid.*) This axiomatic statement is expressed in a slightly different way in Pope's last line of his first epistle "One truth is clear, 'Whatever is, IS RIGHT'" (Pope 1970: 51). Both Pope's and Linhart's final statements can be connected with the following quotation from the Bible: "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" (Gen. 18.25), implying the meaning that the ways of the Lord are (always) right. Linhart's final statement also brings to one's mind God's saying to Moses (Exod. 3.14): "And God said to Moses, I AM THAT I AM", which is usually interpreted as: I am the one whose existence does not have a beginning or an end. This is also the explanation in the latest Slovene edition of the *Bible* – "I am God, who am here for you, to save you" (119). Both interpretations are relevant for a number of statements made about God and man's fate by Linhart's characters in *Miss Jenny Love* (e.g. arguments about God expressed by Lord Herington; by Sandwell's former friend Warford as well as by Jenny's father, Sir William Love alias Sudderley). On the other hand many ideas which are stressed in Linhart's essay based on Pope's poetic treatise, reveal Linhart's persuasion that man can only reach the truth through his experience and search for knowledge, by his reason. Pope also stresses the role of an individual and his reasoning, as well as man's necessity to know himself (e.g. in the fourth epistle Pope states: "And all our knowledge, is Ourselves to know"; Pope: line 398). The duality of man's nature, of good and evil which coexist in man as

well as the division between his ratio and his senses, is also mentioned in Pope's essay, e.g. "Virtuous and vicious ev'ry Man must be" (epistle 2, line 231), or, "What Reason weaves, by Passion is undone" (3, 42). Such views also form the backbone of Linhart's philosophy as expressed by his characters in *Miss Jenny Love*. It is understandable that because Linhart shortened Pope's writing he could not include all themes which are dealt with in the source text and that he had to limit himself to essential "messages" from the first epistle. Besides, Pope's poem abounds in references to the Bible and to English writers (e.g. Shakespeare, Milton, Young, Swift) and also to different philosophers (e.g. Plato, Juvenal, Seneca, Horace, Thomas Aquinas, Montaigne etc.) who are not mentioned in Linhart's essay. The only exception among philosophers is Linhart's reference to Sir Isaac Newton (1643-1727), whose discoveries in physics and mathematics Linhart connects with man's knowledge about truth. According to Newton's belief God is present in every particle of Nature and as a transcendental Being he may help us to better understand Nature through Philosophy. Even in his shortened version of Pope's poem Linhart's essay is important regarding the philosophical background of his tragedy *Miss Jenny Love*.

V.

As I have already briefly indicated, Slovene literary historians have attributed an important influence on Linhart's domestic tragedy *Miss Jenny Love* to George Lillo's play *The London Merchant; or, the History of George Barnwell*. George Lillo (1693-1739) is little known today in the history of English literature. He was probably the descendant of Flemish refugees and a jeweller by profession. Lillo wrote six plays among which the most famous is *The London Merchant*. The source for Lillo's play was an old English ballad and the play was first produced at Drury Lane Theatre in London in 1731. By 1740 the play appeared in seven editions and it was also very successfully performed in the eighteenth century on the Continent where it was one of the most popular non-Shakespearean tragedies. This play is often mentioned in connection with the development of German drama, it influenced Lessing's plays and therefore it is understandable that Slovene literary historians started to link Lillo's play with Linhart's tragedy *Miss Jenny Love*. As early as 1920 the Slovene literary historian Ivan Grafenauer expressed his opinion that this play had more influence upon Linhart's play than Shakespeare's tragedies (1920: 111). Gspan, the editor of Linhart's works, thinks that one could find some similarities between the so-called "bourgeois tragedy", which originated in social processes taking place in the eighteenth century, and Linhart's *Miss Jenny Love* (he even mentions in this connection Edward Moore tragedy *The Gamester*, 1753). Among reasons for his statement Gspan mentions the subject-matter of these plays, the playwrights' rejection of Classicistic rules and the substitution of literary dialogue with everyday speech. As the main weakness of this type of drama he points out the exaggerated sentimentalism and bathos typical of Sturm und Drang (1950: 493). This view is mainly shared by another Slovene theatre critic and historian Filip Kalan in his essay and in his book on Anton Tomaž Linhart (1948: 275; 1979: 64, 95). Vladimir Kralj, who was an important Slovene critic and literary theoretician in the period before and immediately

after WWII, attributes Lillo's importance for Linhart to "the dramatist's confrontation of the middle class with the nobility and the feudal system, with which the progressive European bourgeoisie became relevant also in the dramatic art" (1956: 1101). In his monograph on Linhart written by Mirko Zupančič, the Slovene historian of drama and the theatre art, the author agrees with previous critical views on Lillo, and states that Lillo presents "the inner problems of the bourgeois class", which are connected with man's virtue, morality, honesty, "when a virtuous man becomes a victim and at the same time an accomplice in the crimes committed" (1972: 69-70). Janko Kos argues that the German Sturm und Drang movement does not rely so much on the atrocities which are presented in Shakespeare's revenge tragedies, but that their plays rely more on motifs and themes typical of the baroque period, on their sympathy for picturesque portrayal of life and vivid dramatic atmosphere (Kos 2001: 35). To some extent these views may also apply to Linhart's *MJL*, the extreme cruelty typical of the heroes in Shakespeare's great tragedies as well as of the protagonists in revenge tragedies definitely are seen also in Linhart's antagonist, Lord Herington, who could also be a villain in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* or in *Richard III*.

A number of details connecting Lillo's play *The London Merchant* and Linhart's *Miss Jenny Love* are also presented in Luka Vidmar's essay in which he thematically connects Linhart's *MJL* with Lessing's plays and with Klingler's play (2005: 147-167). Vidmar also compares Lillo's heroine, Millwood, with Linhart's villain Herington and points out the playwright's use of allegorical names for Linhart's characters. Because Lillo's play is nowadays almost forgotten some basic dramatic elements which appear in Lillo's tragedy and which are the same / or different than in Linhart's play should be briefly mentioned.

Lillo's play *The London Merchant* deals with the disastrous consequences of a young apprentice, George Barnwell, who is seduced by the pretty and cunning Sarah Millwood. Although he is essentially a virtuous man, his passion leads him to commit one crime after another even though his conscience pricks him at first. But he cannot resist Sarah's charm and when she entices him into stealing money from one of his uncles, he unintentionally kills him. Barnwell escapes imprisonment by going to sea, but his conscience stings him and he returns to London. Millwood, trying to save her skin, betrays Barnwell to the police, but she is finally also caught and they are both tried and sentenced to death. When they meet at the gallows Barnwell is still obsessed by his passion for Millwood, but he nevertheless hopes that he may be saved, whereas Millwood accepts her death without regretting her immorality or her evil deeds.

The play presents evil as a way of life. In this play evil is embodied in Millwood, who is referred to in the play as "a Devil", a moral trait which links her with Linhart's villain, Lord Herington. Both heroes are completely possessed by their sensuality: they lack basic moral norms, as well as essential Protestant virtues, which are typical of other characters in both plays. Some critics see Lillo's play as a morality debate, which echoes Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. Both dramatists, Lillo and Linhart, do not see any possibility of moral redemption of their "heroes", because their villains do not accept repentance as a possibility for redeeming themselves from vice. Millwood is a more powerful and complex character than Linhart's Lord Herington: she explains her immorality, her insatiable sexual lust and greed for money as a means which enables

herself to avoid being used by men for their satisfaction. But at the end of the tragedy she nevertheless sees herself as wicked (Lillo 160-1). On the other hand, Linhart's Herington does not accept his guilt, he also dies still being prepared to kill, he does not show any repentance for evil he has caused to other people, even to his "beloved" Jenny. In Linhart's tragedy his death follows as a natural consequence of his moral corruption as the natural result of the development of the plot.

