

Sites of Performance and Circulation

This chapter explores the mutability of tragedy, both as a mode and as a coalescence of theatrical practices. I explore how tragedy in the nineteenth circulated spatially, temporally, and generically. The troubled relationship of tragedy to melodrama is central to any understanding of the mobility and circulation of tragedy in Europe after the French Revolution. This relationship is at the centre of many of the debates and conflicts over the position of tragedy in European theatres in the first half of the nineteenth century, and markedly present in public discussions and histories of the theatre in this period. While it may at first seem secondary to the material practices of performance, a study of the sites and circulation of tragedy in performance must necessarily include a discussion of this kind of critical history and historiography of tragedy. To a greater or lesser extent, theatre practices in this period were produced discursively; what could or could not be imagined for the stage was framed by the legislative language of regulation, censorship, and ownership (of writing, of productions, of places of performance). Melodrama and the melodramatic mode challenged existing discourses of theatre theory, theatre legislation, and theatre criticism, and had an embodied material effect on the ways in which tragedy and serious drama circulated and were performed and understood.

I start from the assumption that tragedy did not die in the nineteenth century. This is in contrast to powerful critical opinion in the nineteenth century and since, which has placed tragedy at the pinnacle of human expression – claiming this status as well for Western civilisation, of course. George Steiner writes ‘that representation of personal suffering and heroism which we call tragic drama is distinctive of the western tradition.’¹ Robert Heilman defends tragedy as ‘a specific form of experience that needs to be differentiated from all other catastrophic disturbances of life.’² This reification of tragedy and the tragic was embedded in

class-based and sex-segregated education for men across Europe, through training in Greek and Latin language and literature, becoming self-sustaining through the role of this education in the reproduction of elite and clerical cultures. In his study of the ‘sweet violence’ of the tragic, Terry Eagleton argues that for a ‘lineage of modern thinkers, [...] tragedy represents a privileged mode of cognition, a spiritual experience reserved for the metaphysically minded few.’³ It was this rarefied and reified notion of tragedy that was felt to be under attack in post-Revolutionary literary and theatrical cultures. Even theatre practitioners working within the popular theatre of the time internalised the intellectual focus of tragedy and its variants. In Britain in 1832, we have a rich cache of evidence of the complex (and often confused) thinking around the idea of tragedy, and its performance, in the *Report* from the Select Committee on Dramatic Literature. In this enquiry into the standards and regulation of the London theatre, much of the focus was on the groundwork of defining the ‘legitimate’ drama – the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, high comedy, and the traditional repertoire of the English stage. Douglas Jerrold’s evidence encapsulates the thinking of the period:

I describe the legitimate drama to be where the interest of the piece is mental; where the situation of the piece is rather mental than physical. [...]

Q. 2844. A piece rather addressed to the ear than to the eye?—Certainly.⁴

Jerrold’s own situation here is ironic and conflicted, and demonstrates some of the complexity of the material practices in the London theatre industry at the time. Jerrold’s work addressed the eye rather than the ear. Indeed, as the author of *Black-Ey’d Susan* (Surrey, 1829), Jerrold’s deft use of melodrama and its telling situations naturalised melodrama as the ‘domestic drama’ for English audiences. His play *The Rent Day*, which realised well-known domestic genre paintings by David Wilkie, was produced at Drury Lane, drawing on the superior scenographic capacities of that theatre, but also continuing the performance of melodrama –

the very form which was felt to threaten the legitimate drama – at a Patent theatre, the supposed guardian of the national canonical repertoire. However much an intellectual (or metaphysical) concept of tragedy attempted to situate tragedy away from the demotic, the popular, and the commercial, tragedy survived in mainstream nineteenth century theatre because of its contact with those very demotic and popular forms thought to be causing its decline.

Tragedy survived in the nineteenth-century theatres of Europe in two ways. Firstly, through the preservation of national repertoires, continually renewed by spectacular performances and innovative scenography, fuelled by the burgeoning visual culture of nineteenth-century modernity, and circulating nationally and internationally. I discuss this phenomenon in London below, with the work of actor-managers such as William Charles Macready, Charles Kean and Henry Irving. Secondly, tragedy circulated and was renewed through radical generic and aesthetic change, so that what might be considered theatrical tragedy at the end of the nineteenth century would have been unrecognisable (and probably undesired) at the beginning of the period. Melodrama is key here. Rather than being the blight of tragedy, it was the means by which a renewed and revived tragic form circulated in the nineteenth century.

The historiography of the performance and circulation of tragedy in the nineteenth century is marked by a central contradiction, and one which has persisted in historical, anecdotal, professional, and personal narratives of European theatre until very recently. Discussions about tragedy in the public sphere across Europe follow remarkably similar narratives: largely, a narrative of decline or disappearance of traditional theatrical forms such as tragedy and high comedy. This perception of what was labelled in Britain as ‘the decline of the drama’ was linked to unease about new audiences, new theatres, and new approaches to performance. Yet, the overwhelming evidence of a century of theatre programmes,

advertisements, playbills, reviews, and practitioners' careers, is that theatre – and tragedy within it - survived very well in performance. Indeed, the performance of national tragic repertoires was at the forefront of the national and international mobility of theatre and theatrical cultures. There is a fairly general agreement in recent revisionist histories of European national theatres that the 'decline of the drama' was not actually a decline, but rather a specific ideological approach to changes to the material and aesthetic practices in national theatre industries. The theatre industry itself was not in decline. It was a place of innovation and experimentation, with the new energies of the mass cultural 'illegitimate' genres developing and fuelling new audiences' desires for excitement, entertainment, and new imagined worlds on stage. Most notable was the flourishing of the Shakespearean repertoire, which attained a unique position as an international and transhistorical phenomenon. Other 'national poets' such as Racine, and Schiller, had a similarly consistent and successful existence in the French and German national repertoires at the highest level.

In whatever ways twenty-first century histories are helping to redirect our theoretical gaze, understanding this normative discourse about the presence of tragedy in the theatrical repertoire remains essential. It represented both what were felt to be the limits of theatre practice, and the boundaries against which waves of *avant-garde* practitioners could protest. Time and again, critics, actors, playwrights, and legislators wielded stories of the theatre in decline as disciplinary tools– the most obvious example being the establishment in Britain in 1832 of the House of Commons Select Committee into Dramatic Literature. In separate national theatrical cultures, there were repeated attempts to ensure the preservation of the canonical repertoire of dramatic tragedy, matched only by an unease about the production of new tragedies, and outright anxiety about the new form most threatening to tragedy: melodrama. This desire to protect national dramatic repertoires from a perceived 'decline' in the drama in post-Revolutionary Europe fed into the regulation of the theatre in France and

Britain, justified State censorship and regulation across Europe, and generated countless editorials, critical articles, essays, and books on the state of the drama. Most writers started from the assumption that the theatres were in decline, and that national dramatic repertoires performed in stable organisations to knowledgeable audiences were being replaced by poor quality novelties, performed to mass audiences with little discrimination except the desire for novelty, pleasure, and sensation.

