

Tomas Prenekert June 13<sup>th</sup> 2020

# The short story “En flicka i knipa” in Filmjournalen. How much of it is by Wodehouse?

## *“A Damsel in Distress”, study 2*

### I. Introduction

The Swedish magazine **Filmjournalen nr 13 1938** contains a short story “**En flicka i knipa**” based on the Hollywood film “**A damsel in Distress**” from 1937. The film is in turn based on the novel by Wodehouse from 1919. The short story is accordingly a “third generation” of the same story. I found it interesting with this transformation of a story, first into a film and then from a film into a short story. In the study “Ten versions of a Wodehouse story” I have presented different versions of this story and made some comparisons.

I started this project in 2014. Now I can finish it, as I now have got a copy of the Movie Story Magazine so I can compare this with the story in Filmjournalen.

The question in this study is: **To which extent can the short story “En flicka i knipa” be regarded as a work by Wodehouse?** To answer this I need to examine:

- 1) To which extent can the film be regarded as a work by Wodehouse?
- 2) Which are the similarities/differences between the short story and the film?
- 3) Is the short story based on the earlier condensations (Screen Romances or Movie Story Magazine)?

In his excellent book “P. G. Wodehouse and Hollywood” Brian Taves devotes a chapter to this film and makes a very good and comprehensive comparison of the story in it with that of the novel. I compare the short story with the DVD film I’ve got. Wodehouse gets credit in the film as screen-writer together with two other persons. Question 1) above can also be formulated: **Which influence did Wodehouse really have on the screenplay and on the film?**

### II. A story in many versions (For more information see “Ten versions of a Wodehouse story”.)

1. The **novel** was published 1919.
2. A **silent film** was made already 1919.
3. A condensed **home movie** version was released 1924 in France with the name Mam’zell Milliard.

4. In 1928 the novel was dramatized into a **theatre play** by Ian Hay and Wodehouse. Richard Burnip (2011) has written a very interesting article about this play and it's first stage-setting, and also compares it with the novel and with the film from 1937.
5. A second **film** was produced in 1937 in Hollywood with Wodehouse as the main screenwriter. It was released November 16<sup>th</sup>.
6. November 1937, before the release of the film, a one-hour **radio** version of the film was sent in USA by CBS.
7. In the magazine Screen Romances Dec 1937 there is a **condensed version** of the story. The condensation is made by Morrie Riskin.
8. Movie Story Magazine also published an anonymous **condensed version** in its December issue 1937. This is just a narration of the main plot, as if a journalist reported from a football game. No dialogue. It is based on the film but otherwise I would hardly call it a story by Wodehouse.
9. Just a few weeks after the Swedish premiere of the film, a "**short story**" was published in Film-journalen (nr 13 1938), with the same Swedish title as the film and with the subtitle: *A short story after the R.K.O. radio movie, which is based on a novel by P. G. Wodehouse. This story is the subject for this study.*
10. **A stage musical** along the lines George Gershwin had proposed was created and performed with the title "Reaching for the moon" 1987 and in a rewritten version with the title "A Foggy Day", performed 1998 and 1999. (Taves 2006 p 96-97, and Mueller.)

### III. The film and the theatre play

The work to transform a lot of narrative text into dialogue was already done in the play, so one could expect Wodehouse to use lines from the play in the film. I have watched the film scene by scene and compared the lines with those in the play and I can't find that this has been the case, with some exceptions.

The plot of the play is quite close to the novel. Much bigger changes are made in the film. The dialogue in the play follows the spirit and style of the novel but is nevertheless *almost totally rewritten*. Just a few lines in the play are close to lines in the novel. As a matter of fact, I have only been able to find just a few lines from the play that are kept in the film. **The film is evidently based on the novel** and the use of the play is really insignificant.

### IV. Some comparisons between the 1937 film and the novel

This comparison is vital to evaluate: **How much of Wodehouse is there in the film?** I compared them in the study "Ten versions of a Wodehouse story" and will just make a few comments here.

There are **many** and **big** differences between the film and the novel, much bigger than between the play and the novel! Some names have for instance been changed and below I will use the names from the film (and the short story).

