NATIONAL THEATRE EXHIBITION MOVES TO NEW YORK

Last winter the National Theatre in London mounted an exhibition of the work of John Haynes, the remarkable British Theatre photographer whose work has been immortalizing plays for more than twenty years. The exhibition, which was transferred to the Colnaghi Gallery in New York this spring, reminds us that Haynes is a theatre practitioner of the highest rank, an artist who can evoke the essence of a play in a single photo.

Jane Horrocks as Fanny in Ask for the Moon, by Shirley Gee (Hampstead Theatre, 1986)

To view Haynes' photographs is to relive one's experience in the theatre, to feel the exhausting passion of Julie Walters and Ian Charleson in Fool for Love, to sigh at the stunning beauty and sadness of Wendy Morgan in Martine—how one recalls that gorgeous opening scene! Even negative feelings come back—Haynes' photo of A Family and a Fortune recalls much squirming and yawning during that tedious play. There is also a marvelous series of photos of David Storey's Home, one of Haynes' earliest assignments, as well as a generous selection from Beckett's plays. And there is Michael Gough in drag, ready to embrace Alan Bates in the 1983 revival of A Patriot for Me.

In addition to the photographs of plays, there are rehearsal shots and some splendid portraits of playwrights—those of Beckett, Bond and Orton are especially noteworthy. And, although the exhibition provides a pretty good survey of the Hampstead and National Theatres, it is particularly excellent in its coverage of the Royal Court Theatre since 1970.

The Colnaghi show closes May 9, 1987—you may still purchase a copy of Taking the Stage: Twenty-One Years of the London Theatre (Thames & Hudson, $14.95). This book, which includes 132 of Haynes' photographs, is an extraordinary testament to the living theatre and gives more joy than most recent theatre books. The work of Mr. Haynes is really an international treasure, providing theatre-lovers of the present with happy memories and those of the future with documents to study and enjoy the history of this wonderful, transient art form.
THEATRE CRAFTSPEOPLE HONORED IN LINCOLN CENTER EXHIBITION

The Association of Theatrical Artists and Craftspeople (ATAC) is the first and only trade association representing craftspeople working in the production fields of entertainment and performance. ATAC's members create an astonishing variety of works, including special effects, specialty costumes, models, masks and armor. Many of these objects were recently on exhibition in the Main Gallery at the Library and Museum of the Performing Arts at Lincoln Center.

Founded in 1981, ATAC's prime goals are to unite members of the theatrical craft profession for the advancement of their art, the promotion of the highest artistic standards, and the sharing of ideas and information with the membership and the public. In addition to their newsletter, they publish The New York Theatrical Sourcebook, a directory of 2,500 companies. Other projects include seminars, grant research, health and safety information, and a job referral service, which categorizes members in more than 80 hard-to-find skills. For further information please contact ATAC, 1742 Second Avenue, #102, New York, NY 10128.
DOLORES PARADES AGAIN, BUT 20 BLOCKS NORTH

Floral Follies: Broadway Revue Costumes 1900-1930, an exhibition of original designs and documents pertaining to the use of flowers, birds, animals and butterflies in the costumes of Broadway extravaganzas, was on view in the Astor Gallery at the Library and Museum of the Performing Arts at Lincoln Center from February 27 through May 23, 1987. The show was curated by Dick Buck and Barbara Naomi Cohen Stratynr and designed by Don Vlack, who enlarged and cut out a cardboard photograph of Dolores and dressed it in her famous peacock costume. The costume was lent by the Museum of the City of New York.
BOOK REVIEWS


In creating the three-volume work entitled American Theatre Companies, editor Weldon Durham has set an ambitious task for himself—chronicling the individual histories of American companies which produced theatre in the stock mode between 1749 and 1966. Fortunately for students of American theatre history, if the first two volumes are an indication of the quality of the total work, Durham will assuredly achieve his goal.

The scope of Durham's study is limited to the documentation of groups which adopted the stock-company mode of organization. In his definition of the stock company, Durham is in close agreement with Jack Poggi (Theatre in America: The Impact of Economic Forces, 1870-1939) and Alfred Bernheim (The Business of the Theatre: An Economic History of the American Theatre, 1750-1932) before him.