Conventional national histories of theatre in France and Germany continue to reinforce this orthodoxy. In standard narratives of national theatre histories, both Marvin Carlson and Erika Fischer-Lichte seek the new and the inventive through writing which aspired to the status of classical or canonical drama, but overlook the innovations in stage craft and performance styles in melodrama, as well as its carriage of much of the aesthetic and intellectual force of Romantic revolutionism.⁵ Counter-narratives, however, can be found. They offer examples of local and national material practices of management, production and performance which suggest that new repertoire, understood intertheatrically, offered a continuation of the serious concerns of tragedy, staged together with the newer forms of bourgeois drama and melodrama which addressed contemporary life. Immerman's theatre in Düsseldorf in the 1830s, for example, staged new writing and older classic repertoire together:

Our repertoire would be admirable for its richness and splendour even if it were badly acted. [...] When he [Karl Immerman] took over direction, there were newly produced and performed between 28 October [1834] and 1 April [1835] *among other things*, [the following] tragedies, historical and romantic dramas: *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, *Käthchen von Heilbronn* [Kleist], *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *King John*, *Das Leben ein Traum* [Calderon] *Stella*, *Maria Stuart*, *Wallensteins Tod* [Schiller],

Maria Tudor [Hugo], *Struensee* [Beer], *Emilia Galotti*, *Raffaele* [Raupach], *Herr und Slave* [von Zedlitz-Nimmersat], *Boccaccio* [Deinhardstein], *Die Räuber* [Schiller], and further items in the programme will be Tieck's *Blaubert*, *Der Arzt seiner Ehre* [Calderon], *Die Jungfrau von Orleans*, Raupach's *Henrich VI*, *König Enzo* [Raupach], *Alexis* [Immerman]. Should one not [...] feel a tremendous thrill at all these spirits from so many different theatres rubbing shoulders with one another within such a short period of time? Perhaps you may ask, is there any space left for something different? That has been found, or rather, genius has shown the way and *created* that space.⁶

Grabbe's essay is a strong counterblast to narratives of decline. He writes proudly of an eclectic range of European drama staged in the (then) relatively small city of Düsseldorf, where the new management had been founded through the 'self-sacrificing efforts of the local friends of art' (322), via subscriptions and shareholdings. The resulting repertoire mixed the transnational and the transhistorical, staging both classics of the German national repertoire by Schiller and Kleist, with the international repertoire of Shakespeare and Calderon, together with the contemporary popular scripts of Raupach, seen as Kotzebue's successor, and a prolific commercial producer of 'relatively undemanding fare.'⁷ His excitement about the deliberate creation of a space for this rich repertoire points towards the growing role of the director as the key theatre practitioner, bringing together site and text in place-making practices which had significance by combining intellectually stimulating entertainment, with moves towards both a national theatre, and a nation-state. In discussing the alignment of theatre and German identity pre-1870, Michael Patterson argues that the idea of a 'National Theatre was therefore thought of not merely as a means of raising the quality of German theatre but also as a way of promoting German identity.'⁸

Excited by the possibilities of such an eclectic, internationally circulating repertoire, Grabbe's confident voice is recoverable if we look for it. In Britain, anxieties about the pressures on the classic repertoire from new leisure cultures in the wake of industrial and urban change were most pronounced – if only by the evidence of the three Select Committee enquiries across the century. Yet despite repeated statements made to these enquiries that the geographic expansion of theatrical activity, and its generic variety, was harmful to the health and improvement of drama and theatre, Shakespeare was regularly programmed on the London stage throughout the century: his plays and those of his contemporaries a staple for theatre managements, and his tragedies central to their business strategy.

William Macready's diary chronicles his first working day after entering upon the management of Drury Lane:

October 7th. [1841]—Rose very early, and reached Drury Lane by a quarter past seven o'clock; found the men's names entered. Went round the work places; retired to my room, and, having first addressed my thoughts to God, began to read. Employed myself with thinking over 'Hamlet' till nine o'clock.⁹

Hamlet and God. Their proximity in Macready's thoughts on his first day as actor-manager suggest that his policies were governed by the particular moral elevation which tragedy was thought to engender in the theatre. The testimonial presented to Macready on his departure from Drury Lane, and in memoriam of his tenure at Covent Garden, marked Macready's work as a public educator through the performance of tragedy in the permanence of silver plate, engraved to commemorate Macready's genius and its 'elevating' influence on public taste.¹⁰

In 1844, Samuel Phelps used the new freedoms offered by the Theatres Regulation Act of 1843 to stage the 'legitimate' drama to place Shakespeare's plays at the centre of his management of Sadler's Wells (1844 to 1862). In these decades he produced almost all of

Shakespeare's repertoire. Charles Kean took on the management of the Princess's in the 1850s with the express intention of producing the full run of Shakespeare's scripts. Fanny Kemble's professional debut at Covent Garden was as Juliet in *Romeo and Juliet*, and her return to performance (if not the stage) was through readings of Shakespeare throughout Britain and America, a touring programme which enabled her to accumulate financial as well as cultural capital. Helen Faucit's reputation was made as a Shakespearean heroine in Macready's management; Ellen Terry and Henry Irving's stage partnership in all its conflicts, controversies, and charisma was typified by Irving's Hamlet and Terry's Ophelia, while Terry's Lady Macbeth is memorialised as a national icon in John Singer Sargeant's portrait of her. It is almost too easy to rattle off a list like this: the nineteenth-century stage is dominated and haunted by Shakespeare.

As chapters in this volume argue, it is almost impossible to think about the circulation and performance of tragedy in the nineteenth century without considering its generic near-relation, melodrama. Melodrama and serious drama were usually placed in a dialectical relationship – tragedy highlighting the apparent shortcomings of melodrama; melodrama casting a fierce light on the difficulties of producing new tragedies for the contemporary world. However, while the weight of critical opinion in the nineteenth century, and orthodox historiography since then, credits melodrama for the death of tragedy (a kind of melodramatic construction in itself), it is clear that melodrama was a vehicle for the renewal and revival of tragedy at the end of the nineteenth century. By then, it is not called tragedy, but has been filtered through the generic labels of melodrama such as 'romantic drama,' or 'domestic drama' into the general term 'serious drama.' Too often, as Jeffrey N. Cox has argued, 'we replace the tragic story of the death of tragedy with a melodramatic tale of the victory of melodrama.'¹¹ By the middle of the nineteenth century, melodrama and tragedy were interdependent, performed and viewed together within larger frameworks of understanding

deriving from nation and history. Both were performed, on the same stages and by the same performers, seen by largely the same audiences. Melodrama was a dramaturgical thinking-through of the tragic mode in a modern materialist age, typified by the emergence of a mass industrialising and democratising society. The serious drama that emerged out of melodrama by the end of the century attempted to understand tragic concepts such as Fate, *hubris*, *hamartia*, and catastrophe in terms of human agency in the material world.

