

---

Chapter Title: A Slap in the Face of American Taste: Transporting He Who Gets Slapped to American Audiences

Chapter Author(s): Frederick H. White

Book Title: Border Crossing

Book Subtitle: Russian Literature into Film

Book Editor(s): Alexander Burry and Frederick H. White

Published by: Edinburgh University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1bh2kpq.12>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



This content is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.



Edinburgh University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Border Crossing*

JSTOR

# A Slap in the Face of American Taste: Transporting *He Who Gets Slapped* to American Audiences

---

*Frederick H. White*

**I**N 1915, the author and playwright Leonid Andreev debuted his play *He Who Gets Slapped* at the Moscow Art Theater. In the following years, this dramatic work about a vanquished intellectual-turned-circus-clown, more than any of his twenty other plays, achieved spectacular success among American audiences, first as a play in English translation, then when adapted for the silver screen, then as a novel and, finally, as an opera. Andreev had argued in his “Letters on the Theater” that cinema would become the place for action and spectacle, diminishing the popularity of the realist theater. Not surprisingly then, a love affair, betrayal, and humiliation are all vividly on display at the outset of Victor Sjöström’s *He Who Gets Slapped* (1924). At the end of Sjöström’s cinematic adaptation, the villains are devoured by a ferocious lion, just the type of spectacle that Andreev had predicted would be possible in the medium of film. Yet, Andreev could not have anticipated a novel adaptation by George A. Carlin (1925), which would attempt to capitalize on the play’s cinematic success, or an operatic adaptation by Robert Ward and Bernard Stambler (1956), that would focus on the clown’s failed search for love. In retrospect, Andreev’s play was astonishingly generative and was easily transported across both temporal and spatial borders, entertaining American audiences as a play, film, novel, and opera.

Of particular interest is how Andreev’s panpsyche drama—a type of theater that focused on the psychological development of characters rather than on external action—could be successfully transported for American audiences in so many different forms. Most certainly, a partial answer may be found in the rich cultural tradition of the circus. As the French semiotician Paul Bouissac has written, the circus “is a kind of mirror in which the culture is reflected, condensed and at the same time transcended; perhaps the circus seems to stand outside culture only because it is at its very center.”<sup>1</sup> *He Who Gets Slapped* may have been written by a Russian author and located in a provincial French

town, but the circus was a readily understandable metaphysical space, ripe for intrigue, mystery, and deception in the American imagination. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the circus could bring the massive New York City to a halt, animate small towns like Waterloo, Iowa, and turn provincial communities into bustling temporary tent cities. Andreev's play about betrayal and revenge, seemingly, struck a chord with modern industrial America, during the unscrupulous Gilded Age of robber barons and a period of great social change due to a rapidly increasing immigrant population, a period in American history when the circus crisscrossed the country providing "a vivid cultural window into this era's complex and volatile web of historical changes."<sup>2</sup>

At issue for this chapter are several important structural issues. First, we will discuss Andreev's understanding of panpsyche theater and how he applied this theory to his own play. Next, we will consider how Sjöström maintained the underlying psychological motivation, but replaced Andreev's duality of external and internal truths with the more dynamic motifs of revenge and romantic suspense. Briefly, we will turn to Carlin's novelistic hypertext and query as to why the writer's attempt to combine elements of the play and the movie script did not result in a third organizing principle. Finally, we will consider Ward and Stambler's operatic hypertext, which did provide a third organizing principle in its transportation of *He Who Gets Slapped* into the American context, ignoring both the panpsyche drama of Andreev and the revenge motif of Sjöström.

Secondarily, this chapter will suggest that several factors contributed to the successful transportation of Andreev's play, not the least of which was America's own infatuation with the circus.<sup>3</sup> More specifically, clown acts deal in dichotomies between the social norm and the lack of that norm that interrupt the shared semantic codes of a society.<sup>4</sup> As a result, Andreev's panpsyche drama benefits from both America's fascination with the circus and the audience's preparedness to interpret the depiction of a clown on more than one level of semantic meaning. The various hypertexts, in turn, are able to investigate the social norms of American society within a mythopoeic space that is organized by a different set of social rules. Consequently, we can assert that Andreev's hypotext, like the American circus, deals with disrupted daily life, the normalization of abnormality and the destabilization of social codes, making the various hypertexts of *He Who Gets Slapped* culturally familiar and yet also a novel source of entertainment for American audiences.

## PANPSYCHE THEATER

---

For the first two decades of the twentieth century, Leonid Andreev was one of Russia's leading cultural figures. His short stories and plays acted like a

weathervane, responding to and often indicating the most important political and social issues of the day. Much of his original success was predicated on this timeliness of his works and the passionate debates that erupted in the press in response. In the second half of Andreev's career, he began to pay ever more attention to the theater, working with leading figures like Konstantin Stanislavskii, Vladimir Nemirovich-Danchenko and Vsevolod Meierkhol'd. On November 10, 1912, Andreev wrote his first "Letter on the Theater," which argued for a new type of theater that would relinquish external action for use in the cinema, while maintaining the internal, psychological and intellectual development of a character for the stage.<sup>5</sup> Andreev argued that life had moved inward and that the theater of spectacle must be supplanted by a theater of the mind. Although this was certainly a criticism of realist theater, it was also a nod to the promising future of cinema. Two years later, Andreev published a second letter, outlining his ideas for a new type of drama, a theater of the "panpsyche." In this letter Andreev described the power that the cinema was gaining with audiences and suggested that only a theater of the panpsyche, like the productions offered by the Moscow Art Theater, could compete for the public's attention.

In Andreev's opinion, the Russian theater needed to concentrate on plays in which the *drama* occurred internally, whereby the characters' external actions were driven by the psychological struggles that occurred within them. No longer were plays to be organized around external action, but around the joys and suffering of the human experience. Andreev created a whole series of plays in which the internal action of the play is associated with psychological torment caused by infidelity, deception, dishonesty, and disloyalty. These struggles are displayed in his plays *Anfisa*, *Professor Storitsyn*, *Ekaterina Ivanovna*, *Waltz of the Dogs*, and *Samson in Chains*. The most successful of these plays for the Russian (and, eventually, the American) stage (and screen) was *He Who Gets Slapped*. At the Russian premiere of the play, Andreev responded to fourteen curtain calls. Consequently, it is compelling to examine Andreev's most successful attempt at panpsyche theater and how hypertexts could be transformed for the screen and then as a novel and an opera. Just as fascinating is how this dramatic text could be transported through both space and time to entertain American audiences.

