

THE DRAMATIC CAREER OF BULWER-LYTTON.

By

Hazel B. Clark, 1914.

Submitted to the Department of English  
and the faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Preface.

Introduction

Bulwer- the Man

Chronological Outline of Bulwer's Works

Bulwer's Novels on the Stage

Burlesques and Parodies of Bulwer's Plays

Stage Representations of Plays

Original Casts

Editions of Richelieu.

Part I.            Bulwer's Dramas

Chapter 1 Eugene Aram

Chapter 2 Cromwell

Chapter 3 La Duchess de La Vallière

Chapter 4 The Lady of Lyons

Chapter 5 Richelieu

Chapter 6 The Sea Captain

Chapter 7 Money

Chapter 8 Oedipus Tyrannus

Chapter 9 Brutus

Chapter 10 Junius

Chapter 11 Not So Bad As We Seem

Chapter 12 The Captives

Chapter 13. The Rightful Heir

Chapter 14. Walpole

Chapter 15. Darnley

Part II. Bulwer and 19th Century Drama.

Chapter 1. Bulwer's Effort to Uplift the Drama

Chapter 2. Bulwer's Place in 19th Century Drama.

Bibliography.

P R E F A C E

I have for some time been interested in a study of the drama. My attention was first called to Bulwer in a research made last year concerning the relations between the French and English drama of the nineteenth century. I handed in for approval two thesis subjects,- one upon the relations between Scribe and Plenche; the other upon the dramas of Bulwer. When Professor Whitcomb offered me the opportunity of using all his notes upon Bulwer and the 19th century drama, made in preparation for editing several of Bulwer's plays, my decision was firmly fixed.

I am indebted to Professor Whitcomb, not only for the privilege of using his books and papers, and for kindness in procuring other books for me, but also ( if I am a skillful enough cribber) for the prestige which the obtaining of some excellent material will give me.

In writing my Master's thesis, I hope, if not intend to present my material in such a scholarly manner that the Professor, I should say Professors, who read it, will think their efforts to make more than " dust" have not been in vain; and that the reading of it will bring awe and wonderment to the next year's graduate student who digs my thesis from out the dust and oblivion of its obscure ~~hiding~~ place in the stacks, in order to ascertain whether or not the Master's theses are " really so wonderful;" and lastly, I hope that I shall be so stimulated to further study in the drama by the writing of this thesis, that in a short time, I may be heartily ashamed of its inferiority.

---oOo---

I n t r o d u c t i o n .

EDWARD BULWER, FIRST LORD LYTTON.THE MAN.

In studying the works of an author to get a true idea of cause and effect, it is necessary to know something of the author as a person. The late "Life of Bulwer Lytton," by his grandson, is an excellent work in this respect. The Life by his son, and the Life of Rosina, Lady Lytton, by Miss Devy were written too soon after Lytton's death to be quite fair.

As a child, we see Lytton struggling against the hatred of his father, the petting of his mother, and an overwhelming sense of his <sup>own</sup> identity. He felt himself always to be misunderstood, always treated unfairly. He received at the hands of his grandfather, while that scholar lived, a beating; after his death, the greatest event in his life, the books, - and books which his mother soon sold to the second hand book-dealer. He lived in a land of visions and dreams. At school, unless appreciated, he was mistreated and unhappy. Among students who praised and lauded him, he developed his talents, and gained honors; Yet, he always labored under the delusion that his individual feelings were entirely particular to him. He was a student in the classics and an eager reader of English literature. The more the praise of great men and honors at college in debating, writing, and athletics. He was an entertaining and charming companion to those who gave him sympathy. He chose his friends ideally

and afterwards was often disappointed. He was always ready to accept apologies and forget the injuries of his friends; but he expected them to acknowledge their mistake.

His love affairs were all disastrous. His first ideal romantic love affair began when he was 17; but the object of his love was taken from him and forced to marry another. She died soon after- sending him from her death-bed a message of her lasting fidelity. His next experience was in the Gypsy Camp, where the beautiful grand-daughter of the Queen/<sup>who</sup>wished to brake the tile with him; ~~she~~ parted from him in sorrow. He began writing young, and was admired and petted by older women. He went in older social sets where he was much favored. Then after he had finished college, came his love-affair with Rosina Wheeler, his marriage, the estrangement from his mother, and the tragedy of his domestic life.

In regard to Bulwer's married life, the less said, the better. One's judgment upon such a question, depends upon one's age, disposition and sex. Bulwer, probably, in a measure, spoke the truth when he said " I am now convinced of what I have long believed; I am only fit to live alone." As long as Bulwer did not make that decision before his marriage, Rosina might have made things run smoothly, if she had, as she said, governed him by condescending to flatter him ( in his words given him appreciation), had she been willing to live entirely in his interests and to receive his material gifts in return. But Rosina's education had been neglected, and she did not.

condescend. She demanded her husband's personal attentions. Neither of them were much interested in their children. Rosina's viciousness was merely the re-action of the foregoing stimuli upon a nature and physique such as hers.

It is unfortunate that she did not know that taking to drink was too manly a recourse for a lady to seek, without being severely condemned. Where Rosina made her vital mistake, if I may be allowed to judge, was in marrying a man who espoused her merely to ease his own conscience. Had he done so to ease hers, at least he would have had an unselfish motive.

Even unfitted for one another as they were, if Mrs. Bulwer Lytton had not discontinued Bulwer's allowance at his marriage, thereby necessitating his literary genius to keep poverty from the door, by earning over fifteen thousand dollars a year, his absence from his wife, his extreme irritableness, her ridicule of his interests, would not have been factors in the quarrels which led to their separation. But, if such had been the case, it is doubtful whether or not Bulwer would have written the plays which are the subject of this thesis. His marriage, unhappy as its results were, spurred him to literary actions; whereas, if circumstances of his marrying had been different, he might have been contented to dream.

In all his life, his son was his only loving, sympathetic, understanding companion. He was connected in friendship to Thacker<sup>a</sup>y, Dickens, Arnold, Swinburne and other



men of note. He protected Swinburne, inspired Arnold, irritated Thackeray, and co-operated with Dickens. He was more productive and more versatile in writing than any of these.

He not only had his mental suffering and domestic incriminations, but also suffered physically from a tumor in the ear which eventually caused his most painful death.

Critics say he could not be an artist because he "followed the fashion", and was too insincere. Following the fashion generally depends as much upon one's tailor and pocket-book as upon one's vanity. And as for being insincere, that should not be concluded because of a versatility which would rather confirm it. They say "an artist summons his mood". He did, perhaps, portray rather unreal love; yet, he could portray nothing beyond his own experience. If he was unartistic in this respect, it was because of his experience and not his intention.

Bulwer's dramas were only a small part of his writings. Perhaps, they do not reach the standard of his novels; yet, they hold a high place in the dramas of his day; and may demand consideration.

CHRONOLOGICAL OUTLINE OF BULWER'S WORKS.

( To show the comparatively small number of dramas ).

- 1820- Ishmael, An Oriental Tale.
- 1824- Sculpture.
- 1824- Weeds and Wild Flowers.
- 1827- Falkland
- 1828- Pelham.
- 1828- The Disowned.
- 1830- Paul Clifford
- 1831- Eugene Aram ( tragedy ).
- 1831- Eugene Aram.
- 1833- Asmodens at Large.
- 1833- Godolphin.
- 1833- England and the English.
- 1834- Pilgrims of the Rhine.
- 1834- Last Days of Pompeii.
- 1834- Letter to a Cabinet Minister.
- 1834- The Student.
- 1835- Rienzi.
- 1836- Cromwell ( Unpublished, unacted ).
- 1837- La Duchesse de La Vallière.
- 1837- Ernest Maltravers.
- 1838- Alice.
- 1838- Leila.
- 1838- Calderon, the Courtier.
- 1838- The Lady of Lyons.
- 1839- Richelieu.
- 1839- The Sea Captain.
- 1840- Money.
- 1841- Night and Morning.
- 1842- Eva and Other Poems.
- 1843- The Last of the Barons.
- 1844- Poems and Ballads of Schiller.
- 1845- Confession of a Water Patient.
- 1845- The Crisis.
- 1846- The New Simon.
- 1846- Oedipus Tyrannus ( unpublished, unacted ).
- 1847- Lucretia.
- 1847- A Ward to the Public.
- 1848- King Author.
- 1848- Harold.
- 1848-9- The Cantons.
- 1849- Brutus.
- 1849 ?- Junius.
- 1851- Not So Bad As We Seem.
- 1853- My Novel.
- 1853- Pisistratus Caxton in Blackwood May.
- 1858- What Will He Do With It?

- 1860- St. Stephens.
- 1862- A Strange Story.
- 1863- Caxtonia.
- 1864- The Boatman.
- 1866- Last Tales of Miletus.
- 1867- The Captives ( Unpublished, unacted).
- 1868- The Rightful Heir.
- 1869- Walpole ( Unacted).
- 1871- The Coming Race.
- 1872- The Parisians.
- 1873- Kenelin Chillingly
- 1876- Pansomias, the Spartan.  
Darnly unfinished ( Performed 1817 or 79 ?)

( Dates signify the time of completion).

BULWER 'S NOVELS ON THE STAGE<sup>1</sup>

Date	Title	Author	Theatre	Remarks.
1830-31	Paul Clifford	Lucy Brandon	Bowery Theatre N.Y.	Ran one week No great Actors.
1832	Eugene Aram. <sup>4</sup>	Moncrieff <sup>2</sup> .	Surrey Theatre London	Mrs. West and Chas. Dickens, Cast.
1832 June 19	Eugene Aram	C.W. Taylor	Bowery Theatre New York	Ran a fortnight
1834	Last Days of Pompeii <sup>3</sup> .	J.B. Buckstone	Adelphia	
1835 Feb. 9	Last Days of Pompeii	Louisa Medina	Bowery Theatre New York	Staged with splendor. Ran one month. Revised often: 1849 Bowery, N.Y. 1837 Broadway " 1844 American, N.O. 1839 Mar 25, Park Theatre. Ran Seven Nights.
1835	Paul Clifford		Covent Garden Theatre	

## BULWER'S NOVELS ON THE STAGE

Date	Title	Author	Theatre	Remarks
1836 April	Rienzi <sup>s.</sup>		Franklin Theatre N.Y.	-Survived fortnight J.R.Scott & Miss Blake Cast and Fisher.
1836 June	Rienzi		Bowery Theatre New York	Ran 1 Month Revived 1839 Pack Theatre Not successful
1838 March 28	Ernest Maltra- vins	Louisa Media	National Theatre, N.Y.	Great success Revived in Theatre reper- toire many yrs.
1838 April 30	Leila	A.Allen		Musical Romance
1842 Feb.	Zanoni		New Chatham	Not certainly from Bulwer's Novel.
?	Night & Morning		New Chatham Theatre	Two weeks run

## BULWER'S NOVELS ON THE STAGE.

Date	Title	Author	Theatre	Remarks
?	Night & Morning	John Brougham		5 act romance
1843 April 3rd	Last of Barons'		Bowery Theatre New York	Notable cast
1849 Oct 15th	Warric The King Maker (Last of Barons).		Bowery Theatre New York	Notable cast Burlesque 1872 Stroud Theatre, London
1852 Jan. 19	Paul Clifford	Fitzball	Bowery Theatre New York	Ran 3 wks Collins & Julia Gould in cast.
1855	Night & Morning		Wallock's Theatre	Ran 2½ mos.
1863	Ione or The Last Days of Pompeii			Opera craze in America Revival 1886 N.Y. Not successful.

## BULWER'S NOVELS ON THE STAGE

Date	Title	Author	Theatre	Remarks
1864	Night & Morning	Falconer		Not certainly from Bulwer's Novels.
1867 Nov. 29	Paul Clifford	B.Chance Newton Denham Harrison	Canterbury, London	Only one episode from Bulwer's novel used.
1872 Jan	Last Days Days of Pompeii	B.John Oxenford		Burlesqued by R.Reece. The Very Last Days of Pompeii. Vaudeville Theatre.
1873 April	The Fate of Eugene Aram	W.G.Wills <sup>7.</sup>	Lyceum London	Henry Irving bad title told Only new play in 12 months." Made into one act and tableaux for Irving.
1875 Mar 29	Harold	A.Nance	The Princess Theatre, Portsmouth, Eng.	

## BULWER'S NOVELS ON THE STAGE.

Date	Title	Author	Theatre	Remarks
1882 April	Lucy Brandon Paul Clif- ford	Robert Buchanan's	Imperial Theatre	Not success- ful. Play poor.
	Rose- dale	Wallock		Incident from "What will he do with it?"
	What will he do with it? Same.	Lorimer	Unacted	Written for Mansfield.
1897	Eugene Aram.	Paul Keister		Often acted by Walker Whiteside.

Based upon "Bulwer's Dramatizations" by Paul Wilstache,  
Bookman, July 1903.

1. Bulwer did not dramatize his novels.
2. Moncrieff is said to have dramatized "every novel that came out."
3. The adaptation of the Last Days of Pompeii, are without number.
4. "Eugene Aram" held its popularity with the maker of plays longer than any other of Bulwer's novels.
5. There were other plays "Rienzi" which were not taken from Bulwer's novel.



---

BULWER'S NOVELS ON THE STAGE.

---

- 
6. Last of Bulwer's Novels to be dramatized successfully .
  7. A dramatist of note.
  8. An author of considerable note.
- 
-

## PARODIES AND BURLESQUES OF BULWER'S PLAYS.

Date	Title	Author	Theatre	Remarks.
1839	Ch-sy-elwpl-sh esq.-so Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer( Sea Captain).	Thackeray		Criticism burlesque Appeared in Frasier's Mag. Caused Lytton to try to suppress printed copy of " Sea Captain."
1842. Feb. 7th	Perpurow, The Bellows Mender and the Beauty of Lyons ( Lady of Lyons).	W.T.Moncrieff	Sadlers Wells Theatre	A domestic drama in 3 acts based upon The Bellows Mender.
1852 Oct 30	Richelieu In Love ( Richelieu)		Haymarket Theatre	Do not know that this was a burlesque of Bulwer's Play.
<u>1852</u>	Cinderella (Melnottes Visionary Home in Lady of Lyons).	Albert Smith	_____	Parodies the Clap-Trap in speech.
1858	The Lady of Lyons or Twopenny Pride and Penny-Tenée	H.J.Bryen	Strand Theatre	Burlesque Extravaganza

## PARODIES AND BURLESQUES OF BULWER'S PLAYS.

Date	Title	Author	Theatre	Remarks
1859	The <u>Very</u> Latest edi- tion of The Lady of Lyons.	H.J.Byron	Strand Theatre	Burlesque extravaganza in one act Miss M.Olive Miss Charlotte Saunders & Messrs. H.J.Turner, Jones, Rogers, & J.Clark took the leading parts.
1868	The Fright ful Hair; as who shot the Dog ( Right- ful Heir)	F,C,Burnard	Haymark- et Thea-	Managed by J.B.Buckstone Cast inc. Miss F.Gwynn Miss Ione Burk Miss F.Wright Messrs. Ken- dal, Compton, Weatherby. Named for Mr. Bonds- mouns' persona peculiarities.
—	The Right- Fall Heir; or the Sea- Rover and the Fall- over.	W.T.Arden	—	Printed copy does not mention when or at what theatre this was produced.
1873 Oct 27	Richelieu Redressed	A. Reece	Olympic Theatre	

## PARODIES AND BURLSQUES OF BULWER'S PLAYS.

Date	Title	Author	Theatre	Remarks
1879 Feb 3	The Model-Palace in Lady of Lyons	Funny Folks		Burlesque in Funny Folks. According to Dr. Richardson's health-towns and model houses.
1878 Oct 5	The Lady of Lyons Married and Settled	Herman C. Merivale	Gaiety Theatre London	Vaudeville in 3 acts. Miss Nellie Farren, and Messrs. Edward Terry, Royce, Maclean and Squire in Principal Parts. Claude praises Darwinian theory, the evolution of species in a patter song to his wife.
1879 Apr 23	Lady of Lyons	W. Younge	Imperial Theatre	
1884 Sept 27	The Lady of Lyons Married and Claude Unsettled.	R. Reece	Glasgow Royalty	Absurdity

PARODIES AND BURLESQUES OF BULWER'S PLAYS.

Date	Title	Author	Theatre	Remarks.
1889 Oct. 2	The Castle of Como ( Lady of Lyons)	Lib. by Charles Searle with Add. & M. by Geo. Cockle M.B.		Romantic Opera three acts.
—	In The Lyons Den	Mr. Punch	—	Sequel showing the discord Bulwer's conventional " Happy in Play" Made.

Based on " The Stage Cyclopoedia" and Hamilton's Parodies with one ref. from " Classic Curiosities of Dramatic Literature. Edition by Alfred Nates, M.B.

EUGENE ARAM.? PRESENTATIONS.--

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1831.			
London			Performed at one of the Theatres, 1839.

LA DUCHESS DE LA VALLIÈRE.REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1837			
London	Covent Garden	Macready & Fawcett	Jan. 4. Not successful.
New York	Park	Mason & Miss Ellen Terry Fredericks	May 13 Not successful

CAST OF CHARACTERS.