Tragedy in the nineteenth century theatre thus maintained a powerful presence in a tense, uneasy relationship with melodrama, historical drama, and - later in the century - opera. Tragedy, in its reified place in the canon of dramatic literature, was often cast as the monolithic presence which authorised the aesthetic, moral, and educational place of the stage in national cultures and justified the pleasures of theatre in the face of long-standing anti-theatrical prejudices. Anselm Heinrich notes the enduring influence of Schiller's advocacy of the classic theatre as an essential part of individual and national *Bildung* - self-development and moral education - in both German and British movements for a National Theatre to the end of the nineteenth century.¹² In his defence of tragedy, Schiller alludes to its educative effects, through a series of complex emotions:

the species of poesy which affords us moral delight to an exceptional degree has for that very reason to employ mixed sensations and to delight us by means of pain. This is done to an exceptional degree by *tragedy*, and its domain comprehends all possible cases where some natural purpose is sacrificed to a moral one¹³

Schiller's idealist aesthetics are typical of theatre theory, but the evidence from the theatre industry suggests that nineteenth-century tragedy was increasingly a modified, transitional form.

In this account of the circulation and performance of tragedy, I am not primarily concerned with writing of the period which tried to imitate traditional forms of tragedy. There was a steady flow of such new verse-tragedies in English, French and German, but this is not where the force of nineteenth century theatricality – what Stephen Greenblatt calls ‘the circulation of social energy’ – is to be found. And in another paradox of the period, some of the efforts to avert the decline of the drama by producing new works aspiring to classic tragic form, content, and intellectual seriousness probably hampered the very cause they sought to encourage – at least in the case of the British theatre. Debates in the first half of the century constructed a binary opposition between ‘traditional’ drama (which in the British theatre came to be called the ‘legitimate’) and new forms of industrial modernity, chiefly melodrama. National cultural politics in Britain turned this binary into a powerful hierarchy of aesthetic value, which was closely interwoven with the attribution of moral value in a complex set of professional and industrial practices. To write in the conventions of tragedy was to aspire to powerful cultural capital, while at the same time recognising that its power was contingent and contested, as demonstrated by the frustrations expressed in a wide variety of public discourse around the ‘decline of the drama.’

The new writing encouraged by William Macready is a case in point. During his time as manager of Covent Garden (1836-8), and then Drury Lane (1841-43), Macready was in dialogue with various writers, including Mary Russell Mitford, who wrote *Rienzi* for him, and the poet Robert Browning. He had a long-standing working relationship and friendship with Thomas Noon Talfourd, who wrote *Ion* as a vehicle for Macready at Covent Garden in 1836, and the play was the hit of the season, going on to have a long life of revivals for several decades, with performances in France and America, including Mary Anderson starring in the title role in Boston in 1877.¹⁴ Macready’s commitment to reviving tragedy at the Theatres Royal was clear, but was stalled in traditional notions of verse drama, tragic heroism, and

largely derivative dramaturgical techniques. Nevertheless, Macready premiered Browning's plays, *Strafford*, and *A Blot in the 'Scutcheon*, as part of his ambition to elevate the London stage. Browning's failure to produce tragic dramas which would be the modern rivals to the plays of Shakespeare was a great disappointment, and led the theatre critic of *The Athenaeum* to speculate that if Shakespeare were alive in 1843 he would write 'immortal libretti for operas, or pathetic melodramas or farces.'¹⁵ Browning's plays met with muted comment or silence. *The Athenaeum* critic tries to give Browning credit for his work, reasoning that:

If to pain and perplex were the end and aim of tragedy, Mr. Browning's poetic melodrama, called 'A Blot on the 'Scutcheon,' would be worthy of admiration, for it is a very puzzling and unpleasant business.¹⁶

Notably, Macready did not play the hero – his part was taken by Samuel Phelps; Helen Faucit however, took her usual place as the heroine. *The Athenaeum* pronounced their acting 'while not faultless, effective.' In contrast, the farce that followed, John Maddison Morton's *A Thumping Legacy*, also performed for the first time, was all the more enjoyable 'for the foregone horrors.' *John Bull* called Morton's 'screaming' farce 'triumphant' while noting that Browning's tragedy was all the better for having only three acts rather than the conventional five, and that the piece was largely remarkable for 'the quick situation and novel construction of the piece, taking you like a bold, unfinished sketch.'¹⁷ Other critics were equally torn between respect for Browning as a poet, and dissatisfaction with the play he offered. *The Times* forthrightly declared that although Browning had 'poetical qualifications of no common order,' he has:

produced one of the most faulty dramas we ever beheld. His whole thoughts seem to have been directed to the production of striking effects, and these, in some instances, he certainly has obtained, but it has been at the expense of nature and probability.¹⁸

The *Morning Post* negotiated delicately between its critical judgement of Browning's piece and the managerial ambitions of Macready's staging of the tragedy. While doubting the play's power to sustain a run at Drury Lane, the *Post* commends Macready's judgement in producing

a work of genuine genius, conceived with an abundant and spirit-stirring passion, for which we cordially thank the writer, in these bleak and leaf-stripped days of a cold and lifeless literature.¹⁹

Macready was exercised in trying to produce appropriate content for the stages of the London Theatres Royal, whose special status of (theoretical) monopoly of the spoken drama called for only the best of the traditional repertoire. The irony of this approach was that in straining after legitimacy in drama through the conventions of classical poetic tragedy, Macready and Browning were in danger of turning audiences away from the very thing they wished to foster.

The specificity of legislation about *where* tragedy might be performed in Britain up until 1843 reminds us that the demarcation of 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate' theatre happened on spatial and geographic lines, as well as aesthetic and legislative. Conventional thinking (then and now) about theatrical tragedy in the nineteenth-century rarely moves far from the assumption of the playhouse, the theatre building, as the site for performance. Across Europe, 'monumental theatres' for tragedy (and latterly, opera) were built to dominate their urban locations: the architecture and space of such sites making physical connections between high art, money, and high social status.²⁰ Tragedy was authorised and framed within these sites of State- and capital-regulated theatres in London, Paris, and various German city-states. These frameworks of law and capital determined the production and status of tragedy as much as the aesthetic content of the scripts and performances themselves.

In this way, nineteenth-century tragedy is 'site-specific.' As Susan Bennett and Julie Sanders argue, the concept of site-specificity enables the understanding of the 'wider conceptual and jurisdictional site in which any performance takes place.'²¹ The reference to juridical power here is as relevant for performance in the nineteenth century as it was for the seventeenth. Attention to the site-specificity of tragedy performance, as an example of a place and space made active through practice, becomes key to the cultural politics of the theatre at the start of the nineteenth century. By this time, theatres that routinely - and legally - housed tragedy in France and Britain were located at physical sites where material and symbolic capital intersected. The 'conventions and techniques of the auditorium'²² of these theatres are indeed inadequate to explain impact and effect of tragedy in the theatrical and political cultures of the first half of the nineteenth century, nor its longevity as a desirable ideal of theatrical culture. Still, by the beginning of the nineteenth century the performance of tragedy was deeply connected to particular sites, and the symbolic meanings of these sites served reiteratively to authorise what was performed within them. This is another way of understanding the power of tragedy as a cultural form – not just as a dominant theatrical genre or aesthetic mode – but as sited in specific spaces, which existed in relationship to other forms of cultural and material capital.

