

2013

Talfourd's *Ion*: Classical Reception and Gender in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia

Lee Percy

Bryn Mawr College, lpercy@brynmawr.edu

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.brynmawr.edu/classics_pubs

 Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Custom Citation

L. T. Percy, "Talfourd's *Ion*: Classical Reception and Gender in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia," in *Domina Illustris: Essays for Judith P. Hallett*, edd. Barbara Gold, Donald Lateiner, and Judith Perkins. London: Routledge (2013): 241-251.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/classics_pubs/104

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

16 Talfourd's *Ion*

Classical Reception and Gender in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia

Lee T. Percy

Abstract. In mid-nineteenth-century Philadelphia, plays with classical subjects were nearly as popular as Shakespeare. Contemporary reaction to one of these plays, Thomas Talfourd's *Ion, or The Foundling of Argos*, reveals its audiences' expectations about gender on stage and in society. American audiences, unlike their English counterparts, expected to see the role of *Ion* played by a woman. Especially in the 1830s, actresses playing *Ion* faced audiences who expected to see their feminine qualities preserved. They were disguised as a boy on the edge of manhood, but to be successful, the disguise had to fail by preserving their essential character as women.

Classical reception is no single or uniform phenomenon. The eighteenth century had a different relationship to Greece and Rome than the nineteenth; Britain and America look at their classical pasts with different eyes.¹ There may be some profit in zooming in still closer and examining the reception of Classical drama within a nation in a single city at a single time. In this chapter I intend first to attempt to discover just how popular neoclassical drama was in mid-nineteenth-century Philadelphia. I will then turn to Thomas Talfourd's *Ion, or The Foundling of Argos*. I hope to show how the reception of this play reflects its audiences' expectations about gender on stage and their anxieties about its negotiation in their own society.

There are many reasons to focus attention on neoclassical drama and its audience in Philadelphia between 1835 and 1855. First, the history of theater in America often reduces itself to a history of theater in New York, with due attention to the class distinctions between audiences at the Park and Bowery, the Astor Place riot, the place of imported plays and actors and so on. Yet American theater happened in other places—not only in regional metropolises like Philadelphia or New Orleans, but in frontier cities like Pittsburgh or Buffalo.² Second, Philadelphia with 63,802 citizens was still the second-largest city in the country in 1830. It had been the nation's capital and retained a strong sense of its importance in American cultural life. For these and other reasons Philadelphia has at least as good a claim as New

York to represent important aspects of American attitudes toward Classical drama in the years before the Civil War.³

The two decades between 1835 and 1855 also form a distinct period in the history of theater in Philadelphia.⁴ In 1835 William B. Wood, the leading actor-manager of the city since 1800 and diarist of its theatrical life, ended his active career. Twenty years later the splendidly neoclassical Chesnut Street Theatre,⁵ known as “Old Drury,” closed after sixty-two years, and Dion Boucicault made his first appearance in Philadelphia. Boucicault’s first American venture, 1853–1860, marked the beginning of the end of the old stock companies tied to single theaters and their replacement by touring casts and productions. Between these events, however, the actors and managers of the Arch Street, Chesnut Street and Walnut Street theaters, along with the National, the Olympic, the Pennsylvania and half-a-dozen others that flickered in and out of existence, gave Philadelphia a vibrant theatrical life in which neoclassical dramas played a leading role.