#### The novel

Belpher Castle

Lady Maud, female leading part

George Bevan, male leading part, a composer

#### The film

renamed to Totleigh Castle (as in the play)

renamed to Lady Alyce

renamed to Jerry Halliday, a dancer (Astaire)

To make room for the comedians Burns and Allen, Jerry is supplied with a press agent and his secretary. Taves wrote: "*While their participation was definitely outside the original, and the humor*

*different from the Wodehouse style, Burns and Allen provide the picture with needed additional amusement.*”(2006, p. 90). The dialogue for these comedians is new for the film. They are funny, but is it typical Wodehouse humor? Like Taves I have doubts. There are a lot of new scenes and new dialogue in the film that has no correspondence at all with the novel. What was Wodehouse’s contribution to this? Generally speaking: How important is his contribution to the film? How much of it is Wodehouse’s?

McCrum and Taves don’t hesitate that the film is a work by Wodehouse: *“Wodehouse’s screenplay basically followed the plot of the novel, but merged or dropped many of its characters, so that the film bears only a passing resemblance to the original.”*(McCrum 2004 p. 247) Note his formulation *“Wodehouse’s screenplay”!* Taves (2001): *“Like the Ian Hay stage version, A Damsel in Distress retained the basic plot outline of the novel, but unlike the play, the movie deleted and merged a number of characters, and added others, becoming a second, separate Wodehouse variation on the novel.”*

I agree with Mc Crum. I find lot of Wodehouse in the film. The important events in the plot are there. Even if almost no lines from the novel are kept unchanged, the dialogue still is much in the style of Wodehouse, except for the line of Burns and Allen.

## **V. Wodehouse’s contributions to the screenplay**

At first RKO had employed someone else to write the screenplay. It turned out very badly and Wodehouse was engaged. Wodehouse gets credit in the film as the first name of the screenwriters and reasonably he contributed to, or at least accepted, most of the extensive changes in the screenplay of both story and dialogue compared to the novel. But there are lots of questions. How much in the screenplay comes from Wodehouse and how much from the other screenwriters? How did they co-operate? Who did what? How much freedom did he get from the producer? How did Wodehouse regard this script?

In his autobiography *“Over Seventy”* (1957) Wodehouse devotes a chapter (pp. 160 – 166) to his Hollywood experiences. But in this chapter he only tells us about his work for M-G-M in 1930. He never mentions his shorter visit in 1937 or his work at RKO. It’s quite clear that he disliked the time at M-G-M very much. He wrote to Townend 1937 *“There seems to be a curse over M-G-M, so far as I am concerned.”* (Wodehouse 1954, p. 95). However, when he worked for RKO with *“A Damsel in Distress”*, he wrote some letters in which he tells about his work and here the tone is quite another. He seems delighted!

In July 1937 Wodehouse wrote to Leonora and told her: *“I must say it is altogether different working at RKO on a picture based on my own novel from being on salary at MGM ... !”* ... *“I like my boss, Pandro Berman, very much. He is the first really intelligent man I have come across here -”* ... *“Everything is made very pleasant for me, and I like the man I am working with – a chap called Pagano. The way we work is, we map out a sequence together, then I go home and write the dialogue, merely indicating business, and he takes what I have done and puts it into screen shape. Thus relieving me of all that ‘truck shot’ ‘wipe dissolve’ stuff.”* (Wodehouse 1990, p. 67, Ratcliffe 2011, p. 268 and McCrum 2004, pp. 245-246).

Ernest Pagano, also screenwriter, was a film veteran who apparently took care of everything technical, like the placement and sliding of cameras etc. I interpret the word *“business”* in the letter as *“stage directions”*, including scenery and the movements of the actors. It seems that the plot and

the dialogue was Wodehouse's main task. Wodehouse didn't mention any other of the co-writers than Pagano in any of his published letters although a third name (S. K. Lauren) is given in the film.

