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INTRODUCTION

A few words in regard to the aim and scope of the following dissertation are necessary for an understanding of the task which is here attempted. We are concerned with the dramatic and critical work of Henry Arthur Jones in its relation to the intellectual development of the contemporary English drama. This involves an estimate of his contribution to what is sometimes called the renascence of the English drama, and also a study of the influence of historical tendencies upon his thought and work. We are concerned not so much with questions of technique and dramaturgy as with the intellectual qualities and aspects of Jones's work and the influences that account for them. The particular plays have been studied and analyzed from the standpoint of their relation to his criticism of life and the general aspects of his work as a whole. Some specific questions and problems to be considered are the following:

1. What is Jones's relation to his predecessors, to his contemporaries, and to the later school of dramatists? By what schools of drama has he been chiefly influenced? This involves principally his relation to Robertson, the school of melodrama, Ibsen, the Shakesperian revival, Dumas fils, and the recent sociological school of dramatists.

2. What is Jones's theory of the drama, and what is its relation to historical dramatic controversies?
3. What are the sources of Jones's ideas? This will involve the question of Jones's reading and especially the influence of Victorian literature and science upon his mental development.

4. Exactly what did Jones contribute to the intellectual development of the modern English drama?

5. What modern problems are treated in the plays of Jones, and what are the ethical and social concepts underlying his treatment of them?

6. What is the relation between Jones's fundamental concepts and his dramatic art? What is the ethical basis underlying his conception of comedy and tragedy?

7. In what ways has his work been affected by theatrical conditions? To what extent has he compromised to meet the conditions imposed upon him?

The work of Henry Arthur Jones has a peculiar interest and significance from the historical standpoint, because no man is more representative of the dramatic movement in England during the last twenty years of the nineteenth century. His work reflects a great variety of influence and tendency, and for this reason it throws a flood of light upon the dramatic problems and movements of his time. Henry Arthur Jones is a man of marked talent rather than of positive genius, who has become a very successful playwright through arduous effort in surmounting difficulties and skillful adaptation to theatrical conditions.
His art exhibits a mixture of incongruous aims and tendencies which reflect the various forces and movements of his time. For this reason his work is a most valuable repository of recent dramatic history. It is surprising that the intellectual content of Jones's work has not as yet attracted the attention of many critics and writers.

This investigation is based in the main upon a study of the published plays and critical essays of Henry Arthur Jones. Reviews of unpublished plays are taken into account in so far as they furnish positive evidence in regard to the content and aim of Jones's work. Jones has written altogether about sixty-two plays; of these about forty have been published including a few privately printed plays that are now out of print. Most of his lectures and papers have been published in two volumes called The Renascence of the English Drama and The Foundations of a National Drama. We also have a number of prefaces, pamphlets, and letters that throw considerable light on the man and his work. With the exception of a few magazine articles and chapters of longer works, nothing has been published on the work of Jones except a German thesis of 65 pages by Hans Teichmann. This work, called Henry Arthur Jones's Dramen, was published at Giessen in 1913. Teichmann's dissertation does not deal with Jones's theory of the drama or the intellectual aspects of his work. It gives biographical facts, sources of plots, and discusses Jones's technique.
It gives a brief analysis of seven of Jones's important plays. It also contains a list of plays to date and an incomplete bibliography. There is practically no attempt to treat the specific problems that have been indicated as the subject of the present work. To supplement the material mentioned above the present writer sent a questionnaire to the author, who replied furnishing some valuable collateral evidence on many of the points established by this thesis. In the study of the background original sources were used as far as possible; special use was made of The Theatre and the London Times.

The present writer claims to have thrown some new light on the work of Henry Arthur Jones, especially in regard to the following points:

1. Jones's relation to Robertson has been discussed more fully and definitely than elsewhere. Most critics have ignored it entirely. Hans Teichmann refers to Robertson's influence but offers scarcely any proof or amplification.

2. Jones's relation to Ibsen has been widely discussed by many critics. The present writer has tried to show that Ibsen's influence has been exaggerated by some. He has refuted Teichmann's contention that Jones borrowed characters and situations directly from Ibsen in the writing of certain plays. Jones's antipathy to Ibsen's philosophy has also been made clear in this work.

3. The present work contains the first attempt to give a systematic presentation of Jones's theory of the drama.

4. This work also gives the first detailed account of the sources of Jones's ideas in Victorian literature and thought. His relation to Ruskin and Arnold is not even mentioned by Teichmann. Other critics have called Jones a disciple of Arnold, but the facts have not been presented before. No reference has been found elsewhere as to Ruskin's influence on Jones. The relation between Ruskin's art theories and Jones's theory of the drama has been presented here for the first time. The present work moreover gives the first evidence of Herbert Spencer's influence upon Jones's social philosophy.

5. This is also the first attempt to give a systematic account of Jones's treatment of specific social problems and to get at the basis of his thinking on social and moral questions.
CHAPTER I

A SURVEY OF JONES'S CAREER

Early Life

Henry Arthur Jones was born in the small country
village of Grandborough, Buckinghamshire, England, on
September 20, 1851. His father, Silvanus Jones, was a
farmer, and his mother was a farmer's daughter. He at-
tended the grammar school at Winslow, a nearby town, until
he was thirteen years of age, when he went to Bradford and
entered a commercial firm. The influence of his early
experiences and the circumstances which led him to enter
a literary career are effectively told in his own words:

"My childhood was wholly spent in the country, and I
had golden opportunities for studying and observing every
phase of old village life in England before its transfor-
mation by railroad influences. It is perhaps to this acci-
dent that I owe, in a measure, the success of those sketches
which my critics have been good enough to praise for their
faithfulness. I did my utmost to get all the good I could
out of the middle-class school to which I was sent, but I
was barely thirteen when I went into the world to shift
for myself. I soon began to pester the editors of magazines
with essays, tales, and poems, but they were always returned
with thanks. When I was eighteen I went to a theatre for
the first time and came away stage struck. How well I re-
member the evening! It was the pit of the Haymarket before
the reign of the Bancrofts. Miss Bateman was playing Leah,
and Messrs Compton and Kendal sustained the leading char-
acters in an after piece called His First Champagne. Then
the editors of magazines had a respite, and I transferred
my attentions and importunities to the London managers.
During the day I worked hard in a city warehouse. My even-
ings were passed in theatregoing and playwriting. The
managers, however, made no sign; years went by, and at last I accepted, almost in despair, a place in a Bradford office. Here I pined for a country life and fresh air amidst the smoke and dirt of a manufacturing town; and I rejoiced most heartily when at last I moved to the west of England, where I could in my leisure moments continue my study of home life."

In another place he tells us that business life was "thoroughly distasteful" to him, but goes on to say, "I got on so well as a business man that I was able to marry and settle down when I was only twenty-one years of age." In 1878 his first play Only Round the Corner was performed at Exeter. After he had produced several more short pieces at Exeter, Oxford, and Leeds, his one-act comedy A Clerical Error was performed in London in the fall of 1879. In regard to the production of this play Jones said:

"In the summer of 1879 I had the good fortune to send a little comedy, to which I had given the name of A Clerical Error, to Mr. Wilson Barrett, who was then the Manager of the Grand Theatre at Leeds. Almost by return of post he wrote to say that he had taken the Court Theatre in London, and would produce my play during the coming season. He was as good as his word, and thus commenced in earnest my career as a dramatic author, and my friendship and association with Wilson Barrett." 3.

The play was favorably received, and this encouraged the author to take up his residence in London "to try for a place among English playwrights." This place was securely won in 1882 with the production of his first great success, The Silver King.

1. The Theatre, September, 1886, 8:175.
2. Interview by Raymond Blathwayt, The Idler, 1894, 4:69.
3. The Theatre, September, 1886, 8:175.
4. See the author's comment on Breaking a Butterfly, p. 27.
Periods of His Dramatic Career

Since Jones has passed at different times under the influence of various schools, his work may be divided into several periods marked by some general characteristics and tendencies. It will be our purpose in this chapter to give a brief outline of his career with particular reference to the influences that may be found in his work. For convenience we may divide his career into four periods: first, the period from 1878 to 1882, in which the influence of Robertson is to be noted; second, the period from 1882 to 1890, in which he practiced in the school of melodrama; third, the period from 1890 to 1900, when the influence of Ibsen was of special importance; fourth, the period from 1900 to 1917, in which he reacted against the new tendencies in the drama and continued less effectively to copy his earlier methods. These divisions are somewhat arbitrary and overlap, but they will be found useful.

First Period: 1878-1882.

List of Plays


1880, November 6.  **AN OLD MASTER.**  A comedy in one act.  
Princess's Theatre.

1881  **CHERRY RIPE.**  
Oxford Theatre.

1881, April 16.  **HIS WIFE.**  A play in five acts.  
Sadler's Wells Theatre.

1881, August 7.  **HOMES AGAIN.**  A domestic drama in three acts.  
Theatre Royal, Oxford.

1882, January 26.  **A BED OF ROSES.**  A comedietta in one act.  
Globe Theatre.

**Analysis of the First Period**

This early work is of no literary value; it is of interest only as it throws light on the period and the development of an important dramatic author. Most of the plays are simple one-act pieces, which were originally performed as curtain-raisers for more important performances.

There are some general characteristics in the themes and treatment that are worth noting. That these plays reflect the influence of Robertson is obvious to any one who reads *Hearts of Oak* and *An Old Master* and compares them with *Caste, Ours,* and *School.* That Jones should have copied Robertson in his early work is not surprising if we consider that he began, according to his own testimony, to write dramas about 1870, when the Robertsonian influence was at its height. In his preface to *Saints and Sinners* he said that he wished he could ascribe its many faults "to the bad school in which any English playwright who began to learn his art in 1870 was necessarily nurtured."

1. RED, p. 318.
In all probability many of the little plays produced between 1878 and 1882 were written earlier, when H. J. Byron, James Albery, and William S. Gilbert, the most popular dramatists of England, were imitating Robertson. In regard to Robertson's influence on the dramatists of that period Jones himself said in his lecture on *The Dramatic Outlook* in 1884:

"A distinct vein of Mr. Robertson's influence runs through almost every comedy, and even through almost every melodrama that has since been produced; and it was doubtless necessary and helpful to the formation of a future school of English drama that this phase of rendering English life should be passed through." 1.

The Robertsonian comedy in brief is characterized by restrained emotion, slightness of plot, realistic reflection of the externals of social life, use of English scenes and characters, domesticity, sentimental dialogue, absence of ideas, and a rigid adherence to Mid-Victorian notions of propriety. The theme is invariably the course of true love that does not run smooth. All of these characteristics are to be found in the early comediettas of Jones. Most of his early plays deal with innocent love balked by some kind of interference, generally of a parental character. A brief analysis of several of them will make this clear:

In *Harmony* we have the innocent lovers, Jenny Kinsman and Frank Seaton, the new organist. The progress of their love is interrupted by the drunkenness and antagonism of

1. RED, p. 165.
the girl's father, Michael Kinsman. Michael is the old organist, who has lost his position because of his vice and therefore hates Frank, who has been put in his place. A happy solution is brought about when Frank promises to give Michael's position back to him. After Michael is reinstated he takes a vow that he will never drink again.

In *A Clerical Error* we are told of how Minnie through a sense of gratitude accepts the proposal of her middle-aged guardian, the Rev. Richard Capel, when she is secretly in love with his nephew, Dick Capel, who had left his uncle's home in disgrace some time before. Dick returns, very much in love with Minnie. When the good vicar realizes how matters stand, he gracefully withdraws in favor of his nephew.

Very much in the vein of Robertson is the little play called *An Old Master*, which is similar to *Caste* in its theme and sentiments. In this play Sir Rupert Vanstone has fallen in love with Sophy, the daughter of Matthew Penrose, a poor village schoolmaster. The wrinkles to be smoothed out are as follows: How will Lady Vanstone, Sir Rupert's mother, become reconciled to the engagement, and how will she receive Sophy and her relatives? What is to be done with the old schoolmaster and his sister when the young people are married? Here is a typical Robertsonian theme in the complications arising out of an engagement between two lovers of unequal social rank. Although we have here a *mésalliance* treated
sympathetically, there is running through the play a clear recognition of social distinctions. The humble characters know their proper place, and Sir Rupert is at first inclined to keep them there. When, however, the old schoolmaster in a spirit of extreme humility offers to become his valet, Sir Rupert melts and declares himself ready to receive them as equals. Moreover, Lady Vanstone, although she has some misgivings, writes that she is willing to receive Sophy as her daughter.

In *A Bed of Roses* we have a typical Robertsonian device in two pairs of innocent lovers, whose love does not run smooth because of the interference of an irritable, purse-proud father. The idyllic character of these early pieces is indicated by a comment on the last-named play in *The Theatre*: "In his last play Mr. Jones still shows the freshness and originality of treatment which has hitherto distinguished his work and sets forth a simple story surrounded by a charming framework redolent of purity and sweetness." ¹

The play called *His Wife*, however, offers an exception to those we have been considering. This was his first long play. It was founded on Mark Hope's novel *A Prodigal Daughter* and deals in part with the abuses of prison life. William Archer regarded the play as an improvement on the novel in probability and naturalness, and praised the author for the unconventional manner in which he concluded his acts. "He has," said Archer, "a contempt for tableaux which would delight the heart of M. Zola." ² In this play we note the

². *Dramatists of Today*, p. 223.
first marked expression of Jones's emotional seriousness.

Its emotional quality is emphasized in The Times, as

the following excerpt shows:

"Miss Bateman has chosen the Easter holiday season
to produce a new play entitled His Wife, which has appar­
etly been written for the sole purpose of affording her
unlimited scope for the cultivation of that vein of pathos
in which she excels. The author, Mr. H. A. Jones, does
not spare his audience a pang which it is in his power
to inflict." 1.

These plays made slight impression upon the public.

In fact, in 1882 Henry Arthur Jones was almost an unknown
dramatist, as shown by William Archer's comment in 1886:

"When I published in 1882 the above-mentioned volume of
essays (English Dramatists of Today), several critics
professed themselves greatly amazed to find the name of
Mr. Henry A. Jones on the list of dramatists of the day.

'Who is Mr. Jones?' they asked.....It was his evident
earnestness of purpose rather than his actual achieve­
ment which induced me to include him in my list of four
2. years ago." That Archer did not regard him as especi­
ally important is also shown by the fact that in English
Dramatists of Today (1882) he devoted only six pages to
Jones, while he gave nineteen to Pinero and twenty-seven
to Sydney Grundy.

1. The Times, April 19, 1881.
2. About the Theatre, pp. 45 and 46.
Second Period: 1882-1890.

List of Plays


Analysis of the Second Period

The production of *The Silver King* in the fall of 1882 marks a turning point in Jones's career. This was his first great success; it was also the beginning of a long series of melodramas, the influence of which has left its mark upon most of his later work.
We have noted the Robertsonian flavor of Jones's early domestic pieces. There was, however, almost from the first a conscious reaction against the influence of Robertson and his school, which took the form of an increasing emphasis upon passion and violent emotion. This is found especially in the play called His Wife (1881). It was precisely the absence of strong emotion in the plays of Robertson that Jones found fault with. In 1884 he said:

"Fifteen years ago we had a nearer approach to a school of authorship than we have now. What is called the teacup-and-saucer school of the drama was then in the ascendant. When authors and actors had exactly copied and reproduced the littlenesses of social life, they were thought to have attained perfection. Great passions were eschewed, because they were felt to be out of place in a drawing-room. Moreover, it was observed, and truly observed, that in modern life, and especially in polite life, great emotion is studiously concealed and repressed, and conveyed not in poetry, but usually in very commonplace language indeed. Finally we began to doubt whether there was in modern life any capacity for great passion or emotion. At any rate, if these did exist, it was felt their representation on the stage would be somewhat disturbing to family audiences, and might endanger our placid enjoyment of our elegant teacups and saucers." 1.

During the seventies and early eighties the influence of Robertson was waning, and a new school of violent melodrama was taking its place. Henry Arthur Jones, as joint author of The Silver King, became the most conspicuous member of this new group.

The Silver King has often been called the most successful stage play of the century. It has been played

1. The Dramatic Outlook, RED, p. 164.
all over the world, and revived again and again. There
has been some dispute as to its origin. A writer in
The Times, April 13, 1914, tells a story of how some noted
actor (probably Wilson Barrett) suggested to Herman and
Jones that he would like "a new East Lynne with a father
instead of a mother returning to his family in disguise," and that The Silver King was the result. A letter from
Jones appeared in The Times on the following day denying
the truth of the story but admitting that his play bore
some resemblance to East Lynne. Elsewhere he has told
us that he utilized a three-volume novel that he had
written in his earlier days and which had been returned
by the publisher's reader with his opinion that it was
"a passable third-rate novel."

That Wilson Barrett, however, had much to do with
directing the efforts of the young playwright at this
time is clear from Jones's letter to The Times, in which
he says: "I should never have written melodrama if Wilson
Barrett had not been the manager of the Princess's Theatre.
I am very glad that I did write it, and I wish that some
of our young playwrights could find their early practice
in so good a school."

The Silver King tells of how a drunkard and spend-
thrift named Wilfred Denver, under the false impression
that he has committed murder (the real murderer was the

2. The Times, April 14, 1914.
villain, Captain Skinner), escapes from the hangman's noose by going to America. After making a fortune in silver mines, he returns to England in disguise and finally clears his name and rescues his wife, who has fallen into the clutches of the villain. Although the machinery of The Silver King is for the most part hackneyed enough, it is no ordinary melodrama. The Times hailed the play as a reaction against the sordid realistic type of melodrama, very popular at the time, and commented upon the "perfectly healthy character of the story" and "its freedom from the customary devices and tricks of a morbid sensationalism." One feature of the play that was noted at the time was a strong ethical note, the moral of the piece being given in the words of Tennyson:

"I held it truth with him who sings
To one clear harp in divers tones,
That men may rise on stepping stones
Of their dead selves to higher things."

Another innovation of doubtful value was a new type of villain in the person of "Spider", as Captain Skinner was called. He is a gentleman burglar, who "cracks his cribs in evening dress, and who plans his jewel robberies while dancing with duchesses in society." In a lecture On Being Rightly Amused in the Theatre (1887), Jones commented upon the vogue of this new type and his hand in creating it:

1. The Times, November 20, 1882.
2. Ibid.
"We have recently had a numerous breed of very desperate stage villains. The cool, gentlemanly villain who gaily puffs his cigarette in faultless attire, as he revels in the contemplation of the most diabolical crimes, is at present the most widely-spread variety of the species. It is with some compunction that I own to having had a hand in the creation of this peculiar type." 1

Although The Silver King had been praised by no less a critic than Matthew Arnold, it is much to Jones's credit that he was by no means satisfied with it. With reference to The Silver King Jones wrote:

"After I had obtained a great financial success in melodrama, and was temporarily in a position to please myself rather than the exigences of a theatrical manager, I gave many months to the writing of Saints and Sinners. I was not then acquainted with all the many necessities of theatrical production, and the niceties and peculiarities of audiences at particular theatres, and I confidently reckoned upon as great a success in my new venture as I had just obtained in what I knew to be the cheaper and coarser art of melodrama." 3

Saints and Sinners, produced at the Vaudeville Theatre in 1884, was cast in the conventional mould of melodrama like its predecessor. The plot resembles that of The Vicar of Wakefield, by which the author was perhaps influenced. It is, however, much more than a melodrama; it is a powerful piece of social criticism and an indictment of middle-class greed and hypocrisy.

1. RED, p. 208.
2. The Pall Mall Gazette, December 6, 1882.
3. RED, p. 318.
It was a new departure for the author and a turning point in the history of the modern English drama. M. Filon regarded it as a revival of the conflict between Puritanism and the stage, or to quote his words, The stage "took up the offensive and carried the war into the enemy's camp." The place that this drama holds in the author's development is given in his own words:

"But perhaps the most eventful year in my dramatic career was the year 1884, when I wrote Saints and Sinners. It was a new departure in every way. It presented a phase of English life which had not been treated before, and it dealt with matters which had hitherto been considered beyond the province of a dramatist. There was a great deal of adverse criticism, many people denying my right to present religious problems and people .......on a theatrical stage. The play turned out a great success." 2.

The final success of the play was partly due to the timely advocacy of Matthew Arnold, who witnessed a performance and wrote an encouraging letter to the author.

After Saints and Sinners came a series of poor melodramas that add nothing to the reputation of the author. In the Preface to Saints and Sinners he wrote: "And before I knew that the piece had settled into an assured success, I had weakly sold myself to what the Saturday Review justly calls "the dull devil of spectacular melodrama." And I remained a bond-slave for many years."

1. The English Stage, Frederick Whyte's translation, p. 236.
2. Interview by Raymond Blathwayt in the Idler, 1894, IV.,71.
3. See p. 97.
Hoodman Blind appeared in 1885. It is typical of the series and corresponds to the popular, conventional type of melodrama of that period. The dramatic critic of The Times had this to say about it: "Melodrama of late years has fallen into a groove from which it is high time it should be extricated, and from a playwright of so much promise as Mr. Jones some originality was to be hoped for. In Hoodman Blind, however, the public will find themselves travelling over very familiar ground. The recipe for the manufacture of modern melodrama is a simple one. There is invariably a young married couple to whose door misfortune is brought by a villain. Husband and wife are separated, and both endure much hardship and suffering until the villainy that encompassed them is unmasked. Broadly speaking this is the motive of The Lights o' London, In the Ranks, The Last Chance, and several other recent pieces. It serves once more as the motive of Hoodman Blind." 1 The Theatre for January, 1893, tells of a revival of this play at the Princess's Theatre, November 22, 1892, "in the teeth of the author's protestations." It ran for only a week and seemed "unexpectedly conventional."

The Lord Harry (1886) is one of the few plays of Jones based upon historical material. It tells of the love of a Puritan maiden for the royalist, Lord Harry,

1. The Times, October 19, 1885.
and has a background of seventeenth century conflict. With the exception of the Puritan heroine, the sympathetic characters are Cavaliers. The Noble Vagabond (1886) is a violent, improbable piece "with the usual trio, -- lover, girl, and villain." Hard Hit (1887) resembles Hoodman Blind in its main outline. A pair of villains try to separate a young married couple by luring the girl into an apparently compromising situation. The knot is untied by having a confederate of the villains turn informer.

It was not until 1889 that Jones tried to get away from this rut which he had followed so long. The play called Wealth, produced at the Haymarket in the spring of 1889, is a study of commercial greed which develops into insanity. The play is melodramatic and conventional, but like Saints and Sinners it has a serious ethical purpose. The dramatic critic of The Times found in it considerable social significance, for he said: "More directly, more uncompromisingly than any contemporary work of its kind it grapples with a social problem of vital interest and seeks to solve it in accordance with philosophical principles. Mr. Jones has assumed the rôle of a stage reformer, holding that a play ought to be something more than what M. Zola calls

1. The Times, December 23, 1886.
'an amusing falsehood, destined to console the public at night for the sad realities of the day'.

The Middleman produced at the Shaftsbury Theatre in August, 1889, is even more significant from the standpoint of ethical and social interest. This play has to do with the relation between capital and labor, and throws considerable light upon the social and economic views of the author. In many ways it resembles Saints and Sinners, for it is a serious attempt to portray the realities of modern life in a melodramatic framework. It seems to mark the close of one phase of Jones's career.

This formative period is of immense importance in understanding the subsequent work of Jones. During this decade the young playwright worked largely under the direction of practical men of the theatre; he acquired in this way an intimate understanding of the theatrical conditions underlying dramatic art. Much of his work at this time was done in collaboration with Henry Herman and Wilson Barrett, experienced men, who understood the art of appealing to popular audiences. His long apprenticeship in this school explains Jones's subsequent tendency in many instances to revert to the effects and methods of melodrama. Yet even at this time Jones stood apart from the purveyors of popular amusement in his real spirit and purpose. More than any other dramatist of the time his work exhibits a seriousness of aim and reveals fitful attempts to portray

1. The Times, April 29, 1889.
English life faithfully upon the stage. It must always be remembered that he wrote melodrama because no other door was open to him. Very recently Jones said:

"I should never have written The Silver King or any other melodrama from choice. But Wilson Barrett at that time was the only manager who would so much as consider my work. I escaped from melodrama as soon as I could and refused several offers from Augustus Harris to write a play for Drury Lane. At the same time I think my training in melodrama has been valuable to me." 1.

The real purpose of Jones in this second period is revealed in the criticism of life which appears in Saints and Sinners, Wealth, and The Middleman. It is because of the seriousness of these plays that Jones, more than any of his contemporaries, may be regarded as the prime influence in the dramatic renascence which preceded the Ibsen movement of the nineties. William Archer said: "I should not be surprised if the historian of the future were to find in the plays of Mr. Henry Arthur Jones the first marked symptom of a reaction --- of a tendency to reject extrinsic and fanciful ornament in dialogue, and to rely for its effect upon its vivid appropriateness to character and situation." 2.

1. In a letter to the present writer, April 27, 1920.
List of Plays.

1890, May 21.
Shaftsbury Theatre. JUDAH. A play in three acts.

1890, July 25.
Shaftsbury Theatre. SWEET WILL. A comedy in one act.

1890, August 27.
Shaftsbury Theatre. THE DEACON. A comedy sketch in two acts.