*He Who Gets Slapped* premiered at the Moscow Art Theater on October 27, 1915 and at the Aleksandrinskii Theater in Petrograd a month later. It takes place in a circus in a French city. The character "He" is running from a failed marriage after his wife has left him for their mutual friend. He finds solace in the world of the circus and there is a definite contrast between the real (outside) world and the circus world. In the play there are various references to He's identity prior to entering the circus and what he has become in this new environment. He has clearly suffered from his loss in the outside world

and now claims to be mad: “Never in your life did you use such a precise expression. I am mad!”<sup>6</sup> However, the audience is not quite sure if this is the case or if this is another aspect of his performance. This confusion partially stems from the fact that He is just a role that the intellectual from the outside world is now playing. He admits:

Don’t be angry, Jim. It’s a play, don’t you understand? I become happy when I enter the ring and hear the music. I wear a mask and I feel humorous. There is a mask on my face, and I play. I may say anything as a drunkard. Do you understand? Yesterday when I, with this stupid face, was playing the great man, the philosopher [*he assumes a proud monumental pose, and repeats the gesture of the play—general laughter*] I was walking this way, and was telling how great, how wise, how incomparable I was—how God lived in me, how high I stood above my head [*his voice changes and he is speaking faster*] then you, Jim, you hit me for the first time. And I asked you, “What is it, they’re applauding me?” Then, at the tenth slap, I said: “It seems to me that they sent me from the Academy?” [*Looks around him with an air of unconquerable pride and splendour. Laughter. Jim gives him a real slap.*]<sup>7</sup>

In Andreev’s play and other works, a *performance* is employed to hide the main character’s true emotions and psychological state. Even as he suffers on the inside, He plays the part of a clown and entertains the audience, demonstrating that people prefer the appearance of normalcy to the truth. As Andreev had suggested in his “Letters to the Theater,” this external action—the life of the circus, the slapping of the face of the clown, the laughter of the audience—is not the dramatic impetus of the play. Rather He’s feelings of betrayal, his attempt to lose himself in the artificial world of the circus, his developing love for the circus performer Consuelo, and the desire to inflict psychological pain on her suitor, the Baron (and those like him), are the true, internal drama that informs this panpsyche theater.

In Andreev’s earlier literary and dramatic works, the concept of *verisimilitude* (*pravdopodobnost’* in Russian) was often an organizing principle. For Andreev, verisimilitude meant giving those around you a truth that they wanted to see, rather than the often painful truth that might lead to anger, disappointment or a sense of betrayal. This concept was articulated very clearly in his story “My Notes” (1908).<sup>8</sup> Andreev’s theory of the panpsyche theater seemingly grew out of this understanding of verisimilitude in which there is an outward acceptable truth, a thin veneer, that often hides a less attractive, psychologically complex truth about the individual. At certain moments, this unattractive truth shows through the veneer and creates dramatic, often psychological, tension.



Figure 7.1 Postcard of the Art Theater's 1915 production of *He Who Gets Slapped*, featuring Illarion Pevtsov as He.

Andreev's focus on the subtle psychological moments of his characters can be found in his stage directions to the actress who played Consuelo in the Moscow production:

There is nothing simpler than the drama, in which all is on the outside: in movement, cries, tears, sobs, in clearly visible dramatic conflicts. But the difficulty of this role is terribly great, for all the calamity is based

externally on *half-tones, sighs, smiles, on the expression of sadness in the face and eyes, when the soul is hidden from the very person who is experiencing it all.*<sup>9</sup>

Significantly, *He Who Gets Slapped* is populated by individuals who have a circus persona and a real life history that is only revealed for brief moments during the play. The Count is not really royalty. Consuelo is not really Mancini's daughter. The dashing Bezano is actually quite shy and reserved in person. The interplay of external persona and internal psychological drama is, for Andreev, the actual tension and drama of the play itself.

Andreev's theory of the panpsyche theater, organized around a principle of verisimilitude, benefits greatly when placed within the context of the circus. Bouissac argues that the circus is a meta-cultural code system that represents the totality of our perceived universe. The circus is constituted of acts that are symbolic of cultural units that the audience is asked to decode: wild vs. domesticated, repulsive vs. attractive, situations that are exotic, primitive, or historical.<sup>10</sup> In decoding these cultural units, Andreev's play, similarly, asks the theater audience to unite the various revelations regarding the gentleman-clown's previous life that reproduce universal emotions, such as humiliation, revenge, love, and hate. In this instance, the theater audience is already prepared to view the circus performance as a transgressive manipulation of cultural systems which demands some form of active decoding; therefore, Andreev's panpsyche drama benefits from the audience's preparedness. As a result, the universal quality of the circus also begins to explain why an American film and opera audience might also respond positively to this spatial and temporal transportation of Andreev's panpsyche play.

### ANDREEV'S HYPOTEXT

Andreev's hypotext begins with a gentleman approaching members of the circus, asking to be a clown. The circus entertainers are unsure. They recognize that the stranger is cultured and well educated, but think that he might be drunk. This would-be clown suggests that he might read something literary or make some sort of speech as part of his act. Then, he suggests that his circus name might be "He Who Gets Slapped" and that his act could be to receive slaps from other clowns. This introduction, of course, leaves the theater audience guessing as to the real identity of this strange man and, as the main action of the play develops, the clown's mysterious identity is divulged piecemeal, allowing Andreev to successfully tease out the psychological aspects of the mysterious clown and provide the motivation for his life in the circus.

In the first act, we learn that this odd gentleman is thirty-nine, well educated, and someone quite well known. The owner of the circus asks for identification so as to register his employees with the police. When the gentleman-clown is finally forced to disclose his real name, the reaction of the circus owner reveals that he is to be respected, but the theater audience gains no further information.

In the second act, He is already established as a clown and his act is a success. There are still some indications of his education as the other performers warn him against too much talk of politics and religion during his performance. The theater audience also learns that He is in love with Consuelo and that Count Mancini is trying to marry his daughter to Baron Regnard for financial gain. It is only at the very end of this act that a gentleman visits He in the circus:

Gentleman: [*Humbly*]: You have not forgiven me, He? [*Silence.*]

He: Are you here with my wife? Is she, too, in the circus?

Gentleman: [*Quickly*]: Oh, no! I am alone. She stayed there!

He: You've left her already?

