

71

TRADITIONS IN PRODUCTION OF THE WINTER'S TALE

TRADITIONS IN PRODUCTION

OF

THE WINTER'S TALE

By

JOHN ALEXANDER STRUTHERS, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

March, 1979

MASTER OF ARTS (1979)
(English)

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Traditions in Production of The Winter's Tale

AUTHOR: John Alexander Struthers, B.A. (Queen's University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Berners A.W. Jackson

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 141

ABSTRACT

This thesis concerns the traditions in production of The Winter's Tale that have emerged since 1750. To find these traditions, and to understand the nature of each one, the major productions of The Winter's Tale that have been given in England since 1750, and in North America since 1900, are considered. Also, to clarify the nature of each tradition, the general conditions during the period of a tradition are outlined. This involved outlining the state of Shakespeare production in general, or outlining the trends in literary criticism that influenced production of The Winter's Tale.

I wish to thank Dr. Berners Jackson for the advice and encouragement he has given me throughout the course of this work. Also I am indebted to those connected with the theatre who generously took time to speak with me about theatre production generally, and about productions of The Winter's Tale.

The reference material used in this study was found in the Mills Memorial Library at McMaster University, the Metropolitan Toronto Central Library, and the Robarts Research Library at the University of Toronto. All quotations from Shakespeare's plays are taken from the new Arden editions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY	1
I. <u>THE WINTER'S TALE</u> FROM 1750 TO 1900	7
1. 1750 to 1800	7
2. 1800 to 1900	12
II. A PERIOD OF TRANSITION	41
III. A NEW TRADITION	73
IV. AN EMERGING TRADITION?	93
V. <u>THE WINTER'S TALE</u> AT STRATFORD, ONTARIO	116
CONCLUSION	131
TABLE OF PRODUCTIONS OF <u>THE WINTER'S TALE</u> DISCUSSED	134
BIBLIOGRAPHY	136

INTRODUCTORY

This study is a history of production of The Winter's Tale in the last 225 years in which I have tried to locate several traditions in production of The Winter's Tale and to understand the nature of each tradition. However I have not mentioned every production of the play given in the last 225 years. Soon after beginning the research for this work I realized that researching and writing about every production of The Winter's Tale would require more time than I had to offer and more information than that available to me. As a result I confined myself to a less ambitious task; I have studied only the major productions of the play given in England since 1750 and the major productions given in North America in this century.¹

In the twentieth century many reviewers of productions of The Winter's Tale have commented upon the contrast of the tragedy in the first part of the play with the second part. For instance in 1946 a reviewer reporting upon a production of The Winter's Tale by the Theatre Guild in New York wrote that

the play is pleasing, albeit quite definitely mixed between rip-snorting tragedy and pastoral symphony. It is an odd piece of work upon a stage...²

To be sure, the first section of the play in Sicilia can be tragic, the scenes in Bohemia may be pastoral, and the difference between the tragic effect of the first section and the romantic pastoral effect of the second section may be very pronounced. For our purposes the "effect" of a section in a production can be defined as the overriding feeling the audience senses from the many facets of drama -- from the style of acting, sets, costumes and other illusion-creating devices used in the section. And if one or all of these facets are altered to a large enough extent during a production, there will be a change of effect. Thus in some productions of The Winter's Tale, while the Sicilia section is tragic, when the play switches to Bohemia the illusory devices are altered to create a romantic effect. Almost all productions of the play in the last forty-five years have been handled this way. But could a director avoid a mixture of effects altogether by creating one effect for both sections of the play?

When I started researching I was surprised to find some productions in which the directors avoided either the tragic or the romantic effect, or both, in favour of a single effect throughout the Sicilia and Bohemia sections, and throughout the last section as well in which the action

returns to Sicilia. This discovery revealed a procedure for researching each production of the play and an approach by which traditions can be defined. First I examined the available information about each production to see if there was a change in effect when the action moved from Sicilia to Bohemia. Then I attempted to find the effects, or the single effect, in the production. And, in this study, with each production of The Winter's Tale I have attempted to show what effect or effects were created, and I have grouped those productions having the same or similar effects together as one tradition. Using this approach revealed three traditions in production of The Winter's Tale; the nineteenth-century productions of the play given in the spectacular tradition; the productions after 1930, forming what I have called the "new tradition"; and some very recent productions that appear to be part of a tradition still emerging.

Further, of all the productions of The Winter's Tale that were staged in England after 1750 or in North America after 1900, only McNamara Morgan's in 1754, David Garrick's in 1756, Winthrop Ames' in 1910, Harley Granville-Barker's in 1912, and a production co-directed by John Houseman and Jack Landau in 1958 cannot be said to be part of a tradition in production of the play. And, with the exception of the

production in 1958, this is because these productions were each presented at a time when The Winter's Tale was not produced often enough for a tradition of any kind to evolve. However, both the presentation of the play by Garrick, and the presentations of Barker and Ames when considered together, clarify the route production of The Winter's Tale has followed in the last 225 years and are included in this study.

I hope that, as well as locating traditions and generally mapping out the route taken in production of The Winter's Tale, this work can also serve as a quick reference for scholars who wish to find how a particular production of The Winter's Tale was handled. When discussing each production I have tried to give as complete a picture as the available information will allow. Thus, interesting or significant aspects of a production, though not related to the tradition the production was in, are discussed nevertheless. Unfortunately I was not able to convey a satisfactory picture of most of the productions that had a change in effect when the action moves from Sicilia to Bohemia. Information about the third section of these productions is not available. However in the last chapter I have taken a detailed look at two such productions for which there is abundant information about the final Sicilia scenes. Also in discussing the

productions that had a change in effect, whenever possible I have undertaken to find whether the first two sections of the play had "unity of effects" -- whether the effect of the Bohemia section combined with the effect of the Sicilia section in a pleasing way; and for both productions of The Winter's Tale discussed in the last chapter I have outlined the unity of effects that existed between the three sections of the play.

To clarify my discussion of each tradition of production of The Winter's Tale, I also have sketched the general conditions that shaped these productions. Sometimes this involved outlining the state of Shakespeare production in general, and sometimes it involved outlining the trends in literary criticism that influenced production of The Winter's Tale. To gather the background information I read the critical works that applied and histories of Shakespeare production. Also, to learn about productions of Shakespeare's plays given in the times of the traditions in production of The Winter's Tale, I often read reviews, or parts of reviews cited in the histories of Shakespeare on the stage. And it was mainly in reviews that I found the information about productions of The Winter's Tale. Here I worked upon the premise that one can tell from a number of reviews what a

production was like. Fortunately, as the project proceeded the premise seemed valid. To see which reviews should not be used for detailed information about a production -- type of costumes, sets, etc. -- one can check the information of each reviewer against that given by other reviewers. Similarly to find the reviews that do not present a sensible appreciation of a production one can compare the reasons each reviewer offers for praising or criticizing a production with those of the other reviewers.

Notes to Introductory

¹On pages 134-5 is a list of the productions of The Winter's Tale I discuss. For each production I have listed the name of the director, the date, and the name of the theatre and city the production was given in.

²John Chapman, "The Guild's Shakespeare Troupe Starts Off with 'Winter's Tale'", Daily News, in New York Theatre Critics' Reviews, VII (1946), 488.

I

THE WINTER'S TALE FROM 1750 TO 1900

1. 1750 to 1800

In 1754 a re-arranged and drastically reduced version of The Winter's Tale was prepared by McNamara Morgan for Covent Garden, and in 1756 a slightly different version was offered by David Garrick at Drury Lane. First of all it should be noted that neither version incorporated a change in effect from the Sicilia section to the Bohemia section. Rather, both Garrick and Morgan deleted the first three acts of Shakespeare's text altogether. While in Morgan's version Leontes, Hermione and Paulina were dispensed with entirely, in Garrick's version Camillo was on hand in I, i to tell what happened sixteen years ago, and the principle Sicilian characters had a relatively brief but active role towards the end of the play.¹

In Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving George C.D. Odell wrote that Garrick's version "held the stage as long as Garrick... cared to act it, and was frequently revived."² Further, The Winter's Tale was only one of several of Shakespeare's plays to be revised and to be popular on the

eighteenth-century stage in altered versions. For example, in 1681 Tate revised Shakespeare's King Lear, giving it a happy ending, a love affair between Edgar and Cordelia, and omitting the Fool;³ and Odell noted that the audience of Garrick's time still "preferred Tate's Lear to Shakespeare's."⁴ Likewise, in 1677 Dryden revised Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra, and (even altering the title) he called the result All for Love. Odell commented that Dryden's changes reduced Shakespeare's "tragedy of the downfall of a world to a neat little parlour-drama in Alexandria";⁵ but he also pointed out that, even well into the time of Garrick, Dryden's version surpassed Shakespeare's in popularity.⁶ It seems that in altering a play of Shakespeare's, Dryden, Tate, McNamara, Garrick and others were each seeking a version that would please their audience. Here it will be sufficient to consider Garrick's revision of The Winter's Tale.

In his "Preface" to Shakespeare written in 1756 Samuel Johnson questioned the classical principle, revived in the eighteenth century, that to make "the drama credible" the "unities of time and place" must be observed. And, with faint disdain, he likewise attacked "the triumphant ... critick" who "exults over the misery of an irregular poet" -- who criticizes the playwright (or the manager) who does not

observe the unities.⁷ Indeed, in reviews of productions in the eighteenth century, often the reviewer mentioned whether or not the unities were observed in the play and then criticized the production accordingly. In 1761, for example, Garrick bravely presented a version of Cymbeline on the Drury Lane stage which followed Shakespeare's text quite closely. Francis Gentleman, commenting in the Dramatic Censor, recognized the anachronisms and the varied "places" of Cymbeline and wrote that "the absolute annihilation of unities is rather offensive".⁸ In his production of the play based upon The Winter's Tale, and renamed Florizel and Perdita, Garrick avoided the critics' sting and pleased the other "pseudo classicists" in his audience by altering the text: eliminating the first three acts of Shakespeare's play also eliminated the sixteen year span between Acts III and IV, and thus allowed for unity of time. And with less drastic changes Garrick ensured unity of place. Paulina was living in Bohemia and was hiding Hermione with her, and Leontes came to Bohemia to visit Polixenes. Thus, instead of emulating Shakespeare by transferring the action of the last act to Sicilia, Garrick had all the major characters in Bohemia and the action continued there.

Of course, by lopping off the first three acts Garrick

altered the representation in the play of the issues from which the action evolves. Whereas in Shakespeare's play the jealousy and unjust behaviour of Leontes is stressed at least as much as the natural, unbreakable bond of love between Florizel and Perdita, in Garrick's version the audience was merely told of Leontes' jealousy and for the most part Florizel and Perdita monopolized their attention. Further, the larger issue which their love involves is one of the general issues presented in the eighteenth-century "sentimental" dramas. According to Allardyce Nicoll in his study, British Drama, sentimental plays embodied "the new humanitarianism, the recognition of social problems, the endeavour to make the theatre express in its own way the many social issues confronting the members of the audience".⁹ Nicoll outlined Sir Richard Steele's sentimental play, The Conscious Lovers:

The hero, Bevil junior, is here presented as about to be married to Lucinda, the daughter of Sealand. He has, however, met and befriended an unknown girl named Indiana, with whom he ultimately falls in love. Unlike the rakes of earlier times, he will not endeavour to betray this girl, nor will he marry her without his father's consent. For a time it almost seems as if the play is to end unhappily, until Sealand discovers in Indiana his own daughter.¹⁰

Clearly, in this play Steele exploited the same issue that is central to Florizel and Perdita: can Bevil junior follow his natural affection for Indiana, and Florizel for Perdita, or

do social responsibilities present a higher priority? It appears that, as well as pacifying the pseudo classicists in his audience, when Garrick rejected the first three acts of The Winter's Tale he was trying to please those spectators who wished to see social problems represented in drama.

Garrick may have designed Florizel and Perdita to operate like a sentimental drama in a second way. In A Natural Perspective Northrop Frye argued that the sentimental in drama is "a fixation on the familiar" and that this "appeals to ... stock response" in the audience--to "a set of associations that one already has or at least knows about."¹¹ The eighteenth-century sentimental drama fits this description perfectly. In these plays the principle characters are found in familiar dramatic situations of pathos which, of course, evoke the stock response of pity. Throughout most of The Conscious Lovers, for example, the happiness of Indiana and Bevil junior is in peril -- a familiar dramatic situation (to say the least) which moved the entire audience to pity.¹² And the similar story of Florizel and Perdita offered the same possibilities for pathos. Further, Nicoll wrote that two other forms of eighteenth-century drama -- the pathetic tragedies written by playwrights such as Nicholas Rowe, and the domestic dramas by playwrights such as George Lillo and

Edward Moore -- were designed to provide scenes of pathos for the audience.¹³ Clearly the eighteenth-century audience must have enjoyed such theatre, and probably this is another reason why Garrick chose to focus on the last two acts of Shakespeare's The Winter's Tale.¹⁴

2. 1800 to 1900

In the nineteenth century, managers producing Shakespeare's plays continued to make alterations to the text. Their treatment of Shakespeare's text was a little less drastic than Garrick's treatment of The Winter's Tale and will be explained at the end of this chapter. Aside and apart from textual alterations these managers changed the shape of Shakespeare production in another way. In most theatre productions of the nineteenth century, sets, costumes and stage effects were calculated to create an illusion of reality. And Shakespeare production was part of this development; managers created illusions of reality on their stages that Shakespeare probably never dreamed of, and, considering the limitation of the Elizabethan playhouse, certainly couldn't have expected himself. It seems that the illusion of reality was the main effect achieved in nineteenth-century spectacular productions of Shakespeare's plays.

The stage effects, settings and costumes in spectacular Shakespeare of the nineteenth century became more and more elaborate as the century progressed, from the productions of John Kemble at the beginning of the century to the productions of William Macready between 1837 and 1842, to the efforts of Charles Kean and Samuel Phelps in the forties and fifties; and almost all managers continued to use these elaborate methods to the end of the century, the last major practitioners being Henry Irving and Herbert Beerbohm Tree. However, the first large advancements towards spectacular visual effects were made by Phillipe Jacques de Louthembourg after Garrick invited him to be the designer of scenery in 1771. De Louthembourg, a pupil of Francesco Casanova, was already a member of the French Academy when he joined Garrick's company. After joining the company he made at least two significant contributions towards spectacular visual effects in stage production. First, he avoided the *classical* style of background landscapes which other scenic artists in the later half of the eighteenth century were still using.¹⁵ *Classical* - landscapes were symmetrical. Even in entirely rural landscapes painted in the *classical* style, one side of the landscape was the mirror image of the other side. De Louthembourg's landscapes on the other hand were "wild, precipitous and irregular".¹⁶ Indeed

these background scenes may have been one manifestation of the romantic movement in art generally. In any case the backgrounds were much more interesting and impressive than the classical landscapes. Secondly, de Louthembourg developed new ways of using light, and apparently on occasion he used these techniques in Garrick's productions.¹⁷ However, it was after leaving Garrick's company that in 1782 he developed his most impressive device for lighting effects, a device he called the Eidophusikon. Odell (using Dutton Cook's description in Paint and Canvas) explained,

In his Eidophusikon...he abandoned the unnatural system of a flaming row of footlights, and ranged his lamps above the proscenium, out of sight of the audience. Before his lamps...he placed slips of stained glass, yellow, red, green, blue and purple; and by shifting these or happily combining them was enabled to tint his scenes [his backgrounds] so as to represent various hours of the day ...¹⁸

And, in Shakespeare and the Artist, W. Moelwyn Merchant indicated that de Louthembourg also used this device for the visual illusion of "cloud effects, sunset, storm."¹⁹

Taking de Louthembourg's lead the managers of the nineteenth century, from Kemble to Irving, continued to develop new techniques for stage effects. For example de Louthembourg's advances in lighting probably led to the nineteenth-century invention of the diorama. The procedure

for both the Eidophusikon and a diorama was to flash light upon a background painting for atmospheric effect.²⁰ However the background in a diorama could move. If, for instance, the play was The Winter's Tale and the landscape was of a ship in the sea, the landscape moving from right to left across the stage, at the end of IV.iv, would represent Florizel and Perdita fleeing from Bohemia to Sicilia. Also, as the century passed, landscapes and interior backgrounds became more magnificent and powerful. In an article entitled "The Drama", published in Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine in February 1856, the author discussed, among other things, the trend towards visual splendour on the stage. One observation about the effect on the audience of magnificent setting, and especially of "gorgeous background", is particularly revealing: the author, discussing the settings employed by William Macready and by subsequent managers, wrote,

Mr. Macready and other managers after him paid extraordinary attention to the dressing of the stage, so that cases have occurred, on the representation of a new piece, of the audience calling before the curtain, ... not the manager who brought it effectually to light, not the actors who stood forward as the chief interpreters of the play, but the scenic artist who, with his paint-pots and his Dutch foil, his muslin waterfalls and his paper moon, wrought in the gorgeous background.²¹

Certainly this anecdote shows that by the time of Macready

the visual aspect of nineteenth-century spectacular production had a large effect in the dramas presented.

