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"Henry James On Stage" investigates James as a source of drama. The study embraces James's own plays, and all later dramatisations of his works by other playwrights, which have been produced in New York and in London.

In 1949, The Complete Plays of Henry James, edited by Leon Edel, was published. The present investigator is indebted to Edel's work for James's play texts, for information on their writing, and for details of productions up until 1949. New material in the present study includes an account of productions of James's plays since 1949; an analysis of James's development as a playwright based on his scripts; and an examination of James's own dramatisations, for the purpose of discovering what he did with narrative material when changing it into dramatic form, or vice versa.

To date, nine of James's plays have been professionally produced, although only five were staged during his lifetime. None achieved real success. This study includes a digest of selected critics' reviews.

James's fifteen plays were analysed in four ways: script format; subject and treatment; literary aspects; and stageability. His plays were highly conventional; mostly comedies; with upper class characters, whose language was often complex, and un lifelike. James wrote for the
proscenium stage: his mechanics were often evident, but his understand-
ing of staging gradually improved. His settings were always playable.
In the later plays, James used long stage directions as an outlet for
his comments.

James's plays included seven dramatizations. James dealt freely
with the events, the characters, and the dialogue of the original sto-
ries, only one of which came from another author. He deliberately gave
happy endings to his earlier dramatizations—including Daisy Miller.

In the fifty years since James's death (1916-1966), New York and
London have seen productions of thirteen plays and two operas based on
James's works. This study includes a digest of selected critics' re-
views.

The operas, Benjamin Britten's The Turn of the Screw, and
Douglas Moore's The Wings of the Dove, were not analyzed.

All thirteen of the dramatizations were minutely examined.
Eight dramatizations have been published: John L. Balderston's Berkeley
Square; Hubert Griffith's The Tragic Muse; Ruth and Augustus Goetz's
The Heiress; William Archibald's The Innocents; Dodie Smith's Letter
From Paris; Guy Bolton's Child of Fortune; Michael Redgrave's The
Aspern Papers; and Christopher Taylor's The Wings of the Dove.

Manuscripts of the five unpublished dramatizations were borrowed
from four British and American playwrights. These unpublished plays
were Allan Turpin's The Turn of the Screw, and The Aspern Papers;
William Archibald's Portrait of a Lady; Randolph Carter's Eugenia; and
Bertram Greene's The Summer of Daisy Miller.
Ten Jamesian works provided the bases for the thirteen plays, and two playwrights dramatized James twice. Each dramatization was analyzed in four ways: Staging; The handling of James's material; Items gained; and Items lost.

Generally, the playwrights stayed close to James's intent, but there were some changes in emphasis. Fidelity to James's dialogue varied greatly. Only The Summer of Daisy Miller preserved James's point-of-view method, and it alone employed unrealistic settings.

Judged by the length of the run, five of the dramatizations were successful (with over one hundred performances each), and eight of the dramatizations failed.

There seems to have been no pattern in the success or failure of the dramatizations. Neither depended on the Jamesian work chosen; on the proportion of James's dialogue which was retained; on the period of the original writing; or, to any significant extent, on the playwright's previous experience. There is adequate proof that James's works can be successfully dramatized, when the right playwright chooses the right Jamesian material.
INTRODUCTION

"Henry James On Stage" is a study of James as a source of drama. The purpose of the study is to attempt to bring together in one work a complete account of all of the plays which have stemmed directly, or at second hand, from James's genius. Included in the study is an analysis of James's development as a playwright, an examination of his plays as scripts, and a history of their productions. This is followed by an account of all of the stage adaptations of James's works by other playwrights which have been professionally produced either in New York or in London during the fifty years since the novelist's death (1916-1966). An examination is made of the relationships between the original Jamesian works and the later dramatisations by other writers.

In all, Henry James completed a total of fifteen plays and one dramatic monologue. Only eight of the plays were published during his lifetime, but all of the author's dramatic works were collected and published in 1949, in The Complete Plays of Henry James, edited by Leon Edel. In that work, Professor Edel, of New York University, has given an account of the writing of the plays, and of their productions up until the date of the publication of the collection. The present

---

study goes a step further by analysing the plays as scripts, and in tracing James's development as a playwright on that technical basis.²

In addition, the present investigation includes a brief account of professional productions of James's plays in more recent years.

It is believed by the present researcher that this is the first time that a study has been made which embraces both James's own plays and dramatisations, as well as all of the dramatisations by other playwrights which have been based on James's fictional works.³

In the fifty years since James's death, there have been thirteen dramatisations of his works by other playwrights which have been

²Dr. Leon Edel, and other critical commentators, have made general observations about the differences between James's early and late plays. However, no play by play analysis ever seems to have been made of the scripts from a practical, theatrical standpoint.

³There have been some unpublished studies which have investigated other generally related problems. These include Glenn Meredith Loney's "Dramatisations of American Novels: 1900-1917" (Ph. D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1954); Stephen Foster Elliston's "Dramatic and Narrative Art: Studies of Dramatisations on the New York Stage, 1919-1958" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1959); and Thomas Henry Napieciniski's "The Dramatisation of the American Serious Novel 1926-1952" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1959). In addition, there was a dissertation, written in 1960 at Louisiana State University, by August William Staub, entitled, "The Subjective Perspective: Aspects of Point of View in Modern Drama." Two of these studies included an examination of The Heiress, by Ruth and Augustus Goets—based on Henry James's novel, Washington Square. Elliston pointed out that there was a contrast between the purposes and methods of James and those of the Goetses, and that the emphasis of the original story had been changed. Napieciniski felt that the Goetses had simplified James's novel. No other dramatisations of James's works were examined in any of these four studies.
presented on the stage in New York or in London. In addition to the thirteen plays, two operatic works have been based on James.\textsuperscript{4}

Of the thirteen dramatisations by other playwrights based on James, only eight have been published: Berkeley Square by John L. Balderston, The Tragic Muse by Hubert Griffith, The Heiress by Ruth and Augustus Goets, The Innocents by William Archibald, Letter From Paris by Dodie Smith, Child of Fortune by Guy Bolton, The Aspern Papers by Michael Redgrave, and The Wings of the Dove by Christopher Taylor.\textsuperscript{5}

The writer of the present study has been extraordinarily fortunate in being able to locate the authors of the other five professionally produced dramatisations. In every case, the playwrights were most cooperative: each one was willing to lend the researcher a typed manuscript of his unpublished play, and each playwright gave the researcher permission to quote from his manuscript as she saw fit.

The unpublished plays which were examined in manuscript form, and their authors, were The Turn of the Screw and The Aspern Papers—both by Allan Turpin of London, England; Portrait of a Lady by William Archibald

\textsuperscript{4}The number of dramatisations and operas has been confirmed by Paul R. Reynolds, Inc., of New York, the literary agents for James's estate.

\textsuperscript{5}The published plays are listed in the chronological order in which they were produced.
of New York (who corresponded from Paris); *Eugenia* by Randolph Carter of New York; and *The Summer of Daisy Miller* by Bertram Greene of New York.6

In addition to correspondence with the authors of the five unpublished dramatisations, the present investigator received helpful information in a charming letter from the octogenarian Guy Bolton, author of the play, *Child of Fortune* (based on James's *The Wings of the Dove*). Another correspondent who was thoughtfully helpful was Donald G. Brian of Ardmore, Pennsylvania. Mr. Brian is a collector of Jamesiana, and a friend of Leon Edel's. Correspondence with Mr. Brian was suggested by Edna Cahill of Baker's Plays, Inc., of Boston, whose helpful spirit went far beyond anything dictated by professional duties. The most helpful and authoritative correspondent of all was Dr. Leon Edel of New York University (editor of *The Complete Plays of Henry James*). Professor Edel took time out from his heavy schedule to answer several otherwise unanswerable questions, and to offer suggestions for other sources of information.

The materials of the present study have been organised in the following manner.

The first four chapters are devoted to James. Chapter I gives a brief overview of James and the theatre: his boyhood introduction to the theatre, and his lifelong playgoing habits. Chapter II presents a history of James's playwriting career, including the earliest plays, his first produced play, some published plays, and later plays and

---

6 The unpublished dramatisations are listed in the chronological order in which they were produced.
productions. The text of the chapter ends with a report on recent productions of James's plays. Included in Chapter II is a digest of available literary and dramatic critics' reviews of James's published or produced plays. In Chapter III, an analysis is made of James's plays as scripts, for the purpose of showing how James's playwriting technique developed. His plays are examined in four ways: script format; subject and treatment; literary aspects; and stageability. In Chapter IV, an examination is made of James's own dramatisations, for the purpose of discovering what James himself did with material when transposing it from narrative into dramatic form, or vice versa.

The last two chapters of the study are devoted to dramatisations based on James's works, and written by other playwrights. Chapter V gives an account of all of the professional productions of the dramatisations which have been produced either in New York or in London. It is divided into three sections: plays produced in New York; plays produced in London; and operas based on James's works. Included in Chapter V are details about the productions, and a digest of available critics' reviews. In Chapter VI, an examination is made of the relationships between the original Jamesian works and each of the thirteen dramatisations by other writers. In order to present a complete picture of the growth which led to the final dramatic version of the work, each section in Chapter VI recounts the sources of James's story ideas (when they are known), outlines the plot of the original story or novel, and then presents an analysis of the playscript in order to show what the playwright did with James's material when translating it into stage terms.
Two tables are included in the study. Table I, at the end of Chapter II, "A History of James's Playwriting Efforts," shows basic data about each of James's plays: its title; when it was written; whether or not it was published (prior to its inclusion in Leon Edel's Complete Plays of Henry James); and whether or not it was produced—with the number of performances, when available.

Table II, at the end of Chapter V, "Productions of Dramatisations by Other Writers in New York and London," shows essential data pertaining to the productions of dramatisations by other playwrights: the title of the play; the novel or story by James on which the play was based; whether or not the play was published; and the date of the production—either in New York or in London, with the number of performances, when available.

In the Conclusion to the present study, a summary of the findings is presented. It is noted that while James himself never achieved any real success in writing for the stage, five of the thirteen dramatisations based on his works by other writers have been very successful. An attempt is made in the Conclusion to discover whether the success or failure of the thirteen dramatisations by other playwrights can be traced to the Jamesian work selected; to the period of James's writing to which the original work belonged; to the proportion of James's dialogue which was retained; or to the previous experience of the playwright.

At the end of the study may be found the bibliography and two appendixes. Appendix A provides biographical notes on the principal actors in the first professionally produced play written by Henry James.
Appendix B presents biographical notes on the later playwrights and composers who have dramatised Henry James's fictional works.

The information in the present study has been limited to some extent. Every effort has been made to include data on all major productions of Henry James's plays in England and in America. However, data on dramatisations of James's works by other writers has been limited by two criteria: (1) the play must have been professionally produced; and (2) the play must have been performed on the stage either in New York, or in London.

There has been no attempt to include adaptations of James which have been used in the films, on television, or on the radio.

7 A single exception was the inclusion of Allan Turpin's one-act play, The Aspern Papers. Turpin wrote two one-act plays designed as a double bill, and both were based on James. Both plays were presented by an amateur club in New York, but only one of the plays, The Turn of the Screw, has been professionally produced (London, 1946).

8 Other productions which have come to the attention of the present researcher include Henry James's play, Disengaged, which was produced by an amateur group, the Idler Players, at Radcliffe College, in 1950. At about the same date (1950), the Epson Drama Group, in Epson, England, produced a two-act play called The Sculptor, by Edward Thompson, which was based on James's novel, Roderick Hudson. (Information obtained from undated programs lent to the writer of the present study by Dr. Leon Edel of New York University. The date for the Radcliffe production was supplied by the Radcliffe College Library.)

La Bête dans La Jungle opened in Paris, at the Théâtre Athénée, on September 21, 1962. Adapted from James's story, The Beast in the Jungle, the play, by James Lord and Marguerite Duras, was in two acts, and six scenes. The production was reviewed in Variety [New York], October 3, 1962.

9 Successful films have been made of Berkeley Square (in more than one version), The Heiress, and The Innocents. Television versions have been seen of The Heiress and of The Turn of the Screw (both in more than one version), and also of The Wings of the Dove. One television version of "The Turn of the Screw" has been published in Visit to a Small Planet and Other Television Plays, by Gore Vidal (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1956). Radio adaptations include James's Four Meetings, The Spoils of Poynton, and Daisy Miller.
CHAPTER I
JAMES AND THE THEATRE

Henry James was born in New York City on April 15, 1843. Among his earliest memories were recollections of being taken to the theatres of Manhattan at the age of eight or nine. At that time, he witnessed performances at Brougham's Lyceum—later called Wallack's Theatre, at the Broadway, at Niblo's Gardens, and at other theatres.¹ Plays by Shakespeare and Goldsmith, stage arrangements of Dickens, and plays that have never been heard of again, passed in a golden haze before his eyes.²

When Henry was twelve years old, the James family went to Europe, where they remained, except for a fifteen-month sojourn back in the States, until Henry was well over seventeen.³ James's teen-age

---


² What these plays meant to James as an old man, in retrospect, is told in the pages of his autobiographical work, A Small Boy and Others. James's memory was not always accurate, however. A straightforward chronological account of James's boyhood (his early travels, and his early theatre experiences) may be found in Henry James: The Untried Years by Leon Edel (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1953), pp. 100-102, and 127-129.

³ In his autobiographical writings, Henry James deliberately covered over the temporary return made by the James family to the States. James's reasons, and a chronological explanation and proof
memories, then, were of Europe: of European schools and tutors, and of European theatres. The Janes family moved every few months, and Henry lived in London, Paris, Geneva, Boulogne, and other European cities. In Boulogne, one of James's schoolfellows was a boy with an upturned nose, who was to become in later years the famous actor, Coquelin.\(^4\)

In 1860, the Janeses sailed home, never again as a group to stir forth. After two more short stays in Europe (1869-1870, and 1872-1873), Henry decided to expatriate himself. After a year in Paris (1875), James made his permanent home in England.\(^5\) From then on, England was Henry James's base of operations, with frequent trips to the Continent, and rare visits back to the States.

Throughout his life, James was an inveterate theatregoer. He was by no means a silent critic in the stalls, and there are a number of amusing anecdotes about James's behavior at the theatre, which may be found in Simon Nowell-Smith's \textit{The Legend of the Master}.\(^6\) At the theatre, James was often accompanied by such well-known people as James

\footnotesize

of the facts, may be found in the first volume of Leon Edel's biography of James, \textit{Henry James: The Untried Years} (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1953), pp. 137-138.

\(^4\)James, \textit{A Small Boy and Others}, p. 41(1).


Russell Lowell,\textsuperscript{7} Edith Wharton,\textsuperscript{8} Alfred Sutro,\textsuperscript{9} Hugh Walpole,\textsuperscript{10} Fanny Kemble,\textsuperscript{11} or Elisabeth Robins.\textsuperscript{12}

James was a public critic of the theatre as well as a private one. He put to use his vast acquaintance with the drama in the many essays on plays, playwrights, and actors which he submitted to magazines and newspapers of the day. These essays, stretching from 1872 to 1901, were collected by Allan Wade and published in 1948 under the title, \textit{The Scenic Art}.

James's personal attitude toward the theatre was full of contradictions. He was a devoted playgoer, and yet he despised the conditions of the theatre. He was attracted by the difficulties of writing in dramatic form,\textsuperscript{13} but he abhorred the playwright's market place. Playwriting was a "damnable little art,"\textsuperscript{14} and a "most unholy trade."\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{7}At one time (1872), James went regularly to the Théâtre Français "in company with James Russell Lowell." See Allan Wade, \textit{The Scenic Art} (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1948), p. xili.

\textsuperscript{8}Nowell-Smith, op. cit., pp. 70-71. \textsuperscript{9}Ibid., pp. 71-72.

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., p. 71. \textsuperscript{11}Wade, \textit{The Scenic Art}, p. xvii.


\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 15.
James was repulsed by actors—as people,\textsuperscript{16} and by the stupidity of audiences.\textsuperscript{17} Nevertheless, the drama, as contrasted to the theatre, was to James a "divine little difficult, artistic, ingenious, architectural FORM . . . ."\textsuperscript{18}

Although James had published three little playlets when he was in his twenties, he apparently made no effort to obtain a production until he dramatized his story, \textit{Daisy Miller}, in 1882—when he was nearly forty years old.\textsuperscript{19} At that time, James wrote in his notebooks that playwriting was an old and "cherished" dream,\textsuperscript{20} but when he failed to obtain a production for \textit{Daisy Miller}, he abandoned playwriting for eight years. In 1890, James embarked on five years of intensive playwriting, and two of his plays received professional productions during this period.\textsuperscript{21}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16}"Three Unpublished Letters and a Monologue by Henry James," \textit{London Mercury}, VI, No. 35 (September, 1922), 492-495.
\item \textsuperscript{17}James, "A Most Unholy Trade," pp. 14-15.
\item \textsuperscript{19}Details about the three early plays, \textit{Pyramus and Thisbe, Still Waters, and A Change of Heart}, and about the \textit{Daisy Miller} dramatization, may be found at the beginning of Chapter II, in the present study. (Two of the early pieces were produced by theatre clubs in London, in the 1950's. Information on these posthumous productions may be found at the end of Chapter II.)
\item \textsuperscript{20}Matthiessen and Murdock, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 37.
\item \textsuperscript{21}The American was produced in 1891, and \textit{Guy Domville} was produced in 1895. Other Jamesian plays written in the 1890's were produced years later, and still others reached the boards after James's death. Details of these productions may be found in Chapter II of the present study.
\end{itemize}
Although James felt by 1895 that he had mastered the "whole stiff mystery of 'technique,'" he gave up playwriting for another long interval. It was not until 1907 that he began again. This time James wrote four plays in three years: of these plays, two were produced within a short time, and one soon after his death.

Theodora Bosanquet, who was James's secretary for many years, wrote of the author's predilection for drama,

The theatre had both allured and repelled him for many years. . . . His assertions that he wrote plays solely in the hope of making money should not, I think, be taken as the complete explanation of his dramas. It is pretty clear that he wrote plays because he wanted to write them, because he was convinced that his instinct for dramatic situations could find a happy outlet in plays, because writing for the stage is a game rich in precise rules and he delighted in the multiplication of technical difficulties, and because he lived in circles more addicted to the intelligent criticism of plays than to the intelligent criticism of novels.

It is possible, as his secretary suggested, that the "circles" which James moved in may have fed his desire to write plays. It is known, for instance, that James used to read his plays sometimes to his friends; he read the script of Daisy Miller to Mrs. John L. Gardner of

22 Lubbock, op. cit., I, 235.
23 The High Bid was produced by Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson in London, in 1909; The Saloon was seen there in 1911; and The Outcry was given two performances by the Stage Society in 1917—the year following James's death.
Boston, he read Mrs. Vibert (later retitled Tenants) to Elizabeth Robins; and he read The Saloon to Edith Wharton.

In summary, it may be said that James was an inveterate playgoer from early boyhood on. In his teen-age years, he was introduced to the theatres of Europe. He became a theatre critic with strong opinions and high standards, and he contributed many essays on the theatre to current magazines and newspapers. His personal attitude toward the theatre was full of contradictions: he admired the written form of drama, but he despised the conditions of the theatre.

As a practicing playwright, James had several distinct periods of writing plays. The first period was in his early twenties, and it was insignificant. When he was nearly forty, James dramatized his story, Daisy Miller, but it remained unproduced. Then, from 1890 to 1895, James went through a period of intensive playwriting, and several of his plays were produced. Another period of playwriting followed after a long interval. This time, James wrote four plays between 1907 and 1909: three of them were produced within the decade.

Various reasons have been put forward to explain why James wrote plays. Frederick W. Dupee has suggested that James turned to playwriting

---

25 Matthiessen and Murdock, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

26 Robins, *op. cit.*, p. 61. (There was no question of Miss Robins appearing in the play, for James felt that she was not old enough to play the leading role. The reading, then, was an act of friendship.)

in times of crisis, "His turning to the theatre for a quick and conspicuous success was . . . a distress signal." Dupee saw James's playwriting as a psychological "storm signal advertising a mood of exhaustion and uncertainty following a productive period of novelwriting. . . . Only at times of apparent failure did the question of compensation really come up for him . . . ."

Certainly, James indicated frequently in his correspondence that he wrote plays in order to make money, because his books failed to sell. Interestingly, some of his letters to Robert Louis Stevenson not only proclaimed James's pecuniary need, but they also suggested a certain shame in the need to turn for success to a lower form of art—the drama. Perhaps the simple explanation of James's secretary is the true one, "he wrote plays because he wanted to write them . . . ."


29Ibid., p. 167.

30Lubbock, op. cit., I, 162, and 179-181.

31Ibid., I, 177, and 182.

32Bosanquet, op. cit., p. 20.
CHAPTER II

A HISTORY OF JAMES'S PLAYWRITING EFFORTS

The purpose of the present chapter is to recount the history of James's playwriting efforts, and to trace with particular care what happened to those plays which achieved productions. Information is provided about the process of the writing of each play, its growth, its eventual plot, and whether or not it was published. Most of the later plays were submitted to theatrical managements, and five were produced during James's lifetime. Two were produced soon after his death, and four (including two revivals) were produced relatively recently.¹

In some cases, a few facts are known about revisions which James made at the request of the various theatre managements. Also included is what is known about casting difficulties, and about rehearsals of James's plays. The dates and places of important performances are given, and also a digest of available reviews.

Although the history of James's playwriting may be found in Leon Edel's The Complete Plays of Henry James, primary sources have been consulted for the material in the present study—except where specific credit is given to Professor Edel's distinguished work.²

¹Only regular professional productions, or those given by London's theatre clubs, have been included in the present chapter.

Edel's *Complete Plays*, the history of the writing of James's plays is scattered in twenty-one editorial prefaces or forewords, as well as in the general introduction to the work. The present study provides in a single chapter the same general data about the writing of James's plays, and it extends the history of their productions up until the present time.

For the purposes of the present chapter, the development of James as a playwright has been divided into five sections: I. The Writing of the Early Plays; II. The First Production; III. Four Published Plays; IV. More Plays and Productions (including some posthumous productions); and V. Recent Productions.

Table I, at the end of this chapter, shows the titles of James's plays; the approximate date when each was written; whether or not James published it; and whether or not it was produced—with the number of performances, when available.

I. THE WRITING OF THE EARLY PLAYS

**Pyramus and Thisbe**

Early in February, 1869, Henry James sailed to England and began a European stay that lasted for fourteen months.\(^4\) At some time before

\(^3\)All fifteen of James's plays, and one dramatic monologue were published in 1949 in Leon Edel's *Complete Plays of Henry James*. In addition, that work included fragments of an unfinished play, The Chaperon.

leaving the United States, he had left a play manuscript with *Galaxy* magazine. In April of that year, the magazine published *Pyramus and Thisbe*, a light comedy in one act, by Henry James. As far as it is known, this playlet, written at the age of twenty-six, was the first dramatic piece by James to appear in print.

In a letter to Henry, dated March 22, 1869, William James referred to an advertisement which gave notice of Henry's forthcoming "dialogue" in the April *Galaxy*. William added a postscript to his letter,

P.S. *Galaxy* got yesterday [sig], and your thing reads very well. Better than when you read it to me. Father says, "Harry has decidedly got a gift."

The little play tells the story of Catherine West and Stephen Young, who are neighbors in an apartment house. Catherine is a music teacher, and Stephen is a journalist. Until the action of the play begins, the couple have never met. Stephen annoys Miss West with his late and loud conversations, and with the smell of pipe tobacco which constantly drifts into her room. She annoys him with the sound of her music. As the play opens, the couple meet each other face to face for the first time, and they quarrel about his smoking, and about her noisy music. Then their landlord sends them a letter stating that he has sold the building, and that it will be necessary for them to move. Catherine and Stephen agree to join forces in hunting for new living

---


6 Perry, *op. cit.*, 1, 294.
quarters. The play ends with their discovery that they really can get along together after all, and a budding romance is obviously underway. 7

The title of this first play, Pyramus and Thisbe, alludes to the wall between the neighboring apartments, and it is based on Shakespeare's A Midsummer Night's Dream.

Despite its somewhat stiff dialogue, the play has a certain charm. It has moments of neatly expressed simple philosophy, but, unfortunately, it has a weak, contrived ending.

Still Waters

James returned to Cambridge in April of 1870. The following spring, a group of Boston ladies staged a fair in aid of French victims of the Franco-Prussian war. It was decided that a little paper should appear daily at the fair, and literary figures of the area were invited to make contributions. 8 On April 12, 1871, in the second of the six numbers of the Balloon Post, a one-act play by Henry James was printed. The title of the play was Still Waters. 9

This second play was ostensibly a comedy, but it had a note of sadness running through it. The plot has a recognizably Jamesian touch

---

7Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 74-84.
8Ibid., p. 87.
9Still Waters first appeared in the Balloon Post, No. II (April 12, 1871), pp. 6-10. It was later reprinted in The Dial of the Old South Clock (Boston), II, Nos. 4 and 5 (December 8 and 9, 1879). See Edel and Laurence, A Bibliography of Henry James, p. 269.
in its partially unresolved ending.10 Whether the play's note of 
maturity and sadness can be connected with the recent death of James's 
cousin, Mary Temple, can only be conjectured about.11

The title, Still Waters, seems to refer to one of the charac-
ters, Horace. The plot, too, runs deeper in its ramifications than 
may at first appear. There are three characters in the play: Horace, 
Emma, and Felix. "Little" Horace, who secretly loves Emma, perceives 
that she is unhappy because of Felix's indifference. Horace reveals 
to Felix that the girl is in love with him, and he tells him in such a 
way as to play upon Felix's vanity. The result is that Felix sees Emma 
for the lovely modest girl that she is, and he declares his love to 
her.

The end of Still Waters leaves the reader wondering if the 
match is not a mistake. Felix appears to be shallow, and a bit of a 
cad, and so it seems as though the wrong corners of the triangle have 
been joined.

10 The text of "Still Waters" which was reprinted in Edel's Com-
plete Plays of Henry James was taken from the copy of the Balloon Post 
in the Library of Congress. (Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, 
p. 87.)

11 Mary Temple, James's cousin, died early in 1870. Over forty 
years later, James recorded that the event had marked the end of his 
youth. The story of Mary Temple's long illness and death is told in 
detail in the final chapter of James's Notes of a Son and Brother. See 
Frederick W. Dupee (ed.), Henry James: Autobiography (A Small Boy and 
Others; Notes of a Son and Brother; The Middle Years), New York: Cri-

Mary ("Minnie") Temple served as a model for Milly Theale in 
James's 1902 novel, The Wings of the Dove. The novel eventually served 
as the basis for dramatizations by Guy Bolton, and by Christopher Tay-
lor, and also for an opera by Douglas Moore. (Details of the dramati-
sations and of the opera may be found in Chapters V and VI of the 
present study.)
In this partially unhappy ending to a love triangle problem, James foreshadowed some of his later works. In *Still Waters* a potential love-match is spoiled by Horace's timidity. In the play, *Guy Domville*, written over twenty years later, the possible happiness of Frank Humber and Mrs. Peverel is marred by Mrs. Peverel's unfortunate infatuation for the priestly Guy Domville. In the still later novel, *The Wings of the Dove*, Densher's love for Kate is ruined by his guilty conscience over the way they have deliberately used Milly Theale's love for him.

*A Change of Heart*

James wrote a third one-act play during these early years. In the January issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*, in 1872, there appeared a short play in fifteen scenes, *A Change of Heart*, by H. James, Jr. The divisions of the play were based on the French conception of scenes. No introductory material or editorial comments appeared with the play.\(^\text{12}\)

Despite its many scenes, *A Change of Heart* is no longer than either of James's first two plays, and, like them, it calls for a single setting and for uninterrupted action. There are four characters. The story is concerned mainly with the wooing of Margaret, a willful heiress, by an adventurer, Charles Pepperel. James creates the feeling that they will, in a sense, "serve each other right." The man's jilted former fiancée, Martha, happens to be the paid companion to the

rich girl's aunt. At first the jilted girl means to expose her former suitor, but, later, she decides to remain silent: it is she, therefore, who has the change of heart referred to in the title of the play. The fourth character, Robert Staveley, is interested in Martha. (The aunt does not appear on-stage.)

Daisy Miller

Before James wrote his next play, he had spent six more years in Europe, from the autumn of 1875 until the fall of 1881. During this time, he had written The American (the novel), The Europeans, An International Episode, Daisy Miller, Confidence, Washington Square, The Portrait of a Lady, French Poets and Novelists, and Hawthorne, as well as several volumes of tales, some book reviews, and other pieces for magazines. 13

Back in the United States at the end of 1881, James confided to his notebook,

After long years of waiting, of obstruction, I find myself able to put into execution the most cherished of all my projects—that of beginning to work for the stage. It was one of my earliest—I had it from the first. None has given me brighter hopes—none has given me sweeter emotions. It is strange nevertheless that I should never have done anything—and to a certain extent it is ominous. I wonder at times that the dream should not have faded away. It comes back to me now, however, and I see with longing to settle down at last to a sustained attempt in this direction. I think there is really reason enough for my not having done so before: the little work at any time that I could do, the uninterrupted need of making money on the spot, the inability to do two things at once, the

absence of opportunities, of openings... But it was impossible at the time, and I knew that my chance would come. Here it is; let me guard it sacredly now. Let nothing divert me from it..."

The sudden and unexpected death of James's mother on January 29, 1882—only a few weeks after the above entry was made in his notebook—provided, in a manner of speaking, an opportunity for James to work on his "cherished" project. In the three months following her death, James made a play out of his story, Daisy Miller. It was a period of tranquility, a time that James was to look back on with "a kind of religious veneration." He took rooms in Boston, where he could work during the daytime, and he used to walk over to Cambridge four or five times a week to dine with his father and sister.

Daisy Miller is in three acts. Like the story on which it is based, the plot centers around a little American flirt, Daisy Miller. In the play, James added two new subplots.

The first act is laid on the terrace of a hotel on the lake of Geneva. Here Daisy Miller strikes up an acquaintance with the American, Winterbourne. Daisy is travelling with her mother and her little brother, and they are accompanied by a courier, Eugenio. Eugenio plans

---


15 Ibid., p. 141.

16 Ibid., pp. 143-44.

17 The plot of James's story, or novelette, Daisy Miller, is given in Chapter IV of the present study, "Henry James's Own Dramatizations," under Section I, Daisy Miller. In the same place will be found a discussion of the alterations which James made when dramatizing his story.

18 The plot of the play here given is based on "Daisy Miller" in The Complete Plays of Henry James, edited by Leon Edel, pp. 120-176.
to make use of the girl to obtain some of the Miller family's money. Other characters at the hotel include Winterbourne's aunt, Mrs. Costello, and her travelling companions, Charles Reverdy and Miss Durant. Another guest is the Russian princess, Madame de Katkoff, who is being blackmailed by Eugenio.

The second act is laid in the Pincio gardens in Rome, to which city all of the characters have gone. Madame de Katkoff has been dallying with Winterbourne's affections. Now Eugenio informs her that if she will occupy Winterbourne's time, she may have some incriminating letters which he holds. Eugenio has been plotting to get Daisy Miller married to an Italian accomplice, Giovannelli, but Daisy has been too interested in Winterbourne.

As the third act opens, in the public parlors of a hotel in Rome, Daisy is recovering from Roman fever—which she had contracted on a midnight visit to the Coliseum with Giovannelli. Ill as she is, Daisy wishes to go out into the streets to see a carnival, and she persuades Giovannelli to take her. In the meantime, Madame de Katkoff confesses the truth to Winterbourne, and he rushes out to find Daisy. Winterbourne returns, carrying Daisy, who has fainted, in his arms. The play ends happily with Daisy reviving as Winterbourne proposes to her, and with the engagement of Reverdy and Miss Durant.
James took his play, *Daisy Miller*, to the managers of the Madison Square Theatre in New York. They apparently expressed interest in it, and James was filled with hopes for a production. After some negotiations, however, the management rejected the play.

On his return to London in that same year, 1882, James had copies of *Daisy Miller* privately printed, and he circulated them among London's theatre managers. It is known that James tried to interest the managements of the St. James's Theatre and the Haymarket, but again no production eventuated.

All of this was a bitter experience for James. In his notebooks the author recorded,

> It interested me immensely to write the piece, and the work confirmed all my convictions as to the fascination of this sort of

---


20 Daniel Frohman, who had been the manager of the Madison Square Theatre in 1882, in a memorandum to Dr. Leon Edel, stated that the play had been rejected because "although it was 'beautifully written,' it was 'too literary. It had too much talk and not enough action.'" (Edel, *Complete Plays of Henry James*, p. 117.)


composition. But what it has brought [as] to know, both in New
York and in London, about the manners and ideas of managers and
actors and about the conditions of production on our unhappy
English stage, is almost fatally disgusting and discouraging. 25

The original story, Daisy Miller, had first been published in
1878 in the Cornhill Magazine. 26 The tale had caused a good deal of
controversy. William Dean Howells, in a letter addressed to James
Russell Lowell, on June 22, 1879, said,

Henry James woke up all the women with his Daisy Miller, the in­
tention of which they misconceived, and there has been a vast
discussion in which nobody felt very deeply, and everybody talked
very loudly. The thing went so far that society almost divided
itself in [sic] Daisy Millerites and anti-Daisy Millerites. 27

During the next few years the tale made numerous appearances in various
collections of James's stories.

As a play, Daisy Miller was published twice (as well as being
privately printed by James). It made its initial appearance serially
in the Atlantic Monthly—in the April, May, and June issues of 1883,
where it received the place of honor as the first contribution in each
issue. Later in the same year, it was published in book form by James
R. Osgood (the publisher of the Atlantic Monthly). 28

25 Matthiessen and Murdock, op. cit., p. 444.
27 Mildred Howells (ed.), Life in Letters of William Dean Howells
28 Textual differences between the two publications of James's
play, Daisy Miller, are negligible, amounting to barely a dozen words
altered, some changes in italicising, and minor differences in a couple
of the stage directions.
The differences between the play and the story are discussed in Chapter IV of the present study, "Henry James's Own Dramatisations." Of major interest are the happy ending which James invented for the play, the addition of important new characters, and a shift of emphasis on certain of the characters.

The book reviewers for the New York Times, and for the New York Tribune, agreed in their reactions to the published play. Both of them considered it was an artistic mistake.

The reviewer for the New York Times praised James as a "trained and skillful author . . . but when it comes to his present task, that of dramatization, it must be confessed that his hand has failed him." He gave a grudging nod to the repartee in the play, but he complained that the characters all talked alike.

The New York Tribune reviewer was more caustic:

It is the peculiarity of this work that, so far from being a comedy for two hours, it is not a comedy for five minutes at a time . . . . There is always danger, perhaps, in drawing inferences from the printed or written page as to the effect of a play upon an audience . . . . But it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that an audience would grow as uneasy under five minutes of Mr. James's comedy as under two hours of it, and it is not difficult, therefore, to understand why it was not seen at the Madison Square Theatre.

Both of these newspaper reviewers showed their familiarity with the original story of Daisy Miller, and they had only praise for James's picture of the innocent little American flirt who brings scandal and disaster upon herself in the American colony at Rome.

In the light of the present study, it may be that the Tribune writer pointed to the crux of Henry James's dramatic trouble when he said,

The dramatic faculty is a distinct one, and its existence is not necessarily implied in the possession of literary gifts, even of those implied in fiction. The same qualities which make a novelist's success will endanger his success as a playwright. 31

II. THE FIRST PRODUCTION

The American

It was almost eight years after the Daisy Miller dramatization before Henry James again essayed the drama. In December of 1888, the English actor-manager Edward Compton proposed to James that he should dramatize his novel, The American. 32 James wrote in his notebook,

I had practically given up my old, valued, long cherished dream of doing something for the stage, for fame's sake, and art's, and fortune's: overcome by the vulgarity, the brutality, the baseness of the condition of the English-speaking theatre today. 33

By May of 1889, James had definitely agreed to do the play. He had already determined that, in contrast to the novel, the play should have a happy ending. 34

By February of 1890, the second act had been finished and sent to Compton. 35 At this time, the title of the play was The Californian:

31 Ibid.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibid., p. 100.
later it reverted to the title of James's 1876 novel, *The American*. By May of 1890, James wrote to his brother, William, that the dramatic enterprise was now "on a good and promising footing." James also told his brother that now that he had started, he had some half-dozen other dramatic projects in mind.

The four-act play, as James finally wrote it, opens in Paris, in the shabby sitting-room of M. Nicoche. Nicoche, his daughter, is finishing a painting while she flirts with a visitor, Lord Deepmore. At the ring of the doorbell, Nicoche sends away Deepmore just before her next visitor, Count Valentin, comes in. Soon Christopher Newman, the purchaser of the painting, arrives. Valentin and Newman are introduced, and the Frenchman offers to show the newly arrived American around Paris.

The second act is laid in the salon of a Paris mansion: the home of the de Bellegarde family. Some five weeks have passed since Valentin, the younger son of the house, introduced Newman to his family, which consists of Madame de Bellegarde, his mother; Urbain, his elder brother; and Claire de Cintré, his young and widowed sister. Newman proposes to Claire, and he is tentatively accepted by her family. Lord Deepmore, however, feels that he has a prior claim to Claire, since he has just returned from a trip back to England which was made expressly for the purpose of estimating the value of his estates for Claire's

---

36. Lubbock, op. cit., I, 162.

37. This plot is based on "The American" in *The Complete Plays of Henry James*, edited by Leon Edel, pp. 192-238.
mother. Angered by the duplicity of the de Bellegardes, Deepmore quarrels with Valentin, and a duel is arranged.

The third act takes place in Newman's Paris house, which Noémie is helping him to decorate. Madame de Bellegarde has changed her mind in favor of Lord Deepmore's suit for her daughter's hand, and the old lady deliberately insults Newman by interpreting Noémie's presence in the house as evidence of an intimate relationship. In the meantime, Valentin and Deepmore are dueling in the park which surrounds Newman's house. Valentin is severely wounded, and he is carried indoors. The dying man senses that something has gone wrong between his family and Newman, and he tells the American that he must get a family secret from Mrs. Bread, the de Bellegardes' housekeeper. Newman can use the secret to force the de Bellegardes to give in. Claire is sent for, and she arrives just in time to see her brother die.

The last act takes place at Fleuriráres, the de Bellegardes' country estate. Claire has determined to take refuge in a convent, and she is waiting for a carriage to take her there. The housekeeper gives Newman a letter which Claire's father had written on his deathbed, in which he accused Madame de Bellegarde of murdering him. Claire begs Newman to let her family off. In response to her pleading, Newman gives the letter to Urbain. The play ends with Claire's decision to defy her family by marrying Newman.

James had left a copy of the script with his sister, Alice, in London, while he made a trip to Italy. From there, he wrote to her, on June 6, 1890, about his satisfaction with the form of the play. He felt that he had left nothing to chance, and that he had met the British
production conditions by providing a script which would run "to a minute, including entr'actes,"38 two and three-quarter hours.39 James felt that the writing of this play had been "an education" to him, and he was looking forward to watching rehearsals in the coming autumn.40

Leon Edel reports that James, besides attending rehearsals, "found himself coaching the actors and participating in the direction of the play."41 Above all, James found it necessary to teach Compton how to sound like an American.42

38 Lubbock, op. cit., p. 167.

39 James's estimate of the timing of his script seems to have been somewhat inaccurate. Years later, Compton Mackenzie recalled that in 1890 he had been taken by his father, the actor, Edward Compton, on a visit to Henry James at De Vere Gardens. "No doubt he and my father discussed problems of 'cutting,' for when James had first read The American to the company at the Theatre Royal, Sheffield, the process had lasted six and a half hours!" (Compton Mackenzie, Literature in My Time. London: Rich and Cowan, Ltd., 1933, pp. 36-37.)

According to the London program, the eventual running time of The American was two hours and forty minutes. Curtain time was announced for 8:20 p.m., and it was suggested that patrons should order "Carriages at 11." (The program is reproduced on p. 167 of Edel's Complete Plays of Henry James.)

40 Lubbock, op. cit., I, 167-168.

41 Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 179-180.

42 Of the several original copies extant of the play which Professor Leon Edel examined, he reports that the one in the Lord Chamberlain's office, in London, seems to have belonged personally to Edward Compton. There are corrections in it and pronunciation aids, in parentheses, in James's own handwriting. James's pronunciation aids to the central character—the American, Newman—have all been reproduced in footnotes to the text of "The American," in Edel's Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 192-238. Examples are "waahn" for want; "lung" for long; "jewd" for God; and "Saint-Germane" for Saint-Germain.

These and other pronunciation aids in The American are discussed in more detail in Chapter III of the present study, "Analysis of James's Plays." In the same place may be found a description of other attempts at dialect representation used by James in his plays.
Edward Compton's company customarily played mostly in the provinces. The initial presentation of *The American* was planned for Southport—a resort town in the North. The play was then to be taken on tour in repertory, and, finally, to open in London. The leading roles in the Southport production were to be undertaken by Edward Compton and his wife, the American actress, Virginia Bateman.\(^3\) From very early in their association, James had had a low opinion of the acting capabilities of the company members. Apparently sure of the merits of the script, James wrote to Alice on June 6, 1890, "mediocrity of handling (which is all, at the best, I am pretty sure, that it will get) won't and can't kill it ... ."\(^4\)

As the date for the Southport première approached, James was in a great state of nervousness. In late December he dined with George Du Maurier at Hampstead, and he requested his friend's prayers for *The American*. To Du Maurier he confided his anxiety and his lack of confidence in the Compton Comedy Company.\(^5\) On the day of the opening, January 3, 1891, James wrote to his literary friend Edmund Gosse begging him to "spend this evening in fasting, silence and supplication."

\(^3\) The Southport cast is given by Leon Edel in *The Complete Plays of Henry James*, p. 830, as follows: Newman—Edward Compton; Marquis—Sydney Farson; Valentin—Clarence Blakiston; Despere—Dudley Wilshaw; Nieche—Young Stewart; Claire—Mrs. Compton (Virginia Bateman); Marquis—Miss Eliza Aickin; Noëmie—Miss Sidney Crowe; Mrs. Bread—Alice Burton; De Marignan—Harrison Hunter.

\(^4\) Lubbock, *op. cit.*, I, 167.


\(^6\) Lubbock, *op. cit.*, I, 172.
A week later, James wrote to his friend, Mrs. Hugh Bell, describing his feelings on his first opening night. Watching from the wings, the playwright had experienced a "passage from knock-kneed nervousness . . . to a simmering serenity . . . ."\(^47\)

I flung myself upon Compton after the 1st act: "In heaven's name, is it going?" "Going?—Rather! You could hear a pin drop!"\(^48\)

Then, as author and actor came before the curtain at the end of the performance,

the applaudive house emitted agreeable sounds from a kind of gas-flaring indistinguishable dimness and the gratified Compton publicly pressed one's hand and one felt that, really, as far as Southport could testify to the circumstance, the stake was won. Of course it's only Southport—but I have larger hopes, inasmuch as it was just the meagre provincial conditions and the limited provincial interpretation that deprived the performance of all adventitious aid.\(^49\)

James went on to describe the joyful supper party which he and the leading players had had, and he expressed his own pleasant surprise at the way in which Edward Compton "came out" with a better performance than that which he had exhibited at rehearsals.

Because Henry James was recognised as a distinguished man of letters, public curiosity was very great about the Southport opening of The American. The New York Tribune correspondent cabled that all of the fifteen hundred seats in the theatre had been sold out a week in advance.

The play, of which the leading part was excellently acted by Mr. Compton, was received from beginning to end with enthusiasm. It

\(^47\)Ibid., I, 173.  \(^48\)Ibid.  \(^49\)Ibid., I, 173.
is emphatically an acting play, full of movement, life and dramatic quality.  

Leon Edel had the opportunity to examine the Southport newspapers, and he reports that they agreed the play was too long, and that the Southport Visitor [sic] and the Southport Standard both mentioned that Compton lost his American accent occasionally.  

The distinguished London critic, William Archer, went up for the first night, and he wrote in the World,

Personally, I should have preferred the play without the murder-story; but, plot or no plot, it is a most interesting piece of work, full of alert and telling dialogue and incidents which show a keen eye for stage effect. The first act is the best of the four—a little masterpiece of exposition. A certain maladroitness of development becomes apparent as the action proceeds, and in the fierce light of the stage the heartless worldliness of the Marquis and Marquise de Bellegarde comes out somewhat crudely. . . .  

As for the performance itself, Archer only said, "Mr. Compton's performance of the American was admirable; Mrs. Compton played Claire de Cintré very pleasantly; and the company, as a whole, was more than respectable." In his review, William Archer definitely encouraged James to continue to write for the stage.

In a private interview with James after the performance, Archer expressed the opinion that The American was the kind of play that would be "much more likely to have success in the provinces than in London."  

50 New York Tribune, January 11, 1891.  
51 Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 185.  
52 The World [London], (January 7, 1891), p. 15.  
53 Ibid.  
In mid-January, James joined the Compton company out of town to re-rehearse several portions of the play that needed more "effective playing." Afterwards, James wrote to Robert Louis Stevenson saying that he was thankful that he would now have no further contact with the company until the London opening in the fall.  

In the same letter to R. L. Stevenson, James stated that he had already written two more plays. A month later James was telling his brother, William, "I am in the fever of dramatic production...I am working hard and constantly--and am just attacking my 4th! ..." This statement becomes a little less astounding if we remember that the script for The American had been completed before June of the previous year (1890).  

The American continued to be presented in repertory on tour in the provinces. The Compton Company played it usually only on Friday nights, and this brought James a royalty of "about £5-0-0 for each performance." They even went as far as Ireland, and, less surprising, to Edinburgh.  

The Edinburgh performance was caught by a correspondent of the London Times on March 2, 1891. He wrote that although the first act was rather slow, "the play was received with marked approval by a large and distinguished audience [at the Theatre Royal]. Mr. and Mrs. Compton were called before the curtain at the close of each act, and twice

---

55 Lubbock, op. cit., I, 177-178.  
56 Ibid., I, 178.  
57 Ibid., I, 179-180.  
58 Ibid., I, 181.  
59 Burr, op. cit., p. 212.
at the close of the last act.\textsuperscript{60} Perhaps the fact that this was Mr. Compton's "benefit night" may have had an influence on the audience's effusiveness at the end of every act.

Before the London opening, there were five major cast changes, including the replacement of Mrs. Compton by Elisabeth Robins. (Mrs. Compton relinquished the role "because she was with child."\textsuperscript{61}) The London cast was as follows: Newman—Edward Compton; Marquis—Sydney Paxton; Valentin—Clarence Blakiston; Despere—C. M. Hallard; de Marignac—Harrison Hunter; Nicoche—Young Stewart; Doctor—Fred W. Permain; Servant—W. G. Cunninghame; Marquise de Ballegarde—Kate Bateman (Mrs. Crowe); Mrs. Bread—Louise Moodie; Noeulie—Adrienne Dairelles; Sister of Charity—Miss C. Lindsay; Claire—Elisabeth Robins.\textsuperscript{62}

Elisabeth Robins was a young American actress, who was making a name for herself in London by introducing Ibsen roles to the public. She had already been seen in \textit{The Doll's House}, and Henry James, together with Edward Compton, witnessed her performance of Hedda Gabler. Being very impressed with her ability, James requested that she should

\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Times} [London], March 2, 1891.


\textsuperscript{62} The London cast list of \textit{The American} is based on the program which is reproduced in Edel's \textit{Complete Plays of Henry James}, p. 187. Brief biographical notes on the Comptons, and on the main members of the London cast, may be found in Appendix A of the present study.
meet with Compton to discuss the possibility of her playing the role of Madame de Cintra in the London presentation of The American.\textsuperscript{63}

Miss Robins has left a warm, human picture of James at rehearsals for the London production. James was in constant despair over the company's inadequacies, but he offered them all the help that he could, and he always conducted himself with patience and courtesy. The author was even filled with concern for the long hours of rehearsal endured by the performers, and he would cause hampers of sandwiches to appear off-stage. To Miss Robins, this solicitous treatment was indeed new and appreciated.\textsuperscript{64}

At last the day of the London opening arrived. Compton had leased the Opera Comique Theatre, and the first performance of The American was given on September 26, 1891,\textsuperscript{65} before what was "probably the most distinguished audience the Opera Comique ever held, from a literary point of view."\textsuperscript{66} Partly as a result of the favorable reports

\textsuperscript{63}Elizabeth Robins, \textit{Theatre and Friendship} (London: Jonathan Cape, 1932), p. 27.

\textsuperscript{64}Ibid., pp. 48-50.

\textsuperscript{65}When first presented at the Opéra Comique in London, The American was on a double bill. It was preceded by \textit{A Dead Letter}, a domestic drama in one act, by W. A. Brehmer. In the cast were Lewis Ball, Sydney Parson, Harrison Hunter, and Evelyn M'Neill; this involved some double casting for the evening. (Information based on the reproduction of the program in Edel's Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 187.)

On the occasion of the fiftieth performance of The American, when the critics were invited back to see a revised version of the play, the curtain raiser was changed to "a new comedietta by Mr. Eille Norwood, entitled \textit{Hook and Eye.}" (From the review by William Archer in \textit{The World (London)}, (November 18, 1891), p. 12.)

\textsuperscript{66}\textit{New York Times}, September 27, 1891.
on the play from the provinces, the critics were particularly anxious to see this "first" dramatic attempt by the renowned novelist.

The *Times* of London gave *The American* a long and careful review. The writer was familiar with the novel on which the play had been based, and he commented on the happy ending which James had substituted for the final "note of interrogation" of the book. He felt that parts of the performance dragged, and that the script could do with some pruning. Nevertheless, "With all its drawbacks . . . *The American* is an interesting and worthy addition to our current drama. Its faults of treatment are more than outweighed by the merits of its central character and the terseness and literary grace of its dialogue."67

Most of the critics were in general agreement with the *Times* writer that the dialogue was excellent, but they had various reactions to both the script and the performance.

More than one reviewer felt that the motives of the characters in *The American* were not clear. The writer for the *Atlantic Monthly* felt that the characters of Mioche and his daughter were unnecessary to the play: they "not merely lower the tone of the piece, but confuse its action. . . ."68 He also complained that no reason was shown in the stage version for Valentin to have to fight a duel and die. Clement Scott suggested strongly that James should have written an original play instead of dramatizing a novel.

When Mr. James wrote "*The American*" as a play, he thought he had explained everything. He had really explained nothing. He had

---

67 *Times* (London), September 28, 1891.

68 *Atlantic Monthly*, LXVIII (December, 1891), 847.
his book well in his mind, and forgot that his audience knew nothing whatever of the book. He did not "join his flats." Still, Scott encouraged James to try again.

Cecil Howard, writing for the magazine, The Theatre, complained of the mixed form which James had utilized:

in the opening scenes we are led to suppose that we are going to enjoy a "society" play, in the latter half of the piece we are suddenly plunged into intense melodrama, with a death enacted before our eyes, followed by the revelation, in semi-darkness, of an appalling and revolting secret.

The Illustrated London News similarly reproached the author for having mixed comedy and melodrama in the same scene. The New York Times, in its front page dispatch, alluded to "a mass of bald melodrama" which had been "pitchforked" into the story.

The critics were mixed in their reactions to the acting performances. For the most part, Compton received high praise. The Atlantic Monthly found his conception of the American "much better played than might have been supposed possible for an Englishman." The reviewer thought that Compton had caught the necessary unworldly manner for the part, but that the "nasal tones of the American [were] overdone." Clement Scott thought that Compton did "remarkably well," but he wished that an American actor, such as John Drew, had been cast for the part.

---

69 Illustrated London News, XXIX (October 3, 1891), 435.
70 The Theatre [London], XVIII (November, 1891), 228.
71 New York Times, September 27, 1891.
72 Atlantic Monthly, LXVIII (December, 1891), 846.
73 Ibid.
74 Illustrated London News, loc. cit.
David Christie Murray found Compton inadequate in the serious portions of the role.\textsuperscript{75} Perhaps the most favorable comment came from the staid London \textit{Times}, "it would be difficult to over-estimate the value of the support he [James] receives from Mr. Compton, whose impersonation of the title character is remarkable for its keen observation, quiet truthfulness, and genial humour."\textsuperscript{76}

Far less kind were the criticisms of the leading lady, Elizabeth Robins. Cecil Howard, in \textit{The Theatre}, found her playing too "lachrymose."\textsuperscript{77} Clement Scott ignored her performance altogether in his review. The \textit{Atlantic Monthly}'s writer said it was unfortunate that the actress employed

the hysterical manner of Ibsen's morbid heroines. The fair daughter of the old French noblesse . . . is made to struggle and sob, to flutter and writhe, and in general to comport herself so unlike Newman's angelic ideal that the conventionally "happy" ending which replaces the sombre denouement of the novel makes us feel rather sorry for him than otherwise . . . .\textsuperscript{78}

Of the lesser characters, Louise Moodie as the old housekeeper was praised in several quarters for the power which she brought to the part. Clement Scott went so far as to say that Miss Moodie had rescued James from embarrassment in the scene about the dreaded family secret,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{75}David Christie Murray, "The Renaissance of the Stage," \textit{Contemporary Review}, LX (November, 1891), 696.  \\
\textsuperscript{76}\textit{Times} [London], \textit{loc. cit.}  \\
\textsuperscript{77}\textit{The Theatre} [London], XVIII (November, 1891), 229.  \\
\textsuperscript{78}\textit{Atlantic Monthly}, LXVIII (December, 1891), 848.
\end{flushright}
and that her performance had been the "artistic triumph of the evening." Miss Bateman, as the Marquise, was blamed in some quarters for her overacting, but, on the other hand, the Times credited her with having saved James from "caricature."  

Two of the critics made a point of remarking that the actors created the wrong atmosphere for the Faubourg St. Germain. Murray carped, "the aristocrats of the Faubourg are enlisted obviously from the ranks of the bourgeoisie," and he specifically found Miss Robins lacking in "caste." Clement Scott commented on the lack of contrast between the acting of the Bohemians and that of the well-bred inhabitants of Faubourg St. Germain.  

The American enjoyed a respectable London run of over seventy performances. On the occasion of its fiftieth performance, James and Compton did a strange thing. They invited the critics back again to see a new version. This time, William Archer, writing in the World, said,

---

80 Times [London], loc. cit.  
81 Murray, op. cit., p. 699.  
82 Illustrated London News, loc. cit.  
83 Alice James in her Journal said that there had been seventy-six performances (p. 245). Leon Edel, in The Complete Plays of Henry James, gives the number as seventy (p. 190).
lover's forgiveness. The act now closes most effectively with the death of Valentin. 

The new scene, said Archer, gave a motivation—which had formerly been lacking—for Claire's behavior, and Miss Robins played the new scene "with admirable sincerity of emotion." 

After the London closing, the Comptons kept *The American* in their repertoire on tour. A year later, the play was still being given in the provinces, but Elizabeth Robins was no longer in the cast. On November 7, 1892, James wrote to Miss Robins to the effect that he had now completed a new fourth act for the play.

Thanks for your inquiries about the new 4th act of *The American*. Yes—it is finished, but some of [the] alterations (slight but indispensable) in the previous parts, to fit it, are not. I go on the 11th, however, to Bath, to make over the whole and my views and ideas on it, to the eager interpreters. It will (the new act—of comedy!) be played for the first time on the 18th, at Bristol; but I probably shall not see it till Friday, December 9th at Croydon. 

A typescript of the new fourth act was found among James's papers. Leon Edel has reproduced this separate act in *The Complete Plays of Henry James*—despite a total of five missing pages. The writer of the present study made a careful examination of the composite version of the earlier texts provided by Professor Edel, and compared

---

86. Robins, *op. cit.* p. 73.
87. *Ibid.*, p. 74. (James invited Miss Robins to see the new fourth act with him at Croydon, but, unfortunately, she gives no account of any such theatrical visit—either then or at any other date.)
it with the extra and later fourth act: it is evident that the necessary changes to which James alluded, in the above quoted letter to Miss Robins, would have had to have been made in Act III in order to make sense of the new fourth act.\(^88\)

It is of considerable interest to have this tangible evidence of James's approach to his script. Even after its London production, James treated the material of his play as a malleable substance. This attitude on the part of the author toward his product is seen again, to some extent, in the development of his later play, *The High Bid*. Jamesian scholars will recognize as a trait the novelist's desire to improve and revise his works after their first publication.

**III. FOUR PUBLISHED PLAYS**

The five years following the appearance of *The American* were very productive in terms of the number of scripts written by James. Four plays of this period were published: they appeared in pairs simultaneously on both sides of the Atlantic.\(^89\) In 1894, *Theatrials: Two*

---

\(^{88}\) In the original script, Valentin died off-stage in Act III. Edel reports that in the second version, presented in November of 1891, Valentin died on-stage (in *Complete Plays*, p. 190). (This is confirmed by the review in *The World*, November 18, 1891, which is quoted on pages 40 and 41 of the present chapter.) In the still newer 1892 version Valentin is on-stage in the fourth act, and he is recovering nicely from his wound. Thus it is obvious that Act III must have embodied a major change centering around this character. Similarly, some provision must have been made to give Newman the terrible family secret—though not the proof, the "evidence"—before the action of the fourth act as it was written in the (1892?) typescript.

Comedies (Tenants, and Disengaged) was published, and in 1895, Theatricals: Second Series (The Album, and The Reprobate) appeared.90

To James, the publication of these plays was an admission of defeat.91 In a note prefaced to the first volume, the author says that all four of the plays were

conceived and constructed wholly in the light of possible representation . . . in particular conditions . . . [and with] deference to a theatre, to a company, and especially to the presumable interpreter.92

The Preface to the second volume was more extensive. In it, James described the trials of the novelist who endeavors to confine himself to the limitations of the dramatic form. He expresses the hope that young, inexperienced writers may benefit from these published experiments, or "exercises," of his.

To treat a "big" subject in the intensely summarised fashion demanded by an evening's traffic of the stage when the evening, freely clipped at each end, is reduced to two hours and a half, is a feat of which the difficulty looms large to a writer accustomed to tell his story in another form . . . he has if possible even more to unlearn than to learn . . . .93

The story of Tenants, the first of these published plays, can most clearly be told in terms of the less important characters whose

90Leon Edel has reproduced the scripts of these four plays in his collection, The Complete Plays of Henry James. The writer of this study has examined the originals and has found no changes other than in the type used, and in the layout of the pages.


92Ibid., p. v.

love story serves as a subplot. Eighteen-year-old Mildred is an orphan, and she lives with her guardian, Sir Frederick Byng. By the terms of her father’s will, Mildred has an income of $7,000 a year, but she will not be of age until she is twenty-two. Sir Frederick’s son, Norman, is in love with Mildred. Because he is a consciously upright man, Sir Frederick fears that people will accuse him of furthering his son’s suit; so he sends the young man away to India, and he asks the couple to wait for four years so that Mildred may have a chance to meet other young men and really choose for herself.

With Norman out of the way, the playwright introduces his main character, Mrs. Vibert. This fashionable lady presents herself at Sir Frederick’s home, and she says that she wants to rent the lodge on the estate. She is accompanied by her grown son, Claude, and a tutor, Captain Lurcher. Since Claude is far too old to need a tutor, this person is referred to as a “preceptor” or adviser. Captain Lurcher is really the villain of the piece. It seems that Mrs. Vibert and Sir Frederick were lovers during their younger days, and that Claude is actually the illegitimate son of Sir Frederick. Claude is in ignorance of this fact, and Captain Lurcher uses the information to blackmail and control the mother.

It becomes evident that the romantic feeling between Sir Frederick and Mrs. Vibert is by no means dead. At the same time, Claude pays court to Mildred, and Captain Lurcher urges the young man’s suit with the ulterior aim of controlling Mildred’s fortune. Mildred cables Norman to come home from India. The exiled son returns just in time to
hear the announcement of his father's engagement to Mrs. Vibert, and, following a quarrel with Claude, Norman claims Mildred as his own.

The plot of Tenants was suggested to James by a short tale, "Flavien," by Henri Rivière, which appeared in *La Revue des Deux Mondes* in November of 1874.94

The idea for the second play in James's 1894 volume, Disengaged, was originally suggested by an anecdote told to the author by Fanny Kemble.95 Actually, James used her story twice. First it served as the basis for his tale, The Solution.96 Then, later, James used his tale as the basis for his play, Disengaged.97

If the plot of Disengaged were explained in all of its details, the account would be very long indeed, and it would probably be quite confusing. In brief, the play may be said to be concerned with two problems. First there is that of young Captain Prime and a somewhat stupid girl, Blandina: Blandina's mother is most anxious that her daughter should get married—to anyone. Second, there is the problem of a couple, Sir Montagu Brisket and Lady Brisket, who mutually

---

94James mentioned his indebtedness to Rivière in a preface note which appeared in the original 1894 publication of *Theatricals: Two Comedies*, on page vi. A consideration of the relationship between Rivière's story and James's dramatic version will be found in Chapter IV of the present study.

95Matthiessen and Murdock, op. cit., pp. 95-96.


97The tale, The Solution, and James's dramatization are compared in Chapter IV of the present study.
distrust each other. The wife suspects the husband with a house guest—the very attractive widow, Mrs. Jasper; while Lord Brisket questions his wife's friendship with another guest, Trafford.

As a joke, Trafford and his friend, Coverley, trick Captain Prime into getting engaged to Blandina by persuading him that he has compromised the girl.

All is straightened out, however, through the maneuverings of Mrs. Jasper and Lady Brisket. At the play's end, it is Trafford who finds himself affianced to Blandina, and Captain Prime is engaged to Mrs. Jasper. These arrangements serve also to allay the mutual suspicions of the Briskets. The title of the play refers to the successful breaking off of Captain Prime's engagement to Blandina.

When Theatricals: Two Comedies was published in 1894, the literary reviewers seemed, on the whole, somewhat disappointed. The Nation felt that James's polished, artificial dialogue would require brilliant playing in order to be performed at all. The writer remarked,

the reader can enjoy the smoothness and neatness of their literary style, the compact and forcible expression, and the humor, which is of far finer quality than that current in the contemporary theatre, even if it is not always quite so spontaneous as it might be.\textsuperscript{98}

He felt that Tenants was the better of the two plays, even though the subject was not "agreeable," nor the outcome convincing. Of Disengaged, the same reviewer complained, "the plot is too involved and the final solution is not satisfactory or reasonable."\textsuperscript{99}

\textsuperscript{98}The Nation, LVIII (June 28, 1894), 491.

\textsuperscript{99}Ibid., p. 491.
The reviewers for both the Critic and the Dial found the plays made amusing reading, but both gentlemen expressed doubt that the plays could be successfully performed. None willing to give James the benefit of the doubt was the Literary World of Boston, which expressed the view that the plays needed "the accompaniment of look and tone." 100

The writer for the Critic complained that the plays were deficient in dramatic value. He wrote that the two comedies were lacking in "action, progressive dramatic interest and plausibility of motive." 101 He felt that the intrigue of Disengaged "would not bear the test of critical examination . . ." 102 Similarly, the Nation voiced its objection to the confused plot and weak motivation. In addition, the Nation called attention to the "lack of dramatic and theatrical action" in both plays. 103 This comment seems to be in slight opposition to the Dial's labelling of the action as "preposterous." 104

As for the characters in general, the Nation found them to be "familiar stage models" whose treatment was governed by "theatrical exigency, especially in the matter of exits and entrances." 105 The writer for the Critic held that despite some clever sketching, James had left the true character of Mrs. Vibert in doubt, and that Sir Frederick Byng was entirely too inconsistent. Further, this critic

100 Literary World, XXV (June 30, 1894), 202.

101 The Critic, XXIII, New Series (January 12, 1895), 38.

102 Ibid. 103 The Nation, loc. cit.

104 The Dial, XVII (September 1, 1894), 125.

105 The Nation, loc. cit.
observed that James's characters failed to reveal themselves in action. 

A comment which might have some slight significance in showing the relationship between James's plays and his stories is that of the Dial reporter,

It is not hard to get a notion of these plays of Mr. James. Imagine any of his stories with everything but the conversation cut out, and you will have something not unlike [chew] . . . . The dialogue has the usual ultra-delicate flavor, the action (where one discovers it from the enigmatic utterances) is usually preposterous, and as to the characters, so far as one ventures to infer, they are extraordinarily conventional and colorless.

It will be remembered that James, in the Preface to Theatricals: Two Comedies, indicated that the plays were specially written to suit certain actors and companies. The reviewers for both the Nation and the Critic expressed the opinion that this is an unwise procedure for a playwright to follow. Both critics deprecated the practice, not because of its effect upon the playwright, but because the tailored play encourages the perpetuation of a star personality to the detriment of the true art of acting.

In 1895, Theatricals: Second Series, the second volume of James's unproduced plays, was published. Again, both plays were comedies, and both were realistic in setting and in general treatment.

The first act of The Album is laid in the country house of the rich and dying Mr. Bedford. Bedford is never seen in the play, but his fortune serves as the chief motivating factor. Sir Ralph Damant, a bachelor cousin of Mr. Bedford and his supposed heir, arrives from

106 The Critic, loc. cit. 107 The Dial, loc. cit.
London, and he is promptly pursued by two lady guests at the house. Another cousin, Mark Bernal, is believed by the family to have died years ago in America. Quite coincidentally, Mark now turns up at the house. Only Sir Ralph and Bedford's secretary, Grace, learn of his presence. The local vicar asks Sir Ralph if there are any other relations living besides himself. Sir Ralph states that there are not, and Mr. Bedford makes a new will leaving everything to Ralph.

The rest of the play is laid in London, and it is concerned with Grace's efforts to persuade Sir Ralph to give up that portion of the inheritance which should have come to Mark. Sir Ralph believes that Grace is trying to force him into marrying her. The two lady guests have followed Sir Ralph to London, and they are openly trying to capture him for matrimonial purposes. Eventually, Sir Ralph gives up the fortune as his only method of escape, and Grace is to marry the now rich Mark.

The story of *The Reprobate* centers around thirty-year old Paul Doubleday. Paul is completely dominated by his stepmother and by his guardian, Mr. Bonsor. Some ten years prior to the action of the play, Paul had run off to Paris with a singer, Nina. The young man had been brought back to England by his late father, and he had been convinced that he was basically immoral. Paul firmly believes now that he is incurably wicked, and that he needs to be guarded against his own low inclinations.

Bonsor's niece, Blanche Amber, arrives to stay with her uncle. She is attracted to Paul by his dangerous reputation. Mr. Bonsor wants
his niece to marry Pitt Brunt—a young and stuffy Member of Parliament. Pitt tries to be charming, but Blanche finds him boring.

Paul's stepmother wants to marry again. Her hand is being sought by a Captain Chanter. Nina, the singer from Paul's past, turns up. Captain Chanter has been involved with Nina quite recently, and she threatens to expose him. However, Nina soon becomes interested in Pitt Brunt—the young Member from Southport, and the stage is set for another happy ending. Nina will obviously get her willing victim, Pitt; Mrs. Doubleday, Paul's stepmother, will marry Captain Chanter; and Paul and Blanche Amber are obviously in love too.

The reaction of the book reviewers to this second volume of James's unproduced plays was again one of disappointment. The Dial found the plays more interesting than the two previously published ones, but the reviewer expressed his irritation that James, who was capable of writing "such captivating things . . . should write such stupid ones." Similarly, The Bookman's reviewer complained that neither play was equal to James's stories. The Critic commented that the plays were not likely to add to their author's reputation, and that the unnamed producer showed prudence in not staging the plays.

The Album and The Reprobate were regarded as "satisfactory experiments," and "recommended to those who study the drama— at home" by

108. The Dial, XVIII (March 1, 1895), 156.
109. The Bookman, VII (January, 1895), 120.
Laurence Hutton, writing in *Harper's Monthly*. Like most of the reviewers, Hutton questioned how well the plays could be acted.

To one student of the stage, from the front of the stage, the two volumes of comedies which Mr. Henry James has recently published, under the name *Theatricals*, contain a collection of words, to which is attached a suggestion of deeds in italics and in square brackets. He realises that they are good words, well put together, full of significance; that, as a series of tales told in the form of dialogue, the "Theatricals" are excellent reading—bright, sparkling, brilliant, well worth careful study, well worth preserving. But as he reads them he is utterly at a loss to know how they would act; how the whole pages of short, snappy sentences which his eye fellows would appeal to his ear if they were spoken upon the stage with the actions suited to them. In the entire second scene of "Disengaged," the characters hardly utter five consecutive words—the average is much less—while the stage directions, which, as has been said, mean so much and express so little—in print—occupy quite one-half of the printed matter.

Hutton perhaps exaggerated a little to make his point, but most of the speeches are actually very short, and the stage directions do seem long in places—especially in the second of the two plays in the volume.

In general, the critics granted that the plays had a certain literary value, but that their quality had been injured by the conditions under which they had been written. James's preface to the second volume had reflected the torture of the novelist who must confine himself to time limits, and to other practical demands of theatrical production. Like their predecessors, these two plays had been written to order. One reviewer commented, "Fitting plays to companies is mere tailor-work, a shocking waste of real talent and a terrible encouragement to bad acting." Another commentator found James's preface "as

---

112 *Ibid*.
113 *The Nation*, LX (January 3, 1895), 18.
good almost as one of his cleverest analytic stories. . . . [It constituted] a subtle and suggestive criticism of the dramatic art as well."¹¹⁴

The Literary World found that, like James's novels, the plays were "essentially undramatic,"¹¹⁵ while the Nation complained of the feebleness of the plays in conception and in construction. A contrast may be seen in the comments of the London Times' reviewer who felt that the plays were more dramatically constructed than those which had appeared in the first volume. Further, the Times expressed the wish that some contemporary dramatists would study their Henry James in order to achieve a higher standard of play writing.¹¹⁶

The general reaction to the plots was that they were too improbable. One reviewer felt that the weakness of the stories lay in their "unreality,"¹¹⁷ and another critic wrote, "Both in plot and in their characters they are curiously artificial, un lifelike, and extravagant for the inventions of a student of modern society."¹¹⁸

James's characterisations received conflicting comments. One reviewer remarked, "The characters have the speech, but not the manners or the habits of the class to which they profess to belong. Their actions are purely theatrical, natural motive being subordinated entirely to the exigencies of the designed situation."¹¹⁹

¹¹⁴The Bookman, loc. cit.
¹¹⁵Literary World, XXVI (March 9, 1895), 76.
¹¹⁶Times [London], December 6, 1894.
¹¹⁷The Critic, loc. cit.
¹¹⁸The Nation, loc. cit.
¹¹⁹The Critic, loc. cit.
Hutton, reviewing both volumes simultaneously, praised James specifically for his creation of Captain Prime (Disengaged), Teddy Ashdown (The Album), and Mr. Bonser (The Reprobate): they were "human beings, and that is saying much for the creations of dramatic art." The writer for The Bookman frankly enjoyed the "unrestrained extravagance" of the characters' behavior; he found the plays "frankly farcical," and he said that he had laughed heartily at the characters' "romping vivacity."

Some of the reviewers made specific comments about the individual plays. Of The Album, the writer for the Critic magazine complained of the flappiness of the story, and of the "farcical treatment employed in many of the scenes." In the Nation, the following comment appeared,

Mr. James's management of the whole testamentary business is unconvincing, while the baronet and his feminine persecutors have scarcely a touch of actuality in them. The hero and heroine are more human, but their troubles fail to excite sympathy, because they arise mainly from that unnatural suppression of fact which is one of the oldest devices for maintaining stage complications.

There was some disagreement as to the relative merits of the two plays. One reviewer found the theme of The Reprobate "still slighter and less reasonable" than that of The Album, while another critic believed The Reprobate to be the cleverer of the two plays.

As for the second play, The Reprobate, the writers for the Critic and the Nation found some of the character sketches amusing—

121. The Bookman, loc. cit.
122. The Critic, loc. cit.
123. The Nation, loc. cit.
124. The Critic, loc. cit.
125. Literary World, loc. cit.
particularly that of the stodgy young Member of Parliament. However, the Nation complained that the central figure, the Reprobate himself, was too fantastic. The critics for both of these journals suggested that the Reprobate belonged to burlesque rather than to comedy. The reviewer for the Literary World said that the characters all seemed to be caricatures, except those which were "lay figures."  

The reviews of James's second volume of Theatricals which appeared in the Dial and in the Literary World were dated in March of 1895. This was some two months after the January 5 opening of James's Guy Domville in London. That production had caused a near riot in the theatre on opening night, and the controversy over the merits of the play had been transferred thereafter to the press. It is interesting that the general conflict of opinion about Guy Domville is reflected in the two reviews of James's published plays just cited. The Literary World referred to James's recent play which had been "hissed off the boards in London." The Dial, on the other hand, said of The Album and The Reprobate,

One is tempted to wonder whether, if they had been given in public, they would have met with as striking success as that attending the production of Mr. James's recent play at the theatre of his patron saint [the St. James Theatre].

---

126 Ibid.
127 The story of the Guy Domville production will be found at the opening of the next section of the present chapter of this study.
128 Literary World, loc. cit.
129 The Dial, loc. cit.
As for the account of the writing of these four plays, there is a great deal of overlapping chronologically. In addition, production plans were underway for several of the plays simultaneously. None of the plans materialized, however. The years 1890 to 1895, loosely speaking, have been labelled by Leon Edel as the "dramatic years" in James's life.  

James himself referred to this period as his "saw-dust and orange-peel phase." His letters have many references to his financial need; his novels and stories did not have a wide appeal, and he hoped that the writing of plays would bring him more tangible rewards. Actually, James had an independent income, and, by most standards, he would have been considered comfortably well off.

It will be remembered from the previous section of the present chapter that James was involved, one way and another, for a very long time with his play, The American. As early as May of 1890, the script had been completed; rehearsals were underway in the autumn of that year; the play opened in Southport on January 3, 1891, and in London on September 26, 1891; the critics were invited to see the new version of the play at its fiftieth London performance, in November, 1891; and in

---

130 "Les Années Dramatiques" is the title of Leon Edel's dissertation, written at the Sorbonne in 1931. Edel has also used the phrase, "The Dramatic Years," as a sectional heading in the Prefaces to both The Complete Plays of Henry James, and to Guy Domville (Lippincott, 1960).

131 Lubbock, op. cit., I, 181.

132 One of James's close friends was Robert Louis Stevenson. It is quite noticeable that in his letters to R.L.S., James adopts an apologetic attitude toward his theatrical ventures. He brings out over and over again his financial need, and he seems to hope that, as one man of letters writing to another, he may be forgiven for his lapse from grace.
November of 1892, in Bristol, a brand new fourth act for The American was performed. During all of this time James was in a "fever of dramatic production." Before the Southport opening, James had completed two more plays, and by February 6, 1891, Henry was writing to his brother that he was "just attacking" his fourth. Unfortunately, James was inclined to be secretive, and he often refrained from naming names and titles in his letters. However, other avenues of information are open, and it is possible to get a fairly complete picture of the writing of the four plays published in the volumes of Theatricals, although, in some cases, an exact date can not be determined.

The writing of the four plays may be considered in order:

Tenants, Dissengaged, The Album, and The Reprobate.

