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CHAPTER I

HISTORY AND CULTURE: THE DRAMA OF RECONCILIATION

"It was in the same battle both were hit. One was a strong Unionist, the other Secesh; both fought on their respective sides, both badly wounded, and both brought together here after a separation of four years. Each died for his cause."

--Walt Whitman, Specimen Days

Two brothers, one Southern, one Northern, touched the sympathy of the poet who encompassed within himself the ideal of the American Union. The War of Rebellion had been a devastating blow to Whitman's grand vision of the United States, and Whitman understood that affection was the one emotion that could heal the breach between the States.

"Reconciliation" was the

Word over all, beautiful as the sky, Beautiful that war and all its deeds of carnage must in time be utterly lost.

Characteristically offering himself as the metaphor of the American who in affection and sympathy would accept, forgive and forget, Whitman acted out the drama of reconciliation:

For my enemy is dead, a man divine as myself is dead, I look where he lies white-faced and still in the coffin --I draw near, Bend down and touch lightly with my lips the white face in the coffin.
The conflict of brother with brother over the sectional issues of the great war was enacted on numerous occasions, not only in the imagination of the writers of the day, but also in actual life. William Harris, an accomplished actor, served the Union bravely in his early youth. His uncle was General N. H. Harris, commander of the Mississippian and Texans in Lee's army, his oldest son, Thomas Jefferson Harris, served in the Confederate Army, and a younger brother was a drummer boy in the Army of the Potomac. M. B. Leavitt in his Fifty Years in Theatrical Management, 1859-1909, comments that "the Harris family provided one of those thrilling instances in which brother was arrayed against brother in the awful business of war."¹

The Harris family represented in actuality the fraternal conflict that Lincoln had in mind in his eloquent appeal for reconciliation at the conclusion of his second inaugural address in 1865:

> With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan--to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations.

Caring for the soldier, the widow, and the orphan was a simple task, of course, compared to the astounding difficulty of binding up the nation's wounds. Government and politicians could provide the human necessities for
sustaining life and caring for the wounded, the sick, and the destitute. But the task of binding wounds was also a spiritual one, and for that the political establishment was ill-equipped. The spiritual reconciliation of the nation's two great political sections was a task that challenged the writers of the nation's literature and the producers of the nation's drama.

The Political Effort--Reconstruction

The political endeavor to bind up the nation's wounds was, of course, managed by the Radical Republicans in Congress, who enlisted the support of the old abolitionists in a determined effort, not only to destroy slavery, but to punish the South and to re-order Southern economic life for the benefit of Northern industrial and financial interests. Lincoln had fought a losing battle to wage the Civil War solely for the preservation of the Union. He had resisted the efforts of the Radical Republicans to include the destruction of slavery as the goal of the war. But the necessities of battle forced Lincoln to capitulate to their demand for emancipation, and he issued the Proclamation in 1862, effectively making the destruction of slavery one of the purposes of the war.

Lincoln lost, too, on the question of what to require of the defeated Confederate States as a requisite to equality with the loyal States. Lincoln considered that
the Confederate states were still in the Union, although in strained relations to it, and would re-admit them on their declaration of loyalty to the Union. The Radical Republicans, however, in an effort to guarantee political equality, required approval of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution before the Southern states could re-enter the Union. The hostility generated in the South toward the Republicans by this requirement made reunion more difficult.

In addition, carpetbag governments were in control of all the Southern states under the aegis of federal troops who maintained order among recalcitrant Rebels. By the time of the election of 1876, however, Democrats had gained control of all the Southern states, except South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana, where carpetbag governments still existed. In the disputed election, the Democrats decided to give the Presidency to Hayes in return for the removal of federal troops from the three remaining states. Reconstruction officially ended with the withdrawal of federal troops from South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana in 1877. The Compromise of 1876, as it is called, is significant in that it signaled the abandonment of the Negro by the Northern Republicans, who along with Southern Democrats hoped to bury the Negro question and merge into one party. But the Negro question was not buried, and Southern whites were driven into the Democratic party because of the race issue, although they saw more eye to eye with the Republicans on economic
issues, such as federal aid to the Texas and Pacific Railroad and to flood control on the Mississippi—both of which Northern Democrats opposed.

Republicans, waving the "bloody shirt," continued to dwell on the issues of the Civil War and side-stepped the important political issues of the day—civil service, tariff, and the gold-standard. The Democrat position on these three issues won the support of the Mugwumps of the Republican party and resulted in the election of Grover Cleveland in 1884, the only Democratic President during the last quarter of the century. With the Republicans in control of Congress during Cleveland's administration and the Democrats in control during all the Republican Presidents' administrations, except for two years (1888-90) under Benjamin Harrison, every issue was fought on political lines. Political control was largely Congressional rather than Executive, and the resulting turmoil spelled bad government and bad policy throughout the period. Republicans were the party of wealth and their alliance with big business created mistrust among Southerners particularly. And even though the Democrats were tainted with charges of treason, secession, and slavery, Southerners gave them their support and created what has become known as the "solid South."

Some twentieth-century historians see the essence of Southernism as the desire to keep the South a white man's country. Others see Southernism as an expression of a state
of mind or a way of life, characterized by a rural order and a lack of competition. Still others see the South as laboring under a guilt complex because it defended slavery when the rest of the West opposed it. Whether Southernism is racism or a guilt complex, the South has, as Cash has discussed, "a fairly definite mental pattern, associated with a fairly definite social pattern--a complex of established relationships and habits of thought, sentiments, prejudices, standards and values, and association of ideas. . . ."  

The actual task of reconciliation was to integrate the "mind of the South" with the mind of the Union. The political effort to reconstruct the South was a pitiful disaster, as evidenced by the turmoil throughout the South over the efforts of the Radical Republicans. In New Orleans, for instance, there was vicious disorder and turmoil in September, 1874, over reconstruction. The Philadelphia Evening Star reported the violence and recorded the comments of a correspondent of the Chicago Inter-Ocean. The journalist told of a Southern woman who poured out a tirade against him and all the North for "bringing a curse," as she said, upon the Southern people. He wondered whether the people of the North realized the "terrible malignity and hatred these Southerners show toward any one who opposes them." The opposition, however, came not only from the average Southerner. As the Evening Star reported on
September 26, 1874, an Alabama official, Judge Clark, "among other profane things," declared "that before he would execute such a law as the civil rights bill proposes he would go to the penitentiary, and even to h-1l!" Some in the North, however, sympathized with the plight of the South, as indicated by the appeal of the Springfield Republican, which claimed that the United States had an obligation toward the South and that Congress ought to meet at once and rectify the Louisiana wrong and put the people of Louisiana in the way of their rights.5

But hostility to Northern "interference" remained a stumbling block. As late as 1892 the New Orleans States denounced Emory Smith, editor of the Philadelphia Press, for his support of the "Force Bill." Smith supports the Force Bill, the States argued editorially, "because he believes it will not only subjugate the South politically, but will also ruin its material prosperity, check its growth in wealth, destroy it as a competitor of the industries of Pennsylvania and New England."6 The editorial then quotes Smith, who, it alleged, had spoken "in terms as plain and fiendish as those in which Satan from his throne in hell declared eternal war against heaven and earth, against virtue and honor":

If the Democrats had never been allowed to regain control of the state governments of the South, Northern capital would never have embarked in the development of Southern coal and iron, and the surest and speediest way to put a stop to this competition from men who are political enemies, as well as our commercial rivals, is
to carry through and enforce measures like the Lodge election law.

The States urged the Democrats of Louisiana to vote only for Democrats, nominated by the Democratic convention, who stand on the Democratic platform, not for Independents, Populists, or Protectionist Democrats.

The conflict between the New Orleans States and the Philadelphia Press symbolizes the vast differences between the South and the North, not only on economic and political issues, but on social issues as well. The conflict also suggests the exceedingly difficult task faced by those who advocated reconciliation of the two sections. Further, the date of the conflict between the Press and the States reminds us that as the Civil War and the slave issue receded into the memories of both Northerners and Southerners, economic dissention between the North and the South came to the fore. Since both the sections came basically to agree on the race issue, it is clear that other issues had to be resolved before reconciliation could effectively take place.

Not that the Civil War was forgotten. Far from it. But the war and its issues were relegated to the status of legend, remembered chiefly in terms of romance. Older people in the South remembered the ante-bellum days and concluded that life was better then. The memories of the war and of their agrarian way of life lingered long in Louisiana, as in other Southern states. One man said that he felt no
allegiance to the United States until his sons volunteered during World War I.\textsuperscript{7} Into the twentieth century, one could still see on the streets men in suits of Confederate gray with buttons of the Southern Cross of the Confederacy on their lapels. In the North the Civil War was kept alive by the Grand Army of the Republic, whose annual reunions were times of memory as well as times for renewed passion for the Union and condemnation of the Confederacy.

The Trend toward Reconciliation

As the century waned, however, even the GAR began to join with the veterans of the Confederacy in reunions in memory of the war.\textsuperscript{8} Among these veterans of the "irrepressible conflict" a feeling of brotherhood gradually developed. That such a feeling was possible is illustrated by Charles Jared Ingersoll, a Philadelphian, who was elected to Congress during the Civil War as a states' rights sympathizer with the South, and later as a Democrat. He was Philadelphia's leading Copperhead, not because he approved of slavery, but because he favored mediation instead of war. But he was a controversial figure and was opposed by his own family, except for his son Edward who devoted himself to the cause of states' rights Democrats in the North during the Civil War.\textsuperscript{9} Charles Ingersoll was ahead of his time in his views on the Civil War and was more in the tradition of Franklin than of the "hotheads who tore the Union to pieces between them."\textsuperscript{10}
One of the symbols of the reconciliation between the North and the South was the World's Industrial and Cotton Centennial Exposition, held in New Orleans in 1884 and 1885. The Philadelphia Press, under the headline "A Symbol of Reconciliation," quoted the London Times on the exposition:

The Times this morning devotes a leader to the New Orleans Exposition. It says, "The Exhibition symbolizes that the complete reconciliation between the North and South is a fact. It is an event in the history of the South deserving of the heartiest congratulations and bright with hopeful auguries."12

While the Times report was a leader, the Press buried its observation on the bottom of page five in small print, indicating that to the Press, at least, the fact of reconciliation was not so obvious as it appeared to those across the Atlantic. The treatment of this notice in the Press is significant, for its brief and hidden notice appeared on the opening day of the New Orleans exhibition, December 16, 1884. The Philadelphia Weekly Times, however, ran an editorial on the exhibition in its December 20, 1884, edition. The importance of the exhibition cannot be exaggerated, the Weekly Times observed, in the political and industrial development of this country, for it is the first of its kind in the South and will have "commanding influence" on the history of the South. The editorial continued: "In spite of the fact that the passions of the war have in large measure disappeared and that feelings of patriotism and nationality were never so
widespread as now, there is a surprising ignorance in each section of the industries and the habits of the life of the other." The editorial concluded by noting that New Orleans was "the only city in the South."

Three important facts emerge from this editorial. First, the paper recognized the now obvious fact that the economic development of the South was a part of the emergence of modern industrialized America. The growth and consolidation of industry and the industrial expansion into the South were key developments in the re-emergence of the South as a part of the Union. Second, the editor recognized that a new feeling of patriotism and nationality was sweeping the nation. Third, the status of New Orleans as "the only city in the South" acknowledged the importance of the large urban centers as the dominant social factor in the nineteenth century and the center of all culture in American life after the Civil War. That acknowledgment also points to the importance of New Orleans in assessing the development of attitudes toward reconciliation in the South. New Orleans was the third largest city in the South in 1890, surpassed only by Louisville and Baltimore. Both of the largest cities were within border states between the Confederacy and the Union and, consequently, would not represent the attitudes of the "deep South" as clearly as New Orleans.

Two other symbols of the re-united nation were the international expositions held in 1876 in Philadelphia in
celebration of the centennial of American independence and the Columbian exposition held in Chicago in 1893 to commemorate the four-hundredth anniversary of Columbus's discovery. The centennial, held in America's third largest city, gave the country a feeling of unity for the first time, and the Columbian exposition convinced Americans that the country had come of age. Arthur Schlesinger points to the significance of these two expositions: "Of the nearly fifteen million who attended the two fairs many had never been farther than a buggy's ride from home, and the impressions they carried away quickened the spread of better standards of taste and living to all parts of the land." The two Northern expositions indicated to all Americans that the fruits of peace were much more desirable than the disasters of war and contributed significantly to the spread of national pride and to the allaying of the fears and prejudices that had accompanied the Civil War and Reconstruction. Since the South was increasingly dependent on Northern capital, and industrialization was molding Southern society in the image of the North, the two Northern expositions also witnessed to the economic interests that were drawing the two sections together.

But the real symbol of reconciliation was appropriately the Spanish-American War. A nation that had torn itself apart in war found that war revived the dying embers of patriotism in the South and extinguished the faggots of sectionalism in the North. The conflict with Spain over
Cuba imposed, if only temporarily, a unity on American life and de-emphasized the social conflicts that emerged at the beginning of the 1890's as the real arbiters of national life. The war made a reality of that hero of a hundred melodramas, as in Richard Harding Davis's *Soldier of Fortune* (1897), who has a natural superiority because he is American, who fought bravely and brought civilization to the backward peoples of the world, and who returns to Park Avenue to tell his equals about it. And the war gave him the ideal companion—the heroine, beautiful, half-mature. Davis offered a vision of life in which old ideals still worked as the hero and heroine walked into a future which was totally under their control.

The sense of national unity was strong in the South. The *Times-Democrat*, that least reconstructed of New Orleans journals, published an editorial on April 20, 1898, entitled, "We Must Be United." The editor noted that differences of opinion on all great questions are to be expected, but after the matter has been settled and the government has acted, there must be no division. During the Civil War, the paper said, many voted against secession, but after the South seceded they were among the first to support the Southern cause. The situation is the same today, the editor said, and we hope to see the same display of loyalty and patriotism. Now that Congress has acted, there is no drawing back: "The man who ceases to support the cause of his
country forfeits all calm to patriotism." If a man refused during the Civil War to enter the Confederate Army or con-
tinued discussion because he opposed secession, he continued, his fellow citizens would hold him in deserved contempt.

There must be union, and the whole people, whatever their previous views may have been, must do their utmost to bring success to the American cause. The man who will not do that will be ranked among the enemies of his country. . . . The American people are naturally patriotic, and all must work patrioti-
cally together to win a glorious victory and bring an early and honorable peace.

Not only one, but two editorials on the war appeared in the paper, the other entitled "A Holy War," in which the editor said that nations shall acclaim us as soldiers of God and the war "shall go down to all coming time as a holy war." Notwithstanding the fact that the war was hardly as holy as the editor conceived it, since American imperialistic and capitalistic motivations were entangled in the conflict, the editorials are significant in pointing to the ideal patriot-
ism that swept the country, including the South, in the wake of the sinking of the Maine. More significant, however, is the editor's comparison of the duty expected of Americans in the Spanish-American conflict to that expected of Sourherners in the Civil War. Loyalty to one's country was the sole cri-
terion. That the South and the North had different concep-
tions of where their loyalty lay in the Civil War indicates not only the different meanings that patriotism had, but also the depth of the fraternal conflict in comparison to
the Spanish-American War when brothers fought on the same side. Nevertheless, the call for united action in the South symbolized the healing of the ruptures of the Civil War. Never again would that rupture take the same form, although American unity might be strained by the economic and social issues that were laid aside to answer the call to duty.

The attitude of the Philadelphia public may be illustrated by an anecdote from the New York Tribune, reprinted in the New Orleans Times-Democrat, December 28, 1898. A Philadelphia reader of the Tribune complained about President McKinley's wearing of a Confederate badge during public festivities in Macon, Georgia. The Tribune responded that a great deal had been written about the completeness of reconciliation which followed the demand for united service against a foreign foe. Everyone rejoiced with this development and if it was a common feeling, the Tribune noted, then it was capable of bearing the pressure of this incident. "If the reconciliation is anywhere as perfect as it is proudly and thankfully represented to be," the editor continued,

it is not at all likely to be disturbed by the circumstance that a Northern President wore a Confederate decoration while receiving overwhelming proofs of Southern devotion to the flag and to the government which he directs. The badge he accepted in Macon is a relic of a cause heroically defended, but in the judgment of its defenders happily lost. It is not a proclamation, but a reminiscence. A host should show
the most delicate consideration for the feeling and even for what he may deem the prejudices of his guest, and it may be that the Confederate veteran at Macon was not perfectly discreet in his attentions; but it appears to us that the President made the best possible use of an unexpected opportunity to verify the sincerity of his conviction that no trace of the old estrangement is left or any basis on which it can be revived.

This story indicates that while the Philadelphian may have harbored some sectional resentment against the Confederacy the Tribune recognized the effort toward reconciliation that was being made by McKinley. And that it was reprinted in New Orleans emphasizes the sense of national unity felt in that city.

A better clue to the attitude toward reconciliation and national unity in Philadelphia, however, is indicated in the performance of Bronson Howard's war play Shenandoah in April, 1898. "My reason for doing 'Shenandoah' after announcing 'Ensign,' and in the face of a heavy sale, is easily answered," Manager Southwell of the Grand Opera House said; "the public want 'Shenandoah.'"

The production, said Southwell, would be superior to the last one, for added to the great battle scene would be a return of the victorious troops and their review by the President and his Cabinet in Washington. And he promised to make it one of the most imposing stage processions of the age, with all characters from the President on down presented as living reproductions, 300 people, a full military brass band, a double fife and drum corps, a detachment of U. S. Infantry,
a troop of U.S. Cavalrymen, a battery of artillery, and a detachment of marines. Presented at the outset of the Spanish-American conflict, Shenandoah rallied Philadelphians to the battle-cry once again, but this time to fight a foreign enemy, not their brothers in the South.

There were other indications of the growing reconciliation spirit in the nation. Robert E. Lee spent the last five years of his life as President of Washington College, later Washington and Lee, helping to educate the new Virginia generation in a loyalty to the Union. Moreover, Jefferson Davis hoped that on the arch of the Union would be written "Esto perpetua." During the war with Spain, the appointment of two ex-Confederate major generals to active command indicated further the reconciliation of the two sections. "By 1898 the sentiment of nationalism binding the American people together . . .," R. H. Gabriel notes, "had taken on a common character from Maine to Georgia." Gabriel concludes that a common language, economic interdependence, a common humanitarian spirit, and a common national tradition were primary elements of the new national unity but that none of them provides a satisfactory explanation of the re-establishment of Southern loyalty to the nation.

Southern loyalty was regained by a common response to the race problem. Before 1859 Calhoun had insisted that the South and the South alone must decide the conditions relating the blacks to the whites. Although the
Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution and the Civil Rights Act of 1875 sought to insure racial equality in civil and political affairs, the Civil Rights cases before the Supreme Court in 1883 fundamentally accepted Calhoun's principle that the matter should be left to the Southern states individually. In the South, as a result of these decisions, a discipline developed that kept the Negro in subjugation to the whites—the Jim Crow laws of the 1890's. This gave Southern whites a sense of security, and other forces were freed to create in the South a sense of national unity. Ex-Confederates discovered that the Northern attitude toward Negroes did not differ in essentials from their own. While the devices by which the Negroes were kept subordinate to the whites in the South were a denial of the spirit of American democratic faith, the denial was more open in the South and only a little less real in the North.23

In addition to a consensus on the race issue, the literary effort was a significant factor in achieving national reconciliation. Writers like Joel C. Harris and Thomas Nelson Page romanticized the old South and helped to drive from the mind of the North the unpleasant view and stereotypes of the Southern plantation owner.

The Literature of Reconciliation

Larzer Ziff in his study of The American 1890's points to the disparity between the national ideal as
represented by the literary establishment and the cultural reality as portrayed by the unrecognized literary talents that were to be the fore-runners of modern American literature. At Chickering Hall in New York on November 28-29, 1887, the literary establishment--Lowell, Holmes, Whittier, Clemens, Eggleston, Stoddard, Bunner, Cable, Johnston, Curtis, and Riley--gathered for a benefit reading for the American Copyright League. The literature read there was regional in tone and setting but national in moral purpose and shared sentiments. But there was a disparity between the literary sentiments and the social realities. "The admission of geographical differences inherent in the exploitation of local color," Ziff explains, "had developed into an ignoring of deeper social differences. Insofar as these differences were a subject for literature, the burden was the underlying good-hearted humanity of all men, regardless of background, when faced with the important matters of courtship, children and age." 24 For the literary men who gathered at Chickering Hall,

Static idealization of the human condition seemed to be the answer to the impossibly unaesthetic whirl of social conditions. Diminishing all seeming difficulties was the feeling that the nation was again united and those in each part of it could appreciate their kinship with the other parts. 25

The great crisis for the generation that grew up in pre-Civil War America was the sectional war, not class differences. For these writers "national reunion overshadowed all and
gave them the key to unity," in spite of the radical changes between the ideal past and the real present that were occurring in every sector of American life.26

But this feeling was not shared by all, especially by a group of young writers absent from Chickering Hall, who "were not so impressed by reunification after the war as they were by the legacy of violence left by the war."27 Young writers like Howells, James, Garland, Bierce, Crane, Norris, and Dreiser, and even Glasgow and Whitman found the literary expression of the day seriously deficient. But they were in the minority and did not express the general attitude. Though the younger writers may have embodied the reality of American life in their writings, they did not embody the ideal that the American public wanted and were receiving from the literary establishment. The literary fare at Chickering Hall supported the feeling of the hundreds and thousands of Americans who visited the Columbian exposition in Chicago in 1893 and who believed that "their culture had come of age" and that "they were showing the world the timeless aesthetic dream in spite of the raw youth and bustle of their civilization."28 What the Americans who visited the exposition believed they saw and what they wanted in their ideal of American life, the literary men of the day were giving them.

Not only were Americans receiving from the literary establishment a banquet of American ideals, they were fed
also on the realism of the local color writers and the romance of the melodrama.

Although Paul Buck in his study *The Road to Reunion* had argued that "Northern opinion had been conquered by the sweep of sentiment in favor of the South before the great popularity of reconciliation drama gave further evidence of the fact," Joyce Appleby, in her study of "Reconciliation and the Northern Novelist, 1865-1880," asserts that the Northern public was already conditioned to the reconciliation theme by the time Southern writers took up the literary campaign to dispel sectional bitterness in the 1870's and 80's, for Northern novels in the 1860's had exploited the reconciliation theme. The writings of Mary Wilkins Freeman and Sarah Orne Jewett were popular between 1865 and 1885 because even as they "set out with a fair prospect of destroying their Union, Americans in the war had discovered one another and so, after it, were receptive to the charms of their own diversity." And other writers, like Richard Malcom Johnston, hastened reunification with their sketches of the charming and quaint ways of life down South. Poets also took up the appeal, the war poems of Melville and Whitman having been written in a spirit of reconciliation. Lesser known poets, too, entered the contest, as witness Walter Malone, a Memphian who eulogized Lincoln in his poem "Had Lincoln Lived":

Had Lincoln lived, the aftermath of war,
More terrible than war itself, had lost
Half of the miseries of its harvesting. 
But Lincoln passed away, and there the South 
Lost her best friend! 32

The Drama of Reconciliation

The efforts of local colorists, novelists, and poets in the reconciliation effort have been widely studied. 33
The place of the drama, however, is another matter. The task of cataloguing the war plays and identifying the ones that have reconciliation themes has been adequately accomplished by Donald T. Skinner in his dissertation, "The Civil War As a Subject For American Drama, 1861-1947," 34 Skinner lists 232 plays with Civil War subject matter, of which forty make an effort, oblique or direct, at reconciliation. Skinner has identified these plays and has helped us to understand their content. Although there are brief references in histories of the drama, no study of the drama of reconciliation comparable to the studies of the fiction of the war has been undertaken. 35

Although from a strictly literary point of view these plays lack the qualities that would make them significant literature or permanent dramatic art, the dramas of reconciliation occupy a place, however tangential, in the cultural processes of the last half of the nineteenth century. And more significantly, perhaps, these plays have an integral place in the national effort for reconciliation between the North and the South in the last quarter of the century.
During 1860-1869 only three plays urge the reconciliation of the North and the South, according to Skinner. Seven Sons, a play no longer extant, shows the North and the South embracing in the final scene, after the North has thrashed the South. Virginia's Woe, a closet drama in verse, has a reconciliation theme; and in its preface the author upholds states' rights and secession but recognizes the passing of slavery. Hager's Grand National Allegory and Tableaux (1865), an amateur drama, shows in the final scene the Rebels re-entering and resuming their places in the Union, with Massachusetts and South Carolina clasping hands over a Negro freed from bondage.

During the seventies an increasing number of war dramas used a variety of devices to suggest reconciliation. Netta. the Vivandiere; The Blue and the Gray, or, Tom Pike, the Arkansaw Traveler; and Madame Surratt all end on a note of reconciliation. Woman's Vows and Mason's Oaths develops the unique thesis that Mason's oaths break down the barriers between the two sections. Arthur Kingsbury, or the Battle of Antietam and Allatoona present characters whose honor, charm, and compassion point toward the reconciliation of former enemies. Dion Boucicault's war drama, Belle Lamar, is the first play in which the reconciliation theme is integrated with the entire action as Belle, spying for the South, is reunited with her Union husband.
The trend away from dramas that were partial to the North—a trend represented by Belle Lamar—intensified in the eighties. Skinner identifies thirteen dramas with reconciliation ideas. Although Ball's Bluff retains the Northern point of view, Our Regiment points to the transition from the drama of Northern partisanship to the drama of reconciliation, for the hero and heroine are re-united in the final scene. Even several GAR dramas begin to suggest reconciliation: Burying the Hatchet; Southern Loyalists, or, Marching Through Georgia; and The Confederate Spy. The device of lovers re-united across the lines that separate them became the most popular theme in the eighties in plays like The Blue and the Grey, Lynwood, Held by the Enemy, Shenandoah, and A Fair Rebel. Our Flag, or, the Boys of '61 simply emphasizes the theme of forgive and forget, while Our Flag, or, the Right Side, and Hesper present Northerners and Southerners who, as noble warriors, are worthy to be brothers under one flag.

Although most Southern writers continued to avoid the war as a subject for drama during the eighties as they had in the seventies, Hamilton C. Graham's Lost Cause, or, Gray and Blue ends on a note of reconciliation.

The 1890's saw the height of war drama popularity with fifteen plays advocating in some measure the reconciliation of the North and the South. In addition to four major plays—Augustus Thomas's Alabama, David Belasco's The Heart
of Maryland, William Gillette's *Secret Service*, and Clyde Fitch's *Barbara Frietchie*—nine Northern plays and two Southern plays present reconciliation ideas. Townsend's *Spy of Gettysburg*, McLean's *Our Dearest Foes*, Tayleure's *Won Back*, Thomas's *Surrender*, Woodville's *Confederates*, Rodebaugh's *Josh Winchester*, Moore's *Brother Against Brother*, and Heller's *Appomattox* are typical dramas from Northern playwrights expressing various degrees of sympathy for the South, reconciliations between lovers of opposing sections, and friendship between Yankees and Rebels.

Russ Whytal's *For Fair Virginia* is, according to Skinner, among the more successful—and neglected—dramas of reconciliation in its favorable portrayal of Southerners. James Herne's *Reverend Griffith Davenport* may have been one of the best of the reconciliation dramas, for it discussed the central issue of the war intelligently and realistically. "Its exposition of the slavery question is the clearest, frankest that has been written, gives fair, open treatment to both sides of the case, utterly without prejudice," a review in the *Dramatic Mirror* commented. 38

The two plays from Southern writers were *Virginia*, by John W. Sherman, and *Sam Davis*, by W. D. Fox, both of which have reconciliation themes. *Virginia* presents the reconciliation of lovers in spite of their sectional origins, and *Sam Davis* presents both the faithful Negro
servant and the nobility of the Confederate spy—both characteristic of the traditional war play from the North. 39

Two plays not discussed by Skinner, for they do not deal with the Civil War directly, are significant for a study of reconciliation drama. Albion W. Tourgee's novel A Fool's Errand (1879) was dramatized by Steele MacKaye in 1881. 40 This reconstruction play deals with the emerging power of the Ku Klux Klan and with both Southern and Northern attitudes toward the activities of the Klan. Two Southern gentlemen, Burleson and Gurney, become members of the Klan because they believe that Comfort Servosse, a carpetbagger, is promoting the Negroes' cause to the detriment of Southern society. In the end the Southerners and Servosse are reconciled. Servosse and Burleson compliment each other for their humanity, and they both express a national patriotism.

Augustus Thomas's play Alabama (1891) leaves the war behind as it focuses on the necessity of the South's accepting its inevitable industrialization. In the play the major conflict is between Colonel Preston and his long-lost son, Harry, who re-appears as Captain Davenport after having served in the Union army and who is planning to build a railroad through the Colonel's plantation. The Colonel's bitterness toward the North is softened by the love affair between Carey, his granddaughter, and Armstrong, a Northerner in Davenport's employ, and by his reconciliation with his son.
Reconciliation Drama--North and South

Since Philadelphia and New Orleans are comparable Northern and Southern cities in many ways and had active theaters between 1875 and 1900, they may be taken as representative cities in studying Northern and Southern points of view in regard to reconciliation drama.

Philadelphia, the cradle of American liberty, certainly might be assumed to be indicative of the Northern point of view during this period. Slavery was always opposed by the Quaker conscience, and when the Civil War came, Philadelphia, in spite of the Quaker aversion to war that caused a certain reluctance, went for the Union and has since been "the bedrock of unreconstructed Republicanism." The aristocrats of old Philadelphia hated democracy and voted against the popular side on principle, but the Civil War stirred up a latent patriotism.

New Orleans, it may be admitted, may be less Southern and more cosmopolitan than other Southern cities--Charleston, Richmond, or Atlanta, for instance. But these perhaps representative cities were seriously damaged during the war and dramatic activities were slow to recover from the devastation. Although these and a few other cities, like Memphis, Nashville and St. Louis, certainly had some theater during the period, especially toward the end of the century, their dramatic activity was not so prolific as that in New Orleans.
Consequently, Philadelphia and New Orleans seem most appropriate—and representative—in seeking to gauge the place of the drama and the stage in the national effort for reunion following the Civil War.

A fairly extensive bill of reconciliation drama played the two cities during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, as the following lists indicate:

**Philadelphia**

- **Belle Lamar**—September, 1874.
- **A Fool's Errand**—October-November, 1881.
- **Lynwood**—December, 1884.
- **Held by the Enemy**—March and December, 1886; November, 1887; February, 1889; April, 1889; September, 1889; October, 1891; December-January, 1896-97; November, 1898; September, 1899.
- **Shenandoah**—October, 1889; December-January, 1889-90; November-December, 1891; January-February, 1895; March-May, 1898; October, 1900.
- **Alabama**—October, 1891; February, 1892; December, 1900.
- **Surrender**—January-February, 1893.
- **The Heart of Maryland**—October, 1896; March, 1897.
- **Secret Service**—May, 1895; January-February, 1898; January-February, 1899; October, 1900.
- **A Fair Rebel**—January, May, 1898; April, 1900.
- **For Fair Virginia**—September, 1898.
- **Reverend Griffith Davenport**—March-April, 1899.
- **Barbara Frietchie**—October, 1899; April, 1900.

**New Orleans**

- **Belle Lamar**—December, 1874.
- **Lynwood**—March, 1885; April, 1888; November, 1898.
- **Held by the Enemy**—December, 1887; November, 1889; November, 1890; October, 1899.
- **Shenandoah**—December-January, 1890-91; January-February, 1892.
- **Alabama**—October, 1891; October, 1892.
- **A Fair Rebel**—January-February, 1893.
- **For Fair Virginia**—February, 1897.
- **The Heart of Maryland**—December, 1898.
- **Secret Service**—January, 1899; January, 1901.
- **Barbara Frietchie**—December, 1900.
Seven of these plays were written by major dramatists of the period—Belle Lamar by Dion Boucicault, Held by the Enemy and Secret Service by William Gillette, Shenandoah by Bronson Howard, Alabama by Augustus Thomas, The Heart of Maryland by David Belasco, and Barbara Frietchie by Clyde Fitch. The seven major plays produced in both cities will form the basis of this study. The other plays that had productions in both cities—A Fair Rebel by Harry P. Mawson, For Fair Virginia by Russ Whytal, Lynwood by J. K. Tilloson, and The Skirmish Line by McKee Rankin—are relatively minor plays by minor playwrights and will be dealt with in an appendix, as also the three plays produced in Philadelphia but not in New Orleans—A Fool's Errand by Steele MacKaye, Surrender by Augustus Thomas, and Reverend Griffith Davenport by James A. Herne. One play, James M. Martin's Dixie Land, was performed in New Orleans but not in Philadelphia and will be discussed in Appendix B. 42

Theater and Stage in America, 1875-1900

Alexis de Tocqueville, that indefatigible observer of American life, commented in 1835:

When the Revolution that has changed the social and political state of an aristocratic people begins to penetrate into literature, it generally first manifests itself in the drama. . . . The spectator of dramatic pieces is, to a certain extent taken by surprise by the impression it conveys. He has no time to refer to his memory or to consult those more able to judge than himself. It does not occur to him to resist the new literary tendencies that begin to be felt by him; he yields to them before he knows
what they are. If you would judge beforehand of a literature that is lapsing into democracy, study its dramatic productions.  

The melodrama that characterized the American stage in the nineteenth century, aside from the foreign drama that was seen in great abundance, was the result of the moral and dramatic conceptions that the nineteenth century inherited.  

The nineteenth-century attitude toward the dramatic heritage of the previous centuries is revealed in the selection, alteration, and criticism of the plays seen in the nineteenth-century theater. The post-Shakespearean plays that the nineteenth century saw revealed developing intellectual and dramatic trends which culminated in melodrama. As Grimsted notes, these plays point toward the taste of the nineteenth century and show how long the melodramatic tradition has been in the making.  

Grimsted identifies five basic elements of melodrama.  

First, the virtuous woman was the focus of melodrama. The conflict of melodrama grew from the fragility of both the heroine's position and the concept of virtue she represented. The heroine was threatened with catastrophe and was warned explicitly to guard her chastity. If she fell, repentance, madness, and death were all that awaited her. Second, shattering virtue's temple was the job of the villain, whose motivation was a general malevolence, commonly assuming the form of revenge, avarice, or ambition; but his object was always the heroine. Third, the hero stood between the
heroine and the villain as a shield or a pawn. His goodness was often tainted—he was allowed moral vacillation—but often he was perfect. He was allowed certain faults—resentment, revenge, impetuosity, doubt, weakness—but he always proved his goodness by respect for the virtuous heroine. Bravery was necessary, for he had "to protect virtue, serve love, rescue innocence." Fourth, the old father served one of two roles. Either he emphasized the moral through his good advice, or he set up the conflict between the heroine's love and her duty around which the plot revolved. Finally, the lively girl and low-comedy stereotypes were less elevated in principle and sentiment than the heroine. Although these characters were simple, they were not abstractions and served as spokesmen for wit and common sense. In this category, the low-comedy man who represented sectional or national types was also prominent—the stage Yankee, the frontiersman, the stage Negro, and Mose, the fire-boy, the first low-comedy representative of American urban population.

More significant than these melodramatic characters, the melodramatic vision, outlined by Grimsted with care, was a presentation of what life ought to be—a utopia or idea that the audience never expected to see anywhere else than in the theater. Grimsted focuses pointedly on the value of melodrama:

The melodrama stressed situations and offered rewards that were perfectly democratic, that were equally
available to all men. It urged men to purity, patriotism, and faith in providence, and it promised them earthly happiness from God, home, and country; but the greatest of these was home with its cornerstone of female purity.\textsuperscript{50}

Further, Grimsted points to the power of melodrama: "The power of melodrama came from the tension it suggested between a threatening common reality and the perfect structure it upheld as a morally necessary transcendent reality."\textsuperscript{51} It advocated faith in historical process, particularly in the superiority of the American experiment. Melodrama had two positive strengths according to Grimsted: "It took human emotion and evil seriously"; and "it filled man's 'capacity for enjoyment.'"\textsuperscript{52} Finally, Grimsted observes that melodrama "took the lives of common people seriously"; "paid respect to their superior purity and wisdom"; elevated them to the aristocracy; "gave audiences a chance to empathize in a direct way"; "held up ideals and promised rewards"; and "struggled to reconcile social fears and life's awesomeness with the period's confidence in absolute moral standards, man's upward progress, and a benevolent providence that assured the triumph of the pure."\textsuperscript{53}

Along with melodramas like \textit{The Old Homestead}, \textit{The Charity Ball}, and \textit{The Country Fair}, \textit{Shenandoah} was a leading play on the New York stage for the 1889-90 season. The old order of imitative melodrama was changing, and the tide of fortunes for native drama turned during this season. This turn of fortune was preparatory to the assault
of the Civil War play on the American stage. Until the
eighties American drama was largely an imitation of foreign
models, but in 1886 Palmer sponsored Gillette's Held by
the Enemy, the first significant Civil War play and an
indication of the coming change. But Shenandoah marked
the actual turning point, followed by The Heart of Maryland,
Alabama, Secret Service, Barbara Frietchie, and other plays
with a war background. These plays were written directly
for the stage and not adapted from novels like the cape-and-
sword dramas and were competently written and theatrically
apt. "As a group," Rahill concludes,

they represent American melodrama at its best.
Indeed they are probably the finest body of work
that the genre as a whole has to show. Several
among them were received with popular and critical
favor in England—a fairly severe criterion of
merit when one considers their purely national
subject matter and the traditional coolness of the
British toward American plays. William Archer
called Secret Service "the best drama of adventure
and situation in the English language."55

Gillette, along with Belasco, Thomas, and Fitch,
modernized American melodrama, making it plausible, adult
and even intellectually respectable. The older trappings
of melodrama—kidnapped orphans, ghosts, foreclosed mort-
gages, providential accidents, disguises, rescuing comics,
missing heirs—all were discarded. Violence was confined
to act-ends, rhetoric was brought under control, and
sentimentality was tempered.56 But these plays still
remained melodrama in their essential effects: startling
situations and striking emotional scenes, high-minded heroes and unimpeachable heroines. 57

The war plays were examples of the changes in all American melodramas. The old order was changing, and the melodrama, besides dividing into middle class and proletarian drama, divided into the play written merely to entertain and the play with a message. Melodrama inherited from the theater of Diderot the villain-heroine conflict as "an almost perfect instrument for propaganda." 58 And the dramatists used the Civil War as one vehicle for propaganda. But whether merely for entertainment or for communicating a message, the melodrama gives us a perspective on nineteenth-century life and an insight into the feeling of the average playgoer that cannot be had from any other source. As Rahill concludes: "With the changing repertory of melodrama as a clue, it is possible to put a finger on specific emotions which swept the people of this nation or that during the century. . . . Melodrama, springing as it did from the people, speaks with their voice and is impressed with their image." 59 Specifically, the reconciliation dramas give us a clue to the emotion of patriotism and nationalism that swept the United States between 1875 and 1900.

Audiences, 1875-1900

The American popular stage in the nineteenth century was distinctly journalistic and polemical. 60 The reason for
this may be understood when we realize why realistic writers of the 1890's failed to gain the public's attention as successfully as did the romance writers. Larzer Ziff's discussion of the success of romance writers in general points to the dramatist's success in the melodramatic plays of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The romance writer, Ziff argues, knew that "his highly rearranged picture of life amused in its melodrama and held up ennobling ideals in its characters." The realist seldom considered why his effort to show life as it is was worth the effort, for "fidelity is a condition of art, not art itself." The realist seldom considered what was the meaningful structure of reality which made his details worthy of representation in fiction, and his mere fidelity to life was superficial.

Ziff has identified the essential appeal of the melodrama. The nineteenth-century theater-goer wanted to see a meaningful structure of reality presented in the plays he attended. His daily life was full of enough uncertainty, enough fear, enough surprises. In the theater he wanted diversion, the opposite of that to which he was accustomed, diversion by contrast. As George Jean Nathan noted:

He wants horse-play, belly laughter, pretty girls, ingenious scenery, imported ladies of joy and eminent home talent, insane melodrama, lovely limbs, lively tunes, gaudy colours, loud humors, farce, flippancy, fol-de-rol. . . . the slapstick above the sceptre of Claudius--life, colour, movement and gaiety
above problems, monotones, technique and authentic merit.  

Although Nathan was writing in condemnation of the popular playgoer of the twentieth century, his characterization is illuminating, for it defines precisely the theater audience of the typical nineteenth-century playhouse. M. B. Leavitt in his *Fifty Years in Theatrical Management* noted that popular taste ran very much to sensationalism. And the reviewer of Augustus Thomas's *Alabama*, performed at the Madison Square Theatre in New York in 1891, observed:

> Our people want plays they can understand--plays that appeal to their national characteristics--plays that bring before them the people, the customs, the country they know. . . . It is in this Mr. Thomas has made his success. He has given the American people a play they can thoroughly understand. He has not gone over their heads; he has respected their prejudices; he has been true to American ideals.

"True to American ideals"--that is the key to the success and the popularity of the American melodrama of the nineteenth century. The meaningful structure of reality that the American theater-goer wanted to see was one that corresponded to his perception of American ideals, and the melodrama gave him that picture.

But what of the audiences more specifically? The characteristics of the Philadelphia audience in the last decade of the nineteenth century have been summarized by Edgar L. Potts. There were three well-marked estates in the theater audience: the elect in the parquette, the staid middle group in the balcony, and the tumultuous
galleryites. These three groups were not a unit and did not respond or think as a unit. The manners of those in the parquette, obviously, were not the manners of the gallery, yet those in the parquette and in the gallery had common qualities. They were not complex in temperament and were easily amused. Their tastes were conservative—they did not demand a constant supply of novelties. They showed intense loyalty to a favorite play or actor. They could be, and frequently were, vehement in their expression of approval or disapproval. Noisy interruptions and disorderly demonstrations were common in all theaters, but in the cheaper theaters the audience would laugh at the actors or heckle them if they did not like a play. Disturbances, brawls, and fights were frequent and often bordered on panicking the audience. Most of the rowdiness originated in the gallery, but the audiences were generally quieter than in earlier times.

New Orleans audiences were much the same. A study by Joseph P. Roppolo of New Orleans audiences prior to the war indicates that they were not essentially different from the Philadelphia audiences at the end of the century. The audiences were representative of a city whose population was shifting, cosmopolitan, and exuberant—clerks, longshoremen, slaves, dandies, quadroons, children, belles, prostitutes, along with ladies and gentlemen of the traditional mold. With the exception of the slaves, this likely was the
composition of the typical audience in the post-war period. In the boxes of the theater--the first choice seats--were families and the socially respectable and wealthy of the city. But there were also latticed boxes that screened their occupants--illicit lovers, the excessively modest, or ladies in mourning--and there were boxes for quadroons. The pit was the second most desirable location. Here sat the white, mixed audience of the middle class, occasional ladies and gentlemen, and occasional representatives of the lower fringe--drunks, rowdies, prostitutes, and vagabonds. The galleries contained sections for Negroes and for whites who could not or would not pay for the more expensive seats. Often at matinees, sections in the gallery were reserved for children. Roppolo notes the shifting character of the theater audience:

The men and the women of the lower and middle classes were increasingly enthusiastic followers of the drama, to whom more and more the profit-conscious managers catered. They were vocal in their criticism, down-to-earth in their comments, and hearty in their applause, and they were as diverse, representative and romantic as the city of New Orleans itself.68

The audiences exhibited a typical enthusiasm that sometimes erupted into disturbances. Typical interruptions were the throwing of bouquets, curtain calls, laughing and gabbing, eating peanuts, and drunkenness. Further, people would rush out of the theater before the curtain fell and the performance was concluded, and the crying of babies was often abusive. Audiences gradually won the right, against
the criticism of some newspapers, to express their disapproval of a play or an actor by hissing. Finally, Roppolo summarizes the importance of the typical audience:

Actually they were a cross section of the city itself, more diversified perhaps than audiences in any other city in America or Europe. And they were alive and human. This fact, it seems to me, has more than surface significance, for the traditional audience, elegant and bloodless, would have had fixed tastes and standards, unyielding and incapable of change. The real audience, vital, vocal, and representative, not only demanded but, more often than not, obtained entertainment to its taste, and in so doing exerted great influence on types of theatres, on policies of management, on modes of acting, and on the stage itself. . . .69

The theater audience of the nineteenth century, as of any other time, held the fate of the stage in its hands. If they wanted drama that idealized their dreams, hopes, and aspirations, they got drama corresponding to those tastes. As the theater widened its appeal to the middle and lower classes, they demanded dramatic art that represented their common conception of what life ought to be, especially what life in America ought to be. Yesterday's gods of the gallery, as Corbin has noted, are today's gods of the parquette.70 They were too newly-learned to care simply for art, Corbin observed, and too jaded to wrestle with the drama of ideas or with great tragic emotions. But the necessity that a play appeal to this popular public was not totally disadvantageous. "That the drama is the greatest of the arts," Corbin argues, "is no less certain than that it is, or should be, the most popular."71 Of course, Corbin
was arguing for a public, which he believed America to have, which would appreciate drama as the highest art. But his dictum is relevant to the theater of the late nineteenth century. That the drama of the period was not the great art that the critics desired may be the partial fault of the newly emerging theater audience whose dramatic tastes were coarse and untutored. But it is no less certain that the drama they saw was the drama they wanted and that they made successes of the plays that held the boards.

In his article on American themes on the New Orleans stage, Roppolo reminds us of the significance of these plays:

They are evidence that theatre people--dramatists, managers, and actors--felt strongly that the theatre had functions beyond (not necessarily above) that of producing great plays with great stars, and that these functions included participation in commemorative activities, dissemination of news, and defense of Southern institutions.

And further, Roppolo notes: "In deploring the lack of great art in nineteenth-century drama one may forget that the demand was often, as in television, for the immediately serviceable." The body of plays that form the basis of this study may not be precisely characterized as drama that was immediately serviceable, but it certainly was drama that served to reflect, perhaps to awaken, the common ideals and hopes that Americans had for their country.

The reactions of the audiences to productions of the dramas of reconciliation should demonstrate the nature of
the question of national unity in the minds of the popular theater-goer. Newspaper reviews of the productions in New Orleans and Philadelphia, which are the most readily available source, seem to give adequate indications of the public reactions. It may be admitted that critical reviews may not reflect accurately the public mind on any issue. They seem to be, however, the best available measure of such attitudes. It is likely that published reviews would more nearly reflect a public consensus than would random comments not written for publication—personal diaries or letters, for instance. The dependency of a critic upon the public's pleasure, or at least upon their continuing support of his reviews, suggests that the two—critic and audience—might not be so different as they might seem at first. Moreover, inferences might be made negatively—with caution, of course. The absence of comment or the condemnation of public opinion tends to suggest what the public's opinion actually was.

The newspaper reviews of productions in both New Orleans and Philadelphia provide sufficient indications of audience reactions to the dramas of reconciliation. In Philadelphia twelve newspapers, dailies for the most part, provide ample coverage of dramatic news. In New Orleans five newspapers furnish sufficient information upon which to base some conclusions. Frequent references to audience responses in these reviews provides an indication of the reception and criticism, not only of the plays in general,
but of specific situations and ideas that impinge on sectional reconciliation. I do not, of course, equate the reviewers' reports of audience response with the actual attitudes of the public on these issues. But these reports are one measure of the public's attitude and provide at least a clue to their feelings. In conjunction with the nature of the plays themselves, with the popularity of the plays, and with the general cultural context, the audience response as indicated in the reviews gives us an idea, which I believe we can trust, of the public's general attitude toward reconciliation.

In considering the cultural implications of the plays, I have adopted the conceptual framework as provided by Robert Heilman in *Tragedy and Melodrama*. The needs giving rise to melodrama, Heilman argues, are rooted deep within the human psyche, for man needs the pleasure of experiencing wholeness. To the sense of wholeness that melodrama provides, he can respond with the wholeness of his personality and find freedom from the anguish of choice and from the pain of struggling with counter-impulses. Assuming that this is true, it appears that the public's reaction to the reconciliation plays would express their desire to put the bitterness of sectional strife behind them and to revel in the freedom of a sense of national unity. Differences in reactions between Northern and Southern audiences, indicating different perceptions of the conflicts,
would seem to clarify our understanding of the public mind in regard to the basic issues of American unity.

In studying the plays as literary documents, I refer again to what Robert Heilman asserts in his study of tragedy and melodrama: that melodrama is "the aesthetic version of polemics." This is true, Heilman argues, because in melodrama man is conceived as essentially whole. In melodrama, Heilman asserts, the conflict is not located in the nature of man, as in tragedy, but arises when man attempts to act within the world. Heilman points out that in melodrama blame belongs to nations, classes, parties, or to monstrous individuals with whom we are not identified. In order to act within the world, Heilman concludes, man has to assume a wholeness, and he has to assert his own "ultimate unquestioning, unquestionable . . . rectitude."

