

OSCAR WILDE: MYTHS
MIRACLES, AND
IMITATIONS

JOHN STOKES

University of Warwick



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oscar Wilde was a major influence on the culture of his time, and remains relevant today, as a model of wit and style, a sexual icon, and a moral example. In a sequence of detailed and imaginative chapters on Wilde and his times, John Stokes shows how in the 1880s and 1890s Wilde played a vital part in the development of modern culture, inspiring others to carry his ideas on into the twentieth century. Stokes offers studies of Wilde's place in the Romantic tradition, and of his relationships with such legendary figures of the *fin de siècle* as Aubrey Beardsley, Alfred Jarry, and Arthur Symons. And always, as part of the process of historical inquiry, Stokes considers those who came after: humanitarian disciples who kept Wilde's memory sacred, performers in his plays, actors who impersonated the man himself. *Oscar Wilde: Myths, Miracles, and Imitations* explains why Wilde, a "material ghost," haunts us still.

OSCAR WILDE: MYTHS, MIRACLES,
AND IMITATIONS

OSCAR WILDE: MYTHS
MIRACLES, AND
IMITATIONS

JOHN STOKES

University of Warwick

Published by the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

© Cambridge University Press 1996

First published 1996

Printed in Great Britain at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data

Stokes, John, 1943-

Oscar Wilde: myths, miracles, and imitations / John Stokes.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 47537 6 (hardback)

1. Wilde, Oscar, 1854-1900. 2. Homosexuality and literature -
Great Britain - History - 19th century. 3. Authors, Irish - 19th
century - Biography. 4. Wilde, Oscar, 1854-1900 - Influence. 5. Gay
men - Great Britain - Biography. 6. Romanticism - Great Britain.

I. Title.

PR5823.s68 1996

828'.809 - dc20 95-32382 CIP

ISBN 0 521 47537 6 hardback

For Richard Ellmann
1918-1987

Contents

<i>List of illustrations</i>	<i>page</i> x
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xiv
Introduction	i
1 The magic ball	23
2 Some gentle criticisms of British justice	39
3 Wilde at bay: the diary of George Ives	65
4 Romantic reincarnations	89
5 Beardsley/Jarry: the art of deformation	110
6 Dieppe: 1895 and after	126
7 Wilde interpretations	152
<i>Notes</i>	186
<i>Select bibliography</i>	207
<i>Index</i>	210

Illustrations

1. Advertisement for <i>Oscar Wilde</i> , starring Robert Morley, in the <i>Evening Standard</i> , 20 May 1960	page 15
2. Aubrey Beardsley, <i>Messalina Returning from the Bath</i>	121
3. Map of Dieppe in 1898	127
4. Cover of <i>A Sea-side Flirt</i> by "John Winter" (1897)	131
5. The Bathing Beach at Dieppe	137
6. The Dieppe Casino at the turn of the century	141
7. Walter Sickert, <i>Quai Henri IV</i>	145
8. "Le Pollet," Dieppe	146
9. Hester (Julie Saunders), Mrs. Arbuthnot (Carol Royle), and Gerald (Andrew Havill) in the final act of Philip Prowse's 1991 production of <i>A Woman of No Importance</i>	160
10. Martin Shaw as Lord Goring in Peter Hall's 1992 production of <i>An Ideal Husband</i>	164
11. Algie (Richard E. Grant) and Jack (Alex Jennings) in Nicholas Hytner's 1993 production of <i>The Importance of Being Earnest</i>	167
12. Maggie Smith as Lady Bracknell in Nicholas Hytner's 1993 production of <i>The Importance of Being Earnest</i>	169
13. Edith Evans as Lady Bracknell	175
14. Wilde represented as a prominent member of the audience by Maurice Greiffenhagen	182

Acknowledgments

My own involvement with Oscar Wilde began when I played the role of Gwendolen Fairfax, not accurately but with wonderful expression, in a school production in the mid-fifties. Like many of the men and women I write about in this book, I felt liberated by my contact with notoriety. In the early 1960s good fortune took me to Reading University. There I encountered Ian Fletcher, who knew more about the *fin de siècle* than anyone else alive. In the 1970s Ian and I ransacked libraries on both sides of the Atlantic for all traces of Wilde and compiled two long bibliographical essays.

In the 1980s I began to realize the paradox of Wilde's reputation. As his historical moment grows ever more distant he is increasingly recognized as an ally in all quarters. This is because he occupied a complicated historical space: the son of an Irish Republican who was at home with the Prince of Wales; a socialist Oxonian who embraced boulevard theater; a radical thinker accused of effeminacy as well as of feminism; a sometimes loving husband and a constantly devoted father who was deeply and proudly homosexual. His cultural permanence depends on his multiple personality – the double life not so much the alternative life as the mirroring life, because all lives involve love, fidelity, betrayal.