Alice James recorded in her journal on April 23, 1891, that the London actor-manager John Hare had accepted Mrs. Vibert (the early title for Tenants). She also mentioned that the play had been

---

133 Lubbock, op. cit., I, 179.
136 Ibid., I, 176.
135 Ibid., I, 180.
137 Ibid., I, 179.

Typical of James’s secretiveness is this passage from the letter of February 6, 1891, to his brother, William. "No. 1 has a destination which it would be premature to disclose; and, in general, please breathe no word of these confidences, as publicity blows on such matters in an injurious and deflowering way, and interests too great to be hurt are at stake." (Lubbock, op. cit., I, 180.)

138 For the sake of clarity, it seems to the writer of this study that it would be better to omit mention of the many indefinite references in James’s correspondence to unidentified dramatic projects on which the author was working simultaneously.

139 Burr, op. cit., p. 222.
written for the actress Genevieve Ward "before Christmas" of 1890.\textsuperscript{140} At the same time, Alice wrote that Hare was enthusiastic about the play, but that he was committed to produce two other plays first.\textsuperscript{141}

There is evidence to show that James had another copy of Mrs. Vibert: on January 4 (1892), the author wrote to Elizaboth Robins proposing that he should bring the script and read it to her.\textsuperscript{142} This was to be done as an act of friendship, not of business, for James felt with regret that Miss Robins was not old enough to play Mrs. Vibert.\textsuperscript{143}

Writing to Miss Robins from Paris in April, 1893, James complained that Hare had had his play for almost three years, and that the producer would "neither produce nor part with" it.\textsuperscript{144} Hare never did bring out James's play, though he apparently did make some attempt to cast it.\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{139}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 222.

\textsuperscript{140}Leon Edel cites further evidence concerning the date of the writing of Tenants. In \textit{The Complete Plays of Henry James}, Edel refers to an unpublished letter from Henry to William James, dated December 9, 1890, in which he said that the play had just been finished (p. 257).

\textsuperscript{141}James's connection with Hare dated back many years: an entry in the author's notebooks shows that as far back as 1881 Hare had urged James to write a play, and that he had offered his services in the event that James should do so. (Matthiessen and Murdock, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 39.)

\textsuperscript{142}Robins, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{143}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 54.

\textsuperscript{144}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 113.

\textsuperscript{145}Leon Edel mentions an unpublished letter of 1 September, 1891, from Henry to William James, in which the author had spoken of the difficulties of casting, and, in particular, of the impossibility of finding a young man to play the part of Claude. (\textit{Complete Plays of Henry James}, p. 258.)
In addition to John Hare and Genevieve Ward, James tried to interest the great Polish actress, Helena Modjeska, in Mrs. Vibert. At an earlier date Mrs. Modjeska actually had been interested in the role of Claire de Cintre in *The American*, but James had written to her saying frankly that "he did not think the part strong enough for her, as he found on working out the plot that it was more a man's than a woman's play . . . [and that he had] grave doubts as to its adaptability to Mrs. Modjeska's talents." 146 With the later play, *Mrs. Vibert* (*Tenants*), the situation was reversed, as this time it was Mrs. Modjeska who had too many doubts. 147

Consideration of the next play, *Disengaged*, brings up other famous theatrical names: the American manager, Augustin Daly, and his leading actress, Ada Rehan.

Back in 1886, James had attended a London dinner given by John Hare in honor of Augustin Daly's theatre company. 148 (A dinner from which Daly himself was conspicuously absent.) 149 The Daly company visited England several times, 150 and, in 1891, Ada Rehan approached

---

146 *The Critic*, XVI, New Series (December 19, 1891), 351.

147 Leon Edel relates that Modjeska wrote to James to the effect that Mrs. Vibert would suit Genevieve Ward better than herself. (*Complete Plays of Henry James*, p. 259.)


James with an invitation to write a play as a vehicle for her. In August, 1892, the script of what became Disengaged was delivered to Daly, and a production was planned for the play late in the following year. Daly called for multiple revisions, and for a change of title. Rehearsals were scheduled for late in 1893, and the play was to be presented at Daly's new London theatre. Matters progressed as far as having scenery and costumes designed, and some scenery was even built.

Meanwhile, on November 21, 1892, James sketched an outline in his notebook for a second possible comedy for Ada Rehan. This outline later became the one-act play, Summertime, which James wrote for Ellen Terry.

The title of the play for Daly underwent various changes. It is referred to most frequently as Mrs. Jasper, although Daly preferred Mrs. Jasper's Way. James eventually published the play as Disengaged.

In a letter to his friend, Elizabeth Robins, James expressed uneasiness about Daly's "intensely private" preliminary rehearsals.

151 Felheim, op. cit., p. 304.
152 At this stage, James admitted that his play suffered from a motive that was too slender, and from lack of action. See his letter to Daly, dated September 1, 1892, in Joseph Francis Daly, op. cit., p. 552.
153 Leon Edel has reproduced James's hand written list of sixty-four alternate titles which he submitted to Daly, in The Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 297.
154 Felheim, op. cit., p. 305.
155 Ibid.
156 Matthiessen and Murdock, op. cit., pp. 127-129.
157 Robins, op. cit., p. 141.
few days later, on December 6, 1893, James was invited to attend a reading by the company. The author had had no contact with the actors, and he felt aggrieved when they evidenced no understanding of the play on this occasion. The reading seems to have been uncomfortable for all concerned. James wrote angrily to Daly the next day and withdrew his play. Other accounts say simply that Daly had lost faith in the play. Whatever the truth of the "désagrément," Daly never presented Mrs. Jasper (Disengaged) before the public.

How the two plays in Theatricals: Second Series came to be written is a very simple story. Both The Album and The Reprobate were written for Edward Compton, the actor-manager who had produced James's The American. They were probably written in 1891. In his

159 James described Ada Rohan as "white, haggard, ill-looking almost in anguish" at the "rehearsal." See Robins, op. cit., pp. 141-142.
160 Edel, Selected Letters, pp. 151-152.
161 Joseph Francis Daly, op. cit., p. 554.
163 Leon Edel quotes an unpublished letter from Henry James to Edmund Gosse, postmarked 10 December, 1894, in which James says the plays in Theatricals: Second Series were written "to bolster up poor Edward Compton three years ago, when after withdrawing my other play [The American], he found himself (asininely) with a theatre on his hands and nothing successful to produce; and they were addressed much to the actual vulgar compass of his and his company's little powers. Then he would have none of 'em." Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 353.

164 This was the period when James wrote to his brother, William, that he was "attacking" his fourth play. (See page 56 of the present study.)
prefatory note to *Theatricals: Second Series*, James stated only that both plays had been written with country audiences in mind.

It was during the London run of *The American*, on October 23, 1891, that James wrote in his notebook that he might use some family history as the basis for a tale. The situation which James had in mind, as Professor Edel has pointed out, seems akin to that of *The Reprobate*.

Of the four plays published in the volumes of *Theatricals*, two eventually were performed: *Disengaged*, and *The Reprobate*.

*Disengaged* received two separate productions. An amateur performance of the play under its older title, *Mrs. Jasper*, was given on February 13, 1902, by the students at the American Academy of Dramatic Art and the Empire Theatre Dramatic School in New York. The performance was reviewed by the *New York Times*, which termed the play a "farce," and spoke of the "infinitely tedious complications" of the plot, and of the "distressing lifelessness and unreality" of the play. Nevertheless, the reviewer found some lines "in the richest vein of wit and nonsense, and several of the situations are developed with a vigorous sense of what goes well on the stage." The "farce"

---


166 James's discursive account of how his uncle, Henry Wyckoff, was dominated by his wife, and of the uncle's willingness to accept the verdict of other people as to his ineffectualness, may be found in James's *A Small Boy and Others* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1913), pp. 134-161.


168 Ibid.
was compared unfavorably with the work of Oscar Wilde. (Two one-act plays were presented on the same program with the full-length Mrs. Jasper [Disengaged].)

In 1909, Disengaged received a professional production in New York; it was seen for a single performance given in aid of St. Andrew's Convalescent Hospital. The play was performed on March 11, 1909, at a special matinee at the Hudson Theatre. Clayton Hamilton reviewed the performance, or rather the play script, in the Forum.

All of the characters are super-civilized beyond all reminiscence of simple natural humanity; as people they are exceedingly clever and entirely unimportant... The dialogue is exceedingly adroit in subtle, intellectual details... But the play makes its appeal merely to the intellect; it is unemotional, unsympathetic, heartless, and therefore empty.

The New York Times, in reviewing the 1909 production of Disengaged, commented on the polished style of the dialogue, and on the excellence of the company. The reviewer called the play a farce rather than a comedy, and he dismissed it as "an amiable trifle."

The Reprobate was not performed until after James's death, when it was given in London by the Stage Society Incorporated in December, 1919. Reviewing the play on December 16, 1919, both the London Times and the Manchester Guardian expressed surprise that the dialogue did not exhibit James's usual style.

171 According to Leon Edel, The Reprobate was seen for only two performances, on December 14 and 15, 1919. (Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 402.)
No psychological supersubtleties, no intricate involutions and convolutions of style... an action all bustle and snap, characters all the broadest, drollest caricatures... We were all in fits of laughter.\textsuperscript{172}

The \textit{Manchester Guardian} found the play "as uproarious and as democratic as a Bank Holiday," despite the fact that if the play were produced on the commercial stage "the modern producer would cut it drastically..."\textsuperscript{173}

The 1919 production of \textit{The Reprobate} was directed for the Stage Society by Allan Wade. Fourteen years later, Wade compared \textit{The Reprobate} with James's \textit{The Outcry}, which, by then, had also been produced by the Stage Society.

\textit{The Outcry} had a qualified success only, as James's latest dialogue proved very difficult to the actors and resulted in a loss of conviction... But the much simpler \textit{Reprobate} was a great success with its audiences and proved extremely "actable." To the best of my recollections I had only to alter one of James's stage directions. The play had a brilliant cast who entered into the fun of the thing with spirit, and I have rarely heard so great a spontaneous burst of laughter as that which greeted Mr. Bonsor's last entrance in boating costume. The play was of course given in the costumes of its period.\textsuperscript{174}

Director Allan Wade's description was not colored by wishful thinking: both the \textit{Times} and the \textit{Manchester Guardian} made special mention of the laughter which greeted the actor's final entrance.

\textsuperscript{172}\textit{Times} [London], December 16, 1919.

\textsuperscript{173}\textit{Manchester Guardian}, December 16, 1919.

\textsuperscript{174}The quotation is from a letter written by Allan Wade to Le Roy Phillips, dated March 30, 1933. A longer excerpt was given to the writer of the present study by Dr. Leon Edel, in June, 1965. (Part of the above quotation appeared in Edel's \textit{Complete Plays of Henry James}, p. 402.)
Not all reaction to the London production of The Reprobate was favorable, however. Arnold Bennett wrote of the play,

[It] contained some agreeable bits; but the spectacle it provided of an unusually able and gifted man trying to do something for which his talents were utterly unfitted was painful; it was humiliating. Half the time the author obviously had not the least idea what he was about.175

Another unfavorable reaction came from the Daily Telegraph's critic, who blamed James for his "lack of lucidity."176

In 1923, The Reprobate was produced in America by the Copley Theatre in Boston.177 The play was presented by Henry Jewett.178

Only one review of this production was available to the writer of the present study. The Boston Evening Transcript reported that the play was an unwise choice,

There was no action; only an incessant bustling on and off the stage. There were no characters to define and animate; only an incessant rattle of speeches as from some tireless talking-machine...179

---


177The Reprobate was being performed "for the first time outside semi-private performances in London," reported the Boston Evening Transcript, March 11, 1923.

178It seems reasonably safe to assume that the Copley Theatre was a professional company, since they advertised matinees on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, in the Boston Evening Transcript (March 14, 1923). This is surely a schedule for professionals only. However, the Boston Public Library reported that they were "unable to find any definite information as to whether the Copley Theatre in Boston, in 1923, was professional or amateur." (Quoted from a letter to the writer of this dissertation, from the Boston Public Library, dated September 29, 1965.)

179Boston Evening Transcript, March 11, 1923.
The play received little aid from the players, who moved too much, and who forgot their lines. (The actors were not named by the paper.)

James failed as a journeyman of the stage, with a plot that was only "vaguely discoverable."180 The play lacked the "flesh of characterisation," and it was full of "nondescript chatter."181

IV. MORE PLAYS AND PRODUCTIONS

Guy Domville

In late November, 1893, while preparations were going forward at Daly's Theatre for the proposed production of Disengaged, James was conferring simultaneously at the St. James's Theatre about the scenery and costumes for another of his plays, Guy Domville.182 The actor-manager, George Alexander, had accepted James's newest play, but production was to be quite far in the future because Alexander had other commitments first.183

The germ of the story for Guy Domville appeared late in 1892 in the following entry in James's notebook.

180Ibid.
181Ibid.
182Robins, op. cit., p. 139, and p. 141.
183Alexander produced Pinero's The Second Mrs. Tanqueray, on May 27, 1893. This was followed by Henry Arthur Jones' The Masquar-adores, April 28, 1894. Then came Henry James's Guy Domville, January 5, 1895, followed immediately by Oscar Wilde's The Importance of Being Earnest, February 14, 1895. All were produced at the St. James's Theatre. See A. E. W. Mason, Sir George Alexander and the St. James' Theatre (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1935), pp. 235-236.
Situation of that once-upon-a-time member of an old Venetian family (I forget which), who had become a monk, and who was taken almost forcibly out of his convent and brought back into the world in order to keep the family from becoming extinct. He was the last rejecto— it was absolutely necessary for him to marry. Adapt this somehow or other to today.104

By the summer of 1893, James was negotiating with George Alexander about the financial terms for the play's production—even though the author had not yet written the second act.105 By December of that year, James optimistically wrote to his brother, William, that Alexander "will produce me at no distant date."106

The play eventually went into rehearsal a year later, in December, 1894. James attended the daily sessions for over four weeks.107 The author described dress rehearsals thus,

as amusing as anything can be, for a man of taste and sensibility, in the odious process of practical dramatic production. I may have been meant for the Drama—God knows!—but I certainly wasn't meant for the Theatre.108

To his friend, Elizabeth Robins, James described the Guy Domville rehearsals as "very human and tranquil."109 By this time, however, James felt that his script had been "abbreviated and simplified out of all close resemblance to my intention."110

104Matthiessen and Murdock, op. cit., p. 126.
106Lubbock, op. cit., I, 211.
107Ibid., I, 226.
108Ibid.
109Robins, op. cit., p. 164.
110Ibid.
Set in 1780, the plot of Guy Domville is centered around a young
man, Guy Domville, who is about to enter the Catholic priesthood. As the play opens, the scene is laid in the country town of Porches, where Guy is employed as tutor to a little boy, the son of an attractive widow, Mrs. Feverel. Guy's close friend, Frank Humber, wishes to marry Mrs. Feverel, but she has said that he must wait. It is made clear to the audience that Mrs. Feverel really loves Guy.

With the arrival of Lord Devenish, Guy learns that he has unexpectedly become the last male alive of the Domville family, as the result of the accidental death of the present Lord of Gays. Lord Devenish takes Guy to London to meet his kinswoman, the widowed Mrs. Domville, aunt of the deceased head of the family. Devenish persuades Guy that he should abandon his plans to enter the church, and that he should marry in order to preserve the ancient family name. It is proposed that Guy should marry Mary Brasier, the daughter of Mrs. Domville by an earlier marriage. To this proposal, Guy agrees. Mrs. Domville wishes to make sure of the title for her daughter, and she has secretly agreed to marry Lord Devenish if he is successful in achieving the desired match for Mary. Lord Devenish's motive is a financial one.

Some three months later, on the very day of the wedding, Guy discovers that Mary has all the while been in love with her cousin, Lieutenant Round. Mary had been willing to submit to the wishes of her mother, and to the persuasiveness of Lord Devenish. Lieutenant Round

---

191 This plot is based on "Guy Domville" in The Complete Plays of Henry James, edited by Leon Edel, pp. 484-516.
reveals to Mary that Lord Devenish is really her father, and it is to this fact that Mary ascribes the strange power of Lord Devenish's appeal to her. When Guy perceives the true situation, he helps the young couple to elope, and he determines once more to enter the church.

In the last act, Guy Domville has returned to Porches to call on Mrs. Feverel. By this time, Guy realises that he loves Mrs. Feverel, but he feels that it would be nobler to enter the church, and to leave her to Frank. As the play ends, Mrs. Feverel once again tells Frank that he must "wait."

The play was printed for private circulation only in 1894. It remained unpublished until Leon Edel reprinted it in the collected Complete Plays of Henry James.

On January 5, 1895, Guy Domville opened at the St. James's Theatre with George Alexander in the title role, and Marion Terry (sister of Ellen Terry) in the role of Mrs. Feverel. Others in the cast included Herbert Waring as Frank Humber, W. G. Elliot as Lord Devenish, and Mrs. Edward Saker as Mrs. Domville. Others in the cast were H. V. Esmond, Frank Dyall, Evelyn Millard, Irene Vanbrugh (as the maid,


Fanny), Blanche Wilmot, and Violet Lyster. The production was "splendidly mounted" in period costumes and lavish settings.

The production of Guy DeMaule had been anticipated with an unusual amount of interest—far more than had been evidenced for James's first play, The American. Perhaps this was because of the prominence of its producer, Alexander. The Critic reported that the audience was "probably the most distinguished of the season," while Edmund Gosse recalled, years later, "such a galaxy of artistic, literary and scientific celebrity gathered in the stalls of the St. James's Theatre as perhaps were never seen in a playhouse before or since." Three leading critics, William Archer, A. B. Walkley, and Clement Scott, were there—as were the then little known critics G. Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, and Arnold Bennett.

---

194 On the same program, a one-act comedy, Too Happy by Half by Julian Field, was presented. (See Mason, op. cit., p. 235.) The program is reproduced in Leon Edel's Les Années Dramatiques (Paris: Jouve and Co., 1931), p. 144.

195 Cited as a quotation from the Tribune (London), in The Critic, XXIII, New Series (January 12, 1895), 40.

196 The Critic, XXIII, New Series (January 26, 1895), 70.


Henry James himself was not in the theatre during most of the first performance of Guy Domville. To ease his nervousness, the author had gone to see a performance of An Ideal Husband by Oscar Wilde at the Haymarket Theatre. James arrived at the St. James's Theatre only a few minutes before the final curtain. When the third act of Guy Domville ended, the actors took their bows. Then, in response to calls of "Author," Alexander led James out before the footlights where he was met by a storm of catcalls and hisses—mainly from the gallery.

"Some twenty minutes or so after the fall of the curtain," Alexander came out alone and delivered an apologetic speech, telling how pained he was to experience such a rebuff, after the many kind receptions that had been given him. The company had worked very hard to do justice to the play. . . . "'T'aint your fault, guv'nor," came from the gallery, "it's the rotten play."

The disturbance at the St. James's Theatre that night caused much comment and speculation in the press. There was talk about a "cabinet" and of an actress who had been replaced in the cast and had sought revenge. Alexander had received a telegram wishing him bad

---

199 Lubbock, op. cit., I, 233.
200 Lubbock, op. cit., I, 227.
201 The Critic, XXIII, New Series (January 26, 1895), 71.
202 The Critic, XXIII, New Series (January 12, 1895), 40.
204 Henry James's Failure as a Dramatist," Literary Digest, LXV, No. 6 (May 8, 1920), 48.
luck. On the other hand, some of the critics thought that the applause of James's over zealous friends had provoked the overt display of dissension. The New York Tribune published, on January 20, excerpts from the letters of three individuals who had been present on the opening night of Guy Domville: sitting in different parts of the house, each correspondent said the catcalls and jeers came from the gallery and from the upper boxes. One, who sat nearby, said that twenty men in the upper boxes hoisted on signal, and it was intimated that the men seemed less sober after each intermission. One of these letter writers to the New York Tribune had returned to see the play on the second night, and he reported that all was calm then.

On the whole, the press devoted more space to the description of the audience's behavior, and to the play as literature, than it did to the actors' performances. George Alexander, in the title role, was generally described as excellent: the Manchester Guardian said he played Domville "with polish and feeling"; while the Theatre's
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205 Leon Edel, in The Complete Plays of Henry James, (p. 468), quotes the text of the telegram which, he says, was afterward printed in the Westminster Gazette, on January 9, 1895.

206 The Theatre [London], XXV (February 1, 1895), 106.

207 Times [London], January 7, 1895.


209 James was in the audience for the second performance, which, he wrote, had a "good 'money' house" and went "singularly well." (Lubbock, op. cit., I, 228.)

210 Manchester Guardian, January 7, 1895.
critic spoke of Alexander's "power of chivalrous earnestness." Miss Marion Terry's playing was variously described as "charming, "wince- some," and "delightful." Herbert Waring and H. V. Esmond were also highly commended. Not so with the actor, W. G. Elliot, "whose portrait of Lord Devenish was conceived in a distinct spirit of caricature," and who "played him just as he might have played an elderly marquis in a comic opera."

When Mrs. Edward Saker, in the role of Mrs. Donville, appeared in "fantastic headgear and a hideously misshapen crinoline," the audience roared with laughter. W. Graham Robertson, who sat with James's old friend, John S. Sargent—the painter, described how the actress took flight at the laughter and tried to efface herself.

Now the spectacle of a stately dame whose balloon-like skirts half filled the stage and whose plumes smote the heavens trying to efface herself was genuinely ludicrous and the laugh became a roar. After this the audience got out of hand; they grew silly and cruel and ready to jeer at everything.

211 The Theatre, loc. cit.


214 Manchester Guardian, loc. cit.

215 The Theatre, loc. cit.


217 Times [London], loc. cit.

The critics found the first act of *Guy Domville* "charming," 219 but they complained almost unanimously about the second act. The second act was "wholly independent of the other two"; 220 it was "deplorably weak"; 221 also,

The ingenuousness of the construction, by which the second act was commenced with an entirely fresh set of characters, was almost inconceivable: it is impossible to sustain the interest of an audience with the devices of fiction. 222

The *Times* found the side issues of the plot perplexing. 223 A. B. Walkley, writing in *Harper's Weekly*, felt that the complications in the second act were too numerous. 224 William Archer complained that Domville's motives were not clear in either the second or the third act. 225 The *Theatre* regarded the play's conclusion as neither "necessary" nor "adequate." 226

Edmund Gosse made a rather interesting observation about the play's ending.

"Guy Domville" ... was a delicate and picturesque play, of which the only disadvantage that I could discover was that instead of

---

219 William Archer in *The World* (January 16, 1895)—see Archer, *op. cit.*, p. 32; and the *Manchester Guardian*, *loc. cit.*

220 *The Theatre*, *loc. cit.*
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223 *Times* [London], *loc. cit.*


225 Archer, *op. cit.*, pp. 33-34.

226 *The Theatre*, *loc. cit.*
having a last scene which tied up all the threads in a neat conclusion, it left all those threads loose as they would be in life.227

"The characters," said A. B. Walkley, "are subtly yet most humanly inconsistent . . . ."228 Walkley observed that their motives were not those of the majority, and they were therefore not popular. Several of the critics complained of the unexplained change in Donville's character after the first act.229

The drinking scene was eliminated after the first couple of performances.230 William Archer thought that the drinking scene "seemed to be a concession to some supposed demand for lively and even violent action, rather than a natural outgrowth of the situation."231

According to one account, the actors in the drinking scene only pretended to drink, and "for some obscure purpose of discovery . . . poured their wine furtively into a convenient bowl of flowers upon the table between them."232 As the script now stands, in Edel's collection of James's plays, there are no stage directions indicating any special

229 Times (London); Manchester Guardian; Harper's Weekly, loc. cit.
231 Archer, op. cit., p. 33.
disposition of the wine, so this business was no doubt invented by Alexander.

The distinctly 'literary' quality of the dialogue in Guy Domville caused divergent reactions. Clement Scott (regular critic for the Daily Telegraph) wrote of the play's "literary charm and fancy . . . the beauty of the subject . . . [and] the delicacy and grace of the dialogue . . . ." Walkley felt the play was a work of "inward and spiritual grace," in which the speech was "exquisite." On the other hand, the Manchester Guardian felt that the "increasing supersubtlety and obscurity of the dialogue . . . exhausted the patience of some of the audience," while the Times felt that although the dialogue was literary, it was neither apt nor vital.

It may be imagined what a painful experience it was for a sensitive man like Henry James to face the jeers of the gallery mob on the opening night of Guy Domville. For him, the theatre, as opposed to the drama, was a "black abyss." The daily papers had been "ill-natured and densely stupid and vulgar." He felt that to return to his "legitimate form" of writing would be a "divine solace." The conflict in James's mind may be seen in a long letter which he wrote to

---
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237 Ibid., Selected Letters of Henry James, p. 155.
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his brother, William, on February 2, 1895—just a few days before Guy
Dowville closed. In it, James remarked that, fortunately, he
quickly got detached from a piece of work once it was finished, and
that he felt his literary production had been "smothered by these thea­
trical lures." Yet in the same letter there seems to be a wistful
hurt.

I have worked like a horse—far harder than anyone will ever know—
over the whole stiff mystery of "technique"—I have run it to
earth, and I don't in the least hesitate to say that, for the com­
paratively poor and meagre, the piteously simplified, purposes of
the English stage, I have made it absolutely my own, put it into my
pocket. The question of realizing how different is the attitude of
the theatre-goer toward the quality of thing which might be a story
in a book from his attitude toward the quality of thing that is
given to him as a story in a play is another matter altogether.
That difficulty is portentous, for any writer who doesn't approach
it naively, as only a very limited and simple-minded writer can.

As a postscript, it might be added that it seems somewhat ironic
that the next play produced by Alexander at the St. James's Theatre was
Oscar Wilde's The Importance of Being Earnest. James had never liked
Wilde's plays, and he found the currently running An Ideal Husband,
"crude . . . feeble and vulgar." The dates clearly show that Alex­
ander's company must have been rehearsing The Importance of Being
Earnest during the end of the run of Guy Dowville.

As for the relative success or failure of Guy Dowville, on the
whole it should probably be counted as a failure. It ran for only

---
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thirty-one performances in London, as compared with the seventy performances achieved by James's first professionally produced play, The American. Nevertheless, Guy Domville attracted far more attention than the earlier play. The opening night was memorable for its near-riot in the theatre, and it may be conjectured whether those of the critics who championed James's work for its literary charms may not have been led to a greater warmth than they otherwise would have expressed, as a reaction against the vociferous rowdies who were present.

Summersoft

In December of 1893, James had determined to wage his "war" for only one year more in the theatre. But even after the heartbreaking experience of Guy Domville, he was not able to turn his back on the drama. As early as February 5, 1895 (only a couple of days after the closing of Guy Domville), James went to see Ellen Terry about writing a short play for her to take on tour to the United States. James's idea was to create a story which would present a kind of Madame Sans-Gêne in reverse, "not a woman of the people, who in consequence of a stroke of fortune has to play the grande dame, but a grande dame who

---

24h In his letter to William James, written on February 2, 1895, Henry stated that Guy Domville would close "tonight" after thirty-one performances. (See Lubbeck, op. cit., I, 233.) Professor Edel, in The Complete Plays of Henry James, mentions forty performances, including an extra week that included a trip to Brighton (p. 483).

245 Lubbeck, op. cit., I, 211.

246 Matthiessen and Murdock, op. cit., p. 184.
in consequence of a stroke of fortune has to play a woman of the people. Miss Terry, however, had a fancy to do an American woman. James recalled an entry which he had made in his notebook over two years earlier, when he had been planning to write a second comedy for Augustin Daly. Starring Ada Rhonan, the play would have revolved around an American woman in London society, and James saw it as a satiric picture built around the "reversal of what the parties traditionally represent." For Ellen Terry, James now envisioned the subject of an American woman as the beneficent intervening agent in the drama of an English social, or English family, crisis... her stepping in as the real conservative, more royalist than the king, etc.

That summer, Ellen Terry paid James the sum of £100 in advance for the little play, which was now called Summerson. However, the actress never produced the play, and James recovered the script from her some three years later and turned it into a story. With
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252 In his letters and in his notebook, James referred to the play as Mrs. Grossedew—the name of the leading character. The country house in the play is called Summerson, and it was named after the house in James's earlier tale, The Lesson of the Master. Later, when James converted the one-act play into a story, he changed the name of the house to Covering End. (See Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 520.)
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the new title of "Covering End," the story was published as a companion piece to "The Turn of the Screw," under the over-all book title, The Two Magics.254

In converting the one-act play, Summersoft, into a story, James simply "paraphrased" the names of the characters, and "added such indications as might be the equivalent of decent acting . . . ."255

There was no change in the plot. Both Summersoft and Covering End revolve around the charming American widow, Mrs. Gracedew.256

Summersoft (Covering End) is a show-house: a country house which is regularly on view to tourists. The setting is the great hall of the house. As the play (story) opens, Mrs. Gracedew, a rich American widow, is enchanted as she roams through the house alone.

Captain Yule has recently inherited the property, but he has never seen the house until the day of the play's action. The impulsive and vivacious American lady offers to show him through his own property. (Mrs. Gracedew also acts as a delightful impromptu guide for a group of tourists. This justifies her staying in the house for quite a long

254 The book, The Two Magics, was published in its first edition by William Heinemann of London in 1898. The Turn of the Screw had been serialised in Collier's Weekly earlier that same year. (Edel and Laurence, A Bibliography of Henry James, pp. 113-114.)

255 Edel, Selected Letters of Henry James, p. 183.

The techniques employed by James in converting Summersoft into a story (Covering End), and then later in converting the story into a three-act play (The High Bid), are described in some detail in Chapter IV of the present study, "Henry James's Own Dramatisations," under Section V, Summersoft—"Covering End"—The High Bid.

256 This plot is based on "Summersoft" in The Complete Plays of Henry James, edited by Leon Edel, pp. 524-546.
time, and James is thus enabled to have Mrs. Gracelaw drift in and out of the great hall at convenient times.)

Summersoft is mortgaged to the wealthy Mr. Prodmore. Prodmore offers a deal to Captain Yule whereby he can keep the house. If Yule will marry Cora, Prodmore's daughter, and if he will run as the conservative representative for the local district, the mortgage will be cancelled. Yule's conscience troubles him because he will have to give up his radical political views, but apparently his conscience is not disturbed about Cora.

Cora tells Mrs. Gracelaw that she intends to refuse Captain Yule, because she is in love with a Mr. Buddle of Bellborough. The girl is sure that her father would object to Buddle, because the young man's name is unprepossessing.

Mrs. Gracelaw buys out Prodmore at an enormous price. She offers to rent the house to Yule, but he proposes marriage instead. Mrs. Gracelaw accepts the latter alternative.

James has left the issue of Yule's politics vague in the denouement, but, since Mrs. Gracelaw is not interested in politics, it may be presumed that Yule will continue to be a radical.

As a play, Summersoft was never published until Professor Edel included it in The Complete Plays of Henry James. However, the play was not a dead issue after the publication of Covering End. James had sent what appears to have been his only copy of the play to his friend, Elizabeth Robins. Then, nearly a year after the publication of the

257 Edel and Laurence, A Bibliography of Henry James, p. 183.
story version, James wrote and asked Miss Robins to send him the script of *Swerreff.*²⁵⁸ It so happened that two of England's leading actor-managers had read the story, and both had suggested to James that he dramatise it. One of the requests came from George Alexander, who had produced James's *Guy Domville,* and the other request was from Johnston Forbes-Robertson.²⁵⁹ At first, James had refused both of these requests.²⁶⁰ Many months later James changed his mind, for "pecuniary" reasons, and he submitted the play to Alexander.²⁶¹ Having read the play, Alexander was no longer interested. James returned the script to Miss Robins again, saying,

Dear Miss Robins,

I send you back poor Mrs. Cracoway, (even as she has been returned on my hands, after all,) for you to have and to hold, to do what you like with—above all to produce, absolutely at your freedom and discretion, when the right occasion rises.²⁶²

Miss Robins was not idle. At some time, probably around the end of 1899, she submitted the play to the reading committee of the New Century Theatre, but they, too, decided not to produce it.²⁶³ The script, for the time being, remained in Miss Robins' hands.

²⁶⁰ Matthiessen and Murdock, op. cit., p. 268.
²⁶² Ibid., p. 213.
²⁶³ The New Century Theatre's negative decision was reached despite a favorable report on the play which was made by William Archer. (Robins, op. cit., pp. 215-216; and Edel, *Complete Plays of Henry James,* p. 523.)
The High Bid

Several years after the publication of the story, Covering End, Johnston Forbes-Robertson renewed his request to James for a dramatization of the story. Accordingly, in October, 1907, James wrote once more to Elisabeth Robins asking her to send him the script of Summersoft. Forbes-Robertson, in his memoirs, reported that James sent him the play, which had been renamed, The High Bid, and that he, Forbes-Robertson, persuaded James to divide the play into three acts.

The most striking change between Summersoft and The High Bid is the almost countless number of minor alterations in the lines, all of which tend to make the speeches longer and more complex. Such changes are in keeping with James's later style, and also with the fact that for him to reread meant, ipso facto, to rewrite—as his secretary,

26| Edel gives the date of James's request to Miss Robins as October 9, 1907—from an unpublished letter. (Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 591.)

According to a communication from Leon Edel to the writer of this present study, dated June 15, 1965, the only extant manuscript of Summersoft is at the University of Texas, Austin. (They also have the originals of Elisabeth Robins' letters.) Apparently, James used the one-act play manuscript, and then he returned it to Miss Robins, but it still remained in its old 1899 envelope.

A careful three-way comparison of Summersoft, Covering End, and The High Bid, seems to indicate that James did, in fact, have a copy of Summersoft available when writing the later, longer play. Details of the relationships between the three versions may be found in Chapter IV of the present study, "Henry James's Own Dramatizations," under Section V. The most important evidence is to be found in the revisions in the lines of The High Bid to the wording of the earliest version, Summersoft.

Miss Bosanquet, has reported.\textsuperscript{266} The stage directions are also noticeably longer in the later play. The character of Frodmore has been strengthened, and the nationality of the group of tourists has been changed. One character has been added: in \textit{The High Bid}, Cora's young man appears on stage at the beginning of the first act. (In the earlier play, and in the story, the young man had merely been referred to: he had remained unseen.) The name of the young man, in \textit{The High Bid}, was changed from Mr. Buddle, to Mr. Hall Pegg. Other than these comparatively minor changes, and the division into three acts, the play remained much the same. The plot is exactly the same as in the two earlier versions, and so is the setting.\textsuperscript{267}

It was proposed that in Forbes-Robertson's production of \textit{The High Bid}, the actor-manager should play Captain Yule, and his actress-wife, Gertrude Elliott, should play Mrs. Gracedew. Since Miss Elliott was American-born, there would be no dialect problem for her part.

Professor Edel had access to a diary of Miss Bosanquet's, which showed the following work dates. Forbes-Robertson had studied the script by December 15, 1907, and James then dictated some changes. Then, in January and February, 1908, James went up to London for conferences with the producer. During the first week in February, James was attending daily rehearsals in London. On February 19 and 20, James


\textsuperscript{267}\textit{The High Bid} was published for the first time in Leon Edel's, \textit{The Complete Plays of Henry James}, pp. 554-603. (See Edel and Laurence, \textit{A Bibliography of Henry James}, p. 183.)
made changes in the script—including the addition of the scene which brings Cora's young man onto the stage.\footnote{Edel, \textit{Complete Plays of Henry James}, p. 550.}

From James's published letters it may be learned that he joined the company in Manchester, where daily rehearsal sessions were being held, in March. The author travelled with the company to Edinburgh, where the play had its first performance on March 26, 1906. James attended the first two performances, and then left Scotland. On tour, the play was taken to Glasgow (for three performances), to Newcastle, and to Liverpool.\footnote{Lubbock, \textit{op. cit.}, II, 94-97.}

Professor Edel reports that \textit{The High Bid} met with a "trepid reception" from the critics in Edinburgh.\footnote{Edel, \textit{Complete Plays of Henry James}, p. 550.} He reports that the Edinburgh \textit{Evening News} grumbled because Forbes-Robertson had accepted a secondary role, while the \textit{Scottish} observed that the play "did not seem likely to increase his reputation as an actor."\footnote{Ibid., p. 551.}

It was while the company was in Edinburgh that Ellen Terry appeared on the scene again. Currently playing in Edinburgh herself, she sent a telegram to Forbes-Robertson, "'You have my play!'"\footnote{Forbes-Robertson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 272.} Miss Terry believed that she still held the acting rights to \textit{Summer艹ft}. However, the misunderstanding was straightened out.

\footnote{Edel, \textit{Complete Plays of Henry James}, p. 550.}
\footnote{Lubbock, \textit{op. cit.}, II, 94-97.}
\footnote{Edel, \textit{Complete Plays of Henry James}, p. 550.}
\footnote{Ibid., p. 551.}
\footnote{Forbes-Robertson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 272.}
At this time, James was hoping for a London opening for the play in May or June of 1908. However, the Forbes-Robertsons postponed the London opening until the autumn. In the meantime, they produced Jerome K. Jerome's *The Passing of the Third Floor Back*, and that production turned out to be one of their greatest successes.

In October, 1908, while *The Passing of the Third Floor Back* was playing at Terry's Theatre, Gertrude Elliott wrote to James about *The High Bid*. She asked for some alterations in the second act, and she complained that, in the provinces, she had not been getting the right kind of audience reaction to her big speech "pleading for preservation of old traditions and old English 'show' houses": instead of applauding her speech, the audiences were applauding Captain Yule's rejoinder that there were "thousands in England who had no houses to show at all."  

James wrote, in return,

> It is always interesting to measure and reconsider things in the light of their apparent effect (or non-effect) on audiences—if they [are] not things of the essence... I can imagine, I think, already a more amusing breaking up—of the centre of Act II—amusing in the sense of more generally attaching and thrilling and dramatic. But the very stuff of the thing can only remain of course—and there it is.

---

273 *Lubbock, op. cit.*, II, 97.
276 *Edel, Selected Letters of Henry James*, p. 158.
Although he was willing to work on the structure of the second act, James was most emphatic in stating that the essence of the character of Mrs. Gracedew could not be changed. The role had been created for Miss Ellen Terry, and specifically with an American production in mind.

My small comedy treats its subject—and its subject is Mrs. Gracedew’s appeal and adventure—on Mrs. Gracedew’s grounds and in Mrs. Gracedew’s spirit, and any deflection from these and that logic and that consistency would send the whole action off into a whirlwind of incoherence.²⁷⁹

Because of the success of The Passing of the Third Floor Back, Forbes-Robertson proposed that they should perform The High Bid concurrently for a series of matinee performances at Beerbohm Tree’s “Afternoon Theatre.” James was agreeable to the suggestion.²⁸⁰ Accordingly, The High Bid opened for the first of five afternoon performances at His Majesty’s Theatre, in London, on February 18, 1909.²⁸¹

²⁷⁹Ibid., p. 158.

²⁸⁰Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 552.

²⁸¹Edel reports that The High Bid was given on February 18, 1909, and for four matinees thereafter on a bill with Louis Tiercelin’s one-act play, A Soul’s Flight. (See Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 552.) The program is reproduced in Leon Edel’s Henry James: Les Années Dramatiques (Paris: Jouve and Co., 1931), p. 209.

In a letter to G. Bernard Shaw, dated January 20, 1909, James related that when the play was about to go into rehearsal, the Forbes-Robertsons needed a curtain raiser. Since they had nothing on hand, James dramatized his story, “Owen Mingrave,” written many years before, and he called the new short play, The Saloon. However, the Forbes-Robertsons could “make neither head nor tail of it; and in the second place . . . The High Bid was going to last too long to allow anything else of importance.” (See Edel, Selected Letters of Henry James, p. 161.) The Saloon was put away in a drawer, but it had a further history, and a production at a considerably later date (cf. post, section on The Saloon, pp. 95-102).
There had been a number of alterations made in the script on the road. James had been "appalled" at the number of cuts, but, on the other hand, presumably he added new material to the second act in response to Gertrude Elliott's request. At any rate, the over-all playing time was ten minutes shorter by the time *The High Bid* reached London.

The small six-member cast consisted of Forbes-Robertson and his wife, Gertrude Elliott, as Captain Yule and Mrs. Gracedew; Edward Sass as Prodmore; Esme Hubbard as the daughter, Cora Prodmore; Ian Robertson as the old servant, Chivers; and Alexander Cassy as the momentarily seen young man, Mr. Hall Pegg.

James himself was not in the house at the opening performance of *The High Bid*. He was "lying paralysed. His friends, John Singer Sargent, and Max Beerbohm (serving as the drama critic for the *Saturday Review*), were there together with the American ambassador, and Mrs. Charles Hunter. In the words of the ambassador, Whitelaw Reid, James's latest play had his "usuel succès d'estime and nothing more."

---


284 The cast list is in the *London Times* (February 19, 1909). (The cast is also listed by Edel in *Complete Plays*, p. 836.)
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On the whole, The High Bid was favorably received in London. The critics acclaimed its literary merits and its charm, but most of the reviewers felt that the play was somewhat deficient in dramatic qualities.

Max Beerbohm, writing in the Saturday Review, devoted most of his space to a discourse on James's artistry in the field of fiction. He concluded that of all that he loved in James's mind, "very little can be translated into the sphere of drama, . . . [but] even that little has a quality which no other man can give us; an inalienable magic." 288

In setting "the exquisite" before the audience, the London Times recognised that James was employing one of his favorite 'motifs': the "joy" which the American visitor finds in the old things of England, "contrasted with the coolness and perhaps indifference towards these old things of the people with the old names who possess them." 289

The High Bid was hailed as "a charming and graceful play." 290 It had a "pleasant literary flavour," 291 which made for "pleasing, if very light entertainment." 292 The literary flavor was in keeping with the purpose of Beerbohm Tree's Afternoon Theatre, which was intended to give "a series of matinee performances of plays too refined for the

288 Beerbohm, op. cit., pp. 544-545.
289 Times (London), February 19, 1909.
291 Illustrated London News, CXXXIV (February 27, 1909), 328.
292 Ibid.
popularity...293 The audience, consisting of the "superior class" that attended the Afternoon Theatre, "listened with respectful attention."294

A cable despatch to the New York Times described The High Bid as "all talk... but delightful talk."295 The London Times opined,

What a pleasure it must be for the players to have continuously to talk Henry James! They all achieve the feat with dexterity and gusto; to listen to them you would almost believe that people do really talk like that.296

The Illustrated London News spoke of the "grace and aptness" of the dialogue, and of the exquisite turn of James's phrases.297 The reviewer made the interesting observation that James had a knack for catching "the trick of modern conversation, which deals in hints and evasions, using words as a sort of shorthand, and answers the underlying thought rather than the remark actually made...".298

The critic for Punch magazine found James "much too leisurely for the stage."299 The characters made their point in two lines, and then went on for ten more lines to make sure of it. The New York Tribune complained of a "great paucity of happenings."300 One reviewer

295Ibid.
296Times [London], loc. cit.
298Ibid.
299Punch, XXXVI (February 24, 1909), 142.
commented, "Mr. James is no hand at a plot,"\textsuperscript{301} while another reviewer felt that the play showed a "lack of most of the qualities expected of drama... action, intrigue, plot-development, interaction of wills, and... clear-cut characterisation."\textsuperscript{302}

The critics found some of the characters not quite real. They were "essentially puppets,"\textsuperscript{303} though they moved with a "lively grace and distinction."\textsuperscript{304} James so over-refined his "elaboration of character that the outlines blurred."\textsuperscript{305} One reviewer found it inconsistent that Captain Yule should be both an aristocratic radical and a "dishonourablecad,"\textsuperscript{306} and the Prodmores were dismissed as "mere phantoms of the theatre."\textsuperscript{307}

The stage is a "great leveller," said \textit{Punch}, and the implication was clear that this play represented a come down for James.\textsuperscript{308} Nevertheless, \textit{The High Bid} was "a most interesting experiment."\textsuperscript{309} Even that staunch Jamesian supporter, Max Beerbohm, felt that the "trite conventionality of the story" was a concession to audience taste.\textsuperscript{310}

\textsuperscript{301}\textit{Times} (London), loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{302}\textit{Illustrated London News}, loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{303}Beerbohm, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 545. \textsuperscript{304}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{305}\textit{Illustrated London News}, loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{306}\textit{Punch}, loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{307}\textit{Times} (London), loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{308}\textit{Punch}, loc. cit. \textsuperscript{309}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{310}Beerbohm, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 545.
As for the acting, it seemed generally held that James had found ideal interpreters in the Forbes-Robertsons.

Max Beerbohm felt that Johnston Forbes-Robertson was "exquisitely equipped" to interpret James, even to the "groping hesitancy before the adverb" in his reading of the line, "'To whom do you--beautifully belong?'" (This question was directed to the aging servant, Chivers.) "It was an authentic part of the soul of Mr. James."  

Forbes-Robertson employed an exemplary "grace" and "elocution," said the Times, while the Illustrated London News' reviewer felt that the actor created an atmosphere of "leisurely ease and refinement."

It was Gertrude Elliott, however, who gathered the accolades.

Miss Gertrude Elliott can seldom have done anything quite so good as this Mrs. Cracehowe of hers; a charming reconciliation of opposite qualities--authority and girlishness, earnestness and raillery, American independence and an accent as English as the old houses and lawns. She does it all with a kind of breathless, half-timid, half-audacious glee.

---

311 Beerbohm, op. cit., p. 541.
312 Beerbohm, op. cit., p. 541.
313 Times [London], loc. cit.
315 Times [London], loc. cit. (The reference to Miss Elliott's English accent seems a little strange in as much as she was born and raised in America, and the role was that of an American widow.)
Her "vivacity and touching grace are just what are needed for Mrs. Gracedew," and she "never acted with brighter intelligence than in the part of this frank and susceptible widow." The players of the lesser parts received warm, if comparatively little, attention from the press. Ian Robertson, as the old servant, was "just the very type"; he was "fine." Edward Sass and Emma Hubbard were "quite good as the Prodmores; it [was] not their fault that the Prodmores were phantoms of the theatre--mere concessions to the brutal nature of the theatrical audience." Miss Hubbard, as Core Prodmore, "gave a delightful reading to a delightfully-drawn character.

Perhaps Forbes-Robertson's own opinion provides a summary of the general reaction to The High Bid.

The play teemed with delicate romance, full of charm and freshness of treatment, and all in the high comedy vein. . . . [The High Bid], however, proved of far too delicate a fibre and literary elegance to appeal to a general public.

---

316 Beerbohm, op. cit., p. 545.
318 Times [London], loc. cit.
319 Beerbohm, op. cit., p. 545.
320 Times [London], loc. cit.
321 Punch, loc. cit.
The Chaperon

In mid-July of 1891, James made a notation in his regular notebook of a situation out of which he thought he could make a story. The idea, James noted, had come from a "word of Mrs. Earle's," and it concerned a woman who had compromised herself, and whose daughter eventually reintroduced her to society. On July 21, James wrote that he had decided to make the story into two parts for the Atlantic Monthly; it was published in that magazine at the end of the year with the title, The Chaperon.

It is interesting from the point of view of the present study that James, in his notebook, considered developing his story in dramatic terms:

"If I can make Part II all it may be, the thing will be very good indeed. Make it purely dramatic, make it movement and action. I have set the stage sufficiently in the first act."

In The Complete Plays of Henry James, Leon Edel has included some unpublished fragments and notes which James left for a proposed dramatization of The Chaperon. Professor Edel had access to some unpublished notes "torn from a scribbler," which were dated about May or June, 1893, and also to a rough scenario dated 1907. Edel also

---

323 Matthiessen and Murdock, op. cit., p. 106.
324 The story, "The Chaperon," was published in the Atlantic Monthly in November and December, 1891, and it was later included in a volume of short stories, published under the title, The Real Thing, in 1893. (See Edel and Laurence, op. cit., pp. 89-90, and p. 326.)
325 Matthiessen and Murdock, op. cit., p. 108.
326 Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 455.
327 Ibid., p. 607.
refers to some unpublished correspondence between James and Arthur
Pinero in 1893, when the latter suggested to James that he should make
a dramatization of his short story.328

In the 1893 notations, James considered various problems involved
in transferring the story of The Chaperon to the stage: his ideas, James
felt, should be "intensified and dramatically pointed";329 a new hero,
in the form of a third suitor, should be provided for the heroine, Rose;
her Aunt Julia should become an uncle—"to diminish the number of
women";330 and perhaps two other women characters could be merged into
one. Although James envisioned many changes in the plot, he felt that
the general subject should remain the same. The story was of a girl
whose mother had a "past," and of the girl's efforts to reinstate her
mother in society. The girl acted as "chaperon" to her mother.

Many years later, in 1907, James returned to the idea of making
his story, The Chaperon, into a full-length play. He had just finished
converting Covering End into the three-act play, The High Bid, for
Forbes-Robertson. According to his secretary, Miss Bosanquet, his in­
terest in writing for the theatre had been rekindled, and he searched
among his stories for dramatic material.331

In his rough draft for The Chaperon, James groped his way through
a maze of ideas for the play. He had decided, provisionally, to retain
the characters' names from the tale: the heroine would still be Rose
Tramore, and her suitor would still be Bertram Jay. James considered how to handle his exposition, and he decided what events should be in the first act. The second act, he thought, should seem to indicate possible defeat for Rose’s plans.

James developed four major sections of dialogue for the first act. He was conscious of problems of staging, and of the necessary functions of certain scenes. Unfortunately, the manuscript broke off in the middle of James’s discourse about the second act.332

The rough draft for the play, The Chapron, was made in November, 1907. However, it became apparent at this time that The High Bid (the Forbes-Robertson play) would be too short for an entire evening, and James looked around for something else which he could make into a one-acter to fill out the bill. His choice fell on his short story, Owen Wingleave, which he promptly converted into dramatic form under the new title of The Saloon. James never again returned to The Chap-eran.333

The Saloon

James’s story, "Owen Wingleave," was first published in the magazine, The Graphic, in 1892,334 and it was included in a collection of tales published in 1893.335 More than a decade later, James tried to

332 Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 609-637.
334 Edel and Laurence, op. cit., p. 327.
335 Ibid., p. 93.
recall the origin of the story, and it seemed to him that the idea had come to him complete, and "right" in all its details, as he observed a young man in Kensington Gardens. The young man "by the mere magic of type" established a situation, complete in all its implications, in James's mind.\footnote{336}

How James came to convert "Owen Wingrave" into his one-act play, The Saloon, has already been recounted in the foregoing sections on The High Bid and The Chaperon. However, in order that the present section will be complete, a little recapitulation is needed. When The High Bid was about to go into rehearsal, Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson decided that it needed a curtain-raiser.\footnote{337} Accordingly, James looked among his short stories for something suitable to convert into dramatic form, and he selected Owen Wingrave. This was at the beginning of December, 1907, and within a month James had his short play ready, with a new title, The Saloon.\footnote{338} However, the Forbes-Robertsons could "make neither head nor tail of it,"\footnote{339} and James put the little play away in a drawer.

Shortly afterwards, James showed The Saloon to Harley Granville-Barker, and he, in turn, showed it to the Stage Society. Unfortunately, the Stage Society rejected the piece.\footnote{340}

\footnote{Henry James, The Altar of the Dead and Other Tales (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922), p. xxii.}

\footnote{337 Selected Letters of Henry James, p. 161.}

\footnote{338 Ibid., Les Annaes Dramatiques, pp. 192-193.}

\footnote{339 Ibid., Selected Letters of Henry James, p. 161.}

\footnote{340 Ibid., p. 159.}
In August of 1910, Henry James visited the States so as to be with his dying brother, William. At the end of the month, William died, but James stayed with the family for about a year longer.\textsuperscript{341}

While James was in America, his agent contacted him with the news that Gertrude Kingston was interested in \textit{The Saloon}, and, in January of 1911, she produced the play in London.\textsuperscript{342} James did not see the production.

The central character of \textit{The Saloon} is young Owen Wingrave. Owen has come home for the express purpose of telling his family that he has made up his mind not to follow the family military tradition: he wishes to pursue a literary or a scholarly career. Since Owen is the last of his line, this is a particularly serious matter. Owen's grandfather, never seen on stage, disowns him.

The action is set in the main living-room (the saloon) of the country home of old General Sir Philip Wingrave, K.C.B.—Owen's grandfather. The room is like a museum with cases of military relics, and pictures of military men on the walls.

There is a Wingrave family legend about a boy who refused to fight, and who was beaten to death by his grandfather. The ghost of the grandfather, the "monster," still walks, and he has been seen in the saloon.

To round out the cast there are some house guests: Spencer Coyle—a professional army coach; Mrs. Coyle; Bobby Leckmere, a friend of Owen's; Kate Julian; and her mother, Mrs. Julian. The Julians are


\textsuperscript{342}Edel, \textit{Complete Plays of Henry James}, p. 647.
also a military family, and there has been an understanding that Kate and Owen would marry.

Kate taunts Owen with cowardice for refusing to enter the army. She says that she has seen the Wingrave ghost, but that Owen would be afraid to meet it. Owen is not afraid, however, and he says that he would like to put an end to the haunting. She goads him on, until he fairly challenges the ghost. By this time, Kate is terrified by what she has done, and she begs Owen to keep silent. Owen persists recklessly, saying, "What do I care for the Demon himself except for the joy of blasting—!" As he says these words, the room is plunged into darkness. When the darkness has passed, Owen is lying dead on the floor: he has died a soldier's death.

In the production which the play received in 1911, there was apparently some actual physical representation of the ghost. A couple of the reviewers referred to a "flicker" of white; one critic wrote of a "concrete . . . dear old family ghost"; the Sun recorded that Owen fell dead at the "shadowy feet" of the ghost; and H. M. Walbrook

---

343 Ibid., p. 673.
344 The text of "The Saloon" was published for the first time in Leon Edel's, The Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 650-674.
345 Daily Chronicle [London], January 18, 1911; and Athenaeum [London], No. 4383 (January 21, 1911), p. 80.
346 The Sketch, LXXXIII (January 25, 1911), 82.
347 The Sun [New York], January 18, 1911.
mentioned a "pale, dialy seen figure." This was not in accord with James's wishes.

On January 17, 1911, Gertrude Kingston presented The Saloon as the first item on a double bill at the Little Theatre in London. James's play served as the curtain-raiser to GIsely Hamilton's Just to Get Married, in which Miss Kingston herself appeared.

There seemed to be some disagreement among the critics as to the merits of James's play. The Athenaeum said that the very qualities which gave distinction to James's novels, his "delicacy and subtlety . . . his fastidiousness," hampered him as a playwright. The Times found it incongruous that such literary dialogue should lead up to such "lurid" melodrama at the end. It was said that James's "superb and sometimes tremendous prose . . . [was] a distinguished compliment" to the stage.

H. M. Walbrook, who was a James enthusiast, wrote in the Pall Mall Gazette of the "soft rhythms," and the "delicate economies" of James's prose. He commented that even a one-act play could become

---

348 H. M. Walbrook, Nights at the Play (London: W. J. Ham-Smith, 1911), p. 115. (Review of January 17, 1911, reprinted from the Pall Mall Gazette.)

349 Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 648-649.

350 Times [London], January 18, 1911.

351 Athenaeum [London], No. 4343 (January 21, 1911), p. 80.

352 Times [London], loc. cit.

353 Daily Chronicle, loc. cit.

354 Walbrook, op. cit., p. 115.
a "thing of power . . . in the hands of a master." Years later, in an article on James, Walbrook recalled,

the long drawn-out conversational exchanges . . . were full of beauty and significance for those listeners who were already familiar with the rhythms and economics of the writer's prose, but their effect upon other members of the audience was evidently very different. "I feel as if I had been sitting in a madhouse!" exclaimed an individual in the smoking-room during the entr'acte that followed.

The Times' critic observed that the players "knit their brows in the effort to remember the unusual collocations" of James's sentences. The writer for the Saturday Review stated that although no one talked in real life like James's characters, "the perfect convention brings one [closer] to nature than any degree of phonetic realism!" To him, the characters sounded "alive" and "natural" in their own idiom.

Most of the critics found The Saloon thrilling, and the comments ranged all the way from Walbrook's warm reaction, "one of the most thrilling one-act plays produced in London of late years," to the Sketch's, "you cannot feel bored," and the Athenæum's observation, "the play affects the nerves without conquering the reason."

---

355 Ibid., p. 114.
357 Times (London), loc. cit.
358 The Saturday Review, CXX, (January 21, 1911), 75.
359 Ibid., p. 76.
360 Walbrook, Nights at the Play, p. 116.
361 The Sketch, loc. cit.
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Regarding the play script technically, the *Sketch* complained of the "clumsiness of the needlessly numerous entrances and exits,"\(^{363}\) and the *Athenaeum* wished that James had handled the supernatural less crudely.\(^{364}\) The latter reviewer also carped that the motives of the characters were "fantastic," and that they talked and behaved "as though they were living in the eighteenth or an earlier century."\(^{365}\) On the other hand, the critic for the *Saturday Review* found the play "essentially dramatic," praised its "force and workmanship," and felt that the play should be seen again so that the "cunning of each stroke" might be appreciated.\(^{366}\)

As for the acting, the cast as a whole was lauded. James was "well served by his interpreters,"\(^{367}\) and the play was "splendidly acted."\(^{368}\)

Some of the individual performances were not judged to be so perfect, however. Everard Vanderlip, who played Owen Wingrave, was said to be a little crude and stagey,\(^{369}\) although he did play with "emotional intensity."\(^{370}\) Dora Barton, as Kate, "played with considerable power,"\(^{371}\) and thrilled her audience "by her shriek at the climax

\(^{363}\) *The Sketch*, loc. cit.
\(^{364}\) *Athenaeum*, loc. cit.
\(^{365}\) Ibid.
\(^{366}\) *The Saturday Review*, loc. cit.
\(^{367}\) *Athenaeum*, loc. cit.
\(^{368}\) *Daily Chronicle*, loc. cit.
\(^{369}\) *The Sketch*, loc. cit.
\(^{370}\) *Athenaeum*, loc. cit.
\(^{371}\) *The Sketch*, loc. cit.
of the little tragedy." However, even Walbrook found fault with the playing at the climax, which, he said, became "a crude contest between a man yelling and a woman screaming."

One actor who really pleased the critics was Halliwell Hobbes, in the role of Spencer Coyle. He "pleased the house"; he delivered his speeches with "point" and "style"; and he said his lines with a "nervous mastery of measured speech that made chapters out of monosyllables."

Others in the cast were Frances Wetherall as Mrs. Coyle, Mary Stuart as Mrs. Julian, and Owen Nares as Bobby Lechemere.

On the whole, The Saloon had met with limited success. The actors seemed to have performed tolerably well. The writing of the play was praised for its delicacy, yet the general feeling seemed to be that whatever success the little thriller might achieve would be in spite of its too literary flavor.

---
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The Other House

Henry James's next play never was produced, but it did reach the hands of prospective producers. That play was The Other House.

The idea for this play appeared in James's notebooks as far back as Christmas of 1893. At that time, James outlined a plot for a possible second play for Edward Compton, who had produced The American two years earlier. At this stage, James envisioned a happy ending for the play, and he planned to write it in three acts. Later, James noted that he had sketched the whole play, and that its title was The Promise.

Apparently, Compton was not interested in the play, and it was laid aside for a couple of years. (Leon Edel has suggested that James hoped that Elisabeth Robins, who had starred in The American, would be in the play—since the major role was for a woman. Besides, Rose Arnaiger is an Ibsen type, and Miss Robins was an Ibsen actress.)

Then, in 1896, James converted his three-act play into a novel which was serialized in the Illustrated London News, and then published

---

379 Matthiessen and Murdock, op. cit., pp. 138-141. In this early version of the plot, the child was to be poisoned, but she would recover. (cf. post, p. 105.)

380 Ibid., p. 233.

381 E. F. Benson (ed.), Henry James: Letters to A. C. Benson and Auguste Monod (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930), p. 107. (James wrote to Monod that the three-act play had been "laid by after only one manager had read it.")

The novel, unlike the first play version, had a tragic ending.

In 1907, the English theatre seemed to be entering a new era with the rise of the repertory system. James's secretary, Theodora Bosanquet, has recorded that when the actor-managers "began to ask for 'non-commercial' plays," James was quick to respond. The Other House was [now] re-dictated as a tragedy. In Les Années Dramatiques, Edel indicated that James began work on the second dramatic version of The Other House in July of 1908, and that he dictated the new scenario in September.

The Other House is divided into a prologue and three acts. The prologue is long enough to constitute an act by itself, but the way the play is divided helps to emphasize the time lapse between the action of the prologue and that of the three main acts. The prologue takes place at the home of Anthony (Tony) Breen, a country banker; and

---

383 The Other House appeared in the Illustrated London News, CIX (4 July—26 September), 1896, in thirteen installments. In that same year, the book was published in London by William Heinemann, and in New York by the Macmillan Co. (See Edel and Laurence, A Bibliography of Henry James, p. 105, and p. 329.)


385 Ibid., p. 21.


387 The version of The Other House which is included in Edel's The Complete Plays of Henry James, "is the longest typescript [of four in existence] following closely the novel," p. 822. The plot given here is based on the script in Edel's Complete Plays, pp. 680-758.
the three acts take place, four years later, "at the 'other' of the pair of houses, that of Mrs. Beaver, his Partner in the Bank."388

In the Prologue, Tony's dying wife (never seen on-stage) extracts from her husband a promise that he will not marry again during the lifetime of their newly born daughter. Rose Arnaiger, the wife's closest friend since girlhood, is staying with the Breams at the time of the wife's death. On the day of the promise, Rose breaks her engagement to Dennis Vidal.

Four years after his wife's death, Tony finds himself in love with Jean Martle. Jean is staying next door with Mrs. Beaver. Rose Arnaiger is also staying there.

It so happens that Jean's birthday is on the same day as that of Tony's little girl, Effie. Their common birthday celebration has brought little Effie over to Mrs. Beaver's house.

After the birthday party, Rose Arnaiger takes up the child in her arms as if to carry her home, and Jean shortly follows them out. Later the child is missing, and Rose declares that she had left little Effie with Jean. Unknown to Rose, however, Jean had met Dennis Vidal and they had gone for a walk. Jean, therefore, can prove her whereabouts at the time of the child's disappearance.

The child is found drowned in a little river which separates Tony's house from "the other house"—that of Mrs. Beaver. Rose tries to throw the blame on Jean. The family physician, however, makes it clear to Tony that Rose drowned the child, and they agree to hush the

388 Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 680.
matter up. The horrible truth is that Rose has always been in love with Tony, and she killed Effie so that Tony would be freed from his promise and could marry again. Rose hoped that Tony would marry her. To protect Rose, Dennis Vidal publicly announces their engagement, and they leave together. However, both Rose and Tony recognize that Dennis has no intention of marrying her. Thus Rose's crime will not be discovered by the law, but she has lost Tony, and she has failed to prevent his eventual marriage to Jean. Her punishment lies within herself.

Early in 1909, James had a couple of meetings with Granville-Barker, at which they discussed the possibility of The Other House as a play for Charles Frohman's repertory company. However, Frohman wanted an original play and not an adapted novel.389

Next, James put the play in the hands of Herbert Trench, who was planning a repertory season at the Haymarket. Plans seem to have progressed to a fairly advanced stage. However, there were difficulties in casting, and various disagreements. Finally, after the repertory company collapsed, the script was returned to James—unproduced.390

The Other House remained unpublished, as a play, until Edel included it in The Complete Plays of Henry James.391

---


390 Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 679. See also Lubbock, Letters of Henry James, II, 129-131; and Henry James, The Other House, [1947], p. xx.

391 In the notes at the end of The Complete Plays of Henry James, Edel lists four extant typescripts of The Other House. In his introduction to the 1947 edition of the novel, Professor Edel states that the four manuscripts which have been preserved were all written for Trench. (See James, The Other House, [1947], p. xix.)
The Outcry

Early in 1909, Charles Frohman announced that he would initiate a repertory season at the Duke of York's Theatre the following spring. His plans were extensive: if the London venture was a success, he planned to open another repertory theatre, at the Empire in New York. Frohman invited such writers as Shaw, Galsworthy, Granville-Barker, Pinero, Masefield, and Henry James, to submit manuscripts of plays for consideration. Associated with Frohman in the venture were James H. Barrie, and, as director, Harley Granville-Barker.

In the previous section of the present chapter, it was mentioned that Frohman rejected James's The Other House because he wanted an original play and not an adapted novel. Accordingly, James set to work on a new play for Frohman, while he offered The Other House to another producer, Herbert Trench. For a time, the author was working on both plays simultaneously: he was cutting the first play for Trench, while he was writing a new three-act comedy for Frohman.

In December of 1909, and in January of 1910, James was working furiously on The Outcry—the new play for Frohman. Part of the time James wrote in London, and part of the time at his home in Rye, Sussex. In an attempt to achieve brevity, James wrote The Outcry in

---
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393 Edel, Les Années Dramatiques, p. 209.
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longhand, and his secretary typed the play from his manuscript.\textsuperscript{397}

Even so, there were the usual cuts to be made, and this was always an agonizing process for James.\textsuperscript{398}

Beginning in January of 1910, James was very unwell for most of that year. In spite of this, \textit{The Outcry} was finally finished. Frohman went so far as to consider matters of casting, and it was hoped that Sir John Hare and Irene Vanbrugh would be in the cast.\textsuperscript{399} However, because of James's illness the play was not put into rehearsal. Then, with the failure of Frohman's repertory venture, a sizable forfeit was paid to the author, and he recovered the rights to his play.\textsuperscript{400}

In August, 1910, James went to America to be with his dying brother, William. In the meantime, Henry James asked his secretary to type out the play again, restoring all the cut material.\textsuperscript{401}

While he was in the States, James re-wrote \textit{The Outcry} as a novel, and it was published in 1911.\textsuperscript{402} Shortly before the novel's publication, James received a request for the play from C. E. Wheeler of the Stage

\textsuperscript{397} Bosanquet, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 8.


\textsuperscript{399} Edel, \textit{Les Années Dramatiques}, p. 212. (See also Simon Newall-Smith, \textit{The Legend of the Master} \textit{New York: Charles Scribner's Sons}, 1948, p. 73.)

\textsuperscript{400} Edel, \textit{Les Années Dramatiques}, pp. 239-240.

\textsuperscript{401} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{402} The novel, \textit{The Outcry}, was published in London by Methuen and Co., in 1911; and it was published by Charles Scribner's Sons in New York, in the same year. (Edel and Laurence, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 147.)
Eventually, a year and a half after James's death, the Stage Society did produce The Outcry. It was presented in London for two performances, on July 1 and 3, 1917.\textsuperscript{404}

The action of the play was, as James said, "highly contemporaneous,"\textsuperscript{405} and it stemmed from the attempts of an American art collector to buy up valuable paintings in Britain. Specifically, the American, Breckenridge Bender, tries to buy a painting by Joshua Reynolds, which is owned by Lord Theign.

The Outcry is in three acts. The first act takes place at the country home of Lord Theign, and the other two acts take place in London at the home of Lady Sandgate—a friend of the family.

Lord Theign has two daughters, Kitty (never seen on-stage), and Grace. Kitty, the older of the two, owes a large debt to a certain duchess. The duchess is willing to forego payment if the younger girl, Grace, will marry her son, Lord John. For this reason, Lord Theign urges Grace to accept Lord John.

Grace has made friends with a young connoisseur of art, Hugh Crimble. Hugh comes to see Lord Theign's collection. Upon looking at a so-called Moretto, Hugh becomes greatly excited, for he is sure that

\textsuperscript{403}Lubbock, \textit{op. cit.}, II, 183-184.

\textsuperscript{404}Edel, \textit{Complete Plays of Henry James}, p. 765.

\textsuperscript{405}Ibid., p. 766.
the painting is really by the great Italian, Mantovano. Hugh offers to try and find out whether the painting is really by Mantovano, but he offers his services only on condition that Lord Theign will promise not to sell the painting out of the country.

Lord Theign bridles at Hugh's apparent attempt to control his actions. Nevertheless, Hugh goes ahead with his investigations, and the painting turns out to be a real Mantovano. As a result of his somewhat perverse pride, Lord Theign offers the painting free to the National Gallery instead of selling it.

It is clear that Grace and Hugh are in love, and, at the end of the play, it is understood that they will marry.\(^{106}\)

James left the question of Kitty's debts unresolved. However, it may be assumed that Lord Theign can afford to pay them, since he had offered to settle some nine or ten thousand pounds on Grace if she should marry Lord John.

In the cast of the Stage Society production of *The Outcry* were Ernest Bodkin as Lord John, Katherine Pole as Lady Sandgate, E. J. Caldwell as Breckenridge Bender, Ellen O'Malley as Lady Grace, William Armstrong as Hugh Crimble, and Albert E. Raynor as Lord Theign.\(^{107}\)

Of James's creation, the London *Times* commented that the stuff of drama was "not exactly his game," and that the author's "love of artistic constatation" could be comprehended by very few of those

\(^{106}\) The script of *The Outcry* which is included in Edel's *The Complete Plays of Henry James* (pp. 766-807), is the version compiled by Miss Bosanquet, in which all cuts were restored. (*Complete Plays*, note on the texts, p. 823.)

\(^{107}\) *Times* [London], July 4, 1917.
present. 

Further, James wrote his own English, "as the players seemed to find to their cost." 

That the actors found the lines difficult was confirmed by the Manchester Guardian's reviewer, who said that the players labored with patient sympathy to convey the play's conflict "through the diaphanous medium of the play's language." 

Allan Wade, who had been associated both with Charles Frohman and with the Stage Society, recalled that the dialogue in The Outcry "proved very difficult to the actors and resulted in a loss of conviction." James's secretary, Theodora Bosanquet, recorded that the actors were "embarrassed by their lines." 

Specifically, the Times complained of James's "wanton use of the interpolated adverb," while the Manchester Guardian spoke of "his adverbial affection and his passion for fine and courteous definitions." Miss Bosanquet explained, 

by 1909, when the play was written, the men and women of Henry James could only talk in the manner of their creator. His own 

Ibid. 

Ibid. 

Manchester Guardian, July 4, 1917. 

Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 763. 

The quotation is from a letter written by Allan Wade to Le Roy Phillips, dated March 30, 1933, which is in the possession of Leon Edel. Professor Edel kindly provided a longer excerpt from the letter to the writer of the present study. cf. ante, p. 63, footnote number 174. 

Bosanquet, op. cit., p. 21. 

Times [London], loc. cit. 
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speech, assisted by the practice of dictating, had by that time become so inveterately characteristic that his questions to a railway clerk or to a fishmonger about a lobster, might easily be recognised as coined in the same mint as his addresses to the Academic Committee of the Royal Society of Literature.\footnote{116}

O. Bernard Shaw called the play a "hopeless failure.\footnote{117} Writing about the performance some years afterwards, Shaw made the point that there is a type of literary language which is "utterly unintelligible to the ear.\footnote{118} He recalled an experiment which he had made between the acts of The Outcry, when he had repeated some of the lines of the dialogue to his friends, but they could not understand what he was saying.\footnote{119}

Not everything that was said about the performance of The Outcry was unfavorable. The Manchester Guardian thought the scene "beautiful" in which Grace "takes the side of the young connoisseur against her father and his outraged traditions.\footnote{120} The Times was divided in its opinion of the acting: the actors who played Lord Theign and Hugh Crimble were criticised adversely for failing to produce the right Jamesian flavor, but the ladies "got nearer the mark.\footnote{121}

\footnote{116}{Bosanquet, op. cit., pp. 21-22.}
\footnote{117}{Times Literary Supplement [London], May 17, 1923.}
\footnote{118}{Ibid.}
\footnote{119}{Perhaps Shaw exaggerated to make his point. How could O. B. S. have repeated sentences from the dialogue unless he himself had understood the words on hearing them spoken from the stage?}
\footnote{120}{Manchester Guardian, loc. cit.}
\footnote{121}{Times [London], loc. cit.}
As a script, the *Manchester Guardian* referred to *The Outcry* as a "subtly-spun comedy."\(^{422}\) Miss Bosanquet felt that *The Outcry* had many advantages over James's earlier plays, particularly in the working out of the solution—which was accomplished "without any use of the mechanical shifts and stage properties needed in *The Reprobate*.\(^{423}\) (*The Reprobate* was written earlier, but it was produced later by the Stage Society—in 1919.) Frederick Dupee, after reading *The Outcry*, felt that it was a poor play, and he wondered how it "ever so much as took root in the fastidious mind of Henry James.\(^{424}\)

It would seem that this, the last play of Henry James, was less favorably received than some of the earlier productions—including the failures. Perhaps, as his secretary indicated, this was because as James grew older, his style became more and more complicated and involved.\(^{425}\)

Monologue Written for Ruth Draper

In 1913, James wrote, apparently for the last time, in dramatic form. This time, however, the work was not a play but a dramatic

---

\(^{422}\) *Manchester Guardian*, *loc. cit.*

\(^{423}\) *Bosanquet, op. cit.*, p. 22.


\(^{425}\) *Bosanquet, op. cit.*, pp. 21-22.
monologue. Written especially for the American monologist, Ruth Draper, the work has no title.\textsuperscript{126}

On December 4, 1913, James wrote to Miss Draper that he was sending the monologue to her.\textsuperscript{127} He gave her full license to do with it as she pleased—to cut it, to give it a title, and so on. The monologue was written as a tribute to "our Ruth, who, if she takes to the thing at all, can be trusted to make more out of it by her own little genius than I can begin to suggest."\textsuperscript{128} In a postscript to his letter, James pleaded for public anonymity as the author of the monologue. Some years after his death, however, the monologue was published in the London Mercury.\textsuperscript{129}

The speaker in the monologue is an American society lady, an "innocently fatuous, female compatriot of ours let loose upon a world and a whole order of things... which she takes so serenely for granted."\textsuperscript{130}

The scene of the monologue is laid in England. As the monologue opens, Cora, Mrs. Alvin Tuff, is in her sitting-room with Mr. Lynch, a secretary of the American embassy. Cora is petulantly demanding to know what is delaying the arrangements for her presentation at

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{126} "Three Unpublished Letters and a Monologue by Henry James," London Mercury, Vol. VI, No. 35 (September, 1922), pp. 496-501.
\item\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., p. 495.
\item\textsuperscript{128} Ibid., p. 496.
\item\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., pp. 496-501. (The text of the monologue may also be found in Edel's The Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 813-816. The two texts are identical except for differences in the type, in the use of italics, and in the layout of the pages.)
\item\textsuperscript{130} London Mercury, p. 495.
\end{footnotes}
court. Her calendar is very full, and the date for the presentation must fit her itinerary. She sends off Mr. Lynch to telephone about the matter, just as Sir Robin Adair arrives. To Sir Robin, Cora explains how differently women are treated in America; they live on a pedestal, as it were.

A cable arrives from Cora's husband to say that he is going to sail from New York to join her. Mr. Lynch returns to say that complications have arisen, and that his colleague is calling the Ambassador about the presentation. Cora sends Lynch off to cable a reply to her husband telling him not to sail, and asking for her remittance. Mr. Lynch comes and goes a couple of times, and then he sends in the maid with a note to say that the Lord Chamberlain requires the presence of her husband if Mrs. Tuff is to be presented.

The monologue ends as Cora sends Sir Robin to telephone the cable office. She sends a message to Mr. Tuff requesting him to come on over to England as the King wants them both.

There are a good many lines in the monologue in which Cora seems to echo what the imaginary character with her on-stage has just said. It is also necessary for her to pantomime taking the cable, and Lynch's note, from her maid.