The seven plays that form the basis for this study are unquestionably reconciliation dramas and are clear examples of Heilman's theoretical principle. Although the suffering heroine appears in all the plays, the persecuting villain is markedly changed or wholly absent; in many cases the war itself or its aftermath is the actual villain. And in these plays, the heroine rescues the hero as frequently as the hero rescues her. Belle Lamar sounds a note deeper than the dramas of the 1860's in the heroine's struggle with the conflict between love and patriotism, a formula followed by all of the war plays of the period. Belle discovers
that she must cling to her lover even though sectional pride pulls her away from him. Their reconciliation—melodramatic and sentimental—re-establishes a sense of wholeness in the conviction that fundamental human relationships can somehow transcend the fractured reality of the actual world.

That the dramatists intended to write dramas of reconciliation is evident chiefly from internal evidence. For example, Bouicault's stage direction at the beginning of Belle Lamar notes that the two songs, sung by sentinels on opposite sides of the conflict are to be "sung tenderly and not intended as defiances." This spirit of reconciliation continues, not only through this play, but through the other six plays as well. Held by the Enemy is a classic drama of reconciliation, eliminating the partisan viewpoints of earlier war dramas. Fielding closes the play with the hope that the union of the two lovers will be "the emblem of the grander, mightier one, which must come with the bright days of peace, the union of the Blue and the Gray and the North and the South."  

Bronson Howard in Shenandoah succeeds in reconciling no less than five pairs of lovers, two sets of whom are unions between Northerners and Southerners. Augustus Thomas's Alabama unites a young Southern girl with a Northern suitor and re-unites two older lovers, as well as a Southern man who had supported the Union with his unreconstructed father.
The Heart of Maryland, the most typical melodrama of the group, clearly portrays the reconciliation theme of the Southern heroine in love with the Union officer (although he is a Southerner by birth). William Gillette's Secret Service, in many respects the best drama of the group, offers reconciliation motifs similar to the other plays.

The hero is in fact a Union spy who is punished for his activities when he is captured by Confederate agents. The heroine must await the completion of his prison term before they can be united. She is, however, completely reconciled in spirit as she supports his refusal to betray the Union by joining the Confederate Secret Service. The physical separation of the heroine and hero is carried to its ultimate extreme in Barbara Frietchie. After a moving conversion of the heroine to the cause of the Union, both the heroine and the hero die for their loyalty. Nevertheless, the political reconciliation of the two is an important aspect of the plot.

In studying the plays as reconciliation dramas I have used three basic themes: (1) lovers who quarrel over patriotic sentiments; (2) families, friends, and villains whose roles involve sectional conflicts; and (3) ideals and virtues that transcend sectional strife. A close analysis of these themes and a study of audience reactions indicate that they represent basic attitudes of reconciliation in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.
The drama of reconciliation is an ambiguous idea. In the general sense the reconciliation of the nation had all the characteristics of dramatic action—tragic conflict, heroic character, atmospheric setting, touching denouement. But in the specific sense the dramatic literature and productions of the period played an important role in reflecting, if not clearly in promoting, the process of reconciliation.
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CHAPTER II

HEROINES AND HEROES: CONFLICT AND REUNION

In the seven dramas of reconciliation the heroine is a charming Southern girl whose life epitomizes all that the South held dear in family and home and whose honor calls forth the bravery and challenges the integrity of her Northern suitor. While her virtue is inevitably tied to sectional loyalty, her commitment to love becomes a stronger power, forcing her to choose between sectional pride and love.

This conflict is represented by two other characters; the hero and the rejected suitor. The Northern hero in the plays is, on one hand, the cause of the tension between sectional loyalty and love, and, on the other, the final shield between the heroine and the assault of the villain on virtue's temple. The hero's success in winning the love of the heroine and in defending her honor is complicated by the rejected suitor, whose appeal to the heroine, aside from love, is on the added basis that he, like she, is a Southern patriot. Thus, the quarrel between the lovers focuses on sectional issues as much as on love. Often the heroine gives the hero an ultimatum that if he fights the South, he will lose her love. In other instances, their union is
prevented by the circumstances of war, or it is forbidden by
the heroine's father, on the theory that it is unpatriotic
for a Southern girl to love a Yankee. The lovers' quarrel
and their reunion is the essence of the plot of the drama of
reconciliation.

The Lovers' Quarrel

In Belle Lamar the conflict between Belle and Philip
Bligh begins to emerge when she learns from Marston Pike
that Bligh is to replace him as commander of the post. Pike
knows Bligh as a perfect man, but Belle remembers him "as the
most unrelenting foe to the South." As his wife she had
pleaded with him to join the Southern cause, but when he
resisted her pleas Belle left him to return to the South to
aid in the Rebel cause (I. ii; p. 136). Bligh's hostility
to women spies of the South prepares us for further conflict
between the two. In response to a comment by Pike that a
friend's wife had been imprisoned for spying for the South
in Washington, Bligh says that she was spared death because
she was a woman but that this was false clemency:

When the serpent coils to take its spring, do we regard
its sex ere we set a heel upon its venomous fangs? By
these Dalilahs our Samson of the North is shorn of half
his might. There is not a plan resolved in Washing­
ton--there's not a movement of our armies discussed
there in secret, but it is betrayed to one of them and
transmitted straight to Richmond. These women have
placed their beauty at the service of the South.
General Crinoline at the Capitol defeats the operations
of General McClellan in the peninsula. There is more
than one Judas amongst our statesmen at the Council board who betray their country with a kiss (I. ii; p. 135).

Bligh is speaking here to Marston Pike, whom Belle has promised to marry after the war in order to receive Union military plans from him. When Belle is captured and brought in to Bligh, he is already committed to her execution. He then learns of Pike's complicity because of his love for Belle, and relates to Pike his former happy marriage to Belle:

Not long ago, I met one to whom all that was good and noble within me went forth at once to know if her virtue could equal her beauty. And as my soul stood beside hers, I thanked God that he had made a woman so perfect, and had given her to me: for she loved me and became my wife—-not my companion—-but my happier, better self, my pride, the casket where I stored my best-loved follies, my secret hopes, my jewelled dreams. Brief ecstasy! This war broke out and I was summoned to my duty. She was of Southern family; they had espoused the cause of Secession with vehemence, and their blood ran hotly in her veins. Pointing to many officers who deserted their flag, she urged me to follow their example. I refused. She left me: fled to her family in the South, and waited for me to join her there. What I suffered, God and I alone know; but He led me to the altar of my country, and, standing beside it, I plucked out my heart, and offered up a human sacrifice. That is why I have none now to pity you (I. ii; pp. 136-137).

Bligh's Union loyalty, Belle's Southern commitment, and Pike's betrayal are all set forth here, establishing the major conflicts in the play. Bligh excoriates Belle for leaving him and getting a divorce and confesses how he has suffered (II; p. 138). When Belle invokes Bligh's friendship with Pike in an effort to save Pike, Bligh shows the
conflict of this tension, as he moans, "Oh, cruel and unnatural conflict—where right is wrong, virtue is crime, love is hate; where noble natures that God made dear companions must meet in deadly feud midst havoc and confusion" (II; p. 138). In sympathy with him, Belle confesses that she too has suffered for her commitments. Bemoaning her choice of leaving him but feeling that there is no turning back, Belle feels she might be able to redeem something if she can persuade Bligh to save Pike. In her despair she also helps Pike and Stuart to escape and remains "to exchange [her] liberty for the liberty of those [she has] betrayed, and take their place" (II; p. 143). This endangers her even further, for she now has imperilled the campaign and 80,000 men. In sympathy Bligh wants to send her to Jackson's lines for safety and to join Pike, but Belle says that she never loved him. When Bligh condemns her for being false to Pike as she had been to himself, she responds:

If the biting lash of your words could kill me, I would rather die under the sweet torture of your jealousy, than live the victim of his passion. Nay, Philip, I listened to your confession—hear mine! The Demon Pride prompted me to challenge your love to a supreme sacrifice for my sake. You resisted, and I left you. I never knew the depth of my heart until I found myself alone, and measured my love by the depth of my despair. Lifeless, hopeless, worthless—for all my life had deserted me to dwell by your side. I would have returned to ask your pardon but the same fiend who had betrayed me—Pride—stood in the path of my repentance, and scorned me back (III; p. 144).

She then reveals that Marston Pike has used the pass she gave him, not to escape, but to go for help to save the
outpost. In this recognition of their mutual love they are reconciled and Bligh exclaims:

I would not exchange this supreme moment of my expiring life for all the barren years I have to come. All my happiness is gathered into this one hour and fills my joy full to the brim. Such an end I would have asked for. But can you look death in the face? (III; p. 146).

Belle responds, "Let me look into yours. I shall heed nothing else. Let it find me in your arms. I shall never know when life ends, and Heaven begins." At the height of their despair of being rescued, Pike returns with reinforcements and the play ends in battle, with the Union victory assured.

First produced in 1874 and standing at the beginning of the period under study, Belle Lamar illustrates the chief elements and the basic pattern of the reconciliation dramas. The heroine is loyal to the South, while the hero is loyal to the Union and to his duty as an officer. The heroine's ultimatum causes a quarrel and their separation. Another suitor for the heroine's love creates added conflicts in the heroine, who discovers that she really loves the hero. Circumstances place both the heroine and the hero in danger from which they must be rescued. The result of the rescue is the happy reconciliation of the lovers and the consequent subordination of the heroine's sectional loyalty to her love. With minor modulations, this theme is replayed in each of the other six plays following Belle Lamar. The hint
of inner conflict in both Belle and Bligh, a note that distinguishes the play from the war dramas of the 1860's, is picked up in other plays, notably Secret Service and Barbara Frietchie, and suggests the first faltering steps towards a more realistic character portrayal. But the lovers' quarrel and their reunion, internalized or not, is the symbol the dramatists used to portray the conflict and reunion of the states in the Civil War and its aftermath.

In William Gillette's Held by the Enemy (1886) sectional commitments are the basis for the conflict that separates the lovers. When Colonel Prescott, the Northern suitor, calls on Rachel to declare his love, she tells him that she is engaged already to Gordon Hayne, her Southern cousin, but she implies that she really loves Prescott. Torn between her duty to her family and her love for the Northern officer, she cries, "No, no, it can not be! . . . It is impossible! You must go and go at once!"2

The conflicts separating Rachel and Prescott are not portrayed as deep personal commitments to their sections, but rather as the result of the circumstances of war and of previous commitments. Rachel's engagement to Hayne prevents her from accepting Prescott's proposal. The conflict between them develops, however, from external circumstances rather than from divided loyalties. Later in the play, Rachel implicates Prescott in the charge of treason in a rash effort to save Hayne from being condemned as a spy.
Rachel confesses to the court that Prescott in his love for her had a motive for trying to kill Hayne, not realizing the implications of her statement for Prescott. She is horrified when she understands what she has done. At this point her conflict begins to be internalized. She makes a similar mistake in involving Prescott in her attempt to free Hayne at the prison hospital but tries to save Prescott even at the risk of foiling her plan. These conflicts touch Rachel deeply and inwardly, but only after she has acted does she realize the implications of her actions in trying to deal with the misfortunes brought upon her by the war. The rescue of the hero is not from the dangers of war, but from the disgrace of impulsive and ill-advised acts motivated by love. The reconciliation of the two, therefore, may be seen as an overcoming of the divisive circumstances that the sectional conflict forces upon them, irrespective of their loyalties or their loves.

The conflict between Gertrude Ellingham and Kerchival West in Bronson Howard's *Shenandoah* (1888) begins in a light-hearted, semi-serious way. Neither expresses love directly to the other. Gertrude learns of Kerchival's love from Madeline, her Northern friend and Kerchival's sister; and Kerchival confesses to Robert, Madeline's brother, that he loves Gertrude. But Gertrude's expression of loyalty to the South prevents Kerchival from declaring his love directly to her. She describes the American flag
as "the flag of an enemy." And when Kerchival asks if he is her enemy, she replies that, since he will fight against her friends and her own brother, they are enemies. Against the background of the screaming shells falling on Fort Sumter, Kerchival finally declares his love, but Gertrude only says, "Now!—do you believe that we Southerners are in deadly earnest?" (I; p. 487). Kerchival replies that the North is in deadly earnest too, and quickly leaves. Gertrude, realizing what has happened, goes after him calling his name, but when he does not answer, she says bitterly, "Enemies!"

In Act II the Ellingham house in the Shenandoah Valley is under the control of Kerchival and the Union troops. Kerchival confides to Captain Heartsease that Gertrude must indeed feel that they are enemies now because her house is under his control (II; p. 490). When Gertrude is brought in a prisoner for having tried to get a message from Robert to Captain Thornton, Kerchival asks Gertrude if she can confess at last that she loves him. Her response is scathing:

Colonel West! Your men made me a prisoner this afternoon; . . . and my brother is also a captive in your hands. When we separated in Charleston you said that we were enemies. What is there lacking to make those words true to-day? You are my enemy! A few moments ago you asked me to make a confession to you. You can judge for yourself whether it is likely to be a confession of—love—or of hatred (II; p. 496).

But later, when Gertrude discovers that Kerchival has been wounded and lies unconscious, she cries, "Kerchival! Forget
those last bitter words I said to you. Can't you hear my confession? I do love you. Can't you hear me? I love you!" (II; p. 498).

Their quarrel begins to find its resolution when Kerchival hears his sister Madeline confess that she is praying for Robert and for the enemies of her country. He acknowledges that a woman's heart belongs only to her lover, and says: "Pray for the man you love, sister--it would be treason not to" (III; p. 503). He then asks Gertrude if he is right, and, confessing that he is, she declares her love directly to him for the first time.

I do love you. I told you so, when you lay bleeding here, last night. But you could not hear me. . . . I said that same thing--to--to--another, more than three years ago. It is in that letter that General Buckthorn gave you. . . . I know it by heart, for I read it a dozen times. The letter is from Mrs. Haverhill.

She then quotes the letter:

"I have kept your secret, my darling, but I was sorely tempted to betray the confidence you reposed in me at Charleston. If Kerchival West--had heard you say, as I did, when your face was hidden in my bosom, that night, that you loved him with your whole heart--" (III; p. 504).

Kerchival interrupts her with, "Ah! . . . You have brought me new life." The ensuing battle goes badly for the Union army, and haggard, defeated Union soldiers begin retreating past the Ellingham house. Kerchival, though wounded, rejoins his troops, and Gertrude stands by the road entreat-
Fight for your flag--and mine!--the flag my father died for!
Turn back! . . . He has been marked for death already, and
I--I can only pray" (III; p. 504). At the conclusion of the
battle Gertrude goes off in search of Kerchival, who has not
returned. Neither she nor Kerchival are heard from again
until the last scene in the play when they appear happily
married (IV; p. 512).

The conflict between Gertrude and Kerchival results
from a deep personal commitment to each one's section of
the country. It develops quickly at the beginning of the
play, and their separation takes the form of verbal expres-
sions of hatred and enmity. The continuing love of each
for the other, however, is clear in Act II, but not until
the end of Act III does Kerchival hear Gertrude's declaration
of love. Her confession of love is accompanied by her con-
version from Southern sympathies to Union loyalty as she
urges the retreating Union soldiers to turn and follow
Kerchival into battle.

This is a new element in reconciliation drama, for
in Belle Lamar, the heroine attributes her desertion of
Bligh to pride, and, although she is reconciled to him, she
expresses no Union loyalty, only love for Bligh. In Held
by the Enemy Rachel's sectional loyalty is only implied, and
when she is freed from her engagement to Hayne, she simply
accepts Colonel Prescott as her lover, although the play
ends with his being "held by the enemy." But with Gertrude,
the dramatist has portrayed a fiery Southern patriot who is actually converted to Union sympathy because of love for a devoted and loyal Union officer. Unlike Bligh, Kerchival West is not torn between love and duty, for his loyalty is unquestioned. His conflicts are personal as he tries to persuade Gertrude to declare her love. Moreover, Gertrude does not express any inner conflict over duty and love. Once she expresses her love to Kerchival, her sympathies lie with the Union. The reconciliation of the two, therefore, may illustrate the one-sided expectation that the North would win out, not only in battle, but also in spirit as the South is converted to the Union point of view.

That this conversion was a false hope is illustrated by Thomas Augustus's play Alabama, first performed in 1891. The source of the sectional resentment and divisiveness is Colonel Preston. When the Colonel learns of Armstrong's intention to marry Carey, he forbids her to see him any further, for

she is but a child. You take advantage of her inexperience. She knows nothing of the world. She would die in your country. No--no, I cannot hear of it. The North robbed me of everything that made life worth living, sir, but this child. And they would take her, too!

Armstrong then charges Colonel Preston with cruelty and asserts that there are matters more important than his prejudices. Colonel Preston responds in bitterness and sadness: "What is it, sir--your wishes? I thought I was so
poor, Mr. Armstrong, that I should never see one of your Northern gentlemen again. Ah--ah--but I'd forgotten that my little girl might be coveted" (III; p. 104). Armstrong says that his resentment should not prevent Carey from pursuing her own happiness, but Colonel Preston again responds bitterly:

Your--happiness--you mean. She could not be content with you--you are too old for her, sir. You must be thirty--she's only eighteen. She belongs here. You wouldn't know how to treat her in your home. She'd die there as quickly as that flower on your coat, sir. Do magnolias grow in Massachusetts?" (III; pp. 104-105).

Davenport, overhearing this comment, responds: "I've seen them growing there, under proper conditions. But women's hearts, Mr. Preston, are not magnolias, and if they were, I've seen magnolias stifled in Alabama" (III; p. 105).

After Davenport sends Carey and Armstrong away so he can talk to Colonel Preston, he says, "Hearts are a little bigger than sectional resentment," but the Colonel responds:

I don't know that they are, sir. Sectional resentment broke my heart. Your North came to my peaceful little corner here, and ruined it. They took my only boy. They impoverished me in possession, and in affection, too. My heart was big enough, sir, but it couldn't keep your cavalry off my graveyard. My colored servants loved me, but they have been driven away into vagabondage and theft and ignorance. My boy loved me, too, but--they estranged his love (III; p. 106).

Then he pleads to be left alone: "I don't want your railroads, Captain, screaming across my quiet bayou. I don't want anything from your people" (III; p. 107). Davenport responds in an eloquent plea for understanding and
reconciliation: "Our resentment, Colonel Preston, is eighteen years behind the sentiment of the day." Colonel Preston bitterly replies, "Mine is not, sir." But Davenport says that it is when it interferes with the happiness of Carey and Armstrong, and the memories of 1865 come between them (III; pp. 107-108). Preston asserts that those "memories" are realities to him: "Do you see that crumbled post? It is leaning on a cannon. Like that, my ruined life has, under it, the realities of that invasion." Davenport then draws aside the vines that cover it to show him that a bird has built a nest in the ruined barrel: "Nature is teaching a lesson from it. See! a meadow-lark has built her nest in the mouth of this silent cannon." The Colonel misses the lesson, but Davenport explains, "If it were charged, and had a lanyard on it, this feathered pioneer would have some rights we old soldiers should respect. Colonel Preston, let us be generous to the little girl" (III; p. 108). Colonel Preston then says that Davenport cannot appreciate what he feels, and he ends the interview.

Among the plays in this study Alabama is the single one based on incidents of the Reconstruction period rather than the war. Additional differences between Alabama and the other plays are the roles of the heroines and the heroes and the source of the conflicts that separate the lovers. The play presents a heroine, Carey Preston, around whom the conflict of love and sectional loyalties revolve, but the
hero is her father, not her lover. She is, however, in love with a Northern suitor, Ned Armstrong. The hero, Captain Davenport (or Harry Preston as he was known in the South), is separated from his former sweetheart, Mrs. Mildred Page, a widow. The reconciliation of these two sets of lovers is the plot of the play.

In his youth Harry Preston (Captain Davenport) was in love with Mildred Page before Colonel Preston forbade the marriage because they were cousins. In Act III as Davenport and Mrs. Page reminisce about the past, Davenport declares that he loved her very, very much. Mrs. Page declares that her love for him never died either, but that she sent him away because both their families opposed them (III; pp. 91-92). Davenport then sets the context for both the conflict that has separated them and the conflict that is now separating Carey and Armstrong: "Yes, the audacious assumption of every generation to regulate the heart affairs of the one that follows. Such a cruel wrong!" When Mrs. Page responds, "Cruel, even if right," Davenport says, "I shall never stay away again. . . . Such a rest! Home, father, a daughter, Mildred" (III; p. 92).

These statements represent the most explicit and the most eloquent presentation of the love conflict theme to be found in any of the plays under consideration. Colonel Preston represents the proud but humiliated Southerner whose resentment continued far beyond the war and who feels that
his bitterness can never be overcome. On the other hand, Armstrong and Davenport express the conviction of the many who felt that the resentments were real, perhaps even justified, but that they should not be continued indefinitely; and, most importantly, they should not be allowed to ruin the lives of the generation that had nothing to do with commitments that brought about the conflict. The message is that the past is over and unchangeable, and resentment must be laid aside to make way for new relationships, not only between people as lovers, but also between people as Southerners and as Northerners.

The reconciliation of the two pairs of lovers illustrates the dramatist's perception of how the affairs of the heart can overcome the divisiveness of sectionalism, even though the resentments may not be entirely laid to rest. Armstrong and Carey resolve to run away to be married, but Davenport stops them with the warning that it would do grievous damage to Colonel Preston. Armstrong's nobleness is exhibited here as he agrees with Davenport that such an act would justify the Colonel's prejudices. The three then work out a plan to convince the Colonel of the strength of the love between Carey and Armstrong. Carey is to leave a note for the Colonel, pretending that she has gone away with Armstrong. When the Colonel hears Mrs. Page read the note, he is stunned:

Yes, yes, you gentlemen of the North, the ruin wasn't quite complete, was it? And so you took the little
girl. O, God, forgive me; was I too proud, was I too harsh? I hate him, but I would have said "yes," rather than this wrong--rather than this wrong to her. Gone--gone all night--night? Ah, ah! the sun can never shine again (IV; p. 139).

But Carey runs in, and he says, "Let me look at you. No, no! no need to question. The Eastern sky is not more beautiful with truth. Carey, Carey, Carey!" (IV; p. 140). He then consents to her marriage: "My darling, did you love him so? Mr. Armstrong, we are rich in something besides weeds, you see. Carey, Carey!" (IV; p. 141). Davenport surprises the Colonel by saying that he has approved the union, and his startling assertion leads to the reconciliation between the Colonel and Davenport, his son.  

Alabama is significant because it treats a theme that the other plays ignore completely--the old Southern planter who has been ruined by the war and whose resentment is strong and deep. He is the cause of the suffering of both Carey and Mrs. Page and of Davenport, for he has forbidden their marriages. Mrs. Page's suffering is the most intense, for she has been deprived of her lover for all of those years, even though she had married Dabney Page for "worthy motives" (II; p. 78). Carey's suffering is only implied and is quickly resolved. Davenport, too, has suffered, but his own choice to side with the Union is the cause of his suffering. The reconciliation of the lovers is a powerful illustration of the theme that old wounds should not destroy the future happiness of lovers whose
commitments to each other are stronger and deeper than any loyalties or duties that may have divided them in the past.

William Gillette's second reconciliation drama, *Secret Service*, first performed in 1895, has the same basic elements of the love conflict theme as the other plays, but it is the first of the plays under study that ends with the lovers physically separated from each other, although their love is strong and they are reconciled in spirit. Edith Varney is engaged to Captain Thorne, whom she believes to be a Confederate officer, but who is a secret agent for the Union army. In order to keep him near her, Edith has persuaded President Davis to give Thorne an appointment to head the Telegraph Department. Her love for him exceeds her commitment to the Southern cause, as is evident from her pleading with him to accept the commission:

> They're sending you on some mission where death is almost certain! They'll sacrifice your life because they know you are fearless and will do anything! There's a chance for you to stay here in Richmond and be just as much use--and I'm going to ask you to do this! It is n't your life alone--there are other lives to think of--that's why I ask you!--It may sound well--but--you see--

Thorne takes her hands and almost succumbs to her plea:

> "Ah my dear one--my dear--my darling--how can I--" He stops and recovers himself: "No! You shan't have this against me too!" (I; p. 560). Edith does not know what he means, but it is obvious that he wants Edith to remember that he
is refusing the commission in order to save her from complicity in his activities.

When Benton Arrelsford, a CSA secret agent, informs Edith that Thorne is probably a Union spy, Edith is torn between her love for Thorne and her fear that he really is a spy (I; p. 574). She tells her mother that Thorne has refused to take the commission, as he said, for Edith's sake. Even though Mrs. Varney condemns him as a traitor, Edith cries in disbelief that he could not be. But then she realizes the truth and whispers to herself, "Yes--yes" (I; p. 574). In order to prove that Thorne is a spy, Arrelsford sets a trap for him with Edith's help in the Varney home. Edith resists taking part in the trap, but both Mrs. Varney and Arrelsford insist. When Thorne arrives, he declares his love for her and, through a series of dramatic circumstances, escapes suspicion once more.

Arrelsford continues his pursuit of Thorne to the Telegraph Department where Thorne is preparing to send a spurious order that will weaken the lines of the Confederate Army at a crucial point. As he is about to send the message, Arrelsford shoots Thorne in the hand and calls for the guard to come in and imprison him. But, again, Thorne, ever the cool, resourceful man under pressure, turns the tables and convinces the guard that Arrelsford has interfered in official business. When the General arrives and tries to straighten out the charges and counter-charges between
Thorne and Arrelsford, Thorne is about to be trapped because he cannot produce the order that placed him in charge of the Telegraph Department. But Edith produces the commission that she had gotten from President Davis and saves Thorne again (III; pp. 599-605).

After Arrelsford is taken away as a prisoner, Thorne orders that the spurious message be sent. Edith is horrified that he would take such advantage of her love. She acted to save his life, she says, and cannot believe that he would use her devotion to betray the South. Thorne turns and orders the message sent; but then, painfully struggling with himself, he orders the operator to stop and to send a message revoking the order: "It was a mistake!—I refuse to act under this Commission!" (III; p. 606).

Benton Arrelsford finally captures Thorne and gives him a drum-head court-martial in the Varney home. While the court is meeting, Jonas, the Varney servant, disarms the cartridges of their guns. Edith tells Thorne to feign death after the executioners discharge their weapons, but Thorne tells the Sergeant in charge that the guns have been tampered with.

Both Edith's love for Thorne which prompts her to take desperate chances and Thorne's honest admission illustrate the highest virtues of noble men and women. Indeed, Thorne's noble behavior saves him, for General Stamburg arrives with the information that the drum-head court has
acted on the assumption that the spurious orders were sent but that they never were actually transmitted; and further he has an order from the President revoking the decision of the court and sentencing Thorne to a prison term. Finally, in recognition of his bravery and intelligence, the General offers Thorne his freedom if he will join the Confederate secret service. But, true to his nature and his country, Thorne refuses. The General suggests that Edith may be able to change his mind, but she says that she supports his decision. As Thorne is being led away, he asks, "What is it--love and good-bye?" Edith responds, "No-no--only the first--and that one every day--every hour--every minute--until we meet again!" (IV; p. 620).

Edith Varney fulfills the traditional role of the suffering heroine, but her Southern patriotism is assumed, and it serves only as the motivation for her anguish when she discovers Thorne's true identity. Yet her anguish is not fully developed in the play. When she realizes the truth of her love for him and acts to save him in two crucial situations, she seems to have no deep inner conflict between her love for Thorne and her Southern commitments. Her words and actions imply that after she has saved him in the telegraph office, she does not expect to see him again. But when Thorne refuses to compromise his loyalty, she supports him in his commitment, even though she knows it means their separation.
The significant interest in the play, however, is Captain Thorne, who exhibits a deep inner conflict between duty and love, while manifesting all the virtues of the ideal soldier. Thorne's refusal to send the spurious order was a confession of his love for Edith, even though it meant failure in his duty as a spy. That he is captured and sent off to prison at the end of the play seems to be Gillette's way of showing the unfortunate suffering brought on people by the war and by their commitments rather than a justification for the punishment that spies deserve. That Thorne is a spy, but more than that, a manly soldier, is Gillette's way of showing that duty and loyalty to one's country must not be sacrificed for one's own gain, even if it wounds one's lover. But the long-suffering of love is also shown in Edith's willingness to wait for Thorne. Their reconciliation is one of love. The sectional sympathies are apparently intact, but Edith's is subordinated to her love for Thorne, whereas Thorne's loyalties remain fully with the Union and are the cause of their temporary separation.

David Belasco's The Heart of Maryland, performed in 1895, is in every way the most typical melodrama of the group of plays in this study. Tom Boone, the rejected suitor, is a "well-to-do young Marylander", who pursues Maryland Calvert, even though she is already engaged to Alan Kendrick, a Southerner loyal to the Union. Tom says that Alan is out of her life now because of the war, but
Maryland still resists Boone, who says: "You love Alan Kendrick still! You love him with all your heart and soul! You can't--you won't forget him--though he is your enemy, and has taken up arms against your cause. This cursed Yankee!" (I; p. 185). Then Boone declares his undying love for Maryland: "I can't go away from you! I can't forget you! I can't! I can't! As long as you live I'll love you... I wish to God you were dead!... Scorned! The second time! Shamed! Damn! Damn!"

Maryland and Alan discuss the loyalties that separate them when he arrives at her house as a prisoner to be exchanged for Rebel prisoners. He says that he did not intend to let her know he was there, but she says that she will tend to him because he is wounded. When he reminds her that although he is a Southerner, he is still a loyal Union soldier, Maryland says that she has treated many a Northern soldier for his sake. Alan recalls that she had sent him away, but Maryland says that she had to:

Oh, you don't know how we feel--we women of the South! How our hearts are torn by this divided duty. On one side, our country--oppressed forlorn, desolate! We couldn't desert it, could we? On the other, our very own turned to foes--and so the long days pass with this awful, awful struggle here (I; p. 194).

Maryland asks Alan to stop fighting her people, but Alan cannot do it, even though his wounds would give him an excuse. He makes it clear that when he is exchanged for Southern prisoners, he will re-enter the fight. Maryland
pleads with him not to: "Ah!... You humiliate me—you cheapen my love! Oh! To have thrown myself at you like that! If you go now, that is the end—and I hope to God our side wins, even though your life be the price" (I; p. 196). Alan cries her name in astonishment, but Maryland fires back: "I'm a Southern woman to the last drop of my blood! I mean it." But her sectional loyalty gives way to her love as she warns him of a Rebel attack on Charlottesville, where he is being taken (I; p. 198).

As Rachel implicated Prescott in *Held by the Enemy*, Maryland implicates Alan in a charge of spying against the South when he is captured at The Lilacs, the Calvert homestead, in an effort to see Maryland. She had thought that she was meeting a Northern soldier-friend of Lloyd, her brother, who had told her to detain the friend until after the battle so that he could not fight (II; pp. 206-207). Not knowing that it was Alan she was meeting, she tells the General about the rendezvous and confirms the suspicion that Alan was spying on the Southern army. Crushed that she has so implicated him, she goes to Colonel Thorpe with a letter from the Union commander asking that Alan not be executed until he can come to prove that he was not spying. Thorpe implies that he will save Alan if Maryland confesses her part in the Rebel defeat at Charlottesville. But Alan convinces her that Thorpe has used her and will not save him. As Thorpe tries to kiss Maryland, with Alan helpless to save
her, Maryland stabs Thorpe four times (III. ii; pp. 233-234). Rescued by her valiant action, Alan says he will not leave her, even though he has a chance to escape, but Maryland convinces him that if he escapes he may be able to save them both. So Alan leaves with the promise to return with his own 9th Cavalry boys (III. ii; p. 234). Thorpe revives long enough to call out for the bell to ring, signaling the escape of a prisoner. The next scene shows the most famous episode in the play as Maryland climbs into the bell tower and swings on the bell tongue to keep the signal from being sounded so that Alan can escape (III. iii; pp. 235-236).

Maryland, after returning to The Lilacs, tells her guardian, Mrs. Gordon, that she can no longer resist her love for Alan even though she is a patriotic Southerner and he is a loyal Union soldier. Maryland is also reconciled to Tom Boone, the rejected suitor, as he apologizes to Maryland for letting Thorpe use him, and Maryland thanks him for missing Alan when he was ordered to shoot him. Finally, Alan arrives with the order that puts an end to Thorpe's villainy, and he and Maryland fall into each other's arms (IV; p. 250).

Maryland's role is typical of the Southern heroines in these reconciliation dramas, for she is the fiery Rebel who subjugates sectional loyalty to her love for the duty-bound Union officer. Although she pleads with him to join her, she recognizes that her love is more important than
Southern loyalty when he resists her entreaty. Both the rejected suitor and the villain also play typical roles. The suitor is shown to be, after all, a noble and good-hearted man, as he refuses to injure Alan, and then as he apologizes for being duped by Thorpe. Through all the conflicts between them, the love between Alan and Maryland remains strong, causing each to take risks that endanger them. These risks imply some conflict between love and duty, but there is no serious expression of the inner torment resulting from such division of obligations. The heroine rescues the hero from the clutches of the villain, and in turn the hero comes to rescue her from him. Their final reconciliation is a simple embrace and the uttering of each other's name in love. Maryland clearly does not relinquish her Southern patriotism, but realizes that when it conflicts with her love, it must take second place. Alan Kendrick is significant, for he is another Southerner, like Captain Davenport (Harry Preston) in Alabama, who is loyal to the Union. *The Heart of Maryland* is the most typical melodrama of the seven plays in this study, not departing in any significant respect from the standard pattern of the melodramas that prevailed on the stage in the nineteenth century. The other plays in this study have interesting and significant departures from the traditional pattern.

Clyde Fitch's *Barbara Fritchie*, performed in 1899, is an evident example of a departure from tradition, as well
as from the patterns of the other reconciliation dramas of this period, for in it the heroine is converted to Union loyalty, having become convinced that the South is wrong; and, further, the hero and the heroine are both killed at the dramatic conclusion of the play.

At the beginning of the play, however, Barbara is presented as the charming Southern coquette who has the whole town upset because she has been seeing Captain Trumbull, the Union soldier occupying the town with his troops. Furthermore, Barbara has thrown over Jack Negly, her suitor, because "he won't fight for the South." Barbara shames him by calling him a coward, and he determines to go, but "not to fight for my country; understand that? to fight him! To kill this damned Northerner who has taken you from me!" (I; p. 18). As Captain Trumbull and Barbara discuss the loyalties that separate them Barbara moans that Trumbull is a Yankee, while "my father's a Rebel, my brother's a Rebel, I'm a Rebel..." (I; p. 34). Admitting that he is rather handsome and nice "for a Yankee" (I; pp. 34-35), Barbara asks Trumbull to fight for the South, explaining that no Rebel would have been rude enough to care for her and then refuse her request (I; p. 36). When she wants to know what he thinks of her, he says that she is very adorable "for a Rebel" (I; p. 37). When he asks if she would be a Yankee for his sake, she is horrified: "What! against the South? My South! How dare you ask me that?" He says that it is no
more than she asked him. Barbara declares: "But the North is wrong; the South is right! . . . You are the aggressive party. We only ask to be left alone!" Trumbull says that the South wants to be let alone to do what they should not do--"to buy and sell human flesh, to take the young child from its mother, the wife from her husband--" (I; p. 38). When Barbara objects to his opinions, Trumbull says that she knows that it is true in her own house. Barbara retorts: "Stop! I won't listen. Not to those blackguard lies from Union papers!"

Declaring that she would die for the South, she says that they have taken down the American flag that used to fly from their flag pole. As they start to depart in anger, they realize that they do love each other, and Barbara says that even though she is a Rebel she will be his wife: "I've fought against it all I could. I've been silly and wilful and frivolous with you, but you saw behind my woman's barricade" (I; p. 41). She realizes the problems that their sectional loyalties will cause, but she says,

I love you! I've tried not to, but a love like mine must rule even in the heart it dwells in. I think its only master can be God. For, though I love my father dearly, dearly! though I love my brother second best, and love this house where mother taught me everything I know--including prayers--and love this town--the very bricks of the streets through which I've wandered into girlhood--and Maryland and all the South, the blessed, sweet, dear South, still you, you Northerner--you Yankee!--you, my soldier lover--I love you most! (I; pp. 41-42).
The conflict then comes from Mr. Frietchie, who forbids Trumbull to see Barbara again. He declares that his prejudice against Northerners is "fixed and unalterable" (I; p. 47). When Barbara says that she has already accepted his proposal, Mr. Frietchie says, "I'd sooner give you to the first Confederate deserter that came crawling along the road and feel surer of your happiness!" (I; p. 49).

But Barbara and Trumbull agree to meet the next morning in Hagerstown to be married (I; p. 51). At the minister's house Barbara and Trumbull discuss their love and the impending battle. Trumbull says, "Be brave, dear. If it should be, I'll fall loving you and trying to serve my country!" (II; p. 62). Barbara is still committed to the South: "Your country against mine!" But Trumbull expresses the reconciliation sentiment: "No. Our country! North and South were one in 1776. They'll be one again in 1876." Barbara sees his point: "Yes, in 1776 they were betrothed. This war's a lovers' quarrel; after it they'll wed for good, like you and I to-day" (II; p. 63). Trumbull replies that then nothing can separate them, and Barbara adds, "not even death!" Barbara then says that she has struggled all night about the rightness of the South, but by the morning it was easier. Perhaps—perhaps we're wrong. But still I'm torn between the two—you whom I love best on one side; everything else I love stands on the other—and this war, this cruel war blackens our skies with its powder clouds, stains our grass with our own heart's blood, destroys our homes and ruins the
land we cherish! What can we women do? My brother—escaped to-day and will be with our—with his troops—when they march into Hagerstown this morning. His gun points toward your heart, yours toward his! (II; p. 63).

They exchange love gifts—Barbara giving Trumbull the old American flag that flew at their house, and Trumbull giving Barbara his mother's wedding ring. But the battle begins before they can be married, and Trumbull rushes off to join his troops (II; pp. 68-69).

Barbara then saves Trumbull's life by shooting Gelwex who is poised in the minister's house as a sniper (II; pp. 81-84). She again saves him from the crazed Jack Negly who intends to kill him as he lies dying in Barbara's room, where he is hidden from Mr. Frietchie (III; pp. 112-119). Act III closes with Barbara murmuring that Trumbull only has one chance in a thousand to survive, but that she will "fight for that chance!" (III; p. 119). But Trumbull dies the next morning, and Barbara moans, "Will! My sweetheart! my lover! my husband! Don't leave me! Don't leave me!" (IV. i; p. 122). When Barbara hears strains of "Dixie" coming through the streets and learns that the Rebels have retaken the town, she cries, "No! no! it can't be true! It can't be true!" She then takes the flag she had given Trumbull and goes out on the balcony (IV. i; p. 123).

As the Rebel soldiers march through the street with Barbara holding up the American flag on her balcony, she is cursed, hissed, booed, shamed, and stoned by the crowd who
are out to welcome the Rebel soldiers. As Stonewall Jackson appears, the crowd goes wild with joy. When a man cries out that someone should shoot Barbara if she does not take in the American flag, Barbara responds: "Shoot! You've taken a life already dearer to me than my own. Shoot, and I'll thank you, but spare your flag!" (IV. ii; p. 126). In sympathetic recognition of her devotion, Jackson orders that anyone "who touches a hair of that woman, dies like a dog" (IV. ii; p. 127). Jack Negly, riding behind his father, Colonel Negly, sees Barbara and in crazed desperation at losing her love, shoots her. When the Colonel learns that it was his son, he realizes that Jack is insane and commands that Jackson's orders be carried out (IV. ii; p. 128). The play closes with the music of "My Country, 'tis of Thee" drifting over the tragic scene.

*Barbara Frietchie* has unique elements that distinguish it from the other reconciliation dramas, although its basic pattern and the elements of the conflict and reconciliation are the same. First, this is the only play of the period in which the causes of the war are discussed at all. When Trumbull tells Barbara that it is wrong for the South to maintain slavery, he asserts an idea that most dramatists avoided. It is true that the play also includes the faithful Negro servant who retains her Southern sympathies, so that the play itself seems to maintain a balance between the two ideas of the evil of slavery and the happiness of the
slaves in the South. This play, too, is unique in making explicit use of the symbolism of love and marriage to express the relationship between the North and the South. Finally, the play is unique in that both the hero and the heroine die at the end of the play. Although they are reconciled in their love and, more significantly, in Barbara's conviction that the South is wrong, the tragedy that their commitments bring upon them is poignantly represented in their deaths. Their reconciliation is the most political one in all of the seven reconciliation dramas of the period under study, and shows that though love is strong and may reconcile the lovers spiritually or symbolically, it cannot easily overcome the tragic consequences of armed conflict or insane jealousy.

All the World Loves a Lover--And War

Since the love theme is the most obvious motif in the reconciliation plays, one would think that it would receive the chief attention of the reviewers from the first, but in general the critics were more concerned about the presence or absence of sectionalism in the plays. The love motif, however, seems to have been the aspect of the plays that appealed most to the audiences. The critic of the Times-Democrat suggested what New Orleans' audiences wanted most in their plays when he noted that Shenandoah was a story of absorbing interest and that it was "a story of love and war told without mockish sentimentality for the one or
melodramatic bombast for the other."\(^{11}\) That Philadelphia audiences also wanted a sweet love story was noted by the *Evening Telegraph*: "It is a somewhat singular quality of the play [Secret Service] that the modest minor plot, which concerns the youngest son of the Richmond family . . . and an Airy Fairy Lillian of the Confederacy . . . should augment as the major plot diminished. Really, these two characters are the most admirable in the play. . . ."\(^{12}\)

Even the producers of the plays were conscious that the love theme was central for their audiences, for a program of the performance of *Shenandoah* at the Grand Opera House in Philadelphia on March 28, 1898, stated that "all the world loves a lover, and 'Shenandoah' is filled with noble passion and heroic deeds. It is a garden of love-making and brave deeds. It fires the blood and makes the pulse beat quickly through every scene."\(^{13}\) The Philadelphia *Inquirer* in commenting on *Held by the Enemy* in 1898, noted that the "struggle of the Northern officer to keep true to his country even when tempted by the woman he loves" was a major dramatic element in the play that appealed to the audience.\(^{14}\)

The reviewers noted, however, that the blending of the love story with the story of war was really what the audiences delighted in. The Philadelphia *Inquirer*, in reference to *Shenandoah*, December, 1889, noted: " . . . this is what the public appreciate--that it is strikingly romantic, that it clothes with fine visual effect, episodes of love
in the midst of war. . . ."15 The reviewer says further that "historians and soldiers may question in vain its proprieties so long as the people sympathize with the troubles of lovers." When Held by the Enemy played New Orleans in 1890, the Times-Democrat reviewer noted that the play had all the requisites to make it a success because it gave the audiences "a realistic though brief glimpse at a picture from the struggle tempered with enough of the softer passion to render it acceptable."16 Further, he said that the love affair between Susan and Bean won public favor and was the life of the play. The critic of the Philadelphia Public-Ledger in reviewing Shenandoah in 1895, commented on the effect of the love-war theme: "There is no play of war times which so vividly and truthfully pictures the military incidents and the domestic implications caused by the rebellion than 'Shenandoah.'"17 Again, the Philadelphia Record in 1896 suggested the power of the love-war theme in Held by the Enemy: "... in few of the dramas dealing with war times have the tender sentiments of a well-constructed love story been so well blended with the martial atmosphere. . . ."18 The Evening Bulletin in reviewing the same performance noted the "loud cheers from the gallery gods and vociferous applause from the pit" when "Robert Drouet, as the Colonel, in all the trappings and suits of war, fell into the arms of his inamorata, who he had [wooed] while the lightning flashed and the loud cannon rattled."19
The critics felt that The Heart of Maryland also interested the audiences because of "the love story unfolded amid the scenes of military activity. . . ."\(^{20}\) The Inquirer also noted the success of The Heart of Maryland in portraying the war in relation to domestic affairs as they were in the South during war-time.\(^{21}\) The same elements were appealing in Barbara Frietchie. The North American said that a strong point of the play was Jack Negly's dancing over the wounded Trumbull because of the Confederate victory and that the audience was receptive to the play.\(^{22}\)

Of course, the conflict between the heroine and the hero is the element that received the most attention. The New Orleans Bulletin in commenting on Belle Lamar in 1874 observed:

> Although we can not express the highest admiration for "Belle Lamar," . . . we yet find in parts true dramatic interest sufficient to draw those who appreciate the highly sensational. The wavering of purpose, the hesitation 'twixt military duty and devotion to his wife, of Col. Bligh, can not but excite the warm sympathies of the audience, and it is around this central idea the whole play turns.\(^{23}\)

But the Philadelphia Evening Call noted that the public was not likely to take kindly to Held by the Enemy, for the hero is too weak to be a hero and the heroine is too easy going in taking up one lover after the other has died. This, the reviewer said, is hardly what one would want in a heroine.\(^{24}\) The New Orleans Daily Picayune in a review of Shenandoah in 1892 noted that "the cruelty that touches the auditors is
the parting of true hearts and the shadow of doubt thrown upon some of them."  

A review of *Secret Service* from the Philadelphia *Press* in 1898 observed that the only battles were those of love. But the New Orleans *Times-Democrat* in a review of Belasco's *The Heart of Maryland* condemned Maryland Calvert as an impossible Southern girl who betrays Southern plans to the enemy in order to save her lover and who connives in his escape. The reviewer acknowledged that the introduction of the villain partly justifies the action but fell short of making of Maryland Calvert "an ideal Southern heroine, such as evidently was the intention of the playwright."  

Barbara Frietchie, however, was the heroine that received the most criticism from both New Orleans and Philadelphia critics. The Philadelphia *Record* in 1900, commented on Barbara's love affair:

> It is not impossible, perhaps, to imagine a fierce young "rebel" like Barbara falling in love with a handsome Northern captain, and we pardon her poetic fancy in conceiving their war-crossed love as an echo of the Capulet-Montague-crossed romance of Romeo and Juliet. Barbara whistles in her lover's ears: "'Tis but thy name that is my enemy!"

But the reviewer says that it is absolutely absurd to see Barbara promising to marry the damned lover only a moment after her father has thrown him out with curses. Surely, the critic concludes, she would not have made light of her first grief. On the other hand, the *Sunday States* in New Orleans was seemingly neutral in characterizing Barbara as the "charming, glowing, Frederickstown maiden, whose golden
heart was given to a Federal officer, and whose love sur-
mounted sectional bitterness and hatred, and held loyalty
to her brave hero in blue even up to the hour of death."29

But the reviewer of the Times-Democrat was indignant:

... the Southerners of to-day cannot be made to look
with favor, or even tolerance, upon a loyal Southern
girl, who, when sectional bitterness was at its highest,
could fall in love with and be willing to marry a
Yankee officer. They believe that at such a time a
Southern girl who was loyal had no business to receive
the attentions of a Yankee officer, to say nothing
of falling in love with him. They did not relish
this sort of thing in "Held by the Enemy," nor in
"Shenandoah," and are not likely to make an exception
in the case of "Barbara Frietchie."30

But the reviewer found Fitch's ending of the play partially
redemptive of Barbara's lapse:

In writing a war play with the inevitable love of a
disloyal Southern woman for a Yankee soldier of
unflinching loyalty, Clyde Fitch has in one respect,

at least, displayed more tact and artistic sense
than either Gillette or Bronson Howard, for instead
of a "lived-happily-ever-after" ending, he has closed
his play with a tragedy which is as thrilling as it
is unexpected, and which throws a mantle of charity
and sympathy over the memory of a Southern girl who
loved a Yankee soldier when such love meant disloyalty
to all that had been nearest, dearest, and most sacred
to her.31

He concluded by asserting that the tragic ending was the
strength of the play.

The interesting contrast here is that the Philadelphia
writer criticized Barbara Frietchie on grounds of dramatic
improbability, whereas the critic of the Times-Democrat was
indignant at Barbara's disloyalty to the South. Another
New Orleans' critic in the Sunday States recognized that
Barbara's loyalty to her lover surmounted sectional bitterness, but he noted her "Federal tendencies" because of her love for Trumbull. The reviewer in the Times-Democrat, however, found slight redemption of Barbara's disloyalty only in her death. The positions of these critics indicate that Southern critics and audiences were sensitive to suggestions of disloyalty, even though the States' critic recognized the apparent intention of the playwright to view the sectional question in terms of the love motif. It is clear that the Times-Democrat reviewer believed that he was stating the view of the "Southerners of to-day" who could not favor such a presentation of a "loyal Southern girl." The Philadelphia reviewer, on the other hand, followed a more artistic and less sectional line in his criticism.

