AMY ROBSART AND KENILWORTH

A Comparative Study.

by
Mamie Dennis Barnes, A.B., Ottawa University, 1920.

Submitted to the Department of
Romance Languages and Literatures
and the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Kansas
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts.

Approved by:

Instructor in Charge

E. Hallows

Head of Department

May 22, 1923.

Table of Contents

Bibliography, with symbols used in the text :

(a) Adams, W.D.__"A Dictionary of the Drama", vol.I, Philadelphia, 1904.

Allais, Gustave__(see Revue des Cours et Conférences).

Ancelot__"Élisabeth d'Angleterre". Paris, 1858.

Anonymous__"Leicester's Commonwealth". A reprint. London, 1904.

Beers, H.A.__"A History of English Romanticism in the 18th Century". New York, 1899.

(b) Biré, Edmond__"Victor Hugo avant 1830", ch.XIV, Paris, 1902.

Bouillet, M.N.__"Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie". Paris, 1914.

(c) Canning, Hon.A.S.G.__"History in Scott's Novels", ch.VIII, London, 1905.

Chesterton, G.K.__"Twelve Types".(Walter Scott). London, 1903.

Davidson, A.F.__"Victor Hugo, his Life and Work". London, 1913.

(d) Doumic, René__"Histoire de la Littérature française", ch.XXXIX. Paris, 1910.

(e) Dupuy, Ernest__"La Jeunesse des Romantiques", ch.VIII. Paris, 1905.

(f) Encyclopedia Britannica, The. Cambridge, Eng. 1911.

(g) English Historical Review, The, vol.I, 235 (April, 1886) and XIII, 83 (Jan. 1898). London.

Faguet, Émile__"Le XIX^{e} siècle: Études littéraires", p.194. Paris, 1900.

Gairdner, James__(see Eng. Hist. Rev.).

(h) Glachant, P. and V.__"Essai Critique sur le théâtre de Victor Hugo: Les drames en prose", ch.I. Paris, 1903.

Gosse, E.W.__"History of 18th Century Literature". London and New York, 1907.

(i) Hay, James__"Sir Walter Scott". New York, 1899.

Hayward, Grace__"History in Scott's Novels". (Master's Thesis, University of Kansas). 1907.

(j) Hazlitt, William__"The Spirit of the Age". (Collected Works, vol.IV). London, 1902.

Holliday, Carl__"English Fiction from the 5th to the 20th Century". New York, 1912.

Hugo, Victor__"Amy Robsart", ne varietur edition. Paris, 1902

(k) " " __"Correspondance", p.72. (fév., 1828). Paris, 1896.

" " __"Littérature et Philosophie Mêlées". (Sur Walter Scott, à propos de Quentin Durward). Paris, n.d.

(l) " " __"Lettres à la Fiancée", p.173. (fév. 1822). Paris.

(m) " " __"Victor Hugo raconté par un Témoin de sa vie", vol.III, ch.XLVIII, and the Testament littéraire. Paris, n.d.

(mm) Hutton, Richard__"Sir Walter Scott". New York. n.d.

(n) Innes,Arthur D.__"England under the Tudors",p.257. N. Y. 1911.

Jack,A.A.__"Essays on the Novel". London,1897.

Jackson,Rev.Canon__(see The 19th Century).

La Grande Encyclopédie. Paris.

(o) Lang,Andrew__Introduction and Notes to "Kenilworth". London,1896.

Larousse,P.__"Dictionnaire du XIX^e siècle".Paris,1866.

Le Soudier,H.__"Bibliographie Française". Paris,1896.

Lindley,Georgia__"French Criticism of Sir Walter Scott", (Master's Thesis,University of Kansas). 1922.

(p) Lingard,John__"History of England",vol.VI,ch.II. Edinburg,1902.

(q) Lockhart,J.G.__"Life of Sir Walter Scott",vol.VI. Edinburgh,1862.

Lorenz__"Catalogue Général de la Librairie française", (1840-1916). Paris,1918.

(r) Maigron,Louis__"Le Roman historique à l'époque romantique". Paris,1898.

Marsan,J.__"La Bataille romantique",ch.III. Paris,1912.

Martineau,Harriet__"Miscellanies".(The Genius of Walter Scott). Boston,1836.

Masson__"British Novelists and their Styles", Lecture III, Cambridge,Eng.1859.

(s) Meurice,Paul__Introduction and Notes to "Amy Robsart", ne varietur edition. Paris,1902.

(t) Nineteenth Century,The,vol.XI(March,1882).London and N.Y.

North American Review,The,vol.XXXII,1831.Boston and N.Y.

Pavie,André__(see Revue Hebdomadaire).

Phelps,__"The Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement". Boston,1893.

(u) Revue des Cours et Conférences,vol.XXI and XXII.(1902-1903). Paris.

(v) Revue Hebdomadaire,mars 1903. Paris.

Scott,Sir Walter__"Kenilworth". London,1906.

(w) Scribe,Eugène__"Opéra-comique:Leicester ou Le Château de Kenilworth". Paris,1877.

(x) Sidney,P.__"Who Killed Amy Robsart?". London,1901.

Stanton,Amida__"Adaptations and Translations of Shakespeare's Othello in France,during the 18th century".(Master's Thesis,University of Kansas). 1919.

(y) Stapfer,P.__"Victor Hugo à Guernsey". Paris,1905.

Stephen,Leslie__"Hours in a Library",vol.I.London,1917.

Taine,Hippolyte__"Histoire de la Littérature anglaise", vol.IV. Paris,1866.

(z) Yonge,C.D.__"Life of Scott".(with Scott bibliography). London,1888.

Young,C.A.__"The Waverley Novels". Glasgow,1907.

Foreword

In 1821, Sir Walter Scott,[1] being then fifty years of age, at the height of his reputation, and in the maturity of his powers, added Kenilworth to the long list of his novels. Like the others of the Waverley series, its popularity was both instant and enduring.

Seven years later, there appeared at the Odéon in Paris, under the title of Amy Robsart, a dramatization of this novel, in French, written by an amateur in his twenties. The play failed, was withdrawn, and would now probably be forgotten, were it not that the young playwright soon afterward sprang into fame, and as a figure in world-literature has since eclipsed the Scotch poet and novelist. As the first serious dramatic attempt of Victor Hugo,[2] Amy Robsart is not without interest today, and some critics have seen in it the germ out of which grew all his later productions for the theatre.

In view of the fact that Walter Scott had perhaps a greater influence upon the French Romantic school than any other one writer, and that Victor Hugo became the acknowledged leader of this school, the connection between their work in general has often been pointed out. But except for the summary treatment by Gustave Allais in the Revue des Cours et Conférences, volume 22, no comparison has, to the writer's knowledge, been previously attempted for Kenilworth and Amy Robsart.

1. 1771-1832
2. 1802-1885

Yet there is a very definite point of contact between the two authors, altho for Scott it marks a culmination in his literary work and for Hugo a starting point.

In contrasting the play with the novel from which it is taken, an attempt has been made to distinguish, where possible, between those changes necessitated by dramatic technique, and those arising from the individual genius of the author.

Chapter I. The Composition and Publication of Amy Robsart.[1]

Altho not performed until 1828, Amy Robsart was written six years before, under the following circumstances.

Young Hugo, finding himself in a position where financial embarrassment alone prevented his marriage with Mlle. Foucher, set himself to the task of earning by his pen "cet argent qui le rapprocherait du bonheur".(m) Some months after Kenilworth appeared, and while Hugo was still casting about for a subject, his friend, Alexandre Soumet, suggested a dramatization of that novel. Hugo agreed to write the first three acts, Soumet was to supply the general plan and the other two acts. But when the time came to compare results, the collaborators found themselves differing somewhat upon dramatic principles---Hugo being inclined to follow the lead of English dramatists, especially in mingling comedy and tragedy, a method disapproved by the more conservative Soumet---and it was decided that each should continue the play independently.

Soumet, having completed his version, had it produced in 1827, with mediocre success.[2] (Owing to the laughter occasioned

---

1. The full title was "Amy Robsart, drame en cinq actes et en prose, tiré du Château de Kenilworth, roman de Sir Walter Scott". (b)

2. Maigron, p. 127, says that the Globe, Sept. 6, 1827, "se moque avec esprit des auteurs dramatiques, comme Soumet, qui, contre le droit des gens, prennent à l'expeditif et laborieux traducteur des romans de sir W. Scott, des chapitres entiers, mots pour mots, y compris les faux-sens". It is a matter of regret to students of this field that Soumet's play, which would have formed an interesting comparison with Hugo's, was apparently never printed. (r)

by the line,"J'étais Amy quand vous m'aimiez," the name Émilia was immediately substituted for Amy,and became the title of the play thereafter).(b)

Hugo,too,finished the play after his own fashion,(m) but appears not to have thot very highly of his work. At any rate,the manuscript lay forgotten,while its author became absorbed in a new production,Cromwell;until 1827,when a brother-inlaw, Paul Foucher,[1] who was eager to make his debut as a playwright,asked to see it. He had heard of the MS. from Soumet,whose comment was:

"....Ça m'a un peu effarouché dans le temps et maintenant encore il y a bien des témerités où je ne me hasarderais pas,moi,mais puisque les drames anglais ont réussi,je ne vois pas pourquoi ça ne réussirait pas. Si j'étais Victor Hugo je ne perdrais pas une pièce où il y a des scènes très belles". (m)

Hugo refused to compromise the success of the rising Romantic school,whose mouthpiece he had become,by this immature production "dont le sujet était emprunté à un autre",(m) but he consented that the play be presented under Foucher's name.[2] For this purpose it was thoroly revised,to conform to the riper judgment which Hugo had since acquired.(s)

No effort was spared for the performance at the Odéon, which took place February 13,1828.[3] The best actors were

---

1. Paul Foucher,1810-1875.

2. "....Eh bien,lui dit Paul Foucher,si tu ne veux pas la faire jouer sous ton nom,laisse-la jouer sous le mien. Tu me rendras un vrai service,une pièce pareille me fera connaître et m'ouvrira le théâtre à deux battants.

....Ma foi,dit M.Victor Hugo,je ne regarde pas cela comme une pièce de moi. Fais-en ce que tu voudras;Walter Scott t'appartient autant qu'à moi". (m)

3. E.Faguet,in his Études sur le XIX^e siècle,includes under Hugo's Théâtre this item in parenthesis:(Amy Robsart, avec Ancelot,à l'Odéon,chute.) The reference to Ancelot,in this connection,I have been unable to explain. His Élisabeth d'Angleterre,1829,does not treat of Amy Robsart.

engaged,among them Mlle.Anais Aubert,MM.Lockroy and Provost (who later starred,respectively,in Le Roi s'amuse,Marie Tudor, and Lucrèce Borgia) (m) ,and even the costumes were designed by the noted painter,Eugène Delacroix.

Yet Amy Robsart was a decided failure.(Some of the current press notices will be cited in a later chapter). "Il n'était pourtant,explains Meurice (s),"ni juste ni sage que pour avoir voulu faire acte d'obligeance,Victor Hugo compromît les vraies grandes batailles qu'il avait à livrer, Marion de Lorme,Hernani. Mais sans se déclarer l'auteur de la pièce,il se déclara bravement l'auteur des passages sifflés, dans la lettre suivante,adressée aux journaux: [1]

"Paris,le 14 février,1828

Monsieur le rédacteur,

Puisque la réussite d'Amy Robsart,début d'un jeune poète dont les succès me sont plus chers que les miens,a eprouvé une si vive opposition,je m'empresse de déclarer que je ne suis pas absolument étranger à cet ouvrage; Il y a dans ce drame quelques mots,quelques fragments de scènes qui sont de moi,et je dois dire que ce sont peut-être ces passages qui ont été le plus sifflés.

Je vous prie,monsieur,de publier cette réclamation dans votre numéro de demain,et d'agréer,etc.

Victor Hugo.

P.S.---L'auteur a retiré sa pièce."

Except for this admission of collaboration,the agreement [2] that Foucher's instead of Hugo's name should be used was consistently carried out. Thus we find in the Figaro, Feb.14,1828:

"M.Victor Hugo n'est pour rien dans la composition de cet ouvrage. Ceci soit dit à l'adresse de ceux qui

---

1. M. André Pavie (r) states that this letter appeared in the Journal des Débats,le Moniteur,and le Figaro.

2.".... .Il était convenu que le nom de M. Victor Hugo ne serait pas prononcé;mais,quelques phrases ou quelques indiscrétions le trahirent,et le directeur,enchanté,s'empressa de répandre le bruit que le drame était de l'auteur de Cromwell. M. Victor Hugo eut beau s'y opposer:le directeur, voyant dans le nom une attraction,continua à le crier sur les toits." (m)

se réunissaient hier pour lui imputer l'oeuvre nouvelle." Foucher's name which was scarcely heard above the tumult in which the play ended, also appeared upon the bill for the sec-
-ond representation,[1] (which, however, did not take place).
Letters from Hugo[2] and Foucher[3] to their intimate friend, Victor Pavie, have the same implication.