THE POPULARITY OF NEOCLASSICAL DRAMA IN PHILADELPHIA

A. H. Wilson’s exhaustive chronicle of mid-nineteenth century Philadelphia dramatic life lists well over 3,300 titles produced between 1835 and 1855.⁶ Philadelphians, not surprisingly, shared Jacksonian⁷ America’s fondness for melodrama, Popular characters included Mose the fireman, comically clever Yankees and anything—anything at all—played by Edwin Forrest, but some titles have a distinctively Philadelphian flavor. Drama in German, for example, appeared not only at the German National Theater, but also at the mainstream Arch and Chesnut Street houses and may have appealed especially to Philadelphia’s large population of German immigrants and people of German descent. Joseph Sterling Coyne’s farce of the 1840s, *Did You Ever Send Your Wife to Brooklyn?*, spawned local imitations in dozens of American cities, including Philadelphia, and Philadelphian audiences had a chance to attend *Did You Ever Send Your Wife to Bristol?* (or to Burlington, Germantown and other nearby towns and cities).⁸ Philadelphians also shared their countrymen’s fondness for dramas set in ancient Greece and Rome. In Philadelphia a few classical dramas could draw repeated audiences year after year. When we consider that only thirty-six of the 3000-plus plays in Wilson’s catalog have titles that suggest a Greek or Roman setting or theme, it may seem that Classical drama was not very popular among Philadelphia audiences in the decades before the Civil War. Sheer number of titles, however, may not be the most reliable indicator of popular taste. It is more telling to consider which dramas had the best chance of drawing audiences to repeated performances year after year. Then as now, long runs indicate popular shows. By this criterion, there were three surefire ways for a theater manager in the 1830s, 40s or 50s to make money in Philadelphia: Dickens, Shakespeare or Greece and Rome.

In 1856, thanks in part to persistent lobbying by Dion Boucicault, an act of Congress gave dramatists “the sole right to print, publish, act, perform, or represent” the plays they wrote. Until then, and perhaps until 1891, when the United States signed an international copyright agreement, there was little to stop a theater manager from producing a dramatization of any popular novel.⁹ Charles Dickens, as he himself frequently complained, was a prime target of this piracy. *David Copperfield*, a play by John Brougham, had twenty-five performances in Philadelphia between 1850 and 1855, and Brougham's *Bleak House* had a good run at the Arch Street Theater in November 1853. *Pickwick Papers* spawned at least two dramatic versions.¹⁰ *Barnaby Rudge* was a hit in 1841 and again in 1853–55. Dickens, though, could not compete with Shakespeare. Between 1835 and 1841 the most frequently performed play on Philadelphia stages was *Richard III*, with eighty-three performances; *Othello* with fifty-seven and *Hamlet* with fifty-three were its nearest competitors. In 1835 alone a Philadelphia theatergoer could have seen *Richard III* fourteen times; *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* seven times each; *King Lear*, *Romeo and Juliet* or *Merchant of Venice* six; *Much Ado About Nothing* five; *As You Like It* three times; *The Tempest* and *Taming of the Shrew* (in David Garrick's adaptation, *Katharine and Petruchio*) twice and single performances of *King John*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and *The Winter's Tale*.

Understanding the popularity of Dickens and Shakespeare allows us to appreciate the relative importance of neoclassical dramas in the cultural life of nineteenth-century Philadelphia. Of the twenty years following 1835, only 1849 and 1850 failed to see a performance of John Banim's *Damon and Pythias*, which had 100 productions in two decades. In the same period *Virginius*, or *The Roman Father* had seventy-six, Thomas Talfourd's *Ion* appeared forty-six times on Philadelphia stages and John Howard Payne's *Brutus*, or *The Fall of Tarquin* was produced thirty-nine times. None of these plays was as popular as *Richard III*, which was performed 199 times in the same period, but *Damon and Pythias* approached the popularity of *Romeo and Juliet* (122 performances), and *Ion* and *Brutus* matched or nearly matched *As You Like It* (forty-five performances).

Popular plays spawned parodies, and the appearance of a comic version of a serious play was another good indicator of popularity. John Augustus Stone's *Metamora*, or *the Last of the Wampanoags*, for example, which became a sensational hit thanks in large part to Edwin Forrest's unforgettable portrayal of the title role, spawned *Metamora*, or *the Last of the Pollywogs* in 1848, and a farcical version of *Damon and Pythias* had Philadelphia performances in 1840, 1841 and 1845. Almost immediately after its first London performances Talfourd's *Ion* gave rise to *Ion Travestie*, by Frederick Fox Cooper, which had a short run at the Walnut Street Theater in 1837. Nor should we forget that Louisa May Alcott's collection of “comic tragedies,” first published in 1893 but written much earlier, contains an *Ion* which owes at least something to Talfourd's, if only the character names Adrastus, Ion and Medon.