Following the conflict between lovers, the audiences expected to see the reunion of the lovers in all the plays. Concerning the reunion of Belle Lamar and Philip Bligh, however, the critic of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin judged the reconciliation to be abrupt and unaccounted for on reasonable grounds. Having a distaste for the sombre atmosphere and plot of Belle Lamar, the critic of the Philadelphia Inquirer found that the audience received "no grace, mercy or peace . . . from the rise of the curtain upon the first act until the curtain finally falls upon the reunited lovers. . . ." Even the union of the lovers did not relieve the sombre feeling of the play. The critic of
the Evening Bulletin rejoiced in the reunion of the lovers in Held by the Enemy: "No happier prisoner ever was held by the enemy than Colonel Charles Prescott (the hero of William Gillette's thrilling war drama), when the curtain fell on the last act at the Girard Avenue Theatre last evening."

The Daily States recognized the power of love to reconcile in Shenandoah: "Hearts and hands join across the chasm and love smoothes away the wrinkles of strife."

When The Heart of Maryland was presented in New Orleans the critic of the States enjoyed the grandeur of action and motive that centered in the heroine's self-sacrificial struggle to save her lover from his fate as a spy. Maryland's denunciation of the man who had been arrested as a spy, not knowing he was her lover, was a touching and thrilling incident. But both the Philadelphia Press and the Evening Bulletin found fault with the ending of Barbara Frietchie. The Press believed that "the sombre melodramatic ending needs changing," for the killing off of both lovers is "ruthless disregard of the feelings of[the] audience."

The Bulletin said that Fitch followed the tradition of war plays in building his drama, except in the finale, where instead of the lovers embracing in reunion and the Union troops on the stage, both lovers are dead, and the Confederate troops have the stage. Apparently, these reviewers and their audiences as well wanted a traditional ending with the lovers reunited.
and living happily ever-after. Finally, the Times-Democrat review of Barbara Frietchie indicates that Southern audiences were not pleased with such reunions at the expense of the heroine's Southern loyalty and could accept Barbara's turning from the Southern cause only because she paid for it with her death.

In general, the reviews indicate that the love motif achieved what the audiences expected and apparently what the playwrights intended—that love overcomes all sectional differences. An advanced publicity notice indicated that this was the intention of the producers of Secret Service: "The play is a love story pure and simple, and although the hero and heroine have differences in sectional sympathy, they find that 'love conquers all.'" The Daily Picayune acknowledged the power of love in Held by the Enemy in this comment:

[The play] deals more with the loves of human hearts than with the carnage of war, and love knows no north and no south—no nothing but love. Colonel [Prescott] was a gallant northern officer, whose heart surrendered to a fair Southern girl. He would have sacrificed rank and position to serve her, and save her confederate lover.

The Daily Picayune also noted that Barbara Frietchie's love theme was as old as the world, and love certainly leaps all barriers of caste, religions, sections of the country, and prejudice.

In conclusion, based on the reviews of the plays, it is clear that the love theme appealed to both Northern and
Southern audiences. Both audiences apparently wanted a traditional love story with strong heroes and virtuous heroines. They expected to see women who were worth loving and who represented the ideals of womanhood. For Southern audiences, particularly, the virtue of the heroine frequently included her unswerving loyalty to the South. But it is also clear that some Southern audiences, like Northern audiences, recognized that love conquered all barriers of race, class, and sectional bitterness. Although some Southern audiences recognized the "wholesomeness" of the power of love to surmount sectionalism, others seem to have resented the implication that a loyal Southern girl could lose her faith in the South because of love. For such girls, like Barbara Frielchie, death was appropriate in the eyes of these Southerners. Northern audiences, however, complained about the sombreness of the deaths of Barbara and Trumbull and wanted a happier ending. It is clear that the Northern audiences were not as sensitive to the sectional loyalty of the heroine as the Southern audiences were, but, after all, none of the plays portrayed a Northern heroine who turned to Southern loyalty. The Northern audiences, however, did expect their heroines to be above suspicion in loyalty to their lovers. Any, like Rachel in Held by the Enemy, who took up too quickly with another was condemned as being too easy-going in the eyes of the audience.
Again, the reviews indicate that both the Northern and Southern audiences enjoyed the mingling of war and love. The vivid portrayal of the domestic implications of the war, the battles of war, tempered by the softer passions, the cruelty of the parting of true hearts because of the circumstances of war—all indicate that the audiences, North and South, sympathized with the troubles of lovers. Southern audiences clearly appreciated the highly sensational, but they also were moved by the wavering between duty and devotion of the heroes. Northern audiences were apparently sensitive to real misery in the world and desired not to see it portrayed on the stage.

The chief conclusion about the audience reactions to the love theme in the plays is that both Northern and Southern audiences generally recognized the power of love to overcome sectional bitterness. But the reconciliation was a personal one and not a political one. Both audiences believed that women should be loyal to their men, and men should be loyal to their country. Although audiences showed some sympathy with the struggle between love and duty, the plays brought about reconciliation of the lovers only by having the heroine subordinate her sectionalism to her love. In two instances—in Shenandoah and in Barbara Frietchie—the heroines express overtly their conversion to Union loyalty. Whether the audiences translated the heroines reconciliation to her lover into a symbol of political
reconciliation is not entirely clear from the evidence of the reviews. Certainly both Philadelphia and New Orleans audiences felt that women should subordinate political commitments to the affairs of the heart. They apparently believed also that love was a solid basis for a lasting personal relationship that transcended political loyalty. When put in the perspective of fundamental human relationships, love was more important than politics. That the heroes were all Union men and that the heroines accepted, however reluctantly at times, the men's Union loyalty clearly represents the victory of the Union over the Confederacy. Audiences certainly could not miss Fitch's statement of this symbol in *Barbara Frietchie*. It seems to be a safe assumption that both Northern and Southern audiences accepted the plays as portraying human relationships and political loyalty in the proper relationship. The love theme demonstrates that the Union and Unionism were victorious. That New Orleans audiences almost completely accepted this circumstance indicates that reconciliation was well underway in 1874 when *Belle Lamar* was performed. By 1900 most New Orleanians apparently could witness without flinching Barbara's assertion that the South was wrong in the Civil War, for none of the critics discussed this point. Surely, there were unreconstructed Southerners like Colonel Preston in *Alabama*, but even he accepted love as a bond for the new generation following
him. The residue of bitterness in the South, represented primarily by the critic of the Times-Democrat alone, certainly remained, but the fact is that it seems to have spent itself and was swallowed up in the sentimental enjoyment of happy reunion. The reviews indicate that though some few attached their pride to the old sectional issues, most theater-goers--both Northern and Southern--were viewing the ideal of love and companionship as a higher value than sectional commitments to a bygone era.
NOTES

1 Dion Boucicault, Belle Lamar, in Plays for the College Theater, ed. Garrett H[asty] Leverton (New York, 1932), p. 132. Subsequent references to this edition will be cited in the text of the paper within parentheses. The following analysis of the love conflict demonstrates that all dramatists were using the typical characters of melodrama to portray reconciliation ideas. See above, pp. 30-33.

2 William Gillette, Held by the Enemy, TS, Morton Collection, University of Chicago Library, [1898], Act I, p. 12-M. Unless otherwise indicated, references to the play will be to the typescript and will be cited in the text of the paper within parentheses.


4 Augustus Thomas, Alabama (Chicago, 1898), pp. 103-104. Subsequent references to this edition will be cited in the text of the paper within parentheses.

5 This is discussed in Chapter Three, pp. 108-111.

6 William Gillette, Secret Service, in Representative American Plays, ed. Quinn, p. 560. Subsequent references to this edition will be cited in the text of the paper within parentheses.

7 Frank Rahill notes the qualities of Gillette's dramatic action in a comment from The World of Melodrama (Univ. Park, Pa., 1967), p. 270: "Throughout the play, Gillette, playwright, has been skillfully adding stroke by stroke to the picture of a people giving everything for a cause. Edith's father is at the front; her youngest brother has left to join him; another brother lies dying from his wounds in their home. Everything that a country can mean to a woman, the South means to her. The sudden and overwhelming realization of all this, Gillette, actor in the role of Thorne, succeeds in conveying in those few moments while he stands motionless over the telegraph instrument facing
rigidly front, his jaw clenched on a cigar and his hand poised above the transmitter. It is a situation superbly imagined and superbly played—melodramatic theatre at its finest."


9 Clyde Fitch, Barbara Frietchie, The Frederick Girl (1900; rpt. New York, n.d.), p. 16. Subsequent references to this edition will be cited in the text of the paper within parentheses.

10 For a discussion of the treatment of Negroes in the plays, see below, pp. 182-191. Writing in 1899, Fitch was able to portray his characters in a more realistic way than the other dramatists, for by the end of the century realism was making advances in drama as well as in other literary forms. See below, pp. 293-294.

11 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 29, 1890.

12 Philadelphia Evening Telegraph, May, 1895; quoted in Edgar L. Potts, "A History of the Philadelphia Theater, 1890-1900." Diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania 1932, chapter 4, p. 14. Although Potts cites the Evening Telegraph for March, the citation is probably to the Evening Telegraph. There was no Evening Telegram in Philadelphia, and Secret Service played Philadelphia in May of 1895. See above, p. 54, n. 66.


14 Philadelphia Inquirer, Nov. 22, 1898.

15 Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 24, 1889.

16 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Nov. 24, 1890. For the love affair between Susan and Bean referred to in the next sentence see Appendix A, pp. 306-307.

17 Philadelphia Public Ledger, Jan. 29, 1895.

18 Philadelphia Record, Dec. 29, 1896.
earlier productions of the play represented by the type typescript Hayne died. In the published version (1898; rpt. 1925) he survives to relinquish his claim on the heroine in favor of the hero.

The review of Shenandoah in the Times-Democrat when it appeared in New Orleans in 1890 expressed a different opinion than that indicated here, for the earlier comment was that Howard had handled the story so deftly that "not a line or scene . . . can give the slightest offense to Northerner or Southerner. The characters are pronounced in their views and express them freely, but the points on each side are so evenly balanced in force and number that it would be impossible to determine which side has the better of it. . . . It is a story calculated to conciliate the bitterest partisans," the reviewer continued, "and make them forget the issues that estranged them, in a realization of the fact that bravery, gentleness, and true manhood are qualities too great and noble to be fettered by geographical or political boundaries" (New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 29, 1890). Either the earlier opinion was written by a different critic or the reviewer had a short memory. The earlier reviewer did not, it is true, comment specifically on the Southern heroine's love for the Union officer, but he noted that Helen Leslie as Gertrude won the sympathies of the audience from the first. This judgment along with the absence of any specific criticism of the love theme indicates that it was not so disagreeable an issue as the later critic remembered.
In a review of Alabama in 1891, however, the Times-Democrat critic said that Howard had trod "delicate and dangerous ground" in Shenandoah (Oct. 20, 1891). The Times-Democrat review of Held by the Enemy in 1899 argued that the play presented "grammatical patriotism . . . at the expense of a Southern dialect as hideous as it is untrue," and that devotion to the flag is exploited "against a background of circumstances which burlesque Southern femininity . . ." (Oct. 2, 1899). Again, he does not specifically condemn the heroine's love for the Union soldier, but he implies distaste for the story.

The view of the Times-Democrat critic is supported by a critic reviewing Barbara Frietchie in Chicago in 1900: "No heroine but that of a play ever turned against a cause to which hitherto she had been an ardent devotee in the fashion that Barbara does. Other Southern girls may have loved Northern officers, may, perhaps, have fled with them, but not, one fancies, at a time a father and a home were threatened by the invaders" (unidentified review of the performance at the Illinois Theatre, Oct. 6, 1900, in a scrapbook in NYPL). The Chicago critic, however, was more concerned about the effect of Barbara's implausible love on the dramatic quality of the play than he was troubled by the sectional issue.

31 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 24, 1900.
32 New Orleans Sunday States, Dec. 23, 1900.
34 Philadelphia Inquirer, Sept. 22, 1874.
36 New Orleans Daily States, Feb. 1, 1892.
37 New Orleans Sunday States, Dec. 25, 1898. This was apparently an advanced publicity notice, for the play opened on Christmas night. It represents audience response to previous productions in other cities.
40 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 24, 1900. Of course, by the end of the nineteenth century the tragic ending was becoming more acceptable in dramatic literature as the trend toward more realistic treatments gained force.
But the disapproval of such endings indicates that the audiences, judging from the reviews, still were clinging to more romantic treatments. Apparently the Times-Democrat critic was the same one who commented that Secret Service was unique among Civil War dramas, for it had no traitor heroes or heroines—"no Southern girls who for the love of an alien betray the cause for which their fathers and brothers are dying. For this Mr. Gillette is entitled to the thanks of all those who believe the traitor to his cause is an odious individual, whatever the sex" (New Orleans Times-Democrat, Jan. 14, 1901).

41 Philadelphia Press, May 12, 1895. I read this notice three times in different papers.

42 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Oct. 2, 1899; the review names the Colonel as Preston, but it clearly should be Prescott.


44 See p. 90, and p. 102, note 24. The earlier drafts of the play had Hayne dying from his wounds, but the published version relieves the problem criticized here by having Rachel declare early in the play that she does not love Hayne and by making it clear that their engagement had been arranged by the family.

45 Although none of the reviews dealt critically to any extent with the plays as drama, the Northern critics commented more frequently on the dramatic quality of the plays. This may suggest a more critically alert audience in Philadelphia than in New Orleans. Southern critics comment in general terms on dramatic qualities, but frequently Northern reviewers point out specific strengths and weaknesses and dramatic probabilities and improbabilities, although they too make occasional judgments on such things as the morality exhibited by the heroes and heroines.
CHAPTER III

FAMILY, FRIENDS, AND VILLAINS: THE GOOD AND THE BAD

The conflict-resolution theme represented primarily in the heroines and heroes of the seven plays extends also to the actions between minor characters. The plays contain minor love plots portraying a conflict and reconciliation between secondary characters, but since these plots merely reinforce the major love themes, I will deal with them in an appendix. But the emphasis on reconciliation involves, in addition to lovers, relationships between other family members, between friends, and between the villains and other characters in the plays. In each of these minor plots sectional commitments form an integral part of the relationships between the characters.

I

Supplementing the reconciliation themes in the love plots, conflicts between a soldier brother and his sister also involve sectional issues. In two plays a Southern soldier-brother condemns his sister’s love of an officer merely because he is a Union soldier. Of course, this minor plot impinges upon the love theme, but the emphasis to be
noticed here is the reaction of the brother. For example, in *Secret Service* Wilfred Varney, assuming the role of the father, condemns Edith for helping Thorne escape entrapment by Arrelsford. Since their father is away at the front, Wilfred determines to see Edith about her actions: "My sister Edith! She gave him the Commission that allowed him to do it." Recognizing his responsibility, he asserts his manliness and orders Edith sent to him. Even though he is wounded, he is determined to confront Edith immediately about her betrayal, for he cannot understand how a Southern girl, with a father away fighting the Yankees, can betray her country in such a way. Mrs. Varney insists that he is too weak and ill, but Wilfred commands Edith's presence. At this point, Thorne bursts into the Varney house, fleeing Arrelsford, and Wilfred places him under arrest. As Thorne pleads with Wilfred to allow him to see his wounded brother before he dies, Arrelsford enters and captures Thorne, and intends to execute him on the spot. Wilfred objects, demanding that Thorne be given a proper trial. When Edith requests permission to speak to Thorne before he is executed, Wilfred objects at first, but responding to the pleas of Caroline, his sweetheart, he relents. At the conclusion of their talk, when Thorne tells the sergeant that his men's guns have been tampered with, Wilfred, openly admiring Thorne's honesty and courage, says, "I'd like to shake hands with you!" (IV; p. 617). When Thorne asks if the handshake
is on behalf of Wilfred or of his father, Wilfred says that it is for both of them. Wilfred's recognition of Thorne's honesty and bravery and of Edith's deep devotion to her lover implies that he accepts the fact that there are qualities of character and affection that transcend sectionalism.

The relationship between Barbara and Arthur Frietchie emphasizes the same point. Sue, Arthur's sweetheart, comments that if Arthur were there, he would not allow Barbara to flirt with the Yankee Trumbull. When Arthur comes to the minister's house, where Barbara and Trumbull are to be married, he is stunned at his sister's intentions. Barbara responds,

Wait! Don't speak yet; you don't know him, you've never even seen him. How can you judge? He saved you from the Search Gang last night, though you don't know it. He's a good, brave man, and he's here in the army you've come to fight! Oh, Arthur, he's as dear to me as you can be to Sue and she to you! Pity me! help me! (II; p. 75).

Arthur says there is nothing he can do. When Barbara asks if he is angry with her, he says, "No, I'm sorry for you" (II; p. 76). They part, each hoping and believing that Arthur and Trumbull will not meet on the battle field (II; p. 77). Apparently, Barbara's plea and their relationship, along with Arthur's noble character, are enough to persuade him to be merciful to Trumbull, for after wounding him, he brings him back to the Frietchie house to be tended by Barbara, helps her to conceal him from Mr. Frietchie, and goes for the doctor to tend his wounds (III; pp. 99-100).
Reconciliation is evident in these acts, which indicate not only sympathy for Barbara's love of Trumbull, but also a recognition of Trumbull's bravery. In both Secret Service and Barbara Frietchie these incidents affirm that family affection is superior to political commitments, when affairs of the heart are concerned, and supplement on another level the implications of the love plots.

Other conflicts between family members emphasize the sectional issues in a different way, for they involve a Southerner who overtly supports the Union cause. Chronologically, the first play to present this theme is Alabama, in which Harry Preston, a Southerner by birth, is represented as having fought in the war on the Union side. Of course, the action of the play occurs in 1880, fifteen years after the close of the war, but Harry Preston's choice has remained as a bitter conflict between him and his father, Colonel Preston. When, during the war, Harry came through Talladega with General Sherman's army, he had visited with his wife against the wishes of his father. In the play, Harry, as Captain Davenport, arrives in Talladega to plan for the railroad he is to build there. He explains to Mrs. Page, his former sweetheart, how he adopted a new name:

Yes--General Davenport died in my arms on the field, and dying he said, "Preston, you are a boy whom I have loved. I have left what worldly goods I have, to you--as I leave you my blessing now." I valued the blessing more than I valued the material bequest, because the next letter from the South brought me a father's curses--brought me the news' of Margery's death. . . .
Out of gratitude to dear old Davenport, I took his name—his little money gave me some leverage—my civil engineering threw me with the railroads. . . . I have succeeded—if bank accounts and embankments and new cities in the wilderness mean success (II; p. 83).

When Mrs. Page asks him if this is not success, he says, "I do not know—I feel my years. Time has left its warning on the temples. I am strong enough in the material sense, but my life is empty and unpromising. I have thought so much of late—about—my father" (II; p. 84). Recognizing that each has suffered, Davenport says, "Of course . . . you have suffered. It becomes so different at forty, doesn't it?" Davenport relates that the railroad was to run five miles from Colonel Preston's plantation, but since the plantation was bankrupt, he thought that if he could send it through his father's land, it would bring him riches (II; p. 85).

When Davenport sees the Colonel for the first time, he muses, "How changed—how changed! . . . My voice does not startle him—and the old eyes are grown too dim with age" (II; p. 87). In order to increase the effect of estrangement and reconciliation Thomas presents the Colonel as not recognizing his son. When the Colonel invites him to partake of his breakfast, Davenport is almost overcome with emotion and starts to embrace the Colonel and Carey, his daughter, but Mrs. Page restrains him. Act II closes with Davenport murmuring to himself: "My father—and my child!" (II; p. 88). Mrs. Page tells him that although the Colonel has spoken tenderly of him for the past twelve years,
Davenport has not written in all that time (III; p. 93).
Davenport attributes his neglect to his "blind resentment."
Then in an eloquent plea to reconcile Preston to the marriage of Armstrong and Carey, he makes a heartfelt attempt to bridge the gap between himself and his father:

I respect your feeling in the matter, Colonel Preston, but I can't help thinking it is your personal view that blinds you. Things, sometimes, are too personal for a correct appreciation. The North and South were two sections when they were a fortnight's journey apart by stages and canals. But now we may see the sun rise in Pennsylvania and can take supper the same day in Talladega. It is one country. Alabama sends its cotton to Massachusetts--some of it grown very near your graveyards. The garment you have on was woven twenty miles from Boston. Every summer Georgia puts her watermelons on the New York docks. Pennsylvania builds her furnaces at Birmingham. The North took some of your slaves away--yes--but one freight car is worth a hundred of them at transportation. Our resentment, Colonel Preston, is eighteen years behind the sentiment of the day (III; p. 107).

Finally, when Davenport tells the Colonel that he has approved the union of Armstrong and Carey, the Colonel responds, "You approved it, sir?" (IV; p. 142). Davenport explains that he has done so in the name of Carey's father who had given him a letter. He pretends to read Harry Preston's letter that refers to certain boyhood experiences: "I think of him always. Tell him to remember the day he gave me my pony with the silver tail--the old canoe on the bayou. Tell him I long to put my arm about him, as he so often put his strong one around me" (IV; pp. 143-144). When the Colonel takes the blank paper and sees nothing there, he realizes that Davenport is his son, for he could not have
made up the sentimental memories that he just expressed. Davenport embraces him and says, "Dear--dear old father! And we've lost all these years" (IV; p. 145). Colonel Preston replies, "We haven't lost a day. I've had you with me always." When Colonel Preston remembers the railroad, Davenport says that the railroad "shall not disturb you, father. I meant it only for your good, but I am with you now," and he directs Armstrong to route the railroad through Mrs. Stockton's land (IV; pp. 147-148).

Other Southerners who support the Union and create conflicts within their families appear in The Heart of Maryland. Lloyd Calvert, Maryland's brother, has just come from Washington and is detailed on secret service to enlist in the Southern ranks and report to Thorpe. Thorpe comments: "Your family is the first here; and your sister Miss Maryland, one of the most loyal women in the South, and your local knowledge makes you invaluable." Lloyd responds:

When I entered the Military Academy at West Point, I took the oath of allegiance to the North, I swore to serve it, and I'm going where my duty calls me. I know I'm doing right. But if I'm caught--Oh! I'm not afraid to die--. . . They--my people will learn I have not been fighting for them--I was a spy against them (I; p. 181).

The Southern army is headquartered at The Lilacs, and Mrs. Gordon, Lloyd's guardian, tells him how proud she is to have him chosen as confidential secretary to General Kendrick, the Southern commander (II; p. 200). This position gives Lloyd the opportunity to try to get a copy of General
Kendrick's plan of operations to the Union commander, but he is shot in the attempt (II; p. 209). Thorpe learns that Lloyd revealed to Maryland the plan to attack Charlottesville and that because Maryland had told Alan, the Southern troops had been defeated. Since this has upset Thorpe's plans to revenge himself on Alan Kendrick, he decides to arrest Lloyd as a traitor and deserter; but Lloyd dies, and Thorpe says, "Served him right! He was too infernally zealous!" (II; p. 210). When she learns of Lloyd's death, Maryland defends his name against the charge of spying for the Union (II; pp. 216-218). When the truth is evident, however, Mrs. Gordon is crushed that Lloyd spied for the North. Since he is killed there is no reconciliation between Lloyd and members of his family, but Maryland's love for Lloyd and Mrs. Gordon's hope that the South would lose the battle indicates that they would have accepted, finally, his commitment to his conscience.

The separation among members of a family is illustrated further in *The Heart of Maryland* by Alan Kendrick's dispute with his father General Kendrick. Alan, like Harry Preston and Lloyd Calvert, is a Southerner but commands the 9th Cavalry of the U. S. Army, while his father commands the Southern forces. When Alan is captured for spying at The Lilacs, he tells his father that he had come back on private business, not to spy on them. But he cannot tell him that he came to see Maryland for fear of implicating
her. The General can take no chances when he learns of Alan's complicity in the Charleston disaster and orders that Alan be held as a prisoner. Alan's relationship to his father had been strained when the General drove his wife away because he suspected that she had been unfaithful to him. The General, in a plea for understanding, tells Alan,

You have reason to think harshly of me—you did right to stand by your mother. . . . My love made me unreasonably jealous, and, suspecting a rival, I drove her from me—hurt beyond pardon. Ah, Alan! . . . I had hoped that one day my boy—a man—would know the love of a woman—would feel just one such pang as mine—to make him—forgive, and understand (II; p. 215).

Alan says that he does understand, and they clasp hands. But while Alan is still imprisoned, the General is killed in the battle. Their reconciliation, however, illustrates the sympathy among men of differing commitments when they are faced with the common problems of love.

A powerful representation of a Southern daughter separated from her father results from Barbara Frietchie's conversion to Union sympathies. After the battle to retake Frederick, Barbara asks if Mr. Frietchie has any news of Trumbull. He responds that he has no news, but "better for you if he were among the missing!" (III; p. 89). Barbara declares that she still loves Trumbull, but Mr. Frietchie says, "You love your father too, don't you" Well, he's my enemy and your brother's; but he seems to have driven love for your brother out of your heart! I've not heard you ask about his life!" (III; pp. 89-90). When Mr. Frietchie asks
her to help him fly the Confederate flag in celebration of
the victory that Arthur has helped to win, Barbara tells
him that she has wandered in her allegiance to the Southern
flag. He responds, "You've been attracted by a handsome
stranger--this Yankee officer. You think you love him, but
you're only a girl. I'm an old man, and I know what such
love is worth. Wait till your [sic] older" (III; p. 91).
In order to bring pressure on her, Frietchie recalls that
Barbara's mother, who had died in giving birth to her, had
said that he should keep Barbara happy as he had made her
happy, and he tells her also that her uncle had died in the
battle that day. Bitterly he says that if they brought the
dead body of Trumbull to his house, he would not let it rest
under his roof.

Further, when Mr. Frietchie learns that Barbara has
shot Gelwex in order to save Trumbull, he says, "My daughter
shot a soldier of the South! Would to God you'd killed him
[Trumbull] first! It's he who made the fighting here to-day
double the work. We almost had the town when he came on with
reinforcements and fought like a very devil!" (III; p. 93).
Barbara tells Mr. Frietchie that Gelwex is a deserter from
the North and that "I love the South, but I think this time
she's wrong!" Mr. Frietchie reacts in disbelief: "Wrong?
Hush! you're crazy!" But Barbara says, "No! A mother loves
her child even when he's naughty, and so I love the South;
but the only flag I'll wave is the flag of the Union, the flag my lover fights for!" (III; p. 93).

When Arthur brings the mortally wounded Trumbull to the Frietchie house so that Barbara can tend to him, Mr. Frietchie guesses that the wounded soldier in her room is Trumbull and orders Gelwex to get Trumbull out of his house. Barbara pleads that it would kill Trumbull to move him, but Mr. Frietchie says that he is not concerned. Barbara responds: "No! . . . You can't carry your hatred of the North so far as that!" (III; p. 107). But Mr. Frietchie is adamant: "He came here to war against my son. He's taken you from me, and made you a traitor to your country!" Barbara denies that she was ever a traitor, but Mr. Frietchie says, "Wasn't it enough . . . that this man should push his way into my very house and lay its happiness in ruins?" Barbara continues to plead, telling him that if Trumbull goes, she will go also. Then Barbara reminds him of her mother's request that Mr. Frietchie should keep her happy as he had made her mother happy:

"Father, my only happiness, all the joy there can ever be for me in this world, depends on the life of that man upstairs! Send him out to die in our streets! . . . You break my heart—and damn my soul, for if merciful death shouldn't come to me, I swear to you before heaven, I'd go myself to meet death" (III; p. 108).

Moved by her plea and by the memory of his wife, Frietchie agrees to let Trumbull stay (III; p. 109).

The reconciliation between Barbara and her father occurs symbolically as he agrees to let the dying Trumbull
remain under his roof. But the separation is deep because of Mr. Frietchie's sectional bitterness, and perhaps irreconcilable, because Barbara dies, flying the American flag from her balcony. The conflict illustrates, more realistically than any other in these plays, the consequences of sectional bitterness. Not only has Barbara lost her lover, but Mr. Frietchie has lost a daughter both literally in her death and spiritually in her conviction that the South was wrong. It is clear that Mr. Frietchie's convictions are strong and unchangeable, and in these circumstances even the love between a father and his daughter do not overcome them.

Although Alabama, The Heart of Maryland, and Barbara Frietchie exploit the conflicts between members of a family directly along sectional lines, Shenandoah portrays a conflict between a father and a son that suggests on a secondary level of symbolism the reconciliation of the North and the South. Although General Haverhill and his son Frank Bedloe are both Northerners who fight in the Union army, it is possible to see the disgrace of the son and his redemption as a symbol of the disgrace that the South brought upon the Union and the son's gallantry and bravery as a symbol of the redemption of the South from its errors. Frank Bedloe had disgraced the family by embezzling funds from a New York bank. The General disowned him, but his step-mother, Mrs. Haverhill, pleads with the General to forget his resentment and to send his son a message of forgiveness. Haverhill
gives her a portrait of herself, which he has always carried with him, and tells her to send it to his son: "I would like him to--to think tenderly of me, also. He will do it when he looks at this picture. . . . I could not send a kinder message, and he will understand it, . . . ." for it is a message "a man will understand" (I; p. 486). He goes out murmuring, "My son! My son! We shall never meet again!"

Frank, however, escaping from prison, joins the army and a year later joins his father's regiment. Kerchival West assures him that he will do everything he can for him and that his father will not recognize him with his full beard, especially since Frank was supposed to have been killed in New Orleans a year before. Responding to Kerchival's kindness, Frank comments on his relationship to his father: "I am dead to him. It would have been better if I had died. Nothing but my death--not even that--can wipe out the disgrace which I brought upon his name" (II; p. 491).

When the General needs a soldier to go on a dangerous mission in order to find out the Rebel code, Frank volunteers. The General accepts, warning him that it is a dangerous mission and expressing the hope that he will keep a brave heart and return to them. Frank thinks to himself, "He is my father still" (II; p. 492). When Frank is wounded and captured, the General arranges to exchange Robert Ellingham for him. Frank is brought back on a stretcher,
but the General arrives after he dies and wishes he had a son like Frank:

\begin{quote}
Brave boy! I hoped once to have a son like you. I shall be in your father's place to-day, at your grave. . . . We will carry him to his comrades in the front. He shall have a soldier's burial in sight of the mountain-top beneath which he sacrificed his young life; that shall be his monument (III; p. 503).
\end{quote}

At the end of the war Edith, Frank's widow, and Mrs. Haverhill discuss the General's honoring of Frank Bedloe, whom the General still does not know was his son. Edith hopes that her baby son will soon grow up, for she wants

to have him old enough to understand me when I repeat to him the words in which General Haverhill told the whole world how his father died! . . . And yet, even in his official report to the Government, he only honored him as Lieutenant Bedloe. He has never forgiven his son for the disgrace he brought upon his name (IV; p. 506).

When the General finally consents to see them, he lovingly embraces Edith: "My son's wife. . . . You shall take the place he once filled in my heart. His crime and his disgrace are buried in a distant grave." Then Mrs. Haverhill tells him that the words he had spoken over Frank Bedloe's grave were references to his own son. The General, aware for the first time that Frank was his own son, moans, "I left him alone in his grave, unknown; but my tears fell for him then, as they do now. He died before I reached him" (IV; p. 511). The conflict and reconciliation between the General and his son, although portrayed on a personal level,
are based on the same qualities of courage and gallantry that the dramatists use to portray the reunion of the North and the South when they characterize the ideal soldiers of both sections. Although the relationship of General Haverhill and Frank Bedloe does not involve sectional issues directly, it does portray the growth of a young boy into manhood and the development of virtues that Howard often uses to appeal for reconciliation. The acceptance of the youth's redeeming actions by the father is an attractive symbol of the acceptance of the South by the North.

II

In addition to conflicts among members of families, the plays portray the separation of friends over the Civil War. In Belle Lamar Marston Pike and Philip Bligh discuss their separation from mutual friends at West Point who went South to join the Rebels. One of these friends, Patrick Stuart, they have just captured for spying on their troops. During their West Point days Bligh and Pike had nursed Stuart through a fever, and now that he is their prisoner they treat him compassionately, demonstrating that the war cannot completely destroy the kindness that has existed between friends. On the other hand, friendship cannot be allowed to dissuade a loyal soldier from the performance of his duty. Consequently, Bligh condemns Pike for his betrayal of the Union for Belle's sake, and when Belle appeals to Bligh
in the name of friendship to save Pike, Bligh resists, torn between his duty and his friendship. But Pike redeems himself and restores his friendship with Bligh to wholeness by bringing reinforcements at the last moment to save Bligh, Belle, and the Union outpost.

The stereotypical relationships between friends were standard fare in most melodramas, and the dramatists writing plays of reconciliation used the device to give another dimension to their treatment of relationships between the North and the South. Another instance of this device is the friendship between Captain Davenport and Colonel Moberly in Alabama. Colonel Moberly recounts how he had met Harry Preston (Captain Davenport) on the field of battle and how they had re-enacted a charade from Macbeth, which they had performed before the war, to make the others think they were fighting (IV; pp. 125-126). As the Colonel and Davenport muse about the past and the war, Davenport says, "I am willing to admit that your Southern moons seem brighter than our colder ones" (III; p. 94). Moberly responds, "More gold in them, sah--more heart in them, and I contend, sah, that a girl raised under them has got more music and more poetry in her soul, sah" (III; p. 95). Davenport comments, "I think that, too; and this old place is like some enchanted ruin in its decay." But Moberly tells him that all of the ruin is not decay. The old gate had been battered down by Sherman's army when Colonel Cavanaugh made a stand against the Yankees.
He shows Davenport an old cannon and tells him of the Talla-dega Light Artillery that had been recruited six years before, "when the county felt the need of some military organization for its moral salutary influence upon the blacks . . ." (III; p. 96). Although Moberly expresses Southern convictions that were anathema to Unionists, like Davenport, who fought ostensibly to free the slaves, Davenport is amused rather than offended. Moberly explains that the Light Artillery is the balance of power in the primary elections, and they do not permit the blacks into the caucus, but the organization is united on the subject of Davenport's railroad. Davenport thanks them for their support, and since the old ruined cannon is the only gun the organization has, promises Moberly four guns. When Moberly makes him an honorary member of the military organization, Davenport muses,

Bless the old war horse! He's like them all--big-hearted and loyal if you once get through their insulation of politeness and pomposity. But the new generation is pushing them from their hobbies. They are going as the old wall here has gone. . . . And time in its tenderness, I hope, will hide their faults, as it has covered these--with beauties (III; p. 98).

Davenport's recognition of the humanity of the old Southern gentleman, in spite of his prejudices, is a forceful presentation of the acceptance of men as they are--an acceptance upon which, Thomas seems to imply, sectional reconciliation must be based.
The separation between military friends is developed into one of the major elements of *Shenandoah*. Kerchival West is a loyal Union soldier, but Robert Ellingham, his West Point friend, is faithful to the South. In the opening scene on the eve of the shelling of Fort Sumter, Kerchival and Robert discuss the impending crisis that threatens the friendship they have known since their student days. Robert asserts that Northerners are all blind and that war is inevitable. Kerchival replies: "And if it does come, you Virginians will join the rest." Robert responds that Virginia will be the battleground of the war, "but every loyal son of Virginia will follow her flag. It is our religion!" Kerchival expresses the Union point of view: "If New York should go against the old flag, New York might go to the devil. That is my religion." Robert's reply indicates one of the causes of the division between the North and the South: "So differently have we been taught what the word 'patriotism' means!" Robert expresses the conflict between "states' rights" and federalism that plagued the framers of the Constitution, was a contributing factor in the Civil War, and still remains for us in the twentieth century a troublesome problem. But their friendship is deep and goes beyond sectional commitments. As they reminisce about their friendship and about Robert's having saved Kerchival's scalp once on the plains, Kerchival asks, "Are we to be enemies?" Robert assures him that whatever comes
their friendship will never be broken. They both hope that they will never have to meet in battle, and Kerchival, grasping Robert's hand, says, "My dear old comrade, one of us will be wrong in this great fight, but we shall both be honest in it" (I; p. 480). The emphasis in the conflict between Kerchival and Robert is that men of honest convictions fought on both sides of the war, that there was a crucial problem between the rights of the states and the rights of the Union, and that friendship can still exist between men of strong but differing convictions.

A final conflict between friends is seen in the relationship between Robert Telfair and Alan Kendrick in The Heart of Maryland. These friends have taken different sides in the war, and when Alan comes to The Lilacs as a prisoner of the South, he and Telfair acknowledge their friendship and their divided loyalties. Telfair expresses his happiness that Alan is a prisoner and will not be at Charlottesville when the Southern troops attack it (I; pp. 191-193). Later, when Alan is bound and helpless before Thorpe, Telfair is powerless to help him. He affectionately lays his hand on Alan's shoulder in "silent sympathy" as he goes out to prepare to defend the church against the 9th Cavalry, Alan's regiment (III. ii; p. 231). In Act IV, as Telfair lies wounded at The Lilacs, he says in delirium, "The 9th--Alan Kendrick's 9th Cavalry. By God! Dear old fellow, it's your sweetheart you're coming down on us for, I know--I know--I hate to train
my guns on you, but--I must! Fire--" (IV; p. 237). It is Telfair, however, who arrests Thorpe for his traitorous activities at the end of the play, and he and Alan are reconciled in their character as noble soldiers, even though they continue to support opposing causes. The play suggests that men of differing political convictions can surmount these differences when both act honorably.

The friendship that exists between soldiers separated by the war is supplemented by a friendship between Gertrude Ellingham and Madeline West in Shenandoah. Their conflict emerges from sectional loyalties that they both assume without question until they realize that their friendship is superior to sectionalism. Madeline remarks angrily that "General Beauregard is a bad, wicked man!" (I; p. 482). Gertrude replies, "Oh! Madeline! You are a bad, wicked Northern girl to say such a thing." When Madeline insists that Beauregard is a Rebel, Gertrude responds, "So am I."

The two friends, recognizing what the war is doing to them, become sentimentally speechless, embracing and kissing each other. Kerchival comments, upon seeing their affection, "I say, Bob, if the North and the South do fight, that will be the end of it" (I; p. 482). Three years later Madeline visits Gertrude at the Ellingham homestead in the Shenandoah Valley. As they bemoan their fates because of the war, Gertrude says, "My dear sister! . . . You are a Northern girl, and I am a Rebel--but we are sisters" (II; p. 488).
At the end of the play these friends are together with their lovers, giving a concrete representation of friendship that surmounts the divisiveness of war. The hope that friendship would transcend the divisiveness of war is a significant aspect of reconciliation, not only in *Shenandoah*, but in most of the reconciliation dramas.

III

A striking fact about the reviews of the seven plays in New Orleans and Philadelphia is that the critics gave almost no attention to the minor plots in which various sectional motifs were presented. That families and friends were torn asunder by the war either was ignored by the reviewers or was noticed only in general terms.

An illustration of the manner in which the reviewers treated this motif comes from an 1886 review of *Held by the Enemy* in the Philadelphia *Press*. The reception of the play, the reviewer said, is

proof of how thoroughly the awful struggle of the civil war has become but a legend to the public of the present day. Each of the five acts is a scene which twenty years ago would have recalled deep suffering to thousands of families, and yet the large audience last night . . . found a theme for laughter in nearly every line of Mr. Gillette's story, which should only have appealed to tender feelings of mournful retrospection and patriotism.9

Other illustrations are the *Evening Bulletin*'s comment that "... the pathos of estrangement of families caused by the War of the Rebellion was strikingly depicted" in *Shenandoah*,
and the New Orleans Sunday States' observation that the "supreme height of [Maryland's] grief over the death of her brother" was a touching and thrilling incident in The Heart of Maryland. 10

Olive Weston in a review of an unidentified performance of Shenandoah commented: "An old veteran in front of me often wept at the mention of some name or incident; and in the first row were a Northern and a Southern officer side by side--I noticed that at one point these clasped each other's hands, where it was said, 'That will be the end of it.'" 11

Even such comments are scarce in the reviews, and this scarcity may indicate that the audiences either were not critically alert to the sectional issues raised in the minor plots or, more likely, that they accepted these conflicts as a matter of course and were not unduly impressed by them. Those who remembered the war or knew anything at all about the conflict surely were aware of the disruption of families, especially in the South, and seemed to accept the estrangement of families and friends as a given part of plays about the war.

Of course, the reviews do not represent the multiplicity of reactions that an audience had, but to the extent that they do, the reviews indicate that the audiences were moved by the bravery and loyalty of the soldiers and the citizens of both sections. We have seen examples of
virtuous character and brave action in this chapter, but the contribution of these elements to reconciliation will be examined in detail in Chapter Four. In any case, the relationships between members of families and between friends illustrate two ideas upon which the plays appeal for reconciliation. On the one hand, the plays suggest that personal relationships are more fundamental than political ones; and on the other, they suggest that certain ideals of character can transcend conflicts in personal relationships, and by extension, in political commitments.

IV

In contrast to the ideals of family affection and friendship that transcend sectionalism, various antagonists in the plays create situations that highlight the conflict between the North and the South. These antagonists, some properly called villains and others who merely complicate the plot, are equally divided between the North and the South. Since these plays are all written by Northern dramatists, it is not surprising that they present Northern antagonists who are basically honorable in character and action; but even more significant is the fact that they present some Northerners whose actions and characters are reprehensible.

Two of the Northern antagonists in the plays are basically honorable men. One of them, Marston Pike, however,
betrays the Union in order to extract a promise from Belle Lamar that she will marry him after the war. Apparently, he genuinely loves Belle and is concerned for her safety. Nevertheless, his actions become a threat to her because he aids her in spying for the South. Belle's despair about her broken marriage is so great that she is little concerned about what will become of her after the war. Pike comforts her but does nothing to keep her from entrapping herself in traitorous activities:

I know the Southern cause fills your heart, so that you have no room in your breast for me, but I am not jealous of that rival, nor do I despair of expelling the foe, and conquering this fair country. Time and my love, will work wonders, for true love is patience, and I will be patient (I; p. 132).

But Belle shrugs off his advances:

Forgive me, Marston, if my heart lags behind your rapture. It is not so I should return your love. But when you speak of Northern triumphs do not forget I stood by my father's side at Falling Waters, when your bullets struck him down. Those bullets are here now--here in my breast--they have never been extracted! And if I shrink from your embrace, remember my wounds are tender still (I; p. 133).

When Bligh learns of Pike's betrayal, he excoriates him:

I would sooner spare this rebel officer, for he but did his duty. You betrayed yours. He staked his life--'twas his to stake. You staked the lives of your comrades. You staked the fortunes of your cause and country against the kisses of a wanton--betrayed a nation's trust for her lies--exchanged your honour for her infamy (I; p. 136).

Pike retaliates: "'Tis you have no humanity. Cold, stern,
unfeeling: because you have never loved. Ah! You have no heart, or you would pity me" (I; p. 136).

Realizing his mistake after Bligh condemns him, Pike uses the pass Belle gives him, not to escape, but to bring reinforcements to Bligh to save the outpost for the Union and to rescue Bligh and Belle (III; pp. 144-146). Pike's actions are the foolish actions of a man passionately in love. That he redeems himself by courageous, unselfish action and saves the hero and the heroine certainly implies that a true man will not persist in such errors, especially when they involve the betrayal of his country.

Like Pike in Belle Lamar, Fielding in Held by the Enemy is an honorable man whose duty casts him into situations that threaten the hero and the heroine. During Gordon Hayne's trial, Fielding, who is acting as the prosecutor, casts suspicion on Colonel Prescott's character. Prescott had taken a paper from Hayne when he arrested him, a paper on which were drawings of the Union fortifications. General Stamburg advises Prescott that the paper should have been introduced earlier and implies that the Colonel had not done his duty (II; p. 3-M). Prescott's character is further damaged by Rachel's testimony that his love for her was a possible motive for his testimony against Hayne. The responsibility for entrapping Prescott here is divided among Fielding, Stamburg, and Rachel and arises more from the circumstances of love and war than from malicious intent. But
later in the play, Fielding becomes a crucial threat to the heroine. When Rachel is trying secretly to get Hayne out of the prison hospital by pretending that he has already died, Fielding interrupts her plan and demands to examine Hayne's body in order to certify his death. Since Hayne is not dead and since Rachel has an order from General Stamburg to take the "body," she resists Fielding's efforts; and she is supported by Prescott, who arrives in time to place Fielding under arrest for interfering with the General's order. Fielding says that Colonel Prescott's position in this matter again lays him open to grave suspicion (IV; p. 8-E). When Stamburg arrives, Fielding tells him that Colonel Prescott has prevented the examination of Hayne's body and implies that Prescott is conspiring to free the Rebel prisoner. Colonel Prescott, who believes Hayne to be dead, objects to Fielding's accusations against his character and permits Fielding to examine Hayne. Hayne has died by the time Fielding examines him, and Fielding apologizes to Prescott and pronounces Hayne dead.

In Act V Fielding is tending to the wounded Colonel Prescott in the McCreery house. He sees the implications of the love affair between Rachel and Prescott and along with Euphemia decides that it would be advisable to move the Northern officer out of the Southern household, especially since Rachel's father is expected to return. After Rachel convinces Prescott to stay, Fielding changes his opinion of
the necessity to move Prescott, recognizes their love for each other, and sees their union as an emblem of the union of the North and the South: "And may this happy union be the emblem of the grander, mightier one, which must come with the bright days of peace, the union of the Blue and the Gray and the North and the South" (V; p. 15-E). Unlike Marston Pike in Belle Lamar, Fielding commits no act that casts any doubt on his own character; but like Pike he demonstrates a noble character, his role as antagonist arising only from his conscientious loyalty to duty. His actions interfere with Rachel's attempts to free Hayne and cast doubt—properly—on the character of the hero. When he is shown to be wrong, he apologizes for the suspicions he had of Colonel Prescott.13

In contrast to these loyal Union antagonists, there are three Northerners in the plays who are traitors to their country. Gelwex in Barbara Frietchie, is a drunkard who deserted the Union army because Captain Trumbull gave him "a hard time" (II; p. 80). Gelwex sympathizes with the South because the South pays him money and because he thinks the South is going to win (II; p. 79). When Arthur Frietchie places him in the minister's house as a sniper, Gelwex determines to get revenge on Trumbull. Barbara pleads with him not to shoot Trumbull, but he is heartless, saying it is no matter to him. As he is about to fire on Trumbull, Barbara shoots him to save her lover (II; pp. 84-85). But
the kind-hearted Barbara takes Gelwex to her house to tend his wound, and when Mr. Frietchie learns that she had shot him, he is horrified. Barbara explains that he is a Union deserter, but this affects Frietchie little (III; p. 93). When Frietchie asks Gelwex if the wounded soldier in Barbara's room is Trumbull, Gelwex does not betray Barbara's secret, although he knows the truth. When Barbara wants to know why he has protected her and Trumbull, he says "It was the least I could do. . . . Don't know another woman good enough shot to only 'wing' me!" (III; pp. 117-118). This comic response indicates that Gelwex is not thoroughly corrupt, although he has most of the characteristics of a villain--drunkenness, a desire for revenge, and heartlessness. His chief significance for this study, however, is that he is a Northerner of unreputable character who fights for the South. But he is only a mercenary with no genuine Southern loyalty, and genuine Southerners would be expected to react to him as Robert Ellingham reacts to Captain Thornton, the villain of Shenandoah: "We native Southerners will defend our own rights, sir; you may leave them in our keeping" (I; p. 481).

Captain Thornton is "an utterly unscrupulous man," Ellingham says, and when Thornton has entered, he is scorned by both Robert and Kerchival West. Robert remarks snidely that Thornton is a Northern "gentleman," to which Thornton replies, "A Southerner by choice; I shall join the cause"
(I; p. 481). Later, Mrs. Haverhill, alone on the stage, confides to the audience that Thornton had entered her room to press his attentions upon her: "What encouragement could I have given him?" she asks. "Innocence is never on its guard--but, (drawing up) the last I remember before I fell unconscious, he was crouching before me like a whipped cur!" (I; p. 484). Seeing Thornton, she flares out with anger and resentment and realizes that she must keep Thornton and her husband from meeting because Thornton "would shoot my husband down without remorse" (I; p. 484).