Lillo's heroine, Millwood, notices Barnwell's dependence on her, as she says, in the way he gazes at her, "as if Desire increas'd by being fed" (Lillo 173). This image reminds us of Hamlet's description of the false relationship between Gertrude and Hamlet's father: "...she would hang on him / As if increase of appetite had grown / By what it fed on" (*Hamlet* 1.2.143-4). Whereas Barnwell repents his crimes when he is in prison, Millwood admits to her former lover that she had "sinn'd beyond the Reach of Mercy" and that she was "doom'd before the World began to endless Pains", because she had fallen prey to Despair (Lillo 207). Her views on life do not arouse in the reader any sympathetic feelings for the heroine. Lillo's didactic point of the play is rather obvious: those who transgress moral norms will be judged by society. The reader may nevertheless feel some compassion for Barnwell who admitted his crimes and his lust, but who was too weak morally to reject this way of life. The view that society will punish the evil-doer is also noticeable in Linhart's presentation of Lord Herington, who does not stop at performing any kind of crime in order to get his sensual satisfaction. Both characters, Lillo's Millwood and Linhart's Herington, only long for power which would enable them to satisfy their extreme sensuality, and which is, of course, in opposition to Protestant morality founded on reason. Lillo's heroine Millwood reminds us of Shakespeare's Lady Macbeth who also lures her husband into crimes, but who finally loses the clarity of her mind and "betrays" Macbeth by committing suicide, just as Millwood betrays Barnwell and brings him to destruction. Lord Herington in Linhart's play has the same kind of dramatic function as the two main characters in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, but he also reminds us of brutal villains of the Elizabethan and the Jacobean tragedy, e.g. of Hieronimo in Thomas Kyd's play *The Spanish Tragedy* (1592), of the Cardinal and his brother Ferdinand in John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* as well as of De Flores in *The Changeling*, which was written by Thomas Middleton and William Rowley. The last two plays were both first produced in 1623. There is no evidence that Linhart actually knew any of these plays, although *The Spanish Tragedy* was the prototype of the Revenge tragedy which influenced later tragedies of blood. Its influence may have been more indirect through works of minor playwrights like Lillo, even though the powerful impact of Shakespeare's great tragedies was dominant in the eighteenth century too.

Among morally positive characters in Lillo's play Vidmar enumerates some of them who may have served as possible parallels with characters in *Miss Jenny Love*. Such characters are, for example Trueman, who represents friendship in Lillo's play and who resembles Linhart's Heartwich; Maria, who symbolizes love, is like Jenny; Thorowgood, who stands for mercy, is similar to Linhart's Warford. Vidmar also suggests that names of characters in Linhart's play have allegorical features, e.g. Jenny symbolizes her longing for Love; Lord Herington's name shows his domineering personality (German "Herr" means "Sir, master"); Sandwell's and Heartwich's names signify that they are Jenny's "unfated saviours" (Vidmar 2005: 151-2). If we accept this supposition it is

still somewhat surprising that Linhart uses in *MJL* names of characters, which are not even listed in dictionaries of English names,³ and that he does not spell them properly (Herington's English version would be "Harrington", "Eduard" should be "Edward"). Such proper names are e.g. Heartwich, Warford, Sund, Andrews, Thomsen. It is possible that Linhart simply "invented" these names, and tried to link them with the features of their character, but without paying his attention to their possible usage in English language he made their symbolism rather ambiguous.

Among characters whom Luka Vidmar compares with Linhart's characters is also Marwood in Lessing's *Miss Sara Simpson* and Linhart's Lord Herington. But Marwood is not only a character in Lessing's play, she is also a well known character in William Congreve's comedy *The Way of the World; or, 1700*. In this play Marwood is rather ironically presented as an offended and revengeful woman who was rejected by the young lover Mirabell. Lord Herington's role is completely different: he is a real villain, a murderer, whereas Marwood's character is rather pitiful, almost comical. Among minor characters in Congreve's comedy the servant Waitwell also appears in Lessing's play. Such use of originally comic characters in a domestic tragedy not only shows the continuity of English literary tradition, it may also indicate the introduction of new social values and a new interpretation of characters which may be in juxtaposition to the previous period. In this way Lillo's debt to English literature in *The London Merchant* is seen in a continuation of English literary tradition, especially of the Restoration comedy. But Millwood's servants, Lucy and Blunt, are not only witty and humorous, as such minor characters in Restoration plays, but they are also the ones who finally observe the Protestant morality and are important for the development of the plot: they contribute to the tragic reversal in Lillo's play. Even in Shakespeare's great tragedies there are some comic characters, which provide a sharp contrast with the prevailing tragic action and which often create dramatic irony. However, there are no comic characters in Linhart's tragedy and this is one of the important differences between Lillo's and Linhart's play. Lillo established the connection between the English dramatic tradition, whereas Linhart could not do this and therefore the comic elements are missing in his play. In Lillo's *The London Merchant* this literary heritage is evident especially in Acts 1 and 2, when the heroine and her companions still enjoy the benefits of luxurious life provided to them by the easily ensnared victims, like Barnwell. In Lillo's tragedy we also come across a number of allusions made to other English literary works and to the Bible: e.g. Lillo's characters "borrow lines" which are spoken by Lady Wishfort in William Congreve's comedy *The Way of the World* (1.3.2); in Lillo's play there are several references to Shakespeare's play *The Comedy of Errors* (2.11.18), to Milton's *Paradise Lost* (2.1.9-11) and to Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* (5.11.25-30), not to mention allusions made to some other minor English playwrights. These allusions and references in Lillo's play also enrich its figurative language. In Linhart's *MJL* a number of thematic and linguistic parallels can be found between this play and plays written by German playwrights of the Sturm und Drang movement, and between Shakespeare's plays. The above examples show that similarities in the subject-matter

³ See: E. G. Withycombe, *The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names* (Oxford: OUP, 1950); John Ballard, ed. *Pronouncing Dictionary of Proper Names* (Detroit, Mich.: Omnigraphics Inc., 1993); *Chambers Encyclopedic English Dictionary*, ed. Robert Allen (Edinburgh: Chambers, 1994).

and portrayal of characters may to some extent show Lillo's influence on Linhart's *MJL*, but the supposition made by some Slovene critics and literary historians that Lillo's *The London Merchant* represents "the major source" for Linhart's play cannot be accepted. It is true that both in Lillo's play as well as Linhart's *MJL* the same spirit of the age is expressed, social values in both plays are very much alike, both plays are domestic tragedies marred by excessive sentimentality. But the plot of Lillo's play is much simpler than Linhart's complicated structure of events in *MJL* (which reminds us much more of Shakespeare's plays, especially of *King Lear* than of Lillo's play), each of the characters in Lillo's play has a very pointed and explicit moral purpose and is more persuasive as a human being than characters in Linhart's play who do not provide verisimilitude, the image of reality; they are too pathetic and too bombastic to be close to reality. Although there are a number of similarities between Lillo's and Linhart's play Linhart was nevertheless under much stronger influence of Shakespeare than of Lillo's *The London Merchant*.

VI.