The first volume, which covers the years 1749 to 1887, presents eighty-one "group biographies" of American theatre companies. Each entry begins with a narrative summary of the company's history outlining both its business and artistic practices. In addition, contributors have provided a list of key personnel and the positions they held; a sample repertory, sometimes for only one season, but more frequently for several years; and a bibliography of published, unpublished, and archival sources. The second volume contains 105 portraits of companies formed between 1888 and 1930 and is organized like the first volume. Companies are listed alphabetically by their principal names with cross-references to alternate names. When references are made to companies documented in other entries, they are indicated by an asterisk. Separate appendices list the companies chronologically and by state. Each volume is thoroughly indexed.

Despite their overall length, the first two volumes of American Theatre Companies are remarkably easy to use. In addition to being thoroughly cross-referenced and indexed, the scope of each of the volumes is logical. Individual entries are comprehensive without burdening the reader with unnecessary detail, and entries are constructed so that readers can select what information—a company's personnel, for example—may apply to their study without being forced to survey a great deal of unnecessary material. These volumes are a valuable contribution to the literature and should be a welcome addition to any library—public, academic or private.

—John W. Frick


David Glockley of the Houston Grand Opera recently admitted that Danny Newman's popular theatre dogma, "Subscribe Now!" is just as true today as when Houston mounts a Porgy and Bess or a Teemighthouse—or even one of the war-horses of the operatic repertory—it has to be sold to the public as a special "event." Busy people, so the argument runs, don't want to be tied down to a routine of musical theatre on the first Tuesday of alternate months. And that's in a city where there's not much choice.

With the recent advent of Les Miserables and Starlight Express, both of them spectacular productions, it's clear that musical theatre in New York is also becoming a series of special events. With tickets at the Metropolitan Opera at an upper level of $90—but they are printed on silver card!—lavish musical spectacles by Franco Zeffirelli and Jean-Pierre Ponnelle seem to be the wave of the future at Lincoln Center. Indeed, with long runs of 42nd Street, La Cage aux Folies, and Cats, it's possible they will become permanent institutions.

Fans can return each season to see the new casts, as generations now seem to have kept The Fantasticks alive.

Another permutation in the long history of American Musical Theatre is already in progress—without the public seeming to be aware of it. In view of this, a close reading of Julian Mates' provocative and absorbing analysis of our musical theatre will provide some valuable lessons from the past and some clues to the future. This is an entirely worthy successor to Mates' historical masterwork, The American Musical Stage Before 1800 (Rutgers, 1962).

The new volume is not precisely a sequel. Some historical substance is common to both. Mates' earlier achievement is notable, not only for the comprehensive account it provides of early American theatre life, but also for its emulation of Marcel Proust's ingenious narrative device. Mates managed, in that study, to reanimate the past within the framework of a New York audience on the way to—and beyond—18 April 1796 "premiere" of William Dunlap's American musical, The Archers. (In American Musical Theatre, critic Gerald Bordman assesses its stage quality as minimal, a "competent hack work."

The new study clearly could not repeat the Proustian effect, but Mates has attempted a theatrical structure of Overture, Acts, and Scenes. His "Intermission," devoted to The Black Crook, comes rather late in the performance, but it is a needed respite to dispel the folklore that this unusual show was the "first" American musical comedy. Comparisons with Bordman's definitive tome, Mates' survey of the past two hundred years of musical theatre in the United States may seem too brief. Doubtless there could have been much more detail, but there is hardly any point in duplicating Bordman's excellent reference. Instead, what Mates has effectively done is to establish the inter-relationships of the varied musical forms which have held the American stage over the decades, including minstrel shows, circuses, opera, dance, burlesque, revue, and vaudeville. His perceptions are invaluable, as he is dealing with major issues and essentials, rather than rehearsing a dogged documentation.

It's especially important, however, for readers to begin with Mates' Overture. He is intent on establishing the right of American musical theatre to be considered a serious artistic form. He argues for a long view, an historical perspective, which leads to the conclusion that it is not only an indigenous American art form, but probably our oldest performance tradition. Mates is effective in covering so many years and so much substance with such economy, always relating musicals to the mainstream of American theatre life.

