# THEATRE -AN INTERPRETATION

FRANK CONWAY N.C.A.D. 1976.

| NAME:    | FRANK CONWAY                     |
|----------|----------------------------------|
| COLLEGE: | NATIONAL COLLEGE OF ART & DESIGN |
| PROJECT: | THEATRE - AN INTERPRETATION      |
| DATE:    | JUNE 1976.                       |

THESIS

My thesis is an argument against the idea that the playwright is the pinnacle of theatre, the top of the pyramid out of which all the other facets of theatre are dependent.

The first part of the thesis deals with the general attidude that holds with this argument, quoting such people as Lee Simonson, Mrs. Block, etc. Questions are put forward regarding this attitude, and the methods of the Broadway concept of play production are seriously questioned. My thesis then goes on to develop the idea that all the facets of theatre are interdependent, that there is no single facet- such as the script- that is solely creative and all the others merely interpretive. It concludes with the question whether Theatre can develop further on the basis of it's present form.

#### LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

I Jesus Christ Superstar - typical commercial Broadway production.

2 Production by BRECHT - great innovation of direction and design.

3 MOLIERE - French dramatist.

4 PETER WALLS Production of Hamlet.

5 EUGENE O' NEILL .- one of the greatest American playwrights.

E APPRICAL ST MONTAIN

approximation and the second s

nothereth in mitakani tara - This a mitadon -

. hate many of the state of the state

. ration to appendict allow and

and a state of the state of the

Ι.

THEATRE - AN INTERPRETATION.

ON STAGE

### Play and Production

A PLAY, according to William Archer, one of the outstanding dramatic critics of the past generation, is "a ship destined to be launched in a given element, the theatre." In Archer's metaphor the dramatic script is something which comes to the theatre. The wide-spread tendency now is to consider the theatre as something which is placed at the service of the script. Thus in his informative book, The Stage is Set, Lee Simonson arrives at the conclusion that the progress of theatre must wait upon the dramatist. " In the modern theatre, as in every other, the beginning is in the word."

There is even the implication that the forces of production, as distinguished from the script, must be looked upon as a threat to the integrity of drama itself. Mrs. Anita Block, in The Changing World in Plays and Theatre, declares: Theatre-consciousness is the condition of being entranced by the glamour and by the often spurious trappings of the theatre-such as clever acting, smart dialogue, dazzling costumes and effective scenery - into a drugged indifference to the values of the play content. Play-consciousness is the condition of being critically alive, in the theatre, to the play as literature . . . Once a t heatre-goer has developed play-consciousness he can never be deceived in the theatre again.

It is curious that this tendency in dramatic theory should now be current in a type of theatre which, when it was younger, insisted that "the Art of the Theatre is neither acting nor the play, it is not scene nor dance, but it consists of all the elements of which these things are composed." (Gordon Craig, 1905). But in fact few presentday American critics are as extreme in their views on this problem as are Lee Simonson or Mrs. Block. It is still generally affirmed that theatre is something bigger than the playscript. "The play's the thing-in the library," says John Mason Brown.

In practice the fundamental belief is simply that dramatic production exists to illustrate a story written by a dramatist (even though it is quite possible that in the process the story may be drastically altered).

It is comparatively easy to think of the dramatic process beginning with the writing of a play. This chronological order, however, is not sufficiently chronological. Before the dramatist can write a play for the theatre, the theatre has to be there. And not only a theatre in the abstract but a very particular kind of theatre-the theatre of the playwright's own epoch.

What comes first, the dramatist's script or the forces of theatre in general? Can it be said that the script alone is truly creative, while the other elements of production are "interpretive"? What is the value of such a distinction? Or is it of no more pressing importance than the question of which came first: the chicken or the egg?

It happens to be a question of great theoretical and practical importance whether the script alone is creative while the other factors of production are interpretive.

The belief that the script alone enters upon new paths, while the other elements of production must wait upon the script because they are "interpretive" has been set forth by Lee Simonson:

... the development of scene-designing as an art must wait upon the arrival, in sufficient numbers, of dramatic poets capable of interpreting life profoundly. Until they appear the scene-designer, whatever his graphic gifts may be, can do little more than mark time... As designers we cannot perform the functions of dramatic poets, but once they enter the theatre we are their indispensable collaborators. We cannot call them forth. It is they who must summon us. Meanwhile we wait and work.