---

1. From Foucher's letter to Pavie, March 3, 1828: (v)
"Le directeur, quoique, le soir de la représentation, il fût dans le ferme dessein de rejouer la pièce en l'écour-
-tant et en éteignant tout ce qu'il y avait de hardi et de sifflé, c'est-à-dire de mieux, le directeur, dis-je, poussé par une actrice qui est sa maîtresse, et qui n'a pas eu de succès dans l'ouvrage, n'a pas voulu la redonner, malgré tout ce qu'on lui a dit."

2. From Hugo's letter to Pavia, Feb. 29, 1828: (k)
"Vous savez la petite infortune advenue à Paul (Foucher). C'est un bien petit malheur près d'un bien grand. J'ai dû le couvrir de mon mieux dans cette occurrence. D'ailleurs, c'est moi qui lui avais porté malheur. La plébécule cabalante qui a sifflé Amy Robsart croyait siffler Cromwell par contre-coup. C'est une malheureuse petite intrigue classique qui ne vaut pas, du reste, la peine qu'on en parle."

3. From Foucher's letters to Pavie:
Jan. 1828-"Dans quelques jours, on donne cette malen
-contreuse Amy Robsart, qui n'aura d'autre fruit pour moi que de me faire passer pour l'homme de paille ou le prête-nom de l'affaire. Il y a des gens qui ont du malheur. Toutefois, j'espère que la médiocrité de l'ouvrage détrompera le public, car je me trouve dans une si agréable situation que le talent que j'aurais (en supposant qu'on m'en trouvât) tournerait encore à mon désavantage."
March 3, 1828-"....Ils ont sifflé en moi l'Histoire et Walter Scott indistinctement....Ils ont proscrit dans Amy Robsart le premier essai d'un genre qui, nonobstant leurs sifflets, expulse de jour en jour le vieux goût, et dont l'échec de mon ouvrage n'a fait que différer le triomphe. Ils ont proscrit en moi le beau-frère de Victor Hugo, ne pouvant proscrire Victor Hugo lui-même, comme ils l'espéraient.... Quant à l'imprimer, j'y penserais, si la pièce n'était tirée d'un roman; mais, comme Walter Scott est pour moitié dans mon drame, on aimera toujours mieux lire le roman".
For the complete passages, and other letters to the same purpose, see (v).

But in later years, both Hugo and Foucher admit that the former was the real author. (V. Hugo in the Témoin,[m] 1863; and Paul Foucher in his Coulisses du passé, 1873:

"On sait que le véritable auteur me fit l'honneur de m'attribuer ce drame... Si j'ai reparlé de cette chute célèbre, ce n'est pas par amour-propre d'auteur. Je ne fis que la signer, et Victor Hugo, qui a toutes les loyautés du courage, y mit son énergique contre-seing devant les sifflets.—— C'est pour un simple avis au public." (v)

M. André Pavie, who, in 1903, made public some hitherto unedited correspondance of his grandfather, Victor Pavie,[1] has made a very convincing case that these letters of the time give the truth of the matter, and that the later statements may be attributed to the well-established inaccuracy of the Témoin and to the modesty of Foucher.[v]

On the other hand, the following points may be mentioned in favor of Hugo's authorship:

First; there is obvious deception in either case. There was good reason for it at the time of the play's performance, when the success of the Cénacle was not yet assured; while at the later period, no purpose could be served by misstating the case.

Second; in old age a lapse of memory might account for one man's statement, but it is strange that both writers should forget such an important fact as this, and that their mistakes should agree so well.

Third; it is no more strange that Paul Foucher should deceive his close friend, Victor Pavie, than that Hugo should deceive his life-long friend, Paul Meurice.

---

1. SEE notes 1 and 3, page 6.

Fourth; it is argued that not to accept Hugo's letter to the press at its face value would be to cast an impermissible slur upon his character. But in appropriating Hugo's play, Foucher assumed the risk of fail-ure as well as of success, as was doubtless agreed upon; hence there would be no moral obligation, on Hugo's part to reveal himself as the author because the play failed. Or, granted that he did evade responsibility on that occasion, would it be any less contemptible to have claimed for himself, in the Témoin, a work belonging to another? We must admit one or the other.

Fifth; while both persons involved plainly intend to intimate that Foucher is the author, nowhere is so direct a statement made as we find in Foucher's later denial.

Sixth; as to Foucher's mod-esty in the matter, it is difficult to see that he added great-ly to Hugo's credit by declaring him the author of an extreme-ly unsuccessful drama.

At any rate, believing the evidence not to be so conclus-ive as to preclude a choice, and because Amy Robsart has long been published with Victor Hugo's works, we have here followed M. Allais' example (u) in assuming, for the present, that Hugo was the principal author.[1]

---

1. Even tho Foucher be accepted as the author, Hugo's in-fluence would be reflected in the play. "De tous ceux qui fréquentèrent le Cénacle de 183[illegible], nul peut-être ne reçut, dans sa formation, de celui qui en était l'âme, une empreinte aussi profonde que Paul Foucher. Lorsque parut Amy Robsart, sa grande jeunesse le soumettait encore plus naturellement qu'aucun autre à l'influence de son beau-frère." (v)

The manuscript from which the play was performed became lost, and when the posthumous works of Hugo were published, the text of Amy Robsart followed that of the 1828 manuscript.[1] Upon the occasion of the 1902 Centenary, Paul Meurice, to whom Hugo, in his Testament littéraire, entrusted the task of editing his unpublished works, brought out a new version of the play which he claims to be "à peu près tel qu'il a été représenté en 1828 sur le théâtre de l'Odéon."(s) Without any clear proof of its authenticity, we have accepted M. Meurice's text in good faith, and based our discussion upon it; so that, unless otherwise indicated, all quotations are from the ne varietur edition of 1902.[2]

---

1. The Correspondance entre V. Hugo et Paul Meurice, published in 1909, and which might possibly have thrown some light on our subject, was not available.
2. The divergence of the texts is treated by Glachant(h) and . and by Gustave Allais.(u) In general, the first text is punctuated by asides, the language is more extravagant, and the conclusion quite different and highly melodramatic.

Chapter II. The Historical Basis of *Kenilworth*.[1]

The exact state of relations between Queen Elizabeth and her favorite, the Earl of Leicester, has been much discussed, particularly in connection with the death of the Earl's first wife, Amy Robsart Dudley.

In 1550 Robert Dudley, (he was not made Earl of Leicester until 1618 (f)), married the young daughter of Sir John Robesart. It has been supposed that the marriage was not a happy one,[2] for Amy was never presented at court, and the two lived practically separate. When Elizabeth was made Queen, Lord Robert became her favorite, and it was commonly believed that she would marry him if he were free. One faction at court favored their union, altho it is doubtful if Elizabeth ever seriously entertained the idea. Reports were given out that Amy was suffering from cancer and unlikely to live long; but gossip whispered of a plot to poison her, in order that Dudley might be free to marry the Queen. Be that as it may, on the 8th of September, 1560, Amy's servants, whom she had that day sent to Abingdon Fair, returned to find their mistress's body lying at the foot of the hall-stairs. (Amy was then living at Cumnor Place, a house near Oxford, rented by her husband's agent, Anthony Forster or Forrester).

---

1. As authority for this chapter, see (f), (g), (n), (p), (t) and (x). *Leicester's Commonwealth* was rejected as obviously unreliable? Andrew Lang, in his excellent summary of the situation, (o), cites other sources which were not available to the present writer.

2. But the Nineteenth Century, (t), gives a lengthy refutation of this point.

Lord Robert,knowing that suspicion would fall upon himself,immediately ordered a thoro investigation,[1] resulting in a statement by the coroner's jury that Amy had broken her neck by an accidental fall down the stairs.[2] Yet from that day to this,[3] the legend has persisted that Amy Robesart was murdered.

Some suspicion was formerly attached to Queen Elizabeth herself,based upon a contempory letter written by the Spanish ambassador,de Quadra,in which he says:

"The Queen told me,on her return from hunting,that Lord'Robert's wife was dead or nearly so,and begged for me to say nothing about it.Assuredly what they are doing in this matter,is a most shameful and scandalous thing." (g)

According to the first translation of the letter,this is before Amy's death actually occured;but a later translation dates this remark after the tragedy,and so would seem to remove the charge of the Queen's complicity.

The whole truth of the matter will probably never be known,[4] and the only conclusion we can draw is that,thothe Earl of Leicester was none too scrupulous a character,there is no proof of his guilt in this instance. He was accused of[5]

---

1. His letter to Thomas Blount on the day following the tragedy has the ring of sincerity. See (g).
2. The full report of the jury,with its evidence pro and con has not been unearthed. (o)
3. Certain parts of the legend have definitely been disproved. For example,that it was Forster who sent Amy's servants away, and that the body was buried before the coroner's jury was called,and so had to be exhumed.
4. Canon Jackson(t) offers three possible explanations: suicide,due to despondency or insanity;accident;or murder by some of Lord Dudley's faction,but without his knowledge or complicity. To these Lang adds a fourth:"It would be strange if the real explanation of the mystery were Sir Walter's, namely,that Leicester meant to slay Amy,that he relented,and thathis minions passed beyond their commission,and murdered (o) her.This theory would at least cover all the facts of the case".
5. The contradictory testimony of Amy's half-brother,John Appleyard,is of little value.In a mood of angerbecause the Earl refused to advance him certain fmnds,he accused the latter of "covering his sister's murder".Later,in order to be released from prison,he withdrew the charge.

several other crimes,and it is significant that the deaths in question all contributed to the Earl's personal interests, but it must be remembered that in those suspicious times any sudden death was sure to be ascribed to poisoning or violence.

In his preface to Kenilworth,Sir Walter Scott mentions the following sources,all of which echo the popular tradition:

1) Ashmole's Antiquities of Berkshire.

2) Leicester's Commonwealth,an anonymous and very slanderous book which was published abroad. This work,which has been erroneously attributed to a Jesuit,named Parsons,(x) was vigorously denounced by Queen Elizabeth and by Sir Philip Sidney,nephew to the Earl.

3) An obvious allusion in an old play (the Yorkshire Tragedy:"The only way to charm a woman's tongue
Is,break her neck---a politician did it".)

4) Mickle's Ballad of Cumnor Hall,which Scott quotes in full.

While allowing his fancy to play freely about the whole incident,Scott has kept the dark picture of Leicester's character given in the above named sources. Victor Hugo,writing his play admittedly for no other purpose than to raise money,[1] has taken over Scott's interpretation without question.[2]

---

1. "Cet ouvrage pouvant rapporter plusieurs milliers de francs,j'ai accepté d'y coopérer....mais elle (notre comédie) resterait anonyme. Je n'ai consenti à faire cet ouvrage, mon amie,que pour toi,et afin de prouver à tes parents que les lettres sont bonnes à quelquechose". (1)

2. It is extremely doubtful if Hugo could have known the story of Amy Robsart from any other source than Kenilworth

The chief historical inaccuracies of the novel are, (aside from the disputed question of the murder) :

1) The portrait of Varney. The Earl had no Master of the Horse by that name,-altho' there was in his service a Varney of very obscure position,who was never knighted. There was also a Sir Richard Verney,but of unimpeachable reputation and not in Leicester's employ.(t)

2) The reference to the Earl of Sussex as unmarri-ed. He was in fact married to one of the Sidney family.

3) Giving Amy the title,Countess of Leicester; since Dudley was not made Earl until after her death.

4) Placing Amy's death which occurred in 1560, as late as the festivities at Kenilworth (1575). Also Kenil-worth did not belong to Leicester during Amy's life.(not until 1563).(t)

5) Treating the marriage as a secret one,whereas it was publicly performed before Edward VI.

6) Introducing Amy's father into the story,since his death occurred six years before Amy 's ;changing his name from John to Hugh,and his residence from Norfolk to Devonshire

7) The character given to Foster,who was really a member of Parliament from Abingdon, and,to judge from his epitaph,a gentleman and scholar. His name should be spelled Forster.(f)

8) Making Amy's maid Foster's daughter. He had no daughter bearing the name Janet;and a Mrs.Pinto was Amy's maid at the time of the tragedy.

9) The imaginative treatment of the character of

Alasco, based upon an extravagant rumor to the effect that Leicester held communication with an Italian compounder of poisons, Dr. Julio.

10) Representing Walter Raleigh, who was abroad at the time, as being at court.

11) Placing Nicholas Blount with the Sussex faction. The Thomas Blount of history, was of Leicester's house-hold.

12) Mention of Sidney's Arcadia, which had not yet been written.