In a communication to Simon Nowell-Smith, Ruth Draper related that James was interested in her work, and that she had asked his advice as to whether she should devote herself to writing or to acting in regular stage plays. His reply was, "My dear child . . . you . . ."
have woven . . . your own . . . very beautiful . . . little Persian carpet . . . . Stand on it! 

It was Miss Draper's practice to write her own material. She felt that the monologue bore James's "peculiar stamp," and she never used it. 

V. RECENT PRODUCTIONS

In the 1950's, two double bills of James's plays were presented by professional theatre clubs in London. For two of the plays (Still Waters, and Pyramus and Thisbe), this was their first professional presentation. On February 28, 1952, the New Boltons Theatre presented James's plays, The High Bid, and Still Waters. On March 25, 1956, the Studio Theatre Club presented a theatre-in-the-round production of Pyramus and Thisbe, and The Saloon. According to information received from the publishers of "The Stage" Yearbook, it is not known exactly how many performances were given of either double bill, "but these club productions would be not more than a few weeks at the most." The two theatre clubs were professional, but they are "both now extinct."

\footnote{Simon Nowell-Smith (comp.), The Legend of the Master (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), p. 73.}

\footnote{Ibid.}

\footnote{Carson and Comerford, Ltd., the publishers of "The Stage" Yearbook in London, in January, 1966, kindly provided some statistical information to the writer of the present study. In their communication, they indicated that they kept "only records of principal London theatres," but that the club theatre productions would normally run "not more than a few weeks at the most."}

\footnote{Ibid.}
The High Bid, and Still Waters

On February 28, 1952, the New Boltons Club Theatre in London presented a double bill, which consisted of James's three-act play, The High Bid, and his short one-act play, Still Waters.\(^{435}\) The plays were directed by Basil Ashmore. The principal parts in The High Bid, the main event of the evening, were played by Hermione Hannon as Mrs. Gracedew; Hugh Burden as Captain Yule; and D. A. Clarke-Smith as Mr. Prodmore.

Of the play itself, the London Times observed that The High Bid was well constructed, but that James made his points too many times.\(^{436}\) The comedy "crawls even where it should glide."\(^{437}\) The Times' critic found something illogical about Captain Yule changing his views too easily. He noted that the modern audience's sympathy, like that of the original audience (in 1909), was not with the heroine when she made her big appeal in the second act.\(^{438}\)

Writing in the Observer, Ivor Brown complained that James did not keep the story moving, and that, "after a stimulating first scene, [the play] wanders off into repetitions and prolixities. . . ."\(^{439}\) On the favorable side, the Observer's critic commented that the play

\(^{435}\)\textit{Ibid.}\(^{\text{ ante, Section I, "The Writing of the Early Plays"—Still Waters, and Section IV, "More Plays and Productions"—The High Bid, in the present chapter, for information on the two plays, and on productions of The High Bid in 1908, and in 1909.}}

\(^{436}\)\textit{Times} (London), February 29, 1952.

\(^{437}\)\textit{Ibid.}\(^{\text{ Ibid.}}\)

\(^{438}\)\textit{Ibid.}\(^{\text{ Ibid.}}\)

\(^{439}\)\textit{Observer} (London), March 2, 1952.
"offers the new unusual attraction of a dialogue not confined to grunts, monosyllables, and 'cracks.'

As for the acting, the critics' comments were mildly favorable. Miss Hermione Hannen, as the American Mrs. Craseedew, got a "great deal of fun out of the part," and she had a "shrewd sense of the situation." She was a "real enchantress," and her accent was convincing. However, although the actress's performance was lively, the part itself was monotonously repetitious.

Hugh Burden, as the young Captain Yule, countered Miss Hannen with "an air of gentle aristocratic surprise ..." However, the Observer's critic felt that Burden was not lively enough for belief as a fiery radical: he was "too hesitant and colourless."

Of the other players, Gordon Phillott, in the part of the old retainer, Chivers, received the best notices in the available reviews. The Times said that he played "effortlessly," and the Observer commented that Phillott displayed a "nicely dignified humility."

The Prodmore family, father and daughter, were given "their several dues" by D. A. Clarke-Smith, and by Jenny Laird. Clarke-Smith was said to be a "formidable ogre" as Mr. Prodmore.
seen in the part of the unnamed young man, received no comments either in the *Times*, or in the *Observer*.

The curtain-raiser of the double bill, James's *Still Waters*, was dismissed by the *Times* reviewer as being "largely an affair of nicely tuned compliments with American ladies and gentlemen talking as if they were Parisians. It is at once brief and tedious." This is the entire review given to the little work by the *Times*.

Ivor Brown commented that the play contained "abundant soliloquies and asides, and not much else to disprove the opinion that quiet streams make lullaby noises." Acting in *Still Waters* were Godfrey Kenton as Felix, Dennis Goacher as Horace, and Jenny Laird as Emma. (Miss Laird and Mr. Goacher were double cast in the double bill.)

**Pyramus and Thisbe, and The Saloon**

On March 25, 1916, the Studio Theatre Club in London presented a double bill of two one-act plays by Henry James: *Pyramus and Thisbe*, followed by *The Saloon*. The plays were presented in-the-round, and they were directed by Gerard Glaister. The two-member cast of the first play consisted of Anne Fishon as Catherine West, and Alfred Burke as Stephen Young. Featured in the cast of the second play were Rodney

---

451 *Times*, loc. cit.  
452 *Observer*, loc. cit.  
453 cf. ante, Section I, "The Writing of the Early Plays"—*Pyramus and Thisbe*, and Section IV, "More Plays and Productions"—*The Saloon*, in the present chapter, for information on the two plays, and for details on the 1911 production of *The Saloon*.  

Diak as Owen Wingrave, and Jill Raymond as Kate Julian. Others in the cast of *The Saloon* were Owen Nelson, Katherine Parr, Michael Alexander, and Brown Derby.

The critic for the London *Times* characterized *Pyramus and Thisbe* as a "featherweight bed-sittingroom duologue," while *The Saloon*, written forty years later, was "more ambitious . . . [combining] the family tradition motif . . . with James's taste for the macabre." Another critic described *The Saloon* as "a mingling of pacifism [and] grand guignol."

There was some difference of opinion about the dramatic values of James's dialogue. Kenneth Tynan wrote in the *Observer*, "James's dialogue, dense, opaque, and tremulous, proved to be wonderfully speakable . . . ." In reference to *The Saloon*, the *Times* reviewer commented, "Allowing for tight plot, and sharply distinguished characters, communication is muffled by the language in which James is locked.

In general, this reviewer felt that James's "love of language was, perhaps, irreconcilable with [his] love of the theatre."

As far as the performance itself was concerned, the *Times* critic questioned the wisdom of presenting the plays in the round. He particularly felt that the audience should not have been included within the haunted saloon of the second play.

---

454 *Times* [London], March 27, 1956.
456 *Observer* [London], April 1, 1956.
458 *Times*, loc. cit.
In commenting on the actors' performances, Kenneth Tynan, writing in the Observer, blended his reviews of the two plays, "One's heart was exquisitely massaged by Jill Raymond, Rodney Diak, and Alfred Burke." Mr. Burke was in Pyramus and Thisbe, but Miss Raymond and Mr. Diak were in The Saloon.

The London Times' reviewer particularly praised Anne Pishon and Alfred Burke, in Pyramus and Thisbe, for their "immaculate delivery of James's dependent clauses." Jill Raymond and Owen Nelson, who were seen as Kate Julian and her mother in The Saloon, played with "immense assurance," according to the same reviewer. However, the "most successful in converting parentheses into drama was Mr. Rodney Diak," who interpreted Owen Wingrave in The Saloon.

SUMMARY

Over a period of forty-four years (1869-1913), James completed fifteen plays, and one dramatic monologue. In addition, he left notes for the never completed three-act play, The Chaperon, of which parts of a rough scenario have also been preserved. Of the fifteen completed plays, five are only one act in length (Pyramus and Thisbe,}

---

460 Observer, loc. cit. 461 Times, loc. cit. 462 Ibid. 463 Ibid.

464 Specific data related to this summary has been collected in tabular form, and may be found in Table I, pp. 124-126. This table shows when the plays were written; if and when they were published; and if and when they were produced.

465 Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 455-462; and 607-637.
Still Waters, A Change of Heart, Sapphiresoft, and The Saloon). Of the remaining plays, most of them are in three acts. However, The American is in four acts; and The Other House has a long prologue, followed by three acts.

Two of James's early plays are divided into French scenes. These are A Change of Heart, in one act with fifteen scene divisions; and Daisy Miller, in three acts and thirty-one scenes.

During James's lifetime, eight of his plays were published (Pyramus and Thisbe, Still Waters, A Change of Heart, Daisy Miller, Tenants, Disengaged, The Album, and The Reprobate). In addition, The American and Guy Dowville were privately printed—as was also Daisy Miller. After James's death, the monologue written for Ruth Draper was published (1922). The other five plays remained unpublished until they were gathered together in The Complete Plays of Henry James, edited by Leon Edel, in 1949.

All of James's early plays have happy endings. Guy Dowville is the first one which is not entirely happy in its conclusion. This was followed by two more plays with happy endings, Sapphiresoft and The High Bid. Then came the tragic one-acter, The Saloon. This was followed by another tragedy, The Other House, with its horrible murder of the little girl; nevertheless, the ending of The Other House seems to promise future happiness for the worthy characters. James's final play, The Outcry, ended gaily. The monologue for Ruth Draper was a mere vignette, and it ended satisfactorily for its single character. Thus, in giving
most of his plays happy endings, James practiced what he preached. The last plays, however, showed a tendency to break with the happy ending format.

Of James's fifteen plays, nine have been professionally performed: five were produced during James's lifetime; two were presented within a few years after his death; and two were professionally performed for the first time in the 1950's, while two others were revived at the same time. The longest run of a play by James was achieved by The American (the first of his plays to be produced); it ran for over seventy performances in London, in 1891, and it had about twenty-five more performances in the provinces. However, the play which caused the most stir was Guy Domville, starring the popular George Alexander, which ran for some forty performances in London, in 1895.

---

466 In the prefatory note to Theatricals: Second Series (The Album, The Reprobate), New York: Harper and Brothers, 1895, p. x, James advocated the "time-honoured bread-sauce of the happy ending" as a necessary ingredient for success. (James's preface may also be found in Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 349.)
TABLE I
HENRY JAMES'S PLAYS AND THEIR PRODUCTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date when written</th>
<th>Date of original publications</th>
<th>Date and location of productions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pyramus and Thisbe</td>
<td>c. 1869</td>
<td>1869 (April, Galaxy)</td>
<td>1956 London (Theatre club prod.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Waters</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1871 (April, Balloon Post)</td>
<td>1952 London (Theatre club prod.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Change of Heart</td>
<td>c. 1871</td>
<td>1872 (January, Atlantic Monthly) X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Miller</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1882 (privately printed)</td>
<td>1891 London (70 perfs.) (plus approx. 25 more perfs. on road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1883 (April, May, June, Atlantic Monthly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1883 (in book form—publ. by James R. Osgood, Boston)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The American</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1891 (privately printed—prompt—books for London prod. set up by Wm. Heinemann, but never published)</td>
<td>1891 London (70 perfs.) (plus approx. 25 more perfs. on road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The American (new fourth act)</td>
<td>1892 (Autumn)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(New act was used in the provinces after London closing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants</td>
<td>1890 (Nov.—Dec. during rehearsals of The American)</td>
<td>1894 in Theatricals: Two Comedies</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date when written</td>
<td>Date of original publications*</td>
<td>Date and location of productions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disenaged</td>
<td>1891 or 1892</td>
<td>1894 in Theatricals: Two Comedies</td>
<td>1902 New York (amateur prod.) 1909 New York (professional—1 perf. only, in aid of hospital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Album</td>
<td>1891 or 1892</td>
<td>1895 in Theatricals: Second Series</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reprobate</td>
<td>1891 or 1892</td>
<td>1895 in Theatricals: Second Series</td>
<td>1919 London 1923 Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Deville</td>
<td>1893 (Summer)</td>
<td>1894 (privately printed—a few acting copies)</td>
<td>1895 London (40 perfs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summ柔 合</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The High Bid</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1908 Scotland 1909 London (5 matinee perfs. only) 1952 London (Theatre club prod.) X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The Chaperon)</td>
<td>1907, rough scenario</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE I (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date when written</th>
<th>Date of original publication*</th>
<th>Date and location of productions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Saloon</td>
<td>1907 (late)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1911 London (4 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1956 London (Theatre club prod.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Other House</td>
<td>(Sketched 1893 or 1894)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1909—new play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Outcry</td>
<td>1909 (Autumn)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1917 London (2 perfs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monologues, written for Ruth Draper</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1922 (September, London Mercury)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All of the plays in the table, and the monologue, were published in 1949 in The Complete Plays of Henry James, edited by Leon Edel (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.).
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF JAMES'S PLAYS

The purpose of the present chapter is to examine the scripts of James's plays, and to attempt to analyze them. It is not proposed to offer a critical evaluation, but simply to make a report on what the scripts are like from a technical standpoint. The purpose is to show how James's playwriting technique developed, along what lines it progressed, and what his technique had become by the time that he wrote his last play.

In order to compare the plays one with another, and to see in what specific ways James's playwriting technique changed over the years, it was necessary to make a somewhat arbitrary division of the factors involved. Four large categories were examined: I. Script Format; II. Subject and Treatment; III. Literary Aspects; and IV. Stage-ability. The main items examined in each of the four categories were as follows. I. Script Format: A. Form—number of acts; scene division; writing mechanics; B. Conventions used—asides and soliloquies; titles; type of character names used; C. Exposition—methods. II. Subject and Treatment: A. Types of plays—genre; use of the conventional happy ending; subjects and themes; B. Methods of treatment—realism; disregard of the classical unities. III. Literary Aspects: A. Characterisations—outstanding characterisations; the critics on James's characterisations;
techniques of characterisation; B. Language—Jamesian expressions; oddities of grammar and spelling; dialect attempts; humor in lines.¹

IV. Stageability: A. Stage directions—changing usage; business; humor through business;² B. Mechanics of staging—mechanics in general; entrances and exits made by characters; "left" and "right" stage; visualisation of the set; C. James's consciousness of staging—general control of stage movement; favorable effects; lack of a sense of staging.

I. SCRIPT FORMAT

Form

Number of acts. James completed fifteen plays and one monologue. Most of the plays are written in three acts. However, besides the short monologue, there are five plays of one act only: the three earliest plays, *Pyramus and Thisbe*, *Still Waters*, and *A Change of Heart*; and the later plays, *Summersoft* and *The Saloon*. The *American* is in four acts, and *The Other House* is written in a prologue followed by three acts.

Scene division. Two of James's earliest plays are divided into French scènes. These are *A Change of Heart*, in one act with fifteen scene divisions, and *Daisy Miller*, in three acts and thirty-one scenes. All of James's other plays are divided into scenes according to the custom of modern realistic playwrights: that is, there is a scene break

¹cf. infra, humor through business, under Stageability.

²cf. supra, humor in lines, under Literary Aspects.
whenever there is a change of time or location needed for the play's action.

**Writing mechanics.** Apparently James had a definite opinion as to how a play should be laid out on the printed page. When *Daisy Miller* was published in book form, James wrote to the publisher, in 1883,

I should only make the condition that it be printed in the manner of French comedies—that is, with the names of the characters above the speeches, and not on a line with them.³

This same page layout was used, more than a decade later, when the two volumes of *Theatricals* appeared.⁴ For the *Theatricals*, the stage directions were in very small print, and on a separate line from the player's words. In *The Complete Plays of Henry James*, the page layout has been changed so as to save space,⁵ and the handling of the printing has been made uniform throughout the volumes: the stage directions are in italics, and they are placed in parentheses. Leon Edel, in editing

---

³Leon Edel (ed.), *The Complete Plays of Henry James* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1949), p. 11. (Edel states that this unpublished letter to the publisher, J. R. Osgood, was written on 5 May, 1883. The letter is in the Yale University Library. See Complete Plays, p. 825.)

⁴Henry James, *Theatricals: Two Comedies* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1894). Also Henry James, *Theatricals: Second Series* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1895). These plays, as originally published, were examined by the writer of the present study. (Edel, in the *Complete Plays*, states that the privately printed prompt-book of *The American* had the names of the characters similarly centered over the speeches. See Complete Plays, p. 820.)

⁵The number of pages required for the printing of *"The Album* and *"The Reprobate,* the two plays in *Theatricals: Second Series*, is reduced to just under one fourth of the original number.
James's plays, has corrected certain inconsistencies of spelling and punctuation, but he has retained "James's highly personal and likewise inconsistent method of obtaining emphasis or meaning through capitalisation and italicisation."

James's use of italics for emphasis is extremely frequent in the plays, while the use of capitals occurs less often. In the earliest plays, italics appear just a few times on most pages. However, by the time of *The High Bid*, James wrote many speeches in which every sentence had at least one word in italics. For example, Mrs. Gracedew says enthusiastically to the old servant, Chivers,

I mean you're so fatally right, and so deadly complete, that if I wasn't an angel I could scarcely bear it; with every fascinating feature I had already heard of and thought I was prepared for, and ever so many others that, strange to say, I hadn't and wasn't, and that you just spring right at me like ... a royal salute, a hundred guns!

After *The High Bid*, there seems to be a slight tapering off of the frequency of James's use of italics to indicate word stress.

One peculiarity of James's scripts remains to be mentioned. In listing the characters at the beginning of a play, James used the format which had been traditional in earlier centuries: the males were listed first, followed by the females. The only play in which James did not follow this practice was *Still Waters*: the characters were listed as Emma, Horace, and Felix, in that order. Usually, James followed the old tradition further by listing the characters within each sex category in order of social prominence, and with the older generation

---

7Ibid., p. 568.
8Ibid., p. 88.
of a family listed first. (This placed Daisy Miller at the end of the list in the play of that name.) Sometimes, James moved away from the older custom to the extent of listing the characters in the order of their importance to the plot, but he still listed all the males first. Almost always the list was headed "Characters": exceptions were "Persons" for *Pyramus and Thisbe*, and "Dramatis Personae" for Daisy Miller. In listing his characters, James never followed the order of their appearance on stage.

**Conventions Used**

**Aside and soliloquies.** A survey of James's plays shows how he changed with the times, and how he gradually replaced the older conventions of the aside and the soliloquy with more natural, realistic techniques. James gave up the aside first, and then, later, he abandoned the use of the soliloquy.

In his two early plays, *Still Waters* and *A Change of Heart*, James used the aside in the usual conventional manner of the nineteenth century: the aside was a remark said for the benefit of the audience, which was supposedly unheard by other characters on the stage.

---

9 These exceptions were *The American*, *Dissengaged*, *The Album*, and *Guy Domville*.


11 *Ibid.*, p. 120.

12 James's first play, *Pyramus and Thisbe*, contained no asides. In *Still Waters*, there were many asides, but some of the speeches were confusing because James failed to indicate where the section to be said "Aside" ended. With his third play, *A Change of Heart*, James had solved this problem by inserting the direction, "Aloud," following an aside section within a speech.
James continued to use the aside in *Daisy Miller*, and in his first produced play, *The American*. In these two plays, the asides served several different functions: some asides revealed the inner attitudes of a character; some asides conveyed information to the audience; some seemed designed simply to get a laugh—as the character made an apt comment more or less directly to the audience; and sometimes James used the word "aside" to indicate that a remark was to be said privately by one character to another in the presence of a third person, as, for example, "Aside to Miss Durant." Some of James's asides were rather clumsy, and, in *Daisy Miller*, some of the asides inevitably make the reader think of the villain in the stereotype melodramas of the nineteenth century.

With the publication of the four plays, *Tenants*, *Disengaged*, *The Album*, and *The Reprobate*, in 1894 and 1895, James seems to have abandoned the "Aside." The last time that James used the aside, labelled as such, was in *Guy Domville* (written in 1893, and produced in 1895), and there is only one "Aside" in that play.\(^{11}\)

In later plays, when a remark was to be said in a quiet tone of voice by one character to another so as not to be overheard by a third person on the stage, James replaced the word "Aside" with the word "Privately," in the directions. For example, in *Disengaged*, James wrote,

\(^{13}\)Edel, *Complete Plays of Henry James, "Daisy Miller,"* p. 173.

TRAFFORD. (Privately, on COVERLEY’S right.) Nail him, and I'm off!15

Even more interesting, perhaps, is a new technique which James used in his last play, The Outcry. In this play, there are a couple of scenes during which two characters communicate with each other silently, by means of actions, gestures, or facial expressions, in the presence of a third person on stage, who is unaware of the silent communion which is going on. James called these silent communications a "mute passage," or a "reciprocal mute comment."16

This last technique is a far cry from the old aside, and yet the line of development may be traced, as shown, from James’s early conventional use of the aside— as a side remark to the audience; to a line said "aside" by one character to another; to a line said "privately" by one character to another; and eventually to a silent communication between two characters in the presence of a third, and unaware, character.

As for James’s use of soliloquies, they may be found in some form in all of his early plays. The last time that James used a true soliloquy was in The High Bid—produced in 1908.

If all of James’s plays are examined, a definite pattern in his use of the soliloquy becomes apparent. In the earliest plays, soliloquies were used as a rather clumsy and obvious method of exposition. Then James became more complex in his labelling of certain types of speeches: in the four published plays, Tenants, Disengaged, The Album, and The Reprobate, some speeches are to be said "Alone" on stage; but other speeches are meant to be said "To himself/herself" in the presence...

15Ibid., p. 315.  
16Ibid., p. 792, and p. 799.
of other characters. In Guy Domville (1895), a new phrase appears. Guy is described as "Thinking with emotion," as he speaks his thoughts out loud alone on the stage.\(^{17}\)

By the time James wrote The High Bid (1907), the lines which were designated as being said "Alone" on stage had become very few. Now such lines were in the form of rather natural exclamations, and they did not serve the old purpose of a soliloquy—that is, they were not intended to convey information to the audience.

In The High Bid, one rather interesting variation occurs: in Act II, Mrs. Gracedew is alone on the stage, and she is talking to herself. Cora enters, and, on seeing her, Mrs. Gracedew changes the end of her sentence. Thus Mrs. Gracedew has been caught in the act of talking out loud to herself, and the entering character hears, and responds to, the last words of Mrs. Gracedew's line.\(^{18}\) Thus James has made the transition from the old convention of the soliloquy to something which is much more acceptable in the realistic theatre.

In The Saloon (1907), no character says lines alone on stage, and no one gives voice to his inner thoughts. The Other House similarly contains no soliloquies. James's last play, The Outcry, has one speech which is said by a character "Alone" on the stage, but this speech merely consists of two very natural exclamations.\(^{19}\)

In James's last two plays, The Other House and The Outcry, a new technique seems evident. In these two plays, the stage directions

\(^{17}\)Ibid., p. 499.  
\(^{18}\)Ibid., p. 587.  
\(^{19}\)Ibid., p. 805.
include what James called a "passage": this consists of action for the
actor which is to be carried out in silence, alone on stage, and it is
intended to show a definite train of thought, or a series of changing
emotions. For example, in *The Other House*, Tony has just been left
alone in the hall by Mrs. Beaver.

(TONY has then alone in the hall, a considerable nervous anxious
restless passage. It ends for him, after his brief and solitary,
but in various ways significant scene, in the show of sudden lassitude
under which he drops, as conscious of too many troublesome
things, upon the sofa . . . .)20

Other examples of this technique, which might be called an "action
passage," may be found in *The Outcry.*21

Thus it may be seen that James travelled all the way from the
old techniques of the aside and the soliloquy to more modern, realistic
methods of conveying inner thoughts and emotional struggles through
stipulated silent action.

**Titles.** There seems to be nothing particularly significant
about the titles which James chose for his plays. His attitude about
titles was one of flexibility; this can be seen in the number of plays
which had tentative titles for a while.22 For his first two plays,

20Ibid., p. 698.  
21Ibid., p. 779, and p. 789.

22Mrs. Vibert was later renamed Tenants; Mrs. Jasper became
Disengaged; The Hero was retitled Guy Domville; The Promise was changed
to *The Other House*; and in making his short story "Owen Wingrave" into
a play, James changed the title to The Saloon. (Edel, *Complete Plays of
Henry James*, pp. 257, 296, 467, 577, and 641 respectively.)

When Augustin Daly was planning to produce *Mrs. Jasper*, he asked
the author for a new title. James submitted a list of over sixty al-
ternatives. This list, in James's handwriting, has been reproduced in
Edel's *Complete Plays*, p. 297.
James chose titles which implied the subject matter through allusion: **Pyramus and Thisbe**, based on Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, refers to both the actual and the figurative wall which comes between its two characters; **Still Waters** brings to mind the popular saying, "Still waters run deep," and the title seems to refer to the character of little Horace who never spoke his love. After these first two plays, James used titles which referred either to the subject matter directly, or to the main character of the play.

**Type of character names used.** With the exception of his first three plays, James usually named at least some of the characters in each play after the manner of the Restorations that is, with the name suggesting the characteristics of the person. In **Daisy Miller**, the plainness of Daisy's own name suggests her simplicity and innocence, while there is something rather cold about the name, Winterbourne—like an icy stream. Giacomo Giavanelli, like his name, is an elegant individual; and Madame de Katkoff sounds exotic. In later plays, James used the characterising name technique more obviously. His graceful heroines include Claire de Cintré, Mrs. Jasper, Blanche Amber, Grace Jesmond, Mrs. Gracedew, and Lady Grace.23 Blandina, of **Disengaged**, lives up to the mildness of her name with her continual, "Yes, mamma," and "No, mamma." Mention can be made, too, of the de Bellevardes family in **The American**: their name seems to suggest that they guard something well—perhaps the blood line of the French aristocracy, as well as the

---

23The "graceful" ladies appear in **The American, Disengaged, The Reprobate, The Album, The High Bid, and The Outcry** respectively.
family secret. The elder son of the de Bellegarde family is called Urbain—which suggests his polished worldliness; and the younger and more romantic son is called Valentin. In the same play, Christopher Newman’s name suggests the New World from which he comes; while the name, Mrs. Bread, sounds plain and honest.

Other character names suggestive of the personality of the individual include Captain Lurcher—the unreliable villain in Tenants; the assertive Mrs. Wigmore in Disengaged; and Lady Basset—a fortune hunter—in The Album. In The Reprobate there are Mr. Bonson—a good man; Pitt Brunt—a dull member of parliament; and Mrs. Freshville—a smart and showy lady. In Guy Downville, Guy’s own name combines church and town, while Mrs. Peverel’s name calls to mind a romance by Walter Scott. In Summerson and in The High Bid (two plays which have the same characters), there are Mr. Prodmore—whose name sounds ambitious; Captain Yule—who sounds traditional, which is exactly what he is not; and Chivers—the servant whose name sounds like the old and famous brand of marmalade. A gruesome meaning may be read into the name of Owen Wingrave in The Saloon; and perhaps Kate’s name, in the same play, may be meant to suggest that she is a shrew. In The Other House, Mrs. Beever certainly seems to be a busybody, but the names of the other characters are not particularly suggestive of their characteristics.

In James’s last play, The Outcry, there is Mr. Breckenridge Bender, with his ever-present checkbook, whose name may be meant to imply that he is a bounder; and also there is the previously mentioned Lady Grace.
Exposition

Methods. In managing the expositions of his plays, James gradually increased his skill, and his technique became less obvious as time went on. Both of his first two plays opened with a soliloquy in which a character ruminated aloud upon his problems, and upon his present situation. This is a very old-fashioned type of play opening, and it is one which is traditionally delivered almost as a direct address to the audience. With A Change of Heart, James tried a more gradual kind of exposition: the play opened with a mild dispute between two of the characters, and facts about the past gradually were made evident.

For his first full-length play, Daisy Miller, James created a more clever type of opening. The interest of the audience, or of the reader, is immediately captured as the courier, Eugenio, intimidates Madame de Katkoff with his allusions to indiscretions in her past. The threat of blackmail is in the air. In this play, the exposition is spread out: it continues into the second act, where information about the past continues to be brought out. Also for the first time, James built a strong interest in his main character before bringing her on stage. (The author repeated this latter technique many times in subsequent plays.)

In each of his next four plays, The American, Tenants, Disengaged, and The Album, James plunged into the action of the play at the opening, while he spread out the expository information, scattering it in lines even beyond the end of the first act. Of these plays, only the exposition of Disengaged seems not quite satisfactory: the relationships of the people were quickly and skillfully conveyed, but it was not
clear what had brought the particular group of people together on the Brisket estate.

At the opening of The Reprobate, James used an expository device which he was to use again in all of his subsequent plays. One character, not a member of the household, seeks information about the other characters. The explanations given to the inquirer automatically provide the audience with information. In The Reprobate, it is Mrs. Freshville who is finding out who is who in the household, as she questions first the butler, and then Pitt Brunt. In Guy Devenish, it is Lord Devenish who seeks information about Guy and his friends. In both Summersoft and The High Bid, Mr. Prodmore explains the details of the mortgage situation to his daughter. In The Saloon, the characters exchange information as they express their views on the critical situation which has brought them together. Jean Martle is a newcomer in The Other House, and Rose informs her about who is who, and what the relationships are between the people who live in the two houses. In James's last play, The Outcry, Lord John is no stranger to the household, but upon his arrival he cannot find any of the members of the Theign family; he finds, instead, a mutual friend, and he makes inquiries about each separate member of Lord Theign's family.

Thus it may be seen that in writing expositions for his plays, James went through three stages. First, he used the old-fashioned type of opening with a soliloquy designed to give the audience necessary information. Next, the author tried opening his plays with more or less positive action, and the expository material was spread out—usually beyond the first act. Finally, for his last seven plays, James placed
most of the expository information in a question and answer sequence
which he justified within the action of the play.

II. SUBJECT AND TREATMENT

Types of Plays

Genre. Most of James's plays were comedies, with the characters
drawn from the upper middle class, and from the aristocracy. There
were twelve comedies in all: they were all comedies of character, or
what is generally called "high comedy." He wrote no farces, but there
are occasional farcical moments in plays like Disengaged, and The
Album. If the term "melodrama" indicates a serious play with a rela-
tively happy ending, then Guy Domville would have to be classified as
one. James wrote two tragedies, The Saloon, and The Other House.

Use of the conventional happy ending. In his letters, James
stated many times that he wrote plays in the hope of making money.24
He wrote what he thought the public wanted--and deserved. In a pref-
tory note to Theatricals: Second Series, James described the formula
necessary for a successful play: it must be a comedy full of "coinci-
dence" and "perpetual motion," and it must be served up with "the
time-honoured bread-sauce of the happy ending."25 The author was so

24Percy Lubbock (ed.), The Letters of Henry James (London:
Macmillan and Co., 1920), I, 151, 170, 180, and 185. See also Leon
Edel (ed.), The Selected Letters of Henry James (New York: Farrar,
Straus and Cudahy, 1955), pp. 120-121.

and Brothers, 1895), pp. ix, and x. (Also in Edel, The Complete Plays
of Henry James, p. 349.)
intent upon writing plays with happy endings that he changed the outcome of *Daisy Miller* and *The American* when he rewrote those novels as plays.

**Subjects and themes.** The plots of James's plays have been given in detail in the previous chapter. It only remains, therefore, to point out certain relationships between the subjects of the various plays, and to enumerate some of the major recurring themes.26

The characters in James's plays are drawn from the upper middle class, from the landed gentry, and from the titled aristocracy. If not always from the leisured class, they at least have no pressing financial problems. James wrote no social problem plays.

Some four or five recurring themes from James's plays may be listed, together with their variations. Some of the plays incorporate more than one of these themes.

One of the early themes was that of thwarted love. In *Still Waters*, Horace renounces love in favor of his friend, Felix. Similarly, Guy Duval, in the play of that name, gives up Mrs. Feverel, and he urges her to accept his friend, Frank.27 (It might be mentioned that thwarted love plays an important part in the story versions of *Daisy Miller* and *The American*, but not in the dramatised versions with their happy endings.)

---

26 A discussion of the connections between themes in the plays and themes in James's narrative fiction really lies beyond the intended scope of this chapter. However, one or two examples are mentioned, and others will be recalled by Jamesian scholars.

27 In so far as an audience would undoubtedly sense that a possible great love is not to be, these two plays have a connection with James's novels, *The Aspern Papers* and *The Wings of the Dove*. 
Two of the early plays have rather unworthy heroes. Pepperell, in *A Change of Heart*, has definitely been a cad where women are concerned, yet James lets Pepperell win Margaret's heart. In *Still Waters*, Felix seems rather a shallow fellow; his vanity is touched when Horace tells him of Emma's love. Felix declares to Emma that he has studied her in silence, for he wished to be sure of his love before he spoke, but an audience would know that Felix found the girl boring until Horace made his revelation.

The contrast between Americans and Europeans was one of James's favorite themes, and he used it in many of his novels. In the plays, the American female in Europe is personified in Mrs. Grasses— a character in both *Summersoft* and *The High Bid*, and in Mrs. Cora Tuff—the character in the monologue which James wrote for Ruth Draper. Daisy Miller represents the innocent young American girl in Europe. The cultures of the New World and the Old World are contrasted in several plays: *Daisy Miller*, *The American*, *Summersoft*, *The High Bid*, and *The Outcry*.

In two of the plays, a young man, who is the last of his line, is subjected to pressure from his relatives to adopt a way of life which is repulsive to him. In both *Guy Domville* and *The Saloon*, the protagonist goes his own way in the end.28

---

28 Leon Edel has suggested that *Guy Domville* was a projection of James's own conflict in the theatre. James was presented with a choice between the "world" of show business, and the safe retreat of the literary study. (Edel, *Complete Plays of Henry James*, p. 466.)

Other interesting parallelisms between the themes of James's novels and those of his plays are suggested by Edel in *The Complete Plays of Henry James*, pp. 465, and 521.
The importance of tradition is basic to the plots of *Summerson*, *The High Bid*, and *The Saloon*. The need to guard and preserve things of beauty is the basic theme of *Summerson*, *The High Bid*, and *The Outcry*.

**Methods of Treatment**

**Realism.** James's plays are all definitely representational rather than presentational. The plays are realistic rather than naturalistic; that is, the action consists of selected incidents, and the dialogue is carefully arranged—even artificial. The settings called for are either interior box sets, or realistic exterior scenes. No modern staging techniques are needed; there are no light fades, no multiple settings, and no examples of simultaneously staged scenes.

**Disregard of the classical unities.** James believed that in the writing of plays, form was of extreme importance. However, his concept of what that form should be apparently did not include the classical unities. Of James's long plays, only *The High Bid* has both unity of time and place. In a letter to his nephew, James expressed pleasure that in transforming the one-act *Summerson* into the three-act *The High Bid*, he had been able to preserve "the artful beauty of unity of time and place . . . ." The fact that the author's other one-act plays exhibit unity of time and place may be regarded as accidental, for such is the nature of realistic short plays.

---

29 Matthiessen and Murdock, *op. cit.*., p. 268.

Characterisations

Outstanding characterisations. It has been said that when a character in a play is truly great, the reader, or the audience member, feels that he knows the character outside the circumstances of the play. In considering James's dramatic characters, it would be hard to determine whether either the depth of the characterisations, or the peculiar nature of the plot situations, might leave any lasting impression. Some of James's characters are naturally more outstanding than others; whether they could be termed "memorable" is a matter of subjective reaction.

A selected list of outstanding characters in James's plays, based on a subjective evaluation, really has no place in a study such as the present one, yet such a list would be less haphazard than one culled from the critics' uncoordinated remarks about James's plays. Such a list would have to include Horace of the early play, Still Waters; Daisy Miller, and the menacing Eugenio, of Daisy Miller; Christopher Newman in The American; the audacious Mrs. Freshville of The Reprobate; the self-sacrificing Guy Domville, and the warm Mrs. Feverel, in Guy Domville; the gay, fresh Mrs. Gracedew of Summersoft and The High Bid; the strong, willful Kate, and the staunch Owen Wingrave, of The Saloon; Rose, the murderer, in The Other House; and the overdrawn stereotype of stiff aristocracy, Lord Theign, in The Outcry.

The critics on James's characterisations. It will be recalled from the previous chapter of the present study, that when James
published his two volumes of *Theatricals*, the literary reviewers dubbed the characters, "familiar stage models," which were "extraordinarily conventional and colorless," and "curiously artificial, un lifelike, and extravagant." On the other hand, one reviewer praised James for his creation of real "human beings" in the characters of Captain Prime (Disengaged), Teddy Ashdown (The Album), and Mr. Bonsor (The Reprobate).  

When *Guy Domville* was produced, in 1895, William Archer complained that Domville's motives were not clear, yet A. B. Walkley found the persons of the play "subtly yet most humanly inconsistent."  

The *High Bid*, produced in 1909, drew the comment that the characters were "essentially puppets." As for *The Saloon*, which was staged in 1911, some of the reviewers praised James's delicate prose, but the general reaction was that the characters did not talk like people in real life. James's last play, *The Outcry*, which was presented a year and a half after the author's death, contained dialogue which evidently gave the performers some trouble to deliver: both the *Times* and the

---

31 *The Nation*, LVIII (June 28, 1894), 491.

32 *The Dial*, XVII (September 1, 1894), 125.

33 *The Nation*, IX (January 3, 1895), 18.


Manchester Guardian commented on the difficulty which the players seemed to have with their lines.\(^38\) James's secretary, some years later, wrote that the actors in The Outcry had been "embarrassed by their lines."\(^39\)

If the judgment of the contemporary critics was accurate, then James's characters were, on the whole, colorless. They were not individualized. As James grew older, his style became more and more complicated and involved in every way;\(^40\) so much so, that by 1909, when The Outcry was written, "the men and women of Henry James could only talk in the manner of their creator."\(^41\)

**Techniques of characterization.** In the novels of James, what happens to the persons involved in the stories is most often the result of what happens in their minds, in their consciences. The probing of the niceties of conscience is James's method of characterization. In his plays, this avenue of investigation is not open to the author because a realistic play must be presented in terms of exterior action.

Possibly James had nothing to substitute as a technique for the creation of truly individual characters in his dramas. However, note should be taken of one characterizing technique which James deliberately used in several plays: one of the persons in the play was given a distinctly characterizing phrase, which he was to say over and over again.

---

\(^38\) *The Times* [London], July 4, 1917; and *The Manchester Guardian*, July 4, 1917.


For example, in *The American*, Newman keeps saying, "That's just what I want to see." Similarly, in *Tenants*, Miss Dyer constantly says, "I'm not quite sure you [he, she] ought!" In *Disengaged*, Coverley's eternal question, "Have you seen Mrs. Jasper?" is used as a comic device. In the same play, Blandina's monotonous, "Yes, mamma," and "No, mamma," help to characterize her.

James's use of a characterizing phrase really only affects the surface of a dramatic character. The same may be said of his occasional use of a dialect. Neither of these devices can contribute any real depth to a character.

On the whole, then, it would seem that the contemporary critics were right: James's dramatic characters were undistinguished.

**Language**

*Jamesian expressions.* If an over-all view is taken of James's plays, it can be seen that his style of writing gradually became more and more complex. This should be expected as a parallel to his general writing development. As he grew older, James's style became more and more indelibly his. In his plays, not only the lines, but even the stage directions gradually became more and more involuted.

In the early plays there was nothing distinctive about the style. James was even guilty of using clichés—such as, "the sunlight of your presence,"42 and "the bitterness and sweetness of solitude."43

---

42 Edel, *Complete Plays of Henry James* ("Pyramus and Thisbe"), p. 64.

43 Ibid., p. 78.
He followed the custom of the day in employing sentimental phrases like, "Margaret may suffer, when, having believed her lover an honest man, she finds he's a knave," and, "I shan't have to 'think' of you—I shall see you, I shall hear you, I shall touch you."

On the other hand, certain oddities of expression in the early plays foreshadowed what was to come. In Pyramus and Thisbe, Catherine speaks of "the whispery and perfumes of spring," and in Still Waters, Felix says, "She'll never fairly look at you."

By the time he dramatized The American (1890), more of the lines had the distinctive Jamesian stamp. For example, Valentin says, "They [the family] want to know what you're prepared to do . . . for your portionless bride"; Madame de Bellegarde has the line, "We shrink from an intensely new responsibility"; and Newman exclaims, "An unmistakable sign? Do you expect me to take that?"

As late as Guy Domville (written in 1893), there were still lines which sounded like the stereotype melodramas of the nineteenth century—such as, "Out on your knot! Curse your chaplain!" Yet, at the same time, James demanded that the audience be alert to the subtleties involved when two characters used identical words but with quite different meanings: Lord Devenish and Guy both speak of the desirability for Guy to lead his life. Lord Devenish means Domville's social life

---

44Ibid., ("A Change of Heart"), p. 110.
49Ibid., p. 219. 50Ibid., p. 219. 51Ibid., p. 496.
as dictated by his family position, but Guy refers to his chosen life in the church.\footnote{52} James often expected the audience to grasp important meanings from mere intimations.

Certain favorite phrases appeared over and over again both in the stage directions, and in the lines of James's dramas. For example, James used the condensed phrase, "Turning it over," where anyone else would have been more likely to have written 'turning it over in his (or her) mind.' Another of his favorite phrases was "taking it from him/her." These phrases keep recurring in the stage directions of the plays from Guy Domville onwards. They also appear in the lines. In *The Saloon*, Coyle has a line, "If you're prepared to take it from me,"\footnote{53} and in *The Outcry*, Lady Sandgate says, "The sign is unable to take it in, you see, that . . . ."

By 1909, these favorite phrases have been extended in the stage directions of *The Outcry*: "(Taking the rather stately question in),"\footnote{55} "(Taking her expression of face in),"\footnote{56} and "(Having profoundly taken in everything that has passed)."\footnote{57} Two final examples, from *The Other House*, are "(Letting him have it all tragically and significantly while he waits),"\footnote{58} and

\begin{quote}
(ROSE, meanwhile, who has taken in, with a smothered revulsion, Vidal's fidelity, after all, to his vow, which breaks in upon Paul's offer has a moment of deep uncertainty . . . wavers desperately as with a last word to speak. . . .)\footnote{59}
\end{quote}
James's style pervaded his plays. His mode of expression became more and more elaborate—not only in the lines, but also in the stage directions.60

Oddities of grammar and spelling. Although James was, on the whole, an elaborately careful writer, he did make an occasional grammatical slip. For example, in The Saloon, Mrs. Coyle is described as looking elegant, and "(just showing for the least bit bored)."61 In some lines where there is an error in the grammar, James may have been attempting to convey the mode of expression of the character. Examples of such lines would include Catherine's, "You are welcome to share of my loaf," in Pyramus and Thisbe;62 Paul's line, "I ain't so bad—I ain't tempted!" in The Reprobate;63 and also, perhaps, Hugh's long, rambling sentence in The Outcry, "Will you let Pappendick—one of the first authorities in Europe, a good friend of mine, in fact more or less my master, and who is mainly to be found at Brussels."64

The foregoing types of grammatical error cannot be ascribed to possible mistakes on the part of the printer—as could such items as "was" for has, "for as" for as for, "affair" for affairs, etc.65

There is one odd personal expression that constantly recurs in James's plays. He had the habit of ending a phrase with the pronoun

---

60The changing usage of stage directions in James's plays is discussed in the next major section of the present chapter.

61Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 651.
62Ibid., p. 81. 63Ibid., p. 138. 64Ibid., p. 777.
65Ibid., pp. 707, 706, and 728.
"whatever," or "wherever": this left the sentence incomplete. Some examples are, "(a roll of crochet or whatever); 67 he "(has gone to some closet, or whatever)"; 68 "(she leans against the parapet or whatever)"; 69 and he gasses at the "(portrait or whatever within)." 70 The setting for the Ruth Draper monologue is described as "her sitting room at the hotel or wherever." 71 This eccentricity of James's also turns up in spoken lines, such as, "Please say to his lordship—in the Saloon or wherever—that Mr. Cribble must go." 72

Here and there James used a spelling which is now archaic: viz., "courtesy" for curtsey, 73 and "staid" for stayed. 74 Occasionally there is an actual error, as "confidant" in the masculine form, when the feminine confidante is needed. 75

66 This habit of ending a phrase with "whatever" or "wherever" is also evident in James's correspondence, and elsewhere. See E. F. Benson, Henry James: Letters to A. C. Benson and Auguste Monod (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930), p. 69. Also, Henry James, The Middle Years (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917), p. 113, and p. 118.

67 Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James ("The Saloon"), p. 651.

68 Ibid., ("The Saloon"), p. 671.

69 Ibid., ("The Other House"), p. 735.

70 Ibid., ("The Outcry"), p. 791.

71 Ibid., p. 813.

72 Ibid., ("The Outcry"), p. 780.

73 Ibid., ("Pyramus and Thisbe"), p. 75, and ("Still Waters"), p. 93.

74 Ibid., ("Disengaged"), p. 324.

75 Ibid., ("Disengaged"), p. 342, and ("Guy Domville"), p. 490.
Dialect attempts. James's plays involved many characters whose various nationalities and backgrounds would have made them talk differently from each other. Only once, however, did James seriously attempt to represent a character's dialect; this was when he dramatized The American.\footnote{James was concerned about the carelessness of much American speech. He expressed his views on the subject in an address delivered on June 8, 1905, to the graduating class of Bryn Mawr College. See Henry James, The Question of Our Speech; The Lesson of Balsam; Two Lectures (New York: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1905), pp. 3-52.}

In The American, Christopher Newman (the American), uses phrases like "Happy to make your acquaintance," "I don't know but I liked it better," "I don't know as . . . .", "I guess," and "that goes away back."\footnote{Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 197, 196, 197, 204, and 205.} He calls Valentin, "Valentine," and he uses the word "ain't" frequently. (Earlier in the present chapter, mention was made of Newman's recurrent characterizing phrase, "That's just what I want to see.")

So much for the actual text of The American. What is more interesting to the stage-oriented reader are the pronunciation aids which James inserted into the copy owned by Edward Compton (the actor who played Newman). These aids have been reproduced by Leon Edel in The Complete Plays of Henry James.\footnote{Edel states in a footnote that the "phonetic aids" were inserted in parentheses in James's hand, "in the manuscript preserved at the Lord Chamberlain's office." All such aids were for the role of Newman. (Complete Plays, p. 196.)} James did what he could with spelling-indications for Newman's dialect: "lawng" for long, "awf" for off.
"Gawd" for God, "Saint-Germans" for Saint-Germain, and "artust" for artist seem self-explanatory; even the inconsistent "wauhnt" and "wawnt" for want seem clear; but it can only be guessed what James had in mind when he wrote, "taihme (drawn out)" for time; "pahst" for past, yet "fa-e-hst" for fast; "sta-and" for understand; "ahsk" for ask; "mahn" for man; and "ca-ant mahrry" for can't marry.79

There is nothing equivalent to these dialect notations in the novel, The American. In the book, Newman's American quality comes through in what he says, and in his attitudes.

In his other plays, James limited himself to a mere hint here and there in the syntax to indicate dialectal differences between the various characters. Considering that the majority of James's later characters were drawn from the upper British classes, there are surprisingly few typical British expressions in his plays. Here and there, there will be a "By Jove!"; a "What in the world?"; a "Pray, what's that?"; and expressions such as, "a fortnight," and "It's his luck!"80 For the most part, James's British characters simply sound Jamesian.

As for the other incidental dialects which the plays call for (Italian, Russian, American, and lower class British), James contented

---

79 Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 199, 220, 199, 201, 218; 205 and 209; 220; 220, 221; 220; 220; 221; and 221.

himself with a sprinkling of phrases suggestive of nationality and social background.  

Humor in lines. James's earliest plays were sprinkled with light humor. Gradually, James increased the variety of the types of humor which he employed. Light bantering episodes occur in the early Daisy Miller, and again noticeably in The American, Disengaged, and Guy Domville. Epigrams, although not very frequently utilized by James, may be found in Daisy Miller, in The Album, and in Summersoft.

The following dialectal items from James's other plays may be of interest; they are arranged in the order in which the plays were written. In Daisy Miller, the Italian of Eugenio and Giowanni is limited to such trivia as "Signorina," "Per Baccio!", and "Meester Randolph," while no attempt is made to indicate anything Russian in the speech of Madame de Katkoff. In The Album, a footman unexpectedly says, "costume" for costume (p. 396). In The Reprobate, some attempt is made to indicate lower class speech for Mrs., the "golden" haired singer; she says "ain't" with great frequency, she refers to people as "ducks" (p. 406), and she uses the slang term, "chivery" (p. 437). The American quality of Mrs. Gracemow in Summersoft and in The High Bid comes through in her freshness and openness of attitude. James gives no suggestions for her pronunciations, and her choice of words is not noticeably non-English. On the other hand, Chivers, the old family retainer in Summersoft and The High Bid, says "natural" (p. 525), and "curious" (p. 531); he addresses Mrs. Gracemow as "Hum"; he says, "Then flymen—they do be rough" (p. 531); and he drops his h's with seeming deliberateness, when conducting tourists through the "old historic baronial 'all" (p. 572). In The Outcry, the American, Breckenridge Bender, says things like, "Happy to meet you"—addressing Lord Theign (p. 775); "I guess" (p. 786); and "Oh, shucks, Lady Sandgate" (p. 802). In the monologue written for Ruth Draper, the American flavor in the lady's speech is provided by such phrases as, "I want to get the good of it" (p. 812), "Well, I declare" (p. 814), and "I guess it's on the records!" (p. 815). (The page numbers all refer to Edel's Complete Plays of Henry James.)

Samples of James's epigrams include, "I haven't a fault—I'm ashamed of myself!" (Daisy Miller, p. 125); "[Women] are the luxury of the poor," and "The real way to escape . . . is to marry" (The Album, both on p. 370); and "A man has the right opinions as soon as he has something to lose by having the wrong ones" (Summersoft, p. 525). (The page numbers refer to Edel's Complete Plays of Henry James.)
Puns are rather rare in James, but they may be found in Disengaged, and in The Reprobate. Every now and again, James wrote a few slightly risqué lines in a play, but they were hardly of a nature which today would be regarded as lacking propriety. James also knew how to

83 Sir Montagu Brisket tells Mrs. Jasper that she will "never cease...to 'draw'"—meaning both to sketch and to attract men (Disengaged, p. 306); and, in The Reprobate, Mr. Bonsor says that Paul has been "stuck"—meaning that he had his photograph taken, and also that he was ensnared by a woman (p. 433). (Page numbers in Edel's Complete Plays.)

84 Blandina and Capt. Prime are an unconsolably long time examining the ruins of an old abbey, while the rest of the company wonders what they are up to. The following lines are said during the couple's conspicuous absence. (It really does not matter who says what.) "Will you go and fetch them?" "Would it be discreet?" "We'll simply wait." "It's only fair!" "It's only decent!" "We must put ourselves in their place!...Respect their thoroughness. I've taught Blandina not to be superficial..." "They're exploring an endless subject." "Poring over a delightful book." "With their heads, no doubt, very close together!" "It's terrible to think of all they'll know!" (Disengaged, p. 313.)

In The Album, Bernal tells Sir Ralph that he is in love with Grace. Bernal says it is too late to pull up; he wants to keep on.

SIR RALPH. Paying your court?

BERNAL. Paying my court!

SIR RALPH. To make her your wife?

BERNAL. To make her (in deep uncertainty, agitation, distraction, faltering) I'll be hanged if I know what! (The Album, p. 306.)

In The Reprobate, Paul and Captain Chanter are discussing the singer, Mina Freshville.

PAUL. (Considering.) How far have you gone with her?

CHANTER. With Mrs. Freshville? Very far indeed. I once went to Brighton.

PAUL. Oh, I went to Paris! (The Reprobate, p. 434.)

In The Outcry, Lady Grace has been saying that Lord John wants to marry her only because of her father's position, and for her mother's great people. Her friend, Lady Sandgate, observes,

LADY SANDGATE. For the general so immaculate connection. (The Outcry, p. 770.)

(Page numbers in Edel's Complete Plays.)
"plant" a laugh line, but he did not apply the technique very often. At times, James employed exaggeration and irony for their comic effect. It may be mentioned, perhaps as a special category, that James was broad-minded enough to include jokes aimed at Americans in those plays where the opportunity naturally arose, *viz.*, *Daisy Miller*, *The American*, *The Album*, *Summersoft*, *The High Bid*, and *The Outcry*.

James may be credited with a growing awareness of the possibilities open to the playwright for comedy through business. Certain examples are dealt with in the following section of the present chapter.

IV. STAGEABILITY

Stage Directions

Changing usage. In his earliest plays, James provided plenty of business for the actors—such as opening a window, arranging flowers, laughing, etc., but he provided no directions in the sense of left or right on the stage. With his third play, *A Change of Heart*, James indicated that certain doors should be placed left or right, but the actors' movements were still not related to areas of the stage. A change begins with the writing of *Daisy Miller*; in that play, most of

---

85 Here are two instances in which James "planted" a laugh line. In *Disengaged*, four of the characters discuss what Mrs. Wigmore and her daughter, Blandina, would be likely to say if Mr. Trafford should reveal that he wishes to marry Blandina. Mrs. Jasper forecasts that Mrs. Wigmore would say, "You must take what you can get," and that her daughter would answer, "Yes, mamma." Since this is precisely what the mother and daughter do say, the result is inevitably comical.

Similarly, in Act II of *The Reprobate*, Paul repeatedly asks, "What will Mamma say?" Eventually, Nina anticipates him with, "Oh, I don't care what Mamma says!"

(Edel, *Complete Plays*, pp. 341-342; and p. 430.)
the action is painstakingly thought out, although James did not solve quite all of the problems of staging in the later acts.

*The American,* James's first produced play, brought a big change in the terminology of his stage directions. Now, for the first time, James indicated that actors should move "up," or "down," or that a character should "cross" the stage. Doubtless the change can be attributed to James's first connection with a professional company. James's next produced play, *Guy Domville,* contained noticeably fewer directions. Then, in the one-act *Summersoft,* James for the first time suggested alternative stage directions. Perhaps James was beginning to visualize his role of playwright differently in relation to possible productions.

Thirteen years later, in 1908, James saw his next production, *The High Bid.* The new script showed an increase in the number of alternative suggestions for business and movement. James included new terms: "turning off" and "by-play." It is probable that, once again, James's association with professional actors was reflected in his employment of new terminology. In this play, it can definitely be seen that James now understood the psychological use of stage space. In *The High Bid,* when the characters are in opposition to one another, James specifies that the whole width of the stage should be between them: Fordmore and Mrs. Gracedew are "confronted over the width of the

---

86 *Summersoft* was written in 1895, the same year as the production of *Guy Domville.*

In Act III, Yule and Mrs. Gracedew are on opposite sides of the stage, but as the feeling between them becomes warmer, James specifies that they should move toward each other; later, Mrs. Gracedew is described as,

(Holding off from him [Yule], across the hall, the entire space between them now, she decidedly left and he right; with an intensity of suspended response that may almost pass as a plea for further postponement, or even as a plea for mercy...)

James continued to use stage space psychologically in all of his later plays.

One peculiar aspect of James's stage directions, and it is particularly noticeable in the later plays, is that his attitude was that of the author of a story rather than that of a playwright. For example, James referred to himself as "I" in The Saloon:

Owen. (Carried, as I say, further and further, by his surge of reaction, rebellion, repudiation, the passion that, come as it will, has to come now; and even himself affected, in this sense, by the echo of his tone.)

Near the end of the same play, Coyle conveniently reappears on stage, after having left to go to bed. James explains in the stage directions that Coyle had been unable to sleep, but there is no way that the audience would know this. In The High Bid, there is a perfect example of a comment by the playwright—in the stage directions—which could not possibly reach the audience.

Mrs. Gracedew. (Giving way, turning off, before the barrier he thus erects for her [She stands in her path]; but with a motion of

88 Ibid., p. 592.
89 Ibid., p. 598.
90 Ibid., p. 601.
91 Ibid., p. 673.
her arms that makes nothing of what she has done—seems to define it as a case of her having paid ninepence.) I bought him out.

YULE. (Not believing in the ninepence.) For how much?92

Perhaps the most interesting change in James's stage directions occurred when he took up playwriting again after a thirteen year interval. This amount of time elapsed between the writing of Guy Domville and The High Bid. If the texts of the two plays are compared, the improvement in the flow of the dialogue and the readability of the lines can hardly be missed. Of immediate interest, however, is the increase in the number and the length of the stage directions in the later play, and the fact that the directions are intended for a different function. In the earlier play, the directions merely served to indicate the actors' general movements, but, in the later play, the directions provide an outlet for James's commentary on what is taking place, and they give an insight into the mental workings of the characters.

An interesting comparison may be made between the two plays. It so happens that in both Guy Domville and The High Bid there is a scene in which it is discovered that a young girl has run off with her lover in order to escape from a marriage which her family has tried to force upon her.

In Guy Domville, Guy has helped Mary to escape, and the elopement is discovered by Guy's cousin, Mrs. Domville, and by Lord Devenish.

(MRS. DOMVILLE... is heard knocking and calling, "Cousin, Cousin! Daughter, Daughter!") LORD DEVENISH is alone. Enter a FOOTMAN.)

92Ibid., p. 600.
LORD DEVENISH. You've come from above. Is Miss Mary there?
FOOTMAN. I've come from across the water, my Lord. Miss
Braier's [Mary] left the house.
LORD DEVENISH. Left it for where?
FOOTMAN. I've taken a guinea, my Lord, not to say.
LORD DEVENISH. Then take another, damn you, to do your duty.
FOOTMAN. By my duty then, my Lord, she's off in a great boat,
a gentleman close beside her and three watermen to pull.
LORD DEVENISH. The boat of a man of war. The ruffian, the
serpent!

(Enter MRS. DOMVILLE.)

MRS. DOMVILLE. He's locked in. I'll be hanged if he'll answer.
LORD DEVENISH. This knave has sufficiently answered. The
hussy's gone with the villain she was leagued with and who reached
here in time.
MRS. DOMVILLE. And you saw it, and gave no alarm.
FOOTMAN. I only saw, Madam, what Mr. Domville himself saw. He
waved his hat from the terrace.
LORD DEVENISH. Domville, the false wretch, has abetted them.
MRS. DOMVILLE. Pursue them. Start the hue and cry!
LORD DEVENISH. Be off! The horse is stolen and it's all too
late. From the moment they met we were dished. Let them go!93

In a similar passage in The High Bid, Mr. Prodmore learns of his
daughter's elopement from Mrs. Gracedew. Prodmore, unable to find his
daughter in the house, has assumed that she is in the company of Cap-
tain Yule—his chosen suitor.

PRODMORE. Her character [referring to the daughter]—formed by my
assiduous care—enables me to locate her. I may say even to time
her, from moment to moment, (massive, clear-faced, watch in hand)
with all but mathematical certainty! (Then as he complacently sur-
veys his watch.) It's my assured conviction that she's combining
inclination with Duty even while we sit here!

MRS. GRACEDE. (Who, after having with a high, odd, but in-
articulate sound, half an apprehensive groan and half a smothered
joy "taken it from him" in all its fatuity and folly, gives way to
her nervousness and moves up and round; invoking comfort and sup-
port, with all her eyes, from the whole picture, before speaking,
abruptly on an effective change of tone.) Dear Mr. Prodmore, why
are you so awfully rash as to make your Daughter afraid of you?
(With increasing confidence, as she has broken this ice.) You
should have taught her to confide in you. (Advisingly, soothingly,
serene.) She has clearly shown me that she can confide.

93 Ibid., p. 507.
PRODMORE. (With a frown, pulled up by this new note.) She "confides" in you?

MRS. GRACEWIN. Well (facing him, smiling, laughing)—you may "take it from me"! (Then as if seeing her way now.) Let me suggest that, as fortune has thrown us together a minute, you follow her good example.

PRODMORE. Oh!

MRS. GRACEWIN. (She puts out a hand to check him; she knows what she's about; she takes her further step.) Tell me for instance the ground of your objection to poor Mr. Pegg.

PRODMORE. Pegg?

MRS. GRACEWIN. (Then as he starts at the name and remains blank, for excess of amusement, at her audacity; distinct, categorical, and as already with the sense of success.) I mean Mr. Pegg of Bellborough, Mr. Hall Pegg, the Godson of your Daughter's Grandmother and the associate of his father in their flourishing House, to whom—Miss Prodmore is devotedly attached.

PRODMORE. (Who has sunk in his dismay into the nearest chair, staring amazedly before him.) It has gone as far as that?

MRS. GRACEWIN. (Triumphant now; towering above him.) It has gone so far that you must let it go the rest of the way!

PRODMORE. (Physically prostrate, but the solid gasping pretension, the habit of massive dignity of him, asserting themselves through everything, with deep resentment at having been "done." It's too monstrous of you to have plotted with her to keep me in the dark!)

In summary, it may be said that James did not develop a proficient terminology for his stage directions until he had his first professional production—The American. In the earlier plays, although the action had been carefully thought out, it was not indicated in terms of specific stage areas. With the writing of Guy Domville, James for the first time indicated alternative stage directions. With the production of The High Bid, in 1906, James added further technical terminology, and it was evident that he now understood the psychological use of stage space—in the sense in which it is used by a director.

The later plays show an increasing tendency to write with the attitude of a story author rather than that of a playwright. In

94 Ibid., pp. 593-594.
particular, the stage directions have a new function: they serve as an outlet for Jane's comments, and they also show the mental or intellectual motivations of the characters.

**Business.** Jane's plays are full of little actions--stage business--for the actors to perform. As time went on, Jane became quite adept at finding business which would suggest the character of the person concerned. Examples picked at random might include the scheming, old Frenchman, Nioche, in *The American*, who is described as "shrugging his shoulders and pressing his finger-tips together"; and the indolent Paul, in *The Other House*, who is more interested in eating a bun than in listening to his mother speak of his possible forthcoming marriage. In his later plays, Jane often suggested alternative pieces of business. It appears that the author had reached a new understanding of the function of business: the specific nature of the business is less important than that it should reveal the state of mind of the character. For instance, in *The High Bid*, Mrs. Gracedew picks up a small object as a sign of her intention to leave.

*MRS. GRACEDEW.* (Who makes again the circuit of the hall and picks up without interest, as a sign of the intention of going, some small object, a rolled up pair of gloves say that she has deposited on her first arrival in some place where the others won't have seen it; or even simply resumes possession of the note-book she has within a few moments put down, sticking the pencil back into its sheath; anything, in short, that will strike in a small way the note of departure.)

Later in the same play, Mrs. Gracedew makes an absent-minded movement as she searches for the right thing to say,

---

Mrs. Gracedew. (As, pulled up a little at having to take him as he is, since she doesn’t quite know what to do about it, she thinks hard a minute; meanwhile mechanically, with one hand, just pushing some object on a table or elsewhere straight, or smoothing down with her foot the corner of an old rug.) Have you thought very much about it? 

The long and detailed business found in The High Bid even includes indications of the vocal intonation which should be used in some of the lines, such as, "(Very high and confident.)". 

There seems to be evidence of an increasing awareness on James’s part of the possibilities of using gesture alone to convey meaning. As early as Disengaged, Lady Brisket "(makes [in reference to her husband] a nervous, sarcastic gesture to Trafford.)" Part of the exposition of The Album is managed through business alone; before any lines are spoken in the play, Lady Basset enters—dressed for travelling and carrying a dressing-bag; she looks around, finds a book, and puts it in the bag. The audience thereby would see that she is preparing to leave—rather than having just arrived. By the time that James wrote The Outcry, he had realised that an actor all alone on the stage can convey through his actions that the character is preoccupied, or beset with anxiety. Thus, business has taken over the function of the older soliloquy. 

98 Ibid., p. 580.  
99 Ibid., p. 582.  
100 Ibid., p. 314.  
101 Ibid., p. 355.  
102 Ibid., p. 779 (Lady Grace, in her anxiety, moves about restlessly, looks out of the window, etc.); p. 789 (Lord Theign lights a cigarette, and he revolves about the stage "in a manner that shows the degree of his preoccupation").
Humor through business. Examples of comedy business are not over plentiful in James's plays, but a few instances may be cited. The author understood that a contradiction between words and action will produce mirth. In the new fourth act of The American, Newman is saying to Noémie, "You think too much . . . You had better imitate my repose," when he promptly knocks over a jar on the table. Similarly, in The Album, Bernal explains that spare cash is kept in a teacup, and he says, "The teacup's our bank—a bank that's always breaking!" At that very moment, Teddy smashes the cup.

Sometimes James created a humorous effect through slightly ridiculous action. Throughout the first act of Daisy Miller, Reverdy follows Mrs. Costello about carrying a camp-stool for her, but she always refuses to sit on it. In the same scene, Reverdy looks ridiculous as he tries to preserve himself from temptation by hiding from Daisy behind a parasol. Another instance of humor through ridiculous action may be found in Disengaged. In this play, Coverley makes his first entrance while a posed photograph is being taken on-stage. Coverley goes from person to person whispering, "Have you seen Mrs. Jasper?" The only reply which he receives is the photographer's monotonous, repeated admonition, "Keep perfectly still." Occasionally, James indicated that an actor should change his facial expression

103 Ibid., p. 244.
104 Ibid., p. 373.
105 Ibid., pp. 124 ff.
106 Ibid., p. 308.
in the middle of a line; this is a common technique which invariably provokes laughter. 107

Mechanics of Staging

Mechanics in general. The mechanics of playwriting are concerned mainly with the manipulation of the characters for the purpose of staging the action: they include movement in general—particularly the entrances and exits of the characters. The mechanics also determine the locale of the action. James's mechanics, on the whole, were rather obvious, but they were thought out with considerable care.

Entrances and exits made by characters. In James's earliest plays, the movement of the characters was inclined to be monotonous. For example, in A Change of Heart, the characters keep running out of the drawing-room into the garden. There are three doors leading out of the room, and yet they keep using the one up center: it is obvious that James needed to get the characters off the stage by turns. In many of his plays, James called for truly extraordinary coincidences of entrances by characters arriving from different directions, viz., in Daisy Miller, in Guy Domville, and in the late play, The Other House. Usually the movement on and off the stage, in James's plays, was painstakingly thought out. James was particularly careful that the wrong characters should not be able to meet in the off-stage areas; problems of this nature arose for the playwright in Daisy Miller and in The Reprobate. A very rare mistake, and that was of a minor nature,

107 Examples of this technique may be found in Disengaged, and in the untitled monologue written for Ruth Draper. (Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 326, and p. 614, respectively.)
occurred in *The Saloon*. In that play, Kate went out by a door on the left, and came back in through a door on the right. Since she was supposedly leaving to retire for the night, the spectator might wonder why Kate did not go out by the door up center, as the other house guests had done when they had left to go to bed.108

Unfortunately, James's methods of getting characters on and off the stage were not always convincing. Often a character would leave on a flimsy excuse. For example, it is to be suspected that in *Guy Domville* the frequency with which one or another of the characters must leave to go and see "little Geordie" is no more than a pretext on the part of the author for getting rid of a character momentarily. The boy is never seen on stage. Again, in *Summersoft*, Yule and Cora alternately appear and disappear—popping in and out of the great hall but not meeting for a long, long time.

"Left" and "right" stage. There is internal evidence to show that when James spoke of "left" and "right" on the stage, he meant left and right from the audience's point of view: this is in contrast to the technical use of the term, in which "left" refers to the actor's left side as he faces the audience, and "right" refers to the actor's right side.

James drew a stage-plan for the Prologue to *The Other House*. The words, "commodious sofa," are written over a straight line on the left-hand side of the diagram.109 During the action of the play, the

---


109 Leon Edel has reproduced the stage-plan for *The Other House* on p. 663 of *The Complete Plays of Henry James*. The diagram is in James's hand.
stage directions say, "the important sofa at left . . . ." Thus it is evident that James was visualizing this setting with the "left" from the audience's point of view.

There is further evidence of this fact in The Saloon. The setting has three entrances: on the left, on the right, and up center. On the sixth page of the play, three persons are on stage: Mrs. Coyle and Lechmere are down "right," and Coyle stands up center. Kate enters right, and, at the same moment, Owen enters left. Owen speaks and comes down left. The stage directions then say, "KATE ... has come down, and has MRS. COYLE and LECHMERE to her left and OWEN to her right; COYLE remaining up centre." The only way in which it would be physically possible for Mrs. Coyle and Lechmere to be on Kate's own left-hand side, would be if they were on the "right" from the audience's point of view.

Visualization of the set. The settings of James's plays are not very imaginative: the scenic descriptions, for the most part, call for either a simple exterior setting, or an interior "box" set. As would be expected, many of the interior sets are drawing-rooms, but James had a noticeable preference for hall settings— that is, the hall of a house with doors leading off to various apartments, or rooms. Occasionally the pattern was varied, as in the scene laid in the hotel parlors in Rome, in Daisy Miller; in this scene it was possible to go out onto a balcony and to appear to look down on the carnival in the street below.

110 Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 689.
111 Ibid., p. 656.
It seems that James realized that a playwright should be aware of the architectural layout of the immediate off-stage areas—at least, this is the case in *The Other House*, and in *The Outcry*. However, James was not always specific about his settings. For instance, the second act set for *Guy Domville* is merely described as, "Mrs. Domville's villa at Richmond."\(^{112}\) The action of the scene seems to indicate that it takes place in some kind of hall, and that there must be ways to leave the stage in several different directions.

Sometimes James specified that an interior setting should reflect the characteristics of its owner. Sir Ralph's drawing-room, in *The Album*, should be "handsome, cold, conventional, and characteristic."\(^{113}\) Mr. Bonsor's villa, in *The Reprobate*, is "an old bachelor's house; the whole aspect ugly."\(^{114}\) (Jamesian scholars will recognize the psychological rightness of the environment, as seen in many of the author's novels.)

James did not always list the settings before the beginning of a play. He seemed to have no policy about it, and there seems to be no observable pattern for the set listings. Even the two volumes of plays which James published differed in this respect.

In most of his plays, James was very vague about the furniture. His usual habit was not to mention a chair or a sofa until a character needed to sit down, and even then he rarely indicated where the accommodation should be placed. *The Saloon* was an exception, for in that play James indicated in his scenic description where the tables and

chairs should be placed. James's vagueness about the furnishings is strange in combination with his exactitude about the number and placement of entrances in his sets.

The diagram which James drew for the hall in the Prologue to The Other House seems entirely too sparsely furnished. It is curious in another respect: the room is longer from the front to the back wall than it is from left to right. Hence the sketch does not look like the work of someone who is accustomed to visualizing settings with actual stage dimensions.\textsuperscript{115}

In his later plays, James often suggested alternative features in the settings. In The Other House, James stated specifically that the "essence" of two of the settings lay in the number and placement of the entrances—"for the Action."\textsuperscript{116} This seems to be a practical approach.

James's sets, in general, are practical: they are playable. The settings are never really imaginative, but they serve their purpose.

James's Consciousness of Staging

General control of stage movement. It has already been seen that James was conscious of the need to control the movement of the actors on and off the stage. He was consistent in matters of entrances and exits, especially when a character had to reenter. James always thought out how certain characters could be prevented from meeting each

\textsuperscript{115}Ibid., p. 683. \hspace{1cm} 116Ibid., p. 681, and p. 739.
other in the immediate off-stage area, when it would be undesirable to have them do so.\textsuperscript{117} In his directions, James sometimes referred to the "audience," to the "spectator," and to the "stage" \textit{per se}.

\textbf{Favorable effects.} In his later plays, James showed a definite understanding of the psychological use of stage space in the placing of characters on stage.\textsuperscript{118} James also became aware that business should show a character's state of mind.\textsuperscript{119} Sometimes, James indicated that a number of characters should be grouped in a certain way, thus forming what is generally referred to as a stage "picture."\textsuperscript{120} Occasionally, James called for an effect which would definitely be stagey. For example, in \textit{The Saloon}, two failing lamps are extinguished, one quite some time before the other, so as to produce a gradually increasing sense of horror.\textsuperscript{121} Again, in \textit{The Other House}, James specifically states that the infant in its nurse's arms should seem to symbolize "a large white sacrifice, a muslin-muffled offering that seems to lead up to a ceremony."\textsuperscript{122} Every now and again, James

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{117}\textit{cf. ante}, pp. 165-166.
\item \textsuperscript{118}\textit{cf. ante}, pp. 157-158, 161.
\item \textsuperscript{119}\textit{cf. ante}, pp. 162-163.
\item \textsuperscript{120}In \textit{The American}, the characters are carefully moved and grouped around the wounded Valentin. (Edel, \textit{Complete Plays of Henry James}, p. 252.)
\item \textsuperscript{121}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 671. (The effect is not unlike that in Matherlinck's \textit{The Intruder}, which was written in 1890. It is possible that James may have been familiar with that work.)
\item James had a theory that horror, if left to the imagination, would seem greater than if specified. See James, \textit{The Turn of the Screw} (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922), pp. xx-xxii.
\item \textsuperscript{122}Edel, \textit{Complete Plays of Henry James}, p. 700.
\end{itemize}
used a piece of business which was obviously prompted by his vision of it being performed specifically on a stage. For instance, when the wounded Valentin is helped on in *The American*, Newman and Noélie wheel a sofa to the "front" for him to rest on.123 In *Disengaged*, Coverley places a camp-stool in the middle of the stage for Mrs. Jasper to sit on.124

In two of his later plays, it is evident that James was conscious of the use of color in costumes as a method of indicating opposing characters. In *The Saloon*, Mrs. Julian, a widow, is dressed in black; Mrs. Coyle wears white; and Kate Julian wears scarlet. Kate's "vivid red silk dress . . . figures throughout the play, for the eye, as the only big patch of colour . . . ."125 In Act I, not the Prologue, of *The Other House*, Jean wears black, while Rose wears white: symbolically the colors indicate the reverse of their usual associations. In this play, it is Rose, in white, who is evil; and Jean, in black, who is good. However, it is a long time before the true natures of the young women become apparent, and James deliberately obscured their intentions with the surrounding circumstances.

James understood the principle of "planting" a line, or humor, or an object. For example, Kate's final line in *The Saloon*, "Dead of the Death--i", is heightened in its effect because the words were used earlier in reference to the ghost legend.126 In *The Album*, attention is focussed on the sketch book as it is handled by several characters.

123Ibid., p. 222.  
124Ibid., p. 313.  
125Ibid., p. 653.  
126Ibid., p. 674.
before its owner is revealed. James also knew how to "plant" a laugh line, and examples of this technique may be found in Disengaged and in The Reprobate.\textsuperscript{127}

In his late plays, James replaced the older soliloquy with silent action passages for a character alone on stage. Examples of this technique may be found in The Other House, and in The Outcry.\textsuperscript{128} In the latter play, James also used what he called a "mute passage," or a "reciprocal mute comment."\textsuperscript{129} It was thus that James described a silent communication which took place, by means of facial expressions or through gestures, between two characters on stage—in the presence of a third character who was unaware of the exchange of thoughts which was going on.