Gentleman: [*Humbly*]: No—we have—a son. After your sudden and mysterious disappearance—when you left that strange and insulting letter——

He: [*Laughs*]: Insulting? You are still able to feel insults? What are you doing here? Were you looking for me, or is it an accident?

Gentleman: I have been looking for you, for half a year—through many countries. And suddenly, to-day—by accident, indeed—I had no acquaintances here, and I went to the circus. We must talk things over ... He, I implore you. [*Silence.*]

He: Here is a shadow I cannot lose! To talk things over! Do you really think we still have something to talk over? All right. Leave your address with the porter, and I will let you know when you can see me. Now get out. [*Proudly.*] I am busy.<sup>11</sup>

This revelation still does not answer many of the questions about the clown's past. If anything, it becomes even more mystifying: an insulting letter; He's wife now is married to another man; the former friend and former wife have a child together. The psychological *action* of the play has become even more complicated, which is what Andreev desired, each circus performer with his or her own secret, each running away from something by living and working in the circus.

At the beginning of the third act, the gentleman returns to the circus and the audience learns that he has *stolen* the gentleman-clown's wife and his ideas, vulgarizing and publishing them in a book that has been quite





Figure 7.2 Postcard of Illarion Pevtsov as He (1915).

successful. Although the gentleman is now a famous figure, appearing often in the press, with a wife and son, he still is haunted by the existence of his former friend (He) and the possibility that the gentleman-clown shall return. The gentleman has searched out this friend whom he has betrayed in order to ascertain if the former friend ever intends to return home. To the gentleman's seeking a promise from his friend-turned-circus-clown that he will not return, He promises as much, making it clear that he has left an intellectual's life behind for good. Andreev finally provides, in part, the psychological

impetus for why He left behind his life in high society in order to join the circus and to be humiliated each day for the entertainment of strangers. This psychological profile also puts into perspective He's life within the circus and his desire to undermine Count Mancini's attempts to *sell* Consuelo to Baron Regnard. Having endured once the disappointment of losing his wife to a scoundrel, He's strong desire to save Consuelo from the Baron is now psychologically motivated for the theater audience. As a result, in the fourth act He poisons Consuelo in order to save her from an arranged marriage. Off-stage, the Baron commits suicide. Once He learns of the Baron's death, utterly surprised, he poisons himself, wishing to meet Consuelo in the after-life before the Baron.

In *He Who Gets Slapped* the unattractive truth about the clown is that he is running from a failed marriage, betrayed by a good friend and his own wife. He is hiding from this psychological pain within the circus, where he can be a clown whose pain and humiliation are viewed by those around him as part of a humorous act. Those circus colleagues have their own secrets to keep and do not want to know why He suffers so greatly—maybe he is insane or a drunkard. They are more than willing to accept this veneer of a clown who is repeatedly slapped and humiliated as the real man. Tension, therefore, is created by the psychological dissonance found in the appearance of a circus clown, covering the tragic loss and betrayal of an intellectual who has turned his back on his former life. Once this is understood by the theater audience, then the secondary story of He's love for Consuelo gains added meaning as the clown tries to save the young girl from a similar type of betrayal and humiliation. The clown's love is further intensified because his rival for Consuelo's affection is the Baron, the same kind of scoundrel as the former friend who betrayed He's trust and stole his wife.

## SJÖSTRÖM'S HYPERTEXT

---

Excerpts from Andreev's first "Letter to the Theater" were published in English translation by *The New York Times* in October 1919. "Andreyev on the Modern Theater" (October 5) and "Andreyev on Motion Pictures" (October 19) made it possible for American audiences to gain an understanding of Andreev's dissatisfaction with the realist theater and his belief in the future of cinema. Unfortunately, Andreev's second letter was not translated, thereby depriving American audiences of his further developed theories on the panpsyche theater.

*He Who Gets Slapped* was translated into English by Gregory Zilboorg and published in *The Dial* in March 1921. On January 9, 1922, as a production of the Theatre Guild, Andreev's play premiered at the Garrick Theatre. From

its opening night and on through the summer of that year, there were a total of 308 performances of *He Who Gets Slapped* in New York City. In 1924, the play was performed at Le Petit Théâtre du Vieux Carré in New Orleans where “it was well on its way to being taken into the American national theatre repertory,”<sup>12</sup> when Sjöström and Carey Wilson adapted Zilboorg’s translation into a movie script.

Sjöström was one of the leading directors, and a major contributor to the “golden age” of Swedish cinema (1917–23). His first important picture had been *Ingeborg Holm* (1913), about a widow who goes insane when her children are taken from her because she can no longer support them. His *Terje Vigen* (1916), an adaptation of Henrik Ibsen’s classic poem, achieved great international success. The film is about a man who loses everything during the English blockade of the Norwegian coast, but continues to live solely in order to exact revenge on the English ship’s commander. He scored another success with a film based on the novel and play of Icelandic author Johan Sigurjonsson. *The Outlaw and His Wife* (1917) is about an escaped prisoner who finds love with a young widow on a desolate farm. When the search party approaches, the prisoner escapes with his new family to the mountains where they drown their child in a brook. Eventually, the prisoner and his wife freeze to death during a snowstorm. Sjöström’s last important film before leaving for Hollywood was *The Phantom Chariot* (or in the United States: *Thy Soul Shall Bear Witness*) (1921), based on Swedish author Selma Lagerlöf’s novel. In the film, the drunkard David Holm is struck on the head and has a vision in which he must drive a carriage on New Year’s Eve to pick up dead souls. The film mixes dream and reality with Holm’s past and present in a suggestive pattern.<sup>13</sup> Such early experiences in Sweden attest to the fact that Sjöström had experience successfully transporting literary works to the silver screen.

Sjöström (now Seastrom for American audiences) was brought to the United States by Goldwyn Pictures in January 1923, just when the big Hollywood studios were importing the best European talent. His first film was based on British author Hall Caine’s novel *The Master of Man* (1921). The film, *Name the Man* (1924), was a court drama, which displayed none of Sjöström’s creative talents, but was still a financial and popular success with American audiences. Swedish critic Ragnar Cederstrand argued that the film was a hit with Americans because Sjöström had turned a boring courtroom drama into a compelling psychological film. American directors would have approached it as a visual thriller, but Sjöström’s psychological approach was new for American audiences (though not so revolutionary for Europeans or, particularly, for Scandinavians).<sup>14</sup> The point made by the critic is quite remarkable given that Sjöström’s next film would be *He Who Gets Slapped*, based on Andreev’s panpsyche work in which the action of the play is to be driven by the psychological drama of the main characters.