In the case of the London Theatres Royal, Covent Garden and Drury Lane, the license and regulated permission to perform the 'legitimate' drama was grounded in a specific practiced place (to invoke de Certeau) of urban space: the sites of the theatre buildings themselves. That is, tragedy in the nineteenth century was in part constituted by its legitimate performance in specific places, and through practices in those places. The Theatres Royal existed at the intersection of the legislative, symbolic, and spatial axes of Royal Patent, elite patronage of culture, and growing civic prominence in the formation of the entertainment site of London's West End. The West End itself was in the liminal space between the City of

Westminster and the City of London, made distinct by its growing economic role as a centre of entertainment, connected by spatial and legislative axes to both jurisdictions. Tragedy performed outside of those regulated places the Theatres Royal, and in conformity to regulated practices of those theatres, was deemed 'illegitimate' and out of place.

The performance of tragedy in Paris, although not hampered by the complex intersections of regulation and custom engendered by British theatrical regulation since 1737, was similarly situated in a building – the new Comédie Française - which occupied a powerful urban space in Paris both before and after the French Revolution. The theatrical practices linked to the revival and preservation of the canon of classic drama constituted the space of the Comédie Française, as both building and performance company, and as representative of nation and culture under Napoleon Bonaparte, and continued to do so throughout the century. The Comédie Française was seen to produce, so F. W. J. Hemmings argues, national 'products of superb craftsmanship' analogous to the productions of other State supported institutions such as the State Printing Office or the Sèvres and Gobelins manufactories.²³ However, this subsidy of the company by the French State (so often held up as a model of theatre practice in Britain) came with strings attached, including regulations governing the selection of new plays, and an erratic regime of state censorship. John McCormick comments wryly that 'Most of the time censorship was an ongoing nuisance, which probably had far more effect on the Comédie Française than it did on the popular theatres. With each revolution censorship was abolished, and in each case was re-established within a few years.'²⁴ Censorship may have been negligible in practice, but it meant that the Comédie Française was uniquely tied to the politics of the French state at least until the calmer times of the Second Empire in the middle of the century, when the theatre was once again brought closely under government control.²⁵

Before German nation-state unity in 1871, German developments were obviously less focused in a single national capital than in the federal system of city states, where city and Court theatres created their own national legitimation based on the ‘internalization of Schiller’s dictum of the theatre as a “moral institution”’ as discussed above.²⁶ Heinrich also notes the number of theatres founded in the period across cities of German-speaking Europe, including Hamburg, Vienna, Munich, Mannheim, and Weimar, arguing that this network of increasingly State-subsidised or publicly funded civic theatres ‘constituted the national theatre.’²⁷ As a kind of ‘imagined community’ - of performance and spectatorship, rather than readership – this network became part of the cultural construction of the German nation after 1870. An English visitor, reporting on Berlin theatres in 1875 for the *Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News*, notes the plethora of theatres in the new capital, and its ‘multitude of theatrical amusements.’ According to the *Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News* correspondent, the repertoires of the principal houses – the Berlin Opera House, the Königliches Schauspielhaus (described as the Comédie Française of Berlin), the Wallner Theatre, the Stadt-Theater, and the National-Theatre – are strikingly European, all theatres producing a mix of the great works of the French, German, English and Spanish repertoires. Even, the writer comments, ‘however bitterly the Germans may hate the French, as a nation, they have a warm and undisguised admiration for their ‘hereditary enemy’s’ dramatic compositions.’²⁸ However, spectators attending the Berlin Opera House were not likely to forget their own country’s past imperial greatness: the opera house, built by Frederick the Great in 1745, and identified by Marvin Carlson as ‘the first monumental theatre of modern times,’²⁹ is located strategically next to the towering equestrian statue of Frederick, and opposite the Berlin university on Unter den Linden (*ISDN*, 334), thus creating a triptych of public expression of power and modernity.

The alarums and debates over the state of the drama, its role in establishing national identity – or in the case of German theatre, national unity – were largely focused in the first thirty years of the nineteenth century. This period maps roughly onto conventional literary periodisation, which calls the period from the 1780s until roughly the 1830s ‘Romantic’

There is traction in this carving up of the chronology of the nineteenth century, as it identifies a significant period of turmoil and change. Yet it also conceals other patterns and themes, and imposes a misleading sense of uniformity on the period. Conventional periodisation particularly situates the mid-century period as one of little importance: as an interregnum between the excitement of Romantic revolt, and the emergence of Naturalist theatre in the 1870s. In France the mid-century it is the period of the Second Empire, a period of settled governance for the Comédie Française, secured by a Government grant of 240,000 francs each year from 1856.³⁰ This was also the period marked by the emergence of international stars such as Rachel; a young Sarah Bernhardt made her debut at the Comédie Française in 1862. Jacky Bratton notes that Clement Scott refers to these decades as the ‘blank period’ between Macready and Irving. She goes on to ask whether that is a sustainable historiographical position, given that, in Britain at least, the middle years of the century were ‘the most eventful and vigorous years of Victoria’s reign.’³¹ Jim Davis and Victor Emeljanow have already traced the formation of the London West End in the 1850s and 60s, arguing that it is an area ‘demarcated less by its geography and demography than by its cultural and commercial status.’³² What becomes clear when looking at this period is the inadequacy of teleological narratives of a dormant period, of theatrical stagnation (such as Marvin Carlson’s view of the German theatre 1830-70), before Naturalist and social realist theatre leapt forth to save the serious drama.

The professional life of Dion Boucicault encapsulates the circulation of ideas and theatrical practices in the mid-nineteenth century, and I offer him as a case study of the

practices of transformation and reworkings of genre involved in the circulation of tragedy in the nineteenth century in this 'blank period.' Boucicault's transnational identity, iconoclastic approach to theatre making, and practice of dramaturgical bricolage, position him as a typical playwright of the mid-century: 'perhaps the most representative man of the theatre of the Victorian age.'³³ This representativeness is important. His work exemplifies the 'everydayness of experience'³⁴ in a standard repertory theatre, and demonstrates the ways that audiences experienced a 'mesh of connections' between performances in one theatre through an evening (the temporal circulation of performance), and performances across a city, a nation, or transnationally (the spatial, geographical circulation of performance) in what Jacky Bratton calls 'intertheatricality.'³⁵ Dion Boucicault is an exemplum of the dominant trend of the nineteenth century theatre industry towards globalisation which Jeffrey Cox connects with melodrama, in contrast with the idea of the national drama.³⁶ Boucicault himself made much of his international heritage, turning it to his advantage wherever he worked. He was born in Dublin to Anna Darley and Samuel Boursiquot, a man of Irish Huguenot heritage. When in France, Boucicault emphasised his French paternity even 'affect[ing] a French title for a while' and maintaining that his father was French, not Irish.³⁷ In America, Boucicault played his Irish self, and his plays might single-handedly be seen to cement the stage Irishman into the international theatrical imagination. As a sensation melodramatist, Boucicault is one of the few playwrights whose name has survived the general dismissal of the new dramatic writing of the nineteenth-century. In this account of Boucicault's engagement with tragedy, and its performance and circulation, I discuss his forgotten play *Louis XI*, which sits somewhere between melodrama and tragedy, and somewhere between adaptation, translation, and original work. The interplay between genre, writerly production, and theatrical production, offers a framework within which to consider tragedy in its circulation and performance in the mainstream of nineteenth-century theatre.