The effect, felt by the audience, of realism from the visual magnificence of the nineteenth-century stage was a two-part effect. First the audience simply were overawed by the visual display. It was commonplace for the reviewers of nineteenth-century productions to mention how, when the curtain was raised at the beginning of each new act, the audience was moved to spontaneous applause by the opulence of the new set. Thus the magnificence of the décor on the stage was a force which would captivate and hold the audience's attention. Secondly there was a visual illusion that the stage dressed as a battlescene was a battlescene indeed, or that in III,iii of King Lear a real storm had crashed down upon "the thick rotundity o' th'" real world. As the magnificence of the stage secured the audience's attention, stage effects and stage sets gave a visual illusion of realism much as the two-dimensional screen in the cinema does to-day. Further, the very shape of the stage that was used by nineteenth-century managers promoted illusion in much the same way as the movie screen. Both the screen and the proscenium-arch stage present an illusion of reality within a border, and by focusing only on the picture the spectator can forget about the true reality

outside. Indeed it seems that spectators of spectacular Shakespeare production in the nineteenth century were very susceptible to the illusion created within the arch by stage effects and sets. One reviewer, focusing upon the last moments of Tree's production of A Midsummer Night's Dream (1900), wrote,

The glow dies away, the stage is swallowed up in gloom, the lights in the house are suddenly turned up, and the play is over. It is as if the audience was rudely awakened from a pleasing vision... and they find themselves blinking at the curtain, wondering whether it has not really all been a dream.²²

And certainly this is the kind of involvement that the managers wanted their audiences to have. Indeed, in his production of The Tempest (1857) Phelps absolutely ensured the visual effect of realism by contriving a shipwreck that would "make the spectator actually feel sick";²³ and in his production of King Lear (1820) Edmund Kean "contrived so fine a storm ... that the effects of trees bending and wind roaring stole applause from the actor" on the stage.²⁴

Nineteenth-century managers developed another way of achieving a visual illusion of reality. As the century progressed they devoted more and more of their attention to ensuring that the actor's clothing, the articles on the stage, and aspects of the background such as the architecture of rooms and buildings and the vegetation of landscapes, were

consistent with the country and time in which they thought the play takes place. Thus, for example, in Kean's production of King John (1852) the illusion that the actor was King John and that the stage was France and then Britain in the thirteenth century received additional strength from costumes designed upon "safe authority for the costumes of King John's reign" and from the duplication of "Norman Architecture" in the sets.²⁵

It appears that this particular movement began with Kemble near the end of his career. Until his latter productions Kemble did not attempt to match the sets or costumes with the country or period of the play he was dealing with. Indeed it seems that in some productions many times and many countries were represented all at once. For example, a correspondent in the Examiner of January 21, 1810, discussing Kemble's production of Much Ado About Nothing presented "about two years since", wrote

notwithstanding [that] the scene is laid in Messina about two hundred years ago, and the characters are Sicilians, I had the pleasure to see Benedict in the full uniform of a British Infantry Officer of the present day, Leonato in the dress of an English Gentleman of the year 1750, and most of the other characters dressed in the same appropriate manner; but it must be all right for it is under the superintendence of that man of classic lore, Mr. J. P. Kemble!!²⁶

Here the sarcasm of the reviewer for the Examiner indicates both the growing demand for historic realism in the beginning of the nineteenth century and Kemble's failure to satisfy it with the visual confusion of this production. It is perhaps because of this demand that Kemble strove for historic accuracy in his latter productions. And with these presentations most of the reviewers swung from disapproval to enthusiastic approbation of Kemble's efforts in this respect. In the Examiner of March 29, 1812, for example, the reviewer of Kemble's Julius Caesar reported that

the piece goes off in a very satisfactory manner; and an impression is left upon us of Roman manners and greatness, -- of the appearance as well as intellect of Romans, -- which to a young mind in particular must furnish an indelible picture for the assistance of his studies, resembling perhaps the clearness of local conception which is afforded by a panorama.²⁷

The approval which Kemble's efforts received indicates that the nineteenth century was ready to accept the much more pedantic efforts of Macready, Phelps and Kean. The extent to which historic realism was a concern in Macready's productions is again revealed by the comments of reviewers. And it appears that the realistic costumes and settings were just as important to Macready as magnificent scenery and stage effects, and were every bit as impressive on his stage. For instance, in the John Bull publication of March 19, 1838, the reviewer

of Macready's production of Coriolanus wrote that the spectacle

shames even the most splendid efforts of that temple of display, the Opera at Paris; equals it, to the utmost of its magnificence, and shames it even in its strongest and least vulnerable point, historic faithfulness and antiquarian minutæ.²⁸

Certainly the reviewer indicated that in this production the historic realism was just as prominent as the splendour of the visual display, and the combination of the two produced one spectacular visual effect. With the subsequent productions of Phelps and Kean the historical costumes and settings were even more accurate. The seriousness with which Kean attempted to achieve historic realism is evident in the elaborate play-bill to his production of Macbeth. Kean devoted about a thousand words of the play-bill to explaining the reasons behind his choice of costumes, and even though he was comically pedantic, using a barrage of historical evidence to justify his choice, one can't help but be impressed by the integrity of his efforts to uncover an historically accurate costume.²⁹ Probably in the productions of Kean the historic realism was even more impressive than the splendour of the visual display.

It is certainly conceivable that in some productions, especially the productions of Charles Kean, the efforts of the actors may have been lost under the dominance of the stage

effects, sets and costumes, enclosed in a proscenium arch. However it appears that, despite the splendour and historical accuracy surrounding them, in most spectacular nineteenth-century productions of Shakespeare the actors were noticeable. In London before 1843 many forms of drama, including Shakespeare's plays, could only be presented legally at Drury Lane and Covent Garden. Near the end of the eighteenth century Covent Garden was enlarged, and Drury Lane was rebuilt on a larger scale;³⁰ and because of the awesome size of both theatres, if the actors and actresses wished to be understood they had to "indulge in rant and bombast",³¹ shouting, and gesticulating every shouted word with exaggerated movement. One writer, disenchanted with this "declamatory"³² style of acting, characterized it as "individuals ... raising their hands first to their breasts, then towards the heavens, then towards the earth, making recitals of every speech they utter", and he found the declamatory style "fatal to all interpretation of character".³³ Indeed with such exaggerated, stylized speech and mannerisms subtleties of character would have been lost altogether.

Nevertheless it seems that the declamatory style was effective enough in its own way. In 1891 the actress, Helena Faucit, wrote an article for Blackwood's on Hermione. Miss

Faucit had played Hermione for Macready in 1837, and in the closing paragraphs of the article she recalled Macready's rendition, on opening night, of Leontes in the statue scene and the impact of his acting upon the audience:

Tremblingly he advanced, and touched gently the hand held out to him. Then, what a cry came with "O she's warm!" It is impossible to describe Mr. Macready at this point. He was Leontes' self! His passionate joy at finding Hermione really alive seemed beyond control. Now he was prostrate at her feet, then enfolding her in his arms. I had a slight veil or covering over my head and neck, supposed to make the statue look older. This fell off in an instant. The hair, which came unbound, and fell on my shoulders, was reverently kissed and caressed. The whole change was so sudden, so overwhelming that I suppose I cried out hysterically, for he whispered to me, "Don't be frightened, my child! don't be frightened! Control yourself! All this went on during a tumult of applause that sounded like a storm of hail ...³⁴

Now, depending upon the production, at this moment in the statue scene the characters, principally Leontes and Hermione, may be very passionate indeed. But with this display Macready moved outside the realm of natural passion altogether. And he was greeted with "a tumult of applause". Exaggerated speech and mannerisms were employed throughout the century with similar success. In 1807 Mary Anderson played Hermione at the Lyceum. Some years later G.R. Foss wrote that at the moment in the trial scene when the death of Mamillius was announced, Anderson as Hermione "drew a cloak over her face

and stood for full thirty seconds before falling headlong"; and Foss admitted, "I remember still with a catch in my throat her marvellous pose".³⁵

Clearly many in the nineteenth century enjoyed seeing Shakespeare acted in the declamatory style; and this is partly because the same style of acting was used in the melodramas of the day, and these plays were very popular. During the nineteenth century audiences still looked for sentiment in drama, and like some forms of drama popular in the eighteenth century, the melodramas of the nineteenth century are sentimental. A typical melodrama such as Adelmorn the Outlaw (1801) by M.G. Lewis or The Foundling of the Forest (1809) by William Dimond presents "a story of criminal purpose and of distressed virtue triumphant in the end",³⁶ and leads the viewer through the stock responses of pity and happiness. And the declamatory style of acting was perfect for this: the exaggerated movements and speech of the actors exaggerated and thereby emphasized the familiar pathos or joy in a dramatic situation. This ensured the stock response.

To an audience accustomed to associating declamatory acting with the sentimental melodrama of the day, Shakespeare's plays, presented in the declamatory style, would have seemed sentimental. Indeed Faucit's reaction to Macready's

performance of Leontes in the trial scene, and Foss's reaction to Anderson's performance of Hermione in the statue scene, were both stock responses of the kind elicited by sentimental drama. Faucit related that when she (as Hermione) witnessed Macready in the statue scene on opening night she was "like Niobe all tears";³⁷ and many years after seeing Anderson's performance Foss was still moved to pity by the recollection.³⁸ Thus, as the nineteenth-century audience enjoyed the sentimental, the resemblance of spectacular Shakespeare productions in the declamatory style to melodrama made Shakespeare more enjoyable for them. The declamatory acting allowed them to feel the stock emotional involvement during a Shakespeare play that they felt during the popular sentimental melodrama. Further, an audience emotionally involved in the action is experiencing an illusion that the action is real. While the stage, resplendent with sets, costumes and stage effects, appeared to be a real place in a certain time period, the declamatory style of acting, eliciting the stock emotional involvement audiences felt for melodrama, created the illusion that the situations acted on the stage were genuine events. Paradoxically, the unnatural movements and speech of the declamatory style added a dimension to the illusion of reality.

In 1843 an Act of Parliament made it lawful for the minor theatres to stage those forms of drama which formerly had been reserved for Drury Lane and Covent Garden. The minor theatres were relatively small, and this provided actors with the opportunity to portray characters in a more subtle way. Further, in the last half of the nineteenth century the melodrama of the contemporary theatre was slowly being superseded by the "play of ideas".³⁹ These dramas were written by such men as Tom Robertson, Arthur Wing Pinero and Henry Arthur Jones, and one new feature offered in the plays is a more natural dialogue that permitted actors to abandon the declamatory style. And these plays were successful: although audiences still found that declamatory acting furthered the illusion of reality, perhaps many found that natural acting strengthened the illusion much more effectively. Thus, though the declamatory style was still popular and was used in many Shakespeare productions in the second half of the century, many managers of productions of Shakespeare in the minor theatres began to reject exaggerated speech and movements in favour of a new natural style of acting. Samuel Phelps, at Sadler's Wells, was one of the first to encourage his actors towards naturalistic acting. According to Henry Morley, writing in his journal in 1856,

Every member of the [Phelps'] company is taught to regard the poetry he speaks according to its nature rather than its quantity. The personators of the poet and the painter in the first scene of the "Timon" as now acted, manifestly say what Shakespeare has assigned to them to say with as much care, and as much certainty that it will be listened to with due respect, as if they were themselves Timons, Hamlets, or Macbeths. Nobody rants...nothing is slurred, a servant who has anything to say says it in earnest, making his words heard and their meaning felt...⁴⁰

The movement towards naturalistic acting and away from the ranting multi-gestured declamatory style grew, so that in 1895 one writer in the Athenaeum pronounced, perhaps a little prematurely, that the realistic acting had "conquered convention": "Never more shall we, apparently, hear the representative of Macbeth or Othello strive with swelling breast to 'out-roar the lion-throated seas'."⁴¹

Thus, it appears that an illusion of reality was the main effect in nineteenth-century spectacular production of Shakespeare. And, although information about productions of The Winter's Tale in the nineteenth century is scarce, it seems that the productions were in the spectacular tradition. It is true that in the available reviews of these productions and of all spectacular productions in the nineteenth century the writers seldom dealt directly with the question of whether or not an illusion of reality was achieved. To do

this would have required attaining the overview by which their understanding of their own theatre would crystallize-- by which they would fully realize that the productions were designed for an illusion of reality. With this understanding the reviewers would also have realized that to write a perfect review of a spectacular production they had only to state how successfully the illusion was achieved in the stage effects, sets, costumes and acting--those elements that comprise an illusion of reality. However the reviewers did not attain this overview (--a deficiency for which they can hardly be blamed). When reviewing productions they were guided not by a clear understanding of the nature of their theatre but by a reliable intuitive sense of its nature. Although the reviewers used the idea that "theatre provides realistic illusion" as a basis for evaluating productions they, and their readers, didn't fully realize that this idea was their basis for evaluation. As a result, while reviewers evaluated the stage effects, sets, costumes and acting according to the contribution of each of these elements to the illusion, their evaluations were vague. They indicated, rather than stated, whether or not each element strengthened the illusion.

Thus when I was reading reviews of productions of The Winter's Tale given in the nineteenth century I focused

on what the writers' comments "indicate". And the comments of each reviewer indicate two things. First, the reviewers for each production of The Winter's Tale did not imply, even in the remotest terms, that an effect other than realistic illusion was intended or achieved; rather their intuitive decision to use realistic illusion as the basis for evaluation, and the ease with which each production accommodated this method of reviewing, indicates that the productions were designed for spectacular realistic illusion. Far from striving for a change in effect from the Sicilia section to the Bohemia section, the managers of these productions intended one effect throughout--an illusion of reality. Secondly, the comments of reviewers about each facet of a production of The Winter's Tale indicated whether or not the illusion was successfully achieved.

Usually the comments of reviewers for these productions of The Winter's Tale indicate the style of acting used. The remarks of Helena Faucit and G.R. Foss, already considered, indicate that in 1837 William Macready used the declamatory style in the statue scene and in 1887 Mary Anderson used the same style in the trial scene. To be sure, reviewers of each production usually commented on these key moments in each actor's performance. The reviewer in the Illustrated London

News, for example, wrote that "when the news has been whispered round that the son of Leontes and Hermione is dead ... Miss Anderson gives us an instance of her power in dumb acting infinitely finer than anything she has ever attempted before. In dignity it is incomparable, in terror it is grand."⁴² Here especially the writer's word "grand" indicates again that Mary Anderson was using an exaggerated style; and his approval indicates that her rendition of Hermione in the trial scene strengthened the illusion. As might be expected the acting in Phelps' production of The Winter's Tale in 1845 was more naturalistic. The reviewer for the Athenaeum reported,

Mr. Phelps, [was] Leontes, and exhibited many touches of natural passion that told well on the house. Mr. Younge performed the part of Autolycus with care and effect.⁴³

The delicacy of rendition implied by the words "touches" and "care" is not connected with the bombastic declamatory style, but with "natural" acting. And the reviewer's favourable comment that the "many touches of natural passion" by Phelps "told well on the house" indicates that Phelps' attempt to achieve an illusion of reality in his acting was successful.

Reviewers for the productions of The Winter's Tale by Macready, Phelps, Anderson, and by Kemble in 1811, rarely offered whole-hearted praise to the acting. Usually each

reviewer singled out at least one actor who failed in his task -- who failed to maintain the illusion. However the reviewers of each production were much more satisfied with stage effects, scenery and costumes. The reviewer in The Times, for example, wrote of the "splendid trappings" used by Kemble;⁴⁴ and the writer in Bell's Weekly Messenger reported that "The taste and refinement" of Kemble "are well displayed in the elegance of the decorations".⁴⁵ Likewise for Phelps' production the reviewer in The Times was impressed with the "decorations" employed:

The scenery is entirely new, for the most part consisting of felicitous representations of classical interiors, decorated in the polychromatic style. The famous scene of the statue is so managed as to produce a most beautiful stage effect ... The storm in the third, and the rural scene in the fourth act, are also specimens of clever stage-management.⁴⁶

Certainly this indicates that with historically accurate "classical interiors, decorated in the polychromatic style", and with "clever" stage effects Phelps was creating a visual illusion of reality for his audience. It appears that forty-two years later Mary Anderson continued the tradition of splendid illusory stage effects and scenery. In the Illustrated London News the reviewer mentioned "the crash of the thunderstorm" after "the oracle has spoken" in Hermione's

trial,⁴⁷ and the writer in punch stated simply that

all the scenery is excellent. The Palace of Leontes by Mr. W. TELBIN, is only equalled by Mr. W. TELBIN'S Queen's Apartment, and a wonderful cloth of a roadside with a view of a flock of sheep grazing on the brow of a hill (...by Mr. HAWES CRAVEN...), is not more remarkable than Mr. HANN'S Court of Justice.⁴⁸

It seems that, in these nineteenth-century productions of The Winter's Tale, staged in the spectacular tradition, the illusion of reality from the visual display was highly potent. Indeed, if the acting was often less than successful in this respect, the "splendid trappings" may have more than compensated.

In the nineteenth century the illusion of real places provided by the set, or of real people provided by the costumes, was entirely a visual illusion; and, as many of the stage effects were visual and looked real, the illusion of reality from stage effects was largely visual; and although declamatory acting was not realistic, naturalistic acting, as well as creating an auditory illusion, contributed to the visual illusion of reality. With the productions discussed so far, then, it would be fair to say that the illusion of reality was largely a visual illusion. In Kean's production of The Winter's Tale the illusion of reality was almost entirely a visual one. In this important production the

emphasis was on settings and costumes.

The Winter's Tale is replete with anachronisms.

Managers striving for historical accuracy in their productions of the play had to follow some textual indications of the time-period while ignoring others. Kean chose to follow the textual evidence which presented the greatest possibilities for visual spectacle. He explained that

The pivot on which the story revolves is in fact the decision pronounced by the oracle of Delphi; and taking the incident as the corner-stone of the whole fabric, I have adopted a period when Syracuse, according to Thucydides, had, from a mere Doric colony, increased in magnificence to a position in no way inferior to that of Athens herself, when at the summit of her political prosperity. An opportunity is thus afforded of reproducing a classical era, and placing before the eyes of the spectator, Tableaux vivants of the private and public life of the ancient Greeks, at a time when the arts flourished to a perfection...⁴⁹

Though Shakespeare gives little information about Leontes' kingdom, other than that it is Sicilia and there is "great difference betwixt...Bohemia and... Sicilia" (I,i, 3-4), Kean located Leontes in a classical Greek Syracuse equal in magnificence to Athens "at the summit of her political prosperity." Further, Kean, following the example of the eighteenth-century editor, Thomas Hanmer, exchanged the simple pastoral Bohemia for Bithynia. The reviewer in Punch grasped the advantages and the overriding fallacy of this tactic:

HANMER...was not slow to perceive the absurdity of changing the scene to Bohemia, which is described as on the sea-coast, but which he and Mr. KEAN agree in considering to be an inland country, and they have transferred the scene to Bithynia, which is in Asia, and about eight hundred miles from the region selected by Shakespeare. The boldness of this experiment is justified by its success, for the spectator is conducted among an entirely new race of people, of whom SHAKESPEARE had no idea.⁵⁰

Thus in the sets and costumes Kean depicted a magnificent Syracuse and "the more barbaric and primitive splendours of the scene in Asia Minor."⁵¹ For instance, according to the reviewer in the Athenaeum, Hermione wasn't imprisoned in the "worn-out common places of 'A Room of State in a Palace,' or 'The Outer Room of a Prison'", but in a depiction of "the Latomiae, or prisons of Syracuse, excavated out of the rock".⁵² And, in the last act Leontes wore "The Black Himation, or Mantle," because it was "the peculiar sign of mourning among the Greeks of the most refined period."⁵³ It appears that amongst all this visual splendour the illusory effect from the acting was all but lost. The reviewer in The Times devoted nine paragraphs to the visual display, and then wrote that "Having thus attempted a description of this masterpiece of stage production, we must bestow a few words on the acting of the characters"; and on the acting he bestowed very few words indeed.⁵⁴ Although the reviewer in

the Athenaeum declared that the audience witnessed "not only ... a gorgeous [visual] spectacle, but good and sufficient acting", he dwelt mainly upon the visual spectacle.⁵⁵ It seems that the main effect in the production was the visual illusion from sets and costumes, and that often the action was unnoticed. This peculiar situation was best expressed in the sarcasm of the writer for Punch: in Kean's production

The thread of the story,...which is meritorious, has been cleverly retained, and it serves to connect the beautiful [visual] effects for which the theatre is celebrated.⁵⁶

Although this appears to exaggerate the difference between the effect from the visual splendour and the effect from the action, this may, in fact, be a very accurate description of what actually happened.

The last production of The Winter's Tale in the spectacular tradition was managed by Herbert Beerbohm Tree in 1906. However as early as half a century before this production some were criticizing the efforts of managers to achieve historic realism and visual splendour. For example, in the article from Blackwood's (1856) entitled "The Drama" (already cited) the writer directed mild satire at the efforts of Phelps and Kean in this respect. After mentioning how certain archeological discoveries made by Mr. Layard provided

Kean with the historical evidence he needed to represent the drama of Sardanapalus, by Byron, upon the stage realistically, he considered the problems of producing an "accurate" production of The Tempest. Eventually he concluded,

What a splendid hit Mr. Kean or Mr. Phelps would make if only some possible Mr. Layard could be found who should go and excavate the cell of Prospero! Why not?⁵⁷

In the second half of the nineteenth century criticism of visually spectacular productions grew steadily. For example, in Shakespeare and the Artist W. Moelwyn Merchant noted that during the latter half of the nineteenth century reviewers in The Times showed "a growing restiveness with décor conceived in isolation from the 'meaning' of the play."⁵⁸ "To this have we come", wrote one reviewer for The Times in 1882, "that the most vivid and enduring impressions produced by a Shakespearean play are [visually] spectacular."⁵⁹ Theatre-goers were beginning to be of the opinion that effects appropriate to Shakespeare's plays could not be achieved in largely "visual" productions, that the visual illusion could, in fact, distort the play altogether.