In mid-August 1937 Wodehouse wrote in another letter to Leonora: "*I finish my job on the 'Damsel in Distress' tomorrow, after ten weeks all but two days, ... 'I only expected to get a couple of weeks polishing the existing script. But that script turned out so badly that they threw it away, and I and another man started doing a new picture from the bottom up, following the story of the book pretty closely. But much better is the fact that I have really come across with some good stuff, ... 'It was a very pleasant job as I was working under a producer, Pandro Berman, who really has got intelligence, taste and everything. I think the picture is going to be good.' ... 'I think I have made a big hit in my work on this picture.'*" (Wodehouse 1990, p. 69).

Wodehouse clearly liked the script and regarded it to a considerable part as *his* work. It seems probable that a lot of dialogue in the film is Wodehouse's work. The most obvious exception is the dialogues with Burns and Allen. The story and the "sequences" (some linked scenes) which he mentions in the July letter seems more probably to be a product of cooperation than the dialogue.

As a matter of fact, it was just before he finished the work with the screenplay, he wrote that the script was "*following the story of the book pretty closely*"! But there *are* big differences between the film and the novel! Either Wodehouse didn't regard these differences as important, or some important changes were made after Wodehouse left the work with the screenplay in mid-August. Burnip (2011) notes: "*Wodehouse was one of several (credited and uncredited) writers who worked on the script, neither the first nor the last;*" A most interesting question is what happened to the script during the five weeks between August 16<sup>th</sup>, when Wodehouse left the work, and September 25<sup>th</sup> when the script was finished. Maybe the film contains scenes that were considerably changed during these weeks, or added scenes without his participation? He never mentioned any objections against the revisions of the story in the film in his letters.

A little later, in September 1937 Wodehouse wrote in a letter to Townend: "*I don't like doing pictures. A **Damsel in Distress** was fun, because I was working with the best director here – George Stevens – and on my own story, but as a rule pictures are a bore.*" (Wodehouse 1954, p. 99 and Jasen 1975, pp. 155-156). The words "*my own story*" show in my opinion that he regarded the screenplay as *his story* and to a high degree a result of *his own work*.

Taves have compared the plot in the **film** with that in the novel (2006 pp. 89-93). Taves however gives no explicit references to the **screenplay**. He regards the film and the screenplay as the same thing and as a work by Wodehouse. Taves also noted that a few changes in the film compared to the novel followed the stage play.

McCrum tells that there is also another picture of the screenwriting given by Allan Scott. "*The producer Pandro Berman, wary of the novelist as a screenwriter, and unsure of Pagano's usefulness, had taken the precaution of assigning Allan Scott, one of the co-writers on the Fred Astaire – Ginger Rogers musicals, to babysit the production.*" (2004, p 247). Scott afterwards gave the impression that he was the main screen-writer and Wodehouse's roll was reduced to make cheers and suggest small changes. Scott is *not* mentioned in the pretexts of the film, not mentioned as a contributing screen-writer, and not mentioned by Taves. It seems that Scott for some reason exaggerated his contribution a great deal.

**I think it is likely that Wodehouse was the main screenwriter, also to new and rewritten scenes, and to some new dialogue.** The sentence "*I have really come across with some good stuff*" in the letter to Leonora August 1939 reasonably refers to new scenes and new lines. But, as Burnip (2011)

notes: “Wodehouse was one of several (credited and uncredited) writers who worked on the script, neither the first nor the last;”.

## **VI. His change of opinion**

Almost 40 years later Wodehouse in a new preface to a paper-back edition of the novel dissociated himself from the film and claimed that the story in the film was distorted and bungled by the film company (Wodehouse 1975, pp. 5-6 and Green 1981, p. 178). **How come? Is there any truth in his allegations that “his” screenplay was bungled?** Taves rejects this and his explanation is that the failure of the film was a very big disappointment to Wodehouse especially as his name was used in the marketing. I devote the study “Why did Wodehouse change his mind about the film?” to look deeper into this.