Charles Kean employed the Dion Boucicault as his in-house dramatist at the Princess's Theatre, London, in 1850. Boucicault had made his reputation as a playwright almost a decade before with the hit, *London Assurance* (1841) written for Madame Vestris and Charles Mathews' company at Covent Garden. Perhaps, as Peter Thomson surmises, Kean employed Boucicault 'to remind his detractors that he had an interest in modern as well as ancient plays,'³⁸ given that Kean hired the Princess's with a managerial aim of producing all of Shakespeare's plays.³⁹ Their relationship is interesting in many ways, not least because it demonstrates that even the foremost tragedian and 'legitimate' theatrical producer of the mid-nineteenth century sought the kinds of services provided by an in-house playwright with a reputation for writing racy, modern commercial hits. It meant that Boucicault had a relatively secure position in which to develop his writing; while his entrepreneurial instincts may have been frustrated, his development as a playwright was surely enhanced. It was during this brief period of relatively steady employment (rumoured to be paid at the rate of £700 a year⁴⁰) that Boucicault produced the script of *The Corsican Brothers* (1852), a play that grasped audience attention for the rest of the century, and in which Charles Kean made his reputation for powerful, realist acting – just as much as in his more celebrated performances in Shakespearean roles. The inclusion of *The Corsican Brothers* into Kean's, Samuel Phelps' and then Henry Irving's repertoires, indicates the significance of Boucicault's style of drama for these actors. Boucicault's dramas offered weighty substantial roles, using contemporary language and sensibility, and complementing the canonical repertoire of Shakespearean tragedy in which these actor-managers specialised.

Kean's work on Shakespeare, and his aspirations towards a National drama of authentic and thoughtful productions of the national repertoire, has been examined in detail by Richard Schoch.⁴¹ Remembered as the producer of historically authentic and spectacular productions of Shakespeare, he created powerful representations of the past through assiduous

focus on scenography, original texts, and music. Schoch argues persuasively for the reputation and importance of Kean's work in making his theatre 'an agent of historical instruction'; this was 'the very sign of its modernity,' argues Schoch.⁴² But we must not forget that Kean's management presented contemporary drama alongside the carefully realised spectacles of authentic Shakespearean production, and that these productions garnered as much notice and praise from contemporary critics as Kean's historical productions. Kean's modernity, I would argue, lies in his position as facilitator of these kinds of hybrid dramas drawing on melodrama and tragedy written for him by Boucicault. Whatever prompted him to employ Boucicault as his house dramatist, the decision was an astute one, resulting in an output of plays significant not only for their typicality but also for the ways in which Boucicault played with dramatic form to offer original versions of expected conventions.

The collaboration between Kean and Boucicault at the Princess's was an important factor in the gradual adaptation of melodrama from the spectacle of the sensation drama, into the serious, psychological drama of the second half of the century. In 1855, at the very chronological centre of the century, Kean produced *Louis XI*, one of the two plays Boucicault wrote for this season (although by this time Boucicault himself had left for America). *Louis XI* was variously credited as a translation from the French playwright Casimir Delavigne, or – in the characteristically oxymoronic language of the Victorian theatre – an 'original adaptation.'⁴³ Although the title role of French king Louis XI was performed by Kean, then Samuel Phelps (1861) and Henry Irving (1878), *Louis XI* has been lost to any history of London theatre in the nineteenth-century, and even to most accounts of Boucicault's career. This is not surprising: as Thomson remarks in his account of Boucicault's career, it is an 'odd' play.⁴⁴ My argument here is not to renovate the reputation of this play, nor claim it as a great forgotten tragedy of Boucicault's career. My point is rather that in *Louis XI* we have an

example of a typical serious drama of the period, which encapsulates many of the features of site, circulation and performance of tragedy in transition, through features of melodrama. It offers a lens through which to examine the performance practices of serious drama, and the circulation of ideas about genre - specifically, the exchanges between tragedy and melodrama - within the mainstream theatre. It is significant that Kean chose to stage *Louis XI* alongside his Shakespeare repertoire, and that as a theatre manager with a serious mission to renovate the respectability and instructive role of the theatre through its classic forms such as tragedy, he employed a contemporary playwright – and that that playwright was Boucicault. These decisions, together with the contemporary critical success of *Louis XI* suggest a very different set of performance practices and strategies than those we inherit from the orthodox historiography of mid-century theatre.

Commenting on Kean's decision to stage Boucicault's *The Corsican Brothers*, Richard Schoch places Kean's antiquarian revivals of Shakespeare within the context of sensation drama.⁴⁵ Jacky Bratton's concept of intertheatricality is especially pertinent here. Intertheatricality, she notes, 'posits that all entertainments, including the dramas, that are performed within a single theatrical tradition are more or less interdependent.'⁴⁶ Neither *Macbeth* nor *Louis XI* were performed in isolation; the plays appeared under the same managerial aesthetic and on the same site. The 'practiced place' of the Princess's on Oxford Street in London, a central commercial thoroughfare of the city, housed a mixed bill of pantomimes, farces, and melodramas as well as Kean's much-discussed Shakespeare revivals. Kean's audiences saw the performance of classic English tragedy alongside the 'gentlemanly melodrama' of *The Corsican Brothers* and the historical drama of *Louis XI*. In this conceptual framework, the generic characteristics of the Shakespearean canon of tragedy (and history plays, played as tragedy) informed audiences' spectating experiences of *Louis XI*. Conversely, the appearance of plays such as *Corsican Brothers*, *Louis XI*, (and even *Janet Pride* in the

same London season as *Louis XI*) alongside productions of *Macbeth*, *King John*, *Henry VIII* and *Richard II* were viewed in the light of audience's knowledge and memory of Kean as Louis XI. Tragedy and melodrama circulated generically under Kean's management; both forms united through Kean's historicism, and embodied in his radical scenographic approach. Kean's programming at the Princess's produced a set of reiterative and circulating theatrical meanings in which each production – although treated as originals - inflected and informed the performance of tragedy.⁴⁷

Boucicault's play tells a straightforward story of the dying King Louis XI, his fear of dying, and his dynastic struggles with Charles of Burgundy. The historical accuracy of the play, noted by reviewers of both Kean's and Irving's productions, fitted well with Kean's general interest in historicism in performance. Kean's performance was much admired – the London critics almost universally praised his characterisation. The *Times* wryly commented that when the play first appeared in Delavigne's version in 1832, 'kings were not popular among the French dramatists,' and Delavigne made the most of his opportunity to present as black a picture of Louis XI as he could. Nevertheless, the *Times* reviewer could 'scarcely conceive anything more perfect' than Kean's representation of Boucicault's version of the king, judging the performance as 'one of those grand works of histrionic art about which there can be no mistake.'⁴⁸ The *Morning Post* was even more rapturous, hailing Kean's performance as an 'histrionic triumph of the highest order,' and a 'sublime dramatic picture.'⁴⁹ All the reviews comment on the centrality of Kean's performance, most seeing it as almost a one-man play – certainly a *tour de force* for one actor.