These days he's everywhere. As I write this, in the summer of 1994, three events take place in rapid succession. First it is announced that Wilde is to be commemorated in Poets' Corner in Westminster Abbey. The Dean of Westminster counters any objections by insisting that he was "someone who is likely to be remembered a hundred years after his death and someone who is

not a militant atheist. . . basically a religious man" (*Independent*, 21 July 1994). Meanwhile a group of theatrical admirers proposes a scheme to have a statue erected to his memory, perhaps in the Strand, and "Outrage", the gay rights association, continues to press for a pardon in time for the centenary of his arrest in 1995. It is precisely at this moment that the Perrier-Jouet company (which long ago benefited from product placement in *The Importance of Being Earnest*) opts for the advertising slogan, "When Oscar Wilde called for the Champagne waiter he was only after one thing."

"The evolution of man is slow," as Wilde was obliged to conclude in *The Soul of Man under Socialism*.

Over the years my researches have been greatly aided by the expertise and courtesy of library staff. Thanks to the British Library; the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California at Los Angeles; the London Library; the Miller Library, Colby College, Waterville, Maine; the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin, Texas; the Theatre Museum, London; Warwick University Library.

My final chapter, on Wilde in performance, involves special debts. I am much obliged to Joel Kaplan for supplying me with copies of the major reviews of recent productions. The picture of Wilde as member of the audience by Maurice Greiffenhagen first appeared as an illustration to George Moore's *Vain Fortune* in 1891. I owe its reproduction here to Russell Jackson who originally drew my attention to its existence.

Many other individuals have helped me along the way. Thanks to Karl Beckson, Carol Ann Duffy, Claude Féron, Sir Rupert Hart-Davis, Merlin Holland, Nicholas Horsfield, Tony Howard, Robert Langenfeld, Etienne Lymberry, Paul Raven, Anthony Reid, Ian Small, Julie Speedie, Kelsey Thornton, Doreen Vincent, Jeffrey Weeks, John Willett, Erika Wilson. And to Faith Evans.

With the exception of "The Magic Ball," which was delivered as a paper at the International Wilde Conference at the University

of Birmingham in April 1993, all the chapters have appeared previously. In every case I have expanded, sometimes greatly, and updated to take account of more recent research. I am grateful to the editor of the *Times Literary Supplement* and to the editors of the following publications for permission to reprint material:

"Some Gentle Criticisms of British Justice: J. H. Wilson's Defence of Oscar Wilde," in *Journal of the Eighteen Nineties Society*, 12-13, 18-23.

"Wilde at Bay: The Diaries of George Ives," in *English Literature in Transition*, 26, 175-86.

"Arthur Symonds's 'Romantic Movement': Transitional Attitudes and the Victorian Precedent," in *English Literature in Transition*, 31, 133-50.

"Beardsley/Jarry: The Art of Deformation," in *Mr. Aubrey Beardsley Reconsidered: Essays and An Annotated Secondary Bibliography*, ed. by Robert Langenfeld (UMI Research Press, 1989), pp. 55-69.

"Dieppe: 1895," in *English Literature in Transition*, Special Series Number 4: Essays and Poems in Memory of Ian Fletcher, 11-23.

"Wilde Interpretations," *Modern Drama*, 37, 156-74.

Extracts from Wilde's letters appear by permission of Oxford University Press and Merlin Holland; extracts from *De Profundis* © Estate of Oscar Wilde 1962 appear by permission of Merlin Holland.

Figures 1 and 4 are reproduced by permission of the British Library; figures 5, 6, 8 by permission of Rétrocadres, Méru, France. Figure 9 was supplied by Ivan Kyncl, figure 10 by John Haynes, figures 11-12 by Catherine Ashmore and are reproduced by their permission. Figure 13 is reproduced by permission of the Trustees of the Victoria and Albert Museum.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used throughout:

- Ellmann* Richard Ellmann, *Oscar Wilde* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1987).
Letters *The Letters of Oscar Wilde* ed. by Rupert Hart-Davis (London: Hart-Davis, 1962).
Works *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde* (Glasgow: HarperCollins, 1994).

Unless otherwise stated all translations are my own.

Introduction

GETTING IN TOUCH

A few years ago I was sent a posthumous poem said to have been written by Oscar Wilde and communicated to the world via a spiritualist medium. My name had been mentioned, or so the accompanying letter said, as someone who might be able to help with authentication. Before I had even read the poem I was livid, and once I had done so (it was, of course, the inevitable mush) I sent off a short, sharp reply in which I made it plain what I feel about people who thrive upon the gullibility of others.

Only much later did it occur to me that in being true to myself I was betraying Wilde, who would undoubtedly have found the situation of considerable interest and some amusement. Wilde was fascinated by mysteries of all kinds. He was happy to take part when Dr. Onofroff of Paris gave a public demonstration of his extraordinary skills in "thought-reading" in London in 1889;¹ he visited Mrs. Robinson, a Society fortune-teller, in 1894 (and was impressed by what she had to tell him); and he even employed a palmist, the fashionable "Cheiro" who, in later life, was able to boast of his contact with a famously doomed man. Premonitions, prophecies, and strange coincidences are, as many critics have noticed, a constant thread in Wilde's work, at least from *Lord Arthur Saville's Crime* and *The Canterville Ghost* through *The Importance of Being Earnest*.