**Maybe it is possible that some changes that Wodehouse never approved of were made by others during the last five weeks of screenwriting, after Wodehouse left the work, but before the shooting started.** But it must have been minor changes and I can’t tell *which* scenes this would be. I can’t identify any special scenes that seems less Wodehouse than others. The film as a whole feel like a work by Wodehouse and he must be regarded as the main screenwriter. So of course, it was a hard blow to Wodehouse that this film that he, as we have seen, regarded highly was a failure with the movie audience, despite the big stars. It’s natural that he tried to put the blame on others. If his screenplay was “bungled” it must have been minor damage.

## **VII. A comparison between the short story in Filmjournalen and the 1937 film**

The comparisons are made with the version of the film I have got on a DVD from 2010 but with copyright from 1937. The short story in Filmjournalen is a **very condensed version of the film**. I have also compared it with the condensed versions in Screen Romances and in Movie Story Magazine, and they are very different. The version in Filmjournalen is clearly closest to the film of the three condensed versions.

**The plot** in the short story follows the film pretty well. The condensation is focused on the key scenes. Other scenes are excluded or related summarily. The condensation naturally brought omissions. For instance:

- Some characters in the film have been excluded. Gracie Allen doesn’t appear at all in the short story. Nor has her character any greater importance for the basic plot in the film, she is just a funny character. Reggie doesn’t either appear in the short story.
- All “show numbers”, with song and dance are removed.
- The scenes with Keggs’ urge to sing opera arias are omitted.

**In my opinion the plot in the short story feels closer to the novel than the plot in the film, due to the fact that the major part of the short story consists of those scenes in the film that were retained from the novel in the film and added scenes in the film are omitted.**

**The Dialogue** dominates in Filmjournalen. I estimate that the dialogue is about 70% and the narrative text is about 30 % of the text. The dialogue is of course also considerably shortened compared to the film. The omission of scenes means omission of dialogue. Also lines in the remaining scenes are shortened, rewritten or removed. Some action in the film and some dialogue are transformed into narrative text. For instance, all dialogue between George and Gracie is omitted. So

are all lines of Reggie and almost all of Lady Caroline together with the scenes where they appear in the film. There is not much dialogue left from the **novel**, but that was the case already in the film. The few lines that were kept from the novel in the film, mostly remains also in the short story.

There are some minor, but intriguing, deviations in the short story compared to the film that hardly can be explained as the result of condensation:

- Alfred hides in the back of Keggs' car when Keggs follows lady Alyce to London. In the film he rides a bike.
- Jerry knocks Keggs' hat off with an umbrella. In the film he does it with his hand.
- In the film lady Alyce just falls out of love with her American and realizes that she is in love with Jerry instead. In the short story lady Alyce tells Jerry that the reason for the interest she had shown the American guy was just acting, caused by her wish to tease Lady Caroline! She was evidently never in love with him! **This explanation is unique for this short story.**
- In the sweepstake scene in the short story there is a short dialogue between Keggs and a Mrs. Rummit. **This lady does not appear in the film or in the novel!**

These deviations from the film are mystifying! They can hardly be just consequences of a condensation. The last example is in fact an addition. **What is the reason** for these deviations? **Why** do they occur?

- Did the editor of the short story try to make it "better"? Hardly probable.
- Is the short story based on something else than the film in the DVD-version I've got? Anyhow, it's NOT based on the story in Screen Romances, nor in Movie Story Magazine.
- Is it based on another version of the film, **another cut**?
- Is it based on some other material like a **synopsis** instead of the released version of the film?
- Is it based on some **promotional material** that was produced by RKO before the shooting was finished, and in turn **based on the screenplay as it was when the promotion material was written**?

I'm not sure that there is archive material saved anywhere to answer these questions.