13) Anachronisms with regard to Shakespeare[1] and Marlowe. Altho the former could only have been eleven years old at this time, his Venus and Adonis, The Tempest, Midsummer Night's Dream, and Winter's Tale are either mentioned or quoted.[2]

Most of these discrepancies, which may well have been intentional with Scott, were carried over by Victor Hugo, and it is safe to say that any omissions in Amy Robsart were the natural result of his condonsation of the novel, rather than of any critical scruples about its historical foundation.

---

1. It is interesting to note that the anachronisms concerning Shakespeare and Marlowe are quite unnecessarily repeated in the play. Thus Flibbertigibbet says (Act I, sc.6): "Je joue les diables et les lutins dans les mascarades de Shakespeare et de Marlowe," and again (Act III, sc.8): "De par Shakespeare!"

2. Chapters 17, 13, 27, and 20, respectively, of Kenilworth.

Chapter III. Hugo's Simplification of the Story.

For the purposes of dramatization, Scott's rather lengthy novel with its variety of scenes, characters and incidents, would obviously require considerable cutting. So, in Amy Robsart, events are crowded together; a single environment is presented; and only the more important characters appear; thus automatically disposing of certain phases of the plot.

It is curious that the man whose work stands for the breaking-down of the rules of classicism has, in this early play, preserved the unities of time and place. The time covered in the novel, (up to Amy's death), is approximately a month.[1] To judge only from this bit of conversation, (Act I, sc.3) the action in the play would seem to be several days:

Amy____ Quant vous reverrai-je, milord?
Leicester____ Hélas! les devoirs que m'impose la présence de la reine ne le permettront pas avant deux ou trois jours....
Amy____ Deux ou trois jours!
Leicester____ Ecoute: la reine doit repartir jeudi; quand

1. The first evening, at the Black Bear Inn, includes chapters 1 and 2; the events of the next day and evening are related in ch.3-6 inclusive; on the day following, Tressilian begins his journey, ch.7-11; and "about noon of the third day after Tressilian's leaving Cumnor," that is, on the fifth day from the beginning of the story, "arrived at....Lidcote Hall." He takes his departure the same day (ch.12). Allowing the same length of time for the journey from Devonshire to London and thence to Say's Court, nearby (ch.13 and 14), the events of ch. 15 must take place on the ninth or tenth day. In this chapter, Elizabeth announces that she will speedily take up the quarrel of Sussex and Leicester, who are bidden to appear at court shortly, for this purpose. Hence there follows an uncertain lapse of time, perhaps a week, in which preparations are made for the day at court. That eventful meeting occupies ch.16-18 incl.; ch.19 and 20 are on the day following. Arrangements are then made, during perhaps a week or more, (ch.21) for the festivities at Kenilworth. Meanwhile come the events of ch.22-32, including the arrival of Amy and of Queen Elizabeth at the Castle. Ch.33-38 take up the second day of revels, ch. 39 and 40, the third day; ch.41, after some retracing of steps, carries us on into the fourth day. Thus we may estimate that the plot had its beginning and its conclusion within some thirty days. (After Amy's death, the future of the main characters is also sketched).

tu entendras la grosse cloche du château sonner le retour d'Élisabeth dans ces appartements pour les apprêts du départ, je profiterai de ce moment de répit.

But a careful study of all references to time shows that Elizabeth left Kenilworth the very next day, and that all the events are confined to a space of twenty-four hours.[1]

The setting of Kenilworth ranges freely over the southern half of England, including: the Inn of the Black Bear at Cumnor village; Cumnor Hall; the village of Woodstock, temporary stopping-place of the Earl of Leicester; the Vale of the White Horse in Berkshire, where is located the den of Wayland

---

1. In Act1, sc.1, preparations are being made for the coming of the Queen, who "sera ici dans quelques heures et y sera bientot rejointe par....Sussex." Since there is no lapse of time between scenes, we conclude, from references in scenes3 and 5 to "cette nuit," "cette nuit même ", that the whole first act is on the evening preceding the Queen's arrival. (It is strange that in scene 9 Amy should have been able to recognize her father outside the castle). It is not clear whether Elizabeth arrived later that same night, or on the following morning. At any rate she is present at the opening of Act II (We might suppose several days to have elapsed between Acts I and II were it not for a remark of Flibbertigibbet's in Act III, sc.8, "Hier je voulais épouvanter Alasco," in which the hier can refer only to Act I, sc.6):
Élisabeth___"Sussex est arrivé ce matin....il doit repartir ce soir avec moi." In scene 6, she says :"Nous voulons que ....Amy Robsart ....nous soit présentée....aujourd'hui même".
Acts III, IV and V come later in the same day:
(Act III, sc.4: on entend sonner la grosse cloche).
Amy___Ah! la grosse cloche!....Il va venir.
(Act IV, sc.2):
Leicester___Mais ce soir la reine ne sera plus à Kenilworth.
(Act IV, sc.5):
Élisabeth___Nous allons ce soir quitter Kenilworth.
(ActV, sc.2):
Flibbertigibbet___Le soleil descend derrière les arbres du parc.
(Act V, sc.3):
Leicester___Lareine, dans une heure, aura quitté Kenilworth....dès qu'elle sera partie, je reviens.
The promise, "je reviens," is fulfilled in the final scene of the play.

Smith;other scenes on the way from Cumnor to Devonshire; Lidcote Hall;in the apothecary shops of London;Sussex's residence at Says Court,near Deptford;with the Queen's barge on the Thames;the palace of Greenwich;scenes of Amy and Wayland enroute to Kenilworth;Kenilworth grounds and castle;the return journey to Cumnor Hall. But the scene of the drama is restricted to Kenilworth:[1]

Act I---a chamber at Kenilworth.

Act II---"la grande salle"at Kenilworth.

Act III---(same as Act I).

Act IV---the park at Kenilworth.

Act V---interior of the tower at Kenilworth.

By eliminating Cumnor,some of the minor characters naturally are lost,such as the inn-keeper,Giles Gosling,his daughter Cicely,and Laurence Goldthred. Michael Lambourne might very well have been retained,since he later appeared at Kenilworth,but Hugo doubtless felt that the villainous element[2]

1.Maigron,p.174,mentions the "invraisemblance"of placing Amy,in her scene with Leicester,Act I,sc.7,at Kenilworth Castle: "Cette imprudence est en contradiction flagrante avec tout le caractère de Leicester".(r)

This restriction gives rise to another objection,by Allais,who sees no excuse,in the play,for Sir Hugh's ignorance of who seduced his daughter.(u) The mistake on Sir Hugh's part was more natural,in the novel,where Amy was confined at Cumnor Hall,under Foster's guardianship;yet there is nothing so improbable in his supposing that the retainer,Varney,could keep his wife hidden in a hitherto unoccupied part of his lord's castle.

For still another blemish resulting from the unity of place,see note ,page

In the light-opera by Scribe,(w),the only other of the numerous plays taken from Kenilworth which was available to the writer,the first act is kept at Cumnor,while the last two are at Kenilworth.

2. "On s'explique difficilement que l'auteur,qui a donné une place démesurée à Flibbertigibbet et Alasco,ait si complètement sacrifié le rôle épisodique de Michael Lambourne"(r).

Neither does this character appear in Scribe's version(w).

was sufficiently embodied in Varney and Alasco.

Other characters are discarded because only pertinent to the journey to Lidcote Hall. Among these are the peasants, Dame Alison Crane, Master Crane, Gaffer Grimsby, and Jack Hostler; Will Badger, Michael Mumblazen and the curate at Lidcote; and Yogan the Jew (in London).

One of the easiest means of simplification was to reduce the list of those characters who serve as courtiers or officers to the Queen (thus Dr. Masters, the Bishop of Lincoln, Lord Willoughby, the Duchess of Rutland, the Dean of St. Asaph, Lady Derby, Lady Paget, the Earl of Oxford, Walsingham and Bowyer, Usher of the Black Rod); as retainers to the Earl of Sussex (Markham, Nicholas Blount, Walter Raleigh,[1] Tracy); or to the Earl of Leicester (as Robert Laneham, the giant porter, Laurence Steeples, the Sewer at Kenilworth castle, Robin Tider).

With the Vale of the White Horse, disappear the schoolmaster, Erasmus Holiday, Gammer Sludge, and the important character, Wayland Smith.

Another major character to be dispensed with more easily than we had supposed, is Tressilian, who, after all, was quite an ineffectual person. By bringing Sir Robsart in direct contact with the Queen, Tressilian's petitions are obviated.

---

1. In its contemporary criticism of the novel, the Quarterly (o) refers to Raleigh and Blount as "supernumeraries". Yet Raleigh's part, besides being of interest in itself, brings out one side of Elizabeth's character; and his foil, Blount, provides humor.

Also, since Varney's love for Amy is made more of in the play, it would be an unnecessary complication to have two rejected lovers.

This leaves, aside from unnamed pages, courtiers, etc., the following: Queen Elizabeth, Leicester, Sussex, Richard Varney,[1] Foster, Amy, Janet (changed to the French form Jeanette), Sir Hugh Robsart, Alasco (who was also called Dr. Demetrius or Doboobie in the novel), Lord Shrewsbury (a silent actor), and Flibbertigibbet.[2] The latter character, also known in the novel as Dickie Sludge, takes the place of Wayland Smith as a guardian angel to Amy. He is almost the sole supply of humor in the play, and so must replace to some extent Master Goldthred, Giles Gosling, peasants and other characters who contribute that element so richly to Kenilworth. Lord Hunsdon does not appear in the dramatis personae but is indicated in the stage directions (Act IV, sc. 5).

Thus it will be seen that Amy Robsart is really taken from about the last quarter of the novel (ch. 38-41 incl.), which deals with the situation at Kenilworth Castle. Some

---

1. In Scribe's Leicester (w), Walter Raleigh plays the part of Varney. This is possible without blackening his character too much, because in the opera there are no tragic results. The other characters are Leicester, Hugues Robsart, Doboobie, Lords Shrewsbury, Hunsdon and Stanley, Elizabeth, Amy and Cycili (her maid). It will be noted that Flibbertigibbet is not included. Doboobie, rendered perfectly harmless, here supplies the humor, as director of festivities for the Queen's welcome.

2. For the too-large role assigned to him, see chapter VI

scenes from earlier chapters,such as Act I,sc.7,and Act III, scene 5,are brot forward to that point,and the concluding events are made to happen at Kenilworth instead of Cumnor.[1]

---

1. In Allais s opinion,Hugo makes of the Castle of Kenilworth too fantastic a place. He cites the "fenêtre grillée",the "porte de fer",the "porte masquée"which "roule silencieusement sur ses gonds","la tour des oubliettes", "l'escalier secret","le passage secret", the "couloir dont le parquet sonne terriblement creux","la trappe des oubliettes," and compares the whole to the castle of Udolpho,in Anne Radcliffe.(u)

This effect is due to the fact that Hugo was obliged to combine the peculiarities of Cumnor Hall,where Amy met her death in the novel,with those of Kenilworth,where she was imprisoned.

Chapter IV. Divergence of Treatment.

Not only has Victor Hugo condensed and simplified Scott's romance by eliminating such matter as would render it too cumbersome for stage production, but he has treated somewhat in his own fashion those parts which have been retained. The plot is handled differently, and characters appear in a different light, as will be shown in the two chapters following.

The first indication of this variance in viewpoint might be found in the respective titles. Since Scott manifests a preference for place-names rather than the names of characters as titles for his novels, the fact that he calls this one Kenilworth[1] does not necessarily imply that the story of Amy Robsart is not his principal theme. It is interesting to observe that, of the plays founded upon this novel, some take Kenilworth, some Amy Robsart, some Leicester, and some Elizabeth as their title. (We confess, if we had been writing such a play, we might even have gone so far as to name it Richard Varney). Maigron says[2]: "La pauvre Amy Robsart est une ravissante et séduisante créature, toute d'amour candide et de naïveté passionnée et confiante....Voilà certes les éléments d'un beau drame, d'un drame terrible à donner des frissons et à faire couler les larmes; et on ne peut pas dire qu'il ne soit pas développé dans Kenilworth; mais cette mélancolique et douloureuse histoire avec son dénoument si horrible n'est pas le sujet du roman. On sent bien que l'auteur ne la conte pas pour elle-même et qu'elle n'est que le cadre, très intéressant sans doute, mais enfin le cadre d'un tableau dont presque tous les détails sont empruntés à l'histoire et que l'intrigue ne fait que dramatiser",

---

1. To please Constable. His own preference was for Cumnor Hall.(q)
2. Book I, chapter 4, page 82.(r)

Canning is of the same opinion:"The ill-fated heroine, Amy Robsart,and her rejected lover,Edmund Tressilian,....do not take much active part....It(the novel)dwells chiefly on the joyous court of Queen Elizabeth at its most peaceful time and adorned as it was with so many attractions." (c) This is certainly not true of Hugo's production,altho the court-scenes play an important part. Unless Amy Robsart be his main subject,there would be no justification for his change of title,(Except,indeed,to distinguish it from the Château de Kenilworth and the Leicester which had already appeared at Paris.)[1] and we may expect to find the interest focused upon her more sharply than is the case in the novel.