This concern with the paranormal bears an obvious but disturbing relationship to the curiosity about more orthodox beliefs that would eventually allow Wilde's death-bed entry into the Catholic church. He seems to have turned toward Rome on

at least two previous occasions: as an Oxford undergraduate, when his friends were surprised and perturbed by his apparent fervor; immediately after his release from Reading Gaol in 1897, when he applied for six months' retreat among the Jesuits at Farm Street, and was refused. Only on a third occasion, when he was beyond speech, was he admitted.

It is a pattern that suggests sporadic desperation rather than a long-delayed homecoming. Catholicism was only another option; and only occasionally, at times of great personal crisis, was it attractive. In Wilde's mind there were many possibilities for belief, and they coexisted. So, for instance, whereas the long prison letter that came to be known as *De Profundis* may look on the surface to be his most Christian statement, in fact it offers a radically different dispensation, based on outright agnosticism.

The faith that others give to what is unseen, I give to what one can touch, and look at. My Gods dwell in temples made with hands, and within the circle of actual experience is my creed made perfect and complete: too complete it may be, for like many or all of those who have placed their Heaven in this earth, I found in it not merely the beauty of Heaven, but the horror of Hell also. When I think about religion at all, I feel as if I would like to found an order for those who cannot believe: the Confraternity of the Fatherless one might call it, where on an altar, on which no taper burned, a priest, in whose heart peace had no dwelling, might celebrate with unblessed bread and a chalice empty of wine. Everything to be true must become a religion. And agnosticism should have its ritual no less than faith. . . Its symbols must be of my own creating. (*Works*, 1019–20)

The eclectic appeal of agnosticism made it quite different from most versions of Christianity, with their stress on atonement and the afterlife, their essential dreariness. As Vivian complains in *The Decay of Lying*, despite the fact that priests are "men whose duty it is to believe in the supernatural, to perform daily miracles," in the Church of England "a man succeeds, not through his capacity for belief, but through his capacity for disbelief" (*Works*, 1089). Wilde was always on the side of belief, of acceptance, of making the impossible real, and recognizing the material world as a marvelous place.

My own instinctive preference is for the more straightforwardly materialist Wilde, but I now realize that in order to get in touch with that side of him, it is sometimes necessary to engage with his double, the seemingly superstitious man. Together they form the whole. The rationalist was no sceptic, nor was the adept simply naive. Like many of his contemporaries – W. T. Stead, Arthur Conan Doyle, W. B. Yeats among them – Wilde was drawn to manifestations of the supposedly supernatural because he could see there what the feminist historian of spiritualism Alex Owen has called "the unfolding of a vision of human fulfilment."² Yet always he looked for signs of that human fulfillment within the phenomenal world. "It is only shallow people who do not judge by appearances. The mystery of the world is the visible, not the invisible," he wrote in "Cheiro's" visitor's book – slightly misquoting Lord Henry Wotton's unacknowledged borrowing from Gautier.³

The reason why Wilde loved mystery so much is, paradoxically, that he was at heart a rationalist, willing to accept that scientific discovery could offer an increasingly adequate account of the visible world. One of the "Phrases and Philosophies for the Use of the Young" proposes that "religions die when they are proved to be true. Science is the record of dead religions" (*Works*, 1244). Questioned about this by Edward Carson at the Queensberry libel trial in 1895, he described it as "a suggestion towards a philosophy of the absorption of religions by science" though that, naturally enough, was "too big a question to go into now."⁴

It was, though, a question that had interested him for many years.⁵ In the short story *The Canterville Ghost*, written in the 1880s, the ghost is first defied, and then made afraid by mortals. It is finally relieved of its obligation to haunt because of an unnamed act of charity carried out by a living girl. "The mystery of love is greater than the mystery of death": that principle is reasserted again and again throughout Wilde's works (*Works*, 198, 604).

It is not surprising then that no sooner was Wilde dead than he began to reappear in the visions of those who had known and, sometimes, loved him. Lord Alfred Douglas's poem "The Dead Poet", written in Paris in 1901, is only the most famous instance:

I dreamed of him last night, I saw his face
 All radiant and unshadowed of distress,
 And as of old, in music measureless,
 I heard his golden voice and marked him trace
 Under the common thing the hidden grace,
 And conjure wonder out of emptiness,
 Till mean things put on beauty like a dress
 And all the world was an enchanted place.⁶

Douglas had the advantage of having known the face, having heard the voice, though lack of direct contact never deterred others from dreaming of Wilde, from pretending to be him and, in a few cases, from claiming to have seen him after his death. Wilde was glimpsed in New York in 1905⁷ and, as late as 1934, the then occupant of his rooms in Magdalen College, "an Australian who plays ice-hockey for the University – not a man given to aesthetic fancies," saw him standing by the window: "a tall man, with a long jacket, very old-fashioned, with rows of buttons and very short lapels. His tie was loose, and tied in a big knot."⁸ The phantom left through a wall, uncharacteristically silent.