In the mid-1920s, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer emerged as the “Home of the Stars” and dazzled audiences with their big-name celebrities, their high production costs, and the sheer breadth of subject matter. The new studio had hired Irving Thalberg away from Universal to become MGM’s production chief. Thalberg had worked with Lon Chaney on *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* (1923) and was able to convince the actor to sign a one-year contract with his new studio. Thalberg wanted Chaney because his pictures made money and because he could create characters for almost any situation. Thalberg himself was not afraid to spend money both to make money and to maintain artistic integrity.<sup>15</sup>

The first picture made by MGM was Andreev’s *He Who Gets Slapped*. The play had been a success on Broadway two years before with Richard Bennett in the lead role. The studio hired Sjöström and cast Chaney in the lead role of Paul Beaumont. Norma Shearer and John Gilbert were cast in the supporting roles of Consuelo and Bezano. Both actors would go on to earn tremendous popularity in the following years. MGM saw this as a prestige picture (or art film) and the emphasis was on the total picture, rather than as a vehicle for Chaney.

Sjöström took Andreev’s play and wrote a first film draft in Swedish, which was then translated into English and polished by Wilson. In this hypertext, there are several elaborations of the hypotext, some more significant than others. In Sjöström’s hypertext, the main character’s life before the circus and the betrayals that lead to his departure from academic society are significantly augmented, brought forward in the storyline and given nearly sixteen minutes of exposition on screen. In this adaptation, Paul Beaumont (He) is a research scientist, who makes a significant discovery regarding the *Origins of Mankind* that he intends to present to a gathering of academic colleagues at the French Academy of Sciences. Baron Regnard, who has provided material support to Beaumont and his wife, Marie, betrays his friend thrice—once, by conducting a romantic liaison with Marie behind Beaumont’s back, a second time by stealing Beaumont’s working papers (with Marie’s help), and a third time by presenting Beaumont’s scientific discovery to the Academy of Sciences as his own work. Beaumont confronts the Baron at the Academy of Sciences in front of his colleagues, insisting that the scientific findings are his own. Regnard claims that Beaumont is insane, simply a poor student who has aided the Baron in his scientific research. When Beaumont grabs the Baron, enraged by this lie, Regnard slaps Beaumont and the entire gallery of learned men howl in laughter at this intended slight. The inter-title at this moment states: “Laughter—the bitterest and most subtle death to hope—.” Sjöström’s introduction of the slap and Beaumont’s humiliation will become a recurring motif once Beaumont transforms himself into He and entertains circus patrons, who are in fact, many of the same actors, playing both the circus audience and the gallery of learned men.



Figure 7.3 Production still of Lon Chaney as He in Sjöström's *He Who Gets Slapped* (1924).

Beaumont's complete humiliation soon follows, when Marie admits her liaison with the Baron. In this scene, Marie confronts Beaumont, claiming that she is in love with the Baron, especially given Beaumont's infatuation with "silly books"—alluding to both his weak financial and social status. As Marie turns away from Beaumont, she slaps him on the face, the second such occurrence, both associated with Beaumont's humiliation. Marie then says in the

inter-title: “Fool! Clown!” As Beaumont seemingly loses his mind, he repeats this accusation that he is a fool and a clown as he throws his research papers away. The inter-titles then state that Beaumont lived through a night of agony, but left the Baron’s in order to live: “Paul Beaumont lived—to laugh at life. He laughed at his wife and the Baron—and left them to the doubtful joy of each other’s society.” It is at this point that Sjöström transitions to the circus, where Beaumont is already transformed into He.

At issue is Sjöström’s restructuring of Andreev’s play so that the impetus for Beaumont to join the circus is revealed at the outset of the film. One simple explanation for this is that Andreev’s play relies on dialogue, while Sjöström is working in the visual medium of the silent film. Sjöström must *show* this betrayal and humiliation, rather than have it be revealed in dialogue; yet by portraying Beaumont’s humiliation at the beginning of the film, he must then create psychological tension in other ways in order to sustain the audience’s interest. One such way is to conflate from Andreev’s play the gentleman/former friend, who betrayed He and seduced his wife, and Baron Regnard, who wishes to seduce Consuelo. In Andreev’s play, these are two different characters, although the audience understands that He’s passionate desire to save Consuelo from the Baron is most certainly informed by his earlier failure to stop his wife’s infidelity with his former friend. Sjöström turns this implicit understanding into an explicit element of his hypertext—it is Baron Regnard who seduces Marie, betrays Beaumont and then, later, comes to the circus to court Consuelo.

Sjöström, through inter-titles, suggests that it is Consuelo’s aristocratic background that rekindles Beaumont’s heart. This is emphasized visually in a sequence in which Consuelo re-sews a heart back onto He’s clown costume. The rupture of the clown’s heart as part of his act has its own semantic meaning, but is even more salient as the intimate moment that Consuelo and He spend together on screen. This scene is directly followed by He’s clown act, during which he realizes that Baron Regnard is in the audience. As He attempts to point out the Baron in the circus audience, he receives slap after slap from the collection of supporting clowns. Eventually, his heart, which had just recently been re-sewn by Consuelo, is ripped out by another clown. He falls down dead and a mock funeral is enacted as part of the performance. Significantly, Bouissac argues that the circus act is often a prototype of social behavior that provides a demonstration of what is or should be; therefore, the American cinematic audience certainly understands the meaning of He’s humiliation, eviscerated heart and symbolic death as the Baron looks on gleefully.<sup>16</sup>

A few scenes later, Sjöström further emphasizes the Baron’s dastardly character with a scene in which we see Marie Beaumont in shock as she watches the Baron collect his hat, gloves, and cane while departing. The camera then focuses on a check, made out to Marie, underlining that the Baron has ended



the relationship and turned it into a financial, rather than romantic, liaison. In so doing, Sjöström has exacted some revenge on Marie for the enjoyment of the cinema audience, but has also further blackened the reputation of the Baron. In Andreev's play, the revenge factor is abstract, as the Baron and the gentleman-friend are the same type of men within society, but in Sjöström's hypertext there are clear heroes (He and Bezano) and villains (Baron Regnard and Count Mancini) in a struggle over the affection of Marie and Consuelo. Although the psychological motivation remains as an underlying explanation for Beaumont/He's desire for revenge, Andreev's duality of external and internal truths is replaced by a more straightforward and immediate exposition of: (1) Revenge—will Beaumont/He reveal himself to the Baron and receive satisfaction? (2) Romantic suspense—will Consuelo be sold to the Baron by her father or will she find real love with Bezano or, less likely, with Beaumont/He? As Andreev had argued, the cinema had forsworn the slow unwinding of a psychological drama for the immediate action and spectacle of love and revenge.