Many, too, were objecting to the changes that managers were making to Shakespeare's text. Invariably in spectacular Shakespeare productions managers omitted whole scenes to

compensate for the time used to change sets. Also to reduce the number of scene changes required they often changed the order of the scenes. And, as might be expected, they often omitted anachronisms which they felt detracted from the illusion of realism. Certainly the time was ripe for the new ideas about Shakespeare production which were to be introduced to the English theatre by William Poel and Harley Granville-Barker.

Notes to Chapter One

¹A facsimile of Garrick's version has been published by the Cornmarket Press. Morgan's version is described by George C. D. Odell in Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving, I, 357-358.

²I, 361.

³Odell, I, 53-56.

⁴I, 307. Also see I, 379-381.

⁵I, 43.

⁶I, 367.

⁷The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson, VII, 76.

⁸Quoted in Odell, I, 372.

⁹p. 182.

¹⁰p. 185.

¹¹pp. 131-132.

¹²And many other familiar situations were often used to evoke pity. Nicoll noted, for example, that "A son sentimentally seeking for his father, or a maiden cast parentless upon the world, was sure to call for the free use of handkerchiefs in the eighteenth century" (188).

¹³Nicoll, pp. 171, 195.

¹⁴Further, sentimental dramas that were successful, such as The Conscious Lovers, have happy endings, and this indicates that the audience enjoyed feeling the stock emotional involvement of happiness. Thus the ending of Florizel and Perdita would have been successful with eighteenth-century audiences.

¹⁵W. Moelwyn Merchant, Shakespeare and the Artist, pp. 60-61.

- ¹⁶Merchant, p. 61.
- ¹⁷Merchant, p. 64.
- ¹⁸I, 444.
- ¹⁹p. 97. Also see pp. 64-65.
- ²⁰Merchant, p. 97.
- ²¹LXXIX (Jan. - June, 1856), 216.
- ²²Quoted in J. L. Styan, The Shakespeare Revolution,
p. 25.
- ²³Styan, p. 21.
- ²⁴Styan, p. 18.
- ²⁵Odell, II, 329.
- ²⁶Quoted in Odell, II, 100.
- ²⁷Quoted in Odell, II, 106.
- ²⁸Quoted in Odell, II, 212.
- ²⁹Merchant quotes this section of the play-bill in its
entirety (pp. 102-104).
- ³⁰Odell, II, 5-6.
- ³¹Nicoll, p. 200.
- ³²Styan, p. 11.
- ³³William Poel, quoted in Styan, p. 11.
- ³⁴Helena Faucit Martin, "Shakespeare's Women, by One
Who Has Impersonated Them. Hermione.", Blackwood's Edinburgh
Magazine, CXLIX (Jan. - June, 1891), 35.
- ³⁵What the Author Meant, p. 136.
- ³⁶Nicoll, p. 223.

³⁷Helena Faucit Martin, "Shakespeare's Women, by One Who Has Impersonated Them. Hermione.", Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CXLIX (Jan. - June, 1891), 36.

³⁸See p. 23 , above.

³⁹Nicoll discusses the evolution of the play of ideas on pp. 230-246.

⁴⁰Quoted in Odell, II, 280.

⁴¹Quoted in Styan, p. 27.

⁴²"The 'Winter's Tale' at the Lyceum", Illustrated London News, XCI (July - Dec., 1887), 332.

⁴³"Sadler's Wells", Athenaeum (1845), 1180.

⁴⁴Quoted in Odell, II, 103.

⁴⁵"Revival of The Winter's Tale", Bell's Weekly Messenger (1811), 381.

⁴⁶"Sadler's Wells Theatre", The Times (Nov. 28, 1845), p. 4.

⁴⁷"The 'Winter's Tale' at the Lyceum", Illustrated London News (July - Dec., 1887), 332.

⁴⁸"A Very Pretty Tale by Anderson", Punch, XCIII (July - Dec., 1887), 124.

⁴⁹Quoted in Merchant, p. 211.

⁵⁰"Mr. Kean's Winter's Tale", Punch, XXX (Jan. - June, 1856), 198.

⁵¹Merchant, p. 211.

⁵²"Princess's", Athenaeum (Jan. - June, 1856), 561.

⁵³This information about Leontes' apparel was provided by Kean in his published versions of the play and is quoted in Merchant, p. 216.

- ⁵⁴"Princess's Theatre", The Times (May 1, 1856), p. 11.
- ⁵⁵"princess's", Athenaeum (Jan. - June, 1856), 561.
- ⁵⁶"Mr. Kean's Winter's Tale", Punch, XXX (Jan. - June, 1856), 198.
- ⁵⁷LXXIX (Jan. - June, 1856), 219.
- ⁵⁸p. 134.
- ⁵⁹Quoted in Merchant, p. 138.

II

A PERIOD OF TRANSITION

It was the desire to capture effects appropriate to Shakespeare's plays that led twentieth-century directors to abandon the spectacular tradition of the nineteenth century.¹ Further, in the nineteenth century the contribution of scholarship to Shakespeare production was limited to historical research: managers used historical evidence to present costumes and sets that were an accurate representation of a certain place at a certain time. In the twentieth century, however, the techniques and interpretations used by directors of Shakespeare are often based upon other kinds of scholarship, and especially upon literary criticism of the plays. Certainly to a large extent Shakespearian production in the twentieth century is characterized by this trend, a development which J. L. Styan in The Shakespeare Revolution called "the uneasy but passionate marriage of scholarship and the stage."² The first major advances away from spectacular Shakespeare and towards productions of his plays based on scholarship were made by William Poel and Harley Granville-Barker.

That many at the end of the nineteenth century were

questioning the integrity of spectacular Shakespeare production is indicated by their sudden interest in the Elizabethan stage. Scholars like Halliwell-Phillipps set themselves the task of finding the shape of the Elizabethan stage, the proximity of the actors to the audience, and any other noteworthy conditions of Elizabethan staging. In the twentieth century the search was continued by "such men as Joseph Quincy Adams, Edmund Chambers and W. J. Lawrence",³ so that in 1925 Granville-Barker could conclude "we are in debt to many... We know well enough what the Elizabethan stage was like."⁴

In Chapter One, I discussed how managers of nineteenth-century spectacular productions created an illusion of reality through splendid and realistic stage effects, sets and costumes on a proscenium-arch stage, and through declamatory or naturalistic acting. Paradoxically, through these largely visual forms of artifice, managers made it possible for their audiences to forget the artifice of drama--to forget they were watching actors on a stage and not real events. In the Elizabethan playhouse, however, the visual aspect reminded the audience that they were seeing actors in a play. The stage was practically bare and, instead of dressing in costumes suggesting the characters they portrayed, the actors

wore Elizabethan dress. Also, the Elizabethan stage was not bound by a proscenium arch; the stage protruded forward and the audience sat around three sides of it. Thus, rather than being realistic characters in a picture of reality, the characters were clearly actors on a platform. And this was emphasized in the acting: often, when delivering soliloquys, comic sections and other parts of dialogue, the characters faced the audience and spoke directly to them.⁵

Using this new knowledge of Elizabethan dramatic techniques Granville-Barker, W. J. Lawrence, Arthur Quiller-Couch and others used the Elizabethan stage as the focus for stage-centred criticism of Shakespeare's plays --for criticism that considers the effects the plays have when performed on the stage. However, although Lawrence, Quiller-Couch, and especially Granville-Barker were the first major critics to use Elizabethan stage conditions as the basis for stage-centred criticism of Shakespeare, this method of analysis was initiated by William Poel in various essays and lectures given between 1880 and 1930.

To begin with Poel held that realistic visual illusion was not a proper effect for Shakespeare's plays. In Shakespeare in the Theatre Poel urged scholars to recognize the "interdependence of Shakespeare's dramatic art with the

form of theatre for which Shakespeare wrote his plays";⁶ and he argued,

Shakespeare could not have failed to recognize that by employing the existing conventions of his stage he could the more readily bring the public to his point of view, since its thoughts were not being constantly diverted and distracted by those outward decorations and subordinate details which in our day so greatly obliterate the main object of dramatic work.⁷

Thus Poel felt that the sets, costumes and stage effects of the nineteenth century constantly obliterated Shakespeare's "point of view" -- that spectacular decoration did not allow for effects consistent with Shakespeare's conception of each of his plays. He quoted John Addington Symonds' explanation of how the Elizabethan stage enhanced Shakespeare's "point of view":

attention was concentrated on the actors, with whose movements, boldly defined against a simple background, nothing interfered. The stage on which they played was narrow, projecting into the yard, surrounded on all [three] sides by spectators. Their action was thus brought into prominent relief, placed close before the eye, deprived of all perspective.⁸

Thus according to Symonds the bare platform stage presented, to the audience, the actors and nothing else; all effects were from the actors alone. By quoting Symonds, Poel indicated his belief that all effects in the Elizabethan theatre were from the action, and that productions will

reflect Shakespeare's conception of his plays only when directors follow this Elizabethan practice of having all effects created by the actors.

Some of Poel's most vehement criticism was on the "dramatic construction"⁹ of Shakespeare's plays. His commentaries on the individual plays show that in each play he sensed a dramatic structure provided by the contrast of each part of the play with the other parts -- by the varied movement over many parts of the play or by a gradual dramatic build-up of events and information over many parts. Thus, for one thing, Poel felt that if the overall dramatic structure is to evolve the entire text must be retained. Considering Romeo and Juliet he asked, "Why open your play with the quarrel of the two houses if you do not intend to show them reconciled...?"¹⁰ and he commented,

no stage-version of 'Romeo and Juliet' is consistent with Shakespeare's intentions which does not give prominence to the hatred of the two houses and retain intact the three 'crowd scenes'-- the one at the opening of the play, the second in the middle, and the third at the end.¹¹

Poel felt, for example, that in I,i the contrast of the first quarrel with the following action in which Romeo first appears emphasizes that Romeo is "indifferent to every other passion but the one of love"¹² and provides part of the build-up

leading to the dramatic moment when Romeo and Juliet first meet.¹³ And Poel argued that in III, i the "second renewal of hostilities between the two houses ..., the rage of the Capulets at the death of Tybalt, and the grief of the Montagues at the banishment of Romeo [strengthens] ... the tragic significance of the scenes that follow. Without it the audience cannot vividly realize that the hatred of the two houses has reached its acutest stage, and that all hope of reconciliation is at an end".¹⁴

Certainly behind these comments is Poel's critical belief that Shakespeare's plays have a dramatic structure. And it is clear that Poel arrived at this critical opinion by considering the plays as they would appear when performed under Elizabethan conditions. In the nineteenth-century theatre the time that elapsed while elaborate sets were changed reduced the dramatic contrast of scene against scene, thus eliminating part of the overall dramatic structure of a Shakespeare play. Also the omission of scenes to compensate for the time used to change sets, and the re-ordering of scenes, marred the overall structure further. Obviously Poel was considering the dramatic structure that the plays had on the Elizabethan stage, where (presumably) the full text was followed, and where only the bare essentials of setting

necessary for the action were used and the change from scene to scene was almost instantaneous.

Poel was the first to combine Shakespeare scholarship with dramatic presentation.¹⁵ From 1881 to 1920 he endeavoured to demonstrate his critical theories about the plays in general or about specific plays, by staging the plays in the Elizabethan manner. Indeed the only way in which the majority of his productions may have differed from Elizabethan practice was in the shape of the stage. When Poel's company performed in regular nineteenth-century theatres they could not use an Elizabethan platform stage. Nevertheless Poel improvised. First of all he often limited the illusory picture-frame effect of the proscenium arch by enclosing his inner-stage with a small proscenium (constructed within the arch) which reduced the depth and width of the original stage. Secondly he usually constructed an outer-stage extending forward over the orchestra pit.¹⁶ By bringing the characters closer to the audience, the outer-stage disclosed the actors behind the characters, lessening the chances of visual illusion further. Clearly Poel wanted his audiences to abandon their notion that good theatre must offer visual illusion, to consent to the visual artifice of his Elizabethan productions, and to willfully experience effects from the

action. Also, then, by using the outer-stage to bring the characters closer to the audience Poel was increasing the possibility of effects created by the actors. Though this two-level stage was unlike the platform in the large Elizabethan playhouses, probably it was similar to the stage in the small, private theatres of Shakespeare's day.

Poel formed a small group of amateurs called the Elizabethan Stage Society. His first productions, given in the 1880's, were received with indifference. Eventually, however, his "Elizabethan experiments" began to stimulate serious consideration. For example on November 9, 10, and 11, 1893, Poel staged Measure for Measure, and the writer in The Times was obviously inspired enough to review the production constructively. Of course he criticized the production on some points, but he also had this to say:

The present writer ... found himself interested in the persons of the play, without considering whether they were English or foreign, ancient or modern ... That the absence of scenery induces the spectator to concentrate his attention upon the acting is certain...¹⁷

Clearly the effects in this production were achieved in the Elizabethan way: the absence of scenery prompted "the spectator to concentrate his attention upon the acting", and the actors created the effects. By 1910 when Poel presented

The Two Gentlemen of Verona at His Majesty's Theatre, the attitude of The Times was quite favourable.¹⁸ Although the reviewer held that an Elizabethan production cannot be entirely effective because "they cannot reproduce ... the Elizabethan audience with the Elizabethan frame of mind", he still enthusiastically recognized the value of Poel's experiments:

And, better still, one got far more satisfactorily than one could get in a modern setting the "atmosphere" of the play ... Who cares where Shakespeare found his plot or how little trouble he took to make it probable? What one cares about is the beauty, the youthfulness, the passionate mood of the whole thing...¹⁹

This reviewer for The Times felt "the atmosphere of the play": he experienced effects that he felt were suitable for The Two Gentlemen of Verona. Thus, from what Styan calls the "conversion of The Times"²⁰ to Poel's methods it appears that Poel achieved the goal of twentieth-century directors. He disclosed effects appropriate to the plays.

Like Poel's productions, the productions of Granville-Barker were a reaction against the spectacular on the stage. Barker's important productions were The Winter's Tale in 1912, followed by Twelfth Night in the same year, and by A Midsummer Night's Dream in 1914, and it is clear that he was influenced by Poel's ideas.²¹ First of all Barker obviously tried to retain the dramatic structure that Poel felt was so important.

In spectacular Shakespeare often unnecessary stage business--non-essential action and gestures--and slow declamatory delivery of the dialogue deadened the pace to a crawl, and sharp dramatic contrasts, of one part of the play with another, were not possible. Barker avoided losing dramatic structure in this way by avoiding the nineteenth-century tendency to embroider a role with superfluous, time-consuming stage business and by having the dialogue delivered quickly and naturally. Also, in each of his productions, Barker all but avoided the structural chaos caused by breaks in between scenes by limiting his audience to one short intermission. Secondly, Barker followed Poel's practice of avoiding the spectacular element of visual illusion. Barker was, in fact, making the same demand upon the spectator that Poel had made upon his audience for four decades. He was asking them to abandon their predilection for visual illusion, to consent to the frank visual artifice of his productions and to experience the effects of the action. And, like Poel, Barker eliminated realistic visual illusion, and ensured that the audience would watch the actors, largely through staging. Although Barker's stage had three levels instead of two, it resembled Poel's in two important ways: on the highest level furthest from the audience there was a small proscenium constructed

within the large proscenium arch, and the lowest level was an apron built over the orchestra pit.²² Thus, as in Poel's productions the smaller proscenium decreased the illusory picture-frame effect, and the forestage reduced the chances of visual illusion further while increasing the possibility of effects created by the actors.

Of course Poel also presented a practically bare stage to his audience and outfitted his characters in Elizabethan costumes. In Elizabethan times the bare stage and Elizabethan dress did not distract the attention of the audience from the action, and Poel estimated that in his productions similar costumes and a bare stage would enhance the action in the same way. However, although Barker was later to write that it is best to "Gain Shakespeare's effects by Shakespeare's means when you can",²³ in the important matters of setting and costumes he did not follow Poel's lead. In 1912 Barker wrote in a letter to the Play Pictorial that "To be Elizabethan one must be strictly, logically, or quite ineffectively so."²⁴ Perhaps with respect to costumes and setting his opinion was similar to a reviewer's for The Times who (reviewing Poel's 1910 production of Two Gentlemen) held that a twentieth-century director "cannot reproduce ... the Elizabethan audience with the Elizabethan frame of mind":²⁵

perhaps Barker thought that since the twentieth-century audience does not have "the Elizabethan frame of mind", a bare stage and Elizabethan dress would be "quite ineffectively" Elizabethan. Certainly, although in the sixteenth century a bare stage was commonplace and the audience would have immediately focused on the actors, in the twentieth century absence of setting always requires an uneasy adjustment from the audience, and in the meantime effects from the action may be lost. Also to a modern-day audience Elizabethan dress may appear to be historic realism. Thus, in productions in which effects are to come from the action, Elizabethan dress may cause the audience to feel an effect of visual realism that is unconnected with the action.

Barker chose to use sets and costumes that were to add force to the effects created by the actors, and he derived this approach from the scholarship of Gordon Craig. In On the Art of the Theatre Craig indicated that design of costumes and sets should usually be abstract, suggesting rather than imitating reality.²⁶ More importantly, sets and costumes must "be in harmony with the spirit of the play" -- with the spirit of the action.²⁷ This is the one hard and fast condition that Craig felt must be met. Just prior to Barker's important term in Shakespeare production, Craig

designed and publicly displayed stage sets for Hamlet and, judging from a discussion of these sets in the Daily Mail, he caught the spirit of Hamlet in the designs admirably. The writer began by quoting Craig:

To give force to an idea is right and easy, but to give a new form to that which already has a form of its own is not only difficult -- it is utterly wrong and quite foolish.²⁸

He then explained that, in his sets for Hamlet, Craig

does not work with painted backcloth and wings, but with severe architectural forms -- or the suggestion of such forms by means of his ingenious and easily applicable system of movable screens -- and by the direct emotional appeal of cold or warm, soft or harsh light and vague, mysterious shade. He gives "force" to the dramatist's idea, but he does not give it "a new form."

Barker, in a letter to the Daily Mail, credited Craig for having shown him the art of stage decoration,²⁹ and it was primarily this -- the art of giving "force" to the already existing effects of the action with suggestive, abstract sets and costumes, that Barker learned from Gordon Craig.

Thus, in his three important Shakespeare productions, Barker used sets that were abstract, colourful and entirely unique. Styan described "the main set of Olivia's garden" for Twelfth Night:

Against a background of white walls, the columns of Olivia's summerhouse were in a deep pink with a baldachino over a golden throne like a sugar ornament.