Contributions of serious composers, librettists, and performing artists are stressed, underscoring the claims of the musical stage to be regarded as a valid art form. The fact of the tremendous popularity of various kinds of musicals over the years, Mates insists, is in their favor rather than against them. (One recalls, of course, that opera has long been Italy's most popular theatre form. That has not discouraged native critics from treating scores, librettos, performances, and productions with great respect.)

Julian Mates rightly cites the plight of musicals, new and old, in that they are customarily reviewed by drama critics, some of whom know little about the potential of music and dance in a stage work. Or they are evaluated by music critics, who may care little for theatrical values. Few critics, Mates insists, can see a musical whole—as the totality that the amalgam of performance forms becomes. Mates' endnotes and bibliographical essay offer further illumination, adding to the book's value as a reference.

But it can also be a point of orientation as the American (or immigrant British) musical sails onward over troubled seas. Times change. Musical landscapes change. Prices change: the new volume is virtually $30. Mates' Rutgers study cost only $6 in 1962. Tickets for musicals were also cheaper then. Some might well argue that the musicals were better, too.

—Glenn Loney


My first thought upon seeing these two huge volumes was what could they possibly contain? Isn't the British musical theatre, especially when you omit operas, operettas, and pantomimes, rather limited? And, British productions of non-British musicals are mentioned (The Sound of Music 15 times) but without any comments, casts or credits.

—Glenn Loney
Volume I covers the years 1865 through 1914. Except for the first five years, each year is treated as a chapter with a discussion of the various productions. Not only are London productions given, but also those given in Liverpool, Manchester, and other such locations, both British and foreign. Each year is then followed by a reference section of production and cast details. Each production is numbered, with Windsor Castle, produced at the Royal Strand Theatre on June 5, 1865, being numbered 0001. Gilbert and Sullivan are given a great deal of space. In the case of The Pirates of Penzance the production details cover three pages, from the one "copyright performance" on December 30, 1879 at Paignon one day before the New York production, up to the 1980 Joseph Papp production, the 1982 film version, and a television series in 1984.

Volume II covers the years from 1915 through 1984, arranged in the same manner. I looked up the first London musical I have ever seen—a Company—and found a two-page summary of the plot and comments on the cast and performances. The production details indicate that, after engagements at Windsor and Harrissmith, the show opened at the Lyric Theatre in the West End on December 26, 1956 for a run of 673 performances. A careful check in my program reveals that the two-page summary of the plot does include all the song titles, although nowhere are they listed in correct order. The most recent London musical I have seen that is included in this set is The Importance, produced at the Ambassador's Theatre on May 31, 1984 for 29 performances. It is dismissed in one paragraph which includes only four of the fourteen songs in the score. Full cast and production credits are given, however.

Each volume has its own Appendix I (printed music), Appendix II (recorded music) and a complete index of all names and show titles included in the text. Subtracing these appendices and indexes, the total page number of the two volumes is 2,246. There are 1,006 numbered productions, which means each production receives an average of two and one quarter pages.

The author has modestly compared his work to Bordman's American Musical Theatre, but it is much more. This monumental work will answer almost any question one could possibly have concerning the British musical theatre. It certainly belongs in every appropriate library.

—Richard C. Lynch


Despite Jan Kott's assertion to the contrary, Alan C. Dessen insists that the Bard's acknowledged universality does not in fact make him our contemporary. His world and the theatre for which he wrote were different from ours in a number of significant ways. And, even if modern directors and designers have tried to recreate "Globe" stages with various playing areas, that doesn't mean that they have used those spaces as Shakespeare and his colleagues might. Or that things described literally in the playtexts were necessarily actually shown on stage to the audience.

In Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters, Dessen examines this many-faceted problem. The extended title may be more complex than need be—it could warn off readers who will profit much from this valuable study—but it does describe Dessen's areas of interest. He makes frequent reference to productions, notably of the Oregon Shakespearean Festival, the Stratford Festival, the Royal Shakespeare Company, and even Joe Papp's Public Theatre/Shakespeare Festival.

In Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters, Dessen examines this many-faceted problem. The extended title may be more complex than need be—it could warn off readers who will profit much from this valuable study—but it does describe Dessen's areas of interest. He makes frequent reference to productions, notably of the Oregon Shakespearean Festival, the Stratford Festival, the Royal Shakespeare Company, and even Joe Papp's Public Theatre/Shakespeare Festival.

Aside from those peculiar productions in which both director and designers seemed to have no idea of the intention of Shakespeare's plays, Dessen is also concerned about modern stagings of Elizabethan dramas that misfire—or fall short of the power they could achieve—because either the director or the designers have interpreted dialogue or stage directions in terms of modern theatre practice or in terms of the world as we understand it today. When he makes the point that Shakespeare is not alive now and was not writing for a theatre filled with modern technology—or for an audience sated on hours of weekly TV—Dessen may seem to be stating the obvious.

But, as he demonstrates from some notable or notorious recent productions, the obvious needs constant restating. It is a truism that Shakespeare's was a theatre for the ear (and the mind) rather than for the eye. How many English teachers have pointed out to classes coming to the Bard's plays for the first time that the verbal imagery takes the place of that which on stage today—and especially on film or TV—would be shown?

And, despite some disconsoante excursions into the Epic or the Absurd, modern American and British theatre has tended to be solidly realistic. Since Ibsen and Chekhov, that has been the dominant theatre mode. Shakespeare's plays, Dessen believes, sometimes come to grief because of this. Or great moments may be spoilt, by making what was intended to be symbolic into a very real stage-picture, something it's almost certain would not have been seen on Shakespeare's stage.

Because there is so little evidence surviving about stage practices in Shakespeare's time—and precious little about the actual character of the Globe, as well—Dessen has had to infer from what is available and from the close examination of stage directions and actual lines in some four hundred manuscript or printed copies of Elizabethan and Jacobean plays. What he infers is, one is tempted to say, obvious to intelligent readers of the plays, but, from recent productions—some of which he notes—it's all too clear that some directors and designers have forgotten what is intended, or never understood it.

Less Is More seems to be the thread running through Dessen's argument. For the Elizabethans, a candle—possibly even until—on the sunlit stage of the Globe signified a night scene. Audiences, like a meditating player on stage, could join in "not seeing" other actors on stage but not involved in the actual scene. The significance of locale or place, the nature of stage violence, the suggestion of darkness and light, the representation of madness: these and other conventions are examined by Dessen in some detail, to demonstrate the need for more careful, informed study of Shakespeare's texts, especially by those who feel impelled to bring them to life on stage.

Problems, Dessen suggests, don't all originate with misguided or untutored theatre folk who try to make Shakespeare "accessible" to modern audiences. Some recent productions have been the result of trying to make lines or directions match modern customs or stage-practices. But there are other areas of difficulty as well. Serious scholars, Dessen indicates, have also confused issues by reading texts without knowledge of the nature of the Elizabethan stage and its practices. Theatre historians, he notes, may be more secure in those areas, but even they may fall short in understanding the conventions of Shakespeare's time.

This doesn't mean that Dessen wants productions recreated as they might have been done nearly four hundred years ago—even if recreation were possible. But he does argue that some major moments in the plays, some revelations of character, some dynamic actions can all be made more effective today if they are presented with an Elizabethan minimality instead of a contemporary realism.

—Glenn Loney


The Lunts occupied a very special place in the American theatre. They acted together from 1923 (Sweet Nell of Old Drury by Paul Kester) until 1957 (touring the United States in The Great Sebastians by Howard Lindsay and Russel Crouse). They played Shakespeare, Shaw, Coward, O'Neill, Maxwell Anderson, Sidney Howard, and Chekhov, to name only a few. George Freedley wrote a slim monograph
about them in 1957, as part of the Theatre World Monographs.

Jared Brown treats the Lunts’ careers in detail. He tells of Lynn Fontanne’s very early years in the theatre in England, of her early training with Ellen Terry, of her work with Weeden Grossmith, and of her coming to New York with the help of Lurette Taylor to play in J. Hartley Manners’ The Wooling of Eve in 1916. Her first acclaim in this country came in 1921, when she played the lead in Kaufman and Connelly’s Duicy.