It is more common for such ghosts to speak. The strangest report, by far, is the one given by Wilde's nephew, the poet "Arthur Cravan." Cravan's real name was Fabian Avenarius Lloyd: born in 1887,⁹ he was the son of Otho Holland, Constance Wilde's brother. In 1912 Cravan founded in Paris a literary magazine called *Maintenant*, and it is in the third issue, under the title "Oscar Wilde est vivant," that the visitation is described.

Wilde arrives at Cravan's Paris flat one dark rainy night. Old, wrinkled, gray, and bald, he is nevertheless "beautiful," as an elephant is "beautiful"; his rear overwhelms the seat upon which he sits; he has enormous arms and legs, but small, flat feet give him the dreamy and rhythmic allure of a "pachyderm." Cravan loves him for this, imagines him "in the green madness of Africa, amid the music of the flies making mountains of excrement" (56).

The two men compare notes and Cravan offers to put his uncle on the music hall, but then, after a great deal of drink, Cravan turns abusive: "Get out of it! You bum, you good for nothing, with your rotting face, you shovel-load of shit, water-cress from a

urinal, you faker, old queen, great cow!" (61). As Wilde leaves, his nephew is suddenly overcome by pity: remembering that the old man has no overcoat, he runs after him, shouting his name. When he realizes that Wilde has gone for ever he slowly returns – a desolate man.

"Oscar Wilde est vivant" is offered as fiction, though a previous issue of *Maintenant* has a piece entitled "Document inédit," attributed to "W. Cooper" (one of Cravan's pseudonyms), which is presumably factual. Here Cravan gives Wilde more conventional but still exotic features: Greek profile, aristocratic nose, and a sculptured mouth curved like an antique mask, which gave him "a sort of cruelty in repose" (30). When Wilde entered a room he was like a French king, full of "elegant nonchalance" (42); his presence seemed to reverberate, to carry on rolling and shining like a luminous ball. He was, says Cravan, both radiant and intangible.

This more sober though still dazzling description may bear some relation to the impression given by the real Wilde, but the Paris sighting is certainly true to Cravan, a famously cantankerous man – modernist poet of sorts, acquaintance of Apollinaire and Blaise Cendrars, husband of the poet Mina Loy, an amateur boxer who fought the great black heavyweight Jack Johnson in 1916 (and lost). When Cravan disappeared in South America in 1918 he left behind him a vision of Wilde unrivalled for its *bizarrie* yet curiously lacking in aura. As Sigmund Freud was to say about *The Canterville Ghost*, an apparition "loses all power of at least arousing *gruesome* feelings in us as soon as the author begins to amuse himself by being ironical about it and allows liberties to be taken with it."¹⁰

It is precisely for this reason that most Wildean visitations tend to avoid outright comedy, though they, too, often involve a high degree of self-projection. The reasons for reappearance given by the spirit who communicated with Mrs. Hester Travers Smith in 1923 was that he needed to correct rumors that he was still alive:

Men are ever interested, my dear lady, in the remains of those who have had the audacity to be distinguished, and when, added to this, the corpse has the flavour of crime, the carrion birds are eager to light on it. In my case the corpse was taken from the humble place where it was

cast off by my mental portion and conveyed to a retreat where it might decay quietly and in peace. It had none of the gaudy obsequies which would have fitted such as I was.¹¹

If the reality of the discarnate Wilde were to be established then it was essential to maintain that he died in the first place. All questions of authenticity of manner would follow upon that premise. Mrs. Smith was a well-known medium who communicated with Wilde in the best professional way, with the help of automatic writing, ouija boards, and an intermediary or "control." On this occasion, however, her most recognizable control is *De Profundis*, since the visitation comes after its partial revelations as well as after several informative books: two by Robert Sherard (1902 and 1906); Arthur Ransome's *Oscar Wilde: A Critical Study* (1912), which prompted famous lawsuits; and Frank Harris's *Oscar Wilde: His Life and Confessions* (1916). It is inevitable then that Mrs. Smith should produce an inspirational Wilde who brings a message of comfort: "I wither here in twilight, but I know that I shall rise from it again to ecstasy. That thought is given to us to help to endure," the voice pronounces. "The human spirit must pierce to the innermost retreats of good and evil before its consummation is complete" (55). In the "dimness" of another world Wilde reenacts the purgatorial experiences prefigured in *De Profundis*. For this is also a repentant Wilde (quite why is never made clear), who makes the unlikely confession that he adores rustic people because "they are at least near to nature, and, besides, they remind me of all the simple pleasures I somehow missed in life." Nevertheless he remains poetic, anxious to replace the solecism of his "control," who describes the moon as "like a great golden cheese," with "like a great golden pumpkin hanging in the blue night" (7).