It seems clear, then, that Philadelphia audiences in Jacksonian America enjoyed plays with Classical themes. By focusing now on Talfourd's *Ion*, I hope to uncover some of the factors that influenced these plays' popularity. Although *Ion* was not, if we use number of performances as a criterion, the most popular neoclassical play in mid-century Philadelphia, significant differences between the construction of its title role and consequent reception in America and in England make it a useful touchstone to understand developing American approaches to gender on the stage.

TALFOURD'S *ION*

Because Talfourd's *Ion* is not, in fact, much like Euripides' *Ion* or any other Greek tragedy, a brief summary may be in order for those who are unfamiliar with it.¹¹ The play is set in Argos, which is suffering from a plague and oppressed by its cruel king, Adrastus. An oracle reveals that "Argos ne'er shall find release, / Till her monarch's race shall cease"; that is, that Argos is fated to become a republic once the family of Adrastus has died out. Ion, a foundling raised by Medon, priest of Apollo, joins a conspiracy to assassinate Adrastus, and to him falls the task of killing the monarch. While the conspirators are making their way into the palace, Medon learns that Ion is in fact Adrastus' son, whom agents of the king's father had, everyone thought, thrown into the sea. Medon rushes to the palace just in time to prevent parricide with the chiasmic cry, "Ion, forbear! / Behold thy son, Adrastus!" Ion succeeds his father as king, initiates a series of democratic reforms and then kills himself as a sacrifice to the gods of Argos so that the "monarch's race shall cease" and his country be free. As the curtain falls, news arrives that the plague has abated, and Ion dies.

Talfourd himself wrote of his play that Euripides' *Ion* "gave the first hint of the situation in which its hero is introduced . . . but otherwise there is no resemblance between this imperfect sketch and that exquisite picture."¹² Audiences inclined to look for sources must have thought of Sophocles more than Euripides, and especially of *Oedipus Tyrannus* when they saw the play's opening scene, with elders lamenting the plague that afflicts their city, or the first encounter between Ion and Adrastus, which evokes the exchange between Oedipus and Teiresias. *Antigone* may have contributed Ion's deliberate disobedience of the tyrant's edict and his insistence that "the eternal law, that where guilt is / Sorrow shall answer it" trumps Adrastus' human law.

Edith Hall suggests that "the motif of the patriotic youth's suicide owes something to Euripides' *Phoenician Women*" and that "the reconciliation of the dying king Adrastus with his long-lost son Ion powerfully recalls the endings of both *Hippolytus* and *Trachiniae*."¹³ To these I am tempted to add two plays in which Euripides presents kings of Argos opposed by young monarchs with democratic leanings: *Suppliant Women*, which turns on the contrast between Adrastus, king of Argos, and Theseus, and *The Children of*

Heracles, in which the young king of Athens, Demophon, is really a democrat in disguise, and another king of Argos, Eurystheus, becomes a more sympathetic character as his life ends, just as Adrastus does in Talfourd's play. Talfourd certainly knew at least some of these ancient dramas from his time at Reading School. Between 1806 and 1827 Reading School's students, directed by headmaster Richard Valpy, presented eight Greek dramas, including such seldom studied plays as Euripides' *Orestes* and *Heracles*, for the triennial visits of the school's governors, and Talfourd may have acted in Reading's *Antigone* of 1812.¹⁴

It is harder to decide whether and how Greek drama entered into the way a mid-nineteenth century audience in Philadelphia received Talfourd's *Ion*. Writing in the *North American Review* for 1837, Cornelius Felton, Eliot Professor of Greek at Harvard, drew a distinction between the response of "the classical scholar" and "the reader, whose knowledge is bounded by the literature of his mother tongue." The Classical scholar, Felton suggests, will find it hard to shake off the impression that he is reading "a long-lost work of Sophocles," and Talfourd's verses fall so readily into Greek iambs that "at times he hardly knows whether he is reading Greek or English." The Greekless reader, on the other hand, will admire "clear conception of character," "polished and melodious versification," and "rich and enchanting imagery" without inquiring into the relation between Talfourd's *Ion* and Attic tragedy.