Alfred Lunt began his professional career in 1912, at the Castle Square Theatre in Boston. He worked there for two years, toured in Margaret Anglin’s company of Paul Kester’s Beverly’s Balance, and played in several other productions. His first real success came with Booth Tarkington’s Clarence in 1919.

During the years through which they appeared together, Lunt and Fontanne established themselves as America’s favorite acting couple. They played comedy and tragedy at the same time. One can get some idea of their versatility by the descriptions in Brown’s book.

The personal careers of the Lunts somewhat paralleled the growth of the Theatre Guild, for whom they appeared in many productions. Mr. Brown supplies a great deal of history of the Guild, although the relationship between the Guild and the Lunts was not always a happy one. A more congenial partnership existed between the Lunts and Noel Coward.

One of the characteristics of the Lunts’ performances was the vigor of the love scenes. In such works as Molnar’s The Guardsman (1924), they quite literally wrestled. It was said that many in the audience at a performance by the Lunts were comforted by the knowledge that they were a married couple. My one regret in this book is that Mr. Brown did not include the Helen Hokinson cartoon of the two terrific young amateur actors at opposing ends of a long sofa. The directress is standing before them, chin in hand, head in air. The caption read, “As I recall, the Lunts rolled.”

Mr. Brown’s book is well-indexed and annotated. There is a charming introduction by Helen Hayes.

—Paul Myers


Often seen today as a pedantic scholar remembered primarily for his Prefaces to Shakespeare, written and published between 1927 and 1946, actor and director Harley Granville Barker led the English theatre’s progressive development in the early twentieth century. His memory is often overshadowed by the prolific visionary theories and productions of his countrymen and contemporaries Edward Gordon Craig and William Poel. But Barker, perhaps more than any theatrical artist of the day, brought the English theatre out of its slavish dependence on the pervasive conventions of the Victorian stage into a new era of simple, evocative and highly intelligent Shakespearean productions. Certainly less flamboyant and outspoken than Craig (with whom Barker acted as a young man), Barker quietly and steadily brought the revolutionary ideas of Craig and Poel, as well as his own vision, to the center of the English theatre before World War I. Three recent books superbly reconstruct and reassess Barker’s significance in his own time and examine his seminal influence on contemporary production.

The obvious strength of Granville Barker and His Correspondents is that it supplies Barker’s own words on a wide variety of theatrical issues. After offering a concise introductory survey of Barker’s career, as well as a detailed chronology, Salmon wisely divides the correspondence into chapters devoted to some of Barker’s most prolific correspondents, including William Archer, George Bernard Shaw, Lilah McCarthy, Gilbert Murray, Helen Huntington, Thomas Hardy, T.E. Lawrence and John Martin-Harvey. The chapters present correspondence with other actors, directors and playwrights, including John Martin-Harvey, William Poel, Max Reinhardt, Elizabeth Robins, John Galsworthy, Lady Gregory, Laurence Housman, John Masefield, and many others.

Most of the letters are fascinating, particularly the early correspondence with Shaw concerning plans for productions of his works. In very early letters to Archer, Barker articulated the need for an English national drama to put in it. We must get some idea of their versatility by the descriptions in Brown’s book.
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1855, Mr. Lerner traces the development of the musical through Strauss, Gilbert and Sullivan, and on up to Irving Berlin and the great American composers. Numerous photographs, many in color, add to the celebration.

While nothing really new may be learned, Mr. Lerner is consistently entertaining ("I have never quite understood the fascination the operetta composers had for gypsies. Their population was relatively small, their contribution to society nil, and as far as I know their main talent was swirling around and card-reading.") and amusing ("We can cheer ourselves by remembering an observation once made by Sibelius that on the entire face of the earth there is not one statue to a critic."). Of interest are his accounts of such landmark musicals as My Fair Lady and Camelot, as only he could know. Around 1959 he begins to mention the "ominous cloud of rising costs" that prevented respectable shows from making a profit. By the 1980's these costs have pushed the ticket price up out of reach. Mr. Lerner discusses this problem, as well as the theatre organizations that are becoming real estate operators both here and in London. He also discusses the influence today of Sondheim (content) and Andrew Lloyd Webber (form) and the emergence of the British musical (someone tells him that New York is about to become "just a stop on the American tour"). Mr. Lerner also reminds us that Broadway cannot survive without the musical theatre, but that the musical theatre can live without Broadway.