Pale green yew trees with box hedges in a topiarian arrangement reminded spectators of a child's Noah's Ark toy-box... Symmetrically arranged seats were covered in gold like the throne, and gilded garden gates appeared in V.I.³⁰

Certainly such a set could not have produced a realistic effect. Indeed, Norman Wilkinson, Barker's designer of scenery for all three productions and of costumes for the last two, wrote that in Twelfth Night "there was no attempt to convince the eye against the judgement of the mind that one was out-of-doors looking at clipped yew hedges and marble canopies."³¹ Rather, the sets were abstract and were an attempt to reinforce the effects created by the actors -- the effects of the production. Ironically a few reviewers found Barker's sets so unusual that their attention was diverted from the characters altogether. For example, the reviewer of Twelfth Night for the Daily Mail argued that "when 'decoration' of this sort comes in at the stage door, poetry goes out of the window".³² But the comments of most reviewers indicate that the sets used by Barker reinforced the effects of the actors.³³ For instance, the reviewer of Twelfth Night for the Daily Telegram wrote that "it became the inevitably right setting for the laughing romance of Olivia's love and the mad fantastics of Malvolio".³⁴

Costumes for Barker's productions were also very

colourful creations, designed to reinforce the effects of the action. And, especially in the last two productions (in which the costumes were designed by Wilkinson), the costumes were just as successful as the scenery. For example, one reviewer for the Observer commented that the costumes in Twelfth Night "from Orsino's pinks to the blacks of Olivia's court; from the strange, foreign seamen to the Elizabethan fashion-plate of Aguecheek ... bring out the effect of the play".³⁵ Certainly Barker's abstract and colourful costumes and settings bore little resemblance to the bare stage and Elizabethan dress used by Poel. However, in his productions Barker, like Poel, successfully created effects appropriate to the plays. Perhaps it was very significant that, on the opening night for Barker's production of The Winter's Tale after the final curtain fell, the audience called, not for the scenic designer as was common with spectacular productions, and not for Barker, but for the author.³⁶

Thus, like William Poel, Granville-Barker combined scholarship with dramatic production in a reaction against spectacular Shakespeare. Barker's production in 1912 and a production in 1910 by the company at the New Theatre in New York were the only important productions of The Winter's Tale from 1907 (Tree's was in 1906) to 1932, and in both productions

the movement away from the spectacular tradition was very evident. Winthrop Ames was the first director of the company at the New Theatre and the production of The Winter's Tale in 1910 was one of his first "experiments". In the words of the programme, the play was presented "in the manner of Shakespeare's time."³⁷ Like Poel, Ames attempted to re-create Elizabethan conditions from "recently discovered historical data."³⁸ Thus, he created a stage similar to Poel's by covering the orchestra pit for an outer-stage, and by building a smaller proscenium within the original arch. However Ames' "historical data" about Elizabethan scenery differed slightly from Poel's. Whereas Poel presented his productions on a bare stage Ames used a certain amount of setting; and in the programme the historical conception of Elizabethan setting that he emulated was explained:

It has been established that the Shakespearian stage was not, as it is usually represented, a mere arrangement of curtains, but a beautiful background, enriched with carvings and elaborate tapestries, and further, there is abundant evidence that by the use of "properties" -- if not of actual painted scenery -- in the "inner stage" or "alcove", Shakespeare possessed a vivid yet simple means of indicating to his audience visually the actual locations he desired to present.³⁹

Certainly Ames' stage must have been more than bare in appearance. Further, according to this conception of Elizabethan setting the Elizabethan stage was not decorated

realistically: the "'properties'" and "beautiful background" functioned by "indicating" rather than imitating reality. Thus, as Ames emulated this conception his settings were not realistic. Moreover, in Ames' production of The Winter's Tale the visual "suggestion" from the sets was not very evident. The reviewer in Outlook characterized the settings merely as "properties or bits of scenery" in a "small ... inner stage".⁴⁰ Probably the appearance of the settings used by Ames was closer to the appearance of Poel's practically bare stage than to the abstract decoration Barker was to use in 1912.

As in Poel's productions the play was performed rapidly and the full text was used. It is not surprising then that many of the reviewers commented upon the dramatic structure of the play. The reviewer in the New York Times felt that "the retention of a larger share of the text... [produced] a condensation of interest not possible where heavy sets are used";⁴¹ and the reviewer in Outlook concluded that "the entire performance was so co-ordinated and knit together as to give each part its true proportions and its proper place in the picture."⁴² Obviously a dramatic structure (provided by the contrast of each part of the play with the other parts) was evident in this production. The contrast, which occurs in drama, of each "part" with the other parts

gave each segment its "true proportions". Now the most prolific contrast which can possibly occur in a good production of The Winter's Tale is the contrast of the Sicilia section with the Bohemia section of the play. If, for instance, the effect of the Sicilia section is tragic and the effect of the Bohemia scenes is romantic there is a structural contrast of tragedy with romance, and each of these effects is amplified by the juxtaposition with the other effect: in retrospect the completed Sicilia section seems even more tragic, and the romantic effect that follows is heightened as well. Significantly, not one reviewer of Ames' production mentioned a contrast of any kind between the Sicilia part and the Bohemia part. Surely if the production had such a contrast at least those reviewers who commented upon the structure would have mentioned it. We must assume that there wasn't a change of effect when the action of the play moves from Sicilia to Bohemia. Rather there was one effect throughout these two sections of the play.

What then was the effect? Unfortunately the reviewers do not indicate the effect that was achieved. However, in a statement Ames made about the setting is the implication that he had a very original effect in mind for the entire play. In Outlook magazine he is quoted as having said that "the

play [The Winter's Tale] itself, being romantic rather than real, seems to forbid a realistic scenic background".⁴³ Thus Ames felt that a "romantic" effect was appropriate for the play and that non-realistic scenery was consistent with this effect. Also, as the sets were not very evident it is clear that Ames relied upon his actors to create the romantic effect, and this effect was then reinforced a little by the setting used.

Romance can involve anything from an idealistic world to a world of pure fairy-tale, and unfortunately I cannot determine just where in that range Ames wanted his production to fall or how successful he was. But no matter -- the point to be stressed is that, by rejecting spectacular Shakespeare in favour of Elizabethan methods of staging, Ames attempted to disclose The Winter's Tale as Shakespeare conceived it, and in doing so he sensed in the play a romantic effect which was worlds apart from the effect of realism created in spectacular productions. Regardless of the effect that was actually achieved, the production by Ames marks a distinct change in the director's conception of The Winter's Tale. A look at Granville-Barker's production of the play in 1912 will show that he, too, reacted against the illusion of reality in spectacular Shakespeare by swinging to the opposite

side.

Perhaps the aspect of Barker's production of The Winter's Tale about which we can be most certain is that there was not an overriding effect of realistic visual illusion. As John Palmer asserted in the Saturday Review, "Gone was the centuries-old, needless and silly illusion of a picture stage with scene and atmosphere ready-made, and mutoscopically viewed."⁴⁴ To begin with Barker's stage ruled out the picture-frame effect. Also sets and costumes were suggestive, rather than realistic, adding "force" and not "form" to the play. A reviewer for the Pall Mall Gazette wrote that

The palace of Leontes was no more than a few white rectangular columns, with golden curtains hanging between, a few white steps, a white floor, and a towering white wall at the back; yet nothing could have been more impressive. The shepherd's cottage in Bohemia was the simplest of things, with a sort of wicker fence; yet it sufficed. Even the painted cloth which purported to depict "a desert country near the sea" did its work well enough.⁴⁵

Certainly these sets, designed by Wilkinson, were abstract and, as the reviewer concluded, they functioned to "suggest ... splendid palaces and very humble and satisfying cottages." Moreover he also wrote that the sets suggested "moods and atmospheres". A reviewer for the Observer reached the same conclusion when he called the sets "poetic setting": sets

that "add to... the effect of the poet's lines."⁴⁶ Clearly the settings on Barker's stage reinforced the effect of the action.

The costumes for the production were striking.

"Headgear flaunted preposterous plumes, legs were bare with gold and silver boots, dress was boldly embroidered and bespangled."⁴⁷ The reviewer writing for the Observer noted that Albert Rothenstein, the designer of costumes, did "not shrink from contrasting the most vivid hues of magenta, lemon yellow, emerald green, scarlet, and so forth". Time, for example, was "in bright blue, with borders of green, gold edged leaves", and the seamen of III,iii had "costumes of yellow, emerald, green, red and black" and "plumed headgear" with feathers of "red and white".⁴⁸ Some reviewers concluded that the non-realism of the costumes was in tune with the spirit of the play. The reviewer for the Observer commented that "The irresponsibility of it all is delightfully reflected in the costumes".⁴⁹ And another reviewer writing in the same newspaper concluded that "the artistic aim is clear": unrealistic costumes suit a play that is "eclectic or careless of time and place".⁵⁰

However, a few did not feel that the sets suited the play, and more felt that the costumes totally negated the

possibility of effects appropriate to the play. For instance, the writer in Punch claimed that the "veritable orgy of fantastic costumes" strained "the senses of the audience to the point of exhaustion, leaving them scant strength or leisure for the digestion of the play itself."⁵¹ The reviewer in the Spectator felt that while the sets were "cool and stately" the costumes were "baroque and fantastic", and that the "combination of two such extraordinary points of view worries the spectator without affecting him".⁵² Also a few reviewers found Barker's production totally unsuccessful. A dissenter in the Daily Mail, for example, wished only to comfort himself and others with the reflection that "by making this experiment upon us Mr. Barker has probably taken the wind out of the sails of other stage reformers."⁵³ However it is just as obvious that a significant portion of Barker's audience felt they saw, for the first time, Shakespeare's play as Shakespeare himself would have given it. In a letter to the editor of The Times, John Masefield wrote that Barker

has presented the whole play directly (but for the one necessary interval) as Shakespeare meant it to be presented, as a continuous stream of human fate, and this with a colour and vivacity as new as they are delightful; and the performance, besides giving me intense pleasure, gave me (for the first time in any English theatre) a sense of Shakespeare's power

and art, of his mind at work shaping and directing,
and of his dramatic intention.⁵⁴

Clearly Barker's production was successful for some. However it is curious that even those reviewers who did sense Shakespeare's "dramatic intention" usually didn't attempt to explain what it was. What was the effect or effects which these reviewers felt? Why didn't they indicate what the effects were? And why was it that many did not feel an effect of any kind?

Dealing with the first of these questions, instead of having a change of effect the production had a single romantic effect throughout the Sicilia section and the Bohemia section. And it appears that Barker achieved the effect partly by showing his actors how to avoid tragedy in the Sicilia section. In his preface to the acting edition of this production Barker wrote that Leontes' jealousy is one "touch" by which the "tragedy [is] a little less than tragic" in the first half of the play: "Leontes' jealousy is never, as is Othello's, a strength, even a seeming strength ... -- it is a nervous weakness, a mere hysteria."⁵⁵ Now the reviewer in the Pall Mall Gazette criticized Henry Ainley, who played Leontes, because he reduced "Leontes from a criminal lunatic to a sort of hysterolepileptic".⁵⁶ But it appears that the

hysteroepileptic Leontes of Ainley was based upon Barker's interpretation that Leontes' jealousy is "a nervous weakness, a mere hysteria"; and this Leontes must have reduced the possibility of tragedy as Barker thought he should. In the preface Barker also mentioned how Paulina's behaviour diminishes the possibility of a tragic effect.⁵⁷ Further, the reviewer in Punch indicated that Mrs. Beringer acted Paulina in Barker's way: he noted that Mrs. Beringer "seemed to enjoy herself", and this indicates that she played Paulina in the spirited way that is at once stirring and comic, thus diverting the play from tragedy.⁵⁸

In the first part of the play, while the tragic effect was avoided in the acting and while Paulina's behaviour faintly created a comic romantic effect, the romantic effect was reinforced by the costumes and by the setting. As we have seen the costumes were not realistic and certainly this was what Barker intended. But if avoiding visual realism was the only function of the costumes Barker would have dressed his characters in more simple clothing; costumes sporting absurd design and every colour of the rainbow must have been created to suggest something more. Ironically it was a staunch realist, criticizing the production in the Daily Mail, who managed to indicate the way the costumes, and

the setting, functioned in the production. He wrote that "the resultant effect of scenery and costumes together is a conventional baroque illustration suited to some trifling fantastic fable."⁵⁹ Now The Winter's Tale is not "trifling", but like a fable it is filled with anachronisms and improbable events, and Barker's costumes and sets must have furthered the likeness of the play to a "fantastic fable". Indeed a more perceptive reviewer for the Nation commented that the set for the Sicilia scenes was "in character with Shakespeare's fantasy".⁶⁰ In the first part of Barker's production the tragic effect was avoided, and a romantic effect from fantasy was supplied by the action and supported by costumes and settings.

Further, if the effect of a romantic fantasy was established in the Sicilia scenes, the Bohemia scenes, filled with gaiety and near-magical poetry, would hardly have been less fantastical. And the final section in Sicilia, a section of improbable re-unions, would have followed suit. Perhaps the reason why so many did not sense the romantic effect at all, and why those reviewers who did sense the effect did not explain it, is best indicated by a number of related notes in the Pall Mall Gazette. On September 21, 1912, in a section of the newspaper entitled "Talk of the Town" the writer

mentioned how the imminence of Barker's production of The Winter's Tale raised anew the problem of Bohemia's sea-coast;⁶¹ and he briefly mentioned "The suggestion that Bohemia once had a sea-coast, and that Greene⁶² and Shakespeare knew more than their critics".⁶³ It is significant that this seemingly harmless comment ruffled the feathers of more than one reader. In a letter to the editor of the Pall Mall Gazette, published in the edition of September 23, Henrietta Skinner objected to the writer's use of the word "suggestion":

Why should this be a mere "suggestion" when in reality it is an historical fact that Bohemia possessed, not alone one, but two sea coasts? Reference to any history of Bohemia or article on Bohemian history in any large encyclopedia will show that in, if I remember right, the fifteenth century the kingdom of Bohemia extended by a series of conquests from the shores of the Adriatic on the south to the Gulf of Dantzic on the north. The Prussian seaport town of Koenigsberg, on the Baltic, was founded at that period by the conquering King of Bohemia.⁶⁴

Following this lead, in a letter to the editor published in the edition of September 24, Ambrose Peyton wrote,

Ben Jonson was clearly of opinion that Shakespeare had made a mistake. But this only shows that the author of "The Winter's Tale", having himself visited Venezia and the Northern Adriatic, had learned more than Ben Jonson knew respecting the early history of Bohemia. There is no question whatever as regards Bohemia having at one time had a sea coast on the Adriatic.⁶⁵

Peyton and, to a lesser degree, Skinner were anxious to preserve Shakespeare's integrity as a playwright; and to

do this they argued that the play in question does comply with historical fact. Peyton, Skinner, and probably most theatre-goers were still of the opinion established by the great managers of the previous century that realistic illusion is good theatre. When they went to a Shakespeare production this is what they expected to see. Thus some, like the reviewer for the Daily Mail, merely realized they had not been given the realistic visual illusion they had expected, and they used this as ground for criticism. Others realized they had been given an entirely new effect, but they had not yet developed a sense sufficiently attuned to Barker's theatre to be able to characterize an effect created by the actors and reinforced with costumes and settings. Reviews that were more perceptive in this respect, would come with Barker's production of Twelfth Night and of A Midsummer Night's Dream.

Notes to Chapter Two

¹In the nineteenth century the major managers acted in the productions they created. However, as Nicoll has pointed out, by the end of the nineteenth century the theatre had become "so complex as to demand the control of its various activities by one man... who did not act but who devoted all his efforts to the co-ordination and direction of the pieces presented upon the stage." (pp. 206-207) Thus, in the twentieth century one man -- the director -- devotes all his attention to the co-ordination and direction of a production, and the position of actor-manager had disappeared.

²p. 46. In The Shakespeare Revolution it was Styan's main contention that in the twentieth century the different kinds of Shakespeare scholarship have had an influence upon the production of Shakespeare's plays.

³Styan, p. 69.

⁴Quoted in Styan, p. 110.

⁵Although scholars have uncovered a great deal of evidence about the Elizabethan playhouse, nobody can state with certainty exactly what the conditions were. For the purposes of my discussion great certainty about the Elizabethan playhouse is not required. Thus I have followed the views most widely accepted.

⁶p. 3.

⁷p. 8.

⁸p. 9.

⁹William Poel, Shakespeare in the Theatre, p. 119.

¹⁰p. 155.

¹¹p. 156.

¹²p. 136.

¹³p. 138.

¹⁴pp. 143 - 144.

¹⁵Styan, p. 138.

¹⁶See, for example, the description of Poel's stage given by the reviewer writing in The Times of Poel's production of Measure for Measure, given in 1893.

"Shakespeare under Shakespearian Conditions", The Times (Nov. 11, 1893), p. 4.

¹⁷"Shakespeare under Shakespearian Conditions", The Times (Nov. 11, 1893), p. 4.

¹⁸Every year Herbert Beerbohm Tree (the manager at His Majesty's Theatre) organized a Shakespeare Birthday Festival at His Majesty's, and in 1910 he invited Poel to participate.

¹⁹"His Majesty's Theatre. 'The Two Gentlemen of Verona'", The Times (April 21, 1910), p. 12.

²⁰p. 62.

²¹Poel's influence upon Barker may have begun in 1899 when Barker portrayed Richard II in a production by Poel.

²²M. St. Clare Byrne, "Fifty Years of Shakespearian Production: 1898-1948", Shakespeare Survey, II (1949), 8.

²³Quoted in Styan, p. 83.

²⁴Quoted in Styan, p. 82.

²⁵"His Majesty's Theatre. 'The Two Gentlemen of Verona'", The Times (April 21, 1910), p. 12.

²⁶I am indebted to Calvin D. Linton for citing or paraphrasing some of Craig's ideas from On the Art of the Theatre that indicate costumes and settings should be abstract. "Some Recent Trends in Shakespearian Staging", English Literary History, VI-VII (1939-1940), 308-309.

²⁷Quoted in Calvin D. Linton, "Some Recent Trends in Shakespearian Staging", English Literary History, VI-VII (1939-1940), 309.

²⁸"Stage-Setting Reform. Mr. Gordon Craig's Models for 'Hamlet'", Daily Mail (Sept. 10, 1912), p. 5.

²⁹M. St. Clair Byrne, "Fifty Years of Shakespearian Productions: 1898-1948", Shakespeare Survey, II (1949), 8.

³⁰p. 91.

³¹Quoted in Styan, p. 95.

³²Quoted in Styan, p. 91.

³³Also it should be noted that each set readily served for many consecutive scenes. Only a few set changes were required during the course of a production. Further, Barker used sets that could be changed quite quickly. Thus he avoided long and frequent delays in the action from set changes, and this helped to preserve the dramatic structure (the sharp dramatic contrast of one part of the play with another).

³⁴Quoted in Styan, p. 91.

³⁵Quoted in Styan, p. 91.

³⁶"Barkerized Shakespeare", Daily Mail (Sept. 23, 1912), p. 5.

³⁷This phrase from the programme is cited in "In the Manner of Shakespeare's Time", Outlook, XCIV (Jan. - April, 1910), 784.

³⁸"New Theatre", Theatre Magazine, I (1910), 133.

³⁹"In the Manner of Shakespeare's Time", Outlook, XCIV (Jan. - April, 1910), 785.

⁴⁰Ibid., 784.

⁴¹Adolph Klauber, "Saving Time on Shakespeare", New York Times (April 3, 1910), section 6, p. 8; in New York Times Theatre Reviews (1904-1911).

⁴²"In the Manner of Shakespeare's Time", Outlook XCIV (Jan. - April, 1910), 784.

⁴³Quoted in ibid., 785. Actually the reviewer wrote that "the managers" of the production made this statement. However, since Ames was the manager (or, to be more accurate, the director) I have assumed he made this statement.

⁴⁴Quoted in Styan, p. 86.