Among Linhart's literary plans there was another possible tragedy which is mentioned by Linhart in his letter (written on 5 April 1781) to his friend Martin Kuralt. Linhart writes that "approximately four months ago the newspapers reported about the death of a famous Major André" (ZD 276/417). Linhart adds that André was aide-de-camp of British general Henry Clinton who served on the English side, and fought against the Americans. André was caught by the American forces and hanged by the order of George Washington. Historical details about Major André's life and his brave military performance are described by Alfonz Gspan in his notes to Linhart's letter (Gspan ZD: 534-36). What is relevant for our discussion is the fact that Linhart admired the behaviour of this officer, the courage he showed before the military court, so that he was intrigued enough to write a historical play about this soldier. Linhart's sympathy was probably on the side of his hero, because he was informed about the American war for independence by reports published in newspapers issued in the Habsburg Empire. The play should have been printed with the financial help of his patron and his friend, Baron Žiga Zois, but this never happened and even the manuscript of this play does not seem to exist any more. However, as we can gather from Linhart's correspondence with Kuralt, Linhart relied for the plot of his play on newspaper reports and he did not "invent" it. If we take into consideration this fact, and also the genesis of Linhart's poetry and of his two comedies – which he wrote later – we may surmise that Linhart may have had some source which also inspired him to write his tragedy *Miss Jenny Love*. But if we accept the hypothesis that Linhart (at least partly) based the plot of this play on his personal experience, what I have suggested above, such an explanation would support the opinion expressed by Janko Kos in his historical survey of Slovene literature, namely that *Miss Jenny Love* is "Linhart's most original play" (Kos 1982: 202). Particularly so, because we do not have any available evidence to prove that Linhart wrote his play by using some source which is not known. Linhart's dramatic skill is definitely shown in his comedies, whereas *MJL* was, in my opinion, his "dramatic battlefield" which

reflected his interest in the theatre and also enabled him to express his political, moral and social ideas.

VII.

Anton Tomaž Linhart wrote his first play *Miss Jenny Love* in Vienna towards the end of 1779 and it was printed in Augsburg in spring 1780. Various possible reasons for Linhart's decision to have the play printed in Germany have been mentioned before. In 1805 Linhart's book was mentioned by Marko Pohlin, a member of the Augustinian monastic order, who was himself the author of various literary and religious books. In 1918 Linhart's play was "rediscovered" in the National library in Vienna by Slovene literary historian France Kidrič (Kidrič 1918: 213-14). He saw in Linhart's *MJL* an important influence of Shakespeare's tragedies. Two years later Ivan Grafenauer expressed his view that although Linhart wished to write this play in Shakespeare's style, the play shows the influence of English bourgeois tragedy, which the young playwright could see in Lessing's *Miss Sara Simpson* and in Sonnenfels's writings (Grafenauer 1920: 111). In the 1930s France Koblar wrote in his article on Linhart that the subject-matter of Linhart's play reminded him of Shakespeare but in other aspects the dramatist showed his "Baroque taste" (Koblar 1932: 667). Another "spirit" of this tragedy was noticed by Bratko Kreft, who says in his article, which was published in 1946 in a daily newspaper in Ljubljana, that *MJL* was not only "the tragedy full of bloody actions", but that "it was also the manifest of youthful revolutionary spirit expressed by the Jacobean citizens and their hatred of the tyranny of rulers" in which Shakespeare's influence as well as Sturm und Drang movement are also present (Kreft 1946: 5).

A more "moderate" opinion about Linhart's tragedy was expressed by Dušan Moravec in his studies on Shakespeare in Slovenia. He did not find "important similarities" between Shakespeare's tragedies and Linhart's play, and he saw Shakespeare's prevailing influence simply in Linhart's decision to write this play, and much less in its plot, form and style (Moravec 1949: 51-74, 250-291). Moravec stuck to his observation also in later versions of his study. He also pointed out that Linhart appreciated Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and *King Lear* more than his *Hamlet* and he explained this fact with Linhart's concept of the tragic mood, which was closer to him in the first two plays than to *Hamlet*. Moravec also indirectly refers to Lessing's theoretical views on drama, as expressed in Lessing's work *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, but he does not go into details.

In the following year, in 1950, Alfonz Gspan edited Linhart's Collected works and he mainly repeated views expressed by Dušan Moravec as regards Shakespeare's influence on *MJL*. He also mentioned Linhart's rejection of pseudo-classicism. Gspan based Linhart's adoration of Shakespeare's genius in the Bard's psychological delineation of man's nature and on his gigantic personages who are full of extreme passion. Gspan also directs the reader's attention to plays written by Lillo, Moore, and Lessing. The opinion of literary historians like Filip Kalan, Vladimir Kralj, Mirko Zupančič, Jože Pogačnik, Luka Vidmar and views of some others critics about this topic are not essentially different from the above mentioned opinion expressed by Moravec. Some literary

historians, like Mirko Zupančič and Luka Vidmar, have more closely investigated the possible influence of Lessing and Sturm und Drang movement on *Miss Jenny Love*.

Linhart's subtitle to *MJL* is "Ein Trauerspiel in fünf Aufzügen" (Tragedija v petih dejanjih, A tragic play in five acts) and it indicates that the play is not written in the Aristotelian tradition of tragedy representing historical or mythological figures and (semi) gods, but that the author tried to apply the tragic form to the subject-matter dealing with the middle class citizens and their tyrannical feudal lords. Such plays are full of highly coloured (sentimental) melodramatic feelings, and they often present middle-class (bourgeois) citizens and their tyrannical feudal lords. Typical examples of this kind of tragedy are Lillo's play as well as Lessing's tragedies, which have been mentioned before. W. H. Fraser (2009) has suggested to me that another possible source which Linhart may have known is Marie-Jeanne Riccoboni work *The Story of Miss Jenny* (publ. in 1764). Riccoboni was influenced by the Scottish writer Henry Mackenzie, who was the author of *The Man of Feeling* (published anon. in 1771). The hero of this novel is a weak creature, dominated by a futile benevolence, who goes up to London and falls into the hands of people who exploit his innocence. Riccoboni's writing can be compared to Mackenzie's and her story was translated into Italian by Goldoni and it was presumably quite well known.

Linhart tried to follow in his tragedy *Miss Jenny Love* the type of complex dramatic structure by using the synthetic technique, which was also used by Shakespeare in his great tragedies, in which the dramatist presents on the stage only those parts of the story which are directly followed by conflicts and catastrophe. The main trap for the dramatist if he uses this kind of structure lies in the necessity that the dramatist should also include in the present action some basic explanation of events which had taken place before the beginning of the play. Shakespeare masterfully avoided this trap by providing reliable, persuasive motives for actions performed in his plays by various (even minor) characters. Otherwise, if the characters do not have sufficiently developed individual traits, they are likely to become types rather than individuals. In Shakespeare's plays such explanations of previous acts of his characters are intricately interwoven in the texture of his plays and in this way the playwright creates a group of persuasive human beings representing their individual aims, and the effect of the play is the result of well explained causes. This is undoubtedly one of the main difficulties with which a dramatist using this kind of technique is faced. It seems most likely that Linhart was not fully aware of this problem or that he simply did not know how to solve it. The reader does not get enough information about the causes of previous actions of his characters, their actions and their relations, and thus all major characters in *MJL* are insufficiently portrayed to be real human beings. If such "an explanation" which should be provided by the author is missing in minor characters (e.g. in Lord Herington's servants) the problem is less noticeable, because such characters are often interpreted according to the function they perform in the development of the story rather than independent, integral personages. If major characters are one-sided then their speech often remains in the form of a cliché, or as a philosophical, moral or religious monologue, showing maybe even the character's inner struggle, but without a closer link with the development of the story. This is the main cause of insufficient link between the episodes in Linhart play, and this is why Zupančič complained that "it is more difficult to summarize the story of Linhart's

tragedy *Miss Jenny Love* than it appears at the first glance”, because “a survey of the external presentation of events cannot sufficiently demonstrate the real contents and problems of Linhart’s play” (Zupančič 1972: 32, 35). Zupančič summarizes one scene after another of Linhart’s *MJL*, whereas Filip Kalan avoided this difficulty by dividing the characters into two groups, depending on their attitude to Jenny, the heroine, or to her opponent, Lord Herington (Kalan 1979: 68). Both critics thus prove that Linhart’s combination of episodes in *MJL* is rather complicated and that it does not contribute to the unity of the play, to the concentration of events in the development of the plot and, consequently, to the staging of *Miss Jenny Love*.