1.See Appendix.

Chapter V. The Characters.

Amy.

Altho the attitude and actions of the other principal characters,-Leicester,Varney and Elizabeth,-deeply concern Amy's happiness,Walter Scott only gives occasional hints of her state of mind thru it all. Hugo's Amy expresses her thots and feelings freely.[1] To be sure a character on the stage is required to be more articulate than in another form of literature,where the author himself may explain the psychology of a situation;but the result of this outspokenness in the French version is to give a different impression of Amy. This is especially noticeable in the latter part of the story. In the first half of Kenilworth Amy appears more loquacious,but from the moment she sets out with Wayland for Kenilworth castle she is silent and brooding,and has very few speeches in the remainder of the book. This is partly because she is too proud

---

1. By way of example:
(Act I sc.7)

Leicester,-
C'est l'ordre de Saint-André....Il me fut conféré à l'époque où l'on croyait que la jeune douairière de France et d'Écosse,cette infortunée Marie Stuart,ne refuserait pas d'épouser un baron anglais.

Amy,-
Mais ne vaut-il pas mieux être un libre seigneur d'Angleterre,que de partager avec une femme ce triste royaume des rochers du Nord? J'aurais,quant à moi,toujours préféré le main de Dudley à celle de tous les souverains de la terre.Assurément tu ne crois pas que l'amour d'une reine serait plus tendre et plus ardent que l'amour de ton Amy?

(ch.7. The Earl is speaking)

"It(the Order of Saint Andrew)was bestowed on me when it was thought the young widow of France and Scotland would gladly have wedded an English baron,but a free coronet of England is worth a crown matrimonial held at the humor of a woman,and owning only the poor rocks and bogs of the north."

The countess paused,as if what the Earl last said had excited some painful but interesting train of thought;and, as she still remained silent, her husband proceeded.

to confide her troubles and suspicions,and partly because the author becomes absorbed in painting a brilliant picture of Queen Elizabeth and her courtiers. Amy's mute suffering in the last chapter renders her an even more pathetic figure than in the concluding act of the play. It would seem that "her very silence and her patience speak to the people,and they pity her",for even the gruff Foster is touched,and Varney forbears to annoy her altho she is in his power. Now,to return to the play,we are allowed to see Amy's reaction to each new development:

(Act III,sc.7.)
"Est-ce que réellement je ne rêve pas? Ce que me disait ce Varney,c'est donc possible!c'est donc réel! le crime de Dudley m'est affirmé!par la voix de mon père! Hélas! je suis maintenant si peu de chose dans ce monde ma place y est si ignorée,que l'on parle devant moi de ce qui me déchire les entrailles comme d'une nouvelle indifférente,ou même heureuse! Ainsi,demain,oui,demain peut-être,sans que la mort ait visité Kenilworth,il n'y aura plus de lord ni de lady Leicester! Lui,sera roi d'Angleterre,et moi!"

(Act IV,sc.3).
"J'ai abandonné mon père pour suivre mon mari,et voilà qu'aujourd'hui je n'ai plus qu'une idée,c'est de quitter mon mari pour rejoindre mon père. Leicester! est-il possible qu'après avoir tenté de me faire passer pour la femme de ton valet,tu aies voulu m'empoisonner! Hélas! qui peut une lâcheté peut un crime. Où est-il,le grand comte,le noble Dudley? Tout est fini! Il n'y a plus pour lui dans mon âme une étincelle d'amour;le mépris a tout éteint. Je ne le hais même pas."

(Act V,sc.4)
"Adieu!....Il y a quelque chose de saisissant dans ce mot; c'est comme si l'on se renvoyait à l'éternité! Seule! me voilà de nouveau seule. Pourquoi les idées tristes reviennent-elles m'assaillir? Ne vais-je pas être heureuse? Ne vais-je pas être libre,libre de le voir,de l'entendre,libre de l'aimer? --J'ai la tête et le corps brisés;les émotions de cette journée m'ont accablée. Ne serait-il pas bon de prendre quelque repos au moment de commencer ce voyage....ce voyage qui va me mener au bonheur? O mon Dudley,quel doux avenir!--l'exil,mais un exil où tu seras;--quelque retraite bien obscure;--de longues journées près de toi;à tes côtés;--une vie toute d'amour! d'amour...,"

And finally, as she rushes out at the sound of the horn, (where, in Scott, she says not a word):

(Act V, sc.6)
"Quel est ce bruit? N'est-ce pas le cor? Rien, que le vent qui siffle dans les brêches du donjon. C'est peut-être ce qui m'a réveillée. Tant mieux d'ailleurs! je faisais un rêve affreux....Mais, oui, je ne me trompais pas, c'est bien le cor, voilà le signal.--Des torches, des chevaux, des hommes armés. Oui, voilà mon Dudley! Il descend de cheval, il aide mon père à descendre. Qu'il est beau, mon Dudley! Ah! je le lui ai promis, courons à sa rencontre, épargnons-lui de rentrer dans cette prison....O mon Dieu, c'est à toi que je me recommande maintenant! Mon Dudley, je suis à toi!"

Also, Scott dwelt less upon Amy's jealous suspicions. In fact it is not clear whether the Countess ever fully understands the situation. Some indications are given, but, by virtue of the novel's greater bulk, do not stand out:

(ch.7, Amy speaking)
"did you desire it (the avowal of the marriage) half as much as you say,...."

(ch.22, Amy speaking)
"I bore it all with pleasure while I was sure he loved me."

Yet she refuses to believe that the note Varney brings is from her lord.

In chapter 25, her doubts and fears on the way to the Castle arise partly from the act of disobedience she is committing. Altho the chance remarks she overhears about Leicester and the Queen naturally have a disquieting effect, she still can say,
"I know my noble Dudley well! He will be something impatient at my disobeying him, but Amy will weep, and Dudley will forgive her."

(chapter 26)
She seems to entertain no doubts of the results of her letter to Leicester, to be delivered by Wayland, altho she cautions the latter to "mark how he looks on receiving it."

(chapter 33, Amy, as she looks out of the window at the festivities)

"O Leicester! after all---all that thou hast said-hast sworn, that Amy was thy life, thy love, can it be that thou art the magician at whose nod these enchantments arise, and that she sees them as an outcast, if not a captive?"

In chapter 35, upon learning from Leicester himself that he wishes her to pose as Varney's wife, she manifests surprise and indignation, and adds "Amy's life will not long darken your brighter prosperity".

When taken back to Cumnor, (ch.41), she still suspects Varney's villainy more than the Earl's; yet she says she would she were in her grave. She is now patiently resigned; and while she says nothing of what is going in her mind, it is possible that the whole truth has come home to her, during her silent journey.

But in the play her consciousness of the intrigue is b brought out very plainly. Her first inkling of Leicester's deceit comes in the conversation with Varney (Act III, sc.5)

Amy---"Mon Dieu! qu'est-ce que cachent ces menaçantes paroles? Vous m'annoncez des changements de fortune.....La Reine est à Kenilworth--mon mari lui donne des fêtes, il est son favori ----Se pourrait-il?",

but after learning Varney's purpose toward herself she rejects his testimony, until it is corroborated by her father (Act V, sc.6). In Act III, scene 8, Flibbertigibbet informs her plainly of the poisoned drink prepared at Leicester's command. In her scene with Elizabeth she learns even more: (act IV, sc.4)

Élizabeth---"c'est en présence du noble comte de Leicester, son maître, que Varney s'est déclaré ton mari."

The most direct expression of jealousy is in Act V, scene 1:

AMY.-"Dudley!---Je vais m'en aller,et tu resteras à cette Elisabeth,qui est reine! O supplice!et que la jalousie est douloureuse et poignante quand on va mourir!"

In Act V, scene 2, she reviews the situation:

"Quand j'aurais la liberté, qu'est-ce que je ferais de la vie? Dudley ne m'est-il pas infidèle? Dudley ne m'a-til pas voulu empoisonner? Dudley ne m'abandonnait-il pas à son Varney? Dudley ne va-t-il pas épouser Elisabeth?"

But immediately thereafter her faith is completely restored by Flibbertigibbet's reply:

"Ta,ta,ta, c'est vieux cela,madame. La décoration a changé. Votre Dudley n'est pas infidèle,il n'a point tenté de vous empoisonner,il ne vous livrait pas à son écuyer Satan-Varney,et, loin de songer à épouser la reine,il machine en ce moment contre elle un acte de haute trahison,je veux dire votre délivrance."...."C'est Varney qui a tout tramé,tout imaginé, tout supposé,et tout fait---seul,tout!"

Thus Amy has been deluded,disillusioned,and again deluded,and it is in this latter state that she meets her death___ a second reason that the conclusion of the novel,where her cloud is never lifted,has more of real pathos. But to have Amy rush out to her destruction at the crowning moment of her joy heightens the dramatic effect.

Scott pictures Amy as something of a spoiled child,altho not without amiable qualities,as shown by her kindness to Janet. In the first scene in which she makes her appearance in the play,the incident of her begging for Flibbertigibbet's life puts her in a tender light. Her consideration for her servants is shown by this speech,uttered at a time when she might excusably have been wrapped up in her own disappointments:(Act III,sc.8)

AMY.-"A quoi bon boire ceci?---Cependant, ces bons serviteurs qui m'ont préparé ce breuvage,qui se sont dit 'cela fera du bien à notre pauvre maîtresse!',dedaignerai-je leurs soins? Il n'y a plus au monde que ces deux coeurs qui

s'intéressent à moi,il n'y a plus que ce concierge et cette servante qui aient pitié de la comtesse de Leicester;puis qu' ils veulent me soigner,je leur dois au moins de me laisser faire."

Another point in favor of Hugo's Amy is that her lack of filial devotion is not so evident. In chapter 7 of the novel she does express sincere feeling for her father's distress,but after that she seems to have dismissed him entirely from her thots. We resent this the more because of the touching picture of Sir Hugh's illness and loneliness at Lidcote Hall. In the drama ,altho the father does not have so stong a claim upon her sympathy,she cannot resist the temptation to ease his anxiety by revealing her true position,and it is not her fault if the intrusion of Varney causes her plan to miscarry. She remembers her father at the moment of her sorrow,and when her hopes return,he seems to share her thots almost equally with Leicester.

Almost her last action,in the play,is to check her impatient rush to meet her lover,long enuf to kneel in prayer. Altogether,it is a sprightly and tender portrait which Hugo has given us;not without certain touches to remind us of the girlish vanity ascribed to her in the novel. But she was by no means a colorless personage to start with,as might have been the case with the majority of Scott's heroines,for Amy is one of his few well drawn women.

And, to me, the heroine of the play is not the particular Amy of the novel, the proud provincial beauty, reared in idle vanity and carried away by romantic love, but so strongly intrenched in the dignity of her virtue that she refuses for one moment to accept Varney's name, even when so commanded by the Earl in person.[1] Hugo has levelled her personal traits somewhat, and made her conform to the conventional type of the woman who loves and gives all.

Queen Elizabeth

On the other hand, the strong individuality of Queen Elizabeth, her arrogant impulsive nature coupled with warm impulses and a desire to deal justly with her subjects, is practically unchanged. Both here and in the novel, (where she forms a striking contrast to the passivity of Amy's role), we are shown her immediate reaction at each stage of the situation. Many examples of this might be given, but the following should suffice:

(Act II, sc.1. Her reply to the Earl's declaration of love)

ÉLISABETH.- Ce nom dont vous m'appelez me rend à moi-même. Hélas! la reine, par moments, s'oublie pour ne se rappeler que la femme. Si j'étais comme les autres, libre de consulter mon coeur, alors peut-être....

(ch.34) "No, Dudley, said Elizabeth, yet it was with broken accents--"No, I must be the mother of my people. Other ties, that make the lowly maiden happy, are denied to her Sovereign.--No, Leicester, urge it no more---were I as others, free to seek my own happiness-then indeed--but it cannot--cannot be...."

---

1. In Act IV, sc.5, Amy tells Elizabeth that she is Varney's wife; in the novel never.

And her soliloquy afterwards:

(Act II, sc.3)
-Élisabeth.- Pourquoi suis-je reine? La fille de Henri VIII, femme de Dudley! cela ne peut. Ah! c'est qu'il est si grand, si noble! son regard est si tendre et si fier! Mais l'épouser serait abdiquer! Que dis-je? N'est-ce pas lui qui règne?

(ch.34)
The Queen stood gazing after him, and murmured to herself--"Were it possible--were it but possible! but no--no--Elizabeth must be the wife and mother of England alone."