Felton writes for a Classically educated reader capable of composing Greek iambs, or at least of remembering that he had once done so.¹⁵ The review addresses the responses of these highly educated readers, not theatergoers, and it seems unlikely that the audiences who filled the Walnut Street Theater in Philadelphia for four performances of Talfourd's *Ion* between December 6 and 12, 1836, brought with them any very encyclopedic knowledge of Greek drama. Those whose education ran in that direction were likely to have known only *Oedipus Tyrannus* and *Medea*, the two plays included in *Collectanea Graeca Majora*, Andrew Dalzell's (1742–1806) anthology of 1789, which had its first American edition in 1808 and became a standard text at Harvard, Yale, South Carolina College, Columbia, Hamilton and the University of Tennessee by 1829.¹⁶

For the response of Philadelphians "whose knowledge," as Felton put it, "is bounded by the literature of [their] mother tongue" we must go to the recollections of Charles Durang (1794–1870). Durang was an actor, dancing master and author who published a history of the Philadelphia stage as a series of weekly columns in the *Philadelphia Sunday Dispatch* between May 7, 1854, and March 1, 1863. His history spans the years 1749–1855. The publisher and antiquarian Charles Augustus Poulson gathered Durang's columns into a series of scrapbooks. Copies survive in several Philadelphia collections, and I was able to consult the set at the Library Company of Philadelphia.¹⁷

Durang writes as an eyewitness to the Philadelphia premiere of *Ion* and as a man of the theater who could offer knowledgeable comparisons of different productions of the play, but we should bear in mind that he writes of *Ion*

as an old man looking back on the theater of his middle years. He had seen Ellen Tree and Charlotte Cushman play *Ion*, and he could imagine how the originator of the role, William Charles Macready, would have handled it, but he preferred the first *Ion* he saw in Philadelphia, Frances (“Fanny”) Jarman Ternan. (Mrs. Ternan, as she is described in cast lists, was the mother of Ellen Ternan, who later became the mistress of Charles Dickens.)

Durang’s evaluation of the four *Ions* deserves analysis:

We have seen *Ion* acted in a way that embraced no element of the poet’s genius or sublimity of thought. How Macready—the original of the character—played it, we can imagine. His conception may have been chastely Grecian, yet frigid and severe, without the freshness of youth. Miss Cushman did not satisfy us—there was too much of the masculine crispness about the personation of the boy—nor did Miss E. Tree, (who played it soon after at the Chesnut Street Theatre,) although her delineation [*sic*] was replete with polished power. Mrs. Ternan gave it the poetical impress, the psychological feeling of the author’s mind. She snatched the poet’s mantle of pure angelic thoughts. Talfourd’s plays require intellectual acting, probably more so than those of Knowles; and when that quality fails in the actor, the play itself fails.

In an important study of women in male roles on the nineteenth-century American stage, Elizabeth Reitz Mullenix explores the complexity of responses to the common practice of having male roles played by female actors.¹⁸ The 1830s, Reitz Mullenix notes, saw a shift in critical reviews of women in “breeches roles” (as they were called) from approval to censure, paralleling the movement of public opinion on women’s increasing involvement in what had been masculine spheres of activity (p. 56). Durang’s assessment of his four *Ions* reflects this moment of anxiety.

Macready, the lone male actor, must have been “frigid and severe, without the freshness of youth.” Since Durang seems never to have seen Macready in the role, his mental image must draw at least in part on ideas about the effect of gender on performance. American theater in the nineteenth century saw the proliferation of leading roles for boys, and these parts were nearly always played by actresses. Women, it was thought, resembled boys or adolescent youths because of their high voices and slight build, but they had the intellectual maturity and stamina to handle demanding parts. Adult male actors, on the other hand, often seemed too stiff and heavy to be convincing as boys; as a nineteenth-century biographer of Charlotte Cushman said in appraising her work as Romeo, “When a man has achieved the experience requisite to *act* Romeo, he has ceased to be young enough to *look* it; and this discrepancy is felt to be unendurable in the young, passionate Romeo, and detracts from the interest of the play. Who could endure to see a man with the muscles of Macready, in the part of the gallant and loving boy?”¹⁹ Durang’s assessment of Macready as “frigid and severe” echoes this view.

