

ENGLISH DRAMA

(excluding Shakespeare)

Select Bibliographical
Guides

Edited by
Stanley Wells

The Study of Drama

Medieval Drama

Tudor and Early
Elizabethan Drama

Marlowe

Jonson and Chapman

Marston, Middleton,
and Massinger

Beaumont and Fletcher
Heywood, and Dekker

Webster, Tourneur,
and Ford

The Court Masque

Davenant, Dryden, Lee
and Otway

&c

ENGLISH DRAMA
(excluding Shakespeare)
Select Bibliographical Guides

Edited by STANLEY WELLS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1975

Oxford University Press, Ely House, London, W.1

GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON
CAPE TOWN IBADAN NAIROBI DAR ES SALAAM LUSAKA ADDIS ABABA
DELHI BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS KARACHI LAHORE DACCA
KUALA LUMPUR SINGAPORE HONG KONG TOKYO

PAPERBACK ISBN 0 19 8710283

CASEBOUND ISBN 0 19 8710348

© OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1975

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without
the prior permission of Oxford University Press*

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY RICHARD CLAY (THE CHAUCER PRESS), LTD
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK

listed in the catalogues *Paperbacks in Print* (U.K.) and *Paperbound Books in Print* (U.S.A.). In the earlier chapters it has usually been possible to recommend collected editions of a dramatist's work, along with individually edited texts of his more important plays. For the relatively compact Irish school, extensive bibliographies are given. Elsewhere, dramatists' work has had to be selectively represented; no attempt is made to list the constantly increasing output of plays from the living dramatists mentioned in the final chapter. Fuller lists of both primary and secondary material are given in, for example, the *New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, edited by George Watson (vol. 1, 600-1660, Cambridge, 1974; vol. 2, 1660-1800, Cambridge, 1971; vol. 3, 1800-1900, Cambridge, 1969; vol. 4, 1900-1950, Cambridge, 1972).

Readers of this volume will probably not need to be reminded that theatrical experience is fundamental to the study of drama.

S.W.W.

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are used in the References:

AUMLA	<i>AUMLA: Journal of the Australasian Universities' Language and Literature Association</i>
EETS	Early English Text Society
ELH	<i>ELH: A Journal of English Literary History</i>
ES	<i>English Studies</i>
HLQ	<i>Huntington Library Quarterly</i>
JEGP	<i>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</i>
MLN	<i>Modern Language Notes</i>
MLQ	<i>Modern Language Quarterly</i>
MLR	<i>Modern Language Review</i>
MP	<i>Modern Philology</i>
N & Q	<i>Notes and Queries</i>
PMLA	<i>Publications of the Modern Language Association of America</i>
PQ	<i>Philological Quarterly</i>
RES	<i>Review of English Studies</i>
Ren. Dr.	<i>Renaissance Drama</i>
SEL	<i>Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900</i>
SP	<i>Studies in Philology</i>
TLS	<i>Times Literary Supplement</i>

CONTENTS

Introduction	vii
Abbreviations	ix
1. The Study of Drama <i>by Peter Thomson</i>	i
2. Medieval Drama <i>by John Leyerle</i>	19
3. Tudor and Early Elizabethan Drama <i>by T. W. Craik</i>	29
4. Marlowe <i>by D. J. Palmer</i>	42
5. Jonson and Chapman <i>by J. B. Bamborough</i>	54
6. Marston, Middleton, and Massinger <i>by S. Schoenbaum</i>	69
7. Beaumont and Fletcher, Heywood, and Dekker <i>by Michael Taylor</i>	100
8. Webster, Tourneur, and Ford <i>by Inga-Stina Ewbank</i>	113
9. The Court Masque <i>by K. M. Lea</i>	134
10. Davenant, Dryden, Lee, and Otway <i>by H. Neville Davies</i>	150
11. Etherege, Shadwell, Wycherley, Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Farquhar <i>by John Barnard</i>	173
12. Gay, Goldsmith, Sheridan, and Other Eighteenth-century Dramatists <i>by Cecil Price</i>	199
13. Nineteenth-century Drama <i>by Michael R. Booth</i>	213
14. Shaw <i>by Margery M. Morgan</i>	231
15. The Irish School <i>by Ann Saddlemyer</i>	248
16. English Drama 1900-1945 <i>by Allardyce Nicoll</i>	268
17. English Drama since 1945 <i>by John Russell Brown</i>	290
Notes on the Contributors	299
Index	301