(Act II, sc.4. When Sussex and Leicester hesitate to show conciliation:)
ÉLISABETH.- Quel est celui de vous, milords de Sussex et de Leicester, qui veut goûter de notre pain de la Tour de Londres? Nous sommes ici l'hôtesse de l'un de vous; mais, par la mort de Dieu! il se pourrait qu'avant peu l'un de vous fût notre hôte. Pour la dernière fois, obéissez et donnez-vous cordialement la main.

(ch.16) "My Lords of Sussex and Leicester, I bid you once more to join hands---and, God's death! he that refuses shall taste of our tower fare ere he see our face again. I will lower your proud hearts ere we part, and that I promise, on the word of a Queen!"

We may expect to find, as a part of what the French call le grossissement de la scène, that, like Amy, she expresses emotion more freely and in stronger terms.[1] Not only this, but her attitude toward the Earl seems to have more of real affection and less of gratified vanity in the play, for her susceptibility to the attentions of other courtiers, such as Raleigh, is not shown. In her audience with Varney (Act II, sc.5) we are spared the picture of her weakness given in the novel, where she accepts with evident pleasure the compliments of "that

---

1. Note the two versions of Elizabeth's speech of forgiveness after the stormy scene in which she confronts Leicester with Amy:
(Act IV, sc.5) ÉLISABETH.-Ah! c'est bon, que c'est bon, après avoir erré, douté, souffert, que c'est bon de respirer, de se retrouver, de croire! Ah! mes amis, mes bons amis, j'ai été tout à l'heure un peu méchante et injuste, n'est-ce pas? Cette folle m'avait affolée. Par bonheur,

(ch.34) "Discord, as the Italian poet says, will find her way into peaceful convents, as well as into the privacy of families; and we fear our own guards and ushers will hardly exclude her from our courts. My Lord of Leicester, you are offended with us, and we have

very cloak-brushing, shoe-cleaning fellow"[1] whom even Amy had scorned.

Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester.

Since M. Allais[2] has confined his comparison of Amy Robsart and Kenilworth almost entirely to the impressions given of the character of Leicester, we cannot do better than quote from his excellent analysis:

"Ame passionnée, esprit incertain, caractère faible, tel est le personnage de Leicester dans Walter Scott. Il est partagé entre l'amour et l'ambition mais l'ambition n'endurcit pas son coeur; il a pour Amy une tendresse réelle, sérieuse et profonde. Malheureusement, il n'a que trop de confiance en Varney; il est trop prompt aux soupçons et à la jalousie....Malgré ses faiblesses et ses erreurs, Leicester reste toujours un noble gentilhomme aux sentiments fiers, élevés et généreux. Dans le drame français il est tout défiguré; après une jolie scène avec Amy(acte I, sc.VII), où l'on retrouve le héros du roman anglais, il devient peu à peu antipathique et nous laisse finalement une très mauvaise impression.

"Il y a particulièrement une situation(3) où il faudrait beaucoup d'art pour nous faire comprendre, accepter, sinon excuser, son peu de vaillance morale. Je veux parler de la grande scène à la cour, devant la reine et les grands seigneurs du royaume. Cette scène est supérieurement traitée par Walter Scott(Kenilworth, ch. XVI)....

---

tout ceci se passait entre nous, devant vous qui m'aimez. Et qui aime pardonne! et vous me pardonnez parce que vous m'aimez! Oh! moi aussi, mes féaux, je vous aime, je vous aime!

right to be offended with you. We will take the lion's part upon us, and be the first to forgive."

And also her apostrophe to the sword, a touch which met with applause from even Hugo's difficult audience:

(ActII, sc.6)ÉLISABETH.-Épée! toi qui défends le droit et l'honneur, mais que mon sexe, hélas! m'interdit de porter; épée! épée! te voilà! je te tiens, épée!.... Ah, si j'eusse été homme, nul de mes peres n'eût aimé autant que moi voir reluire une bonne épée. Si le ciel m'avait douée de quelque beauté, c'est dans ces miroirs-là que j'aurais plaisir à me regarder!

(ch.32)"Had I been a man", she said, "methinks none of my ancestors would have loved a good sword better. As it is with me, I like to look on one, and could...even trim my hair and arrange my headgear in such a steel mirror as this".

1. Kenilworth, ch.22 2. See Foreword.
3. In Amy Robsart this is ActII, sc.4 and 6.

"Ainsi Walter Scott,dès le début de la scène,s'attache à nous bien faire saisir la lutte qui se passe dans le coeur de Leicester;déjà l'ambition et l'amour-propre étouffent en lui tous autres sentiments. Le romancier,pour expliquer l'état moral d'un personnage,dispose de moyens que n'a pas l'auteur dramatique. Leicester garde le silence,et cependant on se rend fort bien compte du trouble de son âme;transporté au théâtre,le même personnage,s'il reste muet,paraîtra indifférent...."

"Je me suis attaché à faire ressortir avec quel art le romancier anglais nous dépeint l'attitude de Leicester,nous explique son état d'âme,nous mène peu à peu,par une gradation continue et finement nuancée de l'intérêt dramatique, jusqu'à cette malheureuse parole[1] où le comte abdique finalement toute loyauté et toute sincérité. La situation était fort délicate;et l'auteur l'a traitée avec une adresse une légèreté de main qui révèlent un talent consommé. En 1821,Walter Scott était en effet à son apogée;en 1822,Victor Hugo n'etait qu'un débutant."

After discussing Leicester's conference with Varney(Act III,sc.1) and the scene before Elizabeth,in the park(Act IV, sc.5),he concludes:

"Ainsi l'impression que laisse ce personnage dans les trois grandes scènes capitales de son rôle est des plus fâcheuses.Pour compenser une telle impression,il faudrait une autre scène où le comte de Leicester,revenu à plus de franchise,de loyauté,de dignité,avouerait hautement à la reine qu'Amy est sa femme. C'est justement ce qui a lieu dans Walter Scott;il y a,au chapitre XLI de Kenilworth, une scène violente où Leicester fait vaillamment cet aveu;et Élisabeth,doublement blessée et comme reine et comme femme, s'abandonne à une véhémente indignation. La situation est émouvante;Victor Hugo l'a complètement laissée de côté;c'est là une lacune regrettable.[2] De cette façon,le rôle de Leicester reste incomplet,et nous ne voyons en lui qu'un pleutre,dont l'honneur sombre dans une lâcheté odieuse.

Et,ici,dirai-je en finissant,se marque bien nettement la différence entre les conditions du roman et celles du theatre. Pourquoi Leicester nous paraît-il moins vil et moins odieux chez Walter Scott que dans la pièce française? Cependant,à ne regarder que ses actes,ils sont exactement les mêmes de part et d'autre. Seulement l'écrivain anglais

---

1.He is referring to the Earl's equivocal reply,when asked by Elizabeth if Varney had married Amy(ch.XVI):"To the best of my belief---indeed,on my certain knowledge---she is a wedded wife," of which Allais says:"Voilà la parole décisive celle qui constitue la grande,l'irrépable faiblesse du comte."

2.Scribe makes use of this redeeming scene,in his "Leicester."

met un art infini à nous faire comprendre l'attitude et l'état d'âme du personnage. C'est que le romancier peut prendre son temps pour décrire,peindre,analyser,expliquer, nuancer,tous moyens dont ne peut user l'auteur dramatique, entraîné et pressé qu'il est par l'action. Mais ce n'est pas tout,il y a un autre moyen,d'un emploi absolument impossible pour l'auteur dramatique,et dont le romancier peut tirer d'excellents effets;c'est de faire oublier plus ou moins longtemps au lecteur tel ou tel personnage,qui s'est mis dans une situation trop fâcheuse. Et c'est là précisément ce qui a lieu pour Leicester,dans Walter Scott,pendant le développement de la scène du jardin....Dans une même scène, c'est successivement,c'est seulement l'un après l'autre,que nous voyons agir et que nous entendons parler chacun des personnages.Si donc l'un de ces personnages ne parle pas, nous ne faisons plus attention à lui,nous l'oublions;pour nous,il disparaît. Or voyez Leicester chez Walter Scott,dans la scène du jardin;une fois prononcée sa fière réplique aux menaces de la reine Élisabeth,il ne dit plus mot. Ainsi notre intention(sic) s'éloigne de lui,il s'efface,il recule à l'arrière-plan,il est enveloppé de pénombre,nous lui savons gré de ne plus être devant nos yeux,et l'impression odieuse qui s'attache à lui en est très atténuée.

Au théâtre,il n'est pas possible de procéder ainsi. Un personnage en scène pourra bien,si son rôle le permet,s'éloi-gner réellement,se dissimuler derrière d'autres personnes ou même disparaître totalement. Mais,si son rôle est d'être là,malgré tout,et même,____comme c'est le cas pour Leicester___ d'être sur la devant de la scène,tout à fait au premier plan,il faut bien qu'il y reste;même s'il ne dit mot,nous l'avons devant nous.....Ainsi donc,notre personnage de premier plan,si son rôle l'oblige à rester là,même pour ne rien dire, continuera d'être sous nos yeux,et il nous sera impossible de l'oublier,de ne plus penser à lui,de détourner entièrement de lui notre attention,puisqu'il s'impose à nous; nous continuerons à le voir réellement,en chair et en os,réduit à l'état de personnage muet,de mannequin stupide;et s'il fait, comme Leicester,des efforts inutiles pour parler[1],nous continuerons à trouver ses gestes ridicules;si,comme Leicester, il nous est antipathique,nous continuerons à trouver sa présence désagréable,son attitude odieuse....Un tel rôle....est intolérable au théâtre."(u)

But there is another point to be brought out in this connection. Hugo has skillfully counterbalanced,to some degree,the disadvantage mentionned by M.Allais,by stressing

---

1.He speaks elsewhere of the invraisemblance of Leicester's attempting four times to inform the Queen of the true state of affairs about Amy,and of being interrupted or silenced by the Queen each time. Notice that the same device is used in Act III,sc.6,to prevent Amy's explanation to her father.

Amy'sdanger,(the Queen's charge against her is made much graver),so that Leicester is actuated by fear of the Queen's vengeance upon her,and not solely,as in Scott,by selfish motives:

(Act III,sc.1) VARNEY.-Je vous dis que vous exposez vôtre tête,mais d'abord et surtout une tête adorée.

LEICESTER.-Amy!mon Amy en péril!.... Varney,il suffit. Tu as raison. Ce que tu as fait est bien fait.

VARNEY.(à part)- Enfin!....je le tiens.

LEICESTER.-Avant tout,il faut sauver Amy,Varney!

VARNEY.-Et pour la sauver?

LEICESTER.-Allons soit,qu'elle passe pour être____ce que tu as dit à la reine.

And again,inAct IV,sc.2:

VARNEY.-Et la comtesse n'est pas plus en sûreté que vous. La reine pourra épargner l'homme qu'elle aime;épargnerait-elle la rivale qu'elle déteste?

LEICESTER.-Oui,et c'est devant ce danger d'Amy qu'à présent je recule.

In the final scene before Elizabeth(Act IV,sc.5),it is only after Varney's warning:"Vous la perdez!" that Leicester gives up his attempt to explain the truth to his sovereign. After this scene,he makes amends by deciding to renounce his ambition,for Amy's sake;to rescue her from prison and defy the Queen.

It should also be borne in mind that in the novel Leicester definitely consents to Amy's murder,[1] and after it occurs he soon forgets her,continuing in the same path as before. But in Amy Robsart,he is entirely unaware of Varney's

1.Having,however,a much stronger motive for it in the belief that Amy is untrue to him. When this suspicion is removed,he tries in vain to recall Varney.

plan until apprised of it by Alasco, when it is already too late; and at the conclusion we get a vivid impression of his repentance.

Richard Varney

With the possible exception of Queen Elizabeth, there is no more complete transference to the play of a character-portrayal in the novel than in the case of Varney. By narrowing the plot, Hugo has produced, whether consciously or not, some degree of variation in each of the other characters; but there is nothing about the nature or the methods of Varney which is not brought out in one of his speeches. Scene 1 of Act I and scene 1 of Act III are skillfully compounded of bits from all the conversations in Kenilworth between Varney and Leicester. The first line of the drama strikes the key-note of their relations:

LEICESTER.-Tu as raison, Varney, quoique tes conseils ne soient peut-être pas ceux de ma conscience,

and Varney sums up his own character in the words: "Jouer le tout pour le tout, c'est ma manière." (Act V, sc. 5)

M. Allais remarks that the character of Varney is more revolting, in Hugo, because he is supposed to be in love with the woman he murders. "Présenté ainsi, Varney n'est plus cet ambitieux, sombre, entier, tragique, presque infernal-que nous peignait Walter Scott;[1] le voilà réduit aux médiocres proportions et au rôle un peu ridicule de galantin prétentieux. D'autre part, il lui faudra redevenir, à la fin de la pièce, le démon malfaisant que l'on sait; lui qui prétendait aimer

1. But this absence of any touch of human feeling, in the Varney of the novel, is the very thing deplored in an English journal of the day, the Quarterley (o).