Later, Thornton implies to General Haverhill that Kerchival West is the man who has been making advances toward Mrs. Haverhill. Thornton boasts that he has defended the General's honor by wounding West: "If I have killed him--your honor will be buried in the same grave" (II; p. 498). At the end of the play, however, Thornton receives his punishment when it is reported that Captain Heartsease has killed him on the field of battle. Thornton is certainly an unscrupulous man, but his activity is confined to attempting to compromise Mrs. Haverhill, a secondary heroine, and to implicating West. He does not threaten the hero or heroine with destruction, although West would have been destroyed if his name had not been cleared with the General. That he is a "Southerner by choice" may be the dramatist's way of relieving the South of the burden of his villainy, for one could always argue that he was not a genuine Southerner. It seems that
the portrayal of both Thornton and Gelwex suggests that there were men whose loyalties could be bought by money or prompted by unscrupulous desires for love. We would expect such characters to be condemned by both Northerners and Southerners for their cheap loyalty. That the dramatists presented these typically villainous characters as turncoat Yankees is clear indication of their efforts to say that villainy did not belong exclusively to the South.

Colonel Thorpe in The Heart of Maryland is the only genuine villain in the seven plays. Alan Kendrick tells his friend Robert Telfair, one of Thorpe's officers, that Thorpe ruined and then heartlessly deserted the daughter of a dear comrade--my old color-sergeant--a little girl who had been adopted and was idolized by the whole regiment. We found her poor little body among the weeds of a mountain stream. I had it brought to the barracks--forced Thorpe to look on the face of his victim, and flogged him in the presence of the regiment he had disgraced (I; pp. 191-192).

Thorpe is shown to have no remorse for his deed but only revenge for Alan.

Belasco characterizes Thorpe as a standard melodramatic villain: "His face is one not to be soon forgotten: sallow complexion, almost livid, and his hair, jet black. He has the look of a man addicted to very hard drinking, but never unsteady on his feet, nor in his speech. He wears the uniform of a colonel of Confederate infantry" (I; p. 180). Although he is known as "a trusted officer in command of this Post" (I; p. 181), he is a spy for the Northern army.
But he has resentment against the North: "I don't know why I should warn that damn 9th Cavalry that drummed me out" (I; p. 182). And he decides to give information he has for the North to General Kendrick, the Southern commander, in an effort to win a generalship.

Moreover, Thorpe prevents Lloyd from going to warn Charlottesville of the Rebel attack by making Lloyd believe that the Rebels suspect him of being a Union spy (I; pp. 189-190). This is only the first of a series of events proving that Thorpe has no loyalty to the North or to the South. He is motivated by the selfish desire for personal gain. When Alan informs Thorpe that General Hooker suspects him of counter-spying and has promised to hang him when he catches him, Thorpe laughs: "Hang me! Eh? Huh! Ha! Ha! Did they really think I'd warn them? I don't care which rag I serve under. I fight for my own hand (II; p. 212). Alan accuses him of betrayal: "[You] stand self-confessed--a man without a country!" (II; p. 212). Then Alan says that Thorpe's base actions show him unfit to serve the United States; Thorpe, with villainous arrogance, says, "Damn the States!" The loyal Alan Kendrick is stunned, seizes the villain by the throat, and forces him to retract his words.

Further, when Thorpe is in command of the old church in which Alan is imprisoned, he becomes the greatest threat to Alan and Maryland. Maryland comes to the church with a letter from General Hooker, asking that Alan's execution be
delayed until he can explain that Alan was not spying on the Rebel army. But, as a typical villain, Thorpe gloats in his power: "Hooker knows young Calvert came to meet me. Had this paper reached Kendrick it would have saved his son--and--hanged me! Humph! General Kendrick is dead" (III. ii; p. 228). Thorpe refuses to delay Alan's execution but makes Maryland believe he will save him if she will sign a confession of her part in the Charlesvillle defeat (III. ii; p. 231). In spite of Alan's warning, Maryland signs the confession in a desperate effort to save him. Alan sets the character of Thorpe in clear perspective:

You coward! You've taken advantage of the frantic words of a desperate girl! Weren't you satisfied without that? My poor girl, can't you see he has lied--cheated you! That man is my bitterest enemy--I drove him out of my regiment--a scoundrel! Why, it was he sent me to Charlesvilllle! (III. ii; p. 233).

Thorpe feels his revenge working and tells Alan that at last he will be satisfied by killing Alan and taking Maryland: "You leave this woman you love in my hands--and you know I can take care of women" (III. ii; p. 233). Alan is horrified but is bound and helpless. Maryland struggles to free herself from Thorpe as he tries to kiss her and, seizing a bayonet from the table, stabs him four times (III. ii; pp. 233-234).

Thorpe, who miraculously does not die from the four stab wounds, takes Maryland as a prisoner to The Lilacs where he is forced to make a last stand (IV; p. 237). When
Alan comes under truce to ask him to surrender, Thorpe stubbornly refuses and issues terms to Alan, threatening to kill Maryland at the first sign of battle (IV; p. 248). But Alan produces a message from General Lee, relieving Thorpe of command and placing Telfair in charge—an order that has just arrived "in the nick of time." Finally, Telfair arrests Thorpe and frees Maryland from his clutches (IV; pp. 249-250).

Thorpe is the one villain in all the plays who is thoroughly recalcitrant and inherently evil. He has one moment of guilt, when in a drunken stupor he has a vision of the girl he had raped and sees the hand of General Hooker reaching nearer and nearer to him (III. i; p. 222). But no redeeming action or characteristic is associated with him; he is a Northerner who betrays the North but has no genuine loyalty to the South either. No villainous role in the plays—either Northerner or Southerner—is so thoroughly despicable as Thorpe's. Viewing this character, audiences would be expected to understand that loyalty to one section or the other involves more than the wearing of the Blue or the Grey and that honorable character and decent actions are more fundamental than personal gain for either a Northerner or a Southerner.

A Southern villain whose lack of sectional pride and decent behavior illustrates a similar point is Raymond Page in Alabama. Page is motivated by greed and a desire for
personal advantage just as Thorpe is. He accuses Mrs. Page of never having legally married his brother and sues her to recover his brother's land, for the railroad that Davenport is building may come through it, increasing its value. This threat to a secondary heroine is simply a confirmation that he has remained an unscrupulous man, for in the war he had struck down Harry Preston on the field of battle when Colonel Moberly had tried to save Harry because of their friendship. Both Moberly and Raymond Page have believed that Harry had been killed (IV; pp. 125-126). When Davenport learns that Moberly and Page are to duel, he will not permit Raymond to fight Moberly, for

... he has more at risk than you have. He has a daughter--a reputation for honor. Life means something to him. You are only a black-leg. ... I am from the North. The duello does not obtain there. But I am familiar with the code. As I understand it, gentlemen of honor are under no obligation to meet blackmailers and crooks. You are a bribe-taker, Mr. Page--the type of a man we summon the servants to eject (IV; pp. 130-131).

Davenport then verifies Mrs. Page's marriage to Dabney Page, for as Harry Preston, he had witnessed their marriage. And showing the scar that Raymond had given him on the field of Sharpsburg, Davenport says that he will fight Raymond. But Raymond is afraid to fight him, for Davenport can shoot holes in two cards tossed in the air. In order to end the conflict, Davenport requires that Raymond apologize to Moberly for his offenses to him (IV; pp. 132-134).
In contrast to Raymond Page, Benton Arrelsford in *Secret Service* is a loyal Southerner who is conscientious in the performance of his duty but who has a grievance against the heroine. Ever since Edith Varney rejected his love, Arrelsford has treated her badly (I; p. 556). When he begins to suspect that Captain Thorne is a Union spy, he seeks revenge on Edith through him. Up to this point Arrelsford has been a desk soldier, preferring to remain in his office rather than to get out and to pursue the Union spies that were wrecking havoc on the Confederate army. In his determination to catch Thorne, Arrelsford becomes vicious. He arrests and beats Jonas, the Varney's black servant, because Jonas is implicated in carrying a message from a Northern prisoner to Thorne. Arrelsford even becomes paranoid, for after he hears Caroline's simple love note to Wilfred, he suspects that Wilfred and Caroline may be mixed up in Thorne's spying (III; p. 594). When Arrelsford finally has Thorne cornered in the Varney house, he treats Mrs. Varney and Edith scornfully (IV; p. 608). After he captures Thorne, Arrelsford wants to execute him immediately, but Wilfred insists that Thorne be given a proper court-martial. Arrelsford, reluctantly agreeing to a drum-head court, says, "Well--let him have it!--We'll give him a drum-head, boys--but it'll be the quickest drum-head ever held on earth!" (IV; p. 615). When General Randolph arrives to grant President Davis's mercy to Thorne because of the unusual circumstances
of his case, Arrelsford is indignant and is summarily dismissed by the General (IV; p. 619).

Arrelsford's role as a villain is an unusual one, for he is not the usual sort in these plays—one who pursues his own self-interests entirely. His "evil" is more subtle and arises from an excessive sense of duty in pursuing his job as a secret agent. Apparently, he is thoroughly committed to the Southern cause, for his loyalty is not questioned. His ruthlessness and disregard for basic human rights, as well as his disregard of the politeness due women, are certainly characteristics that would make an audience question his character. But that he is not a totally dispicable character and pursues his job with diligence and pertinacity, although with questionable motives, may be a partial tribute to the hard-working Southern secret agent.

Finally, Jack Negly in Barbara Fريetchie is a Southern villain with no strong loyalty for the South, for Barbara has to shame him into going into the army. Even then, he shouts that he will go to the war only to kill Trumbull:

*Very well; I'll go to the war. Do you hear me, Bab? I'll go and fight if you want it! I'll go! But not to fight for my country; understand that? To fight him! To kill this damned Northerner who has taken you from me! You! Barbara Fريetchie, whom I love better than the South, better than my life!* (I; p. 18).

Negly, it is clear, is motivated by a genuine love for the heroine, and in his determination to win Barbara's hand he becomes a threat to Trumbull and consequently to Barbara.
But Negly's mental deterioration begins to show even at this point, for rushing out of Barbara's house he sees his sister and her friends on the front step and shouts: "Out of my way! Damn all women! . . . The Three Graces! Ha! ha! That's what some sentimental idiots would call you! But the witches of Macbeth are what you are! Ha! ha! ha! Liars! cheats! hags! all of you!" (I; pp. 18-19).

After the battle, Jack bursts into the Frietchie house, reveling in his war experiences and in the Confederate victory. Barbara tries to quiet him, but Jack asks her to marry him because he has fought in the battle for love of her. When Jack guesses that Trumbull is in Barbara's room, he starts up to finish him (III; p. 118). But by the force of her character, Barbara commands him to come down the stairs. Negly's mental deterioration showing in his cowering before her sternness. He simply cries, "Oh, Barbara! Barbara! You have broken my heart!" (III; p. 119).

Finally, riding in the victory parade and seeing Barbara flying the American flag from her balcony, Jack's mind and emotions snap, and he shoots Barbara. He tries to commit suicide but is prevented from killing himself by the soldiers who arrest him and carry him away to be executed for disobeying General Jackson's order (IV. ii; pp. 127-128).

Jack Negly is partially relieved of culpability because he is driven mad by Barbara's rejection. Nevertheless, his actions cause much of Barbara's suffering, and he is a
specific threat to the hero. His loyalty to the South is significantly less than his love for Barbara, but it might be expected that audiences would sympathize with his plight and this sympathy might compensate for his less than enthusiastic loyalty to the South.

Several significant facts emerge from this analysis of the antagonists and villains in the plays. First, although there are two "good and true" Northern antagonists, there is not one Southern antagonist whose character is above reproach. If villains are by definition characters who are malevolent and who threaten the heroine or the hero by treacherous acts, then all of the Southern antagonists fulfill the roles of villains. It is perhaps equally significant that there are two Northerners who fit the definition of villain, for we must remember that these plays emanate from the pens of Northern dramatists. In appealing for reconciliation, the plays clearly show that treachery, disloyalty, and dishonorable behavior belonged equally to the two sections. The most treacherous villain in all the plays is Thorpe, a Northerner, even as the most honorable antagonists are both Northerners. The trend away from representing the villains exclusively as Southerners, as was the practice in the Civil War plays of the 1860's, and the portrayal of Southerners as antagonists or even as villains with some sense of loyalty, like Benton Arrelsford, or with some motive that might be common to all men, like
Raymond Page, is clear evidence that the dramatists softened the concept of the villain in the interests of sectional amity.

V

Reviewers gave somewhat more attention to the antagonists in the plays than to the conflicts between family and friends, and the reviewers were frequently pointed in their comments.

The Northern antagonists received some comment from Philadelphia critics. For instance, a critic in the Evening Bulletin objected to the artless way in which Marston Pike in Belle Lamar tells Union secrets to the heroine without dreaming he is doing wrong. Pike's disloyalty to the Union concerned the critic because he was an officer of the Union army "charged with duties of a most serious and delicate nature." The absence of comment on Pike by New Orleans critics suggests that the audiences in New Orleans may have accepted Pike's love for Belle and his saving of Belle and Bligh as redeeming his betrayal of the Union. The New Orleans' papers found Belle Lamar to be unobjectionable in a partisan sense and indicated that Boucicault sought to be inoffensive to both the North and the South.

The only other Northern antagonist who received comment in the Philadelphia papers was Colonel Thorpe in The Heart of Maryland. The Philadelphia Record suggested that
the killing of Thorpe in such "an approved Bowery style" which appeals only to the "gallery god" was hardly necessary. The audience was sent home in good humor by the graceful closing scenes of The Heart of Maryland, another paper observed, that disentangled the web spun of treachery and villainy.

The New Orleans critics seldom commented on the Northern villains, but one noted that Barbara's shooting of Gelwex was one of the elements that carried the audience from sentiments of one extreme to the other. Since Gelwex was portrayed as a despicable Northern deserter, the sympathy of the audiences was clearly with Barbara.

Critics in both New Orleans and Philadelphia commented more often on Raymond Page in Alabama than on any other villain. The Times-Democrat said that the characters in Alabama were all noble and lovable with one exception, and "that character cuts but a very small figure in the dialogue and the story, having evidently been purposely cut down to the narrowest limit consistent with the development of the plot." The Daily Picayune, however, was more pointed: "The villain of the play is a southern man, but such a man as would be called a villain in any section of this country for doing what he did, questioning the validity of the marriage of Widow Page and his brother that he might dispossess her of her property." The Philadelphia Inquirer agreed. The villain is present, the critic said, but he is
not allowed to go on through three acts giving discomfort to
the audience. "He is checkmated in the first act, snubbed
in the second, and so cavalierly treated throughout that
there is never a doubt in the mind of the spectator that he
will come to grief at last, as he does."22

Captain Thornton in Shenandoah, a "Southerner by
choice," received little notice from either Philadelphia or
New Orleans critics. The Daily Picayune, however, noted
that he "seems to have been introduced for the sole purpose
of setting off the other characters and making a story."23

Arrelsford in Secret Service was ignored by critics
in New Orleans, but the Philadelphia North American observed
that although Thorne was regarded with sympathetic interest
from the first, Arrelsford, who was only doing his duty, was
"an interloping villain who deserves to be vanquished."24

Finally, the Southerner Jack Negly in Barbara
Frietchie received brief comment by both New Orleans and
Philadelphia critics. The New Orleans Daily States presented
Jack Negly's killing of Barbara and his threatening to kill
Trumbull as one of the factors in swaying the audience's
sympathies from the Southern characters to those loyal to
the Union.25 But the Philadelphia North American commented
that Barbara's jilting of Negly threw her in a false light,
made her unsympathetic, and would have been repellent, except
that "Fitch executed a bold stroke when he made a heroine of
a flirt who has driven her lover mad," and Julia Marlowe's talents redeemed the role and saved the play.26

The reviews suggest that Philadelphia audiences were concerned with actions of the antagonists that suggested disloyalty to the Union and that New Orleans audiences were concerned about disloyalty to Southern traditions. Both audiences were sensitive to a man who betrayed his own section of the country. Northerners, like Marston Pike, who betrayed the Union were objectionable to Philadelphia audiences, but they apparently escaped the notice of the New Orleans theater-goers. Southerners, like Raymond Page and Thornton, who threatened Southern women, were despicable, particularly to Southerners.

Moral judgments made by the two audiences are basically similar, judging from the comments of the reviews. When a Northern villain, like Colonel Thorpe, for instance, was roundly condemned for personal immorality as well as for betrayal of his country, the reviews indicate that the Philadelphia audience was satisfied. Similarly, when a despicable Northern villain, like Gelwex, was checked by Barbara's shooting him to save her lover, both audiences seem to have sympathized with the heroine. Barbara's character, however, apparently was not as ideal as it could have been because of her treatment of Jack Negly. But both New Orleans and Philadelphia reviewers sympathized with Barbara's troubles with Negly, though the Northern critics felt that the sympathy
arose as much from talented acting as from Barbara's character as a Southern lady. The New Orleans reviewers wanted it understood, however, that bad men existed in all parts of the country, and apparently the Philadelphia reviewers agreed.

No critic reacted to Captain Thornton's choice to abandon the Union and side with the Confederacy, but his minor role probably accounts for this neglect. The sparse comment on Arrelsford may indicate that the audiences did not consider him a typical Southern villain of the type seen in many earlier war plays.

Apparently audiences, both North and South, looked upon these men from basically similar viewpoints. The relative scarcity of reactions to the antagonists in the reviews perhaps indicates that the audiences were more concerned with the war itself. Their reactions as to how the plays presented the sectional issues of the war apparently held their chief interest, as the following chapter will indicate.
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1 See Appendix A, p.


3 Clyde Fitch, Barbara Frietchie, The Frederick Girl (1900; rpt. New York, n.d.), p. 10. Subsequent references to this edition will be cited in the text of the paper within parentheses.

4 Augustus Thomas, Alabama (Chicago, 1898), p. 24. Subsequent references to the text of Alabama will be to this edition and cited in the text of the paper within parentheses.


6 For a treatment of the ideal soldier see below, pp. 168-171. The reading I have given may be a tenuous one; but I give it in order to suggest another dimension of the North-South conflict, one that by its nature remains subjective, and that is the feeling on the part of some that the South had by its rebellion disgraced the ideal of the Union.


8 Bronson Howard, Shenandoah, in Representative American Plays, ed. Quinn, p. 480. Subsequent references to this edition will be cited in the text of the paper within parentheses.
10 Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Oct. 2, 1900; New Orleans Sunday States, Dec. 25, 1898. The New Orleans notice is apparently an advanced publicity notice rather than an actual review, but it indicates, nevertheless, the intention of the producers.

11 A clipping from The Theatre [1891?], p. 472, in a scrapbook in NYPL.

12 William Gillette, Held by the Enemy, TS, Morton Collection, University of Chicago Library, Act II, p. 3-M.

13 Fielding's characterization changes radically in the published version of Held by the Enemy (1898; rpt. New York, 1925). In the published version the opening scene establishes Brigade Surgeon Fielding's character. When he calls on the McCreeyers, he treats Sarah as if she were a servant, ordering her to call Eunice, her niece whom Fielding is wooing. (Euphemia in the TS becomes Sarah in the published version, and Rachel becomes Eunice.) Fielding accuses Colonel Brant (the Colonel Prescott of the TS), his rival for the hand of Eunice, of being a spy and of attempting to kill Gordon Hayne, Edith's cousin and betrothed, in order to lay the blame for spying falsely on him. Further, Fielding stops Eunice's attempt to rescue the wounded Hayne from the prison hospital, but he conceals the fact that Hayne is alive when Eunice promises to marry him if he will help her free Hayne. In the published version, contrary to the typescript, Fielding sacrifices his honor as a soldier in order to win the hand of the woman he loves, but his genuine love for Eunice is not made clear. Fielding remains incorrigible to the end and only frees Eunice under threat of exposure by Brant, who has written a letter to the general explaining both his and Fielding's complicity in freeing Hayne. In the published version, Fielding actually becomes a villainous Northern soldier who would take unfair advantage of a woman in desperate straits and who recognizes truth and honesty only under threat of personal ruin.


15 See the New Orleans Republican, Dec. 6, 9, 1874, and the New Orleans Daily Picayune, Dec. 8, 1874.

16 A New Orleans critic in the Daily States criticized the actor who played Fielding in Held by the Enemy as one of the exceptions to an otherwise excellent company, but he does not indicate that his criticism was based on sectional considerations (Nov. 4, 1889). Fielding in this version of the
play did not fulfill the role of the villain as he does in the published version of the play.

17 Philadelphia Record, Oct. 6, 1896. Again a problem in versions of the play emerges, for in the published versions of The Heart of Maryland, Thorpe is not killed by Maryland's stabbing him four times but survives to give the signal for Alan's escape and to receive his due punishment at the end of the play.

18 Philadelphia Press, Oct. 6, 1896. The paper also noted that Kellerd has "no superior in impersonating a villain on the American stage." This view is supported by an unidentified reviewer writing of the performance of The Heart of Maryland at the Herald Square Theatre in New York in 1895: "... when Col Fulton Thorpe was in sight ... a more convincing demon I have never seen, and his powers of witchcraft might well disorganize army routine. Mr. Kellard [sic], who has been associated with most of the recent war dramas, is certainly the most striking figure in the performance" (from an unidentified clipping in NYPL).


20 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Oct. 20, 1891.

21 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Oct. 20, 1891. When the play was presented in New Orleans in 1892, the Daily Picayune noted that "Raymond Page is a bad man and justly despised. There are bad men in all communities" (Oct. 25, 1892).

22 Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 20, 1891.

23 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Feb. 1, 1892.

24 Philadelphia North American, Jan. 11, 1898. A comment on the performance of Secret Service at the Garrick Theatre in New York, however, may indicate the general consensus regarding the villain: "The man who is at work in the enemy's lines is a spy, and nothing can gloss that fact. The Confederate official who seeks to effect the spy's destruction plays the more honorable part. The author has sought to attribute his fervor to unworthy personal motives, but the attempt is not fully developed" (from an unidentified 1896 review in NYPL). Gillette's unusual treatment of hero and villain in Secret Service was also noted in an editorial from the Washington Post. His making a hero of a spy and a
villain of the man who detected and pursued him, the editorial noted, was a crowning triumph. He has made the villain and the hero change places by "a few light touches and a few quiet, manly words that go straight to every honest heart and will not be denied" (clipping in the Gillette volume of the Robinson Locke Collection of Dramatic Scrapbooks, vol. 242, pp. 17-18, in NYPL).


26 Philadelphia North American, April 3, 1900. Both Negly and Arrelsford become villainous because they are rejected by the heroines, and their love drives them to take actions to demonstrate their love--actions which they would not have performed otherwise. Arrelsford comes from behind his desk to seek revenge on Thorne, and Negly goes to war to kill Trumbull. This is perhaps akin to a typical trait of the Southerner who is ready to fight anyone because he cannot have his own way. Perhaps it suggests also the South's readiness to fight the North because it could not have its own way. See W. J. Cash, The Mind of the South (New York, 1941), pp. 44-46.
CHAPTER IV

IDEALS AND VIRTUES: THE COMMON ASPIRATIONS OF MAN

The universal virtues of compassion and humanity are also elements of the reconciliation theme in these plays. The plays make an appeal to these common aspirations of man in five ways: (1) by the ideal characterizations of the heroines and heroes; (2) by emphasizing the virtues of loyalty, bravery, and sympathy in the soldiers and in other people; (3) by showing the faithfulness of Negro servants; (4) by showing the suffering and anxiety of parents and spouses; and (5) by mollifying expressions of sectional bitterness.

I

The heroines and the heroes of these plays are an idealization of the American character as conceived in the nineteenth century, based on moral integrity and courageous action in the world. The stereotyped characterizations of the major roles in the plays serve well to reinforce the reconciliation theme. The moral integrity of the heroines takes several forms. For the heroines, morality often demands some sacrifice. For instance, Belle Lamar aids Pike and
Stuart to escape through the Union lines by giving them the pass that was to take her to safety; and, since she knows that Pike is going to bring reinforcements rather than escape, she sacrifices herself for Bligh and the Union army.\(^1\) Similarly, Rachel in *Held by the Enemy*, in order to save Hayne, unwittingly implicates her lover in traitorous activities. Later, she confesses to Prescott her conspiracy to free Hayne when she realizes that Prescott is being implicated again in her attempt.\(^2\) The heroine's sacrifice is demonstrated also in *Shenandoah* when Gertrude Ellingham risks her own life to go in search of Kerchival when he does not return after the battle.\(^3\) Also, Carey Preston in *Alabama* foregoes immediate satisfaction of her love for Armstrong in order to protect Colonel Preston's feelings.\(^4\) Moreover, Mrs. Page in *Alabama* suffers from the accusations of Raymond Page, not only for herself, but also for her son Lathrop (I; pp. 30-40; II; p. 62). Edith Varney in *Secret Service* sacrifices also in rescuing Thorne twice at the risk of her own safety.\(^5\) In addition, she portrays long-suffering patience as she supports Thorne's refusal to betray his loyalty to the Union. Maryland Calvert in *The Heart of Maryland* is willing to sacrifice herself by signing a confession of her part in the Charlottesville defeat in an effort to save Alan Kendrick.\(^6\) Finally, Barbara Frietchie sacrifices the good-will of her family by telling her father that she believes that the South is wrong in the war.\(^7\)
The heroine's moral integrity also demands loyalty, not only to her section, but more importantly to her lover and to others who suffer because of her actions. Faithful to those she has implicated in spying, Belle Lamar refuses to go North to safety when she learns that Stuart and Pike are to be executed (II; pp. 142-143). Rachel McCreery, in faithfulness to her cousin and betrothed Hayne, pleads with Prescott not to shoot him (I; p. 12-M) and engages in desperate attempts to rescue him from prison (III; pp. 7-E, 8-E; IV; pp. 6-E, 9-E). Gertrude Ellingham, abandoning her fickleness, maintains implicit faith in the love of Kerchival West for her (III; p. 502). Even though she does not know that he is her father, Carey naively trusts Captain Davenport when he persuades her not to run away with Armstrong and promises to help her overcome the Colonel's opposition to their marriage (III; pp. 115-117). Further, Mrs. Page refuses Colonel Moberly's proposal, declaring that she has always loved Harry Preston (Captain Davenport), although she had married Dabney Page for worthy motives (II; p. 78). Finally, Barbara Frietchie demonstrates her faithfulness to Trumbull by tending his wounds and declaring that she will fight for the one chance in a thousand that he has of surviving (III; p. 119).

The courageous actions of the heroines also display their bravery, compassion and self-sufficiency. Belle Lamar, a soldier's daughter, had stood by her father when he was
shot down by Union soldiers, and Stonewall Jackson himself compliments her courage in helping the Southern army by spying on the Union troops (I. i; p. 133). Compassionately, she pleads with Bligh to save Pike (II; p. 138). Unwilling to use a lost love to save herself, she refuses to tell the court that Bligh was once her husband (II; p. 140). And when she realizes that she has been wrong to let pride separate her from Bligh, she confesses her guilt (III; p. 144). Courage to act is demonstrated further in Rachel's attempting to rescue Hayne, Gertrude's searching for West on the battlefield, and Edith's saving Thorne. The Heart of Maryland, however, shows the heroine's compassion more explicitly in Maryland's caring for Little True Blue and her bravery both in stabbing Thorpe and in hanging to the tongue of the bell in order to allow Alan to escape. Barbara Frietchie's self-sufficiency is shown in her dealing with Jack Negly (III; pp. 118-119). But Barbara's courage to act in desperate situations is perhaps best revealed as she flies the American flag before a hostile crowd that is welcoming the Rebel troops back into town--bravery for which she pays with her life (IV. ii; pp. 123-128).

Also, the heroes are men of moral integrity, patriotism, and compassion. Philip Bligh, the hero in Belle Lamar, is described by Pike as "a man made of one perfect piece, without flaw or speck." His roommate at West Point, Pike felt that in Bligh's presence, he "seemed to breathe a
purer air and felt a better self within me that came forth
to keep him company" (I. i; p. 132). Moreover, Bligh is
highly regarded for his patriotism and inspires faith and
confidence in his superiors (II; p. 137). He feels deeply
the conflict both between duty and friendship and between
duty and love. Again, when the court refuses to judge
Belle's guilt or innocence in respect for her relationship
to him, Bligh moans, "Brave hearts! their gentleness unmans
mine. And Marston, too, no craven: he proved a noble match
for young Stuart. Then, above all, my lion-hearted love, my
own brave Belle!—Must all this wealth of human nature be
squandered?" (II; p. 140).

The hero of Held by the Enemy, Charles Prescott, is
also portrayed as a gallant gentleman when he takes full
responsibility for Rachel's guilt or innocence before his
general (III; p. 8-E). The moral integrity and noble action
of the hero is revealed also in Shenandoah when Kerchival
West, at the risk of bringing suspicion on himself, vindic-
cates Mrs. Haverhill's honor against the illegitimate inten-
tions of Captain Thornton. In addition to his valiant
integrity, his compassion is further demonstrated when
he promises to aid Frank Bedloe in his attempt to redeem
himself in the eyes of General Haverhill, his father (II;
p. 491).

In Alabama Ned Armstrong possesses qualities that fit
him for the role of hero. Colonel Moberly, the Southerner,
addresses Ned Armstrong as "major," recognizing his noble character, explaining,

My dear Miss Carey, do not permit our friend to undervalue himself. That he does not bear the title is mere accident of birth. If he had been born, Mrs. Page, a generation earlier, and when our internecine strife afforded the opportunity, his gallant bearing alone would have won him the rank of Major (I; p. 26).

In addition, Colonel Preston tells Armstrong that he has "brightened up the old place a bit" (III; p. 102). When Davenport prevents Armstrong from running away with Carey, Armstrong agrees with Davenport's opinion that such an act would unjustifiably injure the Colonel and make them unworthy of his trust and hospitality (III; p. 115). Captain Davenport, however, is actually the hero of Alabama. Colonel Moberly characterizes him aptly when he says that he never saw a Northern officer who was not as brave as Julius Caesar (IV; p. 119). The pain of Davenport's resentment against his father shows deeply as he discusses his past with Mildred and expresses his desire to end old bitterness (II; pp. 84-85). His concern for his father is shown also when he routes the railroad through the Colonel's property; but when he realizes that it would offend his father's spirit more than it would aid him financially, he foregoes the plan (II; p. 85; IV; pp. 147-148). His sympathy and understanding is demonstrated when he protects his father's feelings by preventing the two young lovers from running away to be married and when he acknowledges the suffering that Mildred
has endured. Like the noble hero, he lays aside his bitterness and becomes reconciled with his father and champions Carey's marriage to Armstrong.

Alan Kendrick in *The Heart of Maryland* exhibits all the standard virtues of the hero. He is dedicated to his country, compassionate in caring for the wounded Little True Blue, and indignant at Thorpe's treatment of Maryland. Another heroic figure, with a significant difference, is Captain Thorne in *Secret Service*. As the ideal man and soldier, he is fearless and will risk anything to do his duty. When arrested by Arrelsford, he shows his cool command of a desperate situation by making the guards believe that Arrelsford is the spy. When Edith shames him for taking advantage of her rescue in order to send the false orders, he is torn between his duty and his love for Edith and refuses to act under the commission Edith used to save him. An insight into the mind of the hero is afforded when, desperate and tired, Thorne expresses to Edith both his anxiety and his loyalty:

> We can't all die a soldier's death--in the roar of battle--our friends around us--under the flag we love! --No--not at all! Some of us have orders for another kind of work--desperate--dare-devil work--the hazardous schemes of the Secret Service. We fight our battles alone--no comrades to cheer us on--ten thousand to one against us--death at every turn! If we win we escape with our lives--if we lose--dragged out and butchered like dogs--no soldier's grave--not even a trench with the rest of the boys--alone--despised--forgotten! These were my orders Miss Varney--this is the death I die to-night--and I don't want you to think for one minute that I'm ashamed of it (IV; p. 614).
Finally, when his life is at stake, Thorne refuses to conceal the fact that the executioners guns have been tampered with, and later he refuses to save himself from prison by joining the Confederate Secret Service.

The final heroic figure, Captain Trumbull in *Barbara Frietchie*, is also the ideal man and soldier of the typical melodramatic mold. Fitch characterizes him as "a tall, slender, handsome Northerner . . . one of those fine-hearted, open-souled men, who are loved as baby, boy, and man by every one, but so unconsciously, so far as themselves are concerned, as to never be spoiled" (I; p. 28). Every girl in town knows that his eyes are blue and his mustache golden, and his fellow soldiers swear by his bravery and comradeship. When he sees the wounded Arthur Frietchie sneak into the Frietchie house, he saves him from the Search Gang, demonstrating his compassion and love for Barbara. But he shows his Union loyalty by refusing to leave the war when Barbara pleads with him. His keen sense of morality and his mission of justice shows in his condemnation of slavery and its evils, even though Barbara refuses to agree with him.

These heroines and heroes through their ideal character and brave actions inspire confidence in the virtues of the men and women of both the North and the South. The apparent weaknesses or flaws in their characters are shown to be unfounded, or they are overcome completely. For instance, Bligh has a harsh attitude toward women spies of
the South, but he is converted by the gentleness of his comrades. Prescott and Kendrick are suspected of spying but are proven innocent. Davenport's bitterness is softened by the passing of time. West is suspected of having ungentlemanly intentions towards Mrs. Haverhill, but he, too, is proven to be innocent. Thorne, although in fact a spy, rises to the level of a genuine hero by virtue of his manliness.

The heroines, too, exhibit some weaknesses, but these stereotyped views of theatrical characters emanate from the idealization of woman in the nineteenth century. Belle admits that an unseemly pride in placing sectional patriotism before her husband was the cause of their separation. Gertrude is flighty and unserious; Rachel, Edith, Maryland, and Barbara are impulsive and unpredictable. It is clear that the plays suggest that the women's roles are subordinate to their lover's roles, especially in war. This attitude is clearly expressed as Stonewall Jackson compliments Belle Lamar's service to the Confederacy:

I am not unmindful of the service you have rendered it. But such service is not a woman's business. The field of battle is not her place. There are some weapons we soldiers consider to be too inhuman for civilized warfare--such appear to me the use of agents like you, my child! Do not think me ungrateful or unkind to speak thus! What is your position at this moment? You have been capable of inflicting on the North many mortal injuries, and you see they shrink from inflicting on you the penalty. This is not honorable strife! A woman's country is her husband's home--her cause, his happiness--her only place in the world, his side; and death alone should part them (II; p. 141).
Belle accepts Jackson's attitude when she uses his words to explain why she will not go to safety when the battle threatens her. Maryland Calvert in *The Heart of Maryland* expresses a similar attitude: "War is not for women--we may feel--reason--and sacrifice like soldiers in our patriotism--but a glimpse of a loved one in peril--and we are women again--straight our hand goes out to save, no matter what the consequences" (IV; p. 246).

The virtues shared by the heroines and heroes were common properties of men and women on both sides of the civil conflict. That the heroines are all Southerners is a concession to historic reality because the war was fought on Southern soil, and this circumstance frequently put Northern soldiers in houses of Southern women. Southern soldiers had little chance to love Northern women, although there are two instances of this in *Shenandoah* (Robert Ellingham--Madeline West) and *The Heart of Maryland* (Robert Telfair--Nanny MacNair). That the Southern heroines all submitted to their Northern lovers is again a concession to historic probability and is clear evidence that the reconciliations between them were meant to symbolize the South's "giving in" to the North. In any case, the noble characters of the two are important aspects of the reconciliation theme, drawing the sympathy of the audience to ideals that transcended sectional division.
Critics in both Philadelphia and New Orleans were quick to react to the character of the heroine and the hero, especially when they spotted weaknesses.

Although the New Orleans Republican saw Bligh as a "naturally drawn character," it felt that the character of Belle was thoroughly disagreeable and gained no sympathy from the audience. "Deserting one Union officer for being such and promising to marry another, as a reward for treason," the paper continued, loses her a place among noble women, and makes her of as little interest as the Belle Boyds and Pauline Cushmans who figured in the war. It is true, she declares, at the end of the play, she never loved other than Bligh, and her acts have been to test him, but the feeling is that the story is too transparent, and the play, without a good atonement at its close, ends with the firing of guns.

The Philadelphia Inquirer simply noted that Bligh saw duty on one side and Belle upon the other, and "out of this divergence of duty the play and its sombre elements were evolved."10

A New Orleans critic appreciated both the character of Bligh and the skill with which it was acted. "Col. Bligh, as represented by Mr. E. F. Thorne," the New Orleans Bulletin said, "was a neat bit of characterization. Warm and
impassioned, he carried with him, against even the feelings of the audience, a strong sentiment of regard, and in many places fairly outdid his previous efforts.\textsuperscript{11}

The Philadelphia \textit{Press} found an inherent weakness in the hero of \textit{Held by the Enemy} because his "treachery makes possible the only really strong incident in the play."\textsuperscript{12} On the other hand, the \textit{North American} regarded both of the lovers of the heroine as "true-hearted men, and very stirring scenes illustrate the integrity of both."\textsuperscript{13} In New Orleans both the \textit{Daily States} and the \textit{Daily Picayune} recognized Colonel Prescott as a loyal and decent Union officer.\textsuperscript{14}

The Philadelphia \textit{North American} observed of Shenandoah that Kerchival West's portrayal by Henry Weaver, Jr., was manly and of earnest purpose, forceful, and of dramatic effect.\textsuperscript{15} The New Orleans \textit{Daily States} recognized Gertrude as a brave, impetuous Southern girl and a tender, devoted, kind, and true sweetheart of the Union officer.\textsuperscript{16} The same paper noted that Kerchival West was "everything a patriot and lover is" as acted by Frank Dayton. The \textit{Daily Picayune} sympathized with the doubt thrown over Kerchival West and noted that the cruelty of that act touched the audience.\textsuperscript{17}

The Philadelphia reviewers were impressed with the hero of Thomas's \textit{Alabama}. Maurice Barrymore as Davenport, the \textit{Evening Bulletin} noted, was certainly what we would expect from "a nature reared under Southern skies and
tempered by the push and advanced learning of the North at that time." 18

Captain Thorne in *Secret Service* particularly impressed Philadelphia critics. While the *Evening Telegraph* felt that Gillette had plunged his hero into contempt by resorting to every theatrical device to maintain interest, the *Evening Bulletin* was more penetrating in its comment on the dilemma of the hero torn between duty and love:

There may be two opinions as to what such a man should have done; but only one opinion from a soldier's point of view, and to avoid this and at the same time develop a suitable finale for a melodrama is the delicate undertaking of the author. He accomplishes this by an audacious disregard of moral heroism; but he does it with sensational, romantic and heroic touches, which create so intense an interest that the sacrifice is almost overlooked, if, indeed, it is not entirely disregarded. 19

The Philadelphia *Record* in commenting on the 1898 performance said that Gillette missed the real point, the "poetic touch--the real depth, the true meaning," of his story.

That Northern spy of his--manly, brave, cool and audacious as he was--should never have been allowed to live. Spy he was at the best, and spy he should have died--and his death would have blotted out all against him. A happy ending the play has, but the story is pillaged of its poetry. . . . It is really remarkable, in a way, how Playwright Gillette has succeeded in enlisting the sympathy of his audience in the spy's behalf. 20

The *North American* partially agreed. If Gillette had not made Thorne a dauntless, ardent, commanding personality we would not admire him at all, for "it is difficult to make a hero out of a spy even although earnest sympathy is with
the cause he represents."21 The paper concluded, however, that there was no doubt but that Thorne was regarded with sympathetic interest from the first. The Philadelphia Press noted that Mr. Gillette's performance was a most painstaking and worthy effort. . . . The way he turned suspicion from himself against "Arrelsford," his enemy who was also in love with "Miss Varney," was a fine piece of acting, and brought the second act to a close that stirred the audience to the highest pitch of enthusiasm, so that the curtain had to be raised eight times and there were loud calls for a speech from Mr. Gillette.22

Most of the criticism of Barbara Frietchie dealt with Julia Marlowe's acting ability, but the Philadelphia Inquirer noted that the original heroine was an unquenchable, an inextinguishable Unionist, whose penetrating voice could drown the tramp of cavalry and cause Stonewall Jackson to turn in his saddle though half a mile away; but this heroine is another daughter of the Confederacy."23 The Philadelphia Record observed that Miss Marlowe as Barbara, "finally dying in faith to the Stars and Stripes and her dead sweetheart, . . . certainly captivates her audience by her personal charm and art."24 Miss Marlowe's "natural grace, charming personality, and winsomeness" are the "saving graces of a play curiously fashioned from melodramatic clap-trap, patriotism, and some genuine humor and sentiment," according to the North American.25

In summary, although the New Orleans audiences apparently sympathized with Bligh as he struggled with the tension
between love and duty, they condemned Belle for using sectional loyalty as an excuse to desert one man and to lure another into betrayal. On the other hand, a Philadelphia reviewer took exception to Prescott's disloyalty in capitulating to his lover's plea not to expose her as she tried to rescue Hayne. That the New Orleans critic frowned on the Southern lady's loose morals, while the Philadelphia critic condemned the Union soldier's disloyalty indicates the virtues that they each would uphold. For the Southern woman, loyalty to her husband and virtuous action should be the first concerns. For the Northern soldier, on the other hand, loyalty to his country, even at the expense of his lover's safety, was the highest virtue. Moreover, since New Orleans papers found Bligh to be a noble character, it is clear that the Southern audience admired loyalty to country, even though Bligh was fighting against the South.

In Kerchival West the patriotic loyalty of the Union soldier was recognized in both cities. Although the New Orleans critics did not comment on Captain Thorne in *Secret Service*, some Philadelphians indicated their scorn for the Union spy who betrayed his duty for the sake of love. Others, however, sympathized with the dauntless spy. The divided opinion probably indicates an inherent suspicion of the profession more than contempt for the man, whose bravery and commanding personality won the sympathy and interest of many.
For the Philadelphia critics Captain Davenport was a sympathetic character, uniquely combining the warm gentility of the South and the aggressive learning of the North. That he was virtually ignored in New Orleans may indicate that he was not quite forgiven for deserting the Confederacy, but more likely the neglect is the result of a greater interest in Colonel Preston (see below, pp. 171-172; 179-180).

Although the Philadelphia reviewers may not have entirely accepted Barbara's early Southern sympathies, they were won to the character by Miss Marlowe's charm and skill as an actress. The stringent, but isolated, condemnation of Barbara by the critic of the Times-Democrat in New Orleans has been discussed already, and it is somewhat remarkable that New Orleanians did not condemn her any more than they did.

Generally, the characters were accepted as the heroes and heroines that the dramatists intended them to be. The attempts to create dramatic tension were not satisfactory to all, however, and the negative criticism dealt as much with dramatic probability as with character delineation. The critics in general recognized that the flaws of the heroes and heroines resulted from a want of dramatic skill or from the circumstances of war, and not from a deficiency of character. On the other hand, the bravery, loyalty, self-sacrifice of the characters,
sentimental as they are, apparently found sympathetic response in the audiences of both the North and the South.

III

In addition to the ideals portrayed by the heroines and heroes, the minor characters exhibit virtues of loyalty, bravery, honesty, and compassion--virtues that appeal for a recognition of the common qualities of Americans, whether Northerners or Southerners.

The loyalty, duty, and sacrifice of the soldiers, other than the major heroes, are shown in several plays. In Belle Lamar loyalty to his own troops is shown when Stonewall Jackson brings the unopened dispatches he captured in exchange for Belle and Stuart's lives (II; p. 140). In Held by the Enemy Hayne also expresses his Southern loyalty as he expresses his pride in having fought for the South, for his home, and for those he loves (II; p. 5-M).

The loyal Southern soldier is also portrayed by Arthur Frietchie in Barbara Frietchie, who is described as a "high-spirited young Southern soldier, engaged heart and soul in the war" (I; p. 26). His lover, Sue Royce, proud that he is fighting with Stonewall Jackson, sent him off to war with hugs and kisses (I; p. 17). When he recovers from his wounds, he immediately rejoins his Rebel troops in the defense of Frederick. As he is placing snipers in a "confounded Union Preacher's house," he learns of Barbara's
intention to marry Trumbull and pities her for the difficulties that her choice is bringing upon her (II; pp. 72-76). Sympathizing with her, he departs hoping that he will not meet Trumbull, whom he does not know, on the battlefield. But he does meet Trumbull and wounds him. When he discovers his identity, he brings him to his house to be tended by Barbara and aids her in concealing him from Mr. Frietchie (III; pp. 98-100). At the conclusion of the battle, it is known that Arthur was responsible for the Rebel's retaking of Frederick (III; p. 90). Arthur is clearly the ideal Southern soldier whose life is complicated by his sister's love for the Union officer, whose compassion is demonstrated by his treatment of his enemy Trumbull, and whose devotion to the Southern cause never wavers.

This sense of loyalty and duty of the Southern soldiers is also displayed by Northern soldiers. In *Shenandoah* Barket, the typical Irish character, comments to General Buckthorn: "You're a great man, General; we'd never have conquered the South widout such men" (IV; p. 507). But the bravery of the Northern soldier is shown most forcefully in the character of Frank Bedloe in *Shenandoah* as he volunteers for the dangerous mission of discovering the Rebel code for General Haverhill. His bravery is recognized by both General Haverhill of the North and by Surgeon Hardwick of the South.

Another characteristic of the soldier is his integrity. In *Belle Lamar*, when Stuart, the Southerner, is pressed
to reveal the source of his information in exchange for a lighter sentence, he says to his captors: "We were fellow students, gentlemen—and side by side we learned out of the same book the duty of a soldier: there must have been one lesson I overlooked or skipped—I never learned how to turn informer" (II; p. 139). Lieutenant Gordon Hayne in Held by the Enemy also reveals a high sense of integrity when he saves Prescott from being charged with treason by admitting to the court that the paper that Prescott took from him was one Hayne himself had drawn: "Do you think that I am going to escape by charging an innocent man with a crime like that?" (II; p. 5-M).

Finally, compassion and brotherly love are demonstrated in Shenandoah and in Secret Service, two plays that had many productions in both the North and in the South. In Shenandoah the Confederate Surgeon Hardwick sympathetically ministers to Frank Bedloe, the Union soldier captured on a dangerous mission, and accompanies him when he is exchanged for Robert Ellingham. When he dies after their arrival behind Union lines, Hardwick says to General Haverhill, "Pardon me, General. We Virginians are your enemies, but you cannot honor this young soldier more than we do. Will you allow my men the privilege of carrying him to his grave?" (III; p. 503). This is the most touching example of sympathy transcending sectional conflict to be found in any of the plays.
Compassion and brotherly love are demonstrated also in the meeting between Captain Thorne (Lewis Dumont) and his brother Henry, both Northern spies, in Secret Service. When they meet in the Varney's house where Arrelsford is attempting to trap Thorne, Henry delivers the secret message in a whisper to Thorne and demands that Thorne shoot him in the leg to throw off suspicion from himself. Thorne refuses to shoot his own brother, but Henry grabs his gun and succeeds in thwarting Arrelsford's suspicion of Thorne (II; p. 586). The mutual concern for each other in a desperate and dangerous situation certainly wins the sympathies of the audience.

One intention of these characterizations obviously is to emphasize the dedication of the American soldier whether Northern or Southern.26 The emphasis on loyalty, honesty, and compassion of both the Northern and the Southern soldier contributes to the effect of the plays on reconciliation.

Not only are these soldiers ideal characters, other characters also are presented in terms intended to engage the sympathetic response of the spectators of the plays. Colonel Preston in Alabama is a unique character in the plays who forcefully appeals to the audience's understanding. The war has wounded him deeply and "he is very positive in many views," Mrs. Page explains to Armstrong; and "he retains many prejudices against the people of the North" (I; pp. 21-22). But he demonstrates his gracious manner in his
hospitality to Armstrong and to Davenport, whom he does not
know is his son. Further, he defends the honor of Mrs. Page
against the malicious charges of Raymond Page by challenging
him to a duel, asserting that "no action against a lady can
be civil, sir!" (II; p. 72). He wants only to be left alone
with the memories of the past--memories that help to ease
the pain he has suffered because of the devastation of his
plantation by the Union army under Sherman and because of
his son's desertion of the South in the war. Although his
plantation is bankrupt, he tells Armstrong that he does not
want his railroad on his plantation (II; p. 70). In spite
of the injury his son caused him, he always speaks tenderly
of him (III; p. 93). His reluctant assent to Carey's engage­
ment to Armstrong indicates both the depth of his resentment
against the North and his recognition that bitterness is
destructive and that the times are changing. His tender
reconciliation with his son emphasizes his compassionate
humanity and exhibits his genuine fatherly virtue.

Colonel Moberly also is a compassionate father, if
a recalcitrant Rebel. But time, too, is wearing away his
façade of rigidity. In sympathy with Lathrop Page, the
editor of his paper, he refuses to act as Raymond Page's
lawyer when he realizes that the suit, if successful, would
make Lathrop illegitimate. Moreover, in deference to
Colonel Preston's age, he takes up the Colonel's challenge
of Raymond. His commitment to the Southern way of life is
evident when he tells Davenport that Southern moons have more gold and more heart in them than Northern ones, and that girls raised under them have more poetry and more music in their souls (III; p. 95). Although a traditional Southerner in his views of Negroes and in his political practice, he is a genuinely warm-hearted and chivalrous Southern gentleman. As Davenport observes, he, like Colonel Preston, is a relic of an age past and a new generation is pushing them aside (III; pp. 96-98). Magnanimous in recognizing the bravery and noble character of both Armstrong and Davenport, he is, nevertheless, tied to the Old South, as evidenced by his naming his daughter Atlanta because she was born on the day Sherman destroyed that symbolic city (I; p. 26; II; p. 54; IV; p. 119).