For Jacky Bratton, memory is an important element of intertheatricality, and it is notable that debates and discussions about tragedy, and particular performers of tragedy, circulate through memory. This was the case for Charles Kean's performance of Louis XI. It was remembered as one of Kean's best roles, and the memory mobilised when the role was

performed by that other eminent tragedian of the London stage, Henry Irving, in 1878, ten years after Kean's death. We are reminded of the strength of cultural memory of Kean in the role when Kean's widow, Ellen, joined Irving in his curtain call on the first night at the Lyceum. Critic Clement Scott commented that 'our lost actor would cordially have rejoiced to find the traditions and dignity of the stage were upheld in so true [...] a spirit.'⁵⁰

Irving's version was notable not just for his performance of the title role, but the scenography, which had not been a feature of Kean's production:

The richness of costume, the care of archaeology, the beauty of scenery, the sounds of soft music, the wail of the distant hymn, the pomp of the religious ceremony—all serve their legitimate purpose.⁵¹

This was the 'Temple of Art' – what Martin Meisel calls Irving's theatre of Beauty, developed through a conscious pictorialism of staging and performance style.⁵² The *Illustrated London News* commended Irving's 'marvellously thorough [...] historic and pictorial rendering' of Boucicault's adaptation, and Irving's 'highly artistic and deeply thoughtful performance.'⁵³ Critical attention was focused on Irving's achievement in the death scene, almost universally described as horrid, where

Mr Irving saves himself from the charge of completely subordinating mental to physical expression, by the power with which he marks the progress of the mind, as well as of the body, to utter decay. [...] But, even as it is, the representation is too horrible in its reality.⁵⁴

Scott's description of Irving's representation of Louis' death is more detailed, and less horrified. He points out that this death on stage is 'no more reprehensible than the death of a hundred other heroes of tragedy' (127) and praises Irving's playing of a 'melancholy wreck, a decorated effigy.'

Irving's performance as Louis XI is of a piece with his revival of the other Kean/Boucicault hit, *The Corsican Brothers* and their shared practices as actor-managers intent on renovating and reviving the 'National Drama' through serious attention to an eclectic repertoire. Much of this repertoire is now obscure: it was mostly representative and typical, formulaic and hackneyed if our criteria for judging value are those of the post-Victorians. However, such a repertoire should not be cherry-picked for its ground-breaking or unique scripts, which might be seen to anticipate the innovations of Naturalism and Modernist theatre. We need to recognise the circulation of tragedy and the tragic in performance happening through the quotidian, the obscure, and even the 'bad' theatre of the nineteenth century.

In a complement to British playwrights' ransacking of French theatre in the nineteenth century, one of the classics of the English tragic canon – *Hamlet* - received an extraordinary make-over as an opera in French, composed by Ambroise Thomas. Of course, adaptations and translations of English-language drama were not unusual in the rest of Europe, or across the world. The currency of Shakespeare in particular was international and polyglot. English tragedy circulated largely as Shakespeare, and Suddhaseel Sen argues that it was specifically through *Hamlet* that European theatre engaged with Shakespeare.⁵⁵ This adaptation is one of many mid-century operas, notable perhaps for their representativeness, their mainstream and commercial presence, rather than their status as an innovative or striking work of art. However, entwined with this status was the growing claim for opera to be considered as the serious heir 'to the legacy of tragic drama.'⁵⁶ Although not considered to be a composer in the company of Verdi or Wagner, Ambroise Thomas was working at the centre of the mainstream of French state-regulated culture of the mid-century Second Empire, the period in which Paris became one of the cultural centres of the world, the 'paradigmatic city of modern art.'⁵⁷ Thomas' first lasting success was *Mignon* (1866), followed by *Hamlet* in 1868. The combined

success of these pieces placed Thomas at the centre of the artistic establishment, and he succeeded Daniel Auber as Director of the Paris Conservatoire in 1871, serving until his death in 1896.

Thomas' score was developed with a libretto by Michel Florentin Carré and Jules Paul Barbier, based on the French translation of *Hamlet* by Alexandre Dumas *père* and Paul Merice made in the 1840s. This translation, famously, is a version of the play in which Hamlet the Prince does not die. Nor does his mother Gertrude, although Ophelia is shown drowning herself. The opera version was first performed at the Paris Opéra in March 1868, and brought to Covent Garden a year later, followed by revivals and productions in Europe (Palais Garnier, 1875, La Scala Milan, 1890) and America (New York, 1884). The opera is still in the repertoire today, although sporadically. The New York Metropolitan Opera production in 2010, featuring British baritone Simon Keenlyside in the title role, was the culmination of a small revival of interest in Thomas' opera, in a production originating in Geneva in 1996, and touring widely.⁵⁸ Like the Modernist re-imagining of *Hamlet* by Edward Gordon Craig, twenty-first century productions of Thomas' opera have become vehicles for reimagining the possibilities of the canon of the heyday of Second Empire Parisian opera. The most recent production, sung in the original French libretto, with German surtitles, with a radical revisioning of scenography and staging by *Inszenierung* Helen Malkowsky premiered to standing ovations at Theater Krefeld-Moenchengladbach in 2017.⁵⁹ While Thomas allegedly wrote an alternative ending for the 1869 Covent Garden production, in which the Prince Hamlet dies, Malkowsky's achievement was to stage the final scene of Carré's and Barbier's libretto to show the existential burden of the Danish crown – offered to Hamlet by the Ghost (in this production doubling as a Jester) – as a heavy fate, inheriting only death and destruction. At the end of Malkowsky's staging, one comes to believe that death would have been preferable to the crown and the throne (staged as a heavy oversized chair dragged by

Claudius throughout the performance). That is the triumph of this most recent production, with its emphasis on Hamlet's navigation through a nightmarishly distorted Elsinore Castle; survival is not devoutly to be wished in this stage world.