⁴⁵"The Savoy Theatre. A New Interpretation of Shakespeare", Pall Mall Gazette (Sept. 23, 1912), p. 5.

⁴⁶p. G. Konody, "The Artist's Point of View. 'Immeasurably Finer than Reinhardt'", Observer (Sept. 29, 1912), p. 9.

⁴⁷Styan, p. 87.

⁴⁸p. G. Konody, "The Artist's Point of View. 'Immeasurably Finer than Reinhardt'", Observer (Sept. 29, 1912), p. 9.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰"Shakespeare at the Savoy. 'The Winter's Tale'", Observer (Sept. 22, 1912), p. 9.

⁵¹"At the play. 'The Winter's Tale'", Punch, CXLIII (July - Dec., 1912), 280.

⁵²"'The Winter's Tale' at the Savoy", Spectator, CIX (July - Dec., 1912), 450.

⁵³"Barkerized Shakespeare", Daily Mail (Sept. 23, 1912), p. 5.

⁵⁴"Mr. Granville-Barker's Production", The Times (Sept. 27, 1912), p. 7.

⁵⁵More Prefaces to Shakespeare, p. 20.

⁵⁶"The Savoy Theatre. A New Interpretation of Shakespeare", Pall Mall Gazette (Sept. 23, 1912), p. 5.

⁵⁷More Prefaces to Shakespeare, p. 20.

⁵⁸"At the Play. 'The Winter's Tale'", Punch, CXLIII (July - Dec. 1912), 281.

⁵⁹"Barkerized Shakespeare", Daily Mail (Sept. 23, 1912), p. 5.

⁶⁰"'The Winter's Tale' at the Savoy", Nation, VC (July - Dec., 1912), 439.

⁶¹Although Shakespeare gave Bohemia a sea-coast, when he wrote the play Bohemia was an inland country. See pp.32-33, above.

⁶²Robert Greene's prose romance Pandosto, first published in 1588, was Shakespeare's main source for The Winter's Tale. See J. H. P. Pafford, "Introduction", in The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare: The Winter's Tale, p. xxvii.

⁶³p. 1.

⁶⁴"Shakespeare's Bohemia", Pall Mall Gazette (Sept. 23, 1912), p. 4.

⁶⁵"Shakespeare's Bohemia", Pall Mall Gazette (Sept. 24, 1912), p. 4.

III

A NEW TRADITION

After directing A Midsummer Night's Dream in 1914 Granville-Barker retired from stage production. However he continued to exert an influence over Shakespeare on the stage in other ways. First of all in his three important productions Barker had demonstrated principles which other directors followed. In 1919 Nigel Playfair's important production of As You Like It showed Barker's influence. Like Barker he used simple decorative sets designed to strengthen the effects of the play. Indeed one reviewer wrote that "The scenery may best be described as Mr. Norman Wilkinson [Barker's designer] only more so."¹ Also the costumes used by Playfair were every bit as colourful and bizarre as those Granville-Barker had used in The Winter's Tale. Monsieur le Beau, for example, "appeared in a flame-coloured suit and a great headdress of slightly Oriental design."² W. Bridges-Adams, too, directing at Stratford-upon-Avon from 1919 to 1934, was obviously influenced by Barker's principles. It is true that Bridges-Adams did use sets that were more realistic than Barker's. But, as one

reviewer explained, the sets were still "rather a suggestion than a statement, a setting for actors, not a 'landscape with figures'."³ As on Barker's stage the effects were created by the actors and the sets merely added force to the effects. Finally it should be noted that after Barker many directors, including Playfair and Bridges-Adams, employed the entire text of a Shakespeare play with but one or two short intermissions.

After the war Granville-Barker began to write criticism of Shakespeare's plays and many directors were influenced by this stage-centred criticism. From the beginning of his career in Shakespeare criticism Barker stressed the importance of trying to determine the effects of the plays when performed according to Elizabethan staging conditions. In "Shakespeare and Modern Stagecraft", for example, Barker wrote that "A work of art, generally speaking, is to be seen at its best as its author projected it."⁴ He thought that with Shakespeare's plays this is especially true because Shakespeare used the limitations of the Elizabethan stage to advantage: the stage, although "crude in its material resource, became at his touch great in its simplicity."⁵ Eventually, guided by the principle that each play is "at its best as its author projected it ",

Barker began the series of Prefaces to Shakespeare. In each preface he dealt with a single play, and usually he was particularly convincing when describing how important parts of the play should work dramatically. For instance, in his preface to King Lear Barker discussed how the Elizabethan stage, so free from the restrictions of visual illusion, enabled Shakespeare to create the storm through the action of the characters, and principally through Lear. Ultimately Lear symbolizes the storm and this makes him "the great figure which the greater issues of the play demand."⁶

Certainly Barker supplied directors with valuable theories about specific plays. Also, Barker's criticism seems to have had the more general effect of prompting directors towards trying to achieve Shakespeare's effects about all else. For example, it seems that Barry Jackson may have been influenced by this principle when he produced a modern dress version of Hamlet in 1925. The twentieth-century dress and settings were so against anything the audience was accustomed to that, rather than seeking visual illusion, they were forced to concentrate entirely upon the effects of the action. As Muriel St. Clare Byrne put it, the director of a modern dress production of Shakespeare has "forced his audience back to the text and the pursuit of

the authentic Shakespeare. He has shocked them into thinking."⁷

The movement back to Shakespeare's effects, spear-headed in part by the criticism of Granville-Barker, altered production of The Winter's Tale as it did all Shakespeare production. However another aspect of Shakespeare criticism -- the development of a new critical understanding of Shakespeare's final plays -- is more directly connected with the emergence of a new tradition in production of The Winter's Tale. At this point it will be best to briefly summarize the argument of some of the critics involved in this new critical movement.

In his Notes on Shakespeare's Workmanship, published in 1917, Quiller-Couch stated that in the "later plays" Shakespeare had "one common and constant aim--to repair the passionate errors of men and women in the happiness their children discover, and so to renew the hopes of the world; to reconcile the tragedy of one generation with the fresh hope of another".⁸ He argued that to achieve this in The Winter's Tale Shakespeare deliberately combined three acts of tragedy with two acts of comedy -- he worked "into one drama two different stories in two separate categories of Art."⁹ In 1939 Mark Van Doren expressed much the same view-

point about The Winter's Tale. He wrote that the Bohemia section is "conceived in contrast" to the Sicilia section, and the contrast is "dedicated to the task of stating with all the force of which poetry is capable the opposition between age and youth, cruelty and goodness, jealousy and faith."¹⁰ Perdita, embodying youth, goodness, faith, restores "spring" to the world which Leontes has darkened.¹¹ However Van Doren also argued that in the Bohemia scenes faint reminders of Leontes' actions still remain: "The Winter's Tale still has its gravity, its veins of dark iron across an otherwise untroubled pattern."¹²

In Shakespeare's Last Plays, first published in 1938, E. M. W. Tillyard's viewpoint is perhaps over simplified but is enlightening nevertheless. His main argument was that in Cymbeline, The Winter's Tale and The Tempest Shakespeare attempted to represent the "complete tragic pattern "¹³ a pattern which goes "from prosperity to an upsetting of the balance, to suffering, and to a final more excellent state";¹⁴ and Shakespeare was especially concerned with developing the final phase of this tragic pattern culminating in "a fairer prosperity than had first existed."¹⁵ During this final phase the world of the play, as well as being realistic, is also symbolic of the new, more excellent

state. In The Winter's Tale Shakespeare presented the "whole tragic pattern".¹⁶ In the first half of the play he rendered "worthily, in the main through a realistic method, the destructive portion of the tragic pattern."¹⁷ Then in the Bohemia scenes he rendered, realistically and symbolically, the creation of a new prosperity. The Bohemian country-side is both realistic and "an elegant symbol of the new life"; and Perdita, as well as being a realistic character, is "the play's main symbol of the powers of creation."¹⁸ Tillyard also felt that, because the new prosperity is embodied in characters--particularly Perdita--who are new to the play, this sharpens the juxtaposition between the section of destruction and the section of creation, something which he found "easy enough to accept".¹⁹

Each of these critics viewed The Winter's Tale in a slightly different way. However they were united on their opinion of (at least) one aspect of the play; each critic indicated that when the play moves from the Sicilia scenes to the Bohemia scenes there is a change in effect. For Quiller-Couch the effect of the Sicilia scenes is tragic and the effect of the Bohemia scenes is comic; from Van Doren's argument, the two effects could be described as bleakness and romantic optimism, respectively; and Tillyard

argued for tragedy followed by romantic optimism. All three critics, then, were part of the beginning of a new critical development in which a change of effect from the Sicilia section to the Bohemia section of The Winter's Tale was indicated.

Indeed, during the time of this critical development even those critics of The Winter's Tale who did not discuss the change in effect from the Sicilia to the Bohemia scenes often implied indirectly that such a change occurs. For example, in one chapter of his book Scepticism and Poetry (1937), D. G. James documented Shakespeare's use of non-Christian myths in the final plays. In his discussion of how the theme of "finding that which is lost"²⁰ fits into the mythology of the last plays, James noted that in each play a person "of the greatest beauty and incomparable worth" is lost because of a "sudden, inexplicable evil" arising in another character who was formerly in a "state of happiness, love, and loyalty"; and, in each play, when the lost person is found the character inflicted with evil recovers his "true nature".²¹ James concluded that

the most satisfactory interpretation we can place upon this striking repetition, in four plays, of a single theme, is Shakespeare's imagination of human life as a descent into a necessary tragedy and evil which is seen as a sudden irruption into what is

originally perfect, and as a sudden loss of innocence; and as the recovery of a lost perfection...²²

By James' interpretation then the lost person is essentially symbolic of the "recovery of...perfection" in the other character. Clearly, if a director wished to incorporate James' interpretation into a production of The Winter's Tale a change in effect between the Sicilia section and Bohemia section would result. The director would have the Sicilia section sufficiently tragic to emphasize Leontes' "descent into a necessary tragedy and evil ", and in the Bohemia scenes the director, to ensure that Perdita is suitable to eventually symbolize Leontes' recovery to perfection, would present her as a perfect child and would compliment and emphasize her perfection with an idyllic pastoral world.

Whether or not directors of The Winter's Tale since the beginning of the thirties read Shakespeare criticism and then applied the ideas of the critics in productions of The Winter's Tale cannot be determined. However, in the thirties and forties when Barker was (still) encouraging directors to try for Shakespeare's effects, stage production of The Winter's Tale changed substantially. As will be shown, a new tradition emerged. Obviously directors were

beginning to approach the play with new goals in mind. And the new tradition in production of The Winter's Tale was one in which the effect of the Bohemia scenes was different than the effect of the Sicilia scenes: directors of the play shared with contemporary critics the opinion that there is a change in effect. Perhaps the directors had read the critical works; perhaps the new approach to the play resulted from the combined discoveries of scholarship and the stage. In either case scholarship had an important role in bringing about this latest development in production of The Winter's Tale. Almost all productions of The Winter's Tale given in the last forty-five years are part of this "new tradition", productions which I will now consider.

It appears that the new tradition in production of The Winter's Tale began with a production of the play by Harcourt Williams at London's Old Vic Theatre in 1933. Of the many reviews I have read of productions of The Winter's Tale given prior to 1933 not one reviewer discusses, mentions or indicates that a change in effect occurred when the action moved from Sicilia to Bohemia. However there is no doubt that the reviewers noticed this aspect in the production at the Old Vic in 1933. And in reviews of most subsequent productions of The Winter's Tale, from 1933 to

1978, it is equally clear that the reviewers have recognized a change in effect. A reviewer of Harcourt Williams' production, writing for the New Statesman and Nation, commented that the play is "pastoral whimsy sandwiched between scenes of melodrama".²³ Now it is true that when this writer termed the first three acts (and the last act) "melodrama" and the Bohemia scenes "pastoral whimsy" he was referring to the play itself rather than to William's production. However, if Williams had followed a different plan the reviewer would most certainly have described and evaluated it; and he did not. We must assume that Williams followed the pattern outlined by the reviewer, of melodrama contrasted with romance. Indeed the writer for the Observer indicated that Williams used this general pattern:

Together with the fire and dew of this exciting, lovely play Shakespeare bequeathed to his modern producers a teasing problem. The choice seems to lie between presenting it as all of a piece -- that is to say, in one convention; or piecemeal, giving the Sicilian scenes their marvy splendour in sharp contrast to the pastoral simplicity of the Bohemian, and the clowns their heads. Mr. Harcourt Williams chose the alternative method [the piecemeal method] with, I feel, less than complete success.²⁴

Although, as this reviewer implied, Williams may have achieved only partial success with this production, the change of effect was there. Also it is interesting that

the reviewer was able to outline so clearly the "teasing problem" which Shakespeare "bequeathed to his modern producers ". Perhaps some reviewers may have been familiar with the new development in contemporary criticism of the play.

In 1936, again at the Old Vic, Michael MacOwan directed a production of The Winter's Tale. The reviewer for The Times began by explaining that the play has two distinct parts, one enjoyable and one unenjoyable:

In this strangely divided play, it is necessary to wait long for the Shakespearian magic, paying through a long winter of contrivances for the spring that is to come when Perdita grows up ... Nothing can redeem the first part of the play except that at last it gives way to the second.²⁵

The reviewer then reported how the production moved through the "winter of contrivances" until the "shepherd and the clown are the signal of revival...., and by the time Perdita begins to deliver her set flower-piece -- and Miss Ann Carson [as Perdita] ... gave us the music of the words -- the spring is come." Although the reviewer for the New Statesman and Nation was able to enjoy the entire production, he too felt a change when the play moves from Sicilia to Bohemia. He termed the Sicilia section "tragic" and the Bohemia section "pastoral".²⁶ Like Williams, MacOwan incorporated a change of effect into his production.

In 1946 B. Iden-Payne and Romney Brent, working with the Theatre Guild at the Cort Theatre in New York City, co-directed a presentation of The Winter's Tale. Most of the reviewers for this production began by discussing the play itself, focusing upon the odd structure. John Chapman, writing in the Daily News, commented that the play is "quite definitely mixed between rip-snorting tragedy and pastoral symphony";²⁷ Louis Kronenberger of the P M Exclusive wrote that the first three acts are "high-slung melodrama", and "The rest ... is pastoral and preposterous";²⁸ in the Herald Tribune Otis Guernsey Jr. drew attention to the "curious mixture of comedy and drama" in the play.²⁹ Here each reviewer indicated that the effect of the first three acts is different than the effect which follows. Now, again, they were referring to the play and not specifically to the production of Brent and Iden-Payne. But, when they proceeded to discuss the production, they did not indicate that these directors followed a different interpretation. Indeed, Guernsey explained that because the production was organized into two acts with the Sicilia section comprising the first act, the first act of "tragedy" and the second act of "comedy pastoral" were more "sharply separated."³⁰ This production was in the new tradition started at the Old Vic.

Those reviewers of the production in 1946 who mentioned the odd structure felt it was a flaw of the play. "The play suffers from scizophrenia[*sic*]" was Chapman's final diagnosis,³¹ and Guernsey concluded that "neither the poetry nor the construction of this play ... is in the bard's best tradition."³² Now some reviewers found no faults in the actual production whatsoever. For instance Burton Rescoe of the New York World Telegram wrote, "If I had a cornucopia filled with the dandiest adjectives of praise, I would be strewing them around the doorsteps of everyone connected with this play; for they have all contributed much to my education as well as to my entertainment."³³ Indeed it is hard to imagine higher praise than this. But those reviewers who mentioned the structure generally concluded that it was a problem which Brent and Iden-Payne were not able to surmount. Guernsey concluded that, after the treatment of Brent and Iden-Payne, the "curious mixture of comedy and drama ... remains a generally uninspired evening in the theatre."³⁴ And the reviewer for Theatre World concluded that the "dull, badly constructed and unmoving" play was "just as bad on the stage as ... it was in the library."³⁵ Perhaps Brent and Iden-Payne failed to achieve unity of effects in the first two sections of the play:

perhaps the effect of the Bohemia section did not combine with the effect from the Sicilia section in a pleasing way.

Another production of The Winter's Tale in the new tradition was directed by Peter Brook at London's Phoenix Theatre in 1951. Originally the role of Perdita was played by Virginia McKenna; however for three months Frances Hyland played Perdita, and I have spoken with Miss Hyland about the production.³⁶ She confirmed that the Sicilia section had a tragic effect and the Bohemia section a romantic effect. Miss Hyland felt that the romantic effect of the Bohemia scenes was an effect of exuberance and freshness, an exuberance and freshness depicted by Bohemia in general and by Perdita and Florizel in particular. Brook began the sheep-shearing scene with the lights dimmed and with Perdita and Florizel entering from opposite sides of the stage. Walking slowly they met silently in the middle. In this simple yet moving beginning the quality of freshness and innocence of the two young lovers was established -- and they were characterized by this quality for the rest of the play. The lights were then turned up, revealing the setting and the entire crowd of the sheep-shearing feast. Brook highlighted this part of the play with singing and dancing and with colourful rustic-English costumes. In the Sicilia

scenes, on the other hand, Brook used costumes that were rich enough, but immensely stiff and heavy and of sombre colours. The tragedy of this section was established largely by John Gielgud's brilliant portrayal of Leontes: he made the audience feel the full tragic significance of everything happening.

In this particular production there was unity of effects in the first two sections. Miss Hyland explained that, instead of creating a sharp contrast between the effect of the Sicilia section and the effect of the Bohemia section, by his use of sound in the storm scene of III,iii Brook created a smooth transition in which the tragic effect was allowed to slowly transform into the romantic effect. Brook suggested the storm by having his actors shout wild howling noises from the wings, and after the exit of Antigonus the howling transformed slowly into the singing of the shepherds. By managing the change of effect in this way Brook made it seem as if the romantic effect was growing out of the tragedy.

The tradition of staging The Winter's Tale with a change in effect when the action moves from Sicilia to Bohemia, continued. In 1960 Peter Wood's production of the play at Stratford-upon-Avon was in this now well-established

tradition. The reviewer for Plays and Players magazine wrote that Wood decided on the course of producing "the first half as though it were Othello and the second as though it were the Arden part of As You Like It."³⁷ In 1975 Audrey Stanley directed a production of the play for the Oregon Shakespeare Festival. A. C. Dessen noted in the Shakespeare Quarterly that in her programme note Stanley "stressed the three worlds of this romance: the tragic winter world of Sicilia; the rural spring of Bohemia; and the transformed world of the final scenes."³⁸ And Dessen reported that Stanley conveyed the contrasting effects of the first two sections admirably:

The stylized, formal activity of Leontes' court (with the King gradually isolating himself) was contrasted to the informal, rustic energy of the sheep-shearing feast with its maypole, merriment, and sense of community.³⁹

Two interesting productions of The Winter's Tale in the same tradition have been given for the Stratford Festival in Stratford, Ontario: one was directed by Douglas Campbell in 1958, and one, which is currently playing (June - September, 1978), is co-directed by Robin Phillips and Peter Moss. These productions will be the subject of my last chapter.

Thus in the last forty-five years the new tradition has dominated production of The Winter's Tale. In fact, during the years from 1933 to 1960 the major productions of the play have been in this tradition.⁴⁰ And with Audrey Stanley's presentation in 1975 and the current version of Phillips and Moss the tradition is still strong.

Notes to Chapter Three

¹Morning Post, quoted in J. L. Styan, The Shakespeare Revolution, p. 128.