Mr. Frietchie in Barbara Frietchie is, like Colonel Preston and Colonel Moberly, a devoted father and an irreconcilable Rebel. Perhaps only because the play occurs during the war, Mr. Frietchie is more adamant and less understanding of the love between Northerner suitors and Southern ladies, especially since the Southern lady is his daughter. His bitterness explodes when he learns of Barbara's intention to marry Trumbull, and when he thinks they are married he refuses to speak to her (III; p. 87). He curses Trumbull throughout the play, and only under Barbara's threat to harm herself does he relent and let the dying Trumbull remain under his roof. His pride in his son's bravery in
battle only compounds his anguish over Barbara, and he is stunned at her suggestion that the South is wrong in the fight. Having lost his brother in the battle and uncertain about the fate of his son, he is horrified to learn that Barbara has shot a Southern soldier in order to save her lover, even though the Rebel is a Northern mercenary and deserter. The tragedy of Barbara's death leaves him at the end of the play with his prejudices intact, with the memory of a daughter who betrayed her family and country, but also with pride in a gallant son who brought a victory to the South.

All of these characterizations appeal strongly for sympathetic understanding of the Southern fathers who suffered greatly as a result of the war. Their genuine humanity, Southern charm, and sincere compassion, sentimental as they are, emphasize qualities that would engage the hearts of mothers and fathers, and indeed most people, on both sides of the sectional conflict.

IV

Critics in both Philadelphia and New Orleans reacted favorably to the bravery and noble character of the soldiers presented in the plays. Some apparently took exception to a few of the characters, however, as in the review of Belle Lamar by the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin. Although Boucicault pretended to be impartial, the Bulletin noted, he
shows his sympathy for "the rebel cause by glorifying the rebel characters, while he makes most of the federals appear to be very inferior creatures."

Most of the reviewers found, however, that the character of both Northern and Southern soldiers presented in the plays was ennobling, and the audiences seem to have identified with the dramatist's presentations. The reviews indicate that New Orleans audiences, for instance, responded to the bravery of both sides in Held by the Enemy. The Daily Picayune said, the play "shows there were brave, true hearts and noble men on both sides, and that the women of the confederacy were devoted to their own until death during the war. . . ." 28 "The sentiment is of the noblest, the Times-Democrat said, "and a vein of patriotism of an exalted character runs throughout the play. . . ." 29

Apparently the idealization of the soldiers and civilians in the plays was accepted as accurate and realistic. Shenandoah was enjoyable, the Public Ledger noted, because "a remarkably successful distinction is drawn between the appearance and action of the Northern and Southern soldiers. Each force was represented to the life, and down to the smallest details the forces on both sides were accurately portrayed." 30 The play introduces "a number of agreeable people whose individualities have been admirably suggested and portrayed. . . .", the North American commented. 31 The reviewers also felt the characters were full of heroism and
bravery. "Admiration for the gallant deeds performed upon both sides give it logically an attracting power which no passing prejudice can obscure," the Philadelphia Inquirer observed. 32

New Orleans critics generally agreed with the Philadelphia commentators. In reviewing Shenandoah the Times-Democrat reviewer said that the audience is made to forget the issues that estranged North and South, "in a realization of the fact that bravery, gentleness and true manhood are qualities too great and noble to be fettered by geographical or political boundaries." 33 "The soldiers in it are of the kind who know no fear themselves," the Daily Picayune observed, "respect even enemies if they are brave, and gladly risk their lives for a woman's love or a woman's honor." 34

Alabama was the play that received the most response to its presentation of genuine character. The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin noted that "Alabama more than fulfills expectations. It is, perhaps, nothing more or less than a succession of character gems, but that is certainly enough." 35 The Times-Democrat in New Orleans agreed that the strength of the play is not plot but characterization. Thomas, the paper said, has demonstrated "acute perception and comprehensive grasp of the motives and mentalities of types of humanity." 36 The play is "studded with a group of splendidly drawn and capably wrought character sketches,"
the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin observed. The characters were pure types of Southern life, presented with fidelity and naturalness, according to the Evening Star. And the Philadelphia Inquirer found the Southern women in the plays to be charming. The Southern audiences responded to Thomas's characters in the same way. The Daily States discusses at length the audience's response to "the characters that made Southern chivalry a thing to conjure with" and the "brave and warm hearted people" who made dreadful sacrifices in the war.

The Philadelphia Inquirer observed that Belasco had taken human nature as his foundation for The Heart of Maryland and that the people spoke and acted as men and women did in 1863. The Daily Picayune agreed that the play "shows how brave men fought on either side, and . . . clothes with an equal glory both the gray and the blue."

The Philadelphia papers did not comment on the characterization of Secret Service, but the Daily Picayune felt that Gillette wrote the play to show the bravery and chivalry of Southern people.

The virtuous character that the audiences recognized in general was applied to specific characters as well. New Orleans reviewers found the character of Stonewall Jackson in Belle Lamar worthy of note. One paper commented that General Jackson would not be recognized by his old soldiers except for the dignity of language which Boucicault
"sometimes has the grace to put in his mouth." But the New Orleans Bulletin observed that "Mr. Theo. Hamilton as Stonewall Jackson received a greeting seldom accorded any actor on our stage. Shout after shout made the welkin ring." The New Orleans Republican sided with the Bulletin by saying that although few words were put in Jackson's mouth, they are "temperate and characteristic of the man" as he expresses hope for a speedy end of the war with honor to both sides.

One New Orleans paper also commented on Patrick Stuart, the Southern soldier who is arrested with Belle, and found that he "has a sentimental interest thrown about him, which inevitably elicits applause, and nothing else."

Lieutenant Gordon Hayne in Held by the Enemy received considerable notice from New Orleans audiences. The Daily Picayune observed that "at the trial the southern soldier rose superior to them all, and asked for death, rather than liberty at such a sacrifice." The other papers agreed that Hayne excited the Southerner's sympathy. The Daily States said, "Southern sympathy is of course centered in Gordon Hayne, an officer of the Confederate Army, and Mr. Wilbur Hudson naturally had a most acceptable part to portray." The Daily Picayune noted that the audience "ordered up the curtain most peremptorily after the young confederate had declared his loyalty in the face of death, rather than see an innocent enemy suffer through his silence."
Colonel Preston in Alabama, the incorrigible Rebel grandfather of Carey and father of the ex-patriated hero Captain Davenport, was a character that both Philadelphia and New Orleans reviewers responded to sympathetically. The Public Ledger said that J. H. Stoddart's "effective portrayal of the old-time aristocrat, broken in his fortunes, set in his adherence to institutions of a by-gone day, but with a well-spring of human affection behind the barrier of caste and tradition, in 'form and moving' . . . was an artistic characterization." The New Orleans papers agreed that old Colonel Preston was "the embodiment of kindly courtesy, noble chivalry and generous hospitality, [but one who] still retained his prejudices against the north and northern people. . . ." J. H. Stoddart as Colonel Preston, the Times-Democrat observed, was an ideal Southern gentleman of the old school; gentle and courtly in his manner, but at the same time as fixed as the rock-bound shore in his prejudices. With a firey, chivalrous heart alone untamed and unbent by his weight of years, it was a rare study to watch the struggles between his graceful, courtly gentleness and hospitality on the one hand, and his passionate love of his grand-daughter, his devotion to his life-long prejudices, and his bitter hatred of the invaders who had wrecked his home on the other.

Of the 1891 performance the Times-Democrat said that Mr. Frank Bangs gave a touching portrayal of Colonel Preston, "a noble old man whose paternal love, innate good breeding and generous hospitality were made to appear all the more brilliant and richly colored by being displayed against a
background of conservative prejudice and unbending self-will." The Daily States said that Colonel Preston possesses traits of Southern born gentlemen--chivalry, bravery, generosity, urbanity--and is not a creation of fiction, but "an ideal and a reality both in one." Colonel Moberly in Alabama also received notice by critics of both cities. The Philadelphia Inquirer noted that E. M. Holland was picturesque as Colonel Moberly, the North American that he was dignified and courteous, and the Public Ledger that he gave an "exquisite presentation of the gallant Southerner--courteously, spirited, magnanimous and sanguine." The New Orleans Daily States noted that Colonel Moberly's manners, gallantry, patriotism, and strict adherence to duty was admired by people of every section, and they felt the urge to grasp his hand and "assure him of [their] respect for his country and himself." The only paper to comment on the Dumont brothers in Secret Service was the Times-Democrat. The scene in which Henry Dumont shoots himself was admirably staged, the paper observed, and it received four encours from the audience and deserved them. Although the critic appears to be commenting on the staging of the scene, his magnanimity is significant, for in applauding the Union spy's gallant saving of another Union spy, the critic is acknowledging the bravery and self-sacrifice of "Yankee" soldiers. Even
more important, perhaps, is the fact that this critic may be the same one who roundly condemned Maryland Calvert in *The Heart of Maryland* and *Barbara Frietchie* as unworthy Southern heroines, and who applauded *Secret Service* in 1901 for having no traitor heroes or heroines. Whether he is the same critic or not, that he would recognize the bravery of a Yankee spy indicates a willingness to admit that virtuous action belonged to Americans whether they were Southerners or Northerners.

Arthur Frietchie in *Barbara Frietchie* receives brief notice by the *Daily States*. Algeron Tassin as Arthur, the *States* observed, was just what he should have been, and his conception of the character was excellent. The paper also noted that Mr. Frietchie was a loyal Southerner and tender father, and that Charles Steadman in portraying his character paid close attention to realities, discarding all idealities.

The reviews indicate that audiences in both New Orleans and Philadelphia seem to have identified sympathetically with the Northern and Southern characters because they represented virtues that they both held dear--virtues of bravery and heroic character. Especially were Southerners moved by the self-sacrifice of women and by the love that motivated their men to gallant deeds. But they also sympathized with warm-hearted fathers, like Mr. Frietchie. Philadelphians apparently responded similarly to the charm
of Southern ladies in *Alabama* and to Southern fathers like Colonel Preston and Colonel Moberly. The genuineness of Colonel Preston's rock-bound prejudice seems to have evoked more pity than scorn.

The Southern soldier, like Stuart in *Belle Lamar*, Hayne in *Held by the Enemy*, and Arthur Frietchie in *Barbara Frietchie*, drew the enthusiastic approval of New Orleans reviewers for their bravery, honesty and compassion. The apparent approval of Union spies, like the Dumont brothers in *Secret Service* suggests that Southerners recognized bravery and dedication, just as Northerners recognized conviction and loyalty in men like Colonel Preston.

There were more Southerners than Northerners portrayed among the minor characters in the plays and Southern audiences seem to have responded more enthusiastically to them than Northern audiences. But Philadelphia audiences were quick to recognize and applaud genuine gallantry. That the two audiences apparently responded in the same fashion to common virtues that transcend sectional divisions is clear evidence of the appeal of the reconciliation theme in the plays.

V

Since one of the major factors in the war was the condition and treatment of the Negroes in the South, it is not surprising that the plays almost invariably contain a
faithful Negro servant in the Southern households. There are no unhappy servants in these plays, and their contentment implies that the war waged to set them free was not only unnecessary but cruel.

All of the black characters in the plays are typical of the roles of blacks in most drama of the nineteenth-century theater. Uncle Dan in Belle Lamar elected to stay on with the Lamars with his old blind dog Sal after the slaves were freed: "We've got our freedom--dars whats de matter, wot am you gwine do wi' your'n" (II; p. 138). In sympathy with Belle's efforts to aid the Rebel army, Uncle Dan agrees to guide Stuart through the forest so that he can capture the Northern dispatches (I. i; p. 133). His faithfulness is also demonstrated in his willingness to take Belle's place as a prisoner. When Bligh accuses Uncle Dan of giving the dispatches to the Confederates, he sees the accusation as a ruse to save Belle:

Eh! oh! Dar's a fact!--golly--yack--I see you two ha' been callatin' togeder dat she kin get off, ef you put de scratch on somebody else.--I'm de feller--You got him now Curnel sure--Ole Dan's to blame. I'll bar it--let her stan' from under. Oh laws, massy, bless you bot' for tinkin o' me (II; p. 139).

And when the guard comes to take Belle to prison, he proudly says, "Dem sojers is for me. I'm gwine to be a prisoner."

Like Uncle Dan, Rufus in Held by the Enemy offers to take Hayne's place. General Stamburg says that nothing can be done about it, for the law must take its course. Rufus
replies: "I knows dat, sah, I knows dat. But de law am no 'spector of pussons, and I wants to make some 'rangements so dat I can be killed in his place, and if dat am satisfactory to de soldiers, from de North, I'm ready to go through with it at any time" (III; p. 5-E). When Stamburg says that it's impossible, Rufus thinks that he is not a fair exchange because he is an old, worn-out slave:

It aint no ways surprising dat yer has de opinion I aint a fair substitute, I knows dat I aint in de condition I once was, but I'se still a pretty valuable lot and could bring a fair price at a first class sale. De folks used to give me a little money once in a while, and deres quite considerable of it altogether sah. Its under de furderest brick in de left hand corner of de kitchen fire place, and if you would only take me instead of Massa Gordon, why dat could be throwed in (III; p. 5-E).

Rufus goes away dejected at his failure when Stamburg tells him that it can not be done.

Less significant but still present are the servants in Alabama, The Heart of Maryland, and Barbara Frietchie. Uncle Decatur, the loyal, nearly blind servant of Colonel Preston, recognizes Captain Davenport's voice as that of Harry Preston and thinks that he is a ghost. Later, when Davenport asks him why he is helping Carey to run away with Armstrong, Uncle Decatur says, "Why, sah, I'se done raised her. I raised her ma too, e'en most. I loved her ma, too, sah. Miss Carey jis' like her ma used to be" (III; p. 112). Uncle Dan'l in The Heart of Maryland, the lovable servant of the Calverts, is characterized as "a lovable old darky with shining bald pate, and snow-white wool" (I; p. 176).
In Act IV he is busily waiting on wounded Northern and Southern soldiers at The Lilacs and says, "I don' tel' that guard at the gate not to let any more wounded soldiers in here, for the rooms am all filled up now by both sexes of the blue and the grey" (IV; pp. 238-239). The Frietchie's have no servant, but Mammy Lu, servant of the next door neighbor, is a "dear old colored woman" (I; p. 9). When the Provost Guard searches the Royce house for deserters and Rebels, she defends the house and condemns the soldiers:

"Is you froo? Bress de Lawd? Is you done giv' up fin'in' any pore Southern sojers hyah? Ain't you gwine to look inside the roses a-growing on de bushes, you devils? And didn' yer forget to look under the stah carpet? And dere's the kitchen closet; you oughter look in the flour barrel and inside the chickens' eggs, too! The hens hyah hide little Rebs in dem, sure! (I; pp. 30-31).

When the soldiers bid her, "Good night, Venus!" she says: "Don' you call me no names, you low down white trash you! You devils!" She slams the gate and mutters to herself: "I'm a 'spectable culled lady, I is! I ain't taking no back talk from no ornry sojers! No, siree!" Two days after the battle, Mammy Lu is at the Frietchie's praising the Lord that Frederick's a Rebel town again (III; p. 87). And when Trumbull is brought wounded to the Frietchie house, Mammy Lu tends to him and helps Barbara conceal him from Mr. Frietchie (III; p. 101).

In addition to the humor the servants add to the plays, most are loyal, not only to their former masters, but also to the Southern cause. In Secret Service, however,
Jonas seems to be willing to help the Union, even though he remains faithful to the Varneys. Jonas, in trying to deliver a message from Henry Dumont to Captain Thorne, is captured by Arrelsford and mercilessly treated for his betrayal. Further, Jonas removes each cartridge from the rifles of Thorne's executioners and bites off the heads so that Thorne will not be killed. He tells Edith to warn Thorne to fall down as if dead when the soldiers fire.

Jonas pleads:

* Dhey's a-goin' ter shoot 'im--shoot 'im down like a dog, Missy--an' I could n't b'ar to see 'em do dat! I would n't like to see 'im killed--I would n't like it noways! You won't say nuffin' 'bout dis--fer de sake of ole Jonas what was always so fond o' you--ebber sense ye was a little chile! . . . Do dis fur ole Jonas honey--do it fur me--an' I'll be a slabe to ye ez long ez I lib! . . . Dey's a-goin' ter kill 'im! (IV: pp. 615-616).

Although his motivation is his love for Edith, his sympathy with Thorne's cause is also implied. Certainly, he has a sense of humanity in not wanting to see Thorne killed, whether or not his motive is an identification with Thorne's mission. But the fact that he tried to deliver the message from Henry Dumont to Thorne indicates that he sympathized with the Union cause. If so, he is the only one of the Negro characters to show any such conviction. In any case, the portrayal of the Negro servants as loyal to their former Southern masters indicates that their lives were not miserable, and this is what the audiences apparently wanted to believe. Although they are stereotyped as old, blind, simple,
and comic, their stereotyped roles also suggest a basic humanity in their tender concern for their masters and in their willingness to sacrifice their own lives for them. Surely this is an idealized view of black-white relations, but it serves to emphasize the attitudes of dramatists and apparently of the public. They were willing to deal with these romanticized characters perhaps because the actual conditions of race relations were too painful to accept.  

In addition to these portrayals of Negro characters, some white characters express traditional attitudes of prejudice towards Negroes. Prejudice against blacks, however, comes not only from Southerners, but also from Northerners. Thomas Bean, a special correspondent for Leslie's in *Held by the Enemy*, bursts into the McCreery house in order to make sketches for his paper. Euphemia responds with, "What! Here in this house! No sir!" But Bean persists in sketching the room and the McCreerays in spite of their objection. Wondering where the third "defenseless" woman is, he starts to ring the bell but stops with the thought, "No, if I do that the nigger will come, and I've got him" (I; p. 5-M). In the published version of *Held by the Enemy* Gillette apparently felt that he could make better humor of Bean's comment: "Got the old darkey too--that is, got his back--they're all alike in front."  

The Northern prejudice of Bean is complemented by Colonel Moberly in *Alabama* when he tells Captain Davenport...
that the Talladega Light Artillery was formed to exercise "its moral salutary influence upon the blacks" (III; p. 96), and that they do not "permit a blamed nigga' to the caucus" (III; p. 97). Later Squire Tucker expresses a typical Southern attitude toward Negroes, but with a touch of humorous appreciation: "Ef they is any white folks, Colonel, that despise a niggah, it's because they neveh own one, I say. . . . Who could be more intelligent or discriminatin' than that old man? I really believe he would have voted the Democratic ticket, if permitted to exercise his ballot" (IV; p. 121). The effect of these statements--aside from their good humor which was allowed at the turn of the century--indicates that the Northerners and the Southerners in the plays are really no different in their attitudes towards the Negroes.

VI

Reactions to the faithful Negro servants in the plays came almost entirely from the South and almost entirely in regard to the acting rather than to the characters of their actions. 63

Uncle Rufus in Held by the Enemy received more enthusiastic comment than any other character, all of it, however, from New Orleans reviews. The Daily States commented: "Mention must be made of the performance of master Perkins, who represented Uncle Rufus, the faithful negro
slave. His acting was finished and artistic and should win him golden laurels, especially in the South." 64

Uncle Decatur in Alabama also received the notice of the New Orleans papers. The Times-Democrat observed that Decatur was portrayed excellently by Guido Marburg, "who appeared to have photographed the author's idea of the old-time negro servant with wonderful accuracy." 65 The Daily States indicated that the portrayal of the Negro servant was a part of a cluster of precious memories of the strife which were represented as they were: "The faithful negro servant, whose head has been frosted and whose figure has been beat by the visissitudes and the [heart-burnings?] of post-bellum times" is not exaggerated nor burlesqued. 66 The only other comment about the Negro servants was that from the Times-Democrat critic who observed that the only traitor in Secret Service was the old Negro, and "he is only half rascal." 67

The absence of comment about the Negro servants by the Philadelphia papers is an interesting fact, for the portrayals, except possibly for that of Jonas in Secret Service, are of servants who remained faithful to their white masters even after the Emancipation Proclamation. Their faithfulness, of course, seems to have pleased Northerners as well as Southerners. The stereotype of the kindly old ex-slave, happy in his continuing servitude, apparently helped to bring Northerners and Southerners together in their attitudes
toward the black man. Apparently the fervor of abolition was gone from the Northern mind, and they would accept the romantic portrayals of the blacks because they represent what people of both sections wanted to believe. Whatever their thoughts, the reviews do not reveal them. This silence is even more astonishing in regard to Jonas in Secret Service, for he is the only servant who tries to rescue a Union soldier from death and, at the risk of his own life, participates in the spy activities of the Dumont brothers. It is astonishing, too, that the Philadelphia reviewers did not respond to the statements of prejudice by Northerners like Bean in Held by the Enemy or by the Southerners in Alabama. Perhaps their silence suggests that even the Northerner of the late nineteenth century knew little about the subtlety of racial bias. Perhaps, too, it suggests that he was against enslavement but had never considered black people in the same light as whites.

It is clear, however, that the Southern critics, and apparently Southern audiences, accepted the happy portrayals of the servants. Surely, they must have sensed the compassion exhibited by those who sought to give their own in place of their master's lives. The portrayal of old, blind, and ignorant Negroes, viewed from the twentieth century, suggests a contemptuous disregard for the servants as human beings, but the servants display a human loyalty and genuine love between servant and master. The New Orleans audiences seem
to have accepted this portrayal, and in that loyalty and love lay much of the hope for reconciliation between the North and the South, as both sought to find a place for the black man in society. The plays do not aid in solving the problems of relationships between blacks and whites, and the reactions of both audiences indicate that they were not ready to confront the problems that the black man represented. They would, however, enjoy the romanticized treatment of blacks and leave the real world to others.

VII

The suffering of Southern men and women is a significant element in the reconciliation theme in the plays. Southerners suffered most, for the war was fought there, and Southern women bore the burden of the anguish in separation from their husbands and children.

In the plays some Southern women suffer because their children suffer. Mrs. Varney in Secret Service suffers because her husband is at the front, her older son Howard lies wounded in her house, and her younger son Wilfred is preparing to go into battle. She refuses to call the doctor to her dying son because he is desperately needed at the hospital (I; p. 555). She comments that Howard suffers dreadfully when the cannon shakes the house. Wilfred says that he suffers too from not being where the fighting is. Mrs. Varney replies, "Yes, yes,--we all suffered--we all
suffered dear!" When Wilfred persists, impatiently asking for her permission, she says, "Darling boy--I know it! You want to fight for your country--and I'm proud of you! I want my sons to do their duty! But with your father commanding a brigade at the front and one boy lying wounded--perhaps mortally--" (I; pp. 554-555).

Other men and women suffer because of what their children or spouses do to them. Bligh excoriates his former wife Belle:

They tell me that you have the right to give yourself to another without shame or sin, because the law has made you free. A few words were spoken over us two years ago. We signed a page, and were told that we were man and wife. Time passed, you left me, and then some other words were spoken; the page was torn and we were told that we were strangers,--your life that had grown part of me was wrenched away; but hearts are not divorced by forms of law, and mine has followed you--too honest, now to deny its worship, too proud to deny its suffering. Let this confession protect me against yours (II; p. 138).

Belle, too, suffers as she bemoans leaving him and confesses that pride stood in her way.

General Haverhill in Shenandoah also suffers because of the disgrace that his son brought on him: "I am an officer of the United States Army. The name which my son bears came to me from men who had borne it with honor, and I transmitted it to him without a blot. He has disgraced it, by his own confession" (I; p. 485). Edith, Frank Bedloe's wife in Shenandoah, also suffers because Frank has been killed: "More troops returning! The old tattered
battle-flag is waving in the wind, and people are running after them so merrily. Every day, now, seems like a holiday. The war is over. All the women ought to feel very happy, whose—whose husbands are—coming back to them" (IV; p. 505).

General Kendrick in The Heart of Maryland suffers because of his son's abandonment of him and the South and because of his own treatment of his wife. But he acknowledges to Alan that he was wrong to suspect his wife and that Alan had been right to stand by her (II; p. 215). Mrs. Claiborne Gordon, Maryland's guardian, suffers because of the actions of Lloyd in spying for the Union and because of Maryland's actions in aiding Alan Kendrick. Even though Phoebe tells her that "brave men have done what Lloyd did—and their names are honored," Mrs. Gordon curses both Lloyd and Maryland (IV; p. 240). But when Telfair tells her that if the South were to win that day, Maryland would be imprisoned for the duration of the war, she is horrified at the thought: "No, no, they wouldn't do that! The vile prison pens! What would become of her—a woman?" Telfair then says that if she were not a woman the penalty would be death. Mrs. Gordon responds: "Yes, I know—Ah, my poor child! All night long I've watched and waited—not daring to think of the worst. They will drag her away from me. God forgive me, Lieutenant Telfair, for my disloyalty—may our side lose today" (IV; pp. 240-241).
The portrayal of these incidents of anguish and suffering, arising from sectional bitterness and division, evokes an awareness of conflicts in relationships, the difficult choices that must be made, and the disastrous consequences that war brings upon people of both sections. It certainly also evokes compassion and sympathy for those who suffer, whether they are Southerners or Northerners, and adds force to the reconciliation theme.

VIII

Reaction to the suffering and anxiety portrayed in the plays was almost completely absent, except in a general sense. The Philadelphia Inquirer noted that Miss Ida Waterman gave a splendid picture of a heart-sore mother of the South in her role as Mrs. Varney in Secret Service. Her struggles to cope with her husband's absence, an older son who lay dying, and a young son who wanted to get into the fight are apparently what the New Orleans Daily States had in mind when it referred to the "thousands of fathers and sons and brothers and husbands and sweethearts" who were sacrificed "in the dreadful funeral pyre that antedated the freeing of the slaves."71

Apparently the suffering of the characters in the plays was simply accepted as one of the circumstances of the war, the responses to which have been recorded in only
general statements of the sympathy aroused by the tragedies of the war.

IX

Various expressions of sectional bitterness are evident in the plays, but some effort is made to soften these expressions in the interest of reconciliation. These expressions are always shown to be the result of a misconception of or a prejudice toward the opposing section of the country.

Sectional bitterness is implied in Stuart's comment, upon learning that Bligh grants him six hours to live after he is captured as a spy: "Six hours! You are liberal! When we take one of your spies he is tried, condemned, and executed within thirty minutes" (I. ii; p. 135). Bligh responds: "Our justice proceeds with more deliberation and in this case we employ more ceremony; for you will have a companion; and that she may share your fate requires approval from headquarters." His resentment shows also when he is stunned that they would execute a woman. Further, Stuart tells the court that the soldiers who captured him robbed him of his watch and cigar case. He says that he will not need the watch since he has not much time to count, but he does regret the cigars (II; p. 139). In both these instances an act of kind consideration by his Northern captors counteracts Stuart's bitterness. Bligh orders that his wounds be dressed and that he be well cared for, because "he is a
brave fellow" (I. ii; p. 135). And Getz offers Stuart a cigar to smoke during his trial (II; p. 139).

The bitterness of Southerners toward Yankees is shown in *Held by the Enemy*. When Euphemia learns that Rachel is planning to ask a favor of Colonel Prescott, she is horrified that Rachel would take anything from a "Yankee Colonel", for she herself does not want to be "under obligations to these wretches." But Susan says that Prescott has "been right kind to us" (I; p. 2-M). Hatred of Yankee soldiers is shown also in *Barbara Frietchie* as Laura, Sally, and Sue sweep their dresses up when two Union soldiers stroll down the street. When one soldier throws a rose to Laura, she plucks it from her dress and throws it after him in disgust. As the soldiers move on, the girls sing "Dixie" with unmistakable emphasis to taunt them (I; pp. 15-16). Obviously, soldiers will be soldiers, whether Northern or Southern, and the kindness of men like Philip Bligh, Getz, and Colonel Prescott does win some appreciation.

Other traditional sectional prejudice is expressed by Mrs. Claiborne Gordon in *The Heart of Maryland* as she bemoans her fate: "I never expected to see the day when I should shelter the enemy. Dan'l, tell the guard at the gate, not to send another Northern soldier into this house" (IV; p. 238). When a blind Southern soldier comes to the window carrying a crippled Northern soldier, Mrs. Gordon says, "You can come in, not the man with you. I have enough
Northern soldiers under my roof, already" (IV; p. 239). But the Southern soldier says, "Can't do it, mum--I made an agreement with this cuss here--You see, mum, it's like this: I'm blind and he can't walk. We fell about a mile off. I told him if he could do the seein', I could do the walkin' 'till we could sail into a place and get patched up--" (IV; p. 239). Telfair recognizes the Southern soldier, who asks him to direct him to a place where they both can get in. Mrs. Gordon then relents and sends them to the surgeon.

Nanny MacNair, also in *The Heart of Maryland*, expresses the attitude that leads to reconciliation when, in an effort to get some liniment for the Northern soldiers, she says, "There's too much partiality going on in this house" (IV; p. 241).

Other traditional expressions of sectionalism appear in the discussion between Mrs. Page and Squire Tucker in *Alabama* as they discuss Carey and Armstrong's love. The Squire says that Mrs. Clayton is distressed over Carey's attraction to Armstrong because "Mrs. Clayton ain't very partial to Northern people since her Beatrice run off with that Yankee drummer" (I; p. 7). Mrs. Page says that the Yankee drummer makes a very good husband and that Beatrice seems to be happy in her nice home in Chicago. The Squire's response is amusingly typical: "Now-now don't that show? H-how could anybody be happy in Chicago after livin' in Talladega?" Mrs. Page says that she never thought of that.
The Squire gives his view of Northerners when he sees Armstrong coming with Carey: "Jes' see him switchin' that cane of his'n, cuttin' the heads off the four o'clocks. Seems they must always be doin' somethin', them chaps from up North" (I; p. 8). The Squire then tells Armstrong that he hopes they will not build a dam across the bayou because that would "discourage the frogs; and most of our citizens is bitterly opposed to that" (I; p. 10). Armstrong humorously comments on the Squire's interest in protecting the frog population, and Mrs. Page says, "Yes, we guard our institutions very jealously" (I; p. 11). Mrs. Page, who is tending her flowers, asks Armstrong if he admires flowers. He answers that he has not been familiar enough with them to do more: "We live in a brick row in Boston, where the houses are close together like front teeth. A dear old grandmother of mine has put a smile over one window sill with a box of geraniums, but is scarcely generous--never prodigal" (I; p. 13). These expressions of differing ways of life illustrate some stereotyped views, but also demonstrate the commonness of men's fears and aspirations. The Southerners express a sectional superiority in their feeling that the rural South is much better than the urban North. For such defenders of the pride of the South, happiness in the North is unthinkable. The Squire also expresses a fear that his settled life might be upset by the encroachment of the Northern railroad. The aspirations implied in these
expressions are the nostalgic yearnings for the simple, uncluttered, agrarian life of the romanticized South.

Also, the desire for the simple life emerges in Alabama in Colonel Preston's strong resentments against the North. He wants nothing to do with the North, wants nothing from any Northerner but to be left along, for "sectional resentment broke my heart, . . . took my only boy, . . . estranged his love" (III; p. 106). He is heart-broken when he believes that Carey has run off with the Northerner Armstrong. Although his resentment is intact at the end of the play, his reconciliation with his son certainly softens his bitterness.

Vitriolic bitterness is also expressed in Barbara Frietchie by Colonel Negly. When he meets Captain Trumbull, he says, "Oh, I know you sir." You're a damned Yankee, sir" (I; p. 28). Trumbull responds: "I'm a Union soldier, sir." Negly replies: "So was I a soldier, sir, in a just cause. I was a colonel in the Mexican war, sir!" Trumbull says that he is glad that Negly is not fighting this time, but Negly replies that he may if the South needs him. When Trumbull half-humorously threatens to keep Negly a prisoner to prevent him from leaving the town, Negly says,

The town won't be yours, sir, in a fortnight! . . . And, thank God, sir, while you Northerners have our dear town not one of 'em dares to call on my daughter, sir. Frietchie's got to stop it too, sir! We're coming to have a word with him. Not that I have anything against you personally, sir. I'm bound to believe if it weren't for the war you might be a gentle- man, sir (I; p. 29).
When Frietchie tells Trumbull that he must stop seeing Barbara, Trumbull says that his character and his family are unblemished. Negly responds, "Damn you, sir, good night! . . . And damn your family too, sir!" (I; p. 50). Of course, Barbara Frietchie ends differently from the other plays, with both Trumbull and Barbara dead, demonstrating that sectional bitterness does have its tragic results. But acts indicative of common humanity soften the bitterness. Colonel Negly acts the part of a brave soldier when he orders that his own son be executed for killing Barbara, and Mr. Frietchie has some compassion when he allows the wounded Trumbull to remain under his roof. But this play, more than any other, shows the power and sad consequences of sectional bitterness. The recognition of disastrous consequences, however, is an aspect of the reconciliation theme of the play and is a strong indication that reconciliation had already taken place, for the sympathy of the audiences for the Southern girl who gives her life in devotion to her dead lover is a strongly emotional experience that could be shared only by those with common feelings. The following section will demonstrate the validity of this assertion.

X

The possibility that the sectional issues raised in the plays would offend the audience was first voiced by the
Philadelphia critics in reviewing *Belle Lamar* in 1874. The Philadelphia *Press* commented that

the advisability of producing a play of this description so soon after the conclusion of the war admits of but one opinion, while a judicial examination of its merits and defects leads to the conclusion that the latter predominates over the former. Yet in despite of its faults the play—like all of Boucicault's—has about it a dramatic strength which, tinctured as it is with Irish wit and enlivened with Irish dash and vigor, cannot fail to make it popular.*

The *Sunday Dispatch* agreed that this was "a dangerous topic for a drama for our day, some may think; but, then, Boucicault has ventured on more delicate ground and came off victorious." Then the reviewer cites Boucicault's *The Octofoon* as an anti-slavery play that was successful. The writer of a review in the *Evening Bulletin*, however, considered the play to be offensive and perhaps also shows a bit of prejudice against Boucicault:

... it is objectionable as a vehicle for the expression of particularly offensive political sentiments. We shall not quarrel with Mr. Boucicault, however, upon this subject. His opinion of the merit of the questions involved in the late war, naturally, under any circumstances, would be treated by the American people with perfect indifference. Nobody cares what he thinks of that strife or those... engaged in it.*

Similar trepidation was expressed by the critic of the Philadelphia *Inquirer* in an 1886 review of Gillette's *Held by the Enemy*: "Like all such pieces, however, it is difficult to make them at all historically true without having some offensive features." But, he noted, the offensive features in this play were few and insignificant, so, the reviewer judged, the play may be successful.
Interestingly, he did not point out the features that he feared would be offensive.

A stringent condemnation of Gillette's Secret Service came from the writer in the Evening Telegraph in 1895: "Possibly, our quondam enemies south of the Mason and Dixon line will admire the play more than we of the North, since the only uniform seen is the gray, and the only questionable character is the Union spy. . . ." The Philadelphia Press joined the Evening Telegraph's critic in recognizing "the odd fact" that in Secret Service "the Union side is distinctly put in mean light." But, the critic continued, while this did not make it a poor play, "it is certainly a rather daring move and just a trifle unnecessary." On the other hand, the Public Ledger in reviewing Secret Service in 1898 simply noted that "no unpleasant details are introduced, the tragic element of the period having been deftly suggested only." Given the number of productions of the war plays in Philadelphia (29 separate productions in all), the fact that only seven reviews reacted to the sectional issues in a partisan way suggests that the sectionalism in the plays was not as offensive as it might appear from a reading of individual opinions. Philadelphia critics expressed fears in regard to only three of the plays--Belle Lamar, Held by the Enemy, and Secret Service; and the fears appeared sporadically--in 1874, 1886, 1895, and 1898. On the whole, the
reviews suggest that the audiences responded to the sectional questions with little resentment.

Other related issues were occasionally raised by the reviewers in the Philadelphia papers. The Philadelphia Inquirer, for instance, suggested that the audience may not be able to see the Civil War in the same light that Boucicault tried to present it in Belle Lamar:

No play, however well written, mounted and acted it may be, can hope for success founded upon an incident such as this. Boucicault essayed a difficult task when he attempted to make the rebellion seem right and wrong, and he can never hope to lift any audience, North or South, up to his supreme heights from which he sees both sides of the question under the same light.

Another effect of the plays, noted in the reviews, was that they stimulated a genuine war-spirit, although the critics viewed this spirit as patriotic rather than as purely sectional. Held by the Enemy and Shenandoah were two plays that aroused an enthusiastic war-spirit in the audiences. "If the audience at the National last evening (and it was a very large one) was not thrilled with an old time war spirit it certainly was not the fault of either plays or players", the Public Ledger observed of Held by the Enemy. Shenandoah will afford pleasure to all, the North American noted, "especially to those old enough to have some larger interest in the events of the exciting period of the rebellion than that of tradition will it be a genuine delight."

At the outset of the Spanish-American War in April, 1898, Shenandoah was playing in Philadelphia, nightly
arousing the audiences to patriotic fervor. The Public Ledger noted:

The fact that so many of its scenes are now about to be substantially reproduced in real life gives it the additional charm of timeliness. During its presentation the Grand Opera House will again present a martial aspect, being fitted out with arms, emblems and trophies of war in a style that gives a touch of realism, effectively supporting the drama on the stage.83

When Shenandoah played Philadelphia in October, 1900, the Evening Bulletin noted "the thunderous applause that greeted the arrival of 'Phil' Sheridan and his men."84 And the Inquirer commented that the house was packed to the doors, and the audience applauded the stirring war play with as much enthusiasm as they would at an initial performance. The enthusiasm of the audience, the reviewer continued, reached its climax in the battle scene, and the curtain had to be raised again and again. Only when the entire company appeared on stage and sang the "Star-Spangled Banner" was the audience satisfied.85

The war-time spirit stimulated by the plays was similar to the sectionalism and patriotism that divided the country and prompted the Civil War. To be sure, reviewers and audiences may not have been conscious of the effects of the scenes upon their sectional feelings, but that the Philadelphia audience responded with such fervor indicates the "Yankee" commitment to the cause of the Union. When one realizes that the scenes arousing such enthusiasm were scenes in which the North was defeating the South, the sectional
issue becomes apparent. In *Held by the Enemy*, Union troops were beseiging Richmond, and in *Shenandoah* Sheridan's arrival rallies the nearly defeated Union army and leads it to victory. The success of the Union—the central focus of all the plays, naturally—made Philadelphians justly proud.

Unlike Philadelphian audiences, New Orleans audiences had almost no objection to presentations of sectional issues in the plays. Not until the late nineties did objections of a sectional nature emerge in the reviews, and these objections came, apparently, from one critic.

The earliest expression of a fear that any of the plays would offend New Orleans audiences came in a review of *The Heart of Maryland* in 1898. "The play was evidently written" the critic of the *Times-Democrat* noted, "by a man with the love of the Northern cause in his heart, and with crude, unreliable Northern ideas of the South in his head." After noting that Maryland Calvert was anything but an ideal Southern heroine, he continued: "In other respects there is nothing offensive in the play except an undue amount of exultation over Gen. Grant." But apparently the audiences did not share his view; or, if they did, they accommodated their prejudice to a greater interest in seeing the play, for the *Times-Democrat* commented later in the week that, "this play has caught the fancy of the clientele of the Crescent Theatre, and according to present indications could easily play another week to profitable business."
When Gillette's *Held by the Enemy* played New Orleans in 1899, the critic of the *Times-Democrat* commented:

"Held by the Enemy" was not builded for presentation in this part of the country. Patriotism is all very well, and devotion to the Stars and Stripes is very beautiful. A sense of duty to country which cannot be swerved by the heart is a joy forever. But when grammatical patriotism is presented at the expense of a Southern dialect as hideous as it is untrue, when devotion to the Stars and Stripes is exploited against a background of circumstances which burlesque Southern femininity, and when duty unswervable is served piping hot on a platter of impossible ware, it is time to call a halt.

But this critic reserved his most stringent condemnations for *Barbara Frietchie* in 1900. "The play is not one calculated to meet with the unqualified approval of Southern audiences," he noted, and launched into his condemnation of the portrayal of "a loyal Southern girl" falling in love with "a Yankee officer." He concluded with a concession clearly indicating that he objected to the portrayal of sectional disloyalty in the play:

As Clyde Fitch stands out among American playwrights, so "Barbara Frietchie" must of necessity stand out among war plays, but the wisdom of sending such a play through the South is at least doubtful. The great strength of this play is in its tragic ending, although the close of the second act, even though a trifle over-drawn, is strikingly effective. The delightful methods and mental mannerisms of the playwright are preeminently [sic] in evidence, and this greatly relieves what would have been, but for the last act, a rather trite and time-worn dramatic story.

During the week, however, he conceded that large audiences attended the play, that the company was adequate and creditable, and that the pathos was strong and delightfully
shaded. But he had his final word the day after the play closed:

Northern playwrights will never be able to write a war play that will be wholly acceptable to the South until they know more about Southern people and their sentiments and methods of thought. "Barbara Frietchie" has been splendidly put upon the stage, and as a picture of the South for Northern people to look at it is not easy to understand how it could be surpassed. 91

Notwithstanding the fact that Northerners may indeed have been ignorant of Southern ways, he could not accept the portrayal of a Southerner who concluded that the South was wrong in the war. 92 The Times-Democrat review of Secret Service in 1901 made the same point. The play, the reviewer said, is unique among civil war dramas because there are no traitor heroes or traitor heroines, "no Southern girls who for the love of an alien betray the cause for which their fathers and brothers are dying. For this Mr. Gillette is entitled to the thanks of all those who believe the traitor to his cause is an odious individual, whatever the sex." 93

The concern with disloyalty, as it appeared to the Times-Democrat, apparently was not shared by the New Orleans theater-goers, nor by any of the other papers, whose views of Barbara Frietchie were considerably different from the Times-Democrat's view, as will be seen below.

As with the Philadelphia reviewers, New Orleans critics were not unduly concerned with the presentations of sectional issues in the plays. Of the seven plays, only three—Held by the Enemy, The Heart of Maryland, and Barbara
Frietchie--were considered in any respect offensive to Southerners. More significantly, only one newspaper--the Times-Democrat--condemned these plays as offensive in the least, and then chiefly on the grounds of the heroine's dis-loyalty to the South. Just as importantly, this criticism did not emerge until 1898-1900. That these criticisms were confined to one newspaper and to a brief period of time indicates the likelihood that this was a single reviewer with consistent concerns. The fact that the plays drew well indicates that audiences did not agree with the reviewer enough to stay away from the theater, as the following discussion will show.

The sectional neutrality of the plays was acknowledged throughout the period 1875-1900 by critics in both Philadelphia and New Orleans. Although no critic in Philadelphia saw Belle Lamar as sectionally neutral, from the time that Held by the Enemy played in 1836 until Barbara Frietchie held the boards in 1900, all the plays were acknowledged in almost every review to have nothing in them that would displease anyone from either section of the country.94

The New Orleans Republican anticipated that Belle Lamar would "be a non-partisan and evenly balanced play of the war," and that it would "doubtless be successful."95 The paper's review of the opening night confirmed its anticipation, for, the review observed, there is nothing to stir up
sectional strife: "If anything, it leans to the Union side, giving the Federal side most prominence in the action. The recalls of the past do not offend in the play, they come dreamlike, the imaginary with the real, and they again fade away, and we wonder if they have ever been." The New Orleans Bulletin generally agreed, and the Daily Picayune remarked that in attempting to be inoffensive to both the North and the South, Boucicault had written his weakest play.

Although the Philadelphia Inquirer thought that Held by the Enemy might have some unnamed offensive features, the North American said, "there is nothing in 'Held by the Enemy' to displease even the prejudiced." The Bulletin, the Inquirer, the Public Ledger, and the Press all noted the popular reception that the play received in April, 1889.

Of Held by the Enemy, the Times-Democrat said,

Although directly dealing with the stirring scenes and incidents of our great civil strife, yet there is nothing in the play to offend the most sensitive Southerner. Indeed, the most thoroughly unreconstructed of the late war, if such there be, can sit through the play without being provoked to the least spirit of sectional prejudice or bitterness.

The Daily Picayune noted that all the veterans of the Confederate Soldiers' Home attended the matinee and enjoyed the performance. The production in 1889, according to the Daily States, commanded the interest of the audience, and the paper observed that Gillette "has been able to delicately construct a plot without wounding the feelings or
sensibilities of any, whether they have been sympathizers of
the blue or the gray."\textsuperscript{101} The \textit{Daily Picayune} observed that
although a war drama there is no prejudice or sectional
feeling in it. . . . it did not draw the color line--
as to coats--where affection was concerned. It is as
much deserving of applause in New Orleans as in New
York, and got it too, although the audiences may have
selected different scenes to most approve.\textsuperscript{102}

The 1890 production received similar comments, the \textit{Daily
Picayune} noting: "Although dealing with the late war, and
written by a northern dramatist, it deals fairly with the
facts, is evenly balanced and offends neither south or north
in the sentiments uttered."\textsuperscript{103} Similarly, the \textit{Times-Democrat}
observed that the play was familiar and popular with
theater-goers in the South, and that "it portrays the scenes
of warfare in their proper light."\textsuperscript{104}

Shenandoah, the Philadelphia \textit{North American} observed,
was "written without any parade of sectional prejudices or
offensive sectional peculiarities."\textsuperscript{105} The \textit{Evening Bulletin}
observed:

Mr. Howard has contrived to dramatize a story of civil
strife, without introducing any incident that might
justly wound the sensibility of either Northerner or
Southerner. The piece as it stands could be acted in
the South without exciting any show of resentment from
playgoers south of Mason and Dixon's line.\textsuperscript{106}

Of the 1895 production the Philadelphia \textit{Press} commented:

[Howard] aimed at a war play that would tell the story
of our national dissension in a manner that would be
acceptable to both sides in that great and now regretted
conflict. And he succeeded so well that his play has
been successful in the South as it has been in the
North. . . .\textsuperscript{107}
The *Inquirer* noted that the play could be produced in Richmond as well as in Philadelphia and in Charleston as well as in Boston.\(^{108}\)

The 1898 production of *Shenandoah* received numerous accolades for its ability to arouse patriotic fervor. The *Evening Bulletin* observed:

> The most exacting veteran could not have imagined or desired a more spontaneous or enthusiastic demonstration of patriotic ardor than that displayed at the Grand Opera House last night by the vast audience. From start to finish the honors to "Old Glory" were numerous and pronounced, and the event was one to be marked in red in the annals of the American drama, even in Philadelphia, the birth place of the nation and of the National banner, and ever the home of the loftiest and most general expressions of love of country and devotion to her welfare and safety. The demonstration reached its climax when the orchestra, after performing several patriotic airs between the third and fourth acts of the play, struck up the "Star Spangled Banner," when the audience rose en masse and joined the chorus.\(^{109}\)

The play was so popular during this period of the outbreak of the Spanish-American War that the original run of one week was extended to three weeks (March 28 through April 16, 1898) and, after an interval, was extended again for three more weeks (April 25 through May 14).\(^{110}\)

Apparently the critic of the *Evening Bulletin* was correct in judging this production as an unusual event in the annals of American drama. The paid advertisements for the production read: "Not a request but a demand by the public for the continuation of *Shenandoah*."\(^{111}\) On April 12, the *Evening Bulletin* announced that in observance of the anniversary of the fall of Fort Sumter Bronson Howard would
be present and Miss Elizabeth de B. Gill would recite "Sheridan's Ride." On May 10, 1898, the Bulletin recorded that a large audience had greeted the play the previous night. Patriotism ran riot, the Bulletin observed, and "a professional matinee" would be given on Wednesday for all members of resident and travelling companies. Moreover, Shenandoah was the first attraction to attain fifty performances as of May 7, 1898. "Just now it has an irresistible attractiveness," the Philadelphia Record observed.

This attractiveness, of course, was the result of the war fever aroused by the Spanish-American conflict. Headlines in the papers during the week announced, "Resolution For War With Spain Before The Senate To-Day," and, "First Naval Battle of War Fought." Even when the play returned to Philadelphia in 1900, the Philadelphia Inquirer said that the packed house verified that it had lost none of its popularity with the passing years.