Characters	Theatre Royal Covent Garden London, 1/4, 1837.	Park Theatre New York May 13, 1837.
Louis the Fourteenth King of France	Mr. Vandenhoff	Mr. Mason
The Duke de Lawzun	Mr. U. Farren	Mr. Chippendale
The Count de Grammont	Mr. Pritchard	Mr. Nixum
The Marquis Alphonso de Brazelone (Betrothed to Louise de La Vallière)	Mr. Macready	Mr. Fredericks
Bertrand (Armorer to the Marquis)	Mr. Tilbury	Mr. Isherwood
Gentleman in attendance		Mr. Russell
1st, 2nd and 3rd Courtiers		
Maria Theresa, Queen of France		

CAST OF CHARACTERS, ( Continued).

	London	New York
Louise Afterwards Duchess De La Vallière.	Miss Helen Faucit	Miss Ellen True
Madame de La Valliere( mother) Madame de Montespan (Rival of the Duchess and one of the King's Mistresses.	Mrs. W. West  Miss Pelham	Mrs. Wheatleigh  Miss Durie
1st, 2nd & 3rd Ladies of the Court & Maids of Honor to the Queen		
The Lady Abbess ( Superior of the Convent Carmelites) Courtiers, Gentlemen of Chamber Priests Nuns Ladies Maids of Honor etc.		



L A D Y   O F   L Y O N S

## CAST OF CHARACTERS.

## P L A C E S.

Characters :	"Theatre Royal" Covent Garden, London, 1838	"Old Park Theatre" May 14th, 1838-.
Claude Melnotte Colonel Damas Beauseaut Glavis Mous.Deschappelles Landlord Gaspar Captain Gervais ( 1st Officer) Captain Dupont ( 2nd Officer) Major Desmoulins ( 3rd Officer) Notary Servant Pauline	Mr.Macready Mr. Bartley Mr. Elton Mr.Meadows Mr. Strickland Mr.Yarnold Mr. Biddear  Mr. Howe  Mr. Pritchard  Mr. Roberts Mr. Harris Mr. Bender Miss Helen Faucit.	Mr.Edwin Forrest Mr. Placede Mr.Richings Mr.Wm.Wheatley Mr.Clarke
Madame Deschappelles Widow Melnotte Joint Marian	Mrs. Clifford Mrs. Griffiths Mrs. East Miss Garrick	Mrs. Richardson Mrs. Wheatley Miss Cushman

LADY OF LYONS  
REPRESENTATIONS.

1838.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks:
London	Covent Garden	McCready & Faucit	Until 6/5, 32 Times First in U.S.  1840 in Stock Rep. 11/2- 3 times in 10 da 8/8, 4 times first sea son.
New York	Park Theatre	Edwin Forrest	
Boston	Fremont "	Forrest & Co.	
New York	Park "	Stocks Cushman	
Sheffield		Brookeas Claude	
Edinburgh			

1839

London			Royal Command Night of Feb 1st.
New York	Park	Cushman	
New York	National	Forrest	
London		Phelps as Beauseort	

1840

London		Kean & Forrest H. Faucit.	Played Pauline often
--------	--	------------------------------	----------------------

1841

--	--	--	--

1842

--	--	--	--

LADY OF LYONS.

REPRESENTATIONS.

1843.			
Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks.
New York		Macready	Oct 13-1844 in American rep.
Edinbor- ough		Faucit	Poor house 1st night. 11/14, 12 nights.
1844			
1845			
New York	Park	Mrs. Mowatt	Mrs. Mowatt made debut as "Pauline"
Phila.		Mrs. Mowatt ----- H, Faucit	Claude terribly hissed. Well received.
1846			
1847			
Manchester York		Davenport.	

LADY OF LYONS  
REPRESENTATIONS.

1848

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
	Market	Murdock Partman	Oct 15

1849

--	--	--	--

1850

London	Olympic	J.W.Wallackde Brooke and Faucit	Oct 17 Brooke's style by this time, saturnine.
--------	---------	------------------------------------	---

1851

--	--	--	--

LADY OF LYONS  
REPRESENTATIONS.

1852

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
		Laura Keene	

1853

Edin- borough -----	Williams Wallack Brooke		Nov. 19
Australia			Oct.

1854

--	--	--	--

1855

		Laura Keene	
--	--	-------------	--

1856

London	Drury Lane	Emma Waller Barry Sullivan	Opened with it
--------	------------	-------------------------------	----------------

LADY OF LYONSREPRESENTATIONS.

1857			
Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
London	Lyceum		June 16
London	Cambridge		Sept 19
	Haymarket		Oct 3
New York	Chambers St.	Laurence Barrett	
1858			
		Faucit	
1859			
		Irving	Sept 13, Fare- well benefit
1860			
1861			

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Representation.
		1862	
		1863	
	Olympic		May 22, Neville benefit.
		1864	
		1865	
	Adelphia		6/24, Miss Bote- man's benefit.
		1866	
	Drurylane	Faucit	11/23, Favorable criticism had deepened part a good deal.
		1867	
	Lyceum	Fichter Leclercq	9/16 House jammed Excellent acting. Dickens and notables present. Great House 11/28.
Edin. Glasgow		Faucit Faucit	

LADY OF LYONS  
REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1868			
1869			
Glasgow		Booth  Faucit	His impersonations of Claude Melnotte, per example was even more artificial than his B. Lytton style in Lady of Lyons. 11/12-18. hundreds turned away.
1870			
Liverpool	Booth's	Booth  Faucit	12/13. Enthusiasm; but she says play was very poorly acted.
1871			
London Manchester	Drury Lane	Neilson  Faucit	Dec.  tremendous house
1872			



LADY OF LYONS  
REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks.
1873			
London	Globe		June 16
1874			
1875			
Louisville		Mary Anderson	Feb 12
1876			
1877			
1878			
N.Y.		Mary Anderson.	
1879			
London	Lyceum	H. Irving Terry Booth	4/11 cast added to Regular repertory.

LADY OF LYONS.REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks.
1880			
1881			
		Kendals	4/18 - end of May alternating with "The Money Spinner"
1882			
1883			
London	Lyceum	Mary Anderson	Repertoire.
1884			
1885			
	Lyceum	Mary Anderson Terriss Faucit	4/9 4/3 read scenes from Lady of Lyons to Miss Anderson.

LADY OF LYONS.

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actor	Remarks
1886			
1887			
1888			
London London	Olympic	Forbes Robertson	Two revivals
1888			
Shafts- bury		Forbes Robertson	
1889			
		Wilson Barrett	1/30 Discarded point making and humanized Claude

LADY OF LYONS  
REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actor	Remarks
1890			
		Lester Wallock	Acted Claude and De Beringhen.
1891			
		Fanny Davenport Ada Rehn Julia Marlowe	As Pauline. " " " "
1892			
1893			
1894			
1895			

LADY OF LYONSREPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1896			
1897			
1898			
1899			
1900			
1901			
1902			
		Kyle Bellew Mary Mannering	Spring tour, U.S.



RICHELIEU

## ORIGINAL CAST.-

	Theatre, Royal Covent Garden, London, 1839.	Wallock's Old Nat'l Theatre, New York, Sept. 4th, 1839.
Louis XIII. King of Fr. Gaston, Duke of Orleans, (Brother to the King)	Mr. Elton Mr. Diddear	Mr. Walton Mr. Powell
<u>Baradas</u> ( the King's Favorite)	Mr. Warde	Mr. G. Jameson
Cardinal Richelieu The Chevalier de Monprat	Mr. Macready Mr. Anderson	Mr. Edwin Forrest Mr. J.W. Wallock, Jr.
The Siem de Beringhen ( In attendance on the King- one of conspirators) Clermot ( A Courtier	Mr. F. Vining	Mr. Horncastle
Joseph, a Capershin Monk, ( Richelieu's Confidant)	Mr. Phelps	Mr. H.J. Neapée
Francois ( First Page to Richelieu)	Mr. Howe	Mrs. W. Sefton
Hugnet ( an officer of Richelieu's Household- Guard-- a spy--	Mr. G. Bennett	
First Courtier	Mr. Roberts	
First Secretary	Mr. Matthews	
Second       "	Mr. Tilbury	
Third        "	Mr. Yarnold	
Governor of the Bastile Jailer	Mr. Waldron Mr. Ayliffe	
Julie de Martemar ( An orphan, ward to Richelieu)	Miss Helen Faucit	Miss V, Monier
Marian de Lorme ( Mistress to Duke of Orleans, but in Richelieu's pay).	Miss Charles	Mrs. Rogers
Courtiers, Pages, Conspirators, Officers, Soldiers, etc.		

RICHELIEU

## REPRESENTATION.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks.
1839			
London	Covant Garden	Macready	3/7. Conspicuous among great events of season,
New York	National	Forrest	
1840			
1841			
1842			
Edinbor ough		Gasper & Drew Booth	Drew as Francois Car. Richelieu to end of career  First time
1843			
		Phelps as Dam <sup>a</sup> s	January 19th
1844			
		Irving Booth	



RICHELIEU

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1845			
1846			
London	Sadler Wells	Phelps	With Restoration drama
1847			
Liver- pool Manches- ter		Macready  Macready	
1848			
1849			
1850			

RICHELIEU

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1851			
1852			
London	Haymarket		Oct 2, Theatre open.wi.Rich.
London	Drury Lane		
1853			
1854			
1855			

RICHELIEU

## REPRESENTATIONS

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1856			
		Irving	1st professional appearance September 29.
1857			
Edinbo- rough	Lyceum	Dillon	Dillon's benefit last night of season Apr
1858			
1859			
1860			
1861			
	Haymarket	Booth	

RICHELIEU

## REPRESENTATION.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1862			
New York	Winter Garden	Booth	In Repertoire
1863			
New Orleans		Barrett	1864
1864			
1865			
London	Drury Lane	Phelps	February 10th
1866			
New York	Winter Garden	Booth	Feb 1st, sumptuous series.

RICHIELIEU

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1867			
1868			
		Forrest	Broke down in Rep--too feeble in health; had mss. direct from Lytton
1869			
		Booths	
1870			
1871			
New York New York	Booths Booths	Booth Forrest	8 weeks Feb. Last N.Y. engagement
1872			
Boston	Globe	Forrest	Apr. 2, closed career

RICHELIEU

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1873			
		Irving	Opening Lyceum Ran 120 Nights; Pitted Quincy against Macready
1874			
New York San F.	Booth's California	McCullough Booth-Claude McCullough- De Mauprat	
1875			
San Francisco	Calif- ornia	Booth	
1876			
1877			
1878			

RICHELIEU

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1879			
		Edwin Booth	In rep. over country South and to California
1880			
London	Princess	Booth	Inc. in Repertory
London	Lyceum	Keene Irving	
1881			
1882			
1883			
1884			
Lyceum			Season closed with Richelieu

MICHELIEU

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1885			
1886			
1887			
1888			



RICHELIEU

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1889			
1890			
1891			
		Barrett & Barrett	Barrett broke down in 3rd act, and died few days later. Played De Mauprat.
1892			
1893			
1894			

RICHELIEU

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1895			
1896			
1897			
1898			
1899			
1900			
1901			

RICHELIEU

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1901			
		Parker	
1902			
		Parker	
1903			
1904			
1905			
1906			

RICHELIEU

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1907			
1908			
Kansas City, Mo.	Willis Wood	Robert Mantell	Inc in Shak.Rep.
1909			
1910			
1911			
1912			

RICHELIEU

REPRESENTATIONS.

place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1913			
1914			
Kansas City, Mo.	Schubert	Mantell	Inc. in Shak Rep.

RICHELIEU.

## Editions.

1839. 1. First Edition, London?  
 2. Second Edition, ?  
 3. Third Edition, London.  
 4. Fourth Edition, London.  
 ? 5. Fourth Edition, N.Y. Harper.  
 ? 6. French's Standard Drama.  
 ? 7. Fifth London Edition.  
 184? 8. Turner's Dramatic Library. First American  
 from 5th London ed.  
 1841 Turner and Fisher, N.Y. Fisher, Boston 184-  
 1844 9. M. Watt & Co. N.Y.?  
 1840? 10. In new edition, Bulwer's works, London.  
 1860? 11. Edwin Forrest ed. of Shakespearian and other plays.  
 Moore and Bernard, N.Y.  
 1854 12. In Vol. IV. Bulwer's Poems and Dramas. Chapman  
 and Hall. London.  
 1863? 13. Dramatic Works of Bulwer Lytton, Routledge  
 Warne and Routledge, London and N.Y. A new  
 edition.  
 1867. 14. In G.H. Lewis' Selections from Modern British  
 Dramatists, Brockhaus, Leipzig.  
 1875? 15. Knebworth edition?  
 1875. 16. Bulwer's Plays. DeWitt's Acting ed. N.Y.  
 1875. 17. Dramatic Works, London?  
 1875? 18. New York Drama, as performed by Edwin Booth.  
 187? 19. As performed by Edwin Booth. Another Ed?  
 G.H. Lewis': Selections from the Modern British  
 Dramatists, Brockhaus, Leipzig. Richelieu 2 Ed.  
 1890 20. Canterbury Poets. Lady of Lyons and Other Plays.  
 Walter Scott, London.  
 1893. 21. Dramas and Poems. <sup>Brewer</sup> Brewer, Little Brown & Co. Boston.  
 1896. 22. Illustrated Ed. Dodd, Mead & Co. New York.  
 1898 23. Calvin S. Brown. Later Eng. Drama. A.S. Barnes, N.Y.  
 Published with other dramas and also separately.  
 1898 24. Prompt Book of Edwin Booth. W. Winter.  
 1898. 25. Dramas & Poems. Brewer, Little, Brown & Co. Boston.  
 1899. 26. Prompt Book Edwin Booth. W. Winter.  
 1901? 27. The Dramatic Works in 9 Vol. ed. of Works P.F. Collins  
 of N.Y.  
 19-- 28. The Dramatic Wks in 21 Vols. ed of Wks. P.F. Collins, N.Y.

M O N E Y

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Date	Theatre	Place	Actors	Remarks
1840, Dec. 8, ----	Haymarket	London	Macready	15 wks run.
1841 Feb 1	Old Park Theatre	New York	Hield	Good Cast
1843 Sept 4	Chatham		Hield	Good Cast
1847 Nov 4	Broadway		Vanden- hoff	
1857	Burton's New Theatre		Murdock & Burton	
1874	Wallock's	New York	Wallock	
1911	Coronation Festivities England			

M O N E Y

## ORIGINAL CAST OF CHARACTERS.

	"THEATRE ROYAL" HAYMARKET, 12/8, 1840.	"OLD PARK THEATRE " NEW YORK, 2/1, 1841.
Alfred Evelyn	Mr. Macready	Mr. Hield
Sir Jno Visey	Mr. Strickland	Mr. Chippendale
Lord Glassmore	Mr. F. Vining	Mr. C.W. Clarke
Sir Frederic Blount	Mr. Walter Lacy	Mr. A. Anderson
Benjamin Stout	Mr. D. Reece	Mr. Gunn
Graves	Mr. E. Webster	Mr. Fisher
Capt. Dudley Smooth	Mr. Wrench	Mr. Nickerson
Sharp	Mr. Waldron	Mr. Bedford
Old Member	Mr. Wilmott	
Toke	Mr. Oxberry	
MacFinch	Mr. Gough	
Crimson ( or Portrait Painter)	Mr. Gallot	
MacStucco	Mr. Matthews	
Patent	Mr. Clarke	
Frantz ( a Tailor)	Mr. M.O.Smith	
Tabouret ( An upholsterer)	Mr. Howe	
Grab ( A publisher)	Mr. Caulfield	
Clara Douglas	Miss H. Faucit	Mrs. Malder
Lady Franklin	Mrs. Glover	Mrs. Vernon
Georgina	Miss P. Harton	Mrs. Chippendale
Officer, Club Members, Flat, Green Waiters at Club, Pages, Servants.		



B R U T U S

## REPRESENTATIONS.

Date	Theatre	Place	Actors	Remarks.
1885	Princess	London		Under Title of "The Household Gods."

J U N I U S

## REPRESENTATIONS.-

Date	Theatre	Place	Actors	Remarks.
1885 Feb 26	Princess	London	Barrett	Withdraws March 28.

THE SEA CAPTAINREPRESENTATIONS.-

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1839			
London	Haymarket	Macready	Oct. 30. Fairly received. Played occasionally without success.
1849			
New York	Park	Mr. Creswick	June 9th. Mr. Hield's benefit. Never acted again.

CAST OF CHARACTERS.

( at Park Theatre, N.Y.)

---oOo---

Norman----- Mr. Creswick.

Lord Ashdale ----- Mr. Wheatley

Sir Maurice Beevar-----Mr.Hield

Giles Gaussen----- Mr. Richings.

Lady Arundel----- ~~Miss~~ Cushman.

Violet----- Miss S. Cushman.

---oOo---

REPRESENTATIONS.