. HEITATIGUESTIN MA - SETTATION

Tay and Fronterion

A PLAY, according to Million Archer, one of the dramatic ortifics of the past generation, in "s of to be lagached in a given element, the theatre." metaphor the dramatic script is something which theatre. The mide-aprend tendency now is to con theatre as consthing work is placed at the serv theatre as consthing work is placed at the serv is script. Thus in his informative book, The Stage theatre must work the conclusion that the theatre must work the dramatist. " In the theatre, as in every other, the becinning is in

There is even the implication that the roduction, as distinguished from the script, an Fon as a threat to the integrity of drame itsel lock, in The Changing Forld in Plays and Theets Theatre-consciousness is the condition

estranced by the glamour and by the older spart of the theatre-auch as clever acting, amart dia contrares and effective scenery - into a drugged to the volues of the play content. Flay-coest the condition of being critically alive, in the the play as literature . . . Once a theatredeveloped play-consciousness he can never be a theatre again.

It is curious that this tendency in o should now be current in a type of theatre whi younger, insisted that "the Art of the Theatre acting nor the play, it is not scene nor dance consists of all the elements of which these th composed." (Gordon Oraig, 1905). But in fact day American critics ins as extreme in their d

problem as are les Simonson or Fra. Block. It is affirmed that theatre is gomething higger than the "The play's the thing-in the library," says John Me

In practice the fundamental belief in simp aramatic production exists to illustrate a story ar dramatist (even though it is quite practicle that in the story may so drastically situred).

It is comparatively ever to think of the d process beginning with the mitiad of a pley. This order, however, is not sufficiently chronological. dramatist can write a play for the thestre, the the be there. And not only a thestred in the abstract p particular kind of thestre-the thestre of the player own spoch.

Most comes first, the dramatist's script of of theatre in general? Can it be said that the acri is truly creative, while the other elements of produ are "interpretive"? What is the value of such a dis Or is it of no more pressing importance than the que which came first: the chicken or the egr?

It happens to be a question of great theore practical importance whether the script alone is cre the other factors of production are interpretive.

The belief that the script alone enters up paths, while the other elements of production suct the script accause they are "interpretive" has been by Lee Simonson: ... the development of scene-designing as wait upon the arrival, in sufficient anmbers, of a capable of interpreting life profoundly. Until the scene-designer, whatever his graphic gifts may be, more than mark time... As designers we cannot cerio functions of dramatic poets, but once they enter the are their indiscensable collaborators. We cannot c

forth. It is they who must suggon us. Meanwhile work.

Is the theatre really obliged to wait until the dramatist makes up his mind to change it?. It is only the dramatist who can initiate progress in the theatre? Is it true, as those who think always in terms of playscripts assert: "It is the dramatist who brings about changes, for he calls for innovations which the actors, designers and directors hasten to supply"?

The truth is that all the elements of theatrical production are creative. We have no right to put any of them in an uncreative category. The progressive theatre must make progress in all its branches.

The overwhelming importance attached at present to the factor of the script-at the expense of the other factorsis due to a special condition in the production methods of Broadway and Hollywood. Here production usually revolves around the playscript. The script is the center of the theatre's economic set-up, and productions are assembled by the "casting-office" method. That is to say, the productive forces are assembled temporarily for a specific play, after which they are disbanded.

This method, considered in the light of theatre history, is a radical change in the customary manner of production. It happens to be an injurious change.

#### THE STORY ON STAGE

The true relationship of the playscript to production is hidden from us today because of certain conditions peculiar to our theatre. These conditions prevail in the Broadway theatre especially.

The Broadway dramatist, unlike his predecessors (who were usually associated with theatrical companies) as a rule does his work separately. To all appearances he is an independent craftsman who writes his plays in the seclusion of his own study (if he is an established success; in the reading room of

a public library if he is rather less fortunate). The product of his labor is thrown on the play-market, where it may be bought by any one of a score of producing managers or producing organizations. As soon as a manager decides on a script and has the necessary funds, the director, designer, actors and technical people are called in. It therefore looks as if dramatic activity always begins with a number of typewritten pages.