The Philadelphia audience had translated a drama portraying the civil strife of Americans into a patriotic battle-cry against the tyranny of Spain in Cuba. It became for them a symbol of what the North fought for in the Civil War--the championing of oppressed peoples and a strong federal Union inclusive of all the states. Bronson Howard and Manager Southwell took advantage of contemporary circumstances and transformed their production of the play into a vehicle for arousing national unity in a time of crisis.
Although less spectacularly, Shenandoah aroused New Orleans audiences to similar fervor. The Daily Picayune commented that Howard's Shenandoah was fair to both sides and kind to all. The Times-Democrat agreed, observing that Howard had handled the story so deftly that not a line or scene . . . can give the slightest offense to Northerner or Southerner. The characters are pronounced in their views and express them freely, but the points made on each side are so evenly balanced in force and number that it would be impossible to determine which side has the better of it.

The Daily States remarked that "Shenandoah" has been one of the reigning successes of the North and comes to Dixie with the solid stamp of Northern approval. There is basis for all the good that has been said of it. It is an admirably constructed drama, with crisp, delightful dialogue and stirring climaxes, with much to fire the Northern heart and yet with nothing to offend the sensibilities of those whose sympathies were in the Lost Cause.

An interesting comment on the ability of Shenandoah to arouse a sense of patriotism occurred in the Daily Picayune's response to a program note of the December 28, 1890, production at Bidwell's Academy of Music in New Orleans. The program contained a quotation from General W. T. Sherman: "Let me express the conviction that 'Shenandoah' should be seen by every patriot of our country." The reviewer, apparently responding to Sherman's opinion, noted two days later that General Beauregard, who ordered the firing on Charleston, was in the audience the previous night and was "one of the most interested and enthusiastic spectators. . . ." The reviewer concluded by saying that
General Beauregard told the management that he was delighted with the performance. This anecdote has all the trappings of a fabrication, but whether or not it is apocryphal, it clearly indicates the reviewer's desire not to let a Yankee General outdo a Rebel General in approving of the patriotic sentiment of Shenandoah.

The 1892 production of Shenandoah in New Orleans was regarded similarly as devoid of sectional bitterness. The Daily States noted that the play had made friends on both sides of the line because of its fairness and that it was written "to smooth away some of the prejudices of the war. From the standpoint of patriotism, perhaps, it is not so fully calculated to win favor in the South as 'Alabama,' but discriminating judgment has long since put the stamp of approval upon it from an art standpoint." Both the Times-Democrat and the Daily States noted that veterans of the Soldiers' Home attended the performance. When they arrived, the Times-Democrat noted, "they were received in a courteous and becoming manner, the Federal soldiers employed in the play, presenting arms as they marched into the theatre." The Daily States observed: "'Shenandoah' favors the Yankee side of the house in the late unpleasantness, but not in an offensive way, and the veterans will find a great deal to interest them in the play, which is one of the best military dramas written." The Times-Democrat recorded that the President of the Soldier's Home sent a
letter thanking Mrs. Bidwell on behalf of "the war-worn and battle-scarred veterans of the 'Lost Cause.'" 

Augustus Thomas's play Alabama also did not have any sectional prejudice according to a review in the Philadelphia Evening Star: "Although dealing with Southern character and the effects of war, there is not a line or sentence that would jar on the sensibilities of anyone of that section." 

That the New Orleans Daily States considered Alabama more likely to heal the breach between the South and the North than Shenandoah is indicated in a review of the 1891 production. The intelligent and critical audience attending the play verifies the judgment that Alabama is superb, the reviewer said. The audience absorbed its exquisite sentiment, its deep pathos, and its excruciating humor. "If the talented author," the critic continued,

intended to supply a line to bind the South and the North even more closely together in a brotherhood of love than they were before the fell clouds of adversity came to darken the homes of a brave and warm hearted people, honest in their convictions of right and wrong; aye, before the rich Southland was bathed in blood and before the thousands of fathers and sons and brothers and husbands and sweethearts had been sacrificed in the dreadful funeral pyre that antedated the freeing of the slaves; --if that was his intention, let the audiences who witness his masterpiece give the fitting answer of how well he has accomplished his task. It is the olive branch he tenders the South. It is the olive branch he makes the South tender the North. "Alabama" is a moral object lesson. It is like a benediction over the ashes of the past.

It is a great and glorious sermon of peace and goodwill and fraternal feeling which it eloquently, if almost mutely preaches. It is a bond of tranquil union. It is a smoothing over of the horrors of the past. It is a chastening of the memories of the present. It has
nothing in it to offend the North or South. It has everything in it to please them both. Its dialogue is as clear cut as a diamond fresh from the hands of the skillful lapidary. Its action is as spirited as genius and a splendid company can make it. It is better than Shenandoah. It is as fine a bit of war drama as there is on the stage today.124

The Times-Democrat less eloquently joined in this opinion: "Though sectionalism is in the foundation, there is no revival of war issues, no question of North against South, and in this Mr. Thomas has succeeded in quite avoiding the delicate and dangerous ground that has been trodden by Bronson Howard in 'Shenandoah.'"125 The Daily Picayune expressed the same thought about the 1832 production:

"Alabama" can be taken to heart by the people of the south for its kindly spirit, for its good intentions, for its sweetness. It comes soothingly, taking action after the ending of the cruel [war?], and Talladega is only a representative town, as it was before the new south gave it new life.126

The Daily States called it a "beautiful sermon of a re-unified country," and "a benediction of war." Further, the paper observed,

it would teach peace and good will and it would bind in a close brotherhood those who followed the fortunes of the blue and those who cast their lot with the gray. North and South have joined in honoring its author. North and South ought to profit by the lesson it suggests.127

William Gillette's play Secret Service, apart from the Press and the Evening Telegraph's reservations, was regarded by Philadelphia critics as judiciously non-sectional as well. Unlike Held by the Enemy, the Public Ledger commented, all the personages in Secret Service are Confederates, except two
who are Union spies. "The fact that the latter are Northerners," the review continued,

is merely accidental, or, to speak more accurately, the exigencies of the occasion require that such shall be the case. The whole affair is judiciously handled, however, and there is nothing in the drama to give offence, even to those patriotic gentlemen who like to stir up the embers of the Civil War and then go off hurrahing for the old flag--and an appropriation. Perhaps the blatherskites who are shrieking out against the dedication of a Confederate monument in Chicago might be shocked at seeing so many wearers of the gray together, but it is not necessary to consider the susceptibilities of warriors who saw none too much of the enemy during the war, and whose hardest fighting has been done within the past 30 years.128

The Sunday States announced before the New Orleans production of Gillette's Secret Service that the play contained nothing to revive sectional prejudices.129 Following the opening performance, the States confirmed its impression, for the audience, it said, gave manifestations of their approval, and no one of the North or South can object to anything in the play, for it is more of a Southern play if anything.130 The Daily Picayune in its advance publicity said that the play "was presented in the South last year, and without a change in its dialogue, received the enthusiastic approval of southern audiences."131 The paper agreed in its review of the opening performance that the play did not sermonize on the rights and wrongs of the war, nor was it concocted to please the North. "It is more of a southern play," the paper continued, "showing the honor and valor of southern soldiers."132
The Heart of Maryland portrays characters of both the Union and the Confederacy, the Philadelphia Inquirer wrote, and "their expressions of loyalty to the side which they have chosen are plain and pronounced, [but] this stirs up no feeling of sectionalism in the audience. . . ." Although the New Orleans Times-Democrat disliked David Belasco's love of the Northern cause, the Daily Picayune commented that there was "no sectional bitterness in the hand that mixed the colors and painted the scene" in The Heart of Maryland.

Although no critic in Philadelphia commented on Barbara Frietchie's sectional theme when it first appeared in 1899, Moses and Gerson in Clyde Fitch and His Letters assess the general feeling of good-will prevailing at the opening night. It was a gala occasion with people coming early, excited, expectant; memories of the Civil War were revived in many minds, and strains of "Yank" and "Rebel" were heard. "Dixie" played and the audience was receptive when the curtain rose. On the other hand, the Public Ledger wondered "how far interest in the battles of the Blue and the Gray can again be galvanized into life." But the Press observed that Fitch invented the story for the flag as well as for Barbara. Clearly, the Civil War was in the minds of the audience, but perhaps they were willing to put the conflict behind them. Although there were occasional productions of war plays after 1900 in Philadelphia,
the production of *Barbara Frietchie* in 1900 marks the beginning of the declining interest in war plays—an interest that rose to its height in the decade of the 1890's.\(^{138}\)

The *Times-Democrat's* strenuous objections to *Barbara Frietchie* have already been presented.\(^{139}\) Another New Orleans paper found, however, that Fitch had "evidently made a strenuous attempt to write a piece covering the stirring period of the Civil War that would be strictly neutral insofar as expressing sentiments in favor of either the North or the South was concerned. He succeeded right well."\(^{140}\) The *Daily Picayune* agreed with this opinion by noting that *Barbara Frietchie* leapt all barriers of caste, religions, sections of the country, and prejudice. It was a strong play, wholesome in sentiment, and admirably staged.\(^{141}\)

It is clear from these reviews of the plays in New Orleans and in Philadelphia that the dominant attitude was that the plays sought to be inoffensive to both Southerners and Northerners. Occasional fear about dealing with delicate issues was expressed in both cities, but the reviews indicate that most of the people felt that the plays expressed attitudes seeking to overcome the divisiveness of sectionalism. The only play which any Philadelphia and New Orleans critics agreed might be offensive was *Held by the Enemy*. This may be accounted for by the fact that *Held by the Enemy* had almost twice as many productions as any other play.\(^{142}\) Moreover, the productions of the play spanned the years from
1886 through 1899, allowing the play to come under the scrutiny of the unreconstructed critic of the *Times-Democrat* in 1899. Also the Philadelphia reviewers observed only that the play stimulated a war spirit, while the New Orleans critic complained about the burlesque of Southern femininity and the hideous and untrue Southern dialect. Although the Philadelphia critics were concerned chiefly about *Belle Lamar*, the New Orleans critic was most exercised by *Barbara Frietchie*. The play that received the loudest acclaims for patriotism from Philadelphia audiences was *Shenandoah*, and that apparently was caused by the war fever connected with the Spanish-American conflict. According to the reviews *Alabama* was the favorite of New Orleans audiences for its tranquil, idyllic presentation of Southern life.

The inoffensiveness of the plays—chiefly a negative assessment—was complemented by various expressions of the more positive effect of the plays in appealing to the common instincts and feelings of compassion and humanity in the audiences.

*Belle Lamar* would not live long, the New Orleans Republican felt, for it took no hold on human hearts. Yet the play had vigorous action, highly exciting effects, and deep pathos, the New Orleans *Bulletin* said. "The events of the late contest are brought vividly forward," the *Bulletin* continued, "and the touching episodes of war, with
its pictures of want, heroism, and desperation, displayed as by master hand.\textsuperscript{146}

In Philadelphia Gillette's \textit{Held by the Enemy} was regarded as one of the most touchingly human plays that can be seen on the stage.\textsuperscript{147} Plays like \textit{Held by the Enemy} draw well, another paper commented, because "they touch most nearly the lives and sympathies of the majority of theatre-goers."\textsuperscript{148} Similarly, the New Orleans \textit{Times-Democrat} said that the play is "founded on a sentiment of love, honor, duty, and self-sacrificing devotion, and hence will commend itself to popular favor irrespective of sectional lines."\textsuperscript{149}

An enlightening example of the practice of dramatic critics is illustrated by the handling of the advance notices of an 1896 performance of \textit{Held by the Enemy} in Philadelphia. Apparently using a publicity notice sent out by the producers, the Philadelphia \textit{Press} on the day before the opening of the play said that \textit{Held by the Enemy} was a coherent, natural drama, "unfolding a charming story of mingled love and patriotism."\textsuperscript{150} The Philadelphia \textit{Record} on the same day used the identical sentence, except for editing out the highly favorable adjectives and replacing them with more general words: \textit{Held by the Enemy} was a coherent, natural drama, "unfolding a war story of rare interest." Then the \textit{Record} added a sentence emphasizing the patriotic sentiment of the play: It "enforces the lesson that Americans are brethren, that the differences between the blue and the
gray . . . likewise convince . . . that the men in both armies were brave and true." The Record made a concerted effort to emphasize the reconciliation spirit of the play.

Philadelphia reviewers noted with appreciation the death scene of Lieutenant Bedloe in Shenandoah. "What could be a finer bit of genuine sentiment," the Evening Bulletin said, "than that feeling which impels the Confederates to ask permission to bury the young Union soldier who had risked his life to cause them disaster?" The audience drew their handkerchiefs, the Philadelphia Inquirer observed, "when the wounded lieutenant dies and his fellow-soldiers follow the old army custom of drawing his blanket over his face." The play is full of human interest, the North American noted; and the Inquirer noted that the characters "prove the universality of certain human emotions by very natural acts and thrill the hearts of men with appeals to its [sic] better side." "There is something about 'Shenandoah' that sends the blood tingling through the veins of even the most blasé play-goer . . . ," the Philadelphia Record stated, forming a brilliant stage picture which makes one [lose] sight of the glaring footlights and painted scenery. Sneer as he may at melodramatic effects, the average playgoer, deep down in his heart, takes a special delight in just such scenes as these, and this is undoubtedly the secret of "Shenandoah's" popularity.

The New Orleans reviewers agreed generally with the assessments of the Philadelphia papers. "It is a play that
will draw both tears and laughter from the intelligent playgoer," the Times-Democrat observed, "no matter how blasé he happens to be." It is "rich in eloquent expression of pure and noble sentiments that touch the hearts of the most callous," the paper continued.

The reviews indicate that audiences in the two cities also had the same view of Alabama. The Philadelphia audiences greeted some of the scenes in silence, the North American observed,

a responsive--almost ominous--silence that was much more appropriate and much more expressive than any outward show of approbation would have been. It showed sympathetic comprehension of the scenes being portrayed; it evidenced a keen appreciation of the high art that made acting appear almost like nature.

The critic continued by saying that Thomas had woven a story of human interest, human instincts, and human purposes around a conventional plot. The Public Ledger commented that the play has a "truly Southern atmosphere. It is a succession of charming pictures without a jarring feature."

Further, the Ledger noted, "All that is noblest and truest in the Sunny South is suggested when it is not expressed, and the framed picture is dreamy, idyllic, as rhythmical as a day in June." The Philadelphia Press agreed:

It has more vitality and "atmosphere" than almost any other American play in present memory. . . . It shows the somnolent South awaking under the influence of a new generation and an incoming railroad. It shows the old generation, the old sectional feeling against the North, the old customs being crowded out by new people and new thoughts.
The New Orleans Daily Picayune commented that Alabama presents a beautiful poem and an exquisite picture of southern scenes that revive pleasant and sad memories; but its clouds have silver linings. They show a glimpse of a new south with changed conditions, full of strength and hope, and they soften the shadows of the great war that are now lengthening and growing fainter as time marches on.159

Of the 1892 production, the Times-Democrat observed:

The exquisite beauty and purity of the sentiment, and the sweet simplicity of the story had lost none of their freshness, and it may be truthfully said that this graceful Southern idyll came back with all the clinging odors of the misty swamp lands and the delicious fragrance of the magnolias, as rich, as subtle and as balmy as they were the night they first beguiled a Southern audience of its tears and laughter, giving in exchange only healthy, honest sentiment and artistically accurate realism.160

Gillette's Secret Service was viewed less idyllically than Alabama, but interest in the thrilling scenes of the story was noted. "Its story of love and duty and the portrayal of the hatred existing between the North and the South during the days of turmoil is as interesting as it is thrilling," one Philadelphia reviewer commented.161 "The play tells a thrilling story of life in beleaguered Richmond," a New Orleans paper observed, "and gives a graphic picture of the sad as well as comical pictures of life in a beseiged city."162

Belasco's The Heart of Maryland is "instinct with vitality, well-proportioned in form, and, above all, . . . appeals to our common nature," the Philadelphia Inquirer commented. "The audience . . . [is] more interested in
their lives as men and women, and in their griefs and joys
than in their political faith," the *Inquirer* concluded. 163
The New Orleans audience was attracted by the "wonderful
tenderness and truth that shows how brave men fought on
either side, and that clothes with an equal glory both the
gray and the blue." 164

In *Barbara Frietchie* Miss Julia Marlowe, the Phila-
delphia *Press* observed,

accomplishes the extremely difficult task of giving
reality and a convincing impression to scenes, situa-
tions and action not easily accepted by the specta-
tor. . . . She succeeds by a touch, a tone, an accent
or a look in infusing that human feeling to which all
are kin. 165

*Barbara Frietchie*, the New Orleans *Sunday States* observed,
is a "beautiful, unconventional piece, stirring, patriotic
and romantic . . .," everywhere hailed as the "prettiest
American play ever presented." 166

Not only did the audiences in both New Orleans and
Philadelphia find the plays inoffensive as to sectional
prejudices, but they seem to have felt that the plays
appealed to qualities of compassion and humanity that all
Americans shared. The appeal to common interests and
concerns was, in fact, the strongest quality that the plays
had in urging reconciliation between the North and the
South. The audiences of both sections seem to have responded
readily to this appeal. 167
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Boyd was a Confederate spy, born in Virginia, who as a seventeen-year-old took information on Yankee troop movements to Stonewall Jackson during the Valley campaign. Living in West Virginia and Front Royal, she was familiar with the country-side and performed valuable services for the Confederates. Twice arrested, she escaped to England in 1863 where she became an actress. While on tour in the U.S., she died at Kibourne, Wis. Perhaps her life story furnished Bouicault with the idea for Belle Lamar. See Mark M. Boatner, The Civil War Dictionary (New York, 1959), p. 76.

10 Philadelphia Inquirer, Sept. 22, 1874.

11 New Orleans Bulletin, Dec. 9, 1874. "Mr. Thorne's Col. Bligh," the Bulletin noted on Dec. 10, "was up to that gentleman's high standard. Taking a part which naturally brings him in conflict with the feelings of many of the audience he nevertheless, by his truthful portrayal of character, earns the hearty applause of every appreciative spectator present."

12 Philadelphia Press, Mar. 9, 1886. Apparently the reviewer is referring to Colonel Prescott's not revealing to the authorities the plot to get the wounded Hayne out of the prison hospital. Although the reviewer did not identify the incident to which he alludes, this scene was generally regarded as the strongest one in the play.


14 Daily States, Nov. 24, 1890; Daily Picayune, Oct. 2, 1899. The Daily States commented that W. A. Elwood "handled the strong and patriotic lines of the character most acceptably."

15 Philadelphia North American, Jan. 29, 1895. The same paper commented that Margaret Robinson as Gertrude was attractive and earnest.

16 New Orleans Daily States, Dec. 29, 1890. The paper judged that Helen Leslie's acting of the part was natural, pain-staking, earnest, and charming.

17 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Feb. 1, 1892.

18 Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Oct. 20, 1891. A bit of smug superiority, perhaps, is evident in the Bulletin's comment, but Davenport does represent "the
advanced learning of the North" in the play, as contrasted with the warm gentility of the Southern characters. The paper concludes that "we believe it to be measurably accurate in the description of the people of whom it deals. . . ." The Bulletin was not as enthusiastic as the other papers about the play, but admitted that it is "studded with a group of splendidly drawn and capably wrought character sketches," and concluded that "if it does not teach a moral, it at least far from offends, and it certainly cannot fail to interest." The other papers commented on Maurice Barrymore's acting more than on the character of Davenport. The Public Ledger, Oct. 20, 1891, said he had a congenial role, becoming dignity and pathos. The Inquirer, Oct. 20, 1891, noted that he was successful, though a trifle more emotional than was consistent with the rest of the play. An unidentified review of the performance at Madison Square Theatre in New York, April 1, 1895, said that Barrymore was manly and gentle (clipping in a scrapbook in NYPL). In 1900 the Evening Bulletin noted that one of the best touches of character acting was by Frank Peters as Captain Davenport (Dec. 11, 1900).

19 Philadelphia Evening Telegraph, May, 1895, quoted in Edgar L. Potts, "A History of the Philadelphia Theater, 1890-1900," Diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania 1932, chapter 4, p. 14; see p. 101, n. 12; Evening Bulletin, May 14, 1895. Again, Maurice Barrymore received notice for his portrayal of Thorne. He played the part of the hero, "if hero he can be called," characteristically and effectively, according to the Public Ledger, May 14, 1895.

20 Philadelphia Record, Jan. 11, 1898.


22 Philadelphia Press, Jan. 11, 1898. Various reviews from other cities support the general feeling about Thorne. An unidentified review of a performance in New York noted that Mr. Gillette by the deftness of his art "wins the audience over to him and makes them accept the spy as a hero, so that they are ready to cheer him." Of the performance at Hooley's Theatre in Chicago, the reviewer noted that Gillette played the hero as a man, not a ranting machine, and this may have been something modern. But the London Athenæum, May 22, 1897, found that "Gillette demands and forces our sympathy for treachery, and holds up loyal and constant service to ridicule." (Unidentified reviews are in the clipping folder under the name of the play in NYPL.)

23 Philadelphia Inquirer, April 1, 1900.
24 Philadelphia Record, April 1, 1900.

25 Philadelphia North American, April 3, 1900. But the Public Ledger found preposterous the conversation between Trumbull and Mr. Frietchie in which Trumbull "cooly swallows insults heaped on him" (Philadelphia Public Ledger, Oct. 11, 1899). William Winter, in The Wallet of Time, II, 82-84, partly agrees with this assessment. The ethics of the story are mixed, he says, when the Union officer lies in order to connive at the escape of a fugitive Confederate and the Southern girl promises marriage to the Union officer while the war goes on around her house. These are irrational actions, he judges, as is the introduction of the flag scene so soon after the deathbed scene in which Trumbull dies. But, Winter continues, the play was acted with "exceptional ability." "Miss Marlowe involuntarily manifested far greater dramatic powers than were essential for the elucidation of anything in the play. Her management of a colloquy of sentiment, in the First Act, was delicious. She was by turns arch, capricious, tender, passionate, and almost tragically strong. Her utterance of Barbara's appeal to her father, for her wounded lover's life, was spoken with exquisite beauty, and her expression of the frenzy of grief, on finding him dead, reached as great a height as is possible to spoken pathos: for the deepest sorrow is silent; it does not talk, and certainly it does not wave flags and deliver speeches from balconies." Notwithstanding Winter's penetrating criticism, Fitch has Barbara wave the flag for patriotic sentiment and the audiences loved it. An unidentified review of the Chicago performance in 1900 supports the opinion of the implausibility of Barbara's turning against the South when her home was threatened by the Union army (see above, p. 103, n. 30.

26 A somewhat more realistic, though equally stereotyped, view of the Southern soldier is given by W. J. Cash in The Mind of the South (New York, 1941), pp. 45-46. Noting that the Confederate soldier was the ultimate incarnation of Southern individualism, Cash observes that he could not be disciplined, he slouched, he could never learn to salute in brisk fashion, and he treated his superiors with unstudied familiarity. He jeered openly when Stonewall Jackson rode along his lines. His officers knew that they could get him to execute an order more quickly by flattering and jesting with him than by commanding him brusquely and forthrightly. And yet he was "one of the world's very finest fighting men." The spirit that sent him careering up the slope at Gettysburg was "nothing more or less than his conviction... that nothing living could cross him and get away with it." The characterizations of the Confederate soldier in the plays are certainly foreign to Cash's description, but they attempt
to portray him as one of the finest men in the world, though loving, more than fighting, was his forte.

27 Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Sept. 22, 1874. See below, p. 201, where I note that the reviewer continued by saying that the American people would ignore Boucicault's opinions about the merit of the issues raised by the Civil War.

28 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Nov. 4, 1889.

29 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Nov. 24, 1890. Of the 1890 production of Held by the Enemy, the Daily Picayune said, "heroism and devotion of both the blue and gray are portrayed," and all were true men and women (Nov. 24, 1890).

30 Philadelphia Public Ledger, Oct. 15, 1889.


32 Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 29, 1895.

33 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 29, 1890.

34 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Feb. 1, 1892. Other audiences apparently responded similarly. The Boston Advertiser, Feb. 28, 1899, said, "'Shenandoah'... is as well adapted for the latitude of New Orleans as for that of New York, not because it lacks the sentiment of patriotism, but because the manliness and womanliness of the Gray as well as of the Blue are its constant theme."


36 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Oct. 20, 1891.


40 New Orleans Daily States, Oct. 20, 1891. See below, pp. 215-216. The Dramatic Year Book for 1891, p. 347, commented: "It is not the fate or the fortunes of the personages in Alabama that awaken our interest—it is the personages themselves and the scenes amid which they move and the social conditions which they represent. And it is less a dramatic interest than a sociological interest that they excite in us." The program for the Nov. 6, 1891, production of Alabama at Palmer's Theatre in New York, quoted a number
of Southern papers on the play. The Louisville Commercial said: "'Alabama' presents a treatment of Southern life entirely different from anything yet essayed upon the stage. It is more just, more realistic and more delightful in its whole tone than any of its predecessors." The Nashville Herald wrote: "It is an epoch-making drama. He is the first dramatist that has succeeded in depicting the smooth, even flow of Southern life, and in presenting characters that appear to be really to the manner born." The Memphis Commercial said: "Mr. Thomas may congratulate himself that it has remained for him to give to every section of the country, with telling dramatic effect the only true portrayal of the life and character of the Southern people ever put upon the stage" (program in NYPL).


43 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Jan. 1, 1899. The Washington Post also found the characterizations noble: "He has preserved the dignity and amour propre for the north and south alike; he has paid tribute to the gallantry, the self-sacrifice, the heroism of both the Blue and the Gray . . ." (undated review in the Robinson Locke Collection, Gillette volume, number 242, pp. 17-18, in NYPL). An unidentified review of the performance at the Garrick Theatre in New York said that Gillette was one of the first to recognize that the audience would admit that "wearers of the gray and their women were both human and heroic." The Illustrated American, Oct. 31, 1896, p. 598, said that Southern soldiers predominate and "all are represented as . . . chivalrous gentlemen" (the last two reviews are in the clipping folder under the name of the play in NYPL).

44 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Dec. 6, 1874.

45 New Orleans Bulletin, Dec. 8, 1874. On Dec. 9, 1874, the Bulletin remarked that Theo. Hamilton was remarkable.

46 New Orleans Republican, Dec. 9, 1874. Boucicault may have agreed that he did not give as much force to Jackson's character as he should have. In a letter to Henry C. Jarrett, Boucicault said, "On reading over the part of Stonewall Jackson--I see it lose[s] vry [sic] much from want of context" (undated letter in the Dramatic Museum Collection of Columbia University Library).

47 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Dec. 8, 1874. The Daily Picayune felt that no character, except Belle and Bligh had any individuality.
48 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Oct. 2, 1899. Hayne confessed to being a Confederate spy when Colonel Prescott was in danger of being implicated in traitorous activities.

49 New Orleans Daily States, Nov. 24, 1890.

50 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Nov. 4, 1889. The Times-Democrat simply noted that Wilbur Hudson as Hayne had a part "dear to [the] heart of every Southerner," and he was applauded for his "emphatic and clear delivery" (Nov. 24, 1890).

51 Philadelphia Public Ledger, Oct. 20, 1891. The Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 20, 1891, and the North American, Oct. 20, 1891, found Stoddart's portrayal of Colonel Preston to be realistic, skilled, and a "faithful picture of an old but still fiery Southern gentleman." The Evening Bulletin, Dec. 11, 1900, noted that Albert Sackett was "a typical and interesting Southern planter" when he played Colonel Preston at Forepaugh's.


53 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Oct. 25, 1892. Fully one-half of the review is devoted to Colonel Preston and J. H. Stoddart. Alabama played New Orleans in 1891 during the same week that it played Philadelphia. The first company with Stoddart as Colonel Preston was committed to Philadelphia and the second company travelled to New Orleans. In 1892, however, the first company went to New Orleans. See the Times-Democrat, Oct. 24, 1892, which observed that the company in 1892 was the number one company and that if it were equal to the number two company of 1891, the public would be more than satisfied.

54 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Oct. 20, 1891.


56 All reviews dated Oct. 20, 1891. The Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 11, 1900, commented that W. C. Carr gave an artistic characterization of the old Southerner at Forepaugh's.

57 New Orleans Daily States, Oct. 20, 1891. An unidentified review of the performance at the Madison Square Theatre in New York noted that Holland's characterization of Moberly was true to a certain type of Southern character (review in a scrapbook in NYPL). Squire Tucker in Alabama was noticed by a reviewer in each city. The New Orleans Daily States, Oct. 25, 1892, observed that the leading feature of the performance at the Academy of Music was Odell Williams, who was at his best as Squire Tucker and was
enthusiastically applauded throughout the performance. The Philadelphia North American, Oct. 20, 1891, noted that Charles L. Harris as Tucker was excellent in the performance at the Chestnut Street Theatre, Oct. 19, 1891. Frank Rahill comments that Colonel Moberly and Squire Tucker are types of the gnarled rustic from the "b'gosh" dramas, such as The Old Homestead (The World of Melodrama, p. 259).

58 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Jan. 2, 1899.

59 See above, p. 104, n. 40, and below, p. 207.

60 New Orleans Daily States, Dec. 24, 1900.


63 Three notices, however, came from Philadelphia about the acting of Mr. Hemple as the Negro servant in Belle Lamar. One paper reported that his part was received with generous applause and the others simply observed that his was the best part (Philadelphia Inquirer, Evening Bulletin, and Press, all in their Sept. 22, 1874, reviews).

64 New Orleans Daily States, Nov. 4, 1889. The Daily Picayune, Nov. 4, 1889, commented: "Walter Perkins deserves special mention for his impersonation of the faithful old negro servant." On Nov. 24, 1890, the Picayune noted that Mr. W. H. Turner as Uncle Rufus was the best acting done by the men of the company. The Boston reviews of a performance at the Park Theatre, probably in 1888, gave commendations to Mr. Joseph Humphreys for his Uncle Rufus. The Toledo Blade, Aug. 26, 1898, noted, "Mr. Warren Ashley as Uncle Rufus made a minor character one of the most effective bits of character acting. His role was placed perfectly and acted with rare intelligence" (the latter two references are from reviews in the clipping folder under the title of the play in NYPL).

65 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Oct. 25, 1892.

66 New Orleans Daily States, Oct. 20, 1891. The other feature of Alabama commented on by the reviewers was the singing of the Negro quartet, who sang "Carry me back . . ." at the beginning of Act III. The Daily Picayune praised the Columbia Quartet who sang sweetly and in harmony with the moonlight atmosphere of the play. They were four "colored young men of high grade," the paper noted (Daily Picayune, Oct. 22, 1891). The Picayune had observed in an earlier
review that the singing of the Negroes in the distance was one of the elements contributing to the "eloquent picture of the work of time and nature in healing the wounds of the war" (Oct. 20, 1891). Thomas claimed that he would never have thought of the play if he had not heard someone singing "Down on the Farm" while he was dozing in a dark room. The singing "brought up a Southern scene and eventually the whole plot" (see the New Orleans Weekly States, Oct. 23, 1891).

68 See above, p. 186.
69 See above, pp. 187-188.
70 Sarah McCreery in the published version of Held by the Enemy (1898; rpt. New York, 1925) moans to Brant that Eunice is to be married to Fielding: "Oh it's heart-breaking, Colonel--simply heart-breaking! She won't listen--she won't talk about it! All she says is--her word--her word--her word--given to save lives! The lives were saved--yours as well as her cousin's--perhaps even her own--and she thinks it her duty to pay!" (V; p. 103).
71 Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 31, 1899.
72 New Orleans Daily States, Oct. 20, 1891. The statement is in a review of Alabama, but the context makes it clear that the reviewer is recalling the circumstances similar to those represented in Secret Service. The Baltimore World, Oct. 15, 1895, commented that Belasco's The Heart of Maryland "is not only a picture of war, its gloom and sadness, but a monument of those noble Southern women who gave up their all for the cause in which they believed; gave up all with sublime self-sacrifice, but when it came to tearing loved images from the hearts because they believed in the opposite cause, stopped and hesitated between love of lover and love of country, wrenched their heart strings in the effort and--failed" (quoted in Dunlop's Stage News, Nov. 2, 1895, from a clipping in NYPL under the title of the play).
74 Philadelphia Sunday Dispatch, Sept. 27, 1874.
76 Philadelphia Inquirer, Mar. 9, 1886.
77 Philadelphia Evening Telegraph, May, 1895, quoted in Potts, "A History of the Philadelphia Theatre, 1890-1900,"

78 Philadelphia Press, May, 1895, quoted in Potts, chapter 4, p. 13. The Press account that I read of this production was apparently the same one quoted by Potts, for the early part of the review was identical, but it stopped short of the wording here quoted from Potts. It is possible that Potts obtained his review from a different edition of the Press than the one I had access to.

79 Philadelphia Public Ledger, Jan. 11, 1898.
80 Philadelphia Inquirer, Sept. 22, 1874.
81 Philadelphia Public Ledger, Oct. 1, 1889.
83 Philadelphia Public Ledger, April 23, 1898.
85 Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 2, 1900.
87 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 30, 1898.
88 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Oct. 2, 1899. That the call for a halt was a little tardy is indicated by the fact that Held by the Enemy had played New Orleans three times already, in 1887, 1889, and 1890, with little criticism. See pp. 209-210, 221.
89 See above, p. 92.
90 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 24, 1900.
91 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 30, 1900. The reviewer's observation also suggests the growing desire for more realism on the stage.
92 That Northerners were ignorant of Southern ways was conceded by a critic writing in the Philadelphia North American, Oct. 20, 1891, about Alabama: The characters, he said, "are not entirely familiar to us, because they are of a section of our country about whose manners and customs we don't know, perhaps, as much as we ought." Perhaps the critic of the Times-Democrat was chafing unduly because
Barbara is the only heroine in the seven plays who explicitly says that the South was wrong in the war. See above, pp. 84-85.

93 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Jan. 14, 1901. See above, p. 104, n. 40. I am assuming that the same critic wrote all of these reviews because the wording and opinion are so similar that it would be difficult to conclude that they came from different writers. The identification of this critic would be an interesting bit of information, but his anonymity, or the fact that the reviews may have been written by different people, does not negate the basic conclusion that the Times-Democrat chafed at what it concluded was unjustifiable disloyalty to the South.

94 The only play not explicitly regarded as inoffensive in its initial presentation in Philadelphia was Barbara Fritchie in 1899. Most of the reviews do not comment one way or the other on the sectional issue. That one critic, however, may have had some reservations about the play's inoffensiveness is implied by a review in the Evening Bulletin, Oct. 14, 1899. The reviewer noted that Fitch departed from tradition when he ended the play with the Confederate troops on the stage. Other than this implication that Northern audiences may find this objectionable, the critics devoted their energies to a criticism of the play's dramatic structure and incidents.

95 New Orleans Republican, Dec. 6, 1874.

96 New Orleans Republican, Dec. 9, 1874.


99 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 12, 1887. This reviewer is obviously not the same one who said of Barbara Fritchie in 1900 that the audiences could not tolerate a loyal Southern girl falling in love with a Yankee officer and that they did not approve of such a thing in Held by the Enemy. See the Times-Democrat, Dec. 24, 1900, and above, pp. 206-207, 221.

100 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Dec. 14, 1887.

102 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Nov. 4, 1889. The review continued by stating that the audience responded heartily to Hayne's declaration of loyalty in the face of death. See above, p. 178.

103 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Nov. 23, 1890.

104 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Nov. 23 and 24, 1890. Compare the Times-Democrat, Dec. 24, 1900, and above, pp. 206-207, 221.


107 Philadelphia Press, Jan. 27, 1895.

108 Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 29, 1895.


110 Apparently to take care of a commitment that Manager Southwell could not get out of, for The Ensign ran from April 18 - 23, 1898.

111 Philadelphia North American, April 4, 1898.

112 Philadelphia Record, May 8, 1898. It ran for at least eight more days, bringing the total number of performances to around sixty.


114 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Dec. 29, 1890.

115 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 29, 1890.

116 New Orleans Daily States, Dec. 29, 1890.

117 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Dec. 30, 1890. I have not discovered whether or not General Beauregard left any indication of his opinion of Shenandoah other than in this one newspaper account.

118 See the New Orleans Times-Democrat, Jan. 31, 1892.

119 New Orleans Daily States, Feb. 1, 1892.
120 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Feb. 4, 1892.
121 New Orleans Daily States, Feb. 2, 1892.
122 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Feb. 3, 1892.
125 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Oct. 20, 1891; see above, p. 213; the Daily Picayune agreed, but along different lines. See below, p. 224.
126 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Oct. 25, 1892.
127 New Orleans Daily States, Oct. 25, 1892. After seeing Alabama in Louisville, Henry Watterson, editor of the Courier-Journal, told Thomas that he had "done in one night in the theatre what I endeavored to do in twenty years of editorial writing." Thomas says that the subject of Alabama is "the reconciliation of the two great political sections of the country" (Augustus Thomas, The Print of My Remembrance [New York, 1922], p. 298).
128 Philadelphia Public Ledger, May 14, 1895. The Inquirer, Jan. 9, 1898, commented: "No war is so interesting to Americans as the Rebellion, and Mr. Gillette has been wise in making it his theme. The action is placed wholly in the South, and is furnished with a dozen leading characters, of whom all but three are devoted to the Confederacy, and yet the play commends itself to Northern sensibilities, and is acceptable to men and women who are on the side of the Union."
129 See New Orleans Sunday States, Dec. 25, 1898.
130 New Orleans Daily States, Jan. 2, 1899.
131 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Jan. 1, 1899.
133 Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 6, 1896.
134 New Orleans Daily Picayune, Dec. 26, 1898. The review continued, saying that the play shows that brave men fought on both sides and that it clothes both the gray and the blue with equal glory. See above, p. 177.
135 Montrose J. Moses and Virginia Gerson, Clyde Fitch and His Letters (Boston, 1924), pp. 155-156. See above, p. 253, n. 94.

136 Philadelphia Public Ledger, Oct. 11, 1899.

137 Philadelphia Press, April 1, 1900.

138 Barbara Frietchie returned in 1901 and 1903; Secret Service played in 1901 and 1915; and The Heart of Maryland in 1901, 1906, and 1909.

139 See above, pp. 206-207.

140 New Orleans Daily States, Dec. 24, 1900.


142 Fourteen total productions, ten in Philadelphia and four in New Orleans. See Table 2. Shenandoah had a total of eight productions, six in Philadelphia and two in New Orleans.

143 See above, p. 103, n. 30.

144 Alabama had two productions in New Orleans. Secret Service and Shenandoah equalled it. See Table 2. Of course, many more factors than popularity entered into the number of productions a given play had, but audience appeal was certainly one of the major components.

145 New Orleans Republican, Dec. 9, 1874.


149 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 12, 1887.


152 Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 24, 1889. The play elicited applause over and over, the Evening Bulletin noted, especially for Lieutenant Bedloe's death scene (Oct. 2, 1900).

154 Philadelphia Record, Jan. 29, 1895.
155 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 29, 1890.
157 Philadelphia Public Ledger, Oct. 20, 1891.
160 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Oct. 25, 1892.
161 Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 23, 1900.
162 New Orleans Times-Democrat, Dec. 29, 1898.
163 Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 6, 1896.
165 Philadelphia Press, April 3, 1900. In an April 1, 1900 review the Press observed that the scene on Frietchie's doorstep gave a delightful scene of Southern life.
166 New Orleans Sunday States, Dec. 23, 1900.

167 Most of the plays were regarded as patriotic dramas in cities other than Philadelphia and New Orleans as well. Gillette's Held by the Enemy, for instance played at Burt's New Theatre in Toledo, Ohio, in 1898. The Toledo Commercial, Aug. 26, 1898, as quoted in the New York Dramatic News, Sept. 3, 1898, said that the play was "admirably suited to the times" (clipping in NYPL under the title of the play). The performance of Held by the Enemy in Boston, April 13, 1898, had an accompanying program of patriotic music, including "America," "Gems of Stephen Foster," "Yankee Doodle," and "America Forever" (Charles Elwell French, ed. Six Years of Drama at the Castle Square Theatre [Boston, 1903], p. 179).

Shenandoah, according to the Boston Post, Oct. 7, 1890, presented the Federal and Confederate with such skill "as never to wake partisan spirit" (clipping in NYPL under the title of the play). The New York Tribune, Aug. 31, 1894, said that Shenandoah appeals to the memories of some and to the sympathies of all. Further, the Tribune urged, patriotic sentiment is not to be avoided, but it is to be used and is the key element in the dramatist's appeal to the audience. Shenandoah arouses patriotism to the point of actual enthusiasm and excitement--patriotism belongs to the drama and is
a part of it (clipping from Dunlop's Stage News, Sept. 9, 1894, in a folder under the title of the play in NYPL).

The New York Sun, [May] 17, 1898, noted that tumultuous cheers came from the veterans of both the blue and the gray when the national flag waved and the national anthem was sung at the conclusion of Shenandoah. The Sun also observed that a half a dozen GAR posts were present in uniform and when the curtain fell and the band played "We Rally 'Round the Flag, Boys" the veterans rose and sang and cheered the curtain up again and again. "For a while, "the Sun concluded, "the house seemed to fairly shake with the patriotism that was let loose." Finally, Gertrude F. Quinlan, who played Jenny Buckthorn, came before the curtain with the flag and sang the same song and kissed the flag, "while 'Union cheers' and 'rebel yells' broke forth like a whirl-wind from all parts of the house." Patriotic enthusiasm continued for a long time, and then she came out with a Cuban flag and again there was a tumult of applause (clipping in a folder under the title of the play in NYPL). This was apparently the "Greater Shenandoah," modelled after Southwell's production in Philadelphia in April and May of 1898, for the Sun noted that the review of the troops by President Grant and General Sheridan in Washington aroused the audience's enthusiasm.

The addition of the pageant was Southwell's major revision of the play during the war-fever over the Spanish-American conflict. See above, pp. 16-17. The productions of Shenandoah in Boston in 1900, 1901 and 1906 also received notice for its patriotism. (See the Boston Herald, Feb. 27, 1900; French, Six Years of Drama at the Castle Square Theatre, p. 329; and the Boston Transcript, Jan. 23, 1906).

Alabama treats the Civil War background fairly, said William Winter in The Wallet of Time, II, 532-533, "indicating without either partisan motive or aggressive morality the community of interest that should bind all sections of the Republic into one nation." The Colonel and Harry Preston represent the two divisions of the land and their reunion inculcates the obvious moral, Winter concluded (review of the performance at Madison Square Theatre, April 1, 1891).

The Baltimore Sun, Oct. 14, 1895, said that The Heart of Maryland was "a story of love and devotion that touches always upon the heart and the emotions and often comes near causing sympathetic tears to flow" (quoted in Dunlop's Stage News, Nov. 2, 1895, from a clipping in a folder under the title of the play in NYPL). Belasco's play, said an unidentified clipping from Boston, [1896], eliminates all possibility of sectional prejudice by its impartial mixture of blue and gray (clipping in a folder under the title of the play in NYPL).
Edward Carpenter, in the *Dramatic Magazine* (Dec., 1899), said that the current of patriotic appeal may suffice to carry Barbara Frietchie through the season, for it is "powerful to draw applause from almost any American audience" (from a clipping in the Robinson Locke Collection of Dramatic Scrapbooks in NYPL). An eloquent observation from a foreign critic in reviewing the 1899 New York production of *Barbara Frietchie* also indicates the play's patriotic spirit: "Intently watching and analyzing stage and audience last night nothing struck me with greater delight than the temper of the audience, which showed so completely how all the unhappy past is forgotten and how firm the fusion is. I remember it all so well, those days of strife. . . . And now I find myself a guest in your country, sitting at a play and wondering what will happen, what old sores will be reopened, as 'Dixie's Land' is shouted out with its mocking refrain, and as the lovely 'Maryland' brings back to some at least a memory. Nothing, absolutely nothing, but good will, good fellowship and union, which is the greatest force. This was the idea that came to my mind as the curtain fell, and this is the essence of that beautiful little play: 'Over Barbara Frietchie's grave, / Flag of freedom and union wave'" (from a clipping in the Robinson Locke Collection of Dramatic Scrapbooks in NYPL).
CHAPTER V

THEATER AUDIENCE AND AMERICAN CULTURE: THE PLACE OF DRAMA IN THE NATIONAL EFFORT FOR RECONCILIATION

It seems clear from the analysis of the plays and from the audience reaction to them that they are, indeed aesthetic versions of polemics. These plays suggest that by the end of the nineteenth century Americans had concluded that sectional divisiveness, if not folly, was disastrous and destructive of happiness and unity among people who shared much more than a common form of government. Americans seem to have shared an ideal of character and action based upon bravery, loyalty, and integrity. Further, the plays suggest that the American public shared common beliefs that true love between man and woman conquers all separations based on political commitments, that women should be treated with kindness and tenderness, that men should be loyal to their country and women loyal to their men, and that marriage is a sacred and inviolable contract. The plays suggest further that the American public believed friendship and family affection are superior to political commitments in human relationships. Moreover, with common beliefs about patriotism, about good and evil, and about race relations,
the audiences of Philadelphia and New Orleans found that these plays enacted their own ideals of national unity.

The theater of nineteenth-century America was highly propagandistic; and, as I shall demonstrate in this chapter, all of the plays I have studied were moderately successful, having been performed both in the North and the South. The audience reaction to the ideas in the plays, as I have shown, suggests the high hope that the American people had of overcoming the deep divisions in their country. In writing these plays the dramatists seem to have utilized not only the ready-made devices of melodrama but also the built-in ideals of the theatrical public to construct their appeals for national unity. Even though the love conflicts are surmounted in ultimate unity, the plays acknowledge the seriousness of the conflicts between men of differing political persuasions. But the plays also assert that friendship, family affection, kindness, and compassion can overcome honest ideological differences. Human relationships, the plays suggest, transcend political commitments.

Although melodramas typically present a surface view of life, and these melodramas are no significant exception, they do uphold ideals that men seek to realize. They assert a wholeness that supports man as he attempts to act in the fragmented world of reality. Further, these plays hold up the ideal of union between the states, of high moral virtue and human compassion among men. They imply that these
virtues and ideals were the common property of both Southerners and Northerners and that in recognition of these virtues and ideals the men and women of both the Union and the old Confederacy could find sufficient common ground on which to heal their political and spiritual wounds.

The specific relevance of these conclusions can be seen in an examination of the general cultural orientation of the American people during the period and of the specific polemical ideas suggested by the plays.

American Culture, 1875-1900

Post Civil War American culture was characterized by a cultural vacuum between a "doctrinaire humanitarianism" and a "vulgar materialism"--the major forces in American society, according to Benjamin T. Spencer. The humanitarian spirit was identified with the Northern cause, but beneath this bright humanitarianism "flowed a strong undertow of materialism." These opposing forces created an estrangement of the intellectual and literary leadership from the popular will and taste in the 1870's, though the gap was modified in the last decades of the century.

The gap between leadership and the public began to be bridged with the Civil War. Despite the divisiveness created by the issues that led to the conflict, the War itself set in motion forces that welded the original colonies into a nation and virtually destroyed sectionalism. According to
Fred Lewis Pattee in his study of the literature of the period, the Centennial celebration in 1876 proved that provincialism was dying in every part of the land: "America had thrown aside its provincialism and had become a great neighborhood, and in 1876 North, South, East, and West gathered in a great family jubilee." An editorial in *Scribner's Monthly* in 1876 summarized the general feeling:

All the West is coming East. . . . The Southern States will be similarly moved. . . . There will be a tremendous shaking up of the people, a great going to and fro in the land. . . . The nation is to be brought together as it has never been brought before during its history. In one hundred years of intense industry and marvelous development we have been so busy that we never have been able to look one another in the face, except four terrible years of Civil War. . . . This year around the old family altar at Philadelphia we expect to meet and embrace as brothers.

Pattee points out that the new age in literature beginning in 1870 expressed itself in prose; the poetry of the earlier period—soft, lilting, romantic, and sentimental—no longer satisfied. Local color fiction of the age contributed widely to the understanding of the common qualities of American culture. And local color fiction was significant, as Carlos Baker has pointed out:

. . . the regionalists and genre writers of the East and South made their contribution to the history of American culture. At a crucial period in American history, when old faces, manners, customs, recipes, styles, attitudes, and prejudices were undergoing rapid change or total extirpation, they seized and perpetuated, through the medium of fictional character, the cultural landscape: the native idiom, the still unravished rural peace, the feel and flavor of things as they were, and would never be again.
Yet local color fiction was, as Pattee asserts, a blend of romance and realism because it presented a realism of actual conditions and characters in the atmosphere of romance. But the popular taste in reading remained escapist in nature, removed from the realities of historical events, from the West, from adolescence, and from city life.

