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ABSTRACT

Maxwell Anderson was for over twenty five years one of America's most important dramatists. He wrote over forty plays that range in style from poetic tragedy to musical comedy, the majority being at least partially successful. Anderson was one of the most successful writers of tragedy that the American stage has produced thus far, and he was the first American playwright to make verse popular on the American stage. The question arises as to the formulae that he may have employed in order to achieve such a record of success in an extremely difficult profession.

From 1935 to 1947 Anderson wrote a series of essays that contain his rules for dramatic composition. This study aims to distill from the essays those rules and then apply them to Anderson's own plays. Chapter I examines the essays and lists the rules found. In Chapter II the plays of the 1920's are examined in the light of those rules. Chapter III treats the verse plays of 1930-1940. Chapter IV deals with the prose plays of the late 1930's and early 1940's, and Chapter V discusses the plays of the late 1940's and those of the 1950's. From this semi-chronological method it has been determined that Anderson began to be consistent in his play construction by the beginning of the 1930's. By 1935 Anderson had discovered and was using all of the rules for dramatic composition that are found in his essays.
Anderson, himself, felt that the success that attended his works during the early years of his playwriting career was largely accidental. Consequently his rules for writing plays were then constructed out of his expressed necessity for some surer formulae than mere accident or intuition.

Prior to 1930 Anderson's plays follow some of the rules but ignore many of them. This includes the plays he wrote himself and those he wrote in collaboration with others. Anderson's two original plays of the 1920's, *Saturday's Children* and *Gypsy*, follow his rules more closely than do his collaborations and the one dramatization.

The decade of the 1930's saw the greatest number of Anderson's plays being produced, more than twelve. This decade also saw the most careful observance of the rules apparently as they were discovered. The observance of the rules was done imaginatively in most cases. Some of the most successful of Anderson's plays were written and produced in the 1930's.

In the 1940's the number of plays Anderson wrote fell off considerably. There were six full length plays and one dramatization. There is evidence of a marked tendency toward propagandizing in these plays. This is quite natural, however, since the early 1940's were the years of World War II. In the main Anderson followed his rules in this decade, but with less imagination in a few cases and with several deviations.
The 1950's saw only two original plays by Anderson and one dramatization. Neither of the original plays was successful nor do they consistently and imaginatively follow his rules.

In this examination it has been determined that when Anderson followed his rules with imagination and with a fair amount of consistency the plays were usually successful. When he ignored his rules, either through apparent ignorance, as is the case with plays written prior to 1935, or when he deliberately broke the more important rules, as seems to be the case with the plays of the late 1940's and the 1950's, the plays were not successful. In fact the failure was usually quite rapid and in at least one case quite bitter. Therefore, Anderson's rules were valid for himself and may be valid for others.
INTRODUCTION

In the American theatre in the first half of the twentieth century one playwright in the number of plays written and produced stands out from the group. That man is Maxwell Anderson, who wrote approximately forty plays and radio scripts that include such varied forms as musical comedy, domestic comedy, historical drama, fantasy and poetic tragedy. In volume of work alone Anderson stands above most of his contemporaries, and in variety both of subject matter and dramatic form he has few if any peers. Anderson was one of the most successful writers of tragedy that the American stage has produced thus far, and he was the first American playwright to make verse popular on the American stage. More than thirty of his plays have been presented on Broadway. Many of the most successful, both with the public and with the critics, were verse tragedies. In the light of these accomplishments, it is entirely fitting that studies of Anderson and his works should be undertaken.

Maxwell Anderson was born December 15, 1888, in Atlantic, Pennsylvania. He was the son of a Baptist minister and as a result of his father's moving from one pastorate to another Anderson lived successively in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Iowa, and North Dakota. He received his early education wherever he happened to be. Anderson was
graduated from the University of North Dakota in 1911.\(^1\) After teaching in public school for a time he joined the faculty of Stanford University, where he was an instructor in English. He received his Master's degree from Stanford in 1914. He then taught at Whittier College in Whittier, California. After Anderson left Whittier he was on the editorial staff of the San Francisco Call Bulletin and Chronicle. He was next a contributor to the New Republic and was regularly employed first on the Globe and then on the World newspapers in New York City.\(^2\)

It was while working on the World that Anderson became acquainted with Laurence Stallings, with whom he collaborated on his first successful play, What Price Glory? in 1924. Later he collaborated with Stallings on two other plays, First Flight and The Buccaneer, both produced in 1925.\(^3\) The success of What Price Glory? enabled Anderson to leave journalism and devote his entire time to the theatre, for which he continued to write with few interruptions until his death in 1959.

What Price Glory? had been preceded by Anderson's first play, White Desert, written in verse and produced in 1923. In the 1920's Anderson also dramatized Jim Tully's novel Beggars of Life and called it Outside Looking In. In addition he wrote four other plays: Saturday's Children, a domestic comedy; Gypsy, a type of domestic tragedy; 


\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 6-7

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 7.
Sea Wife, an allegorical tale that was never produced professionally nor published; and Chicot the King, which was never produced or published. Also in collaboration with Harold Hickerson, Anderson wrote Gods of the Lightning, which was based on the Sacco-Vanzetti case and was produced in 1928.

The 1930's saw an increase in both volume and quality in Anderson's plays. He began the decade with Elizabeth the Queen in 1930, followed by Night Over Taos in 1932, Mary of Scotland and Both Your Houses, for which he received the Pulitzer Prize, in 1933, Valley Forge in 1934 Winterset in 1935, The Masque of Kings in 1936, Wingless Victory, High Tor and The Star-Wagon, as well as a radio drama The Feast of Ortolans, in 1937, Knickerbocker Holiday in 1938, Key Largo in 1939, and Journey to Jerusalem in 1940. This period was the most productive of Anderson's career. With the exception of Both Your Houses, The Star-Wagon and Knickerbocker Holiday, all of the above named plays were in verse and were tragic in nature. Even High Tor, a sort of comic fantasy, has elements of tragedy in it. During this time Anderson also wrote one other play and a radio drama that were apparently never produced or published, The Princess Renegade and The Bastion Saint Gervais. He also wrote a one-act verse drama, Second Overture, that was published but apparently not produced. As can be seen, this decade was an extremely important phase in his career. Many of the above named plays

---

of the 1930's were successful on Broadway and established Anderson as one of the top dramatists of the American theatre.\(^5\)

In the 1940's Anderson abandoned verse drama until *Anne of the Thousand Days* (1948), which is partly in verse and was one of the more successful plays he wrote. Previously in the 1940's he wrote *Candle in the Wind, The Eve of St. Mark* and *Storm Operation* along with a few radio dramas and one-act plays, most of which dealt with the Second World War and are primarily propaganda pieces. In *Joan of Lorraine*, written in 1946 and produced in 1947, Anderson again turned to history. *Truckline Cafe*, one of the most bitterly attacked plays that Anderson ever wrote, was produced in 1946. The last Anderson play to appear in the 1940's was his dramatization of Alan Paton's novel *Cry, The Beloved Country*, called *Lost in the Stars*, which opened in New York in October, 1949.\(^6\)

In the 1950's Anderson is represented by three plays, *Barefoot in Athens*, *Bad Seed*, adapted from the novel, *The Bad Seed*, by William March; and the last play, also in an historical vein, *The Golden Six*. The playwright's career closed with his death in 1959.

Starting in 1935 with the publication of the preface to *Winterset*, Anderson wrote several essays variously titled and published in various places, that explain his theories or as Anderson called them "rules." These rules are concerned with dramatic composition and Anderson's dramatic philosophy. The preface to *Winterset* was next published in 1939

\(^5\)Ibid., pp. 9-14.

\(^6\)Ibid., pp. 16-22.
in a collection called *The Essence of Tragedy and Other Footnotes and Papers* as "Poetry in the Theatre." The essay then appeared in *Off Broadway,* another collection of Anderson's essays, published in 1957. In 1937 Anderson delivered the Founder's Day Address at Carnegie Institute. This essay is entitled "What Ever Hope We Have," and was also published in *The Essence of Tragedy and Other Footnotes and Papers* and in *Off Broadway* under the same title. The essay "The Essence of Tragedy" was first given as a lecture at a session of The Modern Language Association in New York in 1938 and was subsequently published under the same title in the two collections mentioned above. Another essay originally entitled "Yes, By the Eternal" was first published in *Stage* as a rejoinder to an article by Max Eastman entitled "By the Eternal" in the same magazine, and was subsequently published in the collections previously mentioned as "The Uses of Poetry." The preface to *Knickerbocker Holiday* was also published by Anderson in the above collections under the title "The Politics of Knickerbocker Holiday." "Thoughts About the Critics," "St. Bernard," "Cut is the Branch That Might Have Grown Full Straight," and "Compromise and Keeping the Faith" are other essays of Anderson's that were written in the period 1935-1947. "Off Broadway," originally delivered as a lecture at Rutgers University in 1941, was one of three essays published by Rutgers University in a volume called *The Basis of Artistic Creation.* This essay was originally titled "By Way of Preface: The Theatre as Religion" when it appeared in *The New York Times* on October 26, 1941. In *The Basis of Artistic Creation* the
essay was called "The Basis of Artistic Creation in Literature," and when Anderson published it in the volume Off Broadway it formed the title essay. The discussion above has been an attempt to identify Anderson's essays by the differing titles used in their various appearances in print.

It is the purpose of this study first to attempt to extract from his remarks outside of his dramatic works the "rules" or guides that Anderson used in constructing his plays and second to examine his plays in the light of his own pronouncements. The essays or nondramatic works examined in detail are "Poetry in the Theatre," "The Essence of Tragedy," and "Off Broadway," with reference being made to other essays as needed to establish a point or clarify a principle. These three essays contain the bulk of his statements on dramatic theory and play construction.

The second and major section of this study examines Anderson's major plays in an essentially chronological order. Such an examination makes it possible to determine, first, the development of the rules Anderson used in play composition, and second, whether Anderson followed his own rules in his plays both successful and unsuccessful. There is little recourse to critical comment outside Anderson's own words. The major criteria applied are Anderson's own rules. Through such a use of his rules of dramatic composition applied to his plays, this study attempts to determine whether his rules or principles were valid when his plays were written and whether these rules are valid for the

---

theatre today. This study also attempts to determine whether Anderson's plays exemplify other guides that are not mentioned in his critical essays or nondramatic writings that could be considered further rules for playwriting.

Beginning in the latter part of the 1930's, several studies of Anderson were written. A few of these are concerned with Anderson's nondramatic writings as they are applied to certain of his plays, but none of them has utilized all of the body of nondramatic writings, and none has attempted to discuss all of the major works of Anderson from the beginning of his playwriting career until his last play. These studies either discuss Anderson's plays using only one or at the most two of his nondramatic writings as a basis, or, using just Anderson's statements concerning tragedy, discuss the plays that are considered tragedies. A list of these studies is found in the bibliography. The present investigation differs in that it utilizes the entire body of dramatic and nondramatic works. It is unique in the inclusion of all of these materials.

This dissertation is divided into the following areas for discussion: Anderson's Theories of Playwriting, an examination of the nondramatic works; Anderson's Early Plays, Anderson's Collaborations and other plays of the 1920's; The Verse Dramas of the 1930's; The Prose Dramas of the 1930's and Early 1940's; and The Plays of the Late 1940's and the 1950's. This division is based first on chronology and second on type of play. The object in maintaining a semblance of chronology is to determine the development of Anderson's theories and this
order may also incidentally indicate where the peak of his creative activity occurred.

Two Anderson bibliographies have been of great help in establishing dates of publication of both the dramatic and the nondramatic works: *A Maxwell Anderson Bibliography*, by W. P. Covington, III, an unpublished Master's thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1950; and *Maxwell Anderson Bibliography* by Martha Cox, Bibliographical Society, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1958.
CHAPTER I

Anderson's Theories of Playwriting

Maxwell Anderson began his playwriting career in 1923 with White Desert. From that time until his death in 1959 he wrote over forty plays, ranging from outright failures to glowing successes. Starting in 1935 with the publication of the preface to Winterset, Anderson wrote a series of critical essays that give a fairly complete discussion of his dramatic theories. It is clear that these theories did not spring full blown from Anderson's head, for he wrote in 1941 concerning his entrance into the theatre:

I was a journalist, and I knew nothing about the theater except casually from the outside. But I wrote a verse tragedy, being bored with writing editorials, and a gallant producer put it on the stage--for no reason that I can see now. It failed quietly, as it deserved, but after its production the theater tugged at me, its rewards dazzled me--and I wrote other plays, some of them successful. However, from the very beginning the theater was to me, in some fundamental ways, an exasperating puzzle. Some plays succeeded, some did not, and why, nobody knew. Success on the stage seemed to be one of the ultimate mysteries. Leaving aside the questions of acting and directing, the problems of theme, story and writing appeared only more confused when discussed by the professors of playwriting. I developed a theory which still looks cogent to me--that a playwright's first success was always largely accidental. After that he could analyze what he had done, and begin to develop an intuition that would take him through the maze of difficulties and dangers his action and dialogues must tread. But intuition is an unreliable guide, and I was not as intuitive as some others. I needed a compass--or a pole star--or some theory of what the theater was about, and I had none.¹

¹Ibid., pp. 23-24.
That Anderson did not trust his own intuition is evidenced by the fact that the next few plays he wrote were in collaboration first with Laurence Stallings and later with Harold Hickerson, both of whom were probably just as inexperienced as Anderson considered himself to be. Also during this same period Anderson dramatized the writings of others. The first play that is completely Anderson's is *Saturday's Children*, produced in 1927. The question arises as to when Anderson began to develop his own rules or theories for writing plays. Allan G. Halline wrote:

> I believe it was not until the middle 1930's that Anderson started evolving the theory to which he has given expression in recent years. One reason for so believing is that not until 1933, in *Mary of Scotland*, did Anderson write a play which fully measured up to the theory of tragedy he set forth in 1938. If Anderson is like most writers, he created the work first and theories afterward as to what he had done.

It is fairly evident that for at least ten years after Anderson began writing plays he gave no indication of just what his dramatic theories were, for Barrett H. Clark, in 1933, stated that Anderson had never been interviewed and that, aside from his published or produced work, there was almost nothing to attribute to Anderson concerning his dramatic theories. The preface to *Winterset* gives the first published

---


4Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
indication of just what Anderson's views of drama encompass. The essays appeared in the following order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Later Title (if any)</th>
<th>Place of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface to <em>Winterset</em></td>
<td>&quot;Poetry in the Theatre&quot;</td>
<td>Published version of <em>Winterset</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;What Ever Hope We Have&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Essence of Tragedy and Other Footnotes</em> and Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Essence of Tragedy&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Off Broadway</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Yes, By the Eternal&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The Uses of Poetry&quot;</td>
<td><em>Stage</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The preface to <em>Knickerbocker Holiday</em></td>
<td>&quot;The Politics of <em>Knickerbocker Holiday</em>&quot;</td>
<td>Published version of <em>Knickerbocker Holiday</em> and Other Footnotes and Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Thoughts About the Critics&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Off Broadway</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;St. Bernard&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Off Broadway</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Cut is the Branch that Might Have Grown Full Straight&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Authors' League Bulletin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Compromises and Keeping the Faith&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Off Broadway</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Off Broadway"
Poetry in the Theatre

In his first critical essay, the preface to *Winterset*, Anderson makes several points concerning his theory of drama. He states that the "playwright must pluck from the air about him a fable" that is of immediate concern and interest of the playgoer, and that this "fable" must be presented in such a fashion that it will be acceptable to his neighbors. By 1935, at any rate, Anderson was realistic about the producing theatre, for he says further, "There is no instance in the theater of a writer who left behind him a body of unappreciated work which slowly found its public. . . ."\(^5\) The playwright then, according to Anderson, must write for his time and place if he is to succeed. But Anderson does not disregard the aesthetic approach to drama, for his states further:

\[\ldots\] he will also try to make that fable coincide with something in himself that he wants to put into words. A certain cleverness in striking a compromise between the world about him and the world within has characterized the work of the greatest as well as the least successful playwrights, for they must take the audience with them if they are to continue to function.\(^6\)

According to Anderson this does not in any way compromise the position of the playwright as an artist, and this statement is not "blasphemy"; for if a playwright does not take the audience into consideration, the end product is left completely to chance, "\ldots and a purely chance achievement is not an artistic one."\(^7\)

At the same time Anderson is not setting himself up as a complete judge of what an audience wants, likes, dislikes, or is ready for. That

---

\(^5\)Anderson, *Off Broadway*, p. 47.

\(^6\)Ibid.

\(^7\)Ibid.
he is not able to do this is evidenced by the fact that throughout his playwriting career he had his share of failures. He says in "Poetry in the Theatre" that "Nobody has ever known definitely what any audience wanted." The playwright must make a choice among "imponderables." At the time he makes this choice, the playwright who has more than intuition is indeed fortunate. The playwright who suppresses his own preferences and merely writes what he thinks the audience wants, going completely in that direction, is one who "thinks more of his job than his fame" and he is therefore playing it safe. Anderson has said, then, that the playwright must constantly compromise between two ideas: (1) what he believes the audience wants, and (2) his own personal preferences of what he believes the audience should want. This compromise is often fraught with perils. The main peril that Anderson sees is the inclination on the part of the playwright to believe that "... the public is ready for a theme only because he wishes to treat it--or ready for a dramatic method only because he wishes to employ it."9

All during his career as a playwright, Anderson wrote and spoke about the need for a poetic theatre. "When I wrote my first play, White Desert, I wrote it in verse because I was weary of plays in prose that never lifted from the ground."10 And, "I have a strong chronic hope that the theater of this country will outgrow the phase of journalistic social comment and reach occasionally into the upper air of poetic tragedy. I

---

8Ibid., p. 48.

9Ibid.

10Ibid., p. 53.
believe with Goethe that dramatic poetry is man's greatest achievement
on this earth so far. . . ."\textsuperscript{11} Just how keenly Anderson felt concerning
the need for poetry in the theatre is seen in the following:

None of the prose moderns, not Synge, not O'Casey, not
O'Neill, not Shaw himself, has written anything which we can
set unquestioningly beside \textit{Oedipus the King} or \textit{Macbeth} or
many others we can pick up in the library--and the reason for
that is a fairly simple one. Our modern dramatists are not
poets, and the best prose in the world is inferior on the
stage to the best poetry.\textsuperscript{12}

Anderson states that prose is the language of information and poetry is
the language of emotion. Any prose must be stretched to convey the
emotion desired, and in some very exceptional individuals such as Synge
or O'Casey the prose rises to "poetic heights by substituting the un-
familiar speech rhythms of an untutored people for the rhythm of verse."\textsuperscript{13}
In most cases, however, prose under the stress of great emotion, breaks
down on the stage as it does in real life into inarticulateness. This
leads, Anderson states, to the "cult of understatement, hence the real-
istic drama in which the climax is reached in an eloquent gesture or a
moment of meaningful silence."\textsuperscript{14} Only in poetry can the theatre be
lifted from the "journalistic phase" spoken of before. This is Anderson's
belief, and, as is seen later in this study, he wrote the majority of his
most successful and apparently most enduring plays in poetry.

The question now arises as to why poetry was so essential in Ander-
son's conception of the theatre. The answers can be seen in another
statement in "Poetry in the Theater."

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., p. 50.

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid.
... I believe with the early Bernard Shaw that the theater is essentially a cathedral of the spirit, devoted to the exaltation of men, and boasting an apostolic succession of inspired high priests which extends further into the past than the Christian line founded by St. Peter. ... Lately it has recognized the mysteries only as a sideshow, and has been overrun with guides who prove to an eager public that all saints are plaster and all prophets fakes. 15

Anderson believes that the stage, despite the steady diet of "journalistic" plays, is still a cathedral, and that it will change, and that once again it will house the "mysteries":

An age of reason will be followed once more by an age of faith in things unseen. ... What faith men will then have, when they have lost their certainty of salvation through laboratory work, I don't know, having myself only a faith that man will have a faith. But it will involve a desire for poetry after our starvation diet of prose I have no doubt. 16

The reason Anderson states that men would turn to poetry is his belief that despite the numerous inventions of modern times man has not been altered, that he is still a lonely and frightened creature; that although science has answered a few questions for him, "... in the end science itself is obliged to say that the fact is created by the spirit, not the spirit by the fact." 17

Anderson is optimistic about man and man's desires for improvement. He states that many members of the theatre audience are already impatient for plays that will "take up again the consideration of man's place and destiny in prophetic rather than prosaic terms." It is incumbent upon the dramatist to be a poet and upon the poet to be a

---
15Ibid., pp. 48-49.
16Ibid., p. 51.
17Ibid., pp. 51-52.
prophet and dreamer and the interpreter of the "racial dream." Anderson feels that man has come a long way in his history and that he has a long way to go to reach his goal. "We shall not always be as we are, but what we are to become depends on what we dream and desire. The theater, more than any other art, has the power to weld and determine what the race dreams into what the race will become." Anderson fully realizes that this statement would seem "farfetched" to the Broadway as he knew it in 1935, but as Broadway itself is as transient as its own real-estate values, it can not be expected to be the last word in the theatre's future. Anderson expresses the idea that the theatre, because of its size and vitality, is "The one really living American art," but that it needs the touch of a great poet if it is ever to achieve the heights that it is destined for. "Without at least one such poet we shall never have a great theater in this country, and he must come soon, for these chances don't endure forever."  

Anderson states in "Poetry in the Theater" that "... poetic tragedy had never been successfully written about its own place and time." With this in mind, and having experienced failure with White Desert, written in verse in 1923, he wrote his next verse plays about historical subjects, not returning to modern themes in verse until

\[\text{Footnotes:}\]

18 Ibid., p. 52.  
19 Ibid.  
20 Ibid., p. 53.  
21 Ibid.
Winterset in 1935. In writing Winterset Anderson fully realized that he was attempting to establish a new theatrical convention and that in so doing he was deliberately risking failure. However, this did not seem too important to him. Of much greater importance is his attempt to create poetic drama containing contemporary comment, and contemporary comment was one goal that he strove toward. "Whether or not I solved the problem of contemporary comment in poetic drama in Winterset is probably of little moment. But it must be solved if we are to have a great theatre in America. Our theatre has not yet produced anything worthy to endure--and endurance, though it may be a fallible test, is the only test of excellence."  

To summarize, in "Poetry in the Theatre" Anderson gives indication of the following rules or guides that he considers necessary in drama: (1) the "fable" or story of the play must be of immediate concern and interest to the playgoer; (2) the playwright must make the fable coincide with something in himself that he wants to put into words; (3) the playwright must compromise between the two items just mentioned; (4) this compromise must be deliberate for "a purely chance achievement is not an artistic one"; (5) to be great a play must also be poetic; (6) the aim of the theatre is the exaltation of man; and (7) a playwright must have contemporary comment in his plays.

"What Ever Hope We Have" and "The Uses of Poetry"

In 1937 Anderson gave the Founder's Day Address at Carnegie Institute. This address later was included in both The Essence of Tragedy

22 Ibid., p. 54.
and Other Footnotes and Papers and Off Broadway, as "What Ever Hope We Have." In this essay Anderson notes very little concerning his guides to playwriting. He does say, however, that it is the aim of the artist to set his vision of the world in "... a series of picture writings which convey meaning beyond the scope of direct statement." And he says that all communication is by way of symbols of some kind, "... because the things an artist has to communicate can be said only in symbols, in the symbols of his art."23 No playwright can merely give his audience his ideas in a bald statement, for this is not the means of communication that is most effective. In any abstract medium, the ideas expressed seldom if ever are concretely stated: they are stated in a symbolic way, in terms that others can comprehend.24

Anderson states further his feelings on what art is supposed to accomplish:

The dream of the race is that it may make itself better and wiser than it is, and every great philosopher or artist who has ever appeared among us has turned his face away from what man is toward whatever seems to him most godlike that man may become.25

The purpose of art is to show not what man is, but rather what he may become. The playwright, therefore, must not attempt to depict man as he is now, but rather as he should be, as he dreams of becoming.


24 Ibid.

25 Ibid., p. 20.
In the essay originally entitled "Yes, By the Eternal" when it first appeared in *Stage* and included in *Off Broadway* as "The Uses of Poetry," Anderson expresses this idea again:

For what the poets are always asking for, visioning, and projecting is man as he must and will be, man a step above and beyond his present, man as he may be glimpsed on some horizon of dream, a little nearer what he himself wished to become.\(^{26}\)

He states further that the message of tragedy is "... victory in defeat," that even in death the human spirit can rise to new heights and a greater glory by "... a man's conquest of himself in the face of annihilation."\(^{27}\)

These statements concerning the purpose of the art of the theatre contained in "What Ever Hope We Have" and "The Uses of Poetry" are an indication of Anderson's further thinking on an earlier statement made in "Poetry in the Theater": that the aim of the theatre is the exaltation of men. In "The Uses of Poetry" he also states his conviction that it is not the aim of either poetry or theatre to throw "... its weight toward the practical or scientific reorganization of the affairs of men," for "Poetry is just as unfit for that business as for making up the accounts of a brokerage house."\(^{28}\) The reason that poetry (and to Anderson poetry meant the theatre) is not meant to reorganize society is that poetry "... impels the user powerfully toward emotional utterance, impels him away from the small change of political economy

\(^{26}\) *Anderson, Off Broadway*, p. 91.


and toward whatever vision he may be able to formulate of human destiny."\(^{29}\) From this statement one can deduct one further rule: that it is not the purpose of poetry (or the theatre) to attempt to reorganize the scientific or practical world of men. That a good play or good poetry might sometimes be animated by an attack on an existing order, Anderson does not dispute. "But satire at its best is second or third best. . . ."\(^{30}\) And, therefore, is not and cannot be great theatre or great poetry.

"The Essence of Tragedy"

In 1938 Anderson wrote one of his most important essays on theatre, "The Essence of Tragedy." This paper was first delivered to a session of The Modern Language Association in New York City in January of that year.\(^{31}\) It was published as the title essay in \textit{The Essence of Tragedy and Other Footnotes and Papers} in 1939 and in \textit{Off Broadway} in 1947. Here Anderson clarifies some of his previous statements and makes some illuminating comments in addition. The opening remarks give a clear indication that he is not setting himself up as the final word, but that from his experience as a dramatic poet he has determined some elements that might be of use to others.

Anybody who dares to discuss the making of tragedy lays himself open to critical assault and general barrage, for the theorists have been hunting for the essence of tragedy

\(^{29}\textit{Ibid.}\)

\(^{30}\textit{Ibid.}\)

\(^{31}\textit{Ibid.}, p. \textit{iii}\)
since Aristotle without entire success. There is no doubt that playwrights have occasionally written tragedy success­fully, from Aeschylus on, and there is no doubt that Aris­totle came very close to a definition of what tragedy is in his famous passage on catharsis. But why the perform­ance of a tragedy should have a cleansing effect on the audience, why an audience is willing to listen to tragedy, why tragedy has a place in the education of men, has never, to my knowledge, been convincingly stated. I must begin by saying that I have not solved the Sphinx's riddle which fifty generations of skillful brains have left in shadow. But I have one suggestion which I think might lead to a solution if it were put to laboratory test by those who know something about philosophical analysis and dialectic.32

Anderson then discusses his own entrance into the theatre and his search for the guides and rules previously mentioned. He states, "It was not until after I had fumbled my way through a good many successes and an appalling number of failures that I began to doubt the suffi­ciency of dramatic instinct," and he also says that he began "... to wonder whether or not there were general laws governing dramatic struc­ture which so poor a head for theory as my own might grasp and use."33 Anderson states that each play is a new problem that presents itself only as it is in the process of being written, and that there are so many rules, landmarks, and pitfalls laid down by well-known handbooks on play structure that it is nearly impossible to make one's way through the maze.34

In this light Anderson begins his search for rules or guides to aid him. Although it is not known exactly when he began this search or when he started applying specific rules to his playwriting endeavors, search

---

32Anderson, The Essence of Tragedy, p. 3.
33Ibid., p. 4.
34Ibid.
and find them he did. Anderson gives his definition of a play in these words: "A play is almost always, probably, an attempt to recapture a vision for the stage." And at the same time he states one of the rules he had discovered: that a playwright must have a vision, (termed earlier a fable), and must check it carefully before he can assume that it is the type of vision that will make a play. The playwright must make a choice among his visions before and while checking them, "But by what rules, what maps, what fields of reference can you check so intangible a substance. . . ." as this vision?

I shan't trouble you with the details of my search for a criterion, partly because I can't remember it in detail. But I re-read Aristotle's Poetics in the light of some bitter experience, and one of his observations led me to a comparison of ancient and modern playwriting methods.

Re-reading of the Poetics led Anderson to a realization of one of the most important elements of playwriting: the recognition scene. He states that he came to the conclusion that this recognition, as isolated by Aristotle, is generally "... an artificial device, a central scene in which the leading character saw through a disguise, recognized as a friend or as an enemy ... some person whose identity had been hidden ... . There is an instant and profound emotional reaction. ..." In looking further into the Greek drama Anderson discovered that occasionally "... the recognition turned on a situation far more convincing,

35Anderson, Off Broadway, p. 57.
36Ibid.
37Anderson, The Essence of Tragedy, p. 5.
38Ibid., p. 6.
though no less contrived." On these occasions, as in Oedipus, the effect of the recognition on the individual and on the play determines the entire course of action thereafter.39

I still think that the rule which I formulated for my own guidance is more concise than any other, and so I give it here: A play should lead up to and away from a central crisis, and this crisis should consist in a discovery by the leading character which has an indelible effect on his thought and emotion and completely alters his course of action. The leading character, let me say again, must make the discovery; it must affect him emotionally; and it must alter his direction in the play.40

If Anderson felt that the recognition scenes of the Greeks are obvious and contrived, when he looked carefully into the plays of Shakespeare and the memorable plays of the moderns he found the same recognition scenes, only subtler and more difficult to discover. These scenes, Anderson felt, are always there in the plays we choose to remember. The scene does not, in the best plays, deal with the discovery of identity or disguise but "... the mainspring in the mechanism of a modern play is almost invariable a discovery by the hero of some element in his environment or in his own soul of which he has not been aware--or which he has not taken sufficiently into account."41 Anderson states that this scene is so important that the playwright in checking his "vision" must insure that this scene is paramount.

If the plot he [the playwright] has in mind does not contain a playable episode in which the hero or heroine makes an emotional discovery, a discovery that practically

39Ibid.

40Anderson, Off Broadway, p. 59.

41Ibid.
dictates the end of the story then such an episode must be inserted—and if no place can be found for it the subject is almost certainly a poor one for the theater. If this emotional discovery is contained in the story, but is not central, then it must be made central, and the whole action must revolve around it.42

Regarding the structure of a play focused upon such a recognition scene, Anderson says that the discovery scene must take place, in a three-act play, near the close of the second act though it may be delayed till the beginning of the third act. In a five-act drama the recognition scene should take place at the close of the third act although it too may be delayed until the beginning of the fourth act.43 Anderson gives no indication as to where the recognition scene should fall in a two-act play, which many of his own plays are. But from inference it probably should be found about a third of the way through the second act. This scene is so important to the action of the play that everything else must either lead up to the recognition or discovery or away from it.44

The next element which Anderson discusses is the leading character himself. "The hero who is to make the central discovery in a play must not be a perfect man. He must have some variation of what Aristotle calls a tragic fault..."45 After having made his discovery the hero must be able to change in himself and in his actions. The leading character goes

42Ibid., p. 61.
43Ibid.
44Ibid.
45Ibid.
through some type of experience that will enable him to open his eyes to some fault or error of his own. The audience, watching a play, would not be able sufficiently to identify themselves with a man who was without fault or error or possibility of realization. Therefore, the hero must not be a perfect man in order that he may experience discovery or recognition.

The next logical step in the development of Anderson's rules, as stated in "The Essence of Tragedy," is that the leading character, after making the discovery, must become a better person than he was previously:

... when he makes his discovery he must change both in himself and in his action—and he must change for the better. The fault can be a very simple one—a mere unawareness, for example—but if he has no fault he cannot change for the better, but only for the worse, and for a reason which I shall discuss later, it is necessary that he must become more admirable, and not less so, at the end of the play. ... He must learn through suffering.

According to Anderson the leading character must pass through suffering purified, since "... animal though we are, dispicable though we are in many ways, there is in us all some divine, incalculable fire that urges us to be better than we are." It is not simply that an audience wants the hero to conform to what might be called race morality, nor is it that the audience wants the hero merely to do those things that will insure the survival of the race. This might be the case in some comedies, but in most serious plays and especially in tragedy this is not

---

46 Ibid.
47 Ibid.
48 Ibid., p. 65.
so. What "... the audience wants to believe is that men have a desire
to break the moulds of earth which encase them and claim a kinship with
a higher morality than that which hems them in." In this regard Anderson
points out Antigone and Prometheus Bound.\(^49\) In both these plays
the leading character chooses to rebel against what he or she feels is
an unjust law and, in Antigone, chooses death rather than submit to the
authority that demands her strict obedience.

Anderson warns the playwright against trying a reversal of the for­
mula, in which the hero makes a discovery which affects him in an evil
way or a manner which the audience interprets as evil. This reversal,
Anderson says, inevitably causes the play to be a failure on the stage.
For an example of this type of discovery Anderson points out Troilus
and Cressida where Shakespeare had Troilus discover that Cressida is a
"light woman," and as a result Troilus draws the inference that all
women are faithless and gives his life in the cause of "the strumpet
Helen." "All the glory of Shakespeare's verse cannot rescue the play
for an audience, and save in Macbeth Shakespeare nowhere wrote so richly,
so wisely, or with such a flow of brilliant metaphor."\(^50\) Anderson con­
tinues this discussion by stating that an audience will always demand
that any alteration in the character of "... the hero be for the
better—or for what it believes to be the better."\(^51\) Anderson, as has

\(^{49}\)Anderson, The Essence of Tragedy, p. 13.

\(^{50}\)Anderson, Off Broadway, p. 62.

\(^{51}\)Ibid.
been said before, is realistic concerning an audience and, therefore, the meanings of plays change with the changing attitudes of audiences over the centuries.