Critical responses to actresses in breeches roles like Ion sometimes reveal uneasiness over their possible subversion of gender. Terms of praise like “charming,” “graceful,” “sweet,” “noble” or “suffering” reinforce an ideology in which women were treated as essentially equivalent to children. In 1825 a critic for the New York *Daily Mirror* praised an actress’ realization of a youth in these terms: “Without the energy to sustain the heavier parts of the drama, she has a naiveté, and, if we may be allowed to speak, an infantine grace, which makes her a valuable as well as beautiful ornament of the stage.”²⁰ So strong was the association between femininity and juvenility that actresses like Charlotte Cushman continued to play youthful breeches roles when they were well past youth.

Durang’s ranking of his three female Ions gives first place to Fanny Ternan on the grounds that she conveyed the “pure, angelic thoughts” of Talfourd’s verse better than her rivals. Ternan’s angelic, traditionally feminine Ion contrasts with Charlotte Cushman’s. Hers was too masculine—a reminder that even when playing breeches roles, women were expected to preserve and convey their femininity. The New York *Daily Mirror*, for example, prepared its readers for Ellen Tree’s 1837 debut as Ion by reprinting a review from the *London Times* that characterized her performance in these terms:

She has a woman’s energy, and woman’s passion, and woman’s tenderness, and woman’s weakness. She cannot unsex herself. In Ion, for instance, she is not a whit masculine. She becomes not Ion, but Ion becomes Ellen Tree—most beautifully and eloquently delivering Sergeant Talford’s [*sic*] beautiful and eloquent reveries. Yet she has nothing cold or methodical, or, least of all, lack-a-daisical about her. Energy—nay, fierceness, if need be—she can develop most decidedly. Passion can flash and lighten from her deep dark eye, and scorn distend her exquisitely-chiselled nostrils, and contempt curl her very beautiful lip; but still all is emphatically feminine. She is evidently of the stuff of which the maids, wives, and mothers who daily surround us, are fashioned.²¹

Durang could have seen Tree play Ion at the Chestnut Street Theater in April 1837, five months after Fanny Ternan’s appearance at the Walnut Street Theater in December 1836. He admired her “polished power,” as had the London critic, but preferred Ternan’s more overtly feminine portrayal of the character.

Ion in America was uniformly a breeches role, while in England the part became associated with its muscled originator, William Macready. This circumstance, I suggest, contributed to the different reception of the play in the two countries. In Britain, as Edith Hall has argued, Talfourd’s *Ion* was received as a contribution to the swirling political debates of the 1830s: electoral reform, the Corn Law, abolition of slavery and the place of the monarchy.²² The play has, or could seem to have, something to say about at least the last two of these issues, and both its author, a radical member of Parliament from 1837, and its leading actor-manager, an enthusiastic

republican who opened his theater to radical causes, embraced the cause of reform. Talfourd, also, might not have approved of casting Ion as a breeches role; in 1821, reviewing Charles Horn's *Dirce*, an opera in which Madame Vestris portrayed an ancient Greek man, he wrote,

A first-rate singer, or a woman dressed in male attire, may be a fit representation of a Persian satrap, or a Neapolitan warrior, but will scarcely be worthy to represent the meanest of that race who fought at Thermopylae and Marathon. Our feelings revolt at the profanation.²³

American theater in the 1830s often dealt with the kind of political themes that British audiences were prepared to find in Talfourd's *Ion*.²⁴ Neoclassical dramas could raise political issues, but it is striking how often in America a Classical setting seems to mute political receptions or remove them to a safely remote time or space. Robert Montgomery Bird's *The Gladiator* (1831), for example, treated the slave revolt led by Spartacus and had its premier performance only a month after Nat Turner's insurrection. It seemed to its author to have direct relevance to the question of slavery, for he wrote in his diary that if the play were to be produced in a slave state, the company "would be rewarded with the Penitentiary."²⁵ Yet the prologue on opening night made no such connection; instead, it evoked contemporary Polish resistance to Czarist Russia. Enthusiastic audiences in Birmingham, Alabama, in 1839 applauded the play without irony.