1891, January 15.
Haymarket Theatre. THE DANCING GIRL. A play in four acts.

1891, November 2.
Avenue Theatre. THE CRUSADERS. A comedy in three acts.

1893, January 26.
Criterion Theatre. THE BAUBLE SHOP. A play in four acts.

1893, September 20.
Haymarket Theatre. THE TEMPTER. A blank verse tragedy in four acts.

1894, April 28.
St. James's Theatre. THE MASQUERADE. A play in four acts.

1894, Oct. 3.
Criterion Theatre. THE CASE OF RE-BELLIOUS SUSAN.

1895, May 11.
St. James's Theatre. THE TRIUMPH OF THE PHILISTINES.

1896, January 15.
"Lyceum" Theatre. MICHAEL AND HIS LOST ANGEL. A play in five acts.

1896, April 21.
Garrick Theatre. THE ROGUE'S COMEDY. A comedy in three acts.

1897, March 25.
Criterion Theatre. THE PHYSICIAN. A play in four acts.

1897, October 6.
Criterion Theatre. THE LIARS. A comedy in four acts.

1898, October 29.
Haymarket Theatre. THE MANŒUVRES OF JANE. A comedy in four acts.

1899, April 12.
His Majesty's Theatre. CARNAC SAHIB. A play in four acts.
Analysis of the Third Period.

Jones's Relation to Ibsen. The period from 1890 to 1900 is especially important in the career of Jones, for it was at this time that he came under the influence of Ibsen and that he did his best and most characteristic work. That Jones could scarcely have written his best plays without the stimulus that he received from Ibsen is pretty clear; yet it is difficult to determine the extent of this influence and easy to exaggerate its importance.

It is evident to the present writer that Ibsen's influence on Jones, or any other English dramatist, was practically negligible before 1889. Although Ibsen had been known to a few English scholars like Edmund Gosse and William Archer, who had studied him in the original, there had been no adequate translations previous to 1886, and no important performance of his plays until June 7, 1889, when A Doll's House was acted at the Novelty Theatre in
London. This was followed by a performance of *The Pillars of Society* on July 17 of the same year. These plays aroused much interest and controversy. In 1891 The Independent Theatre produced *Ghosts* and *Hedda Gabler*, which created a storm of protest and discussion. From this time on the influence of Ibsen on the English drama became very marked.

Among the early plays of Jones there are two that should be spoken of in this connection. In 1884 Jones and Herman brought out an adaptation from *A Doll's House* called *Breaking a Butterfly*. All critics are agreed that this adaptation does not show a trace of Ibsen's spirit. William Archer said, "The adapters

1. Ibsen was introduced to the English people through an article by Edmund Gosse in the Spectator for March, 1872. In 1873 Gosse published a long article on Ibsen, the Norwegian Satirist, in the Fortnightly Review. Miss Henrietta Lord's translation of *A Doll's House* with the title *Nora* appeared in 1882. The first public performance of Ibsen in England was a version of *The Pillars of Society* by William Archer produced at the Gaiety Theatre, December 15, 1880. In 1888 there appeared a volume edited by Havelock Ellis, containing *The Pillars of Society*, *Ghosts*, and *An Enemy of Society*. For a complete bibliography see *Speeches and New Letters* translated by Arne Kildal, and *Ibsen in England* by Miriam Alice Franc.
felt it needful to eliminate all that was satirical or unpleasant, and in making their work sympathetic, they at once made it trivial."

Miriam Alice Franc notes the following changes:

"Mr. Jones and Mr. Herman carefully conventionalized the startling original, placed the setting in England, and supplied a radiantly happy ending. In Breaking a Butterfly, Flora (Nora) has no children. Mrs. Linde is replaced by a virtuous book-keeper, Martin Grittle, who steals the incriminating note. Krogstad is replaced by one Dunkley, a typical stage villain. There is, of course, no sign of a Dr. Rank. Goddard (Helmer) has a mother and sister. Two ineffectual comic characters fill out the cast. In this play Mr. Jones and Mr. Herman were able to bring to pass the miracle that Ibsen failed to produce, for Goddard takes on himself the blame for Flora's forgery, and the play ends with a very pretty domestic scene."

The adaptation tends to show how little Jones understood Ibsen in the early eighties.

1. The Theatre, April 1, 1884.
2. Ibsen in England, p. 78.
3. In 1897 Jones made this comment upon Breaking a Butterfly: "When I came up to London sixteen years ago to try for a place among English playwrights, a rough translation from the German version of The Doll's House was put into my hands, and I was told if it could be turned into a sympathetic play, a ready opening would be found for it on the London boards. I knew nothing of Ibsen, but I knew a great deal of Robertson and H. J. Byron. From these circumstances came the adaptation called Breaking a Butterfly. I pray it may be forgotten from this time, or remembered only with leniency amongst other transgressions of my dramatic youth and ignorance."

Introduction to Augustin Filon's The English Stage, FND, p. 208.
In *Saints and Sinners* (1884) we have a satire on provincial hypocrisy that bears some resemblance to the early social dramas of Ibsen. Thomas Dickinson writes in discussing *Saints and Sinners*: "It is difficult to see how his attack upon the respectable institutions of society can be dissociated from the influence of Ibsen's *Pillars of Society*." Hans Teichman seems to think that Jones borrowed directly from *The Pillars of Society* in writing his play. But no published translation existed before 1888, and unless Jones witnessed the performance at the Gaiety, December 15, 1880, or read a translation in manuscript, he had no access to the play. Moreover, in a recent letter Jones wrote, "I knew nothing of *The Pillars of Society*, except its title, till long after I wrote *Saints and Sinners*." In defence of his position Teichman points out the similarity in the satire and also that in both plays there is a public confession. But the public declaration of the old pastor in regard to his daughter's sin is so utterly unlike the confession of Consul Bernick in its purpose and character that it would seem to be a slender basis for inferring any connection. So far as the ideas of *Saints and Sinners* are concerned, it is much more likely that Jones derived them from certain Victorian writers.

4. The influence of Arnold, Ruskin, and other Victorian writers will be discussed in chapter III.
3. In a letter to the present writer, April 27, 1920.
In the nineties it was impossible for a dramatist of Jones's calibre to escape the direct or indirect influence of Ibsen. In fact Ibsen's influence was such that a considerable portion of the public (even those who disliked Ibsen) found the old conventional melodrama absurd. Jones himself in his article *The Future of the English Drama* (1893) noted this change in public taste, as the following quotations show:

"About 1880 -- a school of English melodrama arose which held sway for nearly ten years. Today it seems to have lost its influence and power of attraction." "We have travelled far the last ten years. This improvement in the intelligence, and in the critical faculties, and in the insight and judgment of the great playgoing public is, I think, likely to continue in an increased ratio." "It seems likely that the English stage will gradually and successfully assert its right to deal quite fearlessly and impartially with all the questions that are shaking and vexing and penetrating the mind of the nation. Religion, politics, science, education, philosophy, are all likely to be dealt with on the English stage during the next generation." 2.

Although Jones did not mention the fact, the literary historian will doubtless assign to Ibsen the chief credit in effecting the change.

1. William Archer gives this observation in the *Fortnightly Review* (1892, Vol. 58, p. 150): "People go to see Ibsen's plays," said a close observer, "and they don't like them a bit -- they say that they don't, and they think they don't -- they are quite sincere and unaffected about it. But when they go to see the old conventional plays they used to think so good, behold they like them still less.

It is a curious fact that in his public utterances before the new century Jones had little to say directly about Ibsen. In his book *The Renascence of the English Drama* (1895) not once does he mention Ibsen by name. Such hints as he has thrown out would lead us to believe that his first impression of Ibsen was far from favorable. He must have recognized Ibsen's masterly technique from the first, but he had no sympathy with his pessimism and the unpleasantness of his subject-matter. We have sufficient evidence to show that Jones did not consciously imitate Ibsen; in fact, he strongly disapproved of English dramatists trying to follow in Ibsen's footsteps.

In an after-dinner speech Jones said: "A strong dirty man has written plays, and now every feeble dirty person thinks himself a dramatist." Again, in the Prologue to *The Tempter* (1893) he wrote:

"Shun the crude present with vain problems rife,
Nor join the bleak Norvwegian's barren quest
For deathless Beauty's self and holy zest
Of rapturous martyrdom in some base strife
Of petty dullards, soused in native filth."

Also in the preface to the same play Jones speaks disapprovingly of Archer's advocacy of "the lobworm-symbolic drama" and of his attempt to make the English theatre "the very lobby and ante-room to a Scandinavian back-parlour."

1. RED, p. 340.
2. Jones's preface to The Tempter, p IX.
Miriam Alice Franc probably goes too far in saying, "Few critics were more violently anti-Ibsen than Jones." Against this there is the fact of his membership in the Independent Theatre in 1891, the avowed purpose of which was to put Ibsen on the English stage. Apparently Jones's feelings at this time were mixed. In later years Jones has come to acknowledge the greatness of Ibsen. In his lecture at Harvard University in 1906 Jones paid Ibsen this glowing tribute: "As there is no modern playwright who understands his craft that does not pay homage to Ibsen's technique, so there is no serious modern dramatist who has not been directly or indirectly influenced by him, and whose path has not been made clearer, and straighter, and easier by Ibsen's matchless veracity, courage, and sincerity." And the following quotation taken from the same lecture may be regarded as a personal confession: "Some tribute may perhaps be offered, belated, but I hope not too late, by those whom his tense and shattering genius has at length conquered, and brought to own with great regret that they have in part misjudged, in part underestimated him."

As to the extent of Ibsen's influence on Jones in the nineties opinions differ. There is very little tangible evidence of direct borrowing, and the question is therefore a matter of speculation and not of conclusive

1. Ibsen in England, p. 139.
2. FND, p. 23.
proof. Most of the influence was perhaps indirect and due to the new atmosphere that had been created. Thomas H. Dickinson says, "Neither in thought nor in technique does he show more than a glimmer of the ideas for which Ibsen was striving." On the other hand, M. Filon says, "As for Mr. Jones he has indeed followed both the artist and thinker in Ibsen." And again, "Mr. Jones has been much happier when inspired by Ibsen than when he has translated him. It is above all when he is depicting women that he seems to me to be haunted by the memory of the Norwegian's heroines. It may be said, speaking generally, that a breath of Ibsen has passed through all his works during the last seven or eight years." Jones himself emphatically repudiates the view that he has been influenced by Ibsen. In a letter to the present writer he says:

"I have a copy of Teichmann's thesis on my work. He is wrong in supposing I was influenced by Ibsen at any time. At first Ibsen repelled me, but I grew to recognize that he had great qualities — masterly construction, searching veracity, and lightning strokes of imagination. In any case, I cannot recognize that any character or incident in any of my plays has been moulded by the influence of Ibsen — still less the general drift and quality of my work. Ibsen's temperament is alien to mine. He sees life from a different angle."

This last statement is undoubtedly true. However, an author often receives suggestions unconsciously, and it is

2. The English Stage, p. 295.
3. Ibid. p. 297.
an unquestionable fact that Jones's work has a different intellectual and artistic quality after the Ibsen influence became marked in England. It became more realistic and less melodramatic; more subtle and less conventional.

The first play that shows the unmistakable influence of Ibsen is Judah (1890). It is significant that Judah was produced the year following the production in London of A Doll's House and The Pillars of Society. The difference between Judah and the play which preceded it is very marked. The Middleman (1889) is melodramatic and full of such improbabilities as the return at the end of the play of the long lost daughter, happily married to the man who had seduced her. The characters moreover are conventional stage figures. In Judah for the first time we have psychological subtlety and a genuine study of character. We have a new artistic and intellectual attitude -- the first complete break with theatricality and melodrama. Judah is moreover a psychological study of remorse and conscience --- a typical Ibsen motif. Hans Teichmann traces the source to Rosmersholm. He says, "Ibsen's Rosmersholm sheint mir hier das Vorbild für das Problem und die Charaktere abgegeben zu haben."

1. Henry Arthur Jones's Dramen, p. 35.
the Welsh preacher (like Rosmer), falls in love with a woman who is unworthy of him, becomes implicated in her sin, and the two seek expiation together. This is, however a mere chance resemblance, for Jones has said recently, "I did not see or read Rosmersholm till long after I wrote Judah." The last act of Judah does, however, bear a close resemblance to the final scene in The Pillars of Society, which was performed in London the preceding year. In both we have a confession of deceit and hypocrisy, and the declaration that the truth is the only sure foundation. The final speech of Judah is: "No, Lady Eve, there was a mistake in the title-deeds. The building-stones were not sound. There is to be no new church......Yes, we will build our new church with our lives, and its foundation shall be the truth." In The Pillars of Society there is the declaration: "The Spirits of Truth and Freedom -- these are the Pillars of Society."

There are many other of Jones's plays of this period that in one way or another suggest Ibsen's influence. Michael and His Lost Angel (1896) is another treatment of sin, remorse, and expiation. As in Rosmersholm we have a man with a Puritan conscience under the influence of an "emancipated woman". It also contains a public

1. In a letter to the writer, April 27, 1920;
confession such as Ibsen has used. Yet it is quite possible that Jones drew the theme, the character of Michael, and the confession from Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*. But no one can doubt that the character of Audrie, with her pagan views of life, is due to the new influence. No such woman appeared on the English stage before 1890. Plays like *The Masqueraders* (1894), *The Case of Rebellious Susan* (1894) and *The Liar* (1897) deal with the marriage problem, particularly the position of the woman unhappily married, reminding us of *Ghosts* and *A Doll's House*. Although many of these plays raise problems similar to those found in Ibsen, the philosophy and underlying ethical assumptions are quite different. Drusilla, the heroine of *The Dancing Girl* (1891) is an emancipated woman with no sense of duty and obligation, but the author has little sympathy with her individualism. According to T. W. Dickinson she is one of the "first embodiments of the 'right to life' motive in English drama."

The new artistic and intellectual attitude found in *Judah* was not by any means consistently maintained in the plays that follow; nor is the influence of Ibsen the only one to be taken into account. We find that he constantly reverted to the methods and emotional effects of melodrama as in *The Dancing Girl* (1891), *The Bauble Shop* (1893), and *Carnac Sahib* (1899). He also at this time occasionally deserted the drama of pathos and emotion in favor of

intellectual comedies like The Crusaders (1891), The Case of Rebellious Susan (1894), and The Triumph of the Philistines (1895). He also tried another daring experiment in The Tempter (1893), the only play that he wrote in verse. The Tempter reveals forcibly a strong vein of romanticism and poetry which links Jones with Shakespeare and the Elizabethans. During the greater part of the nineteenth century Shakespeare had exerted a great influence on the literary or poetic drama. The work of Robertson had tended to eclipse this earlier romantic tradition; but the influence of Henry Irving during the seventies and eighties did much to revive Shakespeare and encourage the writing of romantic verse plays like those of Tennyson and W. G. Wills. The Tempter may be regarded as an expression of this influence. Not only here, but in many of his prose plays he shows this tendency. Although in much of his best work he achieves colloquial, realistic prose, his dialogue often has the qualities of poetry and eloquence. For example, Michael says to Andrew: "Old comrade, we had many happy days together in the summer of our life. Now the autumn has come, now the winter is coming. I'm setting out on a cold, dark journey. Won't you light a little flame in our old lamp of friendship to cheer me on my way?"

1. Michael and His Lost Angel, Act IV.
The French Influence. In discussing the various influences to be found in the work of Jones at this time something should be said of his relation to the French school. The influence from France on the English drama had been immense, especially that of Scribe and his disciple, Sardou, the latter coming into prominence during the seventies and eighties. Jones probably shows less of this influence than either Pinero or Grundy; at least in contrast to them he has had the reputation of being English to the core. His themes and situations have been invariably English. It was moreover a part of Jones's theory that the drama should be national in character, and that English dramatists ought to free themselves from French domination. In 1893 he said: "We have almost ceased to translate and adapt from the French.... To all appearances we shall in the future rely less and less on the French drama. We may, indeed claim that at last we have a school of modern English drama." 1

Yet there are many points of contact. That Jones greatly admired some of the French dramatists and the literary standards of the French theatre is revealed in his critical writings. 2 The French dramatist that seems to have had the strongest influence on Jones is Dumas

2. See the Preface to Foundations of a National Drama, p. ix.
Both dramatists are to a marked degree didactic, and their moral ideas especially as to sex are similar. Jones, however, did not for the most part write thesis plays. Only one work of Jones clearly fits the formula of the thesis play, such as Dumas used; this is *The Case of Rebellious Susan*, and the critics are generally agreed that Jones borrowed his theme from Dumas's *Francillon*. The two plays present exactly the same situation, that of a wife who retaliates on a faithless husband by pretending to have or by having a similar adventure. That Jones was acquainted with Dumas's play and was interested in it is shown by the following statement:

"During the early days of Dumas's *Francillon* at the Franœaïse a few years back, I crushed into the second tier among a crowd of small tradesmen and the higher artisan class. The theatre was packed, and it was my only chance of seeing the piece. The play was intensely interesting and splendidly played. It was one of those curious problems in the ethics of adultery that Dumas propounds now and again to his countrymen --- and that he never answers. But it contains some wonderfully-written philosophy of Parisian life."

In a letter to the writer (June 30, 1920) Jones has this to say in regard to the relation between *Francillon* and *The Case of Rebellious Susan*:

"I saw Francillon when it was first produced at the Franœaïse. I thought it was a brilliant and interesting play; but I felt that Dumas, in making Francillon innocent, had run away from his thesis. Indeed I believe that as he originally wrote the play Francillon was guilty."

1. Interview by Raymond Blathwayt, *The Idler* (1894) 4:79.
therefore took the same situation, that of an erring husband and a wife vowing retaliation (not a very original one) and treated it in what I thought was a more sincere way, in an entirely original story, with characters of my own. This shocked my friend Wyndham, who produced the play, and who was a great stickler for propriety and conventionality. I found that in spite of certain passages in the play which delicately revealed the true relations of Lady Susan with her lover, Wyndham assured everybody that Lady Susan was entirely innocent -- on the word of a manager who had to consider the British public. So I wrote the preface to Lady Susan and dedicated it to Mrs. Grundy."

There is also a character used by both Dumas and Jones, that serves the combined functions of the Greek chorus and the *deus ex machina*. He is the wiseacre of the play, the sage counselor of the other characters, who by his shrewd advice brings events to a happy termination. Compare, for example, from the standpoint of function, Olivier de Jalin in *Le Demi-Monde* with Sir Richard Kato in *The Case of Rebellious Susan* and Sir Daniel Carteret in *Mrs. Dane's Defence*. In fact, the central situation in *Mrs. Dane's Defence* is very similar to that of *Le Demi-Monde*. Both plays present a woman with a past trying to get a foothold in respectable society through marriage and using lies and deception as a means, and in both the attempt is frustrated by a shrewd man of the world who has the mundane interests of the lover at heart."
However, Jones gives this testimony:

"I don't think I owe much to Dumas fils. I have read him constantly and admire his dialogue. We used to consider him as a thinker, and call Sardou a 'faker' of situations! I read L'Etrangère a short time ago, and found Dumas as artificial as Sardou, and not so good a playwright. 'Killing time has glared upon him.' (Dumas fils). I am quite sure that Mrs. Dane's Defence owes nothing to the Demi-Monde -- there may be some resemblances, but these are due to the similarity of theme, and are quite general, and on the surface. They do not reach to the characters, or to the incidents of the story." 1.

Jones professes antagonism to Sardou and his methods.

Yet in comparison with the ultra-realists many of Jones's plays conform pretty well with the formula of the well-made play. There are numerous instances where Jones has used such devices as concealment for the purpose of overhearing (for example, in Judah, Act II., and in The Physician, Act III.), and plays in which plot interest and intrigue tend to eclipse character portrayal. This is certainly true of The Manoeuvres of Jane, The Liars, and Joseph Entangled. The Liars bears some resemblance in its theme and structure to Sardou's Les Pattes de Mouche. In both plays the suspicions of a husband are aroused over a trifling circumstance, and in both the plot is developed through artifice and coincidence. Yet Jones has been frequently praised for his disregard of the artificial French technique. William Archer said, "What pleas-

1. In a letter to the writer, June 30, 1920.
2. See RED, p. 250.
es me, then, in *The Triumph of the Philistines* is that it is such a gloriously ill-made play. There is not a rule of orthodox construction....it does not openly outrage." And Bernard Shaw began his review of *Michael and His Lost Angel* by saying:

"One of the great comforts of criticizing the work of Mr. Henry Arthur Jones is that the critic can go straight to the subject-matter without troubling about the dramatic construction....Mr. Jones's plays grow: they are not cut out of bits of paper and stuck together. Mr. Grundy or Sardou, at their respective worsts, perform such feats of carpentry in constructing showcases for some trumpery little situation, that the critics exhaust all their space in raptures over the mechanical skill displayed. But Mr. Jones's technical skill is taken as a matter of course." 2.

From this survey it will be seen that Jones's plays of this period are of great interest and significance in the reflection of a bewildering variety of dramatic conventions, motives, and tendencies, new and old. Although Jones has been swayed by all the conflicting currents and eddies of his time, he has never been completely dominated by outside influences. He has maintained throughout a certain allegiance to personal ideals and has often exhibited considerable initiative and a willingness to experiment and try new things.

Fourth Period: 1900-1917.

List of Plays.

1902, March 11. THE PRINCESS' S NOSE. A comedy in four acts.

   Wyndham's Theatre.

1903, March 2. WHITEWASHING JULIA. A comedy in three acts.
   Garrick Theatre.

1904, January 19. JOSEPH ENTANGLE D. A comedy in three acts.
   Haymarket Theatre.

1904, August 27. THE CHEVALIER. A comedy in three acts.
   Garrick Theatre.

1906, January 24. THE HEROIC STUBBS. A play in four acts.
   Terry's Theatre.

1906, August 30. THE HYPOCRITES. A play in four acts.
   Hudson Theatre, New York.

1907
   Hick's Theatre, London.

1907, September 30. THE EVANGELIST. A play in four acts.
   (Originally called the Galilean's Victory).
   Knickerbocker's Theatre, New York.

1908, November 3. DOLLY REFORMING HERSELF. A comedy in four acts.
   Haymarket Theatre.

1909, December 20. THE KNIFE. A sketch in one act.
   The Palace Theatre.

1910, October 24. FALL IN ROOKIES. A sketch in two scenes.
   The Alhambra.

1910, December. WE CAN'T BE AS BAD AS ALL THAT. A play in three acts.
   Nazimova Theatre, New York.

1911, September 11. THE OGRE. A play in three acts.
   St. James's Theatre.

1912, January 27. LYDIA GILMORE. A play in four acts.
   Baltimore, Md.
   Lyceum Theatre, New York, February 1, 1912.
1913 (published)  THE DIVINE GIFT.  A play in three acts.
1913, September 18.  MARY GOES FIRST.  The Playhouse.  A comedy in three acts.
1915 (published)  HER TONGUE.  A comedy in one act.
1915 (published)  GRACE MARY.  A tragedy in one act.
1915, October 1.  COCK O' THE WALK.  Atlantic City, N.J.
1917, August 27.  THE PACIFISTS.  Opera House, Southport.

Analysis of the Fourth Period.

Of this last period it is not necessary to say much at this time. Jones did little that was new, and, although he wrote a few plays that are noteworthy, he did not surpass and scarcely equalled his achievement in the nineties. He wrote a good many poor plays like The Princess's Nose (1902), Chance, The Idol (1902) and The Heroic Stubbs (1906). His better plays closely resemble earlier successes. The Hypocrites (1906) shows a minister combatting greed and hypocrisy in a small town, and it resembles Saints and Sinners. Joseph Entangled (1904) in its theme and mood is much like The Liars. We Can't Be as Bad as All That (1910) and Whitewashing Julia (1903) present the woman with a past fighting her way back to respectability, reminding
us of Mrs. Dane's Defence. His best plays of this time are the least serious, such as Dolly Reforming Herself (1908) and Mary Goes First (1913), a brilliant comedy of manners. Here we seem to detect something fresh and new.

A new intellectual school of drama and new organization have made the problem of adaptation a difficult one for Jones. With the new century there has been a more complete separation of the intellectual public from the great public. Jones is too much of an artist to cater to the patrons of musical comedy; on the other hand, he has not the precise intellectual quality to please the devotees of Shaw, Barker, and Galsworthy. Most of Jones's public statements at this time reveal a man who is not at home in the new situation. His criticism shows a strong reaction against the drama of ideas. Only in one play has he adopted any of the methods of the new school. This is The Divine Gift (1912), which has scarcely any plot or action, but a great deal of argument about politics, sex, marriage, etc. In his preface to this play he says:

"We have a large and increasing number of painfully earnest playgoers who hunger and thirst for social and political discussion and enlightenment in the theatre. And so far as my sense of public duty...will allow me, I desire to humour them. On second thought I will stretch a point to please them."

The Divine Gift is one of the least actable of Jones's plays; in fact, it has never been put on the stage. Although it is a play of ideas, the views expressed are fundamentally different from those of the new school.