The plot of *MJL* develops around the attempts of Lord Herington, who has kidnapped Jenny Love, to force her to be his beloved and to do away with his opponents. Herington keeps her hidden at the manor house of Sir William Love, alias Sudderley, who is her father. Her lover Sandwell and his friend Heartwich try to rescue Jenny, although Herington’s men, including Sandwell’s former friend Warford, had already tried to murder Sandwell. Jenny’s mother, Lady Sara, has also come to Sudderley’s house hoping to help her daughter. In the meantime, Herington’s loyal servant Sund returns from his mission and tells Herington that the plot did not succeed and that Sandwell is still alive. They decide to use Warford again as a murderer, although now he regrets his betrayal of Sandwell but is at the same time too afraid of Herington to oppose him. Sudderley is in a similar situation as Warford is: he would like to help his daughter, but he is also scared of Herington, because Herington knows that Sudderley killed his wife’s brother and therefore Herington can victimize him. Sudderley had left his wife Sara and his daughter Jenny sixteen years ago, but now he would like to help them. As the story develops Lady Sara discovers Sudderley’s identity, but she hopes for the best. Warford was sent by Herington to murder Sandwell, but when Warford and Sandwell meet Sandwell forgives Warford. Warford informs Sandwell that Herington has already taken Jenny to his home in Edinburgh. In the mountains a fight between Herington’s men and Warford takes place and at first Sandwell becomes a suspected murderer, but the situation is later cleared up. Sund reports to his master that both Warford and Sandwell were killed, but when the police arrive Herington delivers Sund to the police. He intends to kill his “enemies”, and to sacrifice Jenny who would not accept his proposal to become his “property”. However, Sudderley gathers enough courage to prevent Herington’s murders and he stabs Herington. Jenny unintentionally reveals the identity of her father to the police officer. In spite of all the hardship she and her mother had to go through because of him she still loves her father and tries to protect him before the hands of justice. At this crucial moment several characters appear in Herington’s house with the intention to save Jenny (they are like characters from *deus ex machina* coming just at the right time in the manner of Fortinbras appearing at Elsinore). These are: Jenny’s lover Sandwell, his friend Heartwich and Jenny’s mother, Lady Sara. Jenny is overwhelmed by her happiness and she dies at the moment of her reunion with Sandwell. Before Sudderley is taken to prison he asks for his wife’s forgiveness, and she answers him that “God may forgive you and my prayers”. When Sandwell seizes his sword to kill Sudderley Sandwell’s friend Heartwich stops him by saying that he should pull himself together, for “There are enough people already dead!” (ZD 5.10; 182/365) The dramatic role of Heartwich in *MJL* is like Horatio’s function in Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*:

he is Sandwell's trustworthy friend and at the same time the only rational voice who opposes the extreme emotions of people around him. Heartwisch blames Sandwell for his lack of use of reason and he is ready to sacrifice himself for Sandwell, although the very fact that they have to defend their innocence makes him appeal to Heaven for help but he questions God's mercy (4.7; 177/357). The situation when an innocent person is accused of sin and tries to bring Heaven as a "witness of truth" reminds us of two scenes when Desdemona tries to persuade Othello that she speaks the truth (4.2; 5.2). But Desdemona pays for Iago's wrong judgement about her with her life, whereas Sandwell and Heartwisch remain alive.

In Linhart's tragedy there are a number of examples which prove a strong link between Shakespeare and Linhart, which is mainly provided by the metaphorical language used in Shakespeare's great tragedies and by the figures of speech used by Linhart's characters in *Miss Jenny Love*. What is even more relevant is the fact that Linhart uses the figurative speech in dramatic situations which are very similar (or almost the same) to the ones in Shakespeare's tragedies. These situations happen most frequently in such moments, when the dramatic tension is brought to a climax of a particular scene. In several cases Linhart's image is a direct translation of an image which was used by Shakespeare in one of his tragedies, in some cases it is a paraphrase of Shakespeare's imagery.

The evil Lord Herington, who remains until the end of the play a one-dimensional character, is a real protagonist of the play, but he is without any important opposition regarding his immoral behaviour. Neither his nor Jenny's character develops, and none of them is/ or becomes a human being who would try to see his/her actions from a distance so that they could see the real nature of their mental and physical state. This is also valid for other characters in the play. Whereas the reader notices how "Things fall apart" and how "The best lack all conviction, while the worst / Are full of passionate intensity" (W. B. Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming"), Linhart's characters do not.

Jenny Love is presented in Linhart's play as a naive girl, who is platonically in love with Eduard Sandwell. She passively waits what is going to happen to her after she had been kidnapped. Jenny hates Herington and she is in many ways as helpless as Ophelia is in *Hamlet*. Her mother calls her "an angel" (2.2.; 142/338), an image which was also often used in Shakespeare's plays and in his poetry (e.g. Romeo addresses Juliet "bright angel", 2.1.26 etc.). Although Jenny does not fit Hamlet's description of a perfect human being ("how like an angel in apprehension", *Hamlet* 2.2.309-310), she nevertheless satisfies the basic ethical quality of this simile: she is a kind, lovely, innocent person. Her mother, Lady Sara, feels guilty, because in crucial moments when Jenny is terrorized by Lord Herington, Sara thinks that she has not cared enough for Jenny after her husband had left them. Sara is shocked to see that Jenny would gladly die, if death was her only chance not to become Herington's "property". Sara accuses Sudderley that he delivered Jenny into the hands of the Devil (3.4; 156/348). When Sara brings Jenny the bad news that Lord Herington will take Jenny to his house in Edinburgh, where Jenny would be completely dependent on his mercy, and when Jenny states that this will be her death, Lady Sara appropriately uses for herself a contrasting image to the one she had used for Jenny, she calls herself "an angel of death" (2.2.; 143/339). Before her death Jenny's mind is disturbed, she is like Ophelia before drowning and

in her phantasmagorical dream she hopes that Eduard can provide wings to carry her over “the rocks” to freedom. This image is linked with the precipice above the sea, and her mother reminds Jenny that then she may “possibly have to look the Scottish bear in the mouth” (3.4; 156/348). Shakespeare uses this metaphor in *King Lear* in the scene when the hero is caught in the storm in the open countryside. Kent and the Fool, who accompany Lear, try to persuade him to use the shelter in order and protect himself from rain. But Lear, who had been badly treated by his daughters, Goneril and Regan, and is hurt by their filial ingratitude, answers Kent with the following words:

... where the greater malady is fixed,
The lesser is scarce felt. Thou’dst shun a bear;
But if thy flight lay toward the roaring sea,
Thou’dst meet the bear i’th’mouth. When the mind’s free,
The body’s delicate ... *King Lear* 3.4.8-12

Like *King Lear*, Jenny places her mental state above everything else: if she must fight for her life she would rather look “the Scottish bear in the mouth” than become Herington’s “property”; she is rather prepared to face death than to be “owned” by Herington. The image of “the rugged Russian bear” is used by Macbeth when he sees (Banquo’s) Ghost at the banquet (3.4), but the former image from *King Lear* is closer to the meaning of the scene in *Miss Jenny Love* than the one from *Macbeth*.