²Styan, p. 129.

³Observer, quoted in Styan, p. 134.

⁴Yale Review, XV (1925-1926), 710.

⁵Ibid., 724.

⁶Quoted in Styan, p. 117. I am indebted to Styan (pp. 116-117) for his summary of Barker's preface to King Lear.

⁷"Fifty Years of Shakespearian Production: 1898-1948", Shakespeare Survey, II (1947), 13.

⁸p. 258.

⁹p. 257.

¹⁰Shakespeare, p. 271-272.

¹¹van Doran, p. 277.

¹²van Doran, p. 277.

¹³p. 18.

¹⁴p. 33.

¹⁵p. 26.

¹⁶p. 40.

¹⁷p. 42.

¹⁸pp. 43-44.

¹⁹p. 47.

²⁰p. 27.

²¹pp.228-229.

²²p. 229.

²³"A Winter's Tale ", New Statesman and Nation, V (Jan. - June, 1933), 131.

²⁴"The Winter's Tale", Observer (Jan. 29, 1933), p. 11.

²⁵"Old Vic. 'The Winter's Tale'", The Times (March 18, 1936), p. 12.

²⁶"'The Winter's Tale' at the Old Vic ", New Statesman and Nation, XI (Jan. - June, 1936), 494.

²⁷"The Guild's Shakespeare Troupe Starts Off with 'Winter's Tale'", Daily News, in New York Theatre Critics' Reviews [hereafter cited as NYTCR], VII (1946), 488.

²⁸"When the Bard Went Bohemian ", PM Exclusive, in NYTCR, VII (1946), 488.

²⁹"Cold Night for the Bard ", Herald Tribune, in NYTCR, VII (1946), 489.

³⁰Ibid.

³¹"The Guild's Shakespeare Troupe Starts Off with 'Winter's Tale'", Daily News, in NYTCR, VII (1946), 488.

³²"Cold Night for the Bard", Herald Tribune, in NYTCR, VII (1946), 489.

³³"'The Winter's Tale' Takes Its Place with Bard's Best", New York World Telegram, in NYTCR, VII (1946), 487.

³⁴"Cold Night for the Bard", Herald Tribune, in NYTCR, VII (1946), 489.

³⁵"Echoes from Broadway", Theatre World, XLII (March, 1946), 28. My italics.

³⁶I spoke with Miss Hyland on Sept. 22, 1978 at Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario.

³⁷Peter Roberts, "The Winter's Tale", Plays and Players, VII (May, 1960), 16.

³⁸"Oregon Shakespearian Festival, 1975", Shakespeare Quarterly, XXVII (1976), 91.

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰There was only one production during this time period that was not in the new tradition. In 1958 Jack Landau and John Houseman co-directed a production of the play at Stratford Connecticut. Like Granville-Barker in 1912, Landau and Houseman presented a version that had a romantic effect throughout. Brooks Atkinson wrote in the New York Times that the directors treated the production as "a story-book romance": as a "touching and beautiful fable about the human frailties of monarchs and the ecstasy of young lovers." (July 21, 1958) Atkinson also noted that this effect was supported by the costumes, which had the "soft splendour of illustrations from a modern fairy-tale". In Atkinson's opinion the production was a "well-designed, generally well-acted afternoon of ancient make-believe." Furthermore, the Sicilia costumes, besides having the soft splendour that Atkinson mentioned, had another important feature as well. The reviewer for the Catholic World wrote that the Sicilia scenes were "imaginatively staged as a card game. Screens at the start were suggestive of the backs of the pack, then the Kings and Queens appeared in the squarely conventional and gaily particoloured garb of the face cards while the courtiers sported on their sleeves or tunics the signs of the Italian suits: swords, clubs, cups and money." Probably the fanciful display of playing-cards in the Sicilia costumes would have lessened the possibility of tragedy in the Sicilia section and increased the chances of a romantic effect. Euphemia Wyatt, "Review of the Season: 1957-58 ", Catholic World, CLXXXVIII (Oct., 1958), 69.

IV

AN EMERGING TRADITION?

Since 1960 there have been two productions of The Winter's Tale that should not be grouped with those productions just examined -- one directed by Trevor Nunn at Stratford-upon-Avon in 1969 and one directed by Michael Kahn at Stratford, Connecticut in 1975. In both of these productions the directors used an approach which was, partially at any rate, new. Furthermore the approaches of Nunn and Kahn to the play were remarkably alike. Again, the approach of each director seems to be connected with a new movement in criticism of Shakespeare's plays.

In the twenties and thirties critics began to apply the general concepts of "new criticism" to Shakespeare's plays. Perhaps the most convincing "new critic" of Shakespeare was G. Wilson Knight. In his early critical works Knight outlined his approach to Shakespeare; and throughout his career he followed this approach unwaveringly. In Myth and Miracle, published in 1929, Knight explained,

My method is to regard the plays as they stand in the order to which modern scholarship has assigned them; to refuse to regard "sources" as exerting any limit to the significance of the completed work of art; to avoid the side-issues of Elizabethan and

Jacobean manners, politics, patronage, audiences, revolutions and explorations; to fix attention solely on the poetic quality and human interest of the plays concerned. Secondary considerations necessarily condition the materials of a poet's work: but it is in the nature of his accomplishment within and transcending those limits that we must always search for the lasting significance of either poet or prophet. For this reason, though I refer to the author of the plays as Shakespeare, I leave any discussion of the questions of consciousness and unconsciousness, intention and inspiration, as unnecessary to a purely philosophic analysis of the text. To the critic of the poetry the word "Shakespeare" stands alone for the dynamic life that persists in the plays, and any other "Shakespeare" is a pure abstraction.¹

Here, by implication, Knight was indicating why he felt his approach of "philosophic analysis" to be better than the more conventional methods, involving "secondary considerations", of many of his contemporaries. Similarly in the first chapter of The Wheel of Fire (1930) Knight warned scholars against using "a troop of concepts irrelevant to the nature of the work".² And he devoted much of the chapter to elaborating upon how scholars can achieve a philosophic analysis of a Shakespeare text -- a form of analysis that he called "interpretation".³ First he held that each play contains a central vision -- a "burning core of mental or spiritual reality"⁴--, and he explained how the vision of the play is conveyed to the scholar. Each play is

an expanded metaphor, by means of which the original vision has been projected into forms roughly correspondent with actuality, conforming thereto with greater or less exactitude according to the demands of its own nature.⁵

Shakespeare's original vision for a play determined the "forms"--the characters, events, poetic imagery and other elements -- he would use. Secondly, Knight explained that interpretation involves a "recreation [sic]"⁶ of the play being studied: the scholar starts at Shakespeare's starting point -- the original vision within the play -- and, working outwards, re-creates the outward "forms". In other words the vision of the play is the tenor of the "expanded metaphor", and by his understanding, or sense, of this "germ of composition",⁷ the scholar can re-create in an intellectual medium the vehicles of the metaphor: he can interpret the "forms roughly correspondent with actuality".

In Principles of Shakespearian Production (1936)

Knight wrote that "one experience of a great work is not enough: we must grow to know it."⁸ He also wrote that the "essential" quality of each play "can be received by the ear of imagination in silent reading."⁹ And Knight indicated that whether a scholar chooses to study a play by seeing it or reading it he can grasp the inner vision only by analyzing the play itself with care. Implicit in this basic principle

underlying Knight's interpretations is his assertion that the scholar re-creating a Shakespeare play in an intellectual medium does not need to consider the theatrical techniques used in production of the play. Perhaps Knight explained this position most clearly in his "Prefatory Note" to The Wheel of Fire:

my experience as actor, producer and play-goer leaves me uncompromising in my assertion that the literary analysis of great drama in terms of theatrical technique accomplishes singularly little. Such technicalities should be confined to the theatre from which their terms are drawn. The proper thing to do about a play's dramatic quality is to produce it, to act in it, to attend performances; but the penetration of its deeper meanings is a different matter, and such a study, though the commentator should certainly be dramatically aware, and even wary, will not itself speak in theatrical terms.¹⁰

Of course "the literary analysis of great drama [of great plays] in terms of theatrical technique" is one aspect of stage-centred criticism; and this statement should be read as a mild attack (or counterattack) on stage-centred critics.

Although Knight sees little value in considering the mechanics of the theatre he does not altogether separate the scholarly process from producing a Shakespeare play. In Principles of Shakespearian Production Knight argued that the director's first task is "Close intellectual interpretation".¹¹ Like the scholar the director must begin by understanding the

inner vision of the play:

the producer must not deduce his business from the play's surface. He must make, as it were, a leap to the inward meaning ...; must not be content to start where Shakespeare left off, but rather start with Shakespeare and go with him.¹²

And, just as the scholar works from his understanding of the play's central vision to re-create the play in an intellectual medium, so the director works from this understanding to re-create the play in the medium of the stage:

The producer should be able to hold the play in jig-saw bits in his mind, to sort them all out, to build with them and recreate [sic] the whole from understanding of its nature.¹³

Knight even argued that, once the director has recognized what he feels is the inner vision of the play, he can "cut, adapt, even, on rare occasions, transpose, according to circumstances".¹⁴ Deleting or altering any aspect of the text that does not seem to germinate from the central vision is justified:

The feeling that cutting is sacrilegious derives from a totally false reasoning. The producer's business is not translation, but recreation [sic].¹⁵

Also, Knight explained that the costumes, sets and stage effects in a Shakespeare production should "subserve the play's emotional quality and poetic colour"¹⁶ -- qualities that, in turn, germinate from the inner vision. Thus Knight

indicated that, like everything else, the visual side of production should derive from the inner vision of the play.

In The Shakespeare Revolution Styan asserted that "the kind of 'interpretation' associated with the name of G. Wilson Knight" is influencing Shakespeare production.¹⁷ Now, although Knight continued writing into the seventies, he wrote the works quoted from above towards the beginning of his career (Myth and Miracle in 1929, The Wheel of Fire in 1930 and Principles of Shakespearian Production in 1936); and we might expect that if Knight and other critics interpreting the plays from a central vision had an influence on Shakespeare production it would have begun at this time. However Knight and the handful like him were interpreting the plays at a time when Granville-Barker was directing scholars towards stage-centred criticism; and Knight was arguing for the validity of textual manipulation and of other directorial liberties at a time when directors, following the lead of Barker and Poel, were refraining from altering the text. Scholars of Knight's principles were going against the tide, and it is not surprising that their influence on Shakespeare production was slow to materialize.

In The Shakespeare Revolution Styan also held that one of the first directors to re-create some of the plays on

the stage in the manner Knight argued for was Peter Brook.^{18,19} By the sixties, to emphasize his conception of a play Brook was making cuts to the text, using costumes and settings, and adding large amounts of stage business. In 1962, for example, he exercised his directorial freedom in these ways when he produced King Lear as an absurdist play -- a conception of the play he derived from the existentialist views of Jan Kott in Shakespeare our Contemporary. Styan explained that, as a result of Kott's viewpoint, "Brook saw the play as a metaphysical farce about the blindness of man in an environment of savage cruelty."²⁰ To emphasize the savage cruelty of the environment Brook used, for example, sets "of geometrical sheets... ginger with rust and corrosion";²¹ and he used "costumes, dominantly leather, ... textured to suggest long and hard wear";²² in I,iv after Lear was reprimanded by Goneril, he had Lear's knights "tip chairs, throw plates and generally demolish the chamber";²³ and in the last scene he did not have Edmund instruct Edgar to "send ... to th' castle" and prevent the imminent murder of Lear and Cordelia (V,iii, 245-248).²⁴

Brook's most successful re-creation of a Shakespeare play was his production of A Midsummer Night's Dream at Stratford-upon-Avon in 1970. The stage was a three-sided

white box with a white floor, and there was a catwalk around the top from which the musicians and the fairies could regard the players below.²⁵ By placing the fairies, who occasionally descended and "physically controlled the lovers",²⁶ above the main action Brook invited the audience to regard them as puppet masters;²⁷ and by exposing the musicians and using a white set Brook declared that visual illusion was not his aim. Also the white set helped to establish the element of magic in the play. Irving Wardle, a reviewer for The Times and a correspondent for the New York Times, commented that the set "removes the sense of being earthbound: it is natural here for characters to fly".²⁸ But Brook not only established the magical effect that habitually dominates productions of the Dream: beneath this usual effect was a "darker mood".²⁹ Styan explained that in the production Theseus and Hippolyta doubled as Oberon and Titania, and the audience was made perfectly aware of this: "Theseus and Hippolyta simply shed their white cloaks at 'dusk', and assumed them again at 'daybreak'".³⁰ Styan indicated that Brook's reason for doing this "was to suggest that the dream in the wood near Athens was a premarital fantasy of the Duke and his bride."³¹ As a result of this suggestion the "high spirits of the dream

were constantly undercut by the memory of the real problems facing the mortal lovers. Thus [for example] Oberon's desire to punish, even degrade, the Titania he loved became a sobering issue."³²

Certainly Brook gave audiences a new and different production of the Dream. What's more, many sensed that an inner vision was represented in Brook's interpretation. Helen Dawson, for example, wrote in the Observer that in the "extra-terrestrial world we meet that part of ourselves which we bury under social convention".³³ A writer in The Times, remembering Plato's doctrine of Forms, attempted to explain the relation of Brook's production to Shakespeare's play: the relation is made clearer

if one is allowed to have a Form of the Dream laid up in heaven. Productions of the play to be good would have to resemble the Form of it, the resemblance being not one of copying but of congruence. So it would come about that for all the trapezes, juggling, helical wire trees, and general non-Elizabethanism, the Stratford production is not just good theatre but a true production of the Dream.³⁴

This writer's conception of "congruence" with a "Form" seems to parallel Knight's conception of outer expression of an inner "core of mental or spiritual reality." After citing this article from The Times Styan concluded that "The Platonic Form lay hidden there [within Brook's production],

valid and (one would think) scholarly, awaiting discovery." He then asked the pointed question, "How close are we to Wilson Knight's concept of 'interpretation'?"³⁵

In Trevor Nunn's production of The Winter's Tale at Stratford-upon-Avon in 1969 an inner vision was represented. Thus Nunn was the first to handle a production of The Winter's Tale in the manner argued for by Knight. However the production was not entirely unique. Like other directors Nunn incorporated a change of effect from the Sicilia scenes to the Bohemia scenes. As will be explained later in this chapter, the differing effects, like everything else in the production, were outward manifestations of the inner vision. For the moment, though, the way Nunn achieved the effects should be described.

The Sicilia section was tragic, and it seems that this effect largely resulted from the tragic ruin of Leontes himself. At various points near the beginning of the play the action stopped and a stroboscopic light flashed upon Hermione and Polixenes. Ronald Bryden of the Observer explained,

In that pause, the world of the play looks different. The young wife's murmuring to her husband's guest, pressing him affectionately to stay longer, takes on a sickening intimacy.³⁶

And the reviewers agreed that the picture of "sickening intimacy" was clearly intended to represent "the imaginings of Leontes' sick mind rather than a temporary halting of the background".³⁷ Thus Leontes' sickness, already indicated by his convoluted speech and by his unjust actions against Hermione and Polixenes, was represented visually as well and the effect of impending tragedy was heightened. Later in this section of the play Leontes' tragic sickness received additional representation. In one scene he railed against Hermione "whilst peddling furiously at a spinning wheel"³⁸ -- an obvious symbol of his whirling thoughts --, and in another scene he was "at a chessboard plotting" (as one reviewer interpreted) "the moves ahead that shall eliminate ... Polixenes".³⁹ And, just as various devices emphasized Leontes' madness, so the ultimate extent of Leontes' tragic experience was indicated by his final pathetic state. After "reaching a climax of mad fury in the trial" Leontes acquired "a limp and a speech impediment from which he never" recovered.⁴⁰ He let Paulina "lead him off like an aged child, knees trembling, one foot dragging."⁴¹ The contrasting Bohemia scenes were all "beads and hair and bare, stamping feet" -- a "hippy rite of spring":⁴²

Autolycus ... capers charmingly in to the music of an invisible pop group, and his song "When daffodils begin to peer" sounds like any week's No. 1 hit. The sheep-shearing leaps to life with ...explosive jazz rhythms and the stage fills with long-haired men and gay leggy girls.⁴³

Clearly this light, comic, modern treatment of the Bohemia scenes yielded an effect far different than the tragic effect of the Sicilia section.⁴⁴

A clue to understanding the philosophic inner vision that Nunn represented in the production was in the programme.⁴⁵ On one page of the programme Cellini's bas-relief of Persephone and Hades was reproduced, and underneath was the explanation that the story of Demeter, Persephone and Hades is "a myth which was in Shakespeare's mind when he was writing The Winter's Tale."⁴⁶ Also, in his programme note Trevor Nunn expressed his opinion that "Leontes is in a destructive nightmare, 'performed' in a 'wide gap of time'. Spring breaks through the grip of winter, love returns, enabling Leontes to awake his faith and be redeemed."

As Nunn saw an analogy between the action of The Winter's Tale and winter giving way to spring and as the Cellini bas-relief would only have been reproduced with his approval, Nunn must have felt that the movement of the seasons was inherent in The Winter's Tale. Perhaps the

relation Nunn sensed of the seasons to the play is clarified somewhat by the way he chose to start the production. The production began with a stroboscopic light flickering on an "image of Renaissance man changed to a helpless figure spinning in a transparent box".⁴⁷ Now, as Bryden pointed out, the stroboscopic light -- the alteration of light and dark --, symbolized the movement of day and night -- of time.⁴⁸ Thus the flickering light on that helpless spinning figure would have represented the ascendancy of Time over man. Indeed in The Times Irving Wardle wrote that the device represented "time's fool."⁴⁹ Further then, when the light was flickering on the frozen "sickening intimacy"⁵⁰ of Polixenes and Hermione (an intimacy imagined by Leontes) this represented the ascendancy of Time over Leontes -- Leontes' illusions came with time and only time would unravel the damage caused. As Wardle explained, "Time is the central personage in the production, which takes the play as a poem on death and rebirth, nature versus art, with all its elements passing through the conditioning temporal medium."⁵¹ Likewise Bryden concluded that Time was the "protagonist" in the production: "It is Time, giver and destroyer, friend and enemy, bringer of death and flowers",⁵² If this was the case then the relation Nunn sensed of the

seasons with the play is obvious: The Sicilia scenes are dominated by Time the destroyer and thus are the winter of the play, and in the last two acts Time, as giver, returns spring to the world of the play.

The flickering light, then, represented cycles of time, and Nunn's use of this lighting device seems to have germinated from the philosophic reality -- the vision -- that Time, working through his medium of cycles of time, is giver and destroyer. However it is not important, and perhaps not possible, to discover the exact nature of the vision. It is important to note that Nunn's representation in the production of an inner vision was noticed by the reviewers. For example, in The Times Wardle wrote about the "emphasis on the play's higher meaning";⁵³ and corresponding for the New York Times he called this emphasis "a philosophic meditation on time".⁵⁴ Nunn's representation of the vision must have had an effect in the production. The exact nature of this effect would have depended upon what the vision was and how much of the representation of the vision was perceived by the audience. At the very least it would have been that mystical effect produced by the obscured presence of a higher significance.