It is an interesting fact that many of his later plays were produced first in the United States, and it would seem that some of these have never been produced in England. The Hypocrites was produced first in New York in 1906, and then in London in 1907. The Evangelist (1907), We Can't Be as Bad as All That (1910), Lydia Gilmore (1912), The Lie (1914), Cock o' the Walk (1915) have all been produced first in the United States, and no production of them in England has been discovered by the present writer. It would appear that in this last period Jones has to some extent lost his hold upon London audiences. His work belongs characteristically to the last fifteen years of the nineteenth century.
CHAPTER II.

JONES'S THEORY OF THE DRAMA.

With the exception of George Bernard Shaw no English dramatist has expressed himself more fully on the nature and purpose of dramatic art than has Henry Arthur Jones. Beginning in 1883, when he published an article called The Theatre and the Mob, he has been lecturing and writing extensively to explain his aim and methods and to make possible in England a more dignified and elevated dramatic art. Most of his important lectures, essays, and prefaces have been collected and published in two volumes, called respectively The Renascence of the English Drama (1895) and The Foundations of a National Drama (1912). Yet unlike Mr. Shaw, who tells us that he enjoys writing prefaces and explaining his plays to the public, Jones has more than once spoken of how irksome he has found the task. He has written dramatic essays from a sense of public duty. In 1916 Jones said:

"I hate lecturing and writing about the drama; I should never have written a word about it, if we in England had any tolerable school of drama. I have had to give much of my best effort and most precious time to bring about a condition of the English drama which would make it possible for an English dramatist to produce his best work without the almost certain result that it would be slighted, or hooted off the stage." 2.

1. Nineteenth Century Review, September 1883. Reprinted in RED.
Jones's dramatic opinions bear a definite relation to the views and theories that were current during his formative period. Before 1870 there had been very little dramatic criticism in England worthy of the name. One of the signs of the dramatic renaissance during the last quarter of the century was the large volume of critical discussion about the drama. Not only did many brilliant dramatic critics appear, but the dramatists also had very positive views. William Archer wrote in 1885, "I think it a most hopeful sign that some of our leading playwrights such as Mr. H.A. Jones and Mr. Grundy should take to theorizing."

The situation in England during the eighties and nineties was nevertheless extremely chaotic; there was no agreement among dramatists and critics as to the direction in which English drama should develop. In general there were two important groups, generally referred to as the Old Critics and the New Critics. The Old Critics, led by Clement Scott, looked back to older theories and models, and regarded Zola and Ibsen with extreme abhorrence and disapproval. They emphasized the emotional, popular, theatrical, conventional, and romantic features of the drama, and were opposed to realism, unpleasantness, new intellectual attitudes, and subversive ethical ideas. But the Old Critics themselves were by no means agreed. To

Sydney Grundy dramatic progress meant following Scribe and Sardou. To Clement Scott it meant Robertsonian purity, sweetness, and sentiment. To Sir Henry Irving the dramatic renascence signified a revival of Shakespeare and blank verse plays based on Elizabethan models. Opposed to these traditionists were William Archer and the New Critics, including A. B. Walkley, George Moore, and Bernard Shaw, who demanded reality, sincerity, scientific analysis, and modern thought. The feud developed in the eighties and became a veritable earthquake with the advent of Ibsen in the nineties. The following analysis will attempt to show that Jones did not ally himself altogether with either group, and that his criticism as well as his creative art is a compromise between the old and the new.

To discuss all of Jones's views on the drama is not possible within the limits of this paper. We shall confine ourselves to four closely related topics which furnished the basis for most of the critical controversy that raged during the closing decades of the nineteenth century. These are: (1) the function of the drama, (2) the relation of the drama to literature, (3) the question of realism, and (4) the conditions, conventions, and laws of dramatic art.

1. Jones's View of the Function of the Drama.

One of the topics discussed in Jones's early period was the question of the end or function of the drama. The Old Critics generally held that the sole function of the drama is to amuse and delight. This was also the popular view and the one held by most of the managers and playwrights. One of the distinguishing marks of the new drama and the new criticism was a strong ethical emphasis. In France, Augier and especially the younger Dumas had created a type of the ethical drama, and some of these were acted in England by the company of the Comédie-Française in 1879. This visit aroused Matthew Arnold's interest in the importance of the theatre as a social institution and led him to write his noted article on The French Play in London. In October of this same year a Social Science Congress met in London and one of the topics discussed was the moral aspect of the drama. A paper was read by a Mr. Woodhouse entitled The Power of the Drama as a Moral Teacher, in which he set forth the view that the educational influence of the stage is the principal excuse for its existence. His views were discussed and strongly opposed by The Theatre. In 1885 William Archer expressed himself strongly in favor of the ethical

1. The Nineteenth Century, 1879, p. 228.
drama. "What is best," he said, "is a play in which a serious moral problem is seriously handled; and from this the public would shrink as from a visit to a dentist's. We are not yet within measurable distance of an ethical drama -- a drama which shall be an efficient factor in the spiritual life of the nation."

In the dramatic criticism of Henry Arthur Jones place is given to both of these attitudes. His utterances do not seem entirely consistent, but in general he seems to believe that the primary function of the drama is to give pleasure, but that it has a secondary and indirect function of teaching and uplifting. But by far the more space is given to showing the importance of the drama as a moral and educational influence. The following quotations are illustrative:

"The more the Church becomes an archaeological museum of fossil dogmas, the less hold and command will it have upon the religion and morality of the nation. If the pulpit loses its power, will the Drama take its place?" 2.

"Hamlet, Macbeth, Faust, the Agamemnon do teach, and teach most impressively, these great central truths, And because they do teach, and because they purpose to teach, they are greater than dramas which do not concern themselves with these great central truths...." 3.

"This then is the use of the theatre: that men may learn the great rules of life and conduct in the guise of a play; learn them, not formally and didactically, as they learn in school and in church, but pleasantly, insensibly, spontaneously, and oftentimes, believe me, with a more assured and lasting result in manners and conduct." 1.

Yet Jones tells us repeatedly that the didactic function must be unobtrusive and indirect, as for example in the following passage:

"The drama does teach, must teach, is a potent influence and also a great art in direct proportion as it does teach; yet the moment it sets out to teach, the moment it takes the professorial chair, the moment it assumes the professorial robes, it stultifies itself, it usurps a function as an authority that it has no right to or business with, and it becomes a meddler and a bungler. The drama cannot directly and explicitly affirm or teach or solve or prove anything." 2.

Jones has little liking for doctrinaire dramatists or for the thesis play, and is never tired of exposing the follies of those who think that "the first business of the playwright is not to have a story or a plot, but to have 'ideas' and a 'mission', to sweep up social abuses, to debate endlessly upon social questions and disputed points in sociology." 3.

There are also many passages where he emphasizes the recreational side of dramatic art. He fears that his derogatory remarks on popular amusement may be misconstrued and that people will imagine that he is trying to foist upon the British public something dull and moralistic, so in characteristic vein he says:

1. Corner Stone of the Modern Drama (1906) in FND, p. 35.
2. Relations of the Drama to Education (1893) in RED, p. 302.
"I have been constantly misrepresented as seeking to deprive theatre-goers of their enjoyment; yet all my aim has been to show them how they may increase it. There is not a lecture or paper in this book that does not contain a statement explicit or implicit....that the theatre exists for the one end of giving pleasure, that it can instruct and educate only as the other fine arts do; that is, incidentally and indirectly, never with any set purpose." 1.

"The first thing that an author learns is that he must amuse or interest his public. I am always affirming that the end of the drama is to interest and amuse. There is no question about this; the question is on what level and by what means the public shall be interested and amused in the theatre." 2.

His views on this subject may be summarized in three propositions: (1) The primary function of the drama is to give pleasure. (2) This pleasure must be of an artistic and intellectual order. (3) The drama is indirectly an effective agent of moral uplift, and can be used to mould the habits, ideals, and tastes of a people. This attempt on the part of Jones to combine and reconcile these two conceptions of dramatic art is characteristic of all his work. In the plays the two aims are found side by side. They were written perhaps primarily for entertainment, but there is also a good deal of didacticism, which is often direct and obtrusive. The result is something of a patchwork, and we are left in doubt as to whether he regards the recreational or didactic aim as the more important or how they are related.

2. Relation of the Drama to Literature.

The relation between the drama and literature was a favorite topic of discussion during the formative period of the modern English drama. In the Victorian epoch there had been almost a complete divorce between literature and the drama, except for the unactable plays of Browning and Tennyson, and the pseudo-literary work of Bulwer-Lytton. The general opinion prevailed among managers, actors, and playgoers that a play is something to be acted and not to be read and studied like literature. The playwright was regarded as of little importance. His name was often omitted from playbills, while that of the actor loomed large. On the other hand, men of letters were scornful of the literary pretensions of the drama and rather resented the attempt of playwrights to enter the world of literature. With the people at large the idea of literary drama was associated with romantic verse plays such as Knowles and Bulwer-Lytton had produced. Jones regarded the divorce of the English drama from literature as the chief cause of its degradation. This is what he says:

1. Jones in 1885 wrote: "When one considers how comparatively little harm would be done to English literature and art if every acting play since Sheridan and Goldsmith were irrecoverably lost tomorrow, one may well hesitate to vex the public ear with the discussion of any matter appertaining to modern dramatic work." RED, pp. 27 and 28.

2. George Moore said in 1889: "No first-rate man of letters now writes for the stage; None among those who supply the theatre with plays can, if looked at from a literary side, compare with any leading novelist or essayist." Fortnightly Review, 52:620.
"Accompanying this divorce of literature and the drama is the contempt of English men of letters and literary critics for the theatre; their utter ignorance of the difficulties of the modern dramatist; their refusal to recognize the modern drama as literature, which refusal again reacts upon the dramatist, and tends to lower the quality of his work, inasmuch as he is left without encouragement, and without any appeal to high standards of literature and good taste." 1.

One of the signs of a renascent English drama was the recognition on the part of dramatists and critics that the drama is a high art and an integral part of the literature of a nation. Henry Arthur Jones was among the first to recognize this, and no one has been more influential in propagating this view. As early as 1884 he wrote:

"It is often said, and it is a current maxim in the theatre, that the test of a good play is, 'How will it act?' That is doubtless to a great extent the test of a popular play; but I would urge that the test of a really good play is, 'Can it be read as well as acted?' It may act well and be thoroughly worthless, except as a spectacle or as a joke --- it cannot read well to any jury of cultivated minds unless it is a piece of literature." 2.

And in 1916 he said:

I have labored to show that no nation can have a drama that is worth consideration unless it is or becomes a part of the national literature -- that all plays outside this are mere toys of the theatre -- that therefore the highest aim of those who are working for the drama should be to bring it into relation with literature, and to draw men of letters to an understanding of, and a sympathy with the theatre, so that they may exercise their

1. Corner Stones of the Modern Drama (1906) in FND, p.29. See also Jones's reply to H. D. Traill in The Literary Drama (1892) in RHD, p. 102.

2. The Dramatic Outlook, FND, p. 183.
authority as to what is produced.*1.

Moreover, Jones was probably the first among modern English dramatists to advocate the publication of plays, either just before or after production, on the ground that every worthy play should meet the test of print, and he was among the earliest to set the example. His own testimony in regard to this runs as follows:

"In April, 1891, soon after the passing of the American copyright law, I made a strong appeal to English and American dramatists to publish their plays and to the playgoing public to read them. This was interpreted in England as a presumptuous attempt on the part of a mere playwright to 'shove in amongst the worthy bidden guests' of literature. I was bantered, and admonished to pocket the royalties coming from my plays, and therewith to be content. I have, however, continued to advocate the publication of plays, and have had the gratification of seeing it gradually become the practice of English and American dramatists." 2.

On the other hand, Jones does not believe that literary qualities are in themselves sufficient; his main idea is the fusion of literature with the actable drama. Very often a poet like Browning, Jones tells us, attempts to win laurels in the dramatic field without a sufficient understanding of the technical requirements. 3. The conditions of the theatre must be met. Ignorance of these conditions accounts for the unfair and irrelevant judgments of literary critics on the work of contemporary playwrights. In his lecture on Literature and the

See also Preface to The Theatre of Ideas (p.14) where he says: "Every dramatist who respects himself and his public should print his plays either before or after production. This will give playgoers a measure of their intrinsic value."
3. See FND, p. 264f.
Modern Drama (1906) Jones said:

"Here I may perhaps call your attention to a suggestive and well-reasoned paper by Mr. Brander Matthews on the relations of the drama to literature. He truly points out that the art of the drama is not coincident with literature, that though it sometimes overlaps literature, it must not be judged solely by the same rules as a piece of literature." 1.

In other words the drama belongs to the theatre as well as to literature. Yet Jones speaks repeatedly of "the eternal enmity between the theatre and the drama," and tells us that although the drama is "inseparable from popular amusement, yet it is something distinct from popular amusement, and in its higher reaches will always be opposed to popular amusement." 2. Here is another illustration of an essential characteristic in the theory and art of Jones, — the attempt to bring together principles and requirements that in our age are almost, if not entirely, irreconcilable.

3. Jones and the Controversy over Realism.

The question of realism was uppermost in the minds of critics and theorists of the drama during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. It was the battleground for all sorts of dramatic controversy. The attitude taken towards realism indicated exactly where one stood in the modern dramatic movement.

1. FND, p. 46.
To some extent the controversy in England ran parallel with the dramatic revolution in France, where the particular bone of contention was the formula of Scribe. Victorien Sardou had given to the "well-made play" a new lease of life. During the seventies and eighties he won a brilliant triumph in France and his plays were received with enthusiasm in England, his influence tending to eclipse that of Robertson, who had been hailed as the founder of a new school of indigenous English drama. The most important influence on the side of realism was that of Emile Zola, whose play Thérèse Raquin, produced in Paris in 1873, started a violent discussion. In 1881 his dramatic theory was published in a volume called *Le Naturalisme au Théâtre*. That Zola's theories were well-known in England is evinced by many contemporary allusions, although the general feeling was one of disgust and bewilderment. In 1887 the new school of French realists, led by M. Antoine, founded the Théâtre Libre, which exerted a potent influence against the Second-Empire technique both in France and in England.

1. The general feeling was expressed by Tennyson's line in Locksley Hall Sixty Years After: "Set the maiden fancies wallowing in the troughs of Zolaism." See also Robert Buchanan's article called The Modern Drama and its Critics in the Contemporary Review (1889) v.56. p.908. Buchanan asked: "Is cheap Science to strangle Art, as well as to poison and asphyxiate Religion?...Shall the gods of our world be a Shakespeare and a Spinoza, or a Zola and a Schopenhauer?" See also The New Naturalism by W.S. Lilly in Fortnightly Review (1885) vol. 44.
The establishment of the Independent Theatre in London in 1891 by John T. Grein was an attempt to duplicate Antoine's experiment in France. Along with French naturalism came the influence from Norway which divided England into two hostile and bitter dramatic factions.

In this controversy over realism there was considerable confusion and misunderstanding in regard to the use of the term, and a tendency to attach to it very extreme and arbitrary meanings. This may account in part for the dogmatism and severity of Jones's repeated attacks upon realism. Jones has apparently used the term with two rather different meanings. The first meaning has to do with a superficial verisimilitude in external matters of stage mounting and colloquial dialogue, which had come into the English drama with Robertson and his school. This type of realism had become very popular in the seventies and eighties. It was extensively used by the new school of melodrama that flourished in the eighties. The influence of Sardou was also in the direction of accurate mise-en-scène. This fidelity to the minutiae of every day life is the sense in which Jones uses the term in his dramatic essays before 1890. Jones had little interest in this kind of realism; he was in favor of accurate stage mounting, but regarded Robertsonian realism as trivial, superficial, and apart from the true end of drama, which is to paint character and emotion. In his lecture The Dramatic Outlook (1885) he said:
Unless it is touched with this sense of eternity, wrapped round with the splendour of heroism, and imbedded in what is primary and of everlasting import, the mere reproduction on the stage of the commonplace details of everyday life, must always be barren, worthless, and evanescent. Because a thing has happened in real, every-day life, is no reason for putting it on the stage ......Nothing is so untrue and so unreal as ultra-realism ......No; there is but one thing that is worth representing on the stage --- the heart and soul, the passions and emotions of man."

With the founding of the Théâtre Libre in 1887 and the production of Ibsen's plays in London in 1889, Jones sometimes uses the term to indicate the portrayal of disease and ugliness. His attitude towards Zola and his followers has been one of impatience and disgust. In 1894 he wrote: "I have fought for sanity and wholesomeness, for largeness and breadth of view. I have fought against the cramping and deadening influences of modern pessimistic realism, its littleness, its ugliness, its narrowness, its parochial aims." He admitted that realism had been useful on the destructive side in tearing down "the great pasteboard strongholds of bunkum and theatricality."

But on the constructive side the realists by "their admiration of mean, perverse things" had retarded the advance of the English drama. He goes on to say that the four

1. Red, p. 166
3. Ibid, ix.
4. Ibid., x.
great qualities in any work of art are "beauty, mystery, passion, and imagination", qualities which realistic art does not possess but derides. Jones is willing to admit the ugly, but only by way of contrast. In his lecture On Playmaking (1891) he said:

"Lately a school has arisen amongst us which proclaims that the details of ugliness and disease are of the chief importance for us to study, and that curious and distorted forms of vice and selfishness and human degradation are the essential elements to be preserved and treasured in our plays. I protest against it with all my might. I say that all great art is instinctively healthy, instinctively rejects and hates and tramples on mere disease, ugliness, and vice, and uses them only by way of contrast, and to produce the impression of truthfulness. I think that in this respect art should strictly follow nature by preserving a balance, as nature always does --- a balance of health, of beauty, and pleasure in life." 2.

Much of Jones's attack on realism is from the standpoint of dramatic construction, and is based on the idea that the realist desires to reproduce life completely on the stage in order to create an illusion of actuality. Jones piles up many arguments to prove the obvious fact that it is impossible to duplicate nature on the stage, and that illusion is not the true end of drama. The dramatist has only two or three hours in which to set forth a story of human life; it is evident that he must select the moments and details that are most effective for his purpose. He works within exceedingly narrow

1. Preface to RED, p. xii.
2. RED, p. 245.
   See also pp 129-130.
3. See lecture On Playmaking (1891) in RED, p. 235f,
limits, and it is quite impossible to do in the drama what Flaubert did in such masterly fashion in Madame Bovary. "I have been watching real life very carefully for more than thirty years," declared Jones in 1897, "and it has never offered to me any one single scene that could be put on the stage."  

Yet Jones makes a great many concessions to realism, and in fact, as in most things, he takes a middle ground. Over against realism he sets not romance and fustian, but truth and reality. In 1890 he wrote: "The rejection of stage realism is not antagonistic to the most severe, the most faithful, the most searching, the most truthful portraiture of modern life. That Zola is wrong is no reason that Bulwer-Lytton and Sheridan Knowles and the legion of stucco blankverse writers are right." There can be no question that in many ways Jones himself is a part of the great realistic revolt against Victorian art and ideals. That he was considered a realist in 1890 is shown by a reference in one of his essays, in which he said, "It was with some surprise that I saw myself described in one of our leading English dailies the other day as a realist and a champion of realism on the modern stage."

1. Delineation of Character in Drama, FND, p. 185f. See also Playmaking (1891) in RED, pp 235-237.
2. FND, p. 147.
3. Realism and Truth, in RED, p. 89.
4. Ibid., p. 85.
One aspect of realism was the widening of the field to include all aspects of life. Now this "freedom of the modern dramatist.....to portray all aspects of modern life, all passions, all opinions" is one of the things for which Jones has fought through many years. But this freedom apparently does not include the right to portray unpleasantness and disease. In defence of his half-way position he quotes from Meredith's Diana of the Crossways a famous passage, which runs:

"Rose-pink and dirty drab will alike have passed away. Philosophy is the foe of both, and their silly cancelling contest, perpetually renewed in a shuffle of extremes, as it always is where a phantasm falseness reigns,.....smother no longer the soul issuing out of our incessant strife. Philosophy bids us to see that we are not so pretty as rose-pink, not so repulsive as dirty drab; and that, instead of everlastingly shifting those barren aspects, the sight of ourselves is wholesome, bearable, fructifying, finally a delight." 2.

When it comes to the realist's method and technique Jones has yielded in many particulars. His attitude towards verse is a good example. Although he believes that the greatest drama must use poetry as the medium, the prosaic temper of our age demands plain, colloquial prose. "It is useless," he says, "for Englishmen or Americans to hope for much poetry in their drama till they have put a little more into their lives --- that is, until

1. Preface to RED, ix.
2. Introduction to M. Filon, EMD, p. 215.
the present reign of omnipotent, omnipresent commercial-
ism is at an end." And in 1890 he said that the drama-
tist "must make his characters speak the colloquial lan-
guage of the street and of the drawing-room. The least
departure from ordinary conversation can be detected by
every person in the audience." In his early plays he
used the soliloquy and "the aside" very freely, and de-
fended the use of both as useful dramatic conventions.
About 1894 he gave up the use of these devices except in
rare instances, and admitted that they are "to some
extent disturbing and destructive of vraisemblance",
and at the same time declared that "there is no possi-
bility of any great, subtle dramatic creation without
soliloquy."

Jones's arguments seem to be directed against the
extremes and extravagances of realism rather than against
the principle itself. Although he generally seems to re-
gard realism as an absolute body of doctrine, sometimes
he perceives that it is only a tendency. In 1891 he said:

"But if it is urged that the realists are only clai-
moring for an approach to lifelikeness -- for getting as
near nature as possible -- if this is all they want, then
they yield their point, and it becomes at once a question
of selection and degree. The fact is, every dramatist is

1. Literature and the Modern Drama (1906), FND, p. 56.
   Cf. also The Theatre and the Mob (1883), RED, p. 21.
2. Fortnightly Review, 54:3.
3. See table given by Hans Teichmann in Henry Arthur
   Jones' Dramen, p. 51.
4. See RED, pp 247-249.
a realist and an idealist in different proportions, and every play is a blend of realism and idealism." 1.

Mr. A. B. Walkley in an interesting essay on Jones called The Realist in Spite of Himself (1890) finds Jones's arguments confused, inconsistent, and incompatible with his own practice. Among other things Walkley wrote:

"I am sorry that Mr. Jones should have chosen the present moment to run a-tilt against stage realism. Here is a man who, on the morrow of writing a play (Judah) far truer, stronger, sincerer than his other plays precisely because it is more realistic, asks us to reject stage realism as contemptible and untrue! M. Jourdain....spoke prose without knowing it, but he at least refrained from pouring contempt on the prose he unconsciously used. The outcry against realism usually proceeds from the stupid and Philistine, from the people who take their ideas at second-hand, who have never been at the pains clearly to understand what realism is. With them the word has vague associations of Holywell Street, Jan van Beers' pictures, and a general sense of naughtiness. To find one of our foremost dramatists in such company is a thing young Mr. Juxon Prall would call deplorable. Mr. Jones appears to have a somewhat hazy notion of what realism is. He thinks it is something opposed to truth. He says the uneducated playgoer 'knows no difference between realism and truth'. Does then Mr. Jones know any? Does he imagine this to be a sound antithesis?" 2.

Jones's attack ignores the deeper psychological and philosophical implications of realism as a great force in modern art allied with the spirit of positive science. His criticism belongs historically to a definite controversy that raged during the closing decades of the nineteenth century --- a controversy that was couched in dogmatic and arbitrary terms that have already become obsolete.

1. On Playmaking (1891), RED, p. 245.
2. Playhouse Impressions, p. 123.

Closely connected with his attitude towards realism is Jones's view that there are certain laws, conditions, and conventions that the dramatic artist must accept. Many times he tells us that it is not enough for the dramatist to know life or to be able to write. The primary requirement is that certain conditions of the theatre shall be respected. Jones holds that the dramatist more than any other artist is subject to peculiar limitations, which are imposed by the theatre of his time. Novelists and poets may ignore the present and write for posterity; the dramatist must succeed at once or not at all. Unless a drama is immediately successful in a theatre it passes forever into oblivion. Some of these laws and conditions Jones seems to regard as inherent in the very nature of dramatic art; others are the variable conditions of time and place.

Underlying most of what Jones has to say on this subject is his view of the crowd and the requirements which it imposes. The crowd is regarded as a permanent and not a temporary condition; although it may be possible to improve public taste gradually, the crowd will always be master and impose its will upon the dramatist.

1. See RED, p. 4.

2. In a lecture on Being Rightly Amused at the Theatre (1887) Jones said: "You, as playgoers, have to decide which of these definitions shall describe the English drama of your day. We playwrights are in your hands. You are our masters; we obey your wishes: we slave to supply you with the entertainment that you demand. By your encouragement of this play and your rejection of that you decree what form English drama shall take in your generation." RED, p. 225.
In the dramatic theory and practice of Jones nothing is more essential than his view that the drama is a popular art or nothing at all. In this Jones allies himself with a school of criticism of which Brander Matthews is the noted exponent, and which is opposed to every attempt to segregate the lesser from the greater public. Referring to Brander Matthews Jones said in 1911:

"I am most heartily in accord with him upon all the fundamental principles and doctrines that form the staple of his teaching here. Especially do I give my fast adherence to his constant claim that the drama is first of all a popular art; that it must be primarily addressed not to students, to dilettanti, to coteries, to superior persons, but to the populace of its day; that in so far as it is literature, it must be literature that is understood of the multitude; that even the greatest and most profound dramatist must also be a popular playwright of his day; may, indeed, even be the hack playwright of his theatre, as were Shakespeare and Molière; to sum up -- that the drama is like religion, an affair of the whole people." 1.