Date	House	City	Actors	Remarks
1851 5/16	Devonshire House	London	Chas. Dickens	Before Queen
1851	Hanover Square	London	C. Dickens & Amateur Troop.	
1851 8/29	Burton's	New York	Mr. Moorhouse	Unsatisfactory Withdrawn Shortly.
1851 1852		Liverpool Birmingham Sheffield Derby New Castle Sunderland Manchester	Dickens & Amateur Troop on their tour in the Provinces	↑ Ended tour by the "Guild"
1853 2/12	Haymarket	London		Unsatisfactory Withdrawn Shortly

NOT SO BAD AS WE SEEMCAST OF CHARACTERS.--

Characters.	Burton's Theatre New York, 8/29, 1851.	Theatre Royal Haymarket, London, 2/12/1853
Duke of Middlesex Lord Wilmot Mr. Shadowly Softhead Hardman Sir Geoffrey Thornside Mr. Goodenough Easy Mr. David Fallen Colonel Flint Mr. Jacob Touson Smart Hodge Paddy O'Sullivan First Watchman Lucy Barbara Lady Ellinor.	Mr. Moorhouse Mr. Dyatt Mr. Burton Mr. Bland ----- Mr. J. Dunn Mr. Porday  Miss Weston Miss M. Barton	Stewart Mr. Leigh Murray Mr. Keeley Mr. Barry Sullivan Mr. B. Webster Mr. Buckstone Mr. Howe  Miss Rose Bennett Miss Amelia Vining
Coffee House Loungers, Drones, Newsmen, Watchmen, etc.		

THE RIGHTFUL HEIR.REPRESENTATIONS.

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks.
1868			
London	Lyceum	Mr. <sup>an</sup> Boudmann	Not successful

CAST OF CHARACTERS.

Characters	Lyceum Theatre London, 10/3/68
Vyvyan ( Captain of the Privateer ) ( Deadnaught )	Mr. Boudmann
Sir Guy de Malpas ( The poor ) ( Cousin )	Mr. Hermann Vizen
Wrecklyffe ( A Gentleman turned ) ( Pirate )	Mr. Lawler <sup>a</sup> .
Lord Beaufort ( Lady Moutreville's son)	Mr. Neville.
Sir Godfrey Seymour ( A Magistrate)	
Falkner-Harding ( Vyvyan's Lieut)	( Mr. Lin Rayne ( Mr. Anderson
Marsden ( Seveschal of the Castle )	Mr. David Evans.
Alton ( A Village Priest)	Mr. Basil Potter.
Sub- Officer of the Dreadnaught	Mr. Edward
Servant to Lady Moutreville	Mr. W. Templeton.
Eveline ( Her ward)	Miss Milly Palmer.
Lady Moutreville, ( a Widowed Countess )	Mrs. Hermann Vizen.
Halberdiers, Retainers, Soldiers, Peasantry, Servants, etc. etc.	

DARNLEY

## REPRESENTATIONS.--

Place	Theatre	Actors	Remarks
1879			
London	Covent Theator	Mr. Hare	Not successful. Withdrawn after a short run.
Vienna	Burg		In German. Emperor and Imperial Court present. Withdrawn after a short run.

CHAPTER I.

E U G E N E A R A M

Lytton's son in the Preface to the "Life, Letters and Literary Remains of Edward Bulwer Lytton," states that many of Bulwer's novels were first written in drama form. However, the fragmentary tragedy, "Eugene Aram," which the author published in the 1833 edition of Eugene Aram is the only first form, I have been able to find. In the Preface to the edition of the novel in 1831, Bulwer states:

"I originally intended to adapt the story of Eugene Aram to the stage. That design was abandoned when more than half completed; but I wished to impart to this romance something of the nature of the Tragedy, - something of the more transferable of its qualities."

Bulwer's original plan is not mentioned either in the 1840 or the 1851 editions. The volume in hand published in 1864, by Routledge, Warren and Routledge, London, includes all three prefaces mentioned, with the advertisement and fragmentary tragedy of 1833. The advertisement is as follows:-

ADVERTISEMENT:

"In the preface to this Novel, it is stated that the original intention of the author was to compose upon the facts of Aram's gloomy history, a tragedy instead of a romance. It may not be altogether without interest for the reader, if I submit to his indulgence the rough outline of the earlier scenes in the fragment of a drama, which in all probability will never be finished. So far as I have gone, the construction of the tragedy differs, in some respects, materially from that of the tale, although the whole of what is now presented to the reader must be considered merely as a copy of the first hasty sketch of an uncompleted design. November 1833."

In regard to this play, the late Life of Lytton by his grandson states:<sup>37</sup>

"It appears from one of Mrs. Edward Bulwer's letters which describes its representation that it was actually performed at one of the London theatres previous to the production of the novel."

Bulwer had published this sketch of a drama 'Eugene Aram' in the New Monthly, before the completion of the Novel. It seems strange that a fragment was presented upon the boards, at least to a public audience. If it was so presented, it is possible the author had just completed an acting version which he deemed unworthy for publication. This is the only mention I find of its representation. The fragment drama appears together with the novel upon the same subject, in most editions of Bulwer's works.

The subject of the drama is one of crime,- a subject at that time thought to be very unworthy of elevated literature. Bulwer probably chose to have his play and novel about the historic Aram because as he says,-

"The trial of Eugene Aram was one of the strangest, "most remarkable in the register of English crime,"<sup>38</sup>

and because his interest in this particular criminal was further stimulated through his knowledge of Aram's connection with his grandfather. He says in the preface of the 1840 edition:

" His crime does, in fact, belong to those startling paradoxes which the poetry of all countries, and especially of our own, has always delighted to contemplate and examine. Whenever crime appears, the aberration and monstrous product of a great intellect, or of a nature originally virtuous, it becomes not only a subject for genius, which deals with passion, to describe; but a problem for philosophy which deals with action, to investigate and solve:- hence the Macbeths,



the Richards, the Iagos and Othellos."

The only criticism I have found of the drama of Eugene Aram, is the letter written to Bulwer by EBENEZER ELLIOTT:-

" I have just been reading your fragment of a drama in the present number of The New Monthly. It contains passages which, as poetry, have never been excelled and rarely equalled- except by two authors. There is, however, a radical fault in it. Your hero ought to have been made the victim of his mere physical necessities in a moment of temporary delirium. Call the drama "Hunger and Crime." Make it ideal, not historical, and give your hero any name but that of Eugene Aram. Let him appear in the first act, as he does appear, beset with duns. Let him talk wildly and mutter his consciousness that his sanity is giving away. Then let the tempter Botcher wring from him the secret of his utter destitution; and, in like a worse Iago, or the devil, without pause urge him to the commission of the crime-- under the instant influence of temporary madness which hunger, when extreme, is known to produce. These excuses, with which human nature knows how to deceive itself, will then command our sympathies, and you will unlock the terrible with the true key. Scene IV. must be Scene V.; and instead of saying - " If it were done", your hero must say " Now, that it is done," etc. But your criminal learnedly and coldly exculpates the deed before it is done. It is not his poverty, but his will, that consents. Do not defeat what ought to be a master piece. Your hero instead of being the most repulsive being, may just as easily be the reverse. After having, and in the agonies and to real madness of hunger strong as the fates, become a murderer, let him then display his hapless sophistries, his unavailing tenderness, his high intellectuality, and spectator and reader alike to be heartbroken. But why call him Eugene Aram? Why choose difficulty? Why throw away an advantage? He may be of any country, of any time, or any name. Although it is plain that you are to great things, as a dramatist you must not think of abandoning this drama as a subject. As a subject, its capabilities are of the very highest; and you can make it equal in interest to Faust. Pray excuse me. Fools will teach though they can not learn.- I am,

EBENEZER ELLIOTT." 40

Although the play was abandoned for a novel, the present Earl of Lytton believes the above letter to have been of service to Lytton, as the Eugene Aram of the novel "differs

from the hero of the drama in the way suggested in this letter." Indeed, one does feel when reading the drama that Eugene's stoical acceptance of the proposal of the crime rather defeats the sympathy which the reader should feel for him when he is tormented like Byron's Manfred by the consciousness of his sin.

The fragment as it is, has much in common with the Gothic tragedy of the later Eighteenth century. Bulwer's idea of tragedy is expressed in his preface to the novel Eugene Aram 1851:

" I doubt if I have ever excited the two elementary passions of tragedy- viz., pity and terror, to the same degree."

The fragment is written in a minor key, the same note re-curring. It is mysterious and terrible with an almost absolute lack of humour.

The drama in the first act recalls the soliloquies of Hamlet and Macbeth, indeed, their very diction, and the temptation of Faust in Goethe's drama. The last scenes are sentimentally colored by the setting of night in forest gloom and cavern. The second act, deals with Aram's secret, gnawing consciousness of guilt, his keen sense of his unworthiness for the devotion shown him, and with Madaline's romantic love for the ideal which she fancies Aram to be.

There is, perhaps, more Gothicism in this and La Duchess than in Bulwer's later dramas; yet, the style of this play written in verse, is similar to that used in the others. There is seen the use of favorite words such as "glide," "glassed,"

"glass", and "glassing", of italics, capitals, small capitals, dashes, stars, and the use of definite articles before substantives used as nouns: "The Stark Hunger," "The Grim Demon, Penury, " etc.

With alterations, the completed form of the play might have been tolerably successful upon the boards judging from the success of similar tragedies of the time. At all events, I judge its length would not have been a hindrance to its success as in the case of La Duchess de La Valliere.

---

37. "Life of Edward Bulwer," vol. I. page 387.

38. Preface to Novel, Eugene Aram.

39. "Life of Edward Bulwer, First Earl of Lytton", - by the Earl of Lytton. Vol. I, page 387.

40. "The Corn Law Poet."

---oOo---

THE DRAMATIC CAREER OF BULWER LYTTON.

CHAPTER II.

CROMWELL.

Bulwer Lytton's second dramatic attempt was a play entitled, - Cromwell. The fate of this play; like that of most of Bulwer's plays, was influenced by the actor Macready. Macready's diary is our primary source for information in regard to this unpublished, unacted play. On October 31, 1834, Macready recorded:

"I urged Bulwer to write a play; he told me he had written one, a great part of which was lost, on the death of Cromwell."

We read nothing more of a play Cromwell until 1836, the year in which Bulwer separated from his wife, and in which he began his real "career" as a dramatic author. To quote again from Macready's diary, 1836:

" August 1st. On my way, read nearly the whole of Bulwer's play Cromwell. Though containing some passages happy in thought and strong in expression, I do not think either in respect to character, arrangement or poetical beauty that this play will quite reach the level of his existing reputation."

" August 12th. Read over with great attention, Bulwer's play of Cromwell. Received letters from him and Obaldiston who declines engaging Miss Huddart; he is a man of no forethought. Bulwer arrived with Forester; after dinner, we discussed the subject of Cromwell. Bulwer listened to the objections with great equanimity, and finally decided upon delaying publication, considering our respective suggestions as to the alterations of the plot, and re-casting it.

" August 24th. Read in the history of England, Cromwell's proceedings, in order to write to Bulwer about his play.

"Aug. 28th. Endeavored to come to some decision with regard to the plot of Bulwer's play, but find it more difficult than I had supposed; on one point, I am clear, that to make a play of Cromwell, he must begin de novo and be contented to lose all he has already done, patch-work never is of value."

"Sep. 16th. Received a letter from Bulwer thanking me for my observations on Cromwell, and explaining his engagements with regard to La Valliere. I answered at once. "( La Valliere was finished Feb. 23rd, 1836).

From these extracts, we may judge that acting upon Macready's suggestion in 1834, Bulwer brought out what he could find of his play Cromwell and completed the fragment from Macready's use. At least, we have no evidence that the play Cromwell of 1834, was not the Cromwell mentioned in 1836.

In connection with Cromwell, the present Earl of Lytton says:

"The play of Cromwell was first completed and submitted to Macready who criticised it somewhat severely. Bulwer continued to work at it for some years; and many alterations were made in it to meet the criticism of Macready and Forester. Eventually, however, he came to the conclusion that it was unsuited for the stage."

Macready's criticism of this play, was, perhaps, as the Earl of Lytton says, severe; but I fancy it was just, because the alterations Bulwer made in his later plays at the advice of Macready made the plays/<sup>more</sup> adaptable to the stage. Not even in a literary way, did Macready think this play equal to Bulwer's other efforts. As to the nature of the plot and the dramatic personae, we are given no clue, except that the play in its first form as mentioned in 1834 was upon the death of Cromwell. Had we the manuscript, it would be interesting

to compare it with Hugo's Cromwell written in 1827. Strange that although Lytton should consider Hugo's drama "really vulgar and improbable tales set into strange versifications," he himself should be criticised by a modern French critic as writing "Bad Hugo and worse Dumas." I think from Macready's views, we may justly consider Bulwer's play as a dramatic failure, especially in regard to its plot and character delineation, with a few passages of good expression.

---

41. "Life of Edward Bulwer, First Lord Lytton," by the Earl of Lytton, Vol. I. page

42. Augustin Filow.

CHAPTER III.LA DUCHESS DE LA VALLIÈRE.

La Duchess de La Vallière was first acted January 1837 at the Covent Garden Theatre, London with Macready as Bragelone and Helen Faucit as the Duchess. The play is dedicated to the actor Macready for whom it was written. We find interesting notes in regard to it in Macready's diary:-

" Feb. 2rd. 1836. Called on Bulwer, whom I found in very handsome chambers in the Albany. He told me after talking about the Provost of Bruges, and recalling our conversation in Dublin, that he had written the play; that he did not know whether I might think the part intended for me worthy of my powers for that, inevitably, the weight of the action fell upon the woman; that the subject was La Vallière. He handed me a paper in which I read that it was dedicated to myself. It almost affected me to tears. I could not read it. He wished me to read the play, give my opinion, and that he would make any alterations I might suggest. I appointed to see him tomorrow. "

" Feb. 24th. Read very attentively, the play of La Valliere and made my notes upon what I thought it needed."

" Feb. 25th. Called upon Bulwer, we talked over the play, and I mentioned my objections, at the same time suggesting some remedies. He yielded to all readily except the Fifth Act. Upon that he seemed inclined to do battle, but at length I understood him to yield."

Nothing more is noted concerning this play until a note September 16th which shows that Lytton had already made arrangements for the staging of La Vallière. Although the

play was not performed until January, its second edition was published before that time, the first in the autumn of 1836. On November 2nd, 1836, Macready writes:

"Read Bulwer's Play," The Duchess de La Vallière in Mr. Osbaldiston's room. The actors and actresses were, or seemed to be, very much pleased with the play, but I can not put much confidence in them."

" Dec. 7th. Went to rehearsal of La Vallière.

" Dec. 13th. Wrote to Edward and made up a copy of La Vallière with a letter to him."

Upon January 4th, 1837, the first performance of La Valliere was thus described by Macready:-

" Acted Bragelone well with earnestness and freshness; some paragraphs deficient in polish. Being called for, I did not choose to go on without Miss Faucit whom I led forward. The applause was fervent, but there had been considerable impatience throughout the play which did not end till eleven o'clock. Dow Fitzgerald, Browning, Talfourd, C. Butler, came into my room. They all seemed to think much of my performance. Bulwer came in when they had gone, and in the most energetic and ardent manner, thanked me for my performance, and for making him cut out the first scene of the Fifth Act. Mr. Standish took Forester and myself to Lady Blessington's for supper. Count D'Orsay and herself received us most warmly. Bulwer drove me home. His whole talk was La Vallière."

Even with the best actors, the play was not successful; and after nine performances, although the manager wished it to remain for twenty, the author requested it to be withdrawn. It met with no better success when played in New York, 1837, at the Park Theatre, with Miss Ellen True ( Afterwards Mrs. Chas. Kean), in the part of the Duchess. D'Israeli says of this play in a letter to Lady Blessington, written about January 12th, 1837:



"I am sorry about B's ( Bulwer's ) play. I would not write to him, as I detest sympathy, save with good fortune; but I am sorry, very, and for several reasons: 1st, because he is my friend; 2ndly, he is the only literary man whom I do not abominate and despise; 3rdly, because I have no jealousy on principle ( not from feeling), since I think always the more the merrier; and his success would probably have assisted mine; 4thly, Because it proves the public taste lower even than I imagined it, if indeed, there can be a deeper still in my estimate; 5thly, because from the extracts which have met my eye ( in the Examiner), the play seemed excellent, and far the best poesie that he has yet delivered himself of; 6thly, because there seems to have been a vast deal of disgusting kant upon the occasion; 7thly, because he is a good fellow; and 8thly, - I forget the 8th argument, but it was a very strong one. However, the actors of the present day are worse even than the authors- that I knew before, But Ed. B. would not believe it, and I could pardon his skepticism. As for myself, I have locked up my melo-drama in the same strong box with my love letters; both being productions only interesting to the writer."