In this production, then, devices such as the

stroboscopic light informed the audience that a central philosophic vision was behind the production and gave them some idea of what the vision was. Assuming that the vision involved Time as the protagonist, as giver and destroyer, the audience would then have sensed that the vision was represented in the other aspects of the production. Of course the most obvious representation was the appearance of Time himself. The first part of Time's speech concerns this very role as giver and destroyer: "I that please some, try all: both joy and terror of good and bad..." (IV,i, 1-2). But perhaps most of all a sense of Time the destroyer was conveyed by the tragic effect of the Sicilia scenes, and the remunerative quality of Time was indicated by the joyful effect of the Bohemia scenes. Also, depending upon the production, the movement from a tragic Sicilia to a life-affirming Bohemia may have recalled the seasonal movement from winter to spring; and the association of winter with the Sicilia section and of spring (and perhaps summer and fall -- see IV,iv, 78-80) with the remainder of the action, as well as reinforcing the effect of the Sicilia scenes and the effect that followed, may have suggested the inner vision -- the barren destructiveness and fertile gifts of Time. Furthermore, for some the movement of the

production may have recalled the myth of Persephone -- especially for those in the audience who read the programme beforehand. For these viewers Hermione and Perdita, as well as being real characters, would have been Persephone figures -- personifications of the new fertile gifts. No doubt it was in these or other possibilities offered by the play that Nunn first sensed an inner vision, and in his production he added devices such as the flickering light to make the representation of the vision more noticeable.

In 1975 Michael Kahn, at Stratford, Connecticut, developed his production of The Winter's Tale in the same way. In the Shakespeare Quarterly Peter Saccio wrote that Kahn, and John Conklin the scene designer, "had drawn a governing idea from the very shape of the play and expressed it through all available means."⁵⁵ Saccio reported that images of circles and suggestions of circles were used to emphasize the idea, suggested by the shape of the play, that "Human action, under divine guidance, curved back upon itself to close where it had begun":

The stage was occupied by a low white-carpeted circular platform, backed by hanging arcs of clear plexiglass rods that could take color from the lights. Suspended center-stage at the opening was a circular clock-face upon which Time marked off the hours with a bare tree branch. At the beginning of the Bohemia section, he again marked off the hours, but now with

a leafy branch. Finally Time reappeared at the close, on this occasion with a golden branch bearing golden fruit. Obvious, of course, but wholly satisfactory. Apollo ruled these circles: his solar disc appeared far upstage during the trial, and through it Time ringingly announced the decisive words of the oracle. Leontes responded with a frenzy of remorse that verged on a Lear-like madness, while the stage momentarily darkened in a Lear-like storm clearly sent by the god: but even this truly surprising fury was within the pattern of the whole, for Leontes spun across the stage in the crazy spiral of a wheel leaping from its axle. (This was the best moment in Donald Madden's fine performance.) Even the bear was within the circle of Apollo's style; no bearskins here, but rather Time with a golden bear-mask that was backed by a golden disc. (Here the stylization went a touch too far: the disc dwarfed the bear-mask to the extent that theatregoers unfamiliar with the plot may not have known what was threatening Antigonus.) The circle appeared most vividly, of course, in the doubling of mother with daughter. Maria Tucci, in a glowing performance, delicately distinguished the fresh sweetness of Perdita from the majesty and pathos of Hermione, but the fact that it was the same actress gave great strength to the pattern of the whole play. Doubling the roles is no new idea, but in this production, it was profoundly significant.

The costumes, like Time's branch, emphasized the growth within the pattern. The characters of the first three acts were entirely clad in white.... In Act IV, the rural folks appeared in tans, greens, and yellows, with Autolycus unique in russet. In Act V, the white robes of the Sicilian court were trimmed in dull grey, an appropriate sign of mourning that yet pointed forward, for the grey embroidery took the form of leafy vines. The fulfillment of the scheme lay in the robes of the statue, white with rich decoration of golden vines and fruits.⁵⁶

Certainly with these devices, some of them involving the divinity, Kahn must have represented the "governing idea" -- the vision -- successfully. Indeed Saccio in the Shakespeare

Quarterly and Clive Barnes of the New York Times⁵⁷ found the production a great success. Similarly in 1969 most reviewers made Nunn's production the object of their praise; and a comment of Ronald Bryden's may indicate one important reason why both these productions were so successful. In the Observer Bryden wrote that Nunn's production "threads together the disparate elements of Shakespeare's rambling romance ... on a line of consistent intelligence and sweet design."⁵⁸ Now of course everything in the production emanated from an inner vision: clearly, much of the "thread" of unity would have been the consistent representation of the inner vision. Therefore the constant representation of the inner vision was a contributing factor to the success of the production. Perhaps, then, more than usual success was achieved in both productions because this unity, a new dimension of unity for production of The Winter's Tale, was greater than the unity of effects that had been achieved, or could be achieved, under the existing tradition. As these productions were successful, the chances are other directors will venture to follow. And, if the inner vision does offer greater unity, would this not be an even better tradition for production of The Winter's Tale?

Notes to Chapter Four

¹ pp. 5-6.

² p. 7.

³ p. 1.

⁴ p. 14.

⁵ p. 15.

⁶ In the first chapter of The Wheel of Fire Knight used the term "reconstruction"; he used the word "recreation [sic]" synonymously in Principles of Shakespearian Production.

⁷ This term is from G. Wilson Knight, Principles of Shakespearian Production, p. 41.

⁸ G. Wilson Knight, Principles of Shakespearian Production, p. 37.

⁹ Ibid., p. 29.

¹⁰ p. vi. Knight added the "Prefatory Note" to The Wheel of Fire in 1947.

¹¹ Principles of Shakespearian Production, p. 49.

¹² Ibid., p. 50.

¹³ Ibid., p. 51.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 51-52.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 52.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 79. In Principles of Shakespearian Production, these words are italicized.

¹⁷ p. 232. This assertion underlies chapters 9, 10 and 11 of Styan.

¹⁸ pp. 177, 230. In the following discussion of Brook's productions of King Lear and A Midsummer Night's Dream I am indebted to Styan for his discussion of these productions in pp. 217-231.

¹⁹That is not to say that in his productions Brook followed Knight's interpretations of the plays. Rather he followed Knight's principle that a director must study the play first and then re-create it on the stage from the interpretation he feels is correct. Indeed, although the productions discussed in the remainder of this chapter are based upon interpretation, whether or not Knight would have approved of these productions is a matter for speculation. To begin with, there is a good chance he would not have agreed with the interpretation behind these productions. Also the productions discussed in the remainder of this chapter -- especially the productions of The Winter's Tale -- presented the viewer with a large amount of visual significance in the sets, and there is a chance Knight would have found this visual aspect unsuitable at times. In Principles of Shakespearian Production he wrote: "there is so much meaning in Shakespeare's text that if you load the eye with a new sort of independent visual significance, even though it have a parallel correspondence to the play's quality, the mind cannot take it all in. This is what happens. At first the visual details dominate the attention and you don't get the play, the eye always being a more restful medium than the intelligence; then after a while you take the set for granted, see it no more, and watch the action only. The first part of the performance is ruined, the second not improved. Moreover, it is likely that such an elaborate set will not properly fulfil its function of throwing up the figures and especially the faces of the actors. The designer will have been thinking of other things. The only sort of elaborately planned set that is possible would be one that is all the time reacting closely on the text, one that so interlocks with -- rather than runs parallel to -- the action and words that the audience are continually being forced by it, not to neglect them, but to attend with new interest and understanding." (p. 94).

²⁰p. 218.

²¹Charles Marowitz (Brook's assistant director in the production), quoted in Styan, p. 219.

²²Ibid.

²³Ibid.

- ²⁴Styan, p. 223.
- ²⁵Styan, p. 224.
- ²⁶Styan, p. 228.
- ²⁷Styan, pp. 228, 225.
- ²⁸Quoted in Styan, p. 224.
- ²⁹Styan, p. 229.
- ³⁰p. 229.
- ³¹p. 229.
- ³²Styan, p. 229.
- ³³Quoted in Styan, p. 229.
- ³⁴Quoted in Styan, p. 230.
- ³⁵p. 230.
- ³⁶"Time, that conspirator", Observer (May 18, 1969),
p. 27.
- ³⁷Peter Roberts, "The Winter's Tale", Plays and
Players, XVI (July, 1969), 32.
- ³⁸Ibid., 79.
- ³⁹Ibid.
- ⁴⁰Irving Wardle, The Times, in British Council Play
Bulletin [hereafter cited as BCPB] (April - June, 1969),
77.
- ⁴¹Ronald Bryden, "Time that conspirator", Observer
(May 18, 1969), p. 27.
- ⁴²Ibid.
- ⁴³John Barber, Daily Telegraph, in BCPB (April -
June, 1969), 76.

⁴⁴ It should be noted that, just as the Bohemian characters had the appearance of modern-day hippies, so the Sicilian characters wore costumes which at first struck "the onlooker as 'period' but which then... reminded him increasingly of swinging London's use of the uniforms of yesteryear as the trendiest outfit for living it up amongst the Chelsea set in the King's Road today." Peter Roberts, "The Winter's Tale", Plays and Players, XVI (July, 1969), 32.

⁴⁵ A twenty-page programme entitled RSC in The Winter's Tale was on sale before each performance.

⁴⁶ Also, following this comment in the programme was an account of the myth of Demeter, Persephone and Hades: "Persephone (also known as Proserpina, and invoked by that name by Perdita in the play) was abducted by Hades, the god of the underworld, who loved her. Her mother, Demeter (also known as Ceres) goddess of the cornfields, forbade all fruits and herbs to grow on the earth until her daughter was restored to her. Zeus persuaded Hades to relinquish Persephone on condition that she had not already tasted the food of the dead. It was found that Persephone had eaten seven pomegranate seeds, and a compromise was reached: Persephone would spend three months a year with Hades in the underworld, and the other nine with her mother in the cornfields." The time that Persephone must reign with Hades in the underworld represents the annual death of nature in winter, and the time she spends with her mother represents the rebirth of nature in spring and summer.

⁴⁷ Irving Wardle, The Times, in BCPB (April - June, 1969), 77.

⁴⁸ "Time, that conspirator", Observer (May 18, 1969), p. 27.

⁴⁹ In BCPB (April - June, 1969), 77.

⁵⁰ See pp.102-103, above.

⁵¹ The Times, in BCPB (April - June, 1969), 77.

⁵² "Time, that conspirator", Observer (May 18, 1969), p. 27.

⁵³In BCPB (April - June, 1969), 77.

⁵⁴"Stratford Sees Winter's Tale", New York Times (May 17, 1969), p. 18; in New York Times Theatre Reviews, VIII (1969-1970).

⁵⁵"1975 Season at Stratford Connecticut", Shakespeare Quarterly, XXVII (1976), 49.

⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 50-51.

⁵⁷"Stratford 'Winter's Tale' a Model of Style", New York Times (Aug. 1, 1975), p. 10.

⁵⁸"Time, that conspirator", Observer (May 18, 1969), p. 27.

THE WINTER'S TALE AT STRATFORD, ONTARIO

Every tradition in production of The Winter's Tale in the last 225 years has been discussed above. The important productions of the play given in England since 1750, and the important productions given in North America in this century, have been mentioned. However, there are two questions that should still be answered, and both concern the effect that directors achieved in the third section of the play in which the action is back in Sicilia. As productions of the play in the nineteenth century were dominated by an illusion of realism, this effect dominated the third section as well -- that is certain enough. Also, we have seen that Barker and Ames designed their productions to be romantic throughout. But, in the productions of the tradition currently reigning in which the Bohemia scenes have a different effect than the Sicilia scenes, what is the effect of the third section back in Sicilia? And with this section is unity of effects maintained? Unfortunately, for most of the productions that were in the new tradition information about the third section is not available. However, I have been able to find

the effect of the third section in both productions given at Stratford, Ontario. Numerous reviews are available, and I have talked with Douglas Campbell, the director of the production in 1958; Jack Hutt, the stage manager for Campbell's production; Ted Follows, who portrays Polixenes in the current production of Phillips and Moss; and Mervyn Blake, who portrayed the Old Shepherd for Campbell in 1958 and who portrays Time in the current production.¹ Also I was fortunate enough to see the current production.² A look at Campbell's production and at the production of Phillips and Moss will show effects that can be achieved in the third section and will indicate one way unity of effects can be maintained.

Although it provided a very enjoyable evening at the theatre some aspects of Campbell's production were not successful. The greatest fault in the production was the expansion of the role of Time. As well as delivering the lengthy speech of IV,i by which we "slide/O'er sixteen years" (IV,i, 5-6) George McCowan as Time was an observer on stage for almost the entire play. Time was heavily robed and was equipped with a book, a large hourglass³ and a scythe.⁴ Also in II,ii Time temporarily discarded his outer robe and doubled as the jailor, and he repeated the process for the

roles of the prosecutor in the trial scene and the Mariner in the storm scene of III,iii.⁵ Campbell felt that the movement through the three sections of the play suggested the movement of the seasons from death in winter to rebirth in spring and summer to harvest in autumn. The presence of Time on the stage was to act as an additional suggestion of the seasonal movement -- cycles of time --, and the suggestion of the seasons was to reinforce the effect of each section of the play. However those reviewers who mentioned the expanded role of Time did not connect this with the seasonal movement within the play. For example Joyce Goodman writing in the Hamilton Spectator simply concluded that Time "set the timelessness of the Shakespeare romance",⁶ and Herbert Whittaker wrote in the Globe and Mail that the reason for Campbell's "use of Father Time ... as chorus to the play ... was not easily apparent."⁷

Nevertheless, even though Time did not amplify the seasonal movement and reinforce the effect of each section of the play, the effects were still readily apparent. In the Bohemia scenes especially, the effect was strong and constant. Mervyn Blake explained that "Douglas is a master of comedy and the comic scenes naturally became the focal point for much of his direction": this production presented

a Bohemia of "English rustics, complete with rustic superstition and rustic humour." Indeed Herbert Whittaker wrote of the "two wonderful country bumpkins, Mervyn Blake as the good old shepherd, and Douglas Rain, as his simple, honest son."⁸ Also in this production Bruno Gerussi embroidered the role of Autolycus with an abundance of comic stage business. Gerussi's inventiveness in this respect prompted Arnold Edinborough, writing in the Shakespeare Quarterly, to call his Autolycus "an impudently resourceful characterization".⁹

Contrasting with the rustic-comedy effect achieved in the Bohemia scenes was a tragic effect in the Sicilia scenes. Joyce Goodman called the Sicilia section of this production a "heavy tragic beginning";¹⁰ and she indicated that Christopher Plummer as Leontes conveyed the final, fully-developed tragic effect, very well:

When he realized -- too late -- his wife's innocence, Plummer struck the pit of self-abasement and moved onto a plane of finely wrought tragedy.¹¹

Further, Jack Hutt recalled that the entire section of the play was "emotionally charged" and that especially Plummer "was a fiery Leontes". Also he explained that the setting of, for example, "huge bowls of fruit and horns of plenty" suited the spirited atmosphere created by the actors in this

section. The costumes too reinforced the spirited yet tragic effect created by the actors. Campbell explained that the costumes (designed by Tanya Moiseivitsch after the manner of Rubens, the Flemish painter) were "showy but dark": and this is verified by Goodman's description in the Hamilton Spectator of "royal figures" dressed in "heavily draped scarlets, purples, golds with ornate bronzed ornaments".¹²

At this point it should be noted that the juxtaposition of the spirited-tragic effect of the first section with the rustic-comedy effect of the Bohemia scenes bothered some reviewers. Perhaps these effects combined in a less than pleasing way. However if, with this juxtaposition, unity of effects was in peril it was reclaimed by the splendid way in which the effect of the third section balanced the effect of the first section. In this production the overall impression from the third section was dictated by the effect of the statue scene; and Jack Hutt explained that the scene was given a "very emotional" rendering. Mervyn Blake too recalled that "the scene was joyful. There was a great joy at the end." Just as the initial Sicilia scenes offered a spirited-tragic effect so in the final section the characters were ebullient in their joy. And in the final scene the joyful effect was reinforced visually

by the costumes -- particularly the brilliant orange gown worn by Perdita. If a production of The Winter's Tale is to present tragedy in the first section which is emotionally charged, surely the production will only be balanced if in the final scene of the third section the characters show an equal amount of spirit in their joy. In this respect Campbell achieved unity of effects. Considering the current production of The Winter's Tale at Stratford, Ontario will show that the directors, Phillips and Moss, have, with slightly different effects, achieved a similar balance.

In the production of The Winter's Tale co-directed by Robin Phillips and Peter Moss the effect of the first section is tragic. Although Leontes' jealousy and accusations against Hermione are clearly wrong, the Leontes portrayed by Brian Bedford is a character that one feels for nevertheless, and his state at the end of the trial scene, a thoroughly broken man, is tragic indeed. Also, as Ted Follows explained, in this production "Leontes is of middle age: Leontes' jealousy is not a youthful transgression against a youthful wife who has years of child bearing remaining, but a definite sickness of a middle-aged man." Thus the tragedy is heightened because Leontes is destroying that middle-age "segment of their life" that should be stable

and happy. And indeed the Hermione portrayed by Margot Dionne is worthy of a stable, happy life. She is honourable in every sense of the word and bears Leontes' accusations with the proper blend of strength and forgiveness.

Throughout the section, and especially near the end of the trial scene when she is still forgiving though her strength has partly turned to despair, Hermione is a tragic figure.

In the first section, then, tragedy reigns. However, it is not the spirited-tragic effect of Campbell's production. The current production is set in the nineteenth century and the heavy wool suits worn by the men, a heavy fur affair worn by Paulina, as well as the resemblance of Bedford's Leontes to Nicholas II, suggest that the locale is nineteenth-century Russia. Thus all the characters of the Sicilia scenes, even Leontes in his madness, are under the restraints of nineteenth-century ideals of behaviour. Of course the jealousy of Leontes is not in accord with ideals of behaviour for any era. But Bedford does show that the superficial aspects of Leontes' behaviour -- how he speaks and moves -- are largely determined by the inner conflict of his mad jealousy with his Victorian understanding of the proper way to act. Occasionally, for an instant or two, the mad rage wins out. For example, at the moment in II,iii when Leontes

charges his Lords to remove Paulina from the room -- "On your allegiance, / Out of the chamber with her! ... Away with her!" (II,iii, 120-123) -- he suddenly lunges at Paulina as if to perform the task himself. Rebuffed by the calm way that Paulina, portrayed by Martha Henry, says "I pray you, do not push me" (II,iii 124) Leontes retreats, reddens, and packs his shirt cuffs back into the sleeves of his suit.

However, for most of the first section Leontes' Victorian self-control keeps him from such wild behaviour. His shirt cuffs remain in his suit, and though his speech is forceful it is not wild. And the behaviour of the other characters is Victorian in every way.¹³ Thus, whereas in Campbell's production the Sicilia scenes had a spirited-tragic effect, here the effect from the characters is both tragic and subdued. And this effect is reinforced visually by the dark heavy suits of the men, by the gowns of the women, and by the few articles of setting used. For example, the play begins at a court party with the King and Queen, Lords and Ladies, waltzing to the strain of a rather sombre tune, and the range of colour extends from the black suits of the men, to the grey, soft green or brown gowns of the Ladies of the court, to the dull blue-green of an arrangement

of palm leaves behind, to the white of Hermione's gown. Moreover, here the subdued quality which will accompany the ensuing tragedy is perhaps established best of all by the stiff movement of the waltz.