\textbf{Lack of a sense of staging.} James's visualisation of the staging of a play was not always faultless, although any mistakes he made were of a minor nature. For example, there would be a "stage wait" in The Other House if it were performed as written: in the Prologue, Rose reads through a three-page closely written letter twice while Dennis Vidal—and the audience—waits.\textsuperscript{130} Sometimes James's sense of timing was off. For instance, in Act II of Disengaged, Lady Brisket up at the window sees Mrs. Wigmore coming. As the scene is written, it might well appear that Lady Brisket had gone up to the window for the purpose

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{127}cf. ante, pp. 155-156.
\item \textsuperscript{128}Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 698, 749; 779, 789.
\item \textsuperscript{129}Ibid., pp. 792, 799.
\item \textsuperscript{130}Ibid., p. 693.
\end{itemize}
of happening to see Mrs. Wigmore coming in from the court. In rare
instances, James could also be guilty of unrealistic visualization of a
piece of business. In The Reprobate, Paul is in the act of handing a
glass full of wine to Blanche when he is startled by the entrance of his
mother, and he lets the glass fall. There is no reaction to the acci­
dent, and apparently no mess. As if that was not enough, Paul then
pours a cup of tea for Blanche, and he nearly drops it when his mother
speaks sharply. However, this time another gentleman catches the cup
and saves the day. This kind of business may amuse the play reader,
but it could scarcely be acted as written.

Occasionally, James put something into the stage directions
which could not be conveyed to the audience. Madame de Katkoff, in
Daisy Miller, carries a French book in a pink cover under her arm. How
would an audience know that the book was French? In The Outcry,
Hugh is alone on stage, pacing nervously, "waiting for LADY GRACE, to
whom we see that his name has been taken and who comes to him after a
little . . . ." All that the audience could "see" would be Hugh's
nervousness, and his attitude might indicate that he was waiting for
someone.

It has been mentioned that James was vague about what furniture
was needed in his settings, and about where it should be placed. It
seems rather odd, therefore, that in The Reprobate the author stipu­
lates that there should be a tall cabinet below the door on the right.
This would seem precisely the wrong place to put a tall cabinet, since it would hide entering actors in this position. (The cabinet serves no purpose for the action.) This would seem to indicate a lack of staging awareness in James.

Sometimes it appears that James was not alert to possible audience reactions. In too many of his plays, there are coincidences of entrances by characters arriving from different directions, which it might be hard to accept. In Tenants, there is a preposterous coincidence of action: Norman arrives home unexpectedly from India. He enters the room at the very moment when his father is checking the assembled company for dinner. Sir Frederick looks round and says, "Well then, are we all here?" Norman answers loudly, as he comes in, "Yes, father, we're all here!" The likelihood of laughter from the audience would seem strong, indeed.

A curious exception to James's usual carefulness in writing was Guy Domville. When the play was produced by George Alexander, the critics complained about the lack of justification for the change in Guy's attitude after the first act. An item which must have seemed confusing to the audience was Lt. Round's reference to Lord Devenish as "the man who is ready to traffic in [Mary's] innocence with Jews and gamsters . . . ." No explanation was offered for what was meant by trafficking, or what the reference to Jews signified. In the

---

136Ibid., p. 283.

137See the section on Guy Domville in the previous chapter of this study.

138Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 505.
There is no man on-stage, but the line could easily have been changed so that Mrs. Peverel sent the maid out with the money to someone waiting off-stage.

Summary

In this chapter, the scripts of James's plays were analyzed from a technical standpoint, in an attempt to discover how James's playwriting technique developed, and what his technique had become by the time that he wrote his last play. The survey was divided into four large categories: I. Script Format; II. Subject and Treatment; III. Literary Aspects; and IV. Stageability.

All in all, it may be said that James's plays were highly conventional. The findings in each category were as follows.

I. Script Format. Most of James's full-length plays were in three acts, with two exceptions of four acts each. He wrote five one-act plays. Except for two of his earliest plays, which were divided into French scènes, James followed the custom of the realistic theatre in matters of scene division. In the lines of a play, James used italics and capitalization with unusual frequency to indicate where the emphasis should come. In his scripts, James followed the old conventions; he listed the cast with the male characters first; he named many of the characters in such a way as to indicate the characteristics of the person; and, up until roughly the turn of the century, James used asides and soliloquies. James's methods of exposition gradually

139Ibid., p. 508.
became more skillful, and less obvious. His attitude toward the titles, and indeed toward the texts, of his plays was one of flexibility.

II. Subject and Treatment. James favored comedies, and he drew his characters from the upper levels of society. In the hope of winning public favor, James deliberately used the conventional happy ending. However, he did write two tragedies late in his playwriting career. His themes included thwarted love; the romantic success of unworthy heroes; the contrasts between Americans and Europeans; and the importance of tradition. James espoused realism, and he disregarded the classical unities.

III. Literary Aspects. James did not present any deeply probing character studies in his dramas. However, some of the characters stood out above the others. The critics often found his characters conventional, and un lifelike. Although many of James's characters had various national and personal backgrounds, only once did the author seriously attempt to represent a dialect—for Christopher Newman in The American. One technique which James used on several occasions as a method for distinguishing a character was the employment of a recurrent characterizing phrase.

The style of the language in his plays was inevitably Jamesian. As he grew older, not only did the lines become more indelibly his, but the stage directions also became more and more involved. Occasionally, there was a grammatical error, and now and again James used an archaic spelling. The lines in most of James's plays are sprinkled with humor, and he gradually increased the variety of the humor.
IV. Stageability. James did not possess a proficient terminology in his stage directions until he had his first professional production—The American. The mechanics of James's plays were, on the whole, too evident. He was always very careful about specifying where characters should enter, exit, or reenter, and he was aware when it was necessary to prevent certain characters from meeting each other in the immediate off-stage area. There is internal evidence in the plays to show that when James referred to the "left" of the stage, he meant from the point of view of the audience, and correspondingly for stage "right."

James understood how business could be used for purposes of suggesting a type of character, and also for creating humor. He came to understand that meaning could be conveyed through movement alone, and eventually he replaced the soliloquy with silent action passages.

James's sets were not very imaginative, but they were always playable. He was usually vague about the furnishings. Sometimes, James specified that an interior setting should reflect the personality of its owner.

James's consciousness of staging gradually increased. By 1906, when The High Bid was produced, James apparently understood the psychological use of stage space. He realized that business should reflect the state of mind of an individual; sometimes he suggested alternative stage directions; at times, he suggested a definite stage picture; and, in two of his last plays, it seems evident that James understood that color in costumes may be used to indicate opposing characters. He also understood the principle of "planting."
In the later plays, the stage directions reflect more and more the attitude of the author of a story: they provide an outlet for James's own comments, and they also reveal the motivations of the characters.

James's visualization of the staging of a play was not always faultless, but any mistakes he made were of a minor nature. Mistakes of timing, or unrealistic visualization of a piece of business, could doubtless be corrected in an actual performance.
CHAPTER IV
HENRY JAMES’S OWN DRAMATIZATIONS

James wrote fifteen plays and one monologue. Of the fifteen plays, eight were originally written as plays, and seven were dramatizations of stories or novels. The purpose of the present chapter is to examine the relationship between the stories and the plays, when James transposed the material from fictional to dramatic form.

The plays which were conceived in dramatic form were Pyramus and Thisbe, Still Waters, A Change of Heart, The Album, The Reprobate, Guy Domville, Summersoft, and The Outcry. Plays which were dramatised versions of stories or novels included Daisy Miller, The American, Tenants, Disengaged, The High Bid, The Saloon, and The Other House.

Only one of James’s dramatisations was based on the work of an author other than himself: this was Tenants, which was based on “Flavien” by Henri Rivières.¹

At one time, James planned to dramatise his story, The Chaperon, but he never completed the project. In the Complete Plays of Henry James, Leon Edel has included fragments and notes which James left for this planned dramatization.² Some indication of the changes which


James proposed to make in *The Chaperon* may be found in Chapter II of the present study, under the section entitled, "More Plays and Productions."

On three occasions, James converted a play of his into fictional form. He re-used the one-act *Summersoft*, an unproduced play which he had written for Ellen Terry,3 for the story, "Covering End." "Covering End," in turn, was made into the long play, *The High Bid*. Similarly, *The Other House* was transferred back and forth between dramatic and fictional form. This work was first sketched as a play. Then it was converted into a novel, and published as such. Finally, the novel was re-dictated as a play.4 Third, James rewrote his play, *The Outcry*, as a novel—in which form it remained. Unlike *The High Bid* and *The Other House*, James's play, *The Outcry*, was not a dramatisation.

In the present chapter, an examination is made of James's dramatisations for the purpose of discovering what the author actually did with the material when transposing it from fictional into dramatic form. For the sake of simplicity, *Summersoft*, "Covering End," and *The High Bid* will be handled together as a continuous unit. As for *The Other House*, since there seems to be no extant version of the early

---


4Detailed bibliographical information on the several conversions of *Summersoft* and *The Other House* may be found in Chapter II of the present study, under the section entitled, "More Plays and Productions."
first scenario, it can only be examined as a dramatisation of a novel.
This means that there are a total of seven units to be examined: *Daisy Miller; The American; Tenants; Disengaged; Summersoft—"Covering End"—The High Bid; The Saloon; and The Other House.*

Each dramatisation will be analysed in four ways: I. **Staging:**
A. **Mechanics**—number of acts; number of settings required; elimination of action which could not be staged; new motivation needed for entrances and exits of characters; B. **Theatrical devices**—special stage effects (sound, lighting, or other kinds); addition of business or lines of a peculiarly theatrical nature; multi-set possibilities. II. **The handling of the story or novel material:** A. Changes in the story (plot or theme); B. Scenes added or omitted; C. Changes in the type or number of characters; D. Changes in the dialogue; E. Changes in the relative or over-all time involved; and F. Changes in organisation or evolvement of the story. III. **Gained** items such as humor, or dramatic action which illustrates factors only mentioned in the story. IV. **Lost** items such as author omniscience, point of view, or stream of consciousness.

For practical reasons, these items will not always be taken up strictly in the order here indicated. However, a brief summary will

---

5Leon Edel states, "The manuscript of the scenario was not found among his James's posthumous papers." cf. Henry James, *The Other House*, with an introduction by Leon Edel (Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions 1947), p. xi.
be given for each play, under the headings: staging; handling of the original story material; items gained; and items lost.°

I. DAISY MILLER

Staging

James's play, Daisy Miller, is in three acts, and it requires three settings. Act I, the garden and terrace of a hotel on Lake Geneva; Act II, the promenade of the Pincian Gardens, in Rome; and Act III, the public parlors of a hotel in Rome.

James wisely decided to place all of the action in public places, so that it would be natural for the characters to wander in and out of the settings. In the last act, it is carnival time, and thus an added motivation is created for the characters to bustle in and out of the hotel.

As originally written, much of the story would be too hard to stage; there were too many fragmentary sections, and too many locations.

The staging called for in Daisy Miller is relatively simple. Perhaps, for the scenery designer, it would be difficult to represent the distant view of the Château de Chillon in the first act, but doubtless a simplified set would do as well. The only special effects demanded are the noise of the carnival, and the flare of torches in the

°The plots of James's plays are given in Chapter II, "A History of James's Playwriting Efforts," of the present study.
In the same place will be found information concerning what is known of the sources of James's materials. Chapter II also includes details of productions of James's plays—both actual productions given to the plays, and other contemplated productions.
street outside, which the audience should be aware of throughout the third act.

The handling of the story material

James's original story, *Daisy Miller*, is divided into two chapters. The events are presented from the point of view of Frederick Winterbourne, an American, who is captivated by his flirtatious compatriot, Daisy Miller. The story opens "two or three years ago,"7 at a hotel in Vevey, Switzerland. There, for three days, Winterbourne and Daisy enjoy each other's company, in spite of the disapproval of Winterbourne's aunt, Mrs. Costello. In the second chapter, Winterbourne again meets Daisy, but this time they are in Rome. Daisy scandalizes the American colony by her habit of making easy friendships with gentlemen. Winterbourne's faith in Daisy's innocence is shaken, but he continues to pursue her until a certain occasion when, late at night, he is shocked to discover Daisy alone with an Italian, Giovannelli, in the Colosseum. A couple of days afterwards, Winterbourne learns that Daisy is gravely ill with Roman fever, and about two weeks later, Daisy dies. Daisy's mother delivers a message from the girl to Winterbourne, and, as a consequence, Winterbourne believes that he had misjudged Daisy, and that she was probably innocent after all. Winterbourne feels that he has lived abroad too long, and that he can no


longer judge Americans by their behavior. James ends his story, nevertheless, with the intimation that Winterbourne returns to a clever foreign lady friend at Geneva.

Other characters in James's story include Daisy's travelling companions: her mother; her brother, Randolph; and their courier, Eugenio. In Rome, an American lady, Mrs. Walker, endeavors to "save" Daisy's reputation by interfering between Daisy and Giovanelli. Winterbourne's mysterious lady friend at Geneva is never actually revealed.

In rewriting Daisy Miller for the stage, James made some radical changes in the story, in the number of characters, and in the relationships between certain characters. The main plot-line and the theme are the same, and the central figures are virtually unchanged. However, James gave the play a happy ending. Daisy not only recovers from her illness, but she and Winterbourne are engaged to be married. The author extended the events, and he added two new subplots.

In the play, Winterbourne's mysterious lady friend at Geneva materializes in the prominent character of Madame de Katkoff. Not only does the lady emerge, but she vies with Daisy for the attention and interest of the audience. An added dimension is created when the courier, Eugenio, blackmails Madame de Katkoff. This strong incident, in fact, opens the play. This episode, and its consequences, constitute one important subplot.

---

8The plot of the play may be found in Chapter II of the present study, under the section entitled, "The Writing of the Early Plays."
Other new characters in the play are Miss Durant and Reverdy—the travelling companions of Mrs. Costello. These two characters add a light comic touch to the proceedings, and their romance provides the other subplot.

With the exception of Eugenio, the natures of the various characters who appear in both versions have remained unchanged. James even transferred the physical descriptions of Daisy and Randolph, word for word, into the play. However, the author did not re-use Randolph's habit of pronouncing his "r" sounds hard, as in a "har-r-d" lump of sugar. As for Eugenio, in the play he is presented as positively evil. There are several scenes in which the courier plots with Giovanelli to ensnare Daisy's affections—and her dollars. This, together with his blackmailing activities, enlarges the role of Eugenio to one of major importance.

Missing from the dramatized version is Daisy's mother, who is never seen on-stage. (In the story, Mrs. Miller had been depicted as a timid woman, who was incapable of controlling either Daisy or Randolph.)

Mrs. Walker, the American lady in Rome, has been socially elevated to the position of wife of the American consul. However, she is less prominent in the play than she had been in the story. Her party

---


10In the story, Mrs. Costello surmises that Eugenio may be in league with Giovanelli, but her idea remains without confirmation.
is not seen on-stage, and Mrs. Walker does not pursue Daisy and Gio-
vanelli in her carriage as she did in the story.

More is seen of the boy, Randolph, in the play than in the
narrative version of *Daisy Miller*. Also, there is a waiter who is more
prominent in the dramatic version. (For some unknown reason, James
specifically mentions in the lines of the play that the same waiter is
both at Vevey and in Rome.\textsuperscript{11} Perhaps the author was trying to econo-
mise on the number of actors necessary for the piece.)

The major movement of the locale, from Switzerland to Rome, has
remained the same. The episodes involving Daisy are basically the
same, except for the added ending which takes up the entire third act.
In this last act, Daisy, who is convalescent, persuades Giovanelli to
take her out to see the carnival. In the press of the crowd, Daisy
faints, and she is carried back to the hotel, where she recovers in
the despairing Winterbourne's arms.

The new characters, Madame de Katkoff, Miss Durant, and Reverdy,
drift in and out of the scenes. This device has enabled the author to
join sections of dialogue which occurred in the story on separate oc-
casions. In effect, these changes are highly practical for staging
purposes.

A minor addition in the play, but one which might unfavorably
affect the audience's feeling toward Winterbourne, is the second act
dinner invitation scene. Winterbourne had accepted Daisy's invitation
to dine with her and with her family, but he changes his mind when

\textsuperscript{11}Edel, *Complete Plays of Henry James*, p. 163.
Madame de Katkoff invites him for supper and a moonlight drive. As a consequence, Daisy goes off with Giovanelli on her almost fatal jaunt.

In summary, the important additions which appear in the play include the intrigues of Eugenio; all of the scenes involving Madame de Katkoff; and those in which Miss Durant and Reverdy appear. The third act consists of completely new incidents, with a few scattered lines from the story.

Principal omissions include all of the incidents involving Daisy's mother, and the actual visit by Daisy and Winterbourne to the Château de Chillon. This has eliminated some long sections at the end of Chapter One, as well as some shorter sections in Chapter Two.

Less important omissions include a number of short scenes in Rome—some involving Daisy, some about Winterbourne, and others showing Mrs. Costello and her friends. The story contained hints of the dangers of Roman fever long before Daisy became ill; thus James partly prepared the reader for the story's ending.

The dialogue of the play is, of course, typically Jamesian, and it shows the relatively simpler form of his earlier period. In some sections of the play, the wording is the same as in the story; in other scenes, the wording has been altered slightly, or rearranged.

The over-all time element is about the same in the story and in the play. The main events of the story take place in decidedly less than a year, while the action of the play covers a little over six months.

As for the organisation, the main plot has the same general progression in both versions; in the play, a few minor transpositions of
dialogue may be observed, and, as has been noted, James added a couple of subplots.

**Gained**

The dramatic version of *Daisy Miller* has gained two major items: humor--largely created by the new characters of Reverdy and Miss Durant; and intrigue--between Eugenio and Madame de Katkoff, and also between Eugenio and Giovanelli. Another important addition is the build-up which James created for Daisy before her first appearance on the stage.

Even though the ending of the play is different from that of the story, the final line recalls the feeling of the end of the original. After Winterbourne has said that they will be married in America, Daisy has the final line, "Oh, yes; you ought to go home!" At the end of the story, Winterbourne indicates that he misjudged Daisy because he had been too long away from America.

**Lost**

Certain elements of *Daisy Miller* have been lost in the transferral from narrative to dramatic form. The ironic ambiguity about Daisy's virtue has gone: in the story, there had been room for doubt even at the graveside when Giovanelli spoke of Daisy's innocence. In the play, with its happy ending, and with the added motivation of Winterbourne's unkindness at the time of the dinner invitation, Daisy seems more definitely guiltless.

---

Although the story is not told in the first person, the events are seen only from Winterbourne's point-of-view. Thus James left the way open for the reader to doubt the accuracy of Winterbourne's conclusions. (The publication of the story originally led to a furor over James's intentions. The author was accused of slandering American womanhood. James, himself, however, stated that Daisy was "above all things innocent."\textsuperscript{14})

Summary

In comparing James's dramatization of \textit{Daisy Miller} with his original story, the following items may be summarized.

I. \textbf{Staging:}

A. Three settings are required, one for each act.

B. The third act calls for special sound and lighting effects to create the illusion that there is a carnival going on in the street outside.

II. \textbf{The handling of the story material:}

A. The main plot has been extended, and two subplots have been added.

1. As far as the two central characters are concerned, the main plot and its locations are the same, except that

\textsuperscript{13}The point-of-view treatment is quite consistent even though James occasionally refers to himself as "I," and even though he sometimes addresses the "reader" directly. Of Henry James, \textit{Daisy Miller}, pp. 169, 178, and 182.

\textsuperscript{14}George Somes Layard, \textit{Mrs. Lynn Linton} (London: Methuen and Co., 1901), p. 233.
there is now a happy ending. There are some minor transpositions of material.

2. The two new subplots revolve around new characters in the play.

B. Major additions and omissions include the following:
   1. The material of the third act is completely new, except for a few scattered lines.
   2. The visit to the Château de Chillon by Daisy and Winterbourne is not seen on-stage.
   3. Omitted are all incidents involving Daisy's mother.

C. There are some major changes in the dramatis personae.
   1. The two central figures are virtually unchanged.
   2. New characters are Madame de Katkoff (developed out of Winterbourne's rumored lady friend of the story); and the comically romantic Reverdy and Miss Durant.
   3. Eugenio has been developed into the villain of the piece.

D. The dialogue is much the same as that of the story; it is characteristic of James's earlier period— that is, it is relatively simple and uninvolved.

E. The over-all time element is approximately the same.

III. Gained:

A. An element of humor has been introduced with the new characters of Reverdy and Miss Durant.

B. Intrigue is created now through the enlarged role of Eugenio: he blackmails Madame de Katkoff; and he plots with Giovanelli to capture Daisy's heart—and her fortune.
IV. Lost:

A. The ambiguity concerning Daisy's virtue has been removed from the dramatic version. The happy ending establishes her innocence.

B. The realistic, objective presentation of the events in the play has canceled the single point-of-view presentation of the story.

II. THE AMERICAN

James created a four-act play out of his long novel, The American. In the version of the play which was staged in London in 1891, four settings were required: the sitting-room in the home of M. Mioche, in Paris; a salon in the Paris mansion of the de Bellegardes; a large room in Newman's house in Paris; and the drawing-room at the Château de Fleurières—the de Bellegardes' country home. In the revised version of the play, the third and fourth acts both took place in Newman's house in Paris. The number of locations in the original novel was almost uncountable.

The stage effects called for are relatively simple. They are limited to controlled sound effects: a doorbell in Act I, and cued music to be played by off-stage musicians in Act II. Then, during the last act, the effect of deepening dusk must be created with the stage lights.

15 See Chapter II of the present study, pp. 40-41, for an account of the various versions of the play.
James's novel, *The American*, is in twenty-six chapters. The story opens in 1868. Christopher Newman, a young American, is in the Louvre. He observes a pretty, young French woman, Noémie Nioche, copying one of the paintings, and he arranges to purchase her work when it is finished.

Newman runs across an old friend, Tom Tristram, to whom he recounts the story of his business successes in San Francisco during the last few years.

Newman pays many visits to the Tristrams' Paris home, where he meets the widowed Claire de Cintré, with whom he falls in love. Newman wishes to marry well; he has been looking for a magnificent woman, "the best article in the market." 16

Claire belongs to an old artistocratic family, the de Belle-gardes. Her mother is English, and her late father was French. Claire has two brothers: Urbain, the elder, who is the present Marquis de Bellegarde; and Valentin. Valentin and Newman become close friends.

In the meantime, M. Nioche has been teaching Newman to speak French. Newman commissions Noémie to copy six more paintings while he travels about Europe.

After he returns to Paris, Newman sees Claire and Valentin frequently. The American proposes to Claire, and she asks him to wait for six months for her answer. The Marquis and old Madame de Bellegarde formally accept Newman as a candidate for Claire's hand.

16 Henry James, *The American* (New York: Rinehart and Co., 1959), p. 34. (According to a bibliographical note on p. xv, this is the same text as the first edition, Boston: Houghton, Osgood and Co., 1877. Presumably, that was the edition which James used when writing the play.)
One day, Newman and Valentin meet Noémie at the Louvre, and Valentin is much taken with the girl. Soon afterwards, Noémie leaves her father's house and begins a career as a courtesan.

After the six months have elapsed, Newman proposes again to Claire, and she accepts him. The de Bellegardes give a ball in Newman's honor. Present at the ball is a wealthy English cousin of the family, Lord Deepmere, who, it turns out, is also after Claire's hand.

Valentin quarrels with a young German over Noémie, and a duel is arranged. The next day, Claire tells Newman that she cannot marry him; her mother has commanded her to give him up. In the words of Madame de Bellegarde, they "cannot reconcile [themselves] to a commercial person."

Valentin is severely wounded in the duel, and he sends for Newman. The dying man senses that something has gone wrong between his sister and his American friend. When Newman tells him how the family has interfered, Valentin says that Newman must avenge himself. He must obtain a family secret from Mrs. Bread, the de Bellegardes' housekeeper. Newman can use the secret to force the family to give in to his wishes.

Mrs. Bread gives Newman a note which the late Marquis had written on his death-bed, in which he accused his wife of murdering him. Mrs. Bread believes that Madame de Bellegarde deliberately poured away her husband's medicine, thereby causing his death.

After Valentin is buried, Claire enters a Carmelite convent. When Newman confronts the de Bellegardes with the note written by the

---

17Ibid., p. 247.
late Marquis, they say that the sick man's mind was disordered. Newman, at first, thinks he will show the evidence to influential people in Paris, but he changes his mind because it seems useless.

Newman travels about restlessly; in London, he sees Noémie with Lord Deepmere; back in the United States, he attempts to take up his old pursuits. Finally, he returns to Paris, where Claire has taken the veil for life. There, standing outside the convent wall, Newman realizes that he has lost Claire forever. He burns the evidence against the de Bellegardes, and he leaves Paris, never to return.

In making the novel over into a play, James kept the main characters the same, and with the same names. The central love story emerges intact, but with a happy ending. However, many of the surrounding circumstances are changed. For example, at the beginning of the play, Noémie knows both Valentin and Deepmere, and it is Noémie who introduces Newman to Valentin. In the play, Valentin fights his duel with Lord Deepmere over Claire, to whom Deepmere feels he has a prior claim: Madame de Bellegarde had practically pledged her daughter's hand to him, but she seems to have changed her mind in favor of the richer American.

Later in the play, Noémie helps Newman to decorate his new house. Madame de Bellegarde deliberately interprets Noémie's presence in the house as evidence of an intimate relationship, and she breaks her daughter's engagement to Newman. Madame de Bellegarde has decided to favor Lord Deepmere's title over Newman's millions.

18 The complete plot of the play may be found in Chapter II of the present study, under the section entitled, "The First Production."
However, even while Madam de Bellegarde and her elder son, Urbain, are insulting Newman in his own house, Valentin and Lord Deepmere are dueling in the park which surrounds it. In the original version of the play, and in the revised version which was introduced at the fiftieth London performance, Valentin dies, and Claire and Newman plan to marry. Thus, for the couple at least, the ending is happy. As James later rewrote the fourth act, for performances in the provinces, Valentin recovers from his wound, and the ending is even happier. 19

The terrible family secret is basically the same as in the novel, with the added element that Claire's first husband had been the lover of Madame de Bellegarde. Eventually, Newman gives the evidence to Urbain in response to Claire's pleading, and, as a reward, she defies her family and marries the American. Urbain burns the incriminating note at the end of the play.

Many of the novel's characters are missing from the play. Those omitted include the Tristrams; Urbain's young wife; and Stanislas Kapp, with whom Valentin fought the duel. Also left out are a number of less significant characters.

Only one of Valentin's seconds is seen in the play: his name is M. de Marignac, and his role is considerably larger than that of his counterpart in the novel. The sister of charity in the play is a new character.

19 Details and dates of the various versions of the play will be found in Chapter II of the present study, as well as a review from *The World* (November 18, 1891) which indicates the contents of the revised third act. cf. ante, pp. 40-41.
As for the dialogue, it is almost entirely new in the play. Here and there a phrase from the novel appears; sometimes these phrases are said by different characters, and sometimes under quite different circumstances from the original.

Perhaps the most interesting change is in the speech of the American himself. In the novel, James established the Americanism of the protagonist almost entirely through his attitudes, but in the play the author has indicated many of Newman's pronunciations, and he has vulgarized the American's grammar. As a result, the character of Newman seems broadened—in the comedy sense. This effect is heightened by his constant repetition, under many different kinds of circumstances, of the phrase, "That's just what I want to see!" (A minor but pointed change in the role of Newman is the fact that in the play he smokes, whereas in the novel he specifically did not smoke.)

James gets around the difficulty of the language barrier in the play, as he did in the novel, by making the de Bellegardes bilingual. In the dramatic version, Nodmie is also bilingual; she explains more than once that she spent years as a child in England. In addition, there conveniently happens to be an English doctor present at the duel.

As for the time coverage, the main events of the novel occupied well over a year and a half, whereas the action of the play is completed in a little over two months.

\[20\] Details of James's pronunciation aids for the role of Newman may be found in Chapter III of the present study, in the section entitled, "Dialect Attempts."
The novel was written objectively, and James referred to himself as Newman's "biographer." The author even said at one point that he was unable to fathom Newman's thoughts. This seems to be a most unusual approach for an author, but it created the illusion of veracity, and of the actual existence of the character.

Summary

In comparing James's dramatization of The American with his original novel, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:

A. In the original London version, four settings were required, one for each act. Later the number of sets was reduced to three.

B. The play calls for controlled sound effects: a doorbell in Act I, and cued music in Act II. The lights must convey the effect of gathering dusk in Act IV.

II. The handling of the story material:

A. The central love story emerges intact, but with a happy ending. Many of the surrounding circumstances are changed.

B. Important new scenes include essentially the whole of the first act; the scenes showing Nôlvie's friendship with Valentin and Deepmere; and the introduction of Newman to Valentin. Also new is the visit by the Bellegardes to Newman's house, and the ensuing insult to Newman; Deepmere's

---

21 James, The American, p. 162.  
22 Ibid., p. 164.
claim to Claire's hand; the added licentious element in the
family's secret; and the surrender of the inorimininating evi-
dence by Newman to Urbain, who subsequently burns it.

C. The reason for the duel is changed, and it is between Valen-
tin and Deepmore in the play—instead of between Valentin
and a stranger.

D. The main characters are in essence the same, and they have
the same names. The character of Newman is comically
broadened, and indications of his pronunciations are pro-
vided. His grammar has been vulgarized.

E. Omitted are many of the novel's lesser characters, and its
countless settings.

F. Almost all of the dialogue is new in the play. A few phrases
from the book appear—often in the mouths of different char-
acters and under new circumstances.

G. The over-all time has been reduced from a year and a half to
only two months.

III. Gained:

A. A little humor has been injected into the part of Newman.

B. James uses soliloquies as a method of showing Noémie's cal-
culating inner nature.

IV. Lost:

A. Much of the subtlety of Newman's character seems to have been
lost. Gone, too, is Valentin's assessment of Newman's social
blindness.
B. Papa Nioche has become a rather amusing old scoundrel in the play, and the pathetic element in his character has been eliminated.

III. TENANTS

Tenants was the only play which James wrote that was based on another author's work. In 1894, Tenants was published in James's first volume of Theatricals, and the author stated in a prefatory note,

The situation presented in the first act of the first piece was directly, though long since, suggested by a short tale of the late Commandant Henri Rivière, a tale published some five-and-twenty years ago . . . in a single number of La Revue des Deux Mondes. The action of the play, which is a free translation of the subject of the story, greatly deviates, it must be admitted, from the original, though remaining distinctly indebted to it again for an incident in the third act.23

James was rather fond of tracing his literary origins, but he did not specify which of Rivière's stories gave rise to Tenants.24

However, Leon Edel has indicated that the original was "Flavien," published in La Revue des Deux Mondes, on November 1, 1874.25 The writer of the present study secured a copy of the original and made a translation—on which the following observations are based.26

---


25Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 257.

26Henri Rivière, "Flavien," Revue des Deux Mondes, VI (November 1, 1874), 35-80.
Tenants is not a dramatization. In fact, the play is so far removed from the original that it can scarcely be called an adaptation. James owed no more to the story than what he indicated in his prefatory note: the basic situation presented in the first act, and a quarrel in the third act which grew out of that basic situation. Even at that, James eliminated some of the circumstances of the initial events.

"Flavien" is divided into six chapters. The opening situation of the story concerns General d'Herbel, whose brother had died and left to his care a beautiful eighteen-year-old daughter, Léonie—an heiress. The retired General, now a widower, lives at Tourelles with his former aide and servant, Spandau.

The General has a son, Emmanuel, whom he rarely sees. Emmanuel comes home on leave from Arabia, and he and Léonie fall in love and wish to marry. The General objects for two reasons: Léonie is too young; and she is an heiress, while his son has nothing. The couple agree to wait for three years, until Léonie comes of age.

After Emmanuel returns to his regiment, the General is remorseful, for he realises that he was jealous of the young girl's affections.

On a business trip to Paris, General d'Herbel unexpectedly encounters the Countess Sampara, with whom he had been on intimate terms some twenty years earlier, in Italy. Now the Countess is a widow, and she has a grown son, Flavien. The Countess intimates that Flavien is the son of the General. The General proposes that they should marry.

When the General arrives home with his new wife, his ward is happy to have a companion, but old Spandau mistrusts the new state of things.
Flavien, who has been travelling, arrives at Tourelles, accompanied by his tutor, the Chevalier, Griotti. Flavien falls in love with Léonie, but she does not return his feeling. The Countess, who completely dominates the General with her seductiveness, accustoms him to the idea that a marriage between Flavien and Léonie would be highly suitable.

Léonie feels herself menaced. Once, during a thunder storm, Flavien seizes the girl feverishly. Then, one night, Léonie drinks a cup of tea which tastes strange; she fears that she has been drugged, and she bolts her bedroom door. As she falls asleep, she hears voices, and someone attempts to open her door. Léonie writes to Emmanuel and begs him to return at once.

A few days later, Emmanuel arrives at the château. He begs the General to allow him to marry his cousin immediately. When the General refuses his request, Emmanuel states that Léonie is no longer safe in his father's house, because of Flavien's hypocrisy and violence. Emmanuel calls Flavien into the room, and they quarrel. When Flavien declines to accept a challenge to a duel, Emmanuel raises his hand to strike him, but the General intervenes.

Emmanuel says that he will appeal to the law to take Léonie away from the General's guardianship. The General is furious, and he disowns his son.

Flavien, overcome with jealousy, and ashamed of his cowardice, persuades the Chevalier to give him a lesson in fencing. However, the youth discovers that he is afraid of swords.
In a strange change of heart, Flavien warns Léonie of a plot against her. Feeling that he cannot trust himself, Flavien urges the girl to take refuge in a convent.

Suspecting what the youth has done, the tutor attempts to regain control over Flavien by making certain revelations to him. The Chevalier says that Flavien has been deceived; he has no fortune. Flavien's mother and he have been counting on a marriage between the youth and the rich Léonie. The Chevalier includes himself, he says, because he is really Flavien's father. Flavien is appalled to think that the man who has taught him nothing but evil could be his father.

Léonie arranges to run away with Emmanuel. As their carriage approaches a crossroads, they are overtaken by the Chevalier on horseback. The two men quarrel, and, as they start to duel, Flavien and Spandau come running up.

The Chevalier wounds Emmanuel, and Flavien intervenes—taking Emmanuel's sword as he does so. When the Chevalier tells Flavien to defend himself, the youth realizes that the Chevalier is not really his father. More or less by accident, the Chevalier is killed; and the three young people return to the château.

Léonie and the wounded Emmanuel tell the General about Flavien's brave conduct. The father says that God's ways are impenetrable, and he no longer opposes their union. The General adopts Flavien, and Emmanuel departs for Africa with his bride.

In writing his play, Tenants, James transferred the setting to England, and he made the characters British—instead of French and
Italian. All of the events on-stage occur in the spacious hall of a manor house in Devonshire. The central characters, and their relationships, correspond to those in the story. General d'Herbel has become Sir Frederick Byng; his son is Norman; and his ward—no longer a niece—is Mildred Stanmore. Sir Frederick's ex-paramour is Mrs. Vibert; and her son is Claude (corresponding to Flavien). The tutor is Captain Lurcher. There is a man-servant, Frost, but he does not replace Stansdau—who has been eliminated.

Miss Dyer, a paid companion to Mildred, is a new character in the play. She provides a whimsically comic touch.

The family tradition is now one of civil service in India, rather than military service. As the play opens, Norman is home on leave, and he and Mildred are in love. Sir Frederick objects to their union for the same two reasons as those in the story: the girl is too young; and she is an heiress, while Norman has nothing. However, James has eliminated the element of jealousy on the father's part.

James had to invent a new motivation for the appearance of Mrs. Vibert on the scene: Sir Frederick has decided to let an old lodge on his estate, and Mrs. Vibert applies to become his tenant.

In the play, there is no doubt as to the paternity of Mrs. Vibert's son, Claude. The boy is ignorant of the facts, but they are known to his tutor, and Captain Lurcher uses his knowledge as a blackmail device to control the mother. Another new element is the tutor's

27The complete plot of the play may be found in Chapter II of the present study, in the section entitled, "Four Published Plays."
friendship with Mrs. Vibert's late husband: Lurcher had been intent on avenging his wronged friend. 28

As for the two young men, their age relationship is the same as in the story: Norman, the legitimate son, is the elder. The half brothers do not meet before Norman returns to India.

As in the story, Claude makes overtures to Mildred, but the despicable aspects of his behavior have been removed. The girl still says that he is urged on by others, but there are no planned attacks, and Mildred is not drugged—as Léonie was.

In the play, Mildred's primary reason for cabling Norman to come home is the impending marriage of Sir Frederick and Mrs. Vibert. Claude's advances are secondary.

The incident in the third act which James owed to the original story, and which he mentioned in the preface to the play, is a quarrel between Norman and his father—which, in both instances, is followed by a quarrel between the half brothers. In the story, Emmanuel (Norman) raises his hand to strike the cowardly Flavien (Claude), and the General intervenes physically. 29 In the play, it is Claude who is about to strike Norman, when the mother intervenes with the line,

MRS. VIBERT. Don't strike him—he's your brother. 30

(In the story, the relationship was never clearly revealed to Flavien.)

28 The situation is interestingly parallel to that which James invented for Eugenio in the dramatic version of Daisy Miller.

29 Rivière, op. cit., p. 59.

30 Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 292.
The events of the story covered a period of over a year, but the action of the play is reduced to four months.

There is no sign of the original dialogue in James's play. As for the events of the story, they have all been omitted—with the exception of the basic opening situation, and the inevitable later quarrel between the half brothers.

Summary

In comparing James's play, Tenants, with Rivière's story, "Flavien," the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:

A. The play is in three acts, and it requires only one setting: the hall of Beechingham Manor.

B. No special stage effects are needed. In the second act, James suggests that a blazing fire, evergreen decorations, and a wintry landscape—seen through the window—should suggest the Christmas season.

II. James's handling of Rivière's story material:

A. James has used nothing from the story except the basic situation at the beginning of the play, and the family quarrel in Act III.

B. The main characters and their relationships are the same as in the story, although their names and nationalities have been altered. Spandau has been eliminated, while Miss Dyer and Frost have been added to the cast.

C. No dialogue has been used from the story.
D. The over-all time has been shortened from one year to four months in the play.

III. Gained:

A certain amount of humor has been added—mostly through the character of Miss Dyer.

IV. Lost:

Certain melodramatic elements of the story were not used in the play: for example, the father's jealousy, the drugging of the girl, the tutor's lie about Flavian's paternity, the fencing lesson, and the duel. Actually, all of the events except the opening situation, and the family quarrel, have been disregarded.

IV. DISENGAGED

Disengaged was published with Tenants, in James's first volume of Theatricals, in 1894. In a prefatory note to that publication, James stated that the plays had each been written for a particular company and with "presumable" interpreters in mind. The author limited his explanation of the origin of Disengaged to the statement, "The idea on which Disengaged mainly reposes was supplied to the author by a little story of his own."31 The story to which James referred was The Solution.32


The Solution is divided into four sections plus an introductory paragraph. As the story opens, the author proposes to recount a history which had been told to him by an old Englishman. The main story is then told in the first person by the unnamed gentleman, who had been a secretary in the British legation in Rome in his youth. The narrator had been twenty-three at the time. He had had a number of friends, who worked in one or another of the foreign legations. Among them were an American, Henry Wilmerding, and a Frenchman, Guy de Montaut. This group of young men were constantly in the home of Mrs. Goldie, an English matron who was then dominant in Roman society. Mrs. Goldie had three unattractive daughters of marriageable age: Rosina, Veronica, and Augusta. One summer day the Goldies gave a picnic tea on Monte Cavo, near their summer home at Frascati. Present in the party were the narrator, Wilmerding, and Guy, as well as an attractive widow, Mrs. Rushbrook. (The narrator had hopes that one day Mrs. Rushbrook would marry him.) When the company was ready to leave, Veronica and Wilmerding were missing. Everybody waited with slight embarrassment, and after a quarter of an hour the couple turned up.

Guy dared the narrator to tell Wilmerding that he had compromised Veronica, and that he should marry her. The narrator took up the bet, and, a few days later, he needled Wilmerding about his casualness in the affair. Late that same night, Wilmerding paid a visit to the


The text of the first edition in book form is reprinted in The Complete Tales of Henry James, edited by Leon Edel (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1953), VII, 351-407. This text was used as the basis for comparison in the present study.
narrator, and he questioned him earnestly concerning European manners of conduct in such situations. The very next day, Wilmerding went back to Frascati, where he immediately became engaged to the girl.

Conscience-stricken over the joke which he had played on his friend, the narrator sought advice from Mrs. Rushbrook. Her first suggestion was that the narrator should marry Veronica himself; she also said that he should tell Mrs. Goldie what had really happened.

The next day, the narrator visited Mrs. Goldie. At first she seemed not to understand his story, and then she became angry and asked him to leave.

The narrator had arranged to meet Mrs. Rushbrook afterwards at the Villa Mondragone, a tourist spot, and he found her there strolling about in the company of Wilmerding and Veronica. Later, Mrs. Rushbrook asked the narrator all kinds of questions concerning Wilmerding.

One day, the narrator received word from Wilmerding that he was leaving for a couple of months to travel, and when he went to say farewell to his friend, Wilmerding told him that the engagement was off. Veronica had backed out.

Mrs. Rushbrook later revealed that she had gone to Veronica, but she would not tell the narrator what had passed between them. However, the narrator felt that there was some connection between this visit and a sudden windfall of money which the Goldies had received. He suspected that Wilmerding had been able to buy his way out of the situation.

The Goldies left Rome to travel with their new money. Veronica never got married, but the other two girls eventually did.
Less than two years after his break with Veronica, Wilmerding married Mrs. Rushbrook—much to the chagrin of the narrator, who never learned how she had maneuvered everything.

The story ends with the narrator's reflection that he had brought the whole thing on himself. Mrs. Rushbrook had fallen in love with the idea of Wilmerding's chivalry and his sense of honor, which, but for the joke that had been played on him, would never have been made evident.

In making over his story into a three-act play, James kept almost nothing of the original except the basic idea that a young man could be persuaded by his friends into believing that he had compromised a girl, and that he would then allow himself to become engaged to her. Second, James kept his idea that an attractive widow should extricate the victim of the joke, and that she should marry him herself.33

The locale of the story is changed in the play to England, and the action takes place in three settings: outside a keeper's lodge on the Briskets' estate, near the ruins of an abbey; the hall at Brisket Place; and Mrs. Jasper's London drawing-room.

The compromising disappearance of the couple still takes place at a picnic tea; now the young people take an unconscionably long time to inspect the ruins of an abbey nearby.

The characters are all English in the play. There is a correspondence between the principal characters in the two versions, but

33The plot of the play is sketched in Chapter II of the present study, under the section entitled, "Four Published Plays."
their relative importance is changed somewhat. The principal character in the play is Mrs. Jasper, who takes the place of Mrs. Rushbrook. (Mrs. Jasper is the role which was intended for Ada Rehan.) The victim of the joke is now Captain Prime. The narrator becomes Charles Coverley, and his fellow-conspirator is Percy Trafford. The girl in the play is Blandina, and her domineering mother is Mrs. Wigmore. The girl’s two sisters, and the American Minister (Wilmerding’s chief), have been eliminated.

Two important characters are added in the play. They are Sir Montagu Brisket, and his wife, Lady Brisket. Their mutual suspicions provide a major secondary plot, and as a result of those suspicions all of the characters go to London for the third act. The situation is farcical, for each person is keeping an eye on someone else. All of the men adore Mrs. Jasper, including Sir Montagu. Tired of Lady Brisket’s suspicions, Mrs. Jasper goes back to London; she is followed by Sir Montagu, who is in turn followed by his wife. In the meantime, Captain Prime has gone to Mrs. Jasper to seek her help in getting out of his engagement to Blandina. Sir Montagu suspects his wife with Trafford. Trafford ends up by being engaged to Blandina in place of Captain Prime. Prime, like his counterpart Wilmerding in the story, becomes engaged to Mrs. Jasper.

All of the farcical elements are completely new to the play. Act III includes the time-worn device of hiding one character in an

---

Augustin Daly was at one time thinking of producing Disengaged (Mrs. Jasper) with Miss Rehan as the star. Details of the proposed production may be found in Chapter II of the present study (pp. 58-60).
off-stage room, while various visitors come and go on-stage. It is all very confusing, and an audience, no doubt, would be hard put to it to say who was in love with whom.

Other than the basic idea, then, everything in the plot of the play is new. As for the dialogue, it is entirely new in the dramatised version, except for the retention of a word or two here and there—a mot juste.35

The events of the story, The Solution, covered a period of two years—this omits the introductory section, and the epilogue. However, the time lapse was only three weeks until the breaking of the engagement. In the play, the total time is a week or less: the events begin with the compromising situation, and they end with the breaking of the engagement, and the immediate forming of two new engagements.

Summary

In comparing James's play, Disengaged, with his story, The Solution, the following items may be summarised.

I. Staging:

A. The play is in three acts, and it requires three fairly elaborate settings.

B. Special lighting effects are called for in Act I. The scene is an exterior, and dusk must fall, moonlight must begin, and

35Reference is here intended to such little phrases as a description of Captain Prime (Wilmerding) as a "knight of romance," and as a "preux chevalier," and a statement to the effect that he had "excited expectations." cf., Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 322, 321, and 315; and Edel, Complete Tales of Henry James, VII, 383, 401, and 375.
the lights within the lodge house must be turned on. Sound effects are limited to the slam of a front door "downstairs" in Act III.

II. James's handling of the story material:

A. James has kept almost nothing of the original except the basic idea.

B. The locale is changed from Rome to England.

C. The newly-named main characters correspond to those in the story, but their relative importance is different. They are all English now.

D. An important new secondary plot revolves around two new characters: Sir Montagu Brisket and Lady Brisket.

E. Omitted are the two sisters of the compromised girl, as well as a few minor characters in the story.

F. The dialogue is entirely new in the play, with the exception of a mere word or two.

G. The over-all time is shortened from two years to one week.

III. Gained:

A great deal of humor has been injected into the play; this includes wit, a certain amount of amusing business, and many farcical elements.

IV. Lost:

A. The introduction and the epilogue of the story have simply been omitted from the play.
B. The events of the story were told in retrospect, and they were seen from the single point of view of the narrator. The play is an objective presentation of a series of events.

V. SUMMERSOFT—"COVERING END"—THE HIGH BID

In 1895, James wrote a one-act play, Sumnersoft, for Ellen Terry, but she never produced it. Three years later, the author converted the play into a long story by adding "such indications as might be the equivalent of decent acting . . . ." The story, "Covering End," was published in 1898. Finally, in 1907, James reconverted the story into a play, this time in three acts and with a new title, The High Bid. The long play version was produced by Johnston Forbes-Robertson in Scotland in 1908, and in London in 1909.

James regarded the story as an improvement over the first play. Before the publication of the story, James wrote to his friend,

36 The name of the house in the early play was Sumnersoft; in the story it was changed to Covering End; and in the later play it is referred to simply as Covering. The title of the later play, The High Bid, refers to Mrs. Gracedew's bid for the house.


38 Ibid., p. 186.

39 "Covering End" was published as a companion piece to "The Turn of the Screw," under the over-all book title, The Two Magics. The first edition was issued by William Heinemann of London in 1898. (Edel and Laurence, A Bibliography of Henry James, pp. 113-114.)

40 Details of the production, and the critics' reactions, may be found in Chapter II of the present study, under the section entitled, "More Plays and Productions." In that same place may be found a description of the writing progress of all of the versions.
Elisabeth Robins, "My re-writing of the dialogue has so bettered it."\(^1\)

In a later letter, James wrote of the main character, Mrs. Gracedew,

in the light of the "story" . . . there is much more to be got out of her and put into her; and indeed that tale constitutes for her rather a unique and rich prompt-book.\(^2\)

A close examination of the three versions of this work reveals that there is a closer relationship between the story and the later play than there is between the story and the earlier plays: to be specific, there are almost three times as many identical speeches in the story and in The High Bid, as there are in the story and in the earlier Summersoft. This fact bears out James’s opinion, mentioned above, that the dialogue was better in the story than in the early play. However, there are enough reversions in the later play to the wording of the earlier play to make it clear that James used both Summersoft and "Covering End" when he created The High Bid.

When all three versions are compared, it may be seen that there are no changes in the plot, in the setting, or in the characterisations.\(^3\) The character of Mr. Frodmor is more fully drawn in the last two versions. There is one additional character in The High Bid: Cora's young man is seen briefly on-stage, whereas he was only mentioned in the


\(^2\) Ibid., p. 213.

\(^3\) The common plot is outlined in Chapter II of the present study, under the section entitled, "More Plays and Productions."
two earlier versions. The characters always have the same names, with the exception of Cora's young man, who is called Mr. Buddle in Summersoft, and Mr. Hall Fegg in the story and in the later play. The nationality of the second group of tourists is changed successively from English, to German, and finally to American.

Interestingly enough, there are more examples of speeches which differ to some extent in all three versions, than there are of speeches which have undergone only one alteration—from the 1895 play to the 1898 story. There is much new dialogue in the story which does not appear in either of the plays. (However, the progress of events is always the same—with the exception of the added short scene between Cora and her young man in The High Bid.) There is comparatively little actual new material in the later play, but the number of trivial changes is countless.

Perhaps it would be well to remember that James's secretary has indicated that, for James, to re-read meant to re-write. If the

---

144 Cora's young man has accompanied her from the railway station, and Cora persuades him to hide in the garden and wait for her. After this, Cora leaves; she returns later and pretends that she has only just arrived. The events then follow the same course as in the other versions.

145 Some of the trivial changes which may be observed in the three versions amount to no more than an added, "Oh," "Well," "and," or "but." Other changes seem to have been made for no evident reason: the train times have been altered successively from the 2:10, to the 2:20, to the 2:05 from Paddington. The changes in Chivers' description of the hall seem arbitrary: the "old 'historical, feudal 'all" in Summersoft, becomes the "grand old feudal, baronial 'all" in the story, and finally the "grand old 'istoric, baronial 'all" in the later play. The number of similar minor changes is uncountable. James even tinkered with the closing speeches in each successive version.

three versions are read chronologically, a distinct growth in the complexity of the sentence structure may be observed. A single example will serve to show the type of change to which reference is here intended.

Mrs. Gracedew has just declared that she knows everything about Prodmore's interest in the property. In *Summersoft*, Prodmore's only response is,

**PRODMORE.** Then you must know it has just ceased to exist. ⁴⁷

In "Covering End," James makes Prodmore respond,

"Excuse me, madam!"—he himself was now more reserved. "You don't know everything if you don't know that my interest—considerable as it might well have struck you—has just ceased to exist." ⁴⁸

In *The High Bid*, his reply has become,

**PRODMORE.** Pardon me, Madam (Explaining.) You don't know "everything" if you don't know that my interest—(pompous) considerable as it might well have struck you—has just ceased to—the least bit invidiously perhaps—predominate ⁴⁹

The over-all time element is the same in all three versions.

The action is continuous, and it takes place during a summer afternoon. In converting *Summersoft* into a long story, James divided it into eight chapters at places where scene divisions, in the sense of the French scène, would come. Later, when the story, "Covering End," was reconverted to dramatic form, James used these same natural divisions of his story for the lowering of the act curtain. Thus the break between


⁴⁸Henry James, *The Two Magicians; The Turn of the Screw; Covering End* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898 [Reprint 1911]), p. 357.

Chapters Three and Four became the intermission between Acts I and II of The High Bid, and the break between Chapters Six and Seven became the intermission between Acts II and III.

The two plays were written thirteen years apart. One of the outstanding differences between them is the increased complexity of the sentence structure in the later play. Not only are the lines longer, but the stage directions are similarly stretched out. It would be a mistake to conclude simply that James was endeavoring to lengthen the play, for there are a number of conversational exchanges in the story which are not utilized in The High Bid. It is of greater importance to remember that at this time of his life James's writing had become more complex and involuted. This was the same period, 1907-1909, when James was revising his novels and stories for the definitive New York edition.  

Summary

In comparing James's two plays, Summersoft and The High Bid, with his story, "Covering End," the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging of Summersoft and of The High Bid:

A. Both the one-act Summersoft, and the three-act The High Bid, require a single setting.

B. No special lighting effects are called for, and the sound effects are limited to the bell of the house-door.

II. The relationships between James's one-act play, Summersoft; his story, "Covering End"; and his three-act play, The High Bid.

A. The plot is exactly the same in all three versions.

B. One short scene is added in The High Bid, when Cora's young man is seen briefly on-stage.

C. The main characters are always the same. However, Prodmore's character is more fully developed in the two later versions; the name of Cora's young man is changed from Mr. Buddie in Summersoft, to Mr. Hall Pegg in the two later versions; and the second group of tourists is of a different nationality in each version.

D. The dialogue becomes progressively extended and more complex with each re-writing of the material. However, in this respect, there is a closer relationship between the story and the later play, than between the story and the earlier play.

E. The over-all time element is always the same: the events take place continuously in a single afternoon.

F. When James converted the one-act, Summersoft, into a story, he divided it into eight chapters. In the final three-act version, the intermissions correspond to the breaks between Chapters Three and Four, and between Chapters Six and Seven of the story.

III. Gained and Lost:

A. Cora's young man is mentioned in all three versions, but he only materializes in The High Bid.
B. There are some conversational exchanges in the story which occur in neither of the play versions.
C. There are no appreciable differences in either the wit or the humor in any of the versions.

VI. THE SALOON

The Saloon was a one-act play which James created out of his short story, Owen Wingrave. The play requires a single setting: the saloon in the country home of Sir Philip Wingrave, K. G. B. The room is a combination sitting-room and living-room, and it is two storeys high. It is necessary that there be a clear window high up, in what used to be the second storey, for the ghostly effects which James called for late in the play.

The title of the original story refers to Owen Wingrave, the young man around whom the events are centered. The story is divided into four sections. Written in the third person, the events are nevertheless seen from the single point of view of Spencer Coyle, a professional army coach. Coyle prepares young men for entry into Sandhurst—the great English military college. The coach hand-picks the young men who study under him. As the story opens, Coyle, in his

51"Owen Wingrave" was first published in the Christmas number of the Graphic, 1892. The story received its first book publication in The Private Life (London: James R. Osgood, McIlvaine and Co., 1893). (See Edel and Laurence, A Bibliography of Henry James, pp. 93-94, and 327.) The text of the first edition in book form is reprinted in Edel’s Complete Tales of Henry James, IX, 13-51. This text was used as the basis for comparison in the present study.
London home, is having a serious talk with his favorite pupil, Owen Wingrave. Owen has decided that he does not wish to devote his life to the army, after all.

Following the interview, Owen takes a stroll in nearby Kensington Gardens, where he relaxes with Goethe—a clear indication of his scholastic leanings. Coyle, meanwhile, asks young Leehmere, Owen's intimate friend, to urge Owen to change his mind.

Owen Wingrave is a member of a military family. An orphan, Owen lives at Paramore, his grandfather's country home. Besides his grandfather, old Sir Philip Wingrave, there live in the house his aunt, Miss Jane Wingrave; a dependent friend of the family, Mrs. Julian; and her eighteen-year-old daughter, Kate Julian.

Owen's aunt is staying in London at this particular time, and Coyle pays her a visit on the same day as his interview with Owen. Miss Wingrave is astounded at the news. She asks Coyle to let the young man come home to Paramore for a few days, so that they can straighten him out.

Less than a week later, Miss Wingrave invites Coyle and his wife, as well as young Leehmere, down to Paramore for the week end. When they arrive, they find Owen looking pale and worn out, but he has not changed his mind.

Owen confides to Coyle that both his grandfather and his aunt have disinherited him. He says that the house seems full of strange voices, and the very portraits seem to glare at him from the walls.

On Saturday night, while they are dressing for dinner, Coyle tells his wife of the Wingrave family legend. Owen's great-great-grandfather
had struck one of his children, and the boy had died as a result: the morning after the funeral, Colonel Wingrave had been found dead in the White Room where the dead boy had lain. There was no mark on the father's body, but he looked as though he had reeled and fallen backwards. The ghost of Colonel Wingrave is said to be seen sometimes in that same room.

At dinner that night, some other guests are present: the vicar and his wife from the neighborhood, and another young man. The Wingraves have obviously agreed to behave as though everything were normal.

After dinner, young Kate Julian tells Coyle that she considers Owen's conduct is not worthy of a gentleman. When the family retires for the night, they show a distinct coldness toward the youth. As Coyle goes upstairs, he meets Kate coming down again. The girl says that she has lost a jewel from a locket, and she wants to look for it.

Coyle does not feel like going to bed, so, after a while, he goes to Leehmere's room. Leehmere tells him that he had left Kate and Owen quarrelling downstairs. Kate had said that Owen would not have the courage to spend the night in the haunted room. When Owen replied that he had already spent the previous night there, Kate had said that she did not believe him. Owen had then retorted that she could look him in the White Room tonight if she wished.

Coyle is worried, but he feels that he cannot interfere. He returns to his dressing-room, where he takes up a book. In the early hours of the morning, the dosing Coyle is awakened by the sound of a woman screaming. He follows the sound to a distant part of the house, and there he finds Kate swooning in the corridor. The door of the
White Room is open, and Coyle enters to find Owen dead on the floor in the very spot where his great-great-grandfather had died.

The closing words of the story are, "He looked like a young soldier on a battle-field." What James meant by this description, he did not specify.

In making over his story into a play, James maintained the same basic theme, and the plot moves in the same over-all direction. However, some of the contributing details have been altered, and the dialogue is almost completely new.

The characters maintain their same names, but they are reduced in number. Neither Owen's grandfather nor his aunt are seen on the stage, but their presence in the house is felt, and, indeed, it motivates several entrances and exits made by other characters. Several minor characters have been eliminated: the extra dinner guests, and the inevitable servants.

Leahmere's position in the plot is somewhat altered. He is now related to Owen's family—a fourth cousin. Leahmere is now older instead of younger than Owen, and he is an ex-pupil of Coyle's. He is on leave from Woolwich. Leahmere is now on a footing of teasing familiarity with Kate, and, as an intimate of the family, he joins Owen in telling Coyle about the family legend. On the other hand, Owen's decision not to embrace the military life is new information to

---


53 The complete plot of the play may be found in Chapter II of the present study, under the section entitled, "More Plays and Productions."
Leehmere. Thus James manages much of the exposition of the play through Leehmere.

With the exception of a single speech, James appears to have used nothing from the dialogue of the story in that of the play. Here and there a word from the original crops up, but the only line which reflects what was said in the story is Owen's description of the strange voices which seem to mutter at him in the old house, and the way that the portraits seem to "glower" at him from the walls—especially the picture of the ancestor who perpetrated the dreadful deed which gave rise to the family ghost legend.54 (The only thing that can be concluded from this, perhaps, is that James had the story handy when he wrote the play. Obviously, he preferred to create new dialogue rather than to paraphrase the old.)

The events of the story covered somewhat less than two weeks. In the play, the over-all time is reduced to a single evening, beginning after dinner and extending beyond bedtime. The action of the play starts shortly before the climax of the story.

A few points are given greater clarity in the play than they had in the original story. Coyle is definitely on Owen's side, rather than simply in sympathy with the young man. Owen specifically wants a literary or a scholarly career, rather than just abhorring the military. The horrible legend is practically the same, but in the play the relationship between killer and killed is that of grandfather and grandson, rather than father and son; this provides an ominous parallelism.

54Edel, Complete Tales of Henry James, IX, 34; and Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, p. 656.
between Owen and his living grandfather. Also, a motivation for the slaying is now provided: the boy had refused to fight, and he was consequently beaten to death. With these and other minor touches, James heightens the tension in the dramatic version.

Kate's piano playing is an innovation in the play. As the curtain rises she is playing softly on an upright piano on-stage. Later, she plays wild music on the "big" piano in another room, off-stage. James probably intended her later playing to heighten the dramatic tension.

Importantly new in the play is the presence of Kate in the room at the time of Owen's death. Kate says that she saw the ghost a year ago, and she calls Owen a coward. Then, when he taunts the "monster," she becomes terrified by what she has done, and she begs him to be silent.

In the dramatic version, it is in the saloon that the ghost is said to walk, rather than in a bedroom. As an added subtlety, however, James has specified that the modern saloon is two storeys high, and that the grandfather had died in the upper part, which used to be another room.

At the climax of the play, James uses lighting effects to heighten the dramatic effectiveness of the action. When Kate and Owen are finally left alone together, one of the two lamps seems to be burning low, so Owen turns it out. When Kate leaves, he turns out the remaining lamp, and the saloon is lit only by the starlight which comes in through the high window. Kate comes back with a candle, which goes out when she drops it. Then, at the height of their verbal contest,
when whatever it is that "walks" supposedly appears, the room is plunged into complete darkness. A shade passes over the window. As the dim light filters in again, Owen is discovered mysteriously dead on the floor.

Summary

In comparing James's play, The Saloon, with his story, Owen Wingrave, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:

A. The play is in one act, and it requires a single interior setting.

B. The sound effects include both on-stage and off-stage piano playing. The lighting effects are fairly elaborate: two lamps must be individually extinguished on-stage; starlight must filter in at the high window; a complete blackout must occur on cue; and the starlight must return once more.

II. James's handling of the story material:

A. James has maintained the same theme. The plot moves in the same general direction, but some of the contributing details have been altered.

B. All incidents preceding the night of the catastrophe have been eliminated.

C. The characters keep their same names, but their number has been reduced. Never seen on-stage are two important characters: Owen's grandfather, and his aunt.
D. Owen is unquestionably the central character in the play; while Coyle has been reduced to a secondary role. Lechmere is now related to the family, and he is presented as older instead of younger than Owen.

E. The dialogue is entirely new in the play, with the exception of a single speech by Owen.

F. The over-all time element has been reduced from almost two weeks to a single evening.

G. The haunted room has been changed from a bedroom to the central room of the house, the saloon.

H. The most important new item in the play is Kate's presence on-stage at the time of Owen's death.

III. Gained:

A. Greater clarity is given to several points in the dramatic version. Most important is the motivation provided for the original crime.

B. James has heightened the dramatic tension with devices such as wild off-stage piano playing, and special lighting effects. The strange conflict between Kate and Owen, up to the moment of his death, adds to the macabre quality of the closing scene.

IV. Lost:

The story was written from Spencer Coyle's point of view. This has been lost in the objective presentation of the play, and Coyle has been reduced to a character of secondary importance.
VII. THE OTHER HOUSE

Like Summersoft, James's play The Other House went through a double conversion of form. In 1893, James sketched out an idea for a three-act play for Edward Compton, under the title of The Promise.55 Three years later, James converted the play's scenario into a novel called The Other House.56 Finally, in 1908, James re-dictated the novel as a playscript; he kept the title, The Other House.57 This time the play was in a prologue, and three acts.

Apparently no manuscript of the early play is extant.58 However, anyone reading the novel would suspect that it was originally conceived in play form, because it is written scenically. The novel is divided into three books, and the action within each book is confined to a single location. In Book First, with the exception of the opening chapter which is expositional, the scene is laid in the hall of Tony Bream's house. Book Second opens four years later, and the scene is laid in Mrs. Beever's garden. Less than an hour elapses between the end of Book Second and the beginning of Book Third. The action in Book Third is in Mrs. Beever's drawing-room. Although the


56The Other House was serialized in the Illustrated London News in 1895, and it was published in book form, in two volumes, by William Heinemann of London in the same year. (See Edel and Laurence, op. cit., pp. 105, and 329.)


novel is divided into thirty-three chapters, the action within each of
the three books is continuous.

In making over the novel again into a play, James divided Book
Second into two scenes. Thus the later play is in four divisions: a
prologue, and three acts.

There is no way of knowing what changes James made between his
first notebook jottings, and the draft or scenario of the early
play. There are some important differences between the early note­
book entry and the novel. However, between the novel and the later
play, there are no differences to speak of. The plot is exactly the
same, and so is the over-all time element.

A comparison of the novel and the later play reveals three minor
omissions from the latter. The first, short, expository chapter is
incorporated into the dialogue of the play. The little girl is not


60 Two years after the original entry, James made a list in his
notebook of projected works, which included, "The Promise: the donnee
that I sketched (I have it all), as a 3-act play for poor E.C." (E. C.
was the actor-manager, Edward Compton.) This entry seems to indicate
that James did extend his first outline into some kind of scenario.
(Matthiessen and Murdock, op. cit., p. 231.)

The fact that the early play was completed is further confirmed
by a letter from James to Auguste Monod, August 2, 1907. Here James
stated that the early play and the novel were almost identical. (See
E. F. Benson (ed.), Henry James: Letters to A. C. Benson and Auguste
Monod [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930], p. 107.)

61 As James first sketched his plot idea, the child was to have
been poisoned, but she would recover. In the novel, and in the later
play, the little girl is drowned. There are also a couple of other
differences.

62 The common plot will be found in Chapter II of the present
study, under the section entitled, "More Plays and Productions."
on-stage during scenes between Dennis Vidal and Rose, and between Rose and Jean, as she had been in the novel. In the dramatic version, the child is playing in the house during these scenes, and Rose keeps an eye on her through the window. At the conclusion of her talk with Jean, Rose enters the house, and then she reappears with the child in her arms in order to carry her home to bed—as she had done in the novel.

The third item which James omitted from the play was the closing scene of the novel. After Rose has finally departed, Paul is alone in the drawing-room; in the play, Paul sinks down on a chair in utter dejection as the curtain falls; in the novel, Tony came back into the room, and there followed a short, closing conversation between the two men. 63

There are no changes in the settings, or in the characterisations. The main characters all keep their same names and relationships. Oddly enough, the names of inconsequential characters are changed: the butler, Walker, of the novel, is called Black in the play; the unseen stepmother of the novel, Mrs. Grantham, is referred to as Mrs. Griffin in the play; and Mrs. Beever's unseen guests, the Marshes, of the novel, are named the Duggits in the play. 64

---

63 In the Complete Plays of Henry James, Edel notes that in another manuscript of the play, Tony enters, and then, seeing Paul's dejection, he steals away as the curtain falls. (Complete Plays, pp. 758, and 823.)

64 cf., James, The Other House, pp. 31, 13, and 63; and Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 690, 684, and 698.
There was nothing in the novel which could not be staged. Even the drowning of the child was an unseen event—off-stage, as it were, in the novel.

Considering who the writer was, there are amazingly few changes in the dialogue between the novel and the later play. Actually, James shortened the dialogue for the play by means of continual pruning. As a result, James seems to have copied some of the dialogue blindly without thinking in terms of staging.65

Summary

In comparing James's play, The Other House, with his novel of the same title, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:

A. The play is in a prologue and three acts, and it requires three settings.

B. The staging effects are simple. In Act III, a sunset must be seen through the French windows, and gradually dusk gathers and night falls. The room is lit by two large

65 In Act III, there is a line which indicates that Manning, the parlormaid, had brought the little girl out into the garden; James apparently forgot that he had changed things around a little so that it had been Gorham, the nurse, who had come out to ask Rose to keep an eye on the child. It also might be noted that in the play Rose reads through a three-page letter twice—while the audience waits. Again, this seems to show that James merely copied the novel without visualizing the staging. Similarly, Jean says that she dismissed the footman when she saw Tony asleep on the couch—but the footman did not come onto the stage with her. (cf., Edel, Complete Plays of Henry James, pp. 725, 740, 693, and 698; and James, The Other House, pp. 153, 190, 43, and 62.)
candles. Sound effects are limited to an electric bell in the Prologue.

II. James's handling of the material from his novel:

A. There are no changes in the plot, or in the theme.
B. The settings are the same as the locations in the novel.
C. The type and number of characters is the same. The major characters keep their original names, but James changed the names of the butler, as well as those of the unseen stepmother, and of the guests who are merely mentioned.
D. The dialogue is almost exactly the same, except that it has been shortened for the play.
E. The over-all time is exactly the same in both versions.

III. Gained:

Perhaps the form of the material seems more natural in the dramatic version than in the novel, since James had based the novel on an earlier play version. (The earlier play version is no longer extant.)

IV. Lost:

A. Three minor items are omitted in the play. The opening ex-

positional chapter is incorporated into the dialogue; the child is not seen on-stage except for one fleeting moment; and Tony does not return at the end, so that Paul is alone on-stage at the final curtain.
B. The author's presence was felt in the novel because of an occasional "I" or "we" addressed to the reader. The play is realistically objective.
CONCLUSIONS

In his dramatizations, James kept the staging relatively simple, as he did in all of his plays. As frequently happens with dramatizations, James often had to reduce the number of locations to just a few settings for practical purposes.

In their original form, three of the seven dramatizations were written from a single point of view: these were "Daisy Miller," "The Solution" (Disengaged), and "Owen Wingrave" (The Saloon). However, the dramatizations are all objectively written for realistic presentation on the proscenium stage.

On the whole, two patterns are apparent in James's own dramatizations. First, he was very free with his material: he did not regard the events or the characters within the stories as sacred. He quite often added or omitted characters; he sometimes changed the names and the nationalities of the dramatis personae; and sometimes he altered the relative importance of the characters within a general plot. Sometimes he utilized nothing more than the basic situation or theme from the original fictional work.

Second, James's belief that happy endings and humor were essential for theatrical success is palpably obvious in all of the earlier dramatizations. Notably, and to some Jamesian readers perhaps shockingly, the author gave happy endings to Daisy Miller and to The

---

66 James set forth his belief that happy endings were essential for success in the theatre in the prefatory note which accompanied the publication of "The Album" and "The Reprobate" in Theatricals: Second Series, in 1895. (Henry James, Theatricals: Second Series [New York: Harper and Brothers, 1895], p. x.)
American. Seemingly, James had abandoned this policy by the turn of the century, for he retained the tragic conclusions of "Owen Wingrave" (The Saloon), and of The Other House.

As far as the dialogue is concerned, the following observations may be made. In the two dramatisations which had originally been conceived in dramatic form, then fictionalized, and finally reconverted into plays—namely, The High Bid and The Other House—James stayed close to the original dialogue. In Daisy Miller, much of the original dialogue was kept, but James created an entirely new third act, and also two new subplots for which new dialogue had to be written. For The American, the dialogue was almost all new. For the three later dramatisations, Tenants, Disengaged, and The Saloon, the dialogue, to all intents and purposes, was entirely new. These latter three plays were not dramatisations in the sense of being transposed or transformed material; they were, rather, new creations based on the themes of earlier stories.

If two items are kept in mind, it is not surprising that James created new dialogue for so many of his dramatisations rather than adapting the original dialogue. First, James was such a prolific writer that it may be assumed that he wrote quickly. Second, as his last secretary stated, for James to re-read meant to re-write.

67 In The High Bid, the dialogue became more complex and extensive with each re-writing of the material. In the dramatization of The Other House, the dialogue remained almost exactly the same as in the novel, except that James shortened it by continual pruning.

68 Bosanquet, op. cit., p. 17.
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CHAPTER V

PRODUCTIONS OF DRAMATIZATIONS BY OTHER WRITERS

IN NEW YORK AND LONDON

As far as can be discovered from the records, during the fifty years since the death of Henry James, there have been thirteen different dramatisations of his works presented on the stage in New York or in London. Of these dramatisations, nine have received regular professional productions. Three others have been produced either by off-Broadway organisations in New York, or by theatre clubs in London. One dramatization which was produced by an amateur dramatic society in New York has also been included (although no reviews for this production were available), because the play formed part of a Jamesian double bill—of which the other half had been previously produced professionally in London. In addition to the thirteen plays, two operatic works have been based on James.

The purpose of the present chapter is to present a digest of selected reviews of these plays and operas, together with important data—such as the date of the opening; the length of the run; and the

---

1 The reviews in Chapter V were assembled from many different sources. These included the New York Theatre Critics' Reviews (used for the New York reviews of The Heiress, The Innocents, Portrait of a Lady, Child of Fortune, Eugenia, and Michael Redgrave's The Aspern Papers); and available newspapers, microfilms, and clippings in various libraries.
names of the director, and of the major cast members. Particular care has been taken to include any critical evaluations of the plays as dramatizations. The chapter is in three sections: I. Plays in New York; II. Plays in London; and III. Operas Based on James.

Table II, pages 285-287, shows at a glance the name of the play and its author; the Jamesian work on which it was based; if and when the play was published; the year of the production; and the length of the run—when available.

It may be noticed in the table that two of the playwrights have dramatized James more than once. Also of interest is the fact that certain works by James have been dramatized several times.

A brief biographical sketch of each of the playwrights and composers may be found in Appendix B.

I. PLAYS IN NEW YORK

BERKELEY SQUARE

Berkeley Square, by John L. Balderston (assisted by J. C. Squire), suggested by Henry James's The Sense of the Past, was produced by Gilbert Miller and Leslie Howard at the Lyceum Theatre in New York, on November 4, 1929. It ran for two hundred and twenty-nine performances. Starring in the cast were Leslie Howard as Peter Standish,

and Margalo Gillmore as Helen Pettigrew. The play was staged by Mr. Howard.

The critics found *Berkeley Square* an unusual play with an "extraordinary theme . . . [which was] strangely absorbing and singularly touching . . . ." It was greeted as a "wistful and charming play," and as "an adult ghost story." With moments of quiet humor, it was a "gracefully poignant drama." The New York *World*, the newspaper which Balderston represented in London, commented, "The play's journeys into the distant past and back again are ingeniously arranged. . . . [and it often has] more sense of real strangeness than one might expect from such a tour de force." Although their reviews were, on the whole, enthusiastic, both Brooks Atkinson and John Mason Brown had some reservations about Balderston's ability as a playwright. Both critics complained about a certain awkwardness in the writing of the scene in which Helen sees the future by looking into Peter Standish's eyes, and both critics found some scenes slow-moving. Brown said, "Mr. Balderston shows a sincerity that is at times greater than his skill." Further, Brown thought that both the writing and the acting lacked the right eighteenth century "spark" and "style."

---

3 *New York Times*, November 5, 1929. (Review by J. Brooks Atkinson.)


6 Ibid.

7 *The World*, New York, November 5, 1929.

8 *New York Evening Post*, November 5, 1929.

9 Ibid.
The New York Times and the World commented on the excellence of the direction, and the New York Evening Journal recorded that the production was "handsomely mounted."\(^{10}\)

As for the acting, the critics seem to have been unanimous in bestowing the highest possible praise on Leslie Howard. He acted "marvelously,"\(^{11}\) and with "intelligence and skill."\(^{12}\) He was "brilliantly effective" in a "superbly imaginative piece of acting."\(^{13}\) John Mason Brown thought that Leslie Howard carried "both the play and the production . . . [with his] finely sensitive" portrayal.\(^{14}\)

Margalo Gillmore played the role of Helen with "deep insight,"\(^{15}\) and with "a grace and lightness of touch and a sincerity that [were] enchanting."\(^{16}\) John Mason Brown wrote that Miss Gillmore was "negative and monotonous in her earlier scenes, but truly simple and affecting in the separation scene of the last act."\(^{17}\)

The cast as a whole was complimented, with special credits going to Valerie Taylor as Kate, for her "fearful earnestness,"\(^{18}\) and for her "touching and clear-cut performance";\(^{19}\) to Alice John for her dignity

\(^{10}\) New York Evening Journal, loc. cit.
\(^{13}\) The World, loc. cit. \(^{14}\) New York Evening Post, loc. cit.
\(^{15}\) New York Evening Journal, loc. cit.
\(^{16}\) New York Times, loc. cit.
\(^{17}\) New York Evening Post, loc. cit.
\(^{18}\) New York Times, loc. cit. \(^{19}\) The World, loc. cit.
in the role of Lady Anne;\textsuperscript{20} and to Louise Prussing for her "charm and graciousness" as the Duchess of Devonshire.\textsuperscript{21}

On the whole, the critics found \textit{Berkeley Square} an unusual play of beauty and pathos. In the leading role, Leslie Howard was acclaimed for his sensitive and intelligent performance.