Once it has been announced that the Baron intends to marry Consuelo, Sjöström literally locks He, the Baron, and Count Mancini into a room together. Lon Cheney is brilliant in his depiction of psychotic rage, which is first masked as clown's play, but then is directed at Mancini for *selling* his daughter to the Baron. Mancini throws Beaumont/He out of the room and into an ancillary area where a lion is kept. Lions exist in Andreev's play off-stage (and in the theater audience's imagination), but Sjöström utilizes the lion for the spectacular revenge motif. Beaumont/He strategically positions the cage and re-enters the room through another door, tantalizing the cinema audience with the possible release of the lion into the room with Mancini and the Baron. Sjöström finally realizes the revenge plot in two dissolve shots in which the Baron is confronted with the fact that He is Paul Beaumont.

The tragedy of Andreev's hypotext is found in He's psychological pain and that, after poisoning Consuelo in order to save her from the Baron, he learns that the Baron may have, in fact, loved Consuelo as he has shot himself in the head off-stage. Therefore, He's final act is a desperate one in which he drinks poison in the frantic hope of reaching Consuelo in the afterlife before the Baron. Sjöström decides on a much more visually dazzling conclusion, one in which Mancini stabs He with a knife blade that has been hidden in his cane, a weapon that has been revealed to the cinema audience previously. Fatally wounded, He collapses to the floor and tries to staunch the wound with the fake heart that has been the symbol of his love for Consuelo and of the cruelty of the world around him. Final revenge is realized as Mancini and the Baron decide to leave He dying by exiting through the door, where the lion is awaiting. Sjöström, to the sounds of the William Tell overture, revels in the visual beauty of a large, angry lion with rapid cuts to the horrified faces of the Baron and Mancini as well as to the psychotic laughter of the clown. As Andreev had



Figure 7.4 Production still of Consuelo (Norma Shearer), Bezano (John Gilbert), and He (Lon Chaney).

predicted, the visual spectacle would be left to the cinema. Mancini is the first to be eaten by the lion behind an overturned table as He laughs and the Baron looks on in horror. The lion then pounces on the Baron and He revels in this final, sweet revenge. The lion then faces He and the clown invites the lion to come and give him a *final slap*. Just then, the lion tamer Zinida arrives and drives the beast back into its cage.

Sjöström, having already altered the tenor of the hypertext by reveling in the revenge motif, was forced to decide how he would resolve the second storyline, the suspense created by the many suitors for Consuelo's heart. Sjöström certainly could not marry Consuelo to both Bezano and He. In Andreev's play, Bezano is too shy and too confused to actualize his love for Consuelo, but in Sjöström's hypertext, Bezano is the clear hero—attractive and dynamic—and outwardly expressive of his love for Consuelo. In Andreev's play, Consuelo is an obedient daughter, but Sjöström gives his heroine free will and an obvious preference for Bezano. As a result, Sjöström recaptures the tragic quality of Andreev's hypotext with one last performance by He for the circus audience, who along with the supporting clowns, do not realize that he has been fatally wounded by Mancini. As He tries to express himself to the audience, he is



twice slapped and knocked to the ground. As He reveals the bloody heart that he has used to staunch his wound, Consuelo runs out to He and holds him in her arms. The inter-titles that follow suggest that He is now happy to die, having exacted revenge for the Baron's betrayal, and now Consuelo could also find happiness with Bezano.

In Sjöström's hypertext, the psychological motivation is revealed at the outset of the film. In order to sustain the audience's interest, Sjöström makes the revenge motif explicit by making Baron Regnard both the betrayer of Beaumont and the suitor of Consuelo. Sjöström also heightens the romantic suspense by making Bezano more dynamic, by providing Consuelo with free will, and by executing successfully, while continuing to reference, the re-sewn heart scene between He and Consuelo. As Andreev had anticipated, the psychological aspects were diminished for visually spectacular moments, including Beaumont's betrayal, He's circus act, and Baron Regnard's treachery of Marie—none of which are seen in Andreev's play—as well as the final scene involving the lion and He's tragic death in front of the entire circus and their audience. Each is visually stunning and intensifies the internal action of the hypertext.

### CARLIN'S HYPERTEXT

The cinematic *He Who Gets Slapped* opened on November 3, 1924 at the Capitol Theater in New York. It cost relatively little to make for a feature film (\$140,000) and was a huge financial success, setting the records for best single day (\$15,000), best week (\$71,900) and best two-week (\$121,574) box office return.<sup>17</sup> The film was also considered an artistic success, which is captured in *The New York Times* review of November 10, 1924:

It is a shadow drama so beautifully told, so flawlessly directed that we might imagine that it will be held up as a model by all producers. Throughout its length there is not an instant of ennui, not a second one wants to lose ... Never in his efforts before the camera has Mr. Chaney delivered such a marvelous performance as he does as this character. He is restrained in his acting, never overdoing the sentimental situation, and is guarded in his make-up.<sup>18</sup>

*He Who Gets Slapped* eventually turned a profit of \$349,000, not a small sum for the studio. It was also critically acclaimed and made *The New York Times* list of the 10 Best Productions of 1924.

The following year, *He Who Gets Slapped* by George A. Carlin was published, transporting the text once again—from stage to screen to book for

the American audience. On the cover, there is a needed explanation: "The Complete Novel. Illustrated with scenes from the photoplay." Seemingly, the success of Sjöström's film had created a demand for yet another hypertext. By the book's cover description, one would expect, more or less, a faithful rendering of Sjöström's hypertext in novelistic form. Surprisingly, Carlin begins his novel just as Andreev had begun his play, with an odd gentleman approaching the circus, asking for work. As just discussed, Sjöström's film begins with Beaumont's scientific discovery and his excitement in sharing this with his wife and his patron. In fact, Carlin's entire hypertext is an odd mixture of Andreev's play, Sjöström's adaptation, and the author's own creative imagination. For example, Carlin waits until the last third of the novel to reveal the reason for HE's departure from society and his entry into the circus.<sup>19</sup> Carlin suggests that a Prince Poniatovsky and his wife Olga were deported from Tsarist Russia. The young Prince is enthusiastic about scientific experimentation and Baron Regnard offers the Russian couple a place to stay and his patronage so that the Prince may continue his scientific research. In time, Princess Olga and the Baron become regulars together at social events, while the Prince is busy with his work on the fourth dimension. Sjöström's Paul and Marie Beaumont and the scientist's discovery of the *Origins of Mankind* are replaced by Carlin's Russian émigrés and a search for an alternate dimension. Even so, there is a still picture from Sjöström's film of the actors Chaney (Beaumont), Gilbert (Regnard), and Ruth King (Marie) in Carlin's book with the caption "The wife he adored and the friend he trusted."<sup>20</sup>