This, too, is Wilde the critic, prepared to pronounce even upon those who have survived or come after him. Arnold Bennett and H. G. Wells, for instance, "believe they are fit for the company of the gods who drink the nectar of pure mind" (21). Shaw "cannot analyse, he is merely trying to overturn the furniture and laughs with delight when he sees the canvas bottoms of the chairs he has flung over" (22). Galsworthy, rather surprisingly, is "the only

mind I have entered into which appeals to my literary sense" (23), while Joyce's *Ulysses* is castigated because "the creatures he gives birth to leap from him in shapeless masses of hideousness, as dragons might, which in their foulsome birth contaminate their parent" (39). Hardy and Meredith are briefly dismissed and the Sitwells passed by altogether: "I do not spend my precious hours in catching tadpoles" (46).

With some of these judgments Mrs. Smith concurs, with others she parts company, providing incidental evidence of the separate reality of the spirit Wilde. Should there be any lingering doubts about the quality of the witticisms, Mrs. Smith is on hand with excuses, pointing out that after all he had been through, Wilde could hardly be expected to maintain his old standards.

But Mrs. Smith didn't really need an excuse, because her Wilde's inability to imitate his own inimitable style neatly coincided with the widespread belief, which she repeats, that the great *mots* were always prepared well in advance (107). Smith's Wilde, speaking from his "place of dimness," makes his entry with such awesome promise that his failure to touch the heights gains an alternative authenticity from the evidence of Wilde's later years (95), reproducing the pattern of the earliest biographies: a tragic life cut down at its peak.

The issue, as usual, is not so much authenticity as appropriateness. Mrs. Smith's Wilde represents an act of biographical reinterpretation that, however much she would deny it, reflects her own involvement in current debates about the reality of the spirit world.

That said, by the side of Mrs. Smith's effusions, *The Ghost-Epigrams of Oscar Wilde as Taken Down through Automatic Writing by Lazar*, which appeared in print in New York in 1929, seem even less Wildean.¹² "Wrinkles are the deathbed wherein women bury their illusions"; "Out of a love affair a man emerges bored to death; woman completely exhausted"; "All works of art are the autobiographies of liars"; "Nothing kills love like an overdose of it"; "Infidelity in woman is a masculine trait." These contain superfluous words, rarely reverse the familiar, and are often deeply misogynistic. They are also inexplicably American: "Bachelors are the bootleggers of love," and "People who live in glass

houses try to sublet their apartments." Whoever he may have been professionally, all that "Lazar" produces here are the leaden quips of a mediocre stand-up comedian.

As time went by, memories of Wilde became stronger – which is no paradox because the facts of his life had become increasingly available through such widely read books as Hesketh Pearson's biography (1946) and H. Montgomery Hyde's account of the trials (1948). John Furnell's *The Stringed Lute*, "An Evocation in Dialogue" of 1955, opens with "a massive and somewhat corpulent gentleman," appearing in a dream to the author, who currently occupies Wilde's Tite Street house:

He wore an overcoat and seemed to be about to set out on some journey for there was a bundle of rugs beside him fastened with a leather strap. There was an extraordinary dignity and kindness about him which gave him the appearance of a benevolent but rather dissipated Roman Emperor, and I at once recognised him as Oscar Wilde, the Wilde whom Toulouse-Lautrec had painted...¹³

What follows is, in fact, a drama, its dialogue based on actual quotes, mainly from Wilde, but also from Douglas, Ada Leverson, and others. At the end the narrator awakes, depressed to realize that Wilde has been nothing but a figment of his own imagination. As he does so, a violet falls to the floor: "Reverently I placed the flower between two folded sheets of paper, and as I did so I knew that it had been no dream; that although my friend was already far away on his travels, yet something of him remained with me here, in this room" (191).

Strange, perhaps, to think of Wilde as a guardian angel, though this is what he has been for so many, right up until today. In his extraordinary meditation *Who Was That Man?*, published in 1988,¹⁴ the actor and theatre director Neil Bartlett is again stalked by a spectral Wilde. Bartlett's book is, at one and the same time, a quest for gay lives in the past, and his own autobiography. Setting out to discover "our" history, he finds that Wilde's words "began to ghost his writing" (26). This is a reversal of what is normally meant by the term, since Wilde becomes the "ghost-writer" whose story Bartlett must tell in order to tell his own. And in the process he discovers that he is by no

means the first gay man to be hooked on history, to pursue the idea "that one man's experience may be a repetition of another's" (199).

"What if I rounded the corner of Villiers Street at midnight," Bartlett speculates, "and suddenly found myself walking by gaslight, and the man looking over his shoulder at me as he passed had the same moustache, but different clothes, the well-cut black and white evening dress of the summer of 1891 – would we recognise each other?" (xx). But this is a Wilde who haunts a gay man of the 1980s, after "liberation" and the coming of AIDS, and although Bartlett is led to conclude that "we have a common identity, common interests," simply to exclaim "he's just like us" would be to abolish time, distance and difference altogether, "to refuse the task (and pleasure) of identifying where he is like us, where he differs" (217). Nor are these the questions that only an author need address. As Bartlett asks his own readers: "When you are old, who will ghost your memoirs?" (208).