1. THE STUDY OF DRAMA

PETER THOMSON

DRAMATIC THEORY

Drama and Theatre

For most students of English Literature, a curiosity about drama begins with the *reading* of plays. They are already unwittingly involved in a dilemma. What, after all, is a play? Is it, like a novel, complete on the page? Or is it, like a musical score, inadequate until realized in performance? Stanley Wells confronts the question with useful directness in *Literature and Drama*. His conclusion, that 'however intangible, the potential theatrical effect of a play is part of its significance', is cautious; more cautious, certainly, than George Hauger's in an essay on 'Theatre in General'. Hauger distinguishes between the performed *play* and the written *script*, affirming that 'a script is written in order that it may result in a play, hence it must be realisable in theatrical terms, it must be playable.' The essay, written with concealed craft, is calculated to offend those who group plays exclusively with other literary kinds. Hauger is prepared to group them rather with operas and ballets. S. W. Dawson, the author of *Drama and the Dramatic*, would be among the offended. 'No one', he imagines, 'would be disposed to question that the novel has been, at least for the last hundred years, the major literary form; there might be protests at the claim that it has been the major dramatic form, though this conclusion is difficult to avoid.' The conclusion, on the contrary, is easily avoidable, but Dawson's short book is an original and lucid product of a literary approach to plays. Literary scholars like Dawson look often to poems and novels for a clearer definition of dramatic terms. J. L. Styan has tried, in *The Dramatic Experience*, to describe ways of reading a play that will take into account the missing theatrical experience. This is an erratic book, rather patronizingly illustrated by David Gentleman, and marred by Styan's extravagant trust in dramatic structure ('Like a good car, a good play matches the shape of the vehicle to the power of the engine'), but it is enlivened by an obvious delight in drama, by a bold attempt to present its ideas pictorially, and by the provision of a suggested notation for dramatic speech.

General Studies

Styan is sensitive to the significance of *time* in plays. A play, unlike a novel, is always imminent, never complete. Susanne Langer makes the point brilliantly in a remarkable chapter of *Feeling and Form*.

It has been said repeatedly that the theater creates a perpetual present moment, but it is only a present filled with its own future that is really dramatic. A sheer immediacy, an imperishable direct experience without the ominous forward movement of consequential action, would not be so. As literature creates a virtual past, drama creates a virtual future. The literary mode is the mode of Memory; the dramatic is the mode of Destiny.

Mrs. Langer is primarily concerned with the nature of dramatic illusion, but her explorations contribute economically to an understanding of the whole dramatic mode. Ronald Peacock's *The Art of Drama* also seeks to distinguish the drama from other art forms. This is a methodical book, more successful in establishing the affinities of drama and other arts than in illuminating the essentially dramatic. It seems to me dangerously remote from the theatre, but in this too it is representative of aesthetic studies of the drama.

Several books, accepting the separateness of drama as a form, analyse its component parts. Allardyce Nicoll's *The Theatre and Dramatic Theory* includes a provocative chapter on dramatic dialogue, but his discussion of the genres is disappointingly ponderous, particularly by comparison with their treatment in Eric Bentley's *The Life of the Drama*. The second part of Bentley's stylish book revitalizes the critical relationship of melodrama to tragedy and of farce to comedy, and the concluding chapter emphasizes the growing significance of tragi-comedy. 'Comedy now,' he concludes, 'when serious, tends in general towards the tragi-comic'—a thesis intelligently strengthened by J. L. Styan's study of *The Dark Comedy*. The first part of Bentley's book treats of particular aspects of a play; plot, character, dialogue, thought, and enactment. The selection of a play's aspects for detailed treatment also characterizes J. L. Styan's lively analysis of *The Elements of Drama*, but where Bentley probes the organism Styan is content to expose the mechanism. Both writers are at ease in the theatre, and these two books together provide an excellent theoretical background to the study of plays.