As is the practice of adaptation (or remediation) from one medium to another, the Thomas, Carré and Barbier adaptation of *Hamlet* removes many of the characters and subplots. The opera is stripped back to the family drama: Claudius, Gertrude, Hamlet, Polonius and Ophelia, and the voice of the Ghost of King Hamlet. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern do not appear, and neither does Fortinbras. This is not a kingdom at war, but a family in crisis. The paring down of the action and characters forces attention on the central relationships between Hamlet and his uncle, Hamlet and his mother, and Hamlet and Ophelia. The requirements of the form of opera also play a part here. Most scenes are solos and duets, where voices as well as characters are matched or contrasted. Ophélie is sung by a soprano, whose virtuoso range and technique is displayed in the fourth act of the opera – the scene of her suicide by drowning – played in the premiere Swedish star, Christine Nilsson (Hamlet was sung by the baritone Jean-Baptiste Faure, and later by Charles Santley in the Covent Garden premiere). The opera's emotional focus is on the acknowledged love between Hamlet and Ophelia, their extended duet taking up most of the second part of Act 1. This makes Ophelia's suicide by drowning, performed on stage in an extraordinarily embroidered and virtuoso aria all the more poignant. Physically and musically, Ophelia is far more present in this performance than in its source texts (Dumas or Shakespeare). Her death by drowning, described obliquely by Gertrude in Shakespeare's text, is played out in full operatic detail on-stage in a Senecan rather than Aristotelian approach to tragic death. This was a celebrated scene from the opera, requiring extraordinary capacities of vocal technique and performance power.

In this recalibration of the focus of *Hamlet*, Thomas and his collaborators are part of a longer national relationship with the play, and various French versions of it.⁶⁰ There is a link

to be made between Thomas's Ophélie and the Romantic 'Ophelia mania' which hit Paris in the wake of Harriet Smithson's performances in 1827. This was the performance through which the character of Ophelia was wholeheartedly embraced by Romanticism, and in France rather than Britain. The interest in Ophelia in France was adapted and circulated into a rich visual culture of the representation of fragile feminine subjectivity through Delacroix's series of lithographs *La mort d'Ophélie* in 1843.⁶¹ The visual cult of Ophelia found its way to Britain, with the controversial Pre-Raphaelite 'Ophelia' of John Millais (1851-2) culminating in J. W. Waterhouse's almost obsessive return to the moments just before Ophelia's death in three paintings from 1889 to 1910. Further French representations of Ophelia were inspired by Nilsson's performance in Thomas' opera in 1868. De Lafond describes the typical Ophelia painting in mid-century France 'depicted in either period or modern costume, with disheveled hair and garlands of flowers, reflecting the styling of [...] the Swedish-born Christina Nilsson' (176). The visual links to later Ophelias can be traced through a multitude of drawings, paintings and photographs of performers playing Ophelia/Ophélie, featuring theatrically disheveled hair (but still beautifully arranged) and holding flowers, including the widely circulated photographic portrait of Ellen Terry playing Ophelia to Irving's Hamlet in 1878, and the Australia soprano, Nellie Melba, as Ophélie in a 1910 revival of Thomas' opera. The close attention to Ophelia in these visual representations reverses the usual focus on Hamlet in stage performances. The ideological import of this translation of Ophelia from text to image, moreover, is significant: as Lee Edwards (cited by Showalter) comments, 'We can imagine Hamlet's story without Ophelia, but Ophelia literally has no story without Hamlet.'⁶² The more or less blank space of Ophelia in Shakespeare's script is filled by Thomas' score and the stripped back libretto, evolving from a century of exchange, circulation, and translation of the source text. In the case of Ophelia, and *Hamlet*, circulation through adaptation and remediation – of the content and site of performance – offers new meanings

and interpretations of what was probably the major text of the English-language canon of tragedy.

The theatre of the nineteenth century was characterised by mobility: the rapid circulation of theatrical practices and ideas in texts, bodies, voices, images, themes, and scenographies. Traditional modes of representation became unfixed – either from their generic conventions or from their sites of performance - after the French Revolution, and in the midst of the upheavals of industrialisation and democratisation across Europe. After 1848, the political urgency of cultural change abated somewhat, but the challenges to the neo-classical Enlightenment culture embodied in European political revolutions were reworked into a theatrical culture both eager to represent contemporary modernity, but anxious about the ethical and aesthetic consequences of doing so. There was a considerable risk in following through Emile Zola's exhortation to 'remak[e] the stage until it is continuous with the auditorium, giving a shiver of life to the painted trees, letting in through the backcloth the great, free air of reality.'⁶³ Part of that risk was the possibility of a loss of a culturally and ideologically powerful tradition of tragic performance, which in the theatrical cultures of Europe, carried with it the central belief in the 'sweetness and light' of European civilisation. Although our primary understanding of the circulation of tragedy in the nineteenth century may be geographic or spatial, performed in the site-specific places of theatres occupying significant urban space, I have also argued for an acknowledgement of the circulation of tragedy in other ways - through translation and adaptation, and for its survival in intertheatrical relationships with melodrama in the nineteenth century. As in the case of *Hamlet* and its adaptations and iterations in opera and visual culture, concepts of tragedy and the tragic survived in other sites and forms of circulation. Artists increasingly crossed genres and media to express human experience at its limits: the metaphysics of the tragic experience. And if theatrical tragedy was occluded, adapted, reconfigured or remediated at the beginning

of the nineteenth century, these transitions also produced new work, new ideas, and a powerful new aesthetic of ‘serious drama’ by the end of the century.

¹ G. Steiner, *The Death of Tragedy* (London: Faber and Faber, 1961), 3.

² R. Heilman, *Tragedy and Melodrama: Versions of Experience* (Seattle & London: University of Washington Press, 1968), 7.

³ T. Eagleton, *Sweet Violence: the Idea of the Tragic* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), p. 46.

⁴ *Report from the Select Committee on Dramatic Literature: With the Minutes of Evidence* (London: House of Commons, 2 August 1832), accessed at *House of Commons Parliamentary Papers Online* (ProQuest, 2006), <http://parlipapers.chadwyck.co.uk>, 158.

⁵ See E. Fischer-Lichte, *History of European Drama and Theatre* (London & New York: Routledge, 2002), and M. Carlson, *The German Stage in the Nineteenth Century* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1972).

⁶ C. D. Grabbe, *Das Theater zu Düsseldorf mit Rückblicken auf die übrige deutsche Schaubühne* [The Düsseldorf Theatre with a Look Back at Other German Theatres], 1835, repr. in *German and Dutch Theatre, 1600-1848. Theatre in Europe: A Documentary History*, ed. G. W. Brandt and W. Hogendoorn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 323.

⁷ M. Carlson, ‘Realistic Theatre and Bourgeois Values,’ in *A History of German Theatre* ed. S. Williams and M. Hamburger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 100..

⁸ M. Patterson, *The First German Theatre: Schiller, Goethe, Kleist and Büchner in Performance* (London & New York: Routledge, 1990), 9.

⁹ W. Macready, *Macready’s Reminiscences, and Selections from his Diaries and Letters*, edited by Frederick Pollock (London: Macmillan and Co., 1876), 506.

¹⁰ *Macready’s Reminiscences*, 528.

¹¹ J. N. Cox, ‘The Death of Tragedy; or, the Birth of Melodrama,’ in *The Performing Century*,

ed. T. C. Davis and P. Holland (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007), 161.

¹² A. Heinrich, 'Performance for Imagined Communities: Gladstone, the National Theatre and Contested Didactics of the Stage,' in *Politics, Performance and Popular Culture: Theatre and Society in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, ed. P. Yeandle, K. Newey and J. Richards (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016), 97.