There is scarcely a lecture or article of Jones in which he has not stressed this point. In 1891 he wrote:

"It will be noticed that I have throughout steadily maintained the necessity of a considerable amount of popular support as the foundation of any possible school of drama. ... Playwriting only exists by virtue of immediately pleasing a large section of the public. If it does not do this it has no raison d'être whatever." "Let any playwright, whose vats are bursting with an immortal vintage too good to be tapped at once by some tolerably large section of the public, be earnestly counselled to bottle it and cork it up for posterity in some other than the dramatic vessel. ... Shakespeare and Molière are the greatest dramatists of their nations. They are, and were, also its most popular playwrights." 2.

1. Aims and Duties of a National Theatre, a lecture delivered at Columbia University, 1911. END, p. 69.
Now what has been Jones’s view of the crowd and the necessities which it inevitably imposes upon the drama? That Jones has not entertained a very good opinion of the average theatre-going crowd is shown by numerous passages. He is constantly holding up to ridicule the intellectual sterility, vulgarity, and smug complacency of the ordinary British Philistine, who wields such preponderate influence in the theatre. Jones, however, knows to the eternal necessity of amusing this creature. Yet it would be comparatively easy to construct plays to appeal to mere Philistinism. But the theatre audience, as Jones has told us, is composed of all sorts and conditions. Its heterogeneous character is the one essential fact that no successful playwright can ignore. "Any popular play," he tells us, "in its every representation appeals to a more or less excited mob; all of different ages, with more or less different moods, different tempers, different tastes, different ideals, different opinions, different states of digestion, different emotions, different degrees of education." And again he declares: "Very few plays are permanently popular that do not recognize and provide for this necessarily composite character of every audience. It was a marked feature of Elizabethan audiences -- audiences that welcomed and applauded plays on the very highest levels of poetry and imagination."

1. Standardizing the Drama (1910), FND, p. 164.
2. Ibid., FND, p. 166.
Much of what Jones has said about "the science of the drama" is based upon this acceptance of the necessity of appealing to a motley popular audience. It explains the large amount of compromise and concession that Jones claims is necessary and which is found in his theory and in his plays. To adapt a play to a heterogeneous audience it is necessary to find a "common level ground of universal emotions," and also to please different tastes in different parts of the play. The dramatist "shapes his play so that each playgoer may be interested or amused at some time, and by some scene of the performance." Jones admits that this "sometimes mars the unity and perfection" of a work, but this is an unfortunate necessity. The first law of the drama, Jones tells us, is that the audience must not be bored; and from this it follows that "it is useless to write plays that are wide away from, or that are far ahead of, the tastes and habits of the general body of the theatre-going public."

On the other hand, it must not be supposed that Jones has willingly and without protest resigned himself to this compromise with inferior taste. The fact is that he has

1. See Our Modern Drama (1892), RED, p. 266.
2. Standardizing the Drama (1910), FND, p. 165.
3. Standardizing the Drama (1910), FND, pp. 165-166
4. Ibid., FND, p. 166
constantly chafed under what he calls the "hard conditions" imposed upon the playwright, and no one has fought more valiantly against vulgarity, banality, and the low standards of the shopkeeping manager. He is constantly saying that the chief cause for the degradation of the drama is its subserviency to the stage. The point is that Jones has not agreed with William Archer and other critics that the solution of the problem is in establishing theatres and producing plays that will appeal exclusively to a small, segregated, intellectual public. Jones has, on the contrary, dreamed of a national drama analogous to the national drama of England in the Elizabethan Age. Jones's whole argument seems to be based on historical analogy -- particularly the examples of Shakespeare and Molière. Shakespeare especially is Jones's dramatic Bible and furnishes the substratum of his whole dramatic theory.

Jones leans on Shakespeare very heavily for support in discussing the popular basis of dramatic art. Rejecting the idea of segregation, he finds the remedy in the gradual improvement of public taste. Although the public is master, it is not necessary to give it exactly what it wants. "Public taste is modifiable within very wide limits."

1. See Recognition of Drama by the State, FND, p. 99.
2. For Archer's view see The Drama in the Doldrums (1892) The Fortnightly Review, Vol. 58.
3. See, for example, RED, pp. 137, 166, 169, 186, 225.
He believes the bad taste of the mob is due in part to the false education which results from commercial pandering. Managers, actors, dramatists, and the more intelligent playgoers should work together to inaugurate a great national drama. "If there is to be any stability and permanence in the movement, it must be a national one. We must engage the sympathies and co-operation of all classes. We have many schisms and sects in religion: let us have none in the drama." Jones has moreover advocated various schemes for freeing the theatres from commercial management by means of endowment, subsidization, and municipal and government ownership. He believes the drama should be organized and recognized by the state. He has written and said much in advocacy of an English National Theatre to be owned and controlled by the government.

Yet curiously enough we find facts in the career of Jones that are hard to reconcile with his persistent hostility to coteries and schisms. For example, Jones was a member of Grein's Independent Theatre in 1891, and later he was a member of the English Stage Society. In his Censorship Muddle and a Way Out (1909) he speaks of both in terms of praise and gratitude. But the avowed aim of these and similar enterprises has been to give encouragement and support to an esoteric intellectual drama. In answer

2. Corner Stones of Modern Drama, FND, p. 37.
3. See The Recognition of the Drama by the State (1904), FND, p. 98.
4. FND, p. 334.
to the question, "Were you entirely in sympathy with Mr. Grein's aims and views?" Jones replied: "I have subscribed to all the side enterprises that have sprung up around the English theatre. They have shown some interesting work, but I question whether any one of them has had a permanent influence. The drama cannot and ought not to be esoteric. So far as I could discern Grein's aims and views, I have never been greatly in sympathy with them; but I thought at the time that the Independent Theatre might stir things in the regular theatre."  

However, the great bulk of Jones's theorizing about the drama is based upon its adaptation to the intellectual level of the general public. Jones from first to last has advocated and has himself tried to produce a dramatic art which will be immediately popular and at the same time will educate and elevate public taste. His antagonism to realism and the "drama of ideas" is because they run counter to the fundamental requirement that the audience must not be bored. This same requirement leads Jones to emphasize the importance of plot construction and the value of strong, emotional scenes and situations. Although professing contempt for the formula of Scribe and Sardou, in many respects he endorses the fundamental principles underlying

1. Letter to the writer, April 27, 1920.  
2. Jones opposes the "drama of ideas", but approves of having ideas in the drama. See the preface to The Divine Gift, p. 38.  
4. See RED, pp. 137, 250.
the "well-made play". Many of Jones's pronouncements on the necessity of accepting the conventions of the theatre are quite in accord with the views of Francisque Sarcey, who defined dramatic art as "l'ensemble des conventions universelles ou locales, éternelles ou temporaires à l'aide desquelles, en représentant la vie humaine sur un théâtre, on donne à un public l'illusion de la vérité." M. Sarcey also spoke much of the necessity of adapting theatrical art to the prejudices and intellectual limitations of the crowd. Jones's partial endorsement of melodrama is another thing that illustrates his allegiance to the popular conception of dramatic art and the older romantic theories of the drama. The crudities and extravagances of popular melodrama he condemns, but says, "The framework of every strong and moving play that was ever written is a melodrama." By this he means that great drama contains strong, stirring, and emotional scenes.

This emphasis on the emotional rather than the intellectual leads Jones to sympathize strongly with Brunetière's famous law of the drama based upon the will in conflict. Jones wrote an introduction to the English translation of Brunetière's Law of the Drama, in which he discussed William Archer's objections to the universal applicability of the law. Archer in his book entitled Playmaking.

2. See Ibid., p. 131.
3. The Drama and Real Life (1897) FND, 145.
pointed to Oedipus and Ghosts as exceptions to the law, on the ground that they are based on determinism, which led him to say that the essence of drama is not struggle but crisis. Jones attempted "to reconcile" the views of these eminent critics by showing that both are included in a larger law. "Drama arises," he says, "when any person or persons in a play are 'up against' some antagonistic person, or circumstance, or fortune." He then goes on to say that such a situation becomes most "arresting and intense when the obstacle takes the form of another human will in almost balanced collision." The essay is significant in showing that Jones believes that there is some universal law of the drama that distinguishes the dramatic from the undramatic, and that this law tends to give prominence to scenes of struggle, crisis, and emotional poignancy, and puts the stamp of disapproval upon the "slice-of-life" play, or what Jones calls the "Harum-scarum and Pentonville-omnibus schools of drama."

1. In his later writings Jones uses these terms repeatedly to indicate recent realistic and intellectual schools of drama. In his pamphlet on Municipal and Repertory Theatres (1913) he says: "We have lately seen the rise in England of two prominent schools of drama, which I have elsewhere called the 'Harum-scarum' and the 'Pentonville-omnibus' schools of drama. The Harum-scarum school in a brilliant, formless, reckless way rattles up our conventional morality and leaves the average playgoer standing on his head, uncertain as to what is right or wrong, or whether there is anything that is right or wrong ...The Pentonville-omnibus school gives us photographs of prosaic persons in their most prosaic surroundings, and solemnly reports their prosaic sayings and doings. Much really interesting work has been done in both these schools. But I will ask the promoters of the repertory theatre whether their failure may not be partly accounted for by the fact that they have baffled playgoers with too much "Harum-scarum" drama and too much Pentonville omnibus drama. (p. 29)
In conclusion it may be said that the dramatic criticism of Henry Arthur Jones shows a constant tendency to find the *via media* between conflicting views, and to combine older romantic and theatrical theories of the drama with the more recent realistic and intellectual theories. His theory is a piece of eclecticism and compromise, — the theory of a practical playwright in a complex age, who must please audiences with a great variety of intellectual and emotional demands. On the one hand, the drama should deal seriously with the issues of the age, it should be a part of the national literature, it should be a faithful representation of life, and it should eschew theatricality and artificial stage devices; on the other hand, its aim is to give immediate pleasure, it belongs to the theatre as well as to literature, it must maintain a contrast with real life, and it must respect the necessary conventions and laws of dramatic art.

There is throughout the underlying assumption that all great and worthy drama appeals to the many as well as to the few. Therefore the dramatist must make the necessary concessions to the unintellectual majority, and at the same time he should strive to be an artist and not make the judicious grieve. This view, however, is challenged by many modern critics like Ludwig Lewissohn, who believes that the most notable achievements of the modern drama have been accomplished by those who have gathered
about themselves a limited intellectual following. 1.

One of the most important changes during the last thirty years has been the breaking up of the one great public into several publics with widely different intellectual demands. But Henry Arthur Jones formulated his theories and methods in an earlier period, when the theatre had become popularized, and he has never readjusted his principles or his art to this later development.

1. See the Bookman, February, 1920.
Chapter III.

SOURCES OF JONES'S IDEAS.

Up to this point we have said little in regard to Jones's ideas and the intellectual content of his work. Yet it is precisely upon the basis of his ideas that many people would be inclined to judge the value and permanent interest of his writings. Nearly all would admit that Jones is an able dramatic craftsman; the tendency to discount his work in some quarters is due more to the character and quality of his thinking. It will be the purpose of this chapter to analyze the influences that have informed the mind and purpose of Jones and that account for his outstanding moral and intellectual attitudes, to show how these influences are reflected in his work, and to establish as accurately as possible Jones's position in the modern revolt against the bourgeois standards of the Victorian era. It will be found that these influences are varied and complex, and the problem that is here attempted is by no means a simple one.

1. See A. B. Walkley's Drama and Life, pp. 42-44.
1. INFLUENCES.

1. Religious Training.

In the first place the religious influences of his childhood are of great importance. The atmosphere of his early home was Puritan to a marked degree. In an interview Jones is reported to have said: "My bringing-up had been almost Puritan, and my mother herself had never entered a theatre until she was persuaded to go and see my Silver King." A strict religious training seems to have had two results. On the one hand, it produced a reaction, which took the form of pronounced antagonism to bigotry, sectarianism, and asceticism; throughout his writings there are many raps at theologists and religious narrowness. On the other hand, it gave to Jones an outlook that has remained essentially religious and moral. In answer to the question, "What have been your church affiliations both in childhood and later life?" Jones replied:

"Till I was about twenty I was connected with Baptist and Congregational Chapels. I owe much to my Puritan training, and gladly acknowledge the debt. Religion was a reality to the Puritans. But the hard ugly narrowness of the creed repelled me, and as soon as I began to read and think for myself I rejected its theology. I have never been a member of any church. There is something ludicrous to me in the idea. But I am convinced that religion is the first necessity for the individual and for a nation; and I've never been so much convinced as today. If I were obliged to classify myself I should call myself 'a believer'." 2.

2. In a letter to the writer, April 27, 1920.
His religious outlook is revealed in the sympathetic and reverent treatment of religious characters and themes that are found in many of his plays. An astonishing number of his heroes are clergymen. For example, we have Richard Capel in *A Clerical Error*, Jacob Fletcher in *Saints and Sinners*, Llewellyn Judah in *Judah*, Michael Faversham in *Michael and His Lost Angel*, Edgar Linnell in *The Hypocrites*, and Sylvanus Rebbings in *The Evangelist*. No one can read plays like *Judah*, *Michael and His Lost Angel*, and *The Hypocrites* without feeling Jones's deeply ingrained Puritanism.

Jones's religion, however, is not attached to forms, creeds, or churches. In fact, towards institutional religion he exhibits considerable antagonism. He refers to the church as "an archaeological museum of fossil dogmas" and speaks of "the stale, withered husks that our two hundred sects fodder themselves on"; but in regard to the religion of the spirit he declares: "Religion can never be in danger. One might as well try to do something to help gravitation as to help religion; As if any of us could escape from it!"

His attitude towards the Bible also bears on this question. Jones's familiarity with the Scriptures is

shown by his frequent allusions and quotations, which always reveal an attitude of reverence. In 1893 he made a plea for the use of Bible stories on the stage, and concluded by saying:

"I see no reason why the great human stories of the Bible should not be utilized on our stage. I am speaking here with the utmost reverence for a Book, or rather Books, which I have dearly loved and constantly studied from my childhood, which have been my classics, and which will, I hope, when our nation has purged its eyesight so as to be able to understand them, continue to be 'a master light of all our seeing.'" 1.

2. The World's Great Literature.

Although Jones had a limited education, he is nevertheless a man of that kind of broad culture, which is gained from extensive reading. In his dramatic essays he alludes frequently to the world's great poets and writers. Although his reading has been varied and extensive, he has kept for the most part to the broad highway of permanent literature. He has never cultivated obscure or eccentric philosophers and poets; it is to the great universal fountains of wisdom and sanity that he appeals constantly. The poet who has influenced Jones most is, of course, Shakespeare; we have already had occasion to refer to Jones's unbounded admiration for Shakespeare in discussing his theory of the drama. He has a similar attitude of respect and admiration towards Dante, Milton,

1. The Bible on the Stage, RED, 122.
2. See p. 69.
and Goethe. He refers to "our sacred Milton" and calls
Goethe "the greatest and sanest voice that has been
heard in Europe since Bacon." Jones also has a spe-
cial fondness for the classic humorists and for sane sa-
tirists such as Rabelais, Cervantes, and Molière. Next
to Shakespeare there is no dramatist of the past that he
refers to more often and with greater respect than to Mo-
lière. From these great writers Jones derived his deep-
er prepossessions and moral concepts.

His attitude towards the special problems of his own
time is colored by the influence of certain Victorian wri-
ters, such as Arnold, Ruskin, Morris, Dickens, Mill, Hux-
ley, and Spencer. The influence of some of these is so
important as to require special consideration. We shall
try to show presently that he derived from Arnold, Ruskin,
and Morris most of his opinions on present-day moral, so-
cial, and aesthetic questions, and that he gained from
Huxley and Spencer a vein of rationalistic and scienti-
fic thought.

This bit of testimony in regard to Jones's library
was furnished by A. J. Hamilton:

1. RED, 20.
2. FND, 322.
3. See FND, 22.
"A large bookcase occupies a prominent position along one side of the study. Unextensive, but good, are its contents. Ruskin and Matthew Arnold fill two shelves. Copies of the scientific and philosophical treatises of Huxley, Darwin, and Herbert Spencer, and the greatest modern proponent of realism, Ibsen, fill two more, while works of all the standard English poets, dramatists, and humorists are thoroughly represented." 1.

In a letter to the present writer Jones has given some valuable testimony as to the important influences to be found in his work. After speaking of Arnold as the author who influenced him especially in his early days, he has this to say about his reading:

"Other authors and thinkers who, at different times and in different ways, have colored and informed my work, are Rabelais (one of the great creative intellects as Coleridge calls him), Montaigne, -- these two in Urquhart's and Florio's translations respectively -- Milton (poetry and prose, -- I often roll out a book of Paradise Lost for the delight of listening to its organ music), Sir Thomas Browne, Jeremy Taylor (so sensuous and so spiritual, perhaps the most seductive English prose writer), Ruskin, Herbert Spencer, Carlyle, George Eliot (sadly faded now), Huxley, Newman, Darwin, Mill, Wordsworth, Voltaire, (he has constantly pricked and stimulated me), Rousseau (I find him charming but not fortifying), Goethe (in Bohn's translations -- I ought to know him better), Swinburne, William Morris (both of whom I knew very well), the incomparable Molière, Congreve, Vanbrugh, Fielding, Sterne, Anatole France, and of course, the most dearly loved and most companionable of them all, Charles Dickens. For the moment I had forgotten three writers to whom I constantly return, -- De Quincey, Swift, and (as great a satirist, more sly, more subtle, more humane) Samuel Butler of Erewhon. You see I have not strayed away from the beaten track, but some parts of it I have trodden many times. I have no knowledge of the Greek and Latin classics, except in translations. I have not the least pretensions to scholarship....Let me confess my deep gratitude to Emerson, Walt Whitman, and Mark Twain, and as another afterthought I mention North's Plutarch, Cervantes, and John Bunyan -- an odd trio." 2.

2. Letter to the present writer, April 27, 1920.
3. The Victorian Influence.

In determining Jones's position in the intellectual development of the modern drama it is very necessary to establish his relation to Victorian literature and thought. Many recent writers -- for example, Shaw, Galsworthy, Barker, and H. G. Wells -- present a fundamental challenge to Victorian doctrines on all moral, economic, and social questions. Henry Arthur Jones, on the other hand, -- as we expect to show -- represents in the drama the revolt of the more vigorous Victorian minds against the vulgarity and materialism of bourgeois civilization, without calling in question many bourgeois doctrines. Let us consider several aspects of the Victorian influence on Jones:

(1) Science. -- In considering Jones's reading we have found references to the scientific writers of the nineteenth century, particularly to Darwin, Huxley, and Spencer. Jones's interest in science is important, because it gives to his work a modernism that it would not otherwise possess. The impregnation of literature with scientific rationalism is perhaps the chief cause of the modern revolt against romanticism and idealism as seen in Samuel Butler and Bernard Shaw. Jones's admiration for Samuel Butler is an interesting point in this connection.
We have abundant evidence that Jones paid considerable attention to scientific thought in his earlier days. In an interview Jones is reported to have said: "I also went in for a great deal of scientific literature in those days (speaking of his Bradford experience). I read Darwin and Spencer carefully, to the deepening of the whole of one's life and views of life. Such training is especially useful to a dramatist. Jones's attitude towards science is also shown in the following passage written in 1889:

"When the dust that we have raised round ourselves has cleared away, and this age and its works can be dispassionately viewed and weighed, who can doubt that its prime achievements, its crowning glories, its great prizes will be adjudged to science? Calm, invincible, celestial minister, whose still small voice is beginning to be heard above the ravings of our two hundred sects, whose healing secrets are for all ears, how surely is thy future rule over all the turbulent, disordered human race!" 2.

Jones occasionally refers to biological facts and principles in his essays. In 1910 he delivered a lecture (before the Ethological Society, of which he himself was a member) in which he set forth the mechanistic and physiological view in psychology with apparent sympathy and considerable familiarity with the literature and technicalities of the subject. In another place he complained that the scientist is not portrayed fairly and truthfully upon the stage, but is represented as "a weak-minded, insincere, comic old fool".

1. Raymond Blathwayt, The Idler, 1894, 4:70.
2. RED, 60.
3. The Delineation of Character in Drama, FND, 180.
4. RED, 60.
Jones has introduced scientific men into some of his plays, and the portrait is always dignified and attractive. We recall Professor Jopp in Judah with his honest skepticism and his fearless search for the truth. It must be confessed, however, that some of his scientists like the astronomer in The Masqueraders and Dr. Carey in The Physician are somewhat too romantic to be convincing.

Raymond Blathwayt has also recorded the following significant utterance of Jones, which shows that his aim was to bring the drama into contact with science as well as with literature:

"The play of the future will, I think, be influenced by the scientific spirit far more than in the past. There will be far greater care for scientific accuracy in character drawing and attempts to deal with questions of the day, and the later discoveries of psychology will be reflected on the stage. The stage has a very great future before it, if it shows itself worthy and up to the scientific movement which began with Darwin."

It can be readily seen that this scientific study and interest was an important factor in his development. It helped to give his work intellectual fibre and to counterbalance his natural tendency towards emotionalism and romanticism. It was perhaps one of the agencies that freed his mind from religious dogma and gave him that outlook of tolerance and latitudinarianism that we have already noted.

1. The Idler, 1894, 4:72.
The Aesthetic Movement. --- Another important influence to be taken into consideration is the aesthetic movement of the Victorian period. Jones's dramatic theory and his whole conception of the function and social bearings of the theatre are colored to a marked degree by the aesthetic and social ideas of Morris, Ruskin, and Matthew Arnold. It is important to note that it is the earlier aestheticism with social and ethical motives and implications that we find in Jones rather than the aesthetic individualism of Pater and Wilde. Towards the eccentricities of fin de siècle aestheticism and decadence his attitude has been one of amused tolerance. In this mood he refers to the "cult of the sunflower" and to "latter-day supersubtle pleasure-seekers" who find in "boredom in the very avatar of delight". In the aestheticism of Jones, as in that of Morris, Ruskin, and Arnold, there is a clear recognition of the social value of art and the importance of bringing beauty and culture to the masses. Jones looked upon the theatre as another agency for accomplishing the social aims of the aesthetic movement. This attitude is expressed in the following characteristic utterance:

1. RED, 130.
2. RED, 93, 94.
"If we wish to inflame these millions and millions of
city dwellers with enthusiasm for great national ideals; if
we wish to persuade them to care for the things that are
more excellent, for the things of the intellect and the
spirit; if we wish to sweeten their manners, to refine
their tastes, to create a daily beauty instead of a dai-
ly ugliness in their lives, what instrument could be so
swiftly and surely operative to these ends as a wisely-
conceived, wisely-regulated, and wisely-encouraged na-
tional drama."

Let us now consider, respectively, his special re-
lation to William Morris, John Ruskin, and Matthew Arnold.

William Morris. -- Jones tells us that he knew Wil-
liam Morris very well, and he unquestionably derived from
Morris much of his interest in the decorative arts and
crafts. His attitude towards Morris and this phase of the
aesthetic movement is clearly expressed as follows:

"Take, again, the aesthetic movement. Did the great
British public get a glimmer of William Morris's lofty
idea of making every home in England beautiful? No. It
got a notion into its head that a set of idiotic fops had
gone crazy in worship of sunflowers; so it giggled and de-
rided, and went back to its geometric-patterned Brussels
carpets, its flock wall-papers, and all the damnable trum-
pery of Tottenham Court Road. The movement was thought to
be killed, but it was only scotched; and whatever beauty
there is in English interiors, whatever advance has been
made in decorating our homes, is due to that movement."

This interest in domestic arts and in interior dec-
oration crops out again in the following passage:

"Even the simplest domestic art, the art of making
a copper kettle, must have this prepared and cultivated
soil. In the farm-house where I was born every utensil,
every piece of crockery, every piece of furniture was a
thing of beauty. You would give a great deal of money
for it in your curiosity shops today."

1. Lecture on The Foundations of a National Drama, (1904)
FND, 4.
2. Introduction to M. Filon, FND, p. 214.
3. FND, p. 74.
Quite in accordance with this temper are the descriptions that are given of Jones's residence in 1894, when he occupied the house which had been owned and decorated by the artist, Alma Tadema. A. J. Hamilton has told us this about it:

"Townsend House is an ideal home for a dramatist. An air of art seems to pervade the whole place and its surroundings.... The room (speaking of the studio) is furnished with artistic Chippendale furniture. Mr. Jones's horror of shams and veneer, in every shape, extends to his surroundings, and every article about the place bears evidence as to the sincerity and genuineness of its originators." 1

And Raymond Blathwayt, after giving a similar description of the interior, says: "The whole mise-en-scène is in strict accordance with the life and habits of a man who, more than anyone else, has done so much to bring together English literature and the English stage." 2

Jones is a firm believer in old-fashioned methods of craftsmanship. In his latest work, Patriotism and Popular Education (1919), he thinks that flimsy dishonest workmanship is one of the chief causes of our modern economic ills. He speaks of "the rickety chairs, the drawers that will not slide, and all the other trumpery inconveniences that make our working-class homes so miserable and uninhabitable." 3

2. The Idler, 1894, V. 4, p. 67f.
3. Ibid., p. 11.
He also says: "The design and shape of most of our modern furniture justifies the current slang epithet, 'appalling.' In all the decoration of our lower and middle-class homes, the more taste we pretend to, the less taste we have."