\section*{THE HEIRESS}

The \textit{Heiress}, by Ruth and Augustus Goetz, suggested by Henry James's novel, \textit{Washington Square}, opened at the Biltmore Theatre in New York on September 29, 1947.\textsuperscript{22} The play, produced by Fred F. Finklehoffe, and under the direction of Jed Harris, ran for four hundred and ten performances.\textsuperscript{23} Starred in the production were Basil Rathbone as Dr. Sloper, and Wendy Hiller as Catherine.

Of nine critics in the daily newspapers, five approved strongly of the play, three mildly favored it, and one complained that he was bored.

\textit{The Heiress} was "almost painfully moving,"\textsuperscript{24} said one critic, while another felt that the subtle tone of the play made it difficult

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20}New York Times, and New York Telegram, \textit{loc. cit.}
\item \textsuperscript{21}New York Times, \textit{loc. cit.}
\item \textsuperscript{22}The play, with a happy ending, had been tried out during the previous season in New England by Producer Oscar Serlin. It was re-written and recast for the New York Production. (John Chapman \textit{(ed.)}, \textit{Burns Mantle Best Plays of 1947-1948}, p. 166; and \textit{Daily Mirror} [New York, September 30, 1947].)
\item \textsuperscript{24}New York Post, September 30, 1947.
\end{itemize}
to feel real sympathy for the characters. Brooks Atkinson felt that the play was a "refreshing excursion into intelligence and good taste." However, continued Atkinson, the authors had "difficulty in making a play out of undramatic material. . . . It is difficult to make a stupid woman the heroine of an interesting drama." Louis Kronenberger felt that although the work had been a perfect novel, it was not particularly dramatic. The adapters had "caught the poignancy and improved on the pitilessness" of James's work, but Kronenberger objected to the discordant note of the Goetses' melodramatic additions.

In the hands of the adapters, the "fine sardonic flavor of the original novel becomes alive and three dimensional," wrote Robert Garland. To Robert Coleman, of the Daily Mirror, it was "good to listen to meaningful dialogue and study character conceived by a master craftsman." John Chapman of the Daily News, and Howard Barnes of the New York Herald Tribune both thought the play was too long and "talky." Barnes thought it was a "bad idea" to direct the production "as though

---


27 Ibid.

28 Friday Mirror, October 1, 1947.


it were a Chekhov masterpiece." Other critics found Jed Harris's
direction "admirable," "exciting," and "sure and skillful."

Most of the critics praised Wendy Hiller's performance highly.
Her playing was said to be "superb," and "magnificent." However,
Howard Barnes commented that Miss Hiller had to struggle with "a tough
role and an English accent." It was said that she gave a "performance of
great sensitivity," and that she made "the girl's taut nervousness a delicately
projected quality." On the other hand, Louis Kronenberger said, "Wendy Hiller's
Catherine seems to me an extension of the Goetzes' Catherine: striking but not very soundly
devised. Miss Hiller is too animal-like at times, and at the end too grand."

As Dr. Sloper, Basil Rathbone also drew mixed notices, but they
were mostly favorable. Comments varied from "Rathbone waggles a beard
with a minimum of conviction as papa," to "Mr. Rathbone has one of
his most actable parts. He plays it perfectly with irony and arrogance."

33 New York Post, loc. cit. 34 Ibid.
40 New York Herald Tribune, loc. cit.
42 New York World-Telegram, loc. cit.
Patricia Collinge, as Mrs. Penniman, gave a "wispy" performance, and she brought "fluttery warmth to the play." Other players singled out for praise by several of the critics were Peter Cookson, who played Morris Townsend; and Betty Linley, who made much of the minor role of Morris's older sister, Mrs. Montgomery.

Although critical opinion was not quite unanimous, The Heiress established itself as a "hit" on Broadway, and it had a long run.

THE TURN OF THE SCREW, and THE ASPERN PAPERS

In 1948, an amateur dramatic club in New York presented a program of two plays adapted from the works of Henry James. The plays were The Turn of the Screw and The Aspern Papers, both by Allan Turpin. The plays were performed at the Amateur Comedy Club in New York on the evenings of March 3 through March 6. The producing organization was a club known as the Snarks.

One of these plays, The Turn of the Screw, had been produced by the Arts Theatre Club in London in 1946. However, there seems to be no record of any other production of the second Turpin play.

---


45According to a letter from Dr. Leon Edel to the writer of the present study, dated June 15, 1965, the Snarks is "a women's dramatic club founded in 1909. An annual production of a new or unusual play, with the men's parts taken by guests of the Club, is given for subscribers and an invited audience only."

Professor Edel kindly loaned a program of the double bill to the present investigator. The program showed that the plays were directed by Hudson Faussett, and that the plays were being given their first presentation in America.

46See the section on The Turn of the Screw, under London productions, p. 262.
Apparently there were no reviews of these plays in the New York newspapers. This is probably due to the fact that they were not professionally produced.

THE INNOCENTS

The Innocents, by William Archibald, based on The Turn of the Screw by Henry James, was produced by Peter Cookson at the Playhouse Theatre in New York, on February 1, 1950. It ran for one hundred and forty-one performances. The director was Peter Glenville. Starring in the cast were Beatrice Straight as the governess, and two child actors, Iris Mann and David Cole.

Of seven newspaper reviews examined, five were highly in favor of The Innocents. Howard Barnes, of the New York Herald Tribune, disapproved mildly of the play, and of some of the performers' work. Robert Coleman, writing in the Daily Mirror, was lukewarm toward the playscript, but he admired the production.

Brooks Atkinson thought it was a "perfectly wrought" drama in a style of which Henry James could approve. Archibald had "retained the baleful candor of the writing," and the whole thing was done with "taste and style." Other critics felt that Archibald had adapted James's story "with a sensitive feeling for its intangible terrors."

---


and that James "could readily approve of what Mr. Archibald has achieved."^50 It was a play of "eerie fascination,"^51 and it was "spell-binding."^52

Against the play, the Daily Mirror reviewer said that it was "somewhat nebulous . . . a mood, a psychological tour de force [which] doesn't seem to be enough . . . ."^53 Howard Barnes, of the New York Herald Tribune, commented, "the action is obscure and lacks momentum."^54 Barnes felt that the playwright had not completely solved the problem of translating the story to the stage, and he complained that the ending was ambiguous. "'The Innocents' is a fairly good thriller, which might better have been left on the printed page."^55

The Innocents was fortunate in its production. Jo Mielsiner "won Variety's poll of the critics as the best designer of the season for his setting for the play."^56 The director was Peter Glenville, who had been brought over from England to direct The Browning Version for Maurice Evans earlier in the season. Atmospheric music was provided by Alex North, who had written the music for Death of a Salesman, and who now provided a score which was "pithy, practical, and terrifying."^57

---

^54 New York Herald Tribune, loc. cit. ^55 Ibid.
^56 Chapman, op. cit., p. 11.
Costumes, which added to the "necromantic spirit of the drama," were by Motley.58

The small cast received extravagant praise for their skill. Beatrice Straight, as the governess, played with "intensity, delicacy and force,"59 and she created a "subtly modulated characterisation."60 Here was "an immensely moving and hypnotic performance"61; she played with "force, sensitivity and old-fashioned charm in a style that Henry James would have been compelled to applaud."62

The two children played with "adult assurance,"63 and with a "combination of youthful charm and diabolical menace."64 Isobel Elsom, as the housekeeper, played with "gravity and mounting anxiety, catching accurately the apprehensive moods of the play."65

For a play that was well received by the critics, The Innocents did not have a very long run (one hundred and forty-one performances). The producer, Peter Cookson, hoped to re-open the play in the following season, but apparently he never did.66

58 Ibid.
59 New York Post, loc. cit.
60 New York Herald Tribune, loc. cit.
66 According to John Chapman, the play was closed because Beatrice Straight, the wife of the play's producer and the star of the show, was soon to become a mother. (Chapman, op. cit., p. 11.)
PORTRAIT OF A LADY

Portrait of a Lady, by William Archibald, and based on the Henry James novel of the same title, opened at the ANTA Theatre in New York, on December 21, 1954. Staged by Jose Quintero, the play was produced by Lyn Austin and Thomas Noyes, and by the Producers Theatre. The play ran for only seven performances. Heading the cast was Jennifer Jones as Isabel Archer. Other important roles were taken by Robert Flemyng as Gilbert Osmond, and Cathleen Nesbitt as Countess Gemini.

The reviewers of seven out of seven New York newspapers disapproved of the play—most of them in a mild and bored way. Portrait of a Lady was said to be "placid dramatically," and "talky and steadily unexciting . . . ." Brooks Atkinson said that the play was "all surface with nothing inside." Two of the critics found the characters Chekhovian; they were "bloodless and but momentarily intriguing." Walter Kerr complained that the outlines of the plot were "vague" and

---

71 Daily Mirror and New York Journal-American. Both reviews were dated December 22, 1954.
72 Daily Mirror [New York], loc. cit.
"undefined." Brooks Atkinson remarked that the playwright had been unable to capture either the mind or the personality of James.

The consensus seemed to be that the direction of the play was monotonous and lifeless; the settings were handsome; and the costumes, by Cecil Beaton, were beautiful.

Jennifer Jones, the film actress, was making her Broadway debut in *Portrait of a Lady.* It is not necessary to read between the lines to see that hers was not a professional performance. The critics said she was "technically immature;" she lacked experience; "the more emotional moments [were] rather beyond her"; she was, in fact, a "roseate nonprofessional."

Comments on Robert Flemyng's performance were scarce, but it was said that his playing was "incisive," and "highly stylized."

Only Cathleen Nesbitt received real praise, but it was not unanimous. The critics of the *Daily News* and the *New York Times* thought that perhaps she overplayed Countess Gemini a little, but other
reviewers praised her for bringing to the play its only "spark," and for her responsibility in giving the only "sense of wit, or of pointed social meaning, to the well-intentioned venture."

CHILD OF FORTUNE

Child of Fortune, adapted by Guy Bolton from James's novel, The Wings of the Dove, opened at the Royale Theatre in New York, on November 13, 1956. Produced and directed by Jed Harris, the play ran for twenty-three performances. Heading the cast were Betsy von Furstenberg as Kate Croy, Pippa Scott as Milly Temple, and Edmund Purdom as Richard Denning.

The New York critics, on the whole, condemned the play. However, most of the reviewers seemed tired rather than vitriolic in their commentaries. They complained about the "lifelessness" of the play, about the fact that the end was "always in sight," and that it was impossible to care about the characters.

As for the play's relationship to James's novel, the adaptation was "shorn of literary art." Bolton had "caught the essentials"

---

82 Daily Mirror, loc. cit.
83 New York Herald Tribune, loc. cit.
85 New York Post, November 14, 1956.
87 Ibid.
but failed to capture the subtleties, the shadings, and the
cogency of James's material. 89

Three of the critics picked out one scene as having more life
than the rest of the play. This was the scene in which the dying
Milly confronts her false lover, only to find that he really does love
her after all. 90 (This scene originated with Bolton; it did not come
from James.)

The direction was "in a low key." 91 It was lifeless and dull.
Jed Harris, who had successfully directed The Heiress a few years
earlier, was unable to rescue this play from "triteness." 92

Of the performers, Betsy von Furstenberg, as Kate, received the
best notices. She gave the play its "only approach to liveliness," 93
and she provided a "welcome flavor of tartness." 94 Pippa Scott, as
the dying Milly, seems to have looked attractive, and she played with
a "gentle radiance." 95 Edmund Purdom, in the role of Richard Denning,
was described as a "handsome tower of carved clay." 96 He performed

89 Daily Mirror [New York], November 14, 1956.
90 New York Times, New York Post, and New York Herald Tribune. All three reviews were dated November 14, 1956.
93 New York Post, loc. cit.
95 New York World-Telegram and The Sun, November 14, 1956.
with a heavy style, and his emotions failed to come through. 

Little was said about the other cast members.

In theatre parlance, Child of Fortune was a "flop."

**EUGENIA**

Eugenia, adapted by Randolph Carter from Henry James's *The Europeans*, opened at the Ambassador Theatre in New York, on January 30, 1957. Eugenia ran for twelve performances. The play was produced by the late John C. Wilson, in association with the Theatre Corporation of America, and it starred Tallulah Bankhead.

The critics seem to have been unanimous in their opinion of the play. They were hostile toward it.

Tallulah Bankhead's performance in Eugenia was described as "a whirlwind in a vacuum," and it was said that "Mr. Carter's adaptation had little to do with whatever dramatic effectiveness the evening had." Eugenia was greeted as an "excessively dull play," and "amasingly pallid."

---

100 *Daily Mirror* (New York), February 2, 1957.
103 *New York Post*, loc. cit.
Of the dramatisation itself, Walter Kerr, of the New York Herald Tribune, felt that Randolph Carter did not have "the patience to draw a detailed picture of the social contrasts that make these people tick ... and without the social groundwork there is no plot." The New York Times' Brooks Atkinson commented,

"Neither Henry James nor Mr. Carter is sturdy enough to sustain one of the Bankhead tornadoes. . . .

Purely as theatre it is a remarkable phenomenon. But James' meticulous study of manners cannot cope with performing on this tumultuous scale. . . . Nothing subtle can survive in a script when Miss Bankhead is sweeping across the stage." 105

In a letter to the writer of the present study, the adapter, Randolph Carter, said of Eugenia, "many strange and devious things happened to the play during production, and the script emerged unrecognisable." 106

Several of the critics commented on the poor direction which the piece received: the characters "kept rushing about the stage without any particular aim or point"; they lined up like a chorus for a musical number; and Herbert Machis, the director, "merely arranged groupings about the blazing star." 109

106 Letter from Randolph Carter to the writer of the present study, dated August 9, 1963.
107 New York Post, loc. cit.
108 Ibid.
109 Daily Mirror, loc. cit.
The costumes by Miles White were "the highlight of the evening," and Oliver Smith provided a "gingerbready period background," in the exterior house setting.

Miss Bankhead apparently gave a noisy and boisterous performance. Two of the critics compared it to a vaudeville act. She played with "enormous relish"; she "strutted and fretted, and gave out occasional roars, in her highly specialized and approved manner."

Scott Merrill, the leading male performer, in the role of Felix, received mixed notices. The New York Times' reviewer thought that he gave an "admirable performance"; the Journal-American found it "unbelievable"; and one commentator wrote,

Scott Merrill is hopelessly lost amid his broad a's, drewled "y'knows," and inexplicably Germanic pronunciations of proper names. In his performance, as in the play, confusion is slightly rampant.

The rest of the cast collected few comments. Anne Meacham, as Gertrude, made a "noble try." Jay Barney, in the role of Robert

111 Daily Mirror, loc. cit.
112 Daily Mirror, and New York Post, loc. cit.
113 Daily Mirror, loc. cit.
114 New York Post, loc. cit.
117 New York Herald Tribune, loc. cit.
Acton, put "a touch of life into his part," and one reviewer termed his performance "excellent."

THE ASPERN PAPERS

The Aspern Papers, adapted by Michael Redgrave from James's novel of the same title, opened at the Playhouse Theatre in New York, on February 7, 1962. Presented by David Black, the play was staged by Margaret Webster. It had ninety-three performances. Starred in the production were Maurice Evans as Henry Jarvis ("H. J."); Wendy Hiller as Miss Tina; and Françoise Rosay as Miss Bordereau.

Of seven critics on the New York daily newspapers, four approved of the play, two were undecided about its merits, and one condemned the script. Since the basic difference of opinion seemed to be about the amount of interest which the play generated, it may be said that The Aspern Papers had a limited appeal.

John Chapman, of the Daily News, wrote, "Its interest lies not in goings-on, but in mood, atmosphere and character . . . ." Chapman was intrigued by the unspoken antagonism of the play, which created an "uncommon suspense." Howard Taubman, writing in the New York Times, found the play,

---

119 New York Post, loc. cit.
120 New York Times, loc. cit.
As rare as it rewarding . . . In translating Henry James' 
story to the stage, Michael Redgrave . . has retained the flowing 
grace of the literary style, the undercurrent of gentle irony and 
the detached yet affectionate regard for character.124

Richard Watts was also struck by Redgrave's "fidelity to the spirit and 
quality of Henry James," and he found the play "an arresting drama."125

Other critics found the play "dated,"126 and "too elusive and re-
mote."127 Walter Kerr felt that Redgrave had made a "dramatic miscal-
culation," in devoting most of the evening to the quest for the dead 
Aspern's letters, instead of concentrating on the "fragile and doomed 
relationship" between the spinster and the editor.128

Margaret Webster's direction captured the "genteel mood of the 
Nineties";129 to some reviewers, the leisurely pace seemed just 
right,130 while to others it seemed too slow.131 The setting was, 
apparently, properly "atmospheric."132

About Maurice Evans' performance, there seemed to be some diver-
gence of opinion. One critic felt that Evans "failed to project a

125 New York Post, February 8, 1962.
130 New York World-Telegram and The Sun, February 8, 1962.
131 New York Herald Tribune, loc. cit.
living personality,"133 while another reviewer said that the actor was "Jarvis to the life—glib, eloquent, resourceful."134 The writer in the Herald Tribune felt that Evans pressed his scenes too fast.135

Wendy Hiller was said to have created a "stirringly beautiful characterisation."136 Her performance was "superb . . . a standout of the season."137

The French actress, Françoise Rosay, was said to have performed "with distinction,"138 and to have brought "a shrewd candor to the role of the blunt old tyrant . . . ."139

Of some interest is the observation of one critic, "Redgrave might better have made all three principal characters English, in that none of them sounds the least bit American."140

Although the performances were praised by the critics, The Aspern Papers was only seen ninety-three times on Broadway, and it was rated as a failure in Variety's tabulation of financial hits and flops.141

---

133 New York World-Telegram and The Sun, loc. cit.
136 New York Post, loc. cit.
137 New York World-Telegram and The Sun, loc. cit.
138 New York Post, loc. cit.
140 New York World-Telegram and The Sun, loc. cit.
THE SUMMER OF DAISY MILLER

The *Summer of Daisy Miller*, by Bertram Greene, based on Henry James's novella, *Daisy Miller*, opened at the Phoenix Theatre in New York, on May 27, 1963. Directed by Denis Vaughan, the play was produced by Stewart Chaney and Theater 12, with settings by Mr. Chaney. The play achieved a run of seventeen performances. Heading the cast were Bryarly Lee as Daisy, and George Neighbors as Winterbourne.

Most of the reviewers looked with disfavor on the play, but there were a few stray complimentary remarks made about the evening, and, in particular, about the settings.

The reviewer in the *Journal-American* found that the play provided a "strangely haunting evening," and that despite its lack of suspense, there was a "pervading interest in the people." An out-of-town reviewer said that the play had "style, a commodity off-Broadway all too often is lacking."

Several of the reviewers took exception to Greene's method of construction. It was "disconcerting rather than poetic," said Howard

---

142 The play was not produced by the regular Phoenix Theatre organization. This fact was specifically mentioned in the *New Yorker*, XXXIX (June 8, 1963), 126.


Taubman in the New York Times, to have "bits of scenes . . . strung together on threads of narration . . . ."146 Another reviewer complained, Mr. Greene has no hesitation in breaking off in the middle of a scene and of having \[^{[sic]}\] the character of Winterbourne advance downstage and solemnly recite portions of the book.147

Winterbourne doubled as the narrator, and he spoke of himself in the third person.148 Sometimes Winterbourne interrupted Daisy, who had to "freeze" on-stage, while he gave a "not-always-enlightening explanation."149 Walter Kerr, in the New York Herald Tribune, said it was as though the character were "trying to dissociate himself from the production."150

More than one reviewer complained that the play was novelistic rather than dramatic,151 but it was recognized that Greene was sincerely attempting to be faithful to James.152

The Summer of Daisy Miller was said to be "placid";153 it was "tepid . . . and a bore";154 "a static and rather wordy play";155 and "steadfastly undramatic."156

---

154 New Yorker, loc. cit.
156 New York Herald Tribune, loc. cit.
The settings by Stewart Chaney elicited favorable comments from several critics; he used colored slides projected onto a backdrop to provide a "fluid and effective background."\(^{157}\)

As for the performance, the director was blamed for the exaggerated speech mannerisms of the cast in general,\(^{158}\) and of the actress portraying Daisy in particular.\(^{159}\)

Bryarly Lee, as Daisy, was said to be "given to excessive mannerisms, [but] she succeeds in offering a curiously appealing portrait of a touching little nitwit."\(^{160}\) It was suggested that she employed her "trills and gurgles" too often,\(^{161}\) that she seemed like a "simpering near-adolescent,"\(^{162}\) and that she imitated Geraldine Page and Julie Harris.\(^{163}\)

George Neighbors, who doubled as the narrator and as Winterbourne, was said to perform "both chores admirably."\(^{164}\) On the other hand, it was said that Neighbors could "do little but smile

\(^{157}\)New York Times, loc. cit.
\(^{158}\)New York Herald Tribune, loc. cit.
\(^{159}\)New York Times, and New Yorker, loc. cit.
\(^{160}\)New York Post, loc. cit.
\(^{161}\)Daily News, loc. cit.
\(^{162}\)New York World-Telegram and The Sun, loc. cit.
\(^{163}\)New York Herald Tribune, loc. cit.
\(^{164}\)New York Journal-American, loc. cit.
inscrutably," and that he turned Winterbourne into a "posturing, unctuous creature," and a "droopy and lovelorn milksop."

Few comments were made about the other performers. The New York Times' reviewer observed that Myra Greene interpreted Mrs. Miller as "a kind of Ma Kettle in Vevey and Rome." Another reviewer commented that Mrs. Miller and Randolph (played by David Feldman) had become "low-comedy clowns," and that Nancy Reardon played the role of Mrs. Walker "like a fourth Gabor sister." On the whole, the lesser roles were found to be "unsatisfying."

II. PLAYS IN LONDON

BERKELEY SQUARE

Berkeley Square, by John L. Balderston (assisted by J. C. Squire), suggested by Henry James's The Sense of the Past, opened at the St. Martin's Theatre in London, on October 6, 1926. It ran for one hundred and eighty-one performances. Starring in the play were

165 New York Post, loc. cit.
166 New York World-Telegram and The Sun, loc. cit.
169 New Yorker, loc. cit. 170 Ibid.
171 New York World-Telegram and The Sun, loc. cit.
Lawrence Anderson as Peter Standish, and Jean Forbes-Robertson (the daughter of Johnston Forbes-Robertson) as Helen Pettigrew. The play was staged by Frank Birch—"produced" in the British sense of that word.

The reviewer for the London Times commented that Balderston's play was "an interesting experiment, made with skill and decorated with humour," that it had a theme of "infinite fascination," but that the love between Peter and Helen never reached full tragic depth. The reviewer for the Observer similarly found the play unsatisfying; he commented that although Berkeley Square seldom stirred the imagination, yet it had an "odd attractiveness." Both of these reviewers felt it was a pity that the eighteenth century Peter was not seen in twentieth century London.

Acting honors were carried off by Jean Forbes-Robertson for her "outstanding performance" as Helen Pettigrew. She was said to have an "unearthliness," and a "quiet beauty of spirit." Her performance would be the one "lasting memory" of the evening.

Lawrence Anderson was said to have played the big scene with Helen "beautifully," and his performance was regarded as "fine." Valerie Taylor played Kate with "intelligent agitation," and Brian

173 Times [London], October 7, 1926.
174 Observer [London], October 10, 1926.
175 Ibid. 176 Ibid. 177 Ibid. 178 Ibid. 179 Ibid. 180 Ibid. 181 Ibid.
Gilmour gave "a good Tony Lumpkin performance" as Tom Pettigrew.\textsuperscript{182}

(Both Miss Taylor and Mr. Gilmour repeated their roles in the New York production three years later.)

One comment on the direction of the play is of interest:

... there was a singular mixture of styles of acting. We even had Miss Griselda Hervey \textsuperscript{[as Marjorie Frantz]} labouring with an American accent which was never attempted by Mr. Lawrence Anderson \textsuperscript{[as Peter]} or Mr. Fisher White \textsuperscript{[as the American ambassador]}.\textsuperscript{183}

THE TRAGIC MUSE

The Tragic Muse, by Hubert Griffith, adapted from Henry James's novel of the same title, was presented by the Arts Theatre Club in London, on July 1, 1928.\textsuperscript{184} The leading parts were undertaken by Miss Edith Evans as Miriam Rooth, and Frank Allenby as Sherringham.

The reviewer for the London Times commented that the subject, the rise of an actress, was appropriate for the stage. He found much that was entertaining in the play, although it suffered from unevenness. There was a conflict of styles between the Jamesian material and those sections which were contributed by the playwright, Hubert Griffith.\textsuperscript{185} The critic for the Observer complained that James's long sentences did not lend themselves to dramatization at all. Nevertheless,

\textsuperscript{182}\textit{Ibid.} \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{183}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{184}The number of performances given is unknown. The play was not advertised in the theatre advertisements of July 3 or 4, 1928, in the Times. (The Arts Theatre is a theatre club located on Great Newport Street, London, according to "The Stage" Yearbook, 1953.) The play was published in 1927 by Allen and Unwin of London.

\textsuperscript{185}\textit{Times [London]}, July 2, 1928.
"Mr. Griffith has done better with him than he [James] was ever able to do with himself on the stage . . . ."\(^{186}\)

The Observer's critic said that the play was dominated by one character, Miriam Rooth. According to the Times' reviewer, the character of Miriam lacked the "depth and subtlety" of James's original conception, but the part was "brilliantly spectacular" in the hands of Edith Evans.\(^{187}\) Frank Allenby, as Sherringham, came "nearer than anyone else to the authentic James," and he treated his part with "remarkably shrewd judgment."\(^{188}\) Both of these critics felt that the writing for the minor characters was less than adequate.

THE TORN OF THE SCREW

The Turn of the Screw, by Allan Turpin, adapted from James's tale of the same title, was presented by the Arts Theatre Club in London, in October, 1946.\(^{189}\) The play was directed by Noel Willman. Leading parts were assumed by Elspeth March as the governess, and Louise Hampton as the housekeeper. The children's roles were undertaken by Brian Veske, and Jill Mason.

\(^{186}\) Observer [London], July 8, 1928.

\(^{187}\) Times, loc. cit.

\(^{188}\) Ibid.

\(^{189}\) The Times' review was dated October 21, 1946. The number of performances is unknown, but according to a letter from the playwright to this investigator, dated December 17, 1965, the play ran for three weeks.
The play was termed "haunted and haunting," and although it was "hardly perfect . . . [it was] far from the calamity it might have been." It was a "courageous experiment," said the Times' reviewer. Harold Hobson, in the Sunday Times, reported feeling "genuinely and unmistakably frightened . . . ." The play had an atmosphere that was "vague, miasmic, choking . . . ."

The dialogue varied from something "beautifully sufficient to stage ends" at the opening of the play, to a style which was too "literary" to be said naturally. The Observer's reviewer said that the tale was "blurred a little," and that the dramatist failed to achieve James's "wealth of suggestion." According to the Times, Turpin had succeeded in creating a spirit of evil, the nature of which was left to the audience's interpretation.

Harold Hobson, in the Sunday Times, averred that Miss Louise Hampton, as the housekeeper, gave "one of the best performances in London." Elsewhere, it was said that Elspeth March and Louise Hampton both played in the "grand manner," and that they managed
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190Observer [London], October 27, 1946.
191Ibid.
192Times [London], October 24, 1946.
193Sunday Times [London], October 27, 1946.
194Ibid.
195Times, loc. cit.
196Ibid.
197Observer, loc. cit.
198Sunday Times, loc. cit.
199Observer, loc. cit.
their parts "admirably." The children were "well directed," and were "pleasantly without fuss."

In this version of *The Turn of the Screw*, the evil spirits were apparently not seen.

**THE HEIRESS**

The Heiress, by Ruth and Augustus Goetz, suggested by Henry James's novel, *Washington Square*, opened at the Haymarket Theatre in London, on February 1, 1949. It ran for six hundred and forty-four performances. Starring in the production were Sir Ralph Richardson as Dr. Sloper, and Peggy Ashcroft as Catherine. The play was directed by John Gielgud.

The dialogue, which was mostly James's own, had "wit, grace, and precision," and it was spoken with "apt deliberation." Opening as a mannered romance, the play developed into "subtle emotional

---

200 *Times*, loc. cit.  
202 *Observer*, loc. cit.  
205 In August of 1949, the leads were temporarily replaced by Pauline Jameson and Cecil Trouncer. Later, in January of 1950, the roles were taken over by Wendy Hiller (who had played the part of Catherine in New York), and by Godfrey Tearle. (cf. *Times [London]*, August 4, 1949; and January 17, 1950.)  
drama." It was "ironic," said the Times, that the Goetzes should have achieved success with a novel which James had disregarded.

Sir Ralph Richardson gave to his part a certain "momentousness." His "stilted authority develop[ed] into a pathetic study of parental disillusion." Peggy Ashcroft played "brilliantly," and she responded to all the "fine shades" of her difficult part. Others in the cast included James Donald as the "calculating lover," and Gillian Lind as Mrs. Penniman. John Gielgud directed "with discretion and power."

THE INNOCENTS

The Innocents, by William Archibald, based on The Turn of the Screw by Henry James, opened at Her Majesty's Theatre in London, on July 3, 1952. The play ran for one hundred and eighty-eight performances. Director Peter Glenville repeated his New York chore. Flora Robson starred as the governess, and the children's roles were played by Jeremy Spenser, and Carol Wolveridge.

211 Daily Herald, loc. cit.
212 Ibid.
214 Ibid.
215 Daily Herald, loc. cit.
"Eerie" was the word used to describe the production—in the Observer, and in the Daily Herald. The mystery was "handled compellingly without cheap theatrical tricks." The audience was "spellbound." The Innocents was "based on—rather than a version of—Henry James's 'The Turn of the Screw.'" The changes of emphasis were "far-reaching." However, it was said that the play never stirred "the dread of discovering more than it is good for us to know"—as James's story had done.

In this version of the Jamesian story, the Times' reviewer noted, the children were "unlovable," and the governess was "frightened of them rather than for them." There seemed more danger of her losing her reason than of the children losing their souls.

It was a "well acted thriller," and Flora Robson's response to it was said to be "admirable in its delicate certainty." No praise was too high for Miss Robson, said the reviewer for the Daily Herald; and another critic remarked that she had a genius for "portraying fear and agony."
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219 Observer [London], July 6, 1952.  
220 Times [London], July 4, 1952.  
221 Ibid.  
222 Times, loc. cit.  
223 Ibid.  
224 Ibid.  
225 Ibid.  
226 Observer, loc. cit.
The children apparently were well directed by Peter Glenville, and their portrayals combined "the droll with the sinister." The Times' reviewer objected to the "too, too solid figures" of the ghosts.

LETTER FROM PARIS

Letter From Paris, by Dodie Smith, based on James's novel, The Reverberator, opened at the Aldwych Theatre in London, on October 10, 1952. It ran for twenty-seven performances. Starred in the play were Brenda Bruce as Francie Dosson, Scott McKay as George Flack, Peter Barkworth as Gaston Frobert, and Nicholas Phippe as Charles Waterlow. The direction was by Peter Glenville.

One reviewer complained that the start of the play was "as sluggish as the oosiest of all the rivers called Ouse," and another critic said that it was "a rather too long drawn out period piece." The Times' reviewer said, "[The play] keeps its shapeliness and charm for just so long as Miss Smith is able to reproduce 'the international situation' of the novel." He felt that where the play went wrong was in the presentation of the French family— the victims of the gossip column— as "helpless and ill-treated," rather than as "delicately
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227 Times, loc. cit.
228 Ibid.
230 Observer [London], October 19, 1952.
231 Times [London], October 11, 1952.
232 Ibid.
schooled in depravity." Thus the heroine lost the sympathy of the audience.

Brenda Bruce was miscast as Francis—according to both the Times and the Observer. She was said to be a clever actress, but "not quite clever enough to catch the artless simplicity of Francis." 

Little was said about the other performers. Scott McKay was "at least alive," and played with "charm." Peter Barkworth made "an agreeable hero," but he had a "dim, damp part which it would be hard to enliven." Nicholas Hannen as Mr. Probert, Sr., played with "convincing dignity," but he played the part "colourlessly . . . and it is hard to see what else he could do with the dialogue at his disposal." 

THE ASPERN PAPERS

The Aspern Papers, by Michael Redgrave, adapted from James's novel of the same title, opened at the Queen's Theatre in London, on August 12, 1959. The play ran for three hundred and seventy performances. Starring in his own adaptation, Michael Redgrave played...
"H. J."—Henry Jarvis. Featured players were Beatrix Lehmann as Miss Bordereau, and Flora Robson as Miss Tina. The play was directed by Basil Dean.

Alan Pryce-Jones, reviewing the play in the Observer, wrote, "With very minor reservations, it would not be easy to overpraise his [Redgrave's] adaptation." However, he found the beginning of the play slow.

The Times' anonymous reviewer also thought that the play began "a little shakily." He felt that Redgrave had made the adaptation with "surprisingly little loss of its original tone and colour," and that he had managed to get around the difficulties "with a theatrical skill which James himself surely would have admired and perhaps envied a little."

Redgrave's performance was "almost too discreet to be fully effective," said the reviewer for the Observer. While the Times reported that a "certain coarsening" had taken place in the "American sleuth hound." Nevertheless, it was remarkable how much of James's "sensibility" the actor managed to convey.

Flora Robson gave such a "sharp emotional impact to the denouement," that the Times' reviewer felt the play was "really about Miss

\[\text{\textsuperscript{2h2 Observer (London), August 16, 1959.}}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{2h3 Times (London), August 13, 1959.}}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{2h4 Ibid.}}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{2h5 Ibid.}}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{2h6 Observer, loc. cit.}}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{2h7 Times, loc. cit.}}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{2h8 Ibid.}}\]
Tina. The Observer found her performance "most painfully compelling." Beatrix Lehmann, as the ancient Miss Bordereau, created "an extraordinary old creature..." With her glaring eyes, she was said to be "magnificently effective." In her tirade scene, Miss Lehmann let off a "dramatic firework of dazzling incandescence."

THE WINGS OF THE DOVE

The Wings of the Dove, by Christopher Taylor, based on James's novel of the same title, opened at the Lyric Theatre in London, on December 3, 1963. Starring in the play were Susannah York as Milly Theale, Wendy Hiller as Susan Shepherd, Gene Anderson as Kate Croy, and James Donald as Merton Denver. The direction was by Frith Banbury. The play finally closed on September 12, 1964, after a run of three hundred and twenty-four performances.

There was some disagreement among the critics as to the value of the dialogue in The Wings of the Dove. In its faithfulness to

---

249 Ibid.
250 Observer, loc. cit. 251 Times, loc. cit.
252 Observer, loc. cit. 253 Ibid.
254 The closing date is from the London Times, September 12, 1964. (The play had closed and then reopened at the Haymarket on April 6, 1964, with Jennifer Hillary, Wendy Hiller, James Donald, Owen Hobbs, Elspeth March, and Gene Anderson, according to the Sunday News [London], July 26, 1964. Information from clipping file at the Research Library of the Performing Arts, Lincoln Center, New York.) The total number of performances was supplied to this investigator by the publishers of "The Stage" Yearbook (Carson and Comerford, Ltd., London).
James, wrote the reviewer for the London Times, "This is very much the play as James might have written it, and the result is every bit as tedious as Guy Domville." At the other extreme, the critic for the Observer found this "an extremely attractive play," and he counted it a distinct pleasure to listen to "the precision of James's dialogue--like an iceberg of cut diamond, gleaming on the surface and trailing beneath it a huge hidden area of unexpressed emotion." Milton Shulman, writing in the Evening Standard, spoke of the baroque atmosphere created by the "Jamesian ornate sentences." However, Shulman felt that the play emerged as "over-stuffed melodrama that only James's meticulous style saves from being embarrassing."

The total result is like reading some digest or précis of a long novel in which one realises that the omissions are more important than what has been left in.

The performance likewise caused a divergence of opinion among the reviewers. The direction reminded the Times' reviewer of the Edwardian theatre: for him, the performances of Susannah York and of Wendy Hiller personified "the grand manner at its most humourless." At the opposite pole, the reviewer for the Observer found Miss York's performance "exquisitely touching," and he felt that Miss Hiller

258 Ibid.
259 Ibid.
260 Times, loc. cit.
261 Observer, loc. cit.
gave "a beautifully rich and easy performance as the heroine's gentle middle-aged chaperone."262

Other remarks on the performances of cast members included an observation that Susannah York looked too healthy for the dying Milly, and that she had insufficient experience for the role;263 and that James Donald looked "sad about his part as a deceiver, but . . . [there was doubt about] his motivations and his redemption."264 Gene Anderson was said to be "harshly enigmatic" as Kate Croy,265 while Elspeth March played Aunt Maud like a "female Goering,"266 and Owen Holder as Lord Mark gave "a nice sneering performance as a titled cad."267

III. OPERAS BASED ON JAMES

THE TURN OF THE SCREW

In 1954, the world premiere of Benjamin Britten's opera, The Turn of the Screw, was given on September 14, at La Fenice Opera House in Venice. Adapted from James's story of the same title, the libretto was by Mrs. Myfanwy Piper. The work is in two acts and sixteen scenes, plus a short prologue. The performance was conducted by the composer, and directed by Basil Coleman.

262Ibid.
263Evening Standard, loc. cit.
264Ibid.
265Ibid.
266Times, loc. cit.
267Ibid.
A reviewer reported that the Venice audience was enthusiastic, but that some criticism was made against the materialization of the ghosts, and against the words which the librettist had them say. (Particular objection was made to the use of a quotation from Yeats, "'The ceremony of innocence is drowned,'" as being "alien to James.")

On October 6, 1954, the first performance of the opera was given in London. The work was presented by the English Opera Group at Sadler's Wells. The composer again conducted the performance. The cast was the same as in Venice, with Jennifer Vyvyan as the governess; Joan Cross as the housekeeper; David Hemmings as Miles; Olive Dyer as Flora; Arda Mandikian as Miss Jessel; and Peter Pears, who sang the prologue as well as Peter Quint's part. "Eerie" gothic settings were provided by John Piper.

According to the magazine, Opera,

[The libretto] . . . is not a transcription of James's novel into another medium, but an independent work fired into being by the imaginative power of the book.

However, Andrew Smith, writing for the Daily Herald, said, "Every mood of the story came to vivid life in the music . . . ." Eric Blom,
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268 *Times* [London], September 16, 1954.

269 The opera was only scheduled to be performed four times. The length of the run, in this case, in no way reflects the popularity of the work. It was reported that tickets were very hard to get. *Opera*, V (November, 1954), 700.

270 *Times* [London], October 7, 1954.  
271 Ibid.


273 *Daily Herald* [London], October 7, 1954.
reviewing the work for the Observer, praised the brilliance of Brit-ten's technique musically, but he questioned the wisdom of the choice of story; the work had "congeniality and intensity," and the composer's invention was "arresting."274

The materialization of the ghosts caused various reactions. The Times' critic complained that the librettist made "too big a demand on our ordinary theatrical credulity when she sets her two ghosts bandying words and blows in the first scene of the second act."275 Nevertheless, the Times found the piece theatrically effective. Andrew Porter, writing in Opera, felt it right that the ghosts should be seen by the audience in the same way as the persons on the stage saw them.276

As for the performers, it was said that Jennifer Vyvyan gave the "performance of her life . . . . Her singing was beautifully clear, her emotional acting superb."277 Less enthusiastic was the Times' comment that Miss Vyvyan gave an "assured interpretation."278 Joan Cross, as the housekeeper, was "moving in her simple humanity";279 the boy sang with "unaffected charm";280 and the ghosts both "sang to chill the blood"—according to the Daily Herald.281

274Observer [London], October 10, 1954.
275Times, October 7, 1954.
276Opera, p. 698.
277Daily Herald, loc. cit.
278Times, October 7, 1954.
279Daily Herald, loc. cit.
280Ibid.
281Ibid.
According to Opera magazine, *The Turn of the Screw* had "aroused public enthusiasm such as had not been known before for a new Britten piece." 282

Some nine years later, in an article on Benjamin Britten in the *Sunday Times*, it was suggested that *The Turn of the Screw* might be called "Britten's operatic masterpiece." 283

In 1962, nearly eight years after its performances in London, Britten's opera, *The Turn of the Screw*, was presented by the New York City Center Opera. 284 The work received its first performance on March 25, 1962, and it was repeated four more times during the year in repertory. 285 Starring in the production was Patricia Neway, as the governess. Others in the cast were Janis Martin, recent winner of the Metropolitan Auditions of the Air, as the housekeeper; Bruce Zahariades as Miles; Michele Farr as Flora; Richard Cassilly as Quint; Jean Kraft as Miss Jessel; and Richard Krause, who sang the prologue.

282 Opera, p. 698.

283 Sunday Times [London], November 17, 1963. (The article was by Desmond Shawe-Taylor.)

284 This was not the first hearing of the opera in America, but it was the first full-scale professional production. According to the *Saturday Review* (April 7, 1962), the opera received its North American premiere, conducted by the composer, at the Stratford Festival in 1957. The work had also been previously performed by semi-professional, or student groups, according to the *New York Times*, the *Daily News*, and the *New York Herald Tribune* (all dated March 26, 1962).

285 According to a communication dated January 12, 1966, from the executive offices of the New York City Center to the writer of this dissertation, five performances were given between March 25, 1962, and November 7, 1962.
The conductor, Julius Rudel, was praised for his "style and
grace,"\textsuperscript{286} and for his sensitivity.\textsuperscript{287} The imaginative staging, by
Allen Fletcher, was "in some ways superior to the English production" according to \textit{Musical America}\textsuperscript{288} The scenery, provided by Jack Venna, was described as "airy and lovely,"\textsuperscript{289} and as "ingenious . . . even if a little cluttered."\textsuperscript{290}

Of six reviews examined, all were strongly favorable, with some
minor reservations.

As a dramatization, Harold C. Schonberg, in the \textit{New York Times},
observed,

The libretto . . . makes free with James, and adds a scene or
two not in the novel, but the basic outlines and even sections of
dialogue are faithfully followed.\textsuperscript{291} Schonberg complained that the prosody was "awkward," but he blamed this
generally on Britten rather than on James, saying, "Sometimes his vocal
settings are almost impossible to enunciate with clarity."\textsuperscript{292}

The \textit{Opera News}' critic noted that the adaptation sacrificed amb-
iguity, because the children were "literally haunted,"\textsuperscript{293} and, in this
same vein, the \textit{New York Times} felt it was clear that the governess was

\textsuperscript{287}\textit{Opera News}, XXVI (May 5, 1962), 27.
\textsuperscript{288}\textit{Musical America}, LXXXII (May, 1962), 25.
\textsuperscript{290}\textit{New York Times}, loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{291}Ibid. \textsuperscript{292}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{293}\textit{Opera News}, loc. cit.
The critic for the *Saturday Review* felt that when the two ghosts became vocal, it was a "definite disadvantage to the mood." Britten had created a work of "real intensity, with all the Gothic flavor of the original story," said one critic. Another reviewer wondered what the opera was about, in as much as James's story was an "enigma." Douglas Watt, in the *Daily News*, found the score "a bit too calculating, remote and, therefore, unmoving." On the other hand, wrote Watt, "Stage direction, scenery, singing and conducting blend stunningly."

Some of the reviewers questioned whether Britten's work was really an opera. Harold Schonberg suspected that *The Turn of the Screw* was "a play with brilliant incidental music rather than a real opera." Similarly, the *New York Herald Tribune* reviewer remarked that the singers were used as an extension of the chamber orchestra to produce a "tour de force of both invention and construction," but he, too, questioned whether it was opera.
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295 *Saturday Review*, XLV (April 7, 1962), 23.
299 Ibid.
301 *New York Herald Tribune*, loc. cit.
Nevertheless, Schonberg admired Britten as a technician of tonal effects. The critic for Musical America found Britten's work "enormously dramatic in its musical means." It was observed in the Saturday Review that the "minimal" orchestra had the advantage of letting the audience hear the libretto.

The cast received praise from all quarters. Patricia Neway was "completely convincing," and "first rate as the anguished but determined governess." One critic felt that she "sang splendidly; [but] her acting was somewhat exaggerated."

Janis Martin, making her debut, showed herself to be a "singer of major qualifications," with a "nice stage sense." The two children (fourteen year old Bruce Zahariades, and eleven year old Michele Farr) received more praise for their acting than for their singing; they were "beautiful" in appearance—as James would have wanted them to be, and their understanding of their roles was "almost clairvoyant." Richard Cassilly and Jean Kraft "eerily portrayed"

---

303 Musical America, loc. cit.
304 Saturday Review, loc. cit.
308 New York Herald Tribune, loc. cit.
311 New York Herald Tribune, loc. cit.
The ghosts, and they were termed "splendid." Richard Krause sang the prologue "clearly."

The New York City Center Opera production of Benjamin Britten's The Turn of the Screw received a citation from the New York Music Critics' Circle in 1962.

A brief comparison between the English and the American productions of the opera was made by the reviewer for Musical America, Everett Helm.

The English production of 1954 was more convincing in its details—particularly in the first act—than the present one, which gathered momentum and intensity as it progressed.

But considering the much greater amount of rehearsal time the English Opera Group had at its disposal, the less fortunate New York City Opera's achievement was relatively greater.

THE WINGS OF THE DOVE

On October 12, 1961, the New York City Center Opera Company presented the world premiere of The Wings of the Dove, an opera by Douglas Moore. The libretto was by Ethan Ayer, and it was based on Henry

312 Ibid.


315 Citations were awarded by the New York Music Critics' Circle to four new works of the season, according to the *New York Times*, May 23, 1962.

316 *Musical America*, loc. cit.

317 A member of the faculty at Columbia University, Douglas Moore had been commissioned by the Ford Foundation to write the opera. The New York City Center Opera Company had previously produced Moore's opera, The Ballad of Baby Doe, with "substantial success." (*New York Times*, March 13, 1950.)
James's novel of the same title. The opera was staged by Christopher Vest, and conducted by Julius Rudel. Scenery was provided by Donald Oenslager. The work received four subsequent performances in repertory during the next year. Leading roles were sung by Dorothy Coulter as Milly Theale; Regina Sarfaty as Kate Croy; and John Reardon as Miles Dunster. A distinguished member of the cast was Martha Lipton, who sang the part of Aunt Maud Lowder.

An unusual feature in the opera was a ballet sequence, choreographed by Robert Joffrey. The ballet, referred to as the Janus ballet, had characters with classical names such as Janus; the Goddess of Spring; and the Goddess of Winter. According to one reviewer, there was a relation between the "Masque of Janus" and Miles Dunster's two-sided behavior.

Of six reviews examined, two were entirely favorable, three had some reservations, and one (Musical America) was not in favor of the work.

---

318 According to a communication dated January 12, 1966, from the executive offices of the New York City Center to the writer of this dissertation, five performances were given between October 12, 1961, and November 8, 1962.

319 The name of the character had been changed from James's Merton Densher for "phonetic reasons," according to the New York Times, October 13, 1961.


Laid in Venice and in London, the opera was in six scenes, with one intermission. The libretto, by Ethan Ayer, was described as "tight and interesting."\[322\]

... Ethan Ayer, by careful pruning and by making explicit things James only suggests, both simplified and clarified the book into a first class libretto.\[323\]

Harold C. Schonberg, writing in the New York Times, said,

[The libretto] cut through James's meanderings, added a few new elements, [and] simplified the characters considerably . . . .

The action . . . is tight and concentrated, though toward the end there do appear to be some inconsistencies and psychological flaws.

In the novel the motivations are clear enough, but in the opera the sudden sorrow and conversion of Miles Dunster and Kate Croy are inexplicable.\[324\]

The Saturday Review's critic also complained that the text was not clear on all points.\[325\]

"Bland" was the word used by more than one critic to describe the music of The Wings of the Dove.\[326\] It was "devoid of personality."\[327\] The music was "almost Italianate,"\[328\] and it showed the influence of Puccini.\[329\] Some critics specifically welcomed the absence


\[325\] Saturday Review, loc. cit.


of modernity in the score; \(^{330}\) one critic condemned the music as "incredibly old-fashioned"; \(^{331}\) another reviewer found it an "honest and touching opera . . . . [with a] finely integrated score"; \(^{332}\) while still another critic specifically noted that Moore had a "very acute feeling for the influence of the word rhythm on the melody, and vice-versa . . . ."\(^{333}\)

The conductor, Julius Rudel, brought a "sure and sympathetic hand" to the opera, \(^{334}\) and he received credit for the "clear orchestral work" of the evening. \(^{335}\)

Set in the late-Victorian period, the production was "elaborate but tasteful." \(^{336}\) Donald Oenslager's settings showed a London parlor; the National Gallery; and various Venetian locales. \(^{337}\)

Dorothy Coulter, in the role of the doomed heiress, Milly Thesale, was praised both for her acting and for her voice. She was "all fragility and lovely vocalism." \(^{338}\) One critic found her convincing despite a voice that was "too light for her role," \(^{339}\) while another reviewer recorded that her "light, clear soprano and blonde beauty ideally suited Milly." \(^{340}\)

\(^{331}\) Musical America, loc. cit.  \(^{332}\) Daily News, loc. cit.
\(^{333}\) New York Herald Tribune, loc. cit.  \(^{334}\) Ibid.
\(^{335}\) New York Times, loc. cit.  \(^{336}\) Ibid.
\(^{337}\) Saturday Review, loc. cit.  \(^{338}\) Daily News, loc. cit.
\(^{339}\) Musical America, loc. cit.
There seemed to be general agreement that the big dramatic mezzo voice of Regina Sarfaty was well suited to the role of Kate. She had a "commanding presence," and she "successfully impersonated a strong-willed, demanding, and persuasive young woman." John Reardon "made the most of the relatively unconvincing character of Miles Dunster," said the critic for Music Magazine: Musical Courier. A similar reaction to the role was expressed by the New York Times' critic. Elsewhere, Reardon was described as a "splendid actor," and as an "ardent and compassionate" singer.

The "accomplished" and experienced Martha Lipton was said to be "formidable" as Aunt Maud Lowder, and "delightfully fin-de-siècle."

Other cast members who received affirmative nods from the critics were Paul Ukena in the role of Homer Croy (James's Lionel Croy), Norman Kelley as Lord Mark, and Mary Le Sawyer as Susan Stringham.

All in all, there was more agreement among the critics about the high level of the performance of the opera than there was about the values of the work. As one commentator put it,
[The Wings of the Dove was] handsomely staged and strongly cast but was only partly successful in translating Henry James' complex novel into a viable lyric drama.349

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAY</th>
<th>Novel or story by Henry James</th>
<th>PLAY Publication</th>
<th>PRODUCTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Tragic Muse by Hubert Griffith</td>
<td>The Tragic Muse</td>
<td>London: Allen &amp; Unwin, 1927</td>
<td>(Theatre club prod.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Turn of the Screw by Allan Turpin</td>
<td>The Turn of the Screw</td>
<td>X 1946</td>
<td>(Theatre club prod.) (Double bill) Amateur prod. by Snarks Club, NY 3 week run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aspern Papers by Allan Turpin</td>
<td>The Aspern Papers</td>
<td>X 1948</td>
<td>(4 perfs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Innocents by William Archibald</td>
<td>The Turn of the Screw</td>
<td>New York: Samuel French, 1950</td>
<td>1952 (188 perfs.) 1950 (141 perfs.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAY</th>
<th>Novel or story by Henry James</th>
<th>PLAY Publication</th>
<th>PRODUCTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Lady by William Archibald</td>
<td>The Portrait of a Lady</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugenia by Randolph Carter</td>
<td>The Europeans</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Summer of Daisy Miller by Bertram Greene</td>
<td>Daisy Miller</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Child of Fortune was produced in England, at the Connaught Theatre in Worthing, in October of 1962, according to a letter from Bolton to the writer of the present study, dated May 4, 1963.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAY</th>
<th>Novel or story by</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>PRODUCTIONS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by Christopher Taylor</td>
<td>Henry James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel French,</td>
<td>(324 perfs.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPERA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAY</th>
<th>Novel or story by</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>PRODUCTIONS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by Benjamin Britten,</td>
<td>The Turn of the Screw</td>
<td>London:</td>
<td>Oct. 6, 1954†</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>libretto by Myfanwy Piper</td>
<td>The Turn of the Screw</td>
<td>Boosey &amp; Hawkes,</td>
<td>(4 perfs. at Sadler's Wells</td>
<td>(5 perfs. in repertory at NYC Center Opera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wings of the Dove</td>
<td>The Wings of the Dove</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Douglas Moore,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5 perfs. in repertory at NYC Center Opera)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>libretto by Ethan Ayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The world premiere of Britten's opera, *The Turn of the Screw*, was given in Venice on September 14, 1954.
CHAPTER VI

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN JAMES'S WORKS AND THEIR DRAMATIZATIONS

BY OTHER WRITERS

There have been thirteen significant dramatizations of James's works by playwrights other than himself. In the present chapter, an examination is made of these thirteen dramatizations in order to discover what the playwrights actually did with James's material when transposing it from fictional into dramatic form.

Arranged in the order in which they were written, the thirteen dramatizations are Berkeley Square by John L. Balderston; The Tragic Muse by Hubert Griffith; The Turn of the Screw, and The Aspern Papers (a double bill) by Allan Turpin; The Heiress by Ruth and Augustus Goetz; The Innocents by William Archibald; Letter From Paris by Dodie Smith; Portrait of a Lady by William Archibald; Child of Fortune by Guy Bolton; Eugenia by Randolph Carter; The Aspern Papers by Michael Redgrave; The Summer of Daisy Miller by Bertram Greene; and The Wings of the Dove by Christopher Taylor.¹

¹Table II, at the end of Chapter V, shows the dates of productions in New York and in London.
Because the genre is different, no analysis has been made of the two opera librettos based on James. Details of the opera productions, however, may be found at the end of the preceding chapter.\(^2\)

In order to present a complete history of the works involved, detailed information has been provided on both the original novel or tale, and on its dramatization. Included in relation to James's works are the source of the theme or story idea, when it is known; publication data; critical assessments of the work when pertinent; the plot; and an indication of the novelist's method in the particular instance. In examining the transfer from novel to stage, the date of the playwright's work is given, and a detailed analysis of the script is provided.\(^3\)

Each dramatization has been analyzed in four ways: I. Staging:
   A. Mechanics—number of acts; number of settings required; elimination of action which could not be staged; new motivation needed for entrances and exits of characters; B. Theatrical devices—special stage effects (sound, lighting, or other kinds); addition of business or lines of a peculiarly theatrical nature; multi-set possibilities. II. The handling of James's novel or story material: A. Changes in the story (plot or theme); B. Scenes added or omitted; C. Changes in the type or number of characters; D. Changes in the dialogue; E. Changes in the

\(^2\)The two operas based on James are The Turn of the Screw by Benjamin Britten, and The Wings of the Dove by Douglas Moore.

\(^3\)The writer of this dissertation has been extremely fortunate in obtaining original play manuscripts from the writers of the five unpublished plays: The Turn of the Screw, and The Aspern Papers—both by Allan Turpin; Portrait of a Lady by William Archibald; Eugenia by Randolph Carter; and The Summer of Daisy Miller by Bertram Greene.
relative or over-all time involved; and F. Changes in organization or evolvement of the story. III. Gained: items such as humor, or dramatic action which illustrates factors only mentioned in the story. IV. Lost: items such as author omniscience; point of view; or stream of consciousness.

For practical reasons, these items have not always been taken up in the exact order here indicated. However, each item has been checked in every script.

At the end of each section, a brief summary is appended. The summary of each play is divided under four headings: staging; the handling of James's material; items gained; and items lost.

Thus this chapter provides a thorough look at the sources of the plays by examining: (1) James's source material; (2) the original Jamesian works; and (3) changes made during the dramatization process. The assessment of the contributions made by the playwrights has been kept as objective as seems consonant with the presentation of significant comparisons.

I. BERKELEY SQUARE BY JOHN L. BALDERSTON; BASED ON JAMES'S THE SENSE OF THE PAST

The Sense of the Past was one of two novels which were unfinished at the time of Henry James's death in 1916. It was published posthumously in its incomplete form the following year.\(^4\) Published

\(^4\)The first edition of The Sense of the Past was published by W. Collins and Co. of London, in 1917. This edition was used as the basis for comparison in the present chapter.
with the incomplete novel were James's notes for the remainder of the work. The nearly three hundred completed pages seem to cover about half of the projected novel.

James had worked on *The Sense of the Past* at various intervals over a span of many years. His notebooks show that he had worked on it before 1900; he then put the novel away until 1911, only to abandon it again under pressure of other work.

The novel opens in New York in 1910, and the central figure is thirty-year-old Ralph Pendrel, a historian. Ralph has just inherited some property in England, and he plans to go over to see it. He has asked Aurora Coyne, a widow, to marry him, but she is tired of traveling, and she refuses to accept Ralph if he goes to Europe.

Ralph's late kinsman had been impressed by a book which the young New Yorker had written. In it, Ralph had written, "There are particular places where things have happened . . . that seem to put us into communication . . . ([with the past])." This, in essence, is the theme of James's novel.

Ralph goes to London about a month later to inspect the property. It consists of a two-hundred-year-old house in Mansfield Square.

---

5James's secretary has described how James was in the habit of dictating preliminary notes for his novels, which were exploratory in nature. He seldom consulted the notes during the actual writing. See Theodora Bosanquet, *Henry James at Work* (London: Hogarth Press, 1924), p. 9.


Old Philip Augustus Pendrel had been in the habit of renting out the house to a regular tenant each year in the "season": he had requested that Ralph continue the practice. The name of the annual tenant was Mrs. Midmore of Drydown in Hampshire. At the present time, however, the house is unoccupied, except for a caretaker couple.

Late one rainy afternoon, Ralph explores the house alone. It is fully furnished. Ralph is fascinated by a particular portrait: it is of a young man wearing the costume of a century ago, but the figure has its back turned to the beholder. Ralph stays in the house absorbing its atmosphere until late that night. As he walks through the rooms holding aloft a large candlestick, he suddenly finds himself face to face with his double. It is the figure from the portrait: the man from 1820 is searching for the future, just as Ralph is searching for the past.

Three or four days later, Ralph visits the American ambassador. He confides to the older man that he has arranged to exchange identities with his double. The ambassador, assuming that Ralph is demented, takes him back to Mansfield Square, and leaves him at the doorstep. As Ralph enters the house, he steps into another world and time.

A footman says that Miss Midmore is at home, and Ralph is ushered into the little parlor, where Molly Midmore greets him with an embrace. Ralph senses that he is engaged to her, although this is their first meeting. They are cousins. Ralph has just come over from America, and the marriage has been arranged by their families.

Soon Mrs. Midmore enters, and she is followed shortly by Perry Midmore--Molly's brother. Ralph feels that Perry mistrusts him. When
Perry mentions a younger sister, Nan, Ralph makes the mistake of saying that he has not heard of her.

Sir Cantopher Bland, an unsuccessful suitor to Nan, arrives to pay his respects to the newly arrived American cousin. Ralph says a number of unexplainable, strange things, and a coolness descends on the group.

Nan arrives unexpectedly by coach from their country estate at Drydown. Ralph feels an immediate closeness to the younger girl.

James's manuscript broke off at this point. In his dictated notes, however, James had explored ideas for the continuation of his novel. The author felt that Ralph should love Nan, and she him. (Later, James conceived that Nan might have loved the other man back in 1820, but that her affection might not have been returned.)

The remainder of the story is here provided, as James set it forth in his dictated notes.

Molly becomes afraid of Ralph, and she breaks her engagement. Because of this, Ralph's double, who is living in the future, makes three or four appearances to Ralph: the real 1820 man feels that Ralph is not playing the game.

Ralph has a growing fear that he will never be able to get back to his own time. He tells Nan the truth, and through some sacrifice on her part, Nan enables him to get back to 1910. (James left it indefinite as to how this could be accomplished.)

---

8 The notes were published with the incomplete novel. See Henry James, *The Sense of the Past*, pp. 285-351.

Ralph has been immersed in the past for six months. Aurora, back in New York, has been growing increasingly anxious; she comes to London, where she asks the ambassador to help her. The ambassador goes to the house in Mansfield Square. Ralph comes out of the door, and he steps back into the world of 1910.

James planned to end his novel with a talk between the ambassador and Ralph. Ralph would tell the ambassador nothing of what had happened to him. The young man would arrange to meet Aurora, but it was the author's intention not to show that meeting to the reader.

In 1926, John L. Balderston wrote a play, Berkeley Square, which was based on James's The Sense of the Past.10 (Balderston was assisted by J. C. Squire, then editor of the London Mercury.)11

The play is in three acts, and seven scenes: it requires only one setting, the morning-room of a Queen Anne house in Berkeley Square, London. The period switches back and forth between 1786 and 1928, and,  

---

10 The text analysed here is that of the 1929 New York production. The play had been partly re-written: it is possible to tell what some of the changes were by consulting the reviews of the 1926 London production. In the London version, Peter's portrait had been painted by Gainsborough—not Reynolds. Peter had made an interesting analogy between time and a folded tape measure; this is omitted from the later version. The London cast of characters did not include Major Clinton, Miss Barrymore, the Duchess of Devonshire, Lord Stanley, or the Duke of Cumberland; these omissions would seem to indicate that the ball scene was written for the later New York production. The year was changed from 1786 to 1784; perhaps this was in response to the Observer's comment that Dr. Johnson had already been dead two years in 1786 when Balderston had made a reference to him. (cf. Times [London], October 7, 1926; and Observer [London], October 10, 1926.)

11 According to one critic, J. C. Squire was "a sympathetic literary archaeologist, who [knew] his way about the Eighteenth Century, its manners and customs . . . ." (New York Evening Journal, November 5, 1929.)
accordingly, slight changes are made in the set dressing, and some of
the furniture pieces are replaced.\textsuperscript{12}

Technically, this would be a fairly difficult show to run. Lighting
effects include ten candles which are individually extinguished; moonlight;
and controlled dims and blackouts. A special lamp to throw Peter's shadow
into the room is also suggested. Sound effects include wind, rain,
thunder, church chimes, two different striking clocks, and the coming
and going of several carriages. Music off-stage is required for the ball
scene. One difficult property to obtain might be the portrait of Peter which
was supposedly painted by Sir Joshua Reynolds.

The title page of the published play announces that the plot was
suggested by Henry James's posthumous fragment, \textit{The Sense of the Past}.\textsuperscript{13}
The debt is clear in the theme of the play, and in the relationships
among the main characters. However, that is as far as the borrowing
goes. The dialogue is entirely new. The names of the main characters
have been changed, and seven minor characters have been added.

The play opens on October 23, 1784. The Pettigrew family is
awaiting the arrival of their American cousin, Peter Standish, who has
come over for the purpose of marrying Kate Pettigrew--whom he has never
seen. Lady Anne, Kate's mother, contrives to leave Kate alone to

\textsuperscript{12}1928 was the date used in the New York production of 1929. Presumably the date was altered from the earlier London production.

receive her cousin. The door opens to admit Peter, and a man's shadow is seen. As Kate curtseys, the curtain falls.

The second scene takes place on October 23, 1928. The American ambassador calls on the present day Peter Standish. Peter is excited about some old letters which he has found in the house, and a two-hundred-year-old diary belonging to his ancestor and namesake. He has a theory that it might be possible to change places with someone from another historical period. However, the events of the past would still have to happen exactly as they had done, because they were real.

In the room now there is a portrait of Peter's ancestor—painted by Reynolds. The resemblance to the present Peter is astounding.

Marjorie Frant, Peter's fiancée, arrives. She is worried because Peter has been behaving strangely. Suddenly Peter seems to hear a coach outside, and then the lights go out all over the house. The housekeeper announces that there is a strange gentleman asking to see Mr. Standish. Peter lights a candle and goes to investigate. As he returns, Marjorie goes to the door to meet him; she is terrified by what she sees—as the curtain falls.

The third scene is back in 1784; it opens at the moment of Peter Standish's first arrival at the house. He meets Kate Pettigrew, his betrothed, and then her family: Lady Anne, Tom, and Helen—also Mr. Throstle, Helen's suitor. The Pettigrews are bewildered by the things that their American cousin seems to know about them, and about the future. Not the least of Peter's slips is his accidental identification of a birthday gift which Helen has not yet opened: Peter, in the future, had read about it in the diary.
The second act opens a few nights later at Helen's birthday ball. Helen, and not Kate, is Peter's partner. The distinguished guests even include royalty. Peter's wit—borrowed from the not yet born Oscar Wilde—makes him the sensation of the evening.

In the second scene of Act II, after the departure of the guests, Helen asks Kate why she avoided dancing with Peter. Kate says that she is afraid of him, and, later, Kate breaks her engagement.

When they are alone, Peter tells Helen the truth, and she is able to see something of the future through his eyes. Peter tells Helen that he has been playing a part: he really loves her and not her sister, Kate.

Act III opens a week later. Helen and Peter have been constantly together. By now, Kate is superstitiously afraid for her sister's safety; both she and Mr. Throstle believe that Peter is possessed.

Surrounded and goaded by the family, Peter loses his self-control. He tells them what he really thinks of their eighteenth century world with its cruelty, its dirt, and its smells. Assuming that he has gone mad, the Pettigrews flee from Peter in horror.

Helen comes to Peter and tells him that he must go back to his own world, for he will really go mad under the strain of his nightmarish existence. She gives him a gift: it is an Egyptian Crux Ansata, the symbol of life. As Peter leaves her, Helen asks him to visit her grave in St. Mark's churchyard.

The final scene of the play is back in 1928. Marjorie and the ambassador are very worried about Peter: he has been behaving like a madman for weeks.
Peter, who has been out of the house, enters carrying a piece of paper. He places the paper on a table, under the Crux Ansata. To Marjorie's joy, Peter seems normal again.

In tidying the room, Marjorie moves the Crux Ansata. She sees that the piece of paper on the table has a Latin epitaph written on it. Peter says that he has just copied it from a tomb in St. Mark's churchyard.

Marjorie sees that Peter is crying, so she leaves quietly. Peter translates the epitaph aloud as the curtain slowly falls. Helen Pettigrew had died at the age of twenty-three, in 1787—less than three years after Peter's departure.

It will be noticed that the over-all period of the action has undergone a considerable change. In James's novel, the man from 1910 went back to 1820—a mere ninety years. In the play, the years are 1928 and 1784—a difference of over one hundred and forty years. In the novel, the modern man disappeared for six months, but in the play, he vanished for less than two weeks. The playwright omitted all material preliminary to the day of the great exchange.

Berkeley Square was a highly successful play, and it owed not a little of its appeal to Balderston's dialogue. He knew how to create both humor and pathos. The playwright also knew how to increase dramatic intensity with well-timed sound effects and other stage trickery.

**Summary**

In comparing John L. Balderston's play, Berkeley Square, with James's incomplete novel, The Sense of the Past, the following items may be summarized.
I. Staging:

A. The play is in three acts and seven scenes. It requires only a single setting.

B. Lighting and sound effects are used effectively to heighten the dramatic impact.

II. Balderston’s handling of the material of James’s novel:

A. The theme of the play is the same as that of the novel: a man changes places with his ancestral double, and tries to lead his life. The basic plot is handled a little differently.

B. The main characters and their family relationships correspond, but there are seven additional minor characters in the play. The names of all the main characters have been changed.

C. The dialogue is entirely new in the play.

D. The over-all time has been changed. The over-all span of the novel was ninety years, but in the play it has become over one hundred and forty years. On the other hand, the man in the novel disappeared for six months, but in the play Peter lived back in the eighteenth century for only two weeks.

E. Although the details have been much changed, the general progression of the story is essentially the same.

F. Most of the novel is written in the impersonal third person, but occasionally the author took the reader into his confidence with phrases like “our young man.” The novel was not written from any particular point of view.
III. Gained:

A. The play has gained both humor and pathos.

B. The dramatic tension is increased by the special lighting and sound effects.

IV. Lost:

Balderston omitted all incidents prior to the day of the historical exchange made by the two men.

II. THE TRAGIC MUSE, A DRAMATIZATION

BY HUBERT GRIFFITH

In his preface to the definitive New York edition of The Tragic Muse, James indicated that he had combined two basic ideas or themes in the book—ideas which he had had for a long time, and of which he could not remember the origins. He had long desired to create a "picture of the 'artist-life," and to illustrate the conflict between art and the world. For this purpose, James had conceived of a young man who abandoned a political career to devote himself to painting. James's second desire was to present a satiric picture of a theatrical personality. In The Tragic Muse, the novelist joined his two themes.

On June 19, 1884, James made a notation in his notebook of a story idea suggested to him by Mrs. H. [Humphrey] Ward. Mrs. Ward's story would have been centered around a young actress who receives the attention of a man who loves the stage. The man loves the girl for

---

herself, "though she doesn't satisfy him at all, artistically." He helps her to develop, and then she goes beyond him: she "soars away and is lost to him." The interest which James saw in the story was the possibility of turning it into "a study of the histrionic character." The novelist envisioned the girl as "crude . . . . Ignorant, illiterate. Rachel."

The Tragic Muse made its first appearance in installment form in the Atlantic Monthly, January, 1889—May, 1890. The novel was published in book form on both sides of the Atlantic in 1890. The differences between the book and the serial forms of the novel are minor—amounting to no more than changes in a few scattered words.

While writing the installments of the novel, James made some more notebook entries, some of which have been preserved. In an undated entry, the author wondered how to present an engagement and bribery scene between the artist, Nick Dormer, and the rich, widowed Julia Dallow. In February, 1889, James made a note to the effect that he was going to base "Sherringham's visit to the Comédie Française

15 Matthiessen and Murdock, op. cit., p. 63.
16 Ibid., p. 63.
17 Ibid., p. 63.
18 Ibid., p. 64.
20 The first book edition of The Tragic Muse was published by Houghton, Mifflin and Company, New York, in 1890. The first English edition was published in the same year by Macmillan and Company, London. (Edel and Laurence, op. cit., p. 84.)
with Miriam—my impression of Bartet, in her loge, the other day in Paris."  

While James was writing *The Tragic Muse*, he was at the same time working on his dramatization of *The American* for the actor-manager, Edward Compton. In his personal correspondence, James at this time was saying things like, "*The Tragic Muse is to be my last long novel,*" and "I mean never to write another novel." Instead, James planned to write only plays, and short stories. He did write plays intensively during the next five years, and spasmodically thereafter. Some of his greatest long novels were yet to come, however.

*The Tragic Muse* opens in Paris at an art exhibition; this provides a natural meeting place for most of the main characters. At the exhibition are Lady Agnes and her three grown children—Nick Dormer, Grace Dormer, and Biddy Dormer.

At the exhibition, Nick runs into an Oxford friend, Gabriel Nash. Nash invites Nick to attend a recitation which he has arranged for a young woman who wants to go on the stage. Miss Miriam Booth is

---

22Ibid., p. 92. (Matthiessen and Murdock conclude that James's French actress, Mademoiselle Voisin, was "no doubt, drawn from Bartet," p. 93.)

23The American was the first of James's professionally produced plays. The history of that production may be found in Chapter II of this dissertation, under the section entitled, "The First Production."


to read on the following day to Madame Carré, a great old French actress.

James uses several chapters to describe how the Dormers spend the rest of the day in Paris. They are joined by their cousin, the rich, widowed Julia Dallow. Julia is interested in helping Nick with his political career. An atmosphere is created, and the characters expose their natures, but the details do not further the story.

Present the next day at Madame Carré's for Miriam Rooth's recitation are her mother, Mrs. Rooth; Gabriel Nash; Nick Dormer; and Peter Sherringham. Peter is Nick's cousin, and the brother of Julia Dallow. He is a secretary in the British Embassy, and a devotee of the stage. Peter was invited by Madame Carré herself.

Miriam is extremely nervous, and she recites monotonously. Mrs. Rooth is afraid for her daughter's morals if she enters the theatre. Her fears are treated with contempt by the French actress. Madame Carré's impression of Miriam is that she is "loud and coarse." Nick is struck by the girl's appearance: he wishes to paint her as "the Tragic Muse."²⁶

On the following day, Miriam recites in Peter Sherringham's rooms. The whole Dormer family is there this time, plus Julia Dallow, Gabriel Nash, and a number of other guests. This time, Miriam impresses them with a violent rendition of Juliet. Afterwards, Gabriel Nash and Nick Dormer wander about Paris, discussing their views on art


²⁷Ibid., p. 103.
and life. They also examine Nick's problems: the conflict between his desire to be an artist, and his family's political aspirations for him.

During the following weeks, Peter sees Miriam often. They go to theatres together—always accompanied by her mother. Peter thinks that Miriam is always acting, and that there is no real person underneath. Before he goes to England for his summer holiday, Peter arranges that Miriam shall study with Madame Carré.

That summer, Nick Dormer is elected to represent the district of Harsh in Parliament. His political campaign is conducted by Julia Dallow. Lady Agnes is anxious to have Nick marry Julia. Nick proposes marriage, and Julia accepts him, but she wants to wait a while. In the meantime, old Mr. Carteret, a friend of Nick's late father, promises to make a handsome settlement on Nick when the marriage takes place.

Back in Paris again, Peter finds that Miriam's acting has greatly improved. She has been working hard under Madame Carré, and she has been receiving help from Basil Dashwood, a young, English actor.

Peter takes Miriam to the Comédie Française, and he introduces her to a couple of the actresses in the green-room. Miriam's constant companions, her mother and Basil Dashwood, also attend the performance.

In England, Julia and Nick set the date for their wedding in the late Spring. By Easter time, Miriam Rooth has opened in London in her first play, and it is a success. The actress asks Nick to paint her portrait.

One day, while Miriam is posing for Nick in his London studio, Julia arrives unexpectedly from the country. Julia suspects the worst,
and, in her well-mannered way, she breaks off the engagement. Within a few days, Julia leaves for the Continent with a woman friend.

Nick Dormer resigns from Parliament. The reactions to this step are varied. Lady Agnes is greatly disturbed; his sister, Biddy, admires him; Gabriel Nash is gleeful; and old Mr. Carteret cuts Nick out of his will.

In the meantime, Peter Sherringham comes to England on leave. He finds Biddy Dormer at Nick’s studio, and he invites her to go with him to the theatre to see Miriam’s play. After this, Peter goes to see the play every night for a week, and he spends many afternoons at Miriam’s house. Other constant callers include Basil Dashwood, and Gabriel Nash.

Gabriel Nash tells Peter that Miriam is in love with Nick Dormer, but that she has enough sense to know that a marriage to Nick would not work. In any case, her feelings are not returned. Peter feels jealous of Nick, and yet he himself is not willing to get more entangled with Miriam. He feels that she would not make a suitable wife for an ambassador.

In order to save himself, Peter asks the Foreign Office for a transfer, and he is assigned to a remote post in Central America. Nevertheless, he declares his passion to Miriam. She is not interested in a liaison, and she indicates that it is wise of him to be going away.

Miriam opens in her second play, and Peter and Nick attend the opening night performance together. After the performance, Peter proposes marriage to Miriam, but on the condition that she give up the
stage. Not only does Miriam refuse him, but she expresses the belief that Biddy Dormer would be "good" for Peter. \textsuperscript{28}

Nick has completed his first portrait of Miriam, and he begins a second one, which is intended for Peter. Nick and Miriam frankly discuss Peter's predicament. Before the portrait is finished, however, Miriam leaves on tour.