Carlin's decision to create a hypertext that draws from both Andreev's hypotext and Sjöström's hypertext elicits the following question: Did Carlin subscribe to Andreev's theory on panpsyche drama, to Sjöström's spectacle of revenge, or did he attempt to fashion a semi-independent hypertext with a third organizing principle? Carlin certainly makes allusions to both texts and both endings, leaving the reader uncertain as to whom he might favor in the end: the notion of poisoning someone's drink is introduced, as are the ferocious lions. For readers aware of both the play and the film, a third organizing principle or some combination of the two texts seems quite possible. Unexpectedly, Carlin blends the two texts into a third, unifying text that might satisfy both the theater audience who had seen Andreev's play and the cinema audience who had watched Sjöström's film. In so doing, Carlin neither recreates a psychological drama nor presents a compelling revenge fantasy for readers. Most disappointingly, Carlin does not claim new territory to truly stake his hypertext's independence from its progenitors. In fact, he seems to strand himself at the border of these two potential territories.

In Carlin's novel, a mysterious man comes to the circus and asks for work. Yet, unlike in Andreev's play, Carlin provides histories for each character so that HE is no more the focus of the novel's development than the whole host

of circus characters—Jim Jackson, Zinida, Papa Briquet, Tilly, and Polly. Carlin often concentrates on the characters' physical features, drawing from Sjöström's film, but avoids the psychological details provided by Andreev. Occasionally, it is mentioned that HE might be insane, but this motif seems to be a lingering remnant of Andreev's hypotext, rather than an important element of Carlin's hypertext. It is not enough to mention several times that HE might be insane. In comparison, Andreev creates situations in which the humiliation and betrayal experienced by the gentleman-clown has left him a rather unstable and emotionally bankrupt individual. Once well established in the circus as HE, Carlin reveals that the clown is a Russian prince who had been betrayed by the Baron. As noted, this is Carlin's invention, possibly a homage to Andreev's own Russian expatriation when the borders of Finland were reestablished after the revolution and his home remained outside of Russia proper. At this point in the hypertext, Carlin seems to favor Sjöström's revenge motif, but then deemphasizes the most important elements of it. One of the most powerful scenes in Sjöström's hypertext is when the Baron breaks from Marie, leaving her a check for her romantic services. Carlin does not incorporate this dastardly behavior in his hypertext, missing an opportunity to further turn his reading audience against the Baron and create sympathy for HE, which will allow the clown some moral latitude to punish/kill the Baron. Carlin also diminishes the moment of recognition and confrontation between the Baron and HE:

"You lie!" The Baron spoke in a calm voice that had conquered his hysterical protégé before the Academy. After the first stunning shock of recognition and the first impact of HE's tirade, Regnard's powerful self-possession had returned, and he silenced his adversary with his cutting tone:

"The Princess preferred that an English millionaire should pay her bills."<sup>21</sup>

After this slight from the Baron, Carlin does not provide an extended description of HE's psychological humiliation, but rather, turns his attention to Mancini's desire to strike HE with a cane. Even in Sjöström's film, Chaney shows a range of emotions at this moment of confrontation that depicts a mixture of humiliation, vengeance, and madness. In Carlin's hypertext, the Baron restrains Mancini, calling the clown mad. HE, in turn, admits that he is insane. Hardly the full range of emotions one might expect if Carlin had decided to favor the revenge motif.

Just as confounding is the moment of HE's final revenge, when the clown releases the lion into the room. In Sjöström's hypertext, the lion's menacing behavior and, eventually, his devouring of first Mancini and then the Baron

is the spectacle that Andreev had predicted for use in the cinema. Sjöström lingers on this moment and allows several shots of He's maniacal pleasure in this ultimate revenge as well as the Baron's utter horror of first Mancini's painful death and then his own realization that the lion will devour him as well. In Carlin's hypertext, one is unsure that the lion has even killed anyone. HE releases the lion into the room and then Zinida almost immediately comes in to drive her lion back into the cage. There is one reference to the lion's actions: "But, as she turned and saw the bodies of Mancini and the Baron, her hands went to her face to blot out the sight."<sup>22</sup> As a result, it is difficult to argue that once Carlin decided to highlight the revenge factor, that he, in fact, executed this organizing principle effectively.

---

### WARD AND STAMBLER'S HYPERTEXT

---

In 1955, the American composer Robert Ward and his Julliard colleague Bernard Stambler wrote and composed the opera *Pantaloön*, which was re-titled *He Who Gets Slapped* in 1959. Based on Andreev's play, Ward and Stambler transform the character He into Pantaloön, a reference to the clown-character from commedia dell'arte. No longer a story of murder and suicide, Pantaloön is simply rejected by the heroine and condemned to the humiliation of the *slap* for the rest of his life. *Pantaloön* first premiered on May 17, 1956, performed by the Columbia University Opera Workshop. The revised version of the opera, under the title *He Who Gets Slapped*, was produced by the New York City Opera on April 12, 1959.

In a recent interview with *Opera Lively*, Ward recounts how he and Stambler came to select *He Who Gets Slapped* for adaptation. In search of new material, Ward remembered Andreev's play and reread the first two acts. He liked that it was set in a circus and that most of the action occurs in the ring itself. The characters were colorful and Ward adored the idea of a vanquished intellectual coming to the circus. He called Stambler and asked him to read the play. Ward then went on to read the last two acts and was less inspired. Ward says: "It was very strange, because it was almost as if these two acts were for a different play, and we wondered about that and figured we'd have to make a lot of changes." Stambler adapted a third act from Andreev's final two acts to complete the opera.<sup>23</sup> From Ward's description of the play, it is quite apparent that he did not favor the deception and humiliation of the intellectual that Sjöström decided to exploit in his adaptation. Ward and Stambler, instead, focused on the story of Mancini and his attempt to marry Consuelo to the Baron. In the third act, Pantaloön reveals to the Baron that Consuelo is not the noble daughter of a Count, but some uneducated waif and that Mancini only meant to profit personally from the marriage. The Baron storms off as Mancini also slinks away,

leaving Bezano and Consuelo to proclaim their love for each other. The opera begins with an aristocratic stranger entering the circus, wishing to become a clown, and ends with Pantaloon shedding his clown costume to go back out into the real world, still in love with Consuelo.