To summarize:

- The short story is a fair summary of the film, condensed to the essentials.
- The biggest changes of the story compared to the novel occurred already when it was transformed to the film, not into the next transformation to a short story.
- The condensation from the film to the short story means that **those scenes that are most close to the novel are, as a matter of fact, more dominant in the short story than they are in the film.**

Unfortunately, there is no information available about **who** made the transition of the film into the short story. It might have been someone at Filmjournalen. It is not a translation of the stories in the two American magazines. As I remarked above, the differences compared to the film are peculiar. Why does for instance a Mrs Rummit appear in the short story? Why let Alyce tell that she was just teasing lady Caroline? **I think these deviations indicate that the short story perhaps was not just a condensation made from the released version of the film.**

### **VIII. A short comparison between Filmjournalen (FJ) and Screen Romances (SR)**

The condensed version in Screen Romances dec 1937 is said to be made "from the "screenplay", not from the film, and there are some details in SR that doesn't occur in the film or in FJ! Many scenes appear of course in both condensations. In those scenes the plot in FJ is usually just condensed. The

dialogue in FJ is closer to the film. This also means that these scenes in FJ also are closer to the novel

- In SR both the plot and the dialogue deviate from the film, for instance in the cab scene.
- Alyce had met an American man, but was hardly in love with him in SR as in the film and FJ.
- Some scenes that are omitted in FJ appears, sometimes with changes, in SR. For instance, scenes and dialogue/gags between George Burns and Gracie Allen are given plenty of space in SR but are excluded in FJ. Reggie and the madrigal singers are also given space in SR.
- Some scenes are omitted in SR but not in FJ, for instance the sweepstake in the beginning of the film that is instead mentioned by Alyce in the cab.
- There are also some scenes that are added in SR but doesn't appear in the film. For instance, a scene with George and Gracie discussing trays of food.

The condensation in FJ is quite true to the film but also to the novel. The text in SR is written by Morrie Riskin, based on "the screenplay". But there were different versions of the screenplay. Did he use the final one? Riskin was a screenwriter (for instance for films with the Marx Brothers, perhaps the most important of them was *A Night at the Opera* 1935). There are similarities in the crazy type of humor in the dialogue in Marx Brothers films and that in the dialogues between Allen and Burns in *A Damsel in Distress!* This humor is different from Wodehouse's own and like Taves I have above expressed doubts about if Wodehouse wrote these dialogues. Riskin maybe was one of the anonymous screenwriters that were involved according to Burnip? I could imagine that he with his background wrote Burns-Allen dialogues? But this is just a speculation. A Riskin involvement in Burns-Allen scenes could explain why these scenes are given so much space in his condensation?

Anyhow, the story in FJ is very clearly NOT a translation from SR. They are two independent condensations, and the one in FJ is closer to both the film and the novel than the SR story is.

### **IX. A short comparison between Filmjournalen (FJ) and Movie Story Magazine (MSM)**

The condensation in MSM has one striking characteristic: There is NO DIALOGUE at all! Someone has made a narration, a report of what happens, without one single quote of a line. It feels as if a sports journalist has reported what happened. No jokes, no funny formulations. All traces of Wodehouse in the dialogue of the film are gone in this version. The focus is totally on the plot and it seems as the "reporter" regards the sweepstake and the fight between Keggs and Albert as the engine that drives the action forwards, not the feelings between Jerry and Alyce. While the story in FJ is a fair condensation of Wodehouse's novel, this MSM story feels very far from Wodehouse! The condensation in FJ is NOT a translation from MSM.

### **X. Back to the first questions about the short story**

Wodehouse gave two different opinions about the film. While he was working with the screenplay he wrote about the film as **his** work and was happy with it. Many years later he wrote that the filmmakers had abandoned his script and that all the changes made the film a mess. Maybe this rejection was an expression of his disappointment. Even *if* there should be a kernel of truth in these allegations, the changes were probably insignificant and I think **Wodehouse should be considered to be a main creator behind the film**. Even if he didn't want to acknowledge it, it was mainly "his" film that was turned down by the audience. Some "bungling" may have taken place, and was easy to put the blame on. In study 3 I try to show that there were some scenes that could have been changed

after Wodehouse left the project and they could be the kernel of truth behind the allegations for bungling.