All this has an important bearing upon Jones's theory of the drama. It explains in part his unwillingness to put ugly and sordid scenes upon the stage. If the theatre is to be used to sweeten the manners and to refine the taste of the masses, it must present beautiful interiors, artistic decorations, and refined and cultivated modes of life. It would follow that the playwright would have to limit his material to sections of life that would make this possible. It is an interesting and significant fact that when Jones had full control of the stage mounting, during the four months when he was manager of the Avenue Theatre, he secured the advice of William Morris on the stage furnishings for The Crusaders.

John Ruskin. -- The influence of Ruskin seems to be of special importance in accounting for some of Jones's characteristic attitudes. That he had read Ruskin assiduously is borne out by numerous passages found in his critical essays and prefaces. Many times, for example, he inveighs against the ugliness and sordidness of modern industrialism and the desecration of natural beauty in a manner that is unmistakably Ruskinian.

2. This was in the fall of 1891. In the preface to The Theatre of Ideas Jones said, referring to The Crusaders, "I gave William Morris carte blanche for the scenery and furniture, and he advised me on the whole production." p. 12.
In 1884 he published an essay called *A Playwright's Gam­ble*, which begins with a quotation from Ruskin and seems almost a paraphrase from his writings. It opens with a picture of an "untainted English landscape", where "there is no railroad within five miles: no gas, but plenty of clean air; no water-companies, but plenty of clean water." From this he goes on to show what industrialism has done to England. Now reminiscent of Ruskin is the following passage:

"The test of any social state is not its power to shelter and teem with hopeless, sickly, impoverished, degraded millions, but its power to produce, in however restricted quantities, average happy, healthy individuals; not its power to compel hecatombs of human organisms into dull, blind uniformity of ceaseless toil, but its power to allow free men free development of character and choice of healthy labour. What can be more striking than the difference between the average Englishman of two generations ago, as any country-bred middle-aged man can recall him from memories of childhood, and the probable average Englishman of two generations to come, the typical Englishman we are menaced with, when railways and steam tram-cars shall have done their perfect work, and having provided us with means of going everywhere at a moment's notice, shall have left us no longer any place worth going to or stopping at?" 2.

Another evidence of Ruskin's influence is found in the Prologue to *The Tempter*, in which Jones speaks of

"the reek of this stockjobbing age,
Its wan-face railway herds, its wealth, its illth,
The muddy ferment of its greed, and rage
Of blind, deaf, mad, industrial war."

2. *RMD*, 149.
   Cf.: "To go fast from this place to that, with nothing to do either at one or the other: these are powers certainly." Fors Clavigera, Vol. I, Letter 5. *Library Edition*, XXVII, 86-'7.
The thought here is characteristic of Ruskin, but the
word illth, meaning the opposite of wealth, is one that
Ruskin coined.

The most important aspect of Ruskin's influence,
however, is in giving support to many of his ideas about
the drama. We have conclusive evidence that Jones accep­
ted Ruskin's art theories and adapted them to the theatre.
In his lecture on Our Modern Drama (1892) he calls Ruskin
"the greatest art critic the world has ever seen", and
then gives this quotation from Ruskin, which he applies to
the drama: "The end of art is not to amuse. All art which
proposes amusement as its end, or which is sought for that
end, must be of an inferior, and is probably of a harmful,
class." Near the close of a lecture on The Dramatic
Outlook (1884) he acknowledges that Ruskin has been the
source of many of his dramatic opinions as follows:

"Here, as in many other places of my address, I am
translating from the rules of art that Ruskin laid down
forty years ago in his Modern Painters. Indeed, if you
will but study him, you will find that much of what he
has said there may be as usefully applied to the criti­
cism of the drama as to the criticism of pictures." 3.

1. Ruskin used the word illth for the first time in Unto
2. RED, 263.
3. RED, 184.

CF: "To go fast from this place to that, with nothing
to do either at one or the other: these are powers
certainly." Fors Clavigera, Vol I. Letter 5. Library
It can be readily seen that Jones's theory of the drama agrees with most of Ruskin's fundamental ideas in aesthetics. For example, Jones's emphasis upon the seriousness and social importance of the theatre is precisely what Ruskin had taught about the fine arts generally. In 1904 Jones said:

"It would, I suppose, be generally agreed in any gathering of educated persons that the measure of a people's advance in the fine arts is the measure of their distance from the brutes; that in reality art is not merely auxiliary to civilization, but may almost be said to be civilization itself. 'Life without art is', as Ruskin says, 'mere brutality'. Even religion itself is apt to become a crude and ghoulish superstition the moment it is separated from art." 1.

Jones proceeds to apply this specifically to the drama.

Jones's attitude towards sordid naturalism is also thoroughly Ruskinian; compare Ruskin's view of the Dutch school of painting. Consider moreover Jones's insistence that deception and illusion should not be attempted upon the stage. "It is with the drama", he tells us, "as it is with painting: the greatest and worthiest and most enduring things cannot be rendered in exact copy of nature. As Ruskin says: 'You can paint a cat or fiddle so that it may be mistaken for real life, but you cannot paint the Alps in such a manner.' So it is with the human passions." 2

1. FND, pp. 1-2.
2. Compare Jones's view of realism with the following quotation from Ruskin: "It is not, therefore, detail sought for its own sake, not the calculable bricks of the Dutch house-painters, nor the numbered hairs and mapped wrinkles of Denner, which constitute great art; they are the lowest and most contemptible art; but it is detail referred to a great end, sought for the sake of the inestimable beauty which exists in the slightest and least of God's works, and treated in a manly, broad, and impressive manner." Preface to the Second Edition of Modern Painters, Library Edition, III, 32.
3. RED, pp. 165-166.
Jones's view that the great aim of the drama is to portray character and emotion offers a close parallel to Ruskin's conception of portrait painting. And when Jones says that "the four great qualities that any work of art can possess, be it play, picture, poem, or statue, are beauty, mystery, passion, imagination", he is giving us the very heart of Ruskin's art creed.

One of the most important ideas that Jones derived from Ruskin (and from Arnold also) is the close dependence of the drama upon national ideals and healthy social conditions. Jones had the same idea about the theatre that Ruskin had about architecture, -- that it should express national life and character. Just as Ruskin sought for the cause of the decay and sterility of English art in commercialism and industrialism, Jones finds similar hindrances to the development of a great national drama. In his lecture on The Foundations of a National Drama (1904) he devotes much space to the analysis of social conditions in England. He finds a large proportion of the English people "living dull, ugly, monotonous sedentary lives, packed

1. Ruskin said: "If you ask any portrait-painter how he gets his likeness, he will tell you, it is not by attention to the form of particular features -- the technicality of countenance -- but by aiming first at the marked expression of individual character, then in touching in the features over this." Library Edition I, 421-422.

2. See Ruskin's lecture on Traffic, in The Crown of Olive, II.
together in little, dull, ugly, square, drab, brick boxes.... denying themselves access to pure air, and to most of the primary conditions of healthy, dignified human existence." Then he proceeds to show the bearing of this upon the drama:

"You are thinking that I ought not to have said that; you are thinking it is quite wide of the subject of my lecture. No, believe me, it is the very essence of my subject. These things are all of a piece; all the strands and fibres of our national life are tensely connected with each other and are interdependent. The careless disorganization and confusion of thought that reign in our drama is all of a piece with the careless disorganization and confusion of thought that reign in other and more important matters."

Matthew Arnold. — There cannot be much question that the most important Victorian influence on Jones came from Matthew Arnold. If Ruskin intensified his romantic and emotional tendencies, Arnold strengthened the intellectual, scientific, and Aristotelian qualities which are such an important part of his make-up. There is much in Jones that recalls Arnold's clearness of vision, freedom from illusions, wholesome sanity and balance; aloofness from sects, parties and special causes; in a word, that disinterested endeavor to see things as they really are.

1. FND, 3.
2. In 1889 Jones spoke of "the wise Arnoldian precept about seeing things as they are." FND, 58.
In a letter to the present writer Jones explicitly acknowledges that of his earlier contemporaries Arnold influenced him the most. This is what he says:

"You are right in thinking that I owe much to Matthew Arnold, to his poetry as much as to his essays. Arnold is much more sincere, penetrating, and fearless religious thinker than Tennyson or Browning; the last long chant in 'Empedocles on Etna' is the best modern expression of my own religious feeling, though it is not the highest example of Arnold's poetry. And Arnold was such a delightful man - charming, accessible, unaffected, and as Lord Chief Justice Coleridge called him - 'the most distinguished Englishman of his generation'. After the Bible and Shakespeare Arnold perhaps influenced me more than any other writer in my early days." 1.

Jones's admiration for Arnold as a thinker also appears in an article written in 1883 in which he says:

"The one main reason why we have no great national modern drama, the reason from which all other reasons shoot and branch, is deeply rooted in the present social condition of the English people at large. It has been finely and truly indicated by him who most of all our teachers of this age has 'seen life steadily and seen it whole', and who, looking upon all the vast maze of our complex religious, political, and artistic life, has read each wound and each weakness clearly, and, striking his finger upon the place, has said, 'Thou art here and here'." 2.

Jones proceeds to quote from Arnold's article in the Nineteenth Century Review, August, 1879.

2. The Theatre and the Mob, RED, 14.
Cf. Arnold's tribute to Goethe in Memorial Verses.
The literary relations between Matthew Arnold and Henry Arthur Jones are of great interest and considerable importance in the history of the dramatic movement. As early as 1879 Jones was pretty well saturated with Arnold's influence, for in this year he wrote an admiring letter to his master and sent him two manuscripts, one called A Garden Party and the other his play, A Clerical Error. In his reply of October 14, 1879, Arnold praised the first and said that he hoped to see A Clerical Error on the stage. The following excerpt from Arnold's letter clearly reveals the attitude of Jones: "Many thanks for your two pieces, and for your letter with its most kind expressions. I produce little effect upon the general public, but I have some excellent readers nevertheless; I may count you as one of them."

In 1882 Jones sent Arnold an invitation to visit the first performance of The Silver King, offering to reserve a box for him. In his reply, November 2, 1882, Arnold suggested that some later time might be more convenient; but added, "If, however, you care much about my coming to see the first representation, let me know the day, and unless I am actually engaged, I will come." 2.

2. Ibid., II, 242.
That he attended the first performance is indicated in a letter to John Morley, the editor of the Pall Mall Gazette, under date of November 19, 1882, in which he asks, "Shall I write you a letter with the impressions called forth by the first representation of The Silver King?"  

The place that Arnold holds in Jones's mental development is clearly shown in the following excerpt from the same letter: "I know nothing of the author personally, but he wrote saying he had nourished himself on my works and wished I would go to his first representation. I resisted, but went at last, expecting to be bored, but am highly pleased." Arnold wrote a very commendatory article on The Silver King, which was published in the Pall Mall Gazette, December 6, 1882.

In the spring of 1884 Jones sent stalls to Arnold for the Chatterton, a play which Arnold did not enjoy especially, for in his letter of May 20, 1884, he said: "The thing is too painful. I feel so strongly the defects of a situation where 'everything is to be endured, nothing to be done,' that I suppressed a dramatic sketch of my own on that account."

2. Ibid., II, 312.
Arnold's letter to Jones, December 23, 1884, in regard to *Saints and Sinners* is of special importance as showing the moral quality in Jones's plays that pleased Arnold and which is to a large extent a result of Arnold's influence. The letter runs as follows:

"I went to see *Saints and Sinners*, and my interest was kept up throughout, as I expected. You have remarkably the art -- so valuable in drama -- of exciting interest and sustaining it. The piece is full of good and telling things, and one cannot watch the audience without seeing that by strokes of this kind faith in the middle-class fetish is weakened, however, slowly, as it could in no other way.

"I must add that I dislike seduction-dramas (even in *Faust* the feeling tells with me), and that the marriage of the heroine with her farmer does not please me as a dénouement.

"Your representative middle-class man was well drawn and excellently acted." 1.

In later years Jones has acknowledged that Arnold overpraised his "crude early work". He takes considerable pride, however, in the fact that he drew Arnold "to take an interest in the modern acted drama" after an absence from the theatre for a quarter of a century. He concludes by saying:

"His advent, however, in the theatre....was of signal benefit to the struggling English drama; inasmuch as it called attention to the fact that work was being done on the modern stage which was worth the attention and examination of a scholar and man of letters. And this told with the general public. I think I may claim that under shelter of the counterpane Matthew Arnold lent me, I did some useful work for the modern drama. Let us forgive any kindly mistake he may have made in forming too favorable an estimate of my early plays." 2.

2. Preface to The Divine Gift (1913) p. 22.
When we turn to Jones's essay and plays, it is not hard to detect the echoes of various Victorian voices and especially the influence of Matthew Arnold. That Jones has had very strong convictions and that his plays and essays are filled with a spirit of protest are evident to the most casual reader. A careful study of his works will reveal that most of his moral strength has been thrown against three things: Puritanism, Philistinism, and hypocrisy. These three things are not always clearly differentiated, but are often found combined as traits in the same individual. Jones's Puritans are likely to be hypocrites and Philistines at the same time, and Jones often uses these terms more or less interchangeably as indicating a certain section of the British public, -- the dissenting middle-class against which Arnold wrote so many caustic things.

Although Jones's Puritans are nearly all of them Philistines, they are not invariably hypocrites. We have a few examples of sincere and honest Puritans in his plays, such as Deacon Boothroyd in *The Deacon* and Drusilla's Quaker father in *The Dancing Girl*. Jones looks upon zealous, narrow Puritanism as a species of fanaticism which has caused the eclipse of art and the degradation of the stage. There are numerous passages in his essays where his attitude is expressed. For instance:
"What a blank and stupefying denial of all the geni­al humane qualities of our nature is implied in the re­cent wholesale condemnation of the theatre by the great Boanerges of the Baptists! But the truth is that reli­gious persons, after having vilified the theatre for two centuries, are fast coming back to it. Not all Mr. Spur­geon's shoutings to his flock to stay and batten in his sheep-pens on the barren, dismal moor of hyper-Calvinism will long keep them from straggling down to the green pas­tures and broad waters of the nation's intellectual life."1.

The earliest play revealing this attitude is the two­act sketch called The Deacon, which was written about 1879 or 1880, although produced for the first time in 1890.2 The play deals with the character of Deacon Abraham Booth­royd, who is described as a "stout, broad-blown, pompous, self-important Philistine, the type and flower of narrow provincial dissent." He is a sausage manufacturer from Chipping Padbury. He comes to the city and is induced much against his will to enter the theatre for the first time to see Romeo and Juliet. He has never heard of Shakespeare, his reading having been confined to Zion's Trumpet, The British Banner, Harvey's Meditations Among the Tombs, and Doddridge on the Doxology. He is, however, so carried away by the performance that he resolves to build a theatre in Chipping Padbury and have Shakespeare played to his two hundred and fifty hands.

2. See The Times, August 28, 1890. The Theatre (1890-2, p. 185) says: "It is generally understood that Mr. Jones wrote this piece some years ago, in fact, about the same time as he did A Clerical Error. Even all those years ago, the author must have had the same conviction that plays should be written with a purpose, for The Deacon is evidently intended to hold up to ridicule the narrow­mindedness and bigotry of those in high places."
In *Saints and Sinners* the attack is not made against sincere Puritanism, but against the greed and hypocrisy of the Victorian middle-class, or what we might call the alliance between commercialism and evangelical Christianity. This is represented in the character of Hoggard, the principal business man of Steepleford and the Deacon of Bethel Chapel. He exhibits a curious mixture of piety, mock humility, and shrewd business sagacity in his attempt to make the most of two worlds. To him religion is the handmaid of commerce, and he expects good financial returns upon his investment of twenty pounds a year in the local church. The plot hinges in part upon the attempt of Hoggard to secure the consent of Pastor Fletcher to a dishonest business deal. Failing in his purpose, he threatens the minister not only with dismissal but also with the exposure of his daughter's shame. The tradesman's point of view is also portrayed in the character of Prabble, the Junior Deacon. Prabble is the shopkeeper of the community; feeling the competition of "the stores" he is especially anxious that the minister should denounce them from the pulpit. He also thinks that the minister is not quite sound on the doctrine of predestination.
Another treatment of Puritan bigotry and hypocrisy is to be found in *The Triumph of the Philistines* (1895). The title is somewhat misleading, as the play deals with Puritanism rather than with Philistinism. William Archer notes the common objection at the time "that they are not Philistines and that they do not triumph." The play tells of how Jorgan and Pote, wholesale boot manufacturers of Market Pewbury, lead a zealous band of local tradesmen in an attempt to destroy an art studio which they believe to be a corrupting influence in the pious little town. Their wrath has been aroused at the rumor of a nude picture which had been painted by the artist, Willie Hasselwood, from his French model, Sally Lebrune. An investigating committee headed by Jorgan confirms the report, and the offending picture is destroyed by one of the band. Jorgan, however, in the end turns out a hypocrite, as he is unable to resist the allurements of the French model, with whom he becomes deeply involved. The other Puritans in the crusade are simply sincere and zealous fanatics.

The descriptions given of these characters are of interest as exhibiting, not only Jones's typical satire, but also his tendency to caricature in the manner of Dickens. For example, Miss Soar, who is carrying on a campaign against low-necked dresses, is described as

1. Theatrical World for 1895, p. 164.
"a maiden lady of about thirty-five, very nervous and
delicate-looking, in a very plain dress, with a very
high collar all round the neck, a pale, sharp face, fea-
tures drawn into an expression of pained earnestness. She
enters hurriedly, panting, one hand on chest, the other
carrying a bundle of pamphlets."  

The didactic purpose of this play is stated quite
explicitly in the author's preface:

"Looking round upon my countrymen, upon their smug
and banal ways of living, their smug and banal forms of
religion, their smug and banal terror and ignorance of
art, their smug and banal haste to make the most of two
worlds, I concluded that the most necessary moral to
drive home to Englishmen today is the wholesome one con­
tained in a verse of Ecclesiastes, 'Be not righteous
overmuch: why shouldst thou destroy thyself?'"

And Lady Beauboys echoes the same thought when she says
to Sir Valentine: "He'll beat you, Val. You're fighting
the strongest force in English life --- that black, bit­
ter, stubborn Puritanism that you'll never change, my
dear boy, till you've changed the climate of the coun-
try and the very bone and marrow of our English race."

In The Hypocrites (1906) Jones again attacked the
selfishness and religiosity of a small town. Here the
principal hypocrites are Mr. and Mrs. Wilmore, who are
pillars in the local church, but are full of trickery
and deceit. The curate, Edgar Linnell, is a more aggres-
sive type than the meek, long-suffering Fletcher in

Saints and Sinners, The play tells of Linnell's struggle to bring about a marriage between Wilmore's son Lennard and a girl whom he had wronged. In doing this he incurs the wrath of the boy's parents, who find their worldly interests jeopardized. Although Jones generally exposes hypocrisy as found in individual examples, sometimes he treats it as if it were the whole code and practice of society. Here Jones comes nearest to expressing the mood and outlook of Ibsen. For example, in The Hypocrites there is a cynical and disillusioned lawyer named Viveash, who exclaims:

"Look at society! What is it? An organized hypocrisy everywhere! We all live by taking in each other's dirty linen, and pretending to wash it; by cashing each other's dirty little lies and shams, and passing them on! Civilization means rottenness when you get to the core of it! It's rotten everywhere! And I fancy it's rather more rotten in this rotten little hole than anywhere else." 1.

Saints and Sinners, The Triumph of the Philistines, and The Hypocrites are perhaps the plays which express most emphatically Jones's attitude towards middle-class Philistinism and Puritanism, but it also appears in nearly all of his serious plays in some form. Many times we are shown Puritan bigots and scandal-mongers such as Pal­sam in The Crusaders, Stoach in The Bauble Shop and Mrs. Bulsom-Porter in Mrs. Dane's Defence.

1. Act I, p. 34.
Jones often creates an effective situation by revealing a hidden flaw in some character who has been particularly self-righteous and severe. He does this in the case of Michael in *Michael and His Lost Angel*. And in *Whitewashing Julia* the Hon. Bevis Pinkney is blackmailed by the mother of a girl that he has been intimate with, yet all through the play he has been putting on moral airs and opposing the marriage of his uncle to Julia Wren, who has a questionable past.

Sometimes Jones brings Puritan asceticism into contrast with a hedonistic Paganism. In *The Dancing Girl* the pleasure-loving Drusilla is contrasted with her grim Quaker father, and *Michael and His Lost Angel* presents a struggle between the ascetic Michael and the Pagan temptress, Audrie. These plays do not, however, uphold Pagan ideals; the author apparently wishes us to steer carefully between the Scylla and Charybdis of these two extremes.

Although Jones's special animus is directed against the middle-class, he sometimes attacks sham and hypocrisy in other classes. For example, in *The Crusaders* and *The Masqueraders* he exposes the insincerity and hollowness of London high life. *The Masqueraders* is somewhat in the vein of Thackeray. The title and atmosphere suggest *Vanity Fair*. The moral key of the piece is struck by David Remon when he says to the society butterfly, Dulcie:
"Your trouble isn't real. This society world of yours isn't a real world. There's one little star in Andromeda, where everything is real. You've wandered down here amongst these shadows when you should have stayed at home."  

III. JONES'S POSITION IN THE MODERN DRAMATIC MOVEMENT.

We are now in a position to state what Jones represents in the evolution of the modern English drama. Let us consider briefly the stages of this development and the unique contribution of Henry Arthur Jones.

The Victorian Theatre.

Nothing could be more insipid and childish than the Victorian theatre between 1840 and 1865. As the Cambridge History says, "The period exhibits a confusing jumble of trivial aims and poor accomplishment." The best drama of this period is represented by the windy rhetoric of Bulwer Lytton, the sentimentalism of Douglas Jerrold, the bourgeois flatness of Tom Taylor. The period witnessed the complete vulgarization of the theatre, and its desertion on the part of intellectual, literary, and religious people. Although a large portion of the religious middle-class held aloof, "the middle-class fetish", to use Arnold's phrase, ruled the theatre as it did other institutions.

1. Act II.
2. Cambridge History of English Literature, XIII, 292.
The Reform Bill of 1832 had brought the tradesmen into an influential position in the affairs of the nation, and art, morals, religion, economic and social science were more or less affected by bourgeois influence. In regard to the Victorian theatre Jones said: "As the Elizabethan drama reeks of the spirit of Raleigh and Sidney and is relative to the age of the Spanish Armada, so the Victorian drama reeks of the spirit of successful tradesmen and is relative to the age of Clapham Junction." Another aspect of this cult was the supremacy of the male and an extreme reticence in regard to sex. Nowhere were sex taboos more rigidly observed than in the theatre. The theatre was moreover completely separated from the great literature and thought of the Victorian period. The period had not only produced great poets, novelists, and scientists, but in Arnold, Ruskin, and Carlyle there had appeared a vigorous social criticism that was directed against the crass commercialism of the age. The censorship, however, kept the theatre immune from this influence. In its development from this condition of extreme ineptitude the drama has passed through three stages or dramatic revolutions, represented respectively by Robertson, Jones, and Bernard Shaw:

1. RED, 15.
1. **Robertson's Contribution.**

Robertson's dramatic revolution was in externals only. William Archer found in Robertson the first revolt against the tyranny of Scribe and "the mechanically well-made play". But for plot he substituted not character or ideas, but a kind of stage business. "His true originality," says Archer, "lay in his knack of placing everyday objects and incidents upon the stage...... I am inclined to regard Robertson as a man with a curious instinct of superficial modernity of which his intimate knowledge of stage-effect enabled him to make the most, without the psychological penetration, the philosophical culture, or the artistic seriousness necessary for the great dramatist."

2. **The Jones-Pinero Movement.**

During the eighties there was a great deal of talk about a "dramatic awakening" or renascence, and perhaps no one talked more about this than Jones himself. This was before there was any appreciable influence from northern Europe. This movement perhaps had some points of contact with the French realism of Augier and Dumas fils through adaptations and the visits of the Comédie Française. It was one of these visits that called forth Matthew Arnold's statement: "We are at the end of a period and have to deal with the facts and symptoms of a new period on which we are entering; and prominent among these fresh facts and symptoms is the irresistibility of the theatre."

1. The Theatrical World for 1894, p. 54-56.
2. The Nineteenth Century Review, 1879. In an article on The French Play in London. p. 239.
The English dramatic renascence was in opposition to the older French technique, and its intellectual and moral inspiration came largely from Victorian England. The movement expressed a demand for reality, seriousness, and ethical significance, and a recognition of the literary value of the drama.

With this dramatic renascence there are generally associated three important figures, ---Jones, Pinero, and Sydney Grundy. William Archer in 1884 set Jones, Pinero, and Grundy over against Robertson, H. J. Byron, and F.C. Burnard, and said in substance that those who prefer the latter see little encouragement. As an influence in the movement Jones was by far the most significant of these three. It is true that Grundy had a good deal of ethical seriousness, and for a time William Archer was inclined to rank him above Jones and Pinero. But he came a little too early, was too closely tied to French sources, and he held a theory of the drama that was too mechanical and theatrical to make him the type of leader that this new movement demanded. In 1897 Archer said, "Mr. Sydney Grundy remains an ardent and militant apostle of the gospel according to Scribe, but who has shown himself capable of throwing a strong individuality into the forms imposed by his religion." There are many who would hold that Pinero's ultimate achievement is greater than that of Jones.