The subject of the play, as that of the Lady of Lyons and Richelieu, has its source in French history. It might be interesting, here, to quote passages in regard to La Duchess from Bulwer's own reading of the three periods in French History with which these three plays deal,- which reading may be found in a preface written to an edition for a collected edition of Bulwer's plays unpublished. This quotation also gives the author's opinion of the play, and his attitude concerning its failure:-

"The three Plays of Richelieu, the Duchess de La Vallière, and the Lady of Lyons, are illustrations of three periods, perhaps the most remarkable in the History of France, and may be said to constitute a dramatic series.

In the time of Louis XIV., as in that of Richelieu, what we call a People did not yet exist. But a Nation did. Of that Nation, the most heroic attributes were

to be found, - not in the lowest class- they were frightened slaves; not in the burgher class- they were servile imitators; but in those of the old warrior nobles, who yet pursued the distinct and independent character of the ancient comrades of Henri Quatre, to whom yet belonged the essentials of chivalric poetry, honour, love and religion, the sword, the favour, and the cross.

Some such creation, I have endeavored, however feebly, to shadow forth in the Bragelone of La Vallière which, take it altogether, is, I am convinced, the highest and the completest delineation of ideal character which I have yet accomplished either in the drama or romance.

The Duchess de La Vallière, the most polished in point of diction, and the highest in point of character, went the first night thro' an ordeal which a play a thousand times better could not have braved unscathed. The practical dramatist knows that there is no fault more perilous to a play than that of being too long; but from some **grievous** error in the stage management, the length of mine had been overlooked, and the curtain did not fall until half past eleven! viz., nearly two hours after the proper and orthodox close of a five-act play. In the next place, the important parts of Lauzun and Louis XIV. were performed by gentlemen whose very ability in their own more peculiar lines made the public less lenient to any failure they might incur in the representation of characters from which they were unsuited. In the composition of the play itself, the court intrigues occupying the 4th Act, are unfamiliar, and therefore uninteresting to an English audience; and the catastrophe of taking the veil wants, on the stage to which Protestants are spectators, the awe which probably any reader has felt in the simplest narrative of that dreary close to the sins and sufferings of Madame de La Valliere. In spite of these defects, inherent and incidental, the extraordinary power which Mr. Macready threw into the part of Bragelone preserved the play from complete failure. It was performed nine nights, and the manager wished to have continued it for twenty, but the author thought it has already served its purpose in affording him the experience of what to avoid in the future. It is possible, however, that by a few alterations, La Vallière might be restored to the stage, with the same theatrical

good fortune as has attended the later offspring of the same family; and, perhaps, at a future period, the experiment will be at least adventured."

The story of the play deals with one of the numerous attachments of Louis XIV., his relation with Louise de La Vallière and her later retirement from court to a convent. The character of Louis is truly drawn. No mention is made in the play of the two children whom Louise de La Vallière bore the King. Neither are historical events strictly adhered to in regard to Madame de Montespan who was not banished from court as is stated in the play, but remained mistress of the royal affections until Francoise D' Aubine ( Madame de Maintenon) came upon the scene.

The total length of the play is 2107 lines including the lyrics 2135. It has a Prologue of 66 lines in pentameter couplets. The rest of the play, except the lyrics is in blank verse. It has Bulwer's characteristic use of dashes, italics, and large type; capitolized words, e.g. Home, Conscience, Past, Merit, etc.; and use of exclamation. Favorite words occur, such as: soothe, chafes, stars, lackeys, dupes, gushed, garnish, glide, and mirror ( verb).

We find the favorite romantic background of a convent at night, amid thunder and lightening; both the exterior and interior of a Gothic Convent of the Carmelites. The romantic devices of "tolling bells and music " heard from within occur. Other Catholic elements are given in the "ritual," " beads",

" hermits", "nun," "abbess," and other church ceremony.

A few of the passages in this play are echoed again in the Lady of Lyons and Richelieu.

Mr. Kingdom in De Witts Acting Edition of Bulwer's plays says, in his remarks upon this play, which, if true, explain in some measure, why La Duchess failed as a drama:

"As a general rule, the first dramatic productions of an author, no matter what his position in other varied paths of literature may be, is seldom, or ever, attended with success; and notwithstanding the high intellect, cultivation and ability of the eminent writer of the present play, it was no exception to this general rule. In all first productions, there is almost invariably found a weakness of plot, and a want of consistency in the arrangement and a crudness of construction which can only be overcome by practice and observation, and the opposite of which can not be born with the genius of the author.

The story marked out in the Duchess de La Valliere is simple; and although it is sufficient for an excellent reading play, it is not sufficiently interesting, nor filled enough with good points and situations to make it interesting and attractive as a play in a theatrical sense."

Mr. Kingdom also praises the language and the good situations in the play. I think that this criticism in the main is true,- The play is more readable thanactable, not only on account of its length, but also because of its structure. Too much is said, which left unsaid, would have been perceived by the spectator with a much better impression. I wonder if Bulwer had ever read " On Ne Badine Pas Avec L'Amour" by Alfred de Musset which appeared in Réve des Deux Mondes on July 1, 1834. I don't know why I should especially compare "La Duchess" with " On Ne Bandine Pas" except that in both on bandine avec L' amour .

both heroines seek the convent, and that Louise has Musset's amour de l'amour. But in contrast, Musset impresses even the reader more by what remains unsaid than with that which is. How clearly the character of Rosette is drawn to us; and yet she speaks few words and is never directly described. La Duchess lacks the lightness of touch, the "rire trempé de larmes" which Musset gives to his piece.

The Duchess has some very good scenes as Mr. Kingdom says. Scenes good in themselves; yet, combined into a whole, lack a subordination, that certain subordination which most American actors, I have seen lack in their interpretation in comparison to the art of the "divine Sarah". The play contains some splendid verse and delightful speeches; yet, one finds them admirable rather in themselves than as a part of a whole.

Lewes in his introduction to the "Modern Dramatists" says:

"The drama is not merely poetry or literature, it is an applied form of these. It is not enough for a man to be a great poet, a great inventor, a great humourist- it is not enough for him to have insight into character, and power of representing it in action- it is not enough for him to have command over brilliant dialogue and striking situations- there must also be added to that a peculiar instinct for dramatic evolution, a peculiar art of construction and ordonnance, which will combine all these qualities so as to meet psychological and theatrical exigencies".

Bulwer was not discouraged by the failure of this play, but wisely profited by its mistakes and soon produced the successful Lady of Lyons.

---

44. "Life of Edward Bulwer, First Lord Lytton", by the Earl of Lytton, Vol. I, pp. 530-531.

CHAPTER IV.THE LADY OF LYONS -

or

LOVE AND PRIDE.

Bulwer seemed bound to succeed in writing a good play, and accordingly after the failure of La Vallière set to work on a new one, although its actual writing occupied only a fortnight. The play was written especially for Macready who was manager of Covent Garden at this time, and with Macready's players in view. As it was written more as a tribute to their friendship than as a business proposition, the author refused to accept any remittance for it. Bulwer writes in his preface:

Sympathizing with the enterprise of Mr. Macready, as manager of Covent Garden, and believing that many of the higher interests of the Drama were involved in the success or failure of an enterprise equally hazardous and disinterested, I felt, if I may so presume to express myself, something of the Brotherhood of Art; and it was only for Mr. Macready to think it possible that I might serve him, to induce me to make the attempt."

-- Bulwer wished to produce his new play anonymously, in order not to subject it to the attacks which social prejudice might bring. Macready was not in favor of this plan, although he aided Bulwer in carrying it out.

Letters from Macready to Bulwer express Macready's anxiety about the concealment of the author's name, his enthusiasm over the play, and his staunch loyalty to Bulwer's cause.

The following note from Macready's diary shows that Macready was no doubt responsible for the title of the new play being "The Lady of Lyons" rather than "The Adventurer:"

"Feb. 3rd. Received a letter from Bulwer with the title of the "Adventure", but when I saw it written down, I would not consent to it."

The play was produced on February 15th, a little later than Macready had at first planned. On that day Macready writes:-

"Went to an early rehearsal of play. Acted Claude Melnotte in Bulwer's play pretty well; the audience felt it very much, and were completely carried away with it; the play in the acting was completely successful."

The audience did "feel it!" The first performance met with great applause and much inquiry concerning the author's name. Detained in the House of Commons, Bulwer was not able to come to the first performance until it was almost over. As he was rushing to the theatre, he met a fellow author who was just returning from Covent Garden. Upon Bulwer's inquiries concerning the success of the play, his friend, not dreaming Bulwer to be the author, replied:

"Oh, it went very well indeed- for that sort of nothing."

To this fellow writer, Sergeant Talfourd, Bulwer dedicated the published edition of his new play.

Bulwer and Macready were both nervous about revealing Bulwer's name. The following extract from Macready's diary may show something of this anxiety:

"Feb. 17th. Read over part of the play, being anxious to play well, as I knew Bulwer would be there- Bulwer came into my room and expressed himself much pleased; offered to give his name whenever I might wish it."

"Feb. 18th. Wrote to Bulwer suggesting his proposal of last night, the announcement of his name. Bulwer called and giving me full power to act on my own judgment, seemed not to wish his name published until further experiment of the play's success had been made- until Thursday, I resolved to wait the whole week."

"Feb. 21st. Bulwer called. I was preparing to go on the stage and mentioned his uncertainty about the policy of publishing his name. I told him of the improvement in the prospect of the house, and we agreed we would wait and see the progress of the night. Saw Bulwer, who left with me carte-blanche as to the time and mode of announcing his name."

The name of Bulwer was first announced as the author of *The Lady of Lyons* in the Covent Garden play-bill of Saturday 24th, 1838.

The play had a most successful history, although greatly criticised and burlesqued, and remained popular through-out Bulwer's lifetime. Even her Royal Highness expressed her approval of the piece.

Justice McCarthy, in *Modern Leaders*, 1872 said: "Probably " It is the most successful acting drama produced in England since the days of Shakespeare."

It is said that after the first night, for a week or so, it was not so successful; and that there had been some talk of taking it off. However, no note to that effect is made in Macready's diary. It is also said that Macready was too old for his part; and that the applause went first to Miss Faucit who made many triumphs in London and elsewhere as "Pauline". A long list of representations, together with the great names in



its casts, has been given in our Introduction, in outline form.

As has been before stated, "The Lady of Lyons" is one of the three Bulwer plays to be founded upon French history. Quoting again from Bulwer's unpublished preface above referred to:

"In taking the period of the French Directory for the third play in this series, two ways of treating the time suggested themselves. One, being the larger and loftier, was to make Paris itself the scene of action and the little great men of the brief day, pulling carelessly at those strings which at a distance moved and brought nearer to them, that machine of iron which under the calm eyes of the young Corsican was already changing the world into a Camp. But for success on the stage, it may be doubtful whether the interest in such a mode of representing the time and circumstances, would not be too vague and general; whether the personages employed would not be too immediately near our own time; and, whether, finally, if manners were admitted as one element of interest, the manners of that loose period were such as could be safely presented upon the stage. The humbler and the easier way of treating the subject was by recurring to the passion rather than to humour, and let one man, selected from the people as their representative, show in his own irregular passions, his discursive but strong ambition, his dreams of equality, his melting into ardour for that young and eager France which had sprung up from the Republic to die under the Empire. The old story which gave me the first suggestion of "The Lady of Lyons" appeared to me capable of being directed to such a purpose."

The old story referred to here is a French story entitled: "The Bellows Mender," Moncrieff's burlesque upon the Lady of Lyons, is founded upon the same story, the original of which I have been unable to find. Bulwer states that the incidents in the play are altered from those of the tale, and that the characters are entirely recast.

It is interesting to compare the different criticisms of the Lady of Lyons. Of course, Bulwer's friends found it perfection :- while his enemies found it nothing but artificial

"Clap-Trap." Modern critics are less spirited, perhaps, in their judgment of it. Perhaps, more find fault than merit in it; yet, many of those who condemn it, do so because it belongs to the type of drama which they find unworthy, the Melo-drama. They condemn it because it has the characteristics of all Melo-drama, and find in it no redeeming virtues. To show what sincere admiration, Bulwer's friends had for the piece, I shall quote two letters of appreciation which the author received; the one, from Lady Blessington, the other from Mrs. Shelly, the poet's widow.

Lady Blessington to Edward Bulwer:

Gare House,  
Saturday.

My DEAREST Friend-

I confess, that I have rarely in my life enjoyed so great a pleasure as on finding that a play, which excited my feelings and delighted my imagination more than any other I had ever beheld, was from your pen. My proudest anticipations are fulfilled, for the success of the Lady of Lyons leaves all competition behind, and this, too, without the prestige of its authorship being known. When I read the extracts in The Examiner last Sunday, I said that I thought there was only one man in England, or in the world, who could have written them. The thoughts, the language, struck me as being yours and yours only; but yet on reflection, I thought you would have entrusted me with the secret; and knowing also your numerous other avocations, I fancied it was impossible that you could have found time to have written this exquisite play.

Now, shall I confess a weakness to you?

I felt the charm of the high-souled and beautiful sentiments, and the eloquent words in which they are dressed, so strongly, that I was jealous for your fame, and pained that another could so write. When I heard everyone I met proclaiming The Lady of Lyons to be perfection, nay some adding: ('Oh, if your friend, Bulwer, wrote a piece like this, he might be unrivalled in his theatrical as in his novelist reputation'), I have felt envious of the author of this piece, which

has won all praise, and wished that so dangerous a rival to you had not sprung forth. And, yet, I never can give up my honest and heart-felt admiration for La Valliere, which, had it been brought out without your name, which served as the watchword for political animosity to take the field against it, and had it been properly cast, must have obtained a most brilliant success; for it richly merited it. The political attacks against The Lady of Lyons, can do it no harm; everyone feels the motives. Heaven bless you and preserve to your country a genius that ennobles it, prays,

Your affectionate and proud friend,

M. BLESSINGTON."

---oOo---

MRS. SHELLY TO EDWARD BULWER:

DEAR MR. BULWER:

Do excuse my writing a few lines to say how very much The Lady of Lyons pleased me. The interest is well maintained, the dialogue, natural, one person answers the other, not as I found in Werner and Sardanapolis, each person made a little speech apart, or one only speaking that the other might say something; the incidents flow from the dialogue, and that without soliloquies, and the incidents themselves flow naturally one from the other. There is the charm of nature and high feeling thrown over all.

I think that in this play, you have done as Mr. Shelly used to exhort Lord Byron to do- left the beaten road of old romance, so worn by modern dramatists, and idealized the present; and my belief is that now that you have found the secret of dramatic interest, and to please the public, you will, while you adhere to the rules that enable you to accomplish this necessary part of a drama, raise the audience to what height you please. I am delighted with the promise you hold out of being a great dramatic writer. But (if I may venture to express an opinion to one so much better able to form them- an opinion springing from something you said the other night) do not be apt to fancy that you

are less great when you are more facile. It is not always the most studied and (consequently) the favorite works of an author, that are his best titles to fame. The soil, ought to be carefully tended, but the flower that springs into bloom most swiftly, is the loveliest.

I have not read your play. I would not until I saw it, for a play is a thing for acting, not the closet.

I hope you will remember your promise of calling on me some evening, and believe me,-

Yours truly,

410 Park St.  
Sunday.

M. SHELLY. "

---oOo---

Lewis in his edition of "Modern Dramatists" says:-

"Whenever a young tragedian, or a tragic actress, wishes to make an impression--- whenever a 'benefit' has to be gotten up and there is no special attraction--- whenever a manager is at a loss what piece to play, the choice is almost certain to fall on The Lady of Lyons."

In the "A New Spirit of the Age," 1844, Richard Hengist Horne says that the interest in the Lady of Lyons is in its plot; and then at the end of his criticism states that the plot will not bear examination by any high standard.

Henry Morley in "Of English Literature in the Reign of Victoria with a Glance at the Past," 1881 attributes the popularity of the Lady of Lyons to its revolutionary spirit. The criticisms together with that of Percy Fitzgerald in the Gentlemen's Magazine, 1889; of Walter Whyte in "The Poets and the Poetry of the Century," 1894, all admit of the tinsel, the improbability, the flaws of the plot; yet, each must acknowledge that the play has at times a genuine ring; that it is successful; and in spite of the spectator's reason, pleases him.

A Mr. Strong, in "Plays and Players," finds no defence whatever for the "Lady of Lyons." He attributes its success to its "theatrical thrills and stunts." This critic, however, then comes near the point, when he says that The Lady of Lyons has held its place upon the stage, because it is primarily a melodrama. He adds in an interesting discussion concerning the acting of The Lady of Lyons, that it must be given

its full melo-dramatic value in the interpretation in order to produce the desired effect.

Filon, is, perhaps, the play's most severe critic. In The English Stage, he makes the following criticism:

" This is a literary melo-drama; a detestable combination for melodrama, considered either as a variation from drama proper, or as a separate type, is not to be raised to the dignity of literature by the veneering of it with a thin layer of poetry. This operation does not produce wild and violent incongruities. In the first act of The Lady of Lyons, Madame Deschappelles is a Palais Royal Mamon. Only a Palais Royal Mamon, and only one of the most pronounced of them at that, could imagine she would become a dowager princess by marrying her daughter to a prince. Pauline belongs to the same repertory. What are one's feelings, then on hearing tragic verses from her lips in the third act and seeing her compete with Imogene and Griselda in the sublimity ( and absurdity) of her self-sacrifice! In the fourth act, she has resumed something of her natural temperament of a prim and tedious governess.