Amy Robsart, c'est lui-même qui va organiser alors le piège destiné à la faire périr. Mais, à ce moment-là, il nous paraîtra encore plus odieux que dans le roman de Walter Scott; il étonnera même Alasco, qui pourtant n'est ni tendre ni bien scrupuleux....La conduite de Varney est abominable, en effet; elle est plus révoltante encore, je le répète, que chez Walter Scott. Dans le roman anglais, Varney n'a que de l'indifférence pour Amy Robsart; il y a même, entre eux, une certaine antipathie." (u)

It is true that his love for Amy is not so much dwelt upon in the novel, yet it is mentioned in an earlier chapter: "She loves me not---I would it were as true that I loved not her!" (ch.5), and we understand that he has already made some overtures to her in an unwise moment.

His reaction to her death is virtually the same in both versions:

(Act V, sc.7)

VARNEY.-(il entre lentement et d'un air égaré)- Est-ce fait?--Oui, j'ai entendu le bruit....Plus personne! C'est fait.-Eh bien, quoi! c'est fini! est-ce que tu as peur, Varney? Non, mais c'est égal, allons hors d'ici, allons à l'air libre. Et réjouis-toi, Richard Varney! ta fortune est faite!

(ch.41)

At the same instant, Varney called in at the window, in an accent and tone which was an indescribable mixture betwixt horror and raillery, "Is the bird caught?--is the deed done?"

Flibbertigibbet[1]

We miss the droll description of Dickie Sludge, and the recital of his pranks. He here takes on the character of a guardian angel to Amy---a part of Wayland Smith's role in the novel---because she has saved him from Leicester's anger. (Act I, sc.7)

Hugo has also made him seem older.[2] In the scene just

---

1. An onomatopoeic word for unmeaning chatter (N.E.Dict.) Also used by Shakespeare as the name of a fiend (King Lear, III scene 4; IV, scene 1)

2. Scott shows him to be, in appearance, "about twelve or thirteen years old, though he was probably, in reality, a year or two older" (ch.9)

mentioned,we see that the instinct of gallantry is already awakened in him. And he pries into the secrets of his superiors not so much from impish curiosity as because of the ascendency he gains thereby. "Je connais,de plus,vos secrets; ce qui fait que vous me craignez et que je ne vous crains pas"(Act I,sc.6)."Me taire étant la seule supériorité qui me reste devant vous,je ne vois pas pourquoi j'y renoncerais." (Act I,sc.7).

Neither is he the ignorant peasant lad of the novel. He makes reference to "le triple souffle de Cerbère"(Act III, sc.8),and to Aldebaran:"Elle était pâle comme une morte,la voilà rose comme une fiancée. Ces jeunes filles changent de couleur plus souvent et plus vite que l'étoile Aldebaran" (Act V,sc.3),and pretends to a wide acquaintance with tragedies,comedies,and pantomimes:"De par Shakespeare! entre un mari qui vous empoisonne en guise de divorce et un Varney qui vous convoite,il n'est qu'un parti d'usage immémorial dans toutes les tragédies,comédies et pantomimes:la fuite." (Act III,sc.8).[1]

But altho his personality has changed,he is none the less interesting and amusing. It is of him that the Globe ,Feb.,1828said:"Un rôle entier plein de hardiesse et d'esprit". (u)

It is not quite clear in just what capacity he is employed by Varney. At any rate,he seems to do the opposite of what his master has intended,being the only one in the play who is able to circumvent the villain.

---

1. In one instance ,he is so learned as to be beyond our comprehension;at least we have been unable to interpret his references in:"j'assistais incognito,comme le jaloux Odragonal,aux entretiens du beau Mériandre et de la belle Indamira".(Act I,sc.7).

Foster

Of "that incomparable trio of villains, the roystering Lambourne, the miserly Foster, and the universal villain Varney", it is really only the last-named that we have left, for tho Foster appears, his part in the drama is negligible and his character has been denatured. He appears only in scene 8 of Act I, where he makes a single insignificant statement, and in scene 3 of Act III, where his raison d'être is to announce to Amy her father's arrival; he is a silent witness tto scene 4 of the same act. Thus his role is entirely colorless, and could just as well have been performed by Jeanette. The only trace of the surly character of the novel is in Varney's reference to him as "notre vieux et rébarbatif concierge, Foster" (Act I, sc.1).

Whereas, in the original, he was Varney's partner in crime, there is nothing here to indicate that he knows the contents of the drink prepared for Amy and which he, Foster, sends to her by Jeanette (Act III, sc.7). Amy certainly does not consider him a villain for she speaks of "ces bons serviteurs.. ,,Il n'y a plus au monde que ces deux coeurs qui s'intéressent à moi, il n'y a plus que ce concierge et cette servante (Jeanette) qui aient pitié de la comtesse de Leicester" (Act III, sc.8). He has nothing to do with her death; indeed, after Act III the author seems to forget him. We should like to know what he is doing during the events of Act V.

Nothing is retained of the very interesting character study presented, in Kenilworth, of Tony Fire-the Fagot.

Alasco.

Much of the role which Scott assigned to Anthony Foster

is here absorbed by Alacco. His conversation with Varney(Act I,sc.5)which makes clear the relations each one has with the Earl,is a parallel to chapter 5 of the novel,which serves the same purpose with regard to Varney and Foster;while Alasco's and Varney's conference about Amy's death is similar to the passage between Varney and Foster in the concluding chapter of Kenilworth. The very words of Foster's comment on the murder are put into Alasco's mouth:

(Act V,sc.5)

ALASCO.- C'est horrible! trouver dans son amour le moyen de sa mort! tu feras bouillir l'agneau dans le lait de sa mère!

(ch.41)

"Oh,if there be judgment in Heaven thou hast deserved it,"said Foster,"and wilt meet it!--Thou hast destroyed her by means of her best affection. It is a seething of the kid in the mother's milk!"

The most interesting feature of Alasco's character,his deception of himself[1] by the "sciences"thru which he was able to deceive others,has been carried over in the play:

(Act I,sc.5)

ALASCO.-Pourquoi pas? puisqu'ils m'épargnaient un temps précieux plus utilement réservé à l'observation de la nature occulte, à la conquête de la science universelle. Encore un pas,et j'aurai pénétré jusqu'au fond du laboratoire de la création, et je tiendrai dans mes mains la semence de l'or! et ce cera mon tour--entends-tu?--d'être ton maître,insolent favori du favori!

(ch.18)

"Thou art right,Master Varney",said the alchymist,setting his teeth close and grinding them together--"thou art right,even in thy very contempt of right and reason. For what thou say'st in mockery,may in sober verity chance to happen ere we meet again. If the most venerable sages of ancient days have spoken the truth---if the most learned of our own have rightly received it---. ...if all this is so, and if there remains but one step--one little step--betwixt my long,deep,and dark,and subterranean progress,and that blaze of light which shall show Nature watching her richest and her most glorious

---

1. As Varney puts it,addressing Alasco in the novel:"I believe thee to be so perfect---so very perfect,in the mystery of cheating,that,having imposed upon all mankind,thou hast at length,in some measures,imposed upon thyself;and

> productions in the very cradle--one step betwixt dependence and the power of sovereignty---one step betwixt poverty and such a sum of wealth as earth, without that noble secret, cannot minister from all her mines in the o old or new-found world--if this be all so, is it not reasonable that to this I dedicate my future life, secure, for a brief period of studious patience, to rise above the mean dependence upon favorites, by which I am now enthralled?"

Allais criticizes the amount of attention which the author has given to Alasco and his occult sciences.

His belief in a future life is borrowed from the Foster of the novel:

(Act I, sc.5)"Il n'y a pas que ce monde, il y a l'autre!";and his comment upon Varney(Act I, sc.6),"Cet homme n'a pas de conscience;il ne croit seulement pas à l'enfer!". His fear of Flibbertigibbet as a ghost seems a little ridiculous, especially since he had already heard the latter's voice in another connection(Act V, sc.1).

The mutual contempt of Varney and Alasco is illustrated by their farewell epithets(Act I, sc.5):

VARNEY.-Sur ce, a dieu, empoisonneur!
ALASCO.-Au revoir, donc, scélérat!

suggested by the passage in Kenilworth where Alasco says:"For what do I take thee, Richard Varney!____Why, for a worse devil than I have been myself. But I am in your toils, and must serve you till my term be out," and Varney mutters to himself:"Worse than thee, thou poisoning quacksalver and witchmonger, who, if thou art not a bounden slave to the devil, it is only because he disdains such an apprentice! Iam a mortal

---

without ceasing to dupe others, hast become a species of dupe to thine own imagination. Blush not for it, man.....None but thyself could have gulled thee."(ch.18)

man,and seek by mortal means the gratifications of my passions,and advancement of my prospects___Thou art a vassal of hell itself."(ch.18) With regard to thesetwo,Amy may well have thought herself 'between the devil and the deep sea'.

In Act III,sc. 2, we have Varney warning Alasco not to poison her;in Act V,sc.5,it is Alasco warning Varney against the trapdoor murder. Our final impression of Alasco is the more favorable,for his last words are in protest:"Ne fais pas cela,Varney! ne fais pas cela!"and soon afterwards it develops that he has informed Leicester of Varney's treachery.

Jeannette

The relationship of Jeannette to Foster is not indicated in the play;she refers to him as 'Foster' and not as 'mon père'. There is nothing to suggest here Puritan tendencies,except the style of dress called for.[1] Compare,in the novel,her taste for religious books and for the Rev. Holdforth's sermons,and her disapproval of jewels. Whereas she assists in the action of the novel by arranging Amy's flight with Wayland Smith,her only contribution to the action of the drama is in preparing us for Sir Hugh's appearance,and as the innocent instrument of Varney in bringing in the prepared drink. Her affection and solicitude for her mistress are evident in the few scenes in which she appears. Amy calls her "Esprit simple,qui s'imagine que les plaies de l'âme peuvent se guérir avec les remèdes du corps"(Act IIIm sc.3);further reference has been quoted in the discussion of Foster. Like Foster,she disappears from the drama at the

1.See Hugo's instructions as to costumes,in the Notes to the 1902 edition.

point where Amy has most need of her.

Sir Hugh Robsart

Of Amy's father, who contributes no small share to the pathos of the novel, we have here a much hardier tho less interesting picture. The story demands that some representative of Amy's family be at hand, to plead her cause before the Queen, and it seems more natural and simple to present her own parentthan to explain his absence and introduce Tressilian in his stead. The only objection to this is that Sir Hugh, if he is to be introduced at all, should logically be in attendance at the court scenes(or, at least, some explanation be given for his absence), which, of course, the necessity of having a tragic denoument prevents. Not the least purpose served by Sir Hugh is to facilitate the escape of Amy and Flibbertigibbet, and later, Leicester's entrance, by means of the safe-conduct which he so conveniently leaves behind him.

Sussex, Shrewsbury, Hunsdon

The participation of Lord Sussex in Amy Robsart is confined to scenes 4 and 6 of Act II(he is a silent presence in Act IV, sc.5), and gives little opportunity for character-study. Altho he has but a few lines, his presence is indispensable in the court scenes, for to effect his reconciliation with Leicester is the pretext of Elizabeth's visit to Kenilworth.

Both Shrewsbury and Hunsdon, who appear in the same scenes with Sussex, are entirely silent, altho each is addressed by the Queen(Act IV, sc.5). Shrewsbury's chief function seems to as an auditor to Sussex's comments. This gives the impression, without foundation in the novel, that he is of the latter's party. Hunsdon fulfills his role by the sole act of removing Amy from the scene. Since no actors are assigned to these two roles, they were doubtless taken by the same actors who played Sir Hugh and Foster.

Chapter VI. The Plot.

It is impossible to say in how far Hugo's treatment of character is governed by the exigencies of plot,.Hence,this division of the subject is purely for convenience,and will take up,somewhat at random,some additional points which were not found place for in the preceding chapter.

By the elimination of certain characters and certain elements of the plot,Hugo was obliged to make some change in motivation. Thus in the novel,Amy's escape from Kenilworth castle into the park,where her crucial meeting with the Queen is to take place,is caused by the fear of the drunken Lambourne. This character does not appear in the drama,and so another reason for her flight is assigned,namely,the attempt to poison her.(A scene which,in the novel,takes place while Amy is still at Cumnor,and which impels her to flee to Kenilworth). It may be observed,in passing,that the poison-scene in Scott(ch.22),of which "the import was not the less obvious(to Amy)that it was not even hinted at",is much the more effective of the two.