It is possible to recognize Wodehouse's work and spirit in major parts of the film, if we disregard from the "show scenes". The scenes in the film where Wodehouse's genius is most obvious are some key scenes which are retained from the novel, even if they appear in new clothes. The short story is a summary of the film concentrated mostly to those scenes in the film that have their origin in the novel. As I accounted for above there are some new stuff in the short story that doesn't come from the film (in the cut I've got) but these additions are few and not very significant. Thus, I think that Wodehouse should also be considered to be a main creator behind the short story in *Filmjournalen*, "En flicka i knipa". Even if the short story is condensed and rewritten by an unknown editor, in my opinion **the focus on the key scenes and the dialogue give the effect that the short story appears to a still higher degree to be a work by Wodehouse than the film is!**

- It is easy to recognize the original novel "A Damsel in Distress" in the short story "En flicka i knipa" and still easier of course to recognize the film.

- Not much of the dialogue in the novel is left unchanged in the film, but the lines still often are in the style of Wodehouse.

**I regard the film as a work by Wodehouse (like McCrum and Taves), and I think that this short story in about the same way may be regarded as a work by Wodehouse (with unknown co-writer)!**

Of course, this short story cannot be compared to those where he wrote every word. It is just an adaptation from a Wodehouse original, made by somebody unknown, but quite a lot of Wodehouse remains in it.

## Sources

### Books:

Connolly Joseph : P. G. Wodehouse An Illustrated Biography, Orbis 1979.

Donaldson, Frances : P.G. Wodehouse A Biography, Allison & Busby 1992

Green, Benny : P. G. Wodehouse A Literary Biography, Pavilion 1981.

Hay, Ian & Wodehouse P. G. : A Damsel in distress, Samuel French 1930.

Jasen, David A. : P. G. Wodehouse A Portrait Of A Master, Garnstone Press 1975.

McCrum, Robert : Wodehouse A Life, Viking 2004.

Phelps, Barry : P.G. Wodehouse Man and Myth, Constable 1992

Ratcliffe, Sophie ed. : P. G. Wodehouse A Life in Letters, Hutchinson 2011.

Taves, Brian : P. G. Wodehouse and Hollywood, Screenwriting, Satires and Adaptations, McFarland 2006.

Wodehouse, P. G. : A Damsel in Distress, Jenkins without year, 12th printing.

Wodehouse, P. G. : A Damsel in Distress, Barrie & Jenkins 1975 (with a new preface)

Wodehouse, P. G. : Performing Flea, Jenkins 1954

Wodehouse, P. G. : Over Seventy, Jenkins 1957

Wodehouse, P. G. : Yours, Plum, Hutchinson 1990



Articles/Magazines:

(Thanks Elin Woodger-Murphy for sending me the articles from *Wooster Sauce* and *Plum Lines*!)

Burnip, Richard : 'Capital Tomfoolery' The Various Guises of *A Damsel in Distress*. *Wooster Sauce* Number 58 June 2011.

Skupin, Michael : *Damsel In Distress* Comments on the 1937 movie from a 1999 perspective, with source material. *Plum Lines* vol 21 No 2 Summer 2000. Also published at Internet (see further down).

Taves, Brian : *A Damsel in Distress: Novel, to Play, to Film*, *Plum Lines* Vol 22 No. 3 Autumn 2001.

Movie Story Magazine Dec 1937, *A Damsel in Distress*, ed. anonymous

Screen Romances Dec 1937. *A Damsel In Distress*, ed. Morrie Riskin

Filmjournalen nr 13 1938. *En flicka i knipa*, ed. anonymous

DVD films:

*A Damsel in Distress*, WB Archive Collection 2010, original : RKO Pictures 1937.

*Mam'zelle Milliard*, Pathé Baby Silent film No 739 of 1924 (one reel missing), abridged version of the 1919 Pathé Exchange Film *A Damsel in Distress*

Internet:

John Mueller: "A Foggy Day: Background information and production history" (undated) is published at <http://politicalscience.osu.edu/faculty/jmueller/Fogweb.htm>.

Michael Skupin : A talk delivered at a convention of the American Wodehouse Society 1999. It is published at <http://www.wodehouse.org/PlumLines/damsel.html>.

Internet Movie Database (IMDb): [www.imdb.com](http://www.imdb.com) keywords: *A Damsel in Distress*.



From the first page of the "Short story" (= Novell in Swedish) in *Filmjournalen* nr 13 1938.