ACTING THE PART

Just as ghosts play parts in the lives of the living, so actors may take on the character of the dead. There have been many theatrical impersonations of Wilde, and even more imitations of a verbal style often described though never recorded. What did he sound like, really? How to embody that legendary voice?

When the English première of *Salome* took place in 1905 the role of Herod was played by a young actor who appeared under the name of Robert Farquarson, though his real name (he was of Spanish descent) was Robin de la Condamine. Both Robert Ross and Max Beerbohm were greatly impressed,¹⁵ and it was on the basis of this performance that Farquarson was cast as Forgael in Yeats's *The Shadowy Waters* in the same year. Yeats, though, was bitterly disappointed, complaining that "he is over-emphatic and shoots his voice up and down the scale in a perfectly accidental way."¹⁶ Farquarson went on to play Duke Ferdinand in *The Duchess of Malfi* (1919), Count Francesco in *The Cenci* (1922 – cast by Lewis Casson because his voice could reach three octaves),¹⁷ Iachimo in a futurist *Cymbeline* (1923), Lenin in Hugh Griffith's *Red*

Sunday (1929), and a number of roles in innovative productions of Chekhov. When he died in 1966, both Sir John Gielgud and Sir Donald Wolfit found time to add their own memories to *The Times* obituary.¹⁸ As by all accounts he had an impressive physical and vocal presence, it is riveting to learn that Farquarson was said to have based his vocal delivery upon that of Wilde himself.¹⁹

Mythic truth or mimicry merely? Farquarson's style links him, apostolically at least, with the man in whose play he had first made his name, and he certainly carried forward, long into the twentieth century, a distinctive manner that came to stand for one version of the Wildean: an imperious hauteur coupled with an ultimately deflationary tendency to excess. Farquarson, in short, was "camp."²⁰

On stage, what Gielgud in his obituary note described as a "powerful and witty, though somewhat malevolent stage personality" gave Farquarson a career. Offstage, he seems to have been able to get away with much the same manner because he operated in the relatively closed and knowing worlds of the theater, of Chelsea, and of expatriate Italy, where Reggie Turner, for another, was renowned for his uncanny ability to mimic Wilde. When Reggie reminisced, "his voice descended to the depths of an imaginary corpulence, his gestures became sculptured and hieratic and his fingers sprouted scarab rings." "It was as if Oscar's spirit had taken possession of him," recalled Harold Acton.²¹

In certain circles Wilde lived on as a private memory, but in 1936 the chance came to imitate him on stage before a wider public. The actor was Robert Morley, the play was *Oscar Wilde* by Leslie and Sewell Stokes, and the opportunity did not come easily, because the play was initially refused a license by the Lord Chamberlain's Office on the grounds of its representation of homosexuality. *Oscar Wilde* eventually opened as a club performance at the Gate Theatre on 29 September 1936 where it was, in general, positively received. One critic noted that "the jokes remain good because Wilde had several practical things to say, and said them extremely well. And the British public, which was his butt, has not so changed that these jokes have lost their truth today."²²

The printed text of the Stokeses' play carries a preface by Alfred Douglas in which he complains about an earlier drama about the trials by the French writer Maurice Rostand, suggesting that Douglas had had no dealings with Wilde after his imprisonment. In deliberate contrast the Stokes play makes Douglas's loyalty a major theme and culminates with a scene in Paris in which Douglas is seen providing a drunken Wilde with the winnings of one of his racehorses. Douglas's own justification for certain inaccuracies in the play-text is that it tells "an historically true story, allowing, of course, for dramatic licence."²³ So, for instance, Wilde returns to Tite Street after prison, and characters who seem to be based on Gide and Ross compete for Wilde's attention.

The most striking misrepresentation, however, lies in the fact that this is a totally male play (no Constance, no Ada Leverson) which refers only to the most familiar of Wilde's works, mainly to *The Importance*. As the authors make clear in their initial description, their aim is to seduce the audience: "Most people dislike him at first, but they are quickly won over by his charm of manner, his exceptionally fine speaking voice, his genial gaiety and vivacity of expression" (24). By all accounts Morley fulfilled this to the letter with his impeccable delivery of the famous witticisms and parables, as well as of dramatic moments from the trials.

Twenty years later John Furnell's "dialogue", *The Stringed Lute*, did have a number of female characters: Constance and Ada Leverson appear together; Douglas, Sherard and Ross make up a chorus of male admirers; Lady Wilde and Willie Wilde feature along with Toulouse-Lautrec and an assortment of cockney maids and French youths. The relationship between Wilde and Douglas is clearly modeled upon that between Lord Henry Wotton and Dorian Gray, the stress is on the "affected and the effeminate," and the coverall word "sin" does service for sexual detail – even though the great speech on the "love that dare not speak its name" is delivered at length with both passion and poise: "His eyes sweep contemptuously over the rows of his listeners, and there is a ring of absolute sincerity in his voice..." (73). As for Bosie, "however much he stirs our disapproval, we are forced to admit that he is a thing of breath-taking beauty" (157).