4.

But in fact the dramatist's script grows out of the whole apparatus of the theatre as it is available in his own day. More than that, it grows out of the living individual talents available in his own day.

Still more, the dramatist's choice of theme and his treatment of that theme are determined by existing theatrical producers. Dramatists write with the expectation of interesting not just the play-market in general, but specifically George Abbott, the Theatre Guild, Guthrie McClintic, the Playwrights' Producing Company or the Group Theatre. The mere existence of the Group Theatre, for example, causes certain types of plays to be composed which would not otherwise be written. On the other hand, some plays even if independently written would never become stage realities did not an organization exist which was willing to give them life. Sklar and Peters' STEVEDORE (1934), written in the spirit of the workers' theatre movement, remained a sheaf of paper untouched until a newly created organization, the Theatre Union, turned it into a stage success.

If the chronology of production is one apparent reason for the overwhelming emphasis on the script on Broadway, a more solid reason is the economic value of the script. The script, more than any other element, more even than the high-priced star, is the cornerstone of commercial theatre enterprise. It is the script in which the producer invests primarily, for which he gathers his financial and artistic resources and from which he hopes to profit on Broadway and in Hollywood.

Is the theatre really oill, so to calt unit dramatist makes up his wind to cheeke is?. It is a drematist who can initiate progress in the theatre? as those who thirk always in terms of physcalate as is the dramatist who brings about chances, for as ca innovations which the actors, destinate and structor heaten to supply"?

The truth is that all the electric of the production are creative. We have an rist to put a in an uncreative category. The progressive theatre progress in all its proches.

The oversheld in inportance attached at prithe factor of the script-at the encade of the other is due to a special condition in the production set Broadway and Bollywood. Here product in usually rethe playedript. The activit is the center of the th economic set-up, and productions are assembled by th "easting-office" method. That is to say, the produforces are assembled temporally for a meetido play which they are disbunded.

This method, considered in the light of the history, is a radical change in the customery range production. It happens to be an injurious change.

# SOATE NO YROTE STA

The true relationship of the playsoript to hidden from us today because of certain possitions our theatre. These conditions prevail in the Bros theatre especially.

The Broadway dramatist, unlike his proded usually associated with theatrical companies) as a his work separately. To all appearances he is an crafteman who writes his plays in the sociasion of study (if he is an established success; in the read A public library if he is rether less fortheats, product of his labor is throm on the clay-same any he bought by any one of a score al moducing or producing organizations. As such as a same on a script and ass the matcherry fush, the tidestigner, actors and technical people are called therefore looks as is dramatic activity always b

Not in fact the dramatist's script gro of the whole apparatus of the thestre as it is a in his own day. More that that, it grows out of indivioual talents available in his own day.

Still more, the dramatist's choice of an his treatment of that there are tetricise by an theatrical producers. Dramatists rrite with the of interesting act just the play-ranget in general accordingly George Abbott, the Theatre Guild, Ca McClintic, the Playwrights' Producing Company or theatre. The more existence of the Group Theatre. Theatre, The more existence of the Group Theatre. and the would not etherence be written would an stage realities did not an or anisation exist which willing to give them life. Stiar and Peters' Sti written in the spirit of the workers' theatre protermined a sheaf of paper unteached until a next organization, the Theatre Union, turned in tare

If the chromology of production is no a reason for the overwhelming emphasis on the script Arosdway, a more solid reason is the economic valscript. The script, more than any other element, even than the high-priced star, is the erneratone commercial theatre enterprise. It is the script i the producer invests orimerily, for which he fathe strong and artistic resources and from which he Audiences, it is too often forgotten, to to the theatre to see a Show. This means that, among the things which the spectator goes to see is a Group Theatre cast, a setting by Donald Oenslager, the direction of Lee Strasberg or a solo performance by Katharine Cornell or by Paul Robeson.

5.