1. About the Theatre, 96-97.
2. The Theatrical World of 1897, p. 183.
But Pinero's development was less rapid, and his contribution is limited to the writing of plays. During the eighties Pinero wrote sentimental and farcical pieces, and he scarcely got into the new current until 1889, when he produced *The Profligate*. The Robertsonian influence lasted much longer in the case of Pinero; in fact, *Sweet Lavender*, one of the most popular plays of 1888, has much in its theme and treatment that recalls Robertson. The priority of Henry Arthur Jones is determined by two facts: first, that in 1884 he wrote *Saints and Sinners*, the first play of conscious revolt against the cult of the middle-class; second, that he was consciously and actively a pioneer of a new dramatic movement, as can be seen from the numerous essays and lectures which he produced between 1883 and 1894.

What, then, is the particular significance of this movement? We have already referred to the gulf that existed between the great literary and scientific achievements of the Victorian age and the trivial aims of the stage. The dramatic movement of the eighties and nineties was an attempt to bridge this gulf, to bring the theatre into contact with a great literature and great science. That this was very consciously the aim of Jones is shown by numerous passages in his early essays. For example, in 1890 he wrote:
"To bring the modern drama into relation with our literature, to make it strike its roots into every corner and cranny of our national life, to make it representative of our age, illustrative of our national tendencies and currents of thought, --- these seem to be the first things that we ought all to bend our shoulders to, because they are of the highest importance in themselves, and because in these respects our drama is lamentably weak and deficient." 1.

Henry Arthur Jones, more than any other dramatist of his time, became the channel through which the ideas, social criticism, and serious temper of great Victorian writers, such as Arnold and Ruskin, entered the theatre.

And this is precisely what Jones has in mind when he speaks repeatedly of "the serious drama". In 1884 he said: "if I appear to have been somewhat one-sided in my advocacy of what I have called the serious drama, it is because I feel just now that it is in need of very earnest support." 2.

And in 1884 he declared: "Our great need is for a school of plays of serious intention, plays that implicitly assert the value and dignity of human life, that it has great passion and great aims, and is full of meaning and importance." 3.

1. RED, 337.
2. Cf. also Introduction to M. Filon, p. 15.
3. RED, 171.
This movement, which began in the eighties, reached its culmination in the nineties, when it was intensified by certain phases of Ibsen's influence in so far as that influence ran parallel with the stream of ideas which came from typical English sources. There is a side of Ibsen's thought, found especially in his early social dramas like *The League of Youth* and *The Pillars of Society*, that is closely allied to characteristic English attitudes. Ibsen in his early social plays attacked individual hypocrisy and sham, the exception to the rule rather than the rule itself, just as Ruskin, Arnold, and Carlyle had done. This is why the satire in *Saints and Sinners* has much in common with that of *The Pillars of Society*. Neither Jones nor Pinero imbibed to any appreciable degree any of that deeper skepticism and pessimism or subversive individualism that Ibsen is supposed to have derived from Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. It is because their ideas were fundamentally Victorian that Jones and Pinero were, during the nineties, best fitted to supply the demand for a more serious drama on the part of a more intellectual public, but one that was repelled and bewildered by Ibsen's bitter iconoclasm.

1. M. Filon believes that Ibsen is more closely allied to the English temperament than to the French. See Filon's *The English Stage*, Frederick Whyte's translation, p. 291 f.

2. See Shaw's testimony on the reception of *Ghosts* in *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*. pp 87 - 89.
3. The Dramatists of the Free Theatre.

George Bernard Shaw may rightly be regarded as the chief instigator of a third dramatic revolution which is characterized by a radically different system of ideas and a far deeper challenge to social conventions and institutions. Grein's Independent Theatre may be regarded as the first marked symptom of this movement, and its first expression in English drama is perhaps Shaw's Widower's Houses (1892), but it reached its culmination in the plays of Shaw, Galsworthy, and Barker during the first decade of the new century. The sources of this new movement came ultimately from the Continent, from certain revolutionary thinkers and writers like Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Ibsen, Tolstoi, Karl Marx, Hauptmann, and Strindberg. With the possible exception of Shaw the movement has never captured the popular theatre, and it belongs to the printed page rather than to the stage. Its appeal is distinctly esoteric.

Jones's antagonism to these recent schools of drama has already been noted, and one is led to suspect that the real basis of his opposition is not so much the presence of ideas in the drama (his own plays make much of ideas), but their subversive character. Jones's attack upon Philistinism is, like that of Arnold, Ruskin, and Carlyle, from the standpoint of order systems of thought and with many Victorian prepossessions.
The attack is not upon institutions, but upon prevalent practice in the light of long-established codes. We have found that Jones's inspiration came almost altogether from the standard literature of the past and the later Victorian writers. It is a significant fact that with the exception of Ibsen and a few of the French dramatists he rarely alludes to any modern Continental writer or thinker. He has apparently received little or nothing from Tolstoi, Hauptmann, Nietzsche, Strindberg, and Karl Marx. This accounts for Jones's essential conservatism. Thomas H. Dickinson has said of him "In spite of an appearance of revolt, his plays defend the status quo, they go down to no absolutes of judgment, they are pungent exposes of surfaces that involve no fundamental searching....Courageous as he is in attacking the Philistine, he throws him no deep challenge of doctrine."

1. The present writer has found only one allusion to Tolstoi in the writings of Jones (See FND, 164). He has found no reference to the others.
2. The Contemporary Drama of England, 93.
3. Ibid., 95.
Chapter IV.

SOCIAL AND ETHICAL CONCEPTS.

In our last chapter we found that Jones's thinking has been colored very largely by the influence of certain Victorian writers, and that this influence helps to establish his intellectual position in the stream of modern thought. Further light will be thrown on this topic by a consideration of his treatment of some specific problems and of the social and ethical concepts underlying such treatment. Among the most important of these are the sex problem, the position of woman, and questions of economic and social reform.

I. Problems of Sex and Marriage.

1. The Sex Question.

The Victorian attitude towards sex is very familiar to every student of literature. Mid-Victorian prudery has become the strongest term that one can use to denote an extreme squeamishness and reserve in speaking of sex matters. On the stage the whole subject of illicit love was taboo, while in France it was the favorite subject in the novel and the drama alike. Since English playwrights
were in the habit of borrowing their plots from French sources, one of the difficulties was to transform the sex elements to comport with the taste of the British public and the conventions of the theatre. Little by little as public taste shifted, playwrights became bolder, the censor relaxed his vigilance, and the theme became a favorite one on the English stage subject to certain limitations and conventions.

It will be remembered that Jones's earliest plays dealt with innocent love in the manner of Robertson. In his reaction against Robertson one important demand was the right to deal freely with the sexual side of life; it is a corollary of the doctrine that the dramatist's province is the whole of human life. Jones's low estimate of the work of Robertson is based partly on the latter's tame and wishy-washy treatment of love as something always pure and innocent. The idea that morality consists in ignoring the sex question Jones terms "wax doll morality," which he applies to Robertson, Gilbert, H. J. Byron, and their imitators. In regard to the English school of 1870 Jones has this to say:

1. See Filon's The English Stage, Frederick Whyte's translation, p. 86.
2. RED, Preface, viii, ix.
3. See FND, p. 212.
"There were usually two pairs of very innocent lovers, one comic and the other sentimental; all the serious affairs of life were carefully avoided; there was not even any attempt to render faithfully the manners of the personages, let alone their passions and the subtler aspects of their characters. All was carefully adapted to minister to the amusement of the average Philistine of that period, to whom even that moderate indulgence in the theatre was a desperate and dangerous experiment. There were many adaptations from the French, but these were always desexualised, and the general heat and vitality and lifeliness of the characters were about those of a china shepherdess." 1.

Elsewhere he speaks of "the faded insipidities of Robertson, the lifeless, punning witicisms of H. J. Byron, the emasculated adaptations from the French which held our theatres between 1860 to 1880." 2. In regard to Gilbert he said: "A measure of Gilbert's views and aims is given in the fact that he never allowed a word or idea to stray into Savoy opera that would give his young lady of fifteen a hint that she was not a large wax doll." 3.

The movement which Jones led to bring the drama into closer contact with the nation's life and to widen its scope, necessarily included a frank recognition of the importance of sex. Beginning with Saints and Sinners we have few plays of Jones in which illicit love or at least some kind of scandal does not play a major or a minor part. His plays abound with ruined girls, adventuresses, women with a past, women whose reputations have been jeopardized, and so forth. In fact, the illicit love motif is the principal one in the dramas of Jones.

1. RED, p. 279-280.
2. FND, p. 247-248.
It is important, then, to discover what reason Jones's gives for using this theme so extensively, and what are the conventions and ethics underlying his treatment of the subject.

It is clear, in the first place, that Jones does not regard this as the only moral question of consequence, for he says:

"I do not shut my eyes to the fact that many of the greatest concerns of human life lie, to a great extent, outside the sexual question; and many great plays have been, and can be, written without touching upon these matters at all. But the general public will have none of them. The general public demands a love-story, and insists that it shall be the main interest of the play." 1.

This would appear to be an all-sufficient reason. But Jones goes on to say in the same passage:

"And every English playwright knows that to offer the public a pure love-story is the surest way of winning a popular success. He knows that if he treats of unlawful love he imperils his chances and tends to drive away whole classes --- one may say, the great majority of playgoers."

That this last statement was altogether true is by no means clear. It is quite impossible to explain the large number of popular sex plays that appeared between 1889 and 1896 on any other basis than that a vogue in favor of such plays existed. The playwrights who produced these plays were not of the type that defy public taste in obedience to an artistic conscience; they were for the most part men who were very adroit in adapting themselves to the shifting currents of popular taste.

1. FND, p. 218.
Besides the plays of Jones consider, for example, Pinero's *The Profligate* (1889), *The Second Mrs. Tanqueray* (1893) and *The Notorious Mrs. Ebbsmith* (1895). Wilde's *Lady Windermere's Fan* (1892), *A Woman of No Importance* (1893), *Salome* (1895), *An Ideal Husband* (1895), Grundy's *A Fool's Paradise* (1889), *Sowing the Wind* (1893), and *The New Woman* (1894). Some of Jones's plays dealing with this theme are among the most successful that he wrote; for example, *The Dancing Girl* (1891), *The Case of Rebellious Susan* (1894), and *Mrs. Dane's Defence* (1900). The fact is that during the nineties there was a strong reaction against Victorian propriety and a great deal of morbid sex curiosity in the younger generation as a result of repression and ignorance. The sex theme was in the air, and permeated the novels, essays, poems, and plays of the period.

It is true, however, that a strong and influential group were greatly offended when unlawful love was portrayed on the public stage. To these people any play that discussed such subjects, no matter how strict the dramatist might be in upholding the moral code, was *ipso facto* immoral. Immorality was thought to be in the choice of subject, not in the treatment. It appears that Jones himself was bitterly attacked by reactionaries who failed to understand the motives and spirit of the new

1. See H. Jackson's *The Eighteen Nineties*, pp 152-154. Jackson says, "The age was extraordinarily sensitive for instance to the suggestiveness of sex. The subject was discussed with a new interest and a new frankness in essays and novels and plays." (p. 153).
movement. On December 4, 1894, a correspondent who
signed himself "X. Y. Z." opened a discussion in the
London Times on the alleged immorality of the modern
society play. This furore raged for eight days. Among
other things "X. Y. Z." said:

"From the immoralities of The Second Mrs. Tanque-
ray... to the deadly dull and not always moral vul-
garities of The Masqueraders was a descent; from the latter
to the sordid theme of John-a-Dreams is a further fall; and
who can say that even now we have reached the bottom of the
abyss?"

Most of the contributors to this correspondence agreed with
"X. Y. Z.", although Beerbohm Tree wrote two letters defend-
ing Jones and the rest. In an editorial, December 12,
1894, The Times summed up the general spirit of this vio-

ten attack:

"We protest against the iteration of this threadbare
theme because it offends against good manners and against
good taste..... The fact is that after the first experi-
ment was made, imitation was fatally easy, and the woman
with a past has been multiplied because the treatment is
facile, and makes no call upon real dramatic invention.
The cheap is often nasty; in this case the nasty is cheap."

It was perhaps this attack that induced Jones to
write The Triumph of the Philistines, which came out the
following May, and which is a sharp thrust at Puritans
whose moral notions were as muddle-headed as those of
"X. Y. Z." and his supporters.
As to Jones's method and point of view in treating this subject some discussion is required. In his lecture on the Relations of the Drama to Education (1893) he defends the use of the illicit love theme, but insists that it "requires the greatest care and delicacy in handling," and after declaring that the truth ought to be known he adds, "I do not say that it is best that we should know the facts. I deprecate any exposure of the facts...Give us as little of the facts as you possibly can, only as much as is necessary for us to know the truth." This would not lead us to expect any very bold or realistic treatment of the sex question from Jones. In fact, his point of view is that of the humane Victorian moralist instead of the scientific analyst or the modern social rebel. He is more tolerant and sympathetic than the average Philistine; at the same time he upholds bourgeois morality with its double-standard, its ultra-monogamous ideals, and its abhorrence of separations and divorce.

In saying that Jones upholds the double standard we do not mean that he defends immorality among men. Theoretically there is one standard for all, but in practice the sins of men and women are not viewed from the same point of view, and a sharp distinction is made between the two sexes as to the degree of moral turpitude involved. In The Dancing Girl Drusilla is a guidepost to warn the erring. Retribution overtakes her and

1. RED, p. 298-299.
she dies far from home. But the Duke of Guisebury, her partner in guilt, is pursued by his good angel, the crippled Midge, and finally arrives at goodness and happiness. He also suffers, but his case is remediable and hers is not. The double standard comes out even more forcibly in The Case of Rebellious Susan. In this play Lady Susan has discovered her husband's unfaithfulness and resolves to pay him back in his own coin, although all her friends advise her to forgive him. She is told that it is only an "average respectable case." She plans to elope with Lucien Edensor. The elopement, however, is prevented by her uncle, Sir Richard Kato, who is a shrewd lawyer and a man of the world. He advises her to go back to her husband. When she learns that her lover has married somebody else, she submits to the inevitable. Her rebellion has failed, and she has learned that it is impossible to apply the same rules to both men and women, or what Sir Richard had told her in the beginning, "What is sauce for the goose will never be sauce for the gander." A. B. Walkley in his review of the play stated Jones's idea to be this: "For the two sexes there can be no identical rules of conduct; because Nature herself unfortunately omitted to establish the 1. Act I, Scene 1, p. 21.
requisite uniformity of function and interest between them."

Mrs. Dane's Defence is also typical of Jones's treatment of the sex question. In this play Mrs. Dane, who poses as a young widow, but is in reality a "woman with a past", comes to Sunningwater to make a fresh start in life. Lionel, the adopted son of Sir Daniel Carteret, falls madly in love with her. Then a certain Mrs. Bulsom-Porter, a society woman with a malicious tongue for gossip, has heard indirectly that Mrs. Dane is no other than a notorious Miss Hinde marsh, who was involved in a scandal in Vienna some years before. Mrs. Dane denies the charge, but the story spreads. Sir Daniel resolves in the interest of both Mrs. Dane and his adopted son to prove the falsity of the story. Sir Daniel cross-examines Mrs. Dane, and the terrible truth is at last revealed. Then the problem arises as to whether or not the young people shall be allowed to marry. There is no doubt that Mrs. Dane has repented of her fault and that she is now a good woman. But Sir Daniel, thinking chiefly of the effect upon Lionel's standing in the world, is unalterably opposed. Mrs. Dane pleads eloquently, but is finally persuaded to give him up and go back to her child rather than to handicap him in his career.

1. The Times, October 4, 1894.

Cf. Charlton Andrews' comment on the play: "The double standard is here being exploited, first truthfully, in frank recognition that no such standard has a right to prevail, but later falsely, in the easy acceptance of social usage in such matters."
The moral significance of this play has been widely discussed with considerable difference of opinion. William Dean Howells took a very unsympathetic attitude towards the heroine and praised Jones for punishing her so severely. Yet there is little doubt that both Jones and his audience sympathized instinctively with Mrs. Dane and not with her inquisitor. A. B. Walkley gives this testimony:

"The audience, be it said, had known the truth all along, and all along its sympathy had been with the hunted, tortured woman. But its sympathy became something fierce and passionate when the poor creature was at last brought to bay. This was the effect, of course, at which the playwright had aimed, and he is entitled to every credit for the meticulous skill with which he has conducted his critical scene." 2.

However, the ending, although not emotionally appealing, satisfied the ethical sense of the author and audience. As Walkley said in the review quoted above: "It was right, no doubt, conventionally right, that the marriage should be broken off; women who have made mistakes and lied to conceal them are not allowed on the English stage to have their reputations white-washed, or their characters redeemed by matrimony." Yet he goes on to say that there is another side and suggests that "the wild-oats theory for instance...so commonly accepted for bride-grooms, might once in a way be tried in the case of a bride."

2. The Times, October 10, 1900.
Jones undoubtedly has considerable sympathy for his heroine and condemns the world's hypocritical harshness, but the play as a whole upholds the conventional moral code. It is not simply against a law of man that Mrs. Dane has sinned; it is against some inscrutable, inexorable law of Nature. There can be no doubt that Jones takes the view of Sir Daniel in the following dialogue:

Mrs. D. Don't you think the world is very hard on a woman?

Sir D. It isn't the world that's hard. It isn't men and women. Am I hard? Call on me at any time, and you shall find me the truest friend to you and yours. Is Lady Eastney hard? She has been fighting all the week to save you.

Mrs. D. Then who is it, what is it, drives me out?

Sir D. The law, the hard law that we didn't make, that we would break if we could, for we are all sinners at heart — the law that is above us all, made for us all, that we can't escape from, that we must keep or perish. 1.

In general it may be said that Jones applies "the wild oats theory" to bridegrooms and not to brides. In some cases he disposes of his sinning heroines by death: for example, Letty in Saints and Sinners (published version), Drusilla in The Dancing Girl. Audrie in Michael and His Lost Angel. In the stage version of Saints and Sinners, Letty was united to her farmer lover after years of suffering, repentance, and good works.

Julia in *Whitewashing Julia* is rehabilitated, but her fault, (although left obscure) was apparently only technical. Only in *We Can't Be as Bad as All That* do we have a clear case of a woman with a past reentering respectable society through matrimony. Many times, however, he allows men who have been far from models of virtue to turn over a new leaf in order to marry an innocent girl. Sometimes he places such men between two women, one bad and the other good, and the play represents the hero as turning from one to the other. In *The Dancing Girl* the Duke turns from Drusilla to Midge. In *Carnac Sahib* the English officer Carnac frees himself from the toils of the wicked Mrs. Arnison and becomes engaged to the pure, sweet Ellice Ford. In *The Physician* Dr. Carey gives up the ignoble alliance with the coarse Lady Valerie to join his life with Edana Hinde, whom he describes as "a pure bright girl, fresh from God's hands." Even those oracles of wisdom and propriety like Sir Richard Kato in *The Case of Rebellious Susan* and Sir Daniel, who lays down the moral law to poor Mrs. Dane, have had their escapades and appear to have sinned far more than the women they preach to. Sir Daniel, for example, once tried to elope with a married woman and admits that "there has never been a moment since I lost her --- when I wouldn't have cheerfully bartered every farthing, every honour, -- to stand again on that platform at Liverpool and know that she was coming to me."

1. See *The Case of Rebellious Susan*, Act III, pp. 122-123.
In regard to separation and divorce Jones's position is clearly conservative, if not bourgeois. He is extremely loathe to solve a marital difficulty by a separation, and not in a single instance does he drag his characters into a divorce court. His plays abound in frustrated elopements and patched-up marriages. Jones's strong penchant for patching up bad marriages is seen in *The Case of Rebellious Susan*, *The Liars*, *Joseph Entangled*, *The Princess's Nose*, *The Lackey's Carnival*, and *The Divine Gift*. He allows only one permanent separation. This occurs in *The Masqueraders*, where he takes Dulcie away from her husband, who is a drunken brute. But here he refuses to give her to her lover, David Remon, who has served faithfully for so long. When David comes to claim her after the separation he says, "Dulcie, say you know we have done right." After further questioning she answers:

"Oh, it was horrible with him. There was no home, no family, no love. It seemed like a blasphemy of home to live with him. But this -- I can't tell you how I feel ---- I don't think any man can understand it..... To live with you seems more horrible than the other. I cannot! I cannot! I cannot!"

In *The Masqueraders* Jones clearly recognizes that some marriages are abominable and intolerable. His heroine gives vent to a magnificent tirade against unholy matrimony at the end of the third act, where Dulcie exclaims: "Is there anything under God's sun so immoral, ah----guess it----guess it----to be married to a man one hates!" The ground taken in the play is that it takes both marriage and love to sanctify the sexual relation.

Antagonism to divorce appears in *The Liars* and in *The Divine Gift*. In the latter Evie, who imagines that she has an artistic temperament, is yoked with Will Janeway, a prosaic tradesman. They quarrel and agree to a divorce. He gallantly sends his wife to Europe to pursue her artistic studies, while he takes it upon himself to face the music alone in the divorce court. She soon becomes disillusioned, however, after some disagreeable experiences, and returns in a humble frame of mind to seek the protection of her husband. She has learned through hard experience what great risks a woman runs who leaves her home and husband. The play illustrates a characteristic tendency of Jones to conduct his characters (as A.B. Walkley says) "to the purlieus of the divorce court" but no farther, and to refuse to dissolve marriages where there is no more serious trouble than mutual incompatibility.

1. See Sir Christopher's long speech, Act IV, Sc. 1, pp 144-146.
II. The Problems of Democracy.

One aspect of the movement away from Victorian ideals was an increasing demand for the further extension of democracy. Recent social history has been characterized by two great revolts; the revolt of woman and the revolt of labor. Much of our modern drama has been especially concerned with these two aspects of insurGENCY. Henry Arthur Jones -- as we shall see -- has had little sympathy with radical democratic doctrines.

1. The Woman Question.

In regard to the question of woman's rights nowhere has Jones betrayed any sympathy with feminism, although he does exhibit much kindly sympathy for woman and some appreciation of the hardships that fall to the sex. His idea of the place and function of woman appears to be fundamentally Victorian in its emphasis upon domesticity and the ideal of "the womanly woman". Nowhere has he drawn sympathetically an intellectual woman or one with independent views. The "new woman" is clearly satirized in the person of Miss Sophie Jopp, who is described as, "a dogmatic, supercilious incisive young lady, with eye-glass and short hair. She speaks in a metallic, confident voice; a girl who could never blush." 1

Elaine in The Case of Rebellious Susan is the embodiment of militant feminism. Sir Richard Kate in addition to

his efforts in bringing Susan back to the domestic fold devotes part of his time in trying to instill into his ward, Elaine, some respect for authority and common sense. Sir Richard’s view is that these questions were settled long ago in the Garden of Eden. The author’s attitude is perhaps given by Sir Richard as follows:

"There is an immense future for women as wives and mothers, and a very limited future for them in any other capacity. Dame Nature is simply laughing up her sleeve and snapping her fingers at you and your new epochs and new movements. Go home! Be sure that old Dame Nature will choose her own darlings to carry on her own schemes. Nature’s darling woman is a stay-at-home woman, a woman who wants to be a good wife and a good mother, and cares very little for anything else." 1.

Most of Jones’s women conform to the domestic type. Those who get some other notion into their heads, like rebellious Susan and Evie Janway (The Divine Gift), are finally overwhelmed and brought back into line by hard facts and the ponderous platitudes of some high-priest of the social code. The plays of Jones present a man-centered world. Occasionally perhaps we find a man who is ruled by his wife, like Freddie Tatton in The Liars, which is clearly an inversion of the normal situation for humorous effect. Jones’s wiseacres like Sir Christopher (The Liars) and Andrew Cutler (The Divine Gift) seem to regard women as weak creatures to be petted, humored, loved, and kept where they belong. In The Liars we have the following:


Cf. with this: "It is likely that the war will change in many ways the tastes and aims and outlook
Note 1 on p. 129 cont.

of English girls, and will tend to develop new types. But until they can persuade Nature to release them from the primal curse of Eve, the very large majority of our girls must, for the very safety and surety of the continuance of the race, accept the career of wifehood and motherhood."

Sir C. Don't think when you've married a woman that you can sit down and neglect her. You can't. You've married one of the most charming women in London, and when a man has married a charming woman, if he doesn't continue to make love to her, some other man will. Such are the sad ways of human kind. How have you treated Lady Jessica?

Gilbert. But do you suppose I will allow my wife to go out dining with other men?

Sir C. The best way to avoid that is to take her out to dinner yourself --- and to give her a good one.

Gilbert. But after she has acted as she has done?