Charisma counts for a great deal. At the first night of *The Importance* Wilde towers above his companions, "one hand on hip, the other dangling his white gloves, as from his lips issues a non-stop stream of wit and epigrams. But his attitude is in no way irritating, since it is belied by the gay and friendly twinkle in his eyes, which shows that he is enjoying the game every bit as much as they are" (48). Given the opportunities that this portrait opens up, it seems a shame that Furnell's drama seems never to have been given a major professional performance.

For those who experienced it (and there were many, for the production toured the world, was seen on television and preserved on a long-playing record), the most charismatic Wilde of modern times was created by the actor Michéal MacLiammoir.

Together with the director Hilton Edwards, MacLiammoir had made the Gate in Dublin one of the hotbeds of Irish theater for some forty years.²⁴ In 1960, stuck for a filler in their programme, the two men came up with a one-man show based on Wilde which they called *The Importance of Being Oscar*. The production was brilliantly economical in its resources. MacLiammoir wore a dinner jacket, bow tie, and green carnation, and the set consisted of a few props, a carpet of violet and gold, and a vase of lilies which turned in the second half to autumn leaves. In the course of the following decade, the show visited London, Paris, and the USA. It even managed to clinch Wilde's rehabilitation in the land of his birth.

A discriminating balance of narration to quotation, recitation to commentary, brought out the variety within the *œuvre*. Portions of *Salome* were delivered in French and there were excerpts from *The Importance*. After the interval Gide's memoirs, *The Ballad of Reading Gaol* and *De Profundis* took the story through to Wilde's death, marked not by the last words most commonly attributed to him, but by his touching promise to Ross that when they were both dead, and the last trumpet was about to sound, he would turn and whisper to his companion, "Robbie, dear boy, let us pretend we do not hear it."²⁵

The trials are assumed to have taken place during the interval. Though Wilde's offense isn't detailed, neither is it concealed. MacLiammoir's comment on the refusal of Mr.

Justice Wills to allow Wilde a final statement was unmistakably heartfelt:

And yet one cannot help wondering if Oscar Wilde had been allowed to speak at that moment what would have happened? Would he have delivered some speech comparable in eloquence and in power to that of the Irish rebel, Robert Emmet: a speech that, independently of his own fate, might have revealed the strange and uniquely Anglo-Saxon quality of the law that has sentenced him? (39)

Orotund yet confiding, equipped with a velvety brogue and a glossy wig, MacLiammoir's Wilde had a deep patina that seemed both richly Irish and glamorously cosmopolitan. "Now, the Hôtel d'Alsace in the rue des Beaux Arts – it is still there, you may see it any day in Paris – was the first place in the world to honour the still dishonoured poet by a plaque upon its outer walls," MacLiammoir informed his audience, adding for those who cared to know: "It is, in fact, a modest, completely unpretentious but by no means unattractive hotel" (64).

Though, like Wilde, MacLiammoir was certainly well traveled, he was not in fact Irish at all. Born in 1899 of English parents, his real name was Alfred Willmore, and he had been raised in Kensal Green, London. The Irish name, considerable fluency in the Irish language, and an entirely fabricated Irish background (he claimed to have been born in Cork) came later. In 1927 MacLiammoir met Hilton Edwards when both men were members of Andrew MacMaster's company, and their homosexual partnership seems to have been happily accepted as a familiar part of the Dublin scene for many years.

MacLiammoir's identification with Wilde was psychological, romantic, and intellectual. Like Wilde, he had a deep and formative friendship with a young woman and, like Wilde, he was much concerned with appearance and with youthfulness, dyeing his hair and using makeup and a toupee long before they were necessary.

As both the narrator and the leading character in his one-man show MacLiammoir was effectively two men, neither of them quite himself. Edwards's director's notes insist that "impersonation" is to be avoided:

At no moment should the actor *play*, that is to say impersonate Wilde. He could identify himself with Wilde's theories and emotions; he could temporarily become the characters of Wilde's creation, but he must never attempt to *be* Wilde but must remain always himself. Stepping, as it were, in and out of the picture as occasion demanded he yet must always maintain an attitude aloof and ultimately objective; that of the Teller of the story, of the *Seanchai*. (xii)

In such ways MacLiammoir could weave his own story into the story he was telling, much as Bartlett was to do decades later. This duality resulted in a magisterial stage presence of a third kind, "camp" in the important sense that MacLiammoir was entirely and visibly in control of his own creation.

"Camp" in its more startling manifestations is precisely what many respectable modern representations of Wilde have tended to play down, substituting sincerity for sex and style for subversion. When two rival films of Wilde's life were made in the early 1960s, the tell-tale demeanor was displaced by romantic sensitivity in the case of Peter Finch, sybaritic girth in the case of Robert Morley.