The store of Boundary

It is true at the same time that the spectator is mentally prepared always for a story which will take place on the stage. Even revues and burlesque shows are accustomed to have a story, however flimsy, upon which the comic scenes and vaudeville acts are strung together. A story, or at least the rudiments of one, seems to be essential.

Still this fact does not settle the matter. The important question for us is not whether a story is essential to theatre, but whether it is theatre. Whether the whole significance of stage production consists in transferring a story to the stage without "hurting" it; or whether the story is no more than an important ingredient of something which, on the stage, becomes more than a story - something which turns into that ceremony, that composite of many art forms, which we call theatre.

### THIS TOO, TOO SOLID FLESH

We have seen that in theory-but not in practice- most critics grant that the dramatic performance is something different from something more than, the playscript which it contains. The performance does not illustrate a script; rather, the script is imbedded in the performance. How do these critics define a dramatic story?

What constitutes a story to some people's notions is not a story to others'. There was a time when a study of private emotions, as the Sturm und Drang period saw them, was not a story to the classicists who understood only objective behavior in stage characters. When the Expressionists set to work, audiences accustomed to Naturalistic plots saw

treatte to see a Show. This means that, sauns t or a solo performance by Katharise Cornell or by

montally propared always for a story which will to on the stage. Even revues and burlandes shows are to have a story, however fliney, upon which the en and veudeville acts are strang together. A story, least the rudiments of one, seems to be essential.

to theatre, but whether it is theatre. Whether th which three into that coremon, that composite of art forms, which we call theatre.

it contains. The performance does not illustrat

not a story to others'. There mas a time when a objective behavior in stave shuracters. When the

no story in the stream-of-consciousness pattern of the newer writers. The plays of Brecht and Piscator were not stories in the opinion of those who did not like politics on the stage. No doubt a well-presented account of drop-forging, which might seem intensely dramatic to some people, would not be considered a story by others.

Again, it becomes evident that a story in its literary form cannot be the same as a story in its form on the stage. The moment the story appears in the theatre it becomes subject to the laws of the theatrical worlk. A chair has to be placed on the stage. What kind of chair? And where to place it? The stage must be lit up. What kind of light? How much of it, from what direction? Shall it be constant, or shall it change from time to time? At once the story, as such, gives way to more immediate problems, more immediate in a theatrical sense.

During the 1937-38 Broadway season there appeared three successful plays - the Mercury Theatre's JULIUS CAESAR and THE CRADLE WILL ROCK, and OUR TOWN, presented by Jed Harris in which there was a minimum of scenery or which had stage walls showing. Immediately it was declared that these "no-scenery" shows proved that scenery and scene designers are really an encumbrance to the plays in which they are used. They should be abolished.

A peculiar kind of idealism governs these theories. They stem from the notion that theatre consists of a priceless soul (the script) and a mere body (the production). As Brown expresses it,

> Great plays are great for other reasons than that they are adapted to the stage. They soar above its physical limitations as the spirit transcends the body.

Technically considered, the value of a good playscript lies in the fact that it functions on the stage. Otherwise what distinguishes it from any other printed literature? A good script is stageworthy, or it is not a good script.

no story in the streat of connoicement patters of t newer writters. The pices of Brecht and Piccator wer atories in the opinion of those sig did not like pol the stage. No doubt a well-presented account of dro which might seem intencely dressile to some people, be considered a story by others.

Again, it becomes prident that a story in it form cannot be the same as a dory in its form on th The moment the story appears in the theatre it secon subject to the laws of the theatrical world. I chai to be placed on the stage, Weat kind of obsir? An elace it? The stage must be lit up. Weat kind of 1 much of it, from what direction? Sudil it be concla shall it change from time to time? It once the stor such, gives may to more incediate problem, more in such a theatrical same.

Juring the 1937-36 Grondray season there and three successful plays - the Hercary Theatro's JUIU and NE CRAULS WILL ROCK, and CON TOW, presented by in which there was a minimum of estenery or which had showing. Insediately it was declared that these "no anows proved that scenery and scene dosigners are re encombrance to the plays in which they are used. To be abolished.