One thing only is certain: that an audience watching a play will go along with it only when the leading character responds in the end to what it considers a higher moral impulse than moved him at the beginning of the story, though an audience will of course define morality as it pleases and in the terms of its own day. It may be that there is no absolute up or down in this world, but the race believes that there is, and will not hear of any denial.52

Anderson felt that the next point which should concern the playwright is what happens to the leading character at the conclusion of the play. Here Anderson still goes along with the traditional belief that the leading character in a tragedy must suffer death and that this death is to be the result either of the fault or weakness that he discovers, or of his attempts to correct this fault. In a serious play, not a tragedy, the character does not necessarily meet death, but he must suffer some punishment for the fault or error he has discovered in himself. The individual answers for his own fault through punishment of one sort or another.53

It has been stated in earlier essays discussed previously that the aim of poetry and especially dramatic poetry is the exaltation of man. Anderson returns to this same thought when he says: "From the point of view of the playwright, then, the essence of tragedy, or even of a serious play, is the spiritual awakening, or regeneration of his hero."54

52 Ibid., pt. 62-63.
53 Ibid., p. 61.
54 Ibid., p. 64.
This also echoes a statement made earlier in this same regard: that the hero of a play must come out of his experiences a better person than he was previously.

The belief that in the essentials modern drama is not greatly altered from that of the days of Sophocles and Euripides led to another of Anderson's rules: that in establishing a play's core of meaning for an audience, a playwright must follow in the essentials the same pattern set out by the ancient writers of Attica:

However unaware of it we may be, our theater has followed the Greek patterns with no change in essence, from Aristophanes and Euripides to our own day. Our more ribald musical comedies are simply our approximation of the Bacchic rites of Old Comedy. In the rest of our theater we sometimes follow Sophocles, whose tragedy is always an exalation of the human spirit, sometimes Euripides, whose tragedy follows the same pattern of an excellence achieved through suffering.55

For this reason Anderson felt that when the playwright chooses his vision he must choose between his "version of a phallic revel" and his "vision of what mankind may or should become."56 The playwright's vision may be faulty or it may even be shallow or sentimental, but Anderson felt if it does not follow the essence of Greek drama in that it conforms to or is part of some aspiration in the theatre audience, that audience will reject it. That the Old Comedy idea of the celebration of the "animal" in man is still with us Anderson did not dispute, but he felt that "... that part of the theater which 'celebrates' man's virtue and his regeneration in hours of crisis is accepted as having the more important function."57

---

55 Ibid., pp. 63-64.
56 Ibid.
57 Anderson, The Essence of Tragedy, pp. 11-12.
In Anderson's few comments on comedy it is apparent that he felt the same essentially about comedy as he did about tragedy; that our modern theatre still follows the Greek model, that of Greek New Comedy. He felt that it differs from tragedy in one respect mainly, that it offers a happier scene and puts its hero through an ordeal or a test that is less than lethal.\(^5\) That comedy differs from tragedy mainly in this respect can also be considered one of Anderson's rules or guides to dramatic composition. Therefore in comedy the leading character does not die and a happier scene is displayed.

Anderson seems to have answered, at least to his own satisfaction, his question as to why an audience was willing to listen to tragedy. This answer seems to lie in Anderson's feeling that an audience goes to the theatre, especially to view a tragedy, to reaffirm its faith in itself and in mankind.

And since our plays, aside from those which are basically Old Comedy, are exaltations of the human spirit, since that is what an audience expects when it comes to the theater, the playwright gradually discovers, as he puts plays before audiences, that he must follow the ancient Aristotelian rule.\(^5\)

In this statement can also be seen one of Anderson's guides: that an audience goes to the theatre to reaffirm its faith in itself and in mankind, and that the audience will not accept a play which does not satisfy this desire.

There is one more concept of theatre that Anderson put forth in "The Essence of Tragedy" which it would be well to consider at this

\(^5\)Anderson, *Off Broadway*, p. 64.

\(^5\)Ibid.
time: "... that the theater at its best is a religious affirmation, an age-old rite restating and reassuring man's belief in his own destiny and his ultimate hope." It has been seen earlier in this study that Anderson considered the theatre as a cathedral, and now he calls drama a religious affirmation. He expressed himself more completely on this subject in a later essay "Off Broadway" which was originally entitled, "By Way of Preface: The Theatre as Religion." This essay will be dealt with extensively later. Whether this was a new idea to Anderson in 1938 when "The Essence of Tragedy" was first written, is unknown, but it is worthy of note at this time.

As in the earlier essay "Poetry in the Theater" Anderson gave in "The Essence of Tragedy" several rules or guides for which he had searched. Let us summarize these rules from "The Essence of Tragedy": (1) A play is the attempt of a dramatist to recapture for the stage a vision that must be checked carefully against whatever intuition or rules the playwright has before it can become a successful play; (2) within this vision there must be a central scene or crisis wherein the leading character or hero makes a discovery that affects his thought, his actions, and his emotions so greatly that his entire direction in the play is altered; (3) this discovery must come near the end of either the second act or the third act, depending on whether it is a three or a five-act play; (4) the leading character must not be a perfect

60 Ibid., p. 66.

person and must have some variation of what Aristotle called a tragic fault; (5) after the discovery is made the hero must change both in himself and his actions and become a nobler person by so doing; (6) the end result of this discovery is that in a tragedy the leading character suffers death as a result of his attempts to change or correct the fault (in a serious play the hero suffers a lesser punishment, but the pattern remains the same); (7) from the point of view of the playwright the essence of tragedy or of a serious drama is the spiritual awakening or regeneration of the hero; (8) in essence our drama must follow the pattern laid down by the Greeks in the core of meaning it has for an audience; (9) comedy differs from tragedy in that it presents a happier scene and does not end in death for the leading character; (10) because the audience goes to the theatre to reaffirm its faith in itself and in mankind, the plays must follow this idea; (11) the theatre is a type of religious affirmation.

"Off Broadway"

In October, 1941, Anderson delivered a lecture at Rutgers University that was published in The New York Times under the title "By Way of Preface: The Theatre as Religion." This essay was next published as one of the three main essays in The Basis of Artistic Creation in 1942 as "The Basis of Artistic Creation in Literature" and finally as the title essay in Off Broadway published in 1947. 62 In the essay "Off Broadway" (by

62 The book Off Broadway states that the essay under discussion above was delivered at Rutgers University in 1942; however, The New York Times Drama Section of October 26, 1941, carries the essay in complete form and states that it had been delivered the preceding week.
which title it shall be referred to in this study), Anderson further explains some of his rules or guides for playwriting. He lists as such only the following eight rules:

However, I did discover that there were rules of playwriting which could not be broken. One by one I unearthed them for myself, or dug them out of the treatises of predecessors. And by and by some of them began to look like essentials. Let me cite a few of the first that came clear to me.

1. The story of a play must be the story of what happens within the mind or heart of a man or woman. It cannot deal primarily with external events. The external events are only symbolic of what goes on within.

2. The story of a play must be conflict, and specifically, a conflict between the forces of good and evil within a single person. The good and evil to be defined, of course, as the audience wants to see them.

3. The protagonist of a play must represent the forces of good and must win, or, if he has been evil, must yield to the forces of the good, and know himself defeated.

4. The protagonist of a play cannot be a perfect person. If he were he could not improve, and he must come out of the play a more admirable human being than he went in.

5. The protagonist of a play must be an exceptional person. He or she cannot be run-of-the-mill. The man in the street simply will not do as the hero of a play. If a man be picked from the street to occupy the center of your stage, he must be so presented as to epitomize qualities which the audience can admire. Or he must indicate how admirable human qualities can be wasted or perverted—must define an ideal by falling short of it, or become symbolic of a whole class of man who are blocked by circumstances from achieving excellence in their lives.

6. Excellence on the stage is always moral excellence. A struggle on the part of a hero to better his material circumstances is of no interest in a play unless his character is somehow tried in the fire, and unless he comes out of his trial a better man.

7. The moral atmosphere of a play must be healthy. An audience will not endure the triumph of evil on the stage.

8. There are human qualities for which the race has a special liking on the stage: in a man positive character, strength of conviction not shaken by opposition; in a woman, fidelity, passionate faith. There are qualities which are especially disliked on the stage: in a man, cowardice, any refusal to fight for a belief; in a woman, an inclination toward the Cressid.

———

Anderson also states that these rules or essentials in playwriting apply not only to the plays that we consider extraordinary, but to all plays and just as much to our modern plays as to plays by Shakespeare or Jonson.64

In the same essay Anderson makes several other statements that shall be examined also. One of these statements has already been referred to: that Anderson considered the theatre to be essentially a religious affirmation. "Yet it was in these godless nineteen-twenties that I stumbled upon the only religion I have. And I came upon it in the most unlikely and supposedly godless of places."65 He says further:

The theatrical profession may protest as much as it likes, the theologians may protest, and the majority of those who see our plays would probably be amazed to hear it, but the theater is a religious institution devoted entirely to the exaltation of the spirit of man. It has no formal religion. It is a church without creed, but there is no doubt in my mind that our theater, instead of being, as the evangelical ministers used to believe, the gateway to hell, is as much a worship as the theater of the Greeks, and has exactly the same meaning in our lives.66

That this idea was not part of Anderson's original philosophy of the theatre is obvious, because he says, "When I first wrote plays this statement would have seemed incredible to me."67 He further says that if one examines the matter that is sold in the theatre this idea is not

64Ibid.
65Ibid., p. 23.
66Ibid., p. 28.
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so difficult to believe, for "The plays that please most and run longest in these dusty alleys are representative of human loyalty, courage, love that purges the soul, grief that ennobles." Clearly Anderson feels that the true and underlying purpose of the theatre is to discover and hold up to the regard of its audience that which is most admirable in the human race. If one keeps in mind this concept that the theatre is essentially a religious institution dedicated to the exaltation of the spirit of man, Anderson's rules and philosophy of theatre are put more definitely into their proper perspective.

In brief, I have found my religion in the theater, where I least expected to find it, and where few will credit it exists. But it is there, and any man among you who tries to write plays will find himself serving it, if only because he can succeed in no other way.

Anderson states that a playwright, more than any other writer or any other artist, must have something intelligible to say in everything he puts before the public. The audience will demand that a play must take an attitude toward the world, and for that the playwright must have some type of convictions.

But if he is going to put plays on the stage he must have at least fragmentary convictions. Sometimes his convictions are subconscious; sometimes they are inherited. Sometimes the convictions that underlie the most modern and snappy of productions are simple-minded or old-fashioned. But dig for them and you will find them. A play can't be

68 Ibid.
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written without them—or, at least, it can't be a success—because no audience is satisfied with a play which doesn't take an attitude toward the world.\textsuperscript{71}

The best atmosphere for the practice of playwriting is a stable society amid a stable group of nations, but the confused and unstable condition of our present-day society makes it even more necessary for the playwright to have an attitude toward the world around him. "Those who have kept going as writers within it have done so because they could cling to inner beliefs not easily destroyed by exterior storm. Or because they believed in nothing and could stimulate whatever belief happened to be popular."\textsuperscript{72} That this latter is not Anderson's own belief is apparent by what he says above concerning the theatre as religion.

It is Anderson's further belief that the theatre is "... the central artistic symbol of the struggle of good and evil within men."\textsuperscript{73} The theatre offers us criteria for judging what is evil and what is good in man, for if a man such as Adolf Hitler had been set upon the stage, even in Germany, the audience would have responded with loathing.\textsuperscript{74} The reason for this is that:

The audiences, sitting in our theaters, make these rules and, in setting them, define the purposes and belief of homo sapiens. There is no comparable test that I know of for what is good in the human soul, what is most likely to lead to that distant and secret destination which the race has chosen for itself and will somehow find.\textsuperscript{75}

\\textsuperscript{71}Ibid., pp. 20-21.
\textsuperscript{72}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{73}Ibid., p. 33.
\textsuperscript{74}Ibid., p. 34.
\textsuperscript{75}Ibid., p. 35.
Regarding the hero and the audience, Anderson felt that the audience would demand "... that he take up what arms he has against what enemies assail him and come out of the battle with his morale intact."\(^76\) Whether his struggle be with forces outside himself or within himself, the leading character must have mind and strength enough to overcome the evil and strive toward the good.\(^77\) Even if he loses his life in the process, the struggle will have been worth the effort.

To Anderson the beliefs and feelings of an audience were always important. He did not prostitute himself for his audience's favor, but they were always in his mind as he wrote. He states that a playwright cannot run too far ahead of his audience because he must, in order to communicate, find some sort of a common denominator of belief with the audience of his generation. Even the greatest playwrights have always had and will always have something to say "which their age can understand."\(^78\) He further states that no play is required to make ethical discoveries. The play is expected only to have a sound meaning, a meaning that is accepted as sound by the audience. One need only examine any play that has "survived the test of continued favor," to find some moral or some rule of social conduct that the human race has considered or does consider important enough to learn and to pass on to succeeding

\(^{76}\text{Ibid.},$ pp. 29-30.

\(^{77}\text{Ibid.},$ p. 30.
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generations.\textsuperscript{79} Not only must a play have a moral or rule of social conduct, but it cannot go against what the race considers moral or ethical.

Put on a play which sets out to prove that dishonesty is the best policy and vice is triumphant in human affairs, and the audience will refuse it coldly. They don't want to believe it and they won't. You can poke farcical fun at homicide, as in \textit{Arsenic and Old Lace} or \textit{The Playboy of the Western World} or \textit{The Beggar's Opera}, but you cannot seriously praise an unrepentant murderer. The race--or the audience--will not allow it. They will register disapproval and they will stay away.\textsuperscript{80}

Thus it can be seen that Anderson was very cognizant of his audience's moralistic demands. Whether he arrived at this point of view from his long association with the theatre audience or from his own convictions is unknown. But that his writings reflected this concept there can be no doubt. He was a moralistic writer at the time this essay was written in 1941.

By way of summary of the rules given in "Off Broadway," Anderson said: (1) the play must deal with the inner life; (2) the story must be of conflict between good and evil within a single person; (3) the protagonist must represent the forces of good and must win; (4) the protagonist cannot be a perfect man, for he must emerge a better man at the end of a play than he was at the beginning; (5) the protagonist must be an exceptional person, or he must epitomize exceptional qualities; (6) excellence on the stage is always moral excellence; (7) the moral

\textsuperscript{79}Ibid., p. 31
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atmosphere must be healthy; and (8) there are certain qualities which
an audience admires on the stage: in a man, positive character and
strength of conviction; in a woman, fidelity and passionate faith;
there are other qualities an audience always dislikes on the stage:
in a man, cowardice and any refusal to fight for a belief; in a woman,
an inclination toward the Cressid. These are the guides that Anderson
called rules. In addition he also made other statements that one might
consider as guides: (1) that the theatre is a type of religious insti­
tution dedicated to the exaltation of the spirit of man; (2) that the
playwright must have something to say and take an attitude toward the
world in which he lives; (3) that the theatre offers us criteria for
judging what is evil and what is good in a man; (4) that a play is not
expected to make ethical discoveries, but that it is expected to estab­
lish a common denominator of belief with its audience.

"St. Bernard"

Anderson wrote a few other essays after writing "Off Broadway" in
1941, but with the exception of one comment in an essay on George Bernard
Shaw called "St. Bernard," written in 1946, there is nothing new concern­
ing his rules of playwriting. This one comment has to do with the dif­
ference between comedy and tragedy and explains why the majority of
Anderson's plays have to do with tragic themes, for it is indicative of
his belief that the ultimate purpose of theatre is the exaltation of
the spirit of man. Anderson says:

The difference between comedy and tragedy seems to be
this—the writer of comedy assumes that something can be
done immediately to save men from themselves, and the writer
of tragedy knows that there is no immediate way out. He
knows that the burning questions of reform are all old, that men have sought the answers since the morning of history, and that the answers will not be found in his time, that nothing final will come of anything he does or says.81

This point of view seems rather pessimistic on the surface as far as a tragic writer is concerned but coupled with Anderson's statement that he hopes men will eventually raise themselves toward their ultimate goal as they have raised themselves in times past, it assumes a better perspective. This, then, is one more guide that a playwright might follow in writing: that the essential difference between a work that is comic in nature and a work that is tragic is in the attitude of the playwright toward man as he is and man when he will become better. This rule or guide does not seem to be meant to restrict a writer to only one form, tragedy or comedy, but rather it seems to apply to the attitude of the playwright in each play.

From the discussion of the various essays on theatre that Anderson wrote, several rules or guides have been mentioned or pointed out. It has also been determined that these rules or guides were developed over a period of time as Anderson wrote his plays. As he wrote: "I developed a theory which still looks cogent to me--that a playwright's first success was always largely accidental. After that he could analyze what he had done, and begin to develop an intuition that would take him through the maze of difficulties and dangers his action and dialogue must tread."82 That Anderson did look back on his success and on

81 Ibid., pp. 15-16.
82 Ibid., p. 24.
his failures and profit by them is apparent in his long career. In re-
response to a questionnaire published in *The Saturday Review* in September
1955, Anderson gave this answer to the question, "What would you advise
someone who wants to make playwriting his profession?" "If you want to
write, write, but do not talk about it. Be insanely certain of your-
self and sanely critical of all you do." That Anderson wrote cannot
be disputed, and that he did not talk about his writing methods for
nearly fifteen years after he began to write is also fairly well estab-
lished. But when he did begin to talk about his writing he gave some
concise rules for that writing.

By way of summary then these are the rules or guides to playwriting
that Anderson gave in the essays examined. The rules have been divided
by this writer as they seem to group themselves logically into three
areas: (1) the playwright's purpose and aim in writing the play, (2) the
structure of the play, and (3) the leading character of the play.

I. The playwright's purpose and aim in writing the play:

1. The aim of the playwright is to recapture a vision for the
stage and that vision must be a compromise between what is
of immediate concern and interest to the playgoer and that
which the playwright has that he wishes to put into words.

2. The choice of vision and the treatment of that vision must
be deliberately constructed for a desired end, for a purely
chance achievement is not an artistic one.

3. It is not the primary purpose or aim of poetry (or the
theatre) to attempt to reorganize the scientific or prac-
tical world of men, it may be attempted but that is not
the primary aim.

---
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4. The greatest achievement of man is poetic tragedy and, therefore, poetry is the best medium for the stage.

5. In essence our drama must follow the pattern laid down by the Greeks in the core of meaning it has for the audience.

6. The audience goes to the theatre to reaffirm its faith in itself and in mankind and, therefore, the play must follow this concept.

7. The theatre is a type of religious institution dedicated to the exaltation of the spirit of man.

8. Excellence on the stage is always moral excellence.

9. The moral atmosphere of a play must be healthy.

10. The theatre offers us criteria for judging what is evil and what is good in a man.

II. The structure of the play:

1. The vision of the playwright that is to be recaptured for the stage must be checked carefully according to whatever intuition or rules the playwright has before it can become a successful play.

2. Within this vision there must be a central scene or crisis wherein the leading character or hero makes a discovery that affects his thought, his action, and his emotions so greatly that his entire direction in the play is altered.

3. This discovery must come near the end of either the second act or the third act depending on whether it is a three act play or a five act play.

4. The end result of this discovery is that in a tragedy the leading character suffers death as a result of his attempt to change or to correct a fault or an error in himself; in a serious play the hero goes through a lesser ordeal, but the pattern remains the same.

5. Comedy differs from tragedy in that it presents a happier scene and does not end in death for the leading character.

6. The essential difference between a work that is comic in nature and a work that is tragic is in the attitude of the playwright toward man as he is and man when he will become better.
7. The play must deal with the inner life. External events are only symbolic of the struggle within.

8. The story must show a conflict between good and evil within a single person.

9. The playwright must have something to say and take an attitude toward the world in which he lives.

10. A play is not expected to make ethical discoveries but it is expected to have a common denominator of belief with its audience.

III. The leading character of the play:

1. The leading character cannot be a perfect man, he must have some variation of what Aristotle called the tragic fault, for he must emerge a better man at the end of the play than he was at the beginning.

2. From the point of view of the playwright the essence of tragedy or of drama is the spiritual awakening or regeneration of the hero.

3. The protagonist must represent the forces of good and must win, or if he be evil must accept the good and know himself defeated.

4. The protagonist must be an exceptional person, or he must epitomize exceptional qualities.

5. There are certain qualities which an audience admires on the stage: in a man, positive character and strength of conviction; in a woman, fidelity and passionate faith; and there are other qualities an audience always dislikes on the stage: in a man, cowardice and refusal to fight for a belief; in a woman, any inclination toward the Cressid.

With these rules in mind the next and major sections of this study will be an examination of Anderson's plays with some special emphasis on those plays that were either very successful or were failures. The purpose of this second part of the study will be to attempt to determine the development of the above theories, to discover whether Anderson followed these theories in his most successful plays and in his failures and whether
there are other concepts of the drama that Anderson did not include in his critical writings that made his plays what they are. This examination will also attempt to determine whether the theories expressed by Anderson are valid theories that might be used by other playwrights to develop the kind of drama that Anderson felt could and should be developed.
CHAPTER II

ANDERSON'S PLAYS OF THE 1920'S

Anderson's first play, White Desert, which was a failure, was withdrawn from the stage after only twelve performances. The play was never published and is, therefore, not available for use in this study. A number of people have given descriptions and synopses, however. Barrett Clark wrote in 1933:

White Desert was tried out in Stamford, Connecticut, by Brock Pemberton, in 1923, and Mr. Anderson, "sitting at the edge of the crowd," says Burns Mantle, "died several deaths as he saw his beautiful play completely misunderstood." I never saw White Desert in the theater, but in its first form it must have been very different from the script I read. The first scenes were comedy scenes and then "suddenly, and without fair warning, they became tensely tragic," and the audience laughed, straight through. Much of the first act was rewritten, but the play failed when it was put on at the Princess Theater in New York.

The play is, on the whole, well written, the dialogue being for the most part the work of a man who understands the color and shape of words. It also has form; the young author knew just where he was going and except for an occasional lapse into the mode of conventional melodrama, he carried his simple story through to its inevitable conclusion.

It is the tale of a young man and his wife whose first attempt at homesteading on the plains brings ruin and tragedy to them both. Possibly the young man's morbid jealousy would never have come to the surface if he and Mary had not been chained by circumstances to their bare cabin and their pitiful new farm. Because the woman has had the honesty to confess to him that she has passions like his own he accuses her of being a prostitute, and when he leaves the cabin for a few days she deliberately throws herself at another man. The husband returns, is told by his wife what she has done, and as she walks out he shoots her.
Probably Maxwell Anderson never read Jules Lemaitre's *LePardon*, but the stories are similar. I prefer the American play, because while it is supposed to be a study in jealousy (as it is), it is more significant as the first work of a man who can write, a man too who feels within him something worth telling about the earth underfoot, and the sky over him.¹

As to whether Anderson followed the rules of playwriting that he articulated later, is extremely difficult if not impossible to tell without the play itself. One rule that Anderson states in "Poetry in the Theater" is apparently disregarded here. That rule is that the aim of the playwright is to recapture a vision for the stage and that that vision must be a compromise between what is of immediate concern and interest to the playgoer and that which the playwright has that he wishes to put into words. That Anderson recaptured a vision, a vision of life on a barren farm, in *White Desert* is fairly well attested. But apparently he did not take his audience sufficiently into account. Also writing in 1933 Carl Carmer said: "The public found it stronger fare than they could stomach."² Whether the fact that the play was in verse had anything to do with its failure is not known. Anderson seems to have felt that it had something to do with it because he said, "When I wrote my first play, *White Desert*, I wrote it in verse because I was weary of plays in prose that never lifted from the ground. It failed, and I did not come back to verse again until I had discovered that poetic tragedy had never been successfully written about its own place and time."³

---

¹Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 11.


Apparently because of the quick demise of his first play, Anderson did not trust his own capabilities for some time. The next and one of the most successful and influential plays that Anderson wrote in collaboration with Laurence Stallings was What Price Glory? Since it is difficult to determine what is Anderson and what is Stallings in this play, a complete discussion of the play in the light of Anderson's later stated rules is not entirely in order. The discussion is therefore rather cursory. The action of the play revolves around Captain Flagg and Sergeant Quirt, professional soldiers. The play takes place behind and on the front lines of the American forces in France during World War I. Flagg is just going on leave, as the play opens, when Sergeant Quirt arrives. They have been together a number of times before, and there is always a battle between them for any available woman or any other prize. After Flagg leaves, Quirt takes Flagg's present girl away from him. When Flagg returns he tries to force a marriage between the girl, Charmaine, and Quirt. Quirt, discovering that the unit is moving up to the front, refuses. The next act does little to advance the plot of the play, but it does further establish the relationship between the two men and gives the play its background of war with all its horror. In the last act the men determine to let the man who wins at cards have Charmaine. Flagg wins just before he is called to return to the front. Quirt, although slightly wounded, runs after Flagg, calling, "Hey, Flagg, wait for baby." The girl is forgotten and the men return to the job of war—for that is how they regard it, no more and no less.  

---

What Price Glory? does follow some of the more general rules that Anderson gave. The play is unquestionably an attempt to recapture for the stage a vision of what war really is, and it is apparently somewhat a compromise between what the authors wanted to say and what the audience was interested in. The playwrights had a definite purpose in writing the play; it was not merely a chance achievement. This is obvious in the note that was included in the published version and in the program for the play's production.

What Price Glory is a play of war as it is, not as it has been presented theatrically for thousands of years. The soldiers talk and act much as soldiers the world over. The speech of men under arms is universally and consistently interlarded with profanity. Oaths mean nothing to a soldier save a means to obtain emphasis. He uses them in place of more polite adjectives.

The authors of What Price Glory have attempted to reproduce this mannerism along with other general atmosphere they believe to be true. In a theatre where war has been lied about, romantically, effectively—and in a city where the war play has usually meant sugary dissimulation—What Price Glory may seem bold. The audience is asked to bear with certain expletives which, under other circumstances, might be used for melodramatic effect, but herein are employed because the mood and the truth of the play demand their employment.5

There is very little correlation between the rules Anderson gives for the leading characters in a play and What Price Glory? The one rule that is adhered to is that the leading characters must epitomize certain characteristics that an audience prefers to see on the stage: manliness and courage. Both Captain Flagg and Sergeant Quirt have these qualities. They are not afraid to fight or to die for what

5Ibid., p.3.
they believe in. The fact that they do not spend their time discussing how noble it is for them to fight for their country does not mean that they either do or do not feel this nobility. It merely means that these are not the most important things, at least on the surface, to them. They are much more concerned with the everyday items of living. And to them the most important items are food, liquor and women; this is what they fight each other for and what they fight the enemy for. These are their everyday concerns.

Anderson and Stallings collaborated on two additional plays, *First Flight* and *The Buccaneer*. *First Flight* was produced by Arthur Hopkins at the Plymouth Theatre in New York on September 17, 1925. The play was withdrawn after only 12 performances.6 *First Flight* is concerned with an episode in the life of the young Andrew Jackson. Jackson has been sent to what is now Tennessee as the representative of North Carolina. There is insurrection in the minds of the people in the Free State of Franklin, as the natives called it, and it was Jackson's duty to keep this area under the control of North Carolina and to prosecute the lawbreakers. Jackson arrives at Peevey's Tavern where he meets two of the main agitators for the Free State of Franklin. He is challenged to a duel, and that night at a party he kills one of the men who has challenged him. Jackson also meets a young girl who falls in love with him, but he leaves her to her neighborhood sweetheart. This might be considered Jackson's first flight from love.7

6Covington, *op. cit.*, p. 150.
The *Buccaneer* tells a story of Sir Henry Morgan, the 17th century English privateer. Morgan and his men, who have taken Panama City, find there an English lady who is the widow of a Spanish nobleman. Morgan is depicted as a swashbuckling and romantic person. He captivates both the lady and her ladies-in-waiting and is about to carry her off when she discovers his amorous exploits with her ladies. He is delivered into the hands of an English Commodore who has a warrant from the king for his arrest. Morgan is taken back to England where the king, instead of hanging him, knights him and grants him the deputy governorship of Jamaica. The lady goes with him as Lady Elizabeth Morgan.8

This play, also produced by Arthur Hopkins at the Plymouth Theatre, was also a failure, being withdrawn after twenty performances.9 Both plays seem to have many of the same faults. The leading characters are not fully drawn and the visions of the young Jackson's first flight and Morgan's conquest in love and war that the playwrights attempted to recapture for the stage are diffused. Here again there are few of the rules followed that Anderson later gave. The plays deal primarily with external events and concern themselves very little with the inner conflicts of the leading characters. There is no discovery scene in which the leading character makes an emotional discovery; the leading character is much the same at the conclusion of the play as he is in the beginning. The leading characters are manly and courageous in the main,

8Ibid., pp. 181-263.

9Covington, op. cit., p. 151.
but in *First Flight* one gets the impression that Jackson was all show and had little real courage. He fights the duel and kills his opponent but only because of the public scorn that he would receive if he runs away. He is presented as a callow youth, and he does not have much maturity at the end of the play either. It would seem that in both plays the playwrights tried to anticipate too much about what the audience wanted to see and were too little concerned with what they themselves had to say concerning the subjects. Another rule of Anderson's, that a playwright must have something to say and take an attitude toward the world in which he lives, seems to have been ignored or not understood at this time. Neither *First Flight* nor *The Buccaneer* seems to take an attitude concerning the world.

Carl Carmer, in the article cited previously, says of *First Flight*, ". . . the plot is too anecdotal. It lacked Anderson's usual desire to say something and say it hard. Audiences found it only mildly diverting. . . ."\(^\text{10}\) And about *The Buccaneer* he says, "Like its predecessor it lacked other purpose than to present a colorful period and a striking personality as entertainingly as possible."\(^\text{11}\)

Anderson also collaborated with Harold Hickerson in the 1920's, on *The Gods of the Lightning*. This play, based on the Sacco-Vanzetti case, was produced at the Little Theatre in New York on October 24, 1928. It too was unsuccessful and was withdrawn after 29 performances.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{10}\)Carmer, *op. cit.*, p. 440

\(^{11}\)Ibid.

\(^{12}\)Covington, *op. cit.*, p. 155.
The story, as told by Anderson and Hickerson, is of two radicals, Macready and Capraro, who are accused of the murder of a payroll clerk in a hold-up. The men are obviously framed and unjustly convicted. The story also introduces a convicted and escaped killer who at the trial confesses to the murder and the hold-up but his story is discounted and the men are executed.13

*Gods of the Lightning* seems to be more characteristic of Anderson's work than the other collaborations mentioned. The play might have been successful if it had not come so quickly on the heels of the celebrated case on which it was based; but because the play was written and produced at that particular time, it seemed to the audience to be too much a propaganda piece instead of the fairly well written play that it is.

The play follows some of Anderson's rules more closely than any of the other plays examined thus far but it also breaks some of what seem to be the most important. The play is without question an attempt to recapture a vision for the stage of man's injustice to man, and it is also something that was both of immediate concern and interest to the playgoer and that said much of what the authors apparently wanted to say. The play was deliberately constructed with a purpose in mind; to tell the audience of what seemed to the authors a gross injustice.

Gods of the Lightning breaks several of Anderson's rules concerning the aim and purpose of the playwright. Anderson states that it is not the primary purpose or aim of the theatre to attempt to reorganize the world, and yet this play obviously tries to do just that as its primary aim. Anderson also states that the audience goes to the theatre to reaffirm its faith in itself and in mankind, and yet Gods of the Lightning shows the complete unfairness of man to his fellows. In the play also there is no central scene in which the leading character or characters make a discovery that affects their entire course of action in the play. Both Macready and Capraro have determined before the play ever begins that there is no justice for them in the courts or from the civil authorities. They both die with this same belief, and this belief is given to the audience. There is in the play little if any inner conflict. The only individuals who could show inner conflict in the play are the actual murderer and the perpetrators of the injustice, and there is no remorse shown on either part. The only remorse shown is by the prosecuting attorney, and his is for the weakness of the case against the men and his ever getting mixed up in it. Salter, the prosecuting attorney, says to Hazlet, who evidently is working for the company that was robbed, "I've got to win this case now or retire. I wish to God I'd never got into it. That's what makes me sore."

(p. 43, Act II Sc. 1)

Anderson also states that the essence of tragedy or of drama is the spiritual awakening or regeneration of the hero of the play. There is none of this in either of the leading characters, since there is no appreciable change in them or in their attitude throughout the play.
In *Gods of the Lightning* Anderson also breaks another of his rules, that the hero of the play must represent the forces of good and must win. Macready and Capraro, as well as all of the forces of good, lose in this play. There is no indication of any hope for this travesty of justice to be rectified, and the people left behind do not give any indication that they will attempt to change things for the better.

There is an indication in this play of what seems to this writer a fairly fundamental concept of drama that Anderson and Hickerson ignored in writing *Gods of the Lightning*. The leading characters, Macready and Capraro, are removed from the scene at the end of the second act. The majority of the action of the third act is carried on by minor characters. The only major character who is seen in the third act is Rosalie, the fiance of Macready and the daughter of the actual murderer. She doesn’t enter the stage until the third act is almost half over. Generally speaking the major character of a play must be the central figure and must be seen frequently after he makes his first entrance on the stage. The fact that the majority of the leading characters are not even present during the third and final act may be one reason that the play was not as successful as it might have been.

In 1925 Anderson dramatized a novel by Jim Tully, *The Beggars of Life*. The play was called *Outside Looking In*. This play, produced by Jones, Macgowan, and O’Neill on September 7, 1925, at the Greenwich Village Theatre in New York, ran for 113 performances.\(^4\) The story

\(^{14}\) Covington, *op. cit.*, p. 149.
concerns hobos in the 1920's and takes place somewhere in North Dakota. The play begins with the arrival of a group of hobos, among whom are Little Red and Edna his girl friend. The two of them are hiding from the police because Edna has killed her step-father, who had previously seduced her. In the group of hobos is Oklahoma Red, who later in a moving box car organizes a kangaroo court to try Little Red for being a sissy. The Court decides that Little Red is unfit to keep Edna and that she should be turned over to the judge, Oklahoma Red. Little Red fights off the gang of hobos and in turn earns the admiration of Oklahoma Red. Finally Little Red and Edna are helped, primarily by Oklahoma Red, to escape from a sheriff's posse while the rest of the hobos go to jail.15

As Outside Looking In is a dramatization of a novel it too is difficult, as with the collaborations, to examine completely in the light of Anderson's stated rules of dramatic composition. Again, however, an examination of the play reveals some adherence to these rules and some divergence from them. As far as the playwright's purpose and aim in writing the play is concerned, the play is an attempt to recapture for the stage a vision of life—in this case a life, that of hobos, quite far removed from the lives of the audience who witnessed the play's production. It is difficult to state whether the atmosphere of this play is a moral one or whether the play has moral excellence. There

15Anderson and Hickerson, Gods of the Lightning; and Outside Looking In, pp. 107-187.
is a moral excellence in the love and devotion of Little Red and Edna who stay together in spite of the danger of prison or death they incur. And there is moral excellence in the help the hobos give to the two young people in allowing them to escape from the law. Whether this escape from punishment would or could be considered morally right is difficult to say. This same pattern of feeling that the poor underdog would not be given fair and just treatment from the law is apparent also in the play Gods of the Lightning. This belief of Anderson's was apparently quite strong at this time and is evidently one of the ideas that he wished to put over to his audience. This is related to a later rule—that the playwright must take an attitude toward the world around him and have something to say concerning that world.