Although our revolution had settled the question of monarchy or republic that is central to Talfourd's *Ion*, other issues, social and cultural more than strictly political, remained, and audiences could find them in the play. Seeing the youthful Ion played by a woman may have allowed American audiences to contemplate from a safe distance their own uncertainties and anxieties about what kind of men, and especially what kind of women, would populate the new republic. It is striking that the most popular neoclassical plays in antebellum Philadelphia give a central place to questions about masculine and feminine roles. John Banim's *Damon and Pythias* examines passionate masculine friendships (and takes care to establish the heterosexuality of the title characters); *Virginius, or The Roman Father* and *Brutus, or The Fall of Tarquin* (and, for that matter, *Ion*) explore the relationship between father and son; and the crossgendered casting of Ion, as I have shown, provoked observers in New York and Philadelphia to reflect on the proper nature and essential qualities of femininity.

Despite the obvious appeal of a republican play in America, critics like Felton and Durang seem not to have focused on the political message of Talfourd's play. Instead, they remark on two features: Talfourd's language and the character of Ion. Both language and character are described in ways that emphasize their feminine aspects. Durang, for example, praises the "poetical impress" and "psychological feeling of the author's mind" in Ternan's "impersonation of the brave and gentle Grecian youth." Talfourd's tragedy

itself is “pure and fine” and needs “a refined audience to appreciate its flowing poetical beauties.”

Actors and producers did have a choice between politics and pathos. Ion's character can be read as poised between Macready and Ternan and between manhood and boyhood. Before his first entrance two sages of Argos, Agenor and Cleon, discuss his character. Agenor wonders that Ion alone has been allowed to leave the temple precinct to visit those sickened by the plague. His delicate, flowerlike character seems unsuited to the task:

By no internal contest is he train'd
For such hard duty; no emotions rude
Hath his clear spirit vanquish'd;—Love, the germ
Of his mild nature, hath spread graces forth,
Expanding with its progress, as the store
Of rainbow colour which the seed conceals
Sheds out its tints from its dim treasury
To flush and circle in the flower. (I.i)

Cleon demurs; recently a change has come over the young man:

His form appears dilated; in those eyes
Where pleasure danced, a thoughtful sadness dwells;
Stern purpose knits the forehead, which till now
Knew not the passing wrinkle of a care:
Those limbs which in their heedless motion own'd
A stripling's playful happiness, are strung
As if the iron hardships of the camp
Had given them sturdy nurture; and his step,
Its airiness of yesterday forgotten,
Awakes the echoes of these desolate courts,
As if a hero of gigantic mould
Paced them in armour. (I.i)

What an actor chooses to emphasize and who an actor is will guide an audience's reception of the character. Especially in the 1830s, actresses playing Ion faced audiences who expected to see their feminine qualities preserved. They were disguised as a boy on the edge of manhood, but to be successful, the disguise had to fail by preserving their essential femininity, and thus their audience's expectations about women.

NOTES

I am glad to offer this small chapter to Judy Hallett in acknowledgement of three decades of friendship, and in gratitude for all she has done to improve my thinking on gender, politics and American receptions of Classics. An earlier version was delivered

as part of a Sawyer Seminar, *Theatre after Athens*, sponsored by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, at Northwestern University on December 5, 2009; I am grateful to the foundation, Northwestern and to the audience and organizers of the seminar for their encouragement and comments.