But I suppose I must put up with Pauline Deschappelle's willy-nilly! It is one of the accepted doctrines of the old dramatic psychology that a character can pass from good to evil at critical moments, and pass out again even when all egress is barred. It is an absurd notion, but if Bulwer conforms to it, at least he is in the same boat with many others. Where he is himself at fault- that which indicates the obliquity of his moral outlook- is his having presented to us in Claude Melnotte a hero who is a double -dyed cheat. A mere peasant by birth, he passes himself off as a prince and marries under his false name, the daughter of a rich bourgeois, a soldier by profession, he becomes a general within two years, and in these two years amasses a fortune- How? By what methods of brigandage, we are not told, but we are left to accept it as a matter of course, As regards the first point, love may, perhaps, be held to

excuse the crime: as regards the second, no one seems ever to have raised any objections, and it has been left for me to state my difficulty. In a sufficiently disingenuous preface, Bulwer accounts for the incoherences and extravagances of his hero by the state of extraordinary excitement into which men's minds have been thrown by the French Revolution. His explanation has sufficed for the author's fellow-countrymen, and the Revolution has a broad back ; but I am afraid that Bulwer was not clear in his mind as to the kind of madness to which Frenchmen were impelled by it- and still more, that he has condoned our generals with our contractors. Our Deseaux and our Ouwards are not made of the same clay nor moulded in the same form; a fact as to which, unfortunately, he remained unenlightened.

After having made his anonymity serve a purpose of an advertisement, the author consented to reveal his identity, whilst announcing at the same time that The Lady of Lyons would be a sole experiment. The very next year, he appeared before the public with the tragedy of Richelieu, in which Macready played the principal role."

Quel dommage that Bulwer hurt Filow's tender feelings concerning the French Revolution!

I think in judging The Lady of Lyons as a drama, one must criticise it as a Melodrama,- surely it does belong to that type. It has, as have all melodramas, the incomplete moral, of having the "good ending" depend upon accident. ( Filon in the same book in which he criticises "The Lady of Lyons as melodrama, makes a plea for the melodrama, and says the moral is only "incomplete"). It contains the same artificiality, exaggerated feeling and sentimentality which all melodramas contain. It was successful on the stage in Bulwer's time, chiefly because melodrama appealed in that day to the sense of romance to which Mr. Strong refers. It is not because we lack romance, that we judge The Lady of Lyons out of date to-

day, but because our romantic sense is of a different manner, satisfied by a different form of entertainment.

We are not entirely over our admiration of the old fashioned melodrama even to-day. Not long ago, when Sothern played "If I were King" in Kansas City, at the end of the performance, the usual murmur of approval arose. Personally, I would have been glad to have had my "money back"; but the lady on my right, had twice her money's worth. It is the fairy tale nature of persons who do not "believe in fairies" that dotes upon a rousing melodrama.

Although some of the critics deny it any literary merit, The Lady of Lyons aims to be poetical as well as theatrical. Although its poetical speeches, are at times, nothing more than "Clap-trap" and fine rhetoric, of which the Visionary Palace seems to have caused the most attacks, they are, nevertheless, not bad verse. It is of interest to note that most verse is employed in the speeches of Pauline-<sup>and</sup> Claude especially where they speak in dialogue. The diction is not without Bulwer's characteristic words, although there are not so many Gothic ones as in La Duchess.

The play is not without worthy motifs. We find Claude Melnotte, not an entirely honorable person according to the strictest sense, perhaps, - a wholesome character persecuted by the vulgar and crude Beauseaut and Glavis. There is the modern situation of an unrefined, conventional mother, against her simple, loyal daughter. There is the problem of caste, a favorite with romantic drama, and the wholesome, healthy action

and loyal, noble feeling/ which bars the tragedy  
As a melodrama, I consider The Lady  
of Lyons, an excellent achievement.

Bulwer had no intention of doing more as a dramatist  
when The Lady of Lyons proved his success in this type of litera-  
ture, and showed his critics that he had the capabilities for  
drama; but Macready needed more plays, and soon called upon  
Bulwer to write another.

A letter to Bulwer from Charles Dickens, 1862, concern-  
ing an operatic version of The Lady of Lyons, seems to infer  
that Bulwer was thinking of allowing Oxenford to make one, - a  
plan/<sup>of</sup> which Dickens did not altogether approve.

45. " Life of Edward Lytton, First Lord Lytton", By the Earl  
of Lytton, Vol.I. pages 536 and 538.



CHAPTER V.R I C H E L I E U.

Richelieu was first performed at Covent Garden on March 7th, 1839. Macready and Bulwer began their discussions with reference to new play in July of the preceding year. On July 25th, 1838, Macready notes:-

" Sir E. Bulwer came into my room and I talked with him about a play for next season. He wants a subject and will go to work."

"In September, he writes again:-  
Sept. 8th. Wrote to Bulwer about his subject for a play. "

"Sept. 17th. Letters from Bulwer about subject."

"Sept. 22nd. Bulwer came and talked about a subject of which he is thinking."

" Sept. 23rd. Letters from Bulwer about subject."

Whether the subject here referred to was Richelieu or not, we do not know. On October 3rd, Bulwer in a letter to Forester says:

"The play stands dead still. Not a subject to be found, though I have read for it like a tiger."

On the 24th day of the same month, Macready notes in his diary:

"Oct. 24th. Letters from Bulwer, informing me that he had made but the rough sketch of a play, an historical comedy, on the subject of Richelieu. I answered him delighted with the news."

Macready had much to do with the alterations of the new play. His efforts in regard to Richelieu may be

traced from his dairy.

"Nov. 12th. Found Bulwer's play at home; set up till half past two to read it."

" Nov. 15th. At home. Read some scenes un the latter part of Richelieu which are not effective. I fear the play will not do- cannot be made effective."

" Nov. 16th. Read Richelieu to Catherine and Letitia making short notes and suggesting alterations as I went along."

" Nov. 15th. Read greater part of Bulwer's play of Richelieu, which, though excellent in parts, is deficient in the important point of certainty of interest. I should also say that the character is not " seroatus ad ."

" November 17th. Called on Bulwer and talked over the play of Richelieu. He combated my objections and acceded to them as his judgment swayed him; but when I developed the object of the whole plan of alterations, he was in ecstasis. I never saw him so excited, several times exclaiming that he was "enchanted" with the plan, and observed in high spirits " What a fellow you are!" I left him the play, and he promised to let me have it in a week! He is a wonderful man."

" Nov. 18th. Sir. E. Bulwer called and showed me the two scenes, good ones, that he had already written. Settled the plot of the remainder. "

" Nov. 21st. Bulwer called, bringing with him the completed Richelieu."

" Nov. 22nd. Thought over Richelieu. Do not yet see my way into it. Marked the first act for cutting, Robertson read and marked the second act of Richelieu. "

" Nov. 23rd. Thought over Richelieu, before I rose. Read and marked the third act. Went to the Theatre reading Richelieu, by the way."

"Nov. 24th. Read and cut the fourth act of Richelieu."

On the 24th also, the present Earl of Lytton states that the drama was read before a few friends, among whom, Robert Browning was the first to pronounce Richelieu 'A great play'. The Earls of Lytton says that during this reading "an amusing incident occurred which might have had unfortunate consequences; during the third act, Forester fell asleep, which consequently offended the sensitive author." Forester apologized for his carelessness in a letter to Bulwer who readily forgave; and the affair was forgotten by both.

The following are other notes from Macready's diary expressing his regard for the piece in the making:

"Nov. 27th. Wrote to Bulwer in answer to his note, expressing to him how foremost in my consideration was his reputation; that his play would have been valuable from any other person; but that it would not serve his interest whatever in reference to his literary fame, his station or his political position. Bulwer came into my room, and in a very warm manner expressed himself most pacified with my note and much obliged. He sat and talked about Richelieu and left me a note ( a very valuable one) that he had written".

"Dec. 8th. Note from Bulwer with his play, which I read; it is greatly improved, but still not quite to the point of success."

Dec. 16th. Gave up morning to marking of Richlieu".

On Jamary 5th, Richelieu was read to the actors, and enthusiastically received, says Macready:

"Jan. 5th, 1839. Read Bulwer's play of Richelieu to the actors, and was most agreeably surprised to find it excite them in a very extraordinary manner. The expression of delight was universal and enthusiastic. Bulwer came into our box and seemed much delighted with the news of his play's reception".

The play was first rehearsed by Macready Feb. 9th, almost one month before the first representation.

Macready seemed somewhat puzzled about the interpretation of the character Richelieu, in which he found some inconsistency. Bulwer, however, seems to have cleared up his doubts in the matter. Macready thus

" Feb. 20th. Gave my attention to the consideration of the character Richelieu, which Bulwer has made particularly difficult by its inconsistency. He has made him resort to low jest, which outrages one's notions of the ideal Cardinal Richelieu, with all his vanity and suppleness and craft."

" Feb. 22nd. Gave my attention to the inquiry as to the possibility of reconciling the character which Bulwer has drawn under the name of Cardinal Richelieu. with the original, from which it so entirely differs. Was not much cheered by the result of my investigations and experiment."

" Feb. 25th. Bulwer spoke to me about Richelieu, and satisfied me on the justice of his draught of character from the evidence that history has given us. Allous dons a la glorie!"

March 4th, Bulwer made some alterations in the play and which Macready thought not to be improvements. We are not told what the alterations were, nor whether or not they remained.

Macready thus describes the first performance on March 7th:

"Acted Cardinal Richelieu very nervously; lost my self-possession, and was obliged to use much effort; it did not satisfy me at all, there were no artist-like touches through the play. How can a person get up such a play and do justice at the same time to such a character? It is not possible.- The success of the play seemed to be unequivocal."

The play was tremendously successful with Macready, as it has since been with other great tragedians, and remained one of the principal plays in his repertoire. Mr. Mantell, to-day, considers it one of his best plays.

The acting versions are, I believe, some what cut, while the literary editions contain as a general rule the

play in its entirety. De Witt's acting edition gives the play cut; the edition published by Collier & Son gives the complete play, placing the cuts in brackets. This condition also exists in the other acted plays of Bulwer. Mr. Mantell told the writer of this paper, that time, is with him, the only consideration in regard to these cuttings. The first edition of Richelieu was published in 1839; also. Many editions followed. A table for these is given in the introduction.

Bulwer takes as the source of his play, a time in French history when Richelieu, although weak physically, by his strong mentality ruled Louis XIV. In the preface before referred to, written for the unpublished, collected edition of Bulwer's early plays, Bulwer interprets the period thus:-

"In the time of Richelieu, the French Monarchy was consolidated on the ruins of a haughty and independent Noblesse ----- . In the time of Richelieu, the people, in its own person awed and sullen, recedes from the stage, as the minister and the noble play their desperate game for power. In that of Louis, effeminate and corrupted, the people stand not invisible indeed, but in silence and shadow, behind the gorgeous throne which the victorious minister bequeathed to the successor of the monarch he ruled and humbled.-----

Compare Richelieu with the Republic. How much wiser in his generation is the one man! Richelieu with his errors, his crimes, his foibles, and his cruelties, marches invariably to one result and obtains it. He overthrows but to construct. He destroys but to establish. He desired to create a great monarchy, and he succeeded. The people, with crimes to which those of the one man seem fair and spotless, with absurdities which turn the tragedy of massacre into farce, with energies to which all individual strength is as the leaf upon the whirlpool, sets up a democracy as the bridge to a despotism. The people vanishes as the trick of a pantomime, and the soldier with the iron crown of the Lombard, files solitary

and sublime, the void space where the loud democracy roared and swayed. And this because in the individual, there is continuity of purpose. The one is a man, the many a child.

Take the time of Richelieu, and we see the monk, the spy, the headsman, the dungeon opening at the one door on the scaffold, on the other to the king's closet. The minister is the state-- where the People? It has no existence in itself save at riotous fits and starts- it has a representative, capricious, frivolous, brave, cruel, but not without a justice in its cruelty, and that representative is the state- in other words, Armand Richelieu. Like all men who rise to supreme power, the great Cardinal had the characteristics of the time and the nation that he ruled. In his faults or his merits, he was eminently French. He represented the want of the French People at that precise period in their history. He reduced provinces into a Nation. He forced discordant elements, whether plebeian or patrician into order. He did not make the people free, nor were they fit for it. But out of riotous and barbarous factions, he called forth orderly subjects and a rough undeveloped system of Civil Government. He never once appeared as the Enemy to the multitude. His cruelty was directed to their enemies.

In all these contests for power in which we see the worn, anxious, solemn image of the Cardinal Minister, with his terrible familiars of spy and hangman, he is still on that side where the French Nation should have ranged, building up the school beside the throne, and making at last a state, tho' the time and the men had not yet arrived for the creation of the People." 47

Such is Bulwer's reading of that period in history upon which he based his play. It may or may not be somewhat visionary. It perhaps would not have suited the taste of Monsieur Filow, but at least it was what Bulwer saw. These changes, he states in his preface, states frankly, little dreaming the outbursts they would cause Filow to make who says:

" When he blended into one plot the journee des Dupes and the conspiracy of the Duc de Bouillon, together with some features borrowed from the adventure of Cinq-Mars and De Thou, the author mingled together two periods which **should not and could not** be thus confounded, - the beginning and the end of Richelieu's career. He managed, too, to falsify English history as well, incidentally, by making Richelieu refer in council to Cromwell at that time a still obscure member of the House of Commons. Richelieu speaks of the antagonism between Charles and Oliver at a period when the latter is not even a captain of cavalry. But what is an anachronism of this kind compared to that which involves the principal character in one continued topsy-turvy dam?

It is the drawback both of the historical play and the historical novel, that they put the great figures of history before us in a form and in an attitude that their contemporaries could never have witnessed- confessing, describing, revealing themselves just to illustrate their character by their conversation, always dilating on their deeds instead of doing them. But of all the braggarts in theatrical history, Bulwer's Richelieu is the most vain-glorious and the most intolerable. It is all very well for the author to say in his preface that the Cardinal was the father of French civilization and the architect of the monarchy; he may say what he likes; but we can not stand Richelieu when he talks of himself, etc."

I agree with Filow that the historical play as well as the historical novel has the drawback of which he complains. Indeed, I think the historical play a very unhappy choice of type unless the writer can give it so universal an application that its interest may always endure. Perhaps, it would not be possible to write a good play which would be perfectly historical. But if so, the history and not the play itself suffers. I admit, it may be a trifle disconcerting after having read French history, or having formed a conception of Richelieu from J.H. **Payne's** Richelieu



or perhaps, from James' novel by that name, to be expected to sympathize with Bulwer's idealistic picture of him. Yet it was Bulwer's picture. As far as historical events are concerned, I think he had the right to "make believe" as he liked about their sequence, especially when he states his premises in the preface. It is interesting to note in this preface that Bulwer states that Cinq-Mars suggested one of the scenes in the fifth act, and a novel by the author of "Picciola" some portion of the intrigue connected with De Mauprat and Julie. So much for Bulwer's sources!

Richelieu, except for a letter in prose is written in blank verse. Although the play has Bulwer's favorite words, capitals, italics and interjections, it has few Gothic words or devices, except a few Catholic ones used in connection with the Cardinal. These, in most cases, have no romantic effect in themselves. The only Catholic device of this nature is the Cardinal's threat to invoke "The Curse of Rome" should any one set but a foot within "the awful circle of our solemn church" which the Cardinal marks around Julie. There is some mysticism introduced, perhaps, in Richelieu's discourse concerning the prophesy of the stars. There is only one Gothic setting, the Cardinal's chamber at midnight lighted by the moonlight; unless the scene of the prison corridor should be called such.

The play is melodramatic in its construction and in its exaggeration of emotion. As Filow says, the situations of the play depend to a great extent upon the loss and re-

covery of a document. The recovery does, indeed, seem rather unnecessarily difficult; but the part of the page who recovers it, is not always as Filow would imply, played by a woman. The "Curse of Rome" before mentioned is also a melo-dramatic device which changes the action of the play. One wonders why the Cardinal did not threaten it more often when circumstances turned against him. No one would have much respect for the hero of a fairy tale who neglected to use his magic wand when placed in justifying circumstances. The device of Richelieu's feigned death, is criticised as weak. I think Richelieu's feigning death, was a clever device; but to have his feigning so readily accepted by Huguet and the other conspirators seems indeed improbable.

The chief interest of the piece is the character sketch of Richelieu. The other characters and the action are invented chiefly to show the Cardinal in different lights and from different angles. The other characters are typical rather than individual. As Filow says some of the characters have but one idea. Yet Filow's criticism should not, I think, be taken too seriously.

In connection with the character, Richelieu, the play has two strong tragic motifs: The strong soul and mind hampered by disease and old age; and a strong nature dependent upon and in bonds to the weak. The tragic end is only averted by the Cardinal's devotion to his Church and State, and by the loyalty of his weaker friends.