Anderson's later statements concerning the protagonist of a play have little significance in his early works. The characters are not exceptional people nor do they epitomize particularly exceptional qualities. The qualities that most of them do possess are qualities of courage and fidelity toward their ideals. This is true of the leading characters in Outside Looking In. While an audience might not agree with the ideals of the leading characters, these characters do, for the most part, hold to their ideals and their convictions.

As in the plays discussed earlier, Outside Looking In deals primarily with external events rather than with the internal conflicts of a single individual. We see little struggle on the part of the leading characters against anything that may be wrong with them and their make-up. Instead we see them struggling with external forces.
Little Red and Edna struggle, not with any feeling of guilt or innocence concerning her killing her step-father, but against the law that holds her and them accountable for the act.

Also in *Outside Looking In* many of the characters, although either amusing or pathetic, are incompletely drawn. The audience sees them only as two-dimensional figures rather than as complete human beings. The girl, Edna, for example is at the end of the play almost as much a stranger as she is when the play first opens. We know that she was originally seduced by her step-father and that she had spent some time in a brothel before going back to kill him. When she and Little Red met is unknown, how long they have been together is unknown, how old she is is unknown, how long she waited to go back and kill her step-father is unknown, and why she finally killed him is mentioned only once. These are examples of the kinds of facts that would, if told, make real people of the leading characters instead of just figures on a stage. There is also no character change throughout the course of the play. The people in the play are the same at the end as they were in the beginning. The only change is in the attitude of one toward the other. No one emerges a better man from his experiences.

The year 1927 saw the first of Anderson's plays that, since the failure of *White Desert*, was completely his. This play is *Saturday's Children*, produced by the Actor's Theatre, Inc., at the Booth Theatre in New York on January 26, 1927. As far as the length of run is concerned, this was the most successful of Anderson's plays thus far. It
ran for 326 performances. The play, a domestic comedy with tragic overtones, deals with the lives of two young people, Bobby and Rims. The first act of the play tells the story of the night that Rims proposes to Bobby and she accepts him. This is done by Bobby's tricking Rims into thinking that she is going to marry someone else. Her sister, Florrie, gave the directions for the deception and helps to carry it out. The second act is a few months later; and although Bobby and Rims are still very much in love, they are beginning to feel the confinement of marriage. They both express a wish that they could have each other without the entanglement of marriage. Bobby especially is smarting under the idea that she has lost her independence and now must be completely dependent upon someone else. At the end of the act they both leave their house, rather unwillingly, but they leave it nevertheless. In the last act Bobby has got a room in a rooming house and Rims comes to try to get her to go back to him. She wants his love but refuses to give up her newly rewon independence and go back to being a wife. Rims is apparently willing to go along with this arrangement as the curtain falls.

As this is the first of Anderson's successful, noncollaborated plays, it would be well to examine it in detail in the light of Anderson's rules. To accomplish this the discussion of this play and the ones to follow is divided into three major parts: (1) the playwright's


purpose and aim in writing the play; (2) the structure of the play; and (3) the leading character of the play.

The Playwright's Purpose and Aim in Writing the Play

*Saturday's Children* is definitely an attempt to recapture for the stage the vision of a young couple's struggles with married life, and it is evidently very well conceived in the compromise between that which was of immediate concern and interest to the playgoer and that which the playwright had to say. The comic elements in the play seem to make the play enjoyable for an audience and at the same time heighten the pathos of the predicament and the struggles of Rims and Bobby with themselves and with their environment.

Anderson's choice of vision and his treatment of that vision are very carefully constructed to make the entire play lead to only one final solution. In the first act, when Bobby follows her sister's advice and tricks Rims into proposing, she goes against her own feelings and inclinations. She is basically a person who wants both independence and love. She consciously overrules her desire for independence and surrenders to her desire for Rims and love in her maneuvering of Rims toward marriage. In the second act she is portrayed as trying very hard to make a success of her marriage, but is frustrated in this by the lack of money, and, consequently, in the final quarrel, money is not the overriding question but merely the obvious one. The main problem is that both she and Rims are having great difficulties in adjusting to the lack of the complete independence they both desire. In the third act Bobby has determined to be independent at any cost, even
to the point of giving Rims up completely. When Rims capitulates to her desire to remain alone and comes back to her through the window, she has achieved both the romance that she craves and the independence that she needs.

In *Saturday's Children* Anderson does not attempt to reorganize the world through his play nor does he attempt to return to poetic tragedy that he says is the best medium for the stage. He does, however, give the audience a core of meaning: that each individual has the right to find the best way for himself to attain happiness. In doing this Anderson draws his characters well and gives the stage individuals that help to reaffirm the audience's faith in mankind as being basically admirable although confused: admirable in that they try to find the answers to their problems without recourse to violence or shame.

The characters in *Saturday's Children* are honest and moral individuals. They have human frailties, as all men do, but they conduct their lives to the best of their abilities with a healthy outlook and with basic human dignity. The rule that Anderson later stated—that the stage offers us criteria for judging what is evil and what is good in a man—holds true in this play. An individual witnessing a production of *Saturday's Children* would be able to tell the innate goodness and honesty of the people in this play.

**The Structure of the Play**

Anderson, as has already been discussed, recaptures a vision of a young couple's struggle with the problems of married life. And it is fairly obvious that this vision was carefully checked with the rules
or intuition concerning the needs of the stage that Anderson had learned up to this time. Within the play Bobby makes a discovery that determines her course of action throughout the rest of the drama. This discovery is that she cannot remain with Rims as his wife. Bobby and Rims are quarreling and she says to him:

Bobby: Good God—am I a family? I won't be a wife—I won't be a family! I'm just me!

Rims: All right, be yourself!

Bobby: All right, I'll be myself—and if you think a man gives up a lot when he gets married, a girl gives up something when she gets married, and don't you forget it! I spend the whole day here taking care of this damned house for you and cooking your meals and washing your dishes and never going anywhere because we can't afford it—and every time I get a dime for myself I have to ask for it! It's degrading!

Rims: It's your own home.

Bobby: It's not mine. It's all yours. You earn the money so it's all yours! I tell you it's despicable! (p. 125 Act II)

And then a few minutes later she leaves.

This discovery follows Anderson's rule that the discovery scene should come at the end of the second act. In the third act the pattern that Anderson laid out later is followed also. Since the play is not a tragedy, the leading character does not die, but Bobby has discovered something about herself, and she does go through a type of punishment for her fault. In the end, however, the two leading characters do find a degree of happiness although they do not go back together as husband and wife.

Anderson states, later, that the story of a play must be concerned primarily with the inner life of the leading character, and that the
story must be conflict between what is good and what is evil within a single person. *Saturday's Children* is conflict and, as far as Bobby is concerned, it is primarily conflict within herself. She is torn between her love for Rims and her intense desire for independence. This conflict is clearly shown in such speeches as the ones quoted above and the one which follows. Bobby is talking with her sister, Florrie.

Bobby: Then I don't want to be married. Because I want to be madly in love.

Florrie: No doubt you wish Rims had gone to Buenos Ayres.

Bobby: No.

Florrie: Well, he's yours, my dear, and he was the one you wanted, so why worry about it?

Bobby: I know it can't go on the way it is. He'll leave me or I'll leave him--or something will happen. We want to be together and then as soon as we are together,--it's no use. We always say the wrong things---. (Act II, pp. 94-95)

Anderson does have something to say in this play, although as he says, the play is not expected to make ethical discoveries. The attitude Anderson takes toward the world around him is that it is disheartening that two people such as Bobby and Rims cannot live their lives without the constant problems that surround them and threaten to destroy their love. This also can be considered the common denominator of belief that an audience must have with a play for it to be successful and meaningful.

The Leading Character of the Play

One of the prime rules that Anderson gives for the leading character of a play is that he must not be a perfect man and must have some
variation of what Aristotle called the tragic fault, for he must emerge a better person at the end of the play than he is at the beginning. In *Saturday's Children* Anderson had apparently not arrived at this rule, for neither of the two leading characters, Bobby and Rims, is a better person at the end of the play than he is at the beginning. They both have faults but not faults that can be considered tragic. They both are somewhat wiser individuals at the close of the play but are not particularly better ones.

Anderson also states that the essence of tragedy or of drama is the spiritual awakening or regeneration of the hero. In this aspect also *Saturday's Children* does not follow his rules. There is no spiritual awakening or regeneration of either Bobby or Rims. There is a certain nobility on the part of Bobby in that she asserts her individuality and independence, but this is something that she has had all along and is not a particular result of the course of action she takes.

Another rule of Anderson's is that the protagonist must represent the forces of good and must win, or if he be evil, must accept the good and know himself defeated. In the case of *Saturday's Children* Anderson seems not to realize or understand this rule, because there does not seem to be any relation between good or evil in the play. If there is a villain, it is society that imposes itself upon the young couple and forces them apart. And if there is one person who represents good, it may be Bobby who fights society and her financial circumstances. But
Bobby capitulates to the circumstances in that she leaves and goes back to work instead of working within the framework and overcoming the financial barriers to happiness.

That the protagonist of a play must be an exceptional person, or that he must epitomize exceptional qualities is another of Anderson’s rules. In this case Bobby is not an exceptional person but she does epitomize exceptional qualities. The quality she represents is a determination to fight for what she believes is her right no matter what the consequences. She cares deeply for Rims and wants to be happy with him, but she is willing to sacrifice that happiness in order to be a free individual, an individual who is master of her own soul and independent of anyone.

Anderson also states that there are certain qualities that an audience likes to see in a woman on the stage. Bobby fulfills these qualities. She has passionate faith in herself and in what she believes is right, and she is willing to sacrifice almost anything for this belief. She is also faithful to Rims. Although she has had dinner with another man after she and Rims have separated, there is no indication in the play of infidelity. Rims also exemplifies the qualities that Anderson states should appear in a man depicted on stage. He has positive character and strength of character. He does not allow Bobby to dictate to him what he should or should not do, and he resents Bobby’s sister, who does dominate her husband. There is no indication that Rims is a coward, a trait of character that Anderson says an audience dislikes on stage. In this respect
Saturday's Children follows Anderson's rules concerning the leading characters in a play.

As can be seen from the above discussion, in Saturday's Children, Anderson either by intuition or knowledge, followed several of the rules he later gave for dramatic composition.

In 1929 another play of Anderson's appeared on the stage. This was Gypsy, a type of domestic tragedy. The play was produced by Richard Herndon at the Klaw Theatre in New York on January 14, 1929, and had a comparatively short run of sixty-four performances.\(^\text{18}\) The story revolves around a girl named Ellen who has the nickname of Gypsy from which the play gets its name. At the beginning of the play Ellen and David have been married for several years. During their marriage Ellen has already had one affair with another man but has gone back to her husband. As the play opens Ellen is falling in love with another man, Cleve, and out of love with David. Ellen's mother, Marilyn, has been married several times and she and Ellen have never gotten along. This seems to be because Ellen doesn't like the idea of being like her mother, unable to be satisfied with one man, but is like her and consequently hates herself and her mother for it. Ellen, throughout her marriage to David, has always been honest with him. She eventually tells him of her current affair with Cleve, leaves him, and goes to Cleve. After living together for some time, Ellen and Cleve quarrel about whether Ellen could be faithful to any man. Ellen says that she doesn't believe that she could, and Cleve leaves her, saying that he doesn't

\(^{18}\) Covington, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 157.
want to be hurt as Ellen has hurt David. Ellen has talked about sui-
cide before; after Cleve leaves she opens the gas jet and lies down to
read a poem that Cleve had written to her that day. As she is reading
and the gas is coming into the room, the phone rings. In the version
of the play that was played most frequently during the play's short
run, the curtain falls on the gas filled room with the telephone ringing
but unanswered. In the other, and apparently original version,
Ellen answers the phone, turns off the gas and accepts a date with
another man. 19

As in the previous discussion of *Saturday's Children*, the dis-
cussion of *Gypsy* will be divided into the three sections of (1) the
playwright's purpose and aim in writing the play; (2) the structure
of the play; and (3) the leading character.

The Playwright's Purpose and Aim in Writing the Play

The vision that Anderson attempts to recapture in *Gypsy* is that
of a girl's struggles against her apparently inherited or learned
proclivities toward adultery. Ellen, the Gypsy of the play, seems to
have inherited all of her mother's inclinations and attitudes toward
marriage and sex. Although Ellen fights against them, these attitudes
and inclinations prevail throughout the play. Ellen hates herself for
giving in to these inclinations but give in to them she does and it
destroys her marriage and her husband at the same time. This struggle
and hate are shown in a scene between Ellen and her mother, Marilyn.

19Burns Mantle, *The Best Plays of 1928-1929, And the Year Book
283-315.
Ellen: I know what you are, and I wouldn't like to tell you! I have begun to tell you what I know about you. You thought I was a child! It's sickening!

Marilyn: You say that to me, knowing that you're deceiving your husband--living with another man and making David a fool--and you find me sickening! Oh, I know you! I know every breath you draw and every thought you think! Looking like a pure, innocent child, and posing that way--and living like a ----. He's your second lover! And how old are you?

Ellen: Why am I that way? Who put it in my blood? You! You! Do you wonder you make me hate myself?---It's not true about me! I won't have it true! (p. 303, Act II)

Anderson deliberately constructed the play for a desired end, that end being to show how one's natural or unnatural inclinations can destroy oneself as well as those around him. There is something reminiscent of Ibsen's *Ghosts* in *Gypsy*. In both plays the inherited weaknesses, or diseases if you will, destroy the leading characters and those they love.

*Gypsy* either ignores or breaks most of the rest of Anderson's rules concerning the playwright's purpose and aim in writing a play. The only rules that *Gypsy* does follow in this regard are that it is not the primary purpose of the play to attempt a reorganization of the scientific or practical world, and that the play does show what is evil and what is good in the characters. Anderson says that the atmosphere of a play must be healthy. He does not seem to condone the actions of Ellen or her mother. He merely reports the actions and allows the audience to draw their own conclusions concerning the people themselves. Anderson does not condemn the people, only the actions themselves that destroy those around them.
The Structure of the Play

Anderson had written or helped to write at least seven plays by the time he wrote *Gypsy*. In this respect he had had considerable experience in dealing with audiences and it would seem that he should have checked more carefully the vision that he tried to recapture for the stage in *Gypsy*. In *Saturday's Children* Anderson had two years previously succeeded in constructing a better play than *Gypsy*. At least he should have been more aware of what would make a successful play in the theatre of that day. It is extremely difficult for a play to succeed if the audience cannot feel some sympathy and liking for the leading character. Carmer, writing in 1933, only four years after the play had been produced, says that although the audience accepted Ellen as an existing person, they could not like her.20 This could be one explanation of the play's failure.

Just as there is a recognition scene in *Saturday's Children* with Bobby, so *Gypsy* does have a scene in which Ellen recognizes or discovers something concerning her character, and this recognition does change her direction in the play. This recognition takes place almost at the end of the play rather than where Anderson said it should—at the end of the second act. Ellen and Cleve have been discussing their relationship and whether she could be true to anyone. Cleve has told Ellen that he thinks he should leave her.

Ellen: Wouldn't you rather fail me now than have me fail you later? Because I assure you I would. I fail everybody in the end. I'm quite certain of that because you told me so yourself.

Cleve: Ellen!

Ellen: How could I want you here after what you've said to me? Go--and go quickly! (As he steps toward her) No! Never! You were quite right about me. I would have betrayed you and lied to you and broken you. I'm perfectly unreliable and indecent! And now that I know it and you know it there's nothing more to say. (p. 314, Act III)

Ellen earlier makes discovery that she cannot remain with David, her husband. This occurs at the end of the second act. But this discovery does not unalterably change her course of action. It only makes her certain of what she has already determined to do—-that is, to leave David and go to Cleve.

Depending on which ending of the play is followed, the next rule of Anderson's is either broken or partially kept: that in a tragedy the leading character suffers death as a result of the attempt to change the fault discovered. Ellen does not, in either ending, attempt to change for the better or to correct the fault; she merely accepts the fault as being part of her make-up. In the one ending she takes her life as a result of this discovery and in the other only starts to commit suicide and then changes her mind when a new man calls her.

Gypsy, according to Anderson's definition or rule, is neither a tragedy nor a comedy if the ending where Ellen accepts a date with the new man is followed. It might be considered a tragedy if the play ends with her apparent suicide. In either case the playwright's attitude toward the world and man is not too evident. Anderson condemns the actions of Ellen because of the consequences to those closely associated with her, but he does not condemn Ellen. He seems to be saying that the audience should be more understanding of such a person although they may not condone her actions.
In one respect Anderson follows quite closely one other rule of his concerning the structure of a play: that the play must deal with the inner life and that external events are only symbolic of the struggle within. *Gypsy* is primarily a story of the struggle of Ellen to decide which of her desires she should follow. Should she be true to the husband who loves her, or should she follow her own inclinations and bestow her love on the current objects of her affection?

In the attitude that Anderson takes concerning the world around him, *Gypsy* has some of the same ideas that are found in *Saturday's Children*. In both plays the story is of a woman's desire for independence and her inability to attain that goal within the confines of marriage. In both plays Anderson does not seem to be able to say what is the best way for women to gain this independence. In *Saturday's Children* Bobby apparently gained her financial independence by leaving her husband and living and working for herself but remaining physically true to him. *Gypsy*, on the other hand, still has her financial independence, but desires emotional independence which she cannot find. In neither play does Anderson solve the problems of his two heroines. Neither play makes any ethical discoveries and at the final curtain one is not sure, especially in *Gypsy*, what really are the author's feelings concerning the subjects treated.

The Leading Character of the Play

Ellen, the leading character in *Gypsy*, is certainly not a perfect person. She has some very basic faults, and, if the subject had been treated somewhat differently, these faults could have become truly tragic. The main criticism in this regard is that Ellen is given no
time in the play, after her recognition of her fault, to make any progress toward becoming a better person. She is also given no time in which to have a spiritual awakening or regeneration. The play ends immediately after the discovery scene. This is because the major discovery scene is not central in the play but seems to be almost an afterthought or a way in which to close a play that is long enough.

The leading character certainly does not represent the forces of good in Gypsy, nor does she know herself defeated if we accept the ending in which she turns off the gas and accepts a date with another man. The forces of good seem to be represented in her husband, and he certainly does not triumph. He is, instead, destroyed by Ellen's actions. Ellen, however, is certainly an extremely honest person with everyone except herself. And in this respect she follows Anderson's rule that the protagonist of a play must epitomize certain qualities. These qualities that she has are honesty, charm, and a tremendous lust for life.

These very qualities that are shown in Ellen lead, however, to her downfall because these are the things that attract the men to her. Ellen has a very positive character, but she does not have other qualities that would lead an audience to admire her. She is not faithful and she does have this inclination toward the Cressid that Anderson says audiences dislike on the stage.

On the whole, Gypsy does not follow many of the rules that Anderson gave for a successful play, and it might be assumed that this was one of the reasons that the play was not too successful.
Some of the rules that Anderson later articulated were used the majority of the time during the 1920's, others were used only part of the time and then not completely. Still others were not used at all during this decade. From this one can only conclude that by the end of this decade Anderson had not yet discovered the rules in their entirety or perhaps he had not yet realized their importance or necessity. Thus in the plays of the 1920's Anderson can be seen as a playwright beginning to find his way but certainly not yet an accomplished master of his chosen profession. One sees a much surer hand in Anderson's plays written in the following decade. This writer can only conclude, therefore, that at least part of the reason for the certainty on one hand and the uncertainty on the other lies in Anderson's knowledge and use of rules as they were discovered.
CHAPTER III

THE VERSE PLAYS OF THE 1930'S

The decade of the 30's saw a vast amount of work by Anderson. This section of this study is concerned with his verse dramas written or produced in the period from 1930 to 1940, from Elizabeth The Queen to Journey to Jerusalem. During this decade Anderson wrote ten full length verse plays and one radio drama and a one-act play. Three prose plays were also written during this period and will be dealt with in a later section.

The first play of Anderson's to appear in the decade of the 1930's marks his return to verse drama. This is Elizabeth The Queen, first produced by The Theatre Guild, Inc., November 3, 1930, at the Guild Theatre in New York. The play ran for 147 performances. In writing Elizabeth The Queen, Anderson apparently had profited from a lesson he had learned with White Desert for this later play does not deal with contemporary subjects. Elizabeth The Queen concerns itself with the loves and lives of Elizabeth and Essex, although Elizabeth is near middle age, and Essex considerably younger. Other members of the court, notably Lord Cecil and Sir Walter Raleigh, are displeased with the favors shown by Elizabeth to Essex and plot to oust him by making it appear as if he were a rebel. In this atmosphere each time

---

1Covington, op. cit., p. 159.
Elizabeth and Essex meet there is a clash. Essex is a natural soldier with great ambitions, while Elizabeth is weary of war and desires to have peace abroad. When in a council meeting Cecil proposes an expedition to Ireland under Raleigh as Lord-Protector, Essex becomes infuriated and insists upon being the commander himself, thus falling into Cecil's plot against him. With Essex in Ireland it is easy for Cecil and Raleigh to intercept the letters of Essex and the Queen, thus causing a breach between them. Essex receives a letter commanding him to disband his army and return to London to answer charges against him. In fury he does return but at the head of his army and to the popular acclaim of the people. Upon seeing him again, Elizabeth is willing to forgive and forget. She dismisses her guard, and Essex takes command. There is then talk of marriage between them, but Essex will not be Elizabeth's consort. On the other hand, Elizabeth will not agree to give up any of her power. She tricks him into dismissing his guard and then has him arrested for treason and condemned to death. She has previously given him a promise that should he ask she would forgive anything at any time. During the last scene of the play, the day of his execution, he is summoned before her in an effort to get him to ask for pardon. He refuses. At the last moment Elizabeth abjectly offers him the throne. This he also refuses and goes to his death believing now that England will be better governed by Elizabeth than by him.²

The second play of the decade of the 1930's is Night Over Taos, first produced by the Group Theatre, Inc., on March 9, 1932, at the 48th Street Theatre in New York. The play was far from successful on the stage, lasting only 13 performances. Night Over Taos tells the story of the last stronghold of the Spanish aristocracy in New Mexico and the battles against the encroachments of the democratic but mercenary Yankees from the north. The story revolves around the feudalistic Montoya family. Pablo, the father, leads a revolt against the American settlers, but he is defeated by the treachery of his oldest son Federico, who has betrayed the movements of Montoya's soldiers to the Americans. Felipe, the younger son, is loyal to his father but desires the freedom offered by the American system. Pablo discovers the treachery of Federico and kills him. Pablo also discovers that Felipe is in love with Diana, a young American girl whom Pablo desires for himself. Because he cannot accept the defeat and the change that seems inevitable, he takes poison and dies, leaving the way clear for the change that is to come.

Night Over Taos was followed in 1933 by Mary of Scotland. This play was produced by the Theatre Guild, Inc., November 27, 1933, at the Alvin Theatre in New York and ran for 248 performances. This was the most successful play, in terms of length of run, that Anderson had had since Saturday's Children in 1927.

---

3Covington, op. cit., p. 161.
5Covington, op. cit., p. 167.
For the story of *Mary of Scotland* Anderson returns to the 16th Century and tells the tale of the young Mary Stuart, beginning with her return to Scotland from France. Mary's Catholic faith brings her the enmity of John Knox, the Protestant zealot. Her youth and beauty brings the love of the Earl of Bothwell, and her close kinship to Elizabeth of England brings her Elizabeth's crafty opposition. At the beginning of the play, Mary has just arrived in Scotland to assume her throne. She is met by her blunt, brave, and loyal admirer Bothwell and also by Knox. Elizabeth fears Mary because of her beauty and her legitimate claim to the throne of England and therefore plots her downfall. Elizabeth determines that Mary will be dethroned by spying and intrigue instead of by a costly war. Through this intrigue Mary accepts the marriage suit of the drunken but Catholic Darnley who is killed by the Scottish Earls while Mary is expecting the heir. After Darnley's death Mary and Bothwell are married, thus incurring the wrath of John Knox who with the help of Elizabeth's machinations raises an army against Mary and takes her prisoner. Mary escapes to England believing that she will find help and refuge there with Elizabeth. Instead Mary is incarcerated in Carlisle Castle and is visited there by Elizabeth. Mary gradually realizes that everything that has happened since her return to Scotland has been controlled and conceived by Elizabeth who now asks Mary to abdicate her throne in favor of her son. This Mary refuses to do, maintaining that she will emerge the victor in the end because she has loved and born a son while Elizabeth has not. Mary states that she will
win in the end because that son, who later became James VI of Scotland and then James I of England and Scotland, would inherit both thrones since Elizabeth has no heir.6

After Mary of Scotland Anderson again turned to American history for his next play, Valley Forge. Valley Forge was produced by the Theatre Guild, Inc., at the Guild Theatre in New York, on December 10, 1934, and it had a comparatively short run of 58 performances.7 The play deals with Washington and his men during the winter of 1778. Because of the privations of his men, the pettiness and aloofness of Congress and the weak spirit of the merchants whose trade is being cut off by the war, Washington determines to deal with the British for the end of the conflict. He changes his mind however, and is aided in making the decision to keep on with the war by the spirit of his men, the love of a woman whom he had known in his youth, and the army's willingness to follow him and him alone.8

The next verse drama that Anderson wrote after Valley Forge was Winterset. Winterset is unique in several ways, not the least of which is that here is verse drama, successful on Broadway, (total of 195 performances), that is written about a fairly current topic and set in a familiar locale. Winterset was produced by Guthrie McClintic at the Martin Beck Theatre in New York and opened on September 25,


7Covington, op. cit., p. 170.

For *Winterset* Anderson again turned, as he had done several years earlier in *Gods of the Lightning*, to the Sacco-Vanzetti case, this time to fashion one of the best known plays of the American theatre. *Winterset* tells the story of Mio, the son of a man who had been executed for murder some years before, and Miriamme. Mio is on the trail of some new evidence that will prove his father innocent, and his search leads him to Garth Esdras, the only witness who did not testify at the trial. Mio meets and falls in love with Miriamme, the sister of Garth. Judge Gaunt, half mad and seeking justification for sentencing Mio's father to death, also appears. Trock, the real criminal, is there also seeking to insure that Garth does not tell what he knows about the crime. Mio finds Garth, but his problem is complicated by his growing love for Miriamme and her loyalty to her brother. To save her brother, Miriamme helps to cover up a murder that, had it been exposed, would have led to the clearing of Mio's father. Mio tries to leave and is shot by Trock and his gunmen. Miriamme, knowing that Mio was the only person worth living for, cries out against Trock and is shot also.10

*Winterset* was followed on Broadway by *The Wingless Victory*. This play was produced by and starred Katherine Cornell at the Empire Theatre in New York. It opened on December 23, 1936, and ran for 110 performances.11 For this play Anderson turned to the Medea legend of

---


Ancient Greece. It tells of Nathaniel McQueston, a New England sea captain, who returns to New England with his wife Oparre, a Malay Princess, and their two children. His puritanical family accepts him for the money he brings to bolster the family fortune but hate Oparre for her dark skin. Nathaniel lends money to various people of the town in order to force them to accept her, but then they discover a way to take away his money and his ship. Nathaniel bows to their pressure and agrees to send Oparre and their children back to her native country. Oparre, knowing that they will be killed there and believing that Nathaniel does not love them, kills herself and her children. Nathaniel realizes his mistake and reaches her side just before she dies. After her death he sails from New England vowing never to return.12

Anderson's next verse play is High Tor, a fantastic comedy highly reminiscent of Shakespeare's Midsummer Night's Dream in its combination of realism and fantasy. High Tor was produced by Guthrie McClintic at the Martin Beck Theatre in New York, and opened January 9, 1937. It ran for 171 performances.13 The story is that of Van Van Dorn, owner of a mountain named High Tor that overlooks the Hudson River. Two unscrupulous real estate dealers are trying to get him to sell the mountain, but he is adamant in his refusal. During a stormy night Van Dorn meets the ghost crew of a Dutch sail

13Covington, op. cit., p. 176.
boat, lost for more than three hundred years, and falls in love with their lovely ward, Lise. The following morning, in the hard light of reality, Judith, Van Dorn's fiancée, and an old Indian convince Van Dorn that it is futile to resist. He consents to sell, for after all "There is nothing made . . . by these new men . . . that will not make good ruins." (Act III, p. 142)\(^\text{14}\)

The Masque of Kings, a dramatization of the events surrounding the deaths of Crown Prince Rudolph of Austria and the Baroness Mary Vetsera at Mayerling in 1889 followed next. This play was produced by the Theatre Guild, Inc., at the Shubert Theatre in New York, and opened February 8, 1937, for a run of 89 performances.\(^\text{15}\) This was the third play of Anderson's to be presented in three months: Wingless Victory, High Tor and The Masque of Kings were all running on Broadway at the same time.

In The Masque of Kings, Crown Prince Rudolph of Austria-Hungary finds himself opposed to his father, the Emperor Franz Joseph. Rudolph is of a liberal mind and is not in agreement with his father's policies. His life is further complicated by his love for the Baroness, and his desire to divorce his wife in order to marry the Baroness. His application to the Pope for a special dispensation is denied. Caught in emotional crises, with his father attempting to destroy the love affair, Rudolph joins with some revolutionaries to overthrow his father and ascend the throne himself. The overthrow is successful,

\(^{14}\)Anderson, "High Tor," Eleven Verse Plays.

\(^{15}\)Covington, op. cit., p. 178.
and Rudolph begins to take command only to discover that in order to insure success, he must first dispose of his father and then dispose of others. These things he refuses to do and leaves for his hunting lodge at Mayerling. The Baroness Vetsera joins him there and upon discovering that her love is suspect shoots herself in order to release Rudolph from all obligations. Rudolph, in order to "keep faith with faith," kills himself with the same revolver.16

The next work of Anderson's to appear was a radio drama called The Feast of Ortolans. This was first performed over the Blue Network of the National Broadcasting Company on September 20, 1937.17 The story involves the gathering of several French aristocrats and intellectuals for a feast of ortolans on the eve of the French Revolution. After a discussion of the impending doom by several of the participants, the master of the house orders a servant to come to him for punishment. The servant refuses, and the master leaves to punish him and is found a few moments later with a dagger in his back. The rest of the company realize the day has arrived.18

In the next play, Key Largo, Anderson attempted to repeat his success with Winterset in a poetic drama set in a familiar and contemporary setting. Key Largo was produced by the Playwright's Company at the Ethel Barrymore Theatre in New York. It opened November 27, 1939, and ran for 105 performances.19 The story is of King

19Covington, op. cit., p. 185.
McCloud, a young American who led a group of Americans into the war in Spain. McCloud leaves the group to their deaths when he realizes that the cause for which they are fighting is lost. He spends the next year wandering through the United States searching for the families of the men who had died in Spain and explaining the circumstances. He finally appears on Key Largo in the Florida Keys at the home of the family of the last man, Victor D'Alcala. Here King finds Alegre, the sister, and Victor's blind father. A group of gamblers have moved in on them and have refused to leave. Two runaway Indians appear on the scene also, and they make prime suspects when a murder is discovered. The sheriff tries to arrest them for the murder which King confesses to so that the Indians will be set free. In the ensuing moments King is shot and in turn shoots the head gambler, Murillo, the real murderer. King dies having found his self-respect and proving his worth as a human being once again.20

After Key Largo Anderson next published a one-act play called Second Overture that deals with a group of Russians who are trying to flee the country during the Communist take-over. So far as this writer is able to determine, the play has never been professionally performed.21

The last play that will be dealt with in this section of the study is Journey to Jerusalem. This play was produced by the Playwright's Company at the National Theatre in New York. It opened on October 5, 1940.

21Ibid., "Second Overture."
1940. This was one of the more poorly received plays that Anderson wrote during this decade, for it closed after only seventeen performances.\textsuperscript{22} The story of \textit{Journey to Jerusalem} is the story of the Child Jesus, called Jeshua in the play, at the age of twelve when He journeys to Jerusalem for the Feast of the Passover and His encounter with the wise men of the Sanhedrin in the Temple. It also tells of how He begins through the words and actions of others, to understand who He is and His mission.\textsuperscript{23}

The discussion of the plays of the decade of the 1930's will be divided into the three divisions: (1) The playwright's purpose and aim in writing the play; (2) the structure of the play; and (3) the leading character of the play. These are the same three divisions used in the discussion of the plays of the 1920's. It is well to state at this time that we do not know when Anderson began to formulate and follow the rules he later made public. We can only surmise that he followed those rules that he had discovered at the time he wrote a particular play. Exactly when Anderson found each rule is difficult if not impossible to say. The first articulation of any rules came in the introduction to the published version of \textit{Winterset} in 1935. Anderson himself states that he came into the theatre by chance and stayed in because he had some rather accidental success. It was not until some time later that he realized that there were rules that must be followed and began to dig them out for himself.\textsuperscript{24} From this it is apparent

\textsuperscript{22}Covington, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 187-189.


\textsuperscript{24}Anderson, \textit{Off Broadway}, pp. 56-58.
that Anderson gained gradually the insight into the rules of playwriting that he later articulated and did not devise them all at one time. Exactly which plays were written under which rules prior to the complete publication of his non-dramatic writing in 1947 is difficult to tell. But we can safely assume that as he discovered a rule, he made use of it in the play or plays on which he was working.

The Playwright's Purpose and Aim in Writing the Play

The main criterion that can be used to judge whether Anderson observed his first rule is audience acceptance. Of Anderson's verse plays produced on Broadway from 1930 to 1940 only two can be considered outright failures from the box office point of view: *Night Over Taos* which closed after 13 performances and *Journey to Jerusalem* which closed after 17. *Valley Forge* with 58 and *The Masque of Kings* with 89 were far from being outstandingly successful, but they were not out-and-out failures either. *Elizabeth the Queen*, 147; *Winterset*, 195; *Wingless Victory*, 110; *High Tor*, 171; and *Key Largo*, 105; range from moderately successful to successful. *Mary of Scotland*, which closed after 248 performances, led the group. Taking into consideration only the number of performances given on Broadway, it would appear that Anderson's attempts at compromise with what he wanted to say and what the audience wished to see were, in the majority of cases, successful ones.