While Miriam is away, Gabriel Nash sits for Nick. He predicts that Nick will paint Julia, and that they will reconcile their differences.

Biddy spends some months staying with Julia, who has returned to England. Julia favors a union between Biddy and her brother, Peter. Lady Agnes and Grace also stay with Julia, but Nick keeps away until Christmas time, when he is a house guest at Julia's home.

In late March of the following year, Biddy is staying in London with a friend. Nick arranges to take them to Miriam's opening night in 
\textit{Romeo and Juliet}. In the meantime, Miriam has quietly married Basil Dashwood, who is to play Mercutio.

Peter arrives back in England on leave just in time to attend the opening of 
\textit{Romeo and Juliet}. During an intermission, Nick tells Peter about Miriam's marriage. Peter is upset by the news, and he leaves for Paris without visiting his friends.

Soon, however, Peter returns. He calls frequently on Biddy Dormer during the following weeks, and at Easter time they become

\textsuperscript{28}Ibid., p. 505.
engaged. At about this same time, Julia arranges to sit to Nick for her portrait.

James ends his novel with a collection of what he calls recent "facts."²⁹ Peter and Biddy have been married, and he has received a better appointment. Julia's portrait has caused a stir among the art critics. Miriam has added several new parts to her repertoire.

Finally, James hints at a union in the future between Julia Dallow and Nick Dormer.

A dramatization of The Tragic Muse was written in England by Hubert Griffith. The play was produced in London, in July, 1928, by the Arts Theatre Club, after it had been published in the previous year by Allen and Unwin, Ltd.³⁰

In writing the play, Hubert Griffith kept James's title, The Tragic Muse.³¹ The play is in three acts, and it is divided into five scenes. Three settings are required. The first act takes place in a drawing room at the British Embassy in Paris. In the second act, the action takes place in the Foyer des Artistes, the green-room, of the

---

²⁹Ibid., p. 575.

³⁰Correspondence with the publishers of "The Stage" Yearbook indicates that they have no record of any earlier production of the play. ("The Stage" Yearbook, published annually, gives statistical data on all London stage productions.) A letter addressed to the publishers of the play, Allen and Unwin, failed to elicit a reply to the question of whether there had been a production prior to the publication of the play.

³¹The differences between James's The Tragic Muse as it appeared in the Atlantic Monthly and in its published book form are very slight. However, there is enough evidence to show that Griffith used the book rather than the magazine as his source. Where the playwright has used James's wording intact, it always agrees with the published book rather than with its serialized form.
Comédie Française. The third act is in three scenes, all of which take place in the garden of a house in St. John's Wood, in London.

Technically, this would be a simple show to produce, except for the fact that three sets are required. Few sound effects are needed: passing taxis; a taxi which stops to let a passenger alight; and the sound of the front gate opening. Simple interior lighting is all that is needed for the first two sets. The third set, an exterior garden scene, is used three times, and the light must indicate morning, late afternoon, and midnight. In the night scene, the lights inside the house are switched on and off twice—in the drawing room beyond the French windows. It is suggested that this should be a theatrical drawing room, hung with photographs. Other technical problems in The Tragic Muse include a fireplace with blazing logs, and a portrait of the great actress, Rachel, both of which are in the foyer of the Comédie Française.

In converting The Tragic Muse into a play, Hubert Griffith has cut the story "to the bone." He has chosen to utilise only the central plot surrounding the young actress, Miriam Rooth. Most of the main characters of the novel have been retained, but they are seen now only in their relationships to Miriam and to her career. There are seventeen roles in the cast, plus necessary extras and "bit" parts. (A manservant, a maid, an attendant, and several extras are mentioned in the various acts, but they are not listed with the "characters" in the published play.) The seventeen characters retain their original names from the novel—with the exception of one of the French actresses, who
is now called Mademoiselle Destrée, rather than Mademoiselle Dunoyer.
(There were more than forty characters in James's novel.)

At the opening of the play, most of the characters have been
brought together for the purpose of hearing the would-be actress,
Miriam Rooth, give an afternoon recitation. Madame Carré, the old
French actress, has been specially invited to hear the girl. The host
is Peter Sherringham, a secretary at the British Embassy in Paris.
Present on this occasion are Nick Dormer and his family—Lady Agnes,
Grace Dormer, and Biddy Dormer; Julia Dallow; Gabriel Nash; and two
embassy couples—the Nevilles, and the Lovicks. Miriam is accompanied
by her ever-present mother, Mrs. Rooth. As in the novel, the girl's
recitation is exaggerated and rather bad.

Miriam is next seen five months later, when she is taken to the
green-room of the Comédie Française by Peter Sherringham. With them
are her mother, and the young English actor, Basil Dashwood. In this
scene, the second act of the play, the girl meets two French actresses,
and Peter proposes marriage to her for the first time. She declines
him.

The last act takes place a year later. It is the day when
Miriam opens in Romeo and Juliet in London. The act is divided into
three scenes: in the morning, in the late afternoon, and at midnight
after the performance. By now, Nick Dormer has turned to painting, and
he has given up his seat in Parliament. It is agreed that Miriam will
come and sit to him soon.

Unexpectedly, Peter Sherringham arrives from Paris; he brings
the news that he is to be transferred to an ambassadorial post in
Central America. That night, after the performance, Peter once more begs Miriam to give up the stage, and to marry him. Miriam refuses, and she hints that she may marry the actor, Basil Dashwood, who, at least, is a part of her theatrical world. (It is on this somewhat inconclusive note that the play ends.)

The playwright has eliminated all of the side issues and subplots which are not directly concerned with the rise of the young actress, Miriam Rooth. In the third act of the play, it is mentioned that Nick Dormer has "broken off his marriage" to Peter's sister, Julia, but no previous mention had been made of an engagement. (This seems to indicate carelessness in the transfer from novel to play.)

The reason for the termination of the engagement is the same in the play as in the novel: Nick had decided to leave the world of politics, and to devote his life to painting, but Julia did not like art. New lines in the play make it clear that Nick took a long time to make up his mind before taking his decisive step in favor of art.

It was James's intention that the interest of his novel should be divided between Miriam Rooth and Nick Dormer, both of whom—and particularly the latter—personify the conflict between the world and art. In the play, Nick has been relegated to a secondary character, and the leads are clearly Miriam Rooth and Peter Sherringham.


The romantic interest in the play is focussed on Miriam Rooth and Peter Sherringham. In the later part of the play, Basil Dashwood, a member of the theatrical company, is always around the house, but Miriam treats him lightly. (In the novel, Miriam married Basil.) Nick Dormer and Gabriel Nash merely form part of Miriam's entourage. There is no romance between Biddy Dormer and Peter Sherringham, as there was in the novel; and, as mentioned previously, the engagement between Nick Dormer and Julia Dallow is all but lost in the transfer into the play.\footnote{Edmund Wilson, in his essay, "The Ambiguity of Henry James," stated that the engagement scene between Julia and Nick was the first "real scene . . . between a man and a woman" which James had up to that time written. Wilson made the observation that sex finally appeared in James's works after five years of playwriting. See F. W. Dupee (ed.), The Question of Henry James (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1945), p. 177, and p. 180.}

Many of James's subtler points have been lost in the dramatisation process. All of the family involvements growing out of Nick Dormer's relationship to Julia have been eliminated. The memorable scene in which Lady Agnes pleads with her son, Nick, to marry the rich Julia for the sake of his family has not been utilised in the play. Indeed, after the first act, Lady Agnes, Grace Dormer, Biddy Dormer, and Julia Dallow are never seen again. The fact that Julia's influence and money were responsible for Nick's election to Parliament is not mentioned. Nick's elderly friend, Mr. Carteret, has been excluded from the dramatic version. Therefore, there is no mention of Mr. Carteret's financial help to Nick, or of the fact that he cut Nick out of his will when the young man resigned his Parliamentary seat.
The playwright has disregarded all of the gradual growth of the various situations at the beginning of the novel. There are no scenes at the art exhibition in Paris—a location which James had used as a natural meeting place for his characters. Instead, the play opens at a point equivalent to Chapter Seven of the novel. Miriam's recitation now serves to bring all of the major characters together. The playwright, however, has bungled his opportunity by having over six pages of tedious introductions as the guests assemble.

The exposition in the first act is necessarily new. The first lines which seem to have any point beyond mere urbanity are some taken from James: these occur when Madame Carré is introduced to Mrs. Rooth, and the two women clash. There are also new sections at the beginning of both the second and the third acts: it is necessary in both instances for the playwright to provide information about what has occurred in the interim.

Nothing new of any consequence has been added in the play. That is, there are no new incidents of any importance. There are, however, a great many new lines. Griffith has supplied new lines for about half of each of the first two acts, but he relies on James almost exclusively for the material in the last act. In other words, the play progressively becomes more and more Jamesian in style. Even so, Griffith has made many changes in James's wording, and quite a number of minor transpositions of James's material. This statement must be understood in conjunction with the fact that Griffith has elected only

35 Griffith, op. cit., p. 18.
to use those elements of the novel which bear directly on Miriam's acting career, and on Peter's unreciprocated love for her. It is still possible, most of the time, to tell which is James's style, and which is Griffith's new material.

The over-all time covered by the events in the novel was nearly four years. The events of the play cover only a year and a half. As for the period, James placed his story in the late eighteen eighties. Griffith did not specify any date, but, presumably, the play was played contemporaneously—that is, in the nineteen twenties. It may be noted, in this connection, that Griffith replaced carriages with cars and taxis.

In dramatising James's work, Griffith has lost many of the author's subtle points. The omniscient author has vanished, and with him has gone his insight into many of the secondary characters; especially reduced in scope are Nick Dormer, Lady Agnes, Biddy Dormer, Julia Dallow, and Gabriel Nash. Gone, too, are James's tricks for creating the feeling of verisimilitude. (For example, at the end of the novel, James treats as familiar to the reader the more recent developments in Miriam's theatrical career, and he seems to assume that the reader knows all about the recent exhibition of Nick Dormer's portrait of Julia Dallow.)

**Summary**

In comparing Hubert Griffith's play, *The Tragic Muse*, with James's novel of the same title, the following items may be summarized.
I. Staging:

A. Griffith's play is in three acts, and it is divided into five scenes. Three settings are required: a drawing room at the British Embassy in Paris; the Foyer des Artistes at the Comédie Française; and the garden of a house in St. John's Wood, London.

B. Technically, this would be a simple show to run. Few sound effects are needed; the lighting is limited to two simple interiors, and to an exterior set which is seen in morning light, in the late afternoon, and at midnight. The script calls for two items which might be more difficult to provide: a fireplace with blazing logs, and a portrait of the great actress, Rachel.

II. Hubert Griffith's handling of the material of James's novel:

A. The action of the play begins at a point equivalent to Chapter Seven of the novel, and it extends to the beginning of the last chapter (Chapter Fifty-one). However, the story has been severely cut. All of the subplots have been eliminated, and only those incidents related directly to the career of the rising actress, Miriam Rooth, have been retained.

B. No scenes of any consequence have been added in the play, although it was necessary for the playwright to write a new exposition, and to write new lines for the opening of both the second and the third acts.

C. The number of characters has been reduced from over forty to seventeen, plus a few extras and "bit" parts. All of the
major characters have been retained; and, with one minor exception, they keep their original names.

D. Because so much of the novel has been cut, a shift of emphasis has occurred. In the novel, Nick Dormer was as important to the author’s purpose as was Miriam Rooth. In the play, Nick merely forms part of Miriam’s entourage. The leads are clearly Miriam and Peter Sherringham.

E. A great many new lines have been written into the play—particularly in the first two acts. As the play progresses, the playwright relies more and more on James for dialogue. It is usually possible to tell which lines are based on James, and which are not.

F. The over-all time covered by the events has been reduced from nearly four years to a year and a half. The period has been changed from the late eighteen eighties to the nineteen twenties. (The playwright did not specify the date, but internal evidence indicates that the play was performed contemporaneously.)

G. The progression of the central plot is essentially the same as in the novel. However, because so much of the original was cut, the major supporting characters have lost their dimensions, and the involvements of their personal stories have been eliminated.
III. Gained:

Nothing of consequence has been added in the dramatic version. However, the playwright had to write a great many new lines in order to piece the play together.

IV. Lost:

A. The omniscient author has vanished.

B. Many of James's subtle points have been lost.

C. James's tricks for creating the feeling of verisimilitude have disappeared.

D. The most severe loss is in the depth of the characterizations. This is particularly true of Nick Dormer, Lady Agnes, Biddy Dormer, Julia Dallow, and Gabriel Nash.

E. All of the family involvements growing out of Nick Dormer's relationship to Julia Dallow have been eliminated. Their engagement is all but lost in the transfer from the novel, and nothing about the fact that Julia's influence and money were responsible for Nick's election to Parliament is included in the play.

F. Memorable scenes involving Lady Agnes are not used.

G. Mr. Carteret is not even mentioned.

H. There is no romance between Biddy Dormer and Peter Sheringham; and there is no marriage between Miriam Rooth and Basil Dashwood in the play.
In 1940, Allan Turpin, an English writer, conceived the idea of adapting James's two short novels, The Turn of the Screw and The Aspern Papers, into two one-act plays "designed as a double bill." Subsequently, Turpin's play, "The Turn of the Screw," was produced professionally in London by the Arts Theatre Club, in October of 1946. In 1948, both plays were presented as a double bill by an amateur dramatic club in New York City.

Neither of these two plays has been published, but the playwright was kind enough to lend manuscripts of each to the writer of this dissertation for study and analysis.

Since the later dramatisations are better

---

36 In a letter from London, dated December 17, 1965, and addressed to the writer of this dissertation, Allan Turpin said, "The plays were designed as a double bill, the same actresses to play the leading parts in each. I never saw either story as suitable for full length treatment, and more recent versions have not converted me."

37 The Arts Theatre Club is a professional theatre which is run as a so-called "club," for purposes of avoiding the censorship of the Lord Chamberlain's office.

38 The plays were produced by a group known as the Snarks--using the premises of the Amateur Comedy Club in New York.

39 Section VI covers The Innocents—the dramatization of The Turn of the Screw by William Archibald; and Section XI is devoted to Michael Redgrave's dramatization of The Aspern Papers.
known, it seems more convenient that the sections dealing with them should be complete within themselves.

Allan Turpin's "THE TURN OF THE SCREW"

Allan Turpin's one-act play, "The Turn of the Screw," is divided into seven scenes, and it requires two settings. Most of the scenes are laid in the hall at Bly, a country house in Essex; but Scenes iii and vi take place by the lake on the estate. (The script is not very specific about the lake setting, but presumably it could be played in front of a drop downstage. At any rate, Scene vi is only three pages long, which would make a fast change of scenery desirable.)

Technically, this would be a fairly easy show to produce. Sound effects include off-stage piano playing—by Miles; distant thunder; and the sound of a carriage approaching and leaving the house. The lighting outside the window changes with the time of day and the season; and, in one scene, moonlight streams in at the window. When the ghost of Quint is present, the light from the window is "gradually obscured, as if by a presence standing outside and looking in." This is the scene

---

40 In the letter to the present writer, dated December 17, 1965, the playwright indicated that the play lasted for about an hour and a half in the London production. "The theatre wanted an interval and I didn't. It breaks the atmosphere." Apparently, the playwright had his wish granted in the New York production: the program—supplied by Dr. Leon Edel, of New York University—indicated only one intermission, and that was between the two plays.

41 Allan Turpin, "The Turn of the Screw" (unpublished manuscript), ii, 1.
in which Quint is first seen by the governess. At one point in the play, the heavy window curtains stir restlessly. All of these effects should help to create an eerie atmosphere.

The basic plot is exactly the same as in James's novel, except that the prologue has been omitted. James's tale was introduced as a ghost story told at a Christmas house party; the play opens at the moment of the governess's first arrival at Bly. There are only four characters seen in the play: the unnamed governess; Mrs. Orose, the housekeeper; and the two children, Flora and Miles. They are exactly the same as they were in the novel. References are made to other servants in the house: Luke, Briggs, and some maids. The children's uncle (Uncle Tom) is merely mentioned. Visitations by Quint are limited to two "appearances" at the window, and Miss Jessel is "seen" in both of the scenes at the lake. (The figure of Miss Jessel is presumably off-stage in the wings, or out in the audience area.) Quint's appearance on the tower is only alluded to in the play. Eliminated are James's manifestations of both figures on the staircase, and that of Miss Jessel in the schoolroom.

Almost every word of James's dialogue is incorporated verbatim into the play. The playwright has been able to combine bits of

---

142 The cast list does not indicate that an actor is needed for Quint. Quint's presence is felt in Scenes ii and vii. In the later scene, Quint appears at the window twice, and the stage directions refer to him there as "the vile figure of Quint" (vii, 10). However, since the window is located in the left wall of the set, the shadow device could again be used. (In the later dramatisation by William Archibald, an actor and an actress are required to represent the two ghosts. In the opera by Benjamin Britten, the two ghosts have singing roles.)
dialogue which were originally spread out over sundry occasions, and thus the number of incidents or scenes, in the French sense, has been considerably reduced. This condensation of the episodes is plausible except in one instance: in the final scene of the play, after the governess has told Mrs. Grose to take Flora to London, there is exactly one more page after Mrs. Grose leaves the room before the carriage is heard departing. (However, if the lights were dimmed to indicate a passage of time, the scene would be believable.)

Only in the exposition has the playwright had to invent much new dialogue. Some six pages of the opening scene are new. In the later scenes, only a sprinkling of new lines has been necessary. Of his two Jamesian dramatizations, Allan Turpin wrote,

I used as much as possible of the original dialogue. To be as James as one could seemed to me the whole point of the affair.\(^{43}\)

The necessary new lines match the style of the original work remarkably well.

James indicated that the children learned "pieces" by heart and amused their governess by reciting them. Playwright Turpin has specified that Miles shall recite the opening lines of Richard III. Miles's piano playing has also been utilised in the play.\(^{44}\)

There is no prologue in the play, although there was in the novel. The action begins with the arrival of the governess at Bly, and it continues over a period of about five months. This is approximately

\(^{43}\) Turpin's letter of December 17, 1965, to the writer of this dissertation.

\(^{44}\) Ibid. Turpin mentioned that in the London production Miles played Mozart's Turkish March, "which I always find rather sinister."
the same span of time as that of the original work. The date specified in the play is 1840, and this is the period which James had in mind.\textsuperscript{45}

Despite the fact that Allan Turpin's play is so faithful to the Jamesian dialogue, it has lost the atmosphere of ambiguity of the original. Perhaps this is inevitable in an objective presentation. The original work was written in the first person, and the events were seen from the point of view of the governess.

Summary

In comparing Allan Turpin's play, "The Turn of the Screw," with James's novel of the same title, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:

A. Turpin's play is in one act, and it is divided into seven scenes. Two sets are required: the hall at Bly, a country house in Essex; and the banks of a lake on the estate.

B. The stage effects are relatively simple. The sound effects include piano playing (off-stage), thunder, and a carriage arriving and departing. The lighting outside the window changes from scene to scene, and it is gradually obscured by the presence of Quint's ghost. A practical oil lamp is needed. The window curtains should stir on cue.

\textsuperscript{45} James's The Turn of the Screw was first published in 1898. The internal evidence in the prologue places the main events quite a bit earlier than 1850.
II. Allan Turpin's handling of the material of James's novel:

A. The plot is just the same as in the novel, but the prologue has been omitted. The play opens with the arrival of the governess at Bly.

B. Nothing of importance has been omitted in the play. The number of ghostly visitations has been reduced; and the playwright has been able to join dialogue which appeared originally on many separate occasions.

C. There are only four characters in the play: the unnamed governess; Mrs. Grose; and the children, Flora and Miles. They are all the same as they were in the novel.

D. James's dialogue is incorporated verbatim into the play—with very little left out. The only new dialogue beyond a scattered line or two, is that needed for purposes of exposition; this amounts to about six pages. The style matches that of James remarkably well.

E. Turpin has made concrete Miles's playing of the piano, and his recitation from Shakespeare.

F. The over-all time of the events, after the arrival of the governess which opens the play, is the same as in the original. It covers more than five months.

III. Gained:

Since the playwright's intention was to remain as close as possible to the original, he has added nothing except the necessary exposition.
IV. Lost

The point of view of the governess has been lost in the objective presentation of this dramatised version. Gone, too, to a large extent, is the original's atmosphere of ambiguity.

Allan Turpin's "THE ASPERN PAPERS"

Allan Turpin's one-act version of James's The Aspern Papers is divided into six scenes, and it requires two settings. Scenes i, iii, v, and vi, are laid in the parlor of Miss Bordereau's home in Venice. Scenes ii and iv take place in the garden outside the parlor windows.⁴⁶

Technically, this would be a very simple show to produce. Sound effects are limited to a few off-stage voices, the sound of a clock striking, and the ring of the doorbell. In the exterior scenes, the controlled lighting must show sunset fading into twilight, and then into night. Indoor scenes take place both during the day and at night. A practical oil lamp is required.

The only part of the novel which seems to have suffered in the transfer to the stage is the opening. In the novel, the editor plotted and schemed with his friend, Mrs. Prest, before he entered Miss Bordereau's home for the first time. At the opening of the play, Mrs. Prest and the editor come together to call unexpectedly on Miss Tina, and the result would possibly be as confusing for the audience as it is

⁴⁶On page ii of the unpublished manuscript of "The Aspern Papers," Allan Turpin made a note, "The parlour and the garden may be incorporated in one set."
for Miss Tina. The names of the characters are not divulged until the third and fourth pages.

The number of characters in the play is six, and, with the exception of the editor, their names are the same as in the novel. James's unnamed editor is now called Adams, and he assumes the name of Grant to disguise his identity during the early scenes. The other characters are the editor's friend, Mrs. Prest; Miss Bordereau—aged eighty-five; Miss Tina (Miss Bordereau's niece); Olimpia, the maid; and an Italian doctor. Additional voices are needed for sounds heard from the canal—a man singing, and the cry of a gondolier. The script also indicates that Olimpia holds a conversation out of the window with a friend, and, presumably, the friend's voice should answer. No lines are provided for this scene, however.

Other characters from the novel are mentioned in the play, but they are not seen on-stage. These include Adams' servant (called Paolo in the play, but Pasquale in the novel); Adams' gondolier; and the publisher, John Cumnor, among others.

The basic plot of the play is the same as that of the novel. However, the playwright has added a number of brief scenes for Mrs. Prest: this character, in fact, is used as a tool. Mrs. Prest comes with Adams on his first visit to Miss Bordereau's home. Then she conveniently has to hurry off to keep another appointment. This same procedure is used twice more in the play, so that Mrs. Prest's brief appearances serve to join—or to separate—pieces of Jamesian dialogue.

---

47 In the original 1888 edition of James's novel, she is called Miss Tita. In James's revised edition, 1908, she is named Miss Tina.
which originally occurred on sundry occasions. At the end of the play, while Mrs. Prest is conversing with Adams on-stage, Miss Tina supposedly burns the all-important "papers" off-stage—in the kitchen.  

In all, the play contains only some eight or nine pages of new dialogue, and almost half of this occurs in the final scene. That is, for the aforementioned scene between Mrs. Prest and Adams, during which Miss Tina burns the "papers" off-stage.

Despite the fact that the action is confined to only two locations in the play, almost every word of James's dialogue has been used verbatim. Such changes as do occur in the dialogue are minor in nature.

In "The Aspern Papers," as in "The Turn of the Screw," Turpin's dialogue matches the style of James's remarkably well.

Several of James's scenes have necessarily been relocated. James's important conversation between Miss Tina and the editor during their excursion in Venice, is now delayed until their return. This is

---

48 In a letter dated January 4, 1966, and addressed to the writer of this dissertation, Allan Turpin indicated that in the version of his play, "The Aspern Papers," which was produced in New York, the papers were burned on-stage. (This is also what happens in the Michael Redgrave dramatization of the same James novel.) However, Turpin further stated that he had at one time "had an idea of attempting to lengthen The Aspern Papers in order to be able to offer it as a three act play. I didn't like the padding and dropped the idea." Mr. Turpin "reassembled the bits" in order to let Miss Steer have "a copy that is almost identical with the one produced. The only difference is that in the first version the papers were burned on [on-stage], whereas they are now burned off . . . ."

49 A careful comparison of Turpin's play with both editions of James's novel shows that the playwright relied on James's 1906 revised edition of The Aspern Papers.
joined onto Miss Bordereau's third interview with the editor, in which she shows him the miniature portrait of Jeffrey Aspern.

The over-all time of the action of the play is four months, and the year is 1685. This corresponds to the four and a half months, or more, of the novel, and the year is approximately that which James had in mind in his 1888 novel.

- In this dramatized version of The Aspern Papers, nothing of significance has been added to James's work. The new scenes for Mrs. Prest serve merely as the playwright's method of joining various pieces from James. On the other hand, the omission of the preliminary plotting between Mrs. Prest and the editor makes the opening of the play a little abrupt, and it might perhaps be momentarily bewildering to an audience.

Although Adams almost never leaves the stage, there is no attempt to preserve the first person, point-of-view method of James's novel. (While Adams is off-stage momentarily, no action of any significance whatsoever goes forward.)

Summary

In comparing Allan Turpin's play, "The Aspern Papers," with James's novel of the same title, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:

A. Turpin's play is in one act, and it is divided into six scenes. Two sets are required: the parlor of Miss Bordereau's home in Venice; and the garden outside.

B. Technically, this is a simple show. The only sound effects are a few voices off-stage; a clock striking; and a doorbell.
Outdoor lighting effects are limited to daylight, sunset, and moonlight; interior scenes take place both in daylight and at night. A practical oil lamp is required.

II. Allan Turpin's handling of the material of James's novel:

A. The basic plot of the play is the same as that of the novel.

B. Several new and brief scenes have been added for Mrs. Prest. She is used as a tool by the playwrights; her visits serve to cement pieces from James together. However, the mechanics of getting Mrs. Prest on and off the stage are not always convincing.

C. Because the playwright has omitted the preliminary plotting between the editor and Mrs. Prest, the opening of the play seems rather abrupt and confusing.

D. Because the action is confined to only two settings, some of James's incidents have been relocated.

E. There are six characters in the play: Adams (James's unnamed editor); Miss Bordereau; Miss Tina; Mrs. Prest; the maid, Olimpia; and the doctor. They are the same as their prototypes.

F. Almost every word of James's dialogue (from the 1906 edition) has been used verbatim, except for minor changes—such as contractions. In addition, playwright Turpin has added some eight or nine pages of new dialogue. The styles match remarkably well.

G. The action of the play extends over four months in 1885, which is about the same time period as James had indicated.
III. Gained:

Nothing of importance has been added to James's work. The new scenes for Mrs. Prest merely serve to join together pieces of the original, or to help the action along.

IV. Lost:

A. The omission of the preliminary plotting between Mrs. Prest and the editor makes the beginning of the play seem abrupt and a little confusing.

B. There is no attempt to preserve the first person, point-of-view method of James's novel.

V. The Heiress by Ruth and Augustus Goetz:

Based on James's Washington Square

On February 21, 1879, James recorded in his notebook an anecdote told to him by the famous English actress, Fanny Kemble. The story concerned the engagement of Fanny's brother, Henry, to a "dull, plain, common-place girl . . . who had a handsome private fortune." The girl's father, the Master of King's College, Cambridge, objected to the proposed marriage on the grounds that the young man was only interested in his daughter's money. Mrs. Kemble herself had advised the girl not to marry her brother--a "handsome, selfish, impecunious soldier." When the father threatened to disinherit his only daughter, Henry Kemble had disentangled himself and had gone off with his regiment.

50 Matthiessen and Murdock, op. cit., p. 12.
51 Ibid., p. 13.
Some ten years later, Henry returned to England. He once more approached the girl on the question of marriage—her father having died in the meantime.

She refused him—it was too late. And yet, said Mrs. K., she cared for him—and she would have married no other man. But H.K.'s selfishness had over-reached itself and this was the retribution of time.52

Barely a year and a half after making this entry, James published his novel, *Washington Square*.53 He transferred the setting of the story from England to New York City, and he added extra characters to fill out the story. The Cambridge master was transformed into a doctor, and the daughter became Catherine Sloper.

Of *Washington Square*, F. W. Dupee made the observation,

[James] chose to treat Catherine Sloper's story more as a family story than as a love story; her aunt and her father are quite as important as her faithless suitor. It is a small subject, and an unmistakably psychological one; and James explores it to perfection, neither slighting his situations as he had done earlier [in his career], nor too industriously ransacking them as he was sometimes to do later on.54

James thought of *Washington Square* as one of his lesser novels; he did not even include it in the definitive New York edition of his works. Joseph Warren Beach points out,

[*Washington Square*] is anything but a typical work of James... the technique on the whole is much more suggestive of Mr. Howells

---

52Ibid.


than of the author of "The Portrait" and "The Ambassadors." . . . "Washington Square" is a very simple account of the love affair of a very simple woman.55

Washington Square opens with three chapters devoted to a resumé of events preceding the story proper. Here James presents a picture of the early married life of the prominent New York physician, Dr. Austin Sloper. Dr. Sloper had married a beautiful and rich woman, only to have the sorrow of losing her some five years later. The marriage had produced two children: a boy who had died at the age of three, and a girl. The mother had died less than two weeks after the birth of the second child, and the little girl had been given her mother's name, Catherine. When the child was aged ten, the doctor invited his widowed sister, Mrs. Lavinia Penniman, to live with them in his house in fashionable Washington Square.

Catherine was plain and dull, but affectionate and obedient. At the time when the main events of James's novel begin, Catherine was twenty-two. She was very shy and quiet, yet she was inclined to overdress—perhaps as a compensation for her personal reserve.

Catherine reached her maturity around 1850. James is not quite specific about the date.

Dr. Sloper had a second sister, a Mrs. Almond, who lived further uptown. Her youngest daughter, Marian, became engaged at the age of seventeen to a young stock-broker, Arthur Townsend. It was at Marian's engagement party that one of the most significant events in Catherine's

life occurred. She met and fell in love with Morris Townsend, a cousin of Arthur's.

During the weeks that followed, Morris was a frequent caller at Washington Square. Morris, a very handsome young man "upward of thirty," had no money and no prospects. He lived with his widowed sister, Mrs. Montgomery, on Second Avenue, and he served as a kind of tutor to her five children.

Dr. Sloper put Morris down as a fortune hunter. When Catherine announced that she and Morris were engaged, her father was most displeased. The doctor visited Mrs. Montgomery, and from her he gained confirmation of his belief that Morris was selfish. Mrs. Montgomery frankly warned the doctor not to let his daughter marry Morris.

Catherine's Aunt Penniman became Morris's confidante. She advised him to make a secret marriage to Catherine. Catherine told Morris that her father would disinherit her if they married, but she would still have an annual income of ten thousand dollars which had been left to her by her mother. Mrs. Penniman, meanwhile, changed her advice, for now she thought that Morris should bide his time until the doctor's attitude softened.

When Catherine told her father that she expected to get married soon, he asked her to put it off for six months and go to Europe with him. This the girl consented to do. However, their trip lasted twelve months instead of only six.

---

When the Slopers returned from Europe, Morris found that the father was as implacable as ever. The young man tried to get out of his engagement gracefully by saying that he had to go to New Orleans on business, but Catherine knew that he was leaving her.

Catherine told her father that it was she who had broken off the engagement. However, Dr. Sloper developed the idea that the girl and Morris had some kind of arrangement, and that they would get married after he died. This idea grew upon him, and it was reinforced by Catherine's refusal of other suitors in the years which followed. Eventually, when he was sixty-eight years old, the doctor broke his silence about the matter, and he asked his daughter to promise that she would not marry Morris after his death. The request injured Catherine's pride, and she refused to promise. About a year later the doctor died, and it was learned that he had changed his will so that Catherine received only one fifth of what had originally been left to her. The wording of the document showed that it was Catherine's refusal to render her promise about Morris that had made her father change his mind.

Catherine was to see Morris once more. During the summer of the year following Dr. Sloper's death, Mrs. Penniman informed Catherine that she had seen Morris, and that he was anxious to see her. A week later Morris called at Washington Square, on the aunt's invitation. Morris was by then a man of forty-five, with a "glossy perfumed beard," and thinning hair. Twenty years had passed since Catherine

57Ibid., p. 204.
had seen him, and she asked him clearly not to call again. Then, after
he had gone, she seated herself at her fancy-work—"for life, as it
were."*58

Unlike many of his later works, James wrote this novel simply
and objectively. The author referred to himself with the pronoun "I,"
and he addressed the reader directly. The sections of the novel were
not presented from the point of view of any one particular character.

In 1917, a dramatic version of Washington Square appeared on
Broadway. The title of the play was The Heiress, and the dramatization
was written by Ruth and Augustus Goetz.

The Heiress is divided into two acts, and it has a total of
seven scenes. The action takes place in a single setting: the front
parlor of Dr. Sloper's house in Washington Square.

The staging called for in The Heiress is quite simple. There
are no problems beyond a few sound effects: the doorbell rings, and
the front door is heard opening and closing at various times. A spinet
is played off-stage in the opening scene. Carriage wheels are heard
approaching the house, or leaving it. Only in the elopement scene,
Act II, Scene ii, are the sound effects really used to enhance the
action: a nearby church clock is heard chiming the quarter hours as
Catherine waits for her lover, and twice the sound of a passing car-
riage makes Catherine think that Morris has come for her. General
interior lighting is needed, and an oil lamp must be provided which
Catherine can carry.

58 Ibid., p. 206.
In transferring the novel to the stage, Ruth and Augustus Goets have presented Catherine unmistakably as the central figure. The new title, The Heiress, seems to signify their intent.

In an unpublished doctoral dissertation written at the University of Wisconsin, Thomas Napiecinski states,

In a preface to the British published edition of the play, Sir Ralph Richardson, who played the role of Doctor Sloper in the London production, writes of a conversation he had with the adapters. In this conversation, according to Richardson, the Goetses said that they considered Henry James a precursor of Freud, an artist who had got a glimpse of some of the same truths as Freud and had revealed them in his art years before the scientific mind had unified and codified them. That the playwrights saw Washington Square entirely in terms of Freudian psychology at least partially explains why, in The Heiress, they change Henry James' complex and many-faceted story into nothing much more than a case history of an abnormal father-daughter relationship.59

In his analysis of the play, Napiecinski stresses the change in thesis: James's purpose, he feels, was to present a sociological picture of a certain type of household produced by the fashionable New York society of the period. The doctor was the central figure of the novel, while the daughter has become the focal point of the play.60

In converting James's novel into a play, Ruth and Augustus Goets have maintained the same central characters with the same names. Catherine and Marian are a little older in the play, and Morris is somewhat younger than in James's book. The "servant" is now called Maria, and the part is quite well developed. The Goetses present Maria as a solicitous and genuine little person. There is also mention of an

---


60 Ibid., p. 761.
off-stage cook, to whom there is no parallel in the original work. Mrs. Almond's progeny and the five children of Mrs. Montgomery were never personalized by James, and they do not appear in the play.

The play opens when Catherine and Morris first meet. The occasion is not now an engagement party, but a simple family gathering. As in the book, the occasion serves to introduce Marian's new fiancé, Arthur, to the family, and Arthur has brought along his cousin Morris. The rest of Act I is devoted to the development of the romance between Catherine and Morris, and to her father's opposition. The act ends with Dr. Sloper's proposal that Catherine should go to Europe with him.

Act II opens six months later when the Slopers return from Europe. Morris proposes to Catherine that they elope. The girl makes the mistake of telling Morris that her father will never be reconciled to the marriage, and that they must depend on him for nothing. In the second scene of this act, Catherine is all packed and ready to elope; then, in perhaps the most poignant scene in the play, Catherine realizes that she has been jilted, and that Morris never loved her at all. In the third scene, Dr. Sloper is ill, and he tells Catherine that he will not recover. The last scene of the play takes place two years later, and the doctor has died in the interim. Morris turns up, and again he asks Catherine to marry him. She takes her revenge by consenting, and then, when he arrives to take her away, she coolly bolts the door and goes upstairs.

The year at the beginning of the play is 1650. This makes the date of the main action about the same as in James's novel, but the over-all time is greatly condensed. James's story, which extended over
forty years, has been reduced to less than three years in the play. The only significant time change, however, is the shortened interval between Morris's disappearance and his return following the doctor's death. In the novel, Morris had married someone else, and he had come back a widower after twenty years, but in the play Morris returns after a two-year absence.

A few important incidents of the novel which took place in other locations have now been transferred to Dr. Sloper's home. These include the opening party scene; Dr. Sloper's visit to Mrs. Montgomery; and part of a conversation which originally took place in Liverpool between Dr. Sloper and Catherine.

A high percentage of the dialogue of the play is transferred directly from James's novel. Whole conversations are lifted in toto. There are also many new lines in the play, and the styles match remarkably well. In many scenes of the play, conversations which took place on separate occasions in the book are now combined into a single episode.

Some of the incidents of the book now appear in new relative positions. For example, the Goetzses use the family gathering in the opening scene of the play to incorporate other incidents: on this occasion, instead of a few weeks later, Dr. Sloper questions his sister, Mrs. Almond, and learns of the existence of Morris's widowed sister; also in this scene, Dr. Sloper asks Morris what kind of position he is seeking. The way is prepared for the European trip when the doctor says that he plans to attend a medical congress in Paris shortly. Morris's many visits to the house when he is wooing Catherine are
condensed, in the play, to just three—and only one of these visits is witnessed by the audience. The two occasions on which Dr. Sloper insulted Morris in the novel are presented as one. Mrs. Penniman’s story of how her clergyman husband had performed a secret marriage for a runaway couple is now deferred until after the doctor and Catherine have left for Europe. In the novel, this anecdote was the basis for Mrs. Penniman’s plotting with Morris before the Slopers departed.

The Goetzes have injected a considerable body of new material into the story. Some of this new material is in the play for purely mechanical reasons, and some apparently for the purpose of emphasizing certain dramatic elements.

On the purely mechanical side may be listed the new opening of every scene, including the exposition at the beginning of the play. Other mechanical devices that the Goetzes have inserted for purposes of staging include getting Morris out of the room momentarily in Act I, Scene ii, on the rather obvious pretext that he has left a poem in his hat; also, the doctor sends Maria out with a note requesting Mrs. Montgomery to visit him; again, when Morris comes to ask Dr. Sloper for his daughter’s hand, the doctor hurries his two sisters off to their marketing—this not only gets rid of the ladies, but it also provides an amusing moment. Mention must be made also of the Goetzes’ planting of the fact that Morris uses bay rum, in Act I, Scene ii, so that the doctor may detect the aroma in the room when he returns unexpectedly in a later scene.

The Goetzes have created an effective closing to Act I by ending with a strong contest between Morris and the doctor. In the last two
pages of the act, the playwrights have combined three pieces of James's dialogue: the doctor's request to Catherine to give Morris up; her statement that they will marry quite soon, followed by the doctor's rejoinder, "Then it is no further concern of mine"; and the doctor's invitation to Catherine to go to Europe with him. In James's version, however, these exchanges between father and daughter did not take place in Morris's presence.

The biggest original contribution by the Goetzses is the elopement scene. This is Act II, Scene ii. In the book, the idea of an elopement remained a vaguely proposed plan. In the play, it marks the turning point for Catherine. She realizes that Morris has tricked her, that no one has ever loved her, and that no one ever will.

Everything else that the Goetzses have added is brief, and it all seems designed to heighten the dramatic impact of the play. In the first half of the play, all new items concerning Catherine increase the pathetic aspects of her position. Then, after the turning point of the elopement scene, all additions serve to emphasize the change in Catherine—her cold control of all situations, and her new and rather commanding manner.

Anyone who has seen the play performed will remember the impact of the business surrounding Catherine's red satin dress in the first act. This dress was described in James's novel as evidence of

---


62 Goetz, op. cit., p. 66.
Catherine's tendency to dress overelaborately. However, in the play, the Goetzes have used the dress as a means of cruelly contrasting Catherine with her dead mother.

Catherine: I thought you would like the color. It is cherry red. My mother used to wear it.
Mrs. Penniman: In her hair ribbons...
Dr. Sloper: Oh... yes. But, Catherine, your mother was dark—she dominated the color.63

Other little additions sprinkled through the first half of the play have the effect of demonstrating Catherine's social awkwardness, her shyness, her diffidence, and the adverse effect of her father's presence upon her powers of conversation. Similar in effect is Catherine's introduction to Mrs. Montgomery, which also never occurred in the novel.

Morris, in Act I, Scene ii, deliberately makes use of Catherine's shortcomings to ingratiate himself with her.

Catherine: I am not very good at this kind of conversation.
Morris: Neither am I. I am afraid that is our trouble—I am not a glib man, Miss Sloper.
Catherine: I think you talk very well.
Morris: Never when I need it most, never when I am with you. Oh, when I'm with Mrs. Penniman, or in my room at home, I can think of the most delightful things to say—Can you understand that?64

Later the playwrights make Morris defend Catherine against her father about her lack of a musical ear. Morris says that a great appreciation for music is sufficient talent.65

Another addition in the play is Catherine's eavesdropping when Morris pays his formal call on her father at the end of Act I.

---

63 Ibid., p. 11.
64 Ibid., p. 24.
Catherine runs down the stairs as Morris is about to depart, and her father comments that she is "without dignity."  

In the later scenes of the play, after the hoped for elopement, Catherine's manner changes. The following specific evidence of this change is new in the play. The girl's bitterness is seen as she says that she has no wish to go to her father's room when he becomes ill. During a transition period, Catherine makes excuses for Morris; she conceives the idea that he may be ill and unable to communicate with her. Catherine's real strength begins to show as she successfully hides from her cousin, Marian, that anything is the matter. Marian misses the irony about the trousseau that Catherine bought in Paris, and she innocently assumes that the baby clothes were bought for her own coming child.  

When the doctor reveals the seriousness of his illness, Catherine's behavior is even stronger than it was in the novel. She tells him straight out that Morris has jilted her, and she does this in such a manner as to injure her father's pride. She says bitterly that she had lived with her father for twenty years before she realized that he did not love her. This scene closes rather melodramatically as Catherine urges her father to alter his will while he is still well enough to do so, because she is not willing to promise that she will not "buy" Morris after her father's death.  

By the last scene of the play, the change in Catherine is complete. Catherine's caustic remarks to her Aunt Penniman and to the

---
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servant, Maria, provide immediate evidence of the change in her. The audience can see that it is Catherine who dominates the household. When Morris comes to beg her to forgive him, the playwrights have provided a number of lines for Catherine which are ambiguous, so that the audience will not be quite sure from her ironic double meanings whether Catherine is waveriing or just playing with Morris. Even her gift of the ruby buttons seems ironic in its implications. In opposition to James's own ending, the Goetses have Catherine state that she will never sew another sampler, for she feels that she can do anything now. The degree of her bitterness may be judged by her answer to her aunt's inquiry as to how she can be so cruel.

Catherine. Yes, I can be cruel. I have been taught by masters.67

(Perhaps the playwrights intended to recreate sympathy toward Catherine's bitterness with this line.) The final action which the Goetses have provided for Catherine shows her strong will: she dismisses her aunt for the night; she tells Maria to bolt the front door; and then she mounts the stairs as Morris knocks on the door and calls to her, while the curtain descends.

Since the foregoing list of new material for Catherine includes the majority of the material which the Goetses have added, their purpose is clear. In order to make Catherine unmistakably the central figure, they have built most of their new lines and business around her.

67Ibid., p. 89.
To this end, the playwrights have increased the number of lines contrasting Catherine with her dead mother. Also, the business of the mother's locked spinet, which the doctor keeps tuned, is the Goetzes' invention. So is the doctor's statement that he refrained from marrying again in order not to interfere with Catherine's chance to develop into her mother's likeness.

There are a couple of additional new items concerning Morris. His refined taste is visibly demonstrated in his admiration of the doctor's Venetian glass, and in his own gloves of fine chamois. These gloves make a contrast to Mrs. Montgomery's poor ones. New in the play, too, is Morris's hiding below stairs when the Slopers come home unexpectedly from Europe, and most of the scene when he comes out of hiding and tells Catherine of his elopement plan. When Catherine says she does not care if she is disinherited, the Goetzes show Morris's desire to escape as he suddenly inquires whether there was a noise, and then he leaves in some haste.

On the other hand, the Goetzes have omitted a fair amount of material which was not really essential to the progress of James's tale. As indicated earlier, all material prior to the time when Catherine reached her maturity has been omitted. In the play, Mrs. Penniman has only recently come to Washington Square, instead of having lived there since Catherine was aged ten. No mention is made of the little boy who died before Catherine was born. Gone are the little secret meetings between Mrs. Penniman and Morris—at an oyster saloon, outside a church, and so on—and the foolish aunt's constantly changing advice to him. Gone, too, is the long, long period during which
Catherine asked Morris to wait while she made up her mind what to do about their situation. The two serious talks between Dr. Sloper and Catherine in Europe have now been eliminated, although part of the Liverpool conversation is used in the play after their return.

After the return of the travelers, Morris no longer asks Mrs. Penniman to help him ease out of his engagement, and he no longer stages an unnecessary tiff with Catherine upon the occasion of his going to New Orleans "on business." In the play, Catherine does not keep Mrs. Penniman in the dark about what happened to break her engagement, and the girl does not visit Morris's house to make inquiries as to his whereabouts. Gone is the doctor's growing suspicion that there is a private arrangement between Catherine and Morris to wait until after his death to marry. The doctor still attempts to make Catherine promise not to marry Morris after his death, but it is only three days after their return from Europe rather than nineteen years afterwards. In the play, the doctor does not change his will to reduce his daughter's inheritance.

Here and there, the Goetzes have added an amusing touch—probably for the purpose of lightening the whole evening if not for actual comic relief. Quite a number of new lines which demonstrate the doctor's dry wit, always at the expense of others, have been added. Amusing moments in the play include such things as the doctor's absent-mindedness when he starts to go into his office while still wearing his hat; the doctor's inquiry as to how Mrs. Penniman likes his cigars; Mrs. Penniman's offer to come with Catherine on her elopement; the doctor's request that Mrs. Penniman be kept out of the sickroom unless
he goes into a coma; and, in the final scene, Mrs. Penniman's amused wonder as Catherine attends to various chores when, so Mrs. Penniman mistakenly believes, the girl should be making ready for her long deferred elopement.

**Summary**

In comparing the play, *The Heiress*, by Ruth and Augustus Goetz, with James's novel, *Washington Square*, the following items may be summarized.

I. **Staging**

   A. *The Heiress* has two acts, and a total of seven scenes. Only one setting is required: the front parlor of Dr. Sloper's house in Washington Square.

   B. The staging called for is quite simple. Sound effects are limited to a doorbell; the front door opening and closing; a spinet played off-stage; carriage wheels; and the chimes of a church clock. General interior lighting is needed, and a practical oil lamp is essential.

II. **The Goetzes' handling of the material of James's novel**

   A. The general progression of the plot is the same. However, there is a definite change in the emphasis, with Catherine now unmistakably the central figure.

   B. There are many new incidents in the play. Two of the most dramatic scenes are new: the elopement scene; and the play's memorable closing moments. A few incidents have been added which serve to emphasize the pathetic aspects of Catherine's
situation in the first half of the play, and the change in her character after she has been jilted.

C. Omitted from the play is James's introductory material about Catherine's childhood. Also eliminated are the scenes between Dr. Sloper and Catherine in Europe, although a small fraction of that particular dialogue has been retained. A few other minor incidents have also been omitted.

D. The main characters are the same, and they all retain their original names. The servant is now named Maria. There is an off-stage cook, who is a new figure in the play.

E. A high percentage of the dialogue is transferred in toto from the novel into the play. Many new lines have been added to the basic dialogue, and by far the majority of these new lines add to the dimensions of Catherine's character. The styles match remarkably well.

F. The over-all time is reduced from forty years to a little less than three years. The only significant difference that this change makes is that it brings Morris back after an absence of only two years, rather than twenty years. The date of the main action, 1850, is the same.

G. There is some re-positioning of James's material, but nothing of real significance.

III. Gained:

A. Two of the most highly dramatic scenes in the play are entirely the invention of the playwrights: the entire elopement scene, Act II, Scene ii; and the play's memorable closing
moments as Catherine mounts the stairs while Morris pounds on the front door.

B. There are some new amusing touches in the play, but these are entirely in accord with the dry, ironic humor which James employed in his novel.

IV. Lost:

The frank author-reader relationship of the novel has been lost.

VI. THE INNOCENTS BY WILLIAM ARCHIBALD: BASED ON JAMES'S THE TURN OF THE SCREW

Henry James's short novel, The Turn of the Screw, first appeared in serial form in the American magazine, Collier's Weekly, 27 January-16 April, 1898. Then, in October of 1898, the novelette was published in book form, together with "Covering End," under the general title of The Two Magics.68

In the preface to the 1908 definitive edition, James gives an account of the origin of The Turn of the Screw. The author recalls a country-house gathering at which ghost stories were told around the fire.69 James's host vaguely remembered a story which had been told to

---

68 According to the Edel and Laurence bibliography of James's works, there are some minor revisions between the serial and book publications. (Edel and Laurence, op. cit., pp. 113-114, and p. 331.)

him as a young man, and which concerned the spirits of some "bad"
servants who had appeared to some children. 70

James regarded The Turn of the Screw merely as a "shameless pot-
boiler," 71 and a "jeu d'esprit." 72

The first chapter of the novel serves as a prologue. In it, an
author, writing in the first person, describes how he heard a certain
story at a country-house gathering. The particular tale marked the
culmination of a series of ghost stories. One of the gathered company,
Douglas, had sent home for a manuscript which was an account of certain
events, as recorded by a governess, who by then was dead. By means of
this prologue, James elaborately postponed the beginning of the actual
story, while he built up the reader's suspense.

The governess's account covered a period extending from June
till some time in the autumn of an unidentified year, some forty years
prior to James's prologue. Although the novel is written in the first
person, the name of the governess is never revealed.

The governess had accepted a new position which involved looking
after two orphaned children, Flora and Miles, at Bly, a country-house
in Essex. The boy was away at school, but he was expelled and came
home a few days after the governess's arrival. No reason was given for
the expulsion, and the governess refrained from broaching the subject.

70 The "host" is identified as the father of Arthur Christopher
Benson in a letter from James to the younger Benson, dated March 11,
1898. See Percy Lubbock (ed.), The Letters of Henry James (London:
Methuen and Co., 1920), I, 286.

71 Lubbock, op. cit., I, 308. (Letter to H. G. Wells.)

72 Ibid., I, 306. (Letter to F. W. H. Myers.)
The children were charming, and the housekeeper, Mrs. Grose, was friendly, but the governess sensed hidden secrets and undercurrents. Twice the governess saw a strange man at Bly, and when she described him to Mrs. Grose, the description fitted Quint, a dead valet. Next, the figure of the previous—but now dead—governess, Miss Jessel, appeared beside a lake on the grounds, where Flora was playing while the new governess watched over her. The governess clearly saw the appari- tion, but the child seemed to be unaware of its presence.

From Mrs. Grose, the governess learned that the children used to be constantly in the company of both Quint and Miss Jessel. Further, it was revealed that a state of intimacy had existed between the valet and the ex-governess.

The new governess took it upon herself to save the children from the evil influence of the two spirits. On one particular occasion, the governess tried to force Flora to admit that she too could see Miss Jessel, but the frightened child only screamed and sought Mrs. Grose's protection.

The governess then sent Flora and Mrs. Grose away to London, to the home of Flora's uncle. Alone with Miles, the governess questioned the boy about what he had done at school to cause his expulsion. Miles admitted only that he had "said things."73 While the governess was questioning the boy, the figure of Quint appeared at the window. Only the governess actually saw Quint. Miles seemed to fight for self-control as he breathed hard and perspired under the pressure of the

73 James, *Turn of the Screw*, p. 306.
governess's interrogation. Then the terrified boy went white with apparent rage as he looked vainly around for the "horror" which the woman said was present. Finally, Miles collapsed and died in the governess's arms.

These are the bare facts of the ghost story. Perhaps more than any other of James's novels, The Turn of the Screw has given rise to controversy. Recently, a number of essays arguing the pros and cons of varied interpretations were collected and published under the title, A Casebook on Henry James's "The Turn of the Screw." These essays were written between 1920 and 1959. The interpretations vary from Harold C. Goddard's hallucination theory, and his belief that the governess was insane; to a Freudian reading by Oscar Cargill, who labels the governess as a "pathological liar," and who believes that James based part of his story on the illness of his own sister, Alice, and part on a case-history in an early Freud publication; to Edna Kenton's theory that James protected his governess by the very naivety of her story; to the proposition by Edmund Wilson that the hallucinations of the governess were the result of a neurotic sex repression.


75Ibid., p. 228.

76These articles from the Casebook may be found in their original sources as follows:
Harold C. Goddard, "A Pre-Freudian Reading of The Turn of the Screw," Nineteenth Century Fiction, XII (June, 1957), 1-36. (Gerald Willen gives the date of composition as about 1920.)
James himself labeled his work a "bogey-tale," which dealt with things so hideous that I felt that to save it at all it needed some infusion of beauty or prettiness, and the beauty of the pathetic was the only attainable—was indeed inevitable. But ah, the exposure indeed, the helpless plasticity of childhood that isn’t dear to somebody! That was my little tragedy . . . .77

To H. G. Wells, James wrote of the necessary childish psychology of the governess, and of the "singleness of effect" which he felt was imperative.78 For this purpose, it was necessary, James said, to eschew all subjective complications in the governess’s telling of her story.

In his preface to the 1908 edition, James stressed the necessity for his tale to keep "on terms with itself,"79 and he spoke of its tone as of an "incalculable sort—the tone of tragic, yet of exquisite, mystification."80

In creating his "ghosts," James said he did not attempt to present them in terms of to-day’s psychical apparitions. Quint and Miss Jessel were not ghosts but demons filled with a "villainy of motive,"81

Edna Kenton, "Henry James to the Ruminant Reader: The Turn of the Screw," The Arts, VI (November, 1924), 245-255.

In Willen’s Casebook, the four articles may be found on pp. 214-272 (Goddard); pp. 223-238 (Cargill); pp. 102-114 (Kenton); and pp. 115-153 (Wilson).

77Lubbock, op. cit., I, 304-305.
78Ibid., I, 306.
79James, Turn of the Screw, p. xvii.
80Ibid., p. xviii.
81Ibid., p. xx.
and "capable . . . of exerting, in respect to the children, the very worst action small victims so conditioned might be conceived as subject to." \textsuperscript{82}

James's aim, then, as he expressed it in a letter to F. W. H. Myers, was "to give the impression of the communication to the children of the most infernal and imaginable evil and danger . . . .\textsuperscript{83} He sought to create a situation which should "reek" with evil.\textsuperscript{84} However, since there can be no absolute for the "utmost conceivability,"\textsuperscript{85} James felt that if only he could make the reader's "vision of evil"\textsuperscript{86} strong enough, make the reader think the evil--create it for himself, then he, as author, would be "released from weak specifications."\textsuperscript{87} There was, said James, "not an inch of expatiation . . . from beginning to end," and he left his values as blanks except for "an excited horror, a promoted pity, [and] a created expertness."\textsuperscript{88}

Note may be taken of James's use of the approximately Aristotelian terms "pity" and "horror" here, and they may be connected with James's expression of "tragedy" as seen in the "helpless plasticity of childhood."\textsuperscript{89}

In 1950, William Archibald's play, The Innocents, based on Henry James's novel, The Turn of the Screw, opened in New York. The play is

\textsuperscript{82}Ibid., p. xxi. \textsuperscript{83}Lubbock, op. cit., I, 308.
\textsuperscript{84}James, Turn of the Screw, p. xx.
\textsuperscript{85}Ibid., p. xxi. \textsuperscript{86}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{87}Ibid., p. xxii. \textsuperscript{88}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{89}Lubbock, op. cit., I, 305.
in two acts and eight scenes—five of which form the first act. The year is specified as 1880.  

So many of the commentators have concentrated on the governess as the center of the tragic events, that it is particularly intriguing to find that William Archibald, in transferring the novel to the stage, has consciously made the children the tragic figures. In *Theatre Arts*, January, 1951, Archibald is quoted as saying,

... I was moved by a deep compassion for the children. ... This transference of tragedy from the governess to the children is, I believe the greatest difference between the book and the play. ... Not knowing the "why" of Henry James, I can only give my "because"; I wrote "The Innocents" for reasons of drama and for reasons of drama alone.

The theatrical magazine states, "For the stage Mr. Archibald chose ghosts rather than psychology, the externals rather than the hidden Freudian meanings."  

The title of the William Archibald play, *The Innocents*, emphasizes the playwright's avowed intention to make the children the center of attention. Archibald has condensed the novel's action of many months into a period of only four consecutive days. The speed of the action of the play tends to negate any gradual psychological build-up in the governess's mind, although, in itself, the shortened time element might not be enough to destroy the hallucination theory. However,

---

90 *The Turn of the Screw* was published in 1898, and the internal evidence in the prologue would place the events of the story quite a bit earlier than 1850. This would be some thirty or forty years earlier than in Archibald's dramatization.

91 *Theatre Arts*, XXXV (January, 1951), 58.

92 Ibid.
the one element which seems strengthened is Mrs. Grose's positive identification of the dead Quint from the governess's description of the man she has seen at the window. This single incident has been the hub of most arguments concerning James's ambiguity. In the play, however, the governess has had no time to learn from other sources—other than the housekeeper or the children—what Quint looked like. Thus, in the play, there seems less possibility of a double interpretation, and the ghosts must be accepted as real. This was, as has been noted, Archibald's stated intention.

Archibald has maintained the same number of main characters, and, as in James, there are little hints dropped which make the onlooker aware that other servants exist in the household. In neither version is the children's uncle made concrete through an actual appearance.

The names of the characters are identical in both versions. However, the unnamed governess becomes Miss Giddens in the play. Essentially, the play's characters are the same individuals as in the novel. There is a minor change in the age of Miles: in the original work, the boy was scarcely ten years old, but in the play he is twelve. Flora is eight years old in both versions.

There is no prologue in the play; no build-up in advance for a "ghost" story. The action begins with Miss Giddens' arrival to take up her new duties as governess, and it ends just four days later with the death of Miles.

All of the action of the play is confined to a single setting: the drawing room of a country house in Essex. This has necessitated
making all of the apparitions appear either indoors or outside the window. In the novel, the window at which Quint appeared was in the dining room, and it allowed him to be seen only from the waist up. (Some of the Freudian interpretations see a significance in this truncated vision.) In the novel, it was necessary for the governess to run out of the room, and then out and around the house, before she could determine whether there really was anyone outside. This always left the possibility that she had perhaps seen a prowler. In the play, however, the high window has become a French window, and the governess only hesitates a second before running straight out into the garden. Thus the disappearance of the "man" seems less explicable than in James's novel.

The figure of the woman visitant in the play requires some stage hocus-pocus. In Act II, Scene i, the dead governess, Miss Jessel, is required to appear on the staircase landing, and then to disappear. In the next scene, the same thing happens on another part of the set.

William Archibald makes an important, though subtle, change from the original at the moment of Miss Jessel's appearance in Act II, Scene i. Archibald has Flora turn, face the figure, and stretch out her hand toward it.93 In the novel, James was very careful never to have the children actually see the apparitions. For example, in The Turn of the Screw, when Miss Jessel first appeared by the lake, Flora's

back was turned, and only the governess positively saw the woman in black. 94

The basic progression of the plot is the same in the play as in the novel. However, there is some rearranging of minor incidents in the main body of the action.

Besides the elimination of James's prologue, there is some difference in the exposition of the play from the opening of the novel. The play opens with Flora on-stage, and a short scene takes place between the child and the housekeeper as they anticipate the arrival of the new governess. Miss Giddens has barely arrived before Archibald introduces evidence of certain aspects of the governess's behavior which are wholly Jamesian in nature—although the specific instances here are different. First, the new governess clasps the little girl and kisses her; in itself this might not be surprising, but in James the frequency of such clasping and kissing, plus the fact that the governess seemed to do it in moments of stress, seemed to have significance. Second, Archibald finds a way to show us very early the governess's habit of jumping to conclusions: Miss Giddens states positively that Flora is lonely, even though she has only just met the child. This habit of quick assumption is typical of James's heroine, although the particular exhibition of the characteristic is new.

The children's uncle is described in the opening scene of the play, and here again Archibald has made a significant change. In James's work, the uncle was a young bachelor man-about-town type, who

could not be bothered to look after his dead brother's children. In
the play, Mrs. Grose describes the uncle, saying, "He's not a young
man and he's never enjoyed good health—He was always a studious man—
wrapped up in his work." Thus Archibald eliminates the uncle as a
possible romantic interest for the governess.

A careful comparison of the novel and the play shows that Archi­
bald has shortened many scenes, and much of the dialogue. The several
chapters which James devoted to describing the charm of the children,
and the leisurely pace of their days, have been converted into new
scenes: story reading, a succession of little songs by Flora, and the
elaborately horrifying game of "dressing up" which closes Act I.

Of the twenty-four chapters in the novel, the bulk of ten chap­
ters has remained unused by Archibald for the play. The omission of
some of the ghostly appearances, as well as their change of location,
has already been mentioned. Other omitted material includes the
governess's awareness of her inability to broach the subject of the
ghosts to the children; her threat to leave if Mrs. Grose tells the
uncle what is going on; the scene outside the church between the
governess and Miles when the boy says he is going to write to his
uncle; the governess's encounter with Miss Jessel in the schoolroom;
the governess's strange alteration of the truth as she tells the


96 The original ballads in the play text were written by William
Archibald, according to Theatre Arts, XXX (January, 1951), p. 59. The
music for the 1950 New York production was by Alex North, according to
the Samuel French edition of the play (New York: Samuel French, c1951),
p. 4.
housekeeper about her meeting with Miss Jessel, and she states that the
ghost had said she was condemned to the torments of the damned—whereas
actually the ghost had been silent; the scene in Miles's bedroom, in
which the governess interrogates Miles about the past, and the boy,
wishing to be "let alone," blows out the candle; the disappearance of
Flora when she goes off to the lake by herself, and the governess's
frantic search for her; and the governess's order that the children are
to be kept apart, following the lakeside episode of Flora's hysteria.

James's novel contained a larger number of instances of the
governess's interrogations than occur in the play. The governess was
constantly questioning the housekeeper about the past, and it became
evident that she asked questions in the village too. The final ques­tion­ing of Miles, with its tragic consequence, lasted longer in the
novel than it does in the play, and James's reader is aware of the ten­sion building up over a period of many hours. On the other hand,
Archibald has perhaps intensified the final scene by having the govern­ness insist that Miles tell her where he first heard the vile things
which he repeated at school, while James only had her ask what those
things were.

Much of the material which James wrote so that it could have a
double interpretation is likewise omitted. A few of the more obvious
omissions include the governess's consciousness of a presence at the
lake even before she looked up and saw the figure of Miss Jessel; the
governess's certainty that Flora, on that occasion, was aware of Miss
Jessel's presence, but that the child deliberately increased her play
activity so as to fool her new governess; the governess's insistenc
that Mrs. Grose was holding something back out of modesty or timidity; the governess's feeling that the children wereironically conscious of her predicament, and her recognition that Miles knew he was therefore in control of the situation.

Closely allied to these ambiguous passages in James's work are the governess's assumptions that Quint has come for the boy when he appears at the window; that the children are already "lost"; that when Miles turns his back to her, it is an "embarrassed" back; and, in the final episode, that Miles's rendering of the name, Quint, is a tribute to the governess's devotion.

Archibald has not eliminated quite everything that could have a double interpretation in the original work. For instance, when Miss Giddens asks about the previous governess, Mrs. Grose answers in the past tense saying that he liked them young and pretty. Then, when the bewildered governess asks, "But of whom did you speak first?", the play's dialogue follows James's words exactly.

MRS. GROSE. (Blankly) Why, of him.
MISS GIDDENS. Of the master?
MRS. GROSE. Of who else?  

The foregoing section has described the major changes and omissions that William Archibald made in converting The Turn of the Screw into a play. It may be added that some of James's ideas turn up in different contexts, but these minor changes really make no difference. For example, the governess's fancy that Bly is like a great drifting
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ship with herself at the helm, becomes, in the play, a little story which Miss Giddens makes up to amuse Flora.

Archibald, as has been seen, has eliminated quite a bit of material from James's The Turn of the Screw. He has made some additions, however, and these serve to heighten the dramatic tension.

Mention has already been made of the songs which Archibald has invented for the children. These are all of a lugubrious nature, and they seem calculated to make an audience shudder. Add to this the weird things that imaginative little Flora says, and a disquieting atmosphere develops. For example, Flora tells Miss Giddens about the unused, empty rooms in the house, where it is possible to see from the markings where all of the furniture, and even the pictures and carpets, used to be. Flora wishes she could have a room like that. Similarly, it is Flora who collects dead beetles, and she sings a little song about them.

FLORA. . . . (Suddenly singing as she runs up to landing)
Beetles don't decay--
Beetles don't decay--
Beetles don't decay, my love,
Beetles don't decay--

In Act I, Scene v, the children's squeaky slate pencils make a nerve-racking sound—a sound which Flora seems almost to enjoy. Later that night, Miss Giddens is crouched on the floor, numb with terror after witnessing the encounter between Flora and Miss Jessel's ghost, and Flora runs into the room to hide behind the curtains. Flora is so intent upon her game that she does not even see Miss Giddens on the floor.

---
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This "game," followed by Miles's contemptuous attitude, brings Miss Giddens' hysteria to a climax at the end of Act II, Scene i.

Other little additions of Archibald's, which seem created in order to horrify the audience, include Mrs. Grose's description of how she found the body of Quint—lying with its eyes open, and with a look of great pain on its face. (In James, the body had been discovered by a laborer.) Further, Archibald specifies that Miss Jessel had killed herself, whereas James had left her death surrounded with mystery. Then, in the tragic final climax of the play, the figure of Quint raises his arms toward Miles; the boy says that Quint will hurt him, but that Miss Giddens does not understand, and he dies calling piteously to her. This is, indeed, a contrast to the novel, in which Miles called the governess a devil just before he died.

As for the actual staging of the play, many special effects are indicated in the script. These devices help to build the action effectively. Music is used to join all of the scenes in the play. Music and strange vibrations accompany the presence of the ghosts, whether they are seen or not. A ghost light is turned on for Miss Jessel's initial appearance, and Quint is seen as a shadow on the closed window curtains. The stage lights are dimmed at specified times, and once Archibald calls for an undulating light so that the room seems to lose its solidity (Act II, Scene ii). Thunder and wind effects are called for at the final climax of each act, and it is raining during a couple of scenes. All musical vibrations stop as Quint appears for the last time, but the new sound of a low thumping is heard. The thumping is the heart of little Miles, and it stops abruptly when he dies. With
his death, there comes a wind from the garden, and "dried leaves swirl across the threshold" of the French window.⁹⁹

Summary

In comparing the play, The Innocents, by William Archibald, with James's novel, The Turn of the Screw, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:

A. The Innocents is in two acts, and it has eight scenes. Only one setting is required: the drawing room of a country house in Essex, England.

B. Technically, this is an elaborate show. The sound effects include music, strange vibrating sounds, thunder, wind, insects at night, the ticking and the chimes of a grandfather clock, carriage wheels, and the thumping sound of the boy's heart.

The lighting must be carefully controlled in many areas of the stage, and the script calls for many light dims. There is a ghost light in the room; a man's shadow must be thrown against the window curtains; and one scene calls for an undulating lighting effect. The light outside the French window changes with the weather, and with the various times of day and night. The script also calls for candelabra, and for a practical oil lamp.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 81.
Special effects include billowing window curtains, rain, and leaves which swirl across the threshold of the French window.

II. William Archibald's handling of the material of James's novel:

A. The basic progression of the plot is the same. However, there is a change in the emphasis: the tragedy has been shifted from the governess to the children.

B. New in the play is the exposition, in which Flora and the housekeeper are anticipating the arrival of the new governess; some early evidence of the warm, impulsive nature of the governess; the weird songs and games of the children; and Mrs. Grose's description of Quint's dead body.

C. Omitted from the play is most of James's deliberately ambiguous material. Of the twenty-four chapters in the novel, the bulk of ten chapters is unused in the play. This has eliminated many details which did not materially alter the progression of James's tale. James's prologue has been eliminated.

D. Because there is only one setting in the play, some of the ghostly visitations have necessarily been relocated, and some have been omitted.

E. Some of James's ideas turn up in different contexts.

F. A few rather important details have been altered. The ghosts in the play are intended to be real. The unseen uncle has been made elderly, and there is no hint of a romantic interest
in that direction. There is a slight change in the boy's death, in that he seems afraid of Quint in the play.

G. The number of characters and their names are unchanged, but James's unnamed governess is now called Miss Giddens.

H. Perhaps somewhat less than one fifth of the play's dialogue comes from James, and that is condensed from the original.

I. The over-all time is reduced from nearly six months to only four consecutive days. The date in the play, 1880, is between thirty and forty years later than the date of the main events in James's work.

III. Gained:

A. The evil seems a little more specific and more physical in the dramatic version: Mrs. Grose's description of the affair between Quint and Miss Jessel is a little longer than in the novel, and the governess is a little more outright as she wonders how the two dead servants had used the children to shield their illicit relationship.

B. In order to heighten the dramatic tension, Archibald brings out the children's seemingly unconscious torture of their governess.

IV. Lost:

A. There has been no attempt to preserve the first person point-of-view method of James's novel.

B. The ambiguity of the original work has been removed.
VII. LETTER FROM PARIS BY DODIE SMITH:
BASED ON JAMES'S THE REVERBERATOR

Late in 1887, James made an entry in his notebook of an incident which had occurred while he had been in Italy the previous winter. A young American woman, Miss McC, had written a chatty letter to the New York World in which she had described—and exposed—the Venetian society whose hospitality she had recently enjoyed. She had acted in good faith, and she was amazed at the indignation which had resulted back in Venice. Using this actual event as a starting-point, James went on to outline a complete story. With a few subsequent changes, the story was published in the following year as a novel, The Reverberator.

Many years later, when The Reverberator was republished as part of the New York edition, James likened the central character, Francie Dosson, to Daisy Miller. Both were young American girls in Europe, and they had no sense of responsibility, and no frame of reference to guide them in their relations with people in the old world.

The story centers around an American family, the Dossons, who are making their second trip to Paris when the novel opens. The family
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consists of middle-aged Mr. Dosson, and his two daughters, Delia, and Francie. George Flack, a shipboard acquaintance of the previous year, sees them frequently. Flack is a reporter; he writes a column, "Letter From Paris," for an American newspaper, The Reverberator. Flack wishes to marry Francie, but her elder sister has higher plans for the girl. As for Francie, she is charming but docile, and she has no plans for herself.

Flack persuades Francie that she should have her portrait painted, and he takes the Dossons to the studio of a young American impressionist, Charles Waterlow. Waterlow is unable to take on more work, and it is arranged that the girls shall return in the autumn. At the studio is Gaston Probert, a friend of the artist, who is charmed with Francie. Gaston calls on the Dossons several times during the next couple of weeks, before he and Waterlow leave for a trip to Spain.

The following autumn, Francie's portrait is begun, and Gaston is often present at the sittings. Gaston, a Paris-born American, is in love with Francie; he wishes to marry her, but he is worried about whether his family will accept the girl. The Proberts are thoroughly Gallicized: Gaston's three sisters have married titled Frenchmen, and his American father has not been back to the States for thirty-five years. Gaston decides to work Francie into their good graces gradually, and he begins by arranging a meeting between Francie and his favorite sister, Suzanne.

In true French fashion, Gaston asks Mr. Dosson for Francie's hand. Mr. Dosson's only concern is that his daughter, his "chicken," should be happy. As for Francie, she confides to her sister that she
feels the marriage will never take place. She will do something terrible that will not be acceptable to Gaston's family. The Proberts seem to like Francie; they are resigned to Gaston's proposed marriage, and to a union with the Dosson family.

Mr. Dosson has some business that must be attended to in the States. Since Mr. Probert has some property there that should be looked after, it is arranged that Gaston will go over for both fathers.

While Gaston is away in America, Flack asks Francie to take him around to the studio to see her portrait. He would like to do a piece about it, and about her forthcoming marriage, for his paper. He asks her a number of questions about the exclusive society, the "grand monde," into which she is to marry. Flack encourages the girl to talk about her future in-laws, and she prattles merrily about the Proberts, and about their family problems, without realizing that Flack is going to use everything that she says.

Someone sends a copy of The Reverberator, with its damaging scandal column, to the Proberts. The family sends for Francie to see whether she knows anything about it. Suzanne receives Francie alone, and she tries to persuade Francie to deny that she had anything to do with it. Suzanne even suggests that Francie should blame her sister, Delia. Then the whole Probert family files in like a jury. Francie refuses to deny that she talked to Flack: she only says that she had no idea that Flack meant to publish anything except information about the portrait. She thought it would be fun to be in the papers.

Francie returns to the hotel in tears, and the members of her family try to comfort her. Delia thinks that Flack wrote the column
just to break up Francie's engagement. Now, for the first time, Francie sees a copy of the offending column, and she realises how her words have been twisted.

Francie wants to go away. She does not want to face Gaston. Susanne writes and tells Francie that the Proberts have decided to remain quiet until Gaston returns from the States. They have heard, in the meantime, that certain French newspapers intend to reproduce the column.

In response to a letter from Mr. Dosson, Flack comes back from Nice, where he has been staying. Flack tells Francie that he thinks the Proberts are just glad of an excuse to break her engagement. He asks Francie to marry him, but she tells him to go away.

Gaston returns from America, and he comes to see Francie twice. He reproaches her for her lack of delicacy, but he still wants to marry her. Francie says that it is all over; she had warned him that she would do something which would upset the Proberts. She knows that Gaston cannot give up his family, and, since they are too terribly different, she wishes to terminate the engagement. The girl tries to explain that she felt she owed something to Flack because it was he who had introduced her to Gaston.

Gaston goes to Waterlow's studio. Waterlow feels both compassion and contempt for his friend. He tells Gaston that the family tie is too strong; Gaston should marry for self-preservation. That night, Gaston goes to Francie and says that he has chosen her over his family. The next day, the Dosson family, including Gaston, leaves the hotel.
James closes his novel with the words, "they were even yet not at all clear as to where they were going." It seems likely that the author intended this to be taken metaphorically as well as literally.

In 1952, The Reverberator was made into a three-act play by Dodie Smith. It was given a new title, Letter From Paris.

The play contains nine scenes—three in each act, and it requires three settings: Charles Waterlow's studio; the Dossons' parlor at the hotel; and the library at Mr. Probert's house. (The description of the Dossons' parlor is copied from the novel.) The playwright suggests the use of a revolving or a swinging stage to take care of the many set changes—there are seven in all.

The stage effects call for nothing unusual, but, technically, this would be a fairly difficult show to run. The lighting must be carefully controlled to suggest many different times of day and seasons of the year. The sound effects too are not difficult, but there are rather a lot of them. They include the sounds of doors being slammed shut off-stage, doorbells, approaching carriages, a flute being practiced, and piano music. Francie's portrait, almost finished, is seen by the audience.