Sir C. My dear fellow, she's only a woman. I never met but one woman that was worth taking seriously. What are they? A kind of children, you know. Humor them, play with them, buy them the toys they cry for, but don't get angry with them. They aren't worth it.1

2. The Labor Movement.

It may be said that for the most part Jones has given the labor movement and the problems associated with poverty and economic readjustment a wide berth. Jones's serious characters are drawn for the most part from the professions, the upper middle-class, and the lower ranks of the aristocracy. We have scientists, ministers, lawyers, business men, artists, soldiers, engineers, property owners, statesmen, physicians, baronets, dukes, society people, but scarcely any genuine representatives from the illiterate and artisan classes. Some of his very early plays like An Old Master and Harmony present rather humble life in an idyllic setting. Rustics are introduced in a comic capacity into Saints and Sinners, and The Physician.

Only in the one-act Cornish tragedy *Grace Mary* do we find any serious realistic treatment of simple working people. The servants found in most of his plays are mere functionaries. That Jones is quite conscious of this exclusiveness in the choice of his material is shown by the following significant utterance:

"Though doubtless in a democratic age, the 'sweepings out of a Pentonville omnibus' do honestly conceive themselves to be of some importance in the scheme of things. And so they are. They are of immense importance to themselves, and to the sociologist. They are of still greater importance to the politician, for they all have votes; or very soon they all will have votes. But why should novelists and playwrights take them out of their omnibus and put them into books and plays? .....And thus cheerfully fulfilling their destiny and the vast designs of Providence, let them be left in their omnibus, till some Dickens comes along and lifts them out of it into the riotous chariots of his humor and fancy, and transfigures them, and clothes their mortal parts with immortality." 1.

There is, however, one play of Jones that is supposed to deal with the subject of labor and capital; this is *The Middleman* that was produced in 1889. The two principal characters are Mr. Chandler, the owner of the Tatlow Porcelain works, and his employee, Cyrus Elenkarn. Chandler is a crude, purse-proud Philistine, who has used unscrupulous and ruthless means to win power and wealth. He is called a middleman by the author because he stands between the producer and the public, living parasitically upon other men's toil.

1. Recent Developments of the Drama (1912), FND, 245-246.
His fortune is chiefly due to the genius and industry of Cyrus Blenkarn, who some years before invented a peculiar process of glazing, which he sold to Chandler for a mere trifle. Neither Chandler nor Blenkarn, however, are representative figures in modern industry. Chandler is a caricature, and Blenkarn has not the slightest relation to modern labor psychology. He seems rather like one of the romantic idealized workers found in the novels of Dickens. One significant point is the humility and submissiveness of Blenkarn under economic exploitation. When Todd, Chandler's manager, asks Blenkarn to sell him his next invention, he replies: "Mr. Chandler has been a good master to me. He has always advanced me money on my wages to carry on my experiments, and I think I ought to give him the first chance." He becomes aggressive only when he learns of the ruin of his daughter by Chandler's son. The play reveals the author's close relation to Victorian literature and thought. We have here no indictment of any social or economic institution, but simply the portrayal of individual greed and dishonesty. It was characteristic of Victorian humanitarianism to ascribe villainy to rich men and to find the cause of human suffering in the flinty natures of

2. In Patriotism and Popular Education Jones says: "It is not a question of capital and labour. It is a question of honesty and dishonesty of workmanship in each particular calling." (p. 13)
Scrooges and Bounderby's.

3. Social Reform.

The play in which Jones has told us most in regard to his attitude towards social idealism and reform is his satirical comedy, The Crusaders, (1891). The purpose of this play is to ridicule the extravagances, illusions, and false motives that actuate enthusiasts and dreamers who attempt impossible tasks. We have here a group of people, very different in character and motive, who have organized the London Reformation League to accomplish nothing less than to make the whole of London pure and sweet and clean. The fiery idealists of the group are Philos Ingarfield and Una Dell. Ingarfield is described as a "new variety of inspired idiot. Something between an angel, a fool, and a poet. And atrociously in earnest! A sort of Shelley from Peckham Rye!" And we are told that Una Dell is the "grand-daughter of the mad Chartist poet. She's a good deal madder than poor dear Ingarfield." One thing that the League does is to take "five hundred poor seamstress-es out of the worst sweating shops in the East End, and set them to growing roses on a rose-farm near Wimbledon Common." Philos Ingarfield moreover conducts a party of ne'er-do-wells to Costa Rica to give them a new start in life. But all these schemes come to naught.

The aristocratic people of Wimbleton do not like the presence of so many vulgar girls from the slums, and the ne'er-do-wells start to rioting and plundering in Costa Rica. The government of that country demands big damages of England as well as the arrest and return of Ingarfield. The cynical Lord Burnham sums it up by saying, "So the net result of our reforming London is a revolution in South America and two pence on the income tax." Una Dell herself is considerably disillusioned and strikes the keynote of the play when she exclaims, "If everybody mended himself, Lord Burnham, society wouldn't want any mending."

Although Jones undoubtedly admires the earnestness and sincerity of Ingarfield and Una Dell, the play sounds the note of pessimism and futility as to the possibility of changing social conditions. In the original playbill is to be found this quotation from Emerson: "Rely on the laws of gravity. Every stone will fall where it is due. The good globe is faithful and carries us securely through the celestial spaces. We need not interfere to help it on. We need not assist the administration of the universe." This attitude is fundamental in Jones's thinking on social questions, and it links him with a great Victorian tradition:

3. p. xiii.
It is fundamentally the view that human institutions exist quite independently of human desire and purpose. The orthodox political economy had taught the absolute unchanging character of economic laws. It is seen in the Malthusian doctrine of population, in Ricardo's "iron law of wages," and in Herbert Spencer's conception of an inexorable cosmic process in which everything is caught up. It is the denial of the possibility of social self-direction, of a rational collective effort to reorganize human institutions. It is precisely a confidence and faith in such a possibility that characterizes the optimism and meliorism of our later social reconstructionists like Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, H. G. Wells, and Bertrand Russell.

But Jones derived his social philosophy from an earlier period. We have evidence that during his formative years he had read Herbert Spencer, and we are able to find much in his work that suggests the outlook of Spencer. Jones many times refers to Nature as to some great external force independent of our will and to which we must submit. In his Prologue to The Tempter he wrote:

Leave for a while the fret of human life, Democracy's cheap aims and sick unrest: Leave social maladies to be redressed In Nature's surgery, by her wise knife."

1. See Chapter III, pp. 81 and 83 of the present work.
Jones moreover identifies Nature to a considerable extent with the whole complex of laws, customs, and institutions under which we live. Here we have the key to the fundamental social concept of Jones, and the essential point of difference between Jones and the sociological school of dramatists. Rebellion against human institutions, in Jones's view, is like banging one's head against a stone wall. For this reason he may sympathize with those who suffer, but he does not approve of those who rebel, and he looks upon social unrest as the unreasoning clamor of fools against eternal and immutable necessity. This view is expressed very clearly in The Divine Gift by Andrew Cutler, the oracle and mouthpiece of the play:

"The present rebellion of women and the present rebellion of labor throughout the civilised world, may therefore be classed together as a twin revolt against the detestable and tyrannical conditions which midguided Nature has for the moment imposed upon the human species."

1.

Jones recognizes that there is great injustice and suffering under our present capitalistic regime, but he sees no possibility of substituting anything else. This is shown explicitly in his latest book called Patriotism and Popular Education (1919), where he says:

1. Act I, p. 56.
"Nobody hates many of the forms and aspects of our present-day commercialism more than I do, or more despises the base truckers who fatten upon it. But all attempts to get rid of the capitalist have ended in farcical or tragical failure; whether made in quite small communities, or on a large national scale, as lately in Russia." 1.

"Let us take care that while we are mainly busy in making a clean sweep of the capitalist and the exploiter, that iron, grim, implacable old Dame isn't preparing to make a clean sweep of us. A very short taste of her 'exploiting' will make us cry out for somebody to 'exploit' us out of our misery. We may even be sorry that we didn't put up with our present 'exploiters', bad and corrupt as many of them are. Sir, for many centuries to come, perhaps while time endures, the great majority of mankind will necessarily have to be 'exploited' in all the main affairs of life by somebody or the other." 2.

This sort of thinking offers a close parallel to the theories of Herbert Spencer, who taught that the evolution of the social organism is conditioned by immutable physical and biological laws. That Jones derived much of his social philosophy from Spencer seems more than likely.

What, for example, could be more Spencerian than the following:

"Having probably made some slight advance upwards from monkeyhood in the course of the present civilization, and having assuredly gained an ever-increasing command of natural forces, we shall doubtless be allowed a greater apparent liberty of action within the confines of the approaching civilization. Being able to read a little further in Nature's infinite book of secrecy, we shall develop a larger measure of our old illusion that we are part authors of it. But the framework and design of that future civilization will be none of our choosing. They will be imposed upon us, and will be largely unforseen by us." 3.

3. Ibid., p. 128.

The character of Jones's political and social thinking is also shown in his ultra-nationalism. Despite his frequent denunciation of many features of English civilization, he is nevertheless a very patriotic and loyal Englishman. In Jones there is no aloofness when national issues are at stake. We find in him not only patriotism but a strong vein of imperialism and something of Kipling's glorification of the soldier and military discipline. For the pacifist, the internationalist, and the dreamer of world-wide peace, Jones has only pity and scorn.

A good example of Jones's treatment of soldierly ideals is his play Carnac Sahib (1899). It is significant that this play was produced when Kipling's popularity was at its height and when British imperialistic feeling ran high just previous to the South African war. In Carnac Sahib there is much glorification of the British soldier. It is true that Jones depicts his weaknesses and vices. But there is a marked contrast presented between the British soldier's courage, chivalry, and devotion to honor, and the baseness, treachery, and cruelty of the natives.

Jones apparently has always been a firm believer in the efficacy of military discipline. As far back as 1879, when he produced Hearts of Oak, he tells of a wild, dissipated young man, who enlists for a term of service in the
army and comes back a reformed character. And in 1910 he wrote a propaganda sketch called *Fall in Rookies*, which has to do with "the reformation of a careless vagabond by the help of military training and discipline." 1. *The Times* describes the piece in this way:

"Not so much of a play as a piece of rather crude scene-painting. Splashes of red for the British Army and patriotism and the happy, jolly, useful, clean life of the soldier. Black for the silly victim of drink, the hopeless rotten fool of a man who degrades his manhood and ruins his hard-working mother by his idleness, instead of putting on a red coat and serving his country, his King, and his God. And black, too, for the whining, canting, methodistical old women in male attire. . . . who deplore and petition against the growing spirit of militarism that they see in the movement of which Lord Roberts is the champion." 2.

This same point of view is brought out in numerous passages in *Patriotism and Popular Education*. 3.

During the war Jones was decidedly not "above the battle". His pen was busy defending England's cause and heaping scorn and wrath upon England's enemies both within and without. He wrote a letter to *The Times* telling English girls not to recognize the lover, brother, or friend "that cannot show an overwhelming reason for not taking up arms", and another advocating a vigorous publicity campaign in America to offset German propaganda. 4.

2. Ibid., October 28, 1910.
In 1917 he wrote a play called The Pacifists, which was dedicated to "the tribe of Wordsters, Pedants, Fanatics, and Impossibilitists, who so rabidly pursued an ignoble peace that they helped to provoke a disastrous war." 1.

In 1916 he wrote a pamphlet entitled Shakespeare and Germany, in which he heaps scorn and ridicule on "all the legion tribes of cranks, freaks, windbags, wordsters, and impossibilists that infest our land...all the nest of petty traitors who have proclaimed their topsy-turvy patriotism for every country but their own; all the pedants and doctrinaires whose queasy stomachs retch at the thought of England's greatness who put scales on their eyes and slime on their tongues to prove that England is always in the wrong." 2.

In Patriotism and Popular Education he attacks among other things internationalism and the League of Nations. The following is a characteristic utterance:

"The catch words and catch phrases of the war—'making the world safe for democracy,' 'self-determination,' 'a brotherhood of nations,' and the like—are proving themselves to be no sterling coins of thought, valid at the counter of fact, but the worthless forgeries of bankrupt idealists, not negotiable anywhere. Even before it is constituted, the League of Nations begins to jeer at its promoters.

"Above all our confusions, clear cut against the sky, plain for all of us to read, stand the two opposing sign-posts, the one directing all our national aims and hopes and activities towards Patriotism. The time shortens. O England, which road will you take?"3.

2. pp. 11-12.
The foregoing analysis would seem to show that Henry Arthur Jones is a pronounced political and social conservative. This is also confirmed in a letter to the present writer, in which he says: "Party government is the necessary accompaniment of Democracy. I have never joined either English party, but I have voted with the Unionist party for 35 years because I believe that Irish Home Rule would disintegrate the British Empire."

III. Ethical Presuppositions.

Much of the modern drama is marked by a revolt against traditional ethics. In this revolt there appear two important aspects. One is the denial of fixed principles, which is expressed in Bernard Shaw's dictum, "The golden rule is that there are no golden rules." The other is the doctrine of determinism, which takes many different forms, but which always goes behind the individual to find the causes of conduct in the economic and social environment or in the laws of heredity. This view has a tendency to shift the responsibility from the individual to society and to make of human sin and failure the starting point in the study of a social problem. It will be found that Jones for the most part has been uninfluenced by these tendencies.

At the basis of the "new ethics" of Ibsen, Shaw, and their followers is a rationalistic method and a critical attitude towards popular beliefs and instincts. Henry Arthur Jones, on the other hand, trusts the deeper instincts of the people. Although he realizes that the judgment of the many may be wrong in a particular case, he holds that their permanent moral attitudes are not to be questioned. "In all matters connected with the feelings, in all questions of conduct and emotion, the instinct of a popular audience is invariably right." And again he declares: "All our individual judgments, whether of Censor or citizen, on morality, especially on intrinsic morality, have finally to be rectified by the masses." Jones also holds that this final intrinsic morality is embodied in the great literature of the past, especially in the Bible and Shakespeare. "How is it that the man who knows well his Bible and Shakespeare is a well-educated man? Because of their wide and searching knowledge of life, of their free handling of character and conduct, of their plain dealing with all that relates to a man's ordering of his steps in this dim world."

1. RED, p. 209.
2. FND, p. 328.
3. RED, p. 297.
The important aspects of Jones's morality can be stated in a few words. In the first place, he is concerned almost entirely with individual and not with social ethics. He seldom, if ever, raises the question of society's duty towards the individual, but is concerned rather with the duty and function of the individual in society. He does not raise the question of how institutions may be moulded to secure greater happiness and freedom for the individual. In Jones's view the important desideratum is not a free, full, and abundant life for every individual, but rather the security, stability, and permanence of the state. This underlies his idea of the purpose of education as seen in the following statement:

"We should give the masses of the people, not that education which we might desire for them, which might most fully develop all their mental powers, and which might be most profitable to them individually, but just that amount and that kind of very unequal, and very varied education which will best assure the safety of the state." 1.

And again he declares that the first great lesson of Popular Education is "that honest, careful, useful, productive work for our fellows, each in our allotted sphere, is the first and main duty of us all to the State." 2.

2. Ibid, p. 15.
In the second place, Jones appears to believe in absolute objective moral standards that have their basis in some reality outside and above human life. It is Sir Daniel's "Law that is above us all." There is no suggestion in the writings of Jones that morality is a man-made affair that varies from place to place and that is superimposed upon individuals in the interest of privileged classes and institutions. Ordinarily Jones does not buttress his objective code by an appeal to God or to the formulas of religion, although a religious view may be lurking in the background. He is more likely to use scientific terms in the vein of Herbert Spencer, so that Nature and the laws of Nature are substituted for God and God's commandments. A theological statement is to be found in the motto chosen for his play The Hypocrites:

1. See present chapter, p. 124.

2. Arthur K. Rogers says of Spencer: "Natural laws represented for Spencer not merely facts to be recognized, but to some extent, also, ideals that have a claim upon us. As one of his friends once said, 'The laws of nature are to him what revealed religion is to us.' To attempt to interfere with them is not only foolish and meddling, it is almost impious as well." (A Student's History of Philosophy, pp. 497-498)

This is also a very good statement of Jones's position.
"Expediency is man's wisdom: doing right is God's."

If Jones were asked for the specific content of this objective code, he would probably refer to the Ten Commandments and to the Sermon on the Mount, as he does occasionally. For example, in *Patriotism and Popular Education*, he says: "When we find that a considerable body of our tradesmen regularly conduct their business by a system of petty pilferings, it is permissible to suggest that classes should be held in all our national schools for the special study of the last six commandments and other obsolete rules of conduct, with demonstrations of their effect upon personal and national character." ¹

Jones's ethical code is simple, straightforward, and devoid of subtlety and sophistry. Sir Lyolf in *Michael and His Lost Angel* says: "Subtlety is the big cant word of our age. Depend upon it, there's nothing in subtlety. It either means hair-splitting or it means downright evil. The devil was the first subtle character we meet with in history." ² It is interesting to note in this connection that Jones's Devil in *The Tempter* is a hair-splitting sophist in discussing morals, as the following shows:

1. p. 219. Cf. the following: "There are two very good old-fashioned laws which are plainly laid down in the seventh and eighth commandments. We see them successfully defied every day. And it is to be sorrowfully noted that the people who successfully defy them are often the most amiable and charming people that we meet. But there is always some danger of the divorce court for those who defy the former of them, and some danger of the jail for those who defy the latter. Not very much danger perhaps, but we every now and then get a rude admonition that the laws remain." Introduction to Brunetière's *Law of the Drama*, p. 61.

2. Act I.
"That's scarce a sin at all
That never comes to light. The worst of sin
Is that it sets a bad example. When
It's strictly covered up and nothing known,
There's not much harm in it. Not so much harm;
Of course, 'tis wicked. Still not very wicked.
There are degrees. 1.

In so far as the plays of Jones raise questions and present problems it is always with reference to the application of some rule of conduct or the attitude to be assumed towards the sinner rather than the fundamental validity of the code itself. In the case of Mrs. Dane we do not ask whether she did right or wrong, but simply what should become of her.

Another point to be noted in discussing Jones's ethics is the emphasis that he puts upon the Christian virtues of abnegation and self-sacrifice, as opposed to the egoism and self-assertion to be found in Ibsen and in all the literature that reflects the influence of Nietzsche. Jones explicitly rejects Ibsen's gospel of self-realization. Referring to Ibsen he said in 1906: "His generation has heard and received his insistent new gospel, 'Live your own life!' But human hearts will always long for that strain of higher mood which we seem to remember, 'Whosoever shall seek to save his own life shall lose it; whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it.'"

1. Act II, p. 60.
The plays of Jones abound in self-sacrificing characters and heroic acts of devotion which have a strong appeal to audiences imbued with Christian sentiment. In *The Silver King* there is the loyal and patient wife of Denver and the faithful servant, Daniel Jaikes, who does not desert the family brought from wealth to poverty. In *Saints and Sinners* there is Pastor Fletcher, a kind and sympathetic father, who heaps coals of fire on his enemy, Hoggard. In *The Middleman* Cyrus Blenkarn forgives his old master, Chandler, and takes him into the firm. In *The Physician* Dr. Carey strives valiantly to save the degenerate, Walter Amphiel, who is engaged to the girl that the physician loves. In *Carnac Sahib* we have the heroic and tireless efforts of Colonel Carnac to save the little band at Fyzapore, including some English women, from the cruel vengeance of the natives. In *The Lie* the devotion and self-sacrifice of Elinor is contrasted with the unscrupulous perfidy of her sister Lucy.

Moreover, characters with a neo-pagan philosophy are in the end defeated and suffer bitter remorse. Quite in the mood of one of Ibsen's characters Drusilla in *The Dancing Girl* says to her old Quaker father: "Your mean narrow life stifled me, crushed me! I couldn't breathe in it! I wanted a larger, freer, wider life!.....I want to live and live in every pulse of me! For every moment
of my life...and I will! I will be myself!" Her father tries to win her back to "repentance and righteousness", and she replies: "Hear me, father—you and I live in a different world—-all the old things have gone—the very words you use—-righteousness, repentance, and the rest seem strange to me! I have forgotten them—they are no longer in use—they are old-fashioned and outworn!" But in the end she comes to the Church for forgiveness and absolution.

And in the same play the Duke, who represents fin de siècle pessimism and skepticism, finally adopts the creed of Sybil Crake, when she says: "You believe in work, and you believe in all the great things that people call by different names.....Faith, Duty, Love, Conscience, God. Nobody can help believing them. Turn them out of the door, they only fly in at the window—-trample them into the ground, they spring up again stronger than ever. Prove them falsehoods in Greek and Latin, and you only find that they are the first truths that the mother tells to her baby."

Similar to this is Helen Larondie's advice to her sister Dulcie in The Masqueraders: "Forget yourself. Deny yourself. Renounce yourself. It's out of fashion just now. But some day the world will hear that message again."

1. Act III, pp. 99-100
2. Act IV, p. 108
4. Act I.
It can be readily seen that this traditionalism and conservativism to be found in Jones would account in large measure for the different attitudes taken towards his work. William Dean Howells has praised him highly because of his "fealty to the eternal verities." Yet it is precisely these social and ethical presuppositions that many modern intellectual men have rejected or find inadequate. There is not enough perplexity or subtlety in Jones's thinking to meet a certain modern demand for paradoxes and enigmas. Some doubtless would find his views old-fashioned. Jones does not especially object to being considered old-fashioned, for, referring to an article by Gilbert Murray, he writes: "I forget what he said, but I don't think he accused me of anything worse than being 'old-fashioned.' That is either the greatest fault, or the greatest virtue an author can have, according to the kind of old-fashionedness. Martin Tupper is old-fashioned; so are the Bible and Shakespeare." 3.


2. According to Jones this article was published in The Boston Evening Transcript, between November, 1911, and May or June, 1912. Jones's Preface to The Divine Gift was a reply to Gilbert Murray.

3. In a letter to the present writer, April 27, 1920.
There remains the question of the relation between Jones's fundamental beliefs and the actual drama he has produced and has tried to produce. In this chapter we shall try to show how Jones's ethical concepts furnish a basis for the popular and national drama that he has tried to create. We shall try to show further that this attempt to create a national drama has been largely frustrated by the adverse theatrical conditions with which he has been obliged to compromise.

I. Jones as the Creator of a National Drama.

In discussing Jones's theory of the drama we found that he puts considerable emphasis upon the national character of great dramatic art. He uses the term "national drama" repeatedly throughout his essays and lectures, and there can be no doubt that he himself, in so far as the conditions of his age would permit, has tried to create such a drama.

Now it will be seen at once that there is a clear relation between Jones's fundamental social and ethical concepts and any clearly recognized national drama. A national drama must be based upon commonly accepted beliefs and ideals. It is hard to see how it could be based on any "new ethics" or upon any sort of rationalistic criticism
of institutions and traditions. Such a criticism is in its nature divisive. National art rests ordinarily upon the unquestioned acceptance of fundamental national institutions and simple, universal ethical ideals. That Jones recognizes this is shown in numerous passages. He gives as one of the foundations of a national drama "a broad, sane, and profound morality." He also speaks of the "profound, instinctive, all-pervasive morality in Molière." And he tells us that "all great dramas...mainly illustrate the greatest, simplest, and tritest, and most universal" of great truths. And furthermore he declares that "there cannot be two main opposing standards of national taste."

Now Jones's own thinking is obviously of the type that is indispensable for a national drama. In his nationalism, his patriotism, his acceptance of fundamental social institutions, his love of order and social integration, his simple objective moral standards, and his strong allegiance to the concept of duty, he has the traditional basis for a national drama. In this he does not differ a whit from Aeschylus, Shakespeare, and Molière.

Whether or not Jones has been able to create a national drama, he held, at least during his successful period, the attention of a large representative English following by plays that appeal to the fundamental emotions and instincts of the crowd. His ability to do that has depended to a

1. FND, p. 17.
2. FND, p. 25.
3. RED, p. 292.
4. FND, Preface, p. xv.
large extent upon the fact that his assumed postulates are readily grasped by the average theatre audience. To make this point clear let us examine the three different types of dramatic effect to be found in Jones's theatre: those belonging respectively to comedy, melodrama, and tragedy.

1. Comedy.

It will be easily seen that in the plays of Jones comedy serves the traditional function of preventing too wide a departure from normal behaviour, of keeping men and women on the broad highway of sanity and common sense. Jones's idea of the ridiculous is that which deviates from broadly established custom and belief, — the fanatical, the sectarian, the novel, the eccentric, the egoistical, the unbalanced, etc. Jones's conception of comedy is not that of Shaw, who holds that only exceptional men have normal sight. While Shaw sets up the superman against the crowd, Jones upholds the wisdom of the many against innovators, egoists, and sophists. Nor are his attacks on Philistinism and middle-class religiosity exceptions, for commercialism and rabid Puritanism are themselves eccentricities as seen in the light of an older and saner wisdom; therefore even this phase of Jones's comedy is essentially conservative. Its conservative temper is seen especially in his treatment of certain recent theories and fads of the time.

1. See The Quintessence of Ibsenism, Ideals and Idealists, p. 19.
Jones is never tired of pillorying intellectual prigs, eccentric philosophers, and political and social extremists. In Judah, for example, we have Juxon Prall, the modern intellectual young man, who looks with infinite contempt upon his parents' mental qualities. His father's book is "simply the most deplorable farrago of unsound logic, sickly sentiment, and blatant ignorance," and his mother "presents the most alarming spectacle of all that is insufferable and prudish in the British matron." In *The Crusaders* we have many comic characters representing modern social fads and theories. Among them we have the philosopher Jawle with his sole disciple and worshiper, Figg. Jawle's philosophy is a compound of Schopenhauer's pessimism and Malthus's doctrine of population, and his fundamental tenet is the immorality of marriage. In *The Case of Rebellious Susan* there is Pybus, with his affectation of genius and aestheticism, and there is Elaine, the fiery feminist. The burlesque narrative, *The Theatre of Ideas* contains a whole gallery of such figures.