A peculiar kind of idealiar governs these they etcan from the notion that thestro consists of soul (the sorigt) and a more body (the production). expresses it.

that they are adapted to the stage. They above its physical limitations as the spi transcends the body.

reconstrainly considered, the velue of a good lies in the fact that it functions on the stage. O what distinguishes it from any other printed liters good script is stageworthy. or it is not a good per The author of a good script knows his way around a stage either by experience or by insight. The playscript is essentially a chart, a definition, of stage action, meaning that it defines something which already exists. It was in this way that Aeschylus constructed upon the ritual of Dionysus. It was in this way that Moliere constructed upon the Connedia dell' Arte.

Few laymen understand that, on the stage, dialogue is no substitute for action. Stage dialogue has dramatic worth only when it is another from of action, when it is muted action. Even so, muted, spoken action of this sort is comparatively rare (George Bernard Shaw is one of the few masters of this art). As a rule dialogue functions as a kind of libretto for the stage action.

# "CREATIVE VERSUS INTERPRETIVE"

It is true that the playscript must be regarded as an original piece of creative work while the other elements of stage production are merely "interpretive"? It is not true. There is no objective basis for the belief that only the script is creative and that the acting, the direction, the setting, must all draw their breath of life from the script.

How often have we not seen scripts without life, scripts which are mere echoes and imitations of previous productions! Such playscripts are occasionally brought to life by superb performances of actors whose every gesture transcends the play. How often a setting creates a dramatic statement of which the play itself is incapable! How often does not a director take a lifeless script and make it live, to some degree at least, on the stage!

In the course of an article on the principles of directing, the Russian director B.E. Zakhava makes some interesting observations on the question of "creative versus interpretive":

By what standards then does the work of the actor and director become creative work? The director and the actor

7.

e nine work on the basis of the material given them by the dramatist; this latter in itself does not an any sense or degree lessen their right to create. There is no art where the artist creates out of thin air. Every artist uses that cultural heritage which has accumulated in his particular field. He must inevitably profit by this accumulation in his art. More than this we know that, in the history of art, great artists have created their finest masterpieces by using the work of their predecessors. For instance, it is well known that Shakespeare wrote HAMLET on the framework of a Scandinavian saga preserved in the vaults of the Danish scholar Saxo Grammaticus and revised before Shakespeare by Belleforest and Thomas Kyd. It is also no news that Ostrovsky often borrowed plots from the French comedies. This does not in any way lessen our admiration for Shakespeare or Ostrovsky.

What is wrong with something being "interpretive"? The script itself is interpretive of the other theatrical elements; its story carries along and makes understandable to the average spectator certain nuances of acting or setting which he might not otherwise appreciate. HAMLET and KING LEAR provide great actors with adequate means of expression. From this point of view these plays are "vehicles," in a good sense, for actors of superior calibre.

A great script, like a great role or a great scene design, is a valuable achievement. The script has a leading function, moreover, above that of the other elements of production, because it is a chart of production, it rallies the forces of production. (Unlike the other factors, also, it is comparatively imperishable in the form of the printed word.) This leading function is an important privilege of the script; but it is a quality which must not be confused with creativeness.

The playwright, like all the other workers in the theatre, has done his share to change the character of the theatre even as he worked in it. Aeschylus is generally

the autors of a good scaled income his new around states of experiance of by incident. The playsonic essentially a chart, a celluition, of make notion that it defines something which already salets. this way that Auschylas constructed whos the rituabiosysam. It was in this may that follows construthe Connedia doli' arts.

. 5

Few laymen anderstand that, on the start, is no substitute for action. State dialorno has worth only when it is another from of action, when action. Hyper so, wother, spoken action of this son comparatively rare (Georie Bernard Shaw is one of masters of this art). As a rule diplogue function (died of libratio for the stage action.

"OHRATIVE VERSUS INTRACERTIVE" It is true that the ployacrist must be rea an original pisce of creative sork while the other of stars production are devely "interpretive"? It There is no objective casts for the belief that on soriot is creative and that the acting, the direct cetting, must all draw their breath of life from t

How often have we not seen scripts without actipts which are more echoes and imitations of a productional Soch playserints are occasionally b life by superb performances of actors whose avery transcends the play. How often a setting creates alatement of which the play itself is incepante! does not a director take a lifeless script and an to some degree at least, on the stage!