The Trials of Oscar Wilde, which starred Finch and was directed by Ken Hughes, was based in part upon John Furnell's *The Stringed Lute* and in part upon Montgomery Hyde's account of the trials.²⁶ "I don't say that you look like one," remarks Lionel Jeffries's scene-stealing Queensberry to Finch's Wilde. In terms of homophobic caricature there is some truth in this, as Hughes later confirmed when he said: "What I felt about Finch was that he would level out any suggestion of the camp faggot because he was basically heterosexual."²⁷ Nor, despite Wilde's several protestations that he is "an Irish gentleman," is there much trace of brogue in Finch's delivery, and there are few of those special emphases, delays, and pauses that his contemporaries remember as being so characteristic.

This time the roles are fairly evenly distributed between the sexes, though Bosie, the male lover as tempter, is finally seen off by two women: Leverson, the understanding female friend, and Constance, the long-suffering wife. What the film offers, following the liberal ideology of the moment – it came out soon after the Wolfenden report of 1957 and just before the film *Victim* of 1961,

1. Advertisement for *Oscar Wilde*, starring Robert Morley, in the *Evening Standard*, 20 May 1960

in which Dirk Bogarde plays a gay barrister soothed by a loving wife – is the “human tragedy” of homosexuality. Wilde’s declaration, “Constance I only loved you and I only will,” suggests that if anyone has killed the thing he loves it is Douglas.

The Trials of Oscar Wilde is full of historical color (quite literally: purple, pink, and puce in the reconstructions of the Café Royal and the foyer of the St. James’s Theatre), whereas the Robert Morley film, simply entitled *Oscar Wilde*, is in stark black and white. Although based on the play Morley had premiered in London and New York in the 1930s, the film is clearly a post-Hyde courtroom drama and that, by and large, is how it was valued by the critics.²⁸

Twenty-five years later the world had changed yet again, and Wilde with it. John Hawkesworth’s three-part television drama *Oscar*, shown on BBC TV in 1985, had full-frontal male nudity, same-sex kissing, and the odd sexually explicit phrase. This was, beyond all doubt, to be the story of a great love affair. “They cannot understand that I can’t live without you,” Douglas promises Wilde. “They can do nothing to stop me loving you. There is nothing I wouldn’t do for you.” The degree of feeling is, in fact, a measure of the comparative sophistication of the adaptation, and it is matched by a generous display of Wilde’s writings, ranging from a rehearsal of *A Woman of No Importance* with Beerbohm Tree to a version of *The Happy Prince* improvised to please Wilde’s sons, Cyril and Vivian. Nevertheless the guiding presence remains, to a great extent, that of Montgomery Hyde, whose *Oscar Wilde: The Aftermath* had appeared in 1963, to be followed by a full biography in 1976. It must have been Hyde’s influence, too, that encouraged yet another rerun of the trials, much legal detail, and an emphasis upon the later years.

Oscar is kind to virtually everyone: to Constance, who is commonsensical and understanding almost to the end, to the rent-boys, and, harder task, to Douglas, who is shown to have been outwitted by his rival, Ross. In the closing moments Wilde’s invitation to Ross to ignore the last trump is followed by a reading of Douglas’s “I dreamed of him last night.” When voice-over readings from *De Profundis* are heard during the long prison

sequences, and flashbacks are shown which confirm Wilde’s mental recollections rather than the complicated set of relationships we have actually seen, the effect, perhaps intentionally, is of conflicting evidence.

For the most part, though, it is *The Ballad of Reading Gaol* that dominates the final episode, turning Wilde’s suffering into a fictional documentary that matches the poem’s particulars with poetic use of television’s capacity for realism. The title credits show the two leading actors in sepia mock-ups of Victorian photographs, offering the authenticity of intimacy rather than the overpersuasive spectacle of period colour.

Michael Gambon’s Oscar, an aging man determined to stay true to a self he is even now in the process of shaping, is large but still handsome, with an instinctive appreciation of masculine beauty. He delivers “The love that dare not speak its name” as if slightly drunk, in a tone both wistful and fervent. Although Gambon himself has Irish origins (and once worked for MacLiammoir), his brogue is very slight in comparison with the actors playing Carson and Shaw. Quite slow to reply, ever thoughtful, even his most lurid sexual exploits have a gentle, exploratory air.

If *Oscar* lacks a sense of danger and therefore doesn’t quite add up historically, that may, in 1985, have been its strength. Only four years later Terry Eagleton’s *Saint Oscar* would present Wilde as far too camp for comfort, a Bakhtinian Lord of Misrule, an Irish socialist (albeit a rather reluctant one) who penetrates the Establishment and exposes its sexual mayhem. Most previous narratives of the life, from the Stokeses to Hawkesworth, had been skeletal frames to be filled with Wilde’s own words according to the preferences of the writer. This convention, which still persists in some biographical treatments, is directly flouted by Eagleton – as it is by Peter Ackroyd in his novel *The Last Testament of Oscar Wilde* (1983). Both devise accounts of Wilde’s life using as few of Wilde’s own words as possible. In such instances the dead author is a blatant vehicle to express the allegiances of the living: for Terry Eagleton, Wilde is a radical intellectual; for Peter Ackroyd, a connoisseur of the shifting boundaries between fact and fiction.