Certain more specialized studies contain implicit theories of the drama. The view that drama aspires essentially to the accurate representation of 'real' life had a long run, and was at its height in 1923 when William Archer could not believe 'that Robertsonian realism, as it has been perfected by his successors, will ever be

entirely ousted from the position it now holds'. Archer's confidence survived Strindberg and the triumphant phase of German Expressionism, largely as a result of his careful misreading of Ibsen and Shaw, but his theory did not. The widening of dramatic concepts to accommodate the predominantly European developments in the writing of plays can be seen in a number of modern studies. The first essay in Eric Bentley's early work *The Playwright as Thinker* (retitled in England, perhaps because thinking in the theatre was felt here to be unpopular or impolite, *The Modern Theatre*) identifies two traditions in twentieth-century drama, one wedded to the 'slice-of-life' theory and the other explicitly opposed to it. Raymond Williams, in *Drama from Ibsen to Brecht* and in the less fruitful *Modern Tragedy*, sets about defining the new conventions and 'structures of feeling' that followed the revolutionary determination 'to confront the human drama in its immediate setting, without reference to "outside" forces and powers'. This critical awareness of a crucial shift in the fortunes of drama coincident with and partly dependent on the plays of Ibsen was given its first important airing in Shaw's *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* (1891). Since then it has bolstered most accounts of the development of the drama. One of the most interesting, Robert Brustein's *The Theatre of Revolt*, begins, like *The Playwright as Thinker*, with an antithesis:

By theatre of communion, I mean the theatre of the past, dominated by Sophocles, Shakespeare, and Racine, where traditional myths were enacted before an audience of believers against the background of a shifting but still coherent universe. By theatre of revolt, I mean the theatre of the great insurgent modern dramatists, where myths of rebellion are enacted before a dwindling number of spectators in a flux of vacancy, bafflement, and accident.

A similar antithesis underlies a fluently contentious book by George Steiner, for whom the passing of a theatre of communion constitutes *The Death of Tragedy*. Steiner ranges round world drama like a major shareholder in the gift of tongues, and the thesis is triter than the accomplishments of the writing lead one to expect. Brustein seems, by contrast, single-minded, although *The Theatre of Revolt* is in fact composed of separate essays on eight dramatists from Ibsen to Genet, and the book's semblance of unity something of a contrivance. However, Brustein is less likely than Steiner and Williams to drown the playwright's own voice, which can be heard more directly in Toby Cole's well-managed anthology of *Playwrights on Playwriting*. There is of course a good deal of special pleading in the dramatic

theories of practising dramatists, and only a few can be accounted major contributors. Granville-Barker (in *On Dramatic Method*) is one, and T. S. Eliot another. John Whiting's occasional pieces, conveniently collected in *John Whiting on Theatre* and *The Art of the Dramatist*, are an evident response to the plight of the dramatist amid emptying theatres, a dilemma which also affects the sharp, scattered prefaces to the published plays of John Arden and Edward Bond.

The Origins of Drama

At the beginning of the twentieth century the work of the Cambridge Anthropologists was giving new currency to the idea that drama is an antecedent as well as a branch of the arts. The debt of Greek drama to ancient ritual and its subsequent implication in the whole of Greek culture are a theme of, for example, Jane Harrison's *Ancient Art and Ritual*. Later critics have sometimes been prepared naively to assume a smooth and gradual passage from ancient ritual to the spoken drama, but the general lines of development are fairly well established. Hunnigher presents them in *The Origin of the Theatre*, and Francis Fergusson, in his influential book *The Idea of a Theater*, develops from them an argument for the centrality of the drama. Fergusson is in search of 'that dramatic art which, in all real plays, underlies the more highly evolved arts of language'. He finds it through a very complex deployment of the Aristotelean term, *action*, not the whole plot nor the individual events, but 'the focus or aim of psychic life from which the events, in that situation, result'. It is Fergusson's view that through the histrionic sensibility a great dramatist or a sensitive audience will perceive the play's action directly ('before all predication'), even when that action is incapable of precise definition. He illustrates the argument by analysing two outstanding successes, *Oedipus Rex* and *Hamlet*, and two outstanding failures, *Bérénice* and *Tristan und Isolde*. It is a defect of *The Idea of a Theater* that some of its explanations need to be explained. The same is true of Lionel Abel's almost equally ambitious *Metatheatre*, which is, in a sense, an extended application of Fergusson's comments on the histrionic sensibility. Abel and Fergusson are immensely talented critics who lack an ample anxiety to be lucid.