1. On some problems inherent in periodization, see Michelakis 2008.
2. The early years of Edwin Forrest's career, before his first New York appearance as Othello in 1826, may serve as an example. After making his debut at the Walnut Street Theater in Philadelphia in 1820, Forrest appeared in Pittsburgh, Louisville, Lexington and Cincinnati. In 1824 he joined James H. Caldwell's New American Theatre in New Orleans, and in 1825 he played supporting roles in Charles Gilfert's company in Albany; see Miller 2007: 59–60.
3. Philadelphia would drop to fourth place in the 1840 census, behind New York, New Orleans (which grew from 27,176 citizens in the 1830 census to 102,913 in 1840) and Baltimore. See Gibson 1998.
4. For the history of theater in Philadelphia, see Wilson 1935 and the collection of material gathered by Charles Durang (1794–1870), Durang 1854–63. I am grateful to the Library Company for permission to use material in its collections.
5. "Chesnut" was the usual nineteenth-century spelling of Chestnut Street.
6. My rough count gives 3346, including alternative titles.
7. For a possible objection to the term "Jacksonian" see Howe 2007: 4–5. I use it for convenience as a purely chronological label.
8. For the fad, see Meserve 1986: 136.
9. On the culture of reprinting in Jacksonian America, see McGill 2003; for Dickens, see especially 109–40.
10. *Pickwick Club, or The Age we Live in*, and W. T. Montcrieff's *Sam Weller, or The Pickwick Papers*.
11. For *Ion* I use the third edition (Talfourd 1836a), supplemented by Talfourd 1836b, an annotated prompt copy in the collection of the Library Company of Philadelphia. The prompt copy is stamped on the front end-paper, "Property of the New Theatre" and lists casts and costumes for the Philadelphia and New York productions of December 1836.
12. Talfourd 1846: 17.
13. Hall 1997a: 291.
14. Hall 1997b.
15. Certainly there were women in nineteenth-century America who knew Greek well (see Winterer 2007), but my masculine pronoun appropriately reflects both the reality of antebellum American higher education and Felton's expectations about his audience.
16. See Winterer 2002: 33.
17. Durang 1854–63.
18. Reitz Mullenix 2000.
19. Stebbins 1879: 59.
20. *New York Mirror* 1825, quoted Reitz Mullenix 2002: 127.
21. Quoted Reitz Mullenix 2002: 163.
22. Hall 1997a.
23. *New Monthly Magazine* vol. III (1821), p. 330; quoted Hall 1997a: 297–8.
24. From many examples I mention Richard Penn Smith's *The Eighth of January* (1829) and *The Triumph at Plattsburg* (1830), both of which deal with victories in the War of 1812; Mordecai Noah's *The Grecian Captive, or, The Fall of Athens* (1822), which treats the Greek struggle for independence from Ottoman Turkey and ends with the heroine's rescue by an American frigate; and Smith's *William Penn* and John Augustus Stone's *Metamora; or, The*

Last of the Wampanoags (both 1829), which present sympathetic portraits of native Americans.

25. Miller 2007: 72.

REFERENCES

- Durang, C. (Charles). 1854–63. *Durang's History of the Philadelphia Stage Scrapbook* (Uy8 1699.F), The Library Company of Philadelphia.
- Gibson, C. 1998. "Population of the 100 Largest Cities and Other Urban Places in the United States: 1790 to 1900," Population Division Working Paper No. 27, U.S. Bureau of the Census, <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0027/twps0027.html>, accessed June 14, 2009.
- Hall, E. 1997a. "Talfourd's Ancient Greeks in the Theatre of Reform." *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 3.3: 283–307.
- . 1997b. "Greek Plays in Georgian Reading." *Greece and Rome* 44.1: 59–81.
- Howe, D.W. 2007. *What Hath God Wrought? The Transformation of America, 1815–1848*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McGill, M. 2003. *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Meserve, W.J. 1986. *Heralds of Promise: The Drama of the American People during the Age of Jackson, 1829–1849*. New York, Westport, CT, London: Greenwood Press.
- Michelakis, P. 2008. "Performance Reception: Canonization and Periodization." In L. Hardwick and C. Stray, eds., *A Companion to Classical Reception*, 219–28. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Miller, T. 2007. *Entertaining the Nation: American Drama in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Reitz Mullenix, E. 2000. *Wearing the Breeches: Gender on the Antebellum Stage*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Stebbins, E. 1879. *Charlotte Cushman: Her Letters and Memories of Her Life*. Boston: Houghton, Osgood, and Company.
- Stephens, S. and P. Vasunia, eds. 2010. *Classics and National Cultures*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Talfourd, T.N. (Thomas Noon). 1836a. *Ion: A Tragedy, in Five Acts*. Philadelphia and New York: Turner and Fisher.
- . 1836b. *Ion; A Tragedy, In Five Acts*. Third edition. London: Edward Moxon.
- . 1846. *Tragedies: To Which are Added A Few Sonnets and Verses*. New York: C. S. Francis.
- Wilson, A.H. 1935. *A History of the Philadelphia Theatre 1835 to 1855*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, repr. 1968. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Winterer, C. 2002. *The Culture of Classicism: Ancient Greece and Rome in American Intellectual Life 1780–1910*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . 2007. *The Mirror of Antiquity: American Women and the Classical Tradition, 1750–1900*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.