Andreev's theory of the panpsyche drama and Sjöström's spectacle of revenge give way to Ward and Stambler's third organizing principle. The two composers completely ignore the psychological elements of Andreev's play in order to focus on the world of the circus. For Andreev, the circus is an unreal veneer that provides covers for the tragic, *real* lives of the performers. For Ward and Stambler, the circus is the only world in this operatic narrative. Their concentration is on the clown's unfulfilled love for Consuelo, without any reference to the outside world. The dastardly behavior of Mancini and his deception of the Baron also are contained within the circus, thereby creating a new organizing principle by elimination and simplification, rather than by addition and magnification. The part of the hypotext that was so important for Sjöström, the spectacle of revenge, is virtually eradicated by Ward and Stambler. Gone are the lion and the poison, leaving everyone still alive at the end of the opera. Again, the gentleman-clown is heartbroken but this time, not due to a cheating wife or the deception of a friend, but simply because Consuelo is in love with the bareback rider Bezano.

At the beginning of the opera, Pantaloon repeats the ironic statement "I am only—what you see."<sup>24</sup> In fact, he is an intellectual from the upper class, starting life anew in the circus. Once again, this is discovered when Papa Briquet must register his new clown with the police. In the second act, Pantaloon admits that he had lived "a loveless life of wealth and pride and power," while trying to convince Mancini that the Baron will never marry Consuelo.<sup>25</sup> At the end of this act, Zinida reveals the clown's past:

Pantaloon, young dreamer of heavenly love—  
 Here, Consuelo, for all to read,  
 He has written of love transcendent.  
 But the earthly reward for his heavenly love  
 Was a beauty, frigid and vain, faithless and jealous,  
 A marriage broken, public scandal,  
 And reality's bitter slaps and kicks  
 To shatter his ardent dream.

Zinida continues to explain that Pantaloon had been a visionary statesman who was not understood by the peasants and was jeered by the nobility. When he finally turned to God, Pantaloon was, once again, ignored by the "squabbling sects."<sup>26</sup> Each time, Pantaloon received proverbial slaps and kicks. In the third act, playing the role of a drunken court jester, Pantaloon

undermines Mancini's plan before the Baron. Pantaloon then unites Consuelo and Bezano. Left alone in the ring, Pantaloon admits his eternal love for Consuelo and suggests "This was not the place for me; Perhaps nowhere is the place for me."<sup>27</sup> He then removes his clown's costume and exits by the street door. As noted, little remains of the clown's past to explain his actions in the present. Unfulfilled love is the organizing principle of this opera, not betrayal or revenge.

A brief review of the opera was provided by Irving Kolodin in *The Saturday Review*, just two weeks after the New York premiere. Kolodin suggests that Andreev's play provides "appealing elements" for a musical adaptation: the circus, mysticism, and a love story—although he notes that Ward and Stambler have "take[n] some liberties with the author's morose philosophy." Here is the bulk of Kolodin's review:

For an act and a half, Ward moves in and around the subject with excellent dramatic sense, some appropriately atmospheric circus music, a sufficiently developed command of English word values to make the drama intelligible through its delivery by his stage characters. But there comes the moment when the melodic issue can be evaded no longer, when Pantaloon ("He" who gets slapped) sits down to explain to young Consuelo where she is, emotionally, and soon finds himself in the midst of the situation he is trying to analyze. Ward has plotted resourcefully in the form of a duo da capo, so to speak, but the whole accent and coloration is Tchaikovsky-cum-Rachmaninoff, which lets the listener down rather badly at this crucial point.<sup>28</sup>

Although Ward and Stambler would become well known for their opera *The Crucible*, it was *He Who Gets Slapped* that gained the two composers initial credibility in opera circles. Winthrop Sargeant of *The New Yorker* wrote that the opera "was the surprise of the season," which, in turn gave Ward and Stambler access to Arthur Miller, resulting in their Pulitzer Prize (1962) for the operatic adaptation of Miller's play about the Salem witch trials.<sup>29</sup>

## CONCLUSION

---

The English film and theater director Peter Brook argues that the difference between a film and a play is the degree of involvement for the audience. A film tends to engulf the audience, as the viewers process only what is visually right before them. The physical distance in the theater forces the audience to supplement what cannot be seen. Intimacy and distance draw the

theater audience forward and back, metaphorically, challenging their minds to complete the picture. Cinema attempts a similar process with the close-up and the long shot, but the audience is still reliant on being shown the story visually.<sup>30</sup> If Brook is correct, then this only further supports Andreev and other playwrights like Bertold Brecht who have suggested that film demands “external action and not introspective psychology.”<sup>31</sup> Andreev could draw out the mystery of the gentleman-clown’s identity in the theater because the audience is expected to fill in the intentional blanks in the story. It is the gaps between the external and internal truths that created drama for Andreev. This is, according to Brook, part of the theater experience. It also explains why Sjöström was compelled to show the betrayal of Paul Beaumont at the beginning of his cinematic hypertext in order to heighten the revenge factor for his audience. If the visual story must be told completely, there should be no intentional gaps in logic for the cinema audience. Ward, in an interview with Bruce Duffie, was asked if his operas, which were intended for an intimate theater space, would work well on television. Clearly, such a new set of boundaries as opera and television requires a different type of border crossing, but Ward does agree with Brook’s line of thinking in stating that the visual *distance* greatly impacts the perceptions of the audience. Ward argues that he would need to rework his operas to be most effective. Television provides “entirely different values.” The ability to focus on two faces is “colossal” but the “massive scenes never really come off on television” as they seem “contrived.”<sup>32</sup>

More to the point: Why were there so many different American adaptations of a Russian play? What made this border crossing relatively easy? It is safe to say that none of Andreev’s other twenty plays has had such an artistic impact in America. Linda Hutcheon offers the premise that “expensive collaborative art forms like operas, musicals, and films are going to look for safe bets with a ready audience—and that usually means adaptations.”<sup>33</sup> The suggestion here is that you only invest capital if you are certain that there is a potential for profit. But what was it about this play that allowed for ready success with American audiences?