The second of Anderson's rules states that the choice of vision and the treatment of that vision must be deliberately constructed for a desired end, for a purely chance achievement is not an artistic one.
In view of the fact that only two of Anderson's plays of this period were box office failures we can say that his successes, particularly after 1935, were not the result of mere chance.

In the verse plays of the 1930's Anderson did not obviously write from a didactic viewpoint. In each of his plays he apparently had something to say. Each of them takes a point of view of the world, but they do not attempt any reorganization of the practical world of men. The closest that any of these plays come to an attempt of this sort is in *Key Largo*. That a bad situation exists first in Spain and then in the Florida Keys is disclosed, but no specific suggestion or demand for reform is made. The situation is simply pointed out in connection with the lives of the main characters and they attempt to solve their own problems and not the problems of the world or the country or even the city in which they reside.

As regards verse tragedy these eleven plays of Anderson's speak for themselves. It is not the aim of this study to decide or even to discuss whether or not Anderson's poetry is good or bad. It is sufficient to say that Anderson wrote these plays primarily in a poetic form. In casting these plays into poetic form, he follows his rule that poetry is the best medium for the stage.

Anderson follows his rule, that man is better than he thinks he is, quite closely in the verse plays of the 1930's, beginning with *Elizabeth the Queen* when Essex goes to his death rather than accept the abject capitulation of Elizabeth, for he knows that England will be better governed by her than it would be by him.
In the second play of this group, *Night Over Taos*, old Pablo Montoya is also better than he thinks he is. Pablo kills himself because he knows that if he lives he will cause the death of his son Filipe and the girl Diana. In perhaps his one and only unselfish act, Pablo removes himself in order not to be the cause of those deaths. *Mary of Scotland* shows us a woman whose only fault was that she was too much a woman to be a queen. Mary, at the end of the play becomes better than she thinks she is because even though she is a prisoner of Elizabeth, she is still a queen and still able to rise above herself. She has been a woman, she has been loved and loved in return, and she has born a son, none of which Elizabeth has done or will do.

In *Valley Forge* Washington is depicted as being bouyed up by his men and the love of a woman. In this case it is the men who are shown to be better than they think they are. In the first scene of the play they are sick and dissatisfied but when it comes to giving up and surrendering to the British, they show their belief in Washington's leadership, thus their nobility of spirit. They refuse to surrender and would rather die fighting under Washington than accept the peace offer of General Howe. At the end of the play Washington finds the courage he needs to continue fighting and ends by saying, "This liberty will look easy by and by when nobody dies to get it." (Act III, p. 166)

In *Winterset*, which is the next play in this series, Mio finds that his revenge of his father's death does not seem so important
when he weighs it against his love for Miriamne. He discovers that this nobler sentiment of love makes him content or resigned to die now that he has found and known her. Miriamne too in her death proves herself to be a nobler individual than before, choosing to die rather than live in a world without Mio.

*Wingless Victory* gives an example of one person who is very definitely shown as being better than he thought himself to be. This is Ruel McQueston, the wastrel brother of Nathaniel. He is the only person in the village of Salem to see through the hypocrisy of the people around him and to take up for Nathaniel and Oparre. At the end of the play Ruel leaves Salem with Nathaniel, forsaking his now wealthy family to seek a better place to live and a better way. At the end of the play even Nathaniel finds that the easy way is the harder way and he forsakes Salem to be with Oparre and finds it is too late.

There is in *High Tor* no particular scene or person that can be pointed out in this regard. There is, however, a general feeling that the petty things that men do are really not too important; it is rather the way in which a man lives and treats his fellow men that is important. So, when Van Dorn agrees, at the end of the play, to sell the mountain to the speculators, he is not capitulating but rather realizing that it is the man who counts and not the material things. There is also the hope that man will, in time, become better than he is at present.

It is in the plays at the end of this decade that Anderson reaches the full realization that the core of meaning laid down
for the audience must follow the ancient Greeks and say that man is better than he thinks he is. In *The Masque of Kings* we find Prince Rudolph first seizing power and then relinquishing it when he discovers that he cannot follow through in the ruthlessness that would be necessary to hold that power and then later committing suicide in order to keep faith with someone, in this case Mary. In *Key Largo* we find King McCloud condemning himself as a coward and everything despicable and then at the end of the play finding the courage to die in helping Alegre and her father and two complete strangers, the Indians, who were being accused of a crime they did not commit. And in *Journey to Jerusalem* there are several examples of individuals who find themselves in the service of the young Jeshua. And Jeshua himself discovers that he has courage and conviction far beyond anything he imagined when confronted with death in the form of a Roman soldier.

Anderson affirms his faith in mankind throughout these verse plays. In no play in this group do we find the major character or characters in the long run unworthy of the admiration of the audience. In *The Wingless Victory* Nathaniel earns the status of a hero when he goes to join Oparre and leaves wealth and family behind. The audience, through the actions of Ruel in particular, is led to believe that there is hope for mankind to become better. King McCloud in *Key Largo* also becomes a fairly admirable person in the final scene of the play. The overall idea of all of these plays is that man is essentially admirable, and though each of us may slip from time to time, and there may be despicable characters also, man is trying to become something better.
One indication that Anderson followed his rule that concerns the theatre being a type of religious institution is that these plays are in verse and as he said, "I believe with Goethe that dramatic poetry is man's greatest achievement on this earth so far...."25 And that poetry "... is a way of using language that impels the user powerfully toward emotional utterance ... and toward whatever vision he may be able to formulate of human destiny."26 In all these plays the spirit of great men and men who become great in times of danger and stress is exalted and is shown to be something good and worthy of emulation.

The authors of tragedy offer the largest hope for mankind which I can discern in the great poetry of the earth, a hope that man is greater than his clay, that the spirit of man may rise superior to physical defeat and death. The theme of tragedy has always been victory in defeat, and man's conquest of himself in the face of annihilation.27

This quotation gives a good picture of the tragedies of this group of verse plays. Each of them shows victory in defeat as Mio conquers himself in his death and Mary of Scotland becomes more of a Queen when under Elizabeth's threats than she had been before. Even in the plays such as High Tor that are not tragedies one finds the admirable men besting, if not in death, the little people around them.

Anderson says that moral excellence is demanded for the stage and that the moral atmosphere of a play must be healthy. It is sufficient to say that all of the plays discussed in this group maintain a healthy

25Ibid., p. 48.
26Ibid., pp. 88-89.
27Ibid., p. 90.
moral atmosphere and show the leading characters as being morally excellent. All of the main characters are fairly admirable people, and those characters who do not measure up to the moral standard of the time are shown in the proper light. That is, the characters whose actions may be reprehensible are not portrayed sympathetically. The actions that may be considered immoral are reported but not condoned.

That Anderson followed the last rule of this group is fairly obvious for in each play one finds ample criteria for judging the actions of each major character. Starting with Elizabeth the Queen, one sees both the wisdom and the obstinacy of Elizabeth, the courage and the impetuousness of Essex and the opportunism and scheming of Raleigh and Cecil. Throughout these plays one sees a character in juxtaposition with several different people and can make comparisons and thereby draw conclusions as to the goodness or evil in a man. For example, it is in Wingless Victory that an audience can sympathize with Nathaniel when he agrees to send Oparre away because the viewer knows the pressures that have been put upon him and also knows the agony that they cause him. This is not to say that an audience would condone this action, but it might understand it.

The Structure of the Play

It seems apparent that Anderson checked his vision against the rules he had discovered and the intuition that he had most, if not all of the time, and this followed the rule that one must do so.
With several outstanding successes to his credit in the 1930's and with a few failures it would seem that this checking, for the most part, took place and accomplished its purpose.

Anderson's realization of the central importance of the discovery scene can be seen to develop through the plays of this period. In *Elizabeth the Queen* the central scene for Elizabeth could be in one of two places. The first occurs in Act II Scene III when Essex returns from Ireland and first seizes the power; then Elizabeth tricks him into relieving his guards and has him arrested for treason. The second such scene for Elizabeth occurs in the final scene of the play when Elizabeth tells Essex he can do as he wishes, for she will give him what he wants even to the throne and kingly power. There is also a discovery by Essex but it is not shown on stage. Sometime during his imprisonment he realizes that if perchance he would be king he would not rule as well as Elizabeth has done and determines to die rather than risk that. Thus when Elizabeth says, "Lord Essex, Take my throne." Essex bows and leaves her and walks to his death.

In *Night Over Taos* the central scene or crisis is there but seems quite contrived. It also occurs at the very end of the play and does not allow a change of direction for anyone but Pablo Montoya. The scene is the one where Pablo is about to force his son Felipe and the girl Diana to drink poison. Instead he somehow realizes that he is the one who must die and drinks the poison himself. There is little if any preparation for this sudden change, and as a result it seems, to this writer, quite contrived.
In *Mary of Scotland*, as in the two preceding plays, the major crisis occurs in the last scene. This major crisis, or realization in this case, occurs when Mary finally realizes that it has been Elizabeth who has been the cause of everything. Up until this time Mary regarded Elizabeth as her friend. After the final realization Mary changes direction to the extent that she tells Elizabeth that she (Mary) will win in the end because she has born a son who will take Elizabeth's place on the throne of England and that Mary has loved and been loved, something that Elizabeth could never do for "A devil has no children."

The next play, *Valley Forge*, shows little more of a realization on Anderson's part of the necessity of this central scene than the preceding plays. In *Valley Forge* Washington, as the central figure, makes somewhat of a discovery again, in the final scene, when he determines to go on fighting because the men of his ragged and starved army are behind him. Washington hardly has a chance to change direction before the play ends. He does not want to give up the fight for independence, but he feels that he is unable to go on because of the outside interferences and the conditions of his men. Thus the discovery does not greatly affect him emotionally but rather spurs him in the direction he already wishes to go.

In *Winterset* we find the first scene that really allows the main character to alter his direction in the play. This occurs in Act II when Miriamne refuses to corroborate Mio's story of the murder of Shadow by Trock in order to protect her brother. Mio's discovery is that he can do nothing that would hurt Miriamne even to avenge his
innocent father, for "... you stick a girl's face between me and the rites I've sworn the dead shall have of me!" He has realized earlier that the love he now feels for Miriamne has cleansed him of the extremes of hate he has felt for the world and all within it, and this last act corroborates this love, and although he tries to tell the policeman of the murder he does not press the issue. After Miriamne tells the policeman that Mio had dreamed the murder, Mio looks at her and says, "You want me to say it. Yes, by God, I was dreaming." A more obvious discovery also occurs in Act II of Winterset. This is where Mio discovers the actual killer of the paymaster for which his father had been executed. This discovery does not cause a tremendous change in Mio's direction in the play however. In fact it occurs just prior to the discovery mentioned above and is almost abrogated by the second which, to this writer's belief, is a greater discovery.

Nathaniel McQueston in The Wingless Victory makes two discoveries in the course of the play. The first occurs in Act II when he discovers that he can no longer live with his wife Oparre in Salem and agrees to send her away; the second occurs in Act III when he realizes that he cannot live without her and rejoins her on the ship just before her death. The first decision alters his course in the play and no doubt affects him greatly. The second occurs off stage, and we see only the results as he arrives on board the ship to be with Oparre and their children. The first discovery or crisis is forced upon him and is not something he discovers for himself. It is not within himself, and, therefore, it is not a true discovery. The second discovery, as has
been stated, occurs off stage; therefore it is not paramount in the play as Anderson said that it should be.

The discovery scene in High Tor comes at the end of Act II. It is the scene where Van Dorn agrees to sell the mountain to the speculators. He agrees to sell this mountain after he realizes that the Lise he fell in love with is a ghost and after Judith, his fiancée, appears. This discovery scene does affect Van Dorn's direction and attitude throughout the rest of the play. He seems to be more resigned and calmer in the last act than before. It seems that his night on High Tor has had a profound effect upon him. He has discovered within himself the courage to move on and not live in the past.

Rudolph, in The Masque of Kings, makes his discovery when he realizes that in order to keep the throne that he has within his grasp he will have to be as ruthless as his father has been. This discovery scene occurs in Act II Scene III. Rudolph is talking with his father, the Emperor Franz Joseph, after seizing the power from his father. In this interview Rudolph finds to his dismay that he must be as willing as Franz Joseph had been to imprison and execute to keep control of the country. This he realizes that he cannot do and leaves the palace and the throne to his father. Rudolph also discovers that Mary, the woman he loved, was in the pay of his father. His direction in the play is very definitely changed, for in the third act Rudolph has left Vienna and gone to his hunting lodge at Mayerling. At the end of the play he shoots himself. His change and disillusionment are clear when he says speaking of his father and the Baroness Mary:
There was little enough left walking on this earth to hold a man from spitting! That's gone now!
This was to be my lover and my queen,
and he sent her to me, to sleep with me and tell!
Even that was his! Let him keep it, Let him have his earth
where men must crawl and women must brawl beneath them
and all their words are lies! I'm sick of it, sick, and sick to my death! -- Hoyos, the guard
that's round the palace---send them all home to bed.
Our revolution's over. (Act II Sc. III, p. 114)

In the radio play, The Feast of Ortolans, there is no single leading character to experience a discovery scene. The group of French aristocrats, however, experience a sense of discovery at the very end of the play when the host is found dead with a knife in his back. In this sense this drama is a discovery scene in its entirety. That is, the characters in the play discuss and discover the causes of the Revolution as the conversation, that makes up the bulk of the play, progresses.

Key Largo presents the viewer and reader with what seems to be a discovery scene at the very beginning of the play when King McCloud has discovered that the attempt to hold the hill they have been asked to hold is futile and that the entire cause for which this group of Americans are giving their lives is not only futile but suspect. These discoveries change McCloud and determine his direction throughout the play. Near the end of Act II McCloud makes another discovery. This discovery is that the girl, Alegre, fell in love with him through her brother's letters and that she still is in love with what he was. McCloud, up to this point, has been trying to save his life and to justify to himself his saving of his life when others were lost. But now he says:
A man must die 
for what he believes—if he's unfortunate 
enough to have to face it in his time—
and if he won't then he'll end up believing 
in nothing at all—and that's death too. (p. 118)

This discovery that life is not worth living if you won't die for what 
you believe, changes McCloud's direction. He first takes the blame 
for the murder, and then after the Indians have been let go tries to 
take Murillo, the gangster and real murderer, away with him but is 
shot and shoots Murillo also. Thus he finally dies for the liberty 
and freedom in which he believes.

**Journey to Jerusalem** presents a very definite discovery scene 
and central crisis for the young Jeshua. It occurs at the end of 
Act II Scene II. Jeshua first talks with the old beggar Ishmael and 
then goes into the temple. When he comes out, Ishmael has been fatally 
wounded by a Roman soldier. Ishmael warns Jeshua to run before he 
is killed, but he refuses. The soldier cannot kill him. At this time 
Jeshua discovers that it is his destiny to suffer for his people and 
that his life will not be an easy one. When he accepts this realiza­
tion, then his direction is changed and he becomes a person with a 
purpose and not one with just an idea of personal glory.

In discussing the discovery scene Anderson states that it should 
come near the end of either the second act or the third act depending 
on whether it is a three or a five-act play. As has been seen, Ande­
son varies the placement of this scene considerably in the plays of 
this group. The major discovery scenes of **Elizabeth the Queen**, **Night 
Over Taos**, **Mary of Scotland**, and **Valley Forge** all occur at the end of
the last act of the respective plays. \textit{Winterset}, \textit{The Wingless Victory}, \textit{High Tor}, and \textit{The Masque of Kings} all have their discovery scene or crisis near the end of the second act of these three-act plays. \textit{Key Largo} presents a different problem, for it is a play in a prologue and two acts. The major discovery scene in \textit{Key Largo} occurs about two-thirds of the way through the second act. This, in comparison to Anderson's rule, means that the crisis was delayed longer for \textit{Key Largo} than for the second group already mentioned, but earlier in the play than the first group. In \textit{Journey to Jerusalem} Anderson returned to the three-act structure and the discovery scene or crisis does occur when he says that it should, at the end of act two.

The application of the rule concerning the death of the leading character in a tragedy varies considerably in this group of plays. Turning first to \textit{Elizabeth the Queen}, we find that one major character does indeed die as a direct result of his trying to correct a fault within himself. Essex goes to his death after he realizes that his ambitious nature would drive him to attempt to seize the throne from Elizabeth again and thereby bring harm to his country. Elizabeth, on the other hand, does not die but for her life now has no further meaning, for she says:

\begin{quote}
Oh, then I'm old, I'm old!
I could be young with you, but now I'm old.
I know now how it will be without you. The sun
Will be empty and circle round an empty earth. . .
And I will be queen of emptiness and death. . .
Why could you not have loved me enough to give me
Your love and let me keep as I was? (Act III, p. 130)
\end{quote}
In *Night Over Taos* Pablo Montoya commits suicide when he realizes his error, the error of believing that he could fight and win over the men, the Americans, from the north. When this realization comes, Pablo finds he cannot force his son Felipe and the girl Diana to drink the poison. Instead, he drinks it and dies. This is a fatalistic and negative effort to correct an error or fault and not a positive one such as Essex makes in the preceding play.

Mary in *Mary of Scotland* does not die at the end of the play, but as anyone who knows history is aware of, Elizabeth eventually had Mary beheaded. This comes about, according to the play, as a direct result of Mary's too trusting nature. This is the error that brought about her downfall, and although she does not have the opportunity to try to correct this fault before the play's end, she does try to let Elizabeth know that she is not going to acquiesce to the demands made upon her to abdicate her throne. The play thus ends upon this note of triumph in defeat with the audience knowing that Mary's son will one day rule over England.

*Valley Forge* presents a different treatment from the plays that preceded it. Washington does not, either in the play or in history, die because of any fault. The nearest situation that occurs that might be the ordeal Anderson spoke of is Washington's belief that, although he believes passionately in the cause for which he is fighting, his men are not capable of carrying on the fight and that they have been deserted by the remainder of the people of the colonies. This error is corrected, and Washington goes on at the end of the play to lead his men once again in their fight against the British.
Mio Romagna in *Winterset* is again a different type of hero from the others mentioned above. Mio does die at the end of the play, and it is a direct result of his trying to correct the error of allowing his love for Miriamme to interfere with his clearing his father's name. If Miriamme had not intervened for her brother Garth, then the police would have found the body of the murdered Shadow. Thus, Trock would have been taken and Mio and Miriamme would not have been killed. As it is, when Mio attempts to go to the police with the new evidence concerning the murder for which his father had been executed, he is shot down by Trock's gunmen. If one accepts the discovery of who had been the actual killer as being the most important, then Mio's death is also the direct result. Mio delays too long in getting to the police after Trock knows that Mio intends to implicate him. Mio delays because of his love for and concern with Miriamme and this "error" costs him his life. Miriamme, knowing that it was because of her that Mio died, also dies telling the killers that she will now carry on where Mio left off to clear his father's name.

*The Wingless Victory* also presents us with a different treatment of the hero and his error. Nathaniel's error is that he consents to send Oparre away, and when he discovers that he cannot live without her, he joins her on the ship only to have her die in his arms. Nathaniel does not die in the flesh but as he says:

```
I go
to be with her while I can. What I've left of life
I shall know what it is to love one dead,
and seek her and not find. Let the sands of years
sift quickly and wash long. I shall have no rest
till my dust lies down with hers. (Act III, p. 133)
```
Thus it would seem that his punishment for the error is far greater than death would have been.

There is quite a different situation in *High Tor* from that in the plays discussed thus far. *High Tor* has varying elements in it that do not allow for exact classification. Van Dorn, at the end of Act II, does go through a scene of crisis. In the first place he decides to sell the mountain, and in the second he realizes that Lise, the girl he loves, is a thing of spirit and not of reality. These two elements combine to make up the Van Dorn that is quite different in Act II from what he is in the preceding acts. He is much more realistic than before. His idealism has not been tarnished but is now tempered with a more realistic approach. This tempering enables him to get a much better price for the mountain than he would have gotten before. It also enables him to agree to marry Judith and leave High Tor for the west where he can escape the extreme commercialism that surrounds him. This tempering also forces him to accept the fact that he can no longer live alone and for himself alone but must take his place in the human race.

The treatment of the discovery scene and the error of Prince Rudolph in *The Masque of Kings* is quite simple in contrast to the complex treatment of the discovery and error in *Winterset* and *High Tor*. The discovery by Rudolph that he cannot rule without force and suppression causes him to flee to his hunting lodge at Mayerling. There he discovers that he cannot keep faith with himself and with Mary, the woman he loves, and live. He also realizes that he cannot maintain his ideals and live in the world of the Court of his father. And so also in order to keep
these ideals and not become a mere shell of a man, he chooses to cease living. He commits suicide with the same pistol that Mary Vetsera uses earlier in the scene. This seems to him to be the only solution to the dilemma in which he finds himself. He can either live and eventually become like his father or he can die. He chooses to die.

Key Largo is, like The Masque of Kings, relatively simple in structure so far as the treatment of the discovery scene and the attempts to rectify the error are concerned. Early in the play King McCloud attempts to rectify the error of his running away to save his life. He acts with honor and bravery to help Alegre and her father and so dies with honor accomplishing his purpose. He rids Key Largo of the gang led by Murillo, saving the Indians from being prosecuted for a murder they did not commit, and wins back his own self respect in his death.

Journey to Jerusalem is somewhat more complex. The leading character, Jeshua, does not die in the course of the play; however, he is told that he will die at the hands of his enemies. The play, like Mary of Scotland, ends with the audience knowing that the hero will die, not because of any error, in this case, but because of the errors and fears of others. The ordeal through which the young Jeshua goes is quite real and frightening to a young boy. And his realization of his destiny is accepted without complaint. This acceptance begins to make the boy into the man that he will become.
In the light of Anderson's statement about the difference in scene between comedy and tragedy the plays of this group can be classified very simply. High Tor is the only play that presents an essentially happy scene and is therefore the closest to a comedy that Anderson wrote in this series of plays. Two of the plays, Mary of Scotland, and Journey to Jerusalem, leave the audience with the leading character still alive, but a knowledge of history tells them that both Mary and Jeshua will die violent deaths. Elizabeth the Queen and The Wingless Victory end with death of one of the leading characters and the other leading character left with an empty life. Valley Forge does not end in death for Washington, and history does not bring violent death either. The Masque of Kings and Night Over Taos both end with the suicide of one of the leading characters when he realizes that he cannot live in the world that is being forced upon him. Winterset is the only play in which the leading character does die and does not wish it.

Anderson's next rule concerns the attitude of the playwright toward man. The writer of comedy assumes that something can help man overcome his problems now, and the writer of tragedy knows that whatever he says, he cannot now help his fellowmen. Such help will only be forthcoming in the ages to come when man can learn to help himself. In this group of plays it is fairly apparent that Anderson did not feel that anything he said would be of direct help to his fellowmen. He seemed to know that no matter what he said, man would not or could not change overnight. But Anderson still had a hope that man would become better in some future time. He expressed his hope for man through the old man d'Alcala in Key Largo:
Now you want to know
What will come of us all, and I don't know that. You should have asked the fish what would come of him before the earth shrank and the land thrust up between the oceans. You should have asked the fish or asked me, or asked yourself, for at that time we were the fish, you and I, or they were we—and we, or they, would have known as much about it as I know now—yet it somehow seems worth while that the fish were not discouraged, and did keep on—at least as far as we are.—For conditions among the fish were quite the opposite of what you'd call encouraging.

Over and over again the human race climbs up out of the mud, and looks around, and finds that it's alone here; and the knowledge hits it like a blight—and down it goes into the mud again. Over and over again we have a hope and make a religion of it—and follow it up till we're out on the topmost limb of the tallest tree along with our stars—and we don't dare to be there, and climb back down again. It may be that the blight's on the race once more—that they're all afraid—and fight their way to the ground. But it won't end in the dark. Our destiny's the other way. There'll be a race of men who can face even the stars without despair, and think without going mad. (Act II, pp. 113-114)

Anderson seems to be saying that man has come a long way and he will, eventually, go a long way farther before he is finished on this earth. He will not be changed for the better overnight by whatever the playwright says, but he may be helped toward a change for the better through long and patient encouragement.

Another of Anderson's statements or rules is that in the main the play must deal with the inner lives of its characters. Therefore, external events are only symbolic of the struggle within. This rule Anderson follows fairly closely in the verse plays of the 1930's. All of the leading characters from Elizabeth to Jeshua experience deep inner conflicts and resolve them, if they do, only after
considerable struggle. For Essex and Elizabeth the struggle within themselves over who is to be the victor in their love is externalized in the struggle over temporal power in the kingdom. Felipe Montoya and Diana's struggle with Pablo over the right to love whom they wish is also symbolized by the struggle of the forces from the north against the autocratic rule of Taos by Pablo. Mary's struggle with herself to become the ruler of her "too loving a heart," is also externalized in her struggle to maintain her throne against the machinations of Elizabeth. Washington's struggle against the British Army and against the treacherous winter of Valley Forge is also, to a certain extent, symbolic of the struggle for the freedom of men's minds everywhere. Mio fights against the tyranny of the conspiracy of silence that surrounds Garth Esdras in the attempts to get the truth concerning the murder of the paymaster years before. Mio's external struggle with Trock symbolizes the struggle of Mio to maintain his belief in the innocence of his father. After Mio has won the internal struggle by finding the truth and also by discovering love in the form of Miriamne, his physical death at the hands of Trock is not so important as it would have been otherwise. The Wingless Victory is the never ending conflict between the narrow heritage of Nathaniel that is represented by the majority of the people of Salem and the wider and freer nature represented by Oparre. The racial bitterness and prejudice are external symbols of the refusal of people to accept anything that is either new or strange to them. Van Dorn's struggle against Biggs and Skimmerhorn who want to cheat him out of his mountain is symbolic of Van Dorn's own struggle to accept the fact that he cannot live entirely
for himself alone. His love for the ghost of Lise seems to symbolize his love for that which is past and cannot return: his complete independence. Prince Rudolph's external struggle against the domination of his father the Emperor is quite symbolic of Rudolph's internal struggle against acceptance of the idea of force making right. In The Feast of Ortolans Anderson makes the eve of the French Revolution symbolize the eve of World War II and the struggle of both wars against the oppression of man. King McCloud's main struggle in Key Largo is within himself to make himself realize that unless a man is willing to die for what he believes, life itself is not worthwhile. The young Jeshua has his most difficult struggle within himself to accept the Messiah as being first himself and second a man of peace and not of strength and to accept that the Messiah's kingdom is of the spirit and not of man.

Just as Anderson says that the play must deal with the inner life, so he also says that the story must depict conflict between the good and the evil within a single person. In Elizabeth the Queen the two leading characters are both motivated by good and evil. The good is the love that they bear each other and the country, and the evil is the jealousy and the overly ambitious nature of Essex. Pablo Montoya in Night Over Taos is trying to do what he considers the best for the people of Taos which is good, but at the same time he is not willing to allow his son and others around him the right to live their own lives which is evil. We get little opportunity to see within Pablo, but when we do, the love he bears his son and his people does show
through as well as the hate of anything new. Washington in Valley Forge really does not or is not allowed by Anderson to come to grips with the idea of good or evil. As a national hero Washington had to epitomize the good, and thus his character is not so completely drawn as it might have been. Anything of evil is laid to those attempting to thwart him and not to Washington himself.

Mary of Scotland presents a picture of a woman who had little evil in her. The major item that could be considered evil is a tendency to be too quick to trust and too quick to make decisions. Her decisions that eventually led to her downfall are made hastily and without proper thought. The goodness in her is shown by her ability to bring out the best of those around her and also to win the trust of most of her close associates. We find much the opposite type of person in Mio of Winterset. At the beginning of the play Mio's heart is so full of hate that he cannot allow anything else room to grow. The conflict within Mio is the struggle to allow the love of which he is capable to grow and begin to crowd out the hate. As his love for Miriamne gradually replaces the hate, he becomes a more nearly complete person, and in the end, although he still wishes to clear his father's name, it is not from a sense of revenge and hate but of duty and love.

Nathaniel McQueston in The Wingless Victory is somewhat different from any of the leading characters discussed thus far. The good within him is shown in his love for Oparre and their children and also in the first impulse to help his family. The evil in him is shown in his concern for his own future and fortune when he agrees to send Oparre and
his children away. He also seems overly concerned with an attempt to "show" the people of Salem. He seems completely unconcerned with the feelings and desires of Oparre and more concerned with flaunting his wealth and wife in the face of the town. The struggle between good and evil within Nathaniel is not clear, and his motives are not completely above reproach. Because of these deficiencies the play suffers. Van Dorn in *High Tor* also suffers from some of the same evil faults that Nathaniel does. Van Dorn is also overly concerned with his own desires and does not consider Judith, his fiancée, sufficiently; the evil within him is his unwillingness to compromise with anyone on anything. The good within him is the desire to be true to the past as symbolized by the old Indian and the mountain itself and is also seen in his love for Judith and for the ghostly Lise also. However, Van Dorn's faults, in the end, hurt no one, and so the play does not suffer as does *The Wingless Victory*.

The struggle between good and evil in Price Rudolph in *The Masque of Kings* seems almost to parallel the external struggle. The evil is Rudolph's desire for power and the good is the desire to help his people. The good is shown in his humanity toward the people, and the evil is his too harsh and unforgiving treatment of the Baroness Mary whom he loves and who loves him in return. *Key Largo* shows us another individual who is a leader of men. King McCloud has very definite and good tendencies that are shown in his concern for his fellow men. The evil within him is shown in his running away when faced with the possibility of danger. These two tendencies war within him throughout the play and are finally resolved in his death while attempting to help others.
The final play in this group, *Journey to Jerusalem*, presents a different problem. The good of the young Jeshua is obvious in his obedient attitude toward his parents and his devotion to God; the only thing that might conceivably be classified as evil is his misunderstanding of his mission. There is a conflict within him concerning his mission, and it does take the form of doubt and misunderstanding about how he is to go about accomplishing his tasks.

In all of the plays of this group Anderson has followed his rule that a playwright must take an attitude toward the world in which he lives. In most cases Anderson’s attitude is that discussed earlier that man is better than he thinks he is and man will also become better. In addition to this, Anderson inveighs against arbitrary and inflexible authority in *Night Over Taos* and *The Masque of Kings*, against cruelty and injustice in *Winterset*, against racial intolerance and hypocrisy in *The Wingless Victory*, against political corruption and racketeering in *Key Largo* and against religious intolerance in *Mary of Scotland*. These are a few of the injustices found in man’s relationships with man that Anderson finds repugnant and says so in his plays. In addition to these reprehensible activities Anderson shows approval for the willingness to fight and die for those things in which one believes as in *Valley Forge*, *Key Largo* and *Winterset*, approval of the pure love of a man for a woman in nearly all the plays and the love of man for God as in *Journey to Jerusalem*.

All of the items discussed lead one to the next rule, that a play is expected to have a common denominator of belief with its audience. Nowhere does Anderson deliberately go against the beliefs of his
audience, nor does he attempt to make new and startling ethical discoveries for the viewer. The major belief that Anderson promulgates is that man is striving toward heights hitherto unknown, and Anderson believes that eventually man will reach them.

The Leading Character of the Play

Anderson's first rule concerning the leading character of a play is that he must have some variation of what Aristotle called the tragic fault and he must emerge a better man at the end of the play than he was at the beginning. If one regards Lord Essex as the leading character in Elizabeth the Queen, then this rule was followed in that play. Essex is one of the two leading characters, and he does have a fault, in his case a tragic fault; he is overly ambitious. He allows his ambition to cause him to demand the leadership of the expedition to Ireland which in turn leads to his attempt to force Elizabeth to give him the throne; this attempt leads to his arrest and condemnation for treason. At the end of the play Essex realizes that Elizabeth is a better ruler than he would have been and goes to his death. Essex is a better man at the close of Elizabeth the Queen than he was at the beginning; he has learned a great deal. In this sense the tragedy is that of Essex and not of Elizabeth, for she does not seem to be either better or worse than at the start of the play.

Night Over Taos presents a different tale. If one regards Pablo Montoya as the leading character, then we have a character with a fault, that of inflexibility. Pablo believes that he and he alone is right and does not allow for any deviation from what he considers right in
those around him. Pablo, in the play, is not given a chance to become a better person than he has been. He dies as he says he knows that he is wrong. In this sense Anderson gave Pablo a tragic fault but did not allow him to show sufficient change for the better at the conclusion of the play.

Mary in *Mary of Scotland* is unquestionably the leading character, and she is endowed with a fault that brings about her tragedy. She is too trusting and loving a person to be a queen. She trusts too much in those people around her who in actuality are trying to destroy and not help her. Mary does emerge at the end of the play a strong, and at the same time a better, person than she was at the beginning. At the conclusion she has the strength to stand up to Elizabeth and refuse to abdicate. And Mary not only stands up to Elizabeth, but to Elizabeth's face Mary tells her that she (Mary) will win in the long run for she has loved and born a son who will rule both Scotland and England.

The major fault that Washington in *Valley Forge* seems to have is that of discouragement. He has, it seems, ample reason for being discouraged and little reason for encouragement. This discouragement takes the form of talking to the British commander about surrendering. Washington receives the encouragement he needs from his men and from a woman. He does not get it from within himself. For this reason Washington, as drawn in *Valley Forge*, is not a particularly strong man, and the play does not give the reader or the viewer much reason to admire Washington more at the end of the play than he did at the beginning. Washington changes little, and what little he does change
comes as a result of outside forces and not, as has been said, from within.

In Winterset, in Mio, we encounter the most complex leading character thus far in Anderson's work. He is both given a chance to grow and does grow in stature through the course of the play. As to Mio's tragic fault at the beginning of the play it would be cynicism toward the world and life and love. Mio has been steeped in hate for so long that it is difficult if not impossible to drag himself clear of it. The fault that inevitably leads Mio to his death is his love for Miriamne. This love prevents him from pressing the issue about the death of Shadow when the police come for Judge Gaunt, the love keeps him too long when he should have gone directly to the authorities after Trock has let him go, and the love also keeps him from telling his friend Carr about his discoveries concerning his father. So if one can call it a fault, Mio's fault was his love for Miriamne that causes his inability to act to save himself at the expense of Miriamne's brother Garth. But the growth of this love is what makes him a better man at the end of the play than at the beginning.