Dramatic Genres

The Idea of a Theater offers a reappraisal of some of the principles of dramatic composition proposed in Aristotle's *Poetics*. There is no ignoring Aristotle, whose shadow covered France even before it spilt over England. English translations should be read with the relentless

John Jones's *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy* as a ready gloss. The *Poetics* as we have it is in obvious need of authorial revision, but its ambiguities have increased its employability. It is the first of countless genre studies, the majority of them ingrown and thesis-ridden. Pickard-Cambridge's *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* links the development of the kinds of drama to the origins of the theatre. For the rest, E. H. Mikhail's list of writings on *Comedy and Tragedy* will give an idea of the size of the field. W. M. Dixon's summarizing book on *Tragedy* is unusually helpful, and Northrop Frye's *A Natural Perspective*, despite its basically Shakespearian theme, is a stimulating commentary on contrasting techniques of comedy. The Michel and Sewall anthology of modern essays on *Tragedy* is well chosen, as is Paul Lauter's collection of *Theories of Comedy*. Such gatherings are made in the knowledge that literary departments throughout the world are committed to genre study. One of the reasons for this is that genre study gives the appearance of exclusiveness without actually rejecting anything; and it is, in fact, the very permissiveness of genre study, and its openness to the idiosyncrasies of particular teachers or critics, that cause student confusion. It is the normal conclusion of scholars that definitions of comedy or tragedy have to be modified in the light of each new comedy or tragedy. The search, then, is for areas of lasting agreement, not for eventual definition; and this search is properly conducted in two books in the Critical Idiom series, Clifford Leech's *Tragedy* and W. Moelwyn Merchant's *Comedy*, both cautious, both containing selective bibliographies, and both short.

REFERENCE BOOKS

Reference books generally explain themselves in their titles. Encyclopedias form one group. Phyllis Hartnoll's *The Oxford Companion to the Theatre* is invaluable. Beside it, Gassner and Quinn's excellent *Reader's Encyclopedia of World Drama* looks ready-made, and the superbly illustrated *Enciclopedia dello spettacolo* almost gaudy. This Italian work is, in fact, a massive scholarly work. Any of these volumes will serve to demonstrate how slight and London-based a book is John Russell Taylor's over-used *Penguin Dictionary of the Theatre*.

Among primarily biographical works, the eighteenth-century Baker's *Biographia Dramatica* holds its own. As finally revised in 1812, its first volume is divided into two parts giving an alphabetical list and critical account of all known (and several by now entirely unknown) British and Irish dramatists, while the last two volumes

give brief comments on their plays. Thus: 'CYMBELINE, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN. A Tragedy, written by Shakespeare, with some alterations by Charles Marsh. 8vo. 1755. Though Mr. Marsh was not at that time a magistrate, the dulness he displayed in the present undertaking, afforded strong presumptions of his future rise to a seat on the bench at Guildhall, Westminster.' The entry on Shakespeare's own *Cymbeline*, burdened with 'absurdities in point of time and place, which the rigid rules of dramatic law do not now admit with so much impunity as at the time when the original author of *Cymbeline* was living', is typical in its prime concern to identify the play's sources. In two modern works of reference, actors take pride of place. Edwin Nungezer's *A Dictionary of Actors* gives full contemporary references for all known English actors until the closing of the theatres in 1642. It is to be supplemented by *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers and Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660-1800*, edited by P. Highfill and others. Last in this group are John Parker's volumes *Who's Who in the Theatre*, primarily valuable for their biographical references, but useful guides also to playhouses and places of performance in London and New York and to the casts of plays performed in those cities.