In the course of an article on the princi directing, the Russian director B.T. Eakhava make interesting observations on the question of "crea interpretive":

By what standards then does the more on director

work on the basis of the material given check of their right to create. There is no art there is dreates out of this air. Story exited uses the heritage which has accumulated in his particulament inevitably profit by this matemalation is than this we know that, is the alementation of et. have created their fine t mesterpieces of raise that predesessore. For instance, it is reliable state predesessore. For instance, it is reliable that the et. the state of the basis of a baskspreare wrote this realise of the basis of their predesessore. For instance, it is reliable their predesessore. For instance, it is reliable dramaticos and revised before Saciessors of a state Thomas Kyd. It is also no ness that for the borrowed plots from the france consolies. This any way lessen our admiration for Shevessers of

What is wrong with something being "intersomethic itself is interpretive of the other thesir alcosets; its story carries along and catch under to the average substator certain mances of actin saiting which he might not otherwise appreciate. First this point of view these plays are "vehicles sense, for actors of sparior calibre.

A great script, like a great role on a radesign, is a valuable schievement. The script ha function, moreover, above that of the other slad production, because it is a chart of production, the forces of production. (Unlike the other fact it is comparatively imperiabable in the form of word.) This leading function is an important an of the script; but it is a quality which and an with creativenes.

The playwright, like all the other worker theatre, has done his share to change the charac theatre even as he worked in it. Asschylus is g known today only for his plays; but his plays were only one department of his dramatic activities. More than a playwright he was a creator of stage form. He is said to have supervised personally the training of his choruses, for whom he devised dances and designed costumes. He is credited with having given definitive form to the strange costume of the Greek tragic actor. It was Aeschylus who cut down the length of the choral odes, stressed dialogue instead and introduced a second actor-changes which transformed the archaic Dionysian ritual tinto "an essentially dramatic species of art." Like Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides also took part actively in the definition of Attic stage form.

Closer to our own times we have the examples of Goethe, Wagner, Victor Hugo, Strindberg and Zola, who were all vehement partisans of scenic reform. They realized that the problems of production.

Many dramatists of our own period have been aware of the need for changes in theatrical form. Among American playwrights Eugene O'Neill has been one of the most restless of scenic innovators, calling upon techniques which ranged from Naturalism to Expressionism (as in THE HAIRY APE, 1922) and Constructivism (as in DYNAMO,1929). In a whole cycle of his plays the actors were called upon to don masks, as in THE HAIRY APE, THE GREAT GOD BROWN (1926), THE RIME OF THE ANCIENT MARINER (1924), LAZARUS LAUGHED (1926). John Howard Lawson has been equally protean in style, from Symbolism in SUCCESS STORY (1932) and GENTLEWOMAN (1934), to Expressionism in ROGER BLOOMER (1923), Theatricalism in PROCESSIONAL (1925) and Constructivism in LOUDSPEAKER (1927).

Beginning with ON TRIAL (1914), Elmer Rice turned to a play-construction of staccato "flash-back" scenes instead of the previous convention of three or four acts. Plays of twelve or more scenes are now a commonplace on modern stages, necessitating new systems of stage mechanics, scene shifting



known today only for his plays; but his plays mere department of his dramatic scilitics. Fore than a be was a creator of otage form. So he call to hove personally the training of the chorness, for when almoses and designed constance. We is created with almoses and designed constance. We is created with almoses and designed constance. We is created with the chornel of the strange costane of he is also chornel of a strange costane of he is chornel odes, attended to the strange costane of he almost time a strange much transformed he strange ritual times a secontially dramatic rescies of a heachylue, somboles and furicions also tox carb in the definition of attic stage form.

blower to our orn times we have the scandow magner, Victor Hugo, Strincherg and Sole, who were a vehewest partisans of scaric reform. They realized problems of production.