—Richard C. Lynch


When you consider the opposition to anything theatrical that persisted in Philadelphia into the early twentieth century, it is remarkable how many theatres were constructed there since 1724. The Quakers in particular denounced the drama and actors, in fact acting was punishable by jail term until 1789 when the Pennsylvania legislature repealed the law prohibiting dramatic performances.

In Philadelphia Theatres, A-Z Irvin R. Glazer records 813 theatres built in more than 200 years, although some of the buildings were called "museum," "hall," or "opera house" to disguise the purpose for which they were used. Also, the term "lecture" was used for "play." Names of some of the celebrities who performed as well as interesting quotations add color to the introductory chapters.

This book is a well-researched, alphabetical list of the theatres with descriptions of the original architectural details in addition to later alterations, decorations and changes in systems of lighting from candlelight and oil lamps through gas lighting. There is a glossary of architectural and theatrical terms.

Philadelphia was for many years the center for theatre and all things artistic and intellectual. Gilbert Stuart referred to it as "the Athens of America," and on the subject of the subject has been lost on overuse. It is unfortunate that Greenwood Press has done a disservice to the author by producing the book in such small, faint print that it is difficult to read. It would, no doubt, put off anyone but an avid researcher from reading it.

—Babette Craven


Having been numbered among those in the entry "Americans invade—Stratford gets so full it might be sick" during the run of Antony Sher's performance in Richard III, this diary of the lives of "the two of us, from the first suggestion to opening night" promised a great deal of interest. How good that it fulfills that promise and offers more—in eloquent writing, astonishing drawings, and cause for laughing out loud.

Year of the King deals with the experience of creating a performance, from "an unkept mess" to "a bottled spider." In this case, the creation began even before a line of "Joe Allen's chat" came from the mouth of Trevor Nunn; it was a popped Achilles' tendon which drove Sher into both physical therapy and psychotherapy—both essential elements in his concept of Richard. It was foreshadowed by a small accident at a Barbican opening, where the old man into whose shoulder Sher crashes is Laurence Olivier. ("God." Sher had written earlier, "it seems terribly unfair of Shakespeare to begin his play with such a famous speech. You don't like to put your mouth to it ... it's as hard as saying 'I love you,' as if you'd just coined the phrase for the first time.") Once the part is offered to him and he accepts, Sher visits both libraries and health farms, tapes TV programs on the disabled and murderers—all in "compulsive" pursuit.

While he searches for Richard, he also tapes two plays for television—and takes a holiday trip back home to South Africa, which he had not visited for eight years. The journey involves yet another search, for feelings long unvoiced. Finally, Stratford-rehearsals begin. The idea of Richard on crutches—Shakespeare's great warrior who is severely disabled—is adopted, ditched, and adopted again. Previews, openings: acclaim from Trevor Nunn, and "a flash of a night in Joe Allen's some millennia ago," and letters from the Richard III Society (only one or two "less enthusiastic"). Accounts of all are here. It is our pleasure that Mr. Sher's "pile of notes and sketches from this past year" has been shared with us. It provides a rare insight into the making of a historic theatrical event, yet one in which the play rests "in pride of place, on the top."

—Adele Bellinger

GOLDEN JUBILEE

There will be a gala reception on Friday, October 9, 1987, honoring the fiftieth anniversary of the Theatre Library Association. The party, which will officially open the International Symposium on Popular Entertainment as a Reflection of National Identity, will also honor TLA’s Past Presidents. All TLA members will receive invitations.

The Symposium is sponsored by the Theatre Library Association, the American Society for Theatre Research, and the Society of Dance History Scholars, in cooperation with the International Federation for Theatre Research. It will be held in New York City from October 9 through October 12, 1987, at the City University of New York’s Graduate Center. TLA will be conducting a panel on popular collections on Sunday morning, October 11. For further information please telephone Dick Buck at 212-870-1670.

Anthony Sher's sketch of himself as Richard III, from Year of the King, published in New York by Limelight Editions and in London by Methuen
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