Flibbertigibbet's concern for Amy's welfare presupposes a stronger interest than the mere curiosity displayed in the novel. This is to be found in his gratitude to Amy for saving his life,adebt which he vows to pay.

That the tragedy might be carried out,it is necessary that Varney's love for the Countess should give way to hatred.

The cause for this change is hinted at in Act III,sc.5:

AMY.-Taisez-vous,valet!
VARNEY.-Ah!c'est trop!ah!vous ne craignez pas de changer mon amour en haine!

and confirmed in Act V,sc.5:

ALASCO.-Jecroyais que tu aimais cette femme?
VARNEY.-Elle m'a appelé valet! je la hais.

Leicester's unexplained change of heart in the final act is a serious flaw. In Kenilworth,the revelation that his jealousy of Amy is unfounded is the motive for his repentance and subsequent confession to Elizabeth;but in the play there is no new development in relation to Amy,the deception of Elizabeth is complete,and the only cause for his attempted flight with Amy is to be sought in the fear that the Queen would wreak some harm upon her. Our only preparation forhis reversal of attitude is Flibbertigibbet's speech to Amy:

(Act V,sc.2)"La décoration a changé. Votre Dudley n'est pas infidèle,il n'a point tenté de vous empoisonner,il ne vous livrait pas à son écuyer Satan-Varney,et,loin de songer à épouser la reine,il machine en ce moment contre elle un acte de haute traison,je veux dire votre délivrance."

This we know to be only partially true,since Leicester has not been entirely innocent.

The presence of Tressilian in the novel,and his friendship with Sir Hugh,on the one hand,and with Lord Sussex,on the other hand,was sufficient excuse for the Earl to forbid Amy's telling her father the exact state of affairs;but in the drama,there is no excuse for his not taking Sir Hugh into the secret.

Scott heightened the dramatic effect of the Queen's discovery of Amy in the park, by placing it immediately after Leicester's proposal. Hugo has separated the two scenes, making the love-scene come much earlier, because of the advisability of showing as soon as possible the relation of these two important characters, Leicester and Elizabeth. But a suggestion of the same effect is gained when the Queen expresses a desire to visit the ruined tower, where Amy is imprisoned.

On the other hand, Hugo makes the episode of the sword (Act II, sc.6) much more dramatic, by keeping both the court and the audience still in doubt as to her attitude toward Leicester, and her purpose with the sword. In the novel, this does not immediately follow Elizabeth's talk with Varney, and so Leicester has already been relieved of suspense.

M.Allais remarks the inconsistency with which Leicester, arrested in Act IV, sc.5, is shown to be at liberty in Act V sc.3. But it is clear that the Queen's order of arrest was not carried out. At that moment, Amy's protestation of the Earl's innocence gives a new angle to the situation; and it is Amy, and not Leicester, whom Hunsdon takes into custody. This whole scene, which marks the climax, has been discussed by M.Allais (u). (from the standpoint of Leicester's culpability).

The most interesting divergence in plot is the denoûment. The Témoin claims that Act V is almost wholly of Hugo's invention. Let us see to what extent this is true. The first two scenes are original; scene 3 is an elaboration, or rather a realization, of Leicester's plan, in the novel, to rescue Amy (ch.40): "....and altho he (Leicester) trusted in great measure to the very positive counter-orders which he had

sent by Lambourne, it was his purpose to set out for Cumnor-Place, in person, as soon as he should be dismissed from the presence of the Queen, who, he concluded, would presently leave Kenilworth." Amy's soliloquy, scene 4, is supplied by Hugo. Scene 5, with Varney and Alasco, serves practically the same purpose as the conversation of Varney and Foster in the novel but the dialog has been freely made up. In scene 6, the manner of Amy's death is the same;[1] scene 7 is from Scott; and in scene 8, Varney dies, asin the novel, but from Leicester's hand and not his own. Introducing Sir Hugh is an innovation.

There are too many deaths in Scott's last chapter; Hugo was saved from this mistake by his smaller number of characters.

Of the plot as a whole, the same criticism applies to the play as to the novel, where the high personages, Queen Elizabeth the Earl of Leicester, Sir Hugh Robsart and Tressillian are consistently the dupes of the lower. Varney whose ambition is the impelling motive of the whole story,[2] and characters of an humble class, like Flibbertigibbet and Wayland Smith, all readily outwit their superiors.

Flibbertigibbet is interesting enuf as a character to justify his presence, in the novel, at least, without being pressed into service to save the plot. But both Scott and

---

1. The Quarterly, commenting on the novel, thought the close was of too unbroken tragedy. "The immediate circumstances of Amy's death, as she rushes to meet what she supposes to be her husband's signal, almost pass the limit that divides pity from horror" (o)

2. Scott said: "My rogue always, in spite of me, turns out my hero." (Lockhart, IV).

Hugo have made him shoulder much responsibility. In Kenilworth, it is only thru Dickie Sludge that Tressilian succeeds in having his horse shod and so is enabled to resume his journey, and at the same time is introduced to a valuable friend, Wayland Smith; and it is due to the lad's prank that Wayland is believed to have been the victim of an explosion and so is safe from pursuit. This much we might concede to him, but when his wits alone not only save Wayland and Amy from detection when Varney questions the party of players, but also secures their admittance to Kenilworth grounds and again to the inner entrance, we feel that he is being overdone. Still more important is his theft of Amy's letter to her husband, which makes possible most of the misunderstanding that follows and so leads to Amy's death; and his interference in the duel of Leicester and Tressilian, without which the latter would have been killed, and the former left unenlightened as to Amy's innocence.

In his first appearance in the play, he succeeds in tricking Alasco, and inspires none the less apprehension when he reveals himself to be alive: (Act I, sc.6)

ALASCO.-Je ne sais si je ne l'aimais pas mieux revenant!

and again: ALASCO.-Si on pouvait....le pendre aux gouttières du château! Quel débarras!

In Act I, sc.8, he even has it in his power to destroy Varney:

VARNEY.-Je respire! il ne m'a point vendu!

He twice surprises Amy by appearing at the critical moment, in the first instance saving her from the poisoned drink, and

aiding her to escape to the park. It is to be presumed that he brings about her meeting with the Queen, otherwise unexplained: (Act IV, sc.3)

FLIBBERTIGIBBET.-Avant un quart d'heure je reviens avec sir Hugh Robsart.

(Act IV, sc.4)

ÉLISABETH.-Que voulait dire sir Hugh Robsart avec ses airs mystérieux? 'Que la reine daigne se rendre seule à la fontaine de Neptune.'

Flibbertigibbet's part in disillusioning the unfortunate bride of Leicester, and again in reviving her hopes, has already been mentioned. His last service is to provide the safe-conduct for Leicester's and Sir Hugh's entrance. Altogether, his part in Amy Robsart is less than in the novel, but appears larger in proportion.

It is Richard Varney in both the novel and the play, who saves the situation for his master, in each of the two scenes before the Queen. Indeed, Leicester is but his puppet throughout. In the drama, Queen Elizabeth remains Varney's dupe to the end; a necessary feature of Hugo's plot, but which leaves a disagreeable impression, as Allais observes.

Chapter VII. Minor Points of Comparison.

Wit and Humor.

The novel, with its wider range of character and incident, and its licence to introduce a certain amount of matter extraneous to the plot, has a varied supply of that lighter element which all but predominates. From the unconscious drollery of peasant manner and speech, to the witty sallies of courtier and queen; the gentle satire of pedantry in Master Mumblazen and the heraldry-versed curate; jovial scenes at the Black Bear with mine-host Giles Gosling, and the carnival of festivities at Kenilworth castle; swaggering Michael Lambourne, who "died without his shoes after all"; and feeble-pated Master Goldthred; honest Blount in his bravery of yellow stockings and crimson rosettes, a perfect foil for Raleigh's light graces; the mock-Puritanism of Tony Foster, or whatever we may term that curious admixture of religious fear and worldly vice, which furnishes a subject for Varney's fine raillery,___ all this is lost in Amy Robsart. Practically the only opportunity for introducing humor is in the earlier conversations of Varney and Alasco, before the tone becomes too earnest, and in the character of Flibbertigibbet. To this Ariel-like creature are denied some of the gamineries of Dickie Sludge; and he misses those characters of duller wit, at the expense of whom to wag his nimble tongue; as when he replied to Blount's inquiry of what he learned at the Fens, "To catch gulls, with their webbed feet and yellow stockings." But he still has a sprightliness which relieves the whole play:

(Act I,sc.6)

FLIBBertigibbet.-Je joue les diables et les lutins dans les mascarades de Shakespeare et de Marlowe,et je porte le costume de mon emploi pour me distinguer parmi les gentilshommes.

ALASCO.-Le singe!....

(Act I,sc.7)

LEICESTER.-Qui es-tu?

FLIBBERTIGIBBET.-Ce qu'il vous plaira. Un mort ou un vivant. Un mort,si tel est le bon plaisir de votre poignard;sinon,un vivant,et un vivant qui aime mieux la fin d'un repas que le commencement d'une dispute.

LEICESTER.-Impudent railleur! Tu joues avec la corde de ton gibet.

FLIBBERTIGIBBET.-Faute de la pouvoir couper.

LEICESTER.-....ton audace sera punie,à faire trembler tous tes pareils.

FLIBBERTIGIBBET. -Ils sont rares!

(Act I,sc.8)

FLIBBERTIGIBBET.-J'ai fait ici mon entrée à la manière de nous autres diables,par le trou de la serrure.

(Act V,sc.2)

AMY.-Dieu soit beni! Il va venir. En quel état vais-je le recevoir? Les cheveux en désordre,cette toute fripée.

FLIBBERTIGIBBET.-Bon signe! la tristesse a fait place à la coquetterie!

The scene of Flibbertigibbet frightening Alasco is of comic purport. To return to Varney and Alasco,we may cite:

(ActI,sc.5)

VARNEY.-Là! Là! monsieur Alasco,ne nous brouillons pas! Je crois tellement à votre science,voyez-vous,que,si je perdais vos bonnes graces,je ne me nourrirais pendant trois mois que d[illegible]ufs frais.

ALASCO.-Présompteux!mes philtres! mes breuvages! crois-tu que je les perdrais sur toi?....Sois tranquille, Varney! Quoiqu'on puisse certes extraire de ton corps plus de venin que d'une vipère,tu ne vaut pas une goutte de mes poisons.

VARNEY.-Voilà ce que jusqu'ici tu m'as dit de plus rassurant. (The first speech of Varney is in Scott, the second is original).

This whole scene is semi-comic in style,altho serving a sober purpose in explaining the situation. Later consultations of these two are [illegible] serious ,except for Alasco's comment on Varney's oath, (perhaps a nervous reaction) :

(Act III, sc.2)

VARNEY.-Si ta composition n'est pas aussi inoffensive qu'un verre d'eau, j'en jure sur mon âme, je te ferai subir autant de morts que tu as de cheveux sur la tête. Tu ris, vieux spectre?

ALASCO.-(ôtant sa mitre)-Sans doute. Comment tremblerais-je de ta menace? Je suis chauve, et tu jures sur ton âme.

We find the young author speaking of his work as a "comédie"[1]. But except that, so far as Amy is concerned, the tragedy lies altogether in the physical fact of her murder rather than in her moral suffering, it is at least as somber as the English production. For of course the dark stain in the novel is the intrigue about Amy, and when that is made the whole center of interest, without the miscellany of pleasant conceits which Scott intermingled, the effect of gloom is deepened.

Dialog.

In naturalness and life-like-ness of dialog, the young Hugo had to contend with a master, altho the result was sometimes an unliterary rambling. Some idea of Hugo's adaptations of the long conversations in Scott, the condensation in order to give them that precision and point required by the French, may be gained from the numerous parallel passages already cited. But, where the variance is shown, just how much of the wording is Hugo's own and how much he has borrowed from the translator[2], we are at a loss to know.

---

1. See note 1 page 12. (y)

2. Hugo was unable to read English. Kenilworth was no sooner published in London than three translations appeared in Paris. That of de Fauconpret was concidered the best.(r) I am unable to learn which one Hugo consulted. Maigron comments at length upon the inadequacy of the translations of Scott, and states that the best of them "l'a rendu plat."

The graceful scene in which Amy, with charming childishness, admires the Earl's costume and asks about his decorations is reproduced.

"Scène délicieuse en vérité et encore plus neuve pour des imaginations françaises, toute rutilante et resplendissante, vraie scène d'opéra, où les yeux trouvent autant de satisfaction que le coeur et l'esprit, et qui ne pouvait manquer d'être imitée, à ces divers titres, par les jeunes romantiques." (r) 1.

Hugo's best example of dialog, in the drama, are two which are original with him: the love passages between Leicester and the Queen (Act II sc.1), and Varney's proposal to Amy (Act III, sc.5). Scott gives us the import, in each case, but did not trust himself to write out the conversation. This Hugo supplies, with delicacy and skill.