Whereas the Bohemia section of Campbell's production had an effect of rustic English comedy, in the Bohemia scenes of the current production comedy is stressed less and rustic England not at all. The Bohemia in the production by Phillips and Moss is simply a pastoral world, and the success of this section of the play rests upon the enchanting nature of everything presented. The comedy provided by the Shepherds and Shepherdesses, and particularly by Lewis Gordon as the Old Shepherd and Tom Wood as his son, springs from a charming innocence rather than from rustic England. And here it is the innocence in their behaviour which makes a lasting impression. Further, Graeme Campbell as Autolycus is a delightful "snapper-up of unconsidered trifles", collecting purses and singing songs with roguish finesse; but he indulges in much less comic stage business than did Bruno Gerussi in 1958. Graeme Campbell's performance does offer comic moments, to be sure, but even here our feeling of enchantment with Autolycus and with the entire Bohemian pastoral world overshadows the comic effect. By far the

most enchanting characters in the pastoral world are Perdita, played by Marti Maraden, and Florizel, played by Stewart Arnott. At times Perdita, dressed in orange and white, and Florizel in shepherd's attire fill the stage with liveliness and an equally buoyant innocent passion.

Thus the Bohemia scenes in the current production have an enchanting, pastoral effect. The final section of this production is characterized by a mingling of opposite effects for a combined effect that Mervyn Blake called "bitter-sweet". In the first half of V,i Paulina takes every opportunity to remind Leontes of his mistakes sixteen years before. Here Martha Henry's Paulina and Brian Bedford's Leontes -- who is obviously uneasy from sixteen years of similar nagging from Paulina -- provide mild comedy. Yet this action has a tragic effect as well. For example, when Paulina mentions Mamillius, Leontes, by now fully exasperated, pleads with Paulina not to do so again: "Prithee, no more; cease; thou know'st/ He dies to me again, when talk'd of" (V,i, 118-119). Here, while the exasperation in Leontes' plea is comic, his lingering sorrow from Mamillius' death is tragic. This mingling of opposite effects continues when Florizel and Perdita arrive in the second half of the scene. Leontes is gladdened by the sight of them but

disturbed by the memories they invoke.

In V,ii the news that the king has recovered his lost daughter is related by soldiers and gentlemen who appear to be lounging in a men's club. Here some of the men are jubilant; but others deliver or accept the news with the studied nonchalance that was fashionable in the nineteenth century. Jubilance and nonchalance are opposites, and the effect is again bitter-sweet. And the bitter-sweet effect continues in the statue scene which follows. In this scene, because Leontes is reunited with Hermione, the action could touch the outer limits of joy. Indeed the scene was played this way in Campbell's production. However Ted Follows explained that in the current production the "easy solution" in which Leontes and Hermione are, again, happily together, has "purposely been kept out." To begin with, after she has responded to Paulina's command, "'Tis time; descend; be stone no more ... Come!... nay, come away" (V,iii,99-101), Hermione, and Leontes too, appear more shocked than joyful. In this final action of the play the embrace indicated in the text -- "She embraces him!/She hangs around his neck!" (V,iii, 111-112) -- has, along with the textual indication, been dropped, and there is very little interaction of any kind between Hermione and Leontes. Thus, as Follows pointed

out, the joy in the final scene is not complete: while the union of Leontes and Hermione is joyous, both realize "they will never entirely recover what is lost, and they will need to go slowly with one another." The bitter-sweet effect from this mingling of tragedy with joy receives additional emphasis from the solemn joy of Perdita, Paulina and the other characters. And the extent of the joy is emphasized by the costumes. Hermione's gown, for example, is radiant but silver-grey in colour, and Perdita's gown is off-white. Also, in this production Leontes does not unite Paulina with Camillo, and again this emphasizes that the tragedy of sixteen years ago cannot be mended completely.

Those who view the current production will certainly agree that unity of effects is achieved. The subdued-tragic effect of the first section, the enchanting, pastoral effect of the second section, and the bitter-sweet effect of the third section combine like the movements of a symphony. Also it appears that, like Campbell in 1958, Phillips and Moss have taken care to achieve a balance between the two Sicilia sections. In fact, though the effect of the Bohemia scenes blends nicely with the effects of the other sections, it is through this balance between the two Sicilia sections that the strongest impression of unity of effects is created.

The bitter-sweet effect of the third section is achieved largely through a mingling of tragedy with joy: essentially, the effect is one of "dampered" joy. The balance, then, is two faceted. First, quite simply, as opposites tragedy and joy balance well. Secondly, the similarity between the subdued quality of the tragedy and the dampered quality of the joy provides a strain of uniformity throughout the two sections. Likewise, in Campbell's production uniformity throughout the two sections was provided by the ebullient quality, and again joy balanced tragedy. Thus, in both productions the director(s) balanced the effect of the first section with the effect of the last section so that the two sections are both opposed and connected; and this renders a very pleasing unity: the viewer moves from experiencing the tragedy in the first section to experiencing the joy in the last, and, since the two sensations are connected by a uniform strain it is as if the second effect grew out of the first.

Hard and fast conclusions about production of The Winter's Tale cannot be made by comparing only two productions. However, this comparison indicates that, if a production of The Winter's Tale is to achieve strong unity of effects, a balance between the two Sicilia sections is one requirement the director must meet; and one method,

demonstrated by Campbell, and by Phillips and Moss, is to oppose tragedy with joy and to provide a uniform quality connecting the two effects.

Notes to Chapter Five

¹ I spoke with Douglas Campbell on September 22, 1978 at Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario, and with Jack Hutt, Ted Follows and Mervyn Blake on July 29, 1978 at Stratford, Ontario.

² The production by Phillips and Moss began on June 8, 1978 and is showing until September 19, 1978.

³ Joyce Goodman, "Stratford Premieres a Slow Winter's Tale", Hamilton Spectator (July 22, 1958), p. 2.

⁴ Sydney Johnson, "'The Winter's Tale'", Montreal Star (July 22, 1958), p. 6.

⁵ Herbert Whittaker, "Stratford Again Matches Own High Standard", Globe and Mail (July 22, 1958), p. 8.

⁶ "Stratford Premieres a Slow Winter's Tale", Hamilton Spectator (July 22, 1958), p. 2.

⁷ "Stratford Again Matches Own High Standard", Globe and Mail (July 22, 1958), p. 8.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ "A Lively Season at Canada's Stratford", Shakespeare Quarterly, IX (1958), 537.

¹⁰ "Stratford Premieres a Slow Winter's Tale", Hamilton Spectator (July 22, 1958), p. 1.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 2.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Perhaps this should not be said of Paulina in II,iii and in the last part of the trial scene. A woman reproaching a King and his Lords is not typically Victorian.

CONCLUSION

Thus, production of The Winter's Tale has changed substantially. In the nineteenth century managers aimed for visual realism, and to achieve this effect in production of The Winter's Tale they adorned the play with lavish and realistic sets, costumes and stage effects. In the twentieth century directors of The Winter's Tale have discarded visual realism and have tried to gain an effect, or effects, appropriate for the play. And recently there seems to be the beginnings of a further development in which directors of The Winter's Tale study the play to find the vision at its core; and they re-create the play on the stage from their understanding of this inner vision. It is true that, in one way, production of The Winter's Tale has come full circle: managers of the nineteenth century, and Nunn and Kahn -- the two, present-day directors who have re-created the play from an inner vision --, relied heavily in their productions of the play upon the visual impression from sets and costumes. However, the managers of the nineteenth century automatically aimed for visual illusion and examined the text of The Winter's Tale merely

to find what period and place their sets and costumes should represent. Nunn and Kahn, on the other hand, studied the text to find how every aspect of the production, including the sets and the costumes, should be done. Whereas the visual display of nineteenth-century managers was based upon indications in the text of place and time, the visual display of Nunn and Kahn was based upon what they sensed was the essence of the play.

Clearly, the route that production of The Winter's Tale has taken in the twentieth century shows that, more and more, directors are using the text as the key to understanding how the play should be performed on the stage. Further, this ever-increasing regard for Shakespeare's text has been the trend in all Shakespeare productions. And, if achieving proper effects in productions of his plays is the right goal, this development seems to be healthy: what better way to locate appropriate effects for a play than to examine the text from which a production germinates?

Indeed, taking this vantage point appears to show that, with productions such as A Midsummer Night's Dream by Brook and The Winter's Tale by Nunn, we are finally staging Shakespeare's plays in the best possible way. After all, if examining the text is the key, Knight's method of

interpretation seems to allow the closest possible understanding of it. However it is here that we should be wary. During the period of 225 years covered in this study managers, directors, actors and spectators have always believed their manner of staging Shakespeare to be the correct one. For example, G. R. Foss was such a staunch believer in realistic Shakespeare that, even after its decline, he felt that the demand for realistic illusion in Shakespeare production would soon return. In What the Author Meant (1932) he warned the reader,

But when... natural scenery and beautiful elocution is once again in demand, will the producer of the future find any scenic artist capable of painting a landscape, or any actor able to speak blank verse? Will these talents have joined the limbo of Lost Arts?¹

Of course visual illusion did not reappear in Shakespeare production; and, because we now believe that visual illusion is inappropriate for poetic drama, a return to realistic Shakespeare is unlikely. Foss was a product of his age; and we are products of ours. The understanding we have of our own theatre is necessarily clouded. But we can see clearly enough to state with reasonable certainty that we have made progress along the proper road. If there is still a distance to travel, Shakespeare production will be all the better.

Notes to Conclusion

¹p. 140.

PRODUCTIONS OF THE WINTER'S TALE DISCUSSED

<u>Manager or Director</u>	<u>Theatre and City</u>	<u>Opening Night</u>
David Garrick	Drury Lane Theatre, London	Jan. 21, 1756
John Kemble	Covent Garden Theatre, London	Nov., 1811
William Maccready	Covent Garden Theatre, London	Sept. 30, 1837
Samuel Phelps	Sadler's Wells Theatre, London	Nov. 19, 1845
Charles Kean	Princess' Theatre, London	April 28, 1856
Mary Anderson	Lyceum Theatre, London	Sept. 10, 1887
Winthrop Ames	New Theatre, New York	April, 1910
Harley Granville- Barker	Savoy Theatre, London	Sept. 21, 1912
Harcourt Williams	Old Vic Theatre, London	Jan., 1933
Michael MacOwan	Old Vic Theatre, London	March, 1936
B. Iden-Payne and Romney Brent	Cort Theatre, New York	Jan. 15, 1946
Peter Brook	Phoenix Theatre, London	June 27, 1951
Douglas Campbell	Festival Theatre, Stratford, Ontario	July 21, 1958
John Houseman and Jack Landau	Shakespeare Festival, Stratford, Connecticut	July, 1958

<u>Manager or Director</u>	<u>Theatre and City</u>	<u>Opening Night</u>
Peter Wood	Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford- upon-Avon	Aug. 30, 1960
Trevor Nunn	Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford- upon-Avon	May 15, 1969
Audrey Stanley	Oregon Shakespeare Festival, Ashland, Oregon	June 22, 1975
Michael Kahn	Shakespeare Festival, Stratford, Connecticut	July 30, 1975
Robin Phillips and Peter Moss	Festival Theatre, Stratford, Ontario	June 8, 1978

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Listed in this Bibliography are the books, pamphlets, and the articles in periodicals or newspapers, that I have drawn from in the text or in the notes. In the cases where I have cited from an article or statement that I found quoted in a book (as indicated in the footnotes) only the book is listed.

1. Books and Pamphlets

- Foss, G. R. What the Author Meant. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- Frye, Northrop. A Natural Perspective. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1965.
- Garrick, David. Florizel and Perdita. London: Cornmarket Press, 1969. A facsimile based upon the copy in the Birmingham Shakespeare Library.
- Granville-Barker, Harley. More Prefaces to Shakespeare. Edited by Edward M. Moore. Princeton, 1974.
- James, D. G. Scepticism and Poetry. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1937.
- Johnson, Samuel. The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson: vol. VII, Johnson on Shakespeare. Edited by Arthur Sherbo. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Knight, G. Wilson. Myth and Miracle: An Essay on the Mystic Symbolism of Shakespeare. London: Ed. J. Burrow & Co. Ltd., 1929.
- _____. Principles of Shakespearian Production. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1936.
- _____. The Wheel of Fire. London: Butler and Tanner Ltd., 1959. Originally published by the Oxford University Press in 1930.

- Merchant, W. Moelwyn. Shakespeare and the Artist. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Nicoll, Allardyce. British Drama. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1963.
- Odell, George C. D. Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving. 2 vols. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1966. Originally published by Charles Scribner's Sons in 1920.
- Pafford, J. H. P. "Introduction", in J. H. P. Pafford ed., The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare: The Winter's Tale. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1976.
- Poel, William. Shakespeare in the Theatre. London and Toronto: Sidgwick and Jackson, Ltd., 1913.
- Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur. Notes on Shakespeare's Workmanship. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1917.
- RSC in The Winter's Tale. Royal Shakespeare Company Publications, 1969.
- Styan, J. L. The Shakespeare Revolution: Criticism and Performance in the Twentieth Century. Cambridge, 1977.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. Shakespeare's Last Plays. London: Chatto and Windus, 1958. Originally published in 1938.
- Trewin, J. C. Shakespeare on the English Stage: 1900-1964. London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1964.
- Van Doren, Mark. Shakespeare. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1939.

2. Articles in Periodicals or Newspapers

- "At the play. 'The Winter's Tale'", Punch CXLIII (July-Dec., 1912), 280-281.
- Atkinson, Brooks. "Stratford 'Winter's Tale' a Model of Style", New York Times (Aug. 1, 1975), p. 10.
- _____. "Theatre: Winter's Tale", New York Times (July 21, 1958), p. 17.

- Barber, John. Daily Telegraph, in British Council Play Bulletin (April - June, 1969), 75-76.
- "Barkerized Shakespeare", Daily Mail (London, Sept. 23, 1912), p. 5.
- Bryden, Ronald. "Time, that conspirator", Observer (London, May 18, 1969), p. 27.
- Byrne, M. St. Clare. "Fifty Years of Shakespearian Production: 1898-1948", Shakespeare Survey, II (1949), 1-21.
- Chapman, John. "The Guild's Shakespeare Troupe Starts Off with 'Winter's Tale'", Daily News, in New York Theatre Critics' Reviews, VII (1946), 488.
- Dessen, A.C. "Oregon Shakespearean Festival, 1975", Shakespeare Quarterly, XXVII (1976), 83-93.
- "The Drama", Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, LXXIX (Jan.-June, 1856), 209-231.
- "Echoes from Broadway", Theatre World, XLII (March, 1946), 27-28, 30.
- Edinborough, Arnold. "A Lively Season at Canada's Stratford", Shakespeare Quarterly, IX (1958), 535-538.
- Goodman, Joyce. "Stratford Premieres a Slow Winter's Tale", Hamilton Spectator (July 22, 1958), p. 2.
- Granville-Barker, Harley. "Shakespeare and Modern Stagecraft", Yale Review XV (1925-1926), 703-724.
- Guernsey, Otis Jr. "Cold Night for the Bard", Herald Tribune, in New York Theatre Critics' Reviews, VII (1946), 488.
- "His Majesty's Theatre. The Two Gentlemen of Verona", The Times (April 21, 1910), p. 12.
- "In the Manner of Shakespeare's Time", Outlook, XCIV (Jan.-April, 1910), 784-785.
- Johnson, Sydney. "'The Winter's Tale'", Montreal Star (July 22, 1958), p. 6.

Klauber, Adolph. "Saving Time on Shakespeare", New York Times (April 3, 1910), section 6, p. 8; in New York Times Theatre Reviews (1904-1911).

Konody, P. G. "The Artist's Point of View. 'Immeasurably Finer than Reinhardt'", Observer (London, Sept. 29, 1912), p. 9.

Kronenberger, Louis. "When the Bard Went Bohemian", PM Exclusive, in New York Theatre Critics' Reviews, VII (1946), 488.

Linton, Calvin D. "Trends in Shakespearian Staging", English Literary History, VI-VII (1939-1940), 300-323.

Martin, Helena Faucit. "Shakespeare's Women, by One Who Has Impersonated Them. Hermione.", Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CXLIX (Jan.-June, 1891), 1-37.

Masefield, John. "Mr. Granville-Barker's Production", The Times (Sept. 27, 1912), p. 7.

"Mr. Kean's Winter's Tale", Punch, XXX (Jan.-June, 1856), 198-199.

"New Theatre", Theatre Magazine, I (1910), 133, xxv.

"Old Vic. 'The Winter's Tale'", The Times (March 18, 1936), p. 12.

Peyton, Ambrose. "Shakespeare's Bohemia", Pall Mall Gazette (London, Sept. 24, 1912), p. 4.

"Princess's", Athenaeum (Jan.-June, 1856), 561.

"Princess's Theatre", The Times (May 1, 1856), p. 11.

Rescoe, Burton. "'The Winter's Tale' Takes Its Place with Bard's Best", New York World Telegram, in New York Theatre Critics' Reviews, VII (1946), 487.

"Revival of The Winter's Tale", Bell's Weekly Messenger (1811), 381.

Roberts, Peter. "The Winter's Tale", Plays and Players, VII (May, 1960), 15-16.

- _____. "The Winter's Tale", Plays and Players, XVI (July, 1969), 30-33.
- Saccio, Peter. "1975 Season at Stratford Connecticut", Shakespeare Quarterly, XXVII (1976), 47-51.
- "Sadler's Wells", Athenaeum (1845), 1180.
- "Sadler's Wells Theatre", The Times (Nov. 28, 1845), p. 4.
- "The Savoy Theatre. A New Interpretation of Shakespeare", Pall Mall Gazette (London, Sept. 23, 1912), p. 5.
- "Shakespeare at the Savoy. 'The Winter's Tale'", Observer (London, Sept. 22, 1912), p. 9.
- "Shakespeare under Shakespearian Conditions", The Times (Nov. 11, 1893), p. 4.
- Skinner, Henrietta. "Shakespeare's Bohemia", Pall Mall Gazette (London, Sept. 23, 1912), p. 4.
- "Stage-Setting Reform. Mr. Gordon Craig's Models for 'Hamlet'", Daily Mail (London, Sept. 10, 1912), p. 5.
- "Talk of the Town", Pall Mall Gazette (London, Sept. 21, 1912), p. 1.
- "A Very Pretty Tale by Anderson", Punch, XCIII (July - Dec., 1887), 124.
- Wardle, Irving. "Stratford Sees Winter's Tale", New York Times (May 17, 1969), p. 18; in New York Times Theatre Reviews, VIII (1969-1970).
- _____. The Times, in British Council Play Bulletin (April-June, 1969), 77.
- Whittaker, Herbert. "Stratford Again Matches Own High Standard", Globe and Mail (Toronto, July 22, 1958), p. 8.
- "A Winter's Tale", New Statesman and Nation, V (Jan. - June, 1933), 131.
- "The Winter's Tale", Observer (London, Jan. 29, 1933), p. 11.

"The 'Winter's Tale' at the Lyceum", Illustrated London News, XCI (July-Dec., 1887), 332.

"The Winter's Tale' at the Old Vic", New Statesman and Nation, XI (Jan.-June, 1936), 494.

"The Winter's Tale' at the Savoy", Nation VC (July - Dec., 1912), 438-440.

"The Winter's Tale' at the Savoy", Spectator, CIX (July - Dec., 1912), 450-451.

Wyatt, Euphemia Van Rensselaer. "Review of the Season: 1957-1958", Catholic World, CLXXXVIII (Oct., 1958), 66-69.