Newy drametists of our our merioe neve been a the mead for connect to treatrical fort. Amore has playwrights Edgeme O'Neill as been one of the most of scenic innovatore, calling upon techniques thick from Naturalism to Expressionian (as in TRE Inter a and Constructivies (as in ERANC, 1923). To a thole the stays the actors were called upon to dom masks, and the stars (as in ERANC, 1923). To a thole the stars the actors were called upon to dom masks, and the stars (1924), 14328715 14104ED (1926). Joh ATCI TAT ARINE (1923), 14328715 14104ED (1926). Joh structure the store of and SETLETOMER (1934), to inter the Rose adouted (1923), Theat to attact in Foresard in Rose allower (1935), Theat to attact in Foresard in Rose allower (1935), Theat to attact in Foresard in Rose allower (1935), Theat to attact in Foresard in Rose allower (1935), Theat to attact in Foresard in Rose allower (1935), Theat to attact in Foresard in Rose allower is Louisering (1927).

Beginning with ON TRIAL (1914), Einer Sice to play-construction of stacosto "flash-back" scares in of the previous convention of three of four scap. P twelve of more scenes are now a concorisco on moder necessitating new systems of stace mechanics, scene





known today only for his black; but his plays as department or his dramatic activities. Here the be wan a creator of stage fore. As is call to b personally the state of stage fore. Is is credited with dances and dealered costance. Is is credited with struct setor. It was teachylas abo cal done the the aborat odes, streesed dialogue instead and struct actor. It was teachylas abo cal done the struct actor. It was teachylas abo cal done the here aborat odes, streesed dialogue instead act structs was teachylas abo cal done the structs actor. It was teachylas abo cal done the here aborat odes, streesed dialogue instead act is the definition of Attic stage form

Closer to our oun times we have the granula Magner, Victor Bugo, Stringborg and Sola, was were vehouset pertisand of scenic reform. They realize problems of production.

Have domatists of our orm period have been the word for changes is theatstand form. Amount a playerights Budess Orabil has been one of the most of scenic innovators, calling upon techniques the iron Waturalian to Expensionian (as in MR TANK) and Constructivies (as in DIMANO,1929). In a shale the playe the actors were called upon to ion scales, and the science were called upon to ion scales, the playe the actors were called upon to ion scales, and the science were called upon to ion scales, and the science were called upon to ion scales, the playe the actors were called upon to ion scales, and the science were called upon to ion scales, and constructivity (1920), Laziatis the state, from and success store (1922) and device wate (1934), to im success store (1923), Theat ricalize is forces in and Constructivity in LOUDIPELIER (1929).

Beginning with ON THIAL (1914), Einer Rice i play-construction of staccato "flash-back" scause i of the previous convention of three of four-sche. J twelve or more scenes are now a commensione on model necessitating new systems of stare mechanics, scene .0

the see a set to the beaution of the set to the second of the second of

Abser to our ora times to the or magnet, Tetar Auto, Stradbers and 2014, No propiets of production. They re

the new line of the set is the of the set of

Beginning with 03 Fills (1927). Beginning with 03 Fills (1911), Elser More in the previous of stacoato "files-back" scane in the previous converties of three 06 from estate in the previous scanes are now a conscanting on ander measure to the scale scale are a scale of the scale of the scale of states of states scale of a scale of the scale of states of states scale of scale of scale of the scale of states of states scale of scale of scale of scale of the scale of states of states scale of scal 10.

and designing. Marc Connelly, Sidney Howard, George Sklar, Marc Blitzstein, Martin Flavin, Irwin Shaw, Sidney Kingsley, Arnold Sundgaard, are other American dramatists who have shown an active interest in technique. Indeed it can be said that every dramatist who has written more than one play has found it necessary to have definite views on the matter, and found it necessary to have left their impress upon the stage those of the past, have left their impress upon the stage conventions which they found, changing the fate of these

In the course of history we come regularly upon periods when the initiative was in hands other than those of the dramatist. The eras of the artistic ascendency of the script have been few and far between in the course of more than twenty-five centuries of production. Such periods can be numbered on the fingers of one hand: the Attic theatre; the Baroque theatre of France, Spain and England; the Elizabethan theatre; the Romantic theatre; the Naturalistic theatre of the late nineteenth century. Theatre has managed to flourish for centuries with the merest rudiments of a script, or with no script at all.