Nathaniel McQueston in The Wingless Victory is a considerably less complex character than Mio. Nathaniel's fault is over concern with the wealth he brought back to Salem, granting that one can overlook the stupidity of bringing Oparre to Salem in the first place with Nathaniel knowing his family and the town for what it really was. Nathaniel really indicates a change for the better only in the final few speeches of the play, and even there he does not regret bringing Oparre and
their children to Salem, just his decision to send them away that
directly caused their deaths. The unexplained reasoning behind bring-
ing Oparre to Salem in the face of all that Nathaniel knew is one of
the major weaknesses of the play.

In Van Dorn of *High Tor* we find another fairly complex character.
Van Dorn's major fault seems to lie in his unwillingness to face reality.
He seems to try to escape first into the past with his withdrawing to
the mountain and second in his love for the long dead Lise. When Van
Dorn finally accepts the inevitability of the "progress" that will take
his mountain from him, he becomes a better person and more able to cope
with life as it is around him. This is evidenced by his dealing with
the speculators about the price of the sale and his agreeing to the old
Indian's request concerning his burial.

The fault of Rudolph in *The Masque of Kings* seems to be his idealism.
He is unwilling to realize that the government of an absolute monarchy is
built on force and if he assumes the throne in that type of government he
will have to rule by force. This idealism also leads him to take his
life when it is completely apparent to him that it will be no other way.
Rudolph does not change a great deal either for the better or the worse
throughout the course of the play. He does realize much more in the
last act than he does in the first, but he remains primarily the same.

*Key Largo* presents us with King McCloud whose tragic fault is
disillusionment. King is disillusioned with the war in Spain, and
so he does not see any point in dying in it. Through the rest of the
play he is trying to rationalize to himself more than anyone else why
he left his friends to die. King realizes this error and tries to compensate for it at the conclusion of the play. He is killed as a result. He is a much more admirable person at the play's end than he was in the beginning, and thus Anderson followed his own rule.

In the final play of this group, *Journey to Jerusalem*, the closest thing that can be called a fault in the young Jeshua is ignorance, ignorance of the true mission of the messiah and ignorance of the fact that he is that messiah. This fault is overcome through the help of the old beggar Ishmael and Jeshua's own diligent study, so that at the conclusion of the play the viewer is aware the Jeshua knows his destiny and what it will bring. The ignorance is dispelled, and the child is on his way to become the man.

Anderson's next point is that the spiritual awakening or regeneration of the hero constitutes the essence of tragedy. This rule Anderson follows fairly well in the plays of this group. In *Elizabeth the Queen*, Essex, in the final scene, shows that he realizes that his way is not the best way for the people of England to be led; he awakes to the fact that a peaceful England is the best England. Pablo Montoya, in *Night Over Taos*, also seems to realize that his course, that of continued rebellion against the United States, is not the best way or the way his people want. In this sense Pablo awakens to the fact that he is what is standing in the way of peace for his people. *Mary of Scotland* presents a somewhat different story. Mary is not a bad person, a little foolish perhaps, but still not a person in too much need of spiritual regeneration or awakening. She awakes in the course of the play only to the realization that her true enemy is Elizabeth. In this
case Anderson did not follow this rule. In *Valley Forge*, Washington, like Mary, is not a bad person. He is discouraged at the beginning of the play and, in the sense that he is no longer discouraged at the conclusion, he does have a type of spiritual awakening. Mio presents the most obvious need and accomplishment of spiritual regeneration. At the beginning of *Winterset* Mio speaks of belief and says it is easy if you are a fool. At the end of the play, while dying in Miriamne's arms, he tells her that he loves her now and will love her tomorrow and will continue to love her after he dies. His love for Miriamne and her love for him have brought about this spiritual regeneration. If, as Anderson says, the essence of tragedy is the spiritual awakening or regeneration of the hero, then *Winterset* has indeed the essence of tragedy.

*The Wingless Victory*, *High Tor* and *The Masque of Kings* all present less spiritual awakening or regeneration than that found in *Winterset*. Nathaniel realizes too late his error in sending Oparre away and joins her to leave Salem, but his regeneration is not complete, for we find no indication that he will do anything but scoff at all things spiritual as he has always done. Van Dorn has a type of awakening of his love for Judith, but even this is just an awakening of something he already had but held in abeyance because of a quarrel over *High Tor*. Van Dorn's awakening is sincere and the circumstances surrounding it more convincing than that in *The Wingless Victory*. In this respect *High Tor* is a much stronger play. Prince Rudolph's awakening comes about as a result of the suicide of the Baroness Mary. He has felt that she is not to be trusted. In order to convince him of her love, she kills herself.
After that he realizes that he has lost the one thing that meant anything to him and joins her in death.

The spiritual awakening or regeneration of King McCloud in *Key Largo* is accomplished through his realization that in order to live one must be willing, if it comes to that, to die for one's beliefs. King is not willing to do so in Spain, and so his life from that moment on is not worth living until he finds that ability once again on Key Largo. *Journey to Jerusalem* shows the gradual spiritual awakening of Jeshua as he begins to realize the magnitude and at the same time difficulty of his mission. These last two plays present very clearly the spiritual awakening and regeneration of the heroes.

In all of the verse plays of the 1930's Anderson has the hero represent the forces of good at least to a certain extent and thus he follows his rule that dictates this. The closest that two of the leading characters come to representing evil is Essex in *Elizabeth the Queen* and Pablo Montoya in *Night Over Taos*. Essex might represent evil because he represents rebellion against established authority and war as opposed to peace. Essex, himself, realizes before he dies that his course is the wrong one. Pablo knows also at the end of the play that his course is the wrong one for his people and so removes himself from the scene by suicide. The remaining leading characters, though they may slip from the good as does Nathaniel in *The Wingless Victory* and McCloud in *Key Largo*, come back to it in the end. The question may be raised as to how the leading characters that die are able to win. Anderson answers that question when he states "... that the spirit of man may rise superior to physical defeat and death."
The theme of tragedy has always been victory in defeat, a man's conquest of himself in the face of annihilation.\textsuperscript{26}

Anderson's next rule states that the protagonist must possess exceptional qualities or be exceptional in some way. He follows this rule fully through all the verse plays of this group. To begin with, the plays deal first with Queen Elizabeth and Lord Essex both exceptional people who are also endowed with exceptional qualities. Next come Pablo and Felipe Montoya who are the hereditary ruling family of Spanish Taos, after that comes Queen Mary of Scotland, then General George Washington, all people of importance in the society in which they live. In \textit{Winterset}, Anderson turns to a person of exceptional qualities in Mio Romagna. Mio is not a person of importance in society, but the audience can certainly admire him for his loyalty to his father throughout the play and his love of Miriamne later. The depth of these two qualities make Mio an exceptional person. Nathaniel and Oparre in \textit{The Wingless Victory} are already exceptional people. Nathaniel is the captain of a ship in the seagoing society of New England and Oparre is the daughter of a king besides epitomizing the qualities of understanding and love. The protagonist of \textit{High Tor}, Van Dorn, is an exceptional person in that he is the owner of High Tor, the control of which is the motivating force throughout the play. In addition to this Van Dorn epitomizes some of the qualities that Americans seem to admire most, those of individualism and the strength of character to be an individual. These qualities, in addition to others such as honesty and integrity, make Van Dorn exceptional. All of the people

\textsuperscript{28}Ibid.
of *The Masque of Kings* are either members of the family of the Emperor or attached to the royal household and as such important to the society in which they live, and the protagonist, Rudolph, is the crown prince of the Austro-Hungarian empire.

King McCloud through most of the play *Key Largo* is not an exceptional person. He has been but has lost the exceptional qualities that he possessed. He has been the leader of the group of Americans that went to Spain; and he has apparently been the bravest fighter of them all. McCloud again regains some if not all of his exceptional stature by his actions at the end of the play. The protagonist of *Journey to Jerusalem* is a child but not an ordinary child. This is apparent at the very beginning of the play. As the story progresses, the young Jeshua becomes more and more an embodiment of many exceptional qualities. Some of these qualities shown in the course of the play are loyalty, courage and wisdom far beyond his years. At the conclusion the audience is led to believe that these qualities and others will continue to grow until Jeshua becomes the Messiah that had been promised.

The last rule of Anderson's to be discussed in connection with the verse plays of the 1930's deals with the qualities an audience either likes or dislikes on the stage. This rule Anderson follows throughout these plays. The closest any man in the group of protagonists comes to being a coward and to refusing to fight for his beliefs is King McCloud in *Key Largo*, and King redeems himself before the end of the play. The one protagonist that might be accused of not having a positive character is Nathaniel McQueston in *The Wingless Victory*. Many of Nathaniel's
actions are not wise and are not really positive in nature. As has been said before, he is overly concerned with the wealth that he has acquired and not concerned enough about his wife and children. Nathaniel seems to be the weakest of all of the protagonists of this group. The women in the plays examined are faithful to the men that they love and faithful to themselves as well. They, as well as the majority of the men, are drawn to live up to the rule that Anderson set down for the protagonists of his plays.

From the foregoing discussion it seems that in the majority of the plays written in this decade Anderson followed the rules he later articulated. At least by the time Winterset was written in 1935, he had evidently discovered or formulated, if not in their final form at least in a tentative way, all the rules or guides that were later written into the essays discussed earlier in this study. The one play that first embodied all of Anderson's rules, Winterset, also is regarded by many critics as the best play Anderson wrote. If this is so, and it seems to be so to this writer at this stage of the examination, then it is because in Winterset Anderson used the rules with great imagination and created characters that not only fit his rules but did so in a complex and not a facile manner. The characters in Winterset seem to fit the mold of Anderson's rules; they are not forced into it.
CHAPTER IV

The Prose Plays of the 1930's and Early 1940's

This chapter deals with Anderson's plays written in prose beginning with Both Your Houses in 1933, and ending with Storm Operation, written in 1944. One unifying element in the majority of these plays is Anderson's tendency toward propaganda. This tendency is discussed in detail later in this section. The plays examined in this chapter are: Both Your Houses, 1933; The Star-Wagon, 1937; Knickerbocker Holiday, 1938; Candle in the Wind, 1941; The Eve of St. Mark, 1942; and Storm Operation, 1944. In addition to the plays listed above and those discussed in the preceding chapter, Anderson also wrote during this period several one-act plays in prose for radio or stage, only some of which were produced. They are: The Bastion of Saint Gervais, 1938; The Miracle of the Danube, 1941; Your Navy, 1942; Letter to Jackie, 1943; and The Greeks Remember Marathon, 1944.

Both Your Houses, the first play of this group, was produced by The Theatre Guild, Inc., on March 6, 1933, at the Royale Theatre in New York. The play received the Pulitzer Price for drama for the season 1932-33 and ran for 120 performances.\footnote{Covington, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 165.} The story concerns
a young idealistic congressman, Alan McClean. McClean's first committee assignment is to the Appropriations Committee, and he discovers himself battling a group of old and not too honest politicians on the same committee. His life is further complicated by the fact that he and the committee chairman's daughter are in love. McClean objects to the bill being drawn up by the committee as being dishonest and tries to draw up an honest one. He shortly discovers that this is almost impossible, and so in an attempt to defeat the dishonest bill, he inserts so many items for special interest groups that he feels no politician could possibly vote for it. He hopes that it will be killed at once. Much to his dismay the bill passes with more than the necessary votes to insure it against presidential veto. McClean is beaten because he made the bill too attractive to everyone. The play is written as a commentary on the American political system of vote trading among the elected officials and shows these officials, in this case the Congress, as being to a great extent concerned only with what they can get out of their positions.²

The next play in this series is The Star-Wagon which was produced by Guthrie McClintic at the Empire Theatre in New York and which opened September 29, 1937, running for 223 performances.³ The story of The Star-Wagon is concerned with Stephen Minch, an inventor, and his best friend, Hanus Wicks. Stephen has invented a time machine which he

²Maxwell Anderson, Both Your Houses (New York: Samuel French, 1933).

³Covington, op. cit., p. 181.
calls the Star-Wagon. In order to rectify their past mistakes they determine to return to the past and live their lives over. This time they are going to marry the "right" girls. After some time in this new life, they discover that their original lives are the best after all and so return to them.4

Knickerbocker Holiday is Anderson's only musical comedy. He wrote the book and lyrics for another musical later, but it is not a comedy. Knickerbocker Holiday was produced by the Playwright's Company at the Ethel Barrymore Theatre in New York and opened on October 19, 1938, running for 168 performances.5 The story begins on the day of the arrival of Peg-leg Pieter Stuyvesant to take over the governorship of New Amsterdam. On that morning the corrupt and somewhat worried councilmen look around for someone to hang in order to impress the new governor and to divert his attention from their not too honorable activities. Brom Broeck is chosen to hang because he is determined to marry Tina, the daughter of Councilman Tienhoven, and because he is just too independent to take orders from anybody. Brom is thus established to be the first American. Stuyvesant pardons Brom but later condemns him again because Stuyvesant wants Tina for himself. Later, after a battle with the Indians, who have been supplied with liquor and guns by Stuyvesant, and which Brom wins for the


5Covington, op. cit., p. 184.
settlement, Stuyvesant reconsiders hanging Brom because he wishes to stand well with posterity.  

In the 1940's, Anderson wrote plays dealing with the Second World War. The first of these is Candle in the Wind which was produced by the Theatre Guild, Inc., and the Playwright's Company at the Shubert Theatre in New York. It opened on October 22, 1941, with Helen Hayes in the starring role and ran for 95 performances. It tells the story of Madeline Guest, an American actress, and her struggle to obtain the release of Raoul St. Cloud from a Nazi prison. The play covers a period from September 1940 to September 1941. In the first act the audience learns of the love between Madeline and Raoul and of Raoul's arrest and imprisonment. The remaining action of the play concerns Madeline's efforts to bribe various guards and officials in the attempt to get Raoul's release. In the final act Madeline gets the confidence of a young German officer who manages to let Raoul escape. The escape is discovered shortly, but Raoul is apparently well on his way to freedom. The Nazi commander of the prison cannot arrest Madeline because Germany and the U.S. are not yet at war, but he does take her passport and in this way manages to keep her a prisoner in France. The audience is left with the impression that she will probably be able to escape to England, but her escape is by no means a certainty.

---


7 Covington, op. cit., p. 191.

Anderson's next play, *The Eve of St. Mark*, appeared a year later. It was produced by the Playwright's Company at the Cort Theatre in New York and opened October 7, 1942, for a run of 307 performances. The story centers on Quizz West, a young farm boy, and his family, and his girl friend. In the first act Quizz is going through basic training in the Army. While on a short leave, Quizz introduces his girl friend to his family. The second act tells of the growing love between Quizz and Janet and his faithfulness to her. In the third act Quizz is in the Philippines during the Japanese invasion. He and his fellows are stationed on an island that commands a strategic location. They must decide whether they will abandon the island or continue to hold it, for they have no orders since their officers have been killed. After a scene, almost mystical, in which Quizz talks first to his mother and then to Janet, the men decide to hold the island as long as they can. The final scene of the play is in his parents home. Quizz has been reported missing in action and presumed dead. Scraps of his final letter reach home, and the audience and the parents discover that both of his younger brothers want to take up the fight where Quizz left off. One is already in the service, and the younger one gets his father's permission to join.

Anderson's last war play is *Storm Operation* which was produced by the Playwright's Company at the Belasco Theatre in New York. It

---


opened on January 11, 1944, and had only a short run of 23 performances.\footnote{Covington, op. cit., p. 194.}
The story is of a group of American soldiers, first seen in the prologue as they storm ashore in North Africa. Sergeant Peter Moldau is the leading character, and because of the death and injury of the officers of the company, he is in charge of the men for the majority of the play. In the first act an Australian nurse named Tommy appears, and the audience is told that she and Peter have fallen in love but that Peter does not want any permanent relationship because of the war. In the second act, realizing that one needs something for which to fight, he asks Tommy to marry him. A marriage ceremony of sorts takes place just before Peter leaves to go back into battle. The epilogue shows Peter and the men who are left with him storming ashore on a beach in Italy.\footnote{Maxwell Anderson, \textit{Storm Operation} (Washington, D. C.: Anderson House, 1944).}

The same type of discussion that has been carried on in the preceding two chapters of this study will be pursued here with the division into (1) the playwright's purpose and aim in writing the play, (2) the structure of the play, and (3) the leading character of the play.

The Playwright's purpose and Aim in Writing the Play

The visions to be recaptured for the stage and the compromises attempted seem to be quite successful in some of the plays and not so effective in others. The first play of the group, \textit{Both Your Houses}, as has been seen, is a play that tells of the American political system
as it operated in Congress in the early 1930's. The time of the opening, March, 1933, came shortly after the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President. Because of the political and economic conditions of the country and innovations that Roosevelt was advocating to meet definite needs, it was natural that any political play that was fairly well written would attract public attention. The fact that the play received the Pulitzer Prize for drama for that season and that a play concerning politics ran for 120 performances shows that Anderson's compromise was a successful one.

The second play of this group also apparently meets the needs of this rule of Anderson's for The Star-Wagon ran for a total of 223 performances, making it one of the most popular of Anderson's plays of this decade. In addition, the musical comedy, Knickerbocker Holiday, was a popular success with 168 performances. The first Anderson war play, Candle in the Wind, was not so popular as the others mentioned but was certainly not a failure. It ran for 95 performances. The Eve of St. Mark with 307 performances was one of the most successful plays in length of run that Anderson had written thus far, and apparently the compromise was quite successful in this case. The last play of this group, Storm Operation, with a run of only 23 performances, was the most poorly received play of those being discussed in this chapter. In the majority of the cases, then, in these plays Anderson was able to make a successful compromise between what he wanted to put on the stage and what he felt that the audience wanted to see there. The single exception is Storm Operation.
As has been stated before, it seems that by 1935 when he wrote *Winterset*, Anderson had formulated at least in part all of the rules that he later discussed in his non-dramatic writings. The only play of this group that was written before this time is *Both Your Houses*; therefore, it is safe to say that his plays after *Both Your Houses* were probably deliberately constructed for the ends which he desired and were not, therefore, purely chance achievements. Thus Anderson lived up to rule number two.

The next rule, that the primary purpose of poetry and the theatre is not the reorganization of the world, seems to be followed most of the time. The major exception to this statement is again *Both Your Houses*. This play represents Anderson's definite attempt at least to call the attention of the people of the United States to certain conditions that Anderson felt prevailed in the Congress of the United States during the 1930's or had prevailed just prior to the opening of this play. The play is a clear indictment of the misuse of national offices by the holders for personal gain. This play is in the same tradition as *Gods of the Lightning* written in the decade before.

*Star Wagon* follows the rule while *Knickerbocker Holiday* has some statements and philosophy that can be construed as an attempt to influence the audience didactically. However, Anderson states in the article "The Politics of *Knickerbocker Holiday*" that didacticism is not his aim.

I should like to explain that it was not my intention to say anything new or shocking on either subject [*government and democracy*], but only to remind the audience of the attitude toward government which was
current in this country at the time of the revolution of
1776 and throughout the early years of the Republic. At
that time it was generally believed, as I believe now,
that the gravest and most constant danger to a man's life,
liberty and happiness is the government under which he
lives.13

The three war plays -- Candle in the Wind, The Eve of St. Mark and
Storm Operation -- all are attempts on Anderson's part first to tell the
audience what was going on in the world, and second to show that some­
thing good could still come out of the holocaust of war. In the plays
of this group after 1935 Anderson does not attempt to influence the
audiences didactically but does try to inform them first about govern­
ment and democracy and then about war and its effects upon the lives
of men. In this way he follows this rule.

None of these plays is written in verse form and, therefore,
Anderson does not follow the rule that states that poetry is the best
medium for the stage. In fact, none of these plays is poetic or tragic.
Only The Eve of St. Mark comes close to being tragedy. This point is
discussed in more detail later. In this group of plays, then, Anderson
does not follow his rule or even attempt to follow it.

Anderson does attempt to follow the next rule, that man is better
than he believes himself to be. This idea is particularly predominant
in the plays that are written about the war. However, in the first of
these plays, Both Your Houses, McClean is the only person who puts the
welfare of the country ahead of his own personal welfare or the wel­
fare of his own group of constituents. Almost without exception the
rest of the people are either concerned with themselves and what they

13Anderson, Knickerbocker Holiday, p. v.
can get out of their offices or with a limited group of people whom they represent or are responsible to. Even McClean is not portrayed as particularly better than he thinks he is; he is just more naive.

In *The Star-Wagon* the characters are presented as wiser and much more fortunate than they think they are. The lives of all of the main characters are better and more productive in the first life than in the second. Much the same sort of thing can be said about *Knickerbocker Holiday*, not in regard to the lives of the people, but rather in regard to the government under which they live. The government that the people themselves erect is better and more effectively suits their needs than would a government that is imposed upon them from the outside.

It is in the three plays concerning the Second World War that Anderson really shows his characters to be better and stronger than they believe themselves to be. In *Candle in the Wind* Madeline Guest is first shown as a rather weak and selfish person who can be concerned only with her own desires and needs. As the play progresses, however, the audience sees her gain in strength of character and determination, so that at the conclusion of the play she can say to the German officer in charge of the prison:

> I came into this fight tardily and by chance, and unwillingly. I never thought to die young, or for a cause. But now that I've seen you close, and now that I know you, I'd give my life gladly to gain one inch against you! And I'll never again be worth so much against you as I am now, if you arrest me, imprison me, put a final end to me! It will be known! And it will not be easy to explain! Berlin will not thank you! (Pause) Lash out and give the order if you're not afraid! (Act III, pp. 115-116)

The same type of courage is displayed by Quizz West, his family, and his girl friend in *The Eve of St. Mark*. In addition to these
characters who are portrayed as strong all during the play, several of
the companions of Quizz on the island show some of the same strength
when it is necessary. Francis Marion is one of these. Up until the
final moment he is presented as a person all too willing to do only
those things that are required and no more. Also he is something of
a cynic. When it comes time to leave the island or stay he says:

... I'm essentially a fool, like those rutting
ancestors of mine. Those oratorical ancestors who
preferred death rather than slavery. In this last
analysis, I string along with them. And you know,
I want to sink those God-damn Jap boats; I want to
sink all of them. I only hope that you have more
sense than I have. (Act II Scene VI, p. 98)

As has been said before, Quizz and all of the men of his company who are
left alive stay on the island to do what they can for as long as they
can. They are shown to be much better, as far as patriotic Americans
are concerned, than they believe themselves to be. The same sort of
devotion to duty and to country is seen in Storm Operation, especially
in Peter who regards himself as a tough and hardened soldier. But
when it comes to actually leaving the nurse, Tommy, he discovers he
wants something to come back to; therefore, he asks her to marry him
in order that he will have that something and someone he needs. In
this war play, as in the others, one also sees examples of individual
heroism that mark the people who perform them as being better than
they think themselves. In these ways Anderson follows his rule quite
closely.

Anderson's belief that the audience goes to the theatre to re-
affirm its faith in itself and in mankind and, therefore, the play
must provide for this reaffirmation is fairly well followed in the plays of this group. Both Your Houses is evidently the play that preceded Anderson's realization of this rule, for Both Your Houses disregards it to a certain extent. The major character, McClean, is the only individual who speaks for the audience against the machinations of the dishonest politicians. One other person in the play, an older congressman named Solomon Fitzmaurice, who came to Washington just as idealistic as McClean is, speaks for the semi-honest politicians who are merely riding the same crest as the majority and would work for the people if they thought that work would do any good. He says that he is too old to change now but that change will probably come. Speaking to some of the other congressmen about McClean's ideas he says:

... On the other hand, he's right about you. I always told you boys you were a bunch of crooks, and you are. The whole blistering blasphemous batch of you! And some day they're going to catch up with you. ... I'm too old... They won't get me. No--- I don't hardly expect it in my time. (Act III Scene II, pp. 179-180)

In this speech Anderson emphasizes a firm belief that the American people will one day awaken and demand honesty and integrity from their elected officials, and that mankind is worthy of his faith in it.

In this connection the statements made above concerning the pattern of the core of meaning which the play follows can also be cited. Each of the plays of this group points to some elements of
man that are worth while and worthy of emulation, thus revealing Anderson's adherence to this rule.

Anderson's next rule, that the theatre must be a type of religious institution that is dedicated to the exaltation of the spirit of man, is fairly well ignored by Anderson in the first play of this group, *Both Your Houses*. It exalts the spirit of man only insofar as it gives a degree of hope for the future. As to the present it shows only that most men are primarily concerned with their own welfare.

In *The Star-Wagon* Anderson's exaltation of the spirit of man is rather weak in that it takes the form of a statement that we probably make the right decisions most of the time, for in the case of the inventors of the star-wagon their second guesses are certainly not better than the first ones. In fact, they are infinitely less productive.

*Knickerbocker Holiday*, on the other hand, is an exaltation of the independent spirit of man. In this play Anderson attempts to distill the quality of "Americanism" from the early Dutch settlers of New Amsterdam. In so doing, Anderson presents Brom Broeck as the prototype of an American. Brom dislikes taking orders and desires to live his own life free from governmental interference. This seems to be Anderson's exaltation of the spirit of man in this play, that is, exalting the desire of man to be independent.

Madeline Guest in *Candle in the Wind* exemplifies another approach to the attempt to exalt the spirit of man. In this play Anderson pits this independent spirit against the Nazi ideal of subjugating the individual to the good of the state. Madeline's love of St. Cloud in the
beginning of the play is purely a selfish one, existing only because it gives her pleasure. By the end of the play, the love exists to help St. Cloud. Self has been forgotten in this quest. The ennobling of the individual is shown against the attempt of the Nazis to degrade the individual. The individual also emerges in a young German who grew up under the Nazi system and yet still helps St. Cloud escape because he seems to see the worth of St. Cloud and of Madeline and he regards them as people with human rights and human dignity.

In *The Eve of St. Mark*, Anderson attempts to exalt not only the spirit of man but also the spirit of patriotism and love of country. The play appeals primarily to the loved ones of a soldier and tells them that the men of the country's armed services are courageous and heroic, no matter what their background. The message in *Storm Operation* is much the same. The people in the play are shown as human beings who are or will be better people if they have someone or something to which they can look forward to returning. In this way Anderson tries to exalt the spirit of man to show that no matter what a man might go through he is a superior creature and not just the animal that some other political systems were attempting to force him to become. Anderson places his characters in these plays in time of crisis and shows that they can, and in most cases will, come out of the crisis better than they went in.

The next rule to be discussed is concerned with moral excellence on stage. In the plays of this group this rule seems to have been followed. In *Both Your Houses* McClean epitomizes this moral excellence, though in a somewhat unimaginative fashion. The rest of the
characters are shown in the light of McClean's moral excellence, and they all come out wanting. This includes the girl McClean is in love with, the daughter of the chairman of the committee. In The Star-Wagon, the three leading characters --- Stephen, Martha, and Hanus --- all have the necessary qualities of moral excellence in the original lives they led; in the second life Stephen seems to have lost much of it, and when he comes to realize his loss, he decides to go back to the earlier life. There he regains the moral sense that he had displayed earlier.

This same theme of moral excellence is displayed to a certain extent in Knickerbocker Holiday. The most excellent character in the play, Brom Broeck, is also the most moral. He refuses at first even to run away from the injustice of being imprisoned without real cause and consents, only too late, to escape when it is pointed out that his sweetheart is going to be forced to marry Stuyvesant. However, it should be pointed out that the entire play is permeated by a feeling of a good time and does not have a sinister overtone. In this atmosphere even the dishonesty of the councilmen does not seem immoral.

In the first two plays of Anderson's war group, Candle in the Wind and The Eve of St. Mark, the major characters are moral individuals. They conduct themselves with honesty and positiveness. The people whom one is to admire in these plays are either not placed in situations where their morality is questioned or put to the test or are shown to be strong enough in their convictions to turn away from
immoral acts. In *Storm Operation*, however, one comes across some of the characters who might be considered less than moral. These characters are not the leading characters of the play, and the mitigating circumstances that surround them are clearly shown. Thus, again, Anderson follows his own rule.

The first and the last plays of this group come the closest to disobeying the next rule about the healthiness of a play's moral atmosphere. *Both Your Houses* is saved from disobeying this rule by the presence of McClean, who is an extremely moral person and who is presented as the motivating force throughout the entire play. In *Storm Operation* the moral atmosphere is not the same as one might find in normal circumstances. The characters in *Storm Operation* are living with death constantly, and its presence affects their every action. But even in this atmosphere of death and destruction the major acts are in accord with the feeling of morality of the audience. When one of the men is mortally injured, Peter refuses to shoot him in order to prevent their discovery by the Germans. The fact that one of the men buys an Arab girl is transposed into a fairly moral act when he falls in love with her and upon her death is shown to be genuinely remorseful. These acts, plus others, give the play a healthy moral atmosphere, although this atmosphere does differ from the normal morality of the audience. The rest of the plays of this group conform to the moral codes of the audience and thereby maintain a healthy moral atmosphere in which immoral acts are shown to be such and are not condoned.
The next rule also is followed in the plays discussed in this section. The rule is that the theatre offers us criteria for judging the evil and the good in a man. In these plays, as in the plays discussed previously, each leading character is shown in juxtaposition with several other people and in several different situations. In this way an audience can evaluate the actions in several instances and get a fairly clear picture of the characters of a play. For example, Sol Fitzmaurice in *Both Your Houses* is shown against the complete moral uprightness of Alan McClean and against the seeming lack of moral excellence in others of his fellows on the Appropriations Committee. Anderson's method permits the audience to see that Fitzmaurice is not all bad but that he is too firmly committed to the present way of doing things to change for the better. The same is true of Gray, the committee chairman. Against the background of the majority of his fellows he is seen as considerably better than they are, but he is also seen as a man who does not keep up with all of the areas necessary to maintain complete independence and integrity and so finds himself forced to compromise with his principles.

The judgment of what is good and what is evil within a man on the stage clearly appears in *The Star-Wagon*. The audience might sympathize with Martha in her disappointment in Stephen in the first life when they are married to each other, but when they are shown later in the second life the audience can see that both of them were better people and better off in the earlier life. This same type of judging of individuals on the stage can be seen in *Knickerbocker*
Holiday. The audience can easily see that Pieter Stuyvesant is a petty tyrant and that Brom Broeck, although mischievous, is much the better man. All of this information is evident to the audience because of the contrasts of the individuals on the stage.

Candle in the Wind also shows the audience what is good and what is evil in its characters. In the beginning of the play Madeline Guest is seen as a shallow and quite selfish woman; however, the audience sees her grow in strength and depth of character through the suffering and privation of her life in German occupied Paris. Madeline is really the only person who is clearly presented in the play. The rest of the characters are quite superficially drawn and are not distinctive. For instance, the major opposition character to Madeline, the German Colonel, is just the embodiment of the Nazi system and not really very much alive.

The characters in The Eve of St. Mark seem to be much more real, especially Quizz, Janet, and his parents. The play shows the strength of character of these people by their reactions to the war and the pain and disruption that it causes them. Also in this play the typical Army sergeant appears, but even here the audience sees, in the last section of the play, that a man is not just all good or all bad, for the typical sergeant acts in an atypical fashion; he does not impose his will on the men but rather follows the path laid out by Quizz. In this manner Anderson shows a trait he would call Americanism, by deferring to inate leadership and not traditional leadership, an idea which Anderson completely endorsed.
Storm Operation also shows both the good and the evil in the leading characters, but it leaves much concerning the characters in doubt. The characters of Storm Operation seem to have little connection with reality in that the audience learns pitifully little about them. In this way the motivations of the characters are not clear. The audience discovers that the nurse Tommy is from Tasmania, Australia, and that Peter, the Sergeant, is an American. This is about all the information that Anderson gives about them. In this context it is extremely difficult to decide whether an individual character in the play is real or only a cardboard figure, and therefore one cannot get too concerned with them. Whether they are good or evil seems rather academic. The attempt to show these characteristics of good and evil is there in the play, but the execution leaves something to be desired. It may be, and is in this writer's opinion, that an audience cannot make concrete associations with people who seem to exist only in a vacuum or only in one contextual situation.

The Structure of The Play

Concerning the checking of the vision for a play it seems that by 1935 Anderson had uncovered or formulated, at least in part, all of the rules he later used and discussed. Whether after that time he used these rules consciously or unconsciously is difficult if not impossible to determine. Of this group of plays the first, Both Your Houses, is the only one that was written prior to 1935 and, therefore, the only play that was written before Anderson had fully discovered his rules for playwriting. But that even in 1933, the time
of the production of *Both Your Houses*, Anderson had determined some of these rules and used them either by intuition or knowledge is in the discussion of that play. The plays written after 1935 undoubtedly were written with the rules somewhat in mind at least, and Anderson's notable successes with *The Star-Wagon*, *Knickerbocker Holiday*, and *The Eve of St. Mark*, show that the visions he attempted to recapture for the stage were checked quite carefully against his rules and intuitions.

The rule about the discovery scene Anderson follows to a considerable extent in the plays after 1935. In *Both Your Houses*, however, this realization scene as the central scene in the play, does not occur. There are several scenes in which the leading character, Alan McClean, makes discoveries, but none of them are completely central. The nearest scene that could be called this realization scene is Scene II of Act I. Here McClean discovers that the majority of the other members of the Appropriations Committee are concerned only with what they can get out of the bill before them. He thus realizes that if he is going to defeat this bill he must fight it. This realization does force a change upon McClean, a realization that everyone in Washington is not trying to be as honest as he is, but it does not change his direction in the play. It merely forces him to the realization that he will have to fight alone. There is also a discovery that takes place in Scene II of Act II. In this scene McClean discovers that even the chairman of the committee, Gray, his sweetheart's father, has something in this bill for himself, and that although it is not strictly dishonest, it is unethical. However, even this realization does not
change McClean's direction in the play. There is another realization that occurs in the final scene, Scene II Act III. Here McClean realizes that he has been beaten by the very tools that he hoped would defeat the measure. In none of these scenes do we see a change of direction on the part of McClean, or for that matter anyone else in the play.

In *The Star-Wagon* we do find a clear discovery or realization scene occurring at the end of Scene II Act II. Here Stephen and Hanus realize that their first lives were infinitely better than their second lives, they determine to try to return to them via the star-wagon. After their return to the first life, their lives are altered for the better. Both of them realize that part of what they had been doing in this first life was being done wrong. Stephen, at least, resolves to change, and he does start to do so by facing up to his old employer and old friend Charles Duffy. In effect, he forces Duffy to rehire him, to increase his salary, and to give him a partnership in the business that his inventions have built. In addition he resolves to try to give Martha more of the things she needs and wants.