2. Melodrama.

There is also a clear relation between Jones's ethical concepts and his melodramas and the melodramatic element to be found in his work. Melodrama requires first of all a simple, conventional, and elemental morality.

1. Act I, p. 29.
3. Act I, p. 31 and 32.
Melodrama addresses itself to the moral feelings of a popular audience, producing an intensification of the emotions through sharp contrasts: hatred for the villain, intense sympathy and admiration for the hero and heroine. Nothing must interfere with the average spectator's immediate emotional responses. No problem in casuistry must be even remotely suggested, and no treatment of character can be allowed that would confuse the moral judgment or take the edge off of the spectator's sympathies and antipathies. As Jones himself has said: "English playgoers in the main like their villains to be very villainous. They like their sympathies to be strongly roused and definitely centered. They relish an appeal to their feelings rather than an appeal to their judgment." 1

There are two things in a dramatist's view of life that would preclude the possibility of his writing sincere melodrama: one is a subtle, complex, or rationalistic ethics; the other is a sense of the complexity of good and evil in human life. Melodrama requires not only a simple morality, but also an artificial simplification of character. It is the latter requirement that explains Jones's rejection of melodrama, his morality has not changed in essentials; but his sense of the complexity of life has grown steadily.

1. RED, p. 209.
2. See Jones's discussion of this, RED, p. 209.
3. Tragedy.

Jones has written at least four plays which, in a broad sense, might be called tragedies. His verse play, The Tempter, is clearly a tragedy, for it has a violent tragic catastrophe. The other three — Judah, Michael and His Lost Angel, and Mrs. Dane's Defence — at least border on tragedy, for they are serious dramas dealing with sin and retribution, and they end in at least a partial defeat. What appears to be the conception of tragedy underlying these plays?

Since Jones holds a traditional view in ethics we would naturally expect him to cling to an older conception of tragedy. In fact, his view of tragedy appears to be essentially Shakespearian with, perhaps, some traces of modern coloring. Jones's tragedy is based upon the freedom of the will, moral responsibility, and the assumption of an objective moral order. The sinner violates a law of this objective order and pays the penalty.

In recent realistic tragedy, however, we have a rationalistic criticism of institutions and a scientific psychology that finds the human mind conditioned by physiological and environmental forces. This has given us modern fate-tragedies such as Ghosts, The Weavers, and Justice, in which responsibility is shifted from the individual to society.
Such plays are essentially revolutionary and subversive, for the objective order is held responsible for human defeat and suffering.

That Jones does not like tragedies of that sort is clear from his writings. In one of his lectures he said, "Rightly understood, tragedy should not make you dull and unhappy." Then after speaking of the delight to be derived from Greek and Shakespearian tragedy he gives this view of what modern tragedy should be:

"In certain modern tragedies where great poetic treatment is impossible, or unattainable, your feeling in seeing them is still to be one of pleasure so far as the author affords you opportunities of witnessing the great passions in full play, so far as he shows you the dignity, the grandeur, the power of endurance and self-sacrifice of which human nature is capable, so far as he shows you beautiful natures proved and sweetened and strengthened by suffering." 2.

His attitude towards modern realistic tragedy is expressed as follows:

"'The end of tragedy,' says Aristotle in his often-quoted definition, 'is to purge the mind by moving in us pity and terror.' 'That is,' according to Milton, 'to temper and reduce these and such like passions to just measure and a kind of delight.' I went to see a modern realistic tragedy. 'No', I said at the end of it, as I tried to rally my stunned senses, and dragged myself home to continue the nightmare in my sleep. 'No! You are wrong, Aristotle. The end of tragedy is to knock us down with a dirty bludgeon.'" 3.

2. RED, p. 335.
Yet Jones as a student of science has some understanding of these modern theories of determinism. In a lecture called *The Delineation of Character in Drama* (1910) delivered before the Ethological Society Jones discussed the physiological basis of character, apparently accepting the full force of the argument for determinism from the standpoint of modern mechanistic psychology. But he goes on to say:

"Instinctively the Western European mind revolts from fatalism, however plainly it may seem to be indicated by the facts of brain structure and brain action .... Without the implicit acceptance of free will, human character becomes no more than a pebble in a sand-drift ---- 'rolled round in earth's diurnal course, with rocks and stones and trees.' Without the assumption of free will you can have no drama." 1.

And in another place he gives us this personal testimony:

"For myself, I am a rigid, inflexible determinist. No other theory of the universe is credible, or will bear examination. I firmly believe it --- in theory. But in practice I find myself lapsing and blacksliding all the day long into the unrestrained indulgence of my free will." 2.

From these passages we gather that Jones feels that the logic of the determinist's theory is irresistible, yet he rejects determinism as a working basis for life and dramatic art. In the tragedies that we have named there is little attempt to relate character and conduct to antecedent causes in such a way as to shift responsibility from the individual to the social environment,

1. FND, p. 191.
2. Introduction to Brunetiere's "Law of the Drama".
although mitigating circumstances are introduced which create a tolerant and sympathetic attitude. For example, in Judah, Vashti Dethic's behaviour is to be understood partly as the result of the malign influence of her father. Heredity also as a cause is almost entirely absent from the plays of Jones. In the tragedies under consideration we have for the most part the portrayal of individual sin with its effects upon the life and conscience. Mrs. Dane's Defence is somewhat different from the others, because her punishment is not so much a matter of conscience, and more than the others it raises the question of the righteousness of the law that condemns her. Mrs. Dane scarcely acknowledges its justice, for she says to Sir Daniel: "Only we mustn't get found out. I'm afraid I've broken that part of the law."

Michael and His Lost Angel is typical of Jones's treatment of a tragic theme. The Reverend Michael Feversham is an ascetic clergyman with very lofty ideals of moral perfection. His ideal is the crystal life, -- one free from the slightest secrecy of dissimulation. When Rose Gibbard, the daughter of one of his parishioners, strays from the path of virtue, he insists that she make a public confession in a church. But later the pleasure-loving Audrie Leaden meets him and, repelled by his cold austerity, resolves to tempt and conquer him.

Through a combination of mischances they are forced to spend a night together on an island. After their return his emotions are mixed. Fascinated by his sin, he says that he is not sorry. But his religious conscience will give him no rest. "The image of my sin," he says, "is a reptile, a greyish-green reptile, with spikes, and cold eyes without lids. It's more horrible than any creature that was ever seen. It comes and sits in my heart and watches me with those cold eyes that never shut, and never sleep, and never pity." He is at last driven to make a public confession in his church, and then he leaves his parish and the ministry. Audrie Lesden dies half-repentant, and Michael, broken and defeated, seeks the peace of a Roman Catholic monastery.

In this tragedy several points are to be noted:

First is the feeling of moral responsibility on the part of the characters. It is true that chance was a factor in the course of events. Michael speaks in one place of various contingencies, including the failure of Audrie's effort to secure a boat to take her from the island. He then says, "I blame nothing..... Besides, Chance? Fate? I had the mastery of all these things. They couldn't have conquered me if my own heart had not first yielded."

1. Act IV.
2. Act III.
Second, the play is pervaded by a sense of the awfulness of sin characteristic of Anglo-Saxon Puritanism. In some of our naturalistic tragedies (such as Strindberg's *Countess Julie*) sin is regarded as error which springs from a pathological condition of body and mind, all of which is conditioned by heredity and environment. But in this play of Jones sin has religious and metaphysical significance. It is Michael's deeply ingrained Puritanism that makes the tragedy possible, and the whole play is addressed to the deep Puritan instincts of an English audience.

Third, a more modern aspect is given to the play through the character of Audrie Lesden, who declares: "I think a little love on this earth is worth a good many paradises hereafter. It's a cold world hereafter. It chills me to the bone when I think of it!" If Audrie succumbs in part to Michael's ideals, he also succumbs in part to hers. Paganism is allowed to assert its claims as well as Christianity, but in the end it is the Christian philosophy that is sustained.

1. Act II.
II. The Drama of Compromise.

Yet granting that Jones's plays have national characteristics and appeal to deep popular instincts, it is too much to claim that he has created a national drama. It would seem that any national art should have in it some underlying unity; that it should conform more or less closely to a recognized pattern. But it is impossible to find any underlying unity in the work of Henry Arthur Jones. When we try to bring his work under a comprehensive survey we are struck with the diversities and incongruities in the large number of plays that he wrote during a period of nearly forty years. After speaking of various contradictions in Jones's work A. B. Walkley asks: "How is Mr. Jones's criticism of life to be disengaged from this tangle of themes and modes, schools and styles, violent affirmations and flat contradictions? .....Is it permissible to suppose that a hodge-podge like this was ever inspired by any constant ideal, directed towards any definite end?"

There appear to be two main reasons for this lack of unity: first, the complexity of influences on the man himself; second, the many shifts and compromises necessitated by the conditions under which many popular playwright must work.

1. Drama and Life, p. 43.
In regard to the first point we have already discussed the various influences to be found in Jones's work. Jones has apparently never brought his idealism and realism, his religion and science, his romanticism and common sense, his aesthetic and ethical motives, his Shakespeare and his Ibsen, his traditionalism and his modernism into any harmonious pattern or singleness of view. And although his work has been full of sincere and earnest purpose, he has never been successful in working out a consistent, personal weltanschauung.

In regard to the second point -- the extent to which his work has been subject to external theatrical conditions -- some discussion is needed. Jones himself has often referred to this in his essays. In the main there appear to be three important theatrical conditions that must be constantly kept in mind in studying his work: the actor-manager system, the censorship, and the playgoing public.

1. The Actor-Manager System

In regard to the relation of the playwright to theatrical management and the actor Jones has said:

"In sitting down to write a play, he (the dramatist) must first ask himself, 'Can I get a manager of repute to produce this, and in such a way and at such a theatre that it can be seen at advantage? Can I get some leading actor or actress to play this part for the benefit of the play as a whole?"' 1.

1. Preface to The Theatre of Ideas, p. 11.
That Jones has followed this practical advice can be readily seen from the evidence. Jones's remarkable success as a playwright has been due in part to his skillful adaptation to the demands of various actor-managers whose names are to be found on the playbills of the original performances. Without question Jones has shaped his plays and created his principal roles to fit the demands of the actually existing management and acting ability.

The first actor-manager of importance associated with Jones's career was Wilson Barrett, who produced *A Clerical Error*, *The Silver King*, *Chatterton*, *Hoodman Blind*, *The Lord Harry*, and *The Noble Vagabond*, in each case acting in the principal part. Fortunately he soon found a less melodramatic type of manager. E. S. Willard became manager of the Shaftsbury Theatre and produced *The Middleman* and *Judah*, taking the part of Cyrus Blenkarn in the first and the title role in the second. Herbert Beerbohm Tree, a manager of unusual taste and refinement, produced *The Dancing Girl* at the Haymarket Theatre in 1891 and took the part of the cynical Duke. In 1893 began Jones's long association with Charles Wyndham, who produced *The Bauble Shop*, *The Case of Rebellious Susan*, *The Liars*, *The Physician*, and *Mrs. Dane's Defence*, appearing as Viscount Clivebrook, Sir Richard Kate, Sir Christopher Deering, Dr. Carey, and Sir Daniel Carteret.
George Alexander appeared as David Remon in *The Masquers* and Sir Valentine Fellowes in *The Triumph of the Philistines*. Cyril Maude produced *The Manoeuvres of Jane* and Joseph Entangled and appeared in leading roles. Forbes Robertson took the part of Michael in *Michael and His Lost Angel*, and T. S. Willard appeared in the part of the hero-villain in *The Rogue's Comedy*. Arthur Bourchier acted in star roles in *Whitewashing Julia* and *The Chevalier*. Enough has been said to indicate the extent to which Jones's career has been linked with the names of important actor-managers.

That this adaptation to the actor-manager system would have an important influence on his work there can be no question. The conditions that actor-managers impose upon playwrights are in the main two: first, that the play shall promise ample financial returns; second, that there shall be a good part for the actor-manager. The first condition is itself dependent upon public taste and contemporary fads and fashions. The second raises the question as to what sort of parts actor-managers like? Bernard Shaw wrote in 1893: "We all know by this time that the effect of the actor-manager system is to impose on every dramatic author who wishes to have his work produced in first-rate style, the condition that there shall be a good part for the actor-manager in it."

1. Introduction to Archer's *Theatrical World of 1894*, p. xvi.
He goes on to tell us that actor-managers like very important roles and ones in which there is a good deal of pose and heroism. They did not like the part of Helmer in _A Doll's House_. In Jones's plays the actor-manager parts -- like Wilfred Denver, Cyrus Blenkam, David Remon, and Dr. Carey -- are generally strong, emotional, sympathetic roles around which the whole play revolves.

2. **The Censorship.**

According to the testimony of many critics, dramatists, and literary students there has been no greater obstacle to the development of dramatic art in England than the censorship exercised by the Lord Chamberlain and his assistants. The effect of the censorship has not been to eliminate indecency, but rather to encourage it; at the same time it has shackled the intellectual drama by preventing a frank and searching portrayal of life.

In the early writings of Jones there is little evidence of antagonism to the censorship, but during his later period he has attacked it unsparingly. In 1909 a committee was appointed to examine the working of the institution, and Jones wrote a long letter to Herbert Samuel, the Chairman. This letter is a masterpiece of invective and blistering irony. Jones's view of the matter, as expressed here and elsewhere, is that the censorship should be abolished altogether.

In its place there should be an inspector to safeguard the public against indecent performances, but he should have no jurisdiction on the ethics and subject-matter of plays.

Yet one wonders why Henry Arthur Jones should feel so intensely on this matter of the censorship. In all his long career as a playwright he has never had the honor of coming under the Censor's ban. In 1913 he wrote: "Then there is the Censor. He has censored Sophocles, Shelley, Ibsen, Maeterlinck, Brieux, Shaw. Who knows whether he might not censor me?" Is Jones's attack on the censorship, then, merely for the sake of a few "advanced men" like Shaw and Barker, or has he found himself shackled and hampered by its restrictions? The latter would appear to be the reasonable view. The plain inference from these facts is that Jones has forestalled the action of the Censor by shrewdly keeping within the limits imposed. This would point to another fundamental compromise.

3. Jones and His Public.

More important than the censorship, however, are the conditions imposed by the taste and beliefs of the public that Jones has served. It will be recalled that Jones from first to last has insisted on the popular character of dramatic art. Let us see what effect this

1. Preface to The Divine Gift, p. 4.
theory has had upon his own work. Before 1890 the problem of appealing to the one great public was not so difficult to solve. During the nineties the problem became increasingly difficult; in the new century the difficulties have become well-nigh insurmountable. The reason for this has been the growth of an intellectual public, comparatively small but influential, whose demands are incompatible with the exigencies of the popular theatre. It is true that diversity of taste had existed before; in fact, to appeal to diversity of taste has always been one of the most difficult problems facing the dramatist. But many of these differences of taste lie near the surface. Before 1890 the stratification of taste had to do for the most part with external matters such as language, mounting, acting, and verisimilitude, and it was possible to satisfy a fastidious taste in such things without getting away from a basis that was essentially popular. Archer said in 1886: "The public is beginning to demand more and more imperatively that the dramatist shall be, not indeed a moralist (that may come later on) but an observer, and shall give in his work, not yet a judgment or an ideal, but a painting." But after 1890, with the influx of ideas from the Continent, a new difference appeared which had to do with fundamental ethical and social beliefs. Thus, while

1. About the Theatre, p. 99.
the great majority were demanding plays of humor and sentiment based on traditional moral conventions, this intellectual public, under the influence of Ibsen, were challenging traditional ethics and demanding plays that would express their challenge. That an impassable gulf had appeared in the dramatic world is shown by the violently opposite views that were expressed in regard to Ibsen's Ghosts in 1891.

William Archer was perhaps the first critic of importance to recognize the existence of a new intellectual demand and to advocate ways and means for satisfying it. In his article called The Drama in the Doldrums (1892) he strongly urged segregation. Among other things he said:

"The progressists of the sixties and seventies were bent upon popularizing the stage, upon attracting the great public, in a mass as it were, to the theatre. We progressists of the nineties, without any hostility to the popular drama (that is where Mr. Pinero misunderstands us) are desirous of elevating a certain section of the stage into a higher intellectual atmosphere, in answer to the demands of a lesser public which has been gradually segregating itself from among the great public."

This, however, required new organization, and, above all, new dramatists. Neither Jones nor Pinero were fitted by endowment or training to give full expression to these new intellectual attitudes. Instead they attempted

1. See Miriam Alice Franc's Ibsen in England, p. 8f.
to appeal to both publics by writing plays based fundamentally upon Victorian ethical conventions, but which, in their subject-matter, problems, and technique borrowed something from Ibsen and the new French school. Because Jones is a man of intellectual and moral force he is in many ways the most interesting and most successful of the group of dramatists who followed this lead in the nineties. There can be no question that for a time his attempt to appeal at once to the ordinary playgoer and the intellectual elite met with a fair degree of success. It is a significant fact that Jones won the admiration of two men holding such widely different views as Clement Scott and Bernard Shaw. Shaw has said of him, "I unhesitatingly class Mr. Jones as first, and eminently first, among the surviving fittest of his own generation of playwrights."

The work of Jones is of immense importance as it bears on a paramount question in the theory of the drama, namely, whether the literary drama should seek a popular or esoteric basis. Brander Matthews, Clayton Hamilton, Henry Arthur Jones, and others have strongly opposed the latter. And doubtless from a social standpoint there is much to be said in favor of an undivided public. It is much to Jones's credit that he has persistently looked upon the theatre as a great social institution (comparable to the church) which can be used to elevate the public.

1. See the review of Jones's plays in The Drama of Yesterday and Today, Vol. II.
Manifestly, to take the cultured and educated people away from the popular theatre is to condemn it to perpetual vulgarity, sterility, and banality. And, indeed, recent attempts at new organization to give support to an ultra-intellectual drama have run parallel, as Jones has pointed out, with the marked degradation of the popular theatre, which has never been more vulgar and trivial than during the last twenty years. There may be some truth in Jones's remark: "I have an uneasy feeling that ideas in the theatre are driving the great crowd of playgoers to musical comedy, and romping farce, and spectacle."

If, however, we consider the effect of having an undivided public on the drama as a work of art, the answer is not so clear. At best we have a drama of confused and wavering aims, a patchwork of emotionalism and intellectualism, a compromise between the demands of the artist and the intellectualist on the one hand, and the exigences of the popular theatre on the other.

In the English public of the nineties there were at least three important groups that a dramatist in the position of Jones had to consider. First, there was a large body of thoughtless people who wanted amusement and relaxation; then, there were the advanced intellectuals who

1. Preface to The Divine Gift, p. 18.
followed the leadership of William Archer; lastly, there was a group of conservative educated people who were very touchy on moral questions and who wished to preserve British respectabilities at any cost. These last were the people who attacked Jones in the columns of The Times in 1894. The difficulties in the way of appeasing these three groups are very evident. A good example of how Jones tried to solve this problem is his play The Masqueraders (1894). For the emotional amusement-seekers, we find romantic love and strong melodramatic situations, such as the famous scene where David stakes his fortune for Dulcie Larondie in a game of cuts. For the advanced people who liked Ibsenism there is the marriage problem, the situation of a woman unhappily married and in love with somebody else. The advanced people, however, would have liked the play much better if it had concluded with the third act after David says to Dulcie's husband: "Dare to break your word -- date to lay a finger on her or her child -- date to show your face in the home that my love shall give to her -- and whatever laws men have made to bind you and her together, I'll break them and rid her of you!" But with such an ending would it ever have passed the Censor? And what would have been the attitude of the guardians of British morality?

But Jones wrote another act in which the lovers are permanently separated, and in which a character -- the older sister of Dulcie -- is introduced as the mouthpiece of the proprieties. Jones has apparently tried to do in this play what he himself insists that the playwright must do, namely, "to meet and satisfy playgoers of different tastes, and different humours, and different views of life." That such a method involves serious defects goes without saying. It is also necessary to remember that with the new century Jones found great difficulty in holding together his "one great public." The process of segregation became more marked. While the great mass of people demanded lighter forms of entertainment, the more serious-minded drifted to new intellectual positions.

In emphasizing the popular character of Jones's work it is also necessary -- in fairness to the author -- to bear in mind the basis on which he has attempted to make his work popular. In 1915 he wrote: "The question to be asked concerning a dramatist is -- 'Does he desire to give the public the best they will accept from him, or does he give them the readiest filth or nonsense that most quickly pays,'" Jones's artistic aims have rarely been completely submerged by theatrical conditions.

1. FND, p. 165.
2. Preface to The Theatre of Ideas, p. 10.
Not only has he tried to give the public the best that they would accept from him, but he has, in several instances, incurred serious losses by going a step further. In the passage quoted above Jones goes on to say:

"It is rarely possible for a dramatist to show his best work in the theatre under our present-day conditions. His best chance comes immediately after a great popular success which has given him vogue and authority with playgoers. He may then venture to say to the public, 'Kind friends, won't you come up a step higher?' He may then venture to give them his best, though he may know that he courts deliberate failure. This has been my practice." 1.

He goes on to speak of Saints and Sinners, The Crusaders, The Tempter, and Michael and His Lost Angel in this connection. In the last three especially are to be found Jones's higher artistic aims struggling against adverse theatrical conditions. As Thomas H. Dickinson has said of him: "The fact remains that he has always been a way-breaker, a vigorous fighter for good things when these were hard to fight for....As a valiant fighter for standards, he has been a specific for the stage." 2.

III. SUMMARY.

Let us state briefly the results of this investigation. Evidence has been presented to establish or to support the following conclusions:

1. Preface to The Theatre of Ideas, p. 11.
1. In the work of Henry Arthur Jones we find reflected a great many dramatic tendencies and influences. He began his work under the influence of Robertson, but soon became the leading playwright in a school of melodrama. He gained a higher mastery of his art through the direct or indirect influence of Ibsen. The influence of Ibsen, however, has been exaggerated by some critics. It is more negative than positive. It pertains to technical principles and to some extent to subject-matter, but not to fundamental views of life. We also find in Jones's work the influence of Shakespeare, and in a much less degree the influence of Dumas fils and Sardou.

2. Jones's dramatic theory also bears a close relation to the controversies and disputes of his time. Here he occupies distinctly a half-way position between the older romantic and theatrical theories and the more recent realistic theories. Although he ostensibly attacks realism, he endorses many realistic principles. He gives place to both recreational and didactic functions. He insists on the popular and national character of great dramatic art.

3. In regard to the sources of Jones's views of life we have found that the earliest influences were strongly religious, and that he has retained an outlook that is essentially religious. We have found further
that his reading has been chiefly confined to great standard poets and prose writers. We have also established his relation to Victorian literature and thought, which includes certain scientific writers such as Darwin, Huxley, and Spencer. The most important Victorian influences, however, were the aesthetic movement as represented by Morris and Ruskin and the social criticism of Arnold. To these writers Jones is chiefly indebted for his attitude towards modern issues.

4. As a dramatist of revolt Jones's attack has been chiefly directed against Puritanism, Philistinism, and hypocrisy. This attack has been from a Victorian point of view and reflects in particular the influence of Arnold. It has been directed against individuals and against the spirit of the age rather than against social institutions.

5. We have found that Jones's contribution to the renascence of the English drama is of great importance, inasmuch as he was consciously and actively the pioneer in a movement to bring the drama into relation with the nation's literature, life, and thought, and that he more than any of his contemporaries brought into the drama the ideas and serious moral temper of the later Victorian literature.
6. In regard to Jones's treatment of specific moral and social problems we have found that his position is generally conservative. In regard to sex and marriage he generally accepts prevailing social usages and customs. He is a defender of monogamous ideals and an opponent of divorce. He has a distinctly domestic ideal of woman's place and function, and is opposed to various types of feminism. In his economic, social and political views he accepts the status quo. He holds the Spencerian view of social evolution, and he has no faith in any scheme for remaking the world. He is moreover a strong nationalist and a believer in military discipline. In his ethics he holds to simple objective standards as embodied in the Ten Commandments and other ancient rules of conduct. He is concerned with duties and not with rights.

7. We have found a clear relation between Jones's social and ethical concepts and his creative art; we have found that his assumed postulates naturally belong to a popular and national dramatic art. We have found that his melodrama and his conception of comedy and tragedy are related to his fundamental beliefs. His comedy has a conservative and common-sense basis. His tragedy like Shakespeare's upholds the moral order against the individual who breaks its laws.
Lastly we have shown in what ways Jones's drama fails to be national,—in its lack of unity and consistent purpose. We have suggested that this is due in large measure to external conditions such as the actor-manager system, the censorship, and the diversity of taste and belief in a modern heterogeneous public. Jones's work, then, raises the problem of how the drama can be freed from these hampering restrictions, and the question of whether the demands of various playgoers are not too incongruous to be satisfactorily met in the same play and through the same organization.
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