The criticisms of the play are mainly given in connection with the tragedians who assume the title role. Some critics consider the play "tommy-rot", while others judge it nearly Shakesperean. At all events, it is a popular piece with the public. This last fall, when Mr. Mantell was in Kansas City, during an interview which he courteously accorded me, I asked him why he kept Richelieu in his otherwise Shakesperean repertoire. His first reason was because the play was popular; his second, because it afforded him a rest:-

"I keep Richelieu in my repertoire, because it is one of my best plays. It is more popular in Canada and in San Francisco, than it is here. In San Francisco, I can play it three times during one week to a crowded house.-----Then, too, Richelieu is a rest from my heavier roles.----- It is very easy to play. --You see, I sit most of the time. I hope, Miss Clark, you have not come to have me say anything against Richelieu, for I should not do that. I know that the critics, the would-be critics, I call them, say that it is melo-dramatic. But I should like one of them to write me a play as good. I'll pay good money for it."

So it seems, the public is responsible for Richelieu's appearance upon the boards. The public like the Revolution has a broad back. If I may venture my own opinion in the matter, it is, that at least half of the people who attend Shakesperean performances, do so because "it's the thing to do." Shakespere was a great man; and it's the duty of all who would be considered refined and cultured to applaud him. When a melo-drama is wound about a great historical personage, and pre-

mented to them in the dignity of blank verse, by a popular tragedian, this half of the audience gets what it really enjoys; and feels that its spontaneous applause is still in "good taste." Some like the play because it's a show; others because it's a melodrama; and some because it affords an opportunity to criticise,- the piece, the acting, and the DO of Julie's hair.

---

---

47. "Life of Edward Bulwer, First Lord Lytton," by the Earl of Lytton, Vol. I. page 544.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SEA CAPTAIN,-

or

THE BIRTHRIGHT.-

---oOo---

By October 15th, 1839, according to Macready's diary, Bulwer had produced a new play called the Sea Captain, which was first performed at the Haymarket on the 31st of the same month. The play was well received, and although it had a successful run of several weeks at the Haymarket, the author had it withdrawn ( even from print), because of the attacks made upon both the play and its preface by Thackeray in the "Yellow-Plush Papers.

Little is noted about the play in Macready's diary, prior to its representation. On October 15th, he merely writes:

" I read some part of Bulwer's play, The Sea Captain."

"Oct. 20. Rehearsed Sea Captain. Bulwer there. Bulwer became more confident as the rehearsal proceeded and seemed at ease in his mind, when it had concluded. I am not. I want time for myself, and much more for other persons and things."

"Oct. 22. Rehearsed the new play of "The Sea Captain." Bulwer came in to ask me for his M.S. alterations."

"Oct. 23. Rehearsed Sea Captain."

From a letter of Macready's written to Bulwer, Dec. 3rd, 1839, we may gather that the management of the Haymarket thought well of the play, and would have had it run

for the rest of the season; also that Bulwer contemplated altering the piece.

Macready to Bulwer:

"York Gate, Regent's Park,  
December 3rd, 1839.

" My Dear Bulwer:

My report to our progress is not so satisfactory as I could wish- our houses have trained off considerably; Webster showed me the last week's receipts last night. We averaged £95 per night ( which is not a winning game) through the last week. This week, he has put up The Lady of Lyons for Monday ( last night when the house was very good), and the Merchant of Venice for Thursday; The Sea Captain on the other four nights. I asked him last night what he anticipated, and he informed me that he expected The Sea Captain to carry us on to the end of the season, but not without intervening plays. It is very difficult to get at the truth of Covent Garden receipts; but I believe them, from the individual reports made to me, to be greatly exaggerated. As to the question of the policy of altering The Sea Captain, I know no instance of the success of such an experiment. Mr. Webster ( of whose judgment and penetration I have no opinion whatever) would be well pleased to have it altered for the next season; but until you can alter Mrs. Warner, Mr. Strickland and Mr. J. Webster I can see little real benefit to be derived from altering their parts. The mother must be the person whose passions are moved the most strongly, and there must be agency applied on Norman, and not through him. Therefore, whatever may be added to his words, his actions must still be subservient to stronger persons. I therefore cannot see that the result would recompense the labour. I read your preface to the fourth edition, and my impression was that you had left a record of the ignorance and spite of your assailants. I thought, too, that it was argumentatively put, and without temper; but I hear angry observations on it, and a pretty general opinion among your friends that it was not worth your while, though they sympathise entirely with you. I shall look at it again, though I scarcely expect to change my opinion, for I read it with great attention. Webster asked me if I would speak to you about another play, which he is anxious about for the next season. Have you any thought of one? I think if you could light upon a promising subject, I think it would be by far better policy than an alteration of The Sea Captain.

Always and ever yours,  
W.C. MACREADY."

It is too bad that Bulwer did not submit this preface to the 4th edition of the Sea Captain to Macready before it was published, as he did the play itself.

The play was produced in New York, June 9th, 1840 at Mr. Hield's benefit with an excellent cast. However, it was not warmly received and was never played again. The preface, especially, called down much ridicule and comment upon it, Thackery not failing to publish his burlesque of it.

The sensitive author felt this criticism keenly, and in spite of its prospect for performance, had it withdrawn even from print. After this, the copies already published were much in demand, - selling for as much as £5 in London.

The idea of the play was suggested to the author by a striking situation in a novel by M.A. Dumas - "La Capitaine Paul." In what measure, it was like The Rightful Heir, we do not know, except that it had corresponding characters.

Although, he intended to alter the play at some time, Bulwer accepted Macready's advice for the present, and did not at least try to alter The Sea Captain into a new play; but the next year, tried his hand at a prose comedy, Money.

CHAPTER VII.M O N E Y . -

On Dec. 8th, 1840, was produced, in my opinion, Bulwer's best play, a prose comedy "Money".

This play, as the other previous plays of Lytton's had the advantage of being well staged and most successfully cast. Bulwer must have had the main scheme of the drama planned before July 25th, 1840, because upon that date, Macready says in a letter to Bulwer:-

" I hope, that you have not given up the comedy with which, as Forester described the story to me, I was very much struck. A successful comedy would achieve quite a sensation. Pray make one."

On August 26th, Bulwer writes to Forester from Aix-la-Chapelle:-

" I have at last succeeded in fixing a character on the young man ( Macready), and the comedy is at least cast at present, in the proper mould. Whether it will go on well, I can't say yet. But the first act and a half are really, I hope, good. The character is that of a half misanthrope, soured by past poverty and despising the world that rallies round his new fortune. The surface, irony and a half careless wit; beneath, a strong and passionate temperament. "

He again writes to Forester two days later:-

"Aix- la Chapelle" is detestable; but I continue to improve, though gradually. All literary labour is sternly interdicted- but I creep on two or three pages a day with the Play . I fancy it is comedy, and so far in a new genre that it certainly admits stronger and more real grave passion than the comedy of the last century. But is not that true to the time? Are we not more in earnest than our grandfathers? I want most especially, Mrs. Glover. I have a widow, always gay and good-humoured, in love with Mr. Doleful ( name first given to Mr. Graves) always cynical and wretched. Mrs. Clifford could not do it, for there



must be some comeliness, or something to do instead. Is Mrs. Arger available? but nothing like Mrs. Glover. Macready's part is individualized, but difficult to act at present alternations too quick from gaiety to passion. I shall oil him all over before I've done. I am now in Act 3, which I intend to end with Crockford's or some other Club. I must have an exact picture of a real club. I have admitted many allusions to present manners, etc., throughout. But whether the whole will do, I can not say till I come to Act 5, where I see great difficulty and the want of a sudden catastrophe."

When Forester wrote to Bulwer asking him whether or not his new play would have a prologue, the latter wrote back a clever letter burlesquing his horror and surprise that Forester should mention a prologue for his new play when a prologue had practically proclaimed the death of "La Valliere"

The play was ready for Macready by October 4th, judging from Macready's first note concerning it in his diary. The following are extracts from Macready's diary relating to the play Money until after the first performance.

"Oct. 4th (1840). Read, cut, and remarked on Bulwer's Comedy of "Money."

"Oct. 9th. Played at piquet in order to learn the game for the new play "Money."

"Oct. 24th. Looked over what I could of the comedy of "Money." Went to the theatre and read it to the company, who were very much excited by it. It was quite successful with them."

"Oct. 25th. After dinner, continued my work on "Money," about which I begin to have my usual apprehensions."

"Nov. 25th. Went to theatre. Rehearsed with much pains, the first three acts of "Money." I was very much depressed and low-spirited. Bulwer came into my room; he was, as usual, obliged by my exertions."

The following letters of Bulwer and Charles Dickens

give some idea of the first production and its reception.

BULWER TO A FRIEND:

" I am sincerely rejoiced that you like the new play, especially the first night, when I own I thought it badly acted. The principal comic part in the play was Sir John Visey whom Strickland made a dead weight throughout. Macready himself was a little unnerved by his own afflictions, and the whole thing was much too long. I hear it has gone more smoothly since. I am also peculiarly glad that you like Clara. I own I had an object in her delineation. It is so common for a young woman of a generous and romantic temper to think that there is something very noble in an imprudent marriage, that I wished to show that there were two sides to think of."

CHARLES DICKENS TO EDWARD BULWER:

" Dear Sir Edward:

" Let me thank you for the copy of your comedy received this morning. I told Macready when he read it to me a few weeks since, that I could not call to mind any play since The Good Natured Man, so full of real, distinct, genuine character; and now that I am better acquainted with it, I am only the more strongly confirmed in the honest opinion.

" You may suppose that I was there to see, last Saturday, I most heartily and cordially congratulate you on its brilliant reception and success, which I hope will encourage you to other efforts in the same path. I feel assured that you will tread it alone.

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES DICKENS."

Money had a most successful run at the Haymarket and remained the only play in its bills until the end of Macready's engagement. The leading rôle was assumed by the actors who had succeeded Macready in The Lady of Lyons and Richelieu; Chas. Kean, Phelps, Anderson, Creswick, and others. In 1857, Charles Dickens wrote to Mr. Forester, concerning a performance of Money. with as much enthusiasm

as he had written to Bulwer in 1840. The play seems to have been generally well received at that time. The play was also successfully staged in America. Yet its popularity was not so long lived as that of The Lady of Lyons and Richelieu. The growing "star" system might have had something to do with this fact. Money requires many good actors. Then, too, the Club Scene is considered hard "to stage;" while the whole performance was an expensive one; at all events, the present King of England chose this play as a "typical English drama" to be represented in honor of the German Emperor during the Coronation festivities of 1911. In regard to its expense, it was used by Mr. Charles Mathews in his letter "to dramatic authors in discussing expenses of management on the English stage. The total amount expended upon the production of Money during its fifteen weeks' run at the Haymarket, M. Mathews estimates at £ 13000." Whether or not, this amount is prodigious compared with the expenditure upon other plays, can not be determined without other statistics.

From the dedication of the play, one might judge that John Forester in the one instance in which he "suffered his judgment to be misled by too great a regard for Money, might have inspired the author with ideas for the play." However, we have no direct evidence of this being the case. We know from the story of Bulwer's Life

that the "disconsolate widower" of Money was suggested by an acquaintance whom Bulwer met at Scarborough during travels at home. From Bulwer's remarks upon Money in his preface to the unpublished edition of his early plays, one may guess that the character of Evelyn was in a manner suggested by Alcest in Moliere's Le Misanthrope. No other clues are given concerning the sources of the play. Bulwer's main intention, perhaps, in trying his hand at something new, was to write a prose comedy, a social satire whose character interest would make it a successful acting piece. Moulton's "The Library of Literary Criticism" notes nothing directly concerning the play Money. Mr. Kingdom in De Witt's Acting Edition of Bulwer's Plays, eulogizes it greatly. But on the whole, it is little mentioned. I doubt if many persons could even place it. Folow, however, spares no words in its condemnation. In referring to the criticism made by an unmentioned critic, that the popularity of the play at its first presentation, and at its later revivals, demonstrated public appreciation of the "humor of a scholar", Folow confesses to recognize neither the scholar nor the humor. He believes the social satire to be greatly overdrawn; and fancies the picture of the "aristocratic club" rather resembles the "back parlor of a public-house." In addition, he twists the motives of the plot and finds them ridiculous. I think probably, it was merely an oversight that he forgot to tare the characters to bits, individually and separately.

Bulwer misled his play to be judged as "one of that school of comedy which finds its material, not in wit but in character," He tried to write a comedy "faithful to the character of the time itself,-" a comedy which with the art of Moliere, would have pathos as well as fun springing from the "comic agencies." Bulwer has succeeded very well in his intention, I believe. We may not, perhaps, attribute to him the entire art of Moliere; yet, his comedy is indeed "faithful to the character of its time." Who cares anything about the probability of the part of a social satire, so long as it is sufficiently successful, dramatically, to carry along the characters. The interest in the part and characters was not neglected by the author in his effort to make his play literary. From the point of view of the theatre, it seems to me that there is more dramatic value in this than in any other of Bulwer's plays.

Bulwer wrote no more plays after the plan of Money. He seemed to like trying new things and wrote only for a short time in any one line of work. Money practically ended his successful dramatic career, although "Not So Bad as We Seem," received at first, some applause.

"Life of Edward Bulwer, First Lord Lytton," by Earl Lytton

Preface to unpublished editions of Bulwer's early plays  
See "Life of Edward Lytton, First Lord Lytton, by the Earl of Lytton, Vol. I. p. 229.

CHAPTER VIII.O E D I P U S    T Y R A N N U S .

In a letter to Lady Blessington from Lyons, April 10th, 1846, Bulwer mentioned an adaptation of Sophecles' Oedipus Tyrannus which he was making for the English stage:-

" I have been undolently employing myself, partly on a version of a Greek play- partly on a novel, anxious to keep my mind distracted from the political field which is close to me."

In a letter to Forester from Rome, Feb. 4th, he says:

"In a fit of classical fervor, I have, since writing to you, completed what I had long meditated- a drama on the Oedipus Tyrannus, with the chorusses etc. More than this, I have arranged with the celebrated Mercadante, the composer, for the music for the choruses and overture. He takes to it con amore, and I have little doubt that his music will be very grand and effective. Now, can you arrange to sell this for me to any theatre where Macready performs? I am convinced that it is a part that will do him good. It always was the greatest part on a Greek stage; and though I can not flatter myself that I have attained to the poetry of a Sophocles, I think that I have improved the mere theatrical effect of the drama; and I have certainly brought out the character of Oedipus in colors more adapted for a modern audience. I have followed the march of the actual plot almost exactly, with a few touches and alterations here and there, but I have not translated the dialogue. I have rather built upon it, also upon the choruses. As a poem, it is more uniform and sustained than anything I have written."

Although upon a return to England, he arranged with Mr. Phelps for the production of this play at Sadler's Well's Theatre, Islington, the engagement was never carried out because of the attack upon the moral influence of the author which the publishing of Lucretia incurred.

" If so much indignation," the author says, " is produced by the written presentation of crime in a novel, what will be said of the actual acted representation of homicide and incest on the stage?"

The play was accordingly withdrawn, and has never been acted nor published.

---

"Life of Edward Bulwer, First Lord Lytton" by the Earl of Lytton.

CHAPTER IX.B R U T U S.<sup>46</sup>

The year 1847, was in part occupied by writing the tragedy on the subject of Brutus.

In a letter of Bulwer's to John Forester, from Nice, November 10th, 1849, Bulwer in referring to the play Brutus says he is ready for it again; and that he thinks it can be "very easily done" as Forester suggests, if he might have the play again. He asks that Forester return it to him, as he has no copy:-

" If I had it for a week, I could finish off and return the third act, as you suggest. But there- you must consider well, before you entrust it to the stage. The money is a very good thing, but my reputation, Sir Knight, think of that, and a half success at Sadler's Wells, for which, I suppose you design it, would be " a heavy blow and a great discouragement, to that frail vested interest." <sup>46</sup>

I find no more of the history of this play, except that it was completed, and though never published, was produced at the Princess Theatre, London, in 1885, under the title " The Household Gods."

46.

---

"Life of Edward Bulwer Lytton, First Lord Lytton," by the Earl of Lytton, Vol II. page 96 and note 125.



CHAPTER X.J U N I U S.

Bulwer's play, Junius, was produced at the Princess Theatre, London, February the 26th, 1885 with Wilson Barrett in the title role. Malloy states " that although there were repeated performances, the play was a failure and withdrawn March 28th."

The Athenium gave voice to the general verdict:-

"Lord Lytton's new drama .....is exactly what might have been anticipated. It is a clever and artificial work, in which the action is all but dramatic, and the dialogue rhetorical."

Author Goddard in "Players of the Period," speaks of Wilson Barrett in Junius, and gives two pages in high praise of the play.

Barton Baker in " History of the London Stage" says:

"Junius, a tragedy of the first Lord Lytton, 1885, was another grand coup de theatre. The ruined temple of Romulus, the streets and place of the Tarquins, were unsurpassable stage pictures. But Junius, like all other classical plays, was a failure, and Mr. Barrett had to fall back upon revivals of his melodramas....."