The discovery scene in the two-act *Knickerbocker Holiday* occurs at the end of Act I. Here both Stuyvesant and Broeck make discoveries. Stuyvesant discovers that Broeck will not submit to his arbitrary rules and so orders Broeck's imprisonment. Broeck discovers that Stuyvesant's rules leave much to be desired and almost openly says he prefers the rule of inefficient amateurs to efficient professionals, especially when the professionals are professional at being petty tyrants. All this is intimated at the end of Act I but is said in detail in Act II.
In the next play, *Candle in the Wind*, Madeline Guest makes her discovery that the German lieutenant, Schoen, will help her and allow St. Cloud to escape. She makes this discovery, or more properly realization, when on orders Schoen comes to her and offers to help. This has happened several times before, nothing coming of it, but this time Madeline believes that Schoen will help her for as she tells him:

> I have seen many men in the world you live in who hate that world. There is a certain veiled regard in the eyes of those who must forever dissemble their unrest, who never dare speak out. And of all those who carry this look about with them, you have seemed the most unhappy. From the first day I saw you in Erfurt's office that look has been on your face. I didn't know what it meant then, but I know now. (Act II Scene II, p. 91)

In his statement of this rule Anderson said that this discovery or realization must change the direction of the leading character in the play. In *Candle in the Wind* the only thing that is changed is that Madeline now has hope which is rewarded. But she has had this hope all the time, and the discovery that one person will really help her does not cause any great change in her direction in the play. In this way Anderson does not completely follow the rule, and therefore the play is not so strong as it might have been.

The realization scene in *The Eve of St. Mark* occurs over two complete scenes and the last of one other. The original idea of the discovery scene occurs to Quizz at the end of Scene II of Act II. Here Quizz realizes that they should hold the island to help their forces. Then in the next two short scenes Quizz mistically talks first to his mother and then to Janet asking their help in what he
must do. He apparently arrives at the decision to stay on the island, for he does stay there, and that is where the play leaves him. This scene does change the direction of the leading character and does affect the other leading characters of the play as well, for in the scenes in which Quizz talks to his mother and to Janet, the effect that his decision will have on both of them is seen. Furthermore, when they are seen again in the last scene of the play, there seems to be a realization that Quizz is dead and that his death is worthwhile. Now they can accept it gracefully.

In the last play of this group, Storm Operation, the leading character, Peter, does make a discovery or realization that in order to be a complete person and in order to have something for which to fight in the war, he needs something to hang on to and someone who will be waiting for him when the war is over. The realization scene is not actually shown in the play. There is an indication of a realization taking place at the end of Scene II Act II where Simeon has told Peter of his love of the Arab girl whom he had originally bought and who is now dead.

\[\text{Simeon} \quad \text{What difference does it make now? I used to believe you when you talked about soldiers being married to the army and living off the country. But it's all wrong. It's not true. If you haven't got somebody to go back to, what's it all good for?}\]

\[\text{Peter} \quad \text{You're talking to me about Tommy?}\]

\[\text{Simeon} \quad \text{No, I'm talking about yourself. If you're a soldier all alone it's just for nothing. If you're all alone you haven't got any country, and it's no use going home. I'm alone now. (Act II Scene II, p. 92)}\]
The next time that Peter is seen, he has apparently realized that what Simeon told him is correct. He then asks Tommy to marry him, and she does.

In this group of plays Anderson stretches his rule about the placement of the discovery scene. In Both Your Houses, as has been pointed out, the rule was apparently not understood or not realized at the time the play was written. Therefore the resulting scenes of the play that show some discovery vary from the second scene of Act I to the final scene of Act III. A clear discovery scene does not occur at all in the play. The discovery scene of The Star-Wagon occurs where Anderson says that it should, at the end of the second act. Knickerbocker Holiday, The Eve of St. Mark and Storm Operation are all two act plays, but they seem to follow Anderson's rule for the placement of this central scene. Candle in the Wind places the realization scene at the end of Act II where Anderson said that it should be placed. Insofar as equating two-act plays with those with three acts allows, it seems that Anderson followed this rule after he determined its necessity.

As regards the death, in tragedy, of the leading character in his attempt to improve or correct his fault, Anderson does not follow his rule in these plays.

In only one play of this group does the leading character probably die at the end of the play. In The Eve of St. Mark Quizz apparently dies, but not as the result of his attempting to correct some error or fault within himself. In none of the other plays of this group do the leading characters suffer death. However, there are ordeals
that the heroes go through. In *Both Your Houses* McClean goes through the rather shattering experience of realizing that men whom he has admired are in reality corrupt and self seeking. This too, however, is not through any fault of his but rather through the faults of others around him.

Stephen Minch in *The Star-Wagon* goes through the ordeal of seeing his best friend, Hanus, ruined with Stephens's participation during the second life. He also sees the ruin of his own life through the mistakes that he makes in this second life. This experience does make a profound impression upon him, and as a result he changes attitudes and habits when he returns to the present. Brom Broeck in *Knickerbocker Holiday*, like Stephen, does not die, but he is fairly close to being hanged a couple of times during the play. In this case it is the direct result of his extreme independence which Stuyvesant regards as a fault.

*Candle in the Wind* shows Madeline suffering for the faults of others primarily, not of her own. She suffers at the hands of the Nazis who are attempting to force all people into subservience to the state and, barring that, to eliminate them. *Storm Operation* also shows people who suffer through no particular fault or error of their own. The closest thing that could be considered suffering for one's own faults or errors on the part of the leading characters would be the remorse on the part of Peter for not marrying Tommy earlier and thereby having something to which to cling all through the fighting. This rule Anderson seems to disregard in the majority of the plays of this group. Even in the plays that contain some of the elements required
by this rule, others' faults cause the suffering, not those of the leading characters.

Anderson next states that comedy presents a fairly happy scene and unlike tragedy does not end in death for the leading character. This rule Anderson follows throughout the plays here discussed. *Both Your Houses* is the only play of this series which presents at the final curtain a fairly gloomy picture for the leading characters. In this play, as far as those characters involved in the action are concerned, McClean has lost, and therefore the leading character is finished as far as his effectiveness is concerned. The play does end on a note of hope for the audience, but not for the characters in the play. All of the rest of the plays end on a note of hope, in some cases triumph, on the part of the leading characters. This is even true of *The Eve of St. Mark*. The family of Quizz West and also his girl friend, Janet, are aware that he is probably dead, but they seem to feel that in his death he has achieved his goal and his purpose toward himself. This realization allows the play to escape from a tragic atmosphere into an atmosphere of hope. Each of the plays ends with the vindication or triumph of the leading characters, sometimes with both.

According to his rule about the essential difference between a comic and a tragic work, Anderson's plays here being discussed are more comic in nature than tragic, for in most of these plays the aim is (1) either to show man what is bad in his society, or (2) to show him where he is good, or (3) to show him where he can be better. *Both Your Houses* is an example of Anderson's concern to show man
what is bad in his society. In this play Anderson attempts to show the people of the United States what one of the faults of their government was in the early 1930's and also to tell them how to eliminate this fault, in this case to wake up and vote the corrupt politicians out of office. The Star-Wagon is an attempt to show man that his lot is essentially a good one and that the things a man might consider mistakes are not necessarily mistakes. Knickerbocker Holiday is also an instance where Anderson is telling the audience that their American form of government as originally devised was and still is the best form for them. Candle in the Wind attempts to tell the audience that they must oppose by every means possible the encroachments of Nazism. Anderson points out the area in which the Nazi system is bad, the subjugation of the individual to the state, the very thing that Brom Boeck fights against in Knickerbocker Holiday. Anderson next points out in The Eve of St. Mark the areas where man is right and attempts to encourage him in these areas: love of country, home, family and respect for all the traditional aspects of those three. In Storm Operation Anderson uses Peter to show that man in the midst of a war has no reason to reject those traditional aspects, especially love and desire for family ties as a part of his life.

The rule that the play must deal with the inner life and that external events are only symbolic of the struggle within is followed only part of the time in the plays being discussed. Both Your Houses was apparently written prior to Anderson's discovery of this rule, for there is little inner turmoil shown in the characters of this
play. Even when McClean discovers that Gray, the chairman of the committee and the father of his fiancee, is involved in some unethical aspects with the bill before the committee, the audience sees almost no hesitation or inner struggle before McClean determines to go on with his campaign. This campaign, if it had succeeded, would have ruined Gray and even caused his probable imprisonment, but this possibility has no obvious effect upon either McClean's actions or attitudes.

By the time The Star-Wagon was written in 1937, Anderson had discovered this rule and used it. The actual journey of Stephen and Hanus on the star-wagon is symbolic of the inner struggle that Stephen is going through because of the things Martha, his wife, has said to him. She told him that their entire life together had been a mistake and that both of them should have married someone else. Stephen's excursion on the star-wagon is symbolic of his desire to examine what she said. In the end both agree that she was wrong.

Knickerbocker Holiday also makes use of this rule in that the major events in the play are symbolic of Brom's attempts to determine that his attitude toward arbitrary authority and his desire for independence are worthwhile and valid. When these traits are shown to be worthwhile, even to Stuyvesant, then the external struggle can be brought to a conclusion. In Candle in the Wind Anderson uses the external struggle between Madeline and the Nazi colonel as the symbolic device to indicate the struggle within Madeline: she must decide whether to flee France after the German occupation, or to become
involved in the fight against the Nazi system. In the next play, *The Eve of St. Mark*, the war in which Quizz finds himself is symbolic of the continual assault upon the foundations of the American way of life and the family and family ties. Quizz apparently gives his life for this heritage, and the audience sees that not one but two of his brothers take up where he left off in the struggle still going on.

The last play, *Storm Operation*, shows some of the same struggle as is seen in *The Eve of St. Mark*. In this play Anderson carries the theme of the assault on the family and family ties further. Here Peter has rejected these for the time that he is in the service and involved in the war, but he discovers that he cannot reject them completely or even partially. He finds himself isolated in the storm of war with nothing to cling to. However he can remain isolated only for a time—then even he must plant roots of some sort in order to give his struggle meaning. These points establish that Anderson followed this rule quite closely after he had discovered it.

The next rule is that the story must concern itself with conflict between that which is good and evil within a single person. This rule is also followed fairly well after 1935. In the play, *Both Your Houses*, just as with the rule above, Anderson had not realized the importance or perhaps the idea of this rule. Just as the play does not deal much with inner conflicts, so too it does not deal with good and evil within a single person. The closest that this rule comes to a realization in *Both Your Houses* is in the person of Gray, the committee chairman. The audience gets an indication that there might be a conflict within him, but his character is just not developed sufficiently to realize the
conflict. Gray is, in fact, a relatively minor character insofar as
time on the stage is concerned.

Just as the conflict within Stephen Minch is externalized in The
Star-Wagon, so the audience can see clearly the conflict between the
good and the evil within him. The good is seen in his real love of
his wife and also in the way in which he treats his old friend and
helper, Hanus. The evil, if one can call it that, is Stephen's lack
of care about those things that will make life easier and more com­
fortable for his wife and an almost complete disregard for anything
that goes on outside his laboratory. Brom Broeck in Knickerbocker
Holiday presents a somewhat similar problem. There is nothing in him
that is really patently evil, but there are traits that could be re­
garded as evil, particularly by Stuyvesant. Brom's good qualities
are his love of Tina, his willingness to fight for that which he be­
lieves, and his courage. Those traits that might be considered evil
are his unwillingness to submit to what he considers unjust authority
and his all too quick temper when given an order.

In Candle in the Wind we see the first clear-cut example of the
conflict between good and evil within a single person. Madeline at
the beginning of the play clearly has no wish to become involved in
the fight against the Nazis and cannot understand anyone else's be­
coming involved in it. This supreme selfishness and complacency to­
ward everything that does not, she feels, directly touch her, are the
prime evils within her. The good, on the other hand, is her love of
St. Cloud and also her concern over an old friend and her desire to
help both. Throughout the play this conflict appears until finally the complacency and the selfishness are gone, and she completely submerges herself in her determination to fight the Nazi system and is even willing to lay down her life in the struggle.

The major trait that could be called evil in Quizz West in *The Eve of St. Mark* is a trait that is found in nearly every person, that is a tendency to seize life as it is presented to us and not to be too much concerned with tomorrow or the consequences. Even this tendency is quite overshadowed in Quizz by the traits one might consider good, his regard for family and family ties, including his girl friend Janet, and his loyalty to country and home. This loyalty completely subjugates the first tendency until at the end of the play it is swallowed up in the final act of staying where he is not told to stay, by doing what he thinks is the best for his country. Some of these same faults are seen in Peter in *Storm Operation*. The major fault of Peter is his unwillingness to allow his life to assume any degree of normalacy during the upheaval of war. He will not, until the latter section of the play, allow himself to realize his dependence and love of the nurse, Tommy. This internal conflict between evil caused by war and the good desire for a life with a loved one permeates the play.

The rule that the playwright must have something to say and take an attitude toward the world in which he lives was followed by Anderson throughout his playwriting career, and the plays of this group are no exception. In the majority of cases these plays are plays of protest
of one kind or another. Both Your Houses protests against the corruption
of elected officials in the Congress of the United States. The Star-
Wagon, by far the mildest play as far as protest is concerned, takes an
attitude that the life we are now living is the best life that we could
have and decries those who say that if only they had done this or that
their lives would have been better. In showing the beginning of indi-
vidual liberty in the Americas, Knickerbocker Holiday decries those who
would take away the freedom of the people in exchange for security.
Candle in the Wind protests to the American people against their un-
concern about Hitler and the Nazi war against humanity. The Eve of St.
Mark is first of all an answer to the protest and fears of those who
said that American men could not fight against their enemies. Second,
it is a protest against those who said that all the soldiers would
automatically become corrupted by their contacts in the services.
Storm Operation also seems to be a protest against those who feel that
all traces of normal life, in particular the home, have to be suspended
or ignored until after the cessation of the war and things got back to
"normal." In all of these plays Anderson seems to be answering the
critics of the United States or telling the people that they have to
work to make the country worthwhile and that they must stop being
complacent and unconcerned about conditions both at home and abroad.

The next rule, that a play must exhibit a common denominator of
belief with its audience, Anderson followed with few exceptions through-
out his career as a playwright. The majority of the plays Anderson
wrote were at least partially successful, and this success speaks
well for the common denominator of belief with the audience, for an audience will certainly not voluntarily support something in which it has no belief. Both Your Houses told its audience that there was something wrong with the way that the Congress was being run, just at the time when a great change was taking place in American politics. The Star-Wagon came along as the country was starting to come out of the depression of the 1930's and told them that money isn't everything and that they are probably happier than they would be if they had been wealthy. Knickerbocker Holiday told its audiences that this country started off well and that it should remain in the same form in order to keep the heritage it had. Candle in the Wind, The Eve of St. Mark, and Storm Operation forecast the eventual downfall of the enemies of the United States, because all Americans would be willing to fight to protect their rights and their human dignity. For the most part these plays treat the common denominator of belief they had with their audiences in such a way that the audience responded favorably and the play succeeded. In this way one can say that Anderson followed this rule.

The Leading Character of the Play

The Aristotelian idea of the tragic fault Anderson follows in the plays of this group with the exception of the first play, Both Your Houses. He probably was unaware of the importance of this rule, or unaware of its existence, at the time this play was written. McClean emerges from the play only wiser than he started, but not morally any better. Throughout the play McClean is drawn almost without fault. He is completely incorruptable and completely honest. Because the
play does not deal with any aspect of the life of McClean or of any other character in the play, other than the political aspects, it is impossible to determine what type of persons these characters might be away from the halls of Congress. But insofar as the story line of the play is concerned, no one changes for the better throughout the play.

The rest of the plays of this group show men as being human, with human failings. Stephen Minch, in *The Star-Wagon*, emerges after his experiences on the star-wagon a better man in that his fault of unawareness is at least overcome in part. At the conclusion he is acutely aware of the value of his work and the worth of his wife and thus is a considerably better person. Brom Broeck at the conclusion of *Knickerbocker Holiday* is able to overcome his ungovernable temper which is his major fault. Brom is still as adamant about his liberty as he ever was, but he is now willing to attempt persuasion to obtain his liberties instead of resorting to violence.

The three war plays also show the leading characters as having human faults and frailties. Madeline Guest in *Candle in the Wind* is depicted at the beginning of the play as selfish and self-centered, but by the time the end of the play has arrived she has completely immersed herself in her battle against the Nazi system, first to obtain the release of St. Cloud and finally for all humanity. In *The Eve of St. Mark* Quizz West is shown somewhat like Stephen Minch in that his major fault is unawareness. He is unaware of his own potential qualities of leadership and strength, and unaware also that
what he has is really worth fighting for. The awareness of these things grows upon him until at the conclusion of the play he is a strong and forceful person who does that which he sees as his duty and also helps others to do theirs as well. Storm Operation shows Peter Moldau as an individual who is unaware of his obligation to himself. He has the usual human failings, but the major fault seems to be this unawareness of his obligation to himself as an individual. He seems to feel that all feelings and actions for his benefit should be left until after the war is finished. He does not realize that all else is without worth if one does not fulfill his obligation to himself first. Once Peter realized that he should fulfill his duty to himself, in this case taking the woman whom he loves for his wife, he becomes a better man and a better soldier, a better leader of men.

The second rule concerning the leading character's spiritual awakening or regeneration Anderson follows, again with the exception of Both Your Houses, throughout the plays of this group. As was stated above, McClean in Both Your Houses does not emerge a different man from what he was at the beginning of the play; he is a little wiser but not particularly better. This is not the case with the leading characters of the rest of these plays. After his experiences during the course of the play, Stephen Minch is considerably more aware of his responsibilities toward his genius as an inventor and toward his wife than he has been earlier. In this way his spiritual awakening does take place. Brom Broeck does follow this dictum of becoming a better person throughout the course of the play, but the person who goes through a type of
spiritual awakening is Pieter Stuyvesant. He realizes that in order to stand well with posterity and history, he must unbend and allow the people of New Amsterdam the freedom they desire. In this manner he achieves the spiritual awakening needed.

The first two of Anderson's war plays, *Candle in the Wind* and *The Eve of St. Mark*, show the spiritual awakening of the leading characters in their realization that the freedoms and opportunities that one has in the United States are worth fighting, and if need be dying, for. When Madeline and Quizz realize this, they have achieved their spiritual awakening. In *Storm Operation* Peter's spiritual awakening occurs when he realizes that in order to make his individual struggle against the storm of war meaningful, he must have something or someone to cling to. After this realization comes, Peter is a more secure person than he had been earlier and, as has been stated before, a better soldier.

The statement that the protagonist must represent the forces of good and must win, or, if he be evil, must accept the good and know himself defeated is the next rule to be discussed. In this case *Both Your Houses* fulfills, in a way, this requirement. McClean does represent the forces of good, but in the play he does not win. In fact, he is defeated. In context of time, however, the forces of good as Anderson apparently saw them had won when the play was performed. There had been a major upheaval in the political structure of the United States that had reached its culmination in the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President just prior to the play's opening. In this context Anderson's rule could apparently be considered to have been fulfilled.
Stephen Minch in *The Star-Wagon* certainly does represent the forces of good, and he does win. First he wins over himself by escaping from the trap of the second life he found himself in and then he wins over Duffy, his old school friend and quite unscrupulous employer. Almost by accident Stephen forces Duffy to increase his salary and give him a share in the company. In this way Stephen wins the stature and remuneration he deserves for his work. Brom Broeck, if he is the leading character of *Knickerbocker Holiday*, does win over Stuyvesant. Brom gets the girl, Tina, and he also obtains the freedom and independence he desires. If Stuyvesant is considered the leading character of the play, he represents the forces of evil and is defeated at the conclusion of the action and he knows himself defeated. He accepts the defeat with grace and charm.

*Candle in the Wind* and *The Eve of St. Mark* depict leading characters who represent the forces of good and, in a restricted sense, win out over the opposing forces. Madeline does obtain the release of St. Cloud and his escape from the hands of the Nazis. Although she is a type of prisoner, she has triumphed, and there is the further possibility that she too may escape from France and the authority of the Nazis. Although Quizz West apparently dies at the conclusion of *The Eve of St. Mark*, he does win in the same way as Mio in *Winterset*. There is the feeling of victory in defeat and triumph in the face of personal annihilation as seen in the attitude of his family and Janet and in his two brothers' desire to take up the fight where he has left off.
Peter Moldau in *Storm Operation* also represents the forces of good, and, insofar as the war is concerned, at the time the play concludes he is winning. In another sense he represents the forces of evil in that he has felt that his life must wait for the war to cease before it could go on. In this sense he capitulates to the other side and knows that he has capitulated. Thus, in several different ways Anderson follows this rule about the leading character of the play.

Anderson's next rule is that the protagonist of a play must exhibit either exceptional qualities or position. This rule Anderson followed, for the most part, throughout his career as a playwright. The people about whom Anderson wrote in *Both Your Houses* are exceptional people in that they are intimately involved in the national life of the United States, in this case the United States House of Representatives. In addition McClean, the protagonist, is an exceptional person by reason of his qualities of honesty and integrity.

Stephen Minch in *The Star-Wagon* is an inventor of genius. From the statements made in the play one concludes that his inventions have made millions of dollars for the company for which he works. Stephen also epitomizes the qualities of loyalty and devotion both to his wife and to his friend, Hanus, during the first life, and his genius for invention is apparent even in the second try. Both Brom Broeck and Stuyvesant are exceptional people in the society of New Amsterdam in *Knickerbocker Holiday*. Stuyvesant is the Governor of the colony, and his very presence is of importance to the people involved there. Brom is the epitome of independence, and further he is depicted as the first
true American. This gives him the status necessary to be a leading character in the play.

_Candle in the Wind_ is primarily concerned with Madeline Guest who is an important American Actress. She is apparently quite well known and respected both in the United States and in Europe, for people in France recognize her and her name. In addition to being exceptional because of her international fame, Madeline comes to epitomize the qualities of loyalty, love, and determination. Even the German colonel admires these qualities. On the opposite end of the scale Quizz West is not an exceptional person by reason of position or birth but becomes an exceptional person by reason of his loyalty to loved ones, to home, and to country. In fact he gives his life in their defense not enthusiastically but courageously. The quality of leadership is the exceptional element in the character of Peter Moldau in _Storm Operation_. From the very beginning of the play Peter is depicted as the type of person who is trusted instinctively by his men and by others. Even though he is a non-commissioned officer, he is in charge of the company because of casualties among the officers. This too makes him an exceptional person.

The last rule deals with the qualities an audience desires to see exhibited by the characters on a stage. With few exceptions Anderson followed this rule religiously through all of his works. Beginning with McClean and running through to Peter Moldau, the men of the plays of this group are willing to fight for their beliefs and to die for them if necessary. Even Stephen Minch in _The Star-Wagon_ eventually is
willing to fight to obtain his just rights. This is also true of the one leading woman character, Madeline Guest. She is passionately faithful to her beliefs and comes to know that they cannot be taken for granted. She is also faithful to the man whom she loves and certainly does not lack the ability to remain faithful to him. This rule, then, is one that Anderson followed most closely throughout his plays and particularly in the plays of this group.

In summary it can be seen that in the plays of this group written after 1935, Anderson followed the majority of the rules that he laid down. *Both Your Houses* follows considerably fewer of the rules Anderson considered essential than any other play of this group and also fewer than many of the verse plays of the early 1930's. Therefore it seems probable that the following of some of the rules in these verse plays was not by knowledge but rather by instinct or experiment. It is fairly obvious then that the rules were not fully realized or discovered until at least 1935.
CHAPTER V

The Plays of the late 1940's and 1950's

The plays dealt with in this chapter were written by Anderson from 1946 to 1958. These plays are: Truckline Cafe, 1946; Joan of Lorraine, 1946; Anne of the Thousand Days, 1948; Barefoot in Athens, 1951; and The Golden Six, 1958. Also some references will be made to the two plays that Anderson dramatized from novels during this period: Lost in the Stars, 1949, a dramatization of Alan Paton's novel, Cry, The Beloved Country; and Bad Seed, 1954, a dramatization of the novel The Bad Seed by William March. Little attention will be paid to these dramatizations because as they are not completely original works, the structure of the plays would not clearly reflect Anderson's use of or failure to use his rules.

Truckline Cafe was produced by Harold Clurman and Elia Kazan in association with the Playwright's Company. It opened on February 27, 1946, at the Belasco Theatre in New York for the short run of 13 performances. The play concerns Anne Carruth and to a lesser extent her husband Mort. The entire action of the play takes place in a cafe at the edge of the Pacific Ocean in California. Anne is from the eastern section of the United States and has arrived in California a short time...
before the play begins. During the Second World War Anne was informed that Mort was dead. In a sense of desperation she turned to another man. Later when she discovered that Mort was alive, she went through an abortion in order to rid herself of the other man's child and then fled her home. Mort finds her working as a waitress in this truckline cafe and wants her to come back to him. He tells Anne of a love affair he had with a Polish girl who is dead and of the child she bore him. Mort has the child with him. In turn Anne tells him of her infidelity. During a series of emotional crisis Mort tries to convince Anne that she should return to him and that they should try to rekindle the love they had shared before the war. At the conclusion of the play Anne has determined to go with him to re-establish the marriage.²

The next play is Joan of Lorraine, produced by The Playwright's Company at the Alvin Theatre in New York. It opened on November 18, 1946, for a run of 199 performances.³ The story is of a group of actors who are rehearsing a play about Joan of Lorraine. The actress who plays the part of Joan objects to the rewriting the author is doing for the character of Joan. She cannot find justification for showing Joan compromising with the truth and with evil men to accomplish her mission. As the rehearsal progresses, Mary, the girl playing Joan, quarrels with the director, Masters, about the play, and then finally she realizes that the play is being written correctly and portrays Joan correctly. Mary then accepts the script, and the rehearsal continues.⁴

²Maxwell Anderson, Truckline Cafe (Unpublished manuscript in the possession of Dramatists Play Service, Inc.).
³Covington, op. cit., p. 200.
Anne of the Thousand Days was the next play of Anderson's to appear on the Broadway stage. It opened December 8, 1948, at the Shubert Theatre in New York for a run of 262 performances. It then closed to go on tour. It was under the production supervision of the Playwright's Company and Leland Hayward. The story is about the thousand days that Anne Boleyn and Henry VIII were together. The play is written as a series of flashbacks. First Anne is seen in the Tower of London as she awaits execution, and then Henry as he awaits the time of her execution. In the series of scenes that follow, the audience sees Henry the first time declare his love for Anne and her rejection of him. Then the audience sees pressure put upon Henry by Anne to divorce his first wife and marry her. Anne refuses his advances until he agrees to the course she has outlined. After the "marriage" they receive the news that the Pope has refused to annul the King's marriage to Catherine of Aragon. Henry then declares the English Church free from the domination of Rome. Anne first wants mercy shown to those who refuse to sign the oath giving Henry dominance over the Pope in the matters of the English Church, but when it comes to allowing her child, Elizabeth, to be declared illegitimate, Anne becomes adamant and causes the deaths of many of those spared earlier. Not too long afterward, Henry's love cools, and desiring a new wife, he contrives to have Anne convicted of adultery and executed. The play ends after the death of Anne, with Henry knowing that he will not soon be able to forget her.6

5Covington, op. cit., p. 202

Anderson's play *Barefoot in Athens* was first produced by the Playwright's Company at the Martin Beck Theatre in New York on October 21, 1951. It had only a short run of 29 performances. The story is about the last few weeks in the life of Socrates in the Fifth Century B.C. The first act of the play tells of the life of Socrates and the conditions of Athens at the time. The Athenian democracy is overthrown by the Spartans, and an oligarchy of thirty is established just as a group of Socrates' enemies brings an indictment against him. The indictment is naturally suspended. During the occupation of Athens by Sparta, Socrates becomes acquainted with the king of Sparta, Pausanias, and as a result Pausanias spares his life when one of the Thirty wishes to have him killed. The person who wished to have him killed is Critias, a former pupil of Socrates'. At the end of the act the Spartans leave Athens, and the democracy is re-established. The second act opens the day before the trial of Socrates and shows the relationship of Socrates to his wife and children. It then shows part of the trial itself and the resulting verdict of death for Socrates. The final scene of the play occurs the day of Socrates' death. Pausanias bribes the jailer into allowing Socrates to escape to Sparta, but Socrates refuses to go, preferring to die a free man than to live in Sparta under their strict rules.

The last play that Anderson wrote was *The Golden Six*. This play was first produced by Warner LeRoy and Norman Twain at the York Playhouse in

---


New York on October 26, 1958. It had a short run of 17 performances.9

The Golden Six centers on the six grandsons and stepgrandsons of the Roman Emperor Augustus. Over a period of years the six are killed because of their opposition to the Empire until only Claudius remains alive. The boys swore to try to discover the murderer and to be avenged. Each time one dies, a new person is suspected. First it was Augustus who they thought was having them killed. On his death they suspected Tiberius, and then Caligula, who was not one of the original six. On the death of Caligula, Claudius discovers that the murderer was Livia the wife of Augustus and the grandmother of some of the original six and the mother of Tiberius. At this time Claudius assumes the throne he has tried to avoid and has fought against all his life.10

Both of the dramatizations that Anderson undertook during the late 1940's and early 50's were very successful. Lost in the Stars was first produced by the Playwright's Company at the Music Box Theatre in New York. It opened October 30, 1949, for a run of 281 performances.11 It is the story of a Negro clergyman in South Africa. At the beginning


of the play Stephen Kumalo is concerned about his son who has left home to work in Johannesburg. Because the son has not been heard from in over a year, Stephen goes to Johannesburg to find him. After much searching, Stephen finds his son, but only after the son has killed a white man in an attempted robbery. The white man is the son of a man who lives in the village Stephen comes from. Absolom Kumalo, the son, is tried and convicted on his own confession and is sentenced to die for the murder. Stephen takes Absolom's wife home with him and tells his parishioners that he must leave them for he no longer knows what is right and what is wrong. At the conclusion of the play, James Jarvis, the father of the murdered man, comes to Stephen and offers help and friendship. Previously Jarvis had been antagonistic toward the Negroes and their problems, while his son had been sympathetic. Jarvis finds that he can no longer retain his old feelings and wishes to take up where his son left off.12

Bad Seed was produced by the Playwright's Company at the Forty-Sixth Street Theatre in New York and opened December 8, 1954 for a run of 334 performances.13 The story is centered on Rhoda Penmark, a girl eight years of age and her mother Christine. Christine has an uneasy feeling about Rhoda and becomes more apprehensive about her when a schoolmate of Rhoda's is drowned on a school picnic. The boy had won a medal that Rhoda felt should be hers. The story develops that Christine is an adopted child and is the daughter of a woman who is famous for her


murders. Rhoda has apparently inherited this bad seed and she has killed the boy. Rhoda also sets fire to the apartment handy man because she fears that he knows about her killing the child. No one knows of these murders except Christine. She gives sleeping pills to Rhoda in an attempt to destroy the bad seed and then shoots herself. Neighbors hear the shot and find Rhoda in time to prevent her death.  

As with the play groupings previously discussed, the major discussion of the plays in this group will consider the following points: (1) the playwright's purpose and aim in writing the play, (2) the structure of the play, and (3) the leading character of the play. 

The Playwright's Purpose and Aim in Writing the Play

Anderson's success in compromising between that which he wishes to say and that which he feels the audience wants to see is somewhat sketchy in this group of plays. Of the five plays that are wholly Anderson's in this group only two were successful: Joan of Lorraine with 199 performances and Anne of the Thousand Days with 262 performances. The other three - Truckline Cafe with 13; Barefoot in Athens with 29; and The Golden Six with 17 performances - were not successful commercially. Apparently they are not successful compromises either. The two dramatizations, Lost in the Stars and Bad Seed, were successful as novels before Anderson ever dramatized them, and thus one cannot be absolutely sure that it was Anderson's work or their own popularity as novels that made them successful as plays. The compromise was already

completed insofar as what the audience wished to see is concerned. It seems reasonable to say then that Anderson misjudged the wishes of the audience at least to a certain extent in three of the plays of this group and thus did not completely live up to the first rule.

Whether Anderson followed his rule about the necessity for deliberate construction of a play will be seen as each of these plays is examined. If Anderson followed this rule - that is, if he applied his own rules to the vision for the stage and they still were not successful - then something is either wrong with the vision for the stage or something is wrong with the rules or with their application. These points are made clearer in the discussion to follow.

The rule that it is not the theatre's primary purpose to reorganize the world Anderson does follow throughout the plays of this group. He does not deal either with questions or with problems of great import, but rather with personalities and questions of individual concern. Truckline Cafe, for example, deals with the relationships that exist between people caught at the end of a long and disrupting war. Joan of Lorraine deals with the relationship first of man to his conscience, and second with the relationship of man to man. Anne of the Thousand Days deals with the questions of individual responsibility in love and in human action. Barefoot in Athens tells of one man's relationship to the state in which he lives, and The Golden Six attempts to deal with a man and his attempt to escape that which seems his destiny but which he has been prepared for all his life. The closest any of these plays come to an attempt to reorganize the practical world of men is
The Golden Six. However, this attempt is very slight, for in the play Claudius says to the audience that they must watch their government and must be forever on their guard against those who would subvert democracy to totalitarianism and eventually to the rule of one man.

Anderson follows the next rule that poetry is the best medium for the stage only partially in one play and not at all in the others of this group. Anne of the Thousand Days is the only one that is even partially written in poetic form. Poetry is employed in Anne of the Thousand Days whenever someone is discussing the love between Henry and Anne, or when either one of the two principals is speaking to the other about that love or the life he led because of it. The dramatization Lost in the Stars employs the poetic form for the lyrics written for the music used in this musical play, but poetry is not used to show emotion or deep feelings other than in connection with the music. Anderson does not use poetry even for the role of Joan in Joan of Lorraine, where poetry might have proved effective. Anderson does not, therefore, follow this rule about poetry in the theatre except incidentally in one play of this group.

Next Anderson says that drama must portray man as being better than he thinks he is. To a certain extent Anderson follows this rule. Truck-Line Cafe portrays some very confused people, confused because of the havoc wrought by long separation and general disruption caused by the Second World War. Yet, despite this confusion, Anne and Mort do decide to try once again to rebuild their lives, in spite of their infidelity.
Anne in particular does not feel that she is capable of rebuilding until shortly before the conclusion of the play, and then not until she has seen the hopelessness of a man who has killed his wife because of her unfaithfulness and who tells Anne that he now has nothing but hopelessness. Neither Anne nor Mort feel that they are worth very much, but their intention to try to become what they were marks them as being a little better than they think themselves to be.