Style and Diction.

As has already been noted, it is difficult to judge of the playwright's style or diction without first comparing it with the French translation of Kenilworth, which we have not at hand. But the use of antithesis, not a feature of the novel, may be laid to Hugo's personal taste:

(Act IV, sc.3) AMY.-J'ai abandonné mon père pour suivre mon mari, et voilà qu'aujourd'hui je n'ai plus qu'une idée, c'est de quitter mon mari pour rejoindre mon père.

(Act III, sc.8) FLIBBERTIGIBBET.-Elle était pâle comme une morte, la voilà rose comme une fiancée.

(Act V, sc.1) AMY.-A toi le trône, à moi la tombe.

Among contemporary criticisms of the play, the "bizarreries de style" are condemned. In the Globe for Feb.29, 1828, we find:

---

1. Scribe overlooks this scene, contenting himself with Amy's gesture of surprise, "des brillants habits que je ne t'avais pas encore vus___Il me semble que je suis au cercle de la reine."

"Cette pièce est devenue....un moyen de faire l'essai d'une nouvelle langue théâtrale. Au lieu d'un retour au naturel et à la vérité, on n'a vu, dans l'étrangeté de leur diction, qu'un arrogant défi porté à toutes les habitudes du public"(v)

Paul Meurice, quoting the opinion of Lockroy, the actor, on the cause of Amy Robsart's failure, says: "Ce n'était cependant pas la pièce elle-même qui....avait provoqué la plus forte résistance....Ce qui avait égayé et choqué au plus haut degré les spectateurs d'alors, c'étaient les mots....Les mots potion, baraque, cuisine, vieux spectre, apothicaire du diable, et bien d'autres, soulevèrent des tempêtes de rires et de huees."

This is a reflection upon the public taste of the day, rather than on the play itself, for phrases such as are here cited would not now be considered objectionable.

The harsh effect of English proper names upon the French ear may be the explanation for the substitution of Templeton for Lidcote, and Pelham for Berkshire. Or, the change may be simply indifference of memory.

Stage Directions

Scott's habit of stressing external features, his lengthy descriptions of dress and furnishings, should facil-itate the re-creation of atmosphere by the playwright. The magnificent white costume in which the Earl of Leicester presented himself as Queen Elizabeth's host(ch.31), was copied in the play. Little attempt was made to follow the novelist's indications for other costumes and settings, except that they be appropriate to the character and in keeping with the cent-ury. For Tony Foster, Hugo imagined a red velvet doublet and

yellow hose. The villain Varney is in black,from head to foot;he wears a "toque avec une fine plume de coq".[1]

Some examples of changing narration into stage directions,are:

(Act I, sc.3)

(En ce moment le regard de Leicester rencontre l'oeil faux et percant d'Alasco fixé sur lui. Le comte met vivement la main à son poignard.)

(ch.18)

The Earl made two or three strides thru the apartment....As he turned,however,he caught the eye of the astrologer fixed on him,while an observing glance of the most shrewd penetration shot from under the penthouse of his shaggy dark eyebrows. Leicester's haughty and suspicious soul at once caught on fire;he darted towards the old manfrom the further end of the lofty apartment, only standing still when his extended hand was within a foot of the astrologer's body.

(Act II, sc.4)

(Les deux lords entrent en même temps par la grande porte ouverte à deux battants; ils saluent la reine et vont se ranger,avec leurs partisans,chacun d'un côté de la scène, Le milieu est occupé par la suite de la reine.)

(ch.16)

In the meantime,the more distinguished persons of each train followed their patrons (Leicester and Sussex) into the lofty halls and antechambers of the royal Palace,flowing on the same current,like two streams which are compelled into the same channel,yet shun to mix their waters. The parties arranged themselves,as it were instinctively,on the different sides of the lofty apartments, and seemed eager to escape from the transient union which the narrowness of the crowded entrance had for an instant compelled them to submit to.

(Act II,sc.4)

ÉLISABETH.-(D'une voix impérieuse.)Comte de Sussex,je vous en prie. (D'une voix douce.) Lord Leicester, je vous l'ordonne.

(ch.16)

"Sussex,"said Elizabeth,"I entreat___Leicester,Icommand you."

Yet,so were her words accented,that the entreaty sounded like command,and the command like entreaty.

---

1. See note 1,page 41.

(Act II, sc.3)

ÉLISABETH.-Richard Varney, avancez et mettez-vous à genoux. (Varney obéit. Elle tire l'épée du fourreau. Mouvement de surprise dans l'assemblee et d'émoi parmi les dames. Elisabeth contemple l'épée avec ravissement.)

(ch.32).

The Earl unbuckled his sword, and, taking it by the point, presented on bended knee the hilt to Elizabeth.

She took it slowly, drew it from the scabbard, and while the ladies who stood around turned away their eyes with real or affected shuddering, she noted with a curious eye the high polish and rich damasked ornaments upon the glittering blade.

Chapter VIII Conclusion.

The verdict against Amy Robsart at the time of its performance[1] has been reaffirmed by later critics:

"La pièce est d'ailleurs médiocre, froide, pleine de longueurs, et on comprend aisément qu'elle n'ait obtenu qu'une chute retentissante." (r)

"La pièce échoua lamentablement, et vraiment, à la relire aujourd'hui, on ne peut se dire de bonne foi qu'elle eût mérité un sort meilleur." (v)

"Si Amy Robsart est tombé, en essayant de monter à l'assaut, c'est que l'oeuvre était née débile, c'est qu'elle avait été, en grande partie, improvisée dans la première jeunesse, à vingt ans, par un auteur qui n'était pas encore en état de dompter une foule." (e)

In the course of our discussion various weak points have been mentioned. M. Allais brings out the abuse of melodrama, adding that "on ne peut avoir la prétention d'exclure absolument le mélodrame d'un drame romantique." (u)

In spite of these drawbacks, the play is not without charm of dialog, wit of invention, and boldness of treatment.[2] We have seen that it presents an interesting adaptation of the plot, and, within its narrowed limits, a very fair portrayal of the main characters. But the chief charm of Kenilworth does not lie in its story, nor its study of a character, but

---

1. La Réunion, Feb., 1828: "L'auteur de ce drame barbaro-amphigouri-romantique a mis, une fois de plus, le roman du Château de Kenilworth en pièce, mais il s'est arrangé de façon à la rendre méconnaissable." (b)
Le Moniteur, Feb., 1828: "Pas d'impressions vives, d'émotions profondes, ce qu'il y en a de plus profond à cette représentation, c'est un ennui de quatre heures." (b)

2. Globe, Feb. 20, 1828: "Il y a de l'avenir dans de telles fautes. Amy Robsart est une pièce mal faite, et péniblement écrite, mais elle suppose dans son auteur de l'esprit, de la hardiesse, surtout une heureuse impuissance à balbutier des phrases communes." (v)

in another feature, which would seem to be outside the province of drama. It lies in the vivid and varied pageant of sixteenth-century life in England which is spread before us in such a way that we seem to be participant in it.[1] "His later works are little else but backgrounds capitally made out."(j) The historical accuracy of his background is another question; but, for the average reader, the illusion is complete.

The local color[2] which crowds its pages and which, an accessory with most writers, is with Scott the very substance of his work; the distinctively English flavor, to which not only the descriptive details of costume and scene and the numerous peasant figures, but the very turn of wit, the choice of language, the opinions reflected, the very situation at court which makes possible the whole story, all contribute____ this the playwright could not hope to reproduce, and least of all in a foreign tongue. And it is in Scott's secondary characters, which naturally are stricken out of the drama, that

---

1. "Puisque l'intérêt n'est plus dans l'intrigue et que les passions particulières des personnages ont cessé d'être le sujet et l'objet du récit, l'élément romanesque ayant été rejeté au second plan, il reste, nous l'avons dit, que l'élément historique vienne prendre sa place, et c'est bien le caractère essentiel et distinctif des Waverley Novels. Leur grande nouveauté est de donner le pas aux intérêts généraux et aux passions publiques sur les intérêts et les passions exclusivement privés, et de nous mettre sous les yeux moins une tragédie domestique que le drame de toute une époque ou de toute une nation ....Les personnages ne sont plus considérés exclusivement en eux-mêmes et pour eux-mêmes, mais plutôt comme en fonction de la société et de l'époque à laquelle ils appartiennent." (r) "The most striking feature of Scott's romances is that, for the most part, they are pivoted on public rather than private interests and passions...., give us an imaginative view, not of mere individuals, but as they are affect-ed by the public strifes and social divisions of the age."(mm)

2. "Elle(the local color)ne se distingue plus des personnages, elle fait corps avec eux et c'est d'elle qu'ils tirent leur réalité et leur existence."(r)

his inventive originality and rich humor are best displayed.

So it would seem that, to one who has read the novel first, and bears in mind its composite picture of Elizabethan times, the interesting side lights, characteristic descriptions and abundant wit, the omissions required for stage production cannot fail to be disappointing. Maigron thinks that what was said of an opera of Guy Mannering in the Diable boiteux, 1816, might apply somewhat to this case:

"Il perdra beaucoup aux yeux de ceux qui connaissent la source où il a été puisé; les beautés du roman consistant principalment en portraits de personnages et en peintures de moeurs, qui ne pouvaient entrer dans le dialogue de la pièce." (r)

This is corroborated by a contemporary criticism of Amy Robsart, in the Figaro:

"Qui ne se rappelait pas sans regrets les moments délicieux passés, au coin de son feu, à lire les malheurs d'Amy Robsart, les infamies de Varney, les fureurs d'Élisabeth, et tant de délicieuses et idéales descriptions, tant de saillies spirituelles, tant d'aventures pleines d'intérêt et de charme, qui disparaissaient tout entières, pour la plupart, ou qu'on revoyait privées de leur coloris, de leur charme, à peu près comme ces plantes exotiques qui perdent toute leur beauté dans les serres de nos amateurs." (b)

Of the numerous attempts to take a play from this novel, not one, English or foreign, has survived the test of time.

In conclusion, then, we may say that Amy Robsart is not a successful play, largely because of the immaturity of its author(or authors), and also because of the disadvantages inherent in the task of dramatizing a work of the type of Kenilworth. The love intrigue alone contains material for a good drama, which Hugo failed to realize; moreover, if he had

succeeded, the essential part of the novel, the sweep of its social picture, would still be lacking.

It may be added that, since Hugo's most successful work for the theatre is praised more for lyrical than for purely dramatic qualities [d], we may not expect his genius to be well exemplified in a prose drama.

Appendix

A List of Plays Founded on Scott's Kenilworth.

French:[1]

"Émilia"___Alexandre Soumet. (At the Théâtre-Français, 1827.) (u)

"Le Château de Kenilworth, mélodrame en trois actes, tiré du roman de sir Walter Scott"___MM. Doirie and H. Lemaire. (At the Porte-Saint-Martin, Paris, 1822.) (b)

"Leicester, opéra-comique en trois actes"___words by Eugène Scribe and M. Melésville, music by Auber. (Théâtre de l'Opéra-comique, Jan. 25, 1823.)

"Amy Robsart, drame en cinq actes et en prose, tiré du Château de Kenilworth, roman de Sir Walter Scott"___Victor Hugo and Paul Foucher(?). (At the Odéon, Feb. 13, 1828.)

Flemish:

"Leicester, drame in vyf bedryven. Naer Walter Scott door F. Roelants."(Brussels, 1852.) (z)

German:

"Schauspiel von J.R.Lenz. Nach Walter Scott's Kenilworth und Ivanhoe"___ J.R.Lenz (Maintz, 1826.) (+z)

---

1. Maigron, quoting from Pontmartin's Mémoirs II, p.3, says that Soulié intended a dramatization of Kenilworth. (r)

English:

"Kenilworth"___D.Terry(?). (Included in the collection,"The Waverley Dramas,from the novels of Sir Walter Scott", London. The collection published in 1845,the separate plays of uncertain date.) (z)

"Kenilworth,a drama in two acts"___T.Dibdin. (Cumberland's British Theater,vol.39) (z)

"Kenilworth,a comic operatic extravaganza in one act"___Andrew Halliday and Frederick Lawrance. (Lacy's Acting Edition of Plays,vol.38.)London,1859. (z)

"Kenilworth. Adrama in two acts"___T.Dibdin and A. Bunn. London,1874. (Lacy's Acting Edition of Plays,vol.93) (z)

"Kenilworth,a melodrama"___W.Oxberry. (English Drama, vol.10) London,1824. (z)

"The Earl of Leicester:a Tragedy"___Samuel Heath. London,1843. (z)

"Amy Robsart,a four act play"___A.Halliday.1870 (a)

"Little Amy Robsart,a burlesque"___Mark Kinghorne, 1880. (a)