Linhart also uses here a metaphor when Jenny expresses her hope that her beloved Sandwell might provide wings for her so that she could be taken like in a storm over all the rocks (ZD 3.4; 156/347). Both images are also connected with Jenny’s imagined jump into the abyss, though still bring her freedom. The second image used by Linhart is also similar to the image used by the Earl of Gloucester who wishes to end his life by a jump from the cliffs at Dover. But Gloucester’s son Edgar makes his blinded father “jump” in such a way that Gloucester falls on the even ground and is thus saved (4. 6). However; both Gloucester and Jenny are saved only temporarily, and their tragic fate seems to be more predictable than the fate of those who caused their tragedies, although the evil-doers are also punished in both plays.

In the final scenes of Linhart’s play Jenny can be compared to Shakespeare’s Ophelia. Both heroines unsuccessfully search for love, for happiness. Ophelia is rejected by Hamlet and used by her father, Polonius, for his own political purposes. She goes insane and she drowns. Jenny is at first maltreated by Herington (5.6) and later, when she loses consciousness, she is not always aware of people who encircle her (5.7 – 5.10). Being only half conscious, Jenny hopes, like Ophelia, that “all will be well” (*Ham.* 4.5.67), that Eduard’s presence will set her free from the “devil” and that she will be reunited with Sandwell. Linhart even includes a grotesque situation which is very close to black comedy: Jenny holds Herington’s hands and speaks to him as if he were Sandwell (ZD 5.6; 176/361). Ophelia does not die on the stage and her death is only reported by the Queen (4.7). Linhart uses the final meeting between Jenny and Herington to make him decide that she is going to die because “he had loved her so much” (*ibid.*) But the playwright does not allow Herington to perform this murder, and Herington is stabbed by Jenny’s father. Jenny “embraces with her final look her father, her mother and her lover” (5.10; 181/364), and she dies overwhelmed by her feelings. Similarly, *King Lear*

wishes to protect Cordelia after she has died and he brings her to the camp in his own hands (5.3), and Jenny's father tries to protect her from Herington. A few moments later Jenny tries to protect her father from the law, she would not allow the officer to take her father to prison and it is he who – in spite of all his sins – gives her the last kiss (5. 8; 5.10; 179, 182/363, 365). If we compare Ophelia in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Jenny in Linhart's tragedy we can see many similarities between their characters: for example, they both lack self-awareness and their personal integrity; emotionally, they completely depend on their lovers even though they also show their filial obedience. These heroines are not mentally sane before their deaths whereas Desdemona's reactions are completely rational before she is smothered by Othello (5.2). Iago's wife Emilia describes the couple with a simile, which fits the moral values of Jenny's and Herington's character: "O, the more angel she, / And you the blacker devil" (*Othello* 5.2.130-31). Just as Othello was suspected to have used "mighty magic" to win Desdemona (1.3), Herington cannot explain his obsession with Jenny as a kind of normal female – male attraction, but he assigns Jenny unnatural qualities: "Oh, you, Magician! Goddess! Fury! Let me use the odour for you! I wish to make sacrifice to you!" (2.4; 144/340). Of course, the reality is just the opposite, it is both lovers and not their "beloved" who have lost the sanity of their judgment.

Linhart's portrayal of Jenny is in complete contrast with Herington's character. Jenny's love for Sandwell is depicted as platonic, although Linhart never discovers the depth of their relationship. When Jenny compares her feelings towards her father with those towards Sandwell, who had often "left her alone in the dizziness of her absorbed delight" (3.5; 158/348), Lady Sara does not encourage Jenny's love for Sudderley, she is rational rather than emotional.

Lady Sara's character is somewhat illusive: although she worries about Jenny's fate she is also quite a practical person who thinks about her future when Jenny is still entrapped by Herington. All of them, Lady Sara, Jenny and Sudderley dream about leaving Scotland (3.4; 157/348), but whereas Sudderley fosters an illusion that the whole family will begin a new life in America, Lady Sara mentions to Jenny that the King has set a price on Sudderley's head and that trying to leave Scotland together would mean his death. In a selfish way she does not even envisage the flight to America together with Jenny: she tells her that she wishes to go to America "to be safe from all the news" (3.5; 158/349). It seems that the image of America as "a promised land" represents for Jenny's mother her "complete independence", her "freedom", even from Jenny and Sudderley. It is interesting that immediately after Linhart's return from Vienna, when he did not have yet a suitable job, Linhart also thought about going to America to find there "freedom" and to earn there his bread rather than starve at home, as he reports in his letter to Kuralt in February 1781 (*ZD* 275/416). In spite of Lady Sara's frequent repetitions how much she loves Jenny, her love is not "pure", but it is somewhat selfish and incomplete. Actually all three characters (Jenny, her mother Sara and her father Sudderley) lack proper feelings of love and therefore Linhart's choice of their surname, Love, is rather ironic.⁴ Although "love" can be considered as the main theme of Linhart's play, it is basically

⁴ Professor Fraser suggests that "this surname (Love) is not a particularly Scottish name". However, certain Mr and Mrs Love, British actors, were active in the London Theatre in these years (in the 1770s, M.J.) at Drury Lane and at the Haymarket" (Fraser 2009).

lack of love which is the cause of this domestic tragedy. Jenny's love is shown mainly as platonic, Sudderly did not love his wife and his daughter enough, he killed Sara's brother and he abandoned the family. Even though the plot in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* cannot be taken as a straightforward parallel between King Claudius in *Hamlet* and Sudderley in *MJL*, they are both criminals, who killed a close relative of those who they proclaim that they love. On the other hand Herington's "love" for Jenny is sick, it is an abnormal obsession and therefore his actions are vile and extreme. Herington is even prepared to kill Jenny in order "to prove his love", just as Othello tries to explain his murder of Desdemona by saying "and I will kill thee, / And love thee after." (5.2.18-9). Although Desdemona asks Othello not to kill her and she says: "That death's unnatural that kills for loving" (5.2.43), Othello does not listen to her and smothers her. Herington plans to act in the same way, but he is stopped by Jenny's father, who tries to save Jenny and he thus commits his second murder.

Although Lady Sara brings to Jenny the message that Herington intends to take her to his house in Edinburgh, the real "angel of death" is Lord Herington, whose life was spent in his abnormal love for Jenny and in killing people who opposed him.⁵ In *Macbeth*, before the hero is slain by Macduff, he is told that he should be prepared to meet "the angel whom thou still has served" (5.8.14-16), i.e. the angel of death. Because of Lord Herington's murders several persons rightly call him "the devil" (e.g. Sandwell, 1.1; 133/332; Lady Sara, 3.4; 154/346; 3.6; 159/349). Herington even dares other people to make him the Devil (1.6; 38/355), and he compares his eloquence to that of Satan (1.6; 140/336). If he were "a man", if he listened to Jenny's pleas for freedom then he would lose Jenny and therefore he rather remains to be "Devil" (3.1.; 151/344). He asks Hell to give him the utmost power so that "his soul will fall into this precipice and enjoy the surplus of delight which it had prepared" (5.3; 173/359). When Herington sees that his end is near he complains to Hell about the loss of power and asks Hell to rage in him – as in any kind of a wild beast – to "crown" his wild deeds (3.7; 177/362). But just as Macbeth cannot accept the news that Fleance had escaped the murderers (3.4), so is Herington unhappy until Sund tells him the lie that Sandwell was murdered (5.2; 172/359).