Joan of Lorraine shows both Joan and Mary, the actress playing Joan, as well as the director of the play, realizing that one must deal with all kinds of people in order to accomplish anything, but that in so doing one need not compromise his own ideals. In this way man is portrayed as being able to deal justly with those who deal unjustly with him and so shows himself as being better than he thinks that he is. This point is seen in a speech that Mary delivers in the final scene. Here she realizes what the playwright has been trying to say. Speaking of Joan, Mary says:

... It's true that she would compromise in little things. You were right. But it's also true that she would not compromise her belief -- her own soul. She'd rather step into the fire--and she does. (Act II Inter III, p. 125)

In Anne of the Thousand Days Anderson again draws some very complex characters and places them in complex and conflicting situations. This play in part shows man as being better than he thinks he is. Henry is not deterred from his aims first of marrying or at least having Anne as his mistress, and later he is not deterred from bringing about her death, but he is portrayed as being completely aware that much of what he does is wrong and that he carries a heavy burden of guilt with him. He speaks
of it as being a bag in which his crimes are collected and which he
drags behind him. At the end of the play he says that the bag has
been opened and Anne's head has been thrust in to add to the already
heavy burden. Anne too is shown as being somewhat aware of her errors
and sins, and she is also shown as being a very strong person who is
able to face the prospect of death with courage so long as she knows
that her daughter will still be recognized as a legitimate child of
the king. In this rather devious way Anderson portrays characters as
being somewhat better than they think they are in that they do not
deceive themselves into thinking they are anything they are not. They
are portrayed as being honest at any rate, if not blameless.

_Barefoot in Athens_ does not show Socrates as being better than he
thought he was for he is portrayed as being almost without fault. He is
wiser than he thinks he is and of greater worth, but not better, for he
seems eminently aware of his own possibilities. He is unafraid of death
and faces it without qualms, his only surprise comes when he is not
acquitted in his trial. The play does show Socrates' wife, Xantippe,
as being a much better person than she believes herself to be. She is
shown all through the play as being something of a shrew, but with some
reason. She finds the strength at the end of the play to tell Socrates
that she will remain in their house and live on the meager income she
will have in order to keep his memory fresh with her. In this manner
Anderson shows her as a person of strength and character and in many
ways better than she thought herself to be.
On the other hand, *The Golden Six* portrays Claudius in almost an offhand fashion. In the entire play the audience learns comparatively little about any of the characters insofar as their inner motives are concerned, and as a result the intent of the play seems obscure. The major character seems to be Claudius, but that is not certain, for one still knows little about him as the play closes. Livia is known by the audience to be the murderer and the prime instigator of much of the action of the play, but she is still quite far from reality. Claudius is depicted as a man able to rule Rome when he thought himself incapable of rule, but this does not indicate that he is either better or worse than he thinks himself. Thus in his last play Anderson does not seem to have followed this rule at all.

The dramatization *Lost in the Stars* portrays two people as being somewhat better than they believed themselves to be. The first is Absolom. After he realizes that he has killed a man, Absolom becomes determined to confess to the crime, no matter what the consequences, and he also determines to change his life and, as he puts it, to sin no more. The other person who seems to come out of the action with a realization that he is better than he thought himself is the murdered man's father, James Jarvis. He fully intended to keep his hatred and distrust of the Negro for his entire life but finds that he cannot and, in his son's name, offers help and friendship to Stephen and the other Negroes in the village.

Anderson follows his next rule that states that the audience desires a reaffirmation of its faith in itself in most of the plays of this section. *Truckline Cafe* conforms to this rule insofar as it shows people
who are willing to admit their faults and then to begin to try to rise above them. The play seems to say, however, that man can be worthy of admiration but he too often is not. Much of the atmosphere of the play gives the impression of complete confusion. There are people coming in and going out of the cafe almost constantly, and in varying degrees these people are just as confused as the leading characters, Anne and Mort Carruth. The main feeling is, as has been stated, that the play presents people in such a manner that one feels they might be worthy of admiration at some time either later in their lives or earlier in their lives and thereby reaffirm the faith of the audience. At the moment they are too confused to know their own feelings, much less give definite impressions to a group of onlookers.

Joan of Lorraine has a little bit of this same feeling of confusion on the part of the characters, but not nearly so much as Truckline Cafe. By the end of the play the characters seem to have found their way once again, and there is a certainty about their actions. This is especially true of the girl playing the part of Joan. Mary has one idea of Joan's character, while the director and the apparent author have others. For the majority of the play Mary seems unable and unwilling to listen to anyone else's ideas about Joan and about how Joan should or should not be portrayed on the stage. By the end of the play, however, Mary has realized that Joan could compromise with evil people and still keep her own integrity intact. By this realization Mary conquers her confusion as she sees Joan conquer hers. This enables the audience to see that the people in both the play about Joan and in the actual play Joan of
Lorraine are human, with human failings and errors, but they try to do the things they believe important in the best way they can. In this manner these characters reaffirm the faith that the audience has in mankind and in itself, that man is better than he thinks he is and that he is capable of deeds and thoughts worthy of admiration.

In Anne of the Thousand Days Anderson writes of people who, on the surface, do not seem particularly worthy of admiration. Nor do they seem to be capable of inspiring any reaffirmation of faith on the part of the audience. However, on close examination, both Anne Boleyn and Henry VIII do have some qualities that call for admiration. Both of these people are strong and determined people. They are not complaisant. For example, Anne, in the face of Henry's absolute power adamantly refuses his advances, this to his face. Henry, on the other hand, is a man of his word. When he agrees to do everything in his power to marry Anne and thus to make legitimate their child, who later became Queen Elizabeth I, he does so. While Henry is in love with Anne, he is tender and solicitous of her. Only when she fails to provide him with a son and makes the mistake of declaring her love for him does he turn away from her. There is also in the play the overall feeling that each person gets his just deserts. Anne is executed, and the audience, although there is sympathy for her, feels that she is being executed with some justification. This is because she had been the direct cause of the death of many just and noble men. Henry is left alive at the conclusion of the play, but alive to his crimes also. In this way Anderson gives the audience a play that reaffirms its faith in itself and in mankind in general.
The character of Socrates in *Barefoot in Athens* does provide the audience with a reaffirmation of its faith in mankind. Socrates is depicted as an individual capable of great depths of compassion and understanding and yet human enough to be a little impatient with a nagging wife. Also, displayed in two young boys, one the son of Socrates and the other the son of Socrates' bitterest opponent, is a definite note of triumph, for each of them declares his devotion to the truth above everything else. This devotion to the truth in the face of personal persecution and threat of annihilation permeates the entire play and provides the basis for the reaffirmation the audience seeks in the theatre.

*The Golden Six*, on the other hand, provides little that can be regarded as reason for one having faith in mankind. The play seems to say, instead, that despite what one might desire, evil will probably win out. There is also the idea, felt if not stated, that in order to survive in this world of dog eat dog, one must appear a fool or an incompetent. Claudius is the only one who gives an indication of hope for mankind, and his character is not developed fully enough for the audience to identify itself with him. Thus, again in his last play Anderson fails to follow one of his rules.

*Lost in the Stars* ends on a note of hope for the human race, a hope that one day all men will be able to eliminate racial hatred and be able to live in peace with each other. *Bad Seed* leaves the audience with only a note of horror that these people, without souls, represented by Rhoda, might survive and might reappear in great numbers to the detriment of all mankind.
Anderson's next rule concerns the theatre's exaltation of the spirit of man. In this connection Truckline Cafe again provides the audience with only a hope that man will regain his balance after the holocaust of war. The feeling of violence and utter hopeless confusion exists throughout the play. The setting of the play, in a cafe on the edge of the Pacific Ocean with the sound of the restless waves constantly in the background, adds to this feeling. Mankind is exalted in Truckline Cafe only in that against this background there comes the note of a possibility that the world now has a time in which to regain its sanity and man might now begin to rebuild a life for himself.

As has been previously stated, Joan of Lorraine continues to a certain extent the feeling of confusion of values and eventual resolution. The idea of the theatre being a type of religious institution is expressed by Masters, the director of the play. The cast of the play is waiting for Mary to return from lunch, and when one girl asks Masters what his religion is, he replies:

I guess democracy. I believe in democracy, and I believe the theatre is the temple of democracy. A democratic society needs a church without a creed -- where anybody is allowed to talk as long as he can hold an audience -- and that's what the theatre is -- though it's sort of dwindling down to a side-chapel here, lately. . . .

(Act II, p. 84)

Masters also says later in the same scene:

We live by illusions and assumptions and concepts, every one of them as questionable as the Voices Joan heard in the garden. We take on our religions the way we fall in love, and we can't defend one any more than the other. . . . More and more men are going to realize that it's our destiny to be in
the dark and yet go forward -- to doubt our religions and yet live by them. To know that our faith can't be proved and yet stick to it. Unless it's a bad one. (Act II, p. 85)

This is one of the clearest affirmations that Anderson was attempting to live up to one of his own rules for playwrighting.

The spirit of man is exalted in *Anne of the Thousand Days* insofar as each of the main characters is fully aware of his mistakes and his responsibilities at the conclusion of the play. Both Anne and Henry are completely honest with themselves, and therefore the audience is given a feeling of honesty and hope. The last glimpse that the audience has of Socrates in *Barefoot in Athens* is an affirmation on the part of the playwright that he believes in the exaltation of the human soul. Just before his death Socrates teaches Xantippe his prayer to Pan in order that she may have something more to remember him by. The prayer leaves one with the impression that Anderson, through Socrates, is saying that man's spiritual life is more important than his temporal life and that he must "think more of living than having lived." The prayer goes:

> Beloved Pan, and all you other gods who haunt this city, give me beauty of the inward soul, for outward beauty I'm not likely to have. May I reckon the wise to be wealthy and those who need least to be most like the gods. Make me content with what I have, but not self-satisfied. Let me give more than I get, love more than I hate, and think more of living than having lived.
> (Act II Scene I, pp. 51-52)

*The Golden Six* shows the exaltation of the spirit of man only insofar as it shows a man, in this case Claudius, who is able to retain simplicity and humility even in the face of all-corrupting power and influence. Claudius is able to retain his touch with reality all during the course of the
play, and thus it is shown that it is possible for a man to remain humble and unassuming even though he is constantly exposed to absolute power and its corrupting influence. The two dramatizations show contrasting attitudes toward this rule. *Lost in the Stars* is very definitely an attempt to show that all men are capable of spiritual exaltation, for in the play violence is returned as compassion and hate is turned into understanding. *Bad Seed*, on the other hand, shows little attempt at exalting the spirit of man; in fact, it presents a picture of spiritual death in the person of Rhoda, who is presented as a person who is incapable of any type of feeling for anyone else.

The next rule is that excellence on the stage should always be moral excellence. *Truckline Cafe* as the first play of this group presents people who are not particularly concerned with morals. Most of the people in this play have abandoned their traditional feelings about morality. The play shows moral excellence only in that most of the characters are now trying to regain a sense of moral values after having lost them. They all seem to be fairly honest about their lack of traditional morality, but they also seem not to be concerned about it. The only person who is even somewhat remorseful about her previous behavior is Anne, and she seems regretful only because her husband was alive while she misbehaved. She seems to believe that if he had been dead everything would have been all right.

In *Joan of Lorraine* Anderson insists strongly on moral excellence. In this play one of the primary factors that causes the disagreement between Mary and Masters is the morality of Joan's compromising and
dealing with evil and with evil men. Each of the people in the play or playing parts in the play seems to be concerned in some way or to some degree with questions of morality. This is particularly true of Mary and of Joan as seen in the play about Joan. Mary is concerned with the portrayal of Joan as being willing to deal with corrupt men in order to perform her task, and Joan is concerned with the morality of her voices or her denial of them.

Anne and Henry are shown in a somewhat different light. It seems that an audience today will accept in the portrayal of a person belonging to a time long since past much more latitude in the realm of morals than it will ordinarily accept. Thus what would be considered immoral in a person of today is accepted without much questioning in Henry VIII. Thus, although Henry might be considered immoral in this play, his immorality stems not so much from the fact that he has a mistress or mistresses, but rather from the way in which he gets rid of them. The major area in which Henry would be considered immoral is that he does not or cannot remain with a woman once he has won her completely. Anne, on the other hand, might be considered immoral in the main instance when she insists on the death of those who refuse to swear fealty to the king in the matters of the church. Anne is saved in the minds of the audience from remaining in this immoral state both in that much of what she does is to protect her child's place and in that she realizes that she was in grave error in causing the deaths. In this sense, then, Anne has moral excellence, as does Henry insofar as he is honest with himself.
Barefoot In Athens follows this rule very closely. Socrates is drawn as a most excellent character, and his excellence is clearly moral excellence. He will not accept even the taint of dishonesty or moral inexactness, as is seen when he refuses to allow his wife and children to wear ragged clothes and weep and wail in order to influence the judges at his trial. He has devoted his life to the search of the truth and does not desert it even to save his life. The Golden Six is completely dissimilar. One sees in the original six quite a bit of excellence, but not in the other characters that surround them. Claudius, the only one of the golden six to survive, is seen so incompletely in the latter sections of the play that it is difficult to evaluate his degree of moral excellence. One merely gets hints that he is an excellent person morally only because he does not display immorality.

Anderson next says that there must be a healthy moral atmosphere in a play. In this regard Truckline Cafe seems to be wanting, not because it is advocating immorality but because no one seems to be advocating morality or seems to care whether anyone else is moral or immoral. There seems to be a feeling of almost complete detachment on the part of each character, detachment from nearly everyone else. As an example, the two owners are describing Anne's arrival at the cafe about two weeks previously and Kip says:

I'd better tell you how she came here. Min and I were down at the far cabin rigging a radio aerial - this was a couple of weeks ago - along toward evening, and we saw a girl out on that new pier they were building. There was no planking on it yet, and she must have been walking the stringers. Well, she walked out to the end - it's about a quarter of a mile - and she just stood there. Pretty soon it got dark,
and the last time we looked there she was, standing out against the sky, her skirt flapping. "She's considering suicide," Min said, "and who would know, except herself, whether it's the best thing?" "Nobody would know," I said. So we forgot about it. . . . (Act I, p. 7)

Later in the play Anne talks to a man who has just killed his wife and who is sorry that he killed her not because it was wrong to kill her or because she is dead, but because he now is all alone. This detachment permeates the play and gives it not only a slight feeling of unreality but also an unhealthy feeling.

Joan of Lorraine certainly does not reveal the same feeling of detachment as Truckline Cafe. Just as there is no feeling of detachment, there is also no unhealthy moral atmosphere. As has been stated earlier, the major conflict in the play is over the morality of Joan's working and dealing with evil people to gain good ends. The fact that Joan does work with these people and that the director of the play, Masters, must work with some rather unscrupulous people in order to put on the play is explained and handled in such a manner that the audience can accept this as morally right and justifiable. Anne of the Thousand Days presents a picture of people living lives that might be considered immoral, but they are not let off without punishment for their immorality. Anne is executed, and Henry is left with his memories and his burden of guilt. In this manner the moral atmosphere is made healthy and acceptable.

The remaining two plays, Barefoot in Athens, and The Golden Six, present two different approaches to this rule. Barefoot in Athens depicts the events leading to the execution of a very moral person,
Socrates, for his so-called crimes against Athens. These scenes are presented in a manner that forces the audience to realize that Socrates is right and Athens wrong. Therefore, it seems that Socrates and his small group of supporters are the only morally right people in the play or in Athens at this time. There is one problem, however, in that the Spartan king, Pausanias, is drawn as an almost completely amoral person, and yet he seems a more real and a more interesting person than the very moral Socrates. This does not completely detract from the moral atmosphere of the play, but it does cause a problem in judging the overall moral tone. *The Golden Six* shows that the absolute power of the Roman emperors was a very corrupting influence and caused much of the immorality of the times. The only moral person, Claudius, is also drawn as both stupid and inconsequential. Whether Claudius remains moral after receiving the absolute power of the empire is left in doubt, for the play ends soon after. Whether the atmosphere of the play is morally healthy or unhealthy is rather left in doubt also, for there is no final resolution of the question of right or wrong, and the play closes with the possibly moral Claudius in the immoral position of absolute ruler of Rome.

Both of the dramatizations leave the audience with a healthy moral atmosphere. Even though both of the plays have leading characters, or at least important characters, who commit murder, one being punished for his crime and the other not, the atmosphere does not condone the murder in either case. The audience sympathizes with Absolom in *Lost in the Stars* but knows his execution is justifiable. On the other hand,
the audience feels nothing but horror at Rhoda's actions and the prospect that she will live to kill again. In these divergent ways these two plays maintain a healthy moral atmosphere.

As far as the theatre offering criteria for judging mankind, some of the plays of this last group follow this rule, and some do not. Truckline Cafe does present its characters in juxtaposition to each other, but the situation is nearly always the same throughout the play, and thus the characters never stand out in full relief against their background. They are instead too much of the background to really be alive. Thus their good or their evil natures are obscured.

Both Joan of Lorraine and Anne of the Thousand Days, on the other hand present their people in such a manner that the audience can judge for themselves concerning the relative goodness or evil of the characters. This is also true of Barefoot in Athens but not of The Golden Six. Here the characters move in such a rapid parade through the picture or the play that one does not get a clear view of them. This is also true of both Livia, the evil influence and instigator of the action, and of Claudius, the representative of the good that remains throughout the play. One really gets so few impressions of each of the characters that it is extremely difficult to feel much of anything about them one way or another. The two dramatizations that Anderson presented during this period do follow this rule fairly closely and quite well.

The Structure of the Play

In this regard it seems that in at least two instances Anderson did follow this rule in that he apparently did check the visions that he wished to transpose to the stage against his knowledge or intuition.
These are Joan of Lorraine and Anne of the Thousand Days. These are the only two of the plays Anderson wrote during this period that succeeded entirely. The other three - Truckline Cafe, Barefoot in Athens, and The Golden Six - were almost complete failures when produced in New York. As has been discussed partially up to this point, Truckline Cafe and The Golden Six do not follow Anderson's rules in many instances. It is seen further in the discussion to follow that this is the case with all three to a certain extent. Both of the dramatizations, Lost in the Stars and Bad Seed, follow his rules quite closely but as has been pointed out earlier, they are not wholly Anderson's work, and therefore one cannot judge the plays fairly in the light of these rules.

The next rule defines the necessity of a central scene of discovery or crises for the leading character. In Truckline Cafe the central scene or crisis occurs in the third act when Anne, after talking to a man who has killed his wife for being unfaithful, decides that she will try to go back to her husband and to rebuild their life. This crisis does affect Anne greatly, for before the crisis she is completely adamant and determined to stay at the cafe and let Mort leave without her. The events leading to the crisis seem somewhat contrived, however. There are just too many coincidences involved. A couple arrive at the Truckline Cafe. Years earlier the wife had had an affair with another man while the husband was in the service. The couple just happen to get the same cabin that the wife and her lover had shared several years earlier. In addition, the husband had served some time with the lover overseas, and the lover had told the husband about his affair and described the cabin
in such detail that the husband recognizes it when they walk in.
Realizing her infidelity, the husband kills his wife, thus precipitating the crisis that leads to Anne's decision. These are just a few of the coincidences that bring about the crisis.

Joan of Lorraine, a two-act play, has this central scene near the end of the second act. First, in the play about Joan, the character Joan discovers that her voices are good and that they have told her the truth. This discovery allows her to face her impending death with courage and to refuse to deny the voices any longer. Mary, the actress playing Joan, discovers a short time later that the play is saying the things about Joan she believes are right and saying them in such a way as to show her in the correct light. This latter discovery allows Mary to say that she will continue to act in the play and to do so with complete confidence and assurance. In this way Anderson fulfills the requirement laid down by this rule for both the play and the play within the play.

In the next play, Anne of the Thousand Days, also in two acts, this central scene occurs shortly after the opening of Act II. It can be considered either in Scene 1 or Scene 2. In Scene 1 of Act II both Henry and Anne in soliloquy talk of the loss of love between them. Anne talks of the one day when she ceased to hate Henry, and then when he realizes that she loves him, he begins to hate her. His hate for her begins in Scene 2 of Act II, where he discovers that Anne has given birth to a daughter instead of a son. In either case Anne's fortune begins to change from this moment on. Shortly after this, Anne
insists that Henry kill those who defy him, and when not long after she gives birth to a son born dead her fate is all but sealed, for Henry must have a son to carry on after him.

The central scene in *Barefoot in Athens* is at the end of the trial scene where Socrates learns that he has been convicted and therefore will be sentenced to death. The discovery he makes is that his Athens wants his death. With this discovery Socrates ceases to struggle and accepts the verdict since it is from Athens the city he loves. *The Golden Six* has no particular discovery scene except the discovery made by Claudius at the very end of the play that Livia is the murderer and the instigator of the evil that has happened throughout the play. As this is the very end of the play, Claudius cannot greatly alter his direction. He alters his direction only insofar as he accepts the position of emperor. He is goaded into this acceptance by the discovery mentioned so that he can order the arrest of Livia. She kills herself immediately after this declaration of acceptance of power on the part of Claudius, and in this way the play ends.

The central scene occurs in *Lost in the Stars* when Stephen discovers that his son Absalom has killed Arthur Jarvis. After this discovery Stephen's direction in the play changes insofar as he no longer is trying to find his son but is now trying to give his life meaning once again. The discovery affects Stephen so profoundly that it shakes his faith, and he regains it only when the murdered man's father comes to him as a friend. The discovery scene that Anderson made central in *Bad Seed* occurs in the first scene of Act II. Here Christine makes a two
fold discovery. First she discovers that her mother was apparently a psychopatical murderer, and next she discovers that Rhoda has killed her school mate by beating him with her shoes until he fell into the water and drowned. Such a discovery naturally has an immense effect upon Christine and determines her course of action throughout the rest of the play. It sets her upon the path to giving Rhoda an overdose of sleeping pills and then shooting herself.

In regard to Anderson's rule about the placement of the central scene, it is varied considerably in these plays. All of them except Truckline Cafe are written in a two-act structure. Truckline Cafe has the central scene quite late in the third act, and Joan of Lorraine places it near the close of the second act. In Anne of the Thousand Days it is near the beginning of Act II, and in Barefoot in Athens the central scene is at the end of Scene 2 of Act II. The Golden Six has the discovery scene at the very end of the play, Scene 3 of Act II. The two dramatizations are also written in two acts. The discovery scene comes in the final scene of Act I in Lost in the Stars and Scene 1 of Act II of Bad Seed. Thus it can be seen that Anderson varied considerably in his usually strict adherance to this rule concerning the placement of the central scene.

The upshot of this discovery, Anderson says, is that in a tragedy the leading character suffers death in his attempt to change. The pattern is the same in a series play but the hero undergoes a lesser ordeal. Truckline Cafe follows this rule to a certain extent. It presents its main character, Anne, as going through an ordeal during
the course of the play, that of facing the husband to whom she has been unfaithful. However, it seems that an even greater ordeal has transpired before the play began, an ordeal that occurred when she discovered that Mort was still alive while she was carrying the child of another man. This seems to have been a much greater ordeal than the one which occurs during the play and by comparison overshadows the ordeal actually presented on the stage. The audience gets the impression that Anne has already gone through a far greater crisis than that shown; thus the crisis and discovery presented on stage lose much of their importance and are not too effective.

In the play within the play of *Joan of Lorraine*, Joan suffers death as a direct result of her trying to correct the fault or error she has made in denouncing her voices. Mary, the actress playing Joan, goes through a slight ordeal during the course of the play in trying to decide what she will do with regard to leaving the play or playing Joan in a way that she feels is wrong. Anne Boleyn does suffer death at the conclusion of *Anne of the Thousand Days*. This too is a result of what might be considered a fault. She has allowed herself to fall in love with Henry knowing that once he has conquered a woman he will leave her. She has a perfect example of this betrayal in her sister who had been Henry's mistress for several years, but Henry had tired of her as soon as he discovered she loved him and cast her off for Anne. While Anne battles Henry, she is safe from him and from death, but as soon as she quits battling and attempts to join him, she is lost and Henry has her put to death.
The death of Socrates in *Barefoot in Athens* comes also as a direct result of Socrates' refusal to fight any longer and as a result of his complete acceptance of the sentence put upon him by his fellow Athenians. As portrayed in the play, Socrates can escape death if he is willing to leave Athens either in voluntary exile or escape from prison with the aid of the king of Sparta, Pausanius. In *The Golden Six* Livia dies at the end of the play as a direct result of the discovery made by Claudius that she is the murderer. Her death is not a result of her attempt to change or correct any fault, but rather a result of someone finding out that the faults are hers. Livia commits suicide rather than accept arrest and probable death at the hands of Claudius.

*Lost in the Stars* does show Stephen going through an ordeal, but it is not an ordeal brought on by any fault of his nor brought on by any attempt on his part to correct a fault or error in himself. It is brought on by his son's killing another man. *Bad Seed* tells of Christine's death as a result of her trying to correct the fault of bringing Rhoda, the bad seed, into the world. Christine has carried this trait and passed it on to her child. In this sense this dramatization follows Anderson's rule.

In the next instance Anderson says that the comic play differs from the tragic one in that comedy presents a happier scene and does not end in the death of the leading character. Two of the plays of this section have the leading character die at the conclusion, *Anne of the Thousand Days* and *Barefoot in Athens*, and if one regards Livia as the leading character in *The Golden Six*, there are three. In the play within the
play Joan of Lorraine, Joan does go to her death; thus, the play about Joan would be considered a tragedy but not the entire play. Insofar as the death of the leading character or one of the leading characters is concerned, there are three plays here that might be considered tragedies. Anne of the Thousand Days and Barefoot in Athens both lead up to the death of the leading character, and therefore the death is central to the plot. The death of Livia, however, is not central to the plot and could be dispensed with without changing the play's meaning. Because the deaths are indispensable to the plots of Anne of the Thousand Days and Barefoot in Athens it seems that Anderson meant both plays to be tragedies. If he meant The Golden Six to be a tragedy then he fails to follow his rule. Bad Seed has the death of Christine to place it in the nearly tragic mold, but her death with the saving of Rhoda adds to the horror of the story and does not give a feeling of triumph that is essential in tragedy.

Anderson's next rule states that the essential difference between a work that is comic in nature and a work that is tragic is in the attitude of the playwright toward man as he is and man as he will be when he becomes better. In this regard most of the plays of this group come closer to the comic tradition than to the tragic, because they take the attitude that man can be influenced and helped now by what is said in the plays. This is true of Truckline Cafe that seems to be saying that man in the aftermath of war should be tolerant of others' errors and allow sufficient time to elapse before one demands or expects the re-establishment of traditional values. The entire play seems to be asking for understanding and tolerance for weakness in moments of stress and pain.
Joan of Lorraine implies that man will, if given sufficient time, be able to accept the right path toward understanding. This play also asks for understanding, as was the case in the previous play. The actors in Joan of Lorraine seem to be almost as confused as were the characters of Truckline Cafe. In this case, they are confused about the best method of portraying Joan; whereas in Truckline Cafe the characters are confused as to the best method of resuming life after dealing with death in the form of war. Both plays seem to call for greater patience and understanding.

The next play, Anne of the Thousand Days, is the only play of this group that does not seem to have a great deal of application to life today. However, there is the caution to everyone to take care lest he become so dependent or independent that he loses perspective. Henry became so dependent upon his emotions that he lost the ability to weigh some things intelligently. Anne, on the other hand, became so independent that she practically forced Henry to seek her out. If she had been more accessible to the king early in their relationship, he would have tired of her early, if he had wanted her at all, and she would have lived longer and better.

The main message of Barefoot in Athens is that one should search for the truth, no matter what the consequences. In this play one finds the triumph of the individual in death as in no other play of this group. Socrates tells the people of Athens that to put him to death is to do him a service, and that is just what happened historically. With his death, his teachings and his pupils spread far beyond the boundaries of Athens and are still influential today. It is useless to speculate about what would have happened had he not been executed, but it seems possible
that there would not have been the fervor on the part of Plato, for example, to justify Socrates as much as he did in his writings. The only attitude of the playwright exhibited in The Golden Six is seen in the first scene of the play where Claudius tells the audience to beware clever men who seek to subvert democracy to their own ends and designs. Other than this, the playwright does not seem to take much of a positive attitude in this play. In the main, then, Anderson follows his rule about the attitude of the playwright determining whether a play is closer to the comic or the tragic tradition. In this case most of these plays are closer to the comic than the tragic.

That the play must deal with the inner life as external events are only symbolic of the struggle within is the next rule of Anderson's to be discussed. In this regard Truckline Cafe follows this rule extremely well. This play seems to be merely an extension of the feelings of Anne Carruth, or it might be of any number of people. The confusion exhibited in the cafe and the detachment exhibited in the setting and in the manner of each person's treatment of the others around seem to be Anne's feelings externalized. In this connection, when she decides to go with Mort, her confusion disappears and she can leave, thus the play can end.

Joan of Lorraine also follows this rule. Here Mary, the actress playing Joan, seems to be an extension of Anne in that once she has found or regained her convictions she does not want to let go of them. In this way when Mary quarrels with Masters over the way Joan is being portrayed, she is merely saying that she does not want to have even a semblance of compromise with evil. This is to a certain extent an
an affirmation of a degree of Puritanism. Anderson's writing of Joan of Lorraine may also have been a reaction to the storm of criticism that greeted Truckline Cafe. In order to answer his critics, he might have written Joan of Lorraine to affirm his basic desires for morality and also to show that what some people might consider immoral is in reality merely a necessary action to accomplish a good end. When Mary, who might represent the critics, realizes that the playwright's approach to Joan is the correct approach, the argument ceases and the play ends, just as Anderson hoped the critics would cease their attacks when they realized he was not advocating an abandonment of traditional morals but asking for tolerance for those who might not have been strong enough to retain them in times of stress.

The inner struggle of which the external events of Anne of the Thousand Days is symbolic is directly traced to the conflict of will and love both in Anne and in Henry. Anne's fortunes rise and continue to do so as long as she holds her love in check and allows her will, or in this case her determination, to withstand Henry's domination. On the other hand, Henry's love is rampant until he conquers Anne's will. Then his love cools, and his undisciplined will takes over leading to his disposal of her. The external events of the play parallel this inner struggle between Anne and Henry. The struggle reaches its peak at the occasion of Anne's declaration of love for Henry in the final scene of Act I. Anne dominates the first act, Henry the second, both internally and externally. The domination is uneven but steady.
The story of Socrates in *Barefoot in Athens* is told in a very calm manner which seems to be symbolic of the inner calm and certainty of Socrates himself. In this regard the play follows this rule, but as Socrates is portrayed as right and having few inner conflicts, the play does not follow the rule. Socrates is drawn as being completely certain of his ideas and, therefore, not tormented by inner doubt and confusion. *The Golden Six* also does not follow this rule. As has been previously stated, the characters are still so shadowy at the conclusion of the play that one sees little if any inner struggle take place. The play seems to be merely a succession of happenings with the only connection among them being that some of the same people are on stage at all times. Claudius, who seems to be the major character, has such a passive role in the events of the play that he seems almost not present.

The next statement of Anderson's that the story must present a conflict between good and evil within a single person is followed in about the same way as was the rule discussed immediately above. The major conflict in *Truckline Cafe* is between what is good and what is evil in Anne. The good is represented by Mort, her husband, and the evil is represented by the cafe itself and the other people who frequent it. In the cafe there is confusion and, if you will, temptation. When Anne resolves to accept the good, once again the story ends. As *Joan of Lorraine* seems, in some ways, to be an extension of *Truckline Cafe* and in other ways an answer to its critics, the character of Mary shows conflict. The major conflict is between the narrow view of Joan and her duty as seen through Mary's eyes and the wider view as seen by the author and by Masters the
director. When Mary sees her mistake and her confusion is resolved, then the conflict is over and the play can come to a conclusion.

The major conflict in *Anne of the Thousand Days* is between the true love existing between Anne and Henry and fierce clash of their strong wills. As long as Anne's will is dominant over her love of Henry, she is safe. But as soon as she allows her love to dominate, she begins to fail. Therefore, the good in the play is symbolized by Henry's love for Anne, and the evil is symbolized by his undisciplined will.

As drawn in *Barefoot in Athens* the character of Socrates reveals little that can be regarded as evil. There is conflict in the play, but it is between Socrates and his teachings and the narrow viewpoints of his enemies. *The Golden Six* also has such shadowy characters that one cannot determine the good and the evil in them. There is good as represented by Claudius and the other members of the golden six, and there is evil as represented primarily by Livia, the two elements coming into conflict. There is, however, little to indicate any inner struggle between that which is good and that which is evil within a single person.

In the dramatizations one sees a great deal of inner struggle going on in the characters of Stephen in *Lost in the Stars* and Christine in *Bad Seed*. Little indication is given of inner conflict in the majority of the rest of the characters of these plays. This is probably not Anderson's fault, for he followed both novels fairly closely in these dramatizations. Thus Anderson follows this rule in the first three plays but not in the last two and apparently not extensively in the dramatizations.
In this group of plays Anderson once again exhibits his attitude concerning the world around him as he does in the majority of his plays. *Truckline Cafe* tries to say that one should be tolerant of the mistakes of others and that if this tolerance exists, then the disrupted lives of those who have been severely affected by war can more quickly return to normalcy. Anderson also points out that if this tolerance does not exist, then we stand in danger of destroying much that can be worthwhile, possibly along with those around us whom we unconsciously depend upon to give meaning to our lives.

*Joan of Lorraine* states very specifically that it is possible for one to work with and compromise with evil and still not compromise one's own ideals. Anderson further states that at times it is absolutely essential that one deal with those who might be considered evil in order to accomplish one's worthwhile tasks. *Anne of the Thousand Days* speaks of life and the value of it and also of death and the value of it. It also talks of guilt and the expiation of that guilt. In this play two people's guilt is shown, Anne's and Henry's. Anne's guilt, she feels, will be expiated in her dying, and Henry's will, he knows, be dragged along behind him for as long as he lives and get heavier each day with each new guilty act. In this manner Anderson took the attitude that each man must pay for his acts if they offend, and the major offense seems to be in Anderson's point of view against one's fellow men.

The attitude Anderson displays in *Barefoot in Athens* is that a man has a responsibility to the truth and must fulfill that responsibility no matter what the cost. This seems to be the major idea he
has Socrates fulfilling in this play. The Golden Six takes the attitude that a man and a nation must be constantly on guard against any eventuality, for a man may be suddenly thrust into a position that he dislikes but cannot escape, and a nation may either suddenly or insidiously lose its democratic character and become a totalitarian state. Anderson seems to say, somewhat unsuccessfully here, that one must constantly guard against unforeseen occurrences that will change his direction.