The action of the play is in Paris in the late eighteen-eighties. The general progression of the plot is the same as in the novel, but the playwright begins further along in the events. As the play opens, Waterlow and Gaston are planning their trip to Spain—a trip which they

---
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never make in the dramatized version. Flack turns up with the Dossoms, whom he introduces, and so the exposition is accomplished. The two young men postpone their trip so that Waterlow may paint Francis's portrait.

The opening scene is just one of several condensations which the playwright has made in the over-all time of the events. In the novel, the time covered was about one year. In the play, the action covers four months: from April until August.

The characters remain exactly the same in the play as they had been in the novel, and they retain their original names. Omitted are some purely incidental characters who really contributed nothing to the events of the novel: people like old Madame d'Outreville, who visited Susanne one day; and various waiters and carriage drivers. The number of Gaston's sisters has been reduced from three to two--as have his brothers-in-law.

As for the dialogue, Dodie Smith has skilfully woven together her own and James's. The style of the writing in the novel was relatively simple and straightforward; it was written during James's middle period. The Reverberator was not a "talky" novel, and many conversational episodes in it were described by the author rather than presented in dialogue form. Much of the dialogue which James did provide, however, has been utilized verbatim, and yet the final impression of the play's dialogue is not that of patchwork.
Here and there in the novel, James indicated that the grammar and the pronunciations used by the Dossons were not always what they should have been. Dodie Smith has echoed this but slightly in the play. It might be added that there is less French spoken than in the original work.

On the whole, The Reverberator was a slow-moving work. The action of the play, on the other hand, does not lag. As has been pointed out, the over-all time of the action has been condensed in the play. Many little formal calls have been left out. The background of the friendship between Flack and the Dossons has been omitted. The play ends with the reconciliation of Francie and Gaston, so that the happy yet peculiarly doubtful note of the end of the novel is avoided.

Action which could not have been staged easily has been eliminated. There are no carriage rides, and no visits to the circus or to restaurants in the play.

The playwright has added little incidents of her own in Letter From Paris. For example, when Francie and Gaston first meet at the artist's studio, Gaston saves Francie from falling off the balcony; this makes their first meeting rather vividly romantic. At the end of the play, Francie comes to keep a promised appointment at Waterlow's studio. Unknown to her, Gaston has been visiting his friend. Gaston comes in unexpectedly from the balcony, and the play ends with their reconciliation on the same spot as their first meeting.

Some of Miss Smith's additions make certain points clearer than they had been in the novel. In the play, Flack writes in a notebook while Francie chats about the Proberts; thus the audience, if not
Francie, can see his intentions. At the family conclave, when the
Proberts are reading the scandalous column, Maxime—Susanne's husband—
needs to have it translated; thus the playwright is able to set forth
clearly just what the column says. It seems clearer than in the novel
just how Flack twisted what Francie had said. Marguerite de Cliché,
Susanne's sister, is so upset that their father shepherds her out of
the room before Francie's expected arrival. Under these circumstances,
it seems more natural that Suzanne has the opportunity to receive
Francie alone before the other Proberts see her.

Miss Smith has heightened the tension of the latter half of the
play with little additions. At the Proberts' house, Marguerite keeps
saying spiteful things to Francie which makes the American girl lose
her self-control. Gaston returns just after this—in the midst of the
uproar. In the next scene, at the hotel, Delia has laid out a pile of
Reverberators which she intends to mail to friends in America; Gaston
sees them and is dumbfounded. Francie gives the engagement ring back
to Gaston in the play, so that the break is more definite.

Summary

In comparing Dodie Smith's play, Letter From Paris, with James's
novel, The Reverberator, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:

A. Letter From Paris has three acts in nine scenes. Although
only three settings are required, there are seven set
changes in all. The settings are an artist's studio; the
Dossons' parlor at a hotel; and the Proberts' library.
B. Technically, this would be a fairly difficult show to run. It calls for many little lighting changes, and there are many sound effects.

II. Dodie Smith's handling of the material of James's novel:

A. The general progression of the plot is the same, but the play starts later in the succession of events.

B. The over-all time is reduced from one year to four months, but the period, the 1880's, is the same.

C. The general movement of the play is faster than that of the novel, partly because many unimportant passing events are omitted.

D. The main characters are exactly the same, and they retain their original names. A few lesser characters in the novel have been eliminated.

E. Much of James's dialogue has been incorporated into the play verbatim. However, the bulk of the dialogue is, of necessity, Dodie Smith's own. The styles match. (The novel was of James's middle period, but still relatively simple.)

F. The playwright has added many little incidents of her own. Some of these additions make certain points clearer than they had been in the novel; other additions heighten the dramatic tension.

III. Gained:

A. On a few points, the play seems clearer than the novel.

B. The dramatic tension seems to have been increased.
IV. Lost:

A. The omniscient author is no longer present.

B. There is less French spoken in the play than in the novel.

C. Many unimportant passing events in the novel are omitted from the play.

VIII. "PORTRAIT OF A LADY," A DRAMATIZATION

BY WILLIAM ARCHIBALD

James's successful novel, The Portrait of a Lady, was mostly written in Italy, in 1880 and 1881, and it began appearing in serialized form on both sides of the Atlantic before the writing was completed.106 The first book editions were published in 1881.107 In his preface to the later definitive New York edition, James recalled that the novel had been built around its central character, Isabel Archer.108 It is known that Isabel, like the later Milly Theale in The Wings of the Dove, was influenced by James's memory of his dead cousin, Minny Temple.109 The novel is divided into fifty-five chapters, and it is about five hundred pages in length.


109 Ibid., p. xiv. (Introduction by Leon Edel.)
The "lady" of the title is Isabel Archer, a young American woman from Albany, New York. As the novel opens, in the summer of 1870, Isabel has just arrived at Gardencourt, located some forty miles from London, where she is to stay with some hitherto unknown relatives, the Touchetts. Mr. Touchett, Isabel's uncle, is an American banker; he is old and ailing, and he lives with his consumptive son, Ralph. Mrs. Touchett habitually lives apart from her husband, in Florence, Italy, but this summer she is at home.

During the summer, Isabel refuses two proposals of marriage: one is made by Lord Warburton, a friend of Ralph's; and the other is made by Caspar Goodwood, an admirer who followed Isabel from America. For a while, Isabel is joined at Gardencourt by a lady journalist friend, Henrietta Stackpole. At about this time, Isabel meets Madame Merle, who is destined to change her whole future.

Old Mr. Touchett dies in the autumn, and he leaves Isabel a fortune. Unknown to anyone, Ralph had persuaded his father to change his will so that Isabel should receive half of his own inheritance, for he had a great curiosity to know what Isabel would do with her life if she were truly independent.

Mrs. Touchett takes her niece to the Continent. In Paris, Isabel sees Henrietta constantly, and she encounters Ned Rosier, whom she had known in her childhood. Isabel and her aunt then make their way via the Italian riviera to Florence.

Suddenly, in Chapter Twenty-two, the novelist introduces a new set of characters. Gilbert Osmond, an indolent American, has just brought home to Florence his teen-aged daughter, Pansy. It is spring,
and the motherless girl has just left a convent school in Rome. Madame Merle calls on Osmond. She tells him about Isabel Archer: the girl is young and ignorant, and she possesses a fortune. It is Madame Merle's plan that Osmond should marry Isabel.

At the Palazzo Crescentini, Mrs. Touchett's home in Florence, Madame Merle introduces Isabel to Osmond. Osmond frequently calls on Isabel, and when she goes to Rome with Ralph and some friends, Osmond turns up and joins the group.

During the next year, Isabel does a great deal of travelling. She is accompanied successively by her aunt; by her sister and her brother-in-law; and finally by Madame Merle.

After her return to Florence in the late spring, Isabel announces her engagement to Osmond. Mrs. Touchett and Ralph think that she is making a mistake, and so does Osmond's sister, the Countess Gemini. Caspar Goodwood comes over from America in a futile effort to prevent the marriage.

At this point in his novel, James jumps forward four years to the autumn of 1876. The Osmonds now live in Rome, at the Palazzo Roccanera, where it is their custom to hold social evenings every Thursday. Lord Warburton and Ralph come to Rome together, but Ralph is very ill and he is confined to his hotel.

Ned Rosier is paying court to Osmond's daughter, Pansy, but her father disapproves of the young man because his fortune is too small. Ned appeals both to Madame Merle and to Isabel to help him, but he receives little encouragement. Isabel is unwilling to oppose her
husband's wishes, and Madame Merle has set her heart on seeing Pansy marry Lord Warburton.

One night, Osmond gives Isabel to understand that he expects her to lead Lord Warburton to propose to Pansy. Isabel sits up most of that night thinking about her marriage. She realizes that Osmond regards her as a possession. He objects to her having a mind of her own. Osmond even objects to her visiting her dying cousin, Ralph, at his hotel, because he thinks it is indecent.

When Lord Warburton suddenly returns to England a week later, Osmond accuses Isabel of working against him. Immediately after Lord Warburton's departure, Madame Merle comes to Isabel demanding to know the truth. Did Warburton get tired of little Pansy, or did he give the girl up to please Isabel? Isabel realizes with horror that Madame Merle had controlled her at the time of her own marriage.

Henrietta Stackpole and Caspar Goodwood are both in Rome at this time, and they look after Ralph at his hotel. At the end of February, Ralph decides to return to England, in order that he may die at home. Henrietta and Caspar, Isabel's two faithful friends, travel with Ralph on his homeward journey.

One day in March, Isabel, Pansy, and the Countess Gemini encounter Ned Rosier while they are visiting the Coliseum. Ned tells Isabel that he has sold his "bibelots" in the hope that the fifty thousand dollars which they brought will gain him favor in the eyes of Mr. Osmond, but Isabel does not hold out any hope to him. A week later, without even consulting his wife, Osmond sends Pansy to the convent so that she can think things over.
A telegram arrives a week later with the news that Ralph is dying, and that he wishes to see Isabel. Osmond opposes Isabel's desire to go to England. The Countess Gemini sees that Isabel is desperately unhappy, and she decides to reveal certain facts about the past in order that Isabel will no longer respect either her husband or his wishes. The Countess discloses that Pansy is really the daughter of Madame Merle, and that the story of the death of Osmond's first wife in childbirth had been a fabrication. Madame Merle had not married Osmond herself because he had no money, but she had wished him to marry Isabel so that the child's future should be assured.

Having decided to go to England, Isabel visits the convent to bid farewell to Pansy. Isabel promises the girl that she will return; she will not desert her. Madame Merle has come to the convent on a similar mission, and the meeting between the two women is cool. Madame Merle reveals to Isabel that she has Ralph to thank for her wealth.

Three days after her arrival at Gardencourt, Isabel has a long talk with Ralph. All barriers are down between them. Ralph believes that he has ruined her; she has been "ground in the very mill of the conventional!" The unhappy Isabel tells her cousin that Osmond married her for her money.

Ralph dies the next morning. Present at the funeral are Lord Warburton, Henrietta, Mr. Bantling—to whom Henrietta is engaged, and Caspar Goodwood.
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A week later, Caspar tries hard to persuade Isabel not to return to Rome. He kisses her violently, but Isabel dislikes his aggressiveness.

Two days later, Caspar calls on Henrietta in London, hoping to find Isabel there. He learns that Isabel has made her decision, and that she has gone back to her husband in Rome. Thus the novel ends with Isabel unwilling, or unable, to break with her destiny.

In 1954, William Archibald's dramatization of James's The Portrait of a Lady was seen on Broadway. The playwright kept James's title, when he turned the novel into a three-act play.111

Archibald's play has eight scenes, but only two settings are required. One set shows simultaneously the garden, and the interior of the conservatory at Gardencourt, the English home of Mr. Touchett. The other set represents the terrace of Gilbert Osmond's villa in Florence, Italy. The action is thus confined to two locations, and much of the movement of the novel has been eliminated.

"Portrait of a Lady" would be a fairly simple show to produce. The script calls for controlled area lighting when the Gardencourt set is in use: the lighting shifts the attention of the audience back and forth between the conservatory and the garden outside. The lighting also varies from bright sunlight, to twilight, and to moonlight. Sound effects are limited to off-stage piano playing.

111William Archibald, the playwright, kindly allowed the writer of the present study to make a Xerox copy of an unpublished manuscript of the play. In a letter to the present writer, dated August 10, 1965, Archibald indicated that the copy "was not used as is for the production--there were many changes made (some good--many bad)."
William Archibald has maintained the general outline of James's novel, but he has eliminated about eighteen of the characters. The remaining eleven characters keep their original names: Isabel Archer, Ralph Touchett, Mr. and Mrs. Touchett, Lord Warburton, Henrietta Stackpole, Madame Serena Merle, Gilbert Osmond, Pansy Osmond, and the Countess Gemini. The role of Caspar Goodwood is greatly diminished in importance, and he is limited to a single appearance on stage, in Act I. Ned Rosier is never seen on-stage at all, but he is mentioned frequently. Mr. Bantling, to whom Henrietta became engaged in the novel, does not exist in the play.

The relationships between the characters are the same as in the novel, and in several instances the physical description of a character is based directly on the book.

The time span of the novel covers nearly seven years: from the summer of 1870 to the spring of 1877. The action of the play has been reduced to just under two years, and it is laid "in the Eighteen Seventies." 112

To accomplish this condensation of time, Archibald has combined and rearranged much of James's material. When the play opens, Isabel has already been staying at Gardencourt for a month; thus the episodes in Albany, and the descriptions of Isabel's girlhood and of her earlier friendship with Henrietta are omitted. The play ends at the moment of Ralph's death, and thus the funeral and subsequent events are eliminated.

112 William Archibald, "Portrait of a Lady" (unpublished manuscript), I, i, l.
Several times in the novel, James jumped backwards in time. The play, on the other hand, progresses straight forward, and it is therefore clearer in this respect than the original work.

More than half of the play's dialogue is taken from the novel. Many long passages have been shortened, and often new lines have been interspersed among the old. Many of James's speeches now turn up under different circumstances.

Sometimes the staging mechanics are a little obvious. For example, in Act II, Scene iii, Mrs. Touchett, Madame Merle, and then Ralph, come out in turn onto the terrace to express to Isabel their individual reactions to the announcement of her forthcoming marriage.

The structure of the play leaves room for improvement. The audience might wonder why Caspar Goodwood is introduced at all: Caspar has an ardent scene with Isabel in Act I; then, later in the play, it is mentioned that Isabel refused to see him in Italy, but nothing comes of it all. Ned Rosier is spoken of as a suitor for Pansy's hand, but he is never seen on-stage. Thus it might be hard for an audience to accept the seriousness of the situation, as well as the unexpected banishment of the seventeen-year-old Pansy to a convent.

The closing moments of the play are a little vague, and the termination seems abrupt. The dying Ralph has, in effect, said farewell to Isabel. He lies alone in the conservatory, and his mother and Isabel are in the garden. Suddenly, Isabel starts as though some one

113 The structure of the play may have been revised somewhat before the Broadway opening, as indicated in footnote number 111.
had called her. Mrs. Touchett hears nothing. Curtain. This is all there is to tell the audience that Ralph has died.  

On the other hand, Archibald provides a clearer motivation for Isabel's decision to return to her husband. In the play, Isabel wishes to help Pansy get away from her father.

In the play, it is mentioned that Ralph had been ill and confined to a "hospital" while visiting Italy, and that Osmond had objected to Isabel's visits to Ralph as indecent. In the novel, Isabel had visited the ailing Ralph in his "hotel" room, and so her husband's objections seemed to have more point.

In some ways, the play may have improved upon the novel. The straightforward organization and development is clearer. Some of the conversations have been tightened: one result of this is that Ralph's love for Isabel comes through more clearly, because the lines which reveal his feelings are less buried. New lines given to the Countess Gemini emphasize her sarcasm and worldliness. Archibald has also added a number of tasteful quips of his own.

In addition, Archibald has written some new lines to create dramatic intensity. For example, Act II, Scene ii, closes with a new and strong implication of a close association in the past between Madame Merle and Osmond. Then, at the close of Act III, Scene i, Isabel tells Osmond that she realizes that he hates her. (In the novel, Isabel did not give voice to her realization.) Archibald again heightens the dramatic tension by letting Osmond be present when his

111 It seems likely that the ending may have been reworked prior to the Broadway performances.
sister reveals to Isabel the truth about Pansy's parentage. Nevertheless, no new major events have been added in the play.

Another value which Archibald has added to the play is a touch of symbolism. In Act II, Scene iii, when Isabel leaves Ralph desolate and alone on the terrace, she shuts the door, and the light which had streamed across the terrace vanishes with her. The cackling laughter of the worldly Countess Gemini, which is heard from the house, punctuates this same scene. The Countess's description of Osmond's house as a "fagade" may also be intended to be symbolical.\(^{115}\)

Certain items from the novel have been noticeably omitted from the play. The closeness between Isabel and her uncle, Mr. Touchett, is not gradually built up as it was in the novel, and the audience is spared the uncle's long, lingering death. There is no mention, in the play, of a baby boy born to Isabel and Osmond. (The child, in the novel, died at the age of six months.) The long courtship of Ned Rosier and Pansy is not witnessed by the audience, since the young man is never seen on-stage.

**Summary**

In comparing William Archibald's play, "Portrait of a Lady," with James's novel of the same title, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:

A. Archibald's three-act play is divided into eight scenes. Two settings are required: one set shows simultaneously the garden and the interior of the conservatory at Gardencourt, in England; and the other set shows the terrace of Osmond's villa in Florence.

B. Technically, "Portrait of a Lady" would be fairly simple to produce. Controlled area lighting is needed, as well as effects of bright sunlight, twilight, and moonlight. Sound effects are limited to off-stage piano playing.

II. William Archibald's handling of the material of James's novel:

A. The general outline of James's novel has been maintained. However, the structure of the play is not really well-balanced.

B. Because the action is limited to two sets, the play does not have the movement of the novel.

C. Sometimes the mechanics of moving characters on or off the stage are a little too obvious.

D. The number of characters is reduced from about thirty to eleven; they keep their original names, and the relationships between them are the same.

E. The over-all time is reduced from seven years to two years, but it is still in the eighteen-seventies.

F. The time progression of the play is straightforward: it has no backward jumps as does the novel. The action of the play
begins one month after Isabel's arrival at Gardencourt, and it ends with Ralph's death.

G. Much of James's material has been rearranged or combined.

H. More than half of the play's dialogue is taken from the novel, and much of that is condensed.

I. No new major scenes or events have been added.

III. Gained:

A. Although Archibald's "Portrait of a Lady" could by no means be called a humorous play, the playwright has added a number of tasteful quips to James's work.

B. The straight-forward organization is clearer than that of the novel.

C. Some of James's dialogue has been tightened.

D. The dramatic intensity is heightened with new lines here and there.

E. A touch of symbolism has been added.

IV. Lost:

A. The omniscient author has vanished.

B. Noticeable omissions include the developing closeness between Isabel and her uncle; the long drawn-out death of the uncle; and the loss of Isabel's infant son.

C. Since Ned Rosier is never seen on-stage, his long courtship of Pansy, and her consequent banishment to a convent have less impact than in the novel.
IX. CHILD OF FORTUNE BY GUY BOLTON: BASED ON JAMES'S THE WINGS OF THE DOVE

In the preface to the 1909 edition of *The Wings of the Dove*, Henry James says that the theme of the story represents to his memory "a very old—if I should n't perhaps rather say a very young—motive." This refers to his long cherished idea of weaving a story around a young person, eager for life, but stricken and doomed by illness. The first appearance of the theme in the author's notebooks appeared on November 3, 1894, and again on November 7, at which time James thought that the central person should preferably be a woman, and perhaps an American. This was at the time when his play, *Guy Domville*, was about to go into rehearsal, and James mentioned in his notes that possibly his idea would make a three-act play. For a play, James supposed that he would have to write a happy ending. Following the failure of *Guy Domville*, James indicated in a notation on February 14, 1895, that he was still impressed with the general plot idea. In December of that same year, James recorded a tentative title for his now proposed novel, *La Mourante*. Eventually, the title became *The Wings of the Dove*, and the work was first published in 1902.

The theme which James referred to as being very old—or very young—seems to refer to the death at an early age of James's cousin, Henry James, *The Wings of the Dove* (2 vols); New York: Modern Library, c1937), p. v.


Ibid., p. 233.

Edel and Laurence, *op. cit.*, p. 120.
Mary Temple. F. O. Matthiessen, the editor of the *Notebooks*, states that it is impossible to say at what point the idea for the novel merged with James's memory of his dead cousin. Mary, or, as she was known in the family, "Minnie" Temple, was a very lovely young girl, who died of tuberculosis while in her early twenties. James has devoted the entire final chapter of his autobiographical work, *Notes of a Son and Brother*, to a tribute to Minnie Temple. The author states that the death of their cousin, Minnie, marked the end of their youth for both himself and for his brother, William James. It seems significant that James, writing in 1913, said that the image of Minnie, which was long to remain with me, appeared so of the essence of tragedy that I was in the far-off aftertime to seek to lay the ghost by wrapping it, a particular occasion aiding, in the beauty and dignity of art.

Here, then, is the basis and real center of *The Wings of the Dove*. Milly Theale, young, beautiful, orphaned, and American, is dying of an unnamed ailment. Milly is extremely rich, and she is traveling with a companion, Mrs. Stringham, in Europe. While she is in England, Milly learns from an eminent physician how seriously ill she really is.

In England, Mrs. Stringham looks up an old girlhood friend, Mrs. Lowder—now a London matron of considerable proportions. Mrs. Lowder—

---


121 Ibid. The figure of Minnie actually appears in more than one of James's writings. In James's story, "Georgina's Reasons," two girls appear: Mildred Theory, an invalid, and her sister, Kate Theory. In *The Wings of the Dove*, the central character is the dying Milly Theale, and her false friend is Kate Croy. Minnie Temple, James's real-life cousin, had a sister named Katherine. The similarity of the various names is inescapable.
is only too happy to receive Milly, for the older woman sees how she can use the wealthy Milly as a means of access to the higher echelons of society. Kate Croy, a niece who lives with Mrs. Lowder, becomes Milly's close friend.

Kate is secretly affianced to a journalist, Merton Densher, but, knowing that her aunt would disapprove of the young man's lack of financial means, Kate does not even tell her friend, Milly, of the engagement. Instead, Kate schemes to have Densher make Milly fall in love with him, in the hope that the dying girl will leave him her money. Kate is even willing to have her lover go so far as to marry Milly if necessary.

With the coming of the hot summer months, Milly decides to go to Italy, and she accordingly rents a Venetian palace. Her new friends, Mrs. Lowder and Kate Croy, go with her to Venice, and Merton Densher follows them independently. In Venice, Densher's conscience pains him so that he wishes to back out of Kate's plans; in fact, his condition for going through with the scheme is that Kate shall come to his rooms as a pledge of their love. This she does, a night or so before she and her aunt are due to return to England.

Left in Venice, Densher proceeds to court Milly. Unfortunately for his plans, Lord Mark arrives. Lord Mark is a young Englishman, a member of the impoverished nobility, who has proposed marriage to both Kate and Milly, and he has come to Venice for the express purpose of telling Milly that Kate has been engaged to Densher all along. Milly gives orders that Densher is not to be admitted to the palace any more. Still, Densher stays in the city, for his strained conscience will not
let him leave. Milly, disappointed in her love, gives up all hope: she "has turned her face to the wall." However, she sends for Densher, and apparently she forgives him.

After Densher's return to England, Milly dies. A final letter to Densher from Milly arrives, and Densher brings it to his fiancée, Kate, to open or not as she sees fit. In an almost unbearably poignant scene, Kate decides that it would be better for them not to read it, and together they watch the letter burn on the fire. Soon, however, a letter from an American lawyer informs Densher that he is included in Milly's will. Subsequently, when a bulky envelope arrives from the lawyer, Densher sends the envelope to Kate. She brings the envelope back to him—having first broken the seal. Densher declares that he does not even want to know what the size of the bequest is, and he states that Kate must make a choice: either they must marry as they are, without the money, or she may have the money for herself if she wishes. Kate sees clearly that their love can never be as it was, for they are not as they were. The book ends inconclusively. James leaves it up to the reader to decide whether or not Kate takes the money. In any case, she has lost Densher.

James has developed his story in a leisurely fashion. The resulting novel, one of his three last major works, is almost eight hundred pages long, and it is divided into two volumes.

In 1956, Guy Bolton converted James's long novel, The Wings of the Dove, into a three-act play, which was produced in New York. The play had a new title, Child of Fortune.

---

122 James, Wings of the Dove, II, 294.
The play only calls for two settings: the morning room at Mrs. Lowder's home in London, for Act I; and a private sitting room in the Palazzo Leporelli in Venice, for Acts II and III.

Bolton has opened his play with a kind of prologue in one paragraph. The stage lights go on to reveal a portrait of a lady in sixteenth century dress, and "a voice that may be that of a guide or gallery attendant speaks on a mike." The voice describes the portrait as the work of Bronzino, and it states that the painting now belongs to "the well-known writer, Richard Denning, and this treasured possession was . . . the inspiration of his autobiographical novel CHILD OF FORTUNE." What is important about the portrait is that there is a very strong resemblance between Milly and the original sitter, one Caterina Sorenzo, and that Milly left the portrait to Richard Denning in her will.

In James's novel, there was indeed such a portrait, but it was discovered by Lord Mark at a country house in England; whereas, in the play, Milly purchased the portrait in Venice. Bolton heightens the interest in the Bronzino portrait by inventing a gruesomely romantic story of feminine revenge to go with it.

Basically, the plot of the play is the same as that of the novel. The first act is equivalent to over three-quarters of the entire two-volume novel.
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The locale of some of the incidents has necessarily been changed to simplify the staging. By means of the simple expedient of having Milly and Mrs. Shepherd stay with Mrs. Lowder at her London home, instead of at a hotel, playwright Bolton has eliminated all kinds of luncheons, dinners, and other comings and goings that were in the book. Similarly, the opening scene of the book, in which Kate called at her father's lodgings, has now been turned around so that, in the play, it is Lionel who calls on his daughter, Kate.

The names of some of the characters in the play are changed slightly. However, the new names are so close to the original ones that there is no room for confusion. Milly Theale has become Milly Temple; Merton Densher has become Richard Denning; and Mrs. Susan Shepherd Stringham has been simplified to Susan Shepherd; but Kate Croy, Lionel Croy, Mrs. Maud Lowder, Lord Mark, and the Major-domo, Eugenio, have all retained their original names intact. The presence of various servants was understood in the book, and these have become personalized for the stage in Bennett—a servant at Mrs. Lowder's home, and Bianca—a maid in the Venetian palace.

Kate's sister, Marian, does not appear in the play, and thus all scenes which took place in her humble Chelsea house have been eliminated. Marian is still referred to, however, as a horrible example of

125 According to a letter, dated May 4, 1963, from Guy Bolton to the writer of this dissertation, Milly's last name was changed to Temple because of the association with James's cousin, "Minnie" Temple, and because "Temple is a singularly attractive name." Merton Densher's name was changed because the play's producer, Jed Harris, "insisted that Densher sounded like denture and Merton has an association with 'Merton of the Movies' a very great stage success of the twenties."
what happens when a woman marries for love alone: she thereby fulfills the same function as she did in the novel. (With Marian, her children and her gossiping sisters-in-law have disappeared too.)

There are some slight changes in the relative ages of the three principal characters, Milly, Kate, and Richard Denning, but these changes do not affect their relationships.

If a general view is taken of the main characters in the play, they seem to be somewhat shallower than they were in the novel. This may be due, in part, to the comparative lengths of the two works; it may be a reflection of the differences in style between James and Bolton; or it may be due to the necessarily objective presentation of the characters in a piece of writing for the realistic theatre. This last item, the objective presentation, has destroyed James's use of successive "centres" or vantage points, and of this more will be said later.

The over-all time of the action of the play is from June to October, 1902. The main incidents of the book, on the other hand, covered slightly more than a year. This disregards several flash backs which James used in the novel—if the term "flash back" may be applied to such a flowing structure.

Bolton has introduced a number of scenes or incidents of a noticeably sentimental nature. For example, it is Bolton's idea that Dr. Strett has lost a daughter, and, because Milly reminds him of his little girl, he and Milly adopt each other in a playful father-daughter relationship. 126

A long sentimental scene occurs at the end of Act III, Scene i, when Richard Denning confesses everything to Milly and begs her forgiveness. Further, he wants her assurance that none of her money will come to him. Milly accordingly promises Richard that she will not alter a single word of her will, which was actually drawn up three days previously. The audience knows what Richard does not, that there is already a bequest to Richard in Milly's will. This scene ends with the following dialogue, as Milly speaks of dying:

RICHARD. No, Milly, no! Put those thoughts away. You must fight, fight for life—for my sake.
MILLY. (With a smile.) I'll try. I'll do my best.
RICHARD. Draw strength from me.
MILLY. Your arms tighten about me. They make me feel safe. Hold me close.
RICHARD. To have and to hold.
MILLY. (Dreamily.) From this day forward . . . yes, say it, say it! . . . For better or worse. (Seizing on it eagerly.) Oh, yes, say it, say it. It may be our only chance—no, I mustn't talk like that . . . but say it, please. For better, for worse.
RICHARD. (Repeating.) For better, for worse.
MILLY. For richer, for poorer.
RICHARD. In sickness and in health . . . Please, dear God, in health.
MILLY. To love and to cherish.
RICHARD. To love and to cherish.
MILLY. Till death do us part.
RICHARD. Till death do us part.
MILLY. Only death shan't part us.
RICHARD. Not for years, and years.
MILLY. Not for ever, darling, not ever, ever.
RICHARD. My dear one, my love. (Embraced they are immobile, singing a plaintive Venetian song.)

---

In the book, James never revealed what was said in the final interview between Milly and Merton Densher. There is certainly nothing to suggest this parallel to the marriage ceremony. On the contrary,
Milly had sent for Densher to put it to him that there was no use in his staying in Venice any longer. She had not even asked him for the truth about Lord Mark's story. The reader, indeed, sees the interview second-hand as Densher tells Kate a little about it upon his return to England.

In the last scene of the play, after Milly's death, it is revealed that Milly had died in Richard Denning's arms. This is another sentimental addition of Bolton's.

Finally, mention might be made of the business at the final curtain of the play. In Act II, Milly had said to Richard that she would not leave him even after death, but that she would come back as a ghost and rustle the papers on his desk. She further said that Richard would know of her presence by the smell of Parma violets, her favorite flowers. In the final scene of the play, there is a bowl of violets on a table, and, sure enough, just before the final curtain, "(A little breeze rustles the pages of the manuscript that lies on the table near the window.)"

If the characterizations in the dramatization are examined individually, there are two that seem to stand out as having been more changed than the others. These are Lionel Croy, and his daughter, Kate.

There is a great deal more of Lionel in the play than there had been in the book. In the novel, Lionel did not actually appear again after the opening chapter, in which he refused to countenance his

---
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daughter's suggestion that she should come to live with him now that her mother had died. James, in his 1909 preface, indicated that he had intended to do much more with the character of Lionel, but that he only "looks in... in a beggarly scene or two..." In the play, Lionel is given new functions: it is he who finds the Venetian palace for Milly; it is Lionel who, working on Milly's behalf and using her money, creates a writing assignment for a magazine, which will take Richard Denning miraculously to Venice at the same time that Milly will be there; and, in the final scene of the play, by revealing to Richard how he had "arranged" for him to get the job, Lionel attempts to persuade the younger man to assist him in getting further money from Milly's estate.

As for the character of Kate Croy, she seems to be handled a little differently by Bolton. In both the novel and the play, it is Kate who is the planner, and her fiancé who is the follower. It is she who schemes to get Milly's money, and he who always demurs because of his conscience. However, one great difference exists between the Kate of the play and the Kate of the book. In the play, it is Kate who is the seducer. Bolton presents Kate as a very passionate woman; a woman who is bold, and proud of her freedom in such matters. In the novel, it was the man who did the pursuing; as James conceived the situation, Merton Densher kept urging Kate to give him proof of her love. Eventually, very late in the book, just before Kate was due to leave Venice, Densher put it to her squarely that if she did not come to his rooms,

130James, Wings of the Dove, p. xviii.
then he would not remain behind in Venice to carry out her plan that he
should court Milly.

In the play, Bolton has created a somewhat stronger situation,
from the point of view of dramatic action. At the climax of a passion­
ate scene between Kate and Richard Denning in the first act, the door
to Mrs. Lowder's drawing room is softly opened and closed. At this
point, neither the audience, nor the lovers, know who it is that has
overheard them. At the end of Act II, Lord Mark tells Mrs. Shepherd
that it was he who had overheard the lovers, and that he had had his
"man" follow Kate afterwards to Richard Denning's rooms in Bloomsbury.
In the novel, there was no consummation of the affair in London--that
came much later, in Venice. Also, in the Jamesian version, all that
Lord Mark could tell Milly was that Kate and Merton Densher had been
engaged all along, for he had no way of knowing how far the couple
might have gone. Thus, with one stroke, Guy Bolton gives concreteness
to the "affair," while the softly opened and closed door creates a
suspenseful ending to his first act.

In the second scene of Act II, in Venice, Kate requests Richard
Denning to let her come to him again. This time Richard hangs back,
saying,

RICHARD. I'm committed to playing a part, Kate. ... I find
there are delicate shades in this matter of double dealing.131

Later in the same scene, when Kate sees that she must accept Richard's
new attitude, she has these lines:

KATE. (With mounting emotion.) Oh, I know ... I know! But
I never thought it would be like this. I've felt so shut out, so

131Bolton, op. cit., p. 46.
lonely and miserable. We were so close—it's that that I've been missing. . . . I've been longing to feel your arms about me as they were that evening in Bloomsbury. . . . Perhaps that was a mistake—you roused something in me. . . . But there, don't listen. I'm talking like a sentimental harlot!132

It is rather hard to conceive James's Kate referring to herself in such language.

Further, in the final scene of the play, Kate admits to her Aunt Maud (Mrs. Lowder), and to Mrs. Shepherd, that Lord Mark's tale about the liaison had been true. Kate even defends her plot by saying that it was justified if the dying Milly could have been made happy by believing that Richard had loved her.

In the novel, Kate's attitude about her scheme had been the same. However, according to James, Aunt Maud never did learn of what had taken place between her niece and Merton Densher.

Other changes made by Bolton while dramatising The Wings of the Dove include a few slight differences in the handling of Milly, and some minor additions to the plot.

Milly gains slightly in certain dimensions. For example, in the play, Milly roguishly sends Kate out of the room on an unnecessary errand, so that she can be alone with Richard Denning. Other new elements concerning Milly include her suggestion to Richard, in the first act, that she should help him financially. Milly invents several stories for Richard to use in his writing. She tentatively proposes marriage to Richard when she asks him whether he would like to live in the Palazzo Leporelli, and she tells him that she should not have any

132Ibid., p. 48.
children. New, too, is Milly's outright request that Richard should kiss her.

Bolton specifies Milly's illness as "Addison's disease."^33 The playwright indicates that there is a hope for Milly's recovery through the use of a new drug which is being developed in Switzerland. Thus, whatever mystery James may have achieved through carefully not revealing the nature of Milly's illness has been lost.

Richard Denning's dream of writing a book is not entirely Bolton's invention. In the original novel by James, Merton Densher had invented the desire to write a book as an excuse for remaining in Venice. In Guy Bolton's play, Richard Denning's book actually does get written during the course of the action.

The most striking difference between Henry James's novel and the dramatization by Guy Bolton is probably in the dialogue. It is hard to reconcile the lines of the play with Henry James at all. The whole style, the atmosphere, is radically different.

The play is full of quips and other examples of ready wit. Whether the type of humor is on James's level, or whether it approaches vulgarity, would be a matter of opinion and aesthetic reaction. The following examples indicate the kind of humor which is new in the play.

Lionel Croy twits Richard about his age, and about the fact that, at thirty-four, he is still only a "penny-a-liner" journalist. Richard defends himself with the observation that will power is a

^33 Ibid., p. 21.
strong weapon. To which Lionel responds, "Yes, men have conquered the world with it—but they’ve usually started a bit earlier."134

When Lionel observes that Kate, with her looks, should be able to marry well, Kate asks her father if he means that she should sell herself to the highest bidder. Lionel's response is, "Well, at least not to the lowest."135 Then the father turns to Richard Denning with the advice, "Marry a rich woman, my boy. Even if she's not as pretty as Kate—don't let that trouble you too greatly. Remember, all cats are grey in the dark."136

Again, it is Lionel who observes, "It may be love that makes marriage attractive but it is only money that makes it endurable."137

In a conversation with Lord Mark, Lionel says that to lose caste is "like taking off a pair of tight boots and getting into your carpet-slippers."138 To Milly, Lionel observes, "When you are poor the doctor cures you quicker."139

Later in the play, Richard Denning conducts Milly around the city of Venice. The girl says that Richard "knows more about the place than Casanova did."140 To which Richard laughingly replies, "Well, not quite from the same standpoint."141

Another example of playwright Bolton's wit is shown in Kate's rejoinder to her aunt's mild remonstrance that, in her secretiveness,

---
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Kate is like her father. Kate says, "Poor Pappal! The sins of the children shall be visited upon the fathers."\(^{142}\)

Even the eminent doctor, Sir Luke Strett, is given his little joke. Sir Luke says to his patient, Milly, "I've heard of honest pride standing between the poor lover and the wealthy girl—but I've never encountered it."\(^{143}\)

All of the foregoing examples of humorous lines are Bolton's and not James's. It should be added that a close comparison of the lines of the play with the dialogue in the novel only serves to underscore the fact that this is a very free adaptation indeed.\(^{144}\)

Bolton has included a noticeable number of clichés in the script. These include Lionel's remark to his daughter, "Oh, so you show your claws, do you?"\(^{145}\); Richard Denning's request to Kate, "Please, don’t conjure up visions of forbidden raptures"\(^{146}\); Richard's line, "... the wheels we have set in motion will keep on turning"\(^{147}\); and, after Milly's death, Richard's observation, "She knew that I had been after her money so she flung it in my face."\(^{148}\)

Other plot alterations by Bolton include the following items:

In the novel, Densher and Lionel Croy never met. In the play, they

\(^{142}\text{Ibid., p. 45.}\)

\(^{143}\text{Ibid., p. 51.}\)

\(^{144}\text{Perhaps the writer in Time magazine put his finger on Bolton's contribution to the play's failure when he wrote of the "host of changes that reduce the book's great cumulative impact to emotional small change." See Time, LXVIII (November 26, 1956), 58.}\)

\(^{145}\text{Bolton, op. cit., p. 8.}\)

\(^{146}\text{Ibid., p. 13.}\)

\(^{147}\text{Ibid., p. 48.}\)
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appear in two scenes together: in the opening scene of the play when Lionel calls on his daughter, and again in Venice after Milly's death.

There is some difference between the chronological order of the events surrounding Lord Mark's first arrival in Venice, as they occur in the novel and in the play. In the novel, Lord Mark went to Venice twice: once to propose to Milly (he was refused); and then, after he had learned of the secret engagement between Kate and Densher, Lord Mark returned to Venice for the express purpose of telling Milly what he had discovered. In the play version, Bolton does not have Lord Mark come to Venice at all until after Milly has proposed to Richard. Then Lord Mark arrives on his brother's yacht, tells his destructive story to Mrs. Shepherd, and immediately departs again. Very conveniently, dramatizer Bolton arranges that Kate and Mrs. Lowder shall sail away with Lord Mark when he leaves Venice on the following day.

In the play, Mrs. Shepherd blames herself for Milly's collapse, because it was she who told the girl about Lord Mark's story concerning the secret engagement between Kate and Richard Denning. It is also Bolton's idea that both Mrs. Shepherd and the doctor know the contents of Milly's will, and that neither of them understands why she wishes to leave a "certain legacy" to the unfaithful Richard.\(^{149}\) Also, in the stage version, it is the doctor who persuades Milly that she should admit Richard when he calls to ask for news of her health.

The final scene in the play takes place a month later. Lord Mark and the yachting party have just returned to Venice, and Milly

\(^{149}\) ibid., p. 62.
has died in the interim. Thus Bolton has chosen to end his version of the story in Venice rather than in London. This has necessarily created some changes besides the condensation of time. For one thing, Mrs. Shepherd, who is getting ready to return to America, meets the other characters once more face to face, and it is a rather bitter meeting.

The play ends on a sentimental note as Richard Denning realizes that he really was in love with Milly. Even so, Richard is ready to keep his pledge to Kate; it is Kate who makes the break. Bolton has thus changed the note of the ending slightly, for, in the play, Richard Denning is in love with Milly herself; but, in the novel, he was in love only with a memory, and it was his conscience that stood between himself and Kate.

Finally, some of the items which have been lost in the transition from novel to play may be considered.

First, Guy Bolton has omitted all mention of Richard Denning's visit to the United States, where, in the novel, he had first met Milly. In the play, Kate merely mentions to Richard that his American friends are staying with her aunt in London. This elimination leads to a further loss of Jamesian material, for it necessitates the omission of the whole strange, subtle business of Kate never mentioning her young man to her "close" friend, Milly. It also rules out the involvements of Milly learning from another source that Kate knows Densher, and of Milly then similarly refraining from mentioning Densher to Kate.

Another item that Bolton has eliminated is the fact that Densher, in the novel, never knew the actual size of the legacy which
Milly had left to him. Upon receipt of a communication from Milly's lawyer, Densher had sent the envelope unopened to Kate. Then, when his fiancée brought the letter to him, Densher declared that he did not wish to be informed of its contents; he wished to refuse the legacy. According to James, it was Kate who recognized that the whole experience had changed them both, so that they would never again be as they once were. All was over between them. For the purposes of James's ending, it is not necessary for the reader to know whether Densher ever does learn the size of Milly's bequest, or even whether or not Kate accepts Densher's offer to let her have the money for herself.

Finally, and this is perhaps the greatest loss of all, Bolton has eliminated anything resembling James's "centres" of interest. Perhaps this was inevitable in writing for the realistic theatre. At any rate, there has been no attempt to duplicate James's method by any means whatsoever. As he explained in his preface, what James had tried to do in The Wings of the Dove was to construct his story in a series of blocks. He wished to move from the consciousness of one character to the consciousness of another one, in the various sections of the work. As James expressed it, he wished to approach Milly "circuitously... watching her, as it were, through the successive windows of other people's interest in her."\(^{150}\)

Through his device of the changing "centres" of interest, James was able to create in this work a tremendous depth for his characterizations. By alternating the points of view, the centers of consciousness from which he wrote, James enabled the reader to see deeply into

\(^{150}\)James, Wings of the Dove, p. xxx.
the workings of the main characters' minds. The reader could thereby be made to understand the intricacies of their several motivations, without James obtruding his omniscience as author.

In closing, mention may be made of one other problem that any would-be dramatizer would have to face in dealing with *The Wings of the Dove*. This work is written in James's later style, with its attendant convolutions of thought. The inner thoughts of the characters which James managed to convey in this book would not seem to lend themselves to stage presentation. Not, at least, in the normal realistic manner.151

A single example will suffice to show the kind of Jamesian writing to which reference is here made. The situation at this moment is that Densher, back in London, is trying to tell Kate about his final call on Milly in Venice. During this difficult interview with Kate, Densher goes back in his memory over the thoughts which he had previously had in anticipation of the present conversation.

His idea had been, in advance, that she would perhaps sound him much more deeply, asking him, above all, two or three specific things. He had fairly fancied her even wanting to know and trying to find out how far, as the odious phrase was, he and Milly had gone. He had asked himself if he were prepared to hear her do that, and had had to take for answer that he was prepared of course for everything.152

151 The question of whether these inner workings of the characters' minds could be successfully dramatized is outside the province of the present study. However, it is interesting to speculate whether something might be done in the manner of Baylor University's famous experimental Hamlet, or, again, something might be managed after the pattern of Eugene O'Neill's inner soliloquies in *Strange Interlude*.

For the dramatizer, the problem of trying to convey this type of consciousness on the part of the characters, would be quite separate from the difficulty of dealing with James's "centres," or successive points of view. In the particular case at hand, Guy Bolton seems to have side-stepped the issue by simply writing an entirely new play based only on the surface plot of The Wings of the Dove.

Summary

In comparing Guy Bolton's play, Child of Fortune, with James's novel, The Wings of the Dove, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:
   A. Guy Bolton's three-act play is divided into five scenes. Two settings are required: the morning room at Mrs. Lowder's home in London; and a sitting room in the Palazzo Leporelli in Venice.
   B. Technically, this is a very simple show. Sound effects include a guide's voice, which is heard over a microphone; and the sound of a gondolier singing. General interior illumination is needed, with some changes in the sky outside the windows. A sixteenth century portrait which resembles the actress playing Milly Temple is required.

II. Guy Bolton's handling of the material of James's novel:
   A. Basically the plot of the play is the same as that of the novel. The first act is equivalent to over three-quarters of the entire two-volume novel. There are some changes in the chronological order of certain events, however, and the
playwright has introduced a few innovations. The play ends in Venice rather than back in London.

B. New scenes in the play include the prologue exhibition of the portrait; the love scene between Kate and Richard Denning at the end of Act I, which is overheard by Lord Mark; the later scene in which Lord Mark tells Mrs. Shepherd what he had overheard; two new scenes between Richard Denning and Lionel Croy; the long scene in which Richard confesses everything to the dying Milly; and the closing moments of the play, when a little breeze—suggestive of Milly's spirit—rustles the pages of Richard's manuscript, while he gazes at the portrait.

Other innovations involve Dr. Strett and Mrs. Shepherd. There is a new father-daughter relationship between Dr. Strett and Milly; Mrs. Shepherd tells Milly about Lord Mark's revelation; Dr. Strett persuades Milly to receive Richard again in Venice; and Dr. Strett and Mrs. Shepherd know the contents of Milly's will before she dies.

C. The events which took place in the home of Kate's sister, Marian, have been omitted from the play. Gone, too, are the subtle involvements in the novel which grew out of the fact that both Kate and Milly early in their friendship refrained from mentioning Merton Densher (Richard Denning).

D. The names of some of the characters have been changed slightly. Milly Theale has become Milly Temple in the play, and Merton Densher is now called Richard Denning. The
companion's name has been simplified to Mrs. Susan Shepherd. The other important characters retain their original names.

The character of Lionel Croy has been developed in the play, and a certain grossness seems to have been introduced into the role of Kate.

E. There seems to be no real relationship between the dialogue of the play and that of the novel.

F. The over-all time has been reduced from over a year to just four months in the play. The period is the same as in the novel; that is, just after the turn of the century.

G. The eventual resolution of the events is made clear in the play, whereas the ending of the novel was inconclusive.

III. Gained:

A. A certain amount of humor has been added.

B. A good deal of sentimental material has been added in the play.

IV. Lost:

A. The omniscient author has vanished.

B. No attempt has been made to preserve James's "centres" of interest.

C. The depth of some of the characterizations seems to have been lost, because the complicated processes of their inner thoughts could not be presented in a realistic type of production.

D. The intriguing inconclusiveness of James's ending has been lost.
X. "EUENIA" BY RANDOLPH CARTER: BASED ON JAMES'S THE EUROPEANS


There seems to be little information about the source of the story. It was written specifically for the Atlantic Monthly. James wrote to his friend, William Dean Howells (the editor of the Atlantic), on March 30, 1877, saying that he planned to develop an idea about a genial, charming youth of a Bohemianish father, who comes back from foreign parts into the midst of a mouldering and ascetic old Puritan family of his kindred... in New England 1830. All the women fall in love with him... But he marries the prettiest, and from a romantic quality of Christian charity, produces a picturesque imbroglio (for the sake of the picturesque I shall play havoc with the New England background of 1830).

James, in 1877, saw his story as "the picture of the conversion of a dusty, dreary domestic circle to epicureanism." By the time the story was published, the center of interest had shifted from the young Bohemian gentleman to his older sister, Eugenia; and of the

---
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"dreary domestic circle," only one member—Gertrude, the younger daughter of the family—was converted to a Bohemian way of life.

James kept his idea of a New England setting, and he made the date about 1818 (thirty years earlier than the writing of the novel). An atmosphere of constant contrast was provided by the presence of the European-bred brother and sister amongst their American relatives, the Wentworths.

James's story opens in a dreary hotel room in Boston. Outside, there is a "dull, moist snow-fall," even though it is the middle of May. Eugenia, who is more impressively known as the Baroness Münster, stands at a window surveying the dreary scene.

Eugenia has come to America seeking her fortune. She is accompanied by her younger brother, Felix Young.

By no means beautiful, Eugenia is nevertheless a charming woman. She has come by her title through a morganatic marriage to the Prince of Silberstadt-Schreckenstein. The prince and his family wish to dissolve the marriage, but, at the time of James's story, nothing has been settled.

Eugenia and her brother visit their relatives, the Wentworths, who live in the country just outside Boston. Mr. Wentworth is the half-brother of their late mother. The Wentworths invite them to make a lengthy stay, and Eugenia and Felix take up residence in a small house on the Wentworth estate.

The Wentworth family consists of the father and his three grown children, Charlotte, Gertrude, and Clifford. Two other young people are constantly at the house: these are Robert Acton, a cousin of Wentworth, and his younger sister, Lizzie. Lizzie and Clifford are planning to become engaged. Another frequent visitor is the ecclesiastical Mr. Brand. Mr. Brand is in love with Gertrude, but she is unable to return his feeling.

The Wentworths are a rather Puritanical family. To them, Eugenia seems fascinating, though perhaps dangerous. Felix, on the other hand, succeeds in charming them all.

Felix is irrepressibly gay. He is an artist, an "amateur," and he manages to eke out a living by painting portraits and selling sketches. He paints flattering portraits of all of the Wentworths. Gertrude is the first member of the family who sits for him. It is during her sittings that the friendship between Felix and Gertrude deepens into love.

Gertrude has always rebelled against the solemnity of her family's way of life. She has, indeed, been a source of worry to them, and her father and sister look on the Reverend Mr. Brand as a kind of savior.

By the middle of August, Eugenia believes that she has found her fortune in the person of Robert Acton. In the eyes of the local gentry, Acton is a man of the world: he has been to China, and his house is full of curios. Acton is obviously interested in Eugenia, but he wonders whether it is love or only an intense curiosity that he feels toward her. He questions Eugenia about her morganatic marriage.
Eugenia tells him that, in order to be free, she need only sign a paper indicating her willingness to have her marriage dissolved. Acton asks the baroness to let him know if she signs the paper; Eugenia interprets this to mean that Acton wishes to marry her.

Acton goes away for a few days, to Newport, to visit an old friend who is seriously ill. Immediately on his return, Acton calls upon Eugenia—even though it is late at night. Acton asks Eugenia to come to Niagara with him—alone, and he tries to find out whether she has yet signed the document which would dissolve her marriage. She answers that she will tell him at Niagara. At that moment, Clifford Wentworth enters from a back room, and Eugenia says lightly that the youth had come to look at Felix's sketches.

A number of days pass, and Acton does not call again: Eugenia concludes that he is avoiding her. She is bored by her surroundings; she feels that she should return to Europe; and she is annoyed at her own vexation concerning Acton. The baroness calls on Acton's mother to say farewell, and she sees Acton at the house. He asks her again whether she has sent off the document which will liberate her from her marriage, and Eugenia answers that she has done so. Acton does not reply, but he finds that he does not believe her. The fact that he has discovered her in a lie—or so he thinks—eases his conscience.

Felix approaches Wentworth to ask for Gertrude's hand in marriage. At first the old man is reluctant to give his consent, but when both Charlotte and Mr. Brand urge him to allow the marriage, he agrees to do so. Brand wishes to perform the marriage ceremony himself for Felix and Gertrude.
That evening, when the family circle is gathered at Mr. Wentworth's, Eugenia congratulates Gertrude. Acton is there too, and he asks Eugenia once again about her marriage. Eugenia says that she has dissolved it, but she can see that Acton doubts her word. Acton hints that the family is soon to have another marriage, and Eugenia thinks he means a marriage between herself and him. However, Acton is speaking of the forthcoming marriage of Lizzie and Clifford.

Disappointed, Eugenia tells her brother that she is returning to Europe, and that she will not wait for his marriage to Gertrude. Eugenia tells Felix that she really has not signed the annulment document, and so she is still married to the Prince of Silberstadt-Schreckenstein. The night before Eugenia departs, Acton expresses his regret that she is going, but he does not make any move to prevent her from leaving.

On the last page of his story, James quickly disposes of the various characters. The reader is told that Felix and Gertrude marry and go to live in Europe; that Gertrude, later, visits her home upon the occasion of Charlotte's marriage to Mr. Brand; that Clifford and Lizzie get married; and that Robert Acton "married a particularly nice young girl," after his mother's death.158

It may be asked whether James had any particular purpose in writing The Europeans besides merely setting forth the events of the story. Apparently, as he told Howells, James intended only to create a "picturesque imbroglio," and to "play havoc with the New England

158 James, The Europeans, p. 384.
The theme of the novel is developed out of the contrast between Americans and Europeans. The American characters are comparatively pure and innocent, while the Europeans are devious.

The foreignness of Eugenia and her brother is exaggerated by their frequent use of French expressions. The novelist suggests that Eugenia looks Oriental in appearance, with her braided hair and her elaborate earrings. In Boston, the visitors noted with surprise the differences in customs, in modes of travel, and in the appearance of the women—whom Eugenia was pleased to observe looked immature.

To Felix, the Wentworth home looked as though it had just been built; he called it a "magnified Nuremberg toy."160 To the Wentworths, however, their eighty-year-old house was a "venerable mansion."161 As for matters of moral behavior, the travelers could not understand their relatives. Eugenia could not accept the freedom which was allowed to the young people, while Felix could not understand why his uncle should worry about Clifford's habit of drinking.

On the other side, Mr. Wentworth was shocked when Felix suggested that Eugenia should introduce Clifford to the ways of the world, and that she could exercise a civilizing influence on the young man. On another occasion, Felix, in speaking of himself, said that "at bottom" he was a Philistine—because he was a God-fearing man.162 This was a remark which Wentworth was unable to fathom.
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159 Edel, Selected Letters of Henry James, p. 70.
160 James, The Europeans, p. 236.
161 Ibid.
162 Ibid., p. 295.
Last, it might be mentioned that Eugenia regarded a little fibbing as a normal part of smooth social intercourse. This may have been due, in large measure, to her experience of court life in Germany. It irritated her that "these people" should not be pleased by such fibbing.\footnote{Ibid., p. 292.}

It may be that this last difference between the baroness and her American relatives caused her downfall. James let the reader see the baroness contradict herself, but he did not always reveal what the truth really was. Eugenia told Felix that she had refused Acton, whereas he had never come out directly and asked her to marry him. More importantly, Eugenia told her brother that she had never signed the document of renunciation, and that she was thus still married to the Prince of Silberstadt-Schreckenstein. This was the exact opposite of what she had told Acton. Thus Eugenia lied either to Acton or to Felix.

James once again created a story with an inconclusive ending. The reader never learns what eventually happened to Eugenia. It may be that she really had signed the document, but that she was too proud to admit to her brother that she had fallen between two stools—as it were. On the other hand, and it would seem more characteristic of the baroness, she may never have signed the paper at all, and thus she would have left open a safe retreat to Europe.

In 1957, a dramatic version of The Europeans appeared on Broadway. The title of the play was "Eugenia," and the dramatisation was
made by Randolph Carter. In converting James's novel into a play, Carter kept essentially the same plot and the same characters. The title role of the play, Eugenia, is the main character. Her brother, Felix Young, has become Felix da Costa; the Reverend Brand has been given a first name—Alfred; and the name of Eugenia's maid has been changed from Augustine to Maria. The other main characters maintain their original names. Acton's invalid mother has been eliminated: this has made it unnecessary to have any scenes in Acton's home. When Eugenia's husband is mentioned, he is called Prince Rudolph—rather than Prince Adolf; and his brother, who was unnamed by James, is now referred to as Maximilian.

164 Randolph Carter, the author, very graciously loaned a copy of the unpublished play script to the writer of this dissertation.

This was not a definitive script: there were many minor points which apparently had not been decided upon. For example, Felix's last name was variously spelled as Da Costa, da Costa, and de Costa. The Rev. Brand's first name was sometimes Alfred and sometimes Arthur; but the New York newspaper reviews of the play, on January 31, 1957, referred to him as Alfred. The setting of the play did not seem to be fully described at the opening of Act I, but the action of the play made it quite obvious what additions needed to be made. (From a director's viewpoint it might be added that, with only one exception, the movement of the players seemed to be logical, motivated, and complete in the script.) There seemed to be a little confusion over the time elements in the play, however. No doubt these inconsistencies had been taken care of by the opening night.

In a letter dated August 29, 1963, and addressed to the writer of this dissertation, Randolph Carter stated that the script was unrecognizable in the New York production. The version which he loaned for examination was the one which the playwright originally wrote, and which he hopes to publish. (Perhaps Carter's complaint about the production was justified. At any rate, it is of some interest that the New York reviewers referred to two items which were not in the borrowed manuscript. Both the Herald Tribune and the New York World-Telegram and the Sun mentioned a chess game which was not in the script. The Daily News complained about the second act curtain line, calling it unforgivable, "'There is a greater fault than pride. It is to sense evil where none exists.'" There was no such line in the borrowed manuscript. All three of these reviews appeared in New York on January 31, 1957.)
The playwright has provided names for other people who were merely mentioned by James. The persons in the play speak of Eugenia's late mother as Celia; Acton's late wife is referred to as Irene; the old Countess who urged Eugenia to marry the Prince is now called the Countess Hohenlohe; and the unseen gardener is named Benjamin.

The relationship between Acton and Lizzie is changed in the play. Acton, on stage, is the father of Lizzie, rather than her brother. Perhaps his generation was changed to fit the age of the actress playing Eugenia—Tallulah Bankhead. In the novel, Eugenia was thirty-three years old; in the play, the baroness is of "indeterminate age."\(^{165}\) Felix is slightly older than he was in the book: thirty-four rather than twenty-eight.\(^{166}\) The Wentworth family and Brand remain virtually unchanged.

In the play, Eugenia was born in Berlin rather than in Vienna. The amount of French spoken by Eugenia is considerably more than in the novel; whereas, for Felix, the amount of French has been reduced to only three expressions. The playwright has provided a special note.

\(^{165}\) Randolph Carter, "Eugenia" (unpublished manuscript), I, i, 9.

\(^{166}\) There was some evidence in the manuscript to show that the role of Felix had been altered after its initial typing. The script, as typed, stated that Felix was born in France, but the words had been altered by hand to say that he was born in Holland. (Felix's father was still referred to as a Sicilian, and his mother as an American.) It is of interest here that the Herald Tribune critic complained of Scott Merrill's "inexplicably Germanic pronunciations of proper names," in the review which appeared on January 31, 1957. (Scott Merrill played the role of Felix.)
with the cast list to the effect that the roles of Eugenia and Felix may be played with or without foreign accents.\(^\text{167}\)

The theme and motivations of the play remain the same as in the novel. The plot, as has been mentioned, is the same in its general outline. However, there is a lot of rearranging of James's material. Even so, the result is not confusing, for each group of characters, each set of lovers, moves logically forward in its own chronological progression.

The action of the play is confined to a single setting: the guest cottage and garden on the grounds of the Wentworth estate, near Boston. A portion of the interior of the guest cottage is seen on the left; the garden fills the rest of the stage. The action indicates that there is a little porch to the cottage, and that there are exits and paths to other parts of the grounds up right, down right, and also off down left below the cottage. Inside the cottage there are two doors leading to other rooms, and a staircase leading to an upper floor. It is understood that the main house is somewhere off-stage up right, and that there is a pond off left.

The playwright makes good use of his multiple area setting. More than once there are conversations being carried on simultaneously by different sets of characters inside and outside the house, and it seems entirely convincing that they should not overhear each other. The appearance of the cottage has been changed. What was a simple, small, white house in James's book has now become a fanciful

\(^{167}\)Carter, op. cit., cast list, unnumbered page.
structure with wings, eaves, verandas, and flying fretwork. The interior seems much as it was in the novel, and Eugenia still feels it necessary to hang pink silk curtains at the windows, and to drape shawls and lace around the cottage to make it fit her own personality.

Some incidents in the book would have been virtually impossible to stage—such as Gertrude and Felix rowing on the pond, Acton and Eugenia driving in a carriage, and Eugenia on board ship about to sail. The many locales of the book have been reduced to one setting. There are now no scenes in the Boston hotel, in the various rooms of Wentworth's house, at Acton's home, or out in the fields.

Many of the book's conversations have necessarily been shortened, but nothing which vitally affected the relationships between the characters seems to have been omitted. Felix does not now suggest that Gertrude should deliberately try to get Charlotte and Brand to marry, and the pecuniary aspect of Felix's desire to paint Gertrude's portrait is absent.

The action of the play begins with Felix's first visit to the Wentworth estate. As in the novel, it is a Sunday, and Gertrude is at home alone while the rest of the family is at church. From this point on, the play more or less follows the course of the novel, with the exception of a number of transpositions of James's material. The final curtain line of the play is Eugenia's statement to Felix that she has signed nothing. This means that the dramatist has omitted those items which followed this statement in James's novel. This has eliminated Eugenia's final evening at her uncle's home, Acton's farewell, Felix's
farewell on board ship, James's summary of future marriages, and the final disposition of his characters.

Carter has strengthened the ending of his play by means of certain earlier lines which prepare the audience for it. In Act I, Scene ii, and also in Act III, Scene ii, Eugenia tells Acton that it is dangerous to want to know the truth about people. In the latter scene, Acton says that he has learned a great deal of wisdom since he has come to know Eugenia, and he says, "Perhaps I have learned to doubt." There is a feeling created in the play that Eugenia and Acton are on the verge of a serious quarrel, and this makes it clearer than in James's novel that it is Eugenia's deviousness which causes her failure with Acton. Thus it seems very significant at the end of the play when Eugenia tells her brother flatly that she had never signed the document renouncing her marriage at all.

Surprisingly enough, a few of the speeches in the novel which bordered on the indelicate have been omitted. Already mentioned is Felix's definition of a Philistine as a God-fearing man. Also left out is the little exchange between Acton and Eugenia concerning Clifford and Lizzie. In the novel, Acton half jokingly asked Eugenia not to encourage Clifford, saying,

"He must not be inconstant to poor Lizzie."
"To your sister?"
"You know they are decidedly intimate," said Acton.
"Ah," cried Eugenia, smiling, "has she—has she"
"I don't know," Acton interrupted, "what she has."
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Similarly left out is Eugenia's answer to Acton's question as to whether she has sent off the document to Germany which would annul her marriage, "I will tell you— at Niagara!"170

Because of the fact that the action is confined to a single setting, it has been necessary for Randolph Carter to invent new motivations for entrances and exits. These many little additions all seem to be executed smoothly and naturally.

The play is divided into three acts of two scenes each. Two of the scenes are further divided into two sections each: in Act I, Scene i, the lights are lowered to denote the passage of forty-eight hours; in Act III, Scene ii, the lights are lowered to show the passage of several hours.

The period of the play is 1878. James's story took place about 1848, or some thirty years prior to the writing of his novel.

The amount of time covered by the incidents in the original story was four months. This has been reduced to only a little over three weeks in the playscript. The action of the play extends from a Sunday in June until July 8, 1878. Nevertheless, the feeling of the play seems to be considerably longer than three weeks. The romance between Felix and Gertrude does not have a whirlwind quality, nor does the relationship between Eugenia and Acton develop with excessive speed. For example, when the playwright retains James's speech for Eugenia, "You must find it strange that I have settled down in this out-of-the-way part of the world,"171 it is hard to reconcile her words

with the script's indication that she has been on the Wentworths' estate for only one week. Similarly, in Act III, Felix says to Brand that he has been waiting to tell him for weeks that Charlotte loves him; it seems odd that Felix should have been waiting "for weeks," when he has been in the town for barely two weeks.\textsuperscript{172}

In adapting James's material, Randolph Carter has made many minor changes in the dialogue. He has shortened many speeches, and he has simplified James's grammatical structure. Certain words have been modernized. For example, a "daguerrotype" is now called simply a "photograph," and a "ball" is now called a "dance." A stilted expression like Gertrude's, "I am determined to marry this gentleman,"\textsuperscript{173} is now more naturally expressed as, "I want to marry Felix."\textsuperscript{174} Because Carter has omitted many sentences, some of the conversations seem to get around to the point more quickly than they did in the novel. Some lines have been lifted out of context. For example, a few things which Eugenia and Felix said to each other in the hotel in Boston at the beginning of the novel now turn up in the third act of the play. Also, it is now Felix who says, "Who are these people to be so upset by a little fibbing!"\textsuperscript{175} rather than Eugenia.\textsuperscript{176}

Sometimes James's subtlety has been lost. There are two examples of this in the first scene of the play. The dramatizer has reversed certain speeches of Gertrude and Charlotte concerning their

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{172}Ibid., III, i, 8. \hspace{2cm} \textsuperscript{173}James, \textit{The Europeans}, p. 373. \\
\textsuperscript{174}Carter, \textit{op. cit.}, III, ii, 15. \\
\textsuperscript{175}Ibid., III, ii, 25. \hspace{2cm} \textsuperscript{176}James, \textit{The Europeans}, p. 292.
\end{flushright}
brother Clifford, thereby losing Gertrude's deliberately contradictory attitude. Then the humorous meaning of Wentworth's comment, "You have come very far," in response to Eugenia's assumption that a Unitarian is something new, has been destroyed by the insertion of several lines in between the original comment and the rebuttal.

Approximately one quarter of the play consists of new material, as far as the lines go, but actually nothing in the nature of major incidents has been added. Carter has built up the dramatic action in small ways, and he has added to the characterizations with little bits of business. For instance, Gertrude, in the play, kicks off her shoes and executes a little dance in the opening scene; this action serves to show her rebellion on the Sabbath, and to demonstrate to the audience that there is a hidden self in the girl. Wentworth's character is developed in a couple of pages of new material in the second scene of the play. The playwright succeeds in showing Wentworth's exactitude, and also his stodginess, as he fails to perceive that Eugenia is twitting him in this interchange,

(MR. WENTWORTH enters with CHARLOTTE and REV. BRAND, LIZZIE and CLIFFORD follow)

EUGENIA. My, but you're prompt!
WENTWORTH. (Looking at watch) We left the house at 4:58. It's exactly a two minute walk.
BRAND. Two minutes if one walks at a leisurely pace; one minute, if one walks briskly.
EUGENIA. If I did not know how kind you are, Mr. Brand, I might take that as a rebuke. Last evening when I was late for supper, it took me quite ten minutes to cover the distance.
LIZZIE. That's because you were walking with father.
ACTON. And we stopped to admire the rhododendrons.
CHARLOTTE. Last year father had Benjamin--our gardener--count every blossom, when he pruned the bushes, that is, after the blossoms had wilted.

Ibid., p. 247.
WENTWORTH. There were 27,616 blooms.
EUGENIA. Amazing! But can one trust the accuracy of Benjamin's count?
WENTWORTH. Benjamin has been with us for fifteen years; I have never had any reason to doubt his integrity. 178

A slightly new view of Eugenia is provided in the play. The first time that Felix and Eugenia are alone together on the stage (I, i, 16-17), Eugenia smokes, and the language of both seems less polished than it had been earlier. (The language change may have been deliberate on Carter's part, or it may have been done unconsciously.) The stage directions at this point indicate that the maid, Maria, brings in some slippers and puts them on her mistress's feet, but that Eugenia takes no notice of her. Perhaps this cold behavior was intended to show some difference between Eugenia's behavior in company and en famille. Two new pages here seem to suggest that the brother and sister have dropped a façade. Carter has reinforced this impression with new closing lines for Act I, Scene i, in which Eugenia and her brother frankly plan the moves in her coming campaign.

Certain lines which are given to the baroness in the play seem unlike the lady of James's novel. In the play, Eugenia says to Clifford, "Use! Use! A wife is useful--a mid-wife is useful. A mistress is a luxury. But you'll never understand that." 179 There are also a couple of speeches which would probably get a laugh from an audience, but which sound more like Tallulah Bankhead than like James's Eugenia. Eugenia says to Acton,

\[\text{178 Carter, op. cit., I, ii, 28-29.}\]
\[\text{179 Ibid., III, ii, 17.}\]
EUGENIA. What you say of a woman's position in China may be all very true. But I knew a Neopolitan princess who was, for a time, the concubine of a Man Chu [sic] War Lord. She undoubtedly exaggerated, as all Italians do, but she found the experience enormously stimulating.  

Again, Eugenia says to Wentworth, in the same scene,

EUGENIA. There's really nothing quite so touching as the loyalty of servants. Take Maria, for example. Once a string of matched pearls I was wearing broke during the Grand March at a ball in Schloss Halstead. Everything stopped—no one dared move for fear of crushing them. But dear Maria saved the day. She darted about and in moments, it seemed, had recovered all except two which had rolled under the Dowager Empress Christine.

With the addition of little pieces of action here and there, Randolph Carter has been able to build up the dramatic elements of the story. The hostility between Eugenia and Lizzie is heightened by lines such as these,

EUGENIA. And now—tell me—what have you all been doing with yourselves?
LIZZIE. (Needles in hand) I have been crocheting. And I hope you will not think me rude if I continue.
EUGENIA. (Giving LIZZIE tea) You could never be rude my dear—unintentionally.

Clifford's habit of drinking is made to seem more dramatic through action also: at Eugenia's tea party in Act I, Scene ii, the youth embarrasses his family by collapsing drunkenly to the ground. He pulls the cloth off the tea table as he falls, and Eugenia's new tea service—a gift from Acton—gets broken. Similarly, the tiff between Lizzie and Clifford seems more serious than in the novel, perhaps because the quarrel is actually seen on stage rather than just being talked about. In a new two-page section in Act III, Scene i, Eugenia

---

180 Ibid., I, ii, 23.
181 Ibid., I, ii, 29.
182 Ibid., I, ii, 30.
nearly becomes hysterical as she talks to Felix about her fear of the future. In the last scene of the play, Eugenia becomes more and more furious, and her seething hurt and resentment culminate in the following exchange.

EUGENIA. Tonight we must all dress for dinner! A real celebration! [She is referring to the double engagement of Felix and Gertrude, and of Clifford and Lizzie] Were we in France it would be an evening for champagne!

WENTWORTH. Fortunately we are not in France.

EUGENIA. (Barely able to maintain control) No--no we are not--what singular fortune! We are in Boston, Boston, U.S.A.--United Sanctified America!

Finally, almost at the end of the play, Carter makes Eugenia bravely try to pretend to her brother that she has refused Acton, but she breaks down and tearfully admits that the American had never asked her to marry him at all. It seems likely that this quick lie and reversal by Eugenia, followed by her tears, would make her a more sympathetic character in the eyes of an audience.

The dramatizer, Randolph Carter, has been able to utilize many of the physical actions described in James's novel as specific business for the actors on stage. James, for example, had visualized Eugenia as a woman who used little movements which characterized her vanity--such as pinching in her waist with her hands, and this is used in the play. James had suggested the difference between the two Wentworth sisters with a little incident involving a scarf: Charlotte was wearing a long scarf, but she could not seem to make it hang gracefully, and her sister, Gertrude, with a light touch put it right--only to see Charlotte,
with a movement of her elbows, make the scarf hang awkwardly again. Carter has similarly incorporated this action into the play. Other stage business which comes directly from the novel includes Acton toying with a fan when he visits Eugenia; Eugenia imprinting a kiss on Gertrude's forehead on hearing of her engagement to Felix; and many little descriptions of how certain speeches should be said—such as "rubbing his forehead," "very gently," "abruptly," or "very seriously."

When the final blow falls on Eugenia, that is, when she thinks Acton is about to announce their engagement but instead he announces the engagement of Clifford and Lizzie, then in both the play and the novel Eugenia is described as throwing back her head and smiling at her uncle, and then turning with an even more intense radiance to Acton.

The Europeans was an early work of James, and so its style is relatively simple. The novel is written from no particular point-of-view; there are no centers of consciousness. James made his presence evident, referring to himself frankly as the author. At one point he referred to himself as Gertrude's "humble historian." Later, James said of Eugenia, "It is my misfortune that in attempting to describe in a short compass the deportment of this remarkable woman I am obliged to express things rather brutally." James is, then, constantly present as the narrator.

184 James, The Europeans, pp. 223-224; and Carter, op. cit., I, i, 2.

185 James, The Europeans, p. 380; and Carter, op. cit., III, ii, 22.

186 James, The Europeans, p. 227.  187 Ibid., p. 316.
All in all, Randolph Carter has kept very close to James. The dialogue has been somewhat simplified and modernized. The new material which the dramatizer has added dovetails smoothly onto James's material. Carter has added some amusing touches here and there; occasionally the type of wit in the new material does not seem Jamesian, however.

There is plenty of evidence in the script to show that Carter knows his way around the stage. The single setting would make this an easy play to produce, and the use of multiple areas would make it more interesting to view. The script calls for the use of distinct area lighting control, and for the creation of a sunset effect. The sound effects are limited to church bells which are heard in the first act. There is also evidence that Carter is aware of other uses of sound; for example, when two conversations are going on simultaneously, one between Felix and Gertrude in the garden, and the other between Eugenia and Acton in the cottage, the playwright uses the sound of Felix ripping a page off of his sketch pad as a device to shift the audience's attention from the cottage out to Felix in the garden. Previously mentioned was Carter's use of the light fade and black-out to signify the passing of time. However, perhaps mention should be made here of a place in the script which might very well cause a "stage wait." At the beginning of Act III, Charlotte pays a call on Felix, and he asks her to use her influence to gain Wentworth's consent to a marriage between himself and Gertrude. The conversation switches to "poor" Mr. Brand, and Charlotte becomes emotional.

(Scarcely able to control her tears, [CHARLOTTE] turns and leaves the room. [FELIX] is about to stop her but thinks better of it. Once outside she hurries away. [FELIX] strolls out on the
porch, looks about and starts to whistle. He tests the weather, which has cleared, observes a handsome sunset which is just beginning. He re-enters the house and goes into his studio. Eugenia comes downstairs. ... She shivers and pokes the fire. Maria enters and starts to gather up the tea things. Maria speaks.)

It would seem that such long, leisurely stage directions would distinctly slow down the action.

Summary

In comparing Randolph Carter's play, "Eugenia," with James's novel, The Europeans, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:

A. A single setting with multiple playing areas is used. The set shows the cottage interior and the garden simultaneously.

B. Lighting control for the several playing areas is called for.

C. Light fades and black-outs are used to denote the passage of time.

II. The handling of James's material:

A. The theme and plot are the same, and the ending is somewhat strengthened.

B. The characters are essentially the same.

1. The playwright, however, has created the feeling that Eugenia and Felix adopt a façade when they are with other people.

2. One major character, Acton's mother, is omitted.

---

188 Carter, op. cit., III, 1, 3.
3. Many of the physical actions of the characters in the novel have been transferred directly into the play as business for the actors.

C. The dialogue has been somewhat simplified and modernized. About one quarter of the lines are new, but no major incidents have been added. The necessary new entrances and exits for staging purposes all seem to be motivated smoothly and naturally.

D. The period of the play, 1878, is thirty years later than that of the novel. The events of the play take place in three weeks rather than in four months.

E. James's material has been much rearranged, but no confusion has resulted because each group of characters still progresses logically in its own development.