The popular taste in reading was represented by the "story-paper literature" in which the traditional characters of melodrama enacted plots that thrilled the simple folk who embodied American popular culture. The producers of popular literature were undisturbed by the difficulties between the Emersonian belief in the moral order of the universe and the doctrine of objectivity in literature advocated by men like W. D. Howells. The writers of popular literature "simply exploited the archaic conventions of 'sensation' fiction to provide a staple commodity for a constantly widening market." The audience that read the story-paper literature was not reflective but, rather, simple in its wants and aspirations, and their lack of culture in any high sense suggested that they lived in a state of continuous childhood. They were far removed from international and national concerns and received most of their information from the newspapers, which, in general, catered to their simple tastes.

But public opinion remained remarkably resilient after the Civil War, and, as Henry Nash Smith has pointed
out, it did so chiefly because the pace of economic expansion left little energy for recrimination. In addition to the demands of economic recovery, however, the resilience of public opinion was also fostered by habits of thought that had been endemic to American life since the days of the Revolution. The eyes of the American public were always on the future rather than on the past, and they believed that they were creating a new nation free from the ills of the Old World which they had left. Progress, they believed, was the controlling force in American history. That American destiny was bound up with technological advancement had become an axiom by the 1880's. But the inability to reconcile the traditional values of American culture with the "dawning perception of social fact" produced a growing fear of class war that became the "besetting dilemma" of American popular culture. Thus, the cult of ideality promoted by the leaders in business, religion, government, and literature became increasingly difficult for the ordinary citizen to incorporate into the daily life he was living, a life of growing hardship and fading promise. In his fear that America might not, after all, be the promised land he imagined, the common citizen seized with avidity upon the dreams of a past golden age when things were better. In literature he wanted something other than he had in his daily life.
In the post-Civil War period the tendency to seize upon the dreams of a romantic illusion is related directly to the place of drama in the national effort for reconciliation. In both Northern and Southern literature the legend of the Old South had a clear impact on the healing of the wounds caused by the Civil War. So much so was this the case, that W. J. Cash in his study of *The Mind of the South* could assert that "in Northern literature and even more in the Northern theater romantic Southern themes grew constantly in popularity, until in the 1890's they were near to dominating all others."\(^{15}\) The South's tendency toward sentimentality is easily understood, and Cash roots the South's sentimentality not only in the legend of the Old South but, more specifically, in both the necessity to defend slavery from attacks by Yankees and its conception of the value of Southern Womanhood.\(^{16}\) Sentimentality was a Western phenomenon; it was an age of nostalgia, and Yankees as well as Southerners were not only ready but eager to believe in the Southern legend.\(^{17}\)

An understanding of American popular culture between 1875 and 1900 emerges from the following facts: first, even the local color fiction, rightly regarded as the forerunner of the new age of realism in fiction, presented its pictures of actual life in an atmosphere of romance; second, the readers of popular literature looked to the sentimental and romantic "story-paper" fiction for an escape to the world of
their dreams; and third, the legend of the Old South became the focus in literature and theater of the dreams of a past golden age. The obvious conclusion is that, although there was a trend both in literature and in public taste away from the soft, lilting romance of the earlier age, sentimental romance in literature and drama still appealed powerfully to the masses because it represented aspirations and ideals that the public, in the whirl of rapidly changing economic and social conditions, found increasingly difficult to hold to in the real world. It gave them, as Heilman has taught us, that sense of wholeness necessary to act in the real world. The public mind held on to the older tradition, and the melodrama catered to the sentiment and romance that made up that tradition.

Audiences did not want to see real misery on the stage; they had enough of it in their own lives. Moreover, the Civil War, according to at least one critic, had become but a legend to the public by 1886. The public quickly forgot the reality of suffering and the tragedy of divisiveness in its desire to keep alive the glories of love and war.

The conflict between the cult of ideality and the dawning perception of social fact, between bright humanitarianism and vulgar materialism, received its philosophical reconciliation in the writings of John Fiske, who reassured the laity that Darwinism could be reconciled with the traditional view of a divinely ordered world. He came up with
a comforting idealism for those who wished to hold to both Darwinism and liberal religion. Something of what Fiske accomplished philosophically, the literature of reconciliation accomplished for the public mind in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. It came up with a comforting idealism for those who wished to hold both to a Future of Progress and a Golden Age of the Past. The cultural orientation of the period was Janus-like as it looked toward future progress, represented by the technology of the North, and back to past glory, represented by the romance of the South. The dramas of reconciliation portrayed more clearly the sentimental romance of the past, but in their presentation of the reconciliation of the North and the South and of the submission of the South to the North, they also clearly implied that the future would be enjoyed by a united country.

The Janus orientation of American culture in the late nineteenth century was undergirded by the whole complex of ideas, beliefs, and mores--intellectual, religious, and social--that received the assent of the American public as a whole. The complex of commitments and beliefs--ideal as they were--gave the only cohesiveness that the popular mind could find for its actions, judgments, and endeavors. Within this complex of ideas the individual American sought to relate to others and to society as a whole. The dramas of reconciliation presented in melodramatic action and in sentimental characters a vivid portrayal of American ideals.
and aspirations. On the specific question of the relationship between the North and the South, the plays dramatized the hope for a great American Nation—a hope that never died even in the heat of fraternal conflict.

**Popularity of the Dramas of Reconciliation**

Analysis of the total number of productions of the seven plays in Philadelphia and New Orleans and of general indications of attendance and business attracted by the productions suggests that the seven dramas of reconciliation were widely popular in both cities. Philadelphia and New Orleans seem to have been representative of the general popularity that these plays attained.

Based on the number of productions, the relative popularity of the plays in the two cities seems to have been the same. The most popular play, based on the number of productions, was Gillette's *Held by the Enemy*, which was presented fourteen different times in the two cities. Following in order of popularity were *Shenandoah*, *Alabama*, *Secret Service*, *The Heart of Maryland*, *Barbara Frietchie*, and *Belle Lamar*. Based on the number of productions, the least popular play was *Belle Lamar*, but *The Heart of Maryland* and *Barbara Frietchie* were not much more popular in New Orleans than was Boucicault’s play.

Further evidence of the popularity of the plays is demonstrated by the number of reviews that indicate success
or failure of the plays in the views of the audiences. In Philadelphia only two plays--Secret Service and Belle Lamar--were considered by any critic to be a failure. As opposed to the one review that rated Secret Service a failure, thirteen reviews in five papers gave the play a favorable rating. For the two negative reviews of Belle Lamar, there were two favorable reviews in other papers. In New Orleans only Belle Lamar and Held by the Enemy received negative reviews. The Daily Picayune rated Belle Lamar a failure, the Bulletin was equivocal, and the Republican rated it a success. Even the Times-Democrat's condemnation of Barbara Frietchie in 1900 was offset by that paper's admission that crowds were attending the performances. There were equivocal reviews of Held by the Enemy by the Philadelphia Inquirer in 1886, and of Barbara Frietchie by the Philadelphia Public Ledger, the North American, and the Evening Bulletin in 1899. All of the other reviews in both cities rate the plays as a success with their respective audiences.

The reviews naturally give only general indications of attendance at the plays, but almost uniformly the reviews indicate that the plays packed the houses at almost every performance. Exceptions to this general rule were the December 1887 performance of Held by the Enemy in New Orleans which was plagued by foul weather and drew small to good houses. The November 1889 performance of the same play in New Orleans was acted by an incompetent troupe, according to
one paper, and this may well explain the small to moderate audiences, although the opening night filled the theater, and several performances during the week drew large audiences and good houses.\textsuperscript{27} The production of the play in 1890 drew fair to good houses during the week, according to the\textit{Times-Democrat}, and had a "successful engagement."\textsuperscript{28}

Exceptionally large audiences attended the initial performance of\textit{Held by the Enemy} in Philadelphia in March 1886, and\textit{Shenandoah} in October 1889. The 1898 and 1900 productions of\textit{Shenandoah} also drew unusually large audiences.\textit{Secret Service} enjoyed a two week's extension of its run in Philadelphia in May 1895. The production of\textit{Held by the Enemy} in New Orleans in 1899 caused the "Standing Room Only" sign to be displayed an hour before the curtain, and hundreds were turned away.\textit{Alabama} drew increasingly large crowds during its one-week run in New Orleans in October 1891, and standing room was occupied during at least one performance. In 1892\textit{Alabama} drew capacity audiences, as did\textit{Secret Service} in January 1899.\textit{Barbara Frietchie} drew a larger than ordinary first night audience in the Crescent city in December 1900.

Indeed, some of the plays attained a popularity that any Broadway producer today would consider miraculous, as a sampling of statistics indicates. For instance,\textit{The Heart of Maryland} held the boards for eleven years from 1895 to 1906. Looking back on this record, Johnson Briscoe observed,
"Nowadays if a play enjoys an existence of two years there is general rejoicing in the land, a hit, a very palpable hit!" 29 A program for Proctor's Fifty-eight Street Theater announced the beginning of the 428th week on May 16, 1904, and it played there again beginning April 1, 1907. 30 Shenandoah had 350 performances in New York and played fourteen weeks in Chicago. 31 Alabama was performed for the one-hundredth time at Palmer's Theatre in New York on January 6, 1892, played a total of two-and-a-half months in New York, besides runs in Chicago and Louisville, and toured the South and West for eighteen months. 32 Secret Service, according to A. H. Quinn, had had 1,791 performances as of 1938. 33 In addition, a film of the play was released in December 1931, and the play has been broadcast on the National Broadcasting Company's Great Plays program. 34 Many newspapers, such as the Washington Post followed the play editorially. 35 Barbara Frietchie toured the Northwest in 1902, playing twenty-five cities in performances by Parker's Barbara Frietchie Company. 36

The reviews, perhaps understandably, indicate very little of the business receipts of the plays. The Philadelphia North American predicted that Held by the Enemy would exceed all records for prosperous business at the Girard in December 1896. 37 A newspaper notice of the 1891-92 season of the three Nixon and Zimmerman theatres indicated that Shenandoah sold 8,162 tickets during its run at the
Chestnut Street Theatre. The play, according to Philadelphia Public Ledger, was bringing Howard thousands of dollars in royalties; and after three years Charles Frohman divided $200,000 among those who backed him in producing the play--Al Hayman and W. R. Hooley had invested $1,500 apiece in the play--besides paying Howard $100,000. Alabama sold 15,137 tickets during its run at the Chestnut in October 1891 and was, according to the Philadelphia Record, the kind of play that made money. The Philadelphia Inquirer noted that The Heart of Maryland earned a quarter of a million dollars during its run at the Herald Square Theatre in New York during the 1895-96 season. According to the New Orleans Times-Democrat Belasco's play could have run another week in December 1900 because of the public demand for it. Barbara Frietchie was, by Fitch's own admission, his biggest money maker. In 1902 the play had the largest gross receipts during the first week of any production at the California Theatre; and it had a run of forty-three performances at $1.00 prices.

These general statistics indicate, of course, only a very wide-spread popularity of the plays with the American public, but they are sufficient, it seems, to support the conclusion that these plays, not only in their dramatic appeal, but also in their polemical ideas, found enthusiastic acceptance with the American theater-going public.
The Polemics of Reconciliation Drama

The obvious symbol of the reconciliation of the sections in the plays is the wedding of lovers, but reconciliation is symbolized also by the reunion of brothers and sisters, of fathers and mothers with sons and daughters, and of friends with friends. In addition, the plays utilize a complex of ideas on patriotism, good and evil, and race. The stories of the conflicts and reunions between these characters dramatize a number of ideas that reflect the mind of the American people and witness to the faith of an age.

Love and Marriage

Sentimental attachment to the home, and to woman as the chief symbol of family life, is the essence of all melodrama. Relying on this traditional symbol, the dramatists writing plays of reconciliation used the love relationship as the most appealing symbol of the union of the North and the South, but they had been anticipated by both poets and novelists. Nevertheless, the dramatists judged rightly in selecting this device, for audiences wanted a love story; they were thrilled with the story of passion mingled with the glory of war; and they were touched by the parting of true hearts and by the doubt thrown on brave and true men
and women as they struggled with the circumstances of love and war.

The appeal of lovers separated by the conflict between the sections was rooted in the cult of Woman widely prevalent in the American mind. This cult received its most distinct definition in the cult of the Southern Woman, penetratingly discussed by W. J. Cash in *The Mind of the South*. The Southern Woman was the perpetuator of white superiority in the legitimate line and inevitably became "the focal center of the fundamental pattern of proto-Dorian pride." Further, the Southern Woman was the South's shield-bearing Athena gleaming whitely in the clouds, the standard for its rallying, the mystic symbol of its nationality in face of the foe. She was the lily-pure maid of Astolat and the hunting goddess of the Boeotian hill. And--she was the pitiful Mother of God. Merely to mention her was to send strong men into tears--or shouts. There was hardly a sermon that did not begin and end with tributes in her honor, hardly a brave speech that did not open and close with the clapping of shields and the flourishing of swords for her glory. At the last, I verily believe, the ranks of the Confederacy went rolling into battle in the misty conviction that it was wholly for her that they fought.

But the cult of Woman persisted in the Northern mind as well. W. H. Bishop points out that the story-papers encouraged "a chivalrous devotion to woman, though they [did] not do so much towards making her more worthy of it." And Ward McAllister, in *Society as I Have Found It*, presents woman as the perfect rationalization of the social utility of fashionable life: "I felt that the fair being
who sat next to me would have graced Alexander's feast

Sitting by my side,
Like a lovely Eastern bride,
In flower of youth and beauty's pride." 49

Such idolizing of woman readily explains the appeal, in The Heart of Maryland, of Alan Kendrick's standing by his mother when his father abandoned her because of unfounded suspicions of her faithfulness. And it justifies Clyde Fitch's explicit portrayal of Barbara Frietchie's love for Captain Trumbull as the emblem of the Union. 50 The devotion to the cult of Woman also explains Stuart's shock in Belle Lamar when he learns that Bligh would consider executing a woman, even though she is a spy, and Mrs. Gordon's willingness to relinquish her Southern loyalty when she learns that Maryland may go to prison if the South wins the battle. 51 The inviolability of marriage, as expressed by Philip Bligh in Belle Lamar, is rooted in the expectation that woman is to preserve the home and perpetuate the race. 52

Woman, as preserver of the home and perpetuator of the race, must be absolutely devoted to her lover and loyal to her marriage. Her place is by her lover's side, not in war or in other affairs outside the home. As Stonewall Jackson tells Belle Lamar, war is not for women: "A woman's country is her husband's home--her cause, his happiness--her only place in the world, his side; and death alone should part them." 53 Even Kerchival West, the devoted and loyal Union officer of Shenandoah, can tell his sister Madeline
that she should pray for her lover, even though he is an enemy, for it would be treason not to. All of the plays imply that woman's love for man is a higher virtue than her political commitments.

Further, if woman is to preserve the home and perpetuate the race, she must be pure in virtue and modest in behavior. Belle Lamar confesses that her pride in allowing her Southern loyalty almost to destroy her marriage is unworthy of a true lady. Her easy-going way of dropping one lover and taking up another was roundly condemned. Similarly, the suggestion of impurity in Carey Preston stuns Colonel Preston when he believes that she has been away all night with Ned Armstrong in Alabama. In Shenandoah the improper advances of Captain Thornton towards Mrs. Haverhill cause the innocent lady to faint, and they outrage the hero, Colonel West. So, also, Alan Kendrick is outraged at Colonel Thorpe's attempt to kiss Maryland, as he is at Thorpe's corruption of an innocent girl. In contrast to these assaults on the purity and modesty of Woman, Edith Varney's willingness to wait for Captain Thorne in Secret Service demonstrates the dictum that love suffers long and is patient.

Finally, in Alabama some progressiveness is suggested by Captain Davenport's criticism of the older generation's attempts to regulate the heart affairs of the following generation. The implication is that the purity of Woman
and her role as preserver and perpetuator of the family can survive her freedom of choice in affairs of the heart. A criticism of family-arranged marriages is suggested also by Rachel's engagement to Lieutenant Hayne. Since the engagement prevents her acceptance of Colonel Prescott, it is seen as undesirable, but the dramatist kills off Hayne and solves the problem.

In conclusion, the portrayal of love and marriage in the plays suggests the feeling of the public that love will overcome all sectional differences. Although audiences seem to have expected a Southern woman's loyalty to the South, they agreed apparently that it had to be subordinated to her love, even if the object of that love was a Yankee. Audiences seem to have sympathized with the troubles of lovers and believed that the plays portrayed human relationships in the proper perspective. Love was superior to ideology, and the reunion of lovers after separations over sectional conflict was the proper symbol for the reunion of the states after the Civil War, because a woman's role demanded that she submit to her husband, just as the South's role after the war demanded submission to the Union.

Filial Loyalty, Family Affection, and Friendship

The plays also represent the relationship of the North and the South with stories of conflicts and reunions between parents and children, brothers and sisters, and friends. Just as the plays illustrate the idea that love
is superior to political commitments, so also they assert that affection between members of the family and between friends is superior to sectionalism. Deriving from the basic attitudes toward the family, the ideas presented about the relationships of members of families other than husband and wife seem to represent traditional attitudes of the public.

Just as the public expected the mother to set the standards for life within the family, it expected the father to set the tone for action in the world. Again, as in the case of the cult of Woman, the legend of the Old South gives the clearest outlines of the relationships between fathers and sons.

The backbone of the legend of the Old South was that the planter was in every sense of the word a "gentleman." The superior fortune of the planter was Heaven's reward for superior virtue and piety. This, along with the other-worldliness of his religious feeling and his natural unrealism of temperament, bred in him "a thorough-going self-satisfaction, the most complete blindness to the true facts of [his] world." But decay came into this conception of the planter through his refusal to surrender to the demands made upon him:

Many of them fell into bankruptcy and found themselves reduced, like their forerunners for whom the cotton frontier of old had been too much, to keeping school or inn. And if the majority survived, they commonly survived to a steadily declining estate.
And flowing with and out of this came terror, defeatism, apathy, the will to escape. A growing inclination to withdraw themselves altogether from the struggle, from a world grown too dangerous; to shut away the present and abandon the future; here to flee to the inglorious asylum of a political sinecure, as likely as not created expressly for the case; there to retreat behind their own barred gates and hold commerce with none save the members of their own caste. A growing tendency to dissociate their standards wholly from reality, and convert them from living principles of action into mere eidolons.65

No more accurate description than this can be given of Colonel Preston in Alabama. Living in memories of the past and having cut himself off from every relationship outside a small circle of family and friends who still honor him as the patriarch of his plantation, he harbors bitter resentment against the Yankee assault that has reduced him to ruin. His resentment against the North is intensified by his son's failure to accede to his opinions about political affairs. When Captain Davenport tells him that his resentment is eighteen years behind the sentiment of the day, he angrily declares that it is not, that his acrimony is justified because of what the North has done to him. The mollifying of Colonel Preston's resentment is symbolized by his reconciliation with his son, and the symbolism intensifies Thomas's belief that by 1891, when the play was produced, the sentiment of the day was running toward reconciliation of the two great political sections of the country. More significantly, Davenport's assertion suggests that reconciliation between the sections had become popular by 1880,
the year in which the action of the play occurs. Certainly, the reception of the play by audiences in 1891 attests to the public belief that such was the sentiment of the American people in 1880. In any case, Colonel Preston learns that bitter resentment can be harbored too long and causes too much sufferin. Captain Davenport, his son, learns with Colonel Preston that resentment of past wrongs strains family relationships and causes needless disaffection. In overcoming disaffection and resentment the father and son symbolize the success of reunion of the sections and, like the reunion of lovers, emphasize the conviction that family affection is superior to ideology.

Although General Kendrick in The Heart of Maryland is not a Southern planter, he is a Southern officer, and it might be assumed that the characteristics of the Southern planter apply to him as well. Indeed, Cash asserts that the masses readily accepted the legend of the planter, looked to him for leadership and accepted him as the soul of honor and responsibility. Alan Kendrick, like Harry Preston, has supported the Union in the Civil War, and this, along with his father's abandonment of his mother, has strained their relationship. But their reunion, when the general admits that he has been wrong about his wife, demonstrates symbolically the overcoming of strained relationships resulting from past mistakes. At the same time, General Kendrick and Alan uphold the popular conviction that brave and true
men had fought on both sides during the war and that the reunion of these virtuous men was the hope of the American public.

The expectation that fathers and sons can overcome the conflicts that separate them is illustrated by General Haverhill and Frank Bedloe in *Shenandoah*. The General represents the popular belief that a father has an inherent right to be proud of his son, to expect him to uphold the honor of his name, and to act nobly and bravely. When his son commits a crime, Haverhill disowns him; but when the son redeems himself by brave and noble action in war, the General is reconciled, although belatedly. The death of Frank Bedloe is a sentimental appeal to emotion, but it suggests the heartbreak of war and certainly is a moving appeal for reconciliation of the differences that cause such suffering. The efficacy of this scene in moving former enemies toward an understanding of the consequences of sectional strife is indicated by the enthusiastic acceptance of the scene by both Northern and Southern audiences.

The motif of filial loyalty is represented also in the relationship between Mrs. Claiborne Gordon and her wards, Maryland and Lloyd, in *The Heart of Maryland*. Lloyd is another Southern lad, who, like Harry Preston and Alan Kendrick, has supported the Union. Mrs. Gordon is crushed when she learns that Lloyd has been a spy for the Union and has paid for his Union loyalty with his life. Her acceptance
of Lloyd's commitments, however, is suggested by her reconciliation to Maryland's efforts to help Alan Kendrick. Although she disdains both Lloyd's and Maryland's betrayal of the South, she, too, recognizes that family affection supersedes political commitments. The implication is that action based on conscience is an acceptable mode of behavior. Further, the suggestion is that the public came to believe in the dictum that some Southerners had supported the Union out of a genuine sense of loyalty to the Nation and that such men should be honored.

Further, the motif of filial loyalty is illustrated by Barbara's relationship to Mr. Frietchie. The emphasis here is on the fatal consequences of disaffection. Barbara sees Mr. Frietchie's hatred of the North in personal terms as he orders Trumbull out of his house. But Mr. Frietchie comes to recognize that the happiness of true love surmounts political bitterness and resentment. The acceptance of this belief is only implied and is overshadowed by the disaster of Barbara's death, leaving Mr. Frietchie with the pain of disaffection caused by sectional conflict.

Moreover, the relationship between brother and sister illustrates the idea that family affection is superior to political commitments. In The Heart of Maryland, the heroine defends Lloyd's honor when he is accused of spying against the South, but her own confession of love for Alan in spite of his Union loyalty suggests that she would have approved
of Lloyd's commitment. Wilfred Varney's brief estrangement from his sister Edith in *Secret Service* is overcome when he recognizes Thorne's manliness and Edith's love for him. Arthur Frietchie pities Barbara for her decision to marry Captain Trumbull; but, when he wounds Trumbull, he brings him to Barbara and helps her attend to him. Each of these minor plots illustrates the traditional conception of the relationships between brothers and sisters. "Blood is thicker than water," even when sectional conflict demands other loyalties.

What the public apparently believed about family relationships is epitomized by Kerchival West's advice to his sister Madeline in *Shenandoah*: "My poor girl! Every woman's heart, the world over, belongs not to any country or any flag, but to her husband—and her lover. Pray for the man you love, sister—it would be treason not to." His acceptance of Madeline's love for Robert is, of course, self serving, for Kerchival uses his generosity toward Madeline as an excuse to press Gertrude into a confession of her love for him. Nevertheless, his statement expresses the kind of acceptance of his sister that the audience was prepared to appreciate and reinforces the mood of the country to lay aside political commitments and concentrate on primary relationships.

The final dimension of this motif suggests that relationships between friends is also superior to sectional
commitments. The efficacy of friendship in overcoming differences is perhaps best expressed by Captain Davenport's hope that time in its tenderness will overcome the faults of his friend Colonel Moberly with the "beauties" of fraternity. 75 When they had met on the battlefield, they refused to fight each other, choosing rather to enact a charade from their more happy past. Their relationship illustrates that man's humaneness and politeness--prime qualities of the Southern character--can overcome, not only the idiosyncrasies of pomposity and façade, but also differences of opinion on the sectional issue. This portrayal of Southern character is in the plays, as it is in local color fiction, one of the most successful literary devices in promoting the cause of national union.

Other relationships between friends suggest the idea that friendship can still exist between men of honest conviction who have fought on different sides in the war. For example, the relationship between Kerchival West, the Northern officer, and Robert Ellingham, the Southern soldier, in Shenandoah depicts their acceptance of each other's commitment because it was an honest one, although they have different conceptions of the meaning of patriotism. 76 The reconciliation of Gertrude and Madeline in the same play is seen by Kerchival as a symbol of the reconciliation of the North and the South. 77 The silent sympathy between Robert Telfair and Alan Kendrick in The Heart of Maryland also
suggests the idea that men of differing obligations can surmount their differences because of friendship.  

Further, friendship across sectional lines evokes a kindness that cannot be destroyed by the circumstances of war, as illustrated in Bligh's treatment of his Rebel prisoner Stuart. On the other hand, friendship between men cannot be used as an excuse to betray one's duty. Bligh resists Belle's pleas to be merciful to Pike for the sake of their friendship. Bligh is torn by the conflict between friendship and duty, but Pike's redemptive action relieves the conflict. Each of these relationships between friends illustrates a conviction that, although loyalty to members of one's family is a compelling duty, friendship also creates a genuine bond between men and women, even across sectional lines.

The audiences that viewed these plays were moved by the pathos of estrangement between members of a family and between friends and by the grief caused by war. By 1880, perhaps, and certainly by 1886 these audiences were viewing the war with eyes of legend and romance, the primary human relationships overshadowing the basic political and sectional bases upon which the plays were founded.
Patriotism

By 1891 it is clear that even in the South the war was receding into the misty shadows of the past, for the New Orleans Daily Picayune observed that Alabama presented a picture of a new South and softened "the shadows of the great war that are now lengthening and growing fainter as time marches on." From the beginning of the period in 1874 audiences seem to have wanted the sectional issue laid aside and generally felt that the plays presented a national unity rather than a narrow sectionalism. That this picture was generally accepted in the South as in the North indicates a strong commitment to overcoming sectionalism in American life. There were, of course, occasional fears that the plays would arouse old bitterness, but the war spirit promoted by the plays took a more romantic and sentimental form than a sectional one. Or, as in the case of the Spanish-American War, it was directed towards a common enemy and promoted national unity rather than sectionalism. In fact, the patriotism evident in the country in 1898-1900 helped make the war plays, especially Held by the Enemy, Shenandoah, and Barbara Frietchie, more popular than they would have been otherwise.
The emergence of criticism based on sectional issues in New Orleans in 1898 is directly related to the prevailing attitudes of Southerners in the decade of the nineties. Fear of losing their political supremacy caused Southern whites to pass laws denying suffrage to Negroes. Although whites in the South gradually stole away the political rights of Negroes guaranteed by the Reconstruction state constitutions during the decade of the eighties, the split of the white electorate into two factions, as a result of the growing agrarian unrest, gave the balance of power to the Negroes and necessitated further action to maintain white supremacy. 83 The first of the "black codes" was passed in Mississippi in 1890, requiring voters to be paid-up taxpayers who could read a passage from the state constitution and give "a reasonable interpretation thereof." South Carolina adopted a similar law in 1895, and Louisiana passed its infamous "grandfather clause" in 1898.

It is not surprising, then, to find the New Orleans critic objecting in 1898 to Belasco's love of the North in The Heart of Maryland, or in 1899 to the burlesque of Southern femininity in Gillette's Held by the Enemy, and in 1900 to Barbara Frietchie's betrayal of the South by falling in love with a Yankee officer. 84 So strong was the feeling on the part of one critic that these plays were treading on forbidden ground that it caused him to revise history to support his position. The critic, writing in the
Times-Democrat in 1900 said that the New Orleans audience did not approve of a Southern girl falling in love with a Yankee officer when Held by the Enemy played in New Orleans in 1887. But the review of the play in the Times-Democrat in 1887 judged that the play did not provoke the least spirit of sectional prejudice or bitterness even in the most thoroughly unreconstructed. But, after all, the critic was in the minority, for the reviews of Held by the Enemy, The Heart of Maryland, and Barbara Frietchie in all of the other papers indicate that none of them felt any of the plays aroused sectional feelings. Rather, the plays were applauded for their presentation of the glory of war and their espousal of national patriotism.

The appeal of the plays to the sense of patriotism and to the romantic sentiment of war had its root in the cult of the Soldier. As in the case of the cult of Woman and the cult of the Planter-father, the cult of the Soldier was most clearly delineated in the Southern mind, and, again, Cash's summary is unsurpassed:

This soldier, I suggest, was in sober truth a proper subject for any people's pride. And men (Western men, at least) have everywhere and eternally sentimentalized the causes of their wars, and particularly the causes that were lost. All of them have bled for God and Womanhood and Holy Right; not one has ever died for anything so crass and unbeautiful as the preservation of slavery. But I doubt that the process has ever elsewhere been carried to the length to which it was carried in the South in this time; that ever elsewhere the laurel and the rue were so heaped upon a tomb; that ever elsewhere any soldier became so identical with Galahad, the cause for which he fought with the quest for the Sangraal.
The portrayal of soldiers in the plays verifies the public's romanticized ideal. The hero must be brave, strong, and true, and each of them is. The reviewers seem to have admired Bligh's loyalty to his military duty, even though Belle pleaded with him to save Pike for the sake of friendship. But when any fails in the performance of his duty as a soldier, like Colonel Prescott in Held by the Enemy and Captain Thorne in Secret Service, he was charged with the heinous crime of treason.

Moreover, the soldier must be morally upright. When suspicions are cast on the character of the soldier, such as the suspicion that Kerchival West in Shenandoah might be less than chivalrous in his relationship to Mrs. Haverhill, the audience seems to have been moved to sympathetic fear of his destruction. Only unrelenting loyalty to his cause was admired in the soldier's performance of duty. So complete is their loyalty, indeed, that most of them are not torn by the conflict they encounter between love and loyalty, or between friendship and duty. Only Bligh in Belle Lamar and Thorne in Secret Service exhibit any internal conflict between divergent obligations.

The undercurrent of conflict between states' rights and federalism that persisted in the public mind during the last quarter of the century is forcefully presented in the differing conceptions of patriotism expressed by Robert Ellingham and Kerchival West in Shenandoah.
Ellingham expresses the Southern viewpoint that loyalty to one's state is not only a patriotic duty but a religious commitment. Even before the war, Cash argues, Southerners had been patriots, but only to their local towns and to their various states. In fact, they were so unaware of any common bond of affection between states that their brand of patriotism often caused "an implacable antagonism toward the states which immediately adjoined their own." This narrow conception of patriotism had changed as a result of the war, and the South's acceptance of the doctrine of Progress in the latter part of the century flowed from the desire "to maintain the South in its essential integrity." A patriotism for the South had replaced a narrow state loyalty.

With this in mind we can understand, not only Robert Ellingham's conception of his duty, but also Colonel Preston's resistance to the encroachment of the railroad on his little plot of sentimental security. Robert's union with Madeline, the Yankee sister of Kerchival, becomes at the end of Shenandoah the emblem of "the kind of volunteers" that the country needs to heal its wounds. His union with Madeline, in fact, suggests the kind of appeal that men like Henry Grady and Lucius Lamar were making--that "the South's fight must be made within the framework of the nation." In contrast to Ellingham's states' rights belief, Kerchival West represents the idea of unionism and federalism--that patriotism means loyalty to the nation; and any
other duty, even to one's individual state, is secondary to this overriding commitment. The plays present this view most consistently, and it is buttressed by three Southern lads who are loyal to the Union--Alan Kendrick and Lloyd Calvert in *The Heart of Maryland* and Harry Preston in *Alabama*. Without question Northern audiences supported the union interpretation, and apparently Southern audiences assented to it out of deference to reality, their traditional tendency towards escapism not strong enough to overcome the suffering reality of their defeat.

It must not be assumed, however, that the trend toward reconciliation and loyalty to the Union meant a giving over of all antagonism within the Union itself. As W. J. Cash reminds us,

> the surrender contemplated was only such a surrender as a general in the field makes when he gives up untenable terrain in order to bring his forces into position to strike more effectively for victory. The New South meant and boasted of was mainly a South which would be new in this: that it would be so rich and powerful that it might rest serene in its ancient positions, forever impregnable.96

The plays do not recognize this caveat--it, perhaps, is too subtle a proposition for the average playgoer. But the plays do proclaim a national unity that was acceptable to both North and South. Audiences accepted the victory of the North over the South as symbolized in the Southern heroines' submission to the Northern heroes, and by 1900 even Southern audiences could accept the declaration that
the South was wrong in the war without lynching Effie Ellsler and burning the Tulane Theater to the ground. In fact, among Southern reviewers the lone criticism of Barbara Frietchie in the Times-Democrat is a strong indication that the New Orleans audiences received the expression of the South's error with equanimity. It may have been, as Cash asserts, that Southerners were to carry on their fight within the Union, but that it would be within the Union marks the significant adjustment that Southern public opinion had made to the reality of federal Union. The dramas of reconciliation clearly express this adjustment, and the reaction to the plays clearly testify to the public's acceptance of it.

Concepts of Good and Evil

The principles governing morality, ethics, and manners during the last quarter of the nineteenth century were founded on the widely held belief in inevitable Progress. As business men sought for a philosophy, they settled on certain virtues: industry, frugality, and sobriety. The cult of success--the glorification of the self-made man--was the theme of men like William Roscoe Thayer, Boston editor and biographer, and Horatio Alger, whose stories promoted the idea that a boy's struggle against poverty would lead inevitably to wealth and power.

The businessman's philosophy, founded on classical *laissez-faire* economics and supported by the social Darwinism
of Herbert Spencer and the essays of William G. Sumner in the 1890's, found great support also in the Protestant church. Conwell's *Acres of Diamonds* gave religious sanction to the businessman's greed: "I say that you ought to get rich; it is your duty to get rich; it is wrong to be poor." A deficiency in the virtues that the businessman upheld explained the failure of the poor: laziness, shiftlessness, sloth, intemperance, and excess. Morality and ethics, therefore, came to be identified with the Gospel of Wealth, for, as Henry Ward Beecher proclaimed, Godliness is in league with riches: "God had intended the great to be great, the little to be little." Although there was a minority movement in the Social Gospel of men like Walter Rauschenbusch and although the close alliance between church and businessman caused a decline in church attendance by many Protestant workingmen, the Gospel of Wealth, Social Darwinism, and Welfare Capitalism formed a nexus of ideas that was widely accepted by the majority of Americans. Government exists because of evil, for evil becomes less necessary as man progresses; government is a relic of barbarism. As a consequence of the dominance of the businessman's philosophy, the worker was told to remain content with his life, and churchmen denounced unions and strikes as against economic laws and, therefore, as sinful. Reform, they said, was a matter of individual condition and responsibility. And businessmen pointed to themselves as the fittest, using Spencer to
show that any interference with them would be bad for society.

The captains of industry were not articulate, read little, and were not interested in new ideas. But they set forth two positive contentions in justification of their philosophy: the West was a safety valve for the shiftless masses who could not make their way in the great cities of the East; and relief from poverty must come from greater productivity. The only things that can bring high wages and steady work, according to Henry Wood in *Natural Law in the Business World* (1887), is industry, patience, providence, temperance, and public confidence. If these virtues do not work, then a man can always go out West, get a piece of land, and make his own way.

In the South, religion and morality were pointedly defined by a simple, completely supernatural Apocalyptic faith and a stern Puritan ideal. While the North drifted, under the influence of the Transcendentalists and Unitarians, toward a liberalization of the old beliefs, the South clung more tightly than ever to "the more primitive faith of the past." But for both North and South Natural Law conferred on Big Business the "faded glamor of Ideality." This ideality appealed both to the North with its devotion to a "rags to riches" romanticism and to the South with its sentimental attachment to the legend of the Old South and
with its conviction that the only way to redeem the legend was through Progress.

In this context, then, the dramas of reconciliation presented their story of the conflict between good and evil. The audiences of the North and the South were moved by plays that appeal to universal human emotions represented in natural acts that thrill the hearts of men and appeal to their better side. Plays that do not make this appeal to human hearts do not live long, the critics warned, but those that portray the sentiments of love, honor, duty, self-sacrifice, and devotion commend themselves to popular favor. Human instincts, human feelings to which all are kin, human purposes, and human interest strike the hearts of all. The plays were applauded for their beauty and purity of sentiment that appealed and beguiled; and the audiences were more interested in the lives of men and women--their griefs and joys--than in their political faith. A play that presents "realistic" characters--men and women behaving as they really lived--was certain to win the approval of the public. That the characters are in most instances acting out ideals conformed merely to the public's belief that the characters are behaving as men ought to, and given the circumstances presented in the play, surely would behave. The audience sympathized with those who suffer, with those caught up in conflicts of relationships, with
those who must make difficult choices, and with those caught in the tragic circumstances of war.

The bravery, heroism, self-sacrifice, charm, and humanity portrayed by the characters of the plays testify to the sentimental ideals of the American people and to their desire to deal with good and evil in clearly defined terms. Bravery in action and idealism in character inspired the confidence of the men and women of both the North and the South. Lieutenant Hayne's pride in spying for the South in Held by the Enemy touched Southern hearts and ennobled his character. In the same play Colonel Prescott's protecting Rachel from imprisonment and from the charge of treason could be approved because it was for Woman. Marston Pike's betrayal of the Union for the sake of Belle's love was understood, if not approved, and his saving of the hero and heroine redeemed his character. In The Heart of Maryland, Alan Kendrick's endangering himself for love of Maryland and his gallant rescue of her from the clutches of the villain moved audiences to jubilant adulation. In Secret Service, Thorne's refusal to implicate Edith in his spying, his refusal to send the spurious orders, as well as his refusal to betray the Union by spying for the South—all enforced the conviction that good men would at last triumph. And Henry Dumont's sacrifice for his brother in the same play endeared him to the hearts of Rebels as well as Northerners. Moreover, Captain Trumbull's loyalty and death, as well as
Arthur Frietchie's Southern patriotism and his sympathy for Barbara and Trumbull, represent the best traditions of integrity and loyalty.

Further, the weaknesses of these men and women were understood to be temporary necessities of the moment that are redeemed by courageous action, or they were understood to be the result of spurious charges. On the other hand, actual sins, such as Belle Lamar's pride, or feminine weaknesses, such as Gertrude's flippancy or Maryland's and Barbara's impulsiveness, are redeemed by confession and repentance, on one hand, or by devoted courage, on the other.

In addition, the charm of Southern women and the hospitality of Southern gentlemen were universally applauded. So, also, the kindness of Northern men and women confirmed the belief that the war must have been an insane exercise in futility. The depiction of charity toward the sick and wounded, like that of Mrs. Gordon and Nanny MacNair in The Heart of Maryland and Mrs. Varney in Secret Service, assuaged much of the feeling of mistrust between the sections. 109

Not that the audiences did not perceive differences between Northern and Southern character. As Squire Tucker says of Ned Armstrong in Alabama, Northern men always must be doing something. 110 And Mrs. Page in the same play reminds Armstrong that Southerners guard their institutions jealously. 111 Northerners, who live in crowded tenements, are aggressive and actively mental in their approach to
life, while Southerners are passive and warm-hearted. These two qualities of American character are uniquely combined in Captain Davenport, the Southerner who had gone North and who demonstrates the warm gentility of the South and the aggressive learning of the North. Such dichotomies were at the root of the Times-Democrat's assertion that the North did not understand the South and would never be able to write plays about the South until they understood more of the South's character, manners, sentiments, and methods of thought. But, again, the reviewer appears to have expressed a minority opinion, for Alabama had already been applauded for its warm and completely authentic picture of the South by the time the reviewer excoriated Barbara Frietchie in 1900.

The public reaction to the villains of the plays further confirms the public's desire to deal with good and evil in easily manageable terms. Although his insanity partially relieves him of culpable evil, the viewers of Barbara Frietchie sympathized with Barbara because Negly was a threat to her, and they sympathized with Trumbull because Negly hated him. The audiences clearly disdained Gelwex because of his reprobate character and threat of revenge on Trumbull, although his one act of charity towards Barbara was not unappreciated. The other "Southerner by choice" in the plays is Captain Thornton in Shenandoah, whose unscrupulous threat to Mrs. Haverhill implies a link between
moral character and political choice. While a true Southerner like Robert Ellingham could be admired, deserters like Gelwex and reprobates like Thornton had to be condemned. Even Mrs. Stowe, Cash points out, made her villain "a Yankee come South to be an overseer." But there are Southern villains in the plays, and Raymond Page was roundly condemned for his economic opportunism and for his ungentlemanly act of casting suspicion on a widow lady's honor. Moreover, he is proven to be a coward when he refuses to duel with Captain Davenport, and audiences both North and South were greatly relieved when he was cavalierly dismissed as a bad man. Arrelsford in Secret Service was similarly condemned for his mistreatment of loyal servants and for his mistreatment of women, even though it results from spurned love. Gillette, however, demands more from his audiences in their appraisal of Arrelsford, for his evil is not easily identified as villainy. Certainly the audiences saw him as an interloping villain, but as one critic pointed out, he is only doing his duty. And he takes his duty seriously, so seriously, in fact, that he becomes paranoid when he suspects Caroline and Wilfred of spying. His excessive sense of duty, indeed, makes him a despicable character, for he fails to act honorably in giving Thorne his due process, and his arrogance is revealed when he refuses to admit that he was wrong about Thorne's sending the spurious orders. Further, he lacks
mercy, and audiences saw him as exhibiting qualities that were much less than desirable.

But the villain of villains in the plays is Colonel Thorpe in *The Heart of Maryland*. Here is a villain that the audiences were accustomed to dealing with in such plays as *Under the Gaslight* and *The Old Homestead*. Remorseless for raping an innocent little girl, full of revenge for the treatment the hero accorded him, a drunken deceiver, an immoral opportunist--he characteristically portrays the spy who is a worthless traitor and who manipulates others for his own gain. Audiences cringed at the machinations of this inherently evil villain, sighed with relief when the hero rescues Maryland from his clutches, and applauded his proper disposition at the hands of Alan Kendrick and Robert Telfair.

Audiences were understandably more concerned with the villains that came from their own sections, but they uniformly condemned disloyalty and personal immorality, especially threatening actions toward women. They understood that bad men existed in all parts of the country and experienced mawkish thrills from witnessing their receipt of justice.

The effect of these character portrayals on the spirit of reconciliation is, of course, not measurable in any quantitative sense, but the evidence of the audiences' reactions gathered from the reviews makes a strong case that
the portrayal of ideal character had no little influence at least in confirming what every American knew to be true—that noble men and women took both sides during the war and that conflict between the sections should be laid aside in deference to the common aspirations and ideals of the entire nation.

Race Relations

One of the significant facts about the Reconstruction period of American history is that the North came to accept the South's view of the innate inferiority of the Negro and that this acceptance led to a basic reconciliation on the most obvious problem that culminated in the Civil War. Not only did the North turn over to the South the control of the problem (after it was apparent that Reconstruction politics had failed to deal with it adequately), but even enlightened and humane men of the North, as well as of the South, believed in the Negro's innate inequality with white men. In fact, the period of 1877 to 1901 marked the "nadir" of American attitudes toward Negroes, as Rayford W. Logan has shown. Representative of the general American attitude is the woodcut by R. N. Brooke that appeared in Harper's Weekly in 1873, entitled "Way Down upon the Swanee Ribber." The cut portrays an old Negro man who, "having served his master long and faithfully before Emancipation, remains loyal through Reconstruction, and functions as a
celebrant of the nostalgic myth of the pre-War Southern plantation."^{123}

Attitudes toward Negroes in the South, according to Cash, were a reaction to the Yankee manipulation of the black man, which had stirred up hate because it seemed to threaten the white man's mastery of the inferior race.^{124} This fear, coupled with the Supreme Court's decisions in the civil rights cases of 1883 that effectively returned control of race relations to the individual states, governed the South's legislative enactment of the "black codes" of the 1890's and its educational attempt to control what the Negro was taught in order to make sure that he knew his place and stayed in it.^{125} No one was more central in stimulating this reaction than the Yankee schoolmarm who traveled South "to 'educate' the black man for his new place in the sun and to furnish an example of Christian love and philanthropy to the benighted native whites."^{126} Along with her journalistic counterpart, the Yankee reporter, she contributed no little amount to the growth of the "hysterical sensibility to criticism" that pervaded the South's reactionary attitudes toward Yankee intervention.^{127}

Since all of the dramas under study here were written by Northern dramatists, it is not surprising to find typical Northern attitudes towards blacks prevailing in the plays. One enlightening example of the change in attitude towards Negroes occurs in Held by the Enemy. A typescript version
of the play in 1898, which represents the version seen by most of the audiences of the period, has Thomas Bean coming to the McCreery house to make sketches for Leslie’s. Hastily drawing outlines of the house and its occupants (over the objections of Euphemia), Bean starts to ring the bell to ask for the other of the "three defenseless women" he expected to find, but he stops because that "nigger [Rufus] will come, and I’ve got him." But in the published version of the play (1898), Bean says, "Got the old darkey too--that is, got his back--they're all alike in front." Since the published version represents a later edition of the play, it is clear that by the end of the century Gillette felt at liberty to reflect more forcefully the prevailing attitudes of the Northern audiences toward the black man. Of course, Gillette added the line in the published version chiefly for its humorous appeal, but the very fact that he could do so indicates the change that was taking place. If the typescript version represents more nearly the original version of initial productions in 1886, as it seems to, it is possible that Gillette felt some constraint in portraying blacks in the early period of adjustment in attitudes that he felt no necessity for in 1898.

In fact, the plays of the nineties reflect the change in public attitudes that began in the seventies and eighties, a change from a commitment to equality, represented by the Civil Rights Act of 1875, to an acceptance of the Negro's
fundamental inferiority. The plays of the seventies and eighties present the old faithful servant, symbolized in Brooke's woodcut, who remained happily faithful to his master and would gladly sacrifice his life for him. These old, blind, simple servants were, of course, humorous stereotypes of the conception that the public wanted of the freed Negro, the type that was popular in the numerous minstrel shows of the period. The portrait of the happy black man occurs also in some plays of the nineties, such as Alabama (1891), The Heart of Maryland (1895), and Barbara Frietchie (1899).

A hint of the actual condition of the freedman, however, occurs in Belle Lamar (1874) as Uncle Dan muses about the implications of freedom:

When your folks come along up de Valley last fall time --the missus dere she would not stop in Mount Lamar and all de slaves was tole to go--for dey was free. Yes, Curnel, jest so. T'odders dey went--dey clar'd right out--all but me. Dar was no Christians left in dis old Virginny home cept Uncle Dan, dat pinter dog, and de pictures agin the wall! Den I ses to Sal; we've got our freedom--dars whats de matter, wot am you gwine do wi' your'n. De blind dog licked de tears off my face, and den sniffen round until she struck a track her ole heart knew so well; she whined me on to follow--so I did ober many a mile until we found Miss Belle. Wha' she is, Sal and me's to hum, so we're come 'long here, Curnel--dass wass de matter.

A further suggestion of the more realistic condition of the Negro occurs in Gillette's Secret Service (1895). Jonas is the only servant in all the plays who gives any hint of support for the Union cause. For his attempt to aid Captain Thorne, he is mercifully beaten by Arrelsford, the
Confederate counter-spy. But these incidents are mere hints of the need to secure protection for the freedman, the prevailing attitude being more accurately reflected in the other plays, particularly in Augustus Thomas's Alabama.

In Alabama Colonel Moberly and Squire Tucker reflect the Southern point of view. Colonel Moberly makes it clear that the South will not tolerate Negro participation in the political process.¹³² And Squire Tucker states a humorous, but patronizing, view in his commentary on Uncle Decatur: "Ef they is any white folks, Colonel, that despise a niggah, it's because they neveh own one, I say. . . . Who could be more intelligent or discriminatin' than that old man? I really believe he would have voted the Democratic ticket, if permitted to exercise his ballot."¹³³ Thomas, through Squire Tucker, expresses the Northern understanding of Southerners' attitudes toward blacks, a belief, judging from the reactions to the play in Philadelphia, that was shared by Northern audiences.¹³⁴ The conclusion seems obvious that Northern attitudes towards blacks were not substantively different from Southern attitudes in this period.

One brief attempt to deal with the question of slavery occurs in the plays. In Barbara Frietchie Captain Trumbull sets forth slavery as a motivation for the Civil War.¹³⁵ This single mention of the abolitionist motivation for the war occurs at the end of the century when the prevailing attitudes had shifted towards a benign neglect of
the Negro problem. But the absence of reaction to these comments either from the North or from the South suggests that the audiences did not want to be reminded of that issue. Moreover, the impact of the passage is diminished by the greater emphasis on the relationship of Barbara and Trumbull, so that whatever effect it might have had on rousing the old bitterness is lost in the sentimental love story.