Among bibliographies listing writings about the theatre, none is more detailed than *English Theatrical Literature 1559-1900*, in which Arnott and Robinson have incorporated the earlier work of the fine theatrical scholar, R. W. Lowe. *A Bibliography of Theatre Arts Publications in English*, by B. F. Dukore, is more strictly utilitarian, as are the lists published in each issue of *Theatre Quarterly*. (Simon Trussler, who compiles these lists, explains and defends his new classification system for a comprehensive Bibliography of Theatre Studies in *Theatre Quarterly*, 2, no. 6 (April-June 1972).) The more specialized aims of C. J. Stratman's *Bibliography of British Dramatic Periodicals, 1720-1960* and R. B. Vowles's *Dramatic Theory: a Bibliography* declare themselves.

Stratman was a tireless theatrical bibliographer. His *Bibliography of English Printed Tragedy, 1565-1900* supplements W. W. Greg's monumental *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*. Alfred Harbage's *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700* arranges chronologically the known performances of plays, gives the dates of their first and last editions, and lists the companies under whose auspices they were first performed. Also useful in tracking down the texts of plays is G. W. Bergquist's index to the microprint collection of *Three Centuries of English and American Plays*, which deals with

English drama between 1500 and 1800. The various volumes of *The London Stage 1660-1800* add detail to accuracy, and the checklist of plays that occupies the final volume of Allardyce Nicoll's revised *History of English Drama 1660-1900* is a basic reference, and one that takes into account performance as well as publication of plays.

Finally, two anthologies that are virtually works of reference—A. M. Nagler's collection of *Sources of Theatrical History*, admirably illustrated, and Barrett H. Clark's gathering of *European Theories of the Drama*, which includes a remarkable proportion of the seminal work since Aristotle.

THEATRE HISTORY AND PRACTICE

Theatre History

James Arnott ends a resourceful essay on 'Theatre History' with a timely reminder: 'Drama uses not only words but also a second language of theatrical conventions and social modes, the dictionary of which is history.' That history is not, of course, merely English, and no student of drama can afford to be insular. Four large works, all copiously illustrated, attempt an account of the whole development of the theatre. For readers of Italian, Silvio d'Amico's four-volume *Storia del teatro drammatico* is certainly the best. Heinz Kindermann's *Theatergeschichte Europas* is more laborious and much longer, the kind of scholarship to which the adjective 'German' has been half-admiringly attached. The two English works, Allardyce Nicoll's *The Development of the Theatre* and Bamber Gascoigne's *World Theatre*, are restricted to a single volume, and have to rely heavily on illustration to extend their reference. They are, nevertheless, sound and useful. So, more modestly still, is Richard Southern's *The Seven Ages of the Theatre*, in which seven crucial phases in the history of the theatre are scrutinized with a stage-manager's eye for inconsistencies. The dramatic and historical judgements of Hugh Hunt's *The Live Theatre* are too simple, and it is a pity that there are not more chapters in which Hunt discusses the staging of the plays of the past in the modern theatre. It is here that he does his best writing.

Attempts to write a comprehensive history of the drama have been less successful. Despite the fact that he is possibly the only Englishman with a right to have written it, Allardyce Nicoll's *World Drama from Aeschylus to Anouilh* is not a masterwork. Even the general histories of the English drama, like Nicoll's own *British Drama*, are critically unadventurous. G. Wilson Knight's *The Golden Labyrinth* is

an exception. Much too quirky to count among his major work, it has the characteristic relishing of opinion and gleeful riding of hobby-horses (Dionysus, Byron, and bisexuality are favourites here). The seminal studies of the English stage and its drama have restricted themselves historically, E. K. Chambers and Glynne Wickham to the medieval and Tudor period, G. E. Bentley to the Jacobean and Caroline, the volumes of *The London Stage* (edited by E. L. Avery and others) to the period from 1660 to 1800, and Allardyce Nicoll to that and a hundred and thirty years more. Their most important antecedent was the work of a little-known clergyman named John Genest who in 1832 provided *Some Account of the English Stage, from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830*, a ten-volume monument to the energy of amateur enthusiasm. Strangely perhaps, one intriguing minor aspect of theatre history, censorship, has not yet received comprehensive treatment. Until it does, Richard Findlater's *Banned!* is a convenient summary.