III. Gained:

A. A certain amount of humor has been added; some of it does not seem typically Jamesian.

B. Certain factors of the story are now shown in dramatic action in the play. These include such things as Clifford's drunkenness, and Gertrude's little rebellious dance on the Sabbath.

IV. Lost:

Nothing essential has been omitted. Occasionally James's subtlety has been obscured.
In writing his novel, *The Aspern Papers*, Henry James drew heavily on some real-life incidents. On January 12, 1887, James made two entries in his notebook, and he subsequently combined them in the novel. The first incident involved a Captain Silsbee, who was a "Shelley-worshipper." In Florence, Italy, Silsbee had managed to move in as a lodger with Miss Clairmont, the one-time mistress of Byron. Miss Clairmont had attained a great age, and she was living with a niece. Silsbee had moved in with the hope of obtaining the old lady's papers, which included letters of both Byron and Shelley. When the old woman eventually died, the middle-aged niece offered the papers to Silsbee on the condition that he marry her. He declined.

To James, the inherent interest in these events was in the struggle of the man with himself. The "price" demanded for the papers was too great, and yet the man "would give almost anything" to get them.  

On the same date in 1887, James made a notation about a friend of his, the Countess Gamba, who owned some letters of Byron's, which she would neither show nor publish. The Countess had said that the letters were discreditable to Byron, and she had even admitted that she had burned one of them.  

---

190 Ibid., p. 72.
191 Ibid.
In using these real-life anecdotes as the basis for his novel, *The Aspern Papers*, James changed the locale and the nationalities of the persons involved. The incidents of the novel take place in Venice, rather than in Florence, and the personalities have all become Americans. The "papers," or letters, in question are those of a fictitious American poet, Jeffrey Aspern. The letters were written to his one-time mistress, Juliana Bordereau. The ancient Miss Bordereau lives with her niece, Miss Tina Bordereau—who is simply referred to as Miss Tina. The gentleman who obtains access to their household as a lodger remains unnamed; it is he who tells the story of the novel, which is written in the first person.

In his preface to the 1908 revised edition of *The Aspern Papers*, James declared that there was "not a reflected glint" of the original Shelley enthusiast in the central figure of his novel, even though he had known him slightly. James took delight in the sense of a past which was still visitable, and it seemed romantic to him to contemplate the possibility that he himself might have met Miss Clairmont, if only he had known of her existence when he had been in Florence.

Henry James's secretary, Theodora Bosanquet, has recorded that for James to reread one of his works meant *ipso facto* that he would

---


Such was the case with The Aspern Papers. A comparison of the 1888 edition with that of 1908 reveals that there are countless revisions in the style, but there are no changes in the progression of the plot, or in the characteristics of the people involved. The name of one character has been changed in the later edition: Miss Tita has become Miss Tina.

The novel is divided into nine chapters, and the whole work is narrated in the first person from the single point-of-view of the unnamed editor. As the novel opens, the editor recalls how he had consulted his friend, Mrs. Prest, as to how he could best gain the acquaintance of the ancient Miss Bordereau without arousing her suspicion that he was after her papers. It had been Mrs. Prest's suggestion that he should endeavor to become a lodger in the old Venetian palace which was Miss Bordereau's home.

Mrs. Prest is alluded to a few more times during the course of the novel as a confidante, but she does not figure in the actual events.

Presenting himself under an assumed name—which James never reveals, the editor persuades the Misses Bordereau to rent him some rooms. By treating the niece with great kindness, he hopes to be able to obtain through her whatever letters or other papers of Aspern's may still be in the old aunt's possession. To gain his ends, the editor deliberately plans to make Miss Tina fall in love with him.

Although the editor lives under their roof, he almost never sees the Misses Bordereau. After three months, the editor encounters Miss Tina in the garden one evening. He takes her into his confidence, and he tells her that he is looking for material on Jeffrey Aspern. Some three weeks later, the editor takes Miss Tina out on an excursion around Venice. On this occasion, Miss Tina promises to help him if she can.

A few days later, old Miss Bordereau shows the editor a miniature portrait of Jeffrey Aspern which she would like to sell for an exorbitant price. Late that evening, the old woman suffers an attack of some kind, and a doctor is sent for. Assuming that Miss Bordereau is safely in bed, the editor takes the opportunity to snoop around her private sitting room looking for the papers. Just as the editor is opening a secretary, the ancient Juliana appears in the doorway. In a great fury, Miss Bordereau calls him a "publishing scoundrel," and then she sinks back into the arms of the attendant Miss Tina.

The editor leaves the palace the next morning for a trip. When he returns twelve days later, the editor learns that Miss Bordereau has died. Miss Tina tells him that there were indeed many papers, but that she cannot let him have them. If they were related, as by marriage, he could have the papers. The embarrassed editor retreats; he leaves the house and roams about the city all that day. The next morning, Miss Tina tells him that she has burned Aspern's papers, for she now has no reason to keep them.

The editor leaves Venice, carrying with him the little portrait of Aspern, and a lasting regret for the loss of the papers.

In 1959, Sir Michael Redgrave, the English actor, wrote and starred in a dramatization of *The Aspern Papers*. He maintained James's title for the play. A careful comparison of Redgrave's adaptation with both of James's versions of the novel, shows that the playwright used the later (1906) revised edition. There are countless speeches in the play in which the wording agrees with the later edition rather than the earlier one, and the reverse seems not to hold true.196

Redgrave's play is written in three acts, and it requires a single setting. All of the action takes place in the "sala" of Miss Bordereau's house in Venice. In the first act, it is a spring afternoon in 1895. Act II is in three scenes: afternoon, six weeks later; early evening, three weeks later; and that evening, later. Act III is in the afternoon, twelve days later.

Technically, this play would be more difficult than is usual for a one-set play. The appearance of the setting changes several times; at the beginning of the play, the "sala" is almost bare, and shabby;

196 It is interesting that Redgrave's description of Tina comes from the revised edition rather than the earlier edition of the novel, as does the change in her name from Tita to Tina. James's description of Tita in the original edition (1886) reads, "Her face was not young, but it was simple; it was not fresh, but it was mild." See Henry James, *The Aspern Papers* ([Original edition]; New York: Dell Publishing Co., c1959), p. 32. The revised edition (1906) reads, "Her face was not young, but it was candid; it was not fresh, but it was clear." See Henry James, *The Aspern Papers* ([Revised edition]; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922), p. 17. In Redgrave's play, Tina is described, "Her face is not young, but candid; not fresh, but clear." See Michael Redgrave, *The Aspern Papers* (Acting edition; London: Samuel French Ltd., c1959), p. 11.
furniture has been installed in Act II, and the room is filled with a profusion of flowers; in a later scene the flowers have all gone, and there has been a change of sofas; in Act III, the "sala" is filled with incongruous objects and dust sheets, so that an appearance of selling or moving is created. Sound effects include chiming church bells, which are used as a time device in the play; a creaking door which leads to Miss Bordereau's room; sounds of the front door being opened and closed; the doorbell; Miss Bordereau's bell; the sounds of footsteps on the stairs; and the voice of a gondolier singing on the canal.

In Act III there is a storm, for which the flashes of lightning and the thunder rolls must be timed as if in response to certain specified lines. In the same scene, there is a shutter outside the French windows which clacks sharply at designated moments; it seems probable that Redgrave intended to suggest that the clacking shutter represented the troubled spirit of the departed Juliana. At the end of the play, withered vine leaves blow across the floor of the "sala." The lighting, other than during the storm, is simple: a few dims and blackouts, moonlight, and afternoon sunlight are called for. Several practical oil lamps, and a practical iron stove are needed.

The setting is cleverly devised to suggest that the "sala" is on the second floor, with stairs leading both up and down to other floors. Another item which is unusual is the double set of doors up center which lead into Juliana's apartments: the inner doors would probably suggest the difficulty of access to her inner sanctum. Because of their placement, these doors would dominate the set, and this would be entirely in keeping with the action.
Although the action has been reduced to a single setting, almost no incidents of the novel have been left out of the play. Fragmentary conversations, and momentary interludes from the novel have been incorporated into various scenes. Conversations which took place in other rooms, in gondolas, or at Florian's café, have all been moved into the "sala." Even the recalled conversations between Mrs. Prest and the editor, which the latter recounts at the opening of the novel, have now been put on-stage. As a result, Redgrave has had to justify the editor's need to explain the reason for his visit to Miss Bordereau's palace after he has actually arrived there accompanied by Mrs. Prest. (In the novel, the editor made his initial visit to the palace alone.)

It has been necessary for Redgrave to invent many little motivations for the exits of the characters. Juliana's wheelchair serves as a device to move two characters off-stage simultaneously several times. Once, Juliana sends Tina off to write a letter. The servants come and go as they fetch and carry various objects. Tina herself goes for the doctor. Late in the play, the visiting Mrs. Prest wanders off to look at the garden, and the editor conveniently excuses himself to go and supervise his servant's packing. As for the entrances, most of them were naturally motivated by the events of the original story.

Redgrave has invented a few good pieces of stage business which seem peculiarly theatrical, and these may possibly have resulted from the playwright's personal stage experiences as an actor. The editor frequently writes surreptitiously in his notebook, and he is placed up-stage of the speaking character so that he may not be observed—except by the audience. This particular piece of business is even
amusing on occasion when Tina is recalling the names of old friends, the editor enters them in his notebook, but when Tina says that old Mrs. Stock-Stock has died, the editor firmly crosses out the name. The playwright visibly shows the editor's fear that the old lady may have burned her papers while he and Miss Tina were out on an excursion, by having the editor examine the stove for charred remains. This piece of business has the added advantage of calling the audience's attention to the stove which is used so dramatically in the closing moments of the play. Finally, it might be mentioned that there is much more frequent physical contact between the editor and Miss Tina in the play than there was in the novel. As a result, the editor's advances seem more open than they were in the original work.

In comparing the play with the novel, it may be seen that there are no changes in the over-all plot, or in the theme. However, Redgrave has added many incidents to the original, and a few new dimensions.

The major characters are the same, but there are some changes in the lesser characters. Miss Tina, and Miss Juliana Bordereau, are essentially the same as they were in the novel, although Miss Tina seems to have become a somewhat stronger character by the end of the play, and Miss Bordereau is even more insulting and spiteful than James had made her. The editor now has a name: Henry Jarvis—referred to as "H. J." Mrs. Prest, the editor's friend, has some new scenes, and she has gained in importance. The maid's name has been changed from Olimpia to Assunta, and she is middle-aged, rather than young, in the play. The editor's manservant is still called Pasquale, but he has
new characteristics and added importance in the dramatization. Pasquale spies on everyone, and he is an Anglophile—thus making it reasonable that he should speak to Assunta in English. It is clear that Pasquale is capable of blackmail, and this adds to the general dramatic tension.

The number of characters in the play is six: H. J., Miss Tina, Miss Bordereau, Mrs. Prest, Assunta, and Pasquale. No doctor is needed for the action on-stage, but it is understood that he is sent for.

Michael Redgrave has chosen to give his main character the initials, "H. J." The question naturally arises as to whether Redgrave intended that the character, Henry Jarvis, should represent Henry James himself. The question was answered by the playwright in the London Times, in response to a joint letter from Leon Edel and Simon Nowell-Smith.

... I may have misled a few people into thinking that I have attempted to make "the publishing scoundrel" into a portrait of "the Master." I am ready to concede that they have a point, but ... the point is a small one.

In the first place, I supply the character with a name, "Henry Jarvis." The use of the novelist's initials is, of course, deliberate, for I have tried to make a character which reflects some of James's passionate devotion to art and literature, his fine aesthetic sensibility ... and even his "intense fondness" for Venice. ...

But I certainly do not intend "Henry Jarvis" as a portrait of Henry James and, so far as I know Professor Edel and Mr. Nowell-Smith are the first to think that I would wish to do so.197

It seems highly unlikely that James meant to indicate himself in the character of the unnamed editor. In the first place, the character

197 Times (London), August 20, 1959. (This letter by Redgrave was in response to one from Leon Edel and Simon Nowell-Smith, published in the Times (London), August 18, 1959.)
is despicable. In the second place, the original is known to have been a Captain Silsbee—at least, as far as his actions are concerned.\textsuperscript{198}

Redgrave has added certain touches to his central character which emphasize the despicable elements in his nature. In the very first scene, the audience sees H. J. listening at doors; he does not hesitate to lie; and his quick inventiveness enables him to concoct a fabrication which smooths his entree. In later scenes, H. J. spies through a keyhole; and he even pretends to have a heart attack so as to gain an advantage in the situation.

In the play, Juliana remarks pointedly that H. J. does not sound American when he talks.\textsuperscript{199} The description of the editor in the stage directions indicates that he is from New England.\textsuperscript{200} It seems likely, in both instances, that Redgrave was preparing the way for himself to play the role of the editor. H. J. replied to Juliana that neither she nor her niece sounded American; these two roles were undertaken by Beatrix Lehmann and Flora Robson in the original production.

It is through the addition of new scenes, incidents, and lines, that Redgrave has added most to the depth of the characters.

Before Miss Tina first comes on-stage, Mrs. Prest remarks on the childishness of her handwriting. Then, soon after her first entrance, Tina starts as if in fear at the sound of her aunt's bell. Thus it would seem that Redgrave was trying to diminish Tina as a force, in

\textsuperscript{198} Matthiessen and Murdock, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 71-72.


\textsuperscript{200} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 2-3.
order to make the dramatic change in her character even stronger at the end of the play. Through such lines as Miss Tina's observation to H. J., "I always thought—you seemed to talk more than you thought," the playwright seems to indicate that there is more depth to Tina than would appear at first glance. Late in the play, Mrs. Prest observes that Tina is not innocent of feminine guile. In the final climactic scene between Miss Tina and H. J., the former says, ironically, "You said once that I was not capable of deceit." Tina hands H. J. the key to Juliana's trunk, daring him to open it so as to discover whether or not she had lied when she said that she had already burned the papers. After H. J.'s final departure from the house, Miss Tina calmly takes the papers out of the trunk, and she is burning them one by one in the stove as the final curtain descends.

Concerning Miss Tina's behavior in the final scene, it may be pointed out that Redgrave has been clever enough to create an atmosphere which is open to more than one interpretation. (This was a favorite technique of James's.) The beholder must guess the exact depth of Miss Tina's perceptions. The members of the audience must make up their own minds about whether Miss Tina was ignorant of the events of the fatal night when Juliana collapsed. (In the earlier scene, Miss Tina had gone out to fetch the doctor when Juliana discovered H. J. trying to open her trunk.) The audience knows that Pasquale moved the trunk out into the "sala," but Tina seems to assume that Juliana had moved it herself. Miss Tina seems to make a deliberate

---

avowal that she does not suspect H. J. either of moving the trunk, or of having tried to open it. This may be her method of leaving the way open for H. J. still to accept her proposal.

The old lady, Juliana, seems to be, if possible, even more insulting in the play than she was in the novel. From the moment of their first meeting, Redgrave has created the sense of a duel between Miss Bordereau and H. J. She, unwarrantably, accuses him of "haggling" about the rent, and, when H. J. intimates that he would like to see the rooms, Juliana says this new line,

JULIANA. You will like the rooms well enough. More important people than you have liked them.203

In the play, Juliana is also spiteful in new ways to Tina. She makes disparaging remarks about her niece's singing voice, and she makes unkind references to Tina's age.

A few completely new scenes occur in the play. In a highly dramatic scene in Act II, Scene iii, Juliana, in a state of delirium, relives an incident from the past. The old woman seems to be at a ball, where she is outraged by the presence of a certain blond woman—the "daughter of a whore"—who has appeared uninvited among her guests. Then, with a change of mood, Juliana caresses the head of the "child" Tina, saying, "You're all mine—you're all of his I've got—she gave you up, remember that."204 Redgrave creates the suspicion in the audience's minds that Tina may be the daughter of Aspern—by some woman other than Juliana. The dramatic tension is high between Tina and

203 Ibid., p. 21. 204 Ibid., p. 51.
H. J. as they listen to Juliana's ravings: Tina wishes to quieten the old woman, but H. J. is anxious that she be allowed to continue to talk.

A short but important new scene is given to Mrs. Prest in the last act. Mrs. Prest has come ostensibly to see whether she can be of any help to Miss Tina in her bereavement. However, it soon becomes apparent that Mrs. Prest has some malicious intent in mind. Mrs. Prest tells Miss Tina that "Harry" has broken several hearts, and, by implication, Mrs. Prest indicates that Tina does not compare well with the type of beautiful, worldly woman whom "Harry" usually picks. This is enough to motivate Tina's change of mind about her proposal to H. J.

When the editor returns to the room after Mrs. Prest's departure, Tina tells him that she has burned the papers during his short absence, and he is obliged to believe her.

This new scene in Act III between Mrs. Prest and Tina accomplishes three things for the playwright. It enables him to join two important episodes which originally happened on different days: Tina's proposal, and her change of mind. The scene fills in the necessary time between the editor's discomfited departure from the room, and his return—when he is about to make his final departure from the house. Most important of all, the scene precipitates Tina's change of attitude toward H. J.

The final farewell between Miss Tina and H. J. is accomplished through very neat dovetailing of Jamesian material and new speeches by Redgrave. The compression of time, and the joining of James's incidents, has created a continuous build throughout the last act. In the final moments of the play, the audience actually sees Tina burn the
precious "papers" on-stage. (In the novel, Tina had simply told the
editor that she had burned the papers the night before when he had been
out, and he had had no way of knowing whether or not she had told the
truth.)

Redgrave has injected some touches of poetry into his script,
and this seems in keeping with the general atmosphere. Miss Tina sings
a song, "The Green Hussars," and it is hinted that the words were by
the poet, Jeffrey Aspern. In another scene, H. J. quotes poetry to
Miss Tina, including lines from Omar Khayyam.

The script is also enlivened with touches of humor here and
there. For example, Pasquale incongruously uses the British phrase,
"Don't menchi" quite frequently. Then there are subtler moments of
humor, such as the scene in which H. J. finds out that Pasquale has
secretly brought Juliana's trunk out into the "sala." The editor half­
heartedly chides his servant, "That was very wrong of you, Pasquale,"
and then he immediately asks him, "Is it unlocked?" 205

The play is filled with a great many new details. Partly as a
result of this, there are between two and three times as many new lines
in the play as there are lines based on speeches in James's novel.
There still are a great many lines from James, but these are often
altered in minor ways. Every scene in the play opens with a new, ex­
pository section. The style of the dialogue throughout the play seems
to be homogeneous, including the scenes which are entirely new in con­
ception.

205 Ibid., p. 54.
The over-all time of the action of the play is a little shorter than that of James's novel. The play covers about eleven weeks, beginning in the spring of 1895. The events of the novel extended over more than four and a half months. The period has also been changed a little in the play: it is some ten years later than in the novel. (The novel was published in 1888, and the events are supposed to have occurred some three or four years earlier.)

Michael Redgrave has made no attempt to preserve the first person, point-of-view method of James's novel in his dramatization.

Summary

In comparing Michael Redgrave's play, The Aspern Papers, with James's novel of the same title, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:

A. Redgrave's play is in three acts, and it is divided into five scenes. One setting is required: the "sala" of Miss Bordereau's house in Venice.

Although the action is confined to a single setting, almost no incidents of the original story had to be omitted. Entrances of characters were naturally motivated by the events, but the playwright had to invent many reasons for their exits.

B. Technically, this is quite a complicated show. The appearance of the setting changes several times. Sound effects are elaborate. The lighting must be carefully controlled. Storm
effects on cue are required. Practical properties include oil lamps, and an iron stove.

The playwright has invented a number of good pieces of stage business which seem peculiarly theatrical. That is, they are of a type which grow out of the proscenium stage actor-audience relationship.

II. Michael Redgrave's handling of the material of James's novel:

A. The over-all plot and the theme are the same as in the novel.
B. A few completely new scenes occur in the play. These include the scene of Juliana's delirium; and the reappearance of Mrs. Prest in the third act, which precipitates Tina's change of mind about her proposal to H. J.
C. No incidents of importance in the novel have been omitted from the play.
D. The major characters, the editor (now named Henry Jarvis, or H. J.), Miss Tina, and Miss Bordereau are essentially the same as they were in the novel, although the ladies have been strengthened somewhat. The three minor roles have been extended: Mrs. Prest is more important to the plot, and the servants, Assunta and Pasquale, have assumed added dimensions. These six are the only characters in the play.
E. As for the dialogue, there are between two and three times as many new lines in the play as there are lines based on James. It is clear that Redgrave used the 1908 edition, rather than that of 1888, as the basis for the play. New lines, and new
scenes, are neatly dovetailed onto James's material. The over-all effect is homogeneous.

F. The over-all action of the play covers about eleven weeks, which is somewhat shorter than the time covered by the novel. The year is 1895, and this is about ten years later than the period indicated by James.

III. Gained:

A. There are a great many new details in the play.

B. Redgrave has added some touches of poetry: H. J. quotes from Omar Khayyam, and from others; and Miss Tina sings a song which is supposed to have written by the poet, Jeffrey Aspern.

C. Here and there the playwright has added a touch of humor.

D. The editor's advances toward Miss Tina seem more open in the play than in the novel—partly because of the more frequent physical contact between them, partly as a result of the poetic interludes, and partly because of H. J.'s general complimentary attitude.

IV. Lost:

There has been no attempt to preserve the first person point-of-view method of James's novel.
XI. "THE SUMMER OF DAISY MILLER" BY BERTRAM GREENE:

BASED ON JAMES'S DAISY MILLER

James's famous story, or novella, Daisy Miller, first appeared in 1878, and it soon ran into several editions on both sides of the Atlantic. The plot of the story may be found in the present study in Chapter IV, "Henry James's Own Dramatisations," under the section headed, Daisy Miller. James made a play out of his own story in 1882.

Eighty-one years later, in 1963, a dramatised version of the story was produced off-Broadway in New York, at the Phoenix Theatre. The play, entitled "The Summer of Daisy Miller," was written by Bertram Greene. Interestingly enough, the new play was very much closer to the original story than James's own play had been.

---

206 James's story, Daisy Miller, first appeared in the Cornhill Magazine, June-July, 1878. The first book edition was put out in the following year by Harper and Brothers, New York. (See Edel and Laurence, op. cit., p. 39, and p. 314.)

207 cf. ante, pp. 183-184.

208 James's play, Daisy Miller, made its first published appearance in the Atlantic Monthly, April-June, 1883. The play was published separately by James R. Osgood and Co., of Boston, later in 1883. (See Edel and Laurence, op. cit., pp. 55-56, and p. 319.)

209 Differences between James's story and his own dramatization of Daisy Miller were explored in Chapter IV of the present study, "Henry James's Own Dramatisations," cf. ante, pp. 183-191. There is apparently no connection between James's dramatization and Bertram Greene's play.
Bertram Greene's play is divided into two acts which correspond with the two chapters of the story. The events in the first act occur in Switzerland—at Vevey, and at Geneva; and those of the second act take place in Rome. It is a curiously fluid play, and when it was produced in New York the scenery changes were accomplished with colored slides projected as a background. The script indicates eleven specific locations, but the action and the lines would make the audience aware of approximately twenty-five changes of both time and locality. The scenes shift from one place to another with approximately the frequency of the original story. Sometimes a character is picked out with a spotlight and only says a line or two. Many short passages have no location: they seem like suspended scenes—in limbo, as it were. Often the script is a little bewildering because the playwright has not indicated exactly when a character should make an entrance or an exit. The character is suddenly there saying lines.

In an interview with the playwright, the writer of the present study learned that "The Summer of Daisy Miller" had first been conceived and presented as a reading program. Later it was expanded into the play version which was produced at the Phoenix Theatre in May of

---

210 The playwright, Bertram Greene, kindly allowed the writer of the present study to make a Xerox copy of an unpublished manuscript of the play. The manuscript thus studied was altered somewhat before the production, but the version was close enough to the final product to give an interesting insight into the New York production.

211 No doubt the director made the timing of entrances and exits concrete. The manuscript which was examined was not for publication purposes.
1963. This fact explains how the playwright arrived at the particular technique which he employed.

The playwright maintained James's single point-of-view by letting the character, Winterbourne, double as narrator for the play. Winterbourne often speaks of himself in the third person, and then he melts into the scene. (Curiously enough, the play does not open with the narrator; it opens with a teasing scene between Daisy and her brother, Randolph. However, the play does end on the narrator alone.) Some of the reviewers were disconcerted when characters on-stage "froze" while Winterbourne launched into an explanation, or made a comment.²¹²

Whether or not the technique was successful in this instance may be regarded as a side issue, but what is intensely interesting is that "The Summer of Daisy Miller" is the only dramatization of those examined which attempts to preserve James's single point-of-view method of writing. The original story was not written in the first person, but all of the events were seen from the perspective of Winterbourne. Thus James left room for ambiguity—for doubt in the reader's mind as to the accuracy of Winterbourne's observations and conclusions. This is probably a major factor in the intriguing quality of James's story.

Because the play was conceived with a fluidity of motion as the action shifted from one locality to another, the playwright did not of necessity have to eliminate anything from the original for staging purposes. He took it for granted that when the characters said that they

were in a certain place (inside Mrs. Walker's carriage, for example),
the audience would believe them. Actually, nothing of any importance
to the evolvement of the story was omitted from the dramatisation.

One major addition was made, however. Mrs. Walker, the American
society leader of the story, has been converted in the play into
Winterbourne's paramour. Greene has used the American Mrs. Walker as
the concrete embodiment of the mysterious foreign lady alluded to in
James's story. The first act ends with a scene between this "lady" and
Winterbourne at Geneva. In the second act, Mrs. Walker is in Rome,
and, as she did in James's story, she holds a party at which Daisy is
present. When Daisy leaves the party to go and meet Giovanelli for a
stroll in the Pincio gardens, Mrs. Walker follows her in a carriage--
as she did in the original story--with the intention of saving the girl
from compromising herself in the eyes of society.

The main characters in the play are the same as in James's
story, and they have the same names: Daisy Miller; Mrs. Miller; Ran-
dolph Miller; Frederick Winterbourne; Mrs. Costello (now referred to
as Winterbourne's Aunt Julia); the courier, Eugenio; Mrs. Walker; and
Giovanelli (now called Count Giovanelli). There was no cast list with
the manuscript of the play which the playwright loaned to the writer of
this dissertation. However, only the foregoing eight characters were
listed in the New York Times, and in the Burns Mantle Yearbook, The
Best Plays of 1962-1963. The script indicated the presence of


\[214\] Henry Hewes (ed.), The Burns Mantle Yearbook, The Best Plays
additional characters: a waiter; two American girls passing by; a butler's voice (off-stage); an Italian man; an English lady school teacher—who addressed some "girls"; and a servant at a hotel in Rome. All of these additional characters in the script had one or two lines each. Possibly these additional characters were represented by off-stage voices only.

The basic plot of the play is the same as that of James's story, except for the additional element of the affair between Winterbourne and Mrs. Walker. The period is in "the last half of the last century."^215 The over-all time element is the same in the play as it was in the story. Daisy and Winterbourne meet in June; she dies in the winter; and there is a kind of epilogue between Winterbourne and his aunt in the following summer—back at Vevey. The only internal time difference is this: in the story, Winterbourne waited until January to go to Rome, and when he got there Daisy already knew Giovanelli. In the play, Winterbourne goes to Rome at the end of September, and he sees Daisy pick up "Count" Giovanelli at Mrs. Walker's party.

Most of James's dialogue is incorporated into the play—with many minor word changes. However, a good half of the total dialogue of the play is new. The new dialogue is partly necessitated by the expository nature of James's writing, but there are many entirely new

---

^215 Ibid., p. 337.

The script which was loaned by the playwright to the writer of this dissertation did not specify the date of the action of the play. However, a photograph appeared in the New York Times before the play opened, which showed seven members of the cast of "The Summer of Daisy Miller" rehearsing in costume. The costumes looked more recent in design than the date here indicated. (New York Times, May 19, 1963.)
brief scenes, in addition to the aforementioned new development around the character of Mrs. Walker.

No doubt it is the combination of sources which accounts for the critics' conflicting comments on the dialogue. In Newsday, it was remarked that Bertram Greene had written his play with such slavish devotion to the original that it still remains a novel rather than a drama. . . . Mr. Greene has no hesitation in breaking off in the middle of a scene and of having [sic] the character of Winterbourne advance downstage and solemnly recite portions of the book. The result is a clumsy blend of Greene dialogue and James recitative.216

Howard Taubman, writing in the New York Times, similarly commented that the play was "novelistic rather than theatrical."217 Taubman further observed, "when the piece moves from the original and tries to stand on its own feet, it often becomes coarse and obvious."218

This last comment, on the coarseness of some of Greene's lines, may have been in reference to such non-Jamesian lines as these:

DAISY. D'you fancy me in scarlet, Mr. Winterbourne? WINTERBOURNE. Rather virginal white. But is there still a choice?219

Another example of new lines in the play which might be said to introduce a certain coarseness is this exchange between Winterbourne and Daisy in the Pincio gardens:

219Bertram Greene, "The Summer of Daisy Miller" (unpublished manuscript), II, 7.
WINTERBOURNE. You would leave me?
DAISY. I didn’t ask you to come in the first place. What are you afraid of? Getting lost—or being accosted?220

On the other hand, Greene should receive credit for inventing quite a number of humorous lines, including several epigrams. These latter include Winterbourne’s, “Zeal—is the world’s original sin”;221 his later line, “Beautiful sins, like beautiful things, are a privilege of the rich”;222 and Daisy’s remark that Randolph “considers it a sign of disloyalty to prosper [to grow tall] on foreign soil.”223

Summary

In comparing Bertram Greene’s play, "The Summer of Daisy Miller," with James’s story or novella, Daisy Miller, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging;

A. "The Summer of Daisy Miller" is in two acts. The number of scenes is a little indefinite, but an audience would be aware of about twenty-five changes of time and location. The action in Act I takes place in Switzerland—at Vevey, and at Geneva. Act II takes place in Rome.

B. This is a very fluid show which depends heavily on lighting. As produced at the Phoenix Theatre in New York, the set changes were indicated with slide projections on a backdrop. Many fragmentary scenes consisted of a figure or two in a

220 Ibid., II, 18.
221 Ibid., I, 31.
222 Ibid., I, 38.
223 Ibid., II, 7.
spotlight—in limbo, as it were. Sound effects were probably limited to music for dancing, and to other party noises off-stage.

II. Bertram Greene's handling of the material of James's story:

A. Greene maintained James's single point-of-view by having the character, Winterbourne, double as narrator in the play. As the narrator, Winterbourne often referred to himself in the third person. (In the story, James referred to himself as "I," and he sometimes addressed the "reader" directly. Nevertheless, all of the events in the third person narrative were seen from Winterbourne's perspective.)

This is the only dramatization of those examined which attempts to preserve James's point-of-view method of writing.

B. The action of the play follows the same general progress as the events of the story. The main plot and the theme are the same.

C. Nothing of importance in the original story has been omitted from the play.

D. One real change is in the form of an addition. In the play, Mrs. Walker and Winterbourne are lovers.

E. The eight main characters in the play are the same as in the story. They retain their original names, and, with the exception of Mrs. Walker and Winterbourne, they have the same relationships as in the story.

F. The play manuscript indicated the presence of some seven additional characters who had a line or two each. However, no
actors were listed for these characters in the newspaper re-
views: perhaps they were merely off-stage voices.

G. The over-all time is the same: one year.

H. Most of James's dialogue is incorporated into the play—with
many minor word changes. A good half of the dialogue is
totally new.

III. Gained:

The new dialogue has here and there added a certain coarseness
to the proceedings. On the other hand, some of the new lines add wel­­come humor, and they include several good epigrams.

IV. Lost:

No elements of the original story seem to have been omitted.

XIII. THE WINGS OF THE DOVE, A DRAMATIZATION

BY CHRISTOPHER TAYLOR

One of James's last three novels, The Wings of the Dove was first
published in 1902. The plot of the novel may be found earlier in the
present chapter, under section IX, "Child of Fortune"—which was an
earlier dramatization than the one to be presently discussed. In the
same place may be found details of the origins of James's novel.

---

224 Edel and Laurence, op. cit., p. 120. (In 1902, The Wings of
the Dove was published in New York by Charles Scribner's Sons; and in
London by Archibald Constable and Co.)

225 cf. ante, pp. 385-388.
In 1963, a second dramatized version of the novel was produced: this time in London. This new play was by Christopher Taylor, and the playwright maintained James's original title, *The Wings of the Dove*.

Christopher Taylor's play is in three acts, of two scenes each. The action is confined to a single setting: "a salon of the Palazzo Leporelli, Venice, at present [late 1900] the residence of Milly Theale."  

Technically, except for the necessary ornateness of the set, this would be a simple show to produce. The script indicates no sound effects. The lighting requirements are limited to effects of different times of day or night outside the windows, and, in the night scenes, the salon is lit by practical oil lamps and candelabra. The script calls also for a practical fire to be ignited on-stage in the fireplace.

James's novel was written in two volumes—the second of which was the longer. The action of Christopher Taylor's play opens about one-third of the way through the second volume of James's work. That is, all of the characters are already in Venice, and the play begins just before Lord Mark's first arrival, when he proposes unsuccessfully to Milly. As in the novel, Merton Densher (now called Merton Denver) arrives at the Palazzo just as Lord Mark is leaving; their paths cross. From this point on, the play follows the development of the novel closely, except that the ending now takes place in Venice rather than back in London. The necessarily new entrances and exits made by the characters are convincingly motivated.

---

The period is set at about the same time as in the novel: that is, at about the turn of the century. However, the action of the play covers only two and a half months (from mid-October to late December, 1900), while the main incidents of the novel extended slightly over a year. This last statement disregards several flash backs in the novel.

The main characters in the play are the same as in James's novel, and, with one exception, they keep the same names: Milly Theale; Merton Denver (James's Merton Densher); Kate Croy; Susan Shepherd; Aunt Maud, or Mrs. Maud Lowder; and Lord Mark. (Mrs. Shepherd's name has been simplified from Mrs. Susan Shepherd Stringham.) Merton is older rather than younger than Kate in the play. There are now three servants: Pasquale, a gondolier; Ganaseta, a footman; and Maria, a housemaid. These represent a slight change from James's servants, and the major-domo, Eugenio, has been eliminated. Fairly important Jamesian characters who have been eliminated from this dramatization include Lionel Croy; Marian, and her children; the two Miss Condrips; the great doctor, Sir Luke Strett; and the little Italian doctor, Tacchini. (The two doctors, however, are both spoken of in the play.) In addition, the novel included many merely incidental characters who are absent from the play.

More than half of the actual wording of the play's dialogue is from James. Although the action of the play begins more than half way through the second volume of the novel, the playwright often utilizes lines from the first volume. Quite a number of times in the play, speeches are juxtaposed which were originally separated by two or three hundred pages. In some scenes, the dialogue is spliced together line
by line, with new lines connecting speeches from the novel. However, since the styles match well, it seems as if an even larger percentage of the dialogue is taken from James than is actually the case.

In point of fact, Christopher Taylor has had to create a new opening for every scene of the play except the final one. The playwright has also presented two scènes à faire which were only hinted at in the novel: in one of these essential scenes, Lord Mark reveals to Milly the truth about the relationship between Merton Denver and Kate Croy; in the other essential scene, Merton Denver has a final interview with the dying Milly. Even in these new scenes, the playwright has found ways to incorporate lines from other parts of James's novel.

Four other new items in the play warrant mention. First, Mrs. Lowder, Kate, and Lord Mark are invited by a Lady Danby to stay with her in Greece; thus the playwright manages to get these characters out of the way during the period when Merton Denver must be alone with Milly in Venice. Second, Susan lies to Mrs. Lowder to make her think that Merton loves Milly—in the hope that eventually he really will. Third, Merton loses his newspaper job as a result of his protracted stay in Venice. Fourth, a good deal of Italian is spoken by the servants, and by Susan Shepherd, in the play: this was not evident in the book.

227 Ibid., pp. 48-50.
228 Ibid., pp. 58-59.
Here and there, the playwright has added a wisp of humor of his own, but it is never obtrusive. Such new humor as there is, is generally centered around the figure of Aunt Maud (Mrs. Lowder).

Since the whole first volume of James's novel has been omitted from the play, this has eliminated all of the incidents involving Kate's father—Lionel Croy, and her sister. Dr. Strett is mentioned, but he never appears on-stage. The earlier meeting of Milly and Merton Densher in America, and Milly's travels with Susan in Europe, have likewise been omitted from the play. Nothing is seen of the earlier relationships between Kate and Milly, or between Merton Densher and Mrs. Lowder.

As a matter of side interest, it may be mentioned that the Bronzino portrait which so much resembled Milly in the novel, and which became a unifying focal point in the earlier dramatization, Child of Fortune, by Guy Bolton, is not mentioned in this adaptation by Christopher Taylor.

Taylor's play is written objectively, in the usual representational manner for proscenium production. The playwright has made no attempt to preserve James's "centres" of interest.

---

229 There seems to be no connection between the two dramatizations. None of Guy Bolton's lines or ideas appear in the later Taylor dramatization. It is probably coincidental that in both plays the playwrights have selected Greece as a convenient place to have Aunt Maud, Kate, and Lord Mark visit—so as to remove them temporarily from the scene of action in Venice. Also it is probably coincidental that both playwrights changed Merton Densher's last name: Bolton called him Richard Denning, and Taylor called him Merton Denver. (In a letter to the writer of this dissertation, dated May 4, 1963, Bolton mentioned that Densher sounded too much like "denture."
Summary

In comparing Christopher Taylor's play, The Wings of the Dove, with James's novel of the same title, the following items may be summarized.

I. Staging:

A. Taylor's play is in three acts, of two scenes each. Only one setting is required: a salon in the Palazzo Leporelli, in Venice.

B. Technically, this is a simple show. No sound effects are called for, and the lighting effects are limited to changes in the sky outside the windows. Practical items include oil lamps, candelabra, and a fire.

II. Christopher Taylor's handling of the material of James's novel:

A. The action of the play begins at a point equivalent to one third of the way through the second volume of James's two-volume novel. From this point on, the story is the same in both works, except that the ending of the play is now in Venice rather than back in London.

B. New scenes include two scènes à faire: Lord Mark's revelation to Milly; and Merton Denver's final interview with Milly. However, the playwright has not added any significant events to James's novel.

C. Omitted from the play is everything that happened in London and elsewhere before Milly went to Venice.

D. The mechanics of moving characters on and off the stage are convincingly motivated.
E. The main characters are the same, and they have the same relationships in both works. In the play their names are unchanged, with the exception of James's Merton Densher who is now called Merton Denver. Omitted from the play are Lionel Croy, Marian Condrip, and Sir Luke Strett, as well as several minor characters. There are some changes also in the palace staff—including the elimination of the major-domo, Eugenio.

F. More than half of the wording of the dialogue of the play is from James. In splicing the material together, the playwright has meticulously matched James's style.

G. The events of the play cover two and a half months as compared to over a year in the novel. The period, 1900, is the same as in the novel.

III. Gained:

Here and there the playwright has added a wisp of humor.

IV. Lost:

A. The omniscient author has vanished.

B. No attempt has been made to preserve James's "centres" of interest.

CONCLUSIONS

When the thirteen dramatizations based on James's works are considered as a group, certain observations may be made.

Two of the playwrights, William Archibald and Allan Turpin, have dramatized James more than once. Also of interest is the fact that certain works of James have been dramatized by more than one writer:
The *Aspern Papers* was dramatized by Allan Turpin, and by Michael Redgrave; The *Turn of the Screw* was dramatized by Allan Turpin, and by William Archibald, and it was turned into an opera by Benjamin Britten; and The *Wings of the Dove* was dramatized by Guy Bolton, and by Christopher Taylor, and it was turned into an opera by Douglas Moore.

Ten different works by James served as the bases for the thirteen dramatizations. Six of these Jamesian works were written in the usual objective storytelling manner in the third person, with the omnipotent author present in some degree. Four of the original works by James were written in some form of his point-of-view method of construction (*Daisy Miller; The Aspern Papers; The Turn of the Screw; and The Wings of the Dove*).

The *Summer of Daisy Miller* is the only dramatization which preserved James's point-of-view method. It is also the only dramatization which called for unrealistic settings. Of the remaining twelve dramatizations, three showed the influence of contemporary staging, but still they were realistic in atmosphere. The prologue of *Child of Fortune* showed nothing on-stage except a portrait of a sixteenth century woman, while a voice—which might have belonged to a guide, or to a gallery attendant—described its significance. *Portrait of a Lady*, and *Eugenia* both had settings which showed simultaneously an interior and an exterior, and which were intended to be used as multiple stage areas with the aid of controlled lighting.

---

230 A description of the scenery method used in the New York production of *The Summer of Daisy Miller* may be found in Section XII of the present chapter.
On the whole, the dramatizations kept close to James's storylines, with some changes of emphasis observable in The Tragic Muse, in The Heiress, and in The Innocents. With the exception of Berkeley Square, the names of the characters were usually kept the same or very close to those invented by James.

As far as the dialogue is concerned, the following observations may be made. The plays were based on works from each of James's three writing periods.231 From the novelist's early period came The Europeans (1878), Daisy Miller (1878), Washington Square (1880), and The Portrait of a Lady (1881). From his middle period came The Reverb­erator (1888), The Aspern Papers (1888), The Tragic Muse (1890), and "The Turn of the Screw" in The Two Magics (1898). From James's last, and most complex period came The Wings of the Dove (1902), and the posthumously published The Sense of the Past (1917).

In the dramatizations, the degree of fidelity to James's dialogue seems not to have been influenced by the period of the original writing. James's dialogue was incorporated verbatim into Allan Turpin's two dramatizations, The Turn of the Screw and The Aspern Papers (with very little left out), and a high percentage of the dialogue in The Heiress is transferred directly from the novel into the play. Perhaps half of the dialogue is from James in The Tragic Muse, in Portrait of a Lady, in The Summer of Daisy Miller, and in The Wings of the Dove.

231 The three-fold division of James's writings is based on Henry James by Leon Edel (Pamphlets on American Writers, Number 4. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1960), pp. 17-18. The order of publication may be found in Edel and Laurence, op. cit., passim.
A large percentage of the dialogue is new in *The Innocents*, in *Letter From Paris*, in *Eugenia*, and in Michael Redgrave's *The Aspern Papers*. The dialogue is totally new in *Child of Fortune*, and in *Berkeley Square*.

An interesting fact is that the thirteen dramatisations, on the whole, stayed close to the intent of James's original works. The playwrights were less free with James's plots than he often was when he wrote his own dramatizations. However, there is a great deal of variation in the amount of Jamesian dialogue which the various playwrights utilized.
CONCLUSION

Henry James is perhaps best known for his development of the international novel, for the depth of his psychological insight, and for the development of his "point of view" technique. Less well known are his dramatic works. In general, critical opinion seems to indicate that James failed as a playwright.

In the present study, "Henry James On Stage," an investigation has been made of Henry James as a source of drama. The study includes the history of James's playwriting career, and an account of the productions of his plays up until the present time; an examination of his plays as scripts; and a comparison of his own dramatisations with the original fictional works, for the purpose of discovering what James himself did with the material when transposing it from fictional into dramatic form. In the later chapters of the present study, an account is given of the professional productions of all of the dramatisations of James's works which have been written by other playwrights—there have been thirteen plays and two operas based on James's stories and novels; and a comparison is made between the original Jamesian works and their dramatisations, in order to discover what the playwrights did with James's material when adapting it for the stage.
A digest of the critics' reviews has been provided both for the productions of James's own plays, and for the productions of the dramatizations by other playwrights based on James's works.

There has been no attempt to include adaptations of James which have been used in the films, on television, or on the radio.

Throughout his life, James was an inveterate theatregoer. He published many essays on plays, playwrights, and actors. Although he admired the written form of the drama, he despised the production conditions of the theatre. He wrote plays, he said, in the hope of finding success, and for financial reasons. As a practicing playwright, James had several distinct periods of writing for the theatre, and his total output amounted to fifteen plays, and one dramatic monologue.

During his lifetime, eight of James's plays were published, and two others were privately printed. After James's death, the monologue which he had written for Ruth Draper was published. The other five plays remained unpublished until they were brought together in The Complete Plays of Henry James, edited by Leon Edel, in 1949.

---

1James's plays, and the dates when they were written, were as follows: Pyramus and Thisbe (probably written in 1869); Still Waters (1871); A Change of Heart (c. 1871); Daisy Miller (1882); The American (1890); a new fourth act for The American (autumn 1892); Tenants (1890); Disengaged (late 1891 or 1892); The Album (1891 or 1892); The Reprobate (1891 or 1892); Guy Domville (1893); Summerson (1895); The High Bid (1907); The Chaperon (unfinished, rough scenario in 1907); The Saloon (late 1907); The Other House (sketched in 1893, or 1894, new play written in 1909); The Outcry (autumn 1909); and the monologue for Ruth Draper (1913).

Nine of James's fifteen plays have been professionally performed: five were produced during James's lifetime; two were presented within a few years after his death; and two were professionally performed for the first time in the 1950's, while two others were revived at the same time. The longest run was achieved by The American, which was the first of James's plays to be produced; it ran for over seventy performances in London, in 1891, and it had about twenty-five more performances in the English provinces. However, the play which caused the most stir was Guy Domville, starring the popular George Alexander, which ran for some forty performances in London, in 1895.

As scripts, James's plays were, on the whole, highly conventional. In the present study, James's scripts were analysed for the purpose of discovering how his playwriting technique developed and changed. The survey of James's plays was divided into four large categories: I. Script Format; II. Subject and Treatment; III. Literary Aspects; and IV. Stageability.

Of James's fifteen plays, five were written in one act. Most of the others were in three acts, but there was one four-act play, and one was written in three acts preceded by a very long prologue. Two of James's early plays were divided into French scènes, but the author gave up this practice in his later plays. In the lines of his plays, James used italics and capitalisation with unusual frequency to indicate where the emphasis should come. In his scripts, James followed the old conventions; he listed the cast with the male characters first; he named many of the characters in such a way as to indicate their characteristics; and, up until roughly the turn of the century, James
used asides and soliloquies. James's methods of exposition gradually became more skillful, and less obvious. His attitude toward the texts of his plays, and toward the titles, was one of flexibility.

James favored comedies, and he drew his characters from the upper levels of society. In the hope of winning public favor, James deliberately used the conventional happy ending. However, he did write two tragedies late in his playwriting career. His themes included thwarted love; the romantic success of unworthy heroes; the contrasts between Americans and Europeans; and the importance of tradition. James espoused realism, and he disregarded the classical unities.

James did not present any deeply probing character studies in his dramas. However, some of the characters stood out above the others. The critics often found his characters conventional, and unlifelike. Although many of James's characters had various national and personal backgrounds, only once did the author seriously attempt to represent a dialect--for Christopher Newman in *The American*. One technique which James used on several occasions as a method for distinguishing a character was the employment of a recurrent characterizing phrase.

The style of the language in his plays was inevitably Jamesian. As he grew older, both the lines and the stage directions became gradually more involved. Occasionally a grammatical error, and sometimes an archaic spelling, appeared in the plays. James gradually increased the variety of the humor which was sprinkled in the lines of most of his plays.
The mechanics of James's plays were, on the whole, too evident. The terminology of James's stage directions was not proficient until he had his first professional production— The American, in 1891. He was always careful about specifying where characters should enter, exit, or reenter. There is internal evidence in the plays to show that when James referred to the "left" or to the "right" of the stage, he meant from the point of view of the audience.

James's settings were not very imaginative, but they were always playable. He was usually vague about furnishings. Sometimes, James specified that an interior setting should reflect the personality of its owner.

James understood how an actor's "business" can be used for purposes of suggesting a type of character, and also for creating humor. He came to understand that meaning could be conveyed through movement alone, and eventually he replaced the soliloquy with silent action passages.

James's consciousness of staging gradually increased. By 1908, when The High Bid was produced, James apparently understood the psychological use of stage space. He realized that business should reflect the state of mind of an individual; sometimes he suggested alternative stage directions; at times, he suggested a definite stage picture; and, in two of his last plays, it seems evident that James understood that color in costumes may be used to indicate opposing characters. He also understood the principle of "planting" lines and business.

In the later plays, James's stage directions reflect more and more the attitude of the author of a story; they provide an outlet for
James's own comments, and they also reveal the motivations of the characters.

James's visualization of the staging of a play was not always faultless, but any mistakes he made were of a minor nature. Mistakes of timing, or unrealistic visualization of a piece of business, could doubtless be corrected in an actual performance.

Of the fifteen plays which James wrote, seven were dramatizations of stories or novels. Only one of James's dramatizations, Tenants, was based on the work of an author other than himself. On three occasions, James later converted a play of his into fictional form. In the present study, James's dramatizations were analyzed in four ways: I. Staging; II. The handling of the story or novel material; III. Items gained; and IV. Items lost. On this four-way basis, a comparison was made between James's dramatizations and the original works, for the purpose of discovering what James himself did with the material when transposing it from fictional into dramatic form.

In his own dramatizations, James kept the staging relatively simple, and he often reduced the number of locations where the action took place.

In their original form, three of James's dramatizations had been written from a single point of view. However, all of his plays were written objectively for realistic presentation on the proscenium stage.

3 James's seven dramatizations were Daisy Miller, The American, Tenants, Disengaged, The High Bid, The Saloon, and The Other House.

4 Three of the stories which James dramatized were written from a single point of view: these were "Daisy Miller," "The Solution," and "Owen Wingrave," which were used for the plays Daisy Miller, Disengaged, and The Saloon, respectively.
On the whole, two patterns are evident in James's own dramatizations. First, he dealt freely with the events and with the characters of the original material. Sometimes he utilized no more than the basic situation, or the theme of the original fictional work. Second, James believed that a happy ending was essential for theatrical success, and so he invented new happy endings for some of his earlier dramatizations. However, after the turn of the century, he retained the tragic conclusions in his last two dramatizations.

As far as the dialogue was concerned, James seemed to have no set policy in his dramatizations. Sometimes the author stayed close to the original dialogue all the way through the dramatization; sometimes James kept much of the original dialogue, but he wrote in additional new scenes; but in several of James's dramatizations, the dialogue was entirely new. In fact, three of his dramatizations were really new creations just based on the themes of earlier stories. (In Tenants, based on a French story by Henri Rivière, the dialogue was entirely new, and James only appropriated part of the original situation.)

In the fifty years since James's death, several highly successful dramatizations by other playwrights have been based on his fictional works. Brooks Atkinson, in the New York Times, suggested that at least one of these (The Innocents by William Archibald, based on James's The Turn of the Screw) might be acceptable to James "as a consolation prize for the stage career that he always wanted but could never achieve."^5

There have been thirteen different dramatizations of James's works written by other playwrights, and presented on the stage in New York or in London.\(^6\) There have also been two operatic works based on James.\(^7\)

In the digest of reviews for each production which is presented in the present study, special care has been taken to include any critical evaluations of the plays as dramatizations, as well as important data about the productions themselves.

The sources of the thirteen dramatizations were explored in the present study by examining: (1) James's own source material; (2) the original Jamesian works; and (3) changes made during the dramatization process. The dramatizations were analyzed in four ways: I. Staging; II. The handling of James's story or novel material; III. Items gained; and IV. Items lost. On this four-way basis, a comparison was made between the thirteen dramatizations and the original Jamesian works.\(^8\)

\(^6\)Arranged in the order in which they were written, the thirteen dramatizations are Berkeley Square by John L. Balderston; The Tragic Muse by Hubert Griffith; The Turn of the Screw, and The Aspern Papers (a double bill) by Allan Turpin; The Heiress by Ruth and Augustus Goetz; The Innocents by William Archibald; Letter From Paris by Dodie Smith; Portrait of a Lady by William Archibald; Child of Fortune by Guy Bolton; Eugenia by Randolph Carter; The Aspern Papers by Michael Redgrave; The Summer of Daisy Miller by Bertram Greene; and The Wings of the Dove by Christopher Taylor.

\(^7\)The two operas based on James are The Turn of the Screw by Benjamin Britten, and The Wings of the Dove by Douglas Moore.

\(^8\)Only eight of the thirteen dramatizations have been published, but the writer of this dissertation was extremely fortunate in being able to borrow original play manuscripts from the writers of the five unpublished plays: The Turn of the Screw, and The Aspern Papers—both by Allan Turpin; Portrait of a Lady by William Archibald; Eugenia by Randolph Carter; and The Summer of Daisy Miller by Bertram Greene.
When the thirteen dramatizations are viewed as a group, certain observations may be made.

Two of the playwrights, William Archibald and Allan Turpin, have dramatized James more than once. Also of interest is the fact that certain works of James have been dramatized by more than one writer: The Aspern Papers was dramatized by Allan Turpin, and by Michael Redgrave; The Turn of the Screw was dramatized by Allan Turpin, and by William Archibald, and it was turned into an opera by Benjamin Britten; and The Wings of the Dove was dramatized by Guy Bolton, and by Christopher Taylor, and it was turned into an opera by Douglas Moore.

Ten different works by James served as the bases for the thirteen dramatizations. Six of these Jamesian works were written in the usual objective storytelling manner in the third person, with the omnipotent author present in some degree. Four of the original works by James were written in some form of his point-of-view method of construction (Daisy Miller; The Aspern Papers; The Turn of the Screw; and The Wings of the Dove).

The Summer of Daisy Miller is the only dramatization which preserved James's point-of-view method. It is also the only dramatization which called for unrealistic settings. Of the remaining twelve dramatizations, three showed the influence of contemporary staging, but still they were realistic in atmosphere. These were Child of Fortune, Portrait of a Lady, and Eugenia.

On the whole, the dramatizations kept close to James's story lines, with some changes of emphasis observable in The Tragic Muse, in The Heiress, and in The Innocents. With the exception of Berkeley
Square, the names of the characters were usually kept the same or very close to those used by James.

As far as the dialogue is concerned, the following observations may be made. The plays were based on works from each of James's three writing periods. From the novelist's early period came The Europeans (1878), Daisy Miller (1878), Washington Square (1880), and The Portrait of a Lady (1881). From his middle period came The Reverberator (1888), The Aspern Papers (1888), The Tragic Muse (1890), and "The Turn of the Screw" in The Two Magics (1898). From James's last, and most complex period came The Wings of the Dove (1902), and the posthumously published The Sense of the Past (1917).

In the dramatizations, the degree of fidelity to James's dialogue seems not to have been influenced by the period of the original writing. James's dialogue was incorporated verbatim into Allan Turpin's two dramatizations, The Turn of the Screw and The Aspern Papers (with very little of James left out), and a high percentage of the dialogue in The Heiress is transferred directly from the novel into the play. Perhaps half of the dialogue is from James in The Tragic Muse, in Portrait of a Lady, in The Summer of Daisy Miller, and in The Wings of the Dove. A large percentage of the dialogue is new in The Innocents, in Letter From Paris, in Eugenia, and in Michael Redgrave's The Aspern Papers. The dialogue is totally new in Child of Fortune, and in Berkeley Square.

An interesting fact is that the thirteen dramatizations, on the whole, stayed close to the intent of James's original works. The playwrights were less free with James's plots than he often was when he
wrote his own dramatizations. However, there is a great deal of variation in the amount of Jamesian dialogue which the various playwrights utilized.

Although some of the dramatizations of James which have been written by other playwrights were very successful, others failed miserably. If the success of a play can be measured by the length of its run, then perhaps the thirteen dramatizations can be divided into two groups. Successful productions (over one hundred performances) were achieved by Berkeley Square, The Heiress, The Innocents, Redgrave's The Aspern Papers, and The Wings of the Dove. Unsuccessful (less than thirty performances) were The Tragic Muse, Turpin's The Turn of the Screw, Turpin's The Aspern Papers, Letter From Paris, Portrait of a Lady, Child of Fortune, Eugenia, and The Summer of Daisy Miller. This is a total of five successes, and eight failures.

It is evident that the success or failure of the thirteen dramatizations did not depend on the Jamesian work selected, for in each of the three instances when a single work was dramatized twice, one play succeeded and the other one failed. Reference is here made to The Aspern Papers (dramatized by Allan Turpin, and by Michael Redgrave); to The Turn of the Screw (dramatized by Allan Turpin, and by William Archibald); and to The Wings of the Dove (dramatized by Guy Bolton,  

9The exact length of each run may be found in Table II, at the end of Chapter V.
and by Christopher Taylor). The last two works were also made into operas, by Benjamin Britten, and by Douglas Moore, respectively.10

Viewing again the five successes and the eight failures, it might be asked whether there is any observable pattern in the use of James's dialogue. Again, the answer is in the negative: there is no correspondence between the closeness of the dialogue to the original work, and the degree of success achieved when the piece was performed. Nor, it should be noted, is there any correspondence between the period of James's writing to which the original work belonged, and the degree of success achieved by its dramatization.

Of the successful dramatizations, a large percentage of the dialogue of *The Heiress* was taken verbatim from James (the novel, *Washington Square*, was written in James's earlier and simpler style); about half of the dialogue was James's in *The Wings of the Dove* (the novel is a fine example of James's later, complex style); perhaps a quarter of the dialogue was from the original works in *The Innocents*, and in Redgrave's *The Aspern Papers* (the originals were both written during James's middle period); and the dialogue in *Berkeley Square* was entirely new (the original novel was posthumously published).

Similarly, the dialogue in the dramatizations which failed shows no pattern as regards its sources: the dialogue was taken almost verbatim from James in Turpin's *The Turn of the Screw*, and in his *The

10 The production conditions of operas in repertory are felt to be different enough to make comparisons invalid on the basis of the number of performances achieved. However, the Britten opera won critical acclaim in several countries, while the Moore work was not very well received.
Aspern Papers (the originals were both written during James's middle period); about half of the dialogue was James's in The Tragic Muse, Letter From Paris, Portrait of a Lady, and The Summer of Daisy Miller (of the originals, the first two listed here were from James's middle period, and the last two were from the author's early period); mostly new dialogue was in Eugenia (based on an early work by James); and totally new dialogue was written for Child of Fortune (the original novel, The Wings of the Dove, was from James's later, complex period).

The most that can be said on the basis of the foregoing facts is that the use of James's dialogue in a dramatization will assure neither success nor failure—regardless of the period of James's writing to which the original work belonged.

Did, then, the success or failure depend solely on the skill of the playwright? Not entirely, for there is one case in which the same playwright dramatized James twice, the first time with success, and the second time with failure. William Archibald successfully dramatized The Turn of the Screw into The Innocents, but he did not achieve success with his later play, Portrait of a Lady.

Of the five successful dramatizations, only two came from well established writers: these were newspaperman John Balderston; and actor, sometimes writer, Michael Redgrave. William Archibald, and Ruth and Augustus Goetz, had all had some Broadway productions previously, but their first big successes were their adaptations of James.

It may be noted that two of the eight failures came from the pens of long established playwrights: Dodie Smith, and Guy Bolton.
To recapitulate, there has been no pattern in the success or failure of the dramatizations based on James. Success or failure of the play has not been dependent on the work chosen; nor has success been dependent on the proportion of James's dialogue which has been retained; nor on the period of James's writing to which the original work belonged; nor, to any great extent, on the amount of previous experience which the playwright has had.

One interesting fact that comes out of the data concerning the dramatizations is that there is a wide gulf between the number of performances achieved by the successes and by the failures. The eight failures had less than thirty performances each, while the five successes each had over one hundred performances. (The most highly successful dramatization, The Heiress, was given over four hundred times in New York, and over six hundred times in London.) Certainly there is proof enough that James's works can be successfully dramatized, when the right playwright is combined with the right work by James.
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APPENDIX A

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON THE LEADING ACTORS IN THE FIRST PRODUCTION

(SOUTHPORT AND LONDON CASTS OF JAMES'S THE AMERICAN)

†

EDWARD COMPTON (1854-1918), English actor-manager who had his own company, the Compton Comedy Company; married the American actress, Virginia Bateman, in 1882; the company toured all over the provinces, and made several London appearances; in September, 1891, Compton leased the Opéra Comique Theatre in London for the production of Henry James's play, The American; Edward Compton, with Milton Bode, opened the Dalston Theatre, Hackney, in 1898.


* MRS. EDWARD COMPTON (1853-1918), (née Virginia Frances Bateman), actress and manageress; sister of Kate, Isabel, and Ellen Bateman—all actresses; first appeared on the London stage in 1865; played many leading parts in London; married Edward Compton in 1882; the mother of five children—Compton Mackenzie, the novelist, was the eldest; the other four all went on the stage, Frank, Viola, Ellen, and Fay Compton. On the death of her husband, Mrs. Compton took over the control of the Compton Comedy Company; opened the Repertory Theatre in Nottingham, in 1920.


† ELIZABETH ROBINS (Mrs. George Richmond Parks), (1865-1952); born in Louisville, Kentucky; educated in Zanesville, Ohio; began her acting career in America, and went to England in 1889, where she played many

Southport cast of The American, opened January 3, 1891.

London cast of The American, opened September 26, 1891.
of the great Ibsen roles. She was also the author of many novels, and of a play, Votes for Women. Her book, Theatre and Friendship, contains many letters from Henry James, and it has been used extensively in the present study. She used the pen name of C. E. Raimond. Her writing career extended from the 1890's until her death.


† LOUISE MOODIE (1846-1934); first appeared in London as Camille in 1870. She appeared in The Crisis at the Haymarket in 1878, and two years later she played Elizabeth to Modjeska's Mary Stuart at the Court Theatre. In 1893, she was one of the three principal players in Ibsen's The Master Builder in London, with Elizabeth Robins, and Herbert Waring. She is reported to have played East Lynne in the English provinces over a thousand times.


† KATE JOSEPHINE BATEMAN (Mrs. Crowe), (1822-1917); born in Baltimore, Maryland. In 1851, she appeared with her sisters, Isabel and Ellen Bateman, in scenes from Shakespeare, at the St. James's Theatre, London. In the early 1860's, Kate Bateman was back in the States, appearing in Augustin Daly's Leah the Forsaken. In 1875, in London, Miss Bateman played Lady Macbeth with Henry Irving; later she played Emilia in Othello, and Queen Margaret in Richard III (1878). She came out of retirement to appear in James's, The American.


† CHARLES MAITLAND HALLARD (1865-1912), born in Edinburgh; attended Edinburgh University; made his first stage appearance in 1889; had a long acting career on both sides of the Atlantic—under Beerbohm Tree's management at the Haymarket almost continuously from January, 1891 until the end of 1896 [C. W. Hallard appeared "by permission of Mr. Beerbohm Tree" in The American in 1891]; under Charles Frohman's management, Empire Theatre, New York, 1906-1907; also played in Australia, and in South Africa; appeared in a number of films in the later part of his career.

†London east of The American, opened September 26, 1891.
APPENDIX B

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON THE PLAYWRIGHTS AND COMPOSERS WHO DRAMATIZED JAMES

WILLIAM ARCHIBALD (1919- ), dancer, singer, writer, and illustrator, born in Trinidad, and educated at the island's College of St. Mary; came to the U. S. in 1937; joined the Charles Weidman dancers, and wrote a verse accompaniment for one of their numbers; has danced in several Broadway musicals; and has appeared in night clubs and on television. As a writer, Archibald has published several short stories; collaborated with the young composer, Baldwin Bergersen, to write Carib Song, which starred Katherine Dunham; a second collaboration with Bergersen resulted in the less successful, Far Harbor. Archibald's first play, The Innocents, based on Henry James's "The Turn of the Screw," scored an immediate success in New York in 1950. His later adaptation of James for the play, Portrait of a Lady, 1954, had only a few performances. 


JOHN LLOYD BALDERSTON (1889-1951), born in Philadelphia; attended Columbia University; was New York correspondent for the Philadelphia Record, 1911-1914; war correspondent in Europe for the McClure Syndicate, 1914-1918; represented the U. S. Committee on Public Information, 1918-1919; editor of The Outlook, 1920-1924; chief London Correspondent for the New York World, 1923-1931.

In the 1920's, Balderston wrote a couple of plays, A Morality Play for the Leisure Class, and Tongo, before he wrote the highly successful Berkeley Square, with the assistance of J. C. Squire. Berkeley Square, based on Henry James's novel, The Sense of the Past, was produced in London in 1926, and in New York in 1929. In the 1930's, Balderston was the co-author of several plays: Dracula; Red Planet; and Frankenstein. His Farewell Performance, from the Hungarian, was produced in London in 1936. Balderston was commissioned to write a number of screen plays and adaptations for motion pictures, including Lives of a Bengal Lancer, and Prisoner of Zenda. His publications include a war book, The Genius of the Marne, and A Goddess to a God. Balderston was a lecturer in drama at the University of Southern California, beginning in 1952.
GUY BOLTON (1884- ), born in England, became an American citizen in 1956, and has had an extraordinarily long career writing for the theatre. His first play, The Drone, written in collaboration with Douglas J. Wood, was produced in New York in 1911. For the next thirty years, Bolton wrote several plays, or books for musicals, each year. After that he began to slow down. His plays include The Rose of China, 1919; Lady Be Good, 1924, and Rio Rita, 1927 (both with Fred Thompson); A Song of Sixpence (with Ian Hay), 1919; Anything Goes (with P. G. Wodehouse), 1930; Theatre (with Somerset Maugham), 1911; Follow the Girls (with Eddie Davis), 1914; the adaptation from the French of Marcelle Maurette's play, Anastasia, 1954; the book for Ankles Aweigh (with Eddie Davis), 1955; Come On Jeeves (with P. G. Wodehouse), 1955; and Child of Fortune, adapted from Henry James's novel, The Wings of the Dove, 1956.

According to a letter from Bolton to the writer of the present study, dated May 4, 1963, the playwright has taken to writing novels in recent years. His novels include The Olympians, 1961, and The Enchantress, 1964.

BENJAMIN BRITTEN (1913- ), born in Lowestoft, England; studied piano and composition on scholarship at the Royal College of Music, London; first published composition, a Sinfonietta for Chamber Orchestra, in 1932, while still at college; is a composer, pianist, and occasional conductor; artistic director of the Aldeburgh Festival, which he founded in 1948 with Peter Pears and Eric Crozier; director, English Opera Group.

Britten's operas include, among others, Peter Grimes; The Rape of Lucretia; Let's Make an Opera; The Turn of the Screw (based on Henry James's story of the same title); A Midsummer Night's Dream; and Curlew River. Britten has also composed choral works; orchestral works; concertos; chamber music; songs; a full-length ballet, Prince of the Pagodas; and incidental music for plays and films, as well as music commissioned by the B.B.C.
RANDOLPH CARTER, is a resident of Manhattan, and he is one of the directors of the Pines Film Society, Fire Island, New York. Carter's play, Eugenia, based on Henry James's novel, The Europeans, was produced by the late John C. Wilson, in New York, early in 1957. Starred were Scott Merrill, and Tallulah Bankhead. The play has not been published.

Information based on correspondence with Mr. Carter, and on reviews of Eugenia.

AUGUSTUS GOETZ (1900-1957), born in Buffalo, New York; navy flier in World War I; attended Fordham and Georgetown Universities, as well as the University of Pennsylvania; tried Wall Street, but became bored; went to Europe, where he met and married Ruth Goodman. With Arthur Sheekman, Augustus Goetz dramatized a book, Franklin Street (written by Philip Goodman, Broadway producer and father of Mrs. Goetz), but the play was withdrawn after a tryout production. Augustus and Ruth Goetz formed a playwriting team; details of their joint efforts are given in the following entry. (An obituary in the New York Times, October 1, 1957, gave Augustus Goetz's age as fifty-six at the time of his death.)


BERTRAM GREENE, born on Long Island; attended the College of William and Mary, and Yale University; is the art director for the Modern Merchandizing Bureau in New York. Greene has had a number of stories published; his work has appeared in Harper's Bazaar; and he has written for the Paris Review. Playwriting includes three off-Broadway productions; an adaptation of Kafka's The Trial, presented at the Provincetown Playhouse, 1955; an adaptation of Wedekind's Spring's Awakening, presented at the Cherry Lane Theatre, 1957; and The Summer
of Daisy Miller, based on Henry James's Daisy Miller, presented at the Phoenix Theatre, 1963. An original play, Fruits of the End, has been given performances at the Arena Theatre in Dallas, Texas, and at the Actors' Workshop in San Francisco. Greene is currently working on an adaptation of My Mother's Side by Colette.

[Information obtained in a personal interview conducted by the writer of this dissertation in August, 1965.]

HUBERT GRIFFITH (1896-1953), born in London; educated at St. Paul's School in London, and in Berlin; following service in World War I, for over ten years Griffith served as dramatic critic successively for the Daily Chronicle, the Observer, the Evening Standard, and the New Leader. His plays include Tunnel-Trench, 1921; The Tragic Muse, adapted from Henry James's novel of the same title, 1928; Red Sunday, 1929; Youth at the Helm (adaptation), 1934, and others. Published books include Iconoclastes, or the Future of Shakespeare, 1928 (criticism); Seeing Soviet Russia, 1932 (travel); and a book about Mistinguett. Griffith again turned to dramatic criticism, writing for the Sunday Graphic, 1945-1950; and for the New English Review, 1947-1950. President of Critics' Circle, 1952.


DOUGLAS STUART MOORE (1893- ), born in Cutchogue, New York; attended Yale University; after service in World War I, Moore had two periods of music study in Europe; received Guggenheim Fellowship, 1934; President of American Academy of Arts and Letters, 1959-1962; received Pulitzer Prize in Music (for opera), 1951; Critics' Circle Award for Opera, 1958. Received honorary doctor of music degrees from Cincinnati Conservatory, Rochester University, and Yale. Moore joined the faculty of Columbia University in 1926, became Chairman of Dept. of Music in 1940, and remained in that position until his retirement in 1963.

Operas include The Devil and Daniel Webster (words by Stephen Vincent Benét), 1938; Giants in the Earth, 1950; The Ballad of Baby Doe (libretto by John Latouche), 1955; and The Wings of the Dove (libretto by Ethan Ayer), based on Henry James's novel, 1961--produced in 1963. Author of Listening to Music (1931), and From Madrigal to Modern Music (1942).


SIR MICHAEL REDGRAVE (1908- ), actor, author, director; born in Bristol; son of an actor and actress; educated at Clifton College, and Magdalene College, Cambridge; formerly a schoolmaster; first acted
professionally in Liverpool, 1934; first London appearance, 1936; first New York stage appearance, 1940. Broke his career for a year of naval service, 1941-1942. Shakespearean roles include Macbeth, Hamlet, Richard III, Shylock, Lear, Antony. Other stage roles include Rakitin in A Month in the Country, the Colonel in Jacobowsky and the Colonel (which he also directed); Hector in Tiger at the Gates, and "N.J." in his adaptation of James's The Aspern Papers (1959). Well-known film appearances include Kipps, The Importance of Being Earnest, The Browning Version, and The Dam Busters.

Delivered a series of lectures at Bristol University (1952), and at Harvard University (1956). Author of plays: The Seventh Man; Circus Boy; and his adaptation of Henry James's The Aspern Papers. Books by Redgrave include The Actor's Ways and Means; Mask or Face; and The Mountebank's Tale.

DODIE SMITH (Dorothy Gladys Smith)—(C. L. Anthony, pseudonym), playwright and former actress; born in Whitefield, Lancashire; educated in Manchester, and in London; studied for stage at Royal Academy of Dramatic Art; acted for several years in London and on tour, beginning in 1915; gave up the stage, became a buyer for a London firm; did some writing for amateur groups; first professionally produced play, Autumn Crocus, written under the pen name of C. L. Anthony, was a success, 1931. Later plays include Service, 1932; Touch Wood, 1934; Call It a Day, 1935 (picked as one of the year's ten best plays in Burns Mantle Best Plays, 1935-1936); Lovers and Friends, 1943; Letter From Paris, based on Henry James's novel, The Reversionator, 1952; I Capture the Castle (adapted from her own novel), 1954. Also author of a book for children.

CHRISTOPHER TAYLOR (1928— ), Canadian born actor and playwright, spent his early childhood in London, England; returned to Canada in 1934; studied economics at the University of Toronto, receiving the B. A. in 1950, and the M. A. in 1951; worked for a year as a research economist, but "hated it—and so left for England to become an actor."

Taylor appeared in numerous plays in London and in the provinces, including The Pink Room (1952); Wonderful Town (1955); and The Good Sailor—an adaptation of Melville's novel, Billy Budd (1956). The last-named play, in which Taylor played the role of Gardner, was directed by Frith Banbury.

Taylor is the author of a play entitled, The Velvet Shotgun, which was produced by Frith Banbury and the late Jack Minster at London's Duchess Theatre (1958).

In 1963, Taylor's play, The Wings of the Dove, based on Henry James's novel of the same title, opened in London for a long run. The Wings of the Dove was produced by Frith Banbury and others, and Mr. Banbury served as the director.

Information on other plays in which Turpin appeared, and on the production of Taylor's play, The Velvet Shotgun, was provided by the London producer, Frith Banbury, in a letter addressed to the present researcher, dated September 29, 1966. Mr. Banbury kindly established contact between this researcher and the playwright.

Personal data, and the quotation used above, are from a letter by Christopher Taylor to the writer of this dissertation, dated October 10, 1966, and postmarked Beirut, Lebanon.

ALLAN TURPIN (1903—), born in London, educated in London, and in France. In all, Turpin has written "about a dozen plays, of which four were produced at fringe theatres. Basil Ashmore produced one of these, Desire Shall Fail, three times, twice in London and once on tour," but negotiations for a West End opening fell through.

Turpin published a novel, Doggett's Tours, 1932. Then, during the war, in 1940, Turpin wrote two one-act plays adapted from Henry James's works, and designed as a double bill: The Turn of the Screw, and The Aspern Papers. (The Turn of the Screw was professionally produced in London in 1946, and both plays were given by an amateur club in New York in 1948.) Turpin wrote nothing between 1948 and 1960. Since then, two novels have been published, My Flat and Her Apartment, 1964, and The Box, 1965. Two more novels are in the process of being published, Beatrice and Bertha, and Ladies.

[Information from letters by Turpin to the writer of this dissertation, dated December 17, 1965, and January 4, 1966.]
Helen Steer was born in Manchester, England, on May 20, 1926. The daughter of concert artists, she travelled extensively in the United States as a child. Later she attended the Godolphin and Latymer School in London, England, and she passed the Senior Cambridge matriculation examinations overseas in Bermuda in 1943. In the following year, she came to the United States again, where she studied acting in New York with the late Norman Brace, and with Betty Cashman. She entered Louisiana State University in September, 1950, and she received the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1954. In 1955, Miss Steer became a United States citizen. After a year and a half as a graduate assistant in the Department of Speech, Miss Steer left Louisiana State University to become the Drama Director for Howard College in Birmingham, Alabama, where she remained for four years. During that period, Miss Steer received the Master of Arts degree from Louisiana State University. Returning to her alma mater in 1960, Miss Steer held a teaching assistantship for two years, and she completed the course work for the doctorate. Since September, 1963, Miss Steer has held the position of Assistant Professor in the Drama and Speech Department at East Carolina College in Greenville, North Carolina. Miss Steer is a member of the editorial board of the Southern Speech Journal.
EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: Helen Vane Steer

Major Field: Speech

Title of Thesis: HENRY JAMES ON STAGE: A Study of Henry James's Plays, and of Dramatisations by Other Writers Based on Works by James

Approved:

[Signatures]

Major Professor and Chairman

Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

[Signatures]

Date of Examination:

December 19, 1966