Among the characters who oppose Herington we notice that he has an uneasy relationship with Lady Sara. He complains about her arrival at Sudderley's estate where she has followed Jenny and he tells Sudderley that he does not wish to see Sara in Edinburgh. He tells Sudderley that if Sara comes to Edinburgh "she will lose her sight because I (Herington, M.J.) will throw at her a handful of Herington's glitter" (*MJL* 1.4;

⁵ A. T. Linhart intended to write a play on major John André who was a historical character (see above) and therefore I was intrigued by the possibility that Linhart's portrayal of Lord Herington might be based on a real person too. "There was a Lord Harrington, the second earl of Harrington, who had been a soldier and a diplomat. He died in April 1779 (*sic!* M.J.) and it is possible that his death was reported in Austria. He had fought in the War of the Austrian Succession in the 1740s, so it is possible that Linhart, looking for an English name hit on this one." (Fraser 2009.) Although the year of Lord Harrington's death coincides with Linhart's stay in Vienna, when Linhart was writing *Miss Jenny Love*, there is not enough evidence that Lord Harrington was a model for Linhart's Lord Herington, because as much as we know Lord Harrington had an unblemished character and therefore it is possible that Linhart's choice of this name was incidental. As regards the spelling of this name my explanation has been given above. Some kind of Linhart's personal involvement in an emotionally difficult situation as I have tried to indicate in my explanation of some of his poems may still be a possible reason for the genesis of this play.

137/334). Herington obviously thinks that he can buy everybody. He tells Jenny's father that he will make Jenny live like a princess (3.2; 153/345), although Jenny is afraid of Herington, she even hates him. Sudderley answers Herington that this will not make Herington "an honest man", and that he would rather see Jenny happy than be married to a man whom she does not love, and who is evil. The announced blinding of Lady Sara if she comes to Edinburgh to save Jenny brings to the reader's mind the blinding of the Earl of Gloucester. Herington is just as evil as Gloucester's daughter Regan and her husband, Duke of Cornwall (*King Lear* 3.6-7), are. However, it seems that in the above mentioned scene such a gruesome act is not (yet) in Herington's mind.

Lord Herington has to persuade himself before he decides to kill his opponents that he is a man whom nobody can contradict and that he is cruel enough to do anything to achieve his goal. However, he does occasionally hesitate, for example, when he forces Sandwell's former friend Warford to kill Sandwell, because he has noticed that Warford does not wish to be loyal to him any more (1.6; 140/336). His sadism creates in his mind such a morbid, gruesome image as that of "his nuptial bed, which will be made of bones of people he had killed" (2.4; 144/339). But when he sees that he has failed in his attempt to win Jenny Herington decides that "the marriage torch should be blown out" and that Jenny should die so that she could not enjoy Sandwell's love. This scene between Jenny and Herington can be compared with the scene when Othello is determined that Desdemona should die, because Iago has persuaded him that she loves Cassio. Othello says that he will "Put out the light, and then put out the light" (5.2.5). A similar image is used by Macbeth after Seton has informed him about the death of Lady Macbeth: "Out, out brief candle!" (3.5.23). Just as the marriage knot between Macbeth and Lady Macbeth is sealed with Duncan's blood and deaths of other people likewise Herington plans that his bond with Jenny will be "coloured with blood" (2.4; 144/339). Iago never regrets his evil plotting and the deaths he has caused and although Othello wounds Iago "that demi-devil" (5.2.300), Othello's message to Iago is: "I'd have thee live-/For, in my sense, 'tis happiness to die" (5.2; 288/89). Such a threat is also expressed by Herington who despises Sudderley's "feminine blood" and has decided that he will not kill Sudderley: Lord Herington tells Sudderley that he wishes him to see the suffering of his daughter and therefore his revenge will be more cruel, he will let Sudderley live and thus "pierce his father's heart" (3.2; 153/345). In both cases, in *Othello* as well as in *Miss Jenny Love*, the avengers find death a lesser evil than living.

A number of parallels between the English tragedy of blood and Linhart's play *Miss Jenny Love* can also be made as regards the villain and his servants – that is, his "tools", his "instruments". Lord Herington knows that it was his "own and the devil's eloquence" which made Warford the instrument of his desire to kill Sandwell (3.1; 151/336), but he nevertheless wants to use Warford for his evil purpose. Although Herington's servant Sund is a real diabolical character, very much like Bosola in Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*, Sund primarily reminds us of Iago and his plotting in *Othello*. The final dramatic situation in *Miss Jenny Love* and in *Othello* is practically the same: Iago is taken prisoner and Othello dies, and in *MJL* Sund is taken away by the guard, and Lord Herington dies. Sund is a character very much like the villains in Jacobean drama; he is a less complex character than Shakespeare's Iago in *Othello* or Edmund in *King Lear*, but these villains are nevertheless appropriate prototypes of people whose

malice has no limit. Linhart's villains are very similar to Shakespeare's evil characters in these plays.

Among characters in this play the most ambiguous and morally instable and weak are Sandwell's former friend Warford, and Jenny's father, Sir William Love, alias Sudderley. Both of them have betrayed people who have trusted them: Warford had betrayed his friend Sandwell and Sudderley his wife Sara and his daughter Jenny. They are both weaklings who only oppose their master when they find themselves in a very crucial situation. Warford has bought Herington's friendship by allowing Herington to use him as Sandwell's murderer but at the moment of his own crisis Warford is so much filled with despair that he is willing to commit suicide rather than continue living his shameful life or standing up to Herington. When Lady Sara sees this she is rather touched by Warford's emotions and her friendliness to him cannot easily be explained (2.5-8). Warford believes that he is a killer (although his attempt to kill Sandwell had failed), and wishes to find out the truth about himself and the world. He is a split personality, and he may be linked with several characters in Shakespeare's tragedies. Warford asks himself a typical Cartesian question: "Where am I? Where have I been?" (2.9; 149/343), which are exactly the same words as the ones spoken by King Lear when he wakes up in the French camp after he had been brought there by Cordelia (4.7.52). Like King Lear Warford is not certain whether the situation in which he finds himself is real or is it just a dream, an illusion. Further on, Warford is not certain if his willingness to murder already makes him a murderer. This is also the question which bothers Macbeth before killing King Duncan. Lady Macbeth answers him: "th'attempt and not the deed / Confounds us" (Mac. 2.1.10-11). Warford's own reply to this question is practically the same: "The willingness is already the guilt! If the act fails, the guilt remains! Only the aim has not been achieved!" (2.9; 149/343). Warford's long monologue before his meeting with Sandwell and Heartwich is a kind of pastiche of the monologue spoken by King Claudius in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* when the King admits his "foul murder" (3.3.52). Both, Claudius and Warford, realize that before God "the action lies / In his true nature" (3.3.61/62). Although Warford's meditation takes place at midnight in a wild, rocky landscape (4.1; 161/351) the land is peaceful and he "wanders around sightless, discovering everywhere the abyss, a deep, immense abyss"; this is a scene which could take place in *Macbeth*. It is not only the imagery which is in Linhart's play similar to Shakespeare's imagery in his great tragedies but also Warford's feelings of hopelessness and despair, which are felt by the Earl of Gloucester and King Lear before their deaths too.