¹³ F. Schiller, 'Über den Grund des Vergnügens an tragischen Gegenständen' [On the Causes of Delight in Tragic Subjects], repr. in *German and Dutch Theatre, 1600-1848*. ed. G. W. Brandt and W. Hogendoorn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 223.

¹⁴ Hall and McIntosh, *Greek Tragedy and the British Theatre*, 285-7.

¹⁵ 'Music and the Drama,' *The Athenaeum*, 17 June, 1843, 573-4.

¹⁶ 'Music and the Drama,' *The Athenaeum*, 18 February, 1843, 166.

¹⁷ 'Theatres,' *John Bull*, 18 February, 1843, 108-09.

¹⁸ 'Drury-Lane Theatre,' *The Times*, 13 February, 1843, 5.

¹⁹ 'Drury-Lane Theatre. A Blot in the 'Scutcheon,' *The Morning Post*, 13 February, 1843, 3.

²⁰ M. Carlson, *Places of Performance: the Semiotics of Theatre Architecture* (Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1989), 81.

²¹ S. Bennett and J. Sanders, 'Rehearsing Across Space and Place: Rethinking *A Masque Presented at Ludlow Castle*' in *Performing Site-Specific theatre: Politics, Place, Practice* ed. A. Birch and J. Tompkins, (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2012), 37, 51.

²² M. Pearson, *Site-Specific Performance* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 1.

²³ F. W. J. Hemmings, *Theatre and State in France, 1760-1905* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 177.

²⁴ J. McCormick, *Popular Theatres of Nineteenth-Century France* (London & New York: Routledge, 1993), 99.

²⁵ Hemmings, *Theatre and State in France*, 190-1.

-
- ²⁶ Heinrich, 'Institutional Frameworks,' in *A Cultural History of Theatre*, Vol. 5, *In the Age of Empire*, ed. P. Marx, (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 36.
- ²⁷ Heinrich, 'Institutional Frameworks,' *A Cultural History of Theatre*, 47-8.
- ²⁸ 'The Berlin Stage,' *Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News*, 2 January, 1875, 334
- ²⁹ Carlson, *Places of Performance*, p. 74.
- ³⁰ As W. E. H. notes admiringly in 'The Comedie-Francaise,' *The Cornhill Magazine*, July 1879, 68.
- ³¹ J. Bratton, *The Making of the West End Stage: Marriage, Management and the Mapping of Gender in London, 1830-1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 1-2.
- ³² J. Davis and V. Emeljanow, *Reflecting the Audience: London Theatregoing, 1840-1880* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2001), 167.
- ³³ J. Donohue, 'The Theatre from 1800 to 1895,' in *Cambridge History of British Theatre*, Vol. 2, ed. J. Donohue (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 251.
- ³⁴ T. C. Davis, 'Nineteenth-Century Repertoire,' *Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film*, 36: 2 (2009): 9.
- ³⁵ J. Bratton, *New Readings in Theatre History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 37-8.
- ³⁶ Cox, 'British Romantic Drama in a European Context,' in *British and European Romanticisms*, 128.
- ³⁷ R. Hogan, *Dion Boucicault* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969), 21 and R. Fawkes, *Dion Boucicault: A Biography* (London: Quartet Books, 1979), 59.
- ³⁸ P. Thomson, 'Introduction,' to *Plays by Dion Boucicault*, ed P. Thomson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 6.
- ³⁹ Parkin, 'Introduction,' in *Selected Plays of Dion Boucicault*, 11.
- ⁴⁰ J. L. Smith, 'Introduction,' to Dion Boucicault, *London Assurance*, ed. J. L. Smith

(London: Adam & Charles Black, 1984), xi.

⁴¹ R. W. Schoch, *Shakespeare's Victorian Stage: Performing History in the Theatre of Charles Kean* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

⁴² R. W. Schoch, 'Theatre and Mid-Victorian Society, 1851-1870,' in *Cambridge History of British Theatre*, Vol. 2, ed. J. Donohue (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 333-4.

⁴³ 'The Theatrical Examiner,' *The Examiner*, 20 January, 1855.

⁴⁴ Thomson, 'Introduction,' *Plays by Dion Boucicault*, 6.

⁴⁵ Schoch, *Shakespeare's Victorian Stage*, 164.

⁴⁶ Bratton, *New Readings*, 37-8.

⁴⁷ See T. C. Davis on repertoire as 'multiple circulating recombinative discourses of intelligibility.' 'Nineteenth-Century Repertoire,' *Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film*, 36: 2 (2009): 7.

⁴⁸ 'Princess's Theatre,' *The Times*, 15 January, 1855, 4.

⁴⁹ 'Princess's Theatre,' *The Morning Post*, 15 January 15, 1855, 5.

⁵⁰ Clement Scott, 'Louis XI,' in *From 'The Bells' to 'King Arthur': A Critical Record of the First-Night Productions at the Lyceum Theatre from 1871 to 1895* (London: John Macqueen, 1897), 123.

⁵¹ Scott, 'Louis XI,' p. 123.

⁵² M. Meisel, *Realizations: Narrative, Pictorial, and Theatrical Arts in Nineteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 402-5.

⁵³ G. A. S. [George Augustus Sala], 'Echoes of the Week,' *Illustrated London News*, 23 March, 1878, 267.

⁵⁴ 'Mr. Henry Irving in "Louis XI,"' *Evening Telegraph*, 19 March, 1878, 4.

⁵⁵ Suddhaseel Sen, 'Shakespeare Reception in France: The Case of Ambroise Thomas's

Hamlet,’ in *Shakespeare and the Culture of Romanticism*, ed. Joseph M. Ortiz (London & New York: Routledge, 2016), 183.

⁵⁶ Steiner, *Death of Tragedy*, 284.

⁵⁷ Richard R. Brettell, *Modern Art 1851-1929: Capitalism and Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 52.

⁵⁸ P. G. Davis, ‘In Defense of the Singing Hamlet,’ *New York Times*, [online], 12 March, 2010 [accessed January 2018].

⁵⁹ ‘Hamlet ein Seelenkrimi,’ [Hamlet, a Metaphysical Thriller], *Rheinische Post*, [Online], 27 November, 2017.; accessed 09-01-18].

⁶⁰ See Sen, pp. 183-4 for a summary of the adaptation and translation of *Hamlet* from English to French.

⁶¹ E. Showalter, ‘Representing Ophelia: Women, Madness and the Responsibilities of Feminist Criticism,’ in *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, ed. P. Parker and G. Hartman (London: Methuen, 1985), 83, and D. G. de Lafond, ‘Ophélie in Nineteenth-Century French Painting,’ in *The Afterlife of Ophelia*, ed. K. L. Peterson and D. Williams (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 171. See also K. Rhodes, *Ophelia and Victorian Visual Culture: Representing Body Politics in the Nineteenth Century*, (London & New York: Routledge, 2017).

⁶² Showalter, ‘Representing Ophelia,’ 78.

⁶³ Emile Zola, ‘Naturalism in the Theatre,’ in *The Theory of the Modern Stage*, ed. E. Bentley, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), 161.