The late Life of Lytton by his grandson, makes no note whatever of this unpublished play. I have been unable to find when the play was written. However, it does not seem to me at all improbable that Junius is no other than Lytton's play Brutus. They were both performed at the same

theatre in the same year; both were Greek plays. It seems to me likely that the original title of the play was "Junius Brutus." I have not been able to procure "The Theatre Magazine" for 1885, or I might have discovered the truth.

---oOo---

## CHAPTER XI.

NOT SO BAD AS WE SEEM.or, Many Sides to a  
Character.

The hardships of literary men like Laman Blanchard, had caused Dickens and Bulwer to think of establishing the Guild of Literature and Art by which similar tragedies might be avoided and genius fostered. To procure money for this project, encouraged by amateur performances at Knebworth, they agreed that Bulwer should write a five act comedy to be followed by a farce written by Dickens. Bulwer, accordingly, produced Not So Bad as We Seem, or Many Sides to a Character, while Dickens had a farce of Lemon's substituted for the one he should have written, to which he added so many jokes and so much fun, that it was really his in part.

Macready and Dickens were both very enthusiastic over Bulwer's play. In the U.S. Macready pronounced it a great hit, and asserted that such plays would have kept him on the stage. Dickens longed to play Sir Gilbert, and although he confessed to look upon the play with the "yellow eye of an actor", found it "full of character, strong in interest, rich in capital situations, and certain to go nobly."

The play was first produced at Devonshire House, by the courtesy of the Duke of Devonshire, who had been for some time a sincere patron of literature and drama.

It was performed on the 16th of May, 1851, before the Queen and a fashionable audience. The following is an account of the first performance given in Mr. R. H. Horne's "Recollections of Contemporaries":

"The Duke gave us the use of his large picture gallery, to be fitted up with seats for the audience; and his library adjoining for the erection of the theatre. The latter room being longer than required for the stage and scenery, the back portion of it was screened off for a "green room". Sir Joseph Paxton was most careful in the erection of the theatre and seats. There was a special box for the Queen. None of the valuable paintings in the picture gallery (arranged for the auditorium) were removed; but all were faced with planks, and covered with crimson velvet draperies; not a nail was allowed to be hammered into the floor or walls, the lateral supports being by the pressure from end to end, of padded beams; and the uprights, or stanchions, were fitted with iron feet, firmly fixed to the floor by copper screws. The lamps and their oil were well considered, so that the smoke should not be offensive or injurious- even the oil being slightly scented- and there was a profusion of wax candles. Sir Joseph Paxton also arranged the ventilation in the most skillful manner; and, with some assistance from a theatrical machinist, he put up all the scenes, curtains and flies. Dickens was unanimously chosen general manager, and Mark Lemon stage manager. We had a professional gentleman for prompter, as none of the amateurs could be entrusted with so technical, ticklish, and momentous a duty".

Judging from Horace Greeley's Glances at Europe, the play was performed twice at Devonshire House, the Queen and royal family attending only the first.

The play met with such enthusiasm at Devonshire, due probably to circumstances as well as to the play itself, that a series of representations were given at the Guild rooms at Hanover Square, before the energetic amateurs proceeded with it to the provinces. The following is one of the

bills used for the first performance at Hanover Square Rooms :

HANOVER SQUARE ROOMS  
 On Wednesday Evening, June 11th, 1851.  
T H E AMATEUR COMPANY OF THE GUILD OF ---  
 LITERATURE AND ART .

To encourage Life Assurance and other Provident habits among Authors and Artists; to render such assistance to both as shall never compromise their independence; and to found a new Institution where honorable rest from arduous labors shall still be associated with the discharge of congenial duties; will have the Honour of Performing for the Third Time, a New Comedy, in Five Acts, by Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, Bart., called:

NOT SO BAD AS WE SEEM,  
 or  
Many Sides to a Character.-

The Duke of Middlesex	( Peers attached to the )	Mr. Frank Stone
	( son of James II., )	
	( commonly called the )	
	( First Pretender. )	Mr. Dudley
The Earl of Loftus.	( )	Costello.

Lord Wilmot ( a young Man at the head  
 of the Mode more than a century ago,  
 Son to Lord Loftus.

Mr. Shadowly Softhead ( a young gentleman from  
 the City, Friend and Double of Lord Wilmot--  
 Mr. Douglas Jerrold.

Mr. Hardman ( A Rising Member of Parliament,  
 and Adherent to Sir Robert Walpole)--  
 Mr. John Forester.

Mr. Goodenough Easy ( in business, highly re-  
 spectable, and a friend of Sir Geoffrey)--  
 Mr. F.W. Topham.

Lord Le Trimmer----Mr. Peter Cunningham.

Sir Thomas Timid----Mr. Westland Marston.

Colonel Flint-----Mr. R.H. Horne.

Mr. Jacob Touseon (a bookseller,)-

Mr. Charles Knight.

Smart( Valet to Lord Wilmot)

Mr. Wilkie Collins.

Hodge (Servant to Sir Geoffrey Thruside)

Mr. John Tennill.

Paddy O'Sullivan (Mr. Fallen's Landlord)--

Mr. Robert Bell.

Mr. David Fallen ( Grub Street Author and Pamphleteer  
 Mr. Augustus Egg.

Lord Strongbow, Sir John Bruin, Coffee- House Loungers,  
Drovers, Watchmen and Newsmen.

Lucy ( Daughter to Sir Geoffrey Thornside) Mrs. Henry Compton  
Barbara ( Daughter to Mr. Easy ) ----- Miss Young.  
The Silent Lady of Deadman's Lane----- Mr. Coe.  
----oOo----

Scenery.-

Lord Wilmot's Lodgings--- Painted by Mr. Pitt.  
" The Murillo"----- " " Mr. Absolom.  
Sir Geoffrey Thornside's Library, Painted by Mr. Pitt.  
Will's Coffee-House ----- " " Mr. Thomas Grieve  
The District Poet's Garret(After Hogarth)-  
Painted by Mr. Pitt.  
The Mall in the Park----- " " Mr. Telbin.  
An open space near the River----- " " Mr. Stonfill, R.H.  
Tapestry Chamber in Deadman's Lane " " Mr. Louis Hughes.  
The Act Drop----- " " Mr. Roberts, R.D.

----oOo----

Previous to the Play, the Band will perform, under the  
direction of Mr. Lund, an Overture, composed expressly  
for this occasion by Mr. C. Coote, Pianist to His Grace,  
the Duke of Devonshire.

----oOo----

Mr. Nightingale's Diary.

Mr. Nightingale-----Mr. Dudley Costello  
Mr. Gobblewig ( of the Middle Temple)---Mr. Chas. Dickens.  
Tip( his Tigh)-----Mr. Augustus Egg.  
Slap ( professional Mr. Flormiville)-----Mr. Mark Lemon.  
Lithus ( landlord of the Water-Lily)---Mr. Wilkie Collins.  
Rosina-----Miss Young.  
Susan-----Mrs. Coe.

----cOo----

The Procession by Mr. Grace. The Theatre constructed by Mr. Sloman, Machinist of the Royal Lyceum Theatre. The Properties and Appointments by Mr. G. Foster. The Costumes ( with the exceptions of the Ladies' dresses, and dresses of the Farce, which are by Messrs. Nathan of Titchborne Street) made by Mr. Barnett of the Theatre Royal, Haymarket, Under the superintendence of Mr. Augustus Egg, D.R.D.Puruguier, Mr. Wilson, of the Strand Prompter, Mr. Coe.

---oOo---

The whole Produced under the Directions of Mr. Charles Dickens.

---oOo---

The Band will be under the Directions of Mr. Lund.

---oOo---

Tickets ( all the seats being reserved) 10 s each to be had of Mr. Sams, I. St. James Street).

---oOo---

Doors open at quarter before SEVEN; commence at exactly a quarter before Eight. The whole of the audience are particularly recommended to be seated before a quarter to Eight."

---oOo---

Bulwer's play was too long for staging; and after a few performances, alterations were found necessary.

A letter from Macready to Bulwer declares that the stage effect of the play, although he somewhat criticised the Coffee-house scene in its inconsistencies, was admirable.

A letter from Charles Dickens to Bulwer written in 1852 after the amateur troop left Liverpool, shows how favorably the play produced by the Guild was received in the provinces.

Nevertheless, apart from the Guild, its actors noted in other professions, and its object, the play itself found little favor <sup>with</sup> the public. It was produced both in America and London with care and skill; but proved unsatisfactory, and after a few performances, was withdrawn.

The historical time of the play is that of George I. of England, when the Jacobites were trying to place James II. on the throne. The story of Lady Ellinor and Sir. Geoffrey Morland has historical foundation.

The idea of the play is a clever one, sufficient only for a farce. It should have had more dash and less length. As it is, it contains sparkling wit and pleasing spirit; yet on the whole it is tedious and at times, careless. The David Fallen incident seems rather unessential to the unity of the plot. The personal struggles of David Fallen seem rather a subject for a complete piece. The key to the play stands as the connecting link between the play and the purpose of the Guild; and stamps the David Fallen motif as the principal one of the play, somewhat, we feel, against the original intentions of the play.

The Style of the play, in keeping with its period is that of the Eighteenth Century. The asides, the dialogue, the gallantry of the play, are of the old fashioned previous Century type. The play has the old Sheridan style and sentiments,



such as "Union of Womanly Feeling and Childlike Innocence"; and "the Ridiculous Pride of Rank."

Had the play been written with more care, it might have made a most successful piece. It is more akin to Money and Walpole than to the other of Bulwer's plays. In fact, without knowing, one would hardly fancy its author to be the author of Richelieu and The Lady of Lyons. Bulwer's efforts dramatically after this play, were for the most part discouraged; and as the writing of a play was with him only an incidental occupation, he made little other determined effort.

---oOo---

CHAPTER XII.

THE CAPTIVES.

Bulwer's letters to Forester and Dickens during September 1867 were concerning Bulwer's second attempt to arrange a Greek play for the English stage.

On September 20th, he writes from Eaux Bonnes to Forester:-

" I want much to consult you about a play I have been writing here. The place was so dull that I was compelled to write. It is in the rough as yet- from a comedy of Plautus which Molière spared, and which is, as far as I know, abandoned by every Englishman. The dramatic situation in the original is superb. I think I have not spoiled it. It has great parts for the chief actor( Fechter), and a girl ( who?), good parts for the others. But, nevertheless, it is full of drawbacks and difficulties, and I really don't know as yet whether it is good or bad. It is written like The Lady of Lyons with great gusto; and as a drama, rather than as a literary work."

The Captives, a prose comedy completed on his return, did not meet the approval of Dickens and Fechter who thought that its Greek setting and names would tend to make it unpopular on the English stage.

Pemberton's " Dickens and the Stage" which I have at hand, a loan from the Library of the University of Wisconsin, gives the following letter from Dickens to Bulwer, written October 25th, 1867, concerning the play- The Captives:

"I have read the play with great attention, interest, and admiration; and I need not say to you, that the art of it- the fine construction- the exquisite nicety of the touches- with which it is brought out, have been a study to me, in the

I have had extraordinary relish.

Now, as to the classical ground and manners of the play, I suppose the objection to Greek dress to be already -- as De Foe would put it -- 'gotten over' by your suggestion. I suppose the dress not to be conventionally associated with stilts and boredom, but to be new to the public eye and very picturesque. Grant all that:-- the names remain. Now, not only used such names to be inseparable in the public mind from stately weariness, but of late days they have become inseparable in the same public from silly puns upon the names and from burlesque. You do not know, I hope at least for my friend's sake) what the Strand Theatre is. A Greek name and a break-down nigger dance, have become inseparable there. I do not mean to say that your genius may not be too powerful for such associations; but I do most positively mean to say that you would lose half the play in overcoming them. At the best, you would have to contend against them during the first three acts. The old tendency to become frozen on classical ground would be in the best part of the audience; the new tendency to titter on such ground, would be in the worst part; and instead of starting fair with the audience, it is my conviction that you would start with them against you, and would have to win them over."

It is unfortunate that Bulwer through fear of the predicted failure of the piece, although reluctantly, did abandon it, having it neither performed nor published.

---oOo---

CHAPTER XIII

THE RIGHTFUL HEIR.-

Although Macready had advised Lytton in 1839, not to revise the Sea Captain, the attacks upon that play, and its unhappy fate made him restless to do so. In the unpublished editions of his early plays, he states that the reason why he omitted the Sea Captain from the collection was because he intended at some future time to revise it. He took the Sea Captain up again with this intention in 1849 as indicated in a letter on November 10th of that year written to Forester; although he did not think he should be satisfied with the attempt. In letters to his son, we learn that in 1868, he was still at the task of re-arranging the Sea Captain. The "alterations once commenced, became so extensive in character, diction and even in revision of plot, that a new play gradually rose from the foundations of the old one;" and The Rightful Heir was the product.

The dedication expresses in a way, Bulwer's appreciation for America's interest in his literary efforts.

"TO ALL FRIENDS AND KINSFOLK

IN

THE AMERICAN COMMONWEALTH,-

This Drama is Dedicated

With Affection and Respect."

London, September 28th, 1869.

The play was first produced at the Lyceum Theatre, London, October 3rd, 1868.

On October 19th, Bulwer writes to his son:-

"The Press have been very civil about my play, more so than about any work I ever wrote. But I doubt if it will have a long run, and only the two Veginns act well. Boudmann, from whom much was expected, falls short. Beaufort and Eveline are very weak and ineffective, and the play itself, though allowed to be in good composition, etc., has not the agreeable emotions that bear repetition, like "The Lady of Lyons." Worst of all, a lettered audience, scarcely exists; and though it might be created, it would require years to do so, aided by good actors."2.

Bulwer was right. It did not have a long run; and was also unfavorably received in America. The play was greatly ridiculed and burlesqued.

The external structure, its verse and diction, is similar to that of Bulwer's earlier plays.

The piece affords motifs around which might have been built a successful play, had not Lytton held so longingly to a melo-dramatic design, hoping to re-create the sentiments and emotions of the Lady of Lyons. The motifs are well suited to the modern Gothic sentiment; but when forced to incline themselves to the melodrama, become perverted. The theme of tragedy arising from the division of strong maternal affection, the unswerving, and unselfish devotion of a son to a treacherous mother, the remorse and suffering of a soul for a crime intended and thought committed,- all of these well handled would have made an excellent drama; but when Bulwer brings about a happy ending through the accident

used by the melodrama, these themes mean nothing; and the happy re-union of the lovers remains the only thing of interest. Aside from the rejecting of the rhetorical ravings, Bulwer would have been obliged to have relinquished the happy ending, Vyvyan's happy return, to have made his motifs effective, dramatic.

---oOo---

1. Preface to the "Rightful Heir"
2. "Life of Edward Bulwer, First Lord Lytton, by the Earl of Lytton."

CHAPTER XIV.W A L P O L E.

or

EVERY MAN HAS HIS PRICE.

---oOo---

In September, 1862, Bulwer "commenced a longed cherished idea of making Sir Robert Walpole the subject of a comedy in rhyme."

When he had finished the first scene, he was convinced that Rhyme would be a new and strong effect for comedy; but bemoaned the fact that at that time, there was no stage.

It is interesting to note that Bulwer began Walpole in there place where he had written Money, - at Aix la Chapelle, where he sought the benefit of the baths. In 1864, while at Hastings, Bath and Tarquay, he was still occupied, along with other things in working on the Comedy of Walpole. The play was finished during the winter of 1868-69; and when published December 1869, was well received. Letters from Bulwer to Forester in 1870 show that Bulwer had received an offer to act Walpole, at a morning performance at the Gaiety. For some reason or other, however, the play was not performed. Forester seems to have prevented the production for reasons which Bulwer appreciated. In a letter of Bulwer's to Forester, dated March 8th, 1873, he says:-

"I am very much obliged by your letter, and entirely approve your refusal to let my ill-starred play be acted under such Malign auspices. I am utterly amazed that Langford should have urged the thing upon me, seeing that he said the manager was his friend; and, therefore, I presumed that he was cognizant of his friend's intentions. If not his friend, declined him -----etc.

As far as I can find, Walpole has never been acted.

This play- as Not So Bad as We Seem- has for its scene, London in the year 1717, in the third year of the reign of George the First. Walpole, the central figure, is said to have based his politics upon the principle that -

" Every Man Has His Price,"

to have played upon the weaknesses of men in order to gain his point. The only circumstance in the play which is at variance with historical facts is that in which Lord Nithsgale escaped from prison in the clothes which his wife brought him. History states that the mother instead of the wife brought the prisoner his means of escape. Bulwer seems to have made no great violations of history in action of his plot.

The play is a well constructed, well written, clever comedy; and I see no reason why it should not have been popular with a public who went wild over Paul Fry, Charles II, and other comedies of the day. With an audience which knew something of the political parties of the time, it might be popular, to-day.

The play reminds one of Moliere's comedies; and has some resemblances to the L'Ecole des Femmes.

The play is built upon no high and lofty ideals; but



but it is highly entertaining; and as a light comedy is, I think, a great success. The characters are well drawn, the diction and versification, suitable, and the unity and construction admirable.