VIII.

Anton Tomaž Linhart wrote his first play *Miss Jenny Love* when he was only twenty-three years old. Although the play was published already in 1780, it was almost completely forgotten and neglected until 1918, when the text was found in the National Library in Vienna. Because the text was written in German it was not whole-heartedly accepted by Slovene literary historians until after the end of World War II, in 1950, when *Miss Jenny Love* was translated into Slovene by Bratko Kreft and published (together with the German original) in Linhart's *Zbrano delo* (Collected Works). Most Slovene

critics have pointed out that *Miss Jenny Love* is artistically a much weaker play than Linhart's comedies and therefore it has been much less discussed than *Županova Micka* (Molly, the Mayor's Daughter) and *Ta veseli dan, ali Matiček se ženi* (This Happy Day, or Matiček Gets Married). The critics' preference for Linhart's comedies is quite natural, because both of them – although they are also adaptations of foreign plays – were so masterfully transformed into Slovene social and cultural environment that in comparison with *Miss Jenny Love*, which takes place in Scotland, they are much closer in spirit to Slovene audiences, and what is even more relevant, they are also dramaturgically much more successfully written.

Miss Jenny Love was performed at the one-hundredth anniversary of the Slovene Dramatic Society on 20 October 1967 at the Slovene National Theatre Drama in Ljubljana, and the performance was dedicated to the memory of Anton Tomaž Linhart. The original translation by Bratko Kreft was slightly revised for the performance and the play was the result of a joint production of professional Drama actors and students of the theatre Academy in Ljubljana. On 28 May 1979 the play was produced at the theatre in Nova Gorica where it was directed by Branko Kraljevič. The two-hundredth anniversary of Linhart's publication of *Miss Jenny Love* was celebrated by a double-bill including *MJL* and *Županova Micka*. This production was prepared by Andrej Inkret under the title *Play Linhart 1780–1789* (SLG Celje, the premiere was on 16 Nov. 1979), and directed by Franci Križaj. All productions were reviewed by well-known Slovene theatre critics, among them by Josip Vidmar, Vasja Predan, Lojze Smasek, Jože Snoj, France Vurnik, Slavko Pezdir and some others. There are two common features which appear in their reviews, namely that Linhart as the beginner of Slovene drama should be produced more often, but that due to the dramaturgical weaknesses of *Miss Jenny Love* the theatres should stick to the production of Linhart's comedies.

In spite of the advantages which place Linhart's comedies on a higher level, a number of Slovene critics and literary historians have analysed the text of Linhart's tragedy *Miss Jenny Love* particularly from the perspective of its "debt" to German philosophical, literary and political movements in the final decades of the eighteenth century. Although there are some minor differences among Slovene critics regarding their views, they have firmly based Linhart's *Miss Jenny Love* in the framework of the then predominant literary achievements, especially the Sturm und Drang movement. Janko Kos persuasively proves that Linhart's tragedy definitely belongs to the European thought of the eighteenth century expressing the playwright's views of the world and that Linhart can definitely be placed among the European thinkers of the Enlightenment period. Ivo Svetina accepts Taras Kermauner's statement that this is the first Slovene tragedy, although this assertion may still seem somewhat questionable to some Slovene literary historians and critics. Although Igor Grdina is persuaded that *Miss Jenny Love* shows the influence of the Sturm und Drang movement (e.g. escalating monologues, the location of the scenes, the exclusion of reason-based cause-effect logic; Grdina 2005: 568), he nevertheless points out that Linhart's whole work is strongly embedded in the European spiritual sphere. Among the early researchers of Linhart's work and especially of his play *Miss Jenny Love* we can find a lot of similarity concerning this play in views taken by Alfonz Gspan, Dušan Moravec and even Mirko Zupančič, whose remarks about the insufficient psychological delineation of characters, the play's loose

structure and emotionally overstressed characters are acceptable. Luka Vidmar's attempt to link Linhart's play with George Lillo's play *The London Merchant*, is worth taking into consideration, although he overestimates this influence particularly if Lillo's play is compared with Linhart's "borrowings" from Shakespeare's plays.

It is really quite surprising that a large majority of Slovene literary historians and critics has not taken under close scrutiny the adaptations of Shakespeare's texts, which were practiced in England since 1660. Their aim to see productions of Shakespeare's plays in Austrian and Central European theatres only as a result of the theatrical activities limited to this region is incomplete because Slovene critics have not taken into consideration theatrical links which existed between England and Europe too in the discussed period. Besides, the intertwined relations between Shakespeare and authors of the revenge tragedy and the Restoration comedy, as I have shown with a number of parallels and "borrowings", also throw light on Linhart's tragedy *Miss Jenny Love*. Therefore the neglect among Slovene critics of the influence Shakespeare had on Anton Tomaž Linhart is rather unusual particularly because it was limited to the genesis of the play rather than "its contents, form and style" (Gspan 1950: 493). The numerous examples quoted in my study show that it is impossible to deny Shakespeare's influence on Linhart's play as regards the structure of the play, its numerous (Shakespearean) monologues, Linhart's use of metaphors and figurative language as well as a number of similar (or the same) essential philosophical questions which are implied in particular dramatic units. Even though these component parts of Linhart's drama do not provide an artistic accomplishment which would place *Miss Jenny Love* among really important Slovene dramatic achievements, Linhart nevertheless made with this play the first – and also difficult – step towards Shakespeare's orbit; it was a step which led him to his great success in his later plays, in his comedies.

University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

WORKS CITED

- Dryden, John. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy." *Selected Works of John Dryden*. Ed. William Frost. New York, Toronto: Reinhart & Co. Inc., 1955. 363-64.
- Fraser, W. H. Letter to Mirko Jurak, 1 June 2009.
- Grafenauer, Ivan. *Zgodovina novejšega slovenskega slovstva I. Od Pohlina do Prešerna*. Ljubljana, Katoliška bukvarna, 1909.
- _____. *Kratka zgodovina slovenskega slovstva*. Ljubljana: Jugoslovanska knjigarna, 1920.
- Grdina, Igor. "Anton Tomaž Linhart. Poskus leksikografskega orisa." *Linhart 2005*: 547- 83.
- Gspan, Alfonz. "Opombe k /Linhartovim/ tekstem." *Anton Tomaž Linhart. Zbrano delo 1. (= ZD)* Ljubljana: DZS, 1950. 443-579.
- _____. "Razsvetljenje." *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva I.* Ed. Lino Legiša. Ljubljana: SM. 329-440.
- _____. "Pisma A. T. Linharta gornjeluziškemu preporoditelju dr. Karlu Gotlobu Antonu." *Dokumenti SGM 8-9* (1966). 133-66.
- _____. "Geneza, vsebina in stil dramatičnih del A. T. Linharta." *IV. Seminar slovenskega jezika, Literature in kulture*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 1968. 1-23.