Stage Design

The increasing prominence of scenery on the English stage has been well documented by Glynne Wickham (in the volumes mentioned above), Lily B. Campbell, Allardyce Nicoll, and Richard Southern. But scenery is only part of a larger subject. The American designer Robert Edmond Jones, writing in 1941, anticipates the time when the designer can 'turn his attention away from the problem of creating stage settings to the larger and far more engrossing problem of creating stages'. Gordon Craig was carrying the same idea around with him forty years earlier. It is the gospel of the writings collected in *On the Art of the Theatre*. Craig was an immoderate man whose articulate self-esteem divided the theatrical world into disciples and enemies. His vision of theatre, though, was splendid and prophetic. There is an old debate about his debt to the Swiss artist Adolphe Appia. Lee Simonson, in his turbulent critique of stage design *The Stage is Set*, is in no doubt. He dismisses Craig as a day-dreamer and plagiarist, and calls the first 120 pages of Appia's *Music and the Art of the Theatre* 'nothing less than the text-book of modern stage-craft that gave it both a new method of approaching its problems and a new solution'. In a later essay, *The Work of Living Art*, Appia makes a clear statement of a recurrent twentieth-century theme. 'It is characteristic of theatre reform', he writes, 'that all serious effort is instinctively directed towards the *mise en scène*.' From Appia and Craig, through Yeats and Stanislavsky with both of whom Craig worked, through Meyerhold, Brecht, and Artaud, and on to the

Living Theatre, Brook, and Grotowski, the instinctive concern with the *mise en scène* gathers new dimensions. Its documentation would be necessarily incomplete without the extensive illustration in such studies as Bablet's *Esthétique générale du décor de théâtre de 1870 à 1914*, Macgowan and Jones's *Continental Stagecraft*, Hume and Fuerst's *Twentieth Century Stage Decoration*, Moussinac's *The New Movement in the Theatre*, Haincaux's two volumes *Stage Design throughout the World since 1935* and *Stage Design throughout the World since 1950*, the first volume of *Les Voies de la création théâtrale* (edited by Jean Jacquot), in which Grotowski's version of *The Constant Prince* is presented in astonishing visual detail, and James Roose-Evans's *Experimental Theatre*, whose disappointing text is rescued by its provocative illustration. The talk of scenic revolution in the twentieth century has often depended on an underrating of the nineteenth century's achievements. The work particularly but not uniquely of Grotowski brings home to me how much has been effected, rather, by the displacement of the audience.

Theatres

Audiences are normally very obedient. They go where they are put. Where that is will depend on the shape and dimensions of the place of performance. Ritual, we can be sure, preceded plays, and plays preceded playhouses. The first purpose-built English theatre was erected in 1576, and the eager search for documentary evidence about this building and its immediate successors has produced a number of special studies. A pioneer among these was T. F. Ordish's pleasantly antiquarian *Early London Theatres*. Later work includes G. F. Reynolds's inquiry into *The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theatre, 1605-25*, and an unavoidably but intelligently speculative attempt by C. Walter Hodges to describe Shakespeare's more famous playhouse, *The Globe Restored*. Hodges may usefully be complemented by Bernard Beckerman's resourceful application of available evidence in *Shakespeare at the Globe, 1599-1609*, and by three more general studies, A. M. Nagler's *Shakespeare's Stage*, Andrew Gurr's *The Shakespearean Stage*, and T. J. King's iconoclastic *Shakespearean Staging, 1599-1642*. The fortunes of the playhouse in other periods have not been studied so intensely. There is not even a detailed scholarly account of the whole history of Drury Lane or Covent Garden to stand in place of Nicoll or the volumes of *The London Stage*. Mander and Mitchenson provide a lot of information in *The Theatres of London* and *London's Lost Theatres*, and Diana Howard's *London Theatres and Music Halls, 1850-1950* is excellently

documented. Less scholarly, but full of insights, is Errol Sherson's *London's Lost Theatres of the Nineteenth Century*.