---

97/ Letter from Bulwer to Forester, 1862, found in the  
"Life of Edward Bulwer, First Lord Lytton," by the  
Earl of Lytton, Vol.II. page 353.

---o0o---

CHAPTER XV.D A R N L E Y.

As indicated in a letter from Bulwer to John Forester dated Jan. 26th, 1846, the author began work on the unfinished play Darnley before the date of the letter. In this letter, Bulwer says concerning the play:-

"I can no longer delay thanking you for your remembrance of the absent, and for your exertions about the play. I have laid it at present, on the shelf, not being inclined to add to my collection of useless MSS., or to swell the dread account of the unacted drama. Whenever, I can learn that if written, it will be accepted by the manager on the conditions stated, or acceptable to Macready, I will return to and complete it."

Bulwer never finished it, however, and after his death it was published by his son, completed by Mr. Coghlan and presented at Covent Theatre in London, 1879.

Bulwer's son writes in the Preface to the edition of Bulwer's Works, published by P.F. Collier, New York:-

"My father left to my unfettered discretion, the task of dealing with his numerous unpublished manuscripts. Amongst them, was one which, under the title of Darnley, is here added to the collection of his dramatic works. Its author had given to it no name and no conclusion. It consisted of four acts of a five-act play, finished only in the rough, and some few notes. The four acts had not received those important final touches which, in the case of acting plays, are best reserved for consultation with the principal actors concerned in their performance. Of the Fifth act, no trace existed; except in a few notes to which reference will be found at the conclusion of the Fourth Act as printed in this Edition. Such was the condition of the manuscript I had to deal with under a two-fold sense of obligation to the living and the dead----- . Notwithstanding, the unfinished condition, of it, the manuscript of Darnley appeared to me too vigorous and valuable a specimen of its' author's dramatic work-

manship, to be permanently withheld from the public. In this impression, I was confirmed by the unqualified opinion of the late Mr. John Forester and the late Mr. George Henry Lewes, to whom I showed it. Those competent judges of dramatic writings, also shared my conviction that for the publication of the work, the stage was the only adequate vehicle -----  
 In the case of this play, however, the unfinished condition of it was an unsurpassable obstacle to placing it upon the stage in a thoroughly satisfactory form-----  
 In order to place this play upon the stage, therefore, it was necessary to add to it a fifth act, by a hand not that of its author."

After some consideration and effort to find an author with the necessary literary and dramatic qualifications to finish the play, Lytton's son submitted it to Alexander Dumas- thinking that author might finish it successfully for representation at the Theatre Francois, in Paris. Dumas, however, found that it would be necessary to not only add a fifth act, but to make marked changes in the original text in order to adapt it to the French taste. This project was accordingly abandoned; and at the proposal of Mr. Hare, an excellent actor, to produce the play at the Covent Theatre, London, it was submitted to Mr. Coghlan for the completion of the fifth act. Mr. Coghlan finished the piece, while Lord Lytton was in India, and without reference to him, had it produced by Mr. Hare at the Covent Garden Theatre. Mr. Hare's impersonation was excellent, and no expense was spared upon the performance; but it had little interest for the public after the fourth act. The play was translated into German and produced at the Burg Theatre, Vienna, with the Emperor and the whole Imperial Court present; but in Vienna, as in London, it was withheld after a short run.

The Second Lord Lytton states some reasons why the fifth act of Mr. Coghlan was not a good one; and offers his own suggestions as to the probable denouement.

It seems to me that the play was hardly worth finishing. It is interesting as a fragment of Bulwer's work, however. The play is a strange mixture of 18th and 19th century spirit, melodrama and farce. It contains poor exposition, some lively description, and many cheap moral maxims. The plot is involved in intrigue and mystery. There is in it, a reckless mass of fashion, a mysterious Lady of the villa, a modern Epiccene; and a relentless cynic. The play might have been made a domestic tragedy; but as it is in its tragic element comes only from blind and unreasonable misunderstanding. The play is written in prose and contains some French phrases. The most interesting feature in the piece is the part which the child Fanny Darnley plays. This is the first instance of a child in any of Lytton's dramas. The child is used here, it seems to heighten the melodramatic effect. Had Bulwer forgotten this melodramatic business, he might have constructed a realistic drama, with his characters. Nevertheless it is difficult, I might say, meaningless, to judge a fragmentary drama whose author as far as we know, considered it unready for the public.

This is the only fragmentary form of Bulwer's work we have. His son asserted that there were a great many.

P A R T II.CHAPTER -- I.BULWER'S EFFORT TO UPLIFT THED R A M A !oOo

Bulwer did more than merely try his hand at play-writing. For the sake of the drama as well as for his own, he tried to make his pieces stageable and, at the same time, literary. He sought history to furnish him with standard characters, unwisely, perhaps, but at least endeavoring to choose worthy subjects for his plot. He was not altogether selfish in his writing. His idealistic nature led him to believe that he could and should write something to uplift both the Drama and its public. He had too much pride, also, to be contented with writing something which would take, have a long run and bring him lots of money. It must be remembered that his play-writing was only incidental and rather interferred with than aided his other remunerative occupation. This same idealistic nature, perhaps, tended to draw characters of exaggerated sentiments and emotions; but at the same time, it kept from making melodramatic effects for commercial purposes. A sensitive man labouring under the impression that he was mistreated and misunderstood, was incapable of portraying normal and realistic emotion.

The drama was in a decline, compared to the preceding Elizabethan drama which had established standards, the public thought must not be changed but imitated. This condition brought about all sorts of imitation and almost no originality except in unworthy projects, farces and vaudeville performances which one would scorn to place under the head of drama. Literature had become divorced from the stage and the novel flourished in place of the drama. There was plenty of material produced, but material of no worth. Bulwer made a conscientious effort encouraged by the actor, Macready, to re-establish the drama and to re-unite literature and the stage.

His effort was not altogether artistic. In his struggle to succeed in Parliament, he did not forget his possible services to literature and art. He brought forward a motion for a Committee of Enquiry into the laws effecting the conditions of the drama and dramatic literature. His desire was to suppress the monopoly held by the two patent theatres- Covent Garden and Drury Lane-; to abolish the existing censorship, and to provide for a dramatic copyright.

At that time, Covent Garden and Drury Lane were the only two theatres possessing patents. As the theatres which existed contrary to a law too unjust to be strictly enforced, in order to insure their existence, were obliged to make their performances of an inferior character, the patent demanded worthless stuff from the theatre without it; and no better pieces from those which had it.

Bulwer did not foresee that the doing away with these

patents, and the establishing of free competition among the theatres, would lead to the star system; although he did submit to the Committee a plan approaching that of the Continental System of Statesubsidised theatres which, if followed, would have guarded against the evils of the star system.

Bulwer believed the spirit of the age to be the true censor of the age, and thought public taste might be trusted to preserve theatrical decorum. He pointed out that although the censor might strike out the smallest political allusions in a new play, he had no power in striking out the grossest indecencies in a new one.

He also wished to obtain for dramatic authors, a copyright by which they might protect their inventions. In a speech regarding the Copyright, he says:

"The commonest invention in calico, a new pattern in the most trumpery article of dress, a new bit to our bridles, a new wheel to our carriages, may make the fortune of the inventor; but the intellectual invention of the finest drama in the world may not relieve by a groat, the property of the inventor. The instant an author publishes a play, any manager may seize it, mangle it, act it, without the consent of the author, and without giving him one six-pence of remuneration."

The proposal for a Committee of Enquiry which Bulwer submitted to the House May 31st, 1832, was agreed to. He succeeded in putting views into law except those mentioned regarding the independent maintenance of theatres and those regarding dramatic censorship. After 1832, thanks to Bulwer, a dramatic author might profit by and protect his labor; and all theatres had free competition.

Thus Lytton's political endeavors come before

his literary ones in regard to the advancement of the drama.

His criticism of the drama in England and the English may also be included in this place.

In 1851, when his successful career as a dramatic author was practically at a close from the success of amateur performances at Knebworth, and from intimate knowledge of the hardships and struggles of authors- especially those in unfortunate financial conditions, Bulwer with Dickens, established the Guild of Literature and Art, and formulated its purposes.

"By the establishment of their Guild of Literature and Art, they hoped to be able to supply to the authors of the future that period of rest and freedom from mental anxiety which is necessary to the production of really durable work. Their new institution was to take the place of the professional chairs in Germany--which had not only saved many a scholar from famine- many a genius from despair, but, by offering subsistence and dignity to that valuable class of writers whose learning and capacities unfit them by reason of their very depth for wide popularity, had given worthy and profitable inducements to grave study; and, more than all else, had maintained the German fame for patient erudition and profound philosophy". 1.

To lay the financial foundations of such a plan- Not so Bad as We Seem was produced by Dickens and his amateur troop. The history of this play, and Lemon's accompanying farce has already been given. The necessary funds - L4000 (Four Thousand Pounds) were at last collected.

In 1854, Bulwer carried a bill through Parliament



which provided for the Guild of Literature and Art the following:-

"(1) To aid those of its members who follow Literature or the Fine Arts as a profession, and to obtain insurance upon their lives; (2) to establish a Provident Sickness Fund for its members; (3) to provide dwellings for its members, and to grant annuities to them or their widows."

In 1863, he made a free gift to the Guild, of a site of land upon his estate on which the houses were built.

It is unfortunate that such good intention and noble effort should come to nothing, not because of any neglect on the part of the founders, but because of the members of the Guild itself. Bulwer's and Dicken's idealism had prevented them from seeing that worthy artists and authors needing pecuniary assistance were too sensitive to acknowledge their need. Then, too, the real men of genius were not to be found. As a result, the number of members of the Guild did not increase; their houses had to be tented to other persons; and at last, in 1897, by an Act of Parliament, the Guild was done away with altogether,- their endowment being divided between the Royal Literary Fund and the Artist's General Benevolent Institution.

Thus Bulwer's last big effort to aid the drama was a failure. Nevertheless, his efforts in that direction, were tremendous and sufficient to make him remembered as a real patron of the Modern Drama.

## CHAPTER II.

## BULWER'S PLACE IN 19TH CENTURY

D R A M A . -

Having given something of the history and criticism of Bulwer's *Victorian* plays, and having spoken of his efforts for dramatic reform, it seems right to establish Bulwer's place in the 19th Century Drama. One may not consider the whole drama during Bulwer's life time worth while; yet, it did exist, and has its place in the history of literature, at a time when foreign influences were pouring into England,- philosophy gave one "la maladie de **siecle**;" and the novel held sway. As the 19th Century drama was an expression of the spirit of the 19th Century, and Bulwer's dramas were a part of it, I wish to establish his dramas in that Century according to artistic standards.

If we judge the dramas of the Century by their popularity in their own time, the standard is quite different. I doubt if Richelieu or The Lady of Lyons could compete in this latter respect with Black Eyed Susan which was played, it is said, four hundred times in one year. Even in judging a work according to artistic standards, one finds one's self facing the problem / <sup>which</sup> artistic standards.

If we work on a basis of durability, we find that Bulwer's plays have lasted longer than those of any playwright during his life-time; yet, one must then say, logically, that Richelieu is the best of Bulwer's dramas. Perhaps, I am

wrong in thinking Money the best.

At all events, I do know that Lytton's dramas seem more aesthetic in the reading than The Hunchback, Raising the Wind, The Heir at Law, The Nervous Man, London Assurance, East or West, Pygmalion and Galatea; and I am sure have held their stage popularity, longer. Perhaps, I should not say Bulwer's dramas, but the Dramas of Bulwer which are mentioned in histories of literature in connection with his name, - Richelieu, The Lady of Lyons and Money. His dramas, any one in fact, are more stage-able, at least have proved to be more popular upon the boards, than The Plot on the Scutcheon; yet, judging his plays from the highest standards, they are little more than good attempts. They are good attempts. Artistic achievements are rare. It is hard to compare Bulwer with the later 19th century writers because in doing so, modern prejudices enter.

After everything has been considered, perhaps all one can say is that he made fourteen or fifteen artistic attempts which have proved more successful than the many hundreds of plays which were performed and written during his day. He was not as clever as Planché; not as psychological as Browning; but his attempts have pleased the public longer; and some one has said the ultimate end of all art is to please.

B I B L I O G R A P H YHISTORY AND CRITICISM.-

- FAIRER, H. BARTON: History of the London Stage.
- BARSA, MARION: The English Stage of To-day.
- BATES, K.L. : English Drama Working Basis.
- \* DEVEY, LOUISA: Life of Rosina, Lady Lytton.
- FILOW, AUGUSTINE: The English Stage.
- FITZGERALD: Dickens and the Drama. ( about Lytton & )  
( his plays. )
- GENEST, P.: Some Account of the English Stage.
- \* GOEDE, C.H.G.: The Stranger in England. ( 1 of 3 vols. 1st Ed)
- GODDARD, ARTHUR: Players of the Period.
- HASTINGS, CHARLES: The Theatre- Its Development in Fr. & En.
- \* HAZLITT, WM. : Dramatic Essays, ( Archer).
- HUNT, LEIGH : Dramatic Essays, ( Archer).
- JONES, HENRY AR. The Foundations of a National Drama.
- LEWES, G.H. : Selections from the Modern British Dramatists ( General and Special Introduction).
- LONE : The English Stage.
- \* LYTTON, EDWARD BULWER: England and the English ( Chap. on Byron and the Drama )
- \* LYTTON, ROBERT: Life and Literary Remains of Edward Bulwer, Lord Lytton.
- LYTTON, PRESENT EARL OF: The Life of Edward Bulwer, First Lord Lytton.
- \* MACREARY, CHARLES: Diary ( about Lytton and his plays).
- MATHEWS, BRANDEN: Dramatists of the 19th Century.

MOLLOY, J.F.: Famous Plays ( Last Chap.)

MORLEY, HENRY: Journal of a London Play-goer (Excerpts).

MOULTON'S : Library of Criticism ( For Lytton).

NICKELSON, D.P.: Struggle for a Free Stage.

PEMBERTON: Dickens and the Drama ( About Lytton & His  
PLAYS:

\* PLANCHE, ROBINSON: Reminiscences.

NOTED IN POOL'S)

)

AND THE A.L.A. )

PORTRAIT INDEX ): Available Magazine.

STRONG: Plays and Players of the Last Qr. Cent.  
Notes about Lytton.

SAINTSBURY: Nineteenth Century Literature.

THE STAGE CYCLO-)

POEDIA ) ( For Bulwer's Plays. )

THORNDIKE: Tragedy.

\* Primary Sources.

P R I M A R Y   S O U R C E SPLAYS READ:B U L W E R S:

- Eugene Aram: Collier's Edition  
Routledge, Warne & Routledge, 1864.
- La Duchesse de La Vallière: Collier Edition, 1901.  
DeWitt's Acting Ed. 1875.
- Lady of Lyons: Collier's Edition, 1901.  
DeWitt's Acting Edition.  
Little Brown & Co.
- Richelieu: Collier's Edition;  
De Witt's Acting Edition.  
Little Brown & Co.  
Mantell's Presentation.
- Money: Collier Edition.  
De Witt's Acting Edition.  
Little Brown.
- Not so Bad  
as We Seem: Collier Edition, 1901.  
De Witt's Edition 1875.
- The Rightful  
Heir: Collier's Edition 1901.  
De Witt's Edition, 1875.
- Darnley : Collier's Edition.
- Parodies of  
Bulwer's Plays: Hamilton's Parodies & Dramatic Classics.
- Other 19th  
Century Plays.

BYRON:

Monfred.

BERNARD, WM.

The Nervous Man and the Man of Nerve.

BOURICICAULT, DION L.

Old Heads and Young Hearts.

London Assurance.

COLMAN, GEO, THE YOUNGER:

The Poor Gentleman.

The Heir at Law.

Blue Devils.

J.P.R. JAMES:

Richelieu ( Novel).

KENNEY, JAMES:

The Irish Ambassador.

Raising The Wind.

Sweethearts and Wives.

KNOWLES, JAMES SHERIDAN:

William Tell.

The Hunchback.

MISS LEE.

The Chapter of Accidents.

LEMON, MARK:

Mind Your Own Business.

MATTHEWS, CHARLES:

PLAYS READ:Used Up.MACREADY, W.The Bank Note.MORTON, JOHN MADISON:Lend Me Five Shillings.Grimshaw, Bagshaw, and Bradshaw.POWER, TYRONE:Born to Good Luck.PLANCHE, J.R.The Loan of a Lover.Fortemio & His Seven Gifted Servants.Somebody Else.PAYNE, HOWARD:Richelieu ( 1st Edition).PAYNE, JOHN HOWARD:Charles the Second.POOLE, JOHN:Paul Pry.ROBERSON:Cast.ROWE, NICHOLAS:Jane Shore.



PLAYS READ:SHERIDAN, RICHARD B.The School For Scandal.The Critic.TERRY, DONILI:

Guy Marmering.

VON KATZEBUE, AUGUSTUS:Deaf and Dumb.

( This Bibliography includes only the Works read in  
Special Connection with this thesis.)

---oOo---