In dramatizing Lost in the Stars Anderson for the most part takes the attitude of the novel as his own. This attitude is that racial intolerance and class hatred do no one any good and may do everyone they touch a great deal of harm. This is not a new attitude with Anderson, but it probably influenced the selection of this novel to be dramatized and also influenced the manner of treatment. Bad Seed, on the other hand, does not seem to take any attitude of particular importance. If one searches, one might find the attitude that says one should beware of appearances, for they can be very wrong and very deceitful.

The lack of an apparent common denominator of belief with the audience, which Anderson considered essential, seems to have been one cause of the criticism of Truckline Cafe. The play discusses in sympathetic terms a couple who have both been unfaithful. Anne has had an abortion to avoid bearing another man's child, and Mort has with him his child by another woman. This sympathetic attitude toward these people rather than any moralistic justification of their acts, which is not evidenced, may have been the element that was found so objectionable. The other plays of this section, including the plays that did not succeed, Barefoot...
in Athena and The Golden Six, do not violate this rule. Both of these plays - as well as Joan of Lorraine, Anne of the Thousand Days, and the dramatizations of Lost in the Stars and Bad Seed - deal with beliefs of the audience in such a manner that there can be little moral objection to them. Therefore, it is safe to say that they had a common denominator with the beliefs of their audience or at least did not offend the beliefs of their audience.

The Leading Character of The Play

The leading character of the first play of this group, Truckline Cafe follows Anderson's interpretation of Aristotle's tragic fault concept very closely. Anne Carruth is not a perfect person, and she does become a better individual through the course of the play. The major fault that Anne has, though it is not displayed during the course of the play, is infidelity. She has been unfaithful to her husband. During the play itself the fault seems to be self-recrimination. Apparently because of her previous errors she feels now that she does not deserve a second chance at life, especially with Mort. When she realizes that she is not alone in her errors and that life without someone to hold on to is meaningless, she agrees to go with Mort and to try to rebuild their lives. In this way Truckline Cafe and Storm Operation in the preceding group are very similar. Life gains meaning when one has someone to whom he can cling.

The major faults of Mary and of the character Joan in Joan of Lorraine differ. The character Joan's fault is doubt that her Voices are true Voices and doubt that she is capable of first leading the armies and second withstanding the ordeal of death by fire. Mary's
fault is inability to achieve understanding. She does not comprehend that one can deal with all sorts of people of varying degrees of honesty and dishonesty and still not compromise one's own ideals. When Mary realizes that this is possible, she becomes a better person, and the implication is that she will probably be a better actress. Anne's fault in *Anne of the Thousand Days* is that she is so completely bound up with her own needs and desires that she cannot be concerned with others. Anne says at her trial that if she had been able to put herself in another's place, she could never have forced the execution of those who opposed the king. Henry's fault is about the same, an undisciplined will. Both of these people are somewhat better at the end of the play than they had been at the beginning. Anne is dead, but she has died almost in triumph with her death as an expiation of her guilt. Henry goes to a life forever burdened with the knowledge of guilt.

In *Socrates of Barefoot in Athens* we find a character that does not seem to follow this rule. Socrates, insofar as he is depicted in this play, does not have a particular fault. If he has one, it is that he does not know the citizens of Athens as well as he thinks he knows them, and although this cannot be considered much of a fault, it is the direct cause of his death. Also Socrates does not emerge at the conclusion of the play a particularly better person than he is at the beginning, for he is shown almost without fault. Neither of the leading characters in *The Golden Six*, Livia and Claudius, emerge better people than they are at the beginning of the play. Livia dies at the conclusion by her own hand fully aware that she has succeeded in the object of her life, the building and the perpetuating of the Roman Empire. She dies exultant
in what she has done even to the extent of murdering her husband, her son, and her grandsons. Claudius is a child at the beginning of the play, and although he probably has faults—among them an indecisive nature—he does not seem to be particularly better or worse as the play ends.

In these last three plays, then, Anderson did not follow his rule.

As far as a regeneration or spiritual awakening is concerned, Anne, in *Truckline Cafe*, comes to a decision to try to make a new life with Mort, but there does not seem to be much of a spiritual awakening. When she makes her discovery or realizes that life without Mort would be without meaning, she comes the closest to a reawakening or regeneration. Much of her inner turmoil has transpired before the play begins, and, therefore, one can only guess at what might have been a regeneration taking place when she contemplated suicide. The regeneration that does occur is somewhat weakened by the audience's knowledge of previous and much greater suffering.

The awakening that Mary goes through in *Joan of Lorraine* occurs during the playing of one of the scenes in the play within the play. The audience discovers that it has taken place when she tells Masters that she now has the answer she has been searching for. She has suddenly realized that one does not have to compromise his ideals simply because of the associations into which he is forced in order to accomplish his ends. The character Joan also goes through a regeneration which occurs when she realizes that the Voices were good and she was not wrong in the things that she did. This includes crowning a corrupt king, for as one of the Voices tells her, "A king is not for long." (Act II, p. 119)
Anne of the Thousand Days has a degree of spiritual awakening in Anne that is seen in the trial scene, Scene 7 of Act IX. Here Anne realizes that she is to die, and now that she is on "the other end," as she calls it, she realizes that much of what she has done has been wrong. This is particularly true of her actions in regard to those executed. The audience is not shown this realization, but is shown the results of it in Anne's behavior. The awakening of Henry, such as it is, occurs in the final scene when he realizes the enormity of his guilt and the immensity of his burden, "... nothing's forgotten or erased, --- Nothing can ever be put back the way it was." (Act III Scene 8, p. 74)

As was pointed out earlier, Socrates is drawn in Barefoot in Athens as being almost without fault, and, therefore, it follows that he stands in no need of a spiritual awakening or regeneration. The closest thing to such an awakening occurs at the conclusion of Scene 1 of Act II when there is a type of reconciliation between Socrates and Xantippe. Xantippe's awakening occurs in the last scene of the play when she realizes that Socrates is going to accept death and so decides to remain in their house in order to keep her memories of him alive and fresh. She seems finally to grasp something of his greatness and his destiny in this final scene. There is no spiritual awakening or regeneration in the last play of this group, The Golden Six. No one becomes a better person, and, therefore, no one experiences this awakening Anderson felt necessary as the essence of tragedy or of drama.

Neither of the two dramatizations of this group, Lost in the Stars and Bad Seed, follow this rule. The characters who seem to emerge better
men at the conclusion of the play Lost in the Stars are Jarvis, the father of the murdered man, and the killer, Absolom. Stephen remains much the same as far as attitude and relative goodness are concerned. In Bad Seed no one emerges better than he was at the beginning. Rhoda certainly is not changed for the better, and Christine is dead without having accomplished her desire to rid the world of this bad seed.

This rule that states that the leading character should represent the forces of good and should win is also followed partially in the plays of this group. Truckline Cafe does follow it if one can accept the fact that neither Anne nor Mort are patently evil but rather confused and not especially strong characters. The goodness in Anne does win out in the final scene of the play, but one cannot say definitely that Anne won. It would seem that some of the hardest moments are yet before her, and they must be lived through before one could say that she has won. When she and Mort have been able to rebuild their lives together, then and only then could one say that she has won. And this final victory, if and when it does come, is a long way off.

Joan of Lorraine, on the other hand, does follow this rule. In the play within the play Joan represents the forces of good, and she triumphs in death. The actress playing Joan, Mary, represents the closest thing to evil that is seen in the actual play. Mary represents a narrow viewpoint of the ability of a person to withstand evil influences. When Mary realizes that she is wrong and that a person can deal with corrupt people without compromising or being compromised, then she forsakes her narrow viewpoint and knows that she is on the wrong side. She is defeated and knows it.
Anne in *Anne of the Thousand Days* represents the forces of good in so far as she stands for honesty and in so far as she demands what she feels is justly due her child. Anne also represents even more the forces of good during the latter section of the play when she is being unjustly accused of infidelity to Henry. The sympathy of the audience is with her most of the time, but when she is indicted on this obviously false charge, there is an even greater sympathy aroused in her behalf. Anne does win in the end, for she goes to her death in a sense of triumph while her opponent, Henry, lives in a sense of defeat, for he knows that although Anne is dead he is tied inextricably to her memory. For as he says "It would have been easier to forget you living than to forget you dead." (Act II Scene 2, p. 74)

*Barefoot in Athens* follows this rule very carefully. Socrates does represent the forces of good, and although he dies at the conclusion of the play, he dies with a full realization that his reputation and his teachings will live and triumph in the end. This is clearly seen in his statements at the conclusion of the trial.

... My accusers think, no doubt, that my death would be a great victory for them and a calamity for Socrates. This is not the case. My death would be of enormous benefit to me, but a disaster to my accusers--and to Athens. Look at what you will have done if this verdict stands. You will have laid hands on an ancient, flea-bitten, philosophic scamp and made him into a great man. (Act II Scene 2, pp. 63-64)

The *Golden Six* follows this rule to a certain extent if one regards Claudius as the leading character, for he represents the forces of good and wins a measure of triumph at the end of the play. But if one regards Livia as the leading character, the play completely disregards the rule. Livia
represents the forces of evil, and though she dies at the end of the play, she dies knowing that the very thing she fought for, the Empire, will survive. Therefore she triumphs over Claudius' desire to restore the Republic. She says to Claudius just before she dies, "You are the emperor? Why, then I have an empire still. You have no children. Nero will follow you." (Act II Scene 3, p. 66)

Anderson's next rule is disregarded in the first play of this group, Truckline Cafe. Here Anne Carruth seems to be neither an exceptional person nor to epitomize exceptional qualities. She might, however, be considered to illustrate the value of fidelity because of the mental anguish she suffers as a result of falling short of this admirable quality. In this regard she would follow the rule, but in most instances she does not evidence exceptional qualities. The character Joan in Joan of Lorraine is certainly an exceptional person and one worthy to be a protagonist of a play. Apparently the actress Mary is meant to represent a fairly exceptional person, for she is an actress with the leading role in a Broadway play. In addition, Mary represents integrity and determination to follow her conscience and not compromise her ideals. Anne and Henry are certainly exceptional people as the king and later queen of England. They also represent and epitomize certain qualities worthy of emulation. Anne in particular epitomizes the quality of determination and Henry the quality of leadership somewhat wasted and dissipated, but nevertheless strong.

As one of the most influential men of Western civilization, Socrates is certainly a person worthy to be the protagonist of a play. In addition to this he is the very epitome of the continual search for truth.
The people in *The Golden Six* were the rulers and the ruling class of Rome and therefore exceptional people. Livia also represents the exceptional quality of unscrupulous use of power and influence. In these varied ways, then, Anderson follows this rule in the plays of this group.

In regard to the qualities which an audience wishes to see on a stage, *Truckline Cafe* seems to follow this rule of Anderson's insofar as the actions of the characters during the play are concerned, but the actions of Anne in particular before the play begins were quite far removed from this rule. This may have been one reason for the play's failure. The audience is told that Anne regrets her actions. But, the regret seems to come only because Mort was alive at the time and not because the actions were essentially wrong at the time. This feeling is seen throughout the play, and one does not receive a clear-cut impression of rejection of immorality and immoral actions particularly on the part of Anne.

The characters in *Joan of Lorraine*, *Anne of the Thousand Days*, and *Barefoot in Athens* follow this rule quite closely. The men are corageous and the women, including a courtesan in *Barefoot in Athens*, are faithful to the men of their choice. *The Golden Six*, in this regard as in others, has such shadowy characters that it is difficult to determine whether they follow this rule or not. *Lost in the Stars* and *Bad Seed*, the two dramatizations, also follow this rule seemingly without exception. The wife of Absolom is faithful to him although she has had relations with
others before she met him, but the audience does not seem to object to her because of her affirmation of love and determination to be faithful to him even in death.

In summary it can be seen that in the plays of this group Anderson does not follow his rules as carefully as in previous plays.

As was stated earlier, it seems that when Anderson followed his rules with imagination his plays succeeded. Such would seem to be the case particularly in this group of plays. The three plays that were not commercially successful when presented on Broadway are the three that follow fewer of his rules. The two successful plays that Anderson wrote wholly follow the rules almost without exception and follow them with imagination and diversity. This also seems to have been the case throughout the plays of the other sections as well. When Anderson followed those rules or his intuitions if he had not yet discovered the rule, with imagination and ingenuity, the play was a success. But when he followed the rules only partially or doggedly, the play was less successful.
CONCLUSION

It is obvious from his own statements that Maxwell Anderson did not begin his playwriting career with clear and firmly set rules. During the period from the production of White Desert in 1924 to the production of Winterset in 1935, Anderson experimented extensively in order to find the best formulae by which a successful play could be written. Then in 1935, with the publication of the preface to Winterset, Anderson began a series of essays in which he set down his theory of drama and his reasoning about the theatre. The last of these essays appeared in February, 1947, and all of them were included in the volume entitled Off Broadway which was published later in that year.

The progressive stages in the chronological development of these rules cannot be emphasized enough, for they reflect a great deal about his artistic conscience. There are strong indications that Anderson had at least partially formulated some of the rules by the time he wrote Elizabeth the Queen in 1930: (1) in this play he followed, at least in part, most of the rules that he later recorded in his essays; and (2) after the failure of White Desert, Anderson stated that he did not return to poetry as the medium for a play until he had discovered that poetic drama had never been successful when written about one's own time and place,¹ thus indicating that he was experimentally seeking

¹Anderson, Off Broadway, p. 53.
for the best methods to construct his plays. It is apparent that by the time Anderson wrote *Winterset* in 1935 he had, at least in mind, all of his rules, for *Winterset* is the first play that follows all of the rules as Anderson recorded them beginning in 1935. Therefore, it is safe to say that during the first eleven years Anderson spent writing for the theatre, he was learning his craft. During the next twelve years, after he had his rules fairly well in mind, he wrote about his craft, probably to save others the difficulties he had experienced in his early search for the best methods to use in writing for the theatre.

The basic disciplines which have guided this study of the chronological development of Anderson's rules are two: (1) it is reasonably safe to assume that Anderson had firmly set a particular rule if he used it in two consecutive plays; and (2) if Anderson disregarded a particular rule after using it in two consecutive plays, one can only assume that after experimenting with the rule, for reasons which will probably never be known, he deliberately broke it or chose to ignore it. The matter is somewhat complex, and each rule must be reconsidered in turn.

I. The Playwright's Purpose and Aim in Writing the Play:

1. The aim of the playwright is to recapture a vision for the stage and that vision must be a compromise between what is of immediate concern and interest to the playgoer and that which the playwright has that he wishes to put into words.

It was approximately 1933 before Anderson fully realized this rule. Up until that time he had written several plays, some of which were quite successful, but he had not had two successful plays in a row. The year
1933 saw two of his plays appear and succeed on Broadway: first, Both Your Houses, followed by Mary of Scotland. This double success would seem to indicate that Anderson had realized that the playwright must compromise in his selection and treatment of a particular vision that he writes as a play. Before this time several of the plays had obviously been written without much thought given to audience attitude toward a topic or a subject. Notable in this regard are Gods of the Lightning and Gypsy.

2. The choice of vision and the treatment of that vision must be deliberately constructed for a desired end, for a purely chance achievement is not an artistic one.

This rule seems to be one that Anderson followed throughout most of his career. It is only in the later plays that one feels that Anderson had forgotten many of his own rules. In the early stages of his playwrighting career a careful reader is able to see his progress as he writes each play. The play that seems to be the most slipshod in its construction is The Golden Six, Anderson's last play. Even What Price Glory?, the first successful play, seems to have more careful construction than does The Golden Six. Therefore, it is apparent that during the majority of his work Anderson followed the rules as he discovered them, or lacking them followed his intuition to the best of his ability in avoiding a mere chance success.

3. It is not the primary purpose or aim of poetry (or the theatre) to attempt to reorganize the scientific or practical world of men, it may be attempted but that is not its primary aim.
Two of Anderson's plays ignored this rule, *Gods of the Lightning* and *Both Your Houses*, and therefore one can assume that Anderson felt, if he did not fully realize all during his years in the theatre, that the theatre was not the place for pursuing such a reorganization.

4. The greatest achievement of man is poetic tragedy and, therefore, poetry is the best medium for the stage.

This rule Anderson realized even before he began writing for the stage, for he said that he wrote his first play, *White Desert*, in verse because he "... was weary of plays in prose that never lifted from the ground."² The fact that Anderson did not write all of his plays in verse does not mean that he did not believe in this rule; it merely indicates that he did not follow it all of the time.

5. In essence our drama must follow the pattern laid down by the Greeks in the core of meaning it has for the audience. Beginning with the plays written in the 1930's Anderson followed this rule. He followed it with particular care beginning in 1933 with *Mary of Scotland*. Prior to that time the leading characters were, for the most part, admirable people and acted in ways that show them to be better than they thought themselves to be, but a few were not. After that play and continuing until Anderson's dramatization *Bad Seed*, the characters in one fashion or another follow this rule closely.

6. The audience goes to the theatre to reaffirm its faith in itself and in mankind and, therefore, the play must follow this concept.

This rule seems to have been discovered and followed about the same time

²Ibid.
as those just mentioned. This is especially seen in the verse plays
that attempt to exalt men through the exalting influence of verse. Even
the prose plays after 1933 take on this task of attempting to exalt the
spirit of man. The exceptions again would be Bad Seed and The Golden Six.

8. Excellence on the stage is always moral excellence.

It seems that Anderson realized this rule after the failure of Gypsy in
1929. After that play the leading characters are moral people, or they
are attempting to become moral after falling from a position of excellence.
Anderson followed this rule, with the possible exception of Truckline Cafe,
until Bad Seed and The Golden Six.

9. The moral atmosphere of a play must be healthy.

This rule too seems to have been followed closely beginning with Elizabeth
the Queen in 1930. Up until that time Anderson's plays did not seem to
take any particular attitude toward a moral or an immoral atmosphere.

10. The theatre offers us criteria for judging what is evil
    and what is good in a man.

Again, beginning with Elizabeth the Queen, Anderson followed this rule in
the majority of his plays. Prior to that time the characters had been
shown in a restricted light and, therefore, the audience could not obtain
a clear view of them and of their actions. Exceptions to this rule after
1930 are Both Your Houses and The Golden Six.

II. The Structure of the Play:

1. The vision of the playwright that is to be recaptured for
   the stage must be checked carefully according to whatever
   intuition or rules the playwright has before it can become
   a successful play.
This rule Anderson seems to have recognized early in his playwrighting career, for from the time of *First Flight* and *The Buccaneer* until *The Golden Six*, the plays follow most of the rules that Anderson seems to have discovered at the time they were written.

2. Within this vision there must be a central scene or crisis wherein the leading character or hero makes a discovery that affects his thought, his action, and his emotions so greatly that his entire direction in the play is altered.

Anderson apparently realized by the end of the 1920's that a play should have a scene of crisis, but he did not make this scene central to the action of the play until *Winterset* in 1935. After that time, in each play there is such a scene of crisis until the last play, *The Golden Six*, where again the scene is not central to the play.

3. This discovery must come near the end of either the second act or the third act depending on whether it is a three or a five-act play.

*Winterset* is again the first play to place this discovery scene in the position described by Anderson. Prior to this play the discovery scene took place in the last act and usually in the final moments of the play.

4. The end result of this discovery is that in a tragedy the leading character suffers death as a result of his attempt to change or to correct a fault or an error in himself, in a serious play the hero goes through a lesser ordeal, but the pattern remains the same.

This rule Anderson began to use in *Elizabeth the Queen* in 1930 and continued to use it in the majority of the plays he wrote from that time on, however, with variations. In a few plays the characters suffer as a result of errors not their own. This is particularly true of *The Eve of St. Mark* and *Barefoot in Athens*. 
5. Comedy differs from tragedy in that it presents a happier scene and does not end in death for the leading character. Throughout his playwrighting career Anderson followed this rule in so far as no leading character is allowed to die in a play that is principally comic in nature. In the 1920's First Flight, The Buccaneer, Saturday's Children, and Outside Looking In are certainly not tragic in intent, but all have certain tragic overtones. Beginning in 1930, the plays display a more clearcut distinction in that the plays that are comic in nature do present a majority of happy scenes. Therefore, it seems that Anderson did not realize the full implication of his rule until about 1930.

6. The essential difference between a work that is comic in nature and a work that is tragic is in the attitude of the playwright toward man as he is and man when he will become better. Here once again Anderson seems to have realized this rule about the time he wrote Elizabeth the Queen. He followed this rule particularly in the plays written in verse, for there the plays take the attitude that man will become better but will not improve overnight and may, in time, be helped by something the playwright has said. The prose plays seem to expect man to improve more directly by what is seen on stage.

7. The play must deal with the inner life. External events are only symbolic of the struggle within. In the plays that he wrote himself, Anderson followed this rule throughout the entire series with the exception of Both Your Houses and The Golden Six. It seems probable that in his own work Anderson followed this rule intuitively until Both Your Houses. After that time it seems that he realized the importance of this rule and incorporated it into the rules he used consciously.
8. The story must be conflict between good and evil within a single person.

Again after 1930 Anderson followed this rule consistently with the exceptions of *Both Your Houses*, *Barefoot in Athens* and *The Golden Six*, with some variations depending upon the make-up of the leading character. If the leading character were drawn as being unaware or perhaps naive, this was the evil that caused the conflict, and if he were selfish or self-centered, this was the cause of conflict. In this way Anderson followed the rule.

9. The playwright must have something to say and take an attitude toward the world in which he lives.

Without exception Anderson followed this rule throughout the plays written after *First Flight* and *The Buccaneer* in 1925. After these two plays, two rather disastrous failures, Anderson seems to have fully realized this rule and followed it even to a certain extent in *The Golden Six*. *Bad Seed* does not follow this rule, but it is a dramatization and, therefore, not wholly Anderson's work.

10. A play is not expected to make ethical discoveries but it is expected to have a common denominator of belief with its audience.

With few exceptions Anderson followed this rule all during his career as a playwright. In the 1920's the major exception seems to have been *Gypsy*, and the other major exception seems to be *Truckline Cafe* in 1946. From this it would seem probable that Anderson fully realized this rule at approximately the time he wrote *Elizabeth the Queen* in 1930 and only misjudged his audience or ignored the rule in 1946.
III. The Leading Character of the Play:

1. The leading character cannot be a perfect man, he must have some variation of what Aristotle called the tragic fault, for he must emerge a better man at the end of the play than he was at the beginning.

The only leading character in any of Anderson's plays who appears not to need a change is Socrates in *Barefoot in Athens*. All of the others are drawn as being far from perfect. This much of the rule Anderson apparently realized from the beginning of his career as a playwright. The rest of the rule, that the character must emerge a better man at the conclusion than he was at the beginning, is not completely followed until 1935 and *Winterset*. This is the time when Anderson apparently fully recognized this rule in its entirety.

2. From the point of view of the playwright the essence of tragedy or of drama is the spiritual awakening or regeneration of the hero.

To an extent Anderson used this rule beginning with *Elizabeth the Queen* in 1930, insofar as each leading character does undergo some degree of awakening. However, *Winterset* is the first play to place this awakening early enough in the course of the play to allow the character sufficient time to undergo a major change. So it would seem that 1935 should also be cited as the time of realization for this rule.

3. The protagonist must represent the forces of good and must win, or if he be evil must accept the good and know himself defeated.

Nineteen Hundred and Thirty marks the clear beginning of the use of this rule. The plays that were wholly Anderson's before this time do not indicate a clear usage of this rule. After 1930 *Truckline Cafe* and The
Golden Six are the only plays that do not show with clarity good triumphing over evil.

4. The protagonist must be an exceptional person, or he must epitomize exceptional qualities. The single exception to this rule seems to be Truckline Cafe, but even here Anderson followed this rule to the extent that Anne shows the need of certain exceptional qualities by falling short of them. Therefore, Anderson followed this rule and apparently realized it throughout his dramatic work.

5. There are certain qualities which an audience admires on the stage: in a man, positive character and strength of conviction; in a woman, fidelity and passionate faith; and there are other qualities an audience always dislikes on the stage: in a man, cowardice and refusal to fight for a belief; in a woman, any inclination toward the Cressid.

After the failure of Gypsy, whose leading character does not follow this rule, Anderson seems to have realized this rule, for he followed it faithfully in all of the plays that came thereafter. Even Anne in Truckline Cafe who had been unfaithful previously is shown as faithful during the course of the play and determined, apparently, to remain so. Therefore one can safely assume that Anderson realized this rule and followed it after 1929.

Throughout the discussion of the plays Anderson wrote, two items which might be regarded as rules appear, but which Anderson did not include nor discuss as such. The first of these appeared in the play Gods of the Lightning. In this play two of the leading characters do not even appear in the third and final act, and the majority of the action of this third act is carried on by minor characters. This technique does not
occur in any other play discussed in this study. Therefore, it would seem to be a rule that the leading character or characters must carry the burden of the action throughout the course of the play once they have been introduced; if not, the play is weakened.

The second item that might be considered an additional rule is seen in connection with *Storm Operation*. In this play the exposition did not inform the audience about the backgrounds of the leading characters. These people seemed, therefore, to exist only in the play and did not become real or identifiable to the audience. The rule could therefore be that the exposition of a play must inform the audience sufficiently about the backgrounds or previous lives of the leading characters so that the audience can identify with these characters and impart to them a feeling of reality.

These omissions from the particular plays seem to have been, at least partially, responsible for weakening that play's structure. And, therefore, they could be regarded as further rules that Anderson used but did not articulate as such.

From the discussion carried on in this study, it seems fairly conclusive that Anderson's rules carried some validity for him and his plays, for when these rules were followed with imagination but not slavishly, the majority of the time the play was successful at least commercially. And when in the later years of his dramatic endeavors Anderson ignored a substantial number of these rules, those plays were not successful
commercially. Therefore, it seems quite obvious that these rules could have some validity for other playwrights who have talent and imagination, particularly if one were to follow them in a general sense and adapt them to the individual circumstances and individual needs.
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Anderson's Plays and When They Appeared

White Desert, a drama in a prologue and four acts.
Produced by Brock Pemberton at the Princess Theatre, New York.
Opened October 18, 1923 and ran for 12 performances.
Unpublished.

What Price Glory? (with Laurence Stallings), a play in three acts.
Produced by Arthur Hopkins at the Plymouth Theatre, New York.
Opened September 3, 1924 and ran for 299 performances.
Published in Three American Plays, Anderson and Stallings,

Outside Looking In (based on Jim Tully's novel Beggars of Life), a
drama in three acts.
Produced by Jones, Macgowan and O'Neill at the Greenwich Village
Theatre, New York.
Opened September 7, 1925 and ran for 113 performances.
Published in Gods of the Lightning and Outside Looking In

First Flight (with Laurence Stallings), a play in three acts.
Produced by Arthur Hopkins at the Plymouth Theatre, New York.
Opened September 17, 1925 and ran for 12 performances.
Published in Three American Plays.

The Buccaneer (with Laurence Stallings), a play in three acts.
Produced by Arthur Hopkins at the Plymouth Theatre, New York.
Opened October 2, 1925 and ran for 20 performances.
Published in Three American Plays.

Chicot the King, a play in three acts.
Unproduced and unpublished.
Copyright 1926.

Saturday's Children, a comedy in three acts.
Produced by The Actor's Theatre, Inc. at the Booth Theatre,
New York. Opened January 26, 1927 and ran for a total of 326
performances. Published New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1926.
Gods of the Lightning (with Harold Hickerson), a play in three acts.
Produced by Macfadden and Gary at the Little Theatre, New York.
Opened October 24, 1928 and ran for 28 performances.
Published in Gods of the Lightning and Outside Looking In.

Gypsy, a drama in three acts.
Produced by Richard Herndon at the Klaw Theatre, New York.
Opened on January 14, 1929 and ran for 64 performances.
Published in condensed form only in Best Plays of 1928-29,

The Marriage Recipe, a play in one act.
Unpublished and apparently unproduced.
Copyright 1929.

Elizabeth the Queen, a drama in three acts.
Produced by The Theatre Guild, Inc. at the Guild Theatre, New York.
Opened November 3, 1930 and ran for 147 performances.
Published New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1930.

Night Over Taos, a drama in two acts.
Produced by the Group Theatre, Inc. at the 48th Street Theatre,
New York.
Opened March 9, 1932 and ran for 13 performances.
Published New York: Samuel French, 1932.

Sea Wife, a folk drama in three acts.
Produced by the University Theatre at Scott Hall, University
of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Opened December 6, 1932 for a run of three performances.
Unpublished, manuscript in New York Public Library.

The Princess Renegade, a play in three acts.
Unproduced and unpublished.
Copyright 1932.

Both Your Houses, a play in three acts.
Produced by The Theatre Guild, Inc., at the Royale Theatre,
New York.
Opened March 6, 1933 and ran for 120 performances.
Published New York: Samuel French, 1933.

Mary of Scotland, a play in three acts.
Produced by The Theatre Guild, Inc. at the Alvin Theatre,
New York.
Opened November 27, 1933 and ran for 248 performances.
Published Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, 1934.
Valley Forge, a play in three acts.
Produced by The Theatre Guild, Inc. at the Guild Theatre, New York.
Opened December 10, 1934 and ran for 58 performances.

Winterset, a play in three acts.
Produced by Guthrie McClintic at the Martin Beck Theatre, New York.
Opened September 25, 1935 and ran for a total of 195 performances.

The Wingless Victory, a play in three acts.
Produced by Katherine Cornell at the Empire Theatre, New York.
Opened December 23, 1936 and ran for 110 performances.

High Tor, a comedy in three acts.
Produced by Guthrie McClintic at the Martin Beck Theatre, New York.
Opened January 7, 1937 and ran for 171 performances.

The Masque of Kings, a tragedy in three acts.
Produced by The Theatre Guild, Inc. at the Shubert Theatre, New York.
Opened February 8, 1937 and ran for 89 performances.

The Feast of Ortolans, a play in one act written especially for radio.
Produced over the Blue Network of the National Broadcasting System.
Performed September 20, 1937.
Published New York: Dramatists Play Service, 1938.

The Star-Wagon, a play in three acts.
Produced by Guthrie McClintic at the Empire Theatre, New York.
Opened September 29, 1937 and ran for 223 performances.

The Bastion Saint Gervais, a play in one act for stage or radio.
Unproduced and unpublished.
Copyright 1938.

Knickerbocker Holiday, a musical comedy in two acts, written to be set
to the music of Kurt Weill.
Produced by the Playwrights' Company at the Ethel Barrymore Theatre
New York.
Opened October 19, 1938 and ran for 168 performances.
Key Largo, a play in a prologue and two acts.
Produced by the Playwrights' Company at the Ethel Barrymore Theatre, New York.
Opened November 27, 1939 and ran for 105 performances.

Journey to Jerusalem, a play in three acts.
Produced by the Playwrights' Company at the National Theatre, New York.
Opened October 5, 1940 and ran for 17 performances.
Published Washington, D. C.: Anderson House, 1940.

Second Overture, a play in one act.
Published New York: Dramatists Play Service, Inc., 1940.

The Miracle of the Danube, a one-act play for stage and radio.
Produced on The Free Company Series for Columbia Broadcasting System, 1941.
Published in The Best One-Act Plays of 1941, Margaret Mayorga, ed., New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1942.

Candle in the Wind, a play in three acts.
Produced by The Theatre Guild, and the Playwrights' Company at the Shubert Theatre, New York.
Opened October 22, 1941 and ran for 95 performances.

Your Navy, a half-hour radio play, music by Kurt Weill.
Broadcast in March, 1942, directed by Norman Corwin.
Published in This is War! New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1942.

The Eve of St. Mark, a play in two acts.
Produced by the Playwrights' Company at the Cort Theatre, New York.
Opened October 7, 1942 and ran for 307 performances.

Storm Operation, a play in a prologue, two acts and an epilogue.
Produced by the Playwrights' Company at the Belasco Theatre, New York.
Opened January 11, 1944 and ran for 23 performances.

The Greeks Remember Marathon, a radio play.
Unpublished.
Copyright 1944.

Letter to Jackie, a play in one act.
Published in The Best One Act Plays of 1943, Margaret Mayorga, ed., New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1944.
Truckline Cafe, a play in three acts.
Produced by Clurman and Kazan in association with the Playwrights's Company at the Belasco Theatre, New York.
Opened February 27, 1946 and ran for 13 performances.
Unpublished manuscript in possession of Dramatists Play Service, Inc.

Joan of Lorraine, a play in two acts.
Produced by the Playwrights' Company at the Alvin Theatre, New York.
Opened November 18, 1946 and ran for 199 performances.

Anne of the Thousand Days, a play in two acts.
Produced by the Playwrights' Company and Leland Hayward at the Shubert Theatre, New York.
Opened December 8, 1948 and ran for over 262 performances.

Lost in the Stars (dramatization of Alan Paton's novel, Cry, the Beloved Country), a play with music in two acts, music by Kurt Weill.
Produced by the Playwrights' Company at the Music Box Theatre, New York.
Opened October 30, 1949 and ran for 281 performances.

Barefoot in Athens, a play in two acts.
Produced by the Playwrights' Company at the Martin Beck Theatre, New York.
Opened October 21, 1951 and ran for 29 performances.

Bad Seed (dramatization of William March's novel, The Bad Seed), a play in two acts.
Produced by the Playwrights' Company at the 46th Street Theatre, New York.
Opened December 8, 1954 and ran for 334 performances.
Published New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1955.

The Golden Six, a play in two acts.
Produced by Warner LeRoy and Norman Twain at the York Playhouse, New York.
Opened October 26, 1958 and ran for 17 performances.
VITA

Randall John Buchanan was born in Venice, Sevier County, Utah on May 15, 1930, the son of Boyd and Catherine Boyer Buchanan. He received his early education in the public schools of Venice and Richfield, Utah and graduated from Richfield High School in 1948. He received his B.A. degree from Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah in June, 1954. He spent two years in the US Army and returned to Brigham Young University and completed his M.A. degree in August, 1958 from Brigham Young University. In September, 1958 he began work on the Ph.D. degree at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
Candidate: Randall John Buchanan

Major Field: Speech

Title of Thesis: Maxwell Anderson's Rules of Playwriting and their Application to his Plays.

Approved:

[Signature]
Major Professor and Chairman

[Signature]
Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

[Signature]
W. J. [Last Name]

[Signature]
Clinton W. [Last Name]

Date of Examination:

January 14, 1964