The whole history of London's various theatres until 1900 is surveyed by Barton Baker in *The London Stage*, a cautious book that is unfortunate to share its title with the massive American work. Stephen Joseph's *The Story of the Playhouse in England* is the best short general survey, a less superficial book than it may seem. Joseph is rare among theatre historians in the possession of a lively and practical knowledge of architecture. It has taken a long time to interest architects in the careful documentation of the English playhouse. D. C. Mullin's survey of theatre architecture from the Renaissance to the present is an encouraging portent, as are some of the better essays in the important French collection edited by Jean Jacquot, *Le Lieu théâtral à la Renaissance*. In *Theatre of the World* Frances Yates is more concerned with the conceptual linking of the Elizabethan theatres to the Vitruvian classical theatre and to patterns of Renaissance thought. But whether the approach is architectural or philosophical, all roads lead through Italy by way of the proscenium arch.

Places of performance inter-react with styles of performance, and the middle decades of the twentieth century have seen notable shifts in both. Some of these are described in Mordecai Gorelik's *New Theatres for Old*, Stephen Joseph's *New Theatre Forms*, and the collected essays, edited by Bablet and Jacquot, of *Le Lieu théâtral dans la société moderne*. The proscenium arch, if not dead, is restless.

Directors and Directing

Kalman Burnim boldly calls his book on Garrick *David Garrick, Director*, since he is primarily concerned to show the extent of Garrick's control over the performances in which he starred; and certainly the 'director' did not emerge suddenly in the person of the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen, Stanislavsky, or even the Mr. Barrymore who was credited on the playbill with the invention and *production* of the Drury Lane pantomime in 1828. E. B. Watson's *Sheridan to Robertson* is a pioneering and original exposition of the English background to the director's rise, and Norman Marshall's *The Producer and the Play* a tolerable description of its consequences. Marshall is primarily concerned with England, but he cannot afford to neglect the vast influence of Stanislavsky on twentieth-century directors. Stanislavsky's ideas are usefully summarized in David Magarshack's introduction to *Stanislavsky on the Art of the Stage*, and partly illustrated in the translated production 'scores' of *The Seagull* and *Othello*.

Stanislavskian concern with the detail of the *mise en scène* was fervent in the first half of the twentieth century. There was a sense of mission in, for example, Granville-Barker's Shakespearian productions which gives body to his famous *Prefaces* and to the comparatively neglected *The Exemplary Theatre*. As modified by English theatrical practice, the ideas of Stanislavsky became the sound basis of English directorial techniques, a new orthodoxy which can be perceived in Hugh Hunt's *Old Vic Prefaces* and John Fernald's *Sense of Direction*, though it is more easily recognized in the representative productions of the major English theatrical companies. Michel Saint-Denis proposes a 'rediscovery of style' as the key to twentieth-century reform, and behind this reform stands Stanislavsky. Other major directors have worked and written in conscious reaction. *Meyerhold on Theatre* and *Brecht on Theatre* present a compilation of the ideas of two of these, usefully introduced and glossed by the translators but without the advantage of authorial synthesis and refinement. Even so they are more lucid than any of Artaud's inspirational but oracular writings. His *The Theatre and its Double* is the chief theatrical product of the age of the manifesto. English directors, having on the whole less to shout about, have been generally more reticent than the Europeans. Peter Brook is rare in having participated fully in Continentally derived movements. *The Empty Space* expresses his sense of a threatened theatre, evolving even as it decays. I find it a profoundly provocative book. Less profound but almost equally provocative is Tyrone Guthrie's *A Life in the Theatre*, which grandly scatters autobiography and opinion. Guthrie, like Brook, has been prominent in the debates about stage shape and actor-audience relationships, perhaps the major common concerns of the modern director.

Actors and Acting

The literature of acting inevitably overlaps that of directing and design. It provides a sometimes fascinating and never negligible commentary on the plays to which it relates. The views of the performers themselves are collected by Cole and Chinoy in *Actors on Acting*. In addition, Colley Cibber's *Apology* and Macready's *Diaries* have already earned themselves a special place in literary and dramatic studies. Almost unsung, Walter Donaldson's *Recollections of an Actor* gives an uncommonly accurate picture of the provincial stock companies and the life of the lesser actor. Donaldson made his stage début in 1807, but his book sheds light on provincial conditions from the mid-eighteenth century to the rise of the repertory movement. He is less garrulous and self-involved than Tate Wilkinson