The most earnest attempt to deal with the implications of the war and Emancipation is James A. Herne's Reverend Griffith Davenport, which played Philadelphia's Chestnut Theatre, in March and April 1899. The play was apparently ahead of its time in its realistic portrayal of character and behind its time in its appeal to the abolitionist spirit. Having played only Washington, Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, the play could not sustain itself and was taken out of production.

The Philadelphia reaction to Reverend Griffith Davenport was appreciative but far from enthusiastic. The North American noted the strengths and weaknesses of the play: its portrayal of the delightful peculiarities of the South, its wealth of incident that draws attention away from the main story, and its peculiar Southern dialect, which was beyond Herne to convey effectively. The Press noted the pure craftsmanship and skill in portraying the "drama of human souls" of men and women with whom we can sympathize and "whose thoughts and feelings are like our own." The
Press further commented: "It deals with the condition which brought about the war, with the feelings that were engendered within the domestic circle by the epic conflict, and with the manner in which the souls and consciences of men and women responded to the call of the times." The Record commented on the play's polemical nature that presents in a new light the attitude of the slaves toward the freedom that Americans often boast of. And the paper observes that the romantic angle in the play is scarcely noticeable in contrast to the national issues that predominate in the action.

Whether Reverend Griffith Davenport would ever have been successful was made a moot question by the destruction of the manuscript. But it is clear that its attempt to deal with both sides of Emancipation--the humane necessity of freeing the slaves, which Herne personally was committed to, and the tragic consequences of thrusting unprepared men into a life that offered them little hope--apparently was not only a shock to the general public, but a question which they preferred not to deal with. In a letter to Frank F. MacKay, February 24, 1899, Herne lamented the general public's failure to accept his work in general and Reverend Griffith Davenport in particular. Further, March Tiempo notes that in New York the play almost fell flat because New Yorkers, caught up in a "libidinous orgie," disliked it.

The public acceptance of the stereotyped portrayals of Negro characters, the total absence of reaction to various
hints of the subject of race relations, and the widespread resistance to any realistic portrayal of the condition of freedmen or of the significant issues consequent upon Emancipation—all these factors imply a general desire to avoid the problems of race relations. Apparently, Northerners came to feel much like Southerners towards blacks and at least to tolerate the South's sometimes ingenious methods of keeping the black man in his place.

This acceptance by the North was one of the chief factors making reconciliation of the sections possible. That the dramas of reconciliation, however slightly, reflect the change in attitude from 1875 to 1900 certainly makes these plays an interesting and significant barometer of the public attitude toward race relations and of the resolution of the knottiest problem that divided the sections.

The Attraction of Melodrama

Man's aversion to tragedy and his attraction to melodrama, according to Robert Heilman, arises from the fact that an awareness of our dividedness—the essential effect of tragedy—is not a serene form of consciousness. Melodrama, as we have seen, appeals to man's sense of wholeness and reassures him that he has some control over his own destiny.

In presenting ideals in accord with their cultural faith, the dramas of reconciliation reaffirmed the American
public's desire to view the crisis of the nineteenth century from the point of view of national unity. These plays affirmed the audiences' belief that they were, indeed, one nation, and assuaged their growing fear that the American ideal was somehow slipping from their grip. We may sneer at the effects of these melodramatic plays, but the audiences of the nineteenth century delighted in them, were touched by melodramatic devices, and applauded the dreamy, idyllic scenes portrayed in them. They wanted a love story, and more, they wanted a love story mingled with the fierceness of war. And though some critics condemned the mawkish sentimentality or the melodramatic bombast of plays like *The Heart of Maryland*, the plays were nevertheless successful. The gap between life and the theater, represented by these plays, was also a part of the "genteel tradition" in literature then championed by writers like James Russell Lowell. And the gap between life and the theater represented by the plays was precisely what the American public paid its money for.

But in the development of dramatic art this gap was being closed. Realism invaded the theater as it had pervaded other forms of literature. Gillette's contributions to the realism of stage art are particularly notable. Captain Thorne, as played by Gillette himself, reveals the growing realistic tendency to portray internal conflict through deft action and reflective countenance, rather than by the stage "aside." Gillette's achievement of this technique, aided of
course by the development of better lighting, was the cul-
mination of trends that began in earlier dramas, Belle Lamar
affording an instance in this study. As I have shown, Belle's
conflict and Bligh's tension between duty and love begin to
reveal the inner contours of the human mind. As faltering as
Boucicault's attempt is in this area, he signals the trend
which, floating on the experiments of Gillette, Fitch, and
Herne, culminated in the realism of twentieth-century writers
like Eugene O'Neill. Further experiments are seen in Barbara
Frietchie, one of the first American melodramas to end
fatally, an experiment Fitch tried also in his play Nathan
Hale. Although some critics considered its fatal ending to
be too sombre, the device was a step in recapturing an ele-
ment of melodrama that had been lost in its American form, for
as Heilman points out, melodrama may end either in success
or failure, in victory or defeat, in triumph or despair. 145

Moreover, the villain, a mainstay of the traditional
melodrama, plays a much less central role in these plays,
disappearing altogether in his traditional mold in Gillette's
two war plays and radically altered in the other plays I
have studied. In Belle Lamar the villain is redeemed by
courageous, self-sacrificing action; in Shenandoah he fades
out of the action altogether, receiving his punishment off
stage; in Barbara Frietchie his role is shared by two char-
acters, one who becomes insane and the other who saves
Barbara at a crucial moment. In Gillette's Held by the Enemy,
Fielding is a true-hearted man whose only "villainy" is a conscientious performance of duty that interferes with the heroine's plan to save her betrothed. In Secret Service, as I have indicated, Arrelsford is a conscientious Confederate soldier whose sense of duty leads him into paranoia and cruelty. But none of these villains, except Colonel Thorpe in The Heart of Maryland can be considered traditional in any sense.

These changes in the roles of the villains indicate that, despite the audience's desire to deal with the problems of good and evil in easily manageable terms, the drama was recognizing the necessity to close the gap between the theater and life by diminishing the role of the villain and by showing him in more "realistic" and complex terms—a man with a conscience, with a sense of duty and loyalty, and with problems of his own that go beyond mere fatalistic malevolence.¹⁴⁶

The hints of changes in the characterization of heroines, heroes, and villains towards realism are preliminary and initial in these plays. The plays remain melodrama and because they are melodrama they appealed to nineteenth-century audiences. Specifically, these plays appealed to the audiences' sense of nationality and patriotism, and people of both the North and the South responded to the ideal of national unity in much the same way. The American public of the late nineteenth century, in its moments of
idealism at least, obviously considered national unity to be an unstinted good, and the theater, as James A. Herne has said, was a major influence for this good:

The theater of to-day is what the civilization and society of to-day have made it. . . . There would be no vicious art if there were no vicious patrons of art, no vicious literature if there were no vicious readers, no vicious dramas if there were no vicious audiences. . . . The theater is a factor of society just as much as is the church, and in spite of all the stigma that is attached to it and all the wise and pernicious power it is charged with, it is still an educator and its influence is for good and not for evil.147

The dramas of reconciliation did not intend to be realistic dramas or historical plays. As Fitch said of his writing Barbara Frietchie, he had no intention of writing a historical play, but he wrote it "merely to picture in an imaginary story some of the spirit and atmosphere of a certain period of our history."148 All seven of the dramas of reconciliation in this study might well be characterized as Fitch characterized his play. Their imaginary stories pictured, not only the spirit and atmosphere of a certain period of American history, but the spirit and atmosphere of the age that witnessed them on the stage.
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APPENDIX A

LOVE THEME IN MINOR CHARACTERS

Various minor characters also portray the love conflict-reconciliation theme in the seven plays. On one hand, three sets of lovers illustrate the reconciliation of a conflict between Northern and Southern sympathies, similar to the conflicts between the major characters. On the other hand, eight sets of lovers may suggest various conflicts that separated the North and the South, but do not in themselves involve sectional conflicts.

A comic representation of the conflict between a Southern lover and a Northern suitor appears in Held by the Enemy. Susan, Rachel's younger sister, falls in love with Thomas Bean, a Northern reporter for Leslie's. When Susan tells Euphemia, her guardian aunt, that she is going to marry Bean, Euphemia objects sternly: "I'm shocked, positively shocked" (V; p. 5-E). Susan replies that he is a Yankee and "he's horrid, but I like him just the same" (V; p. 6-E). Later in the play, after Susan has told Bean that she will marry him, Euphemia sternly objects again: "I will not allow it and that settles it" (V; p. 14-E). But at the end of the play Bean is shown lovingly embracing Susan, and
their marriage seems assured, especially since Rachel's love for Colonel Prescott has received the blessings of her father. The last scene of Held by the Enemy foreshadows a theme expressed by Captain Davenport in Alabama, that the older generation will have nothing to say about the solutions that the younger generation makes in putting the affairs of the heart above sectional divisiveness.

In Shenandoah, Robert Ellingham and Madeline West are the serious lovers, even though their conflict is secondary to that of Gertrude Ellingham and Kerchival West, whose love affair has undertones of the comic about it. They, like Gertrude and Kerchival, are separated when the war breaks out. But Madeline cannot bear the separation and prays for Robert, who is missing in the battle: "I pray for Robert Ellingham--and for the cause in which he risks his life! Heaven forgive me if I am wrong, but I am praying for the enemies of my country. His people are my people, his enemies are my enemies. Heaven defend him and his, in this awful hour" (III; p. 503). Kerchival acknowledges that "Every woman's heart, the world over, belongs not to any country or any flag, but to her husband--and her lover" (III; p. 503). After the battle is over, Robert and Madeline are reunited and Barket responds: "Colonel Ellingham and Miss Madeline--lovers! That's the kind o' volunteers the country nades now!" (IV; p. 507). Complementing the rather tortuous love affair of Gertrude and Kerchival, Robert and Madeline's love
affair gives a completely serious and exemplary illustration of the reconciliation needed to restore the country to wholeness.

In Belasco's *The Heart of Maryland* both a comic and a serious love affair are presented. The comic love affair is between Robert Telfair of the Southern Artillery and Nanny MacNair, daughter of a Northern minister. Telfair is "a tall young fellow, with all the elegance of a Southern gentleman, and an ultra-military bearing, dressed in the uniform of Confederate artillery (a sort of 'Jeb Stuart')" (I; p. 176). Throughout the play he woos Nanny MacNair, whose brother was wounded by a Southerner. Telfair sympathizes: "I'm so sorry--I--I--it's awful for a country to divide, the North on one side, the South on the other. But we shouldn't be enemies" (I; p. 180). When Nanny wonders why she was not born a man, Telfair says, "For the delight of the fellow who was!" (I; p. 180). But Nanny is obstreperous: "I'll never forgive any of you! Never! Never! I hate you! You--you--" (I; p. 180).

At the conclusion of the play, Telfair lies wounded at The Lilacs, which has become a hospital, treating both wounded Southern and Northern soldiers. Nanny cannot get liniment for the Northern soldiers, so Telfair agrees to give her an order for it. He feigns weakness and makes her guide his hand to sign the order. She feeds him his "apple snow" which she made, and they discuss their divided loyalties, she
honoring Grant, he honoring Lee (IV; pp. 242-243). Finally, Telfair tells her that he loves her, but she still resists, although it is obvious that she is weakening (IV; pp. 244-245). Although they are not reconciled completely when the play ends, their relationship does exhibit elements of the reconciliation theme, as Telfair expresses the awfulness of sectional division and as Nanny ministers to both Southern and Northern soldiers.

While the comic love affair in most of the plays is between the minor characters, the serious love conflict is between minor characters in The Heart of Maryland. When Lloyd Calvert returns to The Lilacs, Phoebe Yancey is surprised to see him in civilian clothes. He does not tell her that, although he is a Southerner, he has sided with the Union and has been sent to the Southern headquarters in his home in order to spy on the Rebel troops. He is reserved with her because he knows that she will be offended by his sympathies. She suspects another girl, but he assures her that his coolness toward her is the result of his desire to protect her feelings: he is to be sent on a dangerous mission, "and if anything should happen to me--it would leave only sorrow for you" (II; p. 203). Phoebe assures him that she is proud to have a lover in the war but that she could not give him up to another girl. Lloyd is killed on his mission, and another Southern girl is left without a lover. Since Lloyd and Phoebe are minor characters, their love
affair is not developed, but it reinforces the theme of the Southern youth, loyal to the Union, whose sympathies stand between him and the girl he loves.

Other sets of lovers do not involve a direct conflict between a Southerner and a Northerner. These lovers are of the same section of the country, but their problems also symbolize various aspects of the sectional conflict.

In Belle Lamar a minor reinforcement of the conflict of lovers over sectional loyalty is symbolized in Honor McQuade and Remmy Shea, who were erstwhile sweethearts in Ireland before either came to America. They have not seen each other since Remmy left Honor behind to come to the United States. As comic characters they are battling about with each other after they finally meet again, and Honor explains: "Sure I'm a County Down girl, an' I'd never bemean the North by takin' up with a poor scrap o' the County Cork like him." Bligh, upon hearing this, remarks, "Every country has its North and South you see" (I. ii; p. 134).

Jenny Buckthorn and Captain Heartsease are comic lovers, both Northerners, in Shenandoah. She has not seen him since he left with her lace handkerchief, which she accuses him of stealing. But he assures her that he has carried the handkerchief with him as a reminder of her (II; pp. 489-490). When Jenny learns that Captain Heartsease is missing, she fearfully asks Barket where he is. Barket says
that he cannot say, but whispers aside, "Lyin' unburied in the woods, where he was shot, I'm afraid" (III; p. 499). But the gallant captain turns up at the end of the play, having shot and killed the villain, Captain Thornton, and the lovers are happily reconciled.

The conflict between General Haverhill and Mrs. Haverhill in *Shenandoah* also may symbolize sectional misunderstandings. Although Captain Thornton is the real culprit, the General suspects that Kerchival has taken unfair advantage of his wife and calls West's hand. But the pressure of duties forestalls a show-down between them. The General refuses for a while to see his wife at the conclusion of the war, but when he does, he learns that the portrait that had implicated West ended up in West's possession through fortuitous circumstances, and the General and Mrs. Haverhill are happily reconciled. This conflict might be seen as representing the kinds of misunderstandings that brought about the separation of the North and the South. If so, those misunderstandings are shown to be the result of chance and of pride on the part of the wounded lover.

The conflicts between sets of Northern lovers are complemented with conflicts between an even larger number of Southern lovers.

In *Secret Service* Caroline Mitford is in love with Wilfred Varney, Edith's younger brother. She has broken off with him because she is the only girl on the street who does
not have a lover at the front. She compares him to Captain Thorne, whom she admires because he is a real soldier. She has flirted with all the soldiers in town and loves everyone of them because they are on the way to fight. Wilfred then tells her that he is planning to enlist and asks her to help him get a uniform ready. This changes her demeanor entirely, and she busies herself with cutting off some trousers that are too long for Wilfred (he is only fifteen years old).

Impetuous and impatient for Mrs. Varney to secure permission from his father, Wilfred decides to write his father himself. Then he decides that a telegram would be quicker, and he and Caroline try to revise the letter he had written so that they can afford to send it (it cost $7.50 a word). A comic scene ensues in which they cannot find anything to omit from the letter. But the letter becomes superfluous when Wilfred receives word that his father has ordered him to his side.

After Wilfred leaves, Caroline goes to the telegraph office to send him a message of love. The telegraph officers are amused that Caroline does not realize that they would have to read her love message in order to send it. As the operator is about to send it, Arrelsford arrives, orders the message read to him, and on that basis believes that Wilfred and Caroline are involved in Captain Thorne's traitorous activity.
Wilfred is brought in wounded because he impetuously joined a group of Home Guard men who were trying to head off the Yankees only three miles out of town. He never reached his father's side, but he had enough war experience to win Caroline's undying devotion. Their relationship represents the simplistic naivete of Southern youths about the war, as well as their devotion to the Southern cause.

Alabama presents two sets of Southern lovers who also illustrate various aspects of sectional conflict. Lathrop Page woos Atlanta Moberly, who, because she was born on that day, was named in commemoration of the destruction of Atlanta by Sherman's troops. Armstrong's rapid success with Carey Preston depresses Lathrop because he has not been able to make much head-way with Atlanta. Finally, he secures Colonel Moberly's permission. Mrs. Page, however, refuses her permission because Raymond Page's charge would make Lathrop illegitimate. But when Mrs. Page's name is cleared, the two are given permission to marry. This conflict and its resolution maintains the Southern view that womanhood and manhood must not be tainted by doubts. It could symbolize the difficulties of reconstruction efforts to bring the Southern states together into the Union.

The second minor love affair in Alabama is Colonel Moberly's. When the Colonel learns that Mrs. Page's name has been questioned, he nobly offers to marry her. But Mrs. Page refuses. The Colonel's motivations are not only
magnanimous but economic, for the new railroad that Captain Davenport is to build may go across Mrs. Page's property. That this economic motive does play a part is evident from the fact that the Colonel was trying to decide which woman to marry--Mrs. Page or Mrs. Stockton. The railroad was surely to come across one of their properties, since Colonel Preston was so adamant that it would not come across his. When he loses Mrs. Page, he turns to Mrs. Stockton, who accepts his proposal, and the Colonel is delighted when he learns that the railroad will go across Mrs. Stockton's property.

The Colonel's economic opportunism represents a significant aspect of the post-war condition of the South, a theme which Alabama, alone of the seven plays, mentions. The desire of some Southerners, even those of strong sectional commitments, to take advantage of the changing economic status of the South was an important element in the reconciliation of the South to the North.

The final sets of minor lovers appear in Barbara Frietchie. Although no conflict is evident between Arthur Frietchie and Sue Royce, nor between Edgar Strong and Sally Negly, both contrast to the relationship of Caroline Mitford and Wilfred Varney in Secret Service. Unlike Caroline, Sally has told Edgar that she would not speak to him again if he goes to the war. Sue replies that she has told Arthur Frietchie the same thing, but that he had said, "he'd have
to go all the same" (I; p. 17). And she says that she kept her word; she kissed him. These two sets of youths play off against each other the feeling of lovers, on one hand, who want to keep their sweethearts near them, and the feeling of others that sometimes duty means the separation of lovers. At the end of the play Arthur has acquitted himself nobly, and the two are happily reconciled. They certainly represent the ideal soldier and the ideal sweetheart between whom there is the understanding that sometimes love must await the fulfilment of duty. As such they represent the same theme that the major characters illustrate—that the love of the woman must be subject to the loyalty and duty of the suitor. Edgar and Sally's love represent the feelings, perhaps, of many Southern women who wanted to keep their lovers near to them, rather than risk losing them in the war.
APPENDIX B

OTHER RECONCILIATION PLAYS PERFORMED IN
PHILADELPHIA AND NEW ORLEANS

In addition to the seven plays that form the basis of this study, four other plays with reconciliation themes were also produced in both New Orleans and Philadelphia and a few of other plays were performed in one city but not in the other.

J. K. Tillotson's Lynwood was performed at the Arch Street Theatre in Philadelphia, December 15-20, 1884; and in New Orleans at the St. Charles Theatre, March 22-29, 1885, at the Academy of Music, April 1-6, 1888, and at the St. Charles Theatre, November 20-26, 1898. Set in Kentucky, the play concerns the efforts of a Union officer, falsely accused of murdering his lover's brother, to win the love of a Southern girl. According to the Philadelphia North American, December 16, 1884, the play had been presented in Philadelphia during the 1883-84 season under the name of Belmont's Bride, but had been rewritten and brought out in San Francisco under the new title. The Philadelphia reviews condemned the play as a rehash of old situations that characterize melodrama of the dime novel order. New Orleans
reviewers said the play was a good one, but is a patch-work of situations from other plays.

The Skirmish Line, a play by McKee Rankin, was presented at the St. Charles Theatre in New Orleans, December 14-15, 1888, and at the Academy of Music in Philadelphia, April 15-20, 1889. I have not found the text of this play, but a review in the New Orleans Daily States, December 15, 1888, indicates the reconciliation motif in the play:

A story of war in a land still teeming with personal memories of the strife is always invested with an interest beyond its own, and where the subject is handled with a delicacy and firmness which can offend neither side, with a pretty thread of love for the woof, the interest becomes absorbing indeed. Such a play is "The Skirmish Line" with the added accessories of a funny drummer and his inamorata, slaves, soldiers, and the stereotyped overseer, who, by the way, is in this play a renegade Northerner.

The Daily Picayune, December 15, 1888, was not so enthusiastic, however, for the reviewer said that there is no excuse for writing a play such as this; there are no noble or heroic characters in it on either side but only cowards, sneaks, and vulgar bullies. The Philadelphia papers generally agreed, one commenting that the play was thoroughly bad and disjointed and another that it was very tiresome.

Harry P. Mawson's A Fair Rebel played the Grand Opera House in New Orleans, January 29-February 4, 1893, and in Philadelphia at Forepaugh's, January 10-22, 1898, at the Girard Avenue Theatre, the week of May 2, 1898, and at the Standard Theatre, April 23-28, 1900. The fair Rebel, of
course, loves a Union officer, and they cannot be separated by sectional loyalty. The villain, a jealous French cousin, tells the Rebels that the officer is at the girl's house, and he is imprisoned at Libby. While his lover stands guard in a sentry's uniform, he digs a tunnel under the wall in order to escape. The cousin, mistaking the girl for a prisoner, shoots her down, but she recovers, the war ends, the lovers are reconciled, "and north and south are happily wedded until death do them part" (New Orleans Daily Picayune, January 30, 1893).

Mawson's play evoked considerable comment from reviewers in both cities. On the one hand, the New Orleans critics were divided about the play's appeal to Southern audiences. The Times-Democrat, January 30, 1893, observed that the story is not well calculated to arouse much enthusiasm in the South. A young Southern girl, the reviewer said, is placed in an unpleasant light by helping the Northerner to escape from Libby Prison, especially since she has just learned of the death of her father, a Confederate officer. The review continued:

The women of the South, like other women worthy of the name, have always been loyal to the cause espoused by their families, and a highly bred daughter of Virginia would not be one to lightly fall in love with a Federal officer when the struggle was hottest, and if she did, she would not be likely to turn traitress to the cause of her people merely for the sake of freeing her lover from prison before he could be released in the ordinary course of events.
But the reviewer did admit that mitigating circumstances kept the conduct from appearing as improbable or as disreputable as it might appear to be from a bald repetition of the story. The Daily Picayune, January 30, 1893, however, noted that the play won many friends, partly because it was written to please both sides.

The Philadelphia critics expressed opinions more in line with the Daily Picayune than with the Times-Democrat. The play arouses the patriotic impulses of the audience to a high pitch, the Press (January 18, 1898) noted, without at the same time stirring up those feelings of sectional animosity that culminated in the great rebellion. During its May, 1898, performances the play coincided with the public fervor that was aroused by the Spanish-American War and that made such a success of Shenandoah. The Record noted that "in these times a play dealing with the life of a soldier and the strife of battle appeals directly to the patriotism of the people" (May 1, 1898).

Russ Whytal's play, For Fair Virginia, was presented at the Grand Opera House in New Orleans, February 14-20, 1897, and at Forepaugh's Theatre in Philadelphia, September 12-17, 1898. Virginia Esmond, a Southern girl married to a Northern man, quarrels with her husband's family while on a visit to their New York home, packs up, and returns to her Virginia home. Upon her husband's return to Virginia, she uses all her power to persuade him to espouse the Southern
cause, but he is as strong a Unionist as she is a Rebel. In indignation, she bids him to leave her, and he joins the Union army. The emphasis of the story then shifts to Nell Esmond, Virginia's sister-in-law, who has come to Virginia from New York with her brother. Stephen Dunbar, a Southerner, falls in love with her. But she is accused of giving some valuable Confederate army plans to the Union. A series of dramatic episodes follows in which Nell is mistreated by a Confederate general, but with the firing of the last gun at Richmond and the end of the war, Nell is united with her Confederate lover and Virginia Esmond, surrendering her Southern patriotism to her husband, is re-united with him.

Critics in both New Orleans and Philadelphia commended Whytal's play for its brilliance of language, stirring scenes, and powerful dramatic situations. Recognizing the acclaim of the New York critics, the New Orleans Sunday States, February 14, 1897, noted that "it has been a long time since a play by an American writer has been treated with such special marks of distinction by the metropolitan critics, as that bestowed upon Mr. Whytal." On the reconciliation theme, the Daily States, February 17, 1897, observed: "The war plays that we have heretofore seen have almost without exception done more or less injustice to the South; it is not so with 'For Fair Virginia,' as it has been equally attractive to both Northern and Southern audiences." Although the Times-Democrat, February 15, 1897, commended
the play for its absorbing interest, skillful construction, and brisk action, the same paper on February 21 said that the play had not been received with open arms in New Orleans because it is only of moderate merit, but more probably because it is a war play, and it is too early for war plays to be popular, especially such plays as this. The reviewer continued, "It is to be hoped that New Orleans will not in the near future be agitated by another war play unless the war referred to is on the other side of the Atlantic." In Philadelphia, however, the play was presented at an opportune time, as noted by the Inquirer, September 13, 1898: "With the home coming of our own Third, troopers and artillerists fresh in our minds, there is a good bit of timeliness in the production of Russ Whytal’s war play 'For Fair Virginia.'" It appears that the Spanish-American War was a propitious event for the Philadelphia theater.

Steele MacKaye’s and Albion Tourgee’s A Fool’s Errand, based on Tourgee’s novel of the same name, was presented at the Arch Street Theatre in Philadelphia, October 29-November 5, 1881. Considering the fact that Tourgee’s novel was a highly political one and the added fact that the American stage of the late nineteenth century was unreceptive to serious examination of significant issues, it is not surprising that the dramatization of the novel was not popularly successful. The Philadelphia performances were its sole exposure to the public. The play, set in the Reconstruction
period, deals with the emerging power of the Ku Klux Klan and with both Southern and Northern attitudes towards the activities of the Klan. Two Southern gentlemen, Burleson and Gurney, become members of the Klan because they believe that Comfort Servosse is promoting the Negroes' cause to the detriment of Southern society. When the more radical Klan members plan a lynching of Servosse and his liberal friend Judge Denton, Burleson and Gurney object, endangering their own lives. Maude Bradley, a teacher of the Negroes and a guest in Comfort Servosse's house, is secretly in love with Burleson; and Lily, Servosse's daughter is secretly married to Gurney. Lily, over Maude's protests, goes to warn her father and the Judge about the ambush, and the plot is foiled by Burleson, with the aid of the Negroes and Lily. In the end the Southerners and Servosse are reconciled. Each compliments the other for his humanity, and they both express a national patriotism:

Servosse: I have done you wrong and learned at last that some of the noblest hearts that live, beat beneath a southern breast!

Burleson: Colonel Servosse--Thank God this day has come--The day when we have learned that the whole country is better than any part. That to be an American is a grander thing than to be a northerner or a southerner!!

The Philadelphia Weekly Times, November 5, 1881, expressed the general view of the play in a most perceptive article by noting that the fault of the play is inherent and ineradicable. Some critics suggest cutting the political dialogue,
the paper observed, but the political dialogue is necessary to explain the relations of the characters. The paper's review is worth quoting extensively:

The whole dramatic action of the play depends absolutely upon the political sentiments and prejudices of the several persons concerned, and their action would be unintelligible, unless these sentiments were fully explained and discussed. But the drama is no proper medium for such discussion. If the drama undertakes to enforce a political principle it must do so simply, directly and unreservedly.

The reviewer then offers The Octoroon as an example of a play that did this by showing the horrors of slavery, but by enforcing its own lesson and escaping polemicism. Every enduring work of art, the paper concluded, must embody the permanent facts of human experience. Then, the reviewer applies these dicta to MacKaye's play:

It must be evident how wide a distinction separates such a drama from one that attempts to set forth the complicated political and social relations of a single section in one short period of exceptional history. Such a play might meet with temporary success if presented contemparanously with the incidents and passions represented, but then it must assume that one is right and the other wrong and enforce this conviction with an unswerving dramatic purpose. You can discuss and argue and try to reconcile conflicting interests in a book, but not upon the stage, and while a partisan drama may have a temporary vogue in time of partisan excitement, a "non-partisan" political drama, especially when it discusses questions that people do not wish to discuss, could not be anything else than a bore, even were it far more free from faults of construction than can be claimed for "A Fool's Errand."

The Press, October 27, 1881, observed: "As a political novel Judge Tourgee's work is an important contribution to current literature, but the time is hardly ripe as yet for the
dramatic presentation of such a topic." Noting that Judge Tourgee had lived in the South for several years, endeavoring to reconstruct that section and to bring ex-Confederates to a "right view of national politics," the Evening Bulletin, October 27, 1881, judged that, notwithstanding all the attention to correctness of detail and the ability of MacKaye, the result is not thoroughly successful, for one never forgets that the object is to instruct more than to amuse. "It is like a long lesson about the South," the paper observed, but before it is over one longs to see the stage lecture come to an end.

Augustus Thomas's Surrender was presented at Philadelphia's Park Theatre, January 23-February 5, 1893. The play has in its background the attempt to liberate Confederate prisoners held on Johnson's Island in Lake Erie and to use them to form a Rebel army in New York state, an actual war incident foiled by Lincoln. In the play three Union soldiers are released on parole and occupy Confederate General Colgate's house. Three Southern girls in love with the Union soldiers cause the General to place his own family under surveillance. A Northern girl also occupies the General's residence and furnishes drawings that direct escaped prisoners to safety. When the three Union soldiers are brought to trial, they point out to the General the danger that his son faces in the North as he tries to free Rebels from Johnson's Island. The General saves the Union
officers from re-imprisonment and one is dispatched to save
the General's son and to warn President Lincoln of the plot.
The war ends and places the captives in Richmond in the
role of captors, but "on the battlefield of love they have
capitulated and remain in the South with their fair captors"
(Philadelphia Press, January 24, 1893).

The reviewers were divided on the success of the play.
The Philadelphia Record and the Inquirer, January 24, 1893,
both highly praised it as one of the best of the war plays.
The Evening Star, the Press, the Public Ledger, and the
North American appreciated the play, but did not give it
any unusual accolades. The review in the Evening Bulletin,
however, was perceptive and detailed:

The war is over. Sectional strife has passed away.
The politicians even have ceased to use it as an appeal
to the prejudices of men, and the new generation that
has grown up is rapidly healing all the wounds that the
great internecine struggle opened. Therefore, it is
too late, and altogether in poor taste, for the drama-
tist to seek to create stage effect by appealing to
prejudice, patriotism or whatever it may at this late
date justly be called. It seems that it is to this
sentiment the author of Surrender depends for whatever
excuse he may deem necessary for the motive of his
drama, and unless it has some excuse that is acceptable
it must denominate a production that falls below the
standard, no matter how skilful the pen has been used
at times and no matter how forcibly these truly dra-
matic portions are acted. It is the dramatist's duty
to portray man in his nobleness for the lesson it may
give, or man in his depravity that a moral may be
drawn. There is no license that permits him to use
the latter portrayal as a means to a successful end,
no matter how many examples of the same we may meet
with in every-day life.

A soldier's honor is considered the synonym for the
highest sense of obligation. It is not to be played
upon lightly, and to make a Union officer on parole a spy, to picture him as violating the privileges granted after an oath of neutrality, is something no soldier could view without a feeling of disgust, and which violates all the principles accepted as right. But Mr. Thomas, the author of the drama in question, does this and more, for he asks us to view with approval the most outrageous violations of generous hospitality, and all this for no motive that has relation to the action of the drama, and it must be, therefore, that he appeals for approval to some such sentiment as was naturally and righteously prevalent during the war and excusably prevalent for some time after it. He does not even make heroes of his dishonorable officers. He makes them spies: nothing more. They do not even hesitate. There is no struggle between honor and duty. There is nothing to smooth the acts, no ingenious reasoning. Nothing but the cold-blooded violation of honor.

Thomas's troubles with the play had already been complicated by his director and by the actors. Thomas says in The Print of My Remembrance, pp. 320-322, that he had written the play as a comedy in order to show the less serious side of the Civil War, but Eugene Presbrey, the director, was so appreciative of its values that he persuaded Charles Frohman "to play it seriously, stressing melodramatically every possible point and introducing a horse." Further, Louis Aldrich, who played the Southern General Colgate, refused to deliver the line which Thomas says that he had taken verbatim from Colonel Alfriend that "the South had whipped the North on a thousand fields and had never lost except when overcome by superior numbers." Aldrich refused to say the line, Thomas reported, because "personally he was a Northern man." Moreover, Maude Banks, who played the only Northern girl in the play, refused to be disloyal to her dress-maker by wearing a blue silk sash.
on her white dress—an effect Thomas had prescribed because he remembered the young women of the war days declaring their loyalty by wearing a blue sash. "Altogether," Thomas says, "we had considerable trouble with our temperamental actors."

James A. Herne's play, Reverend Griffith Davenport, played Philadelphia's Chestnut Street Theatre, March 27-April 10, 1899. Founded on Helen H. Gardener's novel, An Unofficial Patriot, which recounts an experience in the life of the author's father, the play deals with the struggles of a conscientious Methodist circuit rider in Virginia over the morality of slavery. Act I shows the slaves in their happy and devoted life at the Davenport's estate, but Katherine Davenport's personal maid reports that the owner of her husband is forced to sell him to avoid bankruptcy and pleads with Davenport to buy him so that their family can remain together. Davenport has resolved never again to guy or sell human flesh, but his big heart cannot hold out, and he buys John. But the event brings a climax to his soul, and he resolves to free all his own slaves and his wife's too, if she consents. Only half understanding the morality of the question, Katherine agrees out of faith in him and love for him.

In Act II Davenport's sons argue over their father's action, Beverly infuriated at his father's dispossession of the family's wealth and Roy supporting his father's decision.
When Davenport gathers his slaves, who anticipate receiving gifts from Davenport because he always has brought them presents when he returned from town, he tells them that they are all free. They do not understand, regarding him curiously and wistfully, like a lot of disappointed children. Katherine explains that they do not belong to the Davenports any longer. The slaves send up a wail of protest, for "free niggahs" are despicable creatures, fit only for hatred and contempt. Their reaction stuns Davenport, who expected a much different result. Suddenly, a slave of Davenport's cruel neighbor bursts into the Davenport house and to avoid recapture kills himself in the presence of the Davenports and the Negroes. Nelson, the neighbor, tells Davenport that this is the result of his anti-slavery theories, and all his neighbors begin to regard the minister with bitterness and alarm.

In Act III the neighbors threaten to burn Davenport's house if he does not leave Virginia. Davenport has announced that he had cast his vote for Lincoln, and this was the last insult he could make to his Southern neighbors. Davenport gathers his family and prays for guidance in the new life that he is to undertake and for protection for his country in the tribulations that he foresees.

Act IV shows Davenport in Washington where Governor Morton of Indiana communicates President Lincoln's request that Davenport guide the Union army through the valley of
the Shenandoah, for as a circuit rider he had become completely familiar with the country-side. Again, Katherine cannot understand Davenport's motivations or why he would involve himself in the conflict. But Davenport feels the compulsion of patriotism, and Katherine, declaring her own Southern loyalty, reluctantly consents to the moral demand of his conscience; but she announces that when he goes to help the North, she will return to her Virginia home "to help the cause I believe in."

In the first scene of Act V Griffith Davenport is captured by the Confederate army under his own son Beverly and is held a prisoner of war. But Davenport is allowed to speak to his wife before he is taken to prison, and the play ends with the couple, sitting on the porch in moonlight, renewing their vows of faith and love to each other.

This summary, based on A. H. Quinn's synopsis in America's Lost Plays (vol. 7), has been given extensively in order to show that Herne's play apparently had a quality of character delineation and realistic portrayal of the conflicts of morality and patriotism that transcend most of the plays that have been examined in this study. The coolness of the reception of the play illustrates, however, that the audiences were not equipped to deal with this type of drama. The failure of the play to win public support needs further examination, especially in the light of the appreciative comments of reviewers who almost unanimously acclaimed its
skillful construction and its penetrating examination of the "drama of human souls." (For some critical reaction, see above, pp. 290-291.

The only reconciliation play presented in New Orleans but not in Philadelphia was James M. Martin's Dixie Land, which was performed at the St. Charles Theatre, September 13-19, 1896. The story occurs before and during the Civil War and tells of the love and devotion of two sentimental captains--one a Northerner, the other a Southerner--who join their respective regiments and fight against each other, their sweethearts, and their people (see the Daily Picayune, September 14, 1896). As the paper noted, it presents the struggles of the two men during the first year of the war, with "streaks of humor and touches of pathos." "For those who like war plays," the Picayune concluded, "this will do as well as any." The play apparently has a well-worn melodramatic plot, with a villain named Ranzy Snaffle, who tries to make life as uncomfortable as possible for the gallant Union officer and his Southern sweetheart and who is dumped into a well in the last act of the play by the comic minstrels played by McIntyre and Heath (see the Times-Democrat, September 14, 1896).

One other play should be mentioned, for it involves some love affairs between Northerners and Southerners, but it apparently has no reconciliation theme. Scott Marble's play, Down in Dixie played at the St. Charles Theatre in
New Orleans, September 23-29, 1894, and at the People's Theatre in Philadelphia, December 26-31, 1898. Apparently, it has a typically melodramatic plot, with Northern villains who fall in love with Southern girls and a widow who, after the death of her worthless Northern husband, marries a Georgia planter. But aside from these North-South love affairs, the play does not deal with sectional issues nor with the war. The play was praised for good specialty work, fine scenic effects, and mechanical contrivances (see the New Orleans Times-Democrat, September 24, 1894). The Philadelphia Inquirer, December 27, 1898, observed:

Scott Marble's mechanical play, "Down in Dixie," was the attraction at the People's last night. The piece, which is a combination of highly colored scenes of Southern life and specialties, has been seen here before. It pleased the audiences at both the matinee and night performances. The illustration of levee peculiarities, as given by the band of colored performers, was a feature that won applause, and the cotton compress at work was an interesting mechanical effect. . . .

This play should be distinguished from another by the same title by Charles Townsend, copyright 1894, for the characters and the situations are different. Townsend's play is, as Donald Skinner notes, a war play with a clear reconciliation theme, but I did not find any productions of it in Philadelphia or New Orleans (see Donald T. Skinner, "The Civil War as a Subject for American Drama, 1861-1947," Diss. Northwestern 1948, pp. 171-174.)
Skinner also discusses several twentieth-century plays that have reconciliation themes:


[Anonymous], *The Crisis* (n.d.).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Production Dates</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Theater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belle Lamar</td>
<td>Sept. 21-Oct. 2, 1874</td>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>Arch St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 7-12, 1874</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>Varieties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by the Enemy</td>
<td>Mar. 8-13, 1886</td>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>Chestnut St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 13-18, 1886</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Arch St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 14-19, 1887</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Chestnut St. Opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 11-17, 1887</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>St. Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb. 18-23, 1889</td>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 15-20, 1889</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Arch St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 30-Oct. 5, 1889</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by the Enemy</td>
<td>Nov. 3-9, 1889</td>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>Broad St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>Dec. 23, 1889-Jan. 4, 1890</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>St. Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by the Enemy</td>
<td>Nov. 23-29, 1890</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Academy of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>Dec. 28, 1890-Jan. 4, 1891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by the Enemy</td>
<td>Oct. 19-24, 1891</td>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>Forepaugh's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 19-24, 1891</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>Academy of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>Nov. 23-Dec. 7, 1891</td>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>Chestnut St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 31-Feb. 6, 1892</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>Academy of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Feb. 8-15, 1892</td>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>Broad St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 24-29, 1892</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>Academy of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah Secret</td>
<td>Jan. 28-Feb. 9, 1895</td>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>May 13-18, 1895</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Broad St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart of Maryland</td>
<td>Oct. 5-31, 1896</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by the Enemy</td>
<td>Dec. 28, 1896-Jan. 2, 1897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart of Maryland</td>
<td>Mar. 15-27, 1897</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Girard Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret</td>
<td>Jan. 10-Feb. 5, 1898</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Chestnut St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Broad St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play/Service</td>
<td>Dates/Location</td>
<td>City/Opera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>Mar. 28-May 14, 1898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by the Enemy</td>
<td>Nov. 21-26, 1898</td>
<td>Phil. Grand Opera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart of Maryland Secret</td>
<td>Dec. 25-31, 1898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forepaugh's Service</td>
<td>Jan. 1-7, 1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 30-Feb. 4, 1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by the Enemy</td>
<td>Sept. 4-9, 1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Frietchie</td>
<td>Oct. 1-6, 1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 10-21, 1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 2-7, 1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>Oct. 1-6, 1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Service</td>
<td>Oct. 22-27, 1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Dec. 10-15, 1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Frietchie</td>
<td>Dec. 23-29, 1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Service</td>
<td>Jan. 13-19, 1901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Number of Productions of Seven Dramas of Reconciliation in Philadelphia and New Orleans, 1874-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Philadelphia</th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belle Lamar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by the Enemy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart of Maryland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Frietchie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Number of Reviews Indicating Success with Audiences in Philadelphia and New Orleans of Seven Reconciliation Plays, 1874-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Indication of Success/Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philadelphia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by the Enemy</td>
<td>29 favorable; 1 equivocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>26 favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>6 favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Service</td>
<td>13 favorable; 1 failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart of Maryland</td>
<td>11 favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Frietchie</td>
<td>2 favorable; 3 equivocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Lamar</td>
<td>2 favorable; 2 failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Orleans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by the Enemy</td>
<td>17 favorable; 1 failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>11 favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>7 favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Service</td>
<td>5 favorable; 1 equivocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart of Maryland</td>
<td>4 favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Frietchie</td>
<td>3 favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Lamar</td>
<td>2 favorable; 1 equivocal; 1 failure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The reviews compiled for this table are those that indicated audience response to the plays, and the success or failure is in terms of audience response, not critical evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Performance Dates</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Held by the Enemy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>Oct. 14-19, 1889</td>
<td>Audience so large the orchestra had to go under the stage; all could not get in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 23-Jan. 4, 1890</td>
<td>Great success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 28-Feb. 9, 1895</td>
<td>Big house even in bad weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 28-May 14, 1898</td>
<td>Unprecedented demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 1-6, 1900</td>
<td>Audiences packed house to doors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Service</td>
<td>Jan. 10-Feb. 5, 1898</td>
<td>Demand stronger every-day; phenomenal advance sale; two week extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart of Maryland</td>
<td>Oct. 5-31, 1896</td>
<td>Large and brilliant audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 15-27, 1897</td>
<td>Large audience; big dramatic success of the season.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (Table 4, continued)

#### New Orleans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Held by the Enemy</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 11-17, 1887</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large audience; doing well in spite of bad weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 3-9, 1889</td>
<td></td>
<td>House filled to doors small, moderate, to good houses during the week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 23-29, 1890</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair to good houses; full house, Nov. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1-6, 1899</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large houses the rule; standing room only one hour before the curtain; hundreds turned away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 28-Jan. 4, 1891</td>
<td></td>
<td>Splendid Sunday night audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 31-Feb. 6, 1892</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair to very large audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 19-24, 1891</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parquette packed, dress circle full, galleries crowded; increasing attendance during week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 24-29, 1892</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1-7, 1899</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crowds filled theater during week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 25-31, 1898</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large audiences during the week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 23-29, 1900</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large audiences continued during week; larger than usual first night crowd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 7-12, 1874</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jammed house Dec. 7; full house Dec. 8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 5

Productions in Other Cities of Seven Reconciliation Plays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Held by the Enemy</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1886, 1887, 1888, 1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1889?, 1890?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth, N.J.</td>
<td>1894?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newark, N.J.</td>
<td>(n.y.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1886(2), 1887(2), 1888, 1890, 1891, 1899, 1901, 1902, 1910, 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plainfield, N.J.</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1888?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>1915?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1888(2), 1890, 1895, 1897, 1899(2), 1900, 1901, 1906, 1908, 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1889, 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisville?</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1889, 1890, 1891, 1894, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1905, 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>(n.y.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>1889, 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1891, 1893, 1897, 1898, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1891?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowell, Mass.</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Table 5, continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alabama (continued)</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>1891, 1892, 1894, 1897, 1901, 1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1899, 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>1915?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Service</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1897, 1898, 1901, 1905, 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1897, 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange, N.J.</td>
<td>(n.y.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1899?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>1897, 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>1915?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Frietchie</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1900, 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth, N.J.</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford, Conn.</td>
<td>1935, 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1899, 1900, 1903, 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart of Maryland</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>1905, 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1896, 1898, 1899, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corning, N.Y.</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford, Conn.</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newark, N.J.</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1895, 1897, 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Lamar</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evanston, Ill.</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1874, 1888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. List of Plays

Note: The following list of plays is not intended to be a complete list of available texts, but it represents all the plays referred to in the study. Where a copy is known to exist, the location is indicated. Much of the information was obtained from Donald T. Skinner, "The Civil War As a Subject for American Drama, 1861-1947," to which the reader is referred for more complete information.


- *Seven Sons* [nonextant].


Dry, Comrade J. P. Ball's Bluff, or, Bell Berkeley's Revenge. Upper Sandusky, Ohio, 1883. Library of Congress.


Gillette, William Hooker. The Five Act War Drama, Held by the Enemy. 1898; rpt. New York: Samuel French, 1925. Held by the Enemy. TS. 219, Morton Collection, Univ. of Chicago, [1898].


Goss, Walter S. Southern Loyalists, or, Marching Through Georgia. Marlboro, Ohio, 1887. Library of Congress.


——. On Both Sides. MS, NYPL, 1898.


Malgum, A. The Blue and the Gray, or, Tom Pike, The Arkansaw Traveler. MS, NYPL, 1873.

Marble, Scott. Down in Dixie [nonextant].

Martin, James M. Dixie Land. MS, Univ. of Chicago, 1910.

Mawson, Harry P. A Fair Rebel. MS, Univ. of Chicago, n.d.


Rankin, McKee, and Fred Maeder. The Skirmish Line [nonextant].


———. *Surrender*. TS, NYPL, [1892].

Tillotson, J. K. *Lynwood*. MS, Univ. of Pennsylvania, n.d.


Whytal, Russ. *For Fair Virginia*. MS, Univ. of Chicago, [1895].

2. Newspapers

New Orleans Bulletin.

New Orleans Daily Picayune.


Philadelphia Evening Call.

Philadelphia Evening News.

Philadelphia Evening Star.

Philadelphia Evening Telegraph.

Philadelphia Inquirer.


Philadelphia Press.

Philadelphia Public Ledger.

Philadelphia Record.

New Orleans Republican.

Philadelphia Sunday Dispatch.


New Orleans Times-Democrat.

Philadelphia Weekly Times.
3. Ephemera

Note: The following entries indicate the most helpful collections of programs, playbills, and clippings used in this study, and they are not intended to be a complete listing of available materials. The Theater Collection of NYPL contains many scrapbooks and folders of ephemeral material, catalogued under the titles of the plays. The Theatrical Index of Philadelphia in the Theater Collection of the Free Library of Philadelphia is helpful in identifying production dates.

Academy of Music Theater Bills, 1887-1930. Univ. of Pennsylvania.

Chestnut Street Opera House Theater Bills, 1891-1938. Univ. of Pennsylvania.

Chestnut and Walnut Street Theaters. 29 Playbills and Press Notices. Univ. of Pennsylvania.


Grand Opera House Theater Bills, 1899-1917. Univ. of Pennsylvania.


Robert De Lapouyade Collection of Programs of Plays and Operas at Various New Orleans Theaters, 1894-1933. Louisiana State Univ.
Robinson Locke Collection of Dramatic Scrapbooks. NYPL.

Scrapbook of Programs, 1875-1880. Furness Collection.
Univ. of Pennsylvania.

Scrapbook of Programs, [1889]-1895. Furness Collection.
Univ. of Pennsylvania.


Tulane Theater. Programs. 2 vols. Tulane Univ. Library.

Walnut Street Theater. Programs of Plays, April 19, 1886-Mar. 9, 1891. Univ. of Pennsylvania.

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Books


Coyle, William, and Harvey G. Damaser. Six Early American Plays. Columbus, Ohio: C. E. Merrill, 1968.


2. Articles

"Alabama." Rev. Illustrated American, May 9, 1891, pp. 577-584.


"Drama and Public Taste." Current Literature, 32 (June 1902), 739-740.


____. "Has Public Taste Changed?: Yesterday." Theatre Magazine, 31 (May 1920), 382.


Gross, T. L. "The South in the Literature of Reconstruction." Mississippi Quarterly, 14 (Spring 1961), 68-78.
Herne, James A. "Herne on the Theatre." Unidentified clipping, NYPL.


3. Dissertations and Theses


Halline, Allan G. "Main Currents of Thought in American Drama." Diss. Univ. of Wisconsin, 1935.