- Halliday, F. E. *A Shakespeare Companion. 1564-1964*. Penguin books, 1964.
- Holy Bible. The New Scofield Reference Bible*. Ed. C. I. Scofield. New York, OUP, 1967.
- Inkret, Andrej. *Play Linhart 1780–1789*. SLG Celje (the premiere: 17 Nov. 1979; theatre programme no. 4).
- Jurak, Mirko. "Vloga in pomen virov za Shakespearovo dramatiko." *William Shakespeare. Zbrana dela*. Ed. Matej Bor. Ljubljana: DZS, 1974. 499-545.
- _____. *Od Shakespeara do naših sodobnikov*. Ljubljana: ZIFF, Partizanska knjiga, 1983.
- _____. "Some Additional Notes on Shakespeare." *Acta Neophilologica* 38.1-2 (2004): 3-48.
- Kalan, Filip. "Obris gledališke zgodovine pri Slovencih." *Novi svet III*. Ljubljana: DZS, 1948.
- _____. *Anton Tomaž Linhart. Znameniti Slovenci*. Ljubljana: Partizanska knjiga, 1979.
- _____. "Linhart med viharštvom in svetovljanstvom." *Gledališki list Drane SNG* 16, 1998/99. 34, 36-40.
- Kermauner, Taras. *Slovenska dramatika – modeli.: Aksiološke in metodološke teme*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 1988.
- _____. *Obračun med vrati*. Ljubljana: SGM, 2000.
- Kidrič, France. "Primerik Linhartove *Miss Jenny Love*." *ČZSJK* 1 (1918): 213-14.
- _____. *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva*. Ljubljana: SM, 1929-1838.
- _____. *Izbrani spisi 2. Slovenski gledališki jubilej*. Ed. Darko Dolinar. Ljubljana: SAZU, 1978.
- Koblar, France. "Anton Tomaž Linhart." *Slovenski biografski leksikon IV*. Ljubljana: Zadružna gospodarska banka, 1932. 664-672.
- Klinger, Friedrich Maximilian. "Sturm und Srang." *Sturm und Drang II*. Heidelberg: Verlag Lambert Schneider, 1072. 289-358.
- Koruza, Jože. *Slovenska dramatika od začetkov do sodobnosti*. Ed. Gregor Kocijan et al. Ljubljana: Mihelač, 1997.
- Kos, Janko. *Razsvetljenje*. Literarni leksikon 28. Ljubljana: DZS, 1986.
- _____. *Predromantika*. Literarni leksikon 31. Ljubljana: DZS, 1987.
- _____. *Leksikon Slovenska književnost*. (1982) Ljubljana: CZ, 1996.
- _____. *Primerjalna zgodovina slovenske literature*. Ljubljana: MK, 2001.
- _____. "A. T. Linhart in evropska misel v 18. stoletju." *Linhart 2005*: 17-37.
- Kralj, Vladimir. "O rojstvu slovenske gledališke kiterature." *Naša sodobnost* IV.12 (1956). 1101-1105.
- Kreft, Bratko. "A. T. Linhart. Ob obletnici francoske revolucije in Linhartove smrti." *Ljudska pravica* 14.6.1946. 5.
- _____. "Na rob *Miss Jenny Love*." *Gledališki list SLG Celje* 3 (1979/1980), n.p.
- Lah, Andrijan. "Med pomoto in polomijo." *Dialogi* 1980. 117-18.
- Lessing, G. E. *Hamburška dramaturgija*. Trans. France Koblar. Ljubljana: CZ, 1956.
- _____. *Dramen*. Berlin und Weimar: 2006.
- Lillo, George. "The London Merchant: or, the History of George Barnwell." *Dramatic Works of Lillo*. Ed. James L. Steffensen. Oxford: Clarendon P., 1993. 149-209.
- Linhart, Anton Tomaž. "Miss Jenny Love." *Zbrano delo 1*. Ed. Alfonz Gspan. Ljubljana: DZS, 1950. (=ZD) 129-82 (in German), 331-65 (in Slovene).
- _____. *Anton Tomaž Linhart. Jubilejna monografija ob 250-letnici rojstva*. Ed. Svetina, Ivo et al. Ljubljana: Slovenski gledališki muzej & Muzeji radovljiške občine, 2005.
- Ludvik, Dušan. *Nemško gledališče v Ljubljani do 1790*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 1957.
- Mahnič, Joža. *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva V*. Ed. Lino Legiša. Ljubljana: SM, 1946.
- Moder, Janko. "Kreftov prevod *Miss Jenny Love*." *Zbornik DSKP 15*. Ljubljana: 1991. 61-75.
- Monmouth, Geoffrey of. *The History of the Kings of Britain*. Penguin books, 1966.
- Moravec, Dušan. "Shakespeare pri Slovencih." *W. Shakespeare. Zbrana dela*. Ed. Matej Bor. Ljubljana: DZS, 1974. 333-497.
- _____. "A. T. Linhart kot utemeljitelj slovenskega gledališča." *Radovljiški zbornik* 1995. 322-330.

- Moravec, Dušan et. al. "Anton Tomaž Linhart." *Enciklopedija Slovenije* 6. Ljubljana: MK, 1991. 188-191.
- Pirjevec, Avgust. "A. T. Linhart." *Slovenski biografski leksikon I* (1932): 664-72.
- Pogačnik, Jože. *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva* 2. Maribor: Obzorja, 1969.
- _____. "Anton Tomaž Linhart." *Gledališki list Drame SNG* 78.10 (1998/99). 33.
- Pohlin, Marko. "Bibliotheca Carnioliae." *Krainska grammatica*. Ed. Jože Faganel. Ljubljana: ZRC, 2003. 316-431.
- Pope, Alexander. *The Poems of Alexander Pope III*. Ed. Maynard Mack. London: Methuen, New Haven: Yale UP, 1970.
- Predan, Vasja. *Sinočnje premiere*. Ljubljana, 1974. 284-87.
- Prešeren, France. *Pesmi in pisma*. Ed. Anton Slodnjak. Ljubljana: MK, 1960. 38.
- Radics, Peter pl. "Anton Linhart." *Ljubljanski zvon* 13 (1893): 27-32, 86-91.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Ed. John Dover Wilson. Cambridge: CUP, 1968.
- _____. *King Lear*. Ed. John Dover Wilson. Cambridge: CUP, 1968.
- _____. *Macbeth*. Ed. John Dover Wilson. Cambridge: CUP, 1968.
- Slivnik, Francka. "A. T. Linhart in gledališče njegovega časa." *Linhart* 2005: 41-97.
- Snoj, Jože. "Strokovno čist in teatrsko lep večer." *Delo* 20 Nov. 1979: 8.
- Svetina, Ivo. "Bolno srce Miss Jenny Love." *Linhart* 2005: 99-145.
- Sveto pismo stare in nove zaveze*. Ed. Jože Kraševc. Ljubljana: Svetopisemska družba Slovenije, 1997.
- Vidmar, Josip. "A. T. Linhart. *Miss Jenny Love*." *Delo* 24 Oct. 1967: 5.
- Vidmar, Luka. "Tematske in motivne zveze Linhartove tragedije *Miss Jenny Love* z Lessingovima tragedijama *Miss Sara Simpson* in *Emilia Galotti* ter s Klingerjevima dramama *Die Zwillinge* in *Sturm und Drang*." *Linhart* 2005: 147-67.
- Vurnik, France. *Odmevi iz parterja*. Ljubljana: Knjižnica MG, 1984. 17-20.
- Zupančič, Mirko. "Linhartova *Miss Jenny Love*". *Gledališki list Drame SNG* 47.2 (1967/68), 53-63.
- _____. *Literarno delo mladega A. T. Linharta*. Ljubljana: SM, 1972.
- _____. "A. T. Linhart. Pionir in svobodomislec." *Gledališki list Drame SNG* 78.10 (1998/9).