"But in past times there were eras when story and poetry weighed heaviest, others when spectacles and trick-effects alone satisfied the audiences; and still others when a vigorous show of virtuoso acting was the clou of stage art . . . In a period covering the late seventeenth and most of the eighteenth century, acting was one of the most conspicuous elements in the theatre's activity, and the only element around which a history of the playhouses of the time could be written. Dramatists of world significance are not met with in France for a long time after Moliere, nor in Spain after Calderon, nor in England after Dryden; and Germany won't bring forward any contribution till the star of Goethe and Schiller rises a century hence. (Cheney: The Theatre).

# THEATRE AS PRODUCTION.

To understand our present-day theatre or the vistas which are opening for the future we must go beyond the study of the playscript for information. It is necessary to follow closely the mutations of style in the theatre, especially in recent years.

In making our inquiry we may learn a great deal from a consideration of the stage setting. The nuances of style in scene design, once they are properly understood, are more obvious than those of acting or directing styles, hence are more readily illustrative. Again, the factor of design is almost at the polar end of production from that of the script; it affords an approach to production which is very different from the one in vogue at this time. Finally the exact connection between scene design and the other factors of production is a question which has provoked much thought among stage workers; it should prove illuminating to bring up the opinions which have been expressed on that subject.

It is our contention that all the forces of stage production are creative; that each of these factors can and should make progress; that the fight for a better theatre has to be waged all along the line of production.

In line with this contention we have re-examined the relation of the dramatist's script to the other production elements. We have given instances from dramatic history to show that theatre has not been merely a succession of playscripts. We have tried to show that the progress of the script itself may be frustrated by the backwardness of other elements. It has also been pointed out that in everyday practice the script is not "inviolate," and should not be.

While granting the special importance of the script, we have also tried to show that the script is not something independent of the rest of the theatre.

It is, on the contrary, something which arises out of the whole apparatus of theatre.

12.

The American commercial stage employs a casting-office system of assembling its personnel. Yet the whole technique which it has inherited is a product of the creative work of permanent companies; and experience warrants the conclusion that future progress will be made primarily in such companies. For stage production is a composite art, and it is practiced by people working together in creative association - a type of rapport which is unfortunately not encouraged by "casting-office" methods.

We have taken note of some of the personalities in recent stage history who were not dramatists yet devoted their lives to the improvement of theatre in general, a work whose importance justified such devotion. None of these men felt that the perfect technique has already been found, but all of them have believed optimistically that the solution would arrive, perhaps in the near future.

It appears now that before we can go on to the future of which these men have dreamt, we must find the answer to a technical problem that has arisen on our stages. That problem, hitherto vague, is becoming clearer.

It is the question whether the theatre can develop further on the basis of its present form.

\_ \_ \_ \_ \_

1 1 2 4 - 0

elements. We have given instan niavsoripte. Se have tried to show seriot itself asy be frustrated elecente. It has also been poin "rectide the sonipt is not "inviolete."

independent of the rest of the thestee.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Lee Simonson: THE STAGE IS SET.

Anita Block: THE CHANGING WORLD IN PLAYS AND THEATRE.

Edward Gordon Craig: ON THE ART OF THE THEATRE.

John Mason Brown: THE ART OF PLAYGOING.

Morton Eustis: B'WAY, INC.

B.E.Zakhava: PRINCIPLES OF DIRECTING. THEATRE WORKSHOP.

Allardyce Nicoll: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEATRE.

John Howard Lawson: THE THEORY AND TECHNIQUE OF PLAYWRITING.

George Bernard Shaw in the LONDON MERCURY.

J.Dover Wilson: WHAT HAPPENS IN HAMLET.

A.E. Haigh: THE ATTIC THEATRE.

Sheldon Cheney: THE THEATRE.

Harry Alan Potemkin: THE EYES OF THE MOVIE.

Constantin Stanislavsky: MY LIFE IN ART.

George Bernard Shaw: ON THE PRINCIPLES THAT GOVERN THE DRAMATIST. From Barrett H. Clark: EUROPEAN THEORIES OF THE DRAMA.

arrive, parhaps in the near future.

further on the basis of its present form.