It is likely that each adaptation had its own specific motivating factors, yet each was underpinned by financial concerns, as Hutcheon argues. MGM was looking to make a prestige film with its newly contracted Scandinavian director. Sjöström was known for his psychological dramas and probably felt comfortable with a play that relied heavily on psychological undercurrents that had already been successful with American theater audiences in New York City. More than likely, Carlin was capitalizing on the financial success of Sjöström’s film in providing a novelistic adaptation of Andreev’s hypotext and Sjöström’s hypertext. Unfortunately, his execution of this particular border crossing was not successful. One of the reasons that Ward and



Stambler chose to adapt *He Who Gets Slapped* was that there was no copyright agreement at that time between the United States and the Soviet Union. Therefore, they were free to adapt the play and not have to worry about any of the legal or financial details.<sup>34</sup>

Yet, an even more cogent argument for why there are so many adaptations of this specific play would be the mythopoeic space that the circus holds in the American imagination. There, one finds stable heroic and villainous archetypes as well as a whole host of ready-made and accepted characters—the lion tamer, ring master, clowns, and acrobats. Andreev's play, in particular, animates basic human emotions—love, betrayal, humiliation, greed, and revenge. For most Americans, *running off with the circus* meant escaping the problems of your present life; therefore, Andreev's play was readily understandable to potential audiences. For those looking for source material, the circus and the universal quality of the story allowed for successful adaptations, modulated solely by the demands of the genre—play, cinema, novel, or opera.

Bouissac argues that in Western culture, identity is determined by the outward appearance. Yet, the clown often represents two radically different individuals as the same person, thereby modifying the cultural rule of identity.<sup>35</sup> As a result, the American audience is ready to accept that Paul Beaumont, the scientist researching the *Origins of Mankind*, can also be the clown He, who is slapped repeatedly for the entertainment of others. The various hypertexts are able to investigate the social norms of American society within a mythopoeic space that is organized by a different set of social rules. In Sjöström's hypertext, it is acceptable that the humiliated and betrayed scientist might punish the Baron and Count Mancini for their dastardly behavior, by setting a ferocious lion upon them. Notably, Ward admits that he was inspired by the possibilities of a reinvented intellectual in this alternative, circus world.

The focus of this chapter is not to evaluate which adaptation was good, better, and best, but instead to view this series of adaptations within the frame of Andreev's own predictions about the growing popularity of cinema and his recommendations for a panpsyche theater of the future. Secondly, it was important to pose a premise as to why this one particular work of Andreev was so successful in crossing into new cultural territory and lent itself to so many American adaptations. Bouissac suggests that the semiotic system of the circus, both as a form of entertainment and as a way of life, is perceived by audiences as a universe of its own.<sup>36</sup> As a result, many of Andreev's theories about the audience's desire for verisimilitude were demonstrable within the context of the circus, a ritualistic spectacle that could be read, interpreted, and enjoyed by Russian theater audiences in 1915, by American cinemagoers in 1924, and by American opera lovers in 1956.



## NOTES

1. Bouissac, *Circus and Culture*, 9.
2. Davis, *The Circus Age*, 10.
3. For a cogent discussion of the American circus, see Davis, *The Circus Age*.
4. Bouissac, *Circus and Culture*, 164–9.
5. Andreev first published “A Letter on the Theater” in the March 1912 issue of the journal *Masks*. This letter was republished with a second letter in 1914 as “Letters on the Theater” in volume 23 of the *Shipovnik* almanac.
6. Andreev, *Tot, kto poluchaet poshchechiny*, 347. In English, I use the translation and page references for Andreyev, *He Who Gets Slapped*, 112.
7. Andreev, *Tot, kto poluchaet poshchechiny*, 329; Andreyev, *He Who Gets Slapped*, 60.
8. In “My Notes,” a doctor of mathematics suggests that people prefer the appearance of truth, rather than truth itself, and this is how he justifies being condemned to prison although, he claims, he did not commit the crime. His theory is that he *appeared* guilty and, therefore, was guilty in the eyes of the jury. He accepts his sentence and writes his notes to explain how, after being condemned to death, he discovered the great purpose of the universe, expressing disgust that those living free continue to slander life. The mathematician’s beliefs are put to the test when he is invited to the warden’s house, where he recounts the details of his family’s murder that seem to point to his own participation. Just as he is about to lose control, he performs for the warden’s family as would be expected of an innocent man—he demands justice and the punishment of the *real* murderer—restoring the appearance of innocence. This successful performance leads the warden to fight for the mathematician’s release and two months later he is liberated from prison. However, in freedom the mathematician realizes that he is losing his mind and decides to recreate for himself the rules and regulations of the prison. In a small house on the outskirts of town he builds a cell and hires a jailer to maintain the prison’s rigid regime. In this way he is able to reclaim his *sanity* although the rest of the town believes that he is insane. Andreev, “Moi zapiski.”
9. Quoted in the commentary provided by Mikhail Koz’menko for this play in Andreev, *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 5, 502–3.
10. Bouissac, *Circus and Culture*, 6–7.
11. Andreev, *Tot, kto poluchaet poshchechiny*, 340–1; Andreyev, *He Who Gets Slapped*, 95–6.
12. Rischin, “Leonid Andreev 1871–1919,” 53.
13. Pensel, *Seastrom and Stiller in Hollywood*, 11–22.
14. *Ibid.*, 29–30.
15. Anderson, *Faces, Forms, Films*, 42–3.
16. Bouissac, *Semiotics at the Circus*, 43.
17. Pensel, *Seastrom and Stiller in Hollywood*, 33.
18. Quoted in Anderson, *Faces, Forms, Films*, 87.
19. In Carlin’s novel, He is referred to as HE with capital letters.
20. Carlin, *He Who Gets Slapped*, 153.
21. *Ibid.*, 246.
22. *Ibid.*, 270.
23. Almaviva, “Exclusive Interview with Composer Robert Ward.”
24. Stambler and Ward, *He Who Gets Slapped [Pantaloen]*, 7.
25. *Ibid.*, 13.
26. *Ibid.*, 17.
27. *Ibid.*, 25.

28. Kolodin, "Music to My Ears."
29. Sargeant, "Oops!"
30. Brook, *The Shifting Point*, 190–1.
31. Brecht, *Brecht on Theater*, 50.
32. Duffie, "Composer Robert Ward."
33. Hutcheon with O'Flynn, *A Theory of Adaptation*, 87.
34. Almaviva, "Exclusive Interview with Composer Robert Ward."
35. Bouissac, *Circus and Culture*, 173.
